CHAPTER II

INTEGRATION, DEVELOPMENT AND POLICY MAKERS: A CRITICAL OVERVIEW

2.1 INTEGRATION

Integration is a fundamental challenge for every plural society. It is an ongoing process which is more challenging for a vast, complex and plural society like India. The process by which historical communities are brought together is known as political integration and when it takes place at the national level (as distinct from regional or international levels) it is best described as national integration.¹

As a concept, integration is the coming together of diverse elements or different entities into one recognizable identity. Historically and conceptually, a nation-state is born as a result of disintegration of an empire or through a process of integration of different values, cultural strains, social groups, tribes and races etc. into one people under a single polity.² In either case, disintegration or integration must precede the emergence of the nation-state. Unless diverse elements are integrated into one whole, there is no nation. However, integration into one whole does not imply annihilation of various identities. It only means their getting subsumed into or under a higher unity.³

There are debates on the conceptual understanding of the terms like nation, national integration and nation-state. To understand the

³ Ibid., p. 2.
process of integration, it is essential to know the phenomenon of nationalism and the terms like nation and nation-state. It is argued here that in Indian context no serious efforts have been made either by successive national leadership or political parties to preserve and promote economic and emotional aspects of national integration.

There is still disagreement on what constitutes or what should constitute national mainstream and national culture in India. It is further argued that any attempt to define them to exclude those in the periphery (not only in geographical but economic and cultural senses) is dangerous and also against the fundamental fact of Indian society and culture which is multi-lingual, multi-religious, multi-ethnic and heterogeneous.

Nationalism has been considered as the most successful political ideology in human history. It has caused the political map of the world to be completely redrawn and now the entire world is divided between nation-states. However, nearly all of these states contain ethnic or cultural minorities within their borders that are only imperfectly integrated into the national society. The process, problems and frequent failures of national integration are issues of central importance in the contemporary world.¹

The basic characteristic of the modern nation is its modernity. All the states of the globe are today officially nations. All liberation movements and national agitations disrupt the oldest nation-states. And nobody can possibly deny the growing and sometimes dramatic impact of nationalist or ethnic politics.² The ethnic nationalism or

---


minority nationalism had shaken political integration theories and the existing political structures had been questioned.6

For most part of human history, humanity was divided into small tribes. As populations increased and communications improved, these tribes merged into larger social groups but nations are relatively recent and relatively artificial creations7. With few exceptions, modern nations are an amalgam of historical communities which possessed a fairly clear sense of separate identity in the past but have been brought together by various economic, social and political developments.8

Critics argue that national liberation movements in the Third World were in theory modeled on the nationalism of the West. But in practice the states they attempted to construct were generally the opposite of the ethnically and linguistically homogeneous entities of the West considered as the standard form of nation-state. However, both (i.e. in the West and Third World) were typically unificatory as well as emancipatory.9

It is argued by some that the nationalist movements of the late twentieth century are essentially negative or rather divisive. Thus, the insistence on ethnicity and linguistic differences, each or both sometimes combined with religion. Most of them reject the modern modes of political organization, both national and supranational. They seem to be reaction of weakness and fear, attempts to erect barricades to keep at bay the forces of the modern world.10 Whatever

8 Ibid., p. 8.
9 For instance see, Hobsbawm, E.J., op. cit., p. 164.
10 Ibid.
the views or the reasons may be, integration is an ongoing process and is still a great challenge for plural societies like India.

The peculiar and fascinating about India is that diversities of all sorts are to be found in India. These diversities are not merely in time and space but even in small towns, sometimes across one and the same street. People are not merely separated by time, distance, language and religion but also by habits and modes of thoughts. The most characteristic of Indian reality has been that of a special pluralism situation leading to unity and strength. It is believed that in Indian ethos, unity does not demand uniformity and diversity becomes the greatest source of strength for national integration.

National integration signifies cohesion, but no fusion, unity but not uniformity, reconciliation, solidarity, but not regimentation of the discrete segments of the people constituting a political community of states. Thus, there is space for existence and promotion of different identities within the larger and higher entity. National integration is described as “an emotional and mental bond which binds all of us irrespective of caste, creed, color, race, religion and region. In reality, it is this common ideal whose intensity in the passions of the people, determines our real strength and true might”.

There are certain elements of the process of national integration. The first is the process of state building which has

---

12 For example see, Kashyap, Subhash C., op. cit., p. 2.
occurred in European states from the twelfth century onwards, in the United States, Canada and Australia in the nineteenth century, in the new states of the Third World since the Second World War. Next is the creation of symbols of national identity such as head of State, a flag and a national anthem. For legitimating of the regime, the next step is the establishment of national political institutions.

The next essential step in the integration process is the creation of an educational system. No modern state can afford to neglect the control of the educational system as an instrument of socialization. The school curricula everywhere have been shaped to serve nationalistic and patriotic ends. There are also debates and controversies within the nations about the contents of such curricula. The next element is the development of national pride.

The above elements may not be present, or may have not occurred in all the modern nation-states. Lack of all of them or any one of them may create problem in the process of national integration. The main obstacle to the development of national integration is the existence of ethnic or cultural minorities within the states who resist integrative tendencies. These minorities are partially integrated into the larger national community by two types of process, one unplanned and the other resulting from deliberate decision.

The unplanned process, generally known as social mobilization is a consequence of industrialization. The planned measures to

---

16 For a discussion on this and the above elements see, ibid., pp. 8-10.
17 For instance in India these elements/process took place in a different environment from those of West because of her complex diversity and colonial past. The developments during colonial period and national movement had a deep impact on these elements in Independent India.
18 Birch, Anthony H., op. cit., p. 10.
integrate cultural minorities normally begin with the adoption a single official language for political, legal and commercial transactions. There are rival sociological models of the integrative process, one maintaining that the assimilation of minorities is an inevitable in the process of modernization. Therefore by implication it is desirable. The other maintains that the process involves exploitation of the minorities by the majority and can appropriately be described as internal colonialism. The third model depicts the cost of social mobilization and national integration as being not so much exploitation as isolation.

National integration is partly a by-product of other social and economic developments, partly the result of deliberate government policies. Such deliberate policies have a great influence on the national integration and unity. Thus, the narrow perspective of national integration in India entertained by central politicians violently clash with the intense nationalism of Northern and North-Eastern peripheries which is rooted not only in cultural and psychological but also increasingly in concrete economic grievances.¹⁹

Any proposal to decentralize or to re-conceptualize the State as a truly federal entity goes against the very gains of most post-colonial states in the Third World.²⁰ The relentless centralization and ruthless unprincipled intervention by the centre in the state politics have been the primary causes of troubles in Punjab and elsewhere in India.²¹

---


There are generally four arguments in favour of the process of national integration. The first is that it is a historical necessity being part of the unfolding of the world spirit or march of history. The second is that integration in the form of social assimilation would be beneficial to the minorities who were assimilated and would be good for them. The third is that representative government should be based on feelings of national unity. The last argument is that national integration is the only secure basis of political authority.22

These arguments would be disputed by many liberals in 1980s. The widely accepted assumptions of modern theories—of progressive integration of peoples and of cultural assimilation largely driven by the process of economic development and modernization—were seriously flawed.23 The capitalist growth in independent India has shown strong tendencies towards self perpetuating unevenness both region-wise and community-wise.24

There is widespread feeling in most sub-national units in India that they are discriminated against, in fact victimized.25 Hence, it is argued that in the Third World countries capitalism does not any longer unify and amalgamate people but divides them and generates separatist tendencies and aspirations.26

A few conservatives regretted the loss of local customs, but liberals and socialists regarded assimilation into national society as necessary aspects of progress. Nation-building was looked upon as a

22 For a discussion on these arguments see, Birch, Anthony H., op. cit., pp. 37-40.
25 Nandy, Ashish, op. cit., p. 28.
desirable activity. The steps taken to promote nation-building can be divided into two categories. On the one hand, there are direct initiatives taken to foster integration and a sense of national identity and pride. On the other hand, there are reactive measures taken by governments to minimize the political effects of ethnic and cultural cleavages within the society.

