CHAPTER VI

POLICY MAKERS AND THEIR EVALUATION

6.1 POLICY ACTORS AND INSTITUTIONS

Policies are the result of multiple decisions taken by policy actors who are often scattered throughout the complex governmental organization. Policy making involves a number of policy actors and institutions of both state and society. The result of their interaction is what public policy is all about. The policy actors who take the policy decisions play a crucial role and they are also responsible for success or failure of policy.

The activity of policy actors is conditioned by the nature of the problems under consideration. It is further shaped by the larger political, economic, institutional and ideological context in which the policy actors function. However, policy actors are not without various options. Various contingencies and tactical alliances among policy actors enable them to overcome or reduce the limitations they face. The present policy decisions may be influenced by the past experiences. The policy decisions are determined by both immediate and long term considerations.

There is debate on the relative importance on the role of policy actors and institutions in the public policy process. The dispute hinges on the causal significance of the actors' interest and capabilities compared to the institutional context in which they operate. The Welfare Economic and Public Choice theories regard individuals as the agents that shape policy. On the other hand the
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theories built on pluralism and corporatism attribute primacy to organized groups.

Statism and neo-institutionalism treat the state itself as an actor and explain public policy in terms of its objectives and capabilities. In contrast, theories based on class treat policy actors as creatures of economic structures, explaining all their actions in terms of structural imperatives or functional necessity. However, it is accepted here the view that both policy actors and institutions play a crucial role in the policy process and one may be more important than the other in specific instances.

Policy actors in the policy process may be either individuals or groups and both are from the machinery of the state and the society at large. The policy actors may be divided into the following five categories: elected officials, appointed officials, interest groups, research organizations and mass media. The first two reside within the state and the latter three in the society and together they form the principal elements from which members of specific policy actors are drawn.

Though various policy actors and institutions are involved in the policy process, the authority to make and implement policies rests ultimately with the political executive or cabinet. Policy makers are resourceful individuals who understand their own interests and have their own ideas about appropriate or feasible policy options and accordingly take the final policy decisions.

For an adequate understanding of a policy outcome, we need to consider social context as well as to know the institutional working and the capacity of the policy makers who ultimately shape
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2 For a discussion on the policy actors, see ibid., pp. 53-59.
the outcomes.³ The capacity of a state which is function of its organizational coherence and expertise, determines its success in performing policy functions. Unity within and among various levels, branches and agencies of the government, and high levels of bureaucratic expertise are regarded as crucial to enhance state capacity.⁴

The capabilities of a state are determined by how it is organized internally as well as how it is linked to the society whose problems it is supposed to resolve through appropriate policies. Fragmentation within and among groups weakens the state's ability to mobilize them towards the resolution of societal problems. If the societal conflicts are particularly severe, the state may find itself paralyzed in performing policy functions.

Thus, Indian State is highly interventionist but has failed to provide basic necessities to majority of its people. There have been conflicts and violence based on religion, caste, ethnicity and region. The separatist and insurgency activities particularly in the remote and peripheries severely affect the normal activities of the State in these areas. These situations have continued for decades in most areas and significantly reduce the capacity of the Indian State to provide the basic services and its normal functioning has been paralyzed.

This is particularly true of insurgency affected areas of North-East. In many areas of the region there have been parallel governments of armed groups. The authority of the State virtually


⁴ Howlett, Michael and Ramesh, M., op. cit., p. 60.
does not exist in many areas. There have been huge collections of
government money as taxes by armed groups for many years. This
has been the case in Manipur for many years. The state government
so far has remained silent spectator and helpless but people live
with constant fear and insecurity. We have already discussed them
in details in the context of Manipur in Chapter III.

The best situation for effective policy making and
implementing of polices is both state and society to be strong with
close partnership between the two. In such situations, state in
partnership with social groups can be expected to devise cohesive
and long-term policies. In contrast, policy effectiveness is lowest
when the state is weak and the society is fragmented. In these
cases, the state can be expected to produce ineffective and
shortsighted policies. This appears to be true of many policies in
India. Thus, unity within and among social groups makes for a
stable policy environment and facilitates policy making. It promotes
effective policy implementation also.

Policy making is dynamic and subject to a continuous
process. It is subject to the influence of several factors like
constitutional provisions and limitations, legislative and laws. It is
also influenced by the prevailing social values, traditions and
conventions, economic situation, impact of public opinion, pressure
groups and international law. It is a cooperative endeavor involving
the efforts of many agencies like the legislature, the executive, the
judiciary, political parties and pressure groups.5

The policy actors in the policy process are determined by
constitutional and legal provisions as well as by the power,

5 Paul, Devika, Public Policy Formulation and Implementation in India, Delhi,
knowledge, and resources of the policy actors involved. The ministers and civil servants in charge of a policy area are the key governmental actors in the policy process involving the area, with the legislators playing a secondary role.

The other policy actors are drawn from the society particularly from among interest groups and research organizations. All these policy actors have their own objectives which they seek to achieve through participation in the policy process. The policy actors in government ultimately take the policy decisions. They have both mandate and responsibility to do so. The other policy actors merely influence the policy making process.

The manners in which policy actors carry out their pursuit and the extent to which they succeed in their efforts depend to a large extent on the domestic and international institutional context in which they operate. At the domestic level, it is the political institutions affecting the autonomy and capacity of the executive and bureaucracy that have the most decisive effect on the policy actors' interests and behaviors and the outcomes of the policy process.6

In the context of the developing countries, bureaucracy certainly emerged as one of the key elements in the politico-administrative process. Governmental policies are the outcomes of a continuous interaction between the political executive, the senior echelons of bureaucracy and many other governmental or non-governmental actors.7
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6 Howlett, Michael and Ramesh, M., op. cit., p. 74.
Within the parliamentary system of government, permanent officials who are known as secretaries to government head ministries. They act as policy advisors to the cabinet minister who is the political head of the ministry. In addition, within the governmental system there are two other agencies, the Cabinet Secretariat and the Prime Minister’s Office which provide policy advice to the highest policy makers. In these institutions too civil servants play a predominant role.\(^8\)

Public policy making in India is a complex process because of existence of parliamentary system, federal polity, size, diversity and pluralistic nature of society, a free press and conflicting demands by various groups. It is also influenced by the regional disparities in development and social stratification. In parliamentary system like United Kingdom, decision making power is confined to the political executive who can make effective and fast policy decisions. The policy making process is not complex as in the case of India.

The federal polity and party system influence the parliamentary system in India. Power and style of Prime Minister, nature of government i.e. single party or coalition government, shape the policy making. Uneven development and regional disparity with attendant differing aspirations and priorities also influence the policy making. In fact they have acted as a serious challenge not only in national integration but also in policy making.

It is the cabinet, an inner group of the council of ministers that shapes government policy. It is also considered as the highest decision making body. Collective decision making is the unique feature of cabinet government. Ministers hold separate and independent portfolios and individually they are responsible of the departments allotted to them. However all policy decisions are taken

\(^8\) Mathur, Kuldeep and Bjorkman, J.W., op. cit., p.15
by the cabinet collectively. Government policies are the handiwork of the cabinet as a whole and this principle is embedded in the Indian Constitution.

Cabinet determines government policies and has the responsibility to govern the country. The importance of this group can hardly be overstated particularly in a country like India. This is because the state plays a strong interventionist role in promoting and regulating many aspects of social and economic life. The cabinet is also critical in coping with difficult tasks of nation building and development. Over the years the Indian cabinet became a forum where many adjustments had to be made and the primacy of politics came to the fore in the choice of ministers. This also meant the primacy of the Prime Minister in decision making.\(^9\)

Policy making in India is shaped within the framework of constitutional system. Indian polity is federal in character but the administrative system is highly integrated and centralized. The state governments are acting as implementing agencies of the centre in more than 200 centrally sponsored schemes. Consultations with state governments take place on a wide variety of matters. The policies acquire final approval at various levels of governance depending on their nature and significance. The cabinet functions on the principle of collective responsibility and is the top policy making body in the government but only on major proposals, other matters being disposed of by the minister at his own level.\(^{10}\)

Central planning agencies determine policies and priorities in the health, education and other social sectors, where the state
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9 Ibid. p. 50.

10 Paul, Devika, op. cit., p. 123
governments are the executing agencies. Thus, policy making in Indian system is highly centralized. The pattern of federal authority under the Indian constitution, and the degree of federal intervention in matters within the states' spheres of responsibility, mean that federal bureaucracy has more power and the state bureaucracies less than in the US, Australia and Canada. The All India Services (AIS), though unusual in federal system are only one among many instruments through which the national government exerts influence on the states.

