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The term bureaucracy is a very perplexing one and is susceptible to more than one meaning. To a common man bureaucracy means, a system of government characterised by inefficiency, delay, corruption, arbitrariness etc. but in administrative parlance, bureaucracy refers to rule of officials.

The bureaucracy has a very important role to play in the socio-economic development of a country. It brings order out of Chaos by imparting stability to the administrative affairs, specifically, of countries, which suffers from frequent political instability. This is so because of officials are selected on the basis of merit, enjoy permanency of tenure, there is a chain of command, or hierarchy with clearly defined authority and responsibility, and above all the bureaucrats are expected to be efficient, rational, impartial and neutral in their dealings and in the implementation of government policies.

Bureaucracy in its modern form had made its appearance much earlier on the continent of Europe than in England. The reason for this is that the English people, by temperament, are lovers of democratic ideas and institutions, consequently in France, Germany, Spain and Italy, the work of administration at national, state as well as local levels was carried on by persons appointed by the monarch in their respective empires. They were under obligation and responsible to the monarchs and not to the people, but in England, the members of the public bureaucracy were always associated with the national and local administration. Bureaucracy, in its present form, was not in existence in England even in the eighteenth century, while by this period it had fully established itself on the European Continent.

Bureaucracy had existed up to a certain extent even in ancient time in Greece, Egypt, Roman Empire, India and China. But, the importance of bureaucracy had increased very greatly in the ninetieth century. With the march of
civilization, bureaucracy is bound to grow more and more in importance. In the first place, with the rise of multiplied over night. In made the parliament pass a number of acts to check abuses in Industries. This called for a number of officials to enforce these laws. Secondly, the march towards socialism of the various countries had called upon the state to enter into new fields of administration.

In India, prior to the independence, bureaucracy was primarily engaged in performing regulatory functions i.e. revenue collection, judiciary and the maintenance of law and order. But new however, the situation has changed. The state has assumed the responsibility of multi-faced development of the society and with this the active and positive role of bureaucracy has increased manifold under the Indian condition. For a developing country like India, state is considered to be the main agency for development. It is expected to tackle challenging problems of poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, ill health, environmental pollution etc.

The system of bureaucracy as it exists in India has a continuous history of more than one hundreds years. While three hundred years have been revolutionary from the point of view of country’s social, economic and political life, the organization of bureaucracy under the assumptions, on which it is based have remained unaltered even unquestioned. The legacy has been accepted. During the masses against the British Raj was focussed and directed primarily against the bureaucracy the visible arms of the Raj. It was the District collector and the patwari, who were Raj to the masses. Bureaucratic Rule was based on fear and awe and mass obedient was extracted by repression and suppression of popular demands. All this has changed. Indian masses are highly politicised and conscious of their rights, coupled with this is the fact of structural change taking place in the society with the initiative and effort of the government. Large scale schemes of economic planning, steel plants, heavy irrigation projects, community developments and family planning programmes are changing the old order and ushering in the new. Two aspects made India different in twenty years of freedom what it was for hundreds of years. First, universal adult franchise has politicised
every concern of the country by involving masses in decision making. Secondly, sponsored programmes of economic change, such as new varieties of seeds and fertilizers have resulted in an “agricultural revolution” bringing in its wake prosperity and rising expectations for better standards of living among hitherto neglected and exploited masses\(^1\). Thus, this heterogeneity and co-existence of many centuries at the same time and the revolutionary impact of “induced” social economic and political change is the “ecology” in which India bureaucracy has to task. Its content, task and roles all have undergone change. But the system of bureaucracy continues to exit in the same shape as it was established by the British in a different environment and for difficult requirement\(^2\). In India some of the Socio-economic, Political factors that were at work from about the middle of the eighteenth century led to the growth of modern bureaucracy\(^3\). Since the bureaucratic structure continued to expand and to grow into a large scale organization. In the process of its growth, the bureaucracy developed a highly organised structure\(^4\) and a set of values and norms determining bureaucratic behaviour\(^5\). When India become free in 1947, she inherited the bureaucracy from the out going regime and have since maintained it with some modifications\(^6\).

The structure of bureaucracy, which India inherited in 1947 had two levels: (i) the administrative organization of the government head quarters called secretariat. And (ii) field of units of administration. At the field of administration, a district was the basis unit of British Government in India.

**Bureaucracy Defined**

The word bureaucracy together with “communism” and “imperialism” forms a trident the most forceful weapon in the armory of words so widely used in all the present day political controversies.

A simple word, which in free translation means a “government by bureau” or “desk government” has, in common used, acquired a colour and power as emotion – raiser and battle – cry. Though distortion and caricature it has come to imply “bungling, arbitrariness, wastefulness, officiousness, and regimentation”\(^7\). A
bureaucratic system is monastic, with a single formal line of command and control. It is characterized by a hierarchy of superior and subordinate relationship, in which the person at the top assumes all authority and issues general orders to initiate action. Orders reach the lowest subordinate though a series of layers, states and reward system closely follow the pattern of these hierarchies. There is no effective delegation of authority and not much scope for discretionary decision-making. This type of control centered administration is ideally suited for discharging routine functions, relatively simple technology. The term bureaucracy has been derived from the word “bureau” (French), which means an office or post. So the bureaucracy means a government of official. According to G. B. Shaw; “The bureaucracy consists of functionaries, the aristocracy of ideas, the democracy idolaters.

