CHAPTER - II

ROLE OF BUREAUCRACY IN DEVELOPMENT

Concept of Bureaucracy:

Bureaucracy has emerged as a dominant feature of the contemporary world. Virtually everywhere in public or large private organisation developed or developing nation's bureaucratic structures are a universal phenomenon. Economic, social and political life are extensively influenced by bureaucratic organisations. Indeed, even the transmission of knowledge and culture have often become bureaucratised and to the extent that the world itself is organised, its organisation is largely bureaucratic. Nowhere has the tendency towards bureaucratisation been greater than in the realm of governance. Hans Rosenberg has rightly observed that "for good or evil, an essential part of the present structure of governance consists of its far-flung system of professionalised administration and its hierarchy of appointed officials upon whom society is thoroughly dependent. Whether we live under the most totalitarian dispotism or in the most liberal democracy, we are governed to a considerable extent by a bureaucracy of
some kind." Bureaucracy' is a perp lexing term and has been subjected to many different definitions. It is used variously to identify an institution or a caste, a mode of operation, an ideology, a view of viewing and organising society, a way of life, a social category etc. The term bureaucracy appears to have began its career to describe a government by officials. Vineet de Gourney is said to have coined the term in 1745. From the start its use appears to have been pejorative and its focus to have been on government officials. It was seen as a form of government by officials, characterised by its tendency to meddle, to exceed its proper functions. An 1813 edition of a German dictionary of foreign expressions defined bureaucracy as "the authority or power which various government departments and their branches aggregate to themselves over fellow citizens". In 1835 Henry Monnein portrayed a day in the life of bureaucrat: "at nine o'clock the employees arrive at the ministry and warm themselves around an excessively hot stove; at ten they have tea and sharpen their quills; at ten-thirty they chat; at one they have lunch; at two they go for walks inside the ministry. The only time they work is midday,
when the head of their makes his tour of inspection. Bengt Abrahamsson says that bureaucracy has been identified with either of the following seven divisions: state administration, group of officials, administrative autocracy, rational organisation, organisational inefficiency, modern organisation a modern society. He observes that the concept of bureaucracy is multisided. It is used as a summary term for a category of persons with special administrative tasks, as specific form of organisation and polemically and poetically as a criticism of certain trends in modern society.

Laski applied the term bureaucracy for a system of government the control of which is so completely in hands of officials that their power jeopardises the liberties of ordinary citizens. The term has caused so much of controversy and confusion that some scholars are of the opinion that the only reasonable approach is to avoid the use of term bureaucracy while pursuing research in the area in which it has been employed.

Changing Concept of Bureaucracy:

Bureaucracy continued to be understood in the manner described earlier through the 19th century. But con-
ceptions began to emerge which recognised that there are differences other than those of power and size between groups of official and modes of organisation. One of the most important of these conceptions "transfers attention from officials as a social group to the mode of organisation of the institution in which they serve. This use of bureaucracy is important as a fore runner of the wide spread 20th century habit of applying the terms "bureaucracies" or 'bureaucratic' to institutions rather than to the official employed in them; these latter are called bureaucrats as much because they work in the institutions as because they are members of a social group". 8

It was Max Weber, a German sociologist, who gave the modern concept of bureaucracy. He never defined bureaucracy in the explicit way in which he defined "Class" or status group: He regarded bureaucracy as a universal social phenomenon, and the means of carrying "Community action" over into rationally ordered "social action". He outlined the characteristics of the 'ideal' type from functional point of view. Some of these characteristic are structural and others behav-
He used the word bureaucracy not to refer disparingly to rule by officials, but to designate a quite specific kind of administrative organisation. He insisted that modern bureaucratic organisation as a form of apparatus was sui generis.⁹

Marshall E. Dimock identified bureaucracy with institutions and large scale organisations in society. For him "Bureaucracy is the state of society in which institutions overshadow individuals and simple family relationships; stage of development in which division of labour, specialisation, organisation, hierarchy, planning and regimentation of large groups of individuals either by voluntary or involuntary methods, are the order of the day. Bureaucracy is simply institutionalism written. It is not some foreign substance which has been infused into the life-blood of an institution, it is merely the accentuation of characteristic found in all. It is a matter of degree, of the combination of components, and of the relative emphasis given to them". ¹⁰

John A. Veig says, in free translation it means 'desk government' or management by bureaus. "It denotes sum total of the personnel apparatus and procedures by
which an organisation manages its work and a
complishes its purposes. The organisation may be pub-
lic or private governmental, commercial, educational, ec-
clesiastical; but if it is of any size, it must be a bureauc-
 racy, in this sense." 11

Theories of Bureaucracy:

Since the rise of bureaucracy in the modern state sys-
tem, its growing strong hold over power and its increas-
ing control over the lives of the citizens, a number of
thinkers and social scientists have viewed it from dif-
ferent angles. It, therefore, will be useful to briefly exam-
ine what representatives of different streams of thought
have said on this subject.