The roots of the pattern of state intervention after independence in 1947 can be traced back to two factors. One was war time economic control imposed by the British administration to mobilize the colonial economy for the war effort and the second was thinking on the economy that came to be influential both in the Congress party and among Indian industrialists. The Bombay Plan, authored by a group of Indian industrialists in 1944, provided a rationale for state direction of the economy and protectionism.

The state led development model did not originate from the Left. It originated very much within the Congress leadership and was broadly supported by at least not opposed by the majority of Indian industrialists. Agriculture remained private and was subject

11 Mozoomdar, Ajit “, National and State Bureaucracies under Federalism: A Comparative Perspective", in Arora, Balveer and Radin, Beryl, (ed.), Changing Roles of the All India Services: An Assessment and Agenda for Future Research of Federalism and All India Services, New Delhi, Centre for the Advanced Study of India, University of Pennsylvania, 2000, p.27.

12 Ibid., p. 27. For a discussion on the distribution of developmental powers and responsibilities and also relation between centre and states see, Arora ,Balveer, "Intergovernmental Relations in the Indian Union", in Levy, Norman and Chris Tapscott,(ed.), Intergovernmental Relations in South Africa, Western Cape, IDASA, 2001,pp.232-251.

to significant intervention only from the mid-1960s with the Green Revolution initiated and promoted by the government. Government intervention in the form of public procurement of grain for the subsidized public distribution system has been institutionalized.

Public enterprise has been heavily concentrated in infrastructural, mining and capital intensive manufacturing. The overall performance of public enterprises in terms of profitability and hence savings generation for investment has been disappointing. The beginning of a rethink on the economic policy paradigm, initially limited to a very small change within the policy regime, is to be found with Emergency (1975-77) period.

Thus, no significant shifts in the balance between the roles of state and market took place until the balance of payment crisis catalyzed stabilization and structural adjustment initiatives by the Congress government in July 1991. The entire legal and regulatory framework of the post-1956 policy regime remained essentially intact in 1991.

The new stabilization and structural adjustment policy explicitly articulated the goal of an internationally competitive economy with the state playing redefined role. The centerpiece of the stabilization programme was fiscal deficit reduction. The new industrial policy greatly eased private and foreign entry into industry and slashed the number of industries reserved for the public sector.

However, looking at what was not done; one finds that almost all the politically difficult decisions were postponed. Apart from the failure to control expenditure there has been no significant expansion of the direct tax base. Public enterprise privatization has

\[14\] Ibid. p.119
been limited to partial disinvestments with the government retaining control. There has been no significant shift of the state's role towards the social sector, a declared reform goal. There has been protest from different quarters as well as intervention by the judiciary in the privatization process. It reflects not only difficulties but also lack of consensus and inability to convince the concerned and affected groups.

The impulse of liberalization in India originated from the top of the state apparatus, either under pressure of a balance of payment crisis, with or without external pressure or due to the thinking of the top leadership. The need for liberation was to promote efficiency and growth. This was usually because economic inefficiency leading to cumulative economic problems that was felt to threaten the political prospects of the top leadership and the ruling party. In no case liberalization impulses were the result of organized pressure from pro-liberalization interests.

Economic liberalization programmes are characterized by a political hurdle, which has to be surmounted by a reforming government by attempting to create a support coalition while keeping an eye on the electoral cycle. The explanation for avoiding hard decisions has been that the political class as well as the protected and subsidized industrialists and farmers have an economic stake in rent seeking and hence in a regulatory state with control over a large public sector and private economic activity. 15 The changes in socio-economic and political environment influence the policy making process as well as policy actors and institutions.

In the executive branch of the government, the Prime Minister
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15 Ibid. p.123. For a discussion on the background and role of state in Indian economy, see ibid., pp.108-123.
and his or her cabinet give the policies final shape and take the policy decision. Various standing committees of the cabinet and Prime Minister's Office assist them. PMO exercises a great deal of influence in shaping them through preparation of briefs, analysis and sifting of information to facilitate decisions of Prime Minister.

The interplay of Prime Minister, cabinet colleagues, committees of cabinet, interaction between the staff of cabinet secretariat, Prime Minister's Office and the secretariats of different ministries determine the final outcome of public policies through the executive branch of government. Nature of such inter-play depends to a great extent on the personal style of Prime Minister, his/her overall personality and political strength of the party in power.16

The Prime Minister enjoys a special position in policy making process and other ministers play varying levels of subordinate role. The subordinate role of other functionaries has always persisted except for a brief period when the Prime Minister was not very powerful. Thus, there is high level of centralization of policy initiative and policy making at least so far as major ones are concerned even today.17 Almost all the functionaries and institutions involved in policy making have implicitly accepted supreme position of Prime Minister's Office by submitting to it.

However, the cabinet and its committees play most significant role in the national policy formulation and in many major decisions of key importance.18 The predominant institution in policy making is the Union Planning Commission which has the continuing function of formulating successive Five-Year developmental plans. However the relevance and importance of the Planning Commission has

17 Paul, Devika, op. cit., p. 123
18 Jain, R, B., op, cit., p. 343.
declined in recent years.\textsuperscript{19} The Prime Minister constitutes a number of advisory committees from time to time to seek advice on national policy issues.

The Central Secretariat stands at an exceptionally high pedestal. It is designed as the policy making organ, being the seat of the government of India.\textsuperscript{20} It has been the official policy to fill the middle and higher management level positions of the secretariat by deputation of officers from the state governments as well as from the various central services with the exception of External Affairs, Railways, and Posts and Telegraphs ministries. The rationale behind such arrangement is that higher civil servants engaged in policy making and advising ministers must possess experience of working in the field.

Thus, the Prime Minister, his/her cabinet, top civil servants, PMO, central secretariat, Planning Commission, and various advisory committees are involved in policy initiatives and policy making process in India. However, it is the cabinet headed by Prime Minister that takes the final decision on key areas of national importance. Planning Commission has functioned as a policy making organ of vital importance particularly developmental both for national and state levels. The others actors, institutions and organs of government involve in policy making are indirect or secondary in nature.

In India, Constitution vests all executive powers in the President and in Governor but in practice they are exercised by council of ministers. At all levels of administration, a chain of public services assists the executives. At the state levels, chief minister,

\textsuperscript{19} For a discussion on history, functions and criticism of Planning Commission, see Maheshwari, S.R., \textit{Indian Administration}, New Delhi, Orient Longman, 2001, pp. 121-136

\textsuperscript{20} Paul, Devika, op. cit., p. 124.
his/her cabinet, higher civil servants, state secretariat, state planning commission, and various departments are involved in policy initiatives and policy making. Chief Minister is the most significant player in major policy decisions concerning the state. The other actors, institutions including state legislature and agencies play in indirect ways as state cabinet headed by chief Minister take up major policy initiatives and take final policy decisions.

The business of the government is allocated to the ministers by assigning one or-more departments. Minister is the political head of the department whose administrative head is a secretary who is a career civil servant. Secretariat refers to the complex of departments; administratively whose heads are secretaries and politically, ministers. Like his central counterpart, the secretary is the principal advisor to the minister and head of the department(s) under his charge. He/she is responsible for carrying out the policies and decisions made by the political chief and represent his departments before the committees of the legislature. The secretariat has been an essential agency for policy making.

The number of secretariat departments varies from state to state. Every state has a chief secretary who is invariably the head of the general administration department whose political head is the chief minister himself. He is the kingpin of the secretariat, his control extending to all its other departments, head of the civil services in the state, their mentor and conscience-keeper. He is the principal advisor to the chief minister and secretary to the cabinet headed by the chief minister. He prepares the cabinet
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agenda of committees and there is hardly any committee concerned with high-level policy on which he is not nominated.

Now we will try to find out the policy actors and institutions in Manipur based on the questionnaire data analysis. As discussed in Chapter V there are two questions in the questionnaire which seek to know institutions and policy actors involved in development and counter-insurgency policy making in Manipur. While framing the two questions the assumption was that several policy actors and institutions were involved in policy making though the final decision came from one of those identified in the two questions.