National integration is regarded as an integral part of the process of modernization and nation-building. It involves a consolidation of the national identity and its goal is the harmonizing of the activities of diverse groups with each group retaining its identity, building together varied interests. In short, national integration requires unity while recognizing diversity.

Nation-building is of vital importance. The problem of nation-building is common to all of new nations which include India who got independence after World War II. The chief characteristics of these countries are the altered or distorted nature of the indigenous economy and educated elite with a culture that was sharply separated from those of the masses. They are beset with the problems of maintaining their political stability and rapid economic development among others.

Before we discuss the process of nation-building and problems of national integration in India, it will be interesting to examine the historical background. British colonialism had influenced different areas of the sub-continent in different ways. The uneven diffusion of administrative, infra-structure means of communication and

---

education affected the growth and development pattern. The structural imbalance of the colonial pattern aggravated the traditional jealousies and rivalries of antagonistic groups. ³⁰

Imperialism in India was ruled by dividing people. British brought the vast country with all its staggering internal diversities under one unified and centralized administration. British conquest and consolidation had insidious influence on the political and economic life of the country. Despite the negative impact, it is true those political institutions that existed before British consolidation could not bring about any structural changes in the socio-economic life. ³¹

It is argued by some that since there was no historic sense, the sense of nationhood that is object of history also was rather vague or non-existent before British came to India. Kingdoms and republics were in existence but not a national consciousness. Thus, politically India was not one entity though religious leaders saw it that a spiritual unity was always maintained. ³²

The constitutional developments did indicate that complete powers were vested absolutely in the hands of Governor General. These sweeping powers were for the first time exercised by a single authority for almost the whole of the country that was under the British. British formed the Provinces in a manner which would serve their needs and colonial interests.

---

³¹ Seshadri, K., Indian Politics: Then and Now: Essays in Historical Perspective, Delhi, Pragatee Prakashan, 1976, p. 4.
³² Ibid., p. 13.
The Hindus-Muslim cleavages were fostered and encouraged. The various horizontal cleavages in the post-independence era like the linguistic and regional identities were not fully contemplated. The caste cleavages and linguistic affinities were still dormant due to the all embracing nature of the opposition to an alien rule. British policy of divide and rule and communal politics led to the partition of India in 1947.33

When British left India in 1947, the country was not only partitioned but faced challenging task of integrating the Princely States. Kashmir problem which almost shaped the course of relations between India and Pakistan and has influenced the politics in these two countries can be traced back to unsettled problems due to partition. Indeed it was a great achievement of nationalist leadership who successfully integrated under one nation the various units including hundreds of Princely States including Manipur.34

The highest value in the minds of the founding fathers was that of building a strong and united India and an integrated nation. The debates in the Constituent Assembly and its Committees would show that nation-building as the chief aspiration and the goal permeated the entire exercise of constitution making.35 The Union Power Committee was unanimous in its view that it would be injurious to the interests of the country to provide for a weak central authority. With the integration of more than 600 Princely States, the number of

33 For a discussion on the process of integration under British and the role of communal politics in the partition see, ibid. pp. 4-21. Also on communalism, British policy of divide and rule, and subsequent partition of India see, Chandra, Bipan, Mukherjee, Mirdula, etc., India's Struggle for Independence 1857-1947, New Delhi, Penguin Books, 1989, pp.398-504.


35 Kashyap, Subhash C., op. cit., p. 2.
state units in the Indian Union could be brought to manageable proportions.

As described by Article 1 of the Constitution, the emphasis was to convey the fact that Union was a declaration by the Constituent Assembly. The predominant concern of the founding fathers as well as of the various Commissions and Committees since independence to consider reorganization of states or Union-State Relations has been that of the unity and integrity of India.36

The ultimate goal as stated in the Preamble to the Constitution of India is to be that of “securing the dignity of the individual and unity of the nation”. The Constitution envisions a new social order free from communal conflicts and based on justice social, economic and political. It visualizes a polity under which laws would not discriminate between citizens on the grounds of religion, caste or the like. It is only through a spirit of common brotherhood and fraternity that could help to build national unity in a highly pluralistic and heterogeneous society.

The current tensions and strains of the Indian polity are essentially a function of the unfinished tasks of nation-building and inadequacy of the strategies evolved since independence to correct the inequities and distortions embedded in the Indian polity during the period of colonial rule.37

National integration should not be confused with centralization. In fact, the tendency towards greater and greater centralization of political and economic power in the contemporary India is becoming a serious impediment in the path of national

36 Ibid., p. 3.
integration. A centralized power structure is incapable of either reducing inter-regional disparities in development or contributing to the healthy flowering of regional cultures. It can only breed and thrive upon the chauvinism of the larger as well as the separatism of the smaller regional or sub-regional entities.38

Viewed from the Centre, the peripheral forces have always tended to assume threatening and dangerous proportions. It is only through a peripheral perspective that the real implications and significance of regionalism could be assessed properly.39 It is found that the non-juridical, non-statutory primordial and parochial factors in the growth and development of regionalism in India were sadly ignored by the Constitution. As a result of the Constitutional process, regionalization also commenced. The regionalism was inspired not merely by primordial factors but perhaps the most significant among these by the prevailing economic conditions of different regional communities.40

Thus, regionalism is a chaotic response to the dysfunctional nature of the political system. The regional disparity at the national or within a state is a reality. The situation is complicated because of electoral politics and political mobilization based on primordial identities. In the process, the myths of domination or discrimination would tend to open the cleavages resulting in counter reaction.41

The "Concept India" has gathered more misconceptions than it could shed off. Many scholars always conveniently forget that the ethnically homogenous Aryan India which mostly concentrates in the

38 Ibid. p.204.
40 Ibid., pp. 463-464.
Gangetic belt was and has been far smaller than the British India and much less than the present India which is the result of integration of many locally or regionally homogenous but nationally heterogeneous states and native states. 42

Indian federation is very much an historical necessity and the "Concept India" is composite, pluralistic and at no point of history has it been unitary and ethnically homogenous.43 In larger Indian context, the ideology of revivalism with its calls for Indianization of Muslims and its identification of the term national mainstream with Hindi, Hindu and Hindustan is pregnant with far reaching consequences.44 It is a perversion of the concept of nationalism, a negation of the principle of Unity in Diversity and repudiation of the pluralistic approach to national consolidation.

The federal nature of the polity and also federal aspects of the Constitution with division of powers between states and centre and disputes regarding distribution of natural resources between states pose yet more intractable problems. 45 It is argued by some that the existing Constitutional arrangements have given legal legitimacy to exploitation of all kinds, suppression of the small nationalities and accordingly, majority tyranny and ethnic injustice have become the approved values.46

Multiplicity of perspectives is inevitable in a country as big, diverse and hierarchical as India and they all have to be taken into

43 Ibid., p. 250.
45 Seshadri, K., op. cit, p. 23. For similar views and also consequences of the problem see, Haqqi, S.A.H., op. cit., pp. 359-360.
46 For instance see, Naorem, Sanajaoba, op, cit., p. 251.
note of in nation-building.\textsuperscript{47} India’s efforts at nation-building may be regarded as one of the most successful attempts by a new nation, and only the short comings tend to be highlighted instead of being seen as growing pains.\textsuperscript{48}

Indian model of state and nation-building is a powerful one, given its undertaking “to simultaneously attain unity, democracy, development and justice and autonomy vis-à-vis the external world. It has reasonably achieved the first two but it badly miscalculated on the third goal i.e. development. This in turn seriously affected the fourth without whose minimum attainment no social entity has ever survived. The same applies to the goal of autonomy”.\textsuperscript{49}

The Indian model of nation-building is indeed peculiar and in some ways unprecedented. National integrity did not form the background when India entered the state of independent nationhood. It was something that had yet to be achieved. India’s nation builders adopted a strategy of transformation that was open, democratic and based on acceptance of diversity and dissent. This was at once bold and necessary, bold in deign but necessary because there was no other way of building a nation out of these diverse elements. India had to pursue both nationhood and economic development simultaneously.