Marxist View of Bureaucracy

Much before Karl Marx, Saint Seimon had viewed bu-
reaucracy as officials who governed in their own inter-
est rather than in the interests of the governed. They
sought high pay for themselves and were not merely use-
less but were an immense, growing and expensive crowd
of incompetent parasites. "Since they had the same
needs and desires as producers, but produced nothing
themselves, these people necessarily live on the work of
others, either they are given or they take; in a word they are idlers, that is to say thieves."  

Karl Marx on Bureaucracy:

Karl Marx used the term bureaucracy in the pejoration sense. All Marxists regard bureaucracy as tied to the capitalist state and is, therefore, a bourgeois phenomenon. Marx did not believe that the state represent the general interest of the society. Likewise bureaucracy is not universal estate, it is particular closed society within the state serving its own, not the general interest. It is a social force through which the interests of capitalism and the bourgeois are implemented. The issue of the emergence of bureaucracy and of its continued existence is, therefore, inextricably connected with the wider topic of the character of the capitalist state. Marx also believed that bureaucracy contributes to the alienation of the people. It becomes an autonomous and oppressive force which is felt by the majority of the people as a mysterious and distant entity as something which although regulating their lives is beyond their control and comprehension, a sort of divinity in the face of which one feels helpless and be wildered."
Marx maintained that the state and its executive constitute an instrument through which the ruling class expresses its power, bureaucracy fulfills the function of contributing to the consolidation of class differences, and of supporting the power of the ruling class. In Marx’s view, bureaucracy was not a class by itself in class societies. It is the servant of the classes; “not basic, but ultimately subordinate to the ruling class. In capitalist society, that class is the bourgeoisie.” Bureaucracy shrouds all of its action in secrecy which is preserved internally by hierarchy, and externally against the community, by its nature when it interacts with the world, the relationship is essentially manipulative.

The only thing for which Marx praised bureaucracy was its role in centralizing nations. He was not in favour of taking over control of the bureaucracy, as earlier revolutions had done, by the proletariat but he favoured that the proletariat must smash the institution.

Lenin:

Lenin agreed with Marx that bureaucracy is a parasite and is connected with bourgeois society. He said that two institutions are most characteristic of the
state machine bureaucracy and standing army. "The bureaucracy and standing army are a parasite on the body of bourgeois society, a parasite created by the inherent antagonisms which rend that society, but a parasite which chokes all its pores of life." 10

Bureaucracy is perceived by him as organically tied to the capitalist state. It cannot be treated as an independent unit of analysis. He objected to bureaucracy because bureaucrats are privileged group holding jobs remunerated on a high bourgeois scale, and also because police and bureaucracy are unanswerable to the people and placed above the people. What will happen to bureaucracy after the revolution? Lenin's basic thesis was that the workers, after winning political power will smash the old bureaucratic apparatus. They will shatter it to its very foundation and raze it to the ground. But he was conscious of the fact that some administrative apparatus would still be needed to manage the socialist society.

He was of the view that the workers will be taken to prevent the new workers from turning into bureaucrats. Obviously there seems to be a contradiction in Lenin's formulations on bureaucracy as a Marxist theoritician
and his views as a leader of the soviet government engaged in the task of administering the state. He overcomes that by saying that the earlier functions of bureaucracy being an instrument of the bourgeois class, had ceased but that the effects of the bureaucratic system survived:-

**Max Weber on Bureaucracy:**

The systematic study of bureaucracy began with the German Sociologist, Max Weber's. In terms of influence it has exerted and the argument it has stimulated Weber's writing on bureaucracy is more important than the sum total of the contributions of countless scholars. Weber's most extensive and systematic discussion of administration occurs within his sociology of domination in economy and society. Parliament and government in the Newly organised Germany is another vital source of knowing his views on this subject. Power, Authority and Bureaucracy:- Weber's conception of bureaucracy can be found in his ideas on powers, domination and authority. Weber defined power as "the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance." Imperative control or
domination is power in a hierarchy; it is the probability that with a given specific content it will be obeyed by a given group of persons. The exercises of authority requires that a person successfully issues order to a group of subordinates who respond because of their belief in the legitimacy of the order. Thus legitimacy turns power and domination into authority. Weber classified authority on the basis of its claim to legitimacy, because on that would depend largely the type of obedience, the kind of administrative staff suitable to it, and the ways of exercising authority. The classification is three fold:

(i) Traditional authority
(ii) Charismatic authority
(iii) Legal rational authority.

Weber's Ideal Type:–

Weber used the word bureaucracy to designate a quite specific kind of administrative organisation. He insisted that modern bureaucratic organisation as a form of apparatus was sui generis. He never define bureaucracy in an explicit way in which he define ‘class or status group’. Martein Albrow observes, however that Weber's concept of bureaucracy can be conveyed in a definition of this
kind: "by bureaucracy is meant an administrative body of appointed officials." He did not include elected officials or those selected by lot, in bureaucracy. The essential feature of the bureaucratic officials was that he was an appointee. Weber thought of bureaucracy as a collective term for a body of officials, a definite and distinct group whose influence can be seen in all kinds of large organisations—state, church, political parties, trade unions, business enterprises, Universities, etc. It also comprised distinct form of action.