Identified institutions and policy actors on development policy are a. Union Planning Commission b. State chief minister and cabinet c. State civil servants d. State political parties e. Union ministers (specify) and f. Any other (please specify). The responses are significant one, considering such studies have not conducted earlier. Majority of the respondents expresses that it is state chief minister and his cabinet that has the determining influences in final decisions on development policy making in Manipur. Union Planning Commission and state civil servants are two other important policy actors and institutions involved in development policy making in the state.

Thus, the cabinet or the political executive in the state takes final policy decisions for development policies. It reconfirms the popular belief that chief minister is the most important policy actor on policy decisions at the state level. It also supports the claim that central government through the Union Planning Commission greatly influences policy making particularly on development even at the state level. The state chief minister and his cabinet takes the final
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23 Appendix-I, Questionnaire, see Question number 4 for details.
decisions, state level civil servants and Union Planning Commission are actively involved in development policy making.

The question on counter-insurgency policy is “Who has the final say in making policies relating to the problem of insurgency?” The given responses are a. Union Home Ministry b. Prime Minister’s Office c. State cabinet d. Governor e. State Civil servants and f. Any other (please specify). On counter-insurgency policies, it is the Union Home Ministry that has final say in making policies relating to insurgency in Manipur. This is believed by majority of the respondents. The significant role of PMO (Prime Minister’s Office) has also been recognized. State cabinet has plays an important role counter-insurgency policy making in the state.

These findings have reconfirmed the dominant role played by central government for policy making in regard to counter-insurgency policies in Manipur. They also indicate minor role and powerlessness of state government in dealing with insurgency problem and policy decisions on counter-insurgency in the state. It reflects the limitations of state government and supremacy of central government in taking policy decisions on insurgency problem.

These findings are also a fact when we recall what actually happened in the state. During the height of secessionist movements or insurgency the state government and police force were ineffective and incapable of dealing with the situation. President’s Rule was imposed with deployment of army and central security forces in Manipur in late 1970s and early 1980s. This deployment still continues though their strength fluctuates.
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24 Appendix-I Questionnaire, see Question Number 16 for details
This is in contrast to development policies in which majority of respondents believe that chief minister and his cabinet has the determining influence on policy decisions in the state. Union government’s influence through Planning Commission is recognized. Many policy actors and government agencies are involved in policy making in the state but the dominant role differs from one problem area to another. Thus, the chief minister and his cabinet on development policies and union home ministry on counter-insurgency have final say in policy decisions in the state.

In Manipur there are 68 departments including general administration department and planning department. There is a State Planning Board headed by the Chief Minister as Chairman and elected member of the state legislative Assembly as Deputy Chairman, the Commissioner (Planning) as member-secretary of the Board. The Planning Department after having detailed discussions with various departments prepares the annual plans.

Thus, though many policy actors and institutions are involved in policy making, Prime Minister and institutions directly associated with Prime Minister at the national level are the most important ones on key areas of national importance. Within their spheres, ministers and civil servants take policy decisions. Cabinet headed by Prime Minister works and takes the policy decisions on the principle of collective responsibility.

Similar system exists in the state level also with Chief Minster and institutions associated with Chief Minister being the important policy actors and institutions. However, Indian polity is highly centralized; the central government and central planning commission take many of policy initiatives and decisions for the
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25 This is as per Administration Report, 1995-96, Directorate of Information and Public Relations, Government of Manipur, Imphal.
states also. In many way and areas state governments act as mere executing agencies. With the economic reforms since 1991, the role of the Planning Commission has declined.

6.2 POLICY MAKERS AND THEIR EVALUATION

Policy makers play the dominant role in policy making process. Both politicians and civil servants particularly at the higher level are complimentary to each other and are partners in the governance and policy making process. The distinction between the two lies in the fact that the political executive takes the final policy decisions and is ultimately responsible for success or failure of policies. They are accountable to the people. Civil servants are actively involved in the implementation of policies and they are directly responsible to the political executive and their accountability to the people is indirect.

The British legacies have a deep impact in independent India's administrative system and policy making process. During British rule administrators from the Indian Civil Service (ICS) were placed in the posts especially reserved for them in the districts and secretariats in each province and at the centre. In the secretariats they were responsible for handling questions of policy arising in India in a manner broadly consistent with the economic and strategic interests of the British government. Setting aside strategic posts for a special group of political administrators in this way had a profound influence on the entire structure of the colonial state and its administration. Although much had changed by the early 1980's, this basic framework of administration was still in place.26

The Indian Administrative Service (IAS) succeeded the ICS

that was the instrument of the imperial power. The leaders of the Indian National Congress had made it clear during struggle for independence that they wanted to abolish the ICS. Yet when the British left in the 1940’s and the new Indian Government took over with Nehru as the Prime Minister, ICS Indians (with their tradition) were invited to stay on. In the year afterwards, the ICS tradition not only survived, it prospered.

One of the factors for the deterioration in working relation between the elected democratic politicians and political administrators which in part was retaining of ICS tradition of administration in a changed political context. Another change to ICS tradition was legislation and administrative action for promoting the welfare of the people based on Directive Principles of State Policy.

Implementing the Directive Principles through the preparation of national plans for economic and social development affected the whole posture of the state, shifting it from an essentially laissez-faire holding operation towards a much more interventionist role. This obviously began to affect the administration. The pace and volume of work increased.

New ministries and departments in development fields were created each with their own separate hierarchies reaching down into the districts. There was increasing dissatisfaction with ICS/IAS generalists being on top from technical experts and others who required ministerial approval for schemes from them. Probably there was no other group of civil servants in the world who held such dominant administrative posts like ICS/IAS. There were superior to any other services including state civil services. Moreover, central government exercised its power through IAS and implemented various programmes including Five-Year Plans.

Thus, there has been an argument that all India administrative frame and the ICS tradition of administration it
represented did not fit well into the three main principles of India’s new constitution—federalism, democracy and the development oriented posture of the state. However, there were ICS and IAS officers as individuals closely worked with state governments and committed to development.

Politicians are prone to blame the bureaucrats and India’s politicians are no exception. Yet, there was no serious proposal from the political leadership of the India to end the IAS and its pre-eminent positions in the administration. Even Prime Minister Nehru who was formerly been such a critic of the ICS offered only mild criticism of their colonial mentality while stressing their value in the maintenance of national unity.27. Though there were proposals for reform and reorganization, there was never any proposal surfaced that would have diminished the power and position of the IAS in the state governments. As for political leaders in the states, they might complain about IAS invasion of state rights but they were in no position to propose its abolition.

The institutional structure in India was highly centralized. Administrative power tended to be gathered together into the hands of a small group of civil servants located strategically in the districts and secretariats. This was a broad consequence of the ICS designed originally to allow a few trusted administrators to oversee a vast apparatus that they felt could not be wholly trusted.

One reason was due to the structural aspect of continuing ICS tradition, the IAS held centralized administrative power at a very high level in the state. This had contributed to much misunderstanding and distrust between the IAS and politicians,

27 Ibid., p.166.Suspicion and hostility between politicians and civil servants continues and each saw the other as a threat and competing force. See, Seshan, T.N. with Sanjoy Hazarika, The Degeneration of India, New Delhi, Penguin Books India, 1995, pp.46-47
both of whom engaged in political work. Equally relevant was the IAS attachment to service class values as part of their tradition.

Another characteristic of state bureaucracy as a whole was that it was easier to cope with problems of unity, stability and order rather than with problems requiring innovation, specialist expertise and responsiveness to local demands. The relation between order and development is complex, but surely some order is a prerequisite for development and over time, some development is a prerequisite for order.

The general orientation towards order was built into the overall fabric of administration. The persistence of the ICS tradition in a general posture taken by the bureaucratic structure as a whole has given strength in areas of maintaining unity and order. The tradition has made it less successful in encouraging innovation, specialist expertise and local demands—all important ingredients in making a development programme work in the districts.

Indian revolutionaries perhaps tended to underestimate the strength of the state bureaucracy. Inefficient in implementing development programmes, they may have been, but that was never their strong point. What the bureaucratic structures of state power in India continued to be good at and what the ICS tradition emphasized was maintaining order and dealing with any serious internal opposition to their rule. The ICS had gone, but the central feature of their tradition lived in the 1980s. So far there has been no significant reform though demand and rhetoric have surfaced from time to time.