Notwithstanding the process of modernization, industrialization and democratization (or rather because of them), the regional and religious communities and weaker sections of society have become more than ever conscious of their identity and communal interests.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{47} For a detailed discussion on the process of nation-building in India, its strength, problems and solutions see, Srinivas, M.N., op. cit., pp. 9-36.

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., p. 11.


\textsuperscript{50} Haqqi, S.A.H., op. cit., p. 359.
The rapid politicization of every section of the country's population was one of the long term effects of adult franchise. However, it did lead to much populist rhetoric and raised the expectations of the people.51

When India became independent, it faced four major tasks: national integration, economic growth, social justice and political democracy.52 Of these national integration was considered to be the paramount goal, given the country's long history of disunity and fragmentation. The approach to national integration was on the lines that made the other three goals necessary. Indeed these three defined the strategy of integration and provided the building blocks of India's peculiar model of integration- a model rooted in Indian social reality and responsive to India's specific historical situation.

This design was laid out during the long nationalist movement itself. Gandhi was the chief architect of the Indian nation. The historic transformation of India with a modern state began with independence in 1947. The grim experience of partition strengthened the resolve of the leadership to secure and preserve national unity against all threats and to build centripetal forces. This was despite the acceptance of a federal constitution largely through a strong central authority. Many other divisions besides communal, linguistic, regional, religious and almost all major issues of integration were still unresolved at the time of independence.

As the system developed apparently opposite but in fact complementary developments gave shape to this design. There was increasing role of electoral and party politics at all levels and in all sectors of society and the growing salience and presence of the

52 Kothari, Rajni, op.cit., pp.119-120.
government in social and economic spheres. It was under Jawaharlal Nehru that the new system was crystallized. Indian model of state presents a different conception of unity, true more to India's own traditions than to any prevailing theories of development. The main characteristic of the system was its centripetality through open counter action: a strong and visible centre towards which various peripheries were drawn through the competitive mechanisms of democratic politics.

The government with its power, bureaucratic apparatus, extensive patronage and central role in the economy came to be the prime focus of the new India. The three channels of integration were government, the Congress and Nehru who provided cohesion and centrality to the whole enterprise. This authoritative convergence of government, party, and personal power into a common centre is what enabled the competitive system to integrate the great diversity and manifold conflicts that characterized India.

The issue of performance of the Indian model of state and nation-building is crucial to the very conception of a state and a polity. The performance is the key to legitimacy, the very basis of any state or nation. Because the building of the nation and the state did not precede but coincided with the building of the Indian polity and the system around which that polity was organized.

The prime concern of the leadership was to build a nation and it was based on consensus rather than force. At the same time such a strong basis of national unity was utilized to suppress separatist and secessionists tendencies, regional and communal fanaticism and extremist defiance of the democratic framework.53

53 For details of this and above see ibid., pp. 119-138.
However, no systematic effort was made to ensure that lowest placed would be able to participate and benefit from the process of national building and development. Distributive justice was not built into the nation-building design and into the development model. An unjust state can only survive on the basis of repression, but repression undermines the basic unity of a nation. Failure to perform on the distributive dimension will therefore produce a state that has ceased to be a nation.

There is argument that the conception of unity in India is increasingly based on denying legitimacy to the diversities and excluding large segments of the population from the national mainstream and in the process narrowing the social and community base of Indian nation.\textsuperscript{54} The state in Indian model is no longer seeking to become autonomous and self-reliant but seeking to be part of dominant structure of the global establishment. The new framework of national unity and integration that emerges is the thinking is one in which a privileged class with an increasing narrow social base, hijacks and monopolizes the nation. It excludes the rest of the society and in fact defines it out of the ambit of the nations, indeed considers several parts thereof as anti-national and thus illegitimate.\textsuperscript{55} This has been rationalized in the name of fighting imagined enemies and creating the myth of destabilization and threats to national unity.

Thus, nation-building and political integration are not ends in themselves. “There is nothing so sacrosanct about this endeavor if it does not mean materially, culturally and spiritually something more than merely a slogan”.\textsuperscript{56} No political integration would endure on the


\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., p 509.

\textsuperscript{56} Seshadri, K., op. cit., p. 27.
basis of wide disparities in wealth. It is meaningless to talk of integration to a starving man.\textsuperscript{57}

Whether or not the people understand the implications of problem like demands for separate state, or secession, there is always a tendency to declare them as nation’s unity is at stake, while the actual picture is that an anti thesis is emerging to polarization of wealth, unbridled corruption and political and administrative immorality.\textsuperscript{58}

"Unity in Diversity" has been the characteristic feature of Indian polity and culture and its translation or incorporation in government policies in both letter and spirit should facilitate and accelerate the process of adjustment and accommodation between the different groups and regions.\textsuperscript{59} Strict and steadfast adherence to the pluralistic model of development alone can ensure the development of a healthy nationalism and a new national culture. Cultural bodies, school education, cinema, mass media and press must play more positive roles and contribute towards the process of national integration and the development of national culture.

Thus, the conceptual understanding of nation, nation-state and national integration and even nationalism is influenced by the experiences of Western liberal societies. These societies are more or less homogenous in terms of language, religion, culture and ever race compared to most of developing societies like India which are heterogeneous and complex with colonial past. The problem of national integration is not a unique phenomenon confined to newly independent nations. It is an ongoing process and a challenge for

\begin{footnotes}
\item[57] Ibid., p. 27.
\item[58] Ibid., p. 162.
\item[59] Haqqi, S.A.H., op. cit., p. 362.
\end{footnotes}
every modern plural society.

The manifestation of the problem of national integration varies from one society to another. It exists in different forms in U.K., Canada, Spain etc. It is more complex and challenging in a vast, diverse and plural society like India. Within India, the integration of isolated and landlocked North-East region which is characterized by pluralism is even more difficult. This aspect in the context of North East India has been discussed already in the previous Chapter I. Thus, the extent of the problem depends on the complexity of ethnic relations, the history of the country and the prevailing socio-economic and political conditions.

Any model of nation-building or the process of national integration which are successful in one society may not be a success in another society. Nation-building and modernization in many of the newly independent nations were inspired by Western liberal models and success of Soviet model. Some of them even implanted these successful models in their respective countries. India had the unique combination of the elements of both of these two models.

However, in the long run they are bound to have conflicts because these successful models were developed on relatively homogenous societies which had existed as nations for longer period of time. In contrast, these new nations become independent only after World War II and are characterized by multi-pluralism with colonial past. Even the relatively successful Indian model began to feel the heat particularly since the mid-1970s. Since then, national integration and unity in diversity, national unity etc. all has become more of slogans with serious challenges of various types. Diversity has been increasingly sacrificed in the name of unity and integrity.
In Indian context, conceptualization of nation, nation-state, nationalism and national integration is lacking. Even today there is multiplicity of perspectives on the nation-building and debates on what constitutes national mainstream and national culture. What is disturbing is the attempt to define Indian nationhood and national culture on the basis of one religion, one culture and one nation. There have been movements for separation and secession which are still continuing in some parts of the country. There are divisions and conflicts based on religion, caste and region.

The founding fathers had the vision of a strong and united India which is reflected in the Constitution of 1950. However, it was to be achieved through a powerful central government and planned economy. It essentially involved centralization through the non-constitutional agencies and means. The successive national leadership and governments have failed to achieve economic integration and to remove the major obstacles in the process of national integration. The emotional integration and sense of national pride among all the various groups and individuals have been lacking.

What we have is centralized system in which less powerful as well as minority groups who are often majority in their own areas feel marginalized and discriminated. Disparity in the levels of development within the states and between the states is an unfortunate reality. Primordial identities have been used for political mobilization and for capturing as well as for retaining power, posing a challenge to national integration.