In the words of Laski; “Bureaucracy is the term usually applied to a system of government, the control of which is so completely in the hands of officials that their liberties of the ordinary citizens”.

Thus in brief, bureaucracy may be used in the sense of a type of administrative organization or government by officials or civil servants. According to Kingsley and Stahle; Bureaucracy is characterised by a hierarchical administrative structure in which each official fits like a cog in a complex machine. In this organization nothing is left to chance. All important relationships are defined in advance, and the pyramid of authority is divided horizontally into levels of responsibility. There is a sense, therefore, in which a bureaucracy is supra organic. However, sometime the term is applied with an opprobrious connotation and symbolises a man eminent for experience, knowledge, responsibility and neutrality. But generally, however, the term, bureaucracy is used in a derogatory sense. And finally, bureaucracy considered to be eager in usurping more and more power and encroaching upon individual liberty. But bureaucracy in its simple sense of professional civil servants, experienced, faithful and honest and indispensable to modern government. A truly representative government with an efficient bureaucracy would constitute an ideal government.
To Willongby, “Bureaucracy is just one of the three main types of personnel system, the bureaucratic, aristocratic and democratic”\textsuperscript{11}. The bureaucratic, system was found in Prussia. The Prussian civil service constituted a distinct career like those of army and navy, which had a rigid discipline and had secured tenure and had adequate provisions for training, and formed a separate and privileged class in society. The nineteenth century British civil service was aristocratic in the sense that here were sharp distinctions between different grades of personnel and it was not easy to rise from lower to the higher grade. Democratic personnel system was found in America. The American Civil Service, by tradition, has not been a profession. There is no rigidity about age limit and no preference to graduate of particular institutions, of course things have been changing of late, and civil service in the U.S.A administration is also readily becoming a career. However, a substantial proportion of top level jobs are still outside the civil service.

**Max Weber and Bureaucracy**

Max Weber (1864 – 1920), a German Sociologist, was the first Social Scientist to have systematically studied the bureaucracy. Therefore his name is associated with the study of bureaucracy. Max Weber developed a typology of authority and distinguished three pure types – traditional, charismatic and legal. He regarded bureaucracy, sustained and sanctified by purest type of exercise of legal authority, as the most effective form of organization. Experience shows that the purely bureaucratic type of administrative organisation is, form a purely technical point of view, capable of obtaining the highest degree of efficiency and in this sense formally the most rational known means of carrying out imperative control over human beings. It is superior both in intensive efficiency and in the scope of its operations and is formally capable of application to all kinds of administrative tasks. But what is bureaucracy; Bureaucracy is a form of organization, which has certain essential characteristics and these Weber has himself listed. These are (i) separation of office and its incumbent, (ii) Selection by merit, (iii) Fixing remuneration of officials. (iv) The official is subject to discipline and control while
performing his official work. (v) Hierarchy of offices, (vi) Allocation of authority required to discharge these activities, (vii) Allocation of activities of the organization needed to fulfil its objectives, and (viii) strict adherence to rules etc.

Furthermore, Weber himself says: The pursuit type of exercise of legal authority is that which employs a bureaucratic administrative staff, only the supreme chief of the organization occupies his position of authority of virtue of appropriation of election or of having been designated for the succession. But even his authority consists in a sphere of legal "competence". The whole administrative staff under the supreme authority then consists, in purest type of individual officials who are appointed and function according to the following criteria :-

A. They are personality free and subject to authority only with respect to their impersonal official obligations.

B. They are organised in a clearly defined hierarchy of offices.

C. Each office has a clearly defined sphere of the competence in the legal sense.

D. The office is filled by a free contractual relationship. Thus, in principle, there is free selection.

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

F. The are rewarded by fixed salaries in money, for the most part with a night to pensions. Only under certain circumstances does the employing authority especially in private organizations, have a right to make the appointment but the official is always free to resign.

G. The office is treated at the sole or atleast the primary occupation of the incumbent.
H. It constitutes a career, there is a system of promotion according to the seniority or the achievement, or both promotion is depended on the judgement of superior.

I. The official work is entirely separated from the ownership of the means of administration and without appropriation of his position.

J. He is subject to strict and systematic discipline and control in the conduct of office.¹²

**Characteristics of Bureaucracy**

Max Weber numerates the characteristics of bureaucracy;

(i) There is the principle of fixed and official jurisdictional areas, which are generally ordered by rules, that is, by laws or administrative regulations.

(ii) The regular activities required for the purpose of bureaucratically governed structure are distributed in a fixed way as official duties.

(iii) The authority to give commands required for the discharge of these duties is distributed in a stable way and is strictly carried by the rules concerning the coercive means, which may be placed at the disposal of officials.