The relationship between the political executive and civil servants in the administrative system depend upon the form of democratic society has opted for. In India the political executive is
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28 For a discussion on features of ICS traditions, see Potter, David C., op.cit., pp. 240-245.
the Council of Ministers with Prime Minister at its head. But in reality, the cabinet which functions on the principle of collective responsibility is the top policy making body in the government and exercises control over the entire machinery of government and public personnel. The cabinet's control over administration is continuous and all pervasive.29

Other matters, which are not under the cabinet, fall within the spheres of individual ministers. The minister is to lay down policies on subjects falling under his charge, ensure their effective implementation and provide drive and leadership to those working under him. He enjoys the right to issue directives and instructions to the public personnel under his charge. The functions of civil service are broadly two fold- staff and line functions. The staff function includes the assisting the minister in policy making. The line function lies outside the direct manipulation by the minister and the authority for these functions derive from specific laws.

The ideal for the civil servants posted in the secretariat is to advice the minister correctly. In practice, the minister does not wholeheartedly welcome correct advice and civil servant is likely to tailor his advice to suit the minister's liking without any concern for the public interest. The minister does not work properly in general with an interest and often an obsession with matters like individual postings, transfer, promotions and similar acts of patronage. The management of civil service postings and transfer appears to be the only creative activity in several governments and departments in India30. Successive administrative reform committees have decried this trend in ministerial behavior.

30 Ibid. p.126. In Manipur it is a lucrative job for ministers for transfer and posting due to natural divide of hills and valley as well as frequent change of governments. Further, every possible attempt has been made by officials for transfer to lucrative areas.
All strategic positions in public administration are increasingly getting reserved for politicians or senior bureaucrats. The civil service in India is not homogeneous; it has factions based on regionalism, casteism or service memberships, mostly obsessed with the manipulation of postings and promotions and matters of personal advancement. It is believed that a civil servant who is devoted only to his work and performs it conscientiously discovers himself to be completely isolated. Majority of higher civil servants would prefer to act according to the time honoured code of uprightness but they would not at the same time dare collide with the ministers. They read the mind and nature of their political masters rather minutely and modify their conduct suitably so that they do not get drenched.

Politician-civil servant relations in India depend on a number of factors of which two are important. They depend on the level of government and the historical process through which each state has passed to reach the present state of statehood. It has its inevitable impact on politician-civil servant relations in the state. For instance, Manipur was an independent kingdom till it became a Princely State for 56 years only under British (1891-1947).

She had constitutional process and elected government (1948-1949) till the then king was forced to sign the merger agreement in Shillong in 1949. She was centrally administered and then became a Union Territory and finally statehood in 1972. Due to such a long central rule (1949-1972) administration in the state particularly in the higher civil service was entirely dominated by the outsiders which resulted in resentment in the state. Such a historical process had a deep impact on the administration and relation between politicians-civil servants in the state.31

31 Another factor in Manipur has been unrest and insurgency, the causes and effects on politicians and civil servants appear to be different as well as their suggestions for solutions to these problems.
It will be interesting to know the findings of various commissions on civil service reforms in India. "The portrait that emerges out of the successive reports of the commissions of inquiry is that civil servants have by and large subordinated themselves to the will of the ministers even when the issues involved are improper or illegal. An almost recurring theme of all these reports is that the civil servants are, if not accomplices, at least privy to the wrongs committed by the ministers in pursuance of their purely personal interests. Where the ministers have strong views, the civil servants toe them almost blindly and meekly, even little bothering about the normal rules and regulations in vogue".\textsuperscript{32}

The principal reason for this malaise is the civil servants' own failure to assert themselves vis-a-vis the politicians. The civil service in India is an old institution much older than all the political institutions and individuals in the country. Besides, the civil service in India functions under conditions of low structural differentiation, which adds to its power. It easily becomes the dominant institution in the land. The voluntary organizations are generally underdeveloped and depend on political and administrative patronage for survival.

The political elite in India generally lack a significant measure of previous administrative experience. When a politician becomes a minister in India, he is generally ill equipped with knowledge of administration, which makes him entirely dependent on the power of the civil service. Except in the selected areas in which the ministers show their keen interest, the civil servants' writ by and large, prevails in other areas, which constitute the major part of public administration. The politicians in India do not command

\textsuperscript{32} Maheshwari, Shriram, op.cit., p.142. Such views are also expressed by the retired civil servants. For Instance see, Seshan, T.N., op.cit, p.68.
executive authority in any field and at best enjoys only a recommendatory status.

Thus, "Taken together, it is an open-ended oligarchy of the politicians and the administrator that wields the levers of power. Although parliamentary democracy postulates the primacy of the politician over the civil service, in reality it is the later that continues to remain the real repository of governmental authority in the country".33

During the planning period, the role of the state and its administrative agencies were considered crucial in implementing programmes of social and economic change. Today administrative reform seeks to reduce the scope of state intervention, but at the same time expects a change in the quality of intervention in the chosen sectors. Little headway was made reforming administration handed down to us by the British during the planning period. So far there have been no reforms and we have yet to see any changes in the era of liberalization. Essentially, the structure of administration processes and procedures of work and dealings with the common citizen have remained as sacred heritage. Laws framed in 1800s, two centuries ago continue to remain on our statue books.34

There is no dearth of policy recommendations for making government efficient and effective. It is just that these recommendations rarely get implemented or when implemented fail to get institutionalized. "Over the decades the bureaucrats emerged as powerful component of the decision making process, largely because the political establishment was too happy to abdicate its
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33 Maheshwari, Shriram, op.cit., p.144-145. In the context of Manipur, civil servants were more educated than the politicians, hence they played more important role in policy making in the past. This was told to the author by an IAS (retired) while discussing the issue.

responsibility to concentrate more on matters that were political. In providing continuity in civil administration despite political turbulence and change in governments, bureaucracy has also proved to be an obstacle in the path of prompt action. 'Red tapism' is as much as product of rulebook, written by the government as its interpretation and application by bureaucrats'.

The new breeds of politicians who see the rulebook as an impediment and find the bureaucracy a needless obstacle that conflicts in relationships have emerged. The bureaucrats are apprehensive about their future and their career while the politicians are in a hurry to do things that create a future for themselves in their short tenures. The result is being the helpless situation for the masses.

Some visible changes have taken place both in the district and district officer due to the fragmented expansion of governmental activities and the growth of "mafia politics". Much of a district officer's time is now simply wasted in listening, persuading and arguing with anti-social elements with whom local political leadership seems to be in companionship, while the regular official work remains unattended.

Along with the decline of the district level administration, there has been a simultaneous decline in the strengths and morale of the main public service. Despite its dominant position, the position and prestige of IAS in general has suffered due to various socio-political factors. There seems to be at present a strong


36 Jain,R.B., "New Directions in Administrative Reforms in India", in Mehta, Vinod, (ed.) op.cit, p.215. In Manipur, members of various armed groups routinely interfere in government activities.
reaction and suspicion against the power of bureaucracy and the constant hammering that it has received at the hands of the politicians. The ethical values of politicians, businessmen and the bureaucrats have gone done low and people in authority seems to have acquired dual personalities, their private actions ill match their public pronouncements.37

Administration is extremely important in the development of the objective component of public policy. However it is most crucial in defining the subjective component of public policy. Administration and policy instead of being discrete phenomena are actually interrelated. In both an objective and a subjective manner, the nature of the administrative system can influence the policy outputs of the political system.

Administration does make policy although these policies are not always written and promulgated in the same manner as the rules made by legislatures and executives. Administrators are the major personal contact between citizens and their government. As such they define a large percentage of the objective outcomes of the policy process.38

Increasingly the ministers charged with extensive political chores in addition to managing a large bureaucratic organization can not be reasonably expected to have a sufficient grasp of the issues involved or of the information available for many policy decisions. Such decisions will therefore be produced through either consultations with or delegation to the senior administrative officials. Consequently, interactions of this type have became one of the dominant features of the policy making process and must be better understood in order to predict the outcomes of the policy process in contemporary political system. 39

37 Ibid.p.216.
39 Ibid.p.149.
An important feature of post-colonialism is the dominance of the state in the process of capital accumulation. The state is rapidly drawn into more areas of intervention on behalf of the neo-colonial relation of production. The state is to provide the physical infrastructure for private enterprises. Indigenous economic interests and institutions became dependent on the state bureaucracy. The bureaucracy uses its vast resources to sponsor dependent classes.