Political integration was achieved in 1947. While some joined in 1949 as in the case of Manipur and Tripura, and Sikkim as late as in 1975. Given the colonial past and partition, her size and diversity India has achieved a considerable success in the nation-building
process and her efforts towards national integration. It is true when compared to other new nations. However, it is only a consolation prize.

Despite more than 50 years of federal polity, democratic functioning and centralized economic planning, the emotional and economic integration still remain as a dream. The ultimate goal must be economic well being of all sections of people and all of them live in harmony with a sense of national pride. Only in such situation we can come closer to the national integration and strong India as dreamt by the founding fathers. Now we will discuss development in its various aspects and in Indian context.

2.2 DEVELOPMENT

Development is a comprehensive term covering almost every aspect of modern life. There have been debates on what constitutes development and how to achieve it. There are various approaches for both defining development and means of achieving it. However, for our purpose, development is conceived as a situation in which people can live with all the basic necessities of life with equal opportunities as well as existence of a feeling of well being by all the people. It aims at the continuous improvement of quality of life. And the State has to ensure such a situation.

Development is a process with several dimensions and numerous inter-linkages for the betterment of the people. It must be seen both as a means and an end, both a process and product. It must aim for transformation of the economic conditions of the people and their well being.

A developed situation means people not only have fulfilled the basic necessities of modern living but equal opportunities are available to all. Each individual and each section of the society
should not feel that they are discriminated against one another. It is both constitutional and moral responsibility of the State to ensure such a situation for its citizens. Failure to provide such a situation means, State has failed in its responsibility and lacks legitimacy. Such a State will face challenge to its authority from those who feel that they are discriminated in sharing the society's scarce resources.

Even though there is debate on the meaning and means of achieving development, there is agreement on the need for progress and development irrespective of any ideology. It is because of the fact that development is a vital need and everyone is aware of the consequences of the lack of development. Before we discuss the Indian situation let us examine the various approaches to development and their relative significance.

Conventional economics equates development with economic development and economic development with large-scale industrialization. It measures the pace of development in terms of the rate of growth of national income. Both mainstream and Marxian economists seem to accept the conventional definition of development. However, there are fundamental disagreements between them on the causes of underdevelopment and policy measures necessary to energize the motors of development.

Mainstream economics believes in the efficiency of market forces in bringing about rapid development and favours the capitalist solution to the economic problems. Marxists on the other hand find the institutional and socio-economic structure of poor countries the most powerful brakes on the motors of development. Therefore, they recommend far reaching socioeconomic and structural changes as necessary preconditions for the generation of growth and

development. Thus, they call for a planned economy in which development is spearheaded by the state.

Among the non-Marxist economists, the neo-classical economists are ardent believers in the efficacy of market forces in bringing about rapid growth. To the developing countries, neo-classical economists recommend deregulation, removal of trade barriers, balanced budgets, reduction of social welfare expenditures, maximum scope for the working of market forces and free flow of foreign capital. Keynesian economists generally assign the state a more interventionist role in the economy. On the whole there is widespread agreement among all kinds both with regard to the definition of development and with regard to the mechanism of the growth process.61

The concept of development can be defined only in terms of the ends of development. Since the desire to improve upon the current circumstances is the motivation behind any process of development, it is imperative that development be defined in terms of qualitative and quantitative changes. Therefore, development is essentially a process through which a change is brought about.62

In may not be totally useful to measure success or otherwise of the process of development only on the indicators like rates of growth of per capita GDP, income, investment and capital formation. Societies being heterogeneous, with unequal distribution of both physical and human resources and skills, a true change involving redistribution of such resources generally results in gains for quite a large number of people at the cost of few. Whatever ends a particular development plan achieves in such an eventuality it may not reflect

61 Ibid., p.10.
the larger interest of a developing society. To devise a plan that satisfies every individual is a very difficult proposition. But without redistribution of resources, it is presumed that no development worth its name is possible.

The configuration of global forces at any moment has a crucial impact on the nature and direction of development plans that recommend themselves to developing countries. The element in the development process is perhaps the most significant element to reckon with in assessing the nature and achievements of national development process in these countries.

Early view of development within the field of development studies undoubtedly stressed catching up with and generally imitating the west. The failure of development in Third World countries together within the post modern critique and trends of globalization are customarily regarded as having given rise to a major impasse in development studies in the 1980s. There has been trend of globalization, the reduction in the importance of the state and associated alienation of the state from civil society.

The issue on which a growing consensus appears to be emerging includes the fact that economic growth is a necessary but not sufficient condition for development. Without redistribution of income and wealth, inequalities are not going to be reduced. Thus, development must be regarded as synonymous with enhancing human rights and welfare, so that self-esteem and self-respect and improving entitlements became central concerns. Because poverty remains the real obstacle to development.

---

63 Ibid. p.3.
65 Ibid. p.2.
The reconstruction of war-torn Europe provided the model for state directed modernization of the new nations. In this model development was largely sociological and political in nature and under-development was defined primarily in terms of differences between rich and poor nations. Development implied the bridging of the gap by means of an imitative process in which less developed countries gradually assumed the qualities of the developed. Marxists essentially shared this perspective.

For structuralism which dominated the early phase of development economics, a certain amount of intervention was considered necessary. This was due to institutional conditions which made growth in poor areas less automatic then it was assumed to be in so called developed countries. From the late 1960s, modernization theory and structuralism were challenged by the Latin American dependencia school which articulated the weak structural position of Third World Countries in the world system.

The 'dependentistas' or neo-Marxist asked for a radical political transformation within these countries as well as delinking of their economies from the world market. With its focus on state-driven industrialization, dependency theory did not differ much from the modernization and structuralist schools with respect to the content of development. In contrast another development, a counter point to the modernist, development was defined as need-oriented, endogenous, self-reliant, and ecologically sound and based on structural transformation.

The interventionist approach was challenged by the rise of neoliberalism in the 1980s, a theoretical shift associated with a deepening of globalization. According to which development was an inherently universal and increasingly global economic process. Development economics was deprived of its autonomous status and
removed from interdisciplinary family. The development problem was seen as primarily domestic, created by rent seeking bureaucrats and corrupt politicians with no blame at all put on the world system.66

After decades of struggle for development, it is increasingly apparent that there has not been any considerable socio-economic progress in many Third World countries. These countries continue to suffer from adverse human conditions such as economic poverty, social inequality, political instability and external dependence. These symptoms of underdevelopment are also becoming permanent features in the former socialist countries. On the other hand the advanced capitalist nations still remain perplexed with fiscal crises, trade deficits, social pathologies, crimes and violence.

At the global level, the problems of unequal world order, ethno-religious conflicts, environmental pollution and ecological disasters also continue to be serious development concerns. These diverse national and international crises of development can be considered to a great extent the manifestations of the failures of the whole development enterprise comprised of various development theories, models, policies, projects, agencies and experts.67

The experiences of the development failure however have not constrained the expansion of the development field. Within the conservative tradition, there emerged various economic growth theories and theories of modernization. The reformist tradition also offered varieties of development theories and models which covered the basic needs approach, the redistribution-with-growth model and the theories of underdevelopment and dependent development. On


the other hand within the radical tradition there evolved different versions of classical Marxist interpretations, neo-Marxist analyses and dependency perspectives.

There appears to be an incongruity between the continuing condition of underdevelopment on the one hand and expanding scope of development theories and policies on the other. This implies the inadequacy and ineffectiveness of such development theories and policies themselves.68 This situation of inadequate development theories and ineffective development policies implies that there is a need for serious rethinking in the field.