Features of Max Weber's Ideal Type Bureaucracy:

Drawing on studies of ancient bureaucracies in Egypt, Rome, China and the Byzantine Empire as well as on the more modern ones emerging in Europe during the 19th and early part of the 20th centuries, Max Weber used an 'ideal type' approach to extract from the empirical world the central core of features that would characterise the most fully developed bureaucratic form of organisation. These are:

1. Each office has a well defined sphere of competence with duties clearly marked off from those of other offices.
2. Offices are ordered in a hierarchy; each lower office is under the supervision and responsibility of a higher one.

3. Authority is restricted to official duties; beyond these, subordinates are not subject to their superiors: there is a complete segregation of official activity from private life.

4. Official hold office by appointment (rather than by election), and on the basis of a contractual relationship between themselves and the organisation.

5. Official are selected on the basis of objective qualification; these are acquired by training established by examinations, diplomas or both.

6. Official are set for a career; they are protected from arbitrary dismissal and can expect to maintain office permanently; promotion is by seniority, achievement or both.

7. Officials are entirely separated from the means of administration, hence they cannot appropriate their positions.

8. Activities are regulated by general, consistent abstract rules, the generality of these rules requires the
categorisation of individual cases on the basis of objective criteria.

9. Official duties are conducted in a spirit of impersonality without hatred but also without affection.

10. A bureaucracy frequently has a non-bureaucratic head. While bureaucrats follow rules, he sets them. While bureaucrats are appointed, he usually inherits his position, appropriates it or is elected to it.

These characteristics of ideal type bureaucracy had been drawn by Weber from Prussian administrative theory and European administrative history. Administrative systems of the industrialised western countries largely approximate to this ideal type. Weber disagree with Marx and Lenin on the point that bureaucracy being tied to capitalism, will disappear when the latter is overthrown by a socialist revolution. He insists that bureaucracy is an independent entity and it will survive whether the society is capitalist or socialist. Weber sees bureaucratic tendencies not only in the modern states and private capitalist enterprises, but also in the modern army, the church and the universities. He says that the latter have gradually lost their archaic characteristics.
Standing armies, material wealth and the consequent increasing role of public sector, modern means of communication, political factors which work towards bureaucratization.

The indispensability of developed bureaucracy is regarded by Weber as the pivotal political fact of modern age. The individual bureaucratic is a powerless 'cog' "in a ceaselessly moving mechanism which prescribes to him an essentially fixed route of march". Whoever gains power is unable to govern without this organisation.

Not only is bureaucracy indispensable but its influence is inescapable. Martin Krygeir observes that "as an administrative organisation found in every kind of enterprise its influence is more pervasive than that of other carriers of the rationality of the modern world and as the most advanced form of administrative organisation, it is stronger, more escapeproof, than any previous form".
BUREAUCRACY AS AN AGENT OF CHANGE

Until 1947, India was a colonial territory and a police state. Society was backward and feudal in character. The civil service established in the pre-independence era was meant mainly to serve the foreign masters. Its primary task was preservation of law and order and collection of revenue. People and their welfare were not their concern. There was lack of responsiveness and authoritarianism in their dealing with the problems. But later on, when the country attained independence and constitutional setup was ushered in and the citizens' rights were established, the civil service had to undergo a great change in response to new compulsions and needs. From the colonial and the servile status, which it had been through for a long period, it had to emerge as a machinery of "the welfare state in action". It had to be transformed as a fit instrument of socio-economic change. It had to shoulder new responsibilities and undertake tasks. Covering a wide spectrum of activities, from formulation of policies to implementation. As a well-endowed and well-knit organisation, the public administrative system in a developing society like ours was...
required to functions as a main catalyst of innovative and structural changes in society. In other words, it had to be a responsive administration in a responsible state. To meet this new role of the government, the civil service had to acquire new knowledge and skills and altogether a new temper and attitude and capability to handle the complex problems. The spread of competence and responsibility as well as accountability were required to be universal and not confined to only patches. As Tottenham in 1945 observed that reliance on too few officers of the right type and too many clerks of the wrong type would surely fail to meet the situation. The administrative lag than would, therefore be unavoidable.

Under the stress and strain of war, whatever the administrative machinery the country had under the British rule had greatly run down and was of very poor quality. War time corruption among the various grades of personnel was very visible for all to see. The scarcities of essential goods had made it worse when India achieved independence. It had in fact provided an opportunity for ushering in a new era of clean and modern administration. The old rotten cobwebs of rules and regulations, the
Unalloyed habits of paper work and file pushing, the hierarchical stratification as well as the remnants of authoritarian trends. And the last but not least the ugly veils of secrecy surrounding the decision making process could have been changed, ended or drastically cut by a more rational system. The chasm between the administration and the people which has becomes bugbear latter, could have been minimized. But unfortunately, the new leaders of India, strangely enough did not make conscious effort to bring major changes in the administrative system to achieve and subserve the democratic goals.