Thus, in colonial state the bureaucracy is overdeveloped. "The bureaucracy benefits disproportionately from the absorption by the state of pre-capitalist institutions, offices, powers and duties. As capitalist relation of production develops, the state is forced to extend these involvements of the bureaucracy into new areas of regulation, support, sponsorship and intervention".40

The dominant feature of British colonial administration was ICS elite cadre of civil servants. They were both the policy makers and the executive officials.41 Power was highly centralized within the bureaucracy which largely lay in the hands of the ICS class. During the colonial period bureaucracy did serve to some extend as an integrative factor of considerable importance in a large and highly populated country. The hopes and aspirations of the people of independent India created new tasks and responsibilities which were assigned to IAS but with no radical break with the British administrative tradition.

Bureaucracy exercises a pernicious cultural influence in India’s official structure not only by reason of its continued expansion but due to unabated influences that it is subjected to from the society at large. Senior officials have some margin or latitude both in advising about policy and carrying it out. They can

41 Dwivedi, O.P. and Jain, R.B., India's Administrative State, New Delhi, Geetanjali Publishing House, 1985, p.34
evaluate a given policy proposal as being highly desirable, merely feasible or ill considered. In so far as political values influence such choices, the ideological preferences of senior officials are an important variable in policy making.42

The constitutional protection accorded to the civil service has proved to be of little avail and today it is prepared to go to any length to accommodate the political bosses. The political boss has been able to make the civil service toe his line because of his triple power of posting and transfer, of promotions and of suspension. Posting and transfers are the normal processes in personnel administration but these processes are often invoked vindictively for punishment or for reward. However, the greater culprit is the civil servant. He has mastered all the rules and regulations and can prepare a case of favorable to the minister's viewpoint to gain favour.43

Planning and control mechanism also brought out the shortcomings of bureaucracy. Centralized planning led to centralized administrative attitudes which inhibited impulses and initiatives at state and local levels. Centralized mechanisms made private enterprise concentrate on manipulating levers of administration. With big public spending and powers of control, the lobbies of big business and contractors increasingly attracted the bureaucracy even at higher levels to the lures of easy money.44

Bureaucracy lacking objectivity and impartiality, expertise and in-depth knowledge with frequent transfers increasing lost its capabilities particularly at higher levels contributing to policy making. Bureaucracy's role was squeezed out between experts of various sorts giving convenient advice to politicians on policy
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42 Ibid., p.50.
43 Maheshwari, Shiram, Indian Administrative System, New Delhi, Jawahar Publishers and Distributors, 1994, p.278.
44 Dubhashi, P.R., Recent Trends in Public Administration, Delhi, Kaveri Books, 1995, p.88. Also see, Seshan, T.N., op.cit, p.48.
matters and politicians themselves deciding how would be the beneficiaries. This is particularly in the context of public funds being allotted to MPs and MLAs. In the states, the officers of the State Civil Services have started questioning the supremacy of the IAS and attacking with increasing ferocity. In this they gave the ready support of the some state politicians who find the independence of the IAS an inconvenient obstruction in rendering public service.45

Not only postings and transfers but the entire career of the civil servants is at the mercy of their political masters, the higher the rung of the career ladder, the more this is so. While the honest, upright and straightforward civil servants have been side tracked, the clever and the ambitious have vied with each other for sharing the plum posts. This is the irony and tragedy of the civil services in India. In such a climate it is no wonder that the rule of law becomes causality. A civil servant that at every step invokes rules for not doing things would be branded as one with a negative attitude and an obstructionist.

Once this kind of thinking becomes common, it becomes a habit for the political master to expect compliance from the civil servant even when it would go against the rules. The area of political interference gets continually extended to serve party, partisan and personal interest. The distinction between public and private interest gets totally blurred. A civil servant has to give his advice without fear or favour. Experience has shown that a civil servant cares for his career, has to care for both fear and favour of his political master. He should master the art of knowing in advance the mind of his minister and tender his advice accordingly.

The implication of democratic government is that the bureaucracy is accountable to the people's representatives. Its

45 Dubhashi, P.R., op.cit., p.90.
further implication is that the bureaucracy should adjust to the
demands and requirements of a democratic political system. The
challenge for the bureaucracy in India is to accept the supremacy of
political leadership and to give it full cooperation. A fact which does
not seem to have been accepted by all the bureaucrats.

There are many factors for this situation. One of the reasons
may be their difference in background and interests as well as their
priorities. It is common knowledge that bureaucrats privately while
they are serving and openly after they retire blame the ministers
and the political leaders for all the ills of Indian administration.\textsuperscript{46} The ministers also publicly condemn the inefficiency of the civil
service. This mutual distrust is serious problems of the present day
situation in India.

When there is conflict of opinions or disagreement between
the minister and civil servant, parting of the ways seems to be the
only solution. The minister is averse to form and routine and
believes in quick disposal of work and finds it difficult to work with
procedure oriented officials preferring instead action oriented or goal
oriented civil servants. Conflicts may arise between ministers and
the civil servant over the correct interpretation of departmental
policy since all the instructions cannot be given in writing. The
result is that some matters are left to individual judgement and
interpretation. Sometimes this leads to the charge that civil servants
are not following the policy and are not co-operative.

Often a request by the minister to his officials to expedite
matters and even to waive some of the procedural formalities is
popularly misinterpreted as ministerial interference. Indian
bureaucracy is notoriously slow moving and a plethora of procedure
creates many bottlenecks. In India there is a great gap between
highly educated, urban sophisticated higher civil service and the

\textsuperscript{46} Bhambri, C.P., \textit{Administrators in a Changing Society}, Delhi, National, 1972,
p.9.
poor, illiterate, rural teeming millions and the minister has to work as an intermediary because he has his hand on the pulse of both the common man and the bureaucrat. This is particularly true of Manipur society.

Many conflicts arise between the central cabinet ministers and the civil servants because the ministers have to look towards the interests of their constituents and party followers. Ministers depend upon votes and votes depend on the capacity to get things done. Thus the sociological factor of the role of primordial royalties and the political factor of keeping his supporters happy lead the ministers both to pressurize the administration and to act in an extra-procedural fashion.

This is in contrast to British colonial days in which ICS officers did not face the constant interaction and pressure of democratic governments and leaders. They were accountable to their administrative leadership only and function within the rules that basically meant to serve the colonial interests. In that sense they were rather independent. But in independent India they have to function under both administrative and political leadership. Unfortunately almost the same set of rules continues and civil servants try to follow them. Moreover people are more aware of their democratic rights. In these changed conditions the problems of relations between the minister-civil servants are not surprising.

In addition, money plays a very important role in speeding up administrative decisions in India. Those who cannot afford to pay money or fail to get things done with money use the influence and prestige of the minister to influence the civil service. It is sometimes pointed out that the maladjustment between ministers and civil service is also due to different socio-economic background of the two. Another dimension of the minister-civil service relationship is whether the minister is able to provide administrative leadership. In the early years after independence civil servants were skeptical
about the capacity of the ministers to manage state affairs but with more experience working together, these opinions tended to change. 47

The system of government prevalent in India postulates a minister who is a part of legislature at the top and holding command over a body of permanent professional civil servants whose administrative head is the secretary. The relationship between the minister and secretary is of critical importance to the effective functioning of the machinery of government. This has not yet fully developed a body of well-crystallized conventions to inform their relationship. 48 A minister comes and goes depending on the fluctuations of party fortunes. The secretary is a permanent civil servant possessing wide administrative experience. Each lacks what is best in the other and therefore supplements the other.

It is not possible to separate policy from administration. Both are in practice intermingled. A close and intimate relationship must exist between the minister and his secretary for the optimal efficiency of the ministry. 49 With the whole system of policy making involving various entities and levels of executive government, the problem of relationship assumes importance. Executive government is a continuous process. Ministers change and go in and out of governmental office, but officials remain set with their different cadres and terms of service. This fact alone raises many serious problems in relationship and quite apart from any individual predilections or points of view on matters of public concerns. 50

47 Details on the areas of conflicts between the ministers and civil servants, see ibid., pp. 50-55. The corruption of political class and bureaucracy besides administration is a reality in Manipur as we have found out in Chapter IV.
49 On a brief discussion on the Minister – Secretary relationship in India, see ibid., pp. 228-237.
There is interdependence in their relationship. Civil servants enjoy constitutional and statuary protection and can count upon remaining in public service for long years as a lifetime career unlike ministers who come and go at vary short notice, according to fortunes of politics. Generations of politicians and civil servants have gone through the mill of government and administration. Minister–secretary relationship has been a mixed picture. On the whole there have been more problems of relationship in the states than at the centre although the central government has had some quite spectacular instances of minister-secretary breakdown of confidence and joint working.51

Coalition governments and governments formed by a minority party in the legislature have been scene of greater difficulty in mutual adjustment between officials and politicians especially at the minister-secretary level. Over a large area of public administration, political expediency tends to assume pressing importance. In the resulting pressures expediency often appears to be preferable to administrative principle.