Theoretically, the dominant trend underlying the pro-market development policies is the revival of neo-classical economic models as the primary basis of such policies. There has been increasing acceptance of pro-market reforms guided by the neo-classical model that hardly address issues such as inequality, dependence and hegemony. Most Third World countries have apparently changed their development priorities from basic needs and social equality to economic growth and efficiency, from equal world order to free international competition, from economic self-reliance to foreign investment and from cultural identity to global culture industry.69

In the Third World countries, strategies of development in fact has increased income inequality, strengthened the centralized power of the civilian and military bureaucracies and expanded the burden of external debt and dependence. The existing theories and policies of development have failed to accomplish many of their stipulated objectives. They have not made any considerable progress in

68 Ibid., p. x.
69 Ibid., p. xii.
resolving the problems of poverty, social inequality, ethnic and racial conflicts and various forms of international hegemony.70

Budget and trade deficits, urban and industrial crises, crime and violence and environmental and ecological problems are also prevalent in advanced countries. These countries are often considered exemplars of progress and models of success in the mainstream development literature. The experience of contradictory policy outcomes and paradoxical contemporary events pose serious developmental challenges for the Third World Countries.

Globalization as influenced by neo-liberal economic policies has become the new world for mainstream development. Globalism as development ideology implies the growth of a world market with increasing penetration and domination of national economies. In contrast with the interventionist bias of the classical discourse, globalists consider too much government as a systematic fault.71 Good governance is thus defined as less government. In accepting this ideology, the state becomes the disciplining spokesperson of global economic forces rather than the protector against these forces.

This is in contract to the earlier notions of state and development. In the 1950s and 1960s, aid programmes and academic advisors propagated the idea of state bureaucracy as the lead agent for transition to what was known as modernization. Aid agencies favoured large scale projects of industrial and agricultural development which required the guarantee of government involvement. On the side of the new political elite, the idea of state-led development was attractive; it apparently offered a way of

70 Ibid., p. 36.
71 Hettne, Bjorn, op. cit., p.8.
satisfying popular expectations and demonstrating a concern with social justice and development.\textsuperscript{72}

The case for state-led development was not only imitative but also built on a response to local circumstances. Where market institutions and indigenous entrepreneurs were weak, often only state enterprise was capable of investing or taking foreign owned plant. The statist model was quickly subject to criticism in the 1970s and 1980s. Critics challenged the view that public administration could act as an agent of development. They argued that bureaucracies were biased to stability or only incremental changes were anti-development and suppressed entrepreneurial interests. Moreover public sector agencies which on the surface looked like rational bureaucracies in practice often served particular interests.

The 1990s and first decade of the 21st century have seen a shift from simple commitment to market liberalization. Free markets and liberal economic policies are seen now to be important but not enough on their own- markets depend on effective state. Failures in structural adjustment have contributed to a renewed concern with the capacity of states and their support of the institutional conditions within which markets and citizen can flourish. These conditions include clear property rights, the rule of law, financial systems, active civil society, good government and effective public administration.\textsuperscript{73}

However, government and public administration will perform their own direct functions but they will also interact with and support

\textsuperscript{72} Batley, Richard, "The changing role of the state in development", in Desai, Vandana and Potter, Robert B., op. cit. p.135. All sections of social opinion at Independence in India visualized a leading role for the state in the development process. See, Patnaik, Prabhat, "The State in India's Economic Development", in Hasan, Zoya,(ed.),Politics and State in India, New Delhi, Sage Publications, 2000, p.142. For a brief discussion on the role of the state in historical and liberalized era see, ibid., pp.142-155.

\textsuperscript{73} Batley, Richard, op.cit.,p.138.
private and community actors. There is also wide recognition of the importance of a professional rule based bureaucracy to provide the basic services and conditions of predictability and honest dealing within which business and citizens can flourish. All this does not constitute a simple return to previous conceptions of the state's role as the lead agent in development.

Underdevelopment means not just low per capita income and low GDP but lack of institutions, missing markets, structural rigidities, information failures and wide spread externalities. It is well recognized that governments have a major role to play and policies do make a difference on development. Government would necessarily move in and design policies that would allow the economic agents to interact appropriately to push the economies into a path of sustained growth and development.74

It is true that there is no agreement about what the role of government should be or what are the features of that appropriate development policy would be. Lack of understanding about how the developing countries actually work is one source of disagreement. Empirical research about the operation of the developing economies, different variables interacted, or how the effects of a policy change were transmitted is still at infancy in most developing countries. That makes it very difficult to design proper and consistent development policies as instruments to realize development goals.75

75 Ibid. At the time of Independence in India, industrialization was thought of as synonymous with development while it was presumed that national interest and the people interest were the same. There was consensus about the strategy of economic development besides political consensus. See, Nayyar, Deepak, “Economic Development and Political Democracy: Interaction of Economics and Politics in Independent India”, in Jayal, Niraja Gopal, (ed), Democracy in India, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 2001,p.371.
A development process that reduces the inequalities in social areas, affecting the dignity of life and basic freedoms, in addition to inequalities in income and capabilities would have substantial implications for the use of economic, technological and institutional resources. It would call for policies which are very different from the ones aimed simply at maximizing the growth of GDP (Gross Domestic Products). Thus, development goals inevitably involve trade offs, since all goals cannot be achieved to the same extent and at the same time given the overall constraints of resources and technology.

In the context of India removal of regional disparities, management of communal tensions, separatist and secessionist challenges and eradication of massive illiteracy, poverty, ill health and population control are crucial policy problems. They are interrelated and solution or inability to reduce them will have a great impact on the economic development and overall development. Political instability is also an important factor which directly or indirectly influences policy making and performance of development policies.

The development policies should be prioritized or designed in such a way that they remove the obstacles in the development as well as overall improvement. The additional policy areas and the specific details of each policy measure have to be worked out depending on the needs, opportunities and context.

The traditionally ignored areas of development include those relating to population, health and education. Therefore, it is not surprising that the country is still facing the massive problems in these areas of development. However, population and economic development are highly positively correlated. In other words, economic development of India will be entirely determined by the quality of its population. It is not a long time ago that even visionary
leaders like Nehru thought of development essentially in terms of natural resources and hardware of the development. So did the others including some eminent scientists.

It is not the size of natural resources that truly matters in economic development but the quality of a country's population. Unfortunately in Nehru's zeal for industrialization, he forgot to emphasize to the desired extent the crucial role of the human resources development. As a result, India remains as one of the poorest countries and one of the most backward economies of the world. Till 1991 census, almost half of India is still illiterate after decades of economic planning and independence.

There are three issues of population growth, which have implications for economic development in India. They are agricultural production to feed the growing population, the environment and the quality of life of the large masses of the Indian people will pose major problems of the Indian economy in the years to come.

If there is one problem, which holds India back in terms of its economic as well as political development, it is the problem of poverty. It is not the food production level, which makes for malnourishment of the poor. It is essentially a problem of income, which ultimately translates itself into a problem of finding gainful employment. According to several studies made by the Government of India, the likely growth of the Indian population will create enormous

78 Panandikar, V.A. Pai, op.cit.p.171.
pressures on the existing resources for meeting the basic needs of the people.\textsuperscript{79} There are no drastic remedies available to remedy the situation.

Health and education are unquestionably highly related and together they perform the most crucial function in the economic development of any country.\textsuperscript{80} The status of education and learning in all Asian countries has been always been very high. Unfortunately access to education and even health to the underprivileged has not been. Access is the key to policy analysis and to future policy making in relation to health and education.

In Indian context and experience, we have seen the above issues and process of development and role of the state. However, Indian model was a unique model which had combination of the elements of both liberal economic and socialist model along with those of a developing country. Planned economy and public sector with great emphasis on centralized system dominated particularly initial phases of 1950s and 1960s. The overwhelming emphasis on the role of the state particularly bureaucracy on development process had resulted in a centralized federal and administrative system in India.

Indian society characterized by massive poverty, illiteracy, ill health and regional disparities almost universally accepted the state led development process. Such a dominant role of the state in development was without much challenge and support from majority irrespective of ideological affiliations particularly in the 1950s and 1960s.

