

P R E F A C E

The Indian Council of Social Science Research must be thanked for encouraging and implementing extensive surveys of research carried out in the various disciplines of Social Sciences. As of to-day, such surveys were carried out ~~to at~~ pointsof time 1970s and 1980s which have brought out voluminous material pertaining to the various disciplines like Economics, Sociology, Political Science, Public Administration etc. The rich material provided by these surveys has not only emphasized the ~~set~~ ^{state} of studies of the various disciplines at ~~the~~ two points of time, but has also very rightly pin-pointed attention on the gaps in the research and publications available so far. Apart from highlighting certain topics for further investigation and research, what comes out time and again is the woeful gap of coherent and conceptual framework. In fact, one major finding of these surveys has been the purely descriptive nature of the various researches carried out in most of the disciplines.

Moreover, due to the publication of these surveys, another fact, which is forcefully brought to one's attention, is the importance of drawing from sister disciplines certain important topics, particularly that of Bureaucracy, which has been very rightly studied by ~~the~~ students of Sociology, Political Science, Public Administration and also Economics. The term 'Bureaucracy' is generally used in a pejorative sense and sometimes effort is made to the ~~commitment~~ ^{condemning} of it.

.. 2.

Bureaucracy for all lacunae in Social, Economic and Political Development, since bureaucracy is looked upon as a major obstacle to the required kind of transformation of society. In all new nations but old societies, there is no denying the fact that considerable reliance has been placed on bureaucracy for formulating, initiating and implementing the desired and desirable kind of transformation of society, right from economic development and prosperity to distributive justice and social, structural change, so that the fruits of development would be made available to everyone. Without defining development, it can be said that what is implied by the concept of development is the ready accessibility to all the good things of life, both material and non-material to every single citizen irrespective of differences of sex, age, generation, caste, ethnicity, class, religion, region etc.

In spite of the fact that much reliance is placed on Bureaucracy to implement such transformation, one cannot be ^{the} mindful of the traditional role of bureaucracy particularly the maintenance of law and order. To this role, has, of course, been added the extremely significant role of management of both development and change, as mentioned above, which certainly attaches maximum importance to rationality and as such the capacity to effectively depart from traditional

.. 3.

modes of thinking and working. However, there is a catch here, in the sense that management of development and change and emphasis on rationality does result in management of people for whom this whole laudable objective and goal of development is intended, by treating them willy-nilly as objects rather than people. Further, it would also mean working for the people in order to 'deliver the goods', though not with the people, leave aside ensuring implementation of the various experiments and programmes of such development with the help of the participation ^{of the people} at all stages. On the other hand, the democratic polity and dissemination of democratic values emphasize the importance of Government of the people, by the people and for the people. It is indeed well-known that any Government, where a large population is involved, has to work through the representatives of the people rather than allowing the people to directly participate in Government. Moreover, apart from the people's representatives, who are in the final analysis, some kind of elites, there is also large scale of administrative and implementing machinery manned by persons specially selected 'to do the job'. Apart from the complication introduced by the elite nature of people's representatives, old governmental machinery is used to administer programmes of development and change, a further complication is inevitably introduced in the sense that personnel manning such governmental machinery is also further removed from common people,

.. 4.

partly because of tradition and partly because of its expertise and demands made on them for impartiality in the discharge of their duties.

Birth in contradiction

Bureaucracy and Public Administration have ^{been} a necessary adjunct of industrial revolution, economic development and transformation of society from status to contract. Max Weber in his seminal discussion on various types of authority, naturally has emphasized the role of bureaucracy in all its ramifications to particularly consider the importance of legal rational authority and its efficacy in maintaining economic prosperity, scientific and industrial development, democratic framework etc. Ofcourse, Max Weber had also maintained that every modern society would have to utilize bureaucracy to manage its ^{completely} ~~complicated~~ affairs, even through social experiments, leave aside socialist state that had ^{not} ~~come~~ into being then. While relying on Max Weber's formulations for providing a starting point for the analysis of bureaucracy both theory and practice, it should be mentioned in the same breath that in view of the changed conditions and new expectations regarding the role which the bureaucracy is expected to play, it will be extremely important to look for appropriate conceptual modifications in the theory of bureaucracy in order to understand its practice as of to-day. R.K.Merton, Peter Blau, Selznick, Michael Crozier and several others have contributed significantly to such conceptual

com

.. 5.

modifications necessary for understanding the functioning of bureaucracy, even in western societies where it is not so directly harnessed for implementing development and social structural transformation so avowedly. In the case of Indian Society, where a great deal of reliance has been placed on the utilization of bureaucracy for comprehensive development and societal transformation, the problem of providing modifications in the traditional conceptual framework acquires all the greater importance. However, as mentioned above, I.C.S.S.R. surveys have brought out the woeful neglect of any conceptual framework and analysis as reflected in the various studies undertaken by different scholars. Naturally, the study of bureaucracy is no exception to these observations. It is precisely because of this, that the present work is addressed to work out a conceptual framework for the study of bureaucracy, particularly when it is used as a very important instrument of development and transformation. Naturally, instead of undertaking field investigation and generating primary data, emphasis is placed on the utilization of the existing material in order to provide a hopefully meaningful conceptual framework. It was felt that no particular-purpose would be served ^{by} ~~in~~ undertaking fresh empirical investigation with the help of such conceptual framework, because again, it would be a very limited exercise confined to a very specific area of study and, therefore, recourse has been taken to the analysis of data generated by the various studies of bureaucracy mainly by sociologists and also by students of public administration, political science as well as economics.

Bureaucracy : Theory and Practice in the
context of Development : Y.B.Damle

Chapter - I

In Search of Theory

Introduction :

"For comprehending social reality, it is necessary to have appropriate conceptual tools since without definite conceptual ideas, it is not possible to understand reality and much less to control it and shape it according to the prevailing values. According to Whitehead(1959)1, 'The secret of progress is the speculative interest in abstract schemes of morphology'. With the help of cosmology, aberrations of the more undisciplined imagination are restrained and the stable factors in experience can be emphasised. Since experience is based on a system of ideas, it is necessary to develop a meaningful system of ideas in a rigorous manner. This can be done only by following rigorous methodology and logical procedure. In short, one has to employ theory which is a system^{of} interrelated definitions and hypotheses. A theoretical framework comprises of more or less inter-related concepts and their definitions as well as propositions linking up different concepts. There are two ways of comprehending reality, namely, describing reality and verifying reality in terms of conceptual formulations.

As a matter of fact, one cannot describe reality without the use of analytical constructs. There are two types of theories: (1) the inclusive and the miniature; (2) or the grandiose and middle-range theories. Nevertheless, one cannot do without some theorization to comprehend social reality. As is well-known, theory is both tested and enriched by empirical enquiry. However, one has to remember that adhoc empiricism would not lead one anywhere. It is necessary to have theoretical framework for the analysis of any social phenomena. It is to be remembered that theoretical framework is to be tested and verified and as such, it has to be tentative rather than dogmatic. Theory has to be tested in the light of the concrete practical problems and in fact due to such testing on the one hand practical problems can be better comprehended and in the bargain theory is also enriched.

"..... definitions in the sphere of the social sciences are substantively tied up with the shift in practical problems and take the guise of a critique to concept construction."2

(Max Weber. The Methodology of the Social Sciences).

Theory of Bureaucracy

1. Weber's Theory of Bureaucracy :

It would be difficult to bypass Weber's formulations regarding bureaucracy in undertaking any systematic review of theory of bureaucracy. There are several authors both

foreign and Indian who have joined issues with Weber's formulations and yet there can be no denying that for worthwhile exposition and formulation of theory of bureaucracy, one had to make reference to Weber's formulations, even though to criticise it and suggest modifications and even to reject some of his formulations. It can be very rightly said that Weber provides a point of departure. In the discussion of various theories of bureaucracy one has to start with Weber's formulations and also mention at the same time the various critiques ^{of} in his formulations. Weber indicated himself in the discussion of bureaucracy in the context of his analysis of legal rational authority as representing a social system type. Bureaucracy is discussed by Weber in the context of legal rational authority and he says that because of the legality of patterns of normative rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands that authority is vested in. Legal authority can be ensured only because of appointment of bureaucratic administrative staff. There are several inter-related propositions which Weber makes about bureaucracy. These propositions can be briefly described in the following way :

The whole administrative staff under the supreme authority then consists, in the purest type, of individual officials who are appointed and function according to the following criteria :

- "(1) They are personally free and subject to authority only with respect ^{to} their impersonal official obligations.
- (2) They are organized in a clearly defined hierarchy of offices.
- (3) Each office has a clearly defined sphere of competence *not in practice* in the legal sense.
- (4) The office is filled by a free contractual relationship. Thus, in principle, there is a free selection.
- (5) Candidates are selected on the basis of technical qualifications. In the most rational case, this is tested by examination or guaranteed by diplomas certifying technical training, or both. They are appointed, not elected.
- (6) They are remunerated by fixed salaries in money, for the most part with a right to pensions. Only under certain circumstances does the employing authority, especially in private organisations, have a right to terminate the appointment, but the official ^{is} always free to resign. The salary scale is primarily graded according to rank of hierarchy; but in addition to this criterion, the responsibility of the position and the requirements of the incumbent's social status may be taken into account.
- (7) The office is treated as the sole, or at least the primary, occupation of the incumbent.

(8) It constitutes a career. There is a system of

"promotion" according to seniority or to achievement.

Promotion is dependent on the judgement of superiors.

(9) The official work is entirely separated from ownership

of the means of administration and without appropriation of his position.

(10) He is subject to strict and systematic discipline and controlling the conduct of the office".³

Weber's formulation about bureaucracy thus typified the essence of legal rational authority and also laid down prerequisites for large-scale industrializations as well as modernization. According to Weber, bureaucracy is a must for modern society which is characterised by complex organisations. As a matter of fact, Parsons and Etzioni emphasise the importance of complex organisations rather than that his delineation of three types of authorities were 'ideal types' and that no given society would completely approximate to such 'ideal types'. Moreover, Weber had in view the highly evolved model of capitalistic economy which he wanted to explicate in terms of both economic, political and socio-cultural development. Of course, Weber was mindful of the fact that an advanced economic system would require a highly developed and efficient system of bureaucracy whether that system was capitalist or socialist. However, Weber had not possibly

welfare state of some hue
foreseen the possibility of political and administrative authority being combined into one. Similarly, Weber had not foreseen the possibility of the bureaucrats being called upon to perform the task of providing leadership for social transformation, as is evinced by the demands made on the democracy in the third world. As a matter of fact, some of the criticisms of Weberian model stem from these circumstances.

2. Critique of Weber :

In his desire to highlight the importance of bureaucracy for facilitating legal rational authority, Weber tended to regard bureaucracy as more or less omniscient and omnipotent. Friedrich says such emphasis on the part of Weber would almost smack of authoritarian notions which make possible imperative control. Friedrich says that only an army, a business concern without any sort of employee or labor participation in management, a totalitarian party and its bureaucratic administration would come nearest to Weberian model of bureaucracy.⁴ The authoritarian tendency may be further encouraged by over-emphasis on pattern maintenance by bureaucracy in their endeavour to stabilize legal rational authority. Over emphasis on rules and regulations gives rise to displacement of goals according to Merton.⁵

Peter M. Blau describes bureaucrats as ritualists and explains their ritualism in terms of their fear of the superior and feeling of insecurity.⁶ Lipset observes, in his discussion of bureaucracy and social change, the nature of vested interests which the bureaucrats ~~are~~ ~~have~~ have in the existing legal order and that therefore, bureaucrats ^{are soverse to change's at a} ~~comes~~ in for criticism as an impediment both to democracy and particularly to change. Modern democratic society faces the dilemma of making extensive grants of power without at the same time ^{abdicating} the right of the democratic constituency to change the policies and the personnel of the bureaucracy. Merton further observes that the governing policy is no doubt set by bureaucracy, and adds that the twin goals of civil service are self-preservation and efficiency. The social ^{background} background of bureaucrats also adds to the difficulties in the implementation of any policy of social change. Thus the fact that bureaucrats are generally trained in the tradition of laissez-faire ^{economic philosophy} government and belonging to conservative groups contribute significantly to the social inertia which blunts the changes which a new radical government wants to make. Due to the delay in initiating reforms, the new government becomes absorbed in the process of operating the old institutions. Even a socialist state which has ^{its} goal a reintegration of societal values, giving

priority of government services to groups that had been neglected and securing a large part of Govt. control may fail, in its objectives, if it leaves administrative powers in the hands of men whose social background and previous training prevent a sympathetic appreciation of the objectives of the new government. In this context must also be mentioned the existing stratification on the basis of power, economic, political and social. Merton has also remarked that there is a tendency on the part of bureaucrats^{ya} to act, irrespective of his position in the hierarchy, as representative of the power and prestige of ~~the entire structure~~ viz. government. This leads to domineering attitude on the part of the bureaucrats. Merton further adds that while theoretically the government personnel are held to be servants of the people, in fact they are usually superordinate. Merton emphasises rationality and a structural source of conflict between bureaucrats and their clients due to the fact that while bureaucracy emphasises rationality and secondary group, the clients who are to be served by bureaucracy want to establish primary group relationship with the bureaucrats in order that they can get things done. Thus there is an incompatibility between the structural demands of a secondary group and the intrusion by primary group. This is bound to happen, particularly in cases where

bureaucracy will be called upon to develop mass contact and work not only for the people but with the people. Another drawback of bureaucracy lies in the fact that bureaucracy is amorphous and that it is very difficult to pin down responsibility on any particular individual. On the other hand bureaucracy can balk down any programme of reform by refusing to act speedily, when it does not accept the programme of change thinking that it is wrong. Bureaucracy tries to guard its interest and thereby tries to slow down or kill any action in favour of reforms which it regards either as incorrect or antithetical to its interests.

The imperatives of real situation necessitate certain modifications in the theory of bureaucracy. There is no denying that commitments are enforced by uniquely organizational imperatives, but they are also enforced by the social character of the personnel.⁸ (Ibid, Phillips Seiznick 'A Theory of Organizational Commitments' pp. 194-201)- It is also equally true that commitments are enforced by institutionalization appropriate to values and goals. More important still is the fact that commitments are enforced by the social and cultural environments. When there is a change in the values and goals and ideologies, there is bound to be pressure exerted on bureaucrats to at least verbalize the new values and goals as well as styles of interaction. The control of bureaucracy by public opinion

and vigilance assumes great significance in the period of transition. Blau has castigated bureaucracy for unduly concentrating power and thus being responsible for undermining democracy⁹ (Blau op.cit.) When bureaucracy is entrusted with the task of development and initiating change, the usual theory of bureaucracy needs to be modified. It has been very rightly asserted by Lipset that the theory of Civil Service neutrality breaks down when the total goals of state change. Normally one associates a law and order and revenue mentality with bureaucracy. But when bureaucrats are required to sell change in all its ramifications to its clients, a different kind of mental framework is expected and desired of the bureaucrats. It is necessary to separate the analysis of bureaucracy in its office setting from its field setting. When a bureaucrat has to deal with files and base his decisions on file work, he is insulated by and large from public pressure. But when he has to work in ^{the} field situation he is continuously subjected to all manners of demands, influences and pressures. Dr.V.A.Pai Panandikar⁽¹⁰⁾ and S.S.Kshirsagar in their study "Bureaucracy in India: An Empirical Study", emphasise this point and maintain that the structural and behavioural characteristics of bureaucracy are only moderately related because the functional content of bureaucracy and the type of office and its level of skill composition has a significant bearing on the behavioural characteristics.