But this is not to say that the subject of administrative reform did not receive attention by the rulers in India since Independence. As a matter of fact, the central government had appointed 18 committees and commissions since 1947 to inquire into various aspects of public administration. In addition, a number of state governments also, from time to time appointed administrative reforms commissions. A number of parliamentary committees have made several recommendations. In spite of these efforts to reform the Indian administration, at both
central and state levels, the gap between promise and performance and administrative response and popular expectations remain wide and is increasing. No sincere and serious approach was made to provide an effective answer to the all important question, namely, what kind of administrative system should the nation have? When the country had undertaken planning and large-scale economic development and the uplift of millions of our population from the morass of poverty. The kind of administration we require should have been honest, clean, responsible, objective and dynamic and should be capable of inspiring confidence and trust among the people. But this is easier said that than done. To secure such a band of men, the present administrative system has to undergo a ruthless catharsis. There has to be revolutionary change in the organisation, methods and procedures of administration.

Once the legislature passes the law, the powers of making rules and administrative orders vest entirely in the bureaucracy of the government. If they are not used properly, they pose a threat to the life and liberty of the people. Indeed actual implementation of laws and rules
is not with the ministers but with the officials. In this situation, officials become more powerful than the ministers and the elected representatives.

In such circumstances, "the government of the people, for the people and by the people" a famous saying of Abraham Lincoln may be conveniently rephrased as "the government of the bureaucracy for the bureaucracy and by the bureaucracy." In a bureaucratic state there can be lot of paper work but no results. There can be any extent of corruption and no accountability.

We are a developing society. We have still a long way to go. But the question is, that even at this early stage of development, when the administration is so weak, flabby and corrupt, how can we make any credible progress as a nation? and how our poor sisters and brothers get justice without being treated as aliens? How can we make the people feel that they are part and parcel of the government? In what way and how to generate the feeling that the citizens and the administrators are co-participants in development? These are some of the questions which cannot be easily answered. But solutions have to be found any way if we have to meet new challenges arising out of complex situations.
The administrative system of independent India has been inherited from the British colonial system. Britishes had major intention to use the Indian resources as much as they can and very little care was given by them to develop administration of India solely for the sake of economic development and social changes. The British administration was only related with the maintenance of law and order and tax collection. In independent India we have often changed. The boundaries of administration. After independence sphere of the functions of government has vastly changed from only being the guardian of law and order to a welfare state. Now, government's role has expanded for the welfare and well being of its citizens. This major shift in its aims became a turning point for the intervention of state into economic and social fields. For the transformation of the backward society, in under developed countries from abysmal social, political and economic conditions into a well developed country required to be well planned in which the government itself has to be the main planner of development effort. The principal planner is to provide the incentives to the system for social changes and also to remove hur-
dles and eliminate imbalances which can effect the sys-
tem in transition, red - tapisim, division of work, hierar-
chical arrangement of offices etc. are considered to be
the ills of bureaucracy and due to these deficiencies in
the civil service, it brings down its role in the society.
This criticism of bureaucracy shows its weakness to play
an active role in development administration.

The principal planner, the government itself promotes
and accelerates all developmental efforts. And these
social and economic developmental activities in the
country has acquired for bureaucracy a new importance
in the mission of nation building. Dwivedi and Jain have
drawn attention to another dysfunctional aspect of de-
velopment bureaucracy, their observation is that "the
central issue of development administration is then no
longer just one of manageability of the administrative
structure. It is a more fundamental one the incompatibil-
ity between bureaucracy, as a form of institutionalized
social control and development agency capable of de-
fining quality of life for the population". It has to un-
dertake a many social and economic function for bring-
ing about social and economic changes for nation build-
ing and improving living standards of society. By bringing about major changes in its focus, the reputation of bureaucracy will ultimately change. Formerly the style of working of bureaucracy was based on colonial requirement but now, it is in the framework of democratic setup with active involvement of the people for whose welfare state exists. In recent times in India the basic issue which has come up is whether the bureaucracy and its functioning which is inherited from colonial rule can respond to the changing values, aspirations and goals of the society. So we can say that "a more carefully organised and deliberately adopted bureaucratic structure and its working would possibly be more flexible and capable of being positive towards the development requirements". The close system of impersonal operation of developmental programmes, the rigid acceptance to formal rules, sticking to precedents and clinging to outdated procedure, must be replaced by a forward looking, change oriented and result oriented system. Bureaucracy is permitted to take initiatives, responsibilities and innovations for development and social change.
The business of the modern state is performed mostly by its administrative agencies, Paul Appleby said, "the heart of administration is the management of programmes designed to serve the general welfare". The welfare activities of the state administration is take place in all the corners of the country and the developmental programmes related to bring about a total change not only in urban areas of the society but rural areas as well, specially in agricultural sector too. British colonial ruler's interests were to use India's resources as much as possible and hardly bothering about developmental work. Their aim was to use bureaucracy for their own interests, not as an instrument of economic and social change. After attaining independence the functions of government machinery have changed. Instead of maintaining law and order alone, welfare and well being of its citizens has become its primary function. Government started many programmes in post independence period, Bureaucracy was required to actively implement these programmes for removing the poverty, reducing unemployment and illiteracy. Many more schemes were launched but majority of them failed continuously be-
cause the reasons for their failure were never identified. The tool of state which is called bureaucracy has been able to stall many programmes and actually became an obstacle in the way of developmental work. The last independence day message which Sardar Patel gave on 15 August 1950, said that "our public life seems to be degenerating into a fun of stagnant waters; our conscience is troubled with doubts and we despair about the possibilities of improvement. We don't seem to be profiting either from history or experience. We appear helplessly to be watching the sickle of time taking away the rich corn, leaving behind the base and whitened stalks. We talk while paramount need is that of action, we are critical of other peoples exertions, but lack the will to contribute our own". The state has become the main apparatus of development of the society, while bureaucracy is considered as basic tool of the state. After independence our political system has changed towards bureaucratic, while administrative system is turning more and more political. Ralph Waldo Emerson, has give a portrait of bureaucracy, "these tools have some questionable properties. They are reagents, machinery is aggressive
The Weaver becomes the Web, the machinist a machine."^29