\textsuperscript{79} Ibid. p.177. The benefits of economic growth accrued mostly to the rich while the process of development largely bypassed the poor. See, Nayyar, Deepak, op.cit, p.374.

Besides the underdevelopment situation, two important factors had contributed to state-led development process. One was nationalist leadership led by Nehru had consensus or at least agreed to this. Such role of the state was envisaged even before independence by the Congress leadership. Second was the combination of anti-colonial ideology and success of socialist model particularly in Soviet Union.

In development literature, the objectives of development have been presented not just a growth in per capita income but in terms of improving socio-economic conditions and reducing inequalities of incomes and assets. The Five Year Plans of independent India from the very beginning focused on economic growth with improvement in all different indices of social progress. The same is true of all the major studies in the economies of development where development goals included several objectives including equality and justice, redistribution and social progress.81

The recent studies on development like Human Development Reports of UNDP and works of Amartya Sen have shown significant changes. They have demonstrated that social goals like spreading literacy, reduction of malnutrition or infant mortality or extending primary education or health care in many developing countries depend more on institutional factors and organizational changes rather than on any substantial additional expenditure of resources. Thus, having different development goals did not seem to make much of a difference in development policies which are designed to promote the rate of growth of GDP. However they have to be complemented by some additional mostly institutional policies to realize those goals of social development.

81 Sengupta, Arjun, op. cit., p.91.
For quite some time, development economists though recognized the multiplicity of development goals tried to reduce them primarily to economic growth or growth of per capita income. This was done by showing that such growth was not only necessary but also largely sufficient for the realization of the other goals. Thus, it has been accepted that growth of GDP becomes both the objective and the instrument of development. This has been the approach of many economists and international development agencies.

Attempts have been made to show that GDP growth was necessary for a sustained realization of other development goals. Thus, development policies aimed at maximizing per capita GDP growth remained center-stage in development literature. The idea of economic development of nations acquired a generic connotation in the Post World War II era and began to be purveyed as a universal paradigm not merely of economic growth but of the multidimensional development of countries of the world over. During international politics of Cold War it was projected as a neutral, non-ideological model. In the post cold War, the conventional development model has acquired a new dimension i.e. of globalization which is in a way an adaptation to the new situation.

One consequences of focusing on the growth of GDP was that development policies would necessarily have to be designed around the concept of efficiency. For an economist, efficiency meant an arrangement of the production system where the maximum values of outputs can be obtained from any given stock of resources and technology. Development policies based on efficiency do not necessarily mean minimal state or limited government intervention. This depends upon the conditions of the economy, the existing

---

structures of production, markets and institutions, the responsiveness of the economic agents to prices and incentives both in short and in the long run. It implies that whatever the state does it has to do efficiently. It has to organize its activities in such manner that there is no waste of resources.

In India, currently there are more than 200 schemes called centrally sponsored schemes sponsored by the Union Ministries. These have considerably distorted multi-level planning process and inter-governmental transfer arrangements in India's federation. These distortions became more glaring when one notes that Controller and Auditor General in his report have vehemently criticized the wanton abuse of authority. The report also has found gross misuse of public resources in different implementation by states, cooking up of outcomes, concealing of short comings and other problems in the implementation of centrally sponsored schemes.83

Thus, it is clear that the debate about development in the above perspective concentrated mostly on the design of development policies aimed at maximizing per capita GDP growth with efficiency. It is also concentrated on the related issues of the operating of the market mechanism and the role of the State in both domestic and international context. In India, in the era of globalization the social-systemic nature of the exclusion of poor continues under globalization as it did under under-development.84 State policies which until recently aimed at removing the structural barriers facing the poor and bringing them in the mainstream of political economy are now seen as market unfriendly.

83 Oommen, M.A., "For Decentralized Development", Frontline, December 21, 2001, p. 82.
84 Sheth, D.L., op. cit., p. 82. Persistent poverty and absolute deprivation remained the reality for a large proportion of the population. See, Nayyar, Deepak, op.cit, p.388.
The Human Development Approach which raises issues of social development and improving life expectancy, health, nutrition and spread of education and other social services marked a definite advance in the economics of development. It brings out the full implications of pursuing them as development goals for changing the institutions and methods of organization. They would quite often draw upon the available resources and called for adopting supplementary policies as GDP maximizing policies would not be always sufficient to realize them.

In case of Human Rights Approach to development, the right to development is regarded as a human right. It is so because the foundation of the human rights approach is the notion of equality. If a development policy has to promote equality it may imply a production structure that would be quite different from the one that maximizes market based value of GDP. When the realization of human rights sets the development goals, it may be necessary to adopt policies that would have effects on the structure of the economy. It also may require the society going far beyond the reach of conventional development policy.

The Right to Development was defined and adopted by the United Nations through a Declaration in 1986. However, it was only in 1993 at the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna, that consensus was reached. It recognized the right to development as a universal and inalienable human right and an integral part of the fundamental rights of human person.

There are different ways for the development of a country. Thus, the market mediated economic growth per se cannot promote balanced regional development in a country as spatially diverse as

85 For details on human development and human right approaches see, Sengupta, Arjun, op.cit., p. 93.
India. This is because the market by its inherent logic excludes those without exchange entitlements. According to the Declaration on the Right to Development, there is one particular process of development in which all human rights and fundamental freedoms can be fully realized. It is that particular process of development which is regarded as a human right by virtue of which every human person and all people are entitled to participate, contribute to and enjoy that process of development. The State has to ensure that this right is fulfilled.

The human right to development would imply that fulfilling that right to a particular process of development would have the highest priority of actions for the states individually and as parts of the international community. Without which these states would lose their legitimacy and would be liable to be changed or overthrown. The Right to Development would mean that goods and services have to be supplied in a manner that respects equity in the sharing of benefits. It also means decision making through a participatory process with transparency, accountability and non-discrimination by sex, gender, caste, creed, color or religion. Thus, in a country like India, there is critical need to dovetail the constitutional mandate of decentralized governance with multi-level planning and multi-level public finance.

Thus, according to human right approach, any strategy or policy of development would have two dimensions. First, it must not violate any human right. The second dimension is that of promotion. To overcome the constraint of resources, a strategy has to be adopted

86 Oommen, M.A., op. cit., p. 82.
87 Sengupta, Arjun, op. cit., p. 94.
88 Ibid.
89 Oommen, M.A., op. cit., p. 82.
to raise GDP in such a manner that it does not increase inequality which would violate the basis of human rights. It also recognizes that a programme for implementing the right to development is not just based on the development policy of the state concerned, but also on the policy of international cooperation.90

If we follow the right to development approach to development policy, it has to be based on a re-distributive policy to reduce income inequality. These distributive policies are not to be confined to individuals or group of individuals, but extend to inequalities across the countries in the international economy and across the regions within an economy.

Thus, if purely market based strategies are followed in India, the disparities between income levels in states like Maharashtra, Gujarat and Tamil Nadu and those known as BIMARU states -Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh – will only grow.91 Such a strategy would only worsen the situation in the North Eastern Region of India which is geographically isolated and lagging behind in all basic indicators of development from the rest of India. Because markets habitually favour the better endowed, weaker parties, both globally and internally tend to be worse off at least in the interim.92

The choice is real although every attempt has to be made to minimize the growth reduction effect by raising the efficiency of public investment and growth of productivity. Thus, when issues of inequality are viewed in the broader context of human rights, the policy choices become even more limited. If we follow the human

90 Sengupta, Arjun, op. cit., p. 94.
91 Ibid. p.96.
rights approach to development, we must have appropriate planning. Policies that pursue efficiency should be able to generate sufficient additional resources to compensate the vulnerable or the worst affected. The fact that the state is not always able to capture these efficiency gains through taxes or administered prices implies the rich and the more powerful are appropriating these gains. 93

If the state is unable to capture the direct gains, it must reorganize the productive system through decentralized beneficiary level management. It also must directly provide for the required resources. That is the obligation of the state derived from accepting the right to development as a human right.