(iv) Methodical provisions are made for the regular and continuous fulfillment of these duties and for the execution of corresponding rights, only persons who have the generally regulated qualifications to serve which are employed.

In public and lawful government these four elements constitute, "bureaucratic authority". In private economic domination these constitute "management". Bureaucracy, thus, understood, is fully developed in political and acciesiastical communities only in the modern state and in the private economy, only in the most advanced institutions of capitalism. Permanent and public office authority, with fixed jurisdiction is not the historical rule but rather than the exception.
The principles of office of hierarchy and of levels of graded authority mean a firmly ordered system of super and subordination in which there is a supervision of the lower offices by the higher ones. Such a system governed the possibility of appealing the decision of a lower office to the higher authority, in a definitely regulated manner, with the full development of bureaucratic type, the office of hierarchy is monacratically organised. The principle of hierarchical office authority is found in all bureaucratic structures in state and in large partly organizations and private enterprises. It does not matter for the character of bureaucracy whether its authority is called “private” or “Public”.

Office management, at least, all specialized office management and such management is distinctly modern usually presupposes through and expert training. This increasingly hold for the modern executive and employee of private enterprises in the same manner as it holds the state official.

When the office is usually developed, official activity demands the full working capacity of the official, irrespective of the act that his obligatory times in the bureau may be firmly devoted. In the normal case, this is only the product of a long development in the public as well as in the private office.

Formerly, in all cases, the normal state of affairs was reserved and official business was discharged as a secondary activity.

The management of office follows general rules, which are, more or less, stable, more or less, exhaustive, and can be learned. Knowledge of these rules represents a special technical learning, which the officials possess. It involves administrative or business management. Thus these are the characteristics of bureaucracy on which a bureaucratic set up is based.

Types of Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy, inspire of its homogeneity, is also shaped by the different external influences i.e. political : social and economic. Still more important may be
cultural influences, such as the German devotion to order and orderliness and the American love of mechanical devices. Thus, each bureaucracy is likely to see itself as a type and to behave accordingly. In broader outline it is possible to distinguish, at least, several types of bureaucracies, depending on the predominance of certain characteristics.

The utility of bureaucracy had been underlined under various shades. The societies felt need to accommodate suiting variety, as they found necessary for regulating their requirements.

1. The Guardian Bureaucracy

There are the two examples of guardian bureaucracy i.e. Chinese bureaucracy upto the advent of the Sung Period (960 AD), and the Prussian Civil Service during 1640 and 1740. This type may be defined as “a Scholastic officialdom trained in right conduct according to the classes” (Marx). Such Civil Service regarded itself as custodian of public interest, was independent of unresponsive to the public opinion.

Now the question arises: What is guardian bureaucracy? Prescription of Plato system as “guardian” were not simply meant to go about doing things as directed: More important was their capacity for the essence or the public interest”. In this sense they were meant to be custodians of the ideals and assumptions about justice and welfare that held together the city – state – political myth, as Plato saw it, which was the ultimate foundation of the community. The guardians were, thus, to serve as the physical representatives of the approved ideology and as it devoted instruments too, yet in the platonic scheme qualification for guardianship was not supposed to be one of the mysteries of divinely guided revolution. On the contrary, Plato sought to put selection for guardianship on a rational basis by systematic utilization of a carefully planed course of education.
The social system of ancient China made it first duty of each official to demonstrate the example of life. This was a matter of knowledge rather than of judgement. Therefore, bureaucracy was a scholastic officialdom trained in right conduct according to the classes rest on the highest organ of the government, the emperor.

To gain for public office, the head men available, the first Han Emperor (206 B.C. – 25 A.D) made it a practice to use their Governors as purveyors of talent. The Government sent candidates to the capital, where they would be questioned by the Emperor and awarded with poets according to their merit. Beginning with Sui period (581 – 618 A.D), a system of civil service examination came to replace the interview. These public examinations held at regular intervals, were not administrative needs. On the contrary for the most especially for the most important positions, they gave more emphasis for the classes as a guided of conduct and to rigid literary standards in dealing with the old textbooks. Although questions were not absent from the examinations of Jang period: as the time went on the entire system developed highly moralistic features and degenerated into memorising growth. Such excesses, however, do not invalidate the underlying concept – that is, to achieve an understanding of the common good by learning.

Several conclusions emerge about this kind of guardian bureaucracy. In the first place, such a bureaucracy can develop because its ultimate guide is unalterable body of doctrine untouched by the changeable winds of current preference.

In following this guide, the officialdom is capable of exercise of power, even the ruler’s power by insisting on the subjugation of power under righteousness.

The guardians bureaucracy of Prussia became the king’s partner in the victorious, because of “enlightened monarchy”.

At times, the light was dimmed by outbursts of naked absolutism bur there was genuine devotion to the “republic”, as Frederick William I had liked to call his State in administration of Cicero. But Republic was what the king said it was. In their concept of duty, therefore, the Civil Servants were as ready to determine the
needs of the public, as they were underlying in the face of interest. Because of their responsiveness to the goals of monarchy and the programme of the state, there were necessity unresponsive to such public sentiment as happened to run counter to the official course. The Prussian guardian bureaucracy of this early period took pride in being inflexible as well as incorruptible in its mission, authoritarian as well as benevolent in its relations with the public, and unimpressed by outside criticism.