Bureaucracy is not a static phenomenon but ~~is~~ a dynamic phenomenon in which its functional content, mass contact inherent in its objectives and several other factors influence its behavioural characteristics. "The present study suggests propositions like (a) bureaucracies involved in developmental tasks at the field level, such as in agriculture, necessitating mass contact and participation and with more skilled personnel, tend to be less structured and behaviourally more flexible than secretariat-based, more remote bureaucracies. Implied is the proposition that (b) bureaucracies essentially in the regulatory and other non-developmental agencies will tend to be structurally more rigid and behaviourally less flexible. In between these would be a whole range of intermediate positions". The authors further suggest a modification in the bureaucratic model and emphasise the distinction between developmental bureaucracy which involves mass contact of achievement of its objectives and the secretarial type with relatively little mass contact. Danle in some other contexts had emphasised the importance of the inter-relationship between the programme, the personnel and the people in the sense of community for which a particular programme is intended.¹¹ On the basis of certain field studies which have been carried out by other Indian scholars, certain criticisms of Weberian model emerge. Thus it was pointed

out that in Bihar¹² bureaucrats fail to inculcate new notions of status based on achievement and only emphasised conformity to rules and regulations. In a study of bureaucracy at district level in Rajasthan, it has been found that the legal rational norms have become largely inoperative, due to the fact that in democracy, bureaucracy has to perform many other roles. In another study of bureaucracy in Rajasthan, it has been pointed out that Weber's emphasis on structural aspects gives rise to the neglect on his part of behavioural aspects of bureaucracy. The formal aspect of bureaucracy is over-emphasised giving rise to the neglect of the informal aspects. In my Study of Bureaucracy¹⁵ and Agricultural Development, I have pointed out as to how Weber's emphasis on formal aspects of bureaucracy is misleading and that in field situation it is necessary to equally emphasise informal organization. Some of the critiques presented above point out the necessity of modification of the Weberian model of bureaucracy particularly in the context of development situation.

3. Technocracy and Bureaucracy

James Burnham and several others have propounded the thesis that bureaucracy will be increasingly manned by technocrats and that there would be a rule of the experts. Such a rule will be efficient and as such it would be able to deliver the goods and therefore, people will not have much to complain about. Of course, implied in such a

a formulation is the elitist concept of bureaucracy. The domination of the elite is legitimated by efficiency and as such the elite domination is inevitable. Such a view emphasises vesting of authority in bureaucracy. Of course, it is also claimed that because of the emphasis on efficiency and technical competence everybody will have a chance to be recruited to bureaucracy. In reality, however, one finds that the technocratic model of bureaucracy puts a premium on privileges arising out of socio-economic background. In fact, even the Soviet Union has not been able to completely do away with such privileges facilitating recruitment to higher technocratic positions.

4. Russian Model of Bureaucracy

In Soviet Russia after the revolution, a great necessity was felt to speed up industrial and technological development. As a consequence of such keen desire, sustained efforts were made to ensure efficient functioning of bureaucracy by not only emphasising technical excellence but also by emphasising the central value system, namely, the socialist ideology. It was felt that it was not enough to have technical efficiency but technical efficiency had to be matched by inculcation and internalisation of socialist ideology. In fact bureaucracy attained a new significance after the revolution.

"It did not organise the sphere of power of traditional political force (as, for instance, Prussian bureaucracy served the feudal power of Prussia); it was itself part of

a new ideology. The sheer survival of the ideological concept (for example, of Bolshevism in Russia) depended on the functioning of this newly established bureaucracy and of the authoritarian supervisory organs which, however, emerged from its own ranks. This development was the stepping stone for bureaucracy and gave the figures in key political positions in the administrative of the country, the decisive increase in power which they managed to extend in spite of all setbacks. The leading ideologies are at the same time the leading bureaucrats. Often there is no clear distinction between policies and administration.¹⁶ Bureaucracy was used in Russia to foster development and change. It was necessary to introduce a new industrial culture and to have new industrial culture heroes, which was also done by the Soviet units. The entire Stakhanov movement and the system of awarding special prizes and medals for enhanced industrial production bear testimony to this new culture of the heroes who were applauded for their performance.

"In a positive sense, the success of the Soviet industrialisation drive was insured by its massive investment in the expansion of elementary and higher education, in the emphasis which educational institutions laid on the training of engineers, technicians, and scientists to serve expanding industry, in the reorganisation of the incentive system to attract and reward the crucial skills necessary for the effective operation of industry, and in the

prestigious place accorded to the new industrialising elite in Soviet society. These measures transformed the Soviet bureaucracy into an effective instrument for technical modernisation, and they made the Soviet populace receptive to the values of industrialisation." 17 Thus we find that according to the Russian model, politics and administration converge into one unit and as such bureaucracy is completely merged with the political machine.

5. Democracy and Bureaucratic Model

While it may be expedient to merge politics and administration and have bureaucracy merge its identity with the political machine, it may not be so possible or even desirable in a democratic set up. In a democratic set up, governance is supposed to be by the people of the people and for the people, and as a matter of fact one has to add that governance has to be done with the people. It would not be desirable, therefore, to have a technocratic rule in a democracy, particularly when modernisation and social change are the desired goals. Democratic process requires that people are involved in the new changes in all walks of life and as such apart from the fact that the bureaucrats have to supply the relevant services and facilitate the production of goods and commodities, they also have to educate the people with a view to change their erstwhile mental attitudes. It is absolutely necessary that in a country democracy, a bureaucrat will have to play a

role over and above that a mere technocrat. It is because of this that the formalistic model of bureaucracy would not be of much avail and informal groupings will have to be reckoned with by bureaucrats in their day-to-day working with the people. Bureaucracy in a democratic framework will have to be much more sensitive to peoples' aspirations and criticisms to develop a two-way process of communication with built-in feedback mechanism. There should be a continuous dialogue between bureaucracy and its clients and it means that rules and regulations will also have to have a certain measure of flexibility. The bureaucratic model under these conditions will be much more open and cannot enjoy the insulation. This will necessitate different personality types as well as the requisite culture which will facilitate effective performance on the part of the bureaucrats so as to meet the new demands of their role. Amenability to change and elasticity would thus characterise the bureaucratic model in a democracy.

18. Y. B. Danke - A Framework for the Study of Bureaucracy pp. 9-30 in Public Service and Social Responsibility ... 17
Edited by S. C. Dubé - Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Vikas Publishers House New Delhi 1979

We have already presented a critique of Weber's theory and similar stand-point is adopted by Michel Crozier in his study on " Bureaucratic Phenomenon " (Tavistock Publications, London, EC 4, 1964). Crozier, while calling it a functional study, tries to examine the bureaucratic phenomenon within the context of human activities. In doing so, he emphasizes the importance of the theory of organisations as well as that of cultural systems, in the context of which, bureaucracy functions. Scientific definition of a phenomenon constitutes theory. Initially, the bureaucracy was mainly a concept used in Political Sciences so as to imply the realm of law and order, while Max Weber emphasized bureaucratisation as rationalisation of collective activities. The study of bureaucracy in action in various ^{situations} ~~positions~~ provides an arbitrary understanding rather than Weber's emphasis on construction of ideal types which makes the study unrealistic. Crozier is very conscious of the fact that " all theory ofcourse, originates in a partial and insufficient contact with reality" (p.5). That is why he attaches importance to the study of Bureaucracy in the context of a general

theory of organisations and general theory of cultural systems. Theory of organisation is based on the assumptions of rationality, certainty and control, whereas human beings do not like to be treated as means and that is why certain problems arise. As a matter of fact, bureaucratic routine, existence and delays are in clear response to the dehumanised goals and aims of scientific organisation. In order to understand " Pathology of organisation, cultural analysis becomes an indispensable tool which terms the delimitation of the global theory and its application in different cultural context.' (p.8)

Looked at from this point of view, the study of bureaucratic phenomenon, is not only the means of social control used within different cultural systems to arrive at ends but also the structural and structured inconsistency not to say contradictions inherent in the implementation of the programmes of any formal organisation. This is so because it is very difficult to modify values, much less the basic personality. ' It is only through action that is by acting through institutions^{and} by modifying these institutions themselves that a society can transform itself.

Sociology of organisation and sociology of cultural systems are thus equally necessary to a general theory of action and the study of the bureaucratic phenomenon makes a

valuable contribution to both. (P.8). While using the functionalist method, Crozier does not accept the functionalist philosophy and tries to emphasize the problem of change, although the kind of change which he has in mind whether of a linear type or of a mutational type is not very clear. Even then, Crozier points out that employees in an organisation are not necessarily interested in the purposes and functioning of their organisation and they feel completely neglected. Crozier is not even very optimistic about the purpose and functioning of Trade Union Organisation as far as actually reality goes. Crozier regards power as the new central problem of the theory of organisation and also points out that the early realistic theory of organisation continued to ignore the problem of power, because it believed ' that mankind had to shift from the government of men to the administration of things. (p. 146). He further mentions that by ignoring the subordinates' claims to freedom, they immediately create among them fear of being manipulated ' (p. 150). The presence of fear is certainly dysfunctional to any rational organisation. A clear-cut hierarchy cannot help people get rid of their fear of being manipulated. Even in the case of an organisation, which is monopolistic, and as such, is in a relatively stronger position to define the rules of

behaviour in rather narrow terms. Ofcourse, it must be conceded that monopolistic situation is an example of an unduly stable equilibrium. On the other hand, undue faith in the superiority of the bureaucratic rationality can have threatening implications in the domain of human values. Michel ^{Crosby} rightly emphasized that bureaucratic organisation is destructive of democratic values (p.176). This is not to suggest that human relations approach will be wholly a substitute to rationalist approach, particularly as far as the technical efficiency and the attendant hierarchy is concerned. Even then, all bureaucrats tend to reduce the tensions that are due to the differences of values amongst groups and also due to the problems of communication. Values and sentiments make it difficult for a bureaucratic model to function automatically. In a modern adaptive society, a bureaucratic system also has to change to become efficient and effective. By and large, power to innovate becomes a preserve of those occupying superior positions in the bureaucratic hierarchy. Their capacity to innovate further necessitates ritualistic acquiescence by the petty officials and also the submissiveness of the employees and the officials. In reality, 'power of discretion, finally, is so exceptional that it must be far removed from face to face relationships and surrounded

by an aura of awe and submissiveness. We ~~are~~ now confronted
with the new ^{Images} myths of the bureaucrat, ^{the} self-satisfied
^{glorious} ~~clearance~~ innovator, the submissive assistant and the
rituals-and-ritualist sub-altern. This set of roles ^{corresponds} ~~respond~~
to regular hierarchical arrangement within a very active
and powerful agency.' (p.202). Crozier further observes
that whenever change and power are present, we find more
and greater involvement and deeper feeling. We cannot
help feeling that this also is a kind of an ideal type,
because it postulates the role set between conformists
and innovators. On the other hand, co-operation means
participation in decision making, and if for any reason
such participation is denied, asymmetrical but stable
relationship implied in a role set may not be forthcoming.
It is further well-known that rules protect people who
submit to them. Achievement of flexibility would diminish
the lure for rules and stability inherent in bureaucratic
system. Likewise, achievement orientation would also
threaten any ascriptive basis of status consciously or
otherwise implied in a system of bureaucratic hierarchy.
There can be no escape from the fact that bureaucratic
world is an arbitrary world and as such exposes itself
to threats from the surrounding culture, questioning its
arbitrariness.

Any bureaucratic structure contains elitism, because power and decision making is vested in bureaucracy. In a certain sense, even in the ascriptive basis, elitism cannot be wished away. Thus, inspite of open competition and recruitment, higher echelons of bureaucracy tend to derive benefits from ascriptive status. Moreover, such links get further strengthened because of linkage of bureaucracy with institutional patterns e.g. education. It is not necessary to labour the point that acquiring education in certain institutions of higher learning lend a tremendous prestige and leeway to its recipients and as such are placed high above the rest of the strata in any system of bureaucratic hierarchy. It is indeed a common place of sociology of education that the system of education reflects ^{the leverage of mobility} ~~with~~ society's social system and at the same time is also the main force perpetuating it. Thus, the educational background for bureaucrats acquires great significance in respect of their status, privilege and power or its absence. Normally it is expected that labour movement, which is institutionalised, would do away with hierarchical system. However, working of labour movement would disabuse one's mind in the sense that it is the leaders of the labour movement who matter and not the rank and file. Crozier's observation is very trenchant " Thus, finally, the labour movement itself can be viewed

as a reflection of our French model -- authoritarian and absolute in its radical beliefs, weak and bureaucratic in day to-day routine operations, avoiding face to face relationships, isolated from other social groups, not very cohesive itself, more ready for negative expressions of position than for constructive, co-operative leadership, preferring finally to submit to impersonal rules and to appeal to superior authority than to fight and to compromise in its own right. On the other hand, it should also be taken into account that it is a powerful reinforcing force for the French bureaucratic model. Because of its radicalism, because of the threat of uncontrollable explosion which it maintains, it is very difficult for the employers and for the State to relinquish their tight and inefficient patterns of social control -- without which they have some ground to fear, chaos would develop. (p.251). 'Thus the administrative sub-system reflects a generalised fear of overlapping which is a characteristic paralysing feature of French administration -- and on the other hand by calling for an overall supra-organisational centralisation'. (p.253). One cannot but think of the parallel example of Indian bureaucracy. Eventually, this results in the lack of communication between the various strata in bureaucracy and imposes remoteness from the field of decision making. Right in duty of making decisions and to

promote new policies that is to ^{permit} adjustment to change is delegated to deliberative bodies and political figures and ofcourse the bureaucratic elite. The culture of differentiation, isolation and exercise of authority cannot but be reflected in both in a bureaucratic system and a political system where utmost importance is accorded to the leaders of opinion and action. Speaking of the dominance of the bourgeois class in the political system and the overall French social system, Crozier observes: " the combination of strong administrative system with unstable policy making system ensured, in the smoothest possible way, the introduction of the exact amount of change that was tolerable without endangering the bourgeois equilibrium. Even at this period, however, it had three far-reaching draw-backs : (1) it allows citizens to participate only in a very remote and indirect way; (2) it deliberately excluded whole groups from any actual possibility of participation; and (3) it slowed down considerably the rhythm of economic and social change. (p.258). He further points out that it is only the myth of revolution which holds labour class together and ensures their participation though ofcourse temporarily. Ofcourse, the French colonial system e.g. the way it worked in Canada, is characterised by undue passion for rationality -- the desire to achieve order, symmetry and harmony, which is

the hallmark of bureaucratic endeavour,' (p.265), and yet, as everyone knows that the bureaucratic centralisation was not really effective. This was so because of the systematic incompatibility between feudal structure and the new rationalistic structure imposed by the French rulers. It would be useful here to mention Macaulay's theory of filteration as ~~en~~unciated in the Indian context. Further, as very rightly observed by Crozier, ' the assimilation ~~goals~~ denied the existence of an autonomous personality to the native population . This provided a good rationale for direct administrative methods and for refusing face to face relationship outside the teaching situation. But, in doing so, the colonising society was imposing a fraudulent world and a fraudulent language of which it was also itself a prisoner -- of the natives. It was not amenable to discussion and, therefore, to change. (p.268). The colonial system of administration provided an impetus to the native Bourgeois class to going in for innovation in the field of commerce and industry by lending to it the legitimacy provided by nationalist fervor. This is how one can account for innovation in the industry and commerce field amongst the colonies, which became a bulwark of nationalist struggle. Ofcourse, after attainment of independence, there is no denying the fact that the local bourgeois class tend to lose their credibility. Then again,

bureaucratic administration is always confronted with the problem of change. However, revolutionary utterances tend to have only a symbolic value and they suffer a constant erosion. Bureaucracy further reflects the will to order and equalise because of egalitarian pressure. Similarly, intellectual creditability amongst bureaucrats is also responsible for the maintenance of hierarchy within the system e.g. the old Indian Civil Servants in India. Ofcourse, intellectuals can create courses and it may not change any modes and philosophy of bureaucratic organisation by insistence on the dependence of the individual per se. Revolutionary pressure of individuals and also to some extent by the example of foreign countries emphasizes the dysfunctional aspects of bureaucracy. 'At the same time, this same dysfunction ensures the permanence of model of change and adjustment to change and thus giving the individuals the protection they require.' (p.292) Because it would be wrong to imagine any society being permanently bound by the existence of cultural pattern. 'It learns constantly through the different organisational experiences to which its members resort to reach its general ends and their own particular ones.' (p. 292). The process of adjustment between the business leaders and higher civil servants would reduce the process of change.