It is often suggested that bureaucracy in India is rarely subjected to any meaningful control and their powers have steadily increased. Public confidence in the bureaucracy appears to have hit an all time low. Recent controversies involving minister-civil servant relationship have raised doubts as to who controls and directs governmental activity.52 In recent years, bureaucratic activism has become fashionable and has often been applauded both by the media and public. Setting aside civil service regulations, serving bureaucrats have publicly criticized both the political leadership and the erring bureaucrats with a view to exposing the unholy
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51 Ibid.p.18
nexus between the two. In recent years several retired bureaucrats too have launched vigorous campaigns to expose both political leaders and the bureaucracy.

The frequent transfer of bureaucrats and attempts to place pliable officers in critical positions is also linked to the phenomenal increase in governmental expenditure on development related activities and the wide scope it provides for corrupt practices. While the political leadership has undoubtedly contributed to crippling control over the bureaucracy, the role of the bureaucracy in perverting the instrumentalities of control cannot be ignored. Not only have the bureaucrats been successful in manipulating the ministers to serve their own group interests, they have often misled the political leaders into taking decisions which are not always in the national interests.53

Thus the policy making is severely affected by the relationship between the politicians and civil servants. It also affects the kind of policies adopted and their implementation. Their positions as well as their respective concerns and interests have defined their relations. It is further conditioned by their changing attitudes and the larger socio-economic and political processes. There have been conflicts and disagreements between the two which seriously hamper effective policy formulation and their implementation.

Now we examine the policy makers based on the primary sources that were collected during the fieldwork in Manipur. The sources mainly consist of questionnaire data and discussion during the fieldwork with a cross section of people. There are seven questions in the Questionnaire, which deal with policy makers in

53 Ibid., p.71. Centralized process of planning gave no accountability and money sanctioned could be badly misused by politicians and civil servants. See, Seshan, T.N., op.cit., p.100.
their various aspects. The questions Nos. are 4, 16, 7, 8, 19, 20 and 15.

Policy makers during the President’s Rules are not discussed here since they are under special circumstances and already discussed in the Chapter V. The examination of policy makers is to find out the relations among the policy makers, their responsiveness to the people and relative importance in policy making of politicians and civil servants. An attempt is also made to evaluate the policy makers in the light of the failures of the policies to produce the desired results.

The Question No. 4 seeks to find out the actual policy makers in development policies. As we have found out, the final decisions on development policies in the state lie with the chief minister and his cabinet. The chief minister being the head of the cabinet is the most important policy maker at the state level. The significant role of Union Planning Commission on development policies of the state is also recognized.

In the case of the problem of insurgency, Union Home Ministry takes the final policy decisions. In other words, the policy makers in counter-insurgency policies are the Union Home Ministry people. The state government plays only minor role on counter-insurgency policy decisions. PMO’s role is also recognized. Thus, actual policy makers of counter-insurgency are from the central government. The Question No. 16 deals with this aspect and it has been discussed above. Now we will examine the relation among the policy makers in the state.

Question Nos. 7 and 8 deal with the relations among the policy makers and factors that affect them. Question No. 7 seeks to find out the three most important factors that obstruct the smooth
relations between civil servants and political leaders in policy making. The question is “what are the three most important factors which obstruct the smooth relations between civil servants and political leaders in policy making?” The given response are (a) lack of mutual trust (b) disagreement on policy choices (c) corruption of political leadership (d) corruption of bureaucracy (e) interference from the centre (f) any other.  

The first most important factor is the corruption of political leadership, which obstructs the smooth relations between civil servants and political leaders in policy making according to 60% of the respondents. The corruption of bureaucracy is the second and disagreement on policy choices, the third most important factors, which obstruct the smooth relations between civil servants and political leaders in policy making in Manipur.

Significantly, civil servants and politicians express almost similar views on these issues. 83% of the politicians and 73% of civil servants feel that corruption of political leadership is the first most important factor. Both civil servants and politicians believe corruption of bureaucracy is the second most important factor which obstructs the smooth relations between them in policy making. Lack of mutual trust and disagreement on policy choices are other important factors.

These findings reflect the confirmation of popular belief and social reality of corruption of political leaders and civil servants. They indicate the existence of corruption of both politicians and civil servants. Both politicians and civil servants of the state have admitted this fact. A significant number of them believe that lack of
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54 Appendix-I, Questionnaire, see Question No. 7 for details.
mutual trust between civil servants and political leaders are the first important factor.

However, knowledgeable persons express a different view from those of civil servants and politicians. They are of the view that corruption of political leadership is the second while corruption of bureaucracy, the third most important factors. For knowledgeable persons lack of mutual trust is the first most important factor. This means that perhaps corruption of both political leadership and bureaucracy could be the reason for lack of mutual trust between them. Disagreement on policy choices is an important factor according to some of them.

Some of the respondents believe administrative incompetence, no long term vision, lack of vision and determination of the political leadership, primacy of self interest over public interest are important factors which obstruct the smooth relations between civil servants and political leaders in policy making. Interference from the centre is also an important factor. However, the three most important factors are corruption of political leadership and bureaucracy, lack of mutual trust and disagreements on policy choices between them.

All the above factors are inter-related. Corruption of political leadership and bureaucracy is a tragic social reality in Manipur. This has been root cause of many problems in the state including the rise and continuation of insurgency. Therefore there is lack of transparency and fairness in the administrative process and governance in Manipur. It may be one of the significant causes of ineffective policies and their implementation in the state. Significantly this reality has been expressed and accepted by those who belong to these two classes. Next we will examine relations among the policy makers in general.
Question No. 8 of the Questionnaire deals with relations between various policy actors. It seeks to examine the relations among the three sets of policy actors, (a) IAS/IPS and political leadership (b) state civil service and political leadership (c) IAS/IPS Direct Recruits and IAS/IPS Promotees. The question is "How would you describe the relations between the following sets of actors in policy making?" The identified responses are good, average and bad.

About 63% of the respondents feel that the relation between IAS/IPS and political leadership in policy making in the state is average. 30% of them believe it is good. The relation between state civil services and political leadership is average according to 52% of the respondents. While 37% of them believe it is good. 59% of the respondents express the view that the relation between IAS/IPS Direct Recruits and IAS/IPS Promotes is average. However, 22% of them believe the relation between the two is bad.

Thus, on the whole the relations among the above set of policy actors are average. The relation between IAS/IPS Direct Recruits and IAS/IPS Promotes is comparatively below average. This may understandable since the direct recruits are mostly outsiders compared to promotees who are locals even though now they belong to the same higher civil service.

The views of civil servants and politicians are almost similar on the relation between the above set of policy actors. However, knowledgeable persons have a different view. Majority of them believes that the relation between state civil services and political leadership is good. 50% of them feel the relation between IAS/IPS Direct Recruits and IAS/IPS promotes is average but the remaining

---

55 Ibid, see Question No. 8 for details.
50% of believe their relation is *bad*. This can be understandable since both the political leadership and IAS/IPS Promotes belong to the state and have similar understanding though their interests may be different.

On the other hand IAS/IPS Direct Recruits are mostly from outside who have a different understanding of the situations. It has been pointed out that there are many ministers who are not comfortable either in Hindi or English. This creates a problem of communication with IAS/IPS Direct Recruits. In the past even the local civil servants have higher educational qualifications than their political masters. However this has been gradually changing with many people with higher educational qualifications joining politics and becoming ministers in the state.

Now we will examine the responsiveness of policy makers to the needs and aspirations of people for whose betterment policies are made and implemented. The Question No. 19 deals with this aspect. The question is “What are the three most important considerations in your mind when suggesting policies options?” The given responses are (a) effectiveness of the policy (b) aspirations of the masses (c) programmes of the party in power (d) interests of the civil servants (e) insurgency containment (f) any other consideration.\(^{56}\) The respondents have been asked to mark in order of importance.

The most important consideration when suggesting policy options is *effectiveness of the policy* according to majority of the respondents about 56%. *Aspirations of the masses* are second most important consideration but according to some of them it is the most important consideration. The third most important

\(^{56}\) Ibid., see Question No. 19 for details.
consideration while suggesting policy options is the *programmes of the party in power*. Except the first most important consideration, the respondents’ opinions are divided on the second and third considerations.