The broadening of state activity into economic and social developmental activities has acquired new importance in the task of nation building. For this process of national planning, heavy responsibility exist with the bureaucracy for bringing about welfare goals in a society. "The functions occurring to the governmental bureaucracy thus goes beyond the traditional frame of reference of a laissez fair state."^30 Many times questions are raised about the role of bureaucracy as an agent of political, social and economic change. Laski observed that; "the characteristics of bureaucracy are its passion for routine administration, the sacrifice of flexibility in rules, delay in making decisions and a refusal to embark upon experiment."^31

The modern welfare state exercise many powers and functions to change the economic life of the people. It is very essential that these powers should be exercised for development purposes for the common man in the remote villages where real India exists. "The manner in which this power of the officials at various level is ex-
ercised is an acid test of democracy, in practice, the center of power is Delhi and state capitals which will have to be deconcentrated to the villages. "Modernization is a social process which can be influence in large measure, by human design. Activity related to development is normatively directed towards the overriding and interrelated goals, of nation building and socio-economic progress." Thus there is a developmental network which start at central level and goes down to blocks level for the implementation and execution of social welfare programmes. So far these programmes are implemented with considerable success. Development has a very wide field, in country like India where there are many social problems, some how or the other related with economic problems, social welfare activities should be given high priority by bureaucracy. Central and state governments always try to develop more and more resources for developmental programmes and try to provide these programmes by the bureaucracy and also try to provide in-service training to bureaucracy to prepare them for any future problems.
Fifty years of Indian Bureaucracy:

"...Yes, the conditions in Bihar are very, very bad. But if you think these maladies are confined to Bihar, You are making a gross underestimation... it is happening all over the country. One of the symptoms of this war collapse is officers not being loyal to the law but to particular governments, or particular castes, or particular ministers... if this disease spreads in the administration it is bound to lead to collapse of law and order."

The composition, the basic orientation and the perceived as well as ordained role and function of Indian bureaucracy have undergone a sea change during the last fifty years since we inherited the steel frame of colonial administration from the departing British rulers. This was only to be expected, as the Indian civil Services fashioned on the model of the British Civil Service with all its virtues belonged to an era that had just ended and the expectations of the free people of India from its administrators were naturally vastly different from its erstwhile colonial masters. The last service rendered by the departing rulers to its hapless subjects had left the country dazed, as lakhs perished in the worst ever communal
holocaust and many times more were rendered homeless and destitute as the so called specialists in maintaining peace and public order miserably failed to prevent or even mitigate marginally the colossal human tragedy their callous ineptitude had invited.

With the traumatic memories of partition and its aftermath still fresh in the anguished hearts of the countryman, it was hardly surprising that there were vociferous demands immediately after independence to abolish the discredited bureaucracy which had been a willing tool in the hands of the British engines of oppression and torment to the freedom fighters. Had it not been for a spirited defence by Sardar Patel, the first Home Minister of free India, of the idea of a permanent bureaucracy to serve as a bulwark against elements of politically partisan conduct creeping into day-to-day administration of the country in its absence, in all probability the ICS/IP would have been abolished at once and their successors IAS/IPS would never have been created. Patel advocated retaining the best of the virtues of the British Civil Service and its colonial version, the ICS, like dedication to duty, unflinching loyalty to the government of the day, po-
itical neutrality and incorruptibility while purging it of all that was anachronistic and untenable in a free country whose sovereignty vested in its people. The idea of permanent bureaucracy is not alien to India, and in a bygone millennium Kautilya, the great master of state craft, had advocated the same to his protégé Chandragupta whom he guided in vanquishing the mighty Nanda dynasty and ascending the throne of the great Magadha empire, and then retired to his hermitage asking him to retain all the competent ministers who had so far served his humbled foes with exemplary devotion and wisdom.

Barely noticeable during the liberal Nehruvian era, the process of reduction of bureaucracy has been accelerated in a geometrical progression particular since the early seventies when loud whispers heard protesting a "committed judiciary while the members of the bureaucracy, far from even mumbling a feeble protest, choose to fall over one another in crawling when asked to bend."^35 It is worthwhile remembering that unlike an independent judiciary and a free press with a appropriate constitutional safeguards, there, is no such things as a
free or independent bureaucracy and safeguards, if any, for a conscientious and law abiding bureaucrat are virtually non existent. Technically, legal remedies are available but in practice a vain pursuit of justice through the unending labyrinths and bylanes of the judicial corridors is ultimately as most debilitating counterproductive in futility. Even high profile CBI director Joginder Singh who was unceremoniously thrown out at a crucial during the fodder scam investigation with just a few months to retire, or earlier N.K. Singh who incurred the wrath of hawala racketeers a few years ago, were finally told that "transfer is an incidence of service" and one can not complain irrespective of the circumstances, that, when malafide was written all-over both the cases.