Bureaucratic Phenomenon as part of the overall
Development of Industrial Society :

Even though Crozier is mainly explicating his theory with reference to the French society by making special studies of its clerical agency and industrial monopoly in the context of bureaucracy as an organisational system and bureaucracy as a cultural phenomenon, with reference to the French society, he has thrown up ideas which can be seriously considered in the understanding of any society, which wants to follow the path of industrial development or overall economic development in general where industrial and technological development will have to necessarily play an important part as in the case of India, where heavy reliance was rightly placed on the development of heavy industries in the first two Five Year Plans. Crozier has very rightly emphasized his concern for understanding and analysing the functioning of bureaucratic phenomenon without subscribing to 'functionalist philosophy', because maintenance of stable pattern of inter-relations does not mean insensitivity to the necessity for change. Every rational organisation in particular, has to change in response to the demands of the changing society and bureaucracy which has been properly regarded as an adjunct of legal rational authority

by Weber, has to be even more open to change and modification, although there are limits of its capacity to change due to the inter-twining of the organisational complex and cultural system, particularly the latter which cannot be changed overnight. In a way, it can be stated that the inter-relationship suggested by Crozier between formal rational organisation and the cultural system is reminiscent of Weber's insistence on pivotal role played by values in shaping economic development. At the same time, rational organisations have a logic of their own which both compels them and enables them to look for new objectives and be sensitive to the sanctions imposed by the changing reality so as to subserve the basic goal of rationality, paying due attention to the forces from within which counterpose elements of rationality. Crozier makes a very important ^{point} in this connection that while initial changes in formal organisations arise out of practical necessity, these changes are transformed into values and as such get integrated in the system. In short, there is a balance between practical necessity and the change in the values. As such 'there is no point in looking for the linear growth of uni-dimensional rationality.' (p.296). Therefore, 'in this final perspective, our models will appear no longer as ends in themselves but has so many stages necessary both for understanding the general orientation of this evolution and for setting the problems in their

proper context.' (In short lack of determinateness).
(p.296). There is mutual supporting relationship between increasing rationality of formal organisations and individuals autonomy and independence. Increase in the in-put of rationality would also transform the cultural system though a bit later, reducing the traditional rigidity of rules and regulations. In a way, rational individualism will have to be matched by moral individualism. There is thus an analogy between Weber's thesis of protestant ethics and moral responsibility and the proposition put forward by Crozier. All the same, there is no gain-saying the fact that history is replac^{te}~~d~~ with hero model which makes it difficult for participants in the formal organisation particularly in the lower echelons to avoid any responsibility (moral) and still no transformation would be really possible without a minimum inculcation of such responsibility. Standardisation and liberalisation are not thus pole or opposites they were assumed to be. ' Neither the logic of standardisation nor the logic of liberalisation is applicable alone if one tries to envisage the total picture. Both are valid at that level. Man seems to derive the logic of standardisation with his goals of efficiency as much as successes of the logic of liberalisation will permit him.

New equilibrium are constantly formed in place of the older ones. They give man both the advantages and the burdens of greater sophistication and more complex entanglements.' (p.299). Even though it seems paradoxical, decentralisation of authority would be the ultimate outcome of such bureaucratisation. Any bureaucratic system cannot be impervious of the external system. Even in its internal system, there has to be a continuous re-evaluation of the role and authority of technocrats and experts. The automation for instance insists re-ordering of the system of stratification within an industrial organisation. Those at the helm of affairs have to per necessity develop humanistic attitudes in order to avoid head on confrontation. While bureaucratic organisations have to be characterised by openness, opportunity to deviate from the laden path ^{i.e.} / rules and regulations and openness and the capacity to innovate, one cannot altogether deny the role of charisma, which is also attached to expertise. In fact, while traditionally bureaucracy is characterised by rationalisation and routinisation because of rules and regulations, innovations and charisma as well as the responsiveness to the external system opens out dynamic possibilities. It had been experienced that centralisation is not conducive to the requirements of efficient modern industrial society. Co-operation,

co-ordination and decentralisation seem to be much more conducive to the efficiency of modern rational organisation. ' This convergence makes it possible to meet the two basic conditions for successful change : urgent necessity and material and moral responsibility of adjusting to it.' (p. 301). Even though Crozier has made these observations with special reference to French society, they have relevance for any society which wants to develop, because ' planned growth implies greater stress in human motivation, fostering initiative at all levels, more co-operation between individuals and more competition between groups. ' (p.304). Stratification had earlier made it possible to safeguard equality while centralisation made the consequences traditionally impossible and accept hierarchy. However, with breakdown of the old hierarchical order, greater emphasis will be placed on direct inter-personal contacts, since due to the diminution of the rigidity of stratification such inter-personal contacts would be less threatening than before. Using the analogy of short-run and long run ^{analysis} ~~annals~~, Crozier realistically points out that in the short run ' higher civil servants who want to initiate reform must resort to authoritarian show of 'force', in the end, defeats its own purpose and reinforces the whole system. In the long run, however, ~~the~~ diffusion of a reformist spirit among most of the higher civil servants must have decisive consequences. When the breaking point

is reached, it will no longer be possible to maintain the bureaucratic faith in the middle ranks while the upper ranks disown it.' (p.310). Ofcourse, openness in recruitment to higher positions in the bureaucracy is also an urgent necessity. However, if for any reason there are fewer candidates for many competitive examinations than there are jobs offered, openness of recruitment will lose its meaning. If bureaucracy is mainly constituted of those holding inferior jobs, bureaucracy will lose its capacity to influence the system and in fact, it will be influenced by the external system. This is very reminiscent of the Indian situation, particularly when we take into account the lower echelons of bureaucracy operating at various levels. In any society which really wants to develop and stabilise its progress, if not enhance it, rational organisation must be matched by developing a new humanism, which August Comte had in mind when he proposed sociology as a new religion for industrial society.

Importance of Bureaucracy and dependence of
Administration for implementing policies and
programmes of development :

A great deal has been written about old societies and 'New Nations' and the extra-ordinary and special problems faced by them particularly in respect of

ensuring economic prosperity consistent with social justice. There is no denying ^{the} fact that 'New Nations' are not ^a homogeneous lot, because each one of them has had a different history and have had differing infra-structures, such as, well developed or otherwise, system of communication and transport, trained manpower availability or otherwise of natural resources and most of all a well-trained administrative personnel. Even if there has been availability of well-trained administrative personnel, there can be ^{no} denying the fact that duties and functions which such personnel are called upon to perform are significantly different after a society has attained nationhood. Ofcourse, another major difference to be mentioned in this context, is the variety of political set-up and framework ranging from authoritarian regime to ^a democratic system. Consequently differential demands would be made on the administrative personnel in respect of formulation and implementation of programmes and policies for development e.g. in the case of an authoritarian regime, utmost importance would be attached to the maintenance of law and order and to quell any kind of unrest, which might eventually develop into rebellion and over-throw of the regime; whereas in the case of ^a democratic regime atleast theoretically and philosophically, even in practice, considerable

importance would be attached to the formulation and implementation of policies and programmes by taking into account the aspirations and views of the people -- Ofcourse, their duly elected representatives. Professor Wriggins in his thought provoking book " Ruler's Imperative " (Columbia University, Press 1969) has very correctly emphasized the importance of power as a concept of central importance for these new nations in particular as far as ruler's are concerned. This is not to deny the importance of power for well established nations and their rulers, but for fledgling nations, it is very crucial that ruler acquire and maintain his/her power, so that he/she can not only hold the nation together but also effect improvement in the conditions of the people. One of the most important areas ~~where~~ where improvement is needed in such nation is ofcourse economic development. Even though one may reject out of hand the traditional concept of 'straggler' as far as these underdeveloped or developed nations are concerned, one cannot afford to be unmindful ^{of} ~~to~~ urgent pressures which are exerted on the rulers to initiate and speed up the process of economic development. At the same time, it must also be remembered that while expressing a very keen desire to increase the size of

the cake, emphasis on distribution of the cake in a more or less egalitarian and acceptable manner is also not lost sight of. It is indeed well-known that most of these 'New Nations' which were colonial regimes had not experienced industrial, technological and economic development with the inevitable result of the impoverishment of large masses of people. The non-availability of various facilities like education, health, housing, employment and so on are indeed large as far as the circumstances in which these nations have been placed. Therefore, there is a very ardent and persistent clamouring for making available/some of these very vital facilities for the people at large. All the same, the rulers, particularly in a democratic regime, are called upon to resort to proper programme and policy formulation so as to impress upon the people about their bonafide intentions and action, though in a halting manner. ' Rulers are beset with anguishing challenge comprising into decades, the changes which took centuries to accomplish elsewhere. They must achieve a productive and flexible economy, one capable of meeting challenge of repeatedly growing demands and changing opportunities for comparative advantage. Increasingly large proportion of the people can no longer be excluded from some form of political participation.

The task is made harder because the yardstick -- by which they are judged and tend to judge themselves -- is usually 'foreign make', derived from different historical experiences and cultural traditions.' (p.6 & 7). Power is certainly needed to not only maintain unity of the nation, but even more so to discharge multifarious and unending demands made on the rulers, which also means incessant pressure on the rulers to perform so as to satisfy the people's demands. As mentioned earlier, the persistent demands to increase the size of the cake, places rulers in a dilemma, which they try to solve by pumping in resources and facilities to those sections which are already fairly well developed and competent, so that they can accelerate the process and progress of economy and industrial -- agricultural development. Inevitably, this enhances the already existing imbalances and inequalities in the system. It is indeed a tight rope walking for the rulers of these nations to simultaneously enhance economic prosperity and also take steps to redress in a more or less ^{ostensible} manner, inequalities and injustice with which the nation is laden. That is all the more ^{that} the pressure to perform becomes very great. Problems are complicated when the machinery for implement-

ing the various programmes and policies is said to be sluggish as well as insensitive to the new demands. Stereotypes about bureaucratic and administrative machinery can be a 'self-fulfilling prophesy'. Nevertheless, there is no escaping the fact that rulers will have to utilise the existing administrative and bureaucratic machinery for formulation of new policies and programmes and even more so for their implementation insofar as it is feasible. This requires enhancing the capability of the existing machinery and also reorienting it for the performance of an altogether different kinds of tasks and responsibilities, while at the same time reposing the required measure of trust and faith in their (a) capability and (b) bonafide. Otherwise, there will be a loss of morale and self-confidence in such machinery which will certainly have disastrous consequences. 'While on the one hand, bureaucracies were dynamic instruments for promoting economic development, despite the ideological preferences, many leaders had to expand the economy primarily through governmental initiatives.' (p.18). The problem is further complicated by persistence of two parallel structures at the same time. 'Since the transfer of power involves little change in the social and economic structure, in the main, those who had been prominent before independence continued to be so afterwards.' (p.19). Naturally and inevitably the domination

of the western educated elite as political rulers and even much more so as important bureaucrats and administrators, has given rise to a hiatus between the rulers, administrators and the common people, which has to be somehow bridged. Many a study of western educated elites and intellectuals -- administrators and bureaucrats have pointedly brought out the gap between the administrators and the common people. It is here that Wriggins emphasizes the importance of popularity, to which rulers have to ^{take} a recourse. There is no denying the fact that contribution made to the nationalist movement and attainment of independence by erstwhile political leaders affords them ^a ~~give a~~ measure of charismatic popularity which they would like to hold too in the post-independence period. Ideological stances, pronouncements not to say gimmicks can help these rulers to enjoy a measure of popularity, which in the short run can be a substitute for relatively inadequate and poor performance and enable them to hold on to their power. However, in the long run, these rulers will have to equip themselves only through performance, for which they have to increasingly depend on the bureaucratic and administrative machinery and personnel. There is a built-in ambivalence about the role of bureaucratic and administrative machinery and personnel, because in popular parlance

bureaucracy has to be condemned for all the inadequacies of performance and they have to be criticised for their incapability, insensitivity and so on, at the same time making increasing, even impossible, demands on their performance. It should be remembered that not much is generally done to enhance their capability and to provide systematically the required quality and quantity of orientation so as to meet ever increasing challenges.

Concept and Philosophy of Development and Planning for it

Historical specificity of development in the West has not only defined the concept of development in a particular way but has also been mainly responsible for imposing that concept including a linear progression in respect of development on the under-developed or developing societies. We have already noted as to how developing societies have been branded or stamped as stragglers and as such made to feel incompetent and guilty. However, the 1975 Dag Hammarskjöld Report makes it very clear 'in the final analysis, crisis are the result of system and exploitation which provides a power structured base largely in the industrial world, although not without annexes in the Third World; ruling 'elites' of most countries are both accomplice and rivals at the same time '. (p.5). There is a very peculiar relationship

of collusion between the dominating and the very small section of the dominated, which further aggravates the crisis . Looking at the world as a whole, the Report further observes: 'that existing 'order' is coming^a part, and rightly so, since it has failed to meet the needs of the vast majority of peoples and reserve its benefits for privileged minority'. (p.6). Thus, therefore, 'development should mean 'development' of every man and woman -- of the whole man and woman -- and not just the growth of things, which means the development to the satisfaction of needs beginning with the basic needs of the poor who constitute world's majority; at the same time, develop to ensure humanisation of man by the satisfaction of his needs for expression, creativity, conviviality and for deciding his own destiny. Development is a whole; it is an integral, value-led, cultural process; it encompasses the natural environment, social relations, education, production, consumption and well-being. The development is indogeneous; it springs from the heart of each society, which relies first on its own strength and resources and advance in sovereignty, the vision of its future, co-operating with societies, sharing its problems and aspirations : they depend upon the technologies employed and the relationship between social and natural systems, on the way human societies organise themselves and on the values they adopt. The true limits of mankind in our time are not primarily physical but social and political.' (p.7). Ofcourse as mentioned earlier,

Ofcourse, as mentioned earlier, integration of the dominating and the dominated brought about false and immoral kind of integration which perpetuated the dependence of the dominated on the dominating. The goals of development as stated in the Report are as follows :

- 1) Place the satisfaction of needs -- beginning with the eradication of poverty -- at the focal point of the development process.
- 2) Strengthen Third World capacity for self-reliant development.
- 3) Transform social, economic and political structures.
- 4) Increase the availability of, and access to, foodstuffs.
- 5) Orient science and technology towards another development
- 6) Improve public information.
- 7) Redefine the policies of international resource transfers and ensure their automatic financing.
- 8) Establish a world authority to manage mankind's common heritage.
- 9) Adapt the United Nation's system to new requirements.
- 10) The need to be able to appeal

(p.13)

In the Third World, concrete programmes are required to satisfy, as matter of urgency, the basic needs. They imply the establishment of targets related to special social groups. First and foremost choice would be whose situation is most critical viz, no children whose full development is jeopardised by mal-nutrition and the poorest

groups, landless peasants, small farmers and un-employed or under-employed in the towns.' (p.13). 'What is intended is improvement in the quality of life by reducing even stopping wasteful consumption, which would necessarily mean transformation of socio-economic and political structures, which includes agrarian reforms, urban reforms, reforms of the commercial and financial control, redistribution of wealth and means of production as well as redesigning of political institutions. There is no doubt that this is a very tall order, but unless an overall and comprehensive effort is made, development which generally takes place cannot be of much use to the traditionally deprived and disprivileged sections. This means stupendous effort on the part of both the State and the society, because it has been very poignantly pointed out by Marx that State is nothing but reflection of the monopoly of power exercised by certain sections of society. To attain the idealised, not to say ^{the} idolised goal of comprehensive development, it is necessary to ensure freedom to people. That is, just as men have right to food, they also have a social right to speak, to know, to understand meaning of their work, to take part in public affairs and to define their beliefs. The right to education, to expression, to information and to the

management of production are all rights which articulate the same need of socialisation.' (p.27). On the other hand, when scientific research is subject to profit and education itself becomes a commodity to be purchased in the market, majority of the people will be bereft of this most important humanising facility. Involvement of peasants and workers and duly respecting ecology and environment, is also a must for ensuring this kind of development, because otherwise as mentioned above, collusion between the dominating and the dominated (a very small minority) will endanger environment and render any development worse than useless for majority of the people. In order to do this, immediate action is both necessary and possible. Because otherwise, future of mankind will be mortgaged beyond repair.