2. The Caste Bureaucracy

An early example of the caste bureaucracy can be found in the history of Roman Empire during the century after Diocletain. The last Emperor was a forceful reformer of government. The legal, fiscal and administrative reforms he introduced between 284 and 304 A.D. enable the Christian Empire after him to live on. But his successors have shown the shadow rather than the substance. Eventually, on all pervading public status system pulled down the entire economy.

At first only the officialdom was affected by the spirit of the caste. A precisely defined separation functions degenerated into a large scheme of ranks and titles until in the ends of a vastly enlarged bureaucracy spent most of its time inventing and enforcing minute distinctions in official standing. As time passed, the conversion of private enterprise to public function extended across the entire body of society. Honorific status proved to be an impoverishing burden because each title carried an increasing load of public duty. Finally, a thoroughly unbureaucratized economic order collapsed under its own weight.

"The caste bureaucracy has a class base and "arises" from the class connection of those in the controlling positions" (Marx). The British rulers introduced the class character in the Indian civil service as well the "Civil Lines" where almost all the "Civilians" lived was just the counterpart of the "cantonment" in which the military forces lived. Even today the civil service in India has not been able to shed completely its class character. In the words of Appleby, "personnel.... are arranged self consciously in too firm classes and too many special 'Services'
with barriers between classes and services too high .... There is too much and too constant consciousness of ranks, class, title and service membership, too title consciousness of membership in the public service”\textsuperscript{15}.

3. The patronage Bureaucracy

Another name for the patronage bureaucracy is the ‘spoil system’. Its traditional development began from the U.S.A though patronage had full sway even in the U.K. till the middle of nineteenth century. This type of civil service exists where the public jobs are given as a personal favour or political award. The system it is increasing to note, worked differently in the U. K. patronage bureaucracy marked side by side with an aristocratic social order and fulfilled its purpose. The patronage in Britain was used only for the benefit of the sanctions of the mobility. In the United States, on the contrary, the system worked quite differently and jobs went as spoils to the victorious political party. The patronage was, thus, an exercise in democracy. “The system of spoil began on a minor scale and apologetically with Washington. Jefferson and Adams became a torrent in 1829 when Jackson came into office and from that time untill 1883, swept through all the offices of government without let and most usually without moral inhibitions. “The case for the spoils systems were put at its best by president Jackson in his first annual message to the congress in 1829”. The duties of the public offices are, or, at least, admit of begin made, so plain and simple that men of intelligence may readily quality themselves for their performance; and I cannot but believe that more is lost by the long continuance of men in office than is generally to be gained by intrinsic right official station than another”\textsuperscript{16}. Such a system, however, could not produce a civil service competent to cope with the ever – growing complexities of the governmental functions after the setting in of the industrial Revolution. “The patronage system was stood condemned as on anarchy for it’s lack of technical competence, its partisanship, and its want of spirit”.
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Whereas in England up to the middle of the past century the patronage bureaucracy had served the purposes on an aristocratic social order, but in the United States was distinctly on the other side. Respect for competence in public office for above contemporary British standards had been firmly accepted in the central department during the Presidency of George Washington. When Thomas Jefferson won control from the federalists, he felt compelled to make better replacements that he could not suffer from the administrative deficiency. But Jefferson was so deeply steeped that in the idea of merit as a condition to government service to slight ability and experience.

After Jackso Lincbin Steffens in his time of patronage system never really satisfied himself that the popular rule and effective administration could be brought together within a profit economy, but in an influential part of the public did not share his doubts. To practical men the patronage bureaucracy was a dangerously effective instrument of government at a time when government has being the instrument of free economy, that it was of the most important that the government acquire the expert touch. The patronage bureaucracy stood condemned as an anarchism for its lack of technical competence, its discipline, its erratic ways, its want of spirit.

4. The Merit Bureaucracy

The merit bureaucracy is more simple that guardian, patronage and caste bureaucracy. Even in the merit system, the intelligence is judged of the people, but the patronage bureaucracy is the product of special influence and its willing tools. The merit bureaucracy, in contrast, as governed by objective standards, specially be the principle of admission on the basis of prescribed qualifications as attested by the outcome of a written examination. Thus, most qualified and competent candidates having the chance to enter into the public service. Thus, they remain free from the political pressure, particularly, they are left free to devote himself to
the promotion of the common good without being bridled by special influence as soon as there is a conflict.