The reforms attempted so far betray a lack of perception of ground realities as well as political will and thus are at best halfhearted and cosmetic. With gradual but indistinguishable blurring, if not complete merger of crime and politics all kinds of administrative perversions are fast gaining wide currency and make acceptance in many parts of the country the mafia dons and Sundry criminals seen to virtually own the administration through
the criminalised politicians in powers. That was the underly­ing themes of Khairnar’s Crusade against the Sharad Pawar government in Maharashtra a few years ago. These are ominous signals of anarchy acquiring a license to rule. The stake for the country are too high to warrant an ostrich policy or cynicism.

There is a much higher degree of accountability and impartiality since the officer concerned knows only too well that once he leaves the place no political god father can protest him if he is hauled up for any of his acts of omission or commission and so he must go by the book and see that his actions stand the scrutiny of even his worst detractors years after he has left the place for good. On the other hand, if Kiran Bedi, is belonging to that Cadre, finds that the state government of Mizoram is treating her unfairly, she can just put in her papers and catch the next plane to New Delhi and renewed spell of glory. The simple reason is that they stay away from local politics in which they have no career stakes since everybody knows that they are there only for a while. Officers condemned to serve a particular state for the entire career have no such option and must dance to the
tunes of their criminality political bosses if they don't want to be earmarked for the rest of their career for 'drop dead' postings where there is no work, no place to sit, not even the basic minimum facilities, no budget and hence no provision for even a regular salary. There are hundreds of such non-posts both in the IAS and the IPS. Recruited through the same common examination conducted by the UPSC officers in some forty group 'A' central services are required to serve in different states while those in the Foreign Service are required to keep adapting to entirely new socio-cultural-linguistic settings throughout their career. Even IAS/IPS officers don't mind going to other states. When greener pastures are in sight. If the logic behind the watertight state cadres has any basis in reality, how is it that K.P.S. Gill from Assam Cadre and before him Julius Ribero from Maharashtra Cadre are respected to be and actually prove themselves move effective than their colleagues who have spent a life time in trouble torn Punjab when asked to take the reins all on a sudden at the top of the police heirarchy there? or, even in Bihar how is it that J.M. Qureshi from Madhya Pradesh Cadre is suddenly brought in as the
Director General of Police even without any such extenuating circumstances? Why does it not offend against the Sacred principles and higher Philosophy of federalism, often cited as a justification for creation and continuance of watertight compartmentalized state cadres in such cases? It is very much possible to rotate the All India Service between the central and state government for fixed duration.

Except in the rarest of rare cases, there should be no inter state transfer within 5 years. When an officer is due for such transfer, he should be asked to take a short term orientation course to prepare himself for the new state. Ideally, learning more Indian languages should be encouraged throughout the career and supported by pecuniary and career incentives. Apart from reversing the current trend of criminalisation of administration, it would instill a healthy fear of law in the minds of those who now believe themselves to be a law unto themselves thanks to guaranteed protection from unscrupulous political godfathers.
DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMMES FOR SC/ST AND UNDER PRIVILEGED SECTION OF SOCIETY IN INDIA:

The local assemblies of citizens constitute the strength of free nations, town meetings are to liberty what primary schools are to science; they teach men how to use and how to enjoy it; A Nation may establish a system of free government, but without the spirit of municipal institution it can not have the spirit of liberty. DeToecqueville.

It is proposed now to offer only a brief account of the structural growth and the changes in the field of development by giving the developmental programmes which are often implemented for the development of society as a whole. It can be said on developments in the Urban areas but the main emphasis will be on thrust areas where people don't have meal even on a day. Democracy is the respecter of numbers and in terms numbers rural India represent two third of the total national population. So a large number of problems like Congestion in city areas leading to development of slums, strains on the existing community services like water supply sewerage, lighting along with these there are many other problems...
too, like unemployment among the people, poverty, untouchability, and many other problems which exist among the masses. It is difficult to solve them from the state head quarters.

For the upliftment of the scheduled caste and scheduled tribes other backward classes in sphere of educationally, economically and socially the development programmes in India in general and in Uttar Pradesh in particular have assumed important proportions not only in programmes content but also in the depth of approach to the problems of development of individual villages in group and community setting. The rural community is still in a stage of transition from the old social order to the new goals of democratic socialism. The paramount task before the elected representatives of the people and other leaders in the community and the full range of personnel engaged in development projects to work in harmony towards attaining the objectives of community development.

