PATTERNS OF INTER-ACTION AND INTER-RELATIONS OF IAS OFFICERS AND POLITICAL ELITES OF H.P.
In a democratic government, political elites and administrators are vital constituents of the governmental system. They become part of the governmental system through entirely different method and together shoulder the responsibility of running it. Although their functions are prescribed separately, yet this line of division overlaps so much that often there is a feeling of intrusion. Administrators and political elites come from different backgrounds, with different motives and orientations. Often their is conflict between them concerning their roles. Eventhough in common man’s views political elites formulate the policies and administrators implement them but in practice, this role specification is not so accurate. The close proximity due to their working environment, often contributes to many conflicts on both sides.

After independence, the pattern of interaction between politicians and administrators has changed. Politicians who were busy throwing out Britishers earlier, were responsible for buidling a nation. Administrators were the masters for common masses and after 1947 they became servants of the people. From the task of collecting taxes from people they started providing welfare facilities to them.
In the words of Guy Peters, one of the most crucial areas of institutional policies in contemporary industrialized democracies is in the interaction between political executives and career civil servants. These interactions are crucial for the capacity of government to perform its routine tasks and to make and implement the decisions required of a modern political system ... the political executives are constantly reporting that they believe themselves to be thwarted in their policy making efforts by the power of an entrenched public bureaucracy. He believes that there is no partisan reason for this but these blocks arise as large organizations tend to proceed from inertia and to persist in their routine unless topped. He further explains that "bureaucrats and their organisations tend to believe that they understand the policy area in question better than the political executive who may be in office only for a short time." To avoid such type of situations the constitution of United States clearly separate the executive from the legislative powers but the actual practice of government has produced during the course of nearly two centuries a variety of devices for avoiding the literal application of such formal doctrine. It appears that whatever devices of rules and regulations may be formulated the interaction between political elites and bureaucrats often encroaches each others territories.

2 Guy Peters, op. cit., p-256
When we look at our country the interaction between politicians and administrators has undergone a sea-change. Before independence politicians were busy fighting against British regime but after independence they were responsible for nation building. The administrators who were masters or sahibs were now serving the country in different capacities. Both political elites and administrators started formulating and implementing various programmes for overall development of the country. The development aspirations symbolize the values that are held by the ruling elites who want to change, through conscious and deliberate efforts, the structure of the society in such a way that it will favourably respond to the demands of development planning. Once the policies have been laid down then the administrators take the responsibility of implementing it. It is a relationship of input-output type through political elites the demands of the general public are channeled into the governmental system and after formulating policies and implementing them, output comes in the form of various facilities provided to the general public. In this way political elites and administrators are the chain between polity and society.

Kothari and Roy have explained few reasons for conflict between politicians and administrators. Administrators are public servants and are supposed to be value

\[4\] Shanti Kothari And Ramashray Roy, op..cit..p-5.
neutral in implementing policy decisions made by political leaders... Secondly political leaders are concerned with the functions of interest articulation and interest aggregation. In actual practice sometimes variation in ideologies leads to conflict. Administrators are much concerned about following rules and regulations. They tend to explain rules and regulations and practical difficulties in implementing the policies proposed by politicians. C.V. Raghavulu's study of politicians and administrators explained critical remarks made by each other. Bureaucrats expressed that the politicians are not interested in people, they are interested in the pursuit of their own interests. The politicians are corrupt, Partisonship is shown at the time of award of contracts, projects etc., they are not educated though to understand the policy process, politicians serve their kinsmen; they are unmindful of rules and regulations; attitudes of political elites towards bureaucrats are equally uncomplimentary. Political elites gave these remarks about bureaucrats. Most of the bureaucrats are unresponsive to people's interests. Bureaucrats use rules and regulations to obstruct certain things from happening, they are corrupt, and they are interested in improving their career prospects.

R.N. Thakur has given types of minister-administrator relationship; relationship based on adjustment, working on the basis of rules, fairness and impartiality, based on
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difference in appreciation and adjustment; of conflict between the two. Of a faithful follower, a 'yes man', minister wants quite disposal of work and official as 'procedure oriented'; conflict over the correct interpretation of departmental policy.  