It may be argued that this is too ~~an~~ idealised a picture of development, but it could not be denied that this is one of the clearest and boldest statements about the complexities of development and the importance of radical steps which have to be taken in order even to make any progress in the desired direction, since any cosmic effort will not help. In this context, it is important to mention : ' the colonial powers tended to have administration without policy; the newly independent countries

tend to have policies (i.e. plans), without efficient administration to implement them '. (Paul P.Streeten : Notes on Development Planning : Problems and Solutions : (p.1) International Journal of Development Planning Literature Vol. 1, No.1, Jan.March, 1986, Jan Tinbergen, Institute for Development Planning, Rohtak, India)². Streeten has naturally emphasized the importance of co-ordination and asserts that with proper co-ordination, the problem of scarcity of resources can be got over and emphasizes the need for participation of regional and sub-regional and sectoral level. ' It is worth sacrificing ' efficiency ' (in a static sense), to get political support for the plan by (perhaps) locating a certain project in a region where it is not justified on purely short term economic grounds. Therefore, the plan should be both politically and economically realistic

. a planning must be more than just a financial and fiscal planning. It must include skills, material plans and non-economic variables such as population control and the system of land tenancy, administration, education, nutrition. It is important to plan conditions for the human, cultural and social variables which are generally neglected.' (^{I had} ~~David P.~~ p.18). In order to make planning for development effective, utmost importance will have to be attached to changing the existing criteria (ascriptive) of division of labour, access to facilities

and the resultant inequality and power. In respect of accepting various social mechanisms and institutions governing social interaction and relationships as given or being lorded from without, efforts should be made to diagnose the ills of the social framework from within so as to change them. To repeat what was mentioned in passing earlier, increasing emphasis has been now placed on the theory of the State as a reflection of the power structure which springs from economic and social domination. There has also been an increasing awareness even amongst economists regarding cultural and institutional variables which according to them affect the working of economy. 'Institutional reform is appropriately viewed more as a response to the new opportunities for the productive use of human and material resources opened up by advances in technology than as a pre-condition for agricultural development.' (Ruttan p.258). ('Agricultural Development' an International Perspective : Baltimore John Hopkins University Press, 1971)²³. As very rightly emphasized in the Hammarskjöld Report, what is at stake is social relations between people. Therefore, the dis-functional aspects of the prevailing economy and political arrangements create a legitimacy crisis and this is a phenomenon commonly experienced by the new States.

Thus, developing planning models tend to bridge the 'gap between the highly esoteric theoretical and technical developments and the practical needs and possibilities of the policy planners.' (Bhagwan Dahia : Some Reflections on the Methodological Evolution on Development Planning Models ' : (p.72); International Journal of Development Planning Literature, Vol.1, No.1, Jan-Mar.1986 Rohtak, India).

Considerable thinking has been devoted to the analysis of the role of the State in developing countries and it has been very rightly emphasized that this should be treated as a very vital object of social science report.

(Rolf Hanisch and Rainer Tetzlaff in their Article on " The State in Developing Countries as object of Social Science Report in the Journal of 'Law and State' Vol.27: Pps.59 to 91; Ed. by the Institute for Scientific Co-operation, Tubingen, 1983). Because there is no denying the fact that rulers of the new States have to willy-nilly give a good account of themselves in terms of performances at least to ^a minimal extent in order to retain their power. As seen earlier, even in order to acquit themselves of the responsibility reposed in them, they must continue to maintain their power, for which a certain degree of reliance can be placed on popularity, but performance cannot be

neglected altogether. Due to the complex blending of the traditional habits of thinking and dependence, people at large look upon the State as not only responsible but also efficient and competent to resolve their pent up problems which are truly of a structural nature. That is why, rulers of new States have to face very critical problem and as such are more often than not placed in an unenviable situation. In his Article on ' Political System and Planning in Developing Countries', (Vol.26, p.110-135 : Law and State, Ed. Institute for Scientific Co-operation, Tübingen, 1982),²⁴ Jürgen Wolff advances the actor model of economic and social planning and stresses the importance of the pluralism model of planning which takes into account the spheres of values and aspirations and as such has to be always concerned with social crisis, philosophical and ideological factors, cultural norms of society. Similarly, there are several structural determinants of planning which point out the basic limitations of opportunities for political action. Mobilisation Function of the State has to necessarily take into account the administrative process i.e. bureaucracy, without neglecting participation consensus and control. The author also critically mentions the world-wide failure of participation in the planning process. He further emphasizes the relationship between

bureaucracy administered citizen and the problem of participation, wherein personal attitudes of the Civil Servants and contradiction between central bureaucratic planning and broad participation in decision making have to be thought of. Thus, the political system particularly in developing countries is compelled to resort to planning by utilising the administrative and bureaucratic structure, inspite of ^{the} attendant problems of the relationship between those who administer and those who are administered.

The development theory, thus, is organically linked with practical action; a point very rightly put forward by Horst Buscher in his Article " Developing Theory: Orientation towards Practical Action : Exploitations of Social References Groups and Epistemological Progress " (Vol.25, p.51-87: Law and State, Ed. Institute for Scientific Co-operation, Tübingen, 1982) The author very rightly questions the theory of the colonial period and the rise of the development theories, modernisation theories, theories of imperialism and takes into account the attack on the modernisation paradigm and also emphasises the theory of the satisfaction of basic needs. Thus, development is not a homogeneous problem or an entity, although its main purpose is to satisfy the basic needs of the people at large. Reinhard Bodemeyer in his Article " Administra-

tion and Development directed towards Basic Needs : Example of Zambia " (Vol. 30, p. 146-159; Law and State, Ed. Institute for Scientific Co-operation, Tübingen, 1984)²⁸, reiterates the same important point. In this Article, he emphasises the importance of de-centralisation of the administration as a strategy for improving the implementation capacity, while at the same time is aware of the restrictions upon decentralisation. In the same fashion, Jürgen Oestereich in his Article " What is Regional Planning in the Third World and whom it is to be served ? " (Vol. 25, p. 102-115, Law and State, Ed. Institute for Scientific Co-operation, Tübingen, 1984)²⁹, states that the top-down concept is not altogether discarded, perpetuating colonial or authoritarian problem and very rightly introduces the bottom-up concept, which must take into account the style of decision making, communication and interaction between planners, administrators, implementors and the common man. There is thus a great deal of serious thinking devoted to the complexities on the problems of development and thereby emphasising impossibility of a unified theory of development. At the same time, ^{the} most vital point which ^{has} ~~is~~ emerged from thinking about development is the supreme importance of administrative bureaucratic machinery and the need to harness it for development under the changed context of needs, aspirations, values and demands for participation and interactional

(two way) process.

In an altogether different context, parallel thinking and philosophy has been vindicated. Thus in a symposium on " Public Policy and Policy Analysis in India " (Sage Publications, New Delhi, Beverley Hills, London, 1985), several scholars have strongly recommended a critical review of erstwhile theories of planning and development, while discussing the problems pertaining to policy analysis and research. Historical importance to policy analysis and research can be traced to the failure of policies to tackle some of the major social problems as exemplified by two Great Wars as well as Vietnam War. Pointed attention has been drawn by Klitgaard of this failure to a gap between bureaucrats and politicians on the one hand and social scientists on the other. While the former failed to comprehend the complexities of unethical techniques later were unfamiliar with the politics of policy making. (p.14). Similarly importance of social structural factors has also brought up again and again in both the formulation of policy and its implementation. Policy formulation and particularly its implementation is naturally regarded as the major task and responsibility of the administrative and bureaucratic machinery. However, what is even more pertinent is the involvement of this machinery in the philosophy underlying the programmes of development,

which necessarily requires interaction between them and the people at large -- giving a go-bye to the concept of impersonality. It is obvious that formulation of policies and programmes are not enough. The point which has been stressed again and again is the supreme necessity of participation and involvement in programmes and policies of the common man through appropriate social and political mechanisms so as to push the pace of 'development' (as adumbrated in the Hammarskjöld Report. This is not to deny that the concept and philosophy of development, as suggested in this report, is normative and not factual.

In fact, the task of the present work is to critically look at the classical (Weberian) theory of bureaucracy, which was of course developed in the context of analysis of legal rational authority -- a stage which was reached by Western developed societies. On the other hand, in societies like India, which are struggling, rightly or wrongly, to follow this path, what are the difficulties created (a) in the pursuit of such path and (b) particularly the requirements of at least a modified and revised, if not, a different theory of bureaucracy when the same is harnessed for development?

Chapter II

Administrative Experience, Bureaucracy and Impediments to its functioning -- lack of adequate theoretical understanding of the problem.

Every society, however simple or complex it may be, needs to be administered in order that the various needs and demands of the people are satisfied in an orderly manner. Even in a family, which is essentially a primary group and based on face to face interaction, creation ^{and} ~~of~~ vesting of authority is needed to ensure disciplined functioning of that unit, so that the desired goals are realised. Talcott Parsons has very correctly emphasized policy as a sub-system which ^{is entrusted with} ~~interested in~~ the task of goal attainment. In order to attain the goals, there is a continuous process of creation and vesting of power and authority, which is absolutely essential for providing effective normative guidelines for day-to-day action. As mentioned earlier, acquisition and maintenance of power is Ruler's imperative, without any exception, no matter the type of society and the kinds of rulers. We have also noted that power cannot be retained without measure of performance which really means employing administrative machinery to attain the goals and objectives, however simple they may be. As a

matter of fact, even to maintain power, use of administrative and bureaucratic mechanism is very vital such as maintenance of law and order, collection of revenue and taxes for undertaking various productive and distributive functions. It may seem paradoxical, but even to maintain popularity and use it as a mere substitute for 'adequate performance', rulers have to utilise administrative mechanisms, for instance management of public opinion by the use of appropriate media: oral, written, technological and so on. According to the types of society, where authority is based on tradition or legal rational consideration, relevant type of administrative machinery is devised and used. In a society where authority is rooted in tradition i.e. historicity, administrative mechanism would be guided by ascriptive considerations and as such the composition of bureaucracy is likely to be arbitrary in nature. On the other hand, in a society, which is essentially based on legal rational criteria, recruitment into bureaucracy would depend on basic qualification, training, capacity to deliver the goods etc. Therefore, rulers insofar as they belong to these two different types of society, have necessarily to evolve and depend on appropriate administrative machinery and bureaucracy. It has

been noted in history that even if a great deal of charisma is attributed to ^a ruler, eventually routinisation of charisma takes place with the result that necessary administrative machinery is evolved and deployed. In his characteristic manner, Max Weber devised three models of society guided by principles which determine authority in ~~the~~ traditional authority, legal rational authority and charismatic authority, while at the same time being very conscious of the fact that these types might overlap and not be so distinct and set apart from each other in their day-to-day working, and that is why he categorises these three types of authorities as ideal types rather than substantive reality. There is no denying the fact that pressures from people at large ^{impose} upon the rulers to evolve appropriate administrative and bureaucratic frameworks.

Administrative History of India

In his comprehensive work on "Administrative History of India from 1834 to 1947", (B.B.Misra (Oxford University Press, Bombay 1970), has very rightly pointed out that existence and utilisation of administrative machinery very much dates back to pre-British period and also speaks of the special characteristics of the Mughal administration. Similarly he also points out the distinctive characteristics of administration and bureaucracy emanating from the colonial

regime. Similarly, the economic philosophy of Laissez Faire imparted special duties and characteristics to bureaucracy, on the one hand facilitating forces of mobility and ensuring the maintenance of law and order to facilitate the implementation of the economic philosophy. While it is conceded that Laissez Faire contributed to the progress of liberalisation, education and economic development, it also simultaneously perpetuated impoverishment. Professor Misra also points out as to how the emergence of Congress and the independence movement in general had also lost the ^{bearing} ~~basis~~ in the sense that it wanted to protect the interest of the educated and business class. Colonial rule further necessitated development of communication, transport and also various administrative mechanisms right from the capital to the remotest village, so as to ensure direct control over all the people. There is no doubt that the British rulers imposed their administrative system of India, at the same time taking care not to introduce certain features like the provision of free legislature, system of education which would enable everyone to develop skills so as to be conducive to one's own and the country's economic development and making allowance for the free play of laissez faire so as to more or less destroy traditional handicrafts and industries. In fact, as a result of the impoverishment

of the people, British rulers had also to undertake certain activities of construction like building of roads, canals, dams etc. Prof. Misra very pertinently points out ' the gap that often remained between the statutory provisions of the Constitution and the practice that had to take into account the exigencies of social economic and political developments' (p.7). Similarly he points out the differences between the ^{con}vented civil servants and ^{un}convented provincial servants and the various regional imbalances, ~~and the Governments~~. In the evolution of administrative mechanisms which derived their inspiration from western liberal thinking and experience, the British rulers were careful to make sure that the executive authority reigned supreme over any other kind of authority, thus impairing the basic liberal philosophy underlying western thinking and experience.

' The Pre-British Mughal system had a highly bureaucratised hierarchical officials and yet it was not contractual but personal in nature. The Officer did not possess any specified sphere of competence and where ^{competence} ~~was due~~ ^{obedience} was due, not so much ^{to the law or status} ~~would allow~~ to the impersonal order of the officer but to the ~~State's~~ structure to which he belonged. ~~nor~~ were there any fixed rules for recruitment, qualifications or for service conditions. Everything depended upon the whims of the King.' (p.639). As such there was no separation between private and official property. Even if the British depended on conquest or constituting ~~to~~ ultimate source of legitimacy of their authority, in order that bureaucracy could function and enforce authority, introduction of elements

of rationality in its organisation, fairness of the competent system, specified conditions of service, rule-bound official functions, respect shown to law and the impersonal character of public officers etc. distinguished pre-British bureaucracy from bureaucracy under the British. The rules and regulations could not be changed fast enough probably mainly because of the lack of backing of the general will of the people at large who were either ignorant or incompetent to air their views and aspirations. Under these circumstances ' administrative change was bound to be slow, independent of the urgency of any political demand ' (p.645). Even though the application of law to village economy seriously impaired the traditional pattern of rural leadership, in real life situation, common people had to look up to such leaders. As in England, the educated middle class tended to acquire economic competence and power through its recruitment into the portals of bureaucracy. This class of urban educated people claimed to represent the interests of ^{all} classes and yet the British Rulers tried to provide a semblance of local self government, mainly at the District and Taluka level. As a result of their education under bureaucratic authority, there was a tendency to develop absentee landlords, which only impoverished the agrarian structure to create rift between the rural and

the urban structure. ^{Reforms movement} ~~Revolution~~ and persistence of Indian bureaucracy during the British rule heightened the cleavage between the urban and the rural, educated and the illiterate and as such concentrated structural contradictions in society, which post-independence Government of India took upon itself to redress. Professor Misra has also drawn our attention to the fact of the impact of Bolshevik revolution and the development of the concept of welfare State, which has provided a frame of reference to our rulers.