The identified goals for these development project focus on standard of living for the entire population particularly schedule caste and schedule tribes, the under
privileged sections, women and minorities. Provisions of education, health housing and social security are some of the targeted objectives of these programmes as emphasized in Eight Five Year Plan document. Human and social development forms the priority area in 8th Five Year plan whose major objectives are:

1. Sufficient Employment generation at a rate of ten lakh additional employment every year.
2. Control on population growth by arresting the present rate of 30.5 per thousand to 26 per thousand.
3. Eradication of illiteracy by providing education to all eleven crore citizen from 15 to 25 years age group.
4. Health for all by 2000 AD.
5. Protection to weaker section and improvement in their standard of living.

The objectives of all around development of the whole community being common to both. The field personnel view the staff of the training agencies as visionaries and every tower observers. It is, to a extent, true that the training programmes lags behind the field requirements programmes lag behind the basic principles of community development of which the training agencies are, more often than not, the true exponent.
Developmental Programmes for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Underprivileged Section of Society:

A quarter century ago, as the Nation entered the silver jubilee year of independence, Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan gave a call for "Total Revolution" to eliminate corruption which was spreading its tentacles choking the country's economy and polity. Ms Indira Gandhi, the then Prime Minister, countered this giving her own clarion call for banishing poverty "Garibi Hatao". The people had to choose between removing corruption and banishing poverty. As we celebrate the golden jubilee of our freedom, poverty remains where it was 25 years ago, but corruption has assumed venal proportions so much so the Prime Minister, Mr. I.K. Gujral exclaimed from the ramparts of the Red Fort on the occasion of independence Day "The nation appears to be sinking into corruption and the common man is the greatest sufferer." Corruption has caused severe damage to the nation's unity and its economic growth. Therefore for the development of SC/ST and underprivileged section of so-
ciety many developmental programmes have been implemented by the central government and state governments so the masses of the Nation can improve their living standard and can participate in the nation building as a whole. These programmes are as follows.....

Panchayati Raj:

The Constitution (73rd Amendment Act, 1992) marks a new era in the federal democratic set-up of the country and provides constitutional status to the Panchayati Raj institutions. Panchayati Raj institutions to function as institutions of self government, endowed with power and authority to formulate and implement schemes for economic development and social justice on 29 subjects given in schedule XI of the constitution of India; Regular Elections to Panchayats every five years. State Election Commissions to conduct these elections.

Reservation of seats for Scheduled Caste Scheduled Tribes in proportion to their population. Reservation of one third seats for women. Similar reservation in respect of the offices of chairpersons.

The Panchayats (Extension to Scheduled Areas) Act, 1996 - extends Panchayti Raj to Scheduled Areas while
empowering scheduled Tribes to safeguard and preserve their traditions, customs and ethos.

The Gram Sabha vested with power to approve programmes for socio-economic development and identification of beneficiaries for providing assistance under anti poverty programmes.

**Jawahar Rozgar Yojna (JRY):** Generates additional gainful employment for rural unemployment and under employed. Creates sustained employment for strengthening the rural economic infrastructure. "6,619.44 million man days of employment generated since inception. A provision of Rs. 25,403.35 crore made in 1997-98."

**Indira Awaas Yojna (IAY):** Provision of dwelling units free of cost to mainly scheduled castes, Scheduled Tribes and freed bonded labourers below the poverty line. Scheme extended to non SC/ST beneficiaries below the poverty line since 1993-94. 37 Lakh houses constructed and distributed free of cost to SC/ST, freed bonded labourers and other people below the poverty line.

**Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS):** Under this programme the labourers are given employment for 100 days during lean period in a year. The U.P. Government alone has
implemented the plan in 145 Blocks of 29 districts in 1997.*

Emphasis on sustained employment through watershed development and creation of durable productive assets.

More than 27.67 million persons registered under the employment assurance scheme and more than 1131.1 million crore mandays employment generated.

**Million Wells Scheme (MWS):** Provision of open irrigation wells minor irrigation schemes and land development works free of cost to small and marginal farmers mainly amongst scheduled castes, scheduled tribes and freed bonded labourers.

Since 1993-94, 2/3 of allocation are SC/ST and 1/3rd for non SC/ST beneficiaries below poverty line. '1.11 million wells constructed at a cost of Rs. 4037.50 crore.'

**Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP):** The first thing to note is that today, the developing countries are urbanizing only more rapidly than the industrial nations did in the heydays of their urban growth.* A major self-employment programme for poverty alleviation, provides productive assets to small and marginal farmers.
agricultural labourers, rural artisan and other rural poor.

50% beneficiaries scheduled castes, Scheduled tribes, forty percent women and three percent physically handicapped. 51% million families assisted at an expenditure of Rs 11,435 crore.

**Ganga Kalyan Yojana (GKY):** A centrally sponsored new scheme, has been launched in February 1997, to help poor farmers by providing irrigation through exploitation of ground water (borewells and tube wells). Individual groups consisting of small and marginal farmers below poverty line would be assisted through subsidy by government and credit by financial institutions. 50% of the funds have been earmarked for SC/ST.

**Development of Women and Children in Rural Areas (DWCRA):**

DWCAR is a part of the rural development programmes for the development of women and children in rural areas. It was started in the state in 1983-84. These programmes are supposed to increase the income of the women in villages, so that they could stand on their feet themselves. It may also be help for the education of
women in order to expand the scope of the economic opportunities for them. DWCRA is also aimed at improving the living standard of women and children by providing income based activities.