Ralph Braibanti has explained the reason for conflict to the "different socio-economic background of the two". There is difference in educational and intellectual qualifications and aspirations. The administrator is critical of the politician because he is sensitive to social class differences between himself and many of the politicians. Administrators feel themselves to be superior to their political bosses as they are better educated and qualified than their bosses. 

Prof. Appleby has explained this relationship in these words, "every government employee is engaged in political work. Government and politics are synonymous although not identical. He has further defined a good administrator as one who needs to have a high respect and sympathy for political processes and political leaders. The relationship between these two constituents of governmental system is between the 'rule-mania' and 'interference by the politician.' But it is expected that there will be few issues of difference of opinion due to their different backgrounds, orientations and working environmental conditions. The establishment of cordial relations between the

8 R.N. Thakur, op. cit., p-251.  
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administrative and the political wings of the government and the proper demarcation of
the responsibilities of the two wings is a sine-qua-non of good democratic administra-
tion. 12

In this section relating to pattern of inter-relationship, the present researcher has
selected the following aspects and asked the IAS officers about these relations:

a Relations with politicians—whether administrators should play second fiddle
to politicians and to what extent?
b Behaviour of public servants—whether it should be guided by the value of
social good, social benefit and social interest?
c Compliance with illegal orders of the politicians (political executive—the
minister)
d Refusal to execute anti-social-interest orders (verbal) of the ministers
e Behaviour or actions of public servants to be brought under the purview of
Parliamentary Commissioner.

The opinions of the IAS officers have been recorded and tabulated in this section
in the following pages.

12 V. Subramaniam, op. cit., p-260.
In a parliamentary democracy minister or political head is at the top of the departmental hierarchy. Bureaucrats below, at various posts receive orders from political executive, administrators consider political executives to be temporary and less informed, unaware and incapable. They are reluctant to obey their orders. In order to know their views about this aspect of their profession, we asked them that in their opinion whether the administrators should play second fiddle to the political executives? The officers replied in an expected manner as refused to accept the idea that an administrator should play second fiddle to political executives.

There were only 6% of the IAS officers of our sample, who approved the statement as extremely and 18% favoured highly and an equal percent said that playing second fiddle to the wishes of a minister should be moderate. Those who refused to
play second fiddle were 34% yet there were 10% of them who failed to answer this question.

Table No. 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excessively</th>
<th>High 51-75%</th>
<th>Moderate 26-50%</th>
<th>Poor 1-25%</th>
<th>Nil 0%</th>
<th>No Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ST/SC</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrators are servants of public. They provide different facilities to the common people. They are responsible for implementing and supervising the policies and programmes for overall socio-economic development of the society. We asked the officers as to what extent did they think that the behaviour of public administrators should benefit, social interests. After analysis of the replies, we have come to know that 54% of officers believed that administrators should be guided extremely or excessively by the value of 'social good'. Rest of the 42% officers felt that they should be guided by the value of 'social good' less than extreme but more than moderate.
It appears from the results that both the categories of officers felt that the behaviour of the administrators should be guided by the value of 'social good.'

Table No. 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excessively High76-100%</th>
<th>High 51-75%</th>
<th>Moderate 26-50%</th>
<th>Poor 1-25%</th>
<th>Nil 0%</th>
<th>No Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ST/SC</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Politics is the centre of power. Criminalisation of politics is a recent phenomenon of Indian politics. With the entrance of anti-social elements in politics, one may assume as to what type of order they are likely to give. Officers of Himachal Pradesh when asked that when political executive is adamant to get 'illegal orders' executed, would you comply and compromise? It was natural that they refused to accept such an aspect of their professional conducted. As expected majority of the officers i.e. 50% refused to get "illegal orders" to be executed even if the political executed was adamant. The officers (29%) revealed the reality of their professional conduct and expressed that
the officers should poorly comply and compromise. There were 10% of them who did not reply to our question.