Therefore, the merit bureaucracy has its bases on the merit of public officials, and, its aim efficiency of the civil service. It aims at “career open at talent”. In other words, the attempt is to recruit the best men for the public service, their merit being judged by objective standards. This method is usually used in all civilized countries. Appointment to public service is no longer governed by class considerations and it is no more a gift or a favour. Nor is the public servant may large the self-appointed guardian of the people. The civil servant in a modern democracy is really an official in the service of the people, and is recruited on the basis of prescribed qualifications tested objectively. He owes his job to no one except to his industry, intelligence lack. After entering into the public service on a showing of fitness, the appointee would not assure to stay, therefore, at any length of time. Certainly, he would have little place of mind if the tenure depended on the approval of particular group or, at least, one conduct that would not bring down their wills. For this reason, the merit bureaucracy is usually not supposed proper by legal guarantees or status or stability, expressed in such concepts as life appointment and regular position. Typically, the merit bureaucracy also draws compensation on the basis of a salary Schedule that is not open to discretionary management. Administrators may not decree from pay day to pay day the amount concerned by each subordinate or for the various worthy causes, including the local party organisation.

The Concept of Bureaucracy

The German economist, Max Weber, employed bureaucracy to mean a rational system of administration. He was followed by other social philosophers, who described it as a system, which increased the likelihood of alienation from work. The modern authors employ this term in a wide variety of theories. To quote Martin Albrow: “It has linked with the growth of territory occupations, with the
differentiation of social functions, with the alienation of man from work, with the growth of oligarchy and with a general process of rationalization. It has been an element in many more restricted theories about rules, hierarchy, communications, participation, and decision making in a wide variety of organization.

The competing concept of bureaucracy has been brought under seven broad categories by Martin Albrow: (1) Bureaucracy as a rational organization, (2) Bureaucracy as organizational inefficiency, (3) Bureaucracy as rule of officials, (4) Bureaucracy as public administration, (5) Bureaucracy as an administration of officials, (6) Bureaucracy as the personnel system, (7) Bureaucracy as the organization, and (8) Bureaucracy as modern society.

They may be discussed in some details as below:

(1) **Bureaucracy as Rational Organization**

The idea of the rationality was adopted by Max Weber. Peter Balu comments: "Weber conceived of bureaucracy as a social mechanism that tends towards the inefficiency and also as a form of social organization with special characteristics. Both these ideas can not be a part of definition since the relationship between the attributes of social institution and its consequence is a question of empirical verification and not a matter of definition". He goes on to define bureaucracy as an organization that maximize efficiency in administration.

Francis and Stone pointed out to the mode of organization which especially adopted to maintaining stability and efficiency in bodies that are large and complex. In the same way Peter Leonard called it a rational and clearly defined arrangement of activities which are directed towards of activities which are directed towards fulfilling the purpose of organization. The idea of efficiency has appealed of many people.
(2) Bureaucracy as Organization of Inefficiency

The concept of bureaucracy as inefficient organization needs no scholarly
 treatment. It was the nineteenth century educated elite which treated it as a rational
 organization. Marchall Dimock has used the concept as the antithesis of
 administrative vitality and managerial activity. He defined it as the composite
 institutional manifestations, which tend towards in flexibility and
depersonalization. The growth of factors which make it a hallmark of inefficiency
 are: (a) big size, (b) proliferation of rules, (c) group introversion, (d) too great
 emphasis on age and security.

Inefficiency is inherent is the structure and functioning of big organizations.
The symptoms include over devotion to performance, duplication of work and
departmentalism. Crozier in his book the bureaucratic phenomenon describes it as
organization that cannot correct its behaviour by learning from its error. From our
own experience we have seen how the rules of an organization are used by the
individuals within it to their own advantage. After the independence, it is the
common complaint that rules have been perverted to benefit the individuals. In one
state all those government servants in a department superseded due to the record
were prompted after adverse remarks.

(3) Bureaucracy as Rule by official

Rule by Officials is said to be the original concept of bureaucracy. It was in
this sense that Cournot and Mill, called this bureaumania “an illness of France,
which bids fair to play havoc with the people”. He went to complain “The offices,
the clerks, the secretaries, the inspectors are not appointed to benefit the public
interest; indeed the public interest appears to have been established so that offices
might exist”.

Democracy has been viewed not as a role of a class but as rule for the good
of the people. In the scheme, bureaucracy is shown to be compatible with, or even
necessary to democracy. The concept rule of officials has been extremely used. Harold Larki says, “Bureaucracy is the term usually applied to be a system of government the control of which so completely in the hands of officials that their powers jeopardize the liberties of ordinary citizens”. A student of the French Civil Service, W. R. Sharp called it the exercise of power by professional administrators.

In his essay, “How Bureaucracies Develop and Function Arnold Brecht defines bureaucracy as government by officials. He separates two types – the legal right to give orders, and two types of power are possessed whenever these are officials. The have these in small or big measures. At the heart of the government apparatus were the officials.

Martin Albrow thinks that seeing public administration in a power complex is only a partial view. Functions are for more manifold that merely providing members of a governing elite. The neutral concept of bureaucracy is without any special reference to the possession of power.

(4) Bureaucracy as a Public Administration

Bureaucracy as an organizational structure was a Fascist’s programme, which kept the state above the society. Here the emphasis is upon the group discharging functions rather than on the functions themselves.