DWCRA is in operation in all the districts in the country. Raises income-levels of poor women to make them economically self-reliant. "Over 1,93,170 groups formed benefiting in more than 31,58,900 women."^4

Training of Rural Youth for Self Employment:
TRYSEM plan is another scheme for the development of the people or rural areas, under this plan, the government provides the funds and facilities of training to the youth in order to make themselves dependent in various trades. It aims at providing basic technical and managerial skills to the rural youth from families below the poverty line to enable them to take up self/wage employment in the broad fields of agricultural and allied sectors, industries, services and business activities.

So far, 4.1 million youth have been trained under this programme.

Supply of Improved Tool Kits To Rural Artisans:
"Keeping this in mind the U.P. government started the programme in 10 districts in 1992-93, 15 districts in 1993-94 and in 1994-
95 this programme has been extended to 25 districts.

The programme aims at enabling the rural artisans to enhance the quality of their products, increase their production and income through improved tools. The programme launched in July 1992 has so far distributed 6.10 lakh tool kits benefiting 8.32 lakh persons.

**Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP)**: Minimises adverse effect of drought on production of crops and livestock and promotes integrated development of natural resources.

Under DPAP, an expenditure of Rs.2,038.02 crore has been made from the year 1973-74 to 1996-97. Since inception till 1994-95 under core sector activities, 29.95 lakh hectare area under land resource development, 9.46 lakh hectare area under water resource development and 17.83 lakh hectare area under afforestation & pasture development has been treated.

Since 1995-96, a new approach based on watershed development has been adopted and 4,995 Micro watersheds have been targeted to be developed through people's participation during next four years.

**Desert Development Programme (DDP)**: Controls
desertification and conserves, develops and harnesses land, water and other natural resources for restoration of ecological balance in the long run and raises land productivity and water resources in desert areas.

Since inception till 1994-95 under core sector activities 1.86 lakh hectare area under land resource development, 0.83 lakh hectare area under water resource development and 2.85 lakh hectare area under afforestation & pasture development has been treated.

Since 1995-96, a new approach based on watershed development has been adopted and 1, 695 Micro watersheds have been targeted to be developed through peoples participation during the next four years.

**Rural Water Supply and Sanitation**: Coverage of population under safe drinking water upto date against 1991 census:
Total 86.16%, SC 82.23% and Sts 90.38% 
Rs 8,726.71 crore invested on accelerated rural water supply sector since 1951.
11,04,826 village/habitations have been covered since 1951. Rs. 29,730.05 lakh have been invested under central Rural Sanitation Programme since inception. 40,25,442 sanitary latrines constructed under Rural Sanitation Programme Since its inception. Rs. 502.38 crores have been invested for removal of contami-
nation water from 1989-90.

**National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP)**

**National old Age Pension Scheme:** Provides assistance to old persons having little or no regular means of subsistence. Each person will get Rs. 75 per month. About 53 lakh persons will be benefited under this component. For this programme Rs. 463.02 crores have been allocated this year (1996-97).

**National Family Benefit Scheme:** Provides financial assistance to households living below the poverty line. In the case of natural death of the primary bread-winner, the family will get Rs 5000/ and in the case of accidental death it will get Rs 10,000/. The scheme provides assistance to about 4.5 lakh beneficiaries every year. For this purpose Rs 175.82 crore have been allocated this year (1998). Two lakh bereaved families have been benefited so far.

**National Maternity Benefit Scheme:** It gives financial assistance of Rs 300/ to pregnant women of households below the poverty line up to first two live birth. 45 lakh women will be benefited under this scheme and for this purpose Rs 93.18 crore has been allocated this
year. About 19 lakh pregnant women have been benefited.

**Rural Road**: Full rural connectivity for ensuring rural prosperity in a time bound manner. Better quality of travel and reduction in travel costs in rural areas. Villages to be linked to market and services for rapid development.

**Land Reforms**: A special drive for distribution of ceiling surplus land launched in October 1991. As a result 4.41 lakh acres distributed till March 1997. Computerization of land records has been undertaken in 323 districts releasing Rs 64.43 crore upto March 1997. To strengthen the revenue administration at the state/union territory level, Rs 134.85 crore have been released as central share since 1987-88. New measures initiated for prevention of tribal land alienation, discrimination in gender issues relating to land and on tenancy reforms.

**Waste lands Development**: Special thrust on development of wastelands given through afforestation and pasture development, horticulture/agro-forestry, soil and moisture conservation, nursery raising etc. Common guidelines for watershed development integrated waste lands development project scheme 163 projects sanc-
tioned in 24 states with an outlay of Rs 415 crore to de-
velop 7 lakh hectares of wastelands. Through 100% grant
to voluntary agencies, 234 projects in 20 states with an
outlay of Rs 13.75 crore to develop 18,900 hectare of
wastelands.

**Voluntary Sector:** Funds to voluntary agencies under
various schemes routed through Council for Advance-
ments of People's Action and Rural Technology
(CAPART). 16,553 projects approved and Rs. 310.71
crore released to 5,600 voluntary agencies.
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