Civil servants have more clear views than the politicians and knowledgeable persons. Thus, 73% of the civil servants believe when they are suggesting policies options *effectiveness of the policy* and *aspirations of the masses* as the first and the second most important considerations respectively. The third consideration is equally divided between *programmes of the party in power* and *insurgency containment*. Some of them express that *insurgency containment* is the first most important consideration when they suggest policy options. It reflects concern about insurgency problem among some of the civil servants.

About 50% of the politicians feel that *effectiveness of the policy*, *aspirations of the masses* and *programmes of the party in power* are the first, second and the third most important considerations respectively. About half of them express the view that *aspirations of the masses* are the first most important consideration. A few of them also mention *insurgency containment* as important consideration.

The opinions of the knowledgeable persons are divided. A significant number but less than half of them believes *effectiveness of the policy* first, *programmes of the party in power*, the second and *aspirations of the masses* the third considerations while suggesting policies options. For some of them the above three considerations and their ranking are interchangeable. Surprisingly they do not feel *containment of insurgency* has been an option when civil servants suggest policy options.
Though there are differences of opinions about the rankings, it is clear that *effectiveness of the policy, aspirations of the masses* and *programmes of the party in power* are the three most important considerations when suggesting policy options. Thus, policy makers have shown responsiveness to the aspirations of the masses though it is not the most important considered policy option. *Insurgency containment* is another important considered policy option.

Next an attempt is made to evaluate the policy makers. It is clear that politicians particularly cabinet headed by chief minister and top level civil servants are actual policy makers in the state. It is also confirmed that cabinet headed by chief minister takes the final policy decision on development policy making. However, Union Planning Commission has great influence on development policies in the state.

In contrast, Union Home Ministry takes final policy decisions on counter-insurgency policies in the state. Evaluating policy makers means critical examination of the role and contribution of civil servants and politicians on the problems as well as policy making on development and counter-insurgency.

The relevant questions for evaluation of policy makers are Question Nos. 7, 13, 15 and 18 of the Questionnaire in Appendix-I. We have seen in analyzing the responses of the Question No. 7 that *corruption of political leadership* and *bureaucracy* are the important factors which obstruct the smooth relations between civil servants and political leaders in policy making. This obviously contributes to *lack of trust* and hence affects their relations and effective policy making in the state.

Similarly, *corruption of the political leaders* has been the most important cause for continuing problem of insurgency as we have
found out in Chapter IV from questionnaire data analysis of Question No. 13.\textsuperscript{57} Corruption of bureaucracy has been another important cause for the problem. Thus, it means for solving the problem of insurgency,

it would require reducing the level of or removal of corruption of political leaders and bureaucracy. This has been confirmed from the response analysis of the Question 15 in Chapter IV. It has agreed by almost all the respondents that solutions to administrative and political corruption along with solution to unemployment of youth must form an essential part in counter-insurgency policy making in Manipur.

\textit{Administrative corruption} has been one of the most important criteria employed in the evaluation of policies of both development and counter-insurgency. This has been clear from the data analysis of the responses to Question No. 18. It means they recognize and accept the fact of the existence of administrative corruption as important problem in policy making: This has caused considerable lack of credibility and in fact legitimacy of administration. These situations are fertile ground for anti-establishment feelings in the state which have been fully exploited by many including armed groups. Therefore any movement even social has anti-establishment tendencies against both state and central governments in the state.

Thus, corruption of political leadership and civil servants who are the policy makers is a critical problem in the society, administration, good governance and above all effective policy making. Significantly, this tragic reality has been expressed and accepted by those who belong to both political and administrative leadership in the state. Corruption of political leadership and civil

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., see Question No. 13 for details.
servants has been important cause for continuation of the problem of insurgency in the state. It would not be an exaggeration to conclude that reduction or removal of corruption of policy makers would have solved half the problem of insurgency and effective policy making in Manipur.

Next we will try to find out the major obstacles in implementing the policies. The Question No. 20 deals with this aspect. "According to you, what are three major obstacles in implementing the policies?" is the question. The given responses are (a) unsuitability of the policies themselves, (b) insurgency, (c) political interference, (d) corruption of political leaders, (e) corruption of bureaucracy, (f) political instability, (g) lack of popular support, (h) any other obstacle. 58

An analysis of the responses indicates a number of obstacles in implementing policies and difference of opinion among policy actors. There is no majority agreement on the first, second and third rankings of the obstacles because of existence of numerous of obstacles. Thus, about one third of them believe unsuitability of the policies themselves, corruption of political leadership and bureaucracy are the first, second and third major obstacles respectively in implementing policies. A significant number of them say political interference and lack of popular support has been the major obstacles in implementing policies in the state.

The difference of opinion exists both among and between the civil servants and politicians. There is no majority agreement on the ranking of the obstacles among the civil servants. Corruption of political leaders and bureaucracy are the most important obstacles

58 Ibid., see Question No. 20 for details.
according to them. These are significant findings since civil servants are actually and actively involved in implementing policies.

The most divided opinion is from the politicians. According to them unsuitability of the policies themselves, political interference, corruption of political leaders and bureaucracy are the major obstacles in implementing policies. A few of them believe besides the above obstacles, insurgency, political instability and lack of popular support are the obstacles. Knowledgeable persons have more clear views. According to them, unsuitability of the policies themselves and corruption of bureaucracy and insurgency are the first, second and third major obstacles respectively in implementing police. Corruption of political leaders and political interference are the other major obstacles.

Thus, lack of popular support has not been the major obstacle in implementing the policies. It means major obstacles are from the system and policy makers themselves in addition to insurgency. Corruption of bureaucracy is the major obstacle in implementing policies. It is significant since civil servants implement the policies. Another obstacle is the political interference along with corruption of political leaders.

Unsuitability of the policies themselves, which has been the most important obstacle, indicates extent of the problem of policy making in the state. It confirms the ineffectiveness of the policies and failure on the part of policy makers to adopt suitable and effective policies. It is clear that policy makers are largely to blame for ineffective policies and for the failure to implement policies successfully in the state.
6.3 SUGGESTIONS FOR EFFECTIVE POLICY MAKING

An ideal situation for effective policy making demands cooperation, trust and agreement on priority areas between the policy makers. It also requires close partnership between policy makers and social groups and citizens in a stable environment. Such a situation does not exist in Manipur.

For effective policies and their successful implementation require number of factors and conditions. The first important requirement is that the policy makers must have a clear vision. They also must be sensitive to the needs and aspirations of the people for whom policies are made. The second is the availability of resources without which the best policies can not be successfully implemented. Related to it is the optimum and efficient utilization of available funds and other resources.

Other conditions include the stable social and political environment under which policy making and implementation take place. It also demands that the institutions must be functioning and actively involved. The conflicts of interests and disagreements over policy priority areas and choices do not contribute to effective policymaking. It means that they are to be removed or minimized.

The above conditions simply do not exist in Manipur. Therefore it is not surprising that effective policy making is still a dream and the result has been failure to achieve the defined goals in both development and counter-insurgency policies. It is indeed a difficult task to combine the various suggestions for effective policy making for development and counter-insurgency policy making in the Manipur from the questionnaire data.

Difficulties are partly due to heterogeneous nature of suggestions, partly due to the complexity of the development and
insurgency problems and due to cross section and distinct categories of people who have offered the suggestions. There is a separate section in the questionnaire (Appendix-I) on this for both development and counter-insurgency policies. Question No.21 deals this aspect.

The Parliament Committee on insurgency situation in the North-East has suggested various measures for containing the insurgency in the region from the regional perspective. It will be interesting to examine some of them first.

The North-Eastern States are faced with the problem of large scale unemployment, especially amongst the youth. These youths who are without jobs, fall an easy prey to insurgent activities. It is very essential that these youths are used for constructive work and brought in the mainstream of national life. If we are able to properly channelise their services in productive work, it will be a serious blow to the insurgent activities and lead to the economic development of the region. It is therefore an immense need of the hour that these youths are provided with gainful employment under various employment/self-employment schemes/programmes of the Government.