B. F. Hoselitz, emphasising on the pressure group activity of bureaucracy, has observed: “A civil service is engaged in meeting the systematic goals of society as a whole. Bureaucratic apparatus is one of the institutions through which goal gratification activity is performed.

The activities are not visible but the group is identifiable. Some authors have classified bureaucracy into classes, such as caste bureaucracy, where the recruitment is confined to a class; merit bureaucracy where the recruitment is through competition; patronage bureaucracy and professional bureaucracy. The French and the British have developed a deep sense of corporate identity and each
in a striking manner reveals a correspondence between the character of the bureaucracy and the political traditions of society.

(5) Bureaucracy as Administration by officials

Max Weber’s concept of bureaucracy was confined to public administration by officials. The idea of office, hierarchy, appointment, prestige, social stratification are the control parts to the concept of bureaucracy. Riggs has analysed public administration in a frame – work. He concludes that the idea of administration in accordance with the policies laid down by a legislature is too limited to industrial societies. He suggests a definition of ‘public administrative system’ as structures for allocating goods and services in a government. In the administration of the developing countries like India, bureaucrats are government officials. The characteristics of complex and large administration are hierarchy of authority, rules, system of records and specialization. But some authors have found bureaucracy as much outside as inside the government.

(6) Bureaucracy as a Personnel System

Bureaucracy as personnel system has become a matter of the past, and as a system of administration is of recent growth. It arose in the wake of modern nationalist is movement and is due mainly to the need for technical expertise and impartial administration as well as to the great size of (governmental) organizations.

As understood in the sense bureaucracy may be defined as “the systematic organization of tasks and individuals into a pattern, which can most effective efforts”. According to professor of the personnel, apparatus, and procedures by which an organization manages its work and achieves its purposes. In other words it is a system of personnel administration under which all the employees are organized into a hierarchy of offices, each with a well – defined sphere of duties
and responsibilities. This is done in order to minimize chances of personal considerations in the performance of public duties and to increase efficiency of bringing technical mind to the solution of technical problem. Max – Weber, an eminent German sociologist, describes it as a “a system of administration characterised by expertness impartiality and the absence of humanity”.

(7) Bureaucracy as the Organisation

In common sense, it is usual to talk of any large organisation as a bureaucracy. Talcott Persons in his “Structure and Process in Modern Societies”, says : “one of the most salient structural characteristics of such a society is the main part of relatively large – scale organizations with specialized functions, with rather loosely tend to be called bureaucracy”. Ferrel Heady writes : “Bureaucracy is a form of organisation, organizations either are bureaucracies or they are not, depending on whether or not they have been these characteristics.

Mortin Albrow thinks that bureaucracy as organizations is a difficult idea : “The facts of organizational structure are not the same data, to be recorded by any one who might care to observe, but abstract phenomena which depend upon interpretative inventiveness”. He goes on to say that boundaries of organizations are difficult to draw. Hierarchy, rules of labour, careers, qualifications seem to pervade modern society, and are not simply housed in separate organization. Perhaps, we can speak for organizations as being bureaucratic; only because they are a part of a wider bureaucracy modern society itself.

(8) Bureaucracy as Modern Society

Bureaucrats and political executives are not much different. The process set in motion by them, the institutions they control, have the same behaviour pattern. James Burnham makes no distinction between the bureaucrats and political officials, “To say that the ruling class is the manager is almost the same thing to say
that it is the state of bureaucracy”, Like Mosca Bumhan is talking of bureaucratic societies which have become bureaucracies. The difference between the two is wide where the society is composed of the large number in percentage of peasants the ruling bureaucratic class is proposed up by the people. The societies where the dominant working class, having specified originational role exists the whole structure may be seen as bureaucracy. Karl Mounheim has argued that changes in social structure in the twentieth century have made opposition of the concept of state and society out of date. He saw no difference between private and public organizations in respect of power, methods of recruitment, public significance and the personality type of members. Public responsibility is necessary in the whole structure of society. Big organizations and bureaucratic structures are the same level. S. N. Eisenstadt makes a distinction between the growth of bureaucracy and bureaucratization of parts environment. The growth of the organizations involves the bureaucratization of society and that is the necessary thing for society becoming bureaucracuY.

Merits of Bureaucracy

There are various merits of bureaucracy. At the first place, its contribution to governmental administration is not insignificant. Infact, it has made administration more efficient, rational impartial and consistent than was the case in the earlier times. In the words of Herbert Marrison: “Bureaucracy is the price of parliamentary democracy”.

Generally speaking, the merits of bureaucracy may be described as below:

(1) Bureaucracy is Efficient

It is hoped by men and women who devote full time to their narrow specialities. They have developed a method, which beyond question, is technically superior to administration by amateurs or dabblers. Bureaucrats have the
background and know – now to get things done in modern world. There is the universe of large – scale organization and centralized control that a money economy has helped to create everywhere.

(2) Bureaucracy is predictable

Since it proceeds from categorical rules and principles, operating from within a context or tight authoritarian discipline and hierarchical status, top officials have every reason to expect that orders will be difficult to be carried out.