When India became independent in 1947, the most conspicuous feature of the Indian economy was that hundreds of people lived in conditions of appalling deprivation in conditions of hunger, ill health and avoidable disease, illiteracy and homelessness and subject to different forms of class, caste and gender oppression. 94 The prospects and failures of development have haunted public spirited Indians since the time of independence. Almost everyone believed that development was both a desirable and an attainable objective. Since then it has turned out to be a rather more elusive phenomenon. 95

In India, over the years, the very concept of development as it was used at first began to be challenged as vague, ill-defined and self-contradictory. Soul searching about what development means or ought to mean by no means come to an end. The late seventies and early eighties brought to the fore the concept of alternatives:

93 Sengupta, Arjun, op. cit., p. 96.
development alternatives and even alternatives to development. In fact, development economists had known all along that Indian problems had many unique features and not much would be achieved by blindly following either the American or the Russian path.

Development was an integral and even non-negotiable part of the modernizing agenda of the Indian state at independence. It was comprehensively defined to encompass not only an industrial economy but also simultaneously a programme of social transformation and political democratization. Underlying this aspiration was a belief that progress could be at once being telescoped and replicated.96

However, the failure to provide the people of India with adequate food, clothing, shelter and the basic means of self-fulfillment constitutes undoubtedly the most serious failure of public policy in independent India. Perhaps this is one of the most tragic failure stories of public policy in the post-war world.97 This is despite the fact that we have democratic functioning and centralized planning for more than five decades.

It is one thing to fashion attractive policies and quite another to ensure their implementation. It is argued by many that Indians never been at a loss to fashion attractive policies, it is the will to implement them that has been lacking. What we recognize today as the failed aspects of the development agenda are to some degree attributable to


97 *Frontline*, op. cit., p. 42. There are reports of starvation deaths in some parts of India from time to time. Also see, Nayyar, Deepak, op.cit, pp.387-388.
the thoughtlessly derivative nature of its conception. At its core lay an unreflective faithfulness to the developmental dogma, interpreting it purely in terms of quantifiable measures of economic growth. The limitations of this definition were manifest on the ground even before it came to be widely challenged and discredited within the international development community itself.

No body either within or outside the Planning Commission has suggested that growth should be pursued at any cost, no matter how adversely it affected distribution. It was also agreed that the size of the cake had to increase for a reasonable distribution of it to be possible. The project of development has finally came to be questioned by the advocates of sustainable development strategies as well as by movements questioning the rational of projects that contribute to the prosperity of some social groups even as they cause the larger scale displacement of others.

The talk about alternatives discredited the idea of development for a while but it could not destroy it. Development is bound to remain a major preoccupation in a country in which there is so much destitution, hunger, illiteracy and ill-health, and such extremes of wealth and poverty.

The projects of social transformation arose out of a deliberative legislative rather than participative democratic process to be realized within the framework of a democratic polity. The idea of democracy was expected to inform, inspire and cohere with the state's initiatives in the areas of welfare, secularism and development.

---
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Since the 1960s, the state's capacity to address and accommodate the development needs of a growing cross-section of people has been diminishing and its authority undermined. The decline really began with Indira Gandhi, who intent upon staving off challenges to her leadership, resorted to the “politics of populism”. Rising above the party fold, she established direct contract with the masses in an attempt to mobilize electoral support. Soon, politics was reduced to sloganeering: Garibi Hatao was the magic mantra that brought the hordes to her gates.\textsuperscript{101}

In fact today, many critics believed that it has become accepted practice for political leaders to behave as if they are the state themselves. They hold the law of the land in contempt, disregarding judicial pronouncements and preventing Parliament from executing its duties. According to them they do this without worrying about the consequences of their actions, secure as they are in the belief that there will always be willing supporters, especially in a society where resources are scarce. Today, the belief that the Indian state is weak has become so pervasive that voters do not think twice about electing or re-electing leaders irrespective of their track records. Thus, the politics of populism has succeeded in mobilizing the marginal groups left out of the political decision making process. But this mobilization has taken place through default rather than through a design of democratic governance.\textsuperscript{102}

The goals of social transformation including development were not popularly derived but set by modernizing elite. The philosophy of state welfare in India was, from the very inception grounded in ideas of charity, benevolence and paternalism. Therefore it has proved to be singularly unresponsive to challenges couched in the more egalitarian

\textsuperscript{101} "Hijacked State", Editorial, \textit{The Times of India}, New Delhi, April 30, 2001.

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.
terms of claims to rights.\textsuperscript{103} The project of development was inspired by the image of successful transition from tradition to modernity eventually mirroring the Western experience.

Despite certain achievements in terms of economic development and political democracy, poverty and illiteracy retain massive presence. The economic gap vis-à-vis the advanced countries have not narrowed. The country is endangered by forces of communalism, regionalism, casteism, separatism, corruption and violence.\textsuperscript{104}

Indian society as it has developed after 1947 continues to be grossly unequal, unjust and inhuman.\textsuperscript{105} Economic inequality has increased rather than decreased. There is inequality of income and economic power. Basic needs of the vast masses remained unfulfilled despite certain amelioration in their condition.

Thus, since independence, development has been both mantra and myth and the promise of prosperity has remained elusive.\textsuperscript{106} Planning has on the whole failed to eradicate regional inequalities even though to do so was one of its major objectives. Regional inequality is a potential time bomb directed against national unity and political stability. The lack of development and process of development that have taken place since independence have a critical link to the process of national integration.

While the talk of alternatives continues, there has been a change in the discourse on development. In the 1950s and 1960s

\textsuperscript{103} Jayal, Niraja Gopal, op. cit., p.2.
\textsuperscript{104} Chandra, Bipan, "The Relevance and Meaning of Nationalism in India Today", in Baxi, Upen, etc., (eds.), Reconstructing the Republic, New Delhi, Har-Anand Publications, 1999, p. 298. Also see, Nayyar, Deepak, op.cit.,p.393.
\textsuperscript{105} Ibid., p. 296.
\textsuperscript{106} Jayal, Niraja Gopal, op. cit., pp. 2-3.
development was discussed mainly in the language of policy. Today it is being increasingly discussed in the language of rights. The persistent failures of policy have led to a loss of faith in the executive government. Policy is the main responsibility of the executive, and where there is a loss of faith in the executive there is bound to be a loss of faith in policy.\textsuperscript{107}

Thus, for nearly 40 years, planning, plan expenditure, loans, and grants to states and public sector investment constituted the making of economic policy. In the milieu, every scheme and every programme attained the dubious status of policy and growth was a mere by product. Mercifully this era of policy making came to an end in the 20th century.\textsuperscript{108}

There has been a change in the climate of international opinion. The NGOs, often with strong international support, are inclined towards right as against policies. This is on the ground that whereas policies are the creatures of governments, rights empower the people. The UN has recently taken the initiative to promote a rights-based approach to development. It has called for world wide recognition of the right to development and for that right to be treated as human right.

The Indian model of development could not produce the expected results. She was rather forced to adopt the economic reforms that have been initiated since 1991. The new policies have slowly led to the abandonment of the old policies. It is argued by many that the economic reform initiated since 1991, in essence,

\textsuperscript{107} Beteille, Andre, op. cit.

\textsuperscript{108} Chidambaram, P., "Overhaul Overdue", \textit{India Today}, February 19, 2001, p. 64.
consists of the policy package of stabilization and structural adjustment policies advocated by IMF and Work Bank.\textsuperscript{109}

The emergence of a neo-liberal agenda in economic policy has discredited the socialistic elements of the strategy of planned development. It has also discredited the need to provide the basic elements of social security for the poorest section of the Indian society.\textsuperscript{110} There has been declining investments in social services including health and education with the change in the tenor of policy rhetoric as it professes the new faith of liberalization, globalization and economic reforms.