Table No. 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excessively High 76-100%</th>
<th>High 51-75%</th>
<th>Moderate 26-50%</th>
<th>Poor 1-25%</th>
<th>Nil 0%</th>
<th>No Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ST/SC</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the ST-IAS Officer said that bureaucrats should refuse to execute 'anti-social' nature of orders but should not be a 'dare devil'. Others gave the following specific replies:

(a) should take reasonable stand in case of such issues.
(b) not possible to be a dare devil
(d) an administrator is part of the system why should he become a martyr?

Politics is a centre of power. Politics is also bane of corruption. This has attracted anti-social elements in politics. Political heads of today are interested in their personal benefits more than social goods or good of people at large. Often they give such
orders which are not in the interest of general public. The administrators were asked that in case they receive such orders, then, to what extent they would prefer to execute them? An IAS officer should be a dare-devil and refuse to execute such orders. even at the cost of earning the wrath of the political executive, was the reply of one of the respondent.

Administrators of Himachal Pradesh expressed positively to this question replied that an officer should be a dare-devil and refuse execution of orders of the nature of 'anti-social' interests. Few of the officers i.e. 14% refused to express themselves in regard to such a question only difference between the two categories of officer was that general category officers opined to refuse execution of such orders in larger percentage i.e. 20 and 32 in superlative degrees.

Table No. 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excessively High76-100%</th>
<th>High51-75%</th>
<th>Moderate26-50%</th>
<th>Poor1-25%</th>
<th>Nil0%</th>
<th>No Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ST/SC</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=50
To place the actions of administrators under some type of judicial authority, the institution of Parliamentary Commissioner/LOKPAL was suggested. This will make administrators accountable for their actions. In order to know the opinion of administrators about such judicial check or accountability of administrators, we asked them to give their views about the establishment of Parliamentary Commissioner or LOKPAL. The researcher received an overwhelming response in favour of parliamentary commissioner or LOKPAL. Nearly 80% of the officers expressed that the actions of public administrators be brought under the scrutinizing of LOKPAL. It was only 6% of the officers who failed to give their opinion.

Table No. 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excessively</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Nil</th>
<th>No Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High76-100%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ST/SC</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrators were asked the extent to which the decisions/judgements of Supreme court about constitutional matters be brought within the purview of a Consti-
tutional Council. It seems that the concept of Constitutional Council as in French-Constitution was not so known to them as 30% of them did not answer the question. And those who gave their opinions views in favour of extremely high and high were not a big number as 16% and 18% felt that the decisions/judgements of supreme court be brought within the scrutiny of a Constitutional Council. The following were two specific replies of IAS:

1. The judgements should be under public scrutiny i.e. the public should have the right to criticism.
2. It should be directly under judiciary only.

CONCLUSIONS:

The patterns of interaction and inter-relations have not led us to circumscribe the Indian Administrative behaviour conforming to American, British, European or of models of authoritarian states because when we ponder over the conclusion one can hardly make any substantiable comment:

1. IAS personnel felt-6% and 8% of them that administrators should excessively and highly play second fiddle to political masters. Although one out of every four IAS officers expressed this idea, yet it is "matter of the fact" answer. Those who
deny this type of behaviour were 34%. One is compelled to say that opinions of IAS were almost divided.

2 Administrators were overwhelmingly infavour of excessive and highly acting for some social cause/interest/purpose.

3 There were 50% of the IAS who thought that they should point blank or outrightly refuse to obey illegal or verbal orders. In a way those who were in the category of nil i.e. zero percentage also could be considered belonging to the category of officers rejecting the proposal. Thus Indian administrators, atleast in theory, remain defiant against verbal illegal orders.

4 Indian administrators opined in favour of extreme and high categories of officers who would refuse to implement anti-scoail interest orders. Even there were officers who expressed their views to implement and nil categories of orders which are anti social in nature.

5 An overwhelming majority of IAS officers were in favour of bringing actions of administrators within the jurisdiction of a Parliamentary Commissioner.

6 Majority of IAS officers did not wish to establish Constitutional Council to review decisions and judgements of the Supreme Court of India relating to constitutional matters. The behavioural characteristics of Indian Administrative Service are, thus, partly Weberian.