(3) Bureaucracy is Impersonal

To administer a modern institution is to be objective, not be influenced by any primary group sentiment, to be emotionally blank, to subdued all personal vagaries and biases, at best to approximate the impartiality of a judge on the bench, and, thus, to be fair.

(4) Bureaucracy is Fast

Uniformity of rules makes it possible for the modern administrator to process thousand of cases with general formulae. The speedy disposition of innumerable cases would be impossible of each one had to be considered on its individual merits.

Both the good and bad aspect of bureaucracy were well brought out by Lord Morly, the Secretary of states for India, in his classical description of the nature of the Indian administration, “Our administration would be a great deal more popular if it were less efficient and has no value more elastic. Our danger is the creation of a pure bureaucracy competent, honourable, faithfully, industrious, but rather mechanical, rather lifeless, perhaps, rather soulless. In fact, bureaucracy is not in itself a bad thing, some element of it is indispensable. What is needed is to guard
against its characteristics, defects, and to subject it to a continuous stream of instructed and effective criticism? Bureaucracy, in brief, has to be kept under control. Some one has remarked that bureaucracy is like fire – invaluable as a servant, ruinous when it becomes the master. So, it has both good and bad aspect. It is found in all the civilized countries.

**Defects of Bureaucracy**

The Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, also criticized the machinery of public administration for acting as the stumbling block in the way of the country’s social and economic progress. She preferred a civil service (bureaucracy) consisting of persons “who would think and see that certain things, which are necessary for our progress are implemented properly. The note on basic economic issues, submitted to the requisitionists by the All India Congress Committee held in Delhi in November 1969, contains: “The present bureaucracy under the orthodox and conservative leadership of the Indian Civil Service with its upper class prejudices can hardly be expected to meet the requirements of social and economic change along socialist lines. The creation of an administrative cadre committed to national objectives and responsive to our social needs is an urgent necessity”.

Jagjivan Ram also in his presidential speech to the requisitions at the congress meeting held in December, 1969 at Bombay referred to the ‘neutrality’ of the civil service as a hindrance, adding further that “the theory of neutral bureaucracy is hardly relevant to the Indian conditions”. We need a service committed to the ideal of democracy, socialism and secularism.

The Indian bureaucracy has been a subject of adverse criticism both at the hands of Englishmen and Indians from time to time. Lord Curzon, the Viceroy of India (1899 – 1905), once likened the Government of India to be an elegant – very stately, very dignified, but very slow in its movement. He wrote in his own inimitable style: “Government here ............ Has become very ponderous and slow : I am prodding up the animal with most vigorous and unexpected digs, and it
gambols plaintively under the novel super. Nothing has been done hitherto under six months. When I suggest six weeks the attitude is one of pained surprise, if six days, one of the pathetic protest, if six hours one of stupefied resignation. He was indignant at the bureaucracy’s passion for nothing, and the note he wrote to highlight its evils and to suggest remedial measures is of freshness and validity even today. “I am grappling with this vile system in my own department, but it has sealed itself like the old man of the sea upon the shoulders of the Indian Government, and every man accepts while deploving the burden”.

Mahatma Gandhi considered the Indian administration as top heavy and ruinously expensive, adding for me, even law, order and good government would be too dearly purchased if the price to be paid for it is to be the grinding poverty of the masses”. Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru was always outspoken in his criticism of the Indian bureaucracy, and this trait, he exhibited right through his Prime Ministerial days. In 1936; he wrote “ .... from one thing I am quite sure, that no new order can be built up in India so long as the spirit of the Indian Civil Service pervades our administration and our public service. That spirit authoritarianism is the ally of imperialism, and it cannot be co-existed with freedom. It will either succeed in crushing freedom or will be swept away itself. Only with one type of state, it is likely to fit in, and that is the fascist quite essential that the Indian Civil Service and similar services must disappear completely as such, before we can start real work on a new order. Individual members of these services if they are willing and component for the new jobs, will be welcomed, not only one new condition. It is quite inconceivable that they will get the high salaries and allowances that are paid to them today. The new India must be served by earnest efficient workers who have an ardent faith in the cause they serve and are bent on achievement, and works for the joy and glory of it, and not for the attraction of high salaries. The money motive must be reduced to a minimum. In 1929, Lord Hewart, a British jurist, published a book entitled, “The New Despotism”, whose main thesis is based on the assumption that the powers and authority of the Civil Servants has increased, that British Citizens are looking their liberties under the weight of growing administrative absolutis. Similarly Ramsay Muir in his book, “How Britain is
Governed” (Published in 1930), observes: In our system of government the power of bureaucracy is very strong, whether in administration in legislation or in finance. Under cloak of democracy it has thriven and grown until, like Frenkenstein’s monster, it sometimes seems likely to devour its creator. … It has become the most vital and potent element in our system of government, although in the eyes of the law it wields scarcely any formal authority. Professor Robson summarizes the defects of bureaucracy in these words, “The maladies from which bureaucracy most frequently suffers are an excessive sense of self – importance on the part of the officials or an undue idea of the importance of their office, and indifference towards the feeling or the convenience of individual citizens; and obsession with the binding and inflexible authority of departmental decisions, precedents, arrangements or forms, regardless of how badly or with what injustice they may work in individual cases; a mania for regulations and formal procedure; a preoccupation with the activities of particular units of administration and an inability to consider the government as a whole, a failure to recognize the relations between the Government as whole; a failure to recognize the relations between the Governors and the governed as an essential part of democratic process.