Thus, there is still debate on the meaning of development and how it can be best achieved. The emphasis has been increasingly on rights and empowerment rather than policies. In India, development was an integral part of nation-building process. The ambitious project was inspired by the successful models of other countries. It was sought to achieve through centralized planning, non-constitutional bodies like Planning Commission and public sectors within the democratic framework. Inability to eradicate poverty, illiteracy and to provide basic health and social services despite decades of democratic functioning and centralized economic planning, indicate the failure of the unique Indian model adopted since 1950.

Democracy and electoral politics have ironically resulted in strengthening the primordial identities which have been misused for power politics. Development must strive to fulfill the basic necessities of life and provide equal opportunities for all. It is the constitutional

\textsuperscript{109} For instance, \textit{Frontline}, op. cit., p. 45.

\textsuperscript{110} Jayal, Niraja Gopal, op. cit., pp. 3-4. The credibility of the state as an institution has eroded and the government appears to be abdicating its role in reconciling economic and political democracy in the liberalized era. See, Nayyar, Deepak, op.cit, p.393.
and moral responsibility of the state to ensure them. It is important to examine who controls the state and who are the actual policy makers. We will discuss briefly this aspect now.

2.3 POLICY MAKERS

The role of policy makers is of great significance in the process of policy making and final policy outcomes. The actual policy decisions are taken by the policy makers. While the influence and inputs in policy making come from the various sources, the ultimate decision are taken by them from the range of options available before them. They are influenced by the nature of problem in hand, availability of resources, past experiences and interest of policy makers.

The political executive or cabinet takes the final policy decisions. However, the real inputs are provided by civil servants who are also in charge of the implementation of the policies. The effectiveness or the failure of a policy depends on a number of factors. However, the credit for the success or responsibility for the failure of a policy is on the policy makers.

In a democratic system, the policies are outcomes of the decisions of political executive or cabinet who are the elected representatives of the people. A policy must reflect the interest and aspirations of wider general public. In non-democratic system, whims and wishes of the rulers or ruling regime are the guiding principles in policy outcomes and governmental actions.

If individual policy makers are inconsequential in the Marxist tradition, the pluralist approach regards them as arbitrators in
negotiating compromises among diverse conflicting groups. Public choice theory assumes that policy makers are part of a group seeking its own interest and thus influence policy outcomes. These dominant approaches do not consider the capacity of policy makers themselves to shape policy outcomes. The policy makers are assumed to manifest societal preferences or to collude with social groups rather than act as honest brokers among them.

It is often inaccurate to conceive policy making as a highly rational process, characterized by foresight and the weighing of most of alternatives. Instead, much of the higher officials, time is spent shifting from one contingency to another.

Policy makers do have room to manoeuvre and can shape policy outcomes. Their motivations and perspectives are imbued by personal and professional values which can counter societal pressures. For an adequate understanding of a policy outcome, we need to consider social context. But it is equally important to know the institutional working and the capacity of the policy makers who ultimately shape the outcome.

Both actors and institutions play a crucial role in the policy process, even though one may be more important then the other in specific instances. Individuals, groups, classes and state

---


participating in the policy process have their own interests. But the manner in which they interpret and pursue their interests and the outcomes of their efforts are shaped by institutional factors. However, there is no way of predicting in advance which one is more important in a particular instance.

Policy makers have a significant role in shaping policy choice, because at any given time, all the consequences of a policy cannot be known. Risk and uncertainty always exist. The logic of politics and logic of economics do not always coincide and the type of costs a social group may have to pay can not be ascertained in advance. This uncertainty provides policy makers a range of options from which to choose.\footnote{Mathur, Kuldeep and Bjorkman, J.W., op. cit., pp. 14-15.}

Policies are made by policy sub-systems consisting of actors dealing with a public problem. Policy sub-systems are forums where actors discuss policy issues and persuade and bargain in pursuit of their interests. Elected officials and appointed officials among the policy actors reside within the state. Executive or cabinet among the elected officials is one of the key players in the policy sub-system. While there are other actors also involved in the process, the authority to make and implement policies rests ultimately with the executive.

In addition to its prerogative in policy matters, the executive possess a range of other resources. However, appointed officials i.e. civil servants are very often the key stone in the policy process and the central figures in many policy subsystems. Most of the policy making and implementing functions once performed by legislatures and the political executive are now performed by the bureaucracy.\footnote{Howlett, Michael and Ramesh, M., op.cit, p. 56.}
Civil servants often play crucial roles in framing new policies or helping the political executive in taking decisions, but their role in the process of decision making must always remain anonymous. All policies and decisions are that of the political executive whatever may be the actual contribution of individual bureaucrats.\textsuperscript{117}

The functions of modern government are too complex and numerous to be preformed by the cabinet. The bureaucracy consists of a large number of specialists who have the time and expertise to deal with a policy issue on a continuing basis. The bureaucracy's power and influence is based on a range of resources. Policy deliberations for the most part occur in secret within the bureaucracy which denies other policy actors the opportunity to mount opposition to its plans. However, the executive is ultimately responsible for all policies, an authority it assert at times.

The nature of government system, i.e. federal or parliamentary, has significant bearing on policy process and effectiveness of policies. For instance, the division of powers promotes difficulties for policy makers in presidential system. The coalition governments also complicates policy making. Generally, speaking however, policy making in parliamentary system is centralized in the executive which usually enables the government to take the decisive action if it so chooses.

Civil servants with top positions in government are a major source of policy advice for cabinet ministers. Civil servants and ministers are partners in the arena of policy making. This partnership is based not only on distinctive contributions but also on complimentary roles. Civil servants emphasize the technical efficiency

of policy while politicians emphasis its responsiveness to relevant constituencies.118

Bureaucrats are also very actively involved in the formulation of policies and implementation cannot be excluded from such responsibilities. Framing policies in a ministry or department is not an isolated exercise. It often involves inter-ministerial consultations and in most cases approved by the cabinet committee or the full cabinet.119

Public policy making in India is perhaps more polyarchal than any other countries. This is because of existence of a federal polity, diversity and pluralistic nature of society, a free press and conflicting demands made by different groups through a vast network of communication developed since independence.120 In the executive branch of the government, the policies are given concrete shape and direction by the Prime Minister and his/her cabinet. They are assisted in their functions by various standing committees of the cabinet, Prime Minister’s Office, cabinet secretariat and secretariat of different ministries.

Though other factors are involved, the cabinet and its committees play most significant role in the national policy formulation and in many major decisions of key importance. The predominant institution in policy making is the National Planning Commission which has the continuing function of formulating successive development Five Year plans. The political parties set the macro policy arena, however they tend to mobilize into policy search

118 Mathur, Kuldeep and Bjrokman, J.W., op. cit., p 51.
119 Alexander, P.C., op.cit., p.91.
120 Jain, R.B., op. cit., p. 343
at the time of elections. Prime Minister and the chief ministers remain the most active policy actors at their levels.\textsuperscript{121}

Policy making cannot take place without the contribution and involvement of bureaucrats and politicians and the politicians are only too happy to acknowledge and encourage their role in this regard. Any demarcation between policy making and their implementation will be arbitrary and artificial in modern administration.\textsuperscript{122}

Thus, the policy makers take the final decisions on a policy matter after taking into account the various factors. Various policy actors and institutions are involved in policy process. Cabinet ministers and top civil servants are partners in policy making process, each contributing distinctive roles which vary from system to system. In parliamentary system, cabinet takes the ultimate policy decision on a policy problem. The detailed discussion on policy actors and institutions are attempted in the Chapter VI.

In the next Chapter, we will discuss the historical background and administrative system of Manipur as well as secessionist movements and responses to them. It also will discuss the electoral politics and government in the state. It is important to understand them since in a way the policies are in response to this environment.

\textsuperscript{121} Ibid. p. 344. For a brief discussion on the role of bureaucrats in policy making in Indian context see ibid., pp. 344-345.

\textsuperscript{122} Alexander, P.C., op. cit., p.92.