Further, these programmes/schemes require periodic review and the follow-up action of their outcome. The small-scale industries would also have to be developed in a big way to utilize the manpower potential. Government should establish recruitment centres and launches recruitment drive in the region for government undertakings like Civil Aviation, Railways and Post and Telegraph so that the unemployed youth get an opportunity of employment. It will be better if recruitment boards of these undertakings have representation from the North-East also. Government must explore all the possibilities in this regard.
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The Committee feels that financial constraints should not come in the way of fighting insurgency and undertaking speedy economic development of the North-Eastern region. Insurgency is a national problem and everyone will be required to make sacrifice to solve this problem. The Committee has been apprised that there has been no proper utilization of funds, with the result that the benefits intended for the common people have not reached them. The Committee therefore, opines that there should be regular and close monitoring of funds to ensure their proper utilization.

There are wide ethnic, religious and cultural diversities in the entire region. Numerous tribes, sub-tribes in the region perceive their status in danger in remaining with other groups/tribes in that district/State. The problem has been aggravated due to poor vigil on our borders, resulting in illegal infiltration and demographic changes. This situation has led to frustration, discontentment and insecurity among the original inhabitants of that State. This is why a demand is now being raised for an ethnographic survey of the North-Eastern Region. The Committee feels that this problem need immediate attention with due cares for Constitutional safeguards.

Government should take steps to prevent alleged diversion of Central Development Funds for the rehabilitation of surrendered militants. Since the internal resources of all the North-Eastern States are limited, centre should come forward with an economic package to assist the state governments in rehabilitation of these surrendered extremists.

To strengthen national integration and to boost economic development, the Regional Council needs to be strengthened. The North-Eastern Council should be reconstituted with the Union Home Minister/Deputy Chairman of Planning Commission as Chairman. In the Council, Union Ministers of Finance, Agriculture,
Railway, Surface Transport, Welfare, Rural Development etc. should be included as members along with Chief Ministers of all the North-Eastern States. The Council should hold regular meetings. These meetings should be held in each state Capital by rotation.59

At the end the Committee feels that the problem of insurgency in the North-Eastern Region has become a national problem with multifaceted dimensions. The problem needs to be viewed as the problem of the entire region, not confined to one state and should be tackled accordingly. This requires a concerted and sincere effort on the part of all concerned rising above narrow considerations and without making any prestige issue in the interest of the country.

Based on the suggestions made by the respondents to questionnaire, we will examine the measures required for effective policy making with special reference to development and counter-insurgency. This is done on the basis of questionnaire data analysis and discussion with a cross section of people during the fieldwork in Manipur.

First, we will discuss the suggestions of knowledgeable persons and then those of politicians and civil servants.60 The most common suggestions for effective policy making by the knowledgeable persons are that both political leaders and bureaucrats should be free from corruption. The policies should be based on the needs and requirements of the local people for their effectiveness.

These measures are understandable since corruption of political leadership and civil servants have been major

60 Question No. 21 of questionnaire deals with this aspect.
contributing factors for the present situations. The present practice of deciding development policy priorities by central government for the state has not produced the desired results. The people must be involved both in policy making and implementing processes since policies are meant for them.

Broadly there are three types of measures suggested by knowledgeable persons. One concerns the priority areas and steps to be taken by political and administrative leadership of the state. Effective leadership is a must and they must be genuinely prepared to commit themselves for the welfare of the masses. The political leadership and administrators (top civil servants) must ensure the government functions according to the principles of economy, efficiency and effectiveness. They have to show that “public offices are to work in the interest of the people. They are not the institutions of exploitation. The beginning may be made with the armed personnel (state police”).

The priority areas are infrastructural development (especially communication, transportation and power), employment generation schemes and rehabilitation of educated youths and technological advancements. A very common and important priority area for many is need for improvement of the education since it is concerned with the future generation. Education will bring more awareness to the people and make citizens vigilant. It will contribute people to take part in decision making process through democratic institutions. Any programme or action may be started to show that the government is doing justice to the public. All these will really help in solving the problem of insurgency and also bring emotional integration.

Another type of measure for effective policy making in the state is the role of central government. It is believed by some
that direct monitoring by the central government of the optimum utilization of public expenditure is needed in the state. The third type of measure is from economic perspective. It includes establishment of a "modern property rights regimes" and viewing development in a South-East Asian context.

Besides the above three types, appreciation of the "good in the other" in a plural society is needed for a harmonious and peaceful existence. Exposure to the outside world and ideas must compliment the above measures. With the fulfillment of the above needs and measures, development of the state and finding a solution to the insurgency problem can be visualized in spite of lack of local responses.

The measures suggested by politicians have common with knowledgeable persons on the need for end to corruption of political leadership, emphasis on education, schemes for employment of youths and infrastructural development. However, they differ from knowledgeable persons in two aspects. One is expectation and role of central government and leadership. The second is their emphasis on need for political stability, dialogue with insurgents and eradication of tendency towards muscle power and criminalization of politics.

Politicians feel the need for a more positive role of central government and leadership. These include adequate central funding, to pressurize the central government for a rapid infrastructural development within a time framework with adequate finance, change the neglecting attitude of the centre and to inculcate a sense of belongingness in the minds of people. To post experienced and honest All India Service officers in the region and "equal attention and avoidance of indifferent attitude
of the central government towards smaller insurgency prone-states of the North East” are also required.

To remove regional imbalance for development and efforts to bring oneness of the Indian nation are also essential. Some of them have suggested “to transfer into actions the provision of Merger Agreements particularly employment for bringing confidence of the state elite as well as the people”.

Some of them have emphasized modernization of agriculture, establishment of industries suited to the local conditions and development of means of transport to support the industries. Politicians have strongly emphasized the need for a solution to the problem of insurgency through the creation of more jobs, poverty eradication and checking of pro-insurgency leaders. It may be summarized as “initiation of dialogue with various insurgent outfits for restoring peace and normal life with a more human approach keeping always in view, among others, that the insurgents are also sons of our soil”. For this, strong political will and determination with mass support are needed. Further, suitable measures must be taken to ensure transparency in administration at all levels.

Compared to knowledgeable persons and politicians, civil servants have suggested more practical measures. For fighting corruption and to make it effective, the C.B.I. should be given powers to take up cases against corruption. This is because state vigilance has “no power to proceed against corruption as they are at the mercy of the state government”. Bribery in appointment is rampant. The government through the P.W.D carries out development works in Manipur. The contractors who actually take up implementation works are “at the mercy of the authority
who willy nilly delays payment”. Thus, they emphasize the need for end to corruption and incentive rules for development.

Many of the civil servants have pointed out the need for small scale industries, agro and horticulture development and special efforts for self employment and maximum job opportunity for unemployed youths. Rehabilitation programmes for ex-insurgents with a view to contain insurgency in the state are needed. They also have emphasized need for political stability, to take up all the development programmes suitable to the local situations and requirements. Above all, development agencies must be allowed “to work freely without political or insurgent interference and pressures”. Adequate funding from central and state government is also required.

For effective counter-insurgency policies, some of the civil servants have suggested to re-organize the police department and other civil departments by giving proper training and equipment required for the purpose. They have pointed out the importance of “a stable government having a firm will power for supporting all agencies fighting the insurgency”.

According to civil servants there is need for strong political will and commitment on the part of the political leaders who are at the helm of the affairs in the state. The political leaders have the responsibility to restore credibility of the state government, administration and to set the self-examples before people and in their minds. They also must have “the ability to identify and project the developmental needs of the state on priority basis and convince the policy makers at the centre”.

For a solution to the problem of insurgency in the state, two options/measures have been suggested by some of the
serving IAS officers. One option is to give full power to army and security forces to flush out the insurgents. The second option is to start a dialogue with insurgent groups for negotiated solution in a democratic and peaceful manner. They are of the view that political leadership in the state is reluctant on the first option while for the second option there is lack of political will and determination on the part of the state political leadership.

Thus there are number of measures to be taken up for effective policy making for development and counter-insurgency in the state. The suggestions differ according to the categories of people who have different understanding and way of looking at the problems of development and insurgency in the state. Civil servants have suggested more practical measures while politicians have emphasized the role of central government. The knowledgeable persons have given the important roles to both politicians and civil servants of the state for effective policy making.

The next Chapter is conclusion with a summary of major and significant findings of the thesis in a perspective. The thesis ends with some thoughts for solutions of the problems of development and insurgency in the state.

---

61 These options/views have been expressed by some of the serving IAS officers in the state to the author while discussing the solutions to the problem of insurgency during his fieldwork in Manipur. These views have been shared by many of the IAS officers in the state, according to them.