Philosophy of Economic Planning : Russian Revolution brought to the fore the importance, necessity and practicability of the concerted economic planning so as to attain the objectives of development of the nation, particularly economic, industrial, scientific and technological development consistent with egalitarian goal. Classical and neo-classical economic theory started looking at the Russian experiment with great interest, although it was also characterised by ambivalence. Free play of market forces and the philosophy of laissez faire received a jolt, particularly because of the great depression of 1929. It has been documented that even in the U.S.A., which is regarded as ^{the} a citadel of free enterprise, President Roosevelt thought it fit and advisable to undertake a great deal of developmental activity through the efforts of the State

so as to tackle problem of unemployment and glut in the market. The operation of Five Year Plans of economic development in Soviet Russia resulted in sensitizing people at the helm of affairs that the economic system can and needs to be controlled so that it can deliver the goods and serve society and polity rather than being its temperamental and unpredictable master. Economic planning certainly affords control over ^a proper development, utilisation and distribution of resources so that the so-called equilibrium is maintained, if not a higher equilibrium is attained. Morass in which the western economic system had got itself into, naturally drew pointed attention to the necessity of some sort of economic planning even though it was not so vocally accepted or acceptable. In India, under the chairmanship of Jawaharlal Nehru, even during the pre-independence period, a Planning Committee was set up so as to formulate a futuristic plan for proper development of Indian economy. Further, economic planning also emphasized the importance of distributive justice consistently with economic development and prosperity or to put it in more realistic terms, Soviet economic planning paid special attention to the development of Soviet industry, science and technology.

at the same time making sure that everybody was offered the minimum necessities of life. There is no denying the fact that the message of economic planning was two-fold viz., acquiring control over the economy and also laying emphasis on making available minimum facilities for living to everyone by reducing inequalities. This is not to suggest that two kinds of emphasis which was a distinct contribution of economic planning were necessarily implemented into it, but it gave rise to both optimism about the potential capacity to control and keep in check economic forces and also to assert the great significance of distributive justice.

Even before the Second World War, Lord William Beveridge^{id} had prepared a copious report on Welfare measures to be taken to rehabilitate and resuscitate British economy and there was considerable thinking devoted to problems posed by transition of the economy and State from war to peace. Ofcourse, as we know, Pigou had written on welfare economics much before the Second World War and Lord Keynes^{Keynes focussed} had located his attention in his study *General Theory of Interest, Money and Employment* the study again to revive economy which was in doldrums due to the great depression, transferring off resources by the State to the needy and the poor by providing them with employment had become an accepted economic philosophy and maxim which acquired considerable impetus after the war.

^{Keynesian}
~~Kansian~~ thinking came to be regarded as ^{Keynesian} ~~Kansian~~ revolution and inspite of the fact that there has been a great deal of thinking about critical appraisal of this description not to say prescription, propositions put forward by ^{Keynes} ~~Kans~~ in his book ' General Theory of Interest, Employment and Money ' came to stay. It would not be wrong to say that ^{Keynesian} ~~Kansian~~ economics and the subsequent development in economic thinking and philosophy accepted the principle of necessity of mixed economy instead of relying on the philosophy of Laissez Faire or competition and unbridled operation of market forces. In India also we have adopted the model of mixed economy, although putting considerable emphasis on public enterprises so as to reduce hegemony and domination of private enterprise. ^{With} Every Five Year Plan, there has been proliferation of more and more public enterprises and the State is undertaking the responsibility of production specially in heavy industries, fertilizers, petroleum, gas, electricity and so on. By resorting to economic planning which has emphasized heavy industries as well as making significant inputs in production of various public utilities, On the one hand, the problem of employment has been tackled, but on the other hand, appropriate orientation of manpower which is employed in these various public enterprises and utilities has not been accorded ~~sufficient~~ sufficient importance and attention. Even then, there has been rather an abrupt

utilisation of manpower right from the highest to the lowest level to take care of the various programmes of development including heavy industries, public utilities, fertilizers, irrigation, electricity and so on. Direct and abrupt utilisation of the manpower in all the projects of development and transformation has taken place in the context of their vaguely verbalised and idolised philosophy of development without making any preparation for the alteration of either the structure, behaviour and personnel involved in the task of development and transformation. It would not at all be wrong to say that such utilisation has been more or less of an adhoc nature and undertaken as an expediency without long term policy or thinking. On the one hand, the existing administrative machinery and personnel have been entrusted with the tasks and responsibilities with which they were not familiar and on the other hand they were expected to deliver the goods. It is here that supreme importance of proper theoretical and analytical understanding of the problems and issues involved in such transfer of administrative bureaucratic personnel from one set of task to another acquires urgent attention. A proper theory enables us to conceptualise and clarify the complex situation. The purpose of theory is to illuminate our understanding of

the reality. Merton has very rightly emphasized the significance of unanticipated consequences ^{of} ~~already in~~ action and speaks about latent function (Robert K. Merton, " Social Theory and Social Structure " Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1957)¹. The purpose of any theory atleast in Social Sciences is to put the whole problem in a proper context so as to unravel the complex variables and their interaction and impact. If, however, there is no awareness of the complexities involved and the capacity or otherwise of the persistent utilization of traditionally trained manpower for attending to new objects and tasks, what is really needed is a theoretical perspective which would take into account the demands of the changing situation in its entirety. It is not suggested that any theory can offer solution to any concrete problem on a platter, yet relevant action and interference would be rendered possible by such understanding. Now-a-days it has been suggested, particularly with reference to research in public policy, that the job of a policy analyst does not stop at mere analysis but should really be extended to appropriate intervention and action on his part and yet there can be denying the importance of appropriate theoretical and analytical understanding of the complexities of the situation which ensue as a result of the immense task of transforming society and economy not to

say polity. We have already pointed out the hazards of employing the classical model of bureaucracy which was based on the specificities of industrial and economic development in the west. What is really needed is a proper examination of the analytical concepts for understanding the new situation entailing new structures and behavioural patterns and personnel training and policies.

Several studies, as mentioned earlier, carried out in the field of public administration and of course bureaucracy, point out ^{the} hurdles inherent in the structural setting of India in respect of utilization of administrative and bureaucratic personnel for undertaking and ensuring the stupendous task of transformation. In fact, most of the scholars in the field of Public Administration and Bureaucracy have been content in merely listing such structural hurdles and have made sweeping suggestions about 'reforming' bureaucracy, if not dispensing with it altogether without bothering to provide any conceptual framework. It may be argued that understanding of structural hurdles which have impaired the capacity and efficiency of the bureaucracy to deliver the goods -- that ^{the} intended and expected quantity as well as quality of transformation which emphasizes both economic prosperity and social justice -- that is structural change of society, is

very necessary but not sufficient. This is reflected in " Survey of Research in Public Administration : " Two Volumes published by Indian Council of Social Science Research, New Delhi, (1975) and in Article by Hans Christoph Rieger on ' Socio and Political Aspects of Economic Development Planning in India, in " Economic and Social Aspects of Indian Development " Ed. Peter Meyer Dohm, Horst Erdmann Verlag Tübingen Basel. "Shakuntala Publishing House, Bombay 1975" ^{of} and ofcourse in numerous books and papers pertaining to development administration on Bureaucracy. In his both famous and controversial work " Asian Drama ", Gunnar Myrdal also discusses this problem.

Structural Setting and the hurdles it poses for effective functioning of bureaucracy to ensure development :

In our discussion of development, sufficient importance has been attached to the reduction of inequality and high rate of consumption on the part of the affluent in order to make development possible or a worthwhile activity for the common man to participate in it. After independence, while the ruling political party and its organisational structure has been entrusted with the task of policy formulation instead of development and ofcourse its implementation

through a proper utilization of the administrative machinery i.e. bureaucracy. In the pre-independence period, the composition of the higher echelons of bureaucracy and their distancing themselves from the common man has been taken due note of. Even as far as the supporting provincial services were concerned, ^{alienation} ~~alienation~~ of the urban based educated middle class bureaucrats from the common man and its problems has also been suitably mentioned. As of to-day, simultaneously one finds that bureaucracy is not ^a homogeneous phenomenon or entity but operates at different levels starting from the village and going up to the cabinet secretariate level where decisions about policies and programmes are usually taken and to a large extent imposed on remote areas. This can be said even about the functioning of bureaucracy at the State level insofar as there is a separation both in terms of spatial set up, hierarchy, power, authority, prestige, status etc. and that operating at the village level. In a survey of research in the area of Public Administration undertaken by the Indian Council of Social Science Research, majority of the authors point out that there is a gap between the organisation of bureaucracy, the pattern of its behaviour and culture and expectations made of bureaucracy in order that they can communicate, facilitate and expedite

the developmental process./As mentioned earlier, developmental activity cannot take place without involving people and ensuring their participation. On the other hand, pressure to meet targets particularly in terms of expenditure incurred on various schemes of development also tempts the officials to spend money on schemes which really make the rich richer or to spend money of eradication of poverty on those very people who were really never below the poverty line, which has been substantiated in several Studies. (Report on Economic Assessment of Poverty, eradication and rural unemployment, alleviation programmes and their prospects, by the Institute for Financial Management and Research, Madras, (1984)³. The possession or otherwise of political or economic power has also affected the functioning of bureaucracy in its task of developmental activities. The relationships between Ministers and Civil Servants as well as leaders of political parties particularly ruling party and bureaucrat officials belonging to the lower echelons has also created obstacles in their functioning. The overall process of planning, budgetary and financial control, district administration, administration of urban areas, physical administration, public personnel administration, administration of development programmes in agriculture and community development, administration of non-agricultural development and rural areas and development of small industries in urban areas, administration of science and technology, administration of law and order

administration of social service and welfare, industrial regulations, administration of public enterprises and so on emphasize time and again the importance of structural factors like power, prestige, authority, caste, class, kinship etc. in the actual operation of bureaucracy at various levels. While economic planning is really supposed to transfer resources from advanced to the backward areas and regions, in reality this has not taken place, because of the pressure to perform and show results in respect of various kinds of development. Ofcourse, the problem of inequality and how far it can be reduced by developmental activity has been discussed umpteen times, yet inequalities of various types : socio-cultural, economic, political, regional, sub-regional etc. are a fact of life to be reckoned with and have as such resulted in the concentration of developmental efforts and activities in areas which were already developed, which has been substantiated by many a field studies. Social and Political aspects of ~~the~~ economic development planning in India has been duly emphasized. Thus economic development brings about changes in the social set-up and aggravates social problems or social resistance may frustrate efforts at economic development. After independence ' Government is admitting impulses on the administration to the client system with the express purpose of bringing about social and economic change.

In this sense bureaucracy functions as a link in an open loop, chain of command, not only does it have to transmit the impulses from the Government system into the impulses it emits to the client system. It is also expected to react to the client systems unexpected reactions in accordance with the Government preference functions. "Bureaucracy is no exception to the rule that machines built for one purpose are not always easily adaptable to another." (p.102):

(Hans Christoph Rieger on 'Socio-Political Aspects of Economic Development Planning in India', in "Economic and Social Aspects of Indian Development" Ed. Peter Meyer Dohm, Horst Erdmann Verlag Tübingen Basel, 'Shakuntala Publishing House, " Bombay, 1975.) ^(p. 82-83) The functioning of bureaucracy at various levels right from the capital of the country to the village with its attendant system of hierarchy and control posed further problems for implementation of the plans by the bureaucracy. In order to attain the results in the short run planning tends to be technocrat^{ic} in nature rather than substantive, so that ideology of planning, equality, in democracy, concepts and practice of socialism, optional controls over the private sector and so on exist more on the statutes instead of being reflected in the implementation. Even while mentioning various kinds of structural constraints both historical and present, very

little attempt is made to provide a conceptual framework for the analysis of the ^{ctive} distinguished nature of development bureaucracy and the deficiencies in the functioning of the bureaucracy arising out the structural factors mentioned above which necessitate evolving of fresh conceptual framework. The next chapter will devote attention to the review of existing material from the point of view of concepts and frameworks pertaining to development bureaucracy and whether or not such concepts and frameworks are ~~having~~ developed at all in the various studies.

Practically all the experts in the field of Public Administration and Bureaucracy have very pointedly drawn our attention to the fact of lack of a coherent conceptual framework for understanding of the functioning of administrative machinery and bureaucracy, particularly insofar as it is harnessed for development. On the one hand, bureaucracy is expected to function as a change agent and on the other appropriate conceptual apparatus to understand the challenges of the new situation and the dilemma it has posed for bureaucracy, political parties and rulers and ofcourse common people, have not been explicitly studied in terms of theoretical concepts. On the other hand, there have been numerous studies which deal with the problems faced by the bureaucrats, politicians and rulers as well as the people arising out of this new role which is imposed on bureaucracy. We have already mentioned about the discussion of structural

constraints which do not allow bureaucracy to perform the new role effectively. Some of the important constraints emphasized practically by every author are the nature of stratification of Indian Society in terms of caste, class and political power, the socio-economic cultural background of bureaucrats, the image of bureaucrats both in their own minds and in the minds of their clientele, derisive attitude towards bureaucracy, lack of proper orientation of bureaucracy to perform the new tasks and functions entrusted to them viz., that of working as an agent of change and development, the dimensions of social and geographical subjects, participation and involvement of common people in the policies and programmes of development or lack of it and so on. Indirectly one might say that by discussing the factors which impeded the working of bureaucracy as an agent of change in an effective and efficient manner, certain pre-requisites have been hinted at though in a negative manner which can be and ought to be used for formulation of appropriate concepts and theory of development bureaucracy. A great deal has been written about the incongruence and the resulting conflict between the two roles and cultures by bureaucracy viz., pre-independence role characterised by emphasis on law and order and the post-independence role particularly after undertaking planning activity, the role

of bureaucracy as change agent. Apart from this conflict, the inability or incapacity of the majority of the clientele to demand the acceptance of new role by bureaucracy, should also be taken note of. It would not be wrong to say that there is a tri-partite interaction and relationship between the bureaucrats, politicians and the people i.e. the community and as such all these three components have not only to be understood and analysed but what is even more necessary is appropriate orientation and socialisation of all these three components involved, to the demands of the changing situation. It is indeed gratifying that the Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi, initiated the studies on Bureaucracy taking into account all these components viz., the bureaucrats and politicians, bureaucrats and citizens and so on. It would not at all be wrong to say that bureaucracy is sandwiched between the people and their aspirations and expectations and the politicians who have to maintain their power ^{by} ~~for~~ performance, of course by proxy, (through the utilization of the existing administrative and bureaucratic machinery) and by maintaining their popular image in the minds of the people. It would also be not out of place here to mention that practically all the studies of bureaucracy have possessed a great deal of normative content as to the proper role and

functioning of bureaucracy in the changing context and is full of suggestions both positive and negative as to the kind of interaction and relationship which is desired and regarded as desirable between the three components mentioned above. In a way, therefore, by implication, suggestions are made as to the required concepts, theory and development bureaucracy. In an indirect manner, this has set the task for the present study viz., to evolve a more or less coherent conceptual framework and theory of bureaucracy, when it is used as an agent of change and development.

References

3. Robert K. Merton "Social Theory & Social Structure, Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1957)
- (P-68)
4. Hans Christoph Rieger 'socio and political Aspects of economic development planning in India in "economic & social Aspects of Indian Development. ed. Peter Meyer Dohm, Horst Erdmann Verlag Tübingen Basel, Shakuntala publishing House, Bombay 1975
- (70)
5. Report on Economic Assessment of Poverty, eradication & rural unemployment, alleviation programmes & their prospects, by Institute for Financial Management & Research, Madras 1984.
6. Hans Christoph Rieger: 'socio-political Aspects of economic development planning in India, in economic & social Aspects of Indian Development ed. Peter Meyer Dohm, Horst Erdmann Verlag Tübingen Basel, Shakuntala publishing House Bombay 1975
- (74-16)
7. Administrative History of India from 1854 to 1947 (Oxford University Press, Bombay 1970) pp. 7, 639, 66
8. Lord Keynes = General Theory of Interest, Employment and Money
- P-59

Chapter III

Concepts which have emerged from the existing literature particularly those specifically in respect of highlighting of structural constraints and suggestions of normative nature.

I have been raising the problem time and again viz., whether formulation of theory is and can be always explicit, particularly whenever researcher is confronted with a dynamic and changing situation. It is a common sense of research methodology that observation and understanding of a new phenomenon and process necessitates improvisation initially of new concepts and frameworks which can become meaningful hypothesis to be tested rigorously rather than starting with a given framework and trying to fit the changing reality into such framework. It is not at all uncommon experience in the field of social science in particular and even in natural sciences to contain rudiments of concepts and theoretical framework which gradually evolve into meaningful scientific and rigorous entities but are relatively fluid and undefined for a fairly long period of time. But awareness displayed about the structural constraints impeding the functioning of bureaucracy as an agent of change and also the copious suggestions of a normative character are a case in point. Out of such a critical mention of

negative aspects and normative suggestions made as to how to make the functioning of ^{bureaucracy} ~~beaucracy~~ effective for the developmental goal, which have been imposed upon it, one can nevertheless get a clue to underlying concepts and would as such be useful to the construction of a conceptual theoretical framework.

There is indeed a voluminous literature pointing out negative aspects of the existing ^{burean} ~~beaucracy~~ in terms of its culture, personality, type and structure, which is regarded as dysfunctional to the task of development entrusted to it particularly insofar as the question of transfer of original resources and facilities to weaker and poorer sections are concerned. Similarly a great deal of importance has been attached to the lack of innovative spirit on the part of ^{bureaucrats} ~~beaucrats~~ and their incapacity to take firm decisions and action as and when required. Likewise, a gap in the socio-economic cultural background of those manning ^{bureaucracy} ~~beaucracy~~ and the common people has also been brought up time and again. It is not necessary to quote everyone and every article or paper which contain such criticism of the negative aspects of ^{bureaucracy} ~~beaucracy~~ as it functions to-day, because it is indeed a common running thread in respect of practically all the writing about ^{bureaucracy} ~~beaucracy~~. Even in the pre-independence days, stalwarts of the nationalist movement like Pt. Jawaharlal

Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Subhashchandra Bose, Chittaranjan Das and others have more or less provided a blue-print for proper civic administration while pointing out the negative features of civic administration. Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, when he was Chairman of the Allahabad Municipality, mentioned : whatever the reasons, the fact remains that our local bodies as rulers, are the shining examples of success and efficiency, though they might even so, compare with some municipalities in advanced democratic countries. They are not usually corrupt, they are just inefficient and their weak point is nepotism and their perceptions are all wrong. All this, is natural enough; for, democracy to be successful, must have a background of informed public opinion and a sense of responsibility. Instead, we have all prevailing atmosphere of authoritarian regime and the accomplishments of democracy are lacking. There is no proper educational system, no effort to build up public opinion based on knowledge. Inevitably, public attention turns to personal or communal or petty issues.' Deshbandhu C.R.Das also stated: " those in-charge of civic administration to provide education, health service, safe water, milk to the poorer sections in order to serve the Daridrinarayan and criticise the existing administration in respect of neglecting its duty.' Even in the post-independence days, failure of the municipal authorities

to perform their duties towards the poorer sections of the people, has been castigated. Ofcourse, S.K.Dey, who was responsible for the creation of 'Nilokheri' points out that a significant innovation tried out in the greater rehabilitation faded away as fast as it came into existence. He ^{attributed} contributed the fading away of innovation to the rein-statement and over-emphasis on underlying discussions and paper-work. The great difficulty experienced in enlisting an administrator with exceptional qualities, capacity, propensity and the desire to sacrifice has been pointed out. In the post-independence era, the refusal by the State Governments to accord freedom and flexibility to local self authorities has also been a negative feature of administrative policy and practice. Paucity of resources and administrative and technical staff have also been responsible for inefficient administration, not to mention inertia or even corruption

4/ The enthusiasm created by the Five Year Plans tended to vanish in the early sixties because of the dissatisfaction with economic and administrative institutions of Government and as such demand was made for major re-organization of the Indian Administrative system. Even in the fifties, the need to re-orient the administrative and beaucratic personnel to new tasks and values was given expression to and doubts were expressed about the existing administrative apparatus

for its suitability for development. It has been mentioned time and again as to how far the existing ^{bureau}cratic values are conducive to administrative performance and similarly the existence of elitism and the corresponding ^{bureaucratic} culture can deliver the goods. While raising such doubts in a way, the negative dimensions of bureaucracy have been stressed. Insensitivity of ^{bureaucracy} to public response to redress citizens' grievances and problem of corruption and lack of integration on the part of ^{bureaucrats} has also been mentioned as negative feature of bureaucracy by several authors. Elitist basis and tendency among the bureaucrats is also common for a great deal of criticism. The process of planning, Union-State relations, budgetary and financial control, fiscal administration, Head-quarter's Organization of Government/and District Administration have been described and discussed and even in these discussions negative aspects of the functioning of bureaucracy have come to the fore time and again. Thus lack of consultation between Union and the States has been regarded as responsible for inefficient administration. Development Planning requires a new re-orientation of administrative ethos, which is lacking, has been again pointed out. Lack of communication between various Ministries and Departments at the Headquarters has also been criticized and the unwillingness and incapacity of persons in authority to delegate powers

has come in for severe criticism. Methods and procedures of work which involve dilatory referencingⁱⁿ and submission of cases and excessive and irrelevant noting has also come under fire. The problem of accommodation and equipment, office procedure and training and personnel in general has been specially mentioned as being responsible for inefficient functioning of government at the Headquarters. As for planning, inadequacies of development planning have been noted and State level planning has also come in for criticism. Centre-State relations as well as the State and District relations have also come in for criticism for inadequacies of planning and naturally ensuing inadequate administration. Budgeting and financial control as well as, fiscal control have also been held responsible for gaps in administration of policies and programmes. Administrative relationships and bureaucratic behaviour including bureaucratic values, attitudes and motivations have also been pointed as negative aspects of the functioning of administration. In spite of ^{the} philosophy and policy of decentralization, District administration has not sufficiently reflected the underlying philosophy of decentralization and is as such responsible for the inadequacies of administration to meet the tasks of development.

In a discussion of concrete situations, several authors have drawn attention to the negative features of bureaucracy and pointed out the gap between planning and implementation. The problem posed by conflict between specialist and generalist and inadequacy of training has been highlighted both with reference to administration of development programmes in agriculture and community development as well as administration of non-agricultural development in rural areas and development of small industries in urban areas. Inadequacies of organization have been again pointed out with reference to administration of science and technology, law and order, external forces, defence, social services, industrial regulations, administration of public enterprise etc. In short, practically all the dimensions of developmental planning and programmes have been discussed from the point of view of the role performance of public administration and bureaucracy. Lack of co-ordination within a given ministry or department and particularly between various departments and ministries has come in for severe criticism. Further it has been pointed out that Government Departments and Ministries do not provide facilities for ^{objective} subjective and forthright

investigation and research in respect of their functioning to outside scholars, probably because of the fear of being exposed. Thus, there is a tendency to put inadequacies and inefficiency of various types including organizations personnel and policy planning under the garb ^{of secrecy} so as to save it from public scrutiny and yet various reports of public Estimate Committees and other Bodies, sure enough, point out the big gap between planning and its implementation.

A concern has been voiced about the ^{obsolescence} ~~absolvence~~ of bureaucracy and the lack of preparation on its part to meet the challenge of change. Similarly, time and again, reference has been made to Indian Administrative Service its socio-economic and elitist background, which is one of the major factors in explaining its lack of responsiveness to public demands. Hamstrung nature of bureaucracy in policy making and ^{of} course in its implementation has also been commented upon. The problem of the existing lack of commitment on the part of bureaucrats has also been voiced time and again. (Survey of Research in Public Administration, Volumes Two, ICSSR, New Delhi, 1975, 'Public Service and Social Responsibility' Ed. by S.C.Dube, Vikas Publishing House Pvt.Ltd., New Delhi, 1979)¹. Ofcourse, there is no dearth of literature pointing out negative features of Indian Bureaucracy such as Appleby Report, Tottenham Report etc. Mutual image of the bureaucrat and

the clientele is also very important in effecting efficacy, efficiency and acceptability of the bureaucratic system. The relationship between bureaucrats and politicians also acquires importance since politicians are required to ensure 'performance'.

Normative suggestions to improve performance of bureaucracy :

Mere listing and some discussions about the criticism of certain negative features of bureaucracy, inevitably bring forth various normative suggestions as to how to improve its performance. It would not at all be wrong to say that these normative suggestions necessarily flow from the awareness and emphasis on the negative aspects of bureaucracy and the concern for its improvement so as to make it an effective instrument of development. Such suggestions are only the other side of the coin. Therefore, these suggestions also enable us to understand the expectations made of bureaucracy regarding its positive functioning so as to deliver the goods. These suggestions range from recruitment of bureaucracy to the dispensability of the erstwhile methodology of recruitment and ofcourse various suggestions about the organizational structure, culture, behaviour and so on. In the first place, practically there seems to be a consensus about making bureaucracy

more responsive to the needs and aspirations of the common people, whom it is expected to serve. This also brings in its train, significant reduction, if not removal of the characteristics ^{of} ~~in~~ personality of bureaucracy. Similarly, the value neutrality of bureaucrats has come in for significant measure of criticism and as such proper ideological and value commitment of the goals of development and the required interaction and action is very forcefully emphasized. Appropriate socialization of personality and ~~and~~ culture of bureaucrats has also been naturally emphasized. Because bureaucracy needs to be sensitized to the changing conditions and requirements. If bureaucracy is to be characterized by rationality, bureaucratic organization also needs a critical scrutiny from time to time and appropriate changes in the same are also needed. Interaction between the officials and non-officials should be a priority requirement for furthering or implementing the goals of development. Secrecy of rules and regulations and procedures has to be eschewed and public opinion needs to be formed by providing inputs of correct information so as to enable common people to both appreciate problems of implementation and to enlist their co-operation in the developmental process.

In the context of developmental organisation what is needed is giving up of the traditional philosophy of trickling down and on the other hand trickling up is recommended

very strongly so as to assure meaningful dialogue and participation between the bureaucrats, people and the politicians, so that participation in developmental activity becomes possible. The Hierarchical, not to say insulated, structure of organization of bureaucracy at the Union level, State level, District Level and the village level needs to be given up and proper rapport between the various levels of organization has been recommended so as to (a) ensure co-ordination, (b) two way communication, (c) mutual understanding and (d) to have effective functioning of the various levels of organization. The erstwhile water-tight compartments between the Centre and the village has come in for very sharp criticism and that is why the trickle up procedure has been recommended. The observability of procedures, rules and regulations by the common people is, time and again emphasized so that application of rules and regulations without fear or favour is brought home to the public. In keeping with the new demands in respect of problem solving, high level planning and management capability, efficient communication, skills, elasticity and pragmatism and direct course of State action is required. As pointed ^{out} in the foregoing a persistent emphasis on working with the people is reflected in the

normative suggestions. Challenge of new situation requires appropriate balance between external and the internal system so as to be continuously aware of the necessity of changing. The existing hiatus between generalist and specialist has to be overcome and the contribution of the specialist needs to be properly apprised and rewarded. The bureaucracy has to be both responsive and responsible in order to be more efficient and effective. Innovative activity has to be encouraged instead of penalised and in order to do this; (1) bureaucratic organization has to be diversified, (2) appropriate system of rewards be instituted for innovation in terms of prestige, status and recognition rather than money and meaningful reciprocal relationships between the bureaucrats and the public are very strongly recommended. Overhauling of the existing bureaucratic machinery with all its hierarchy, impersonality needs to be taken up. Bureaucrats have to be involved in policy making in tune with the existing philosophy, so that they can implement the policies and programmes more effectively. This means giving up of the traditional concepts of hierarchy, secrecy and necessity of freedom of communication both within the system internally and outside the system externally. The traditional philosophy of Laissez faire has to be substituted by the philosophy of intervention.

Similarly, value neutrality has to be substituted by commitment to the values of development so as to ensure ~~the~~ proper redistribution of the fruits of development. Bureaucracy should be made ~~truly~~ representative and as such needs to be regarded from all the sections of society and also needs to be politicized and at the same time political^{ly} representative. Instead of value neutrality, bias in favour of developmental activity and distributive justice is necessary. In order to make bureaucracy more responsive and responsible, the rulers that be, should be given the freedom to pick and chose bureaucrats from outside the traditional system of recruitment. Arbitrary differentiation made on the basis of the level at which the bureaucrat functions such as capital of the country or at the district level or even at village level needs to be given up and mobility of bureaucracy from one level to another would ensure effective functioning through proper sensitization, socialization and increased acceptability to the clientele.

It may be argued that these normative suggestions can be characterised as ~~perching~~^{verging} on idealism and therefore unrealistic. However, there is no denying the fact that these suggestions are positive and constructive response should make the functioning of bureaucracy more effective

and efficient for discharging the task of development which really means transformation of society by transferring resources from haves and have-nots in a regulated and peaceful manner. These, suggestions, therefore, appropriately cover the bureaucratic organization, personality, culture and its interaction with the people and as such contribute to the construction of a meaningful conceptual framework.

References

S. C. Dubé Ed. "Public Service and Social Responsibility," Survey of Research in Public Administration, Vols Two, GCSIR, New Delhi 1975. Vikas Publishing House Pvt Ltd. New Delhi, 1979

Chapter IV

Content of Positive Suggestions affecting reconstruction of the theory of bureaucracy.

Positive suggestions about theory construction, about the changing role of bureaucracy in the context of bureaucratic and egalitarian development must necessarily take cognisance of not only theoretical constructs in the abstract (although based on analysis of rural life situations), but even more so of studies which were theoretically oriented to test certain constructs and formulations. Ofcourse, there is no denying the fact that studies deliberately designed to test theoretical constraints and put forward alternate constructs, models and theories are necessarily few in number, which does not reduce their importance and utility. ' Theory is a system of inter-related definitions and hypothesis ' (Hans L. Zetterberg on 'Theory and Verification in Sociology, Almqvist & Wiksill: Stockholm. The Tressler Press, New York 27, NY.1954).¹ Obviously, this means that a deliberate and systematic effort has to be made to arrive at coherent and consistent definitions of the concepts used. As stated earlier, while the ultimate intention and goal is to arrive at an inclusive theory rather than miniature theory, what is important is orientation towards inclusive theory, even though it is difficult to derive a universal theory. Orientation towards an inclusive theory is an excellent ~~game~~^{game} and yet one finds that in reality it is

difficult to arrive at an inclusive theory due to the differing situations. To take a case in point, development administration is perceived as the motor of social development. However, in reality there are various other forces like the existing power structure which has to be taken into account before treating development administration as an independent variable. Apart from the power structure prevailing within a given society, it is equally important to be aware of dependency relationship between one State and another. This is one of the reasons why inspite of 'impressive array of case studies, observations by experience^d, development ~~to~~ experts and sensitive individual analysis, there is no (patent) paradigm based on a far reaching consensus to colate these individual details intost coherent theoretical structure. What is lacking are projects that incorporate opposite points^{of view}.' (p. 43) (Dietrich Furst and Joachim Jens Hisse on "Bureaucracy and Underdevelopment" in the Journal of Law and State, Vol. 29, Ed. by Institute for Scientific Co-operation, Tubingen, (1984).² In contrast, the ideal type development for the industrial societies of impersonal, rationally acting, administration oriented to universal values, in developing countries, a more partison administration dominates, one oriented to personalist relations of

patronage and clientalism, aligned with the interest of office-holders and internalising external interest (because of cultural value patterns, traditional ties, feudal normative system, lack of identification with personal organisations, notions of States etc. economic dependencies of administration, degree of autonomy is externally low.) in order to solve most problems , support of private economy is necessary, political dependency'. (p. ⁹⁴~~64~~), resorting to innovative practices is generally carried out with the backing of foreign institutions, which in itself creates problems and complete successful innovation becomes instrument of power. There are severe restrictions on recruitment to such administration because the private economy can bid very high and monopolise skilled manpower. Autonomy of institutions gets eroded due to dependence of private economy. Even then, political patronage can be distributed through such autonomous institutions. Ofcourse, the State does not normally appreciate parallel structures ~~where~~ where initiative is taken by voluntary bodies. Even the administrators tend to get more interest in their personal prospects and try to control masses by means of State organisational power particularly when the bureaucratic activity and operations are shrouded in secrecy. Myrdal in his earlier quoted book 'Asian Drama' has also pointed out as to how the administrative

system is restricted by working of the wider system and the difficulties experienced in implementation of democratic socialistic ideals and ⁱⁿ ~~not~~ paying ^{lip} ~~elite~~ service to these ideals & rather than substantively implementing them in practice. Myrdal has also pointed out as to how the policies followed by western developed nations do not really allow for these ideals and values to be implemented in reality by patronising renegade and the reactionary regimes. This is all the more responsible for reducing the efficacy of administration in discharging the task of development.

Illustrations of attempts made to theorise about development bureaucracy :

We have already pointed out as to how the identification of the negative features of bureaucracy in India, particularly in the context of development, and a plethora of normative (may be ideal and unrealistic) suggestions made to improve its performance, provides sufficient clues to the conceptual framework of development bureaucracy. Thus, on the one hand Weberian classical model of bureaucracy has been severely criticised but on the other hand no explicit theory of development bureaucracy has been offered as a substitute. This is not to deny the efforts made to provide meaningful (optional) concepts and framework. We had raised a question earlier as to whether there is and

there can always be a very explicit theoretical formulation and also suggest^{ed} that particularly in the changing situation whether new tasks and challenges are ~~posed~~^{fixed} or imposed upon a particular machinery, in this case bureaucratic machinery, ready-made concepts would neither be available nor desirable, but efforts to improvisation would be more welcome. While admitting that a coherent theoretical structure is not available, Pai Panandikar observes that "ultimately the character of bureaucracy was a theoretical system and as an administrative institution would depend largely on the behavioural propensities and characteristics. (p.19). He further says that 'the Studies would however indicate that some interesting adaptations of the behavioural characteristics tend to take place in a developmental bureaucracy. In particular, different organisational settings appear to influence bureaucratic orientations as well as the degree of bureaucratisation. More important, the studies suggest that behavioural adaptations of bureaucracy to meet the needs of development administration of certain nature tend to influence the structure of bureaucracy itself.' (p.19-20) ^{ibid 3}

In order to have meaningful theory of developmental bureaucracy, inter-penetration between theory and practice ^{of} is crucial importance and as such field studies of

bureaucracy and its utilisation for developmental purpose is very useful.

Training of developmental administration has been thus found to be very important and the implications of development administration for

policy formulation is also well taken. Pai Pandndikar have lists some of the important sub-areas which/a theoretical impact e.g. (a) Studies in bureaucratic behaviour,

(b) bureaucratic values and administrative performance

(c) Bureaucratic elitist -- studies in attitudes and

motivation (d) bureaucratic culture (p.28). Interface

between those manning the profession of bureaucracy and the academicians is thus very important in order to

evolve meaningfully conceptual framework. Central importance

of co-ordination and communication in respect of Union-

State relations, Financial and fiscal policy has been

brought out again and again which really has theoretical

significance, because without such co-ordination and communi-

cation, the working of development bureaucracy at various

levels cannot be hoped to be effective. Similarly, ' the

organisational behaviour, social or human relations within

organisation or department, inter-organisational co-ordi

nation, mutual attitudes and behaviour of administrative

organisations and the citizen, process of decision making,

the programme ~~of~~ and project administration' are regarded

as important for undertaking meaningful researches in development administration and to evolve a useful theory.

(B.S. Khanna: 'Research on Union and State Administration : p. 142). As mentioned earlier, proper co-ordination between

head-quarters and field situation has been emphasized time and again which ~~was~~^{is} also of theoretical significance.

In his Review of District Administration, Pai Panandikar observes that ' Role perceptions of the administrators and the people and of course political leaders are very important. The expected clear division between the spheres of work and responsibility, between the politicians and the officials does not exist but is likely to continue to be so which also means improvisation of a new concept of fluid state of affairs under which development bureaucracy has to function. Behavioural propensities of development administration are thus very important. Similarly communication of development bureaucracy with the politicians and the political process making it favourable for the functioning of democracy is also very important. The continuous feed-back between elected non-officials and the common people is a necessary condition for realising the goals of development. The entire planning activity and exercise has to follow maximum trickle upwards rather than trickle downwards. This further means proper appreciation ^{of the} ^

real needs of the common people, views expressed by their representatives and feasibility of realising the roles. The re-orientation of the bureaucratic personnel to the changing needs and situation is regarded as very crucial. (Survey of Research in Public Administration, Vol.I, Allied Publishers, New Delhi, ICSSR, 1974). In the analysis and evaluation of specific areas such as administration of development programmes in agriculture and community development or the administration of non-agricultural development in rural-urban areas, science and technology, administration of law and order, administration of law and judiciary, administration of defence, administration of social services and welfare programmes, administration of public enterprises as well as industrial revolution, contained in vol.2 of Survey of Research in Public Administration, published by ICSSR, New Delhi, several ^{important} concepts have been listed which help us to evolve a suitable conceptual framework. Thus continuous re-examination of the structure and functioning of the administrative machinery in regard to its operational set-up in a given situation has been brought out again and again. The importance of doing away with arbitrary hierarchy between generalist and specialist is also a suggestion having important theoretical significance. Time and again, re-orientation of bureaucratic personality, development of suitable

bureaucratic culture, which shows once for all the time-honoured distance between themselves and the people and the openness of bureaucratic structure to public scrutiny as an ongoing process, have been recommended, which also provided necessary modifications to the classical model of bureaucracy. Continuous communication and interaction between bureaucrats and the people is also regarded as a must and utilization of new information and knowledge particularly for scientific and technological field for alleviating the sufferings of common man have been emphasized. Thus, importance of rationality so as to serve public purpose, has been mentioned time and again. Stratification and its dysfunctional aspects have to be got rid of which really means that recruitment to bureaucracy would also be not rigid in order to make it more efficient which is also of theoretical importance. Various kinds of administration including law and order, justice, public enterprise, finance and so on require the manning of bureaucracy infused with new spirit and capabilities. Thus, out of the analysis of negative dimensions of the functioning of bureaucratic machinery and the various normative suggestions, have emerged positive concepts which are of importance to the development of appropriate conceptual framework.

There is a voluminous literature about bureaucracy in India, although very few Studies have been theoretically conceived and carried out so as to test the theory and suggest certain modifications, if necessary. Therefore, I have decided to select a few studies which have been theoretically designed and carried out so as to bring together important theoretical strands particularly modifications, amendments to the existing theory. In their study on " Bureaucracy in India : ^{An} Empirical Study " which in itself is a part of the more comprehensive study entitled "Bureaucracy and Development Administration in India " completed by the authors Dr.Pai Panandikar and Dr.S.S.Kshirsagar at the Indian Institute of Public Administration, Indraprastha Estate, Ring Road, New Delhi, in 1968-69, (Ps. 187 to 208), reprinted from Indian Journal of Public Administration, Vol. XVII, No.2, April-June 1971, ⁵ have specifically concerned themselves with the analysis of the working of bureaucracy in India in different setting so as (to) (a) test Weberian classical theory of bureaucracy in the context of development experience -- in the sense that bureaucracy was deliberately used to initiate and implement the process of development right from the planning stage at the secretariate level to its implementation at the field level and (b) to suggest modifications

in the Weberian theory of bureaucracy by emphasizing the lack of complete correspondence between the structural and behavioural aspects of bureaucracy. The authors have very rightly stated in the beginning that whether or not there is a tacit acceptance and recognition of the fact that 'bureaucrats' administrators are not only called upon to implement policies and programmes but for all practical purposes, are also required to participate in the making of policies. However, as Paul Appleby and others have pointed out 'distinction between policy formulation and implementation is very thin; indeed policy is made where decision is made'. (Paul H. Appleby : 'Policy in Administration', Alabama, University of Alabama Press, 1957 (p.173)⁵. Bureaucracy is a necessary adjunct of the functioning of any modern State whether it be capitalist or socialist, totalitarian or democratic. In India, since historical times, the role of bureaucracy has been well recognized by the State. In the introductory chapter, we have already stated Weberian theory of bureaucracy and therefore there is no need to repeat it, although authors of the present study start naturally by providing a proper exposition of Weberian theory and model. While Weber emphasized precision, speedy and immaculate knowledge of files and procedures, strict sub-ordination, objectivity

and so on (ofcourse by studying ~~Real~~, other important characteristics, hierarchy, impersonality and so on), the present study of the authors ^{has} ~~is~~ delineated the differentiation between the structural characteristics such as hierarchy, division of labour, system of rules and the behavioural characteristics such as impersonality, rationality and rule orientation. The precise hypothesis which the authors wanted to examine was (i) the Civil Service in India is highly bureaucratic indicating that all the characteristics of bureaucracy are present in it but equally high degree and since bureaucratic characteristics are inherently related to one another, the Civil Service is uniformly bureaucratic along structural and behavioural dimensions. In order to test this hypothesis, a study was made of more than seven hundred Civil Servants working in different developmental agencies. Almost all of these were more in the nature of secretariate agencies and one of field agency. Respondents covered all the officials in class I, II and III, who dealt with developmental work. Ofcourse, as one would imagine, more than sixty percent of these officers belonged to Class III and about nineteen percent each belonging to class I and class II. Apart from the study being empirical, methodologically also it was sophisticated so as to take

care of methodological rigor required for such study. Taking into account the differentiation between structural and the behavioural dimensions, it has been found that the first hypothesis viz., that Civil Servants in India is highly bureaucratic, is not entirely borne out by the study. Low score of the majority of the respondents on the scale of rationality supports popular belief that decision making in Government is not necessarily guided by objective or efficient considerations. But personal and familiar relations exerted considerable influence on the performance of the officials. On the structural side, characteristics of hierarchy and division of labour were borne out by the study. However, on the third structural characteristic viz., system of rules, score of the respondents were not as high as anticipated. May be that these developmental agencies were very recently instituted and as such the rules had not as yet acquired rigidity. Furthermore, there was sharp differentiation between different levels and in the functions of superior officers from those of their subordinates. Findings of the behavioural dimensions also suggest important variation, because while scores of impersonality were quite high, on both rationality and rule orientation, scores were perceptively low. The degree of adaptation of rules indicate that the process of

bureaucratisation in the developmental agencies inspite of their behavioural characteristic indicates different trend. In short, there is a discrepancy (probably very functional) between the structural pattern and the behavioural pattern and, therefore, assumption on the part of bureaucratisation of development administration is only partially fulfilled. Ofcourse, localewise there are significant differences even between the dimensions, because insófaras an agency was block development office with primary emphasis on agricultural development, there was naturally a greater emphasis on citizen participation in its programme of work. Their work involved mass contact and participation. Therefore, field offices whose performance will depend on citizen participation and ^{mass} contact will tend to be less bureaucratic and conversely headquarters of secretariat type offices whose performance does not depend on mass contact or citizen participation will tend to be more bureaucratic. By and large, it has been found that in terms of the nature of the development programme adherence to the system of rules, rationality and rule orientation tend to be of lower order, particularly as far as adherence to rule orientation is concerned, it is significantly low both in the case of agriculture and industry. The skill of organisation also affects bureaucratic characteristics in the sense that larger the organisation, the higher the emphasis on rule orientation.

Similarly, the higher the level of education, higher the score of rationality and the lower the score of rule orientation, partly because of the capacity to use discretion and discriminate for taking appropriate decision and action. Differences of rural urban background has implications for the proportion of more impersonal and more rational civil servants amongst those having urban background than among those having rural background. In keeping with the variable of education, civil servants brought up in urban environment were generally less rule oriented. Civil servants often tend to be highly rule oriented as they move upwards in the hierarchy which in a way bears out Merton's formulation about observability of norms as they are practised in reality rather than rules and regulations which are prescribed in theory and on paper. Similarly Edward Shills has also very rightly pointed out that access to ~~a~~ confidential and secret information and knowledge provides greater flexibility, not to say ^{exceptional} external capacity to take decisions out of the usual rut and as such be less dominated by the prevailing rules and regulations. The family background also facilitate use of discretion and departure from the ^{rigid} rules and regulations. In-service training also had some

not want

impact on adherence to impersonality and rule orientation in the sense that those who were not trained were more prone to impersonality, probably since they lacked self-confidence. Ofcourse the factor of training was not operative in respect of rule orientation which was low in both the cases. Higher class officials include higher proportion of less impersonal, more rational and also less rule oriented civil servants than among class III respondents.

The study thus brings out that Weberian theory of bureaucracy provides a very good starting point for understanding the functioning of bureaucracy in the context of development and yet a clearcut differentiation between structural and behavioural dimension is necessary. Further, bureaucracy is not a static phenomenon but something which is amenable to change, exposed to change and required to change according to the changing circumstances. The structural postulates are not afterall so independent as to build bureaucratic theory around them and therefore, cognisance has to be taken of the lack of correlation between the structural and behavioural dimensions of bureaucracy. In short, some of the theoretical propositions which emerge from the present study are as follows :

(a) functionally, bureaucracy operates from agency to agency.

(b) the degree of mass contact it involves, especially to attain its objectives vary, and

(c) still composition, including level of education of bureaucracy itself undergoes major alterations between agencies within some governmental apparatus.

Bureaucracies involved in the developmental task at the field level tend to be less structured and behaviourally more flexible than secretariat based more remote bureaucracies. Likewise, bureaucracies essentially in the regulatory and other non-developmental agencies will tend to be structurally more rigid and behaviourally less flexible and inbetween these would be the whole range of intermediate positions. As such the traditional equilibrium bureaucracy in which the structural and behavioural postulates are relatively balanced needs modification. Likewise, the logic of situation and locale also cause modification both to certain extent in the structural dimension of bureaucracy and much more so in its behavioural dimension so as to fetch the expected results. The existing theory, particularly the classical Weberian theory, can be regarded as static whereas when bureaucracy is used for developmental purpose, particularly at the field level, it must contain dynamic elements and as such must be in search of new concepts and formulations.

definitions & demands

h

The study quoted above is a summary statement of a wider study entitled 'Bureaucracy and Development Administration' undertaken by the authors ^{D.V.K.} Pai Panandikar and ^{S.S.} Kshirsagar and circulated in a draft form for discussion in 1976. Without going into the details of the entire material so provided in the study, a certain reiteration of the propositions forwarded in the earlier study as well as raising of certain theoretical and policy questions will, however, be undertaken. In the post-independence period, since Government took upon itself developmental activity, it is very clear that inevitably what was implied was the process of social change, change in the values, attitudes behaviour and even in the vocabulary of the people. Similarly a greater concurrence between those who administer and rule and those who are administered and ruled was also expected and that is why empirical study was designed to find out structural contradiction or inconsistency, particularly between the structural characteristics of the bureaucracy and its developmental role. Of course, as has already been mentioned, the authors have suggested a differentiation between the structural and the behavioural dimensions of bureaucracy and as such have also suggested the possibility of bureaucracy being more amenable for performing developmental task. Even then certain questions and dilemmas persist which pose problems both for theory and policy. As authors

have rightly pointed out, the characteristics of development administration are given below :

Firstly, it is essentially change-oriented and, therefore, there is a moot question as to how far the administration perceives itself in this new light. Secondly the development administration is result oriented i.e. it involves achievement of specific results and, therefore, how does it come about achieving these results. Thirdly, though development administration is entrusted with the task of initiating the programmes and policies of development, ultimately it has to depend on the response and co-operation of the citizens and the people at large and thus to what extent it has the capacity to do so. Fourthly, the development administration requires firm commitment not in the partison sense, but in the administrative sense to the entire programme of development and whether this is so or not, is also equally important.

~~Supervisory~~
Accepting development administration and bureaucracy to be an agent of social change and ofcourse prosperity is a tall order which poses several theoretical and practical problems : (a) because of the current study of theory of bureaucracy as mentioned time and again and (b) because of the difficulties encountered particularly by the bureaucratic personnel, not to say people at large, in the acceptance of the new rôle. Moreover, bureaucracy and its

utilization for development has to be viewed in the context in the context of the existing social structure, economic structure, power structure, cultural stratification and so on. On the other hand, the very deployment of bureaucracy for development is also expected to simultaneously undergo change from within and also ensure change within the wider or external system so as to be conducive to the aims and goals of social change in the desired direction.

While accepting special organisational or structural and behavioural -- personality and cultural characteristics inherent in development bureaucracy, certain concepts come to the fore again and again. It is true that because of bureaucracy being essentially a hand-made of the local rational authority, there would be a maximum premium put on technical competence which in its turn would give rise to domination over clientele whom it is supposed to serve. As Merton points out, this would mean that instrumental value becomes a terminal value since there is a displacement of goals. Further, elitist bias of bureaucracy would render it incapable of delivering the goods insofar as social change is expected to do and yet one has to take into account the existential situation in which development bureaucracy functions. Thus, in India particularly when it functions in the rural setting, there are certain features of behavioural type which emerge and which modify the working of

the system of bureaucracy. From the point of view of the profile of bureaucracy, there are certain characteristics which are listed below :

That development bureaucracy is generally younger as compared to the traditional bureaucracy in India as well as in the more advanced nations; It was also more rural than of urban. In terms of class and stratification it was more representative, even though it was more educated than the traditional bureaucracy. Even though it was more educated, there was no specific training programme which it had undergone for performing its special task viz., that of development.

In terms of bureaucratisation on the structural side, there were characteristics of hierarchy, division of labour as well as system of rules, but on the behavioural side there were quite a few variations, because pronounced structural feature of well-organized system of rules is not necessarily followed by behavioural pattern of rule orientation and as such agricultural development development sector appears to function in a less bureaucratic manner. Even then, it was hierarchical in nature while organisation was less impersonal than ^{the} later. ^{The} Higher class of the Civil Servants, lesser the practice of hierarchy and technical background seem to make for less rule orientation

than the non-technical ones. Then again, ^{the} higher/family background of the bureaucrats, lesser the insistence on rule orientation which can be explained partly in terms of their confidence and sense of security enjoyed by them in respect of administering and ruling over the people. Age also seem to have influenced elasticity in respect of rule orientation because as Merton has very rightly pointed out, as one advances in age and consequent experience and the view from inside, one can afford to be and tends to be more flexible. Likewise, promotion to higher post also ensures flexibility of mind. Even formal training in the performance of developmental task too, results in lesser impersonality in their dealing with citizen clientele than those who have not received any such training.

Thus, on the one hand, while retaining the structural characteristics of bureaucracy due to the variations at the behavioural level, there are significant modifications in the functioning of bureaucracy which also impinge upon the structure of bureaucracy. Thus 'bureaucracy is not a linear and static phenomenon; that functional content of the bureaucracy, the type of office, its level of mass contact for meeting its work programme and the level of its skill composition are all factors that have significant bearing on its behavioural characteristics.'

(p.235)

As a matter of fact, newer and newer inputs made into the system call for an inter-play of new variables, so that bureaucratic structures continuously create conditions that modify these structures. As such, Weber's model, as seen earlier, provides a good starting point but cannot explain the reality and calls for range of sub-models in which various characteristics play differing roles and ^akaleidoscopic picture presents itself necessitating a keen and vigilant perception, understanding and theorising about reality. The present study suggests propositions like ' (1) Bureaucracy involved in the developmental tasks at the field level such as in agriculture, necessitating mass participation and with more educated personnel, tend to be structurally less rigid and behaviourally more flexible than secretariat based bureaucracies; (2) implied is the proposition ^{are} that bureaucracies essentially not regulatory and other non-developmental agencies will tend to be structurally more rigid and behaviourally less flexible inbetween there ^{would} be a whole range of intermediate positions.' (p.237). Therefore, modifications to the existing theory particularly Weberian model are suggested viz., that equilibrium posited between structural and the behavioural dimensions is not warranted and it needs to be substituted

by the concept of moving equilibrium. Then again, tacitly assumed contradiction between the correct bureaucratic behaviour and the role of innovator is also not warranted. Ofcourse, there is no denying the fact that innovation and change also needs institutionalization. Job attitudes certainly play a significant role in facilitating developmental task and it has been found that attitude of the developmental civil servants to work ^{conscientiously} ~~respectability~~ was highly positive, inspite of the fact that developmental task was not necessarily accorded higher status by superiors. If seniority, rather than skill continues to be regarded as important in promotion, morale and involvement of bureaucracy in developmental task would be naturally impaired, which has been finding of the study. Traditional hang-over of maintaining distance between officers and the clientele is further accentuated by the urgency to acquire and show results. The presence of hierarchy and the latitude to innovate and take decisions also further impair the functioning of development bureaucracy from the point of view of innovation. As pointed out earlier, if merit is not accorded sufficient importance for promotion, ~~which means~~ it will reduce the importance of creative and innovative activity.

In discussing adaptation to development characteristics

through dimensions of changed, result, and citizen participation, orientation have been pointed out as important and statistically significant. It was found that industries offices were more change oriented than agricultural ones, mainly because of the easier compatibility of industrial production. Similarly technical respondents were more change-prone than non-technical. Again for the same reason, as one grows higher in age, confidence one acquires and the status one enjoys also enables one to accept change. The higher the level of education and status in the hierarchy, it is also conducive to making one oriented to change. Much higher emphasis was placed by class I and class II officials on result orientation, must be mainly because of the seriousness with which they took their job responsibility. Status in the hierarchy had implications for orientation towards citizens. Here again, higher class officers display greater citizen orientation. In my study of Bureaucracy and Agricultural Development, I had also encountered a similar phenomenon viz., the importance of image of the official working in the situation of development ~~xxxx~~ For example, the lower the official, the smaller the image and the lesser is effectiveness in promoting developmental activity.

As for commitment, respondents in agricultural development programmes appear more positive than in the industrial one. Promotion have positive bar on commitment. The

date of joining of civil servants is also related to commitment. For example, seniority enhances commitment and so does formal training and technical competence. Hierarchy of authority was significantly related to result orientation and citizen participation orientation would not be so with changed orientation or commitment. Division of labour which also reflects hierarchy is negatively associated with citizen orientation. On the whole, the structural characteristics of bureaucracy are negatively associated with developmental works. As one would expect, highly impersonal attitude amongst bureaucrats is dysfunctional in bringing about necessary attitudinal values in them towards citizen clientele. Rationality would promote change particularly the direction of result orientation. Even to attain better results by employing rational methods, greater component of citizen participation would require, which was turned out by the Study. This speaks of the importance of the cognisance of the factor by those who are ^{highly} ~~hard~~ placed and therefore more responsible for attaining results. On the other hand, rationality was inversely related to the degree of commitment. Thus 'rationality as a characteristics appears to be more positively associated with change, result and citizen orientation but negatively related to the feeling of commitment.' (p.247) There was also negative relationship

between change orientation and rule orientation. Then again, there was no inherent contradiction between the system of bureaucracy and developmental task assigned to it, given certain modifications like locale, exposure, training, sense of security and confidence, seniority, technical skill, flexibility etc.

The study has certain policy as well as theoretical implications, because in the first place, extensive use of bureaucracy for initiating and sustaining the process of development means dependence on bureaucratic framework and its functioning and, therefore, also on the classical theory of bureaucracy. Ofcourse, there is no denying the fact that attempts have been made to reform the bureaucratic framework, though not necessarily with great success. Secondly, policy implication stemming from this, seems to be that the existing bureaucratic system can be transformed by integrating it with the political system, which also seems fairly difficult to attain. It would be better still if system is designed to ensure participation of people in developmental activity and as such they should be encouraged to develop their own institutions which have primarily a developmental focus. People's expectations should be fed back into the administrative machinery so as to make it more effective and responsive. There is

no doubt that ^{from the} ~~the~~ ^{view of} ~~very~~ point of policy formulation, people's direct involvement would be a better guarantee of performance. Hierarchical nature of bureaucracy needs to be reduced in order to make it more functional. As mentioned earlier, division of labour also has implications for hierarchy. Rationality and impersonality would fetch results though would not ensure citizens participation or the commitment of the bureaucrats. How to make administrative system more responsive to the people's aspirations and needs has both policy and theoretical implications. It has been pointed out time and again as to how hierarchy, impersonality and rule orientation which are the three critical characteristics of bureaucratic organisation and behaviour run counter to the administrative policy needs of development administration. How to develop ^a ~~h~~ culture appropriate for performance of new tasks is a very important question.

Unfortunately, the study also brings out a clear-cut distinction between bureaucratic structure and bureaucratic behaviour, the ^{later} ~~later~~ being more prone to adaptation and adjustment and accommodation, though not ^{of} ~~h~~ the required degree. Several issues have been raised in this study about the nature of bureaucratic theory, functioning of bureaucracy and its viability as well as utility in the context of development and factors like higher education, social back-

ground, technical competence, higher status and authority in the bureaucratic system and so on, have been conducive to better performance. A rather detailed exposure and discussion of the same will be presented below :

In a later sharply focussed study of 'Development Bureaucracy' by Dr.V.A. Pai Panandikar, R.N.Bishnoi and O.P.Sharma^X conducted in the two States of Haryana and Madhya Pradesh[^] regarding the role played by bureaucracy in agricultural development, the authors wanted to test some of the propositions they had presented in their earlier study entitled " Bureaucracy and Development Administration " brought out in July 1976 which has been already extensively utilized. In the earlier study, certain doubts and misgivings were voiced about the role of bureaucracy in initiating and sustaining development, particularly in the light of the structural characteristics of bureaucracy, notwithstanding the relevant and functional modifications in its behavioural style. In this study, however, the basic objective has been to indicate what bureaucracy can do and make. In doing so, apart from bringing out the positive aspects of the functioning of bureaucracy to promote and contribute to development, certain theoretical concepts and formulations have ensued which are of great significance for our purpose. The authors

have candidly accepted that ' both as an organisation and as an instrument of management, bureaucracy in India handles bulk of the country's programmes of development. Change is systemic both for the bureaucracy and of the bureaucracy.' (p.1). The focus of this study is more on the change to the bureaucracy to handle task of development rather than its own threat to the broader political system. It is indeed well-known that Marx and Michael have thought of bureaucracy as self-sustaining, very selfish in its orientation and proving iron law of oligarchy and at the same time being responsible for complicating the process of alienation. However, in view of the very large scale utilization of bureaucracy for development by the State in India, it is important to know the skills and capabilities of bureaucracy which can promote agricultural development. Thus, the objective of the present study is to ' (1) examine the adequacy of the various dimensions of the bureaucratic system for underlying the tasks of agricultural development, ~~and~~ (2) study the attitude of the bureaucracy towards the development tasks assigned to it and towards the people it has to serve, (3) assess the levels of skills and capabilities of the bureaucracy implementing the programme and (4) observe and evaluate the actual behaviour

of the bureaucracy in implementing the programme, including its relationship with the citizen clientele.' (p.6)

From our point of view, the most important outcome of the study is its contribution to the theory of bureaucracy, when bureaucracy contributes to development or cannot make sufficiently much contribution due to the operation of various factors, which are systemic to bureaucracy and outside the bureaucratic system too. However, greater emphasis is placed on the pliability and resiliance of bureaucracy as a system so as to meet the new tasks and challenges with which it finds itself confronted.

The present study is the next ^{step} to a very important study in testing certain theoretical propositions contained in the earlier study. While using the method of difference and agreement, since two States Haryana and Madhyapradesh and particularly the two districts selected for the study viz., Karnal and Gorakhpur, are illustrations of having attained the goal of agricultural development or having relatively failed in attaining the expected goal of agricultural development. The choice of these two districts was guided by the considerations of similarity of natural endowments in terms of their agro-climatic conditions especially their development potential.

Therefore, the authors felt that the generic administrative factor and its impact on development would be worth studying.

'Theoretically, this study was expected to help in bringing out and highlighting the diverse organisational and managerial issues pertaining to the administration of the agricultural development programme as a part of the larger governmental system.' (p.354). Several factors which accounted for differences expected in the realization or otherwise of the development potential by the two districts are mentioned. (1) Karnal is very well served by roads and communication, electrification of villages, presence of very well organized co-operative activities as exemplified by co-operative credit and serving societies and by and large the presence of very vital infra-structural support needed for agriculture. On the other hand, Gorakhpur shows the paucity of infra-structural support for agriculture which is further complicated by the largeness of the size of the State and also the district selected for study. It has to be very rightly pointed out that the presence of infra-structural facilities and co-ordination of various agencies have facilitated the functioning of bureaucracy, in Karnal. In fact, "the highly pragmatic and result oriented organisational strategy adopted for implementing the programme" in Karnal has been regarded as very crucial

for the success of programme of development through the working of development bureaucracy. Availability of intra-structural facility have thus enabled the development bureaucracy to concentrate on their functions instead of being bothered about credit facility, electrification, road and communication etc. They are freed from supply functions so that they can devote their time and attention to the extension work among the cultivators. As against this, situation in Gorakhpur is quite opposite. Moreover, there is a single line of command in the implementation of the agricultural development programme in Kernal as against compartmentalised functioning of the programme in Gorakhpur, which means that certainty of command ensures confidence and enables location of responsibility. Proliferation of parallel set-ups for agricultural extension leads to dissipation of energy and diversity of command which is not functional for development. Thus, the structural coherence of bureaucracy as a system is very important if it has to discharge the task entrusted to it. Importance of continuous training of both extension workers and the cultivators has been given high priority in Kernal, which is absent in Gorakhpur. Availability of adequate information system and feed back mechanism in Kernal and its relative absence in other districts also makes for difference.

Regular scrutiny and evaluation and monitoring of the work is necessary adjunct to the concept of rationality inherent in the western model. This is further exemplified by higher educational qualifications and status as well as technical competence possessed by majority of the officials concerned, to the task of agricultural development in Kernal and the prevalence of lower educational qualifications and technical competence by the officials in Gorakhpur. Professional, technical and higher education is very important for efficiency. In fact, in the earlier studies of Dr. Pai Panandikar, and Kshirsagar, importance of higher education has been taken proper note of which is vindicated here. The length of the period of service tends to be counter-productive after a certain period which has been brought out even in the case of Kernal where officials had worked for ten years and more. I would like to mention here the coming into operation of 'Peter Principle'. On the other hand, those who had job experience of less than ten years contributed more effectively. While expertise and exposure are very important if a job is done on the spot, it is more important both from the point of view of the satisfaction to the performer and the job and even more so to its clientele. Knowledge and awareness of agriculture and allied development programme, application and funding of

administration, ~~bars frequency of movement of field files~~
~~and~~ extent of contact with the cultivators, promptness
in taking action on field problems, association of officials
in programme planning, freedom of expression in discussion
and policy implementation and solving problems, attitude
of senior officials to the juniors, manner of motivating
officials towards their duties and also motivating people
for adapting newer practices, status of inter-departmental
co-ordination, efficacy of rules and regulations