An all-embracing definition of bureaucracy perhaps may be a political actor, an essential ingredient of the political system, a consumer and producer of social products, a power centre, a pressure group, a system stabilizer, a change agent, a political symbol, a political socializer, a social elite, an interest articulator, a political, social and economic system, a source of political recruitment, a decision broker, and an environmental determinant. Bureaucracy is a form of organization dedicated to the concept of rationality, and to the conduct of administration on the basis of relevant knowledge.

The word ‘bureaucracy’ evokes the slowness, the ponderousness, the routine, the complication of the procedures, and the maladapted responses of ‘bureaucratic’ organization to the needs which they satisfy, and the frustrations which their members, clients or subjects consequently endure.
Michel Crozier's study of bureaucracy is of France. His study gives clue as to how structure has links with culture. The concept of state without bureaucracy and administration cannot be conceived. The administration has always been there and would always exist.

Bureaucracy reaches a stage at which it turns on society and reorders it. The child grows up and controls the parents as earlier pointed out. Bureaucracy is a particular kind of offspring: Although it does grow old, it does not die. It seems content to feed on its surroundings and will not be satisfied until it has consumed these entirely. To be more accurate, bureaucracy is a well-oiled, huge, intricate machine capable of one direction—straight ahead—and one speed—moderately slow—that crushes everything in its path.

Bureaucracy for development serves as an advisor, an inventor and a decision-maker. It also serves as a cushion for absorbing the interactive impact of democratic processes on political system.

Apart from impact of the bureaucracy on the nation as a whole, it has a growing influence on an individual, however indigent or affluent he may be. The increasing role of government and bureaucracy in citizen's affairs leads to a greater dependence of the people on the public decision-making agencies.

The twentieth century has witnessed a phenomenal growth in the powers and functions of the state. This has been mainly due to emergence of the concept of welfare state. The state no longer confines itself to its traditional functions such as defense, administration of justice or maintenance of law and order. The state ensures social security and social welfare for the common man.

The activities of state have expanded and extend from underneath the ocean to above the sky and beyond it, due to welfare activities and enormous problems that we are facing since partition. The country was partitioned on the basis of two nation theory; the continuous, unending inflow of refugees since partition days from the neighbouring countries and migration within the country.
Today the administrative state is concerned with almost all aspects of human life including such areas as social services, education exploration and conservation of natural resources, scientific and technological development and space, satellite and communications research making public services, the largest employer in the modern sector economy of the majority of countries throughout the world. The bureaucracy in India, not content with the total loss of accountability in the assigned fields or even beyond where it has manipulated substantial encroachments, has also made inroads into the judicial system. The consequences are too well known to be repeated.

The modern era is an era of welfare state, whose activities have increased considerably. The civil servants provide the framework of the administration. The undertake the welfare work. Without the services of the bureaucracy no work can be accomplished effectively and the modern era is an age of state welfare. The activities of the state have increased manifold entering the life of the citizen from cradle to grave and so has the grip of the bureaucracy grown tighter and spread for actively. Lest it devours its creator, it is high time to see that the delicate balance of professional autonomy and political neutrality between the bureaucracy and its master is not shattered either by way total subjugation of the bureaucracy or by way of its total dominance. It is to be guarded again that the ‘public servants’ do not turn themselves into ‘masters’ and the real masters – the public at large, the men in the street, the socially, educationally and economically backward classes – become the servants may slaves toiling day and night to feed, to pamper, and to maintained an affluence bureaucracy, the instrumentality created to serve them and their interests.

After all the bureaucracy, after independence, in spite of its background, traditions, education and training has, somehow, isolated itself from the masses and as such is unable to keep pace with the Socio – economic changes. It has so far belied the hopes, ambitions and expectations of the people. It is now viewed as ‘value laden’ instrument of political power. It has been politicised, through the bureaucrats are trained to adopt a neutral posture in relation to politicians and
political parties. The bureaucracy as a system is not merely a passive instrument to be wielded in for a section but for the welfare of the people as a whole. Administration is a tool of executive actions. The decisions regarding location of development projects are reached by political consensus. Politicians decide and administration obeys, and as such the bureaucracy is an instrument must successfully serve, in a democratic setup, any kind of political regime without being aligned to it. It must have commitment to work for the service of the society and no other commitment. It is to work very closely with the people and as such popular participation in development has to be looked as an impetus and resource. The traditional concept of people as passive beneficiaries has to be replaced by concept of people as active participants which is a continuous and unending process. By peoples participation, the people realize that the administration is their own – their instrument for the execution of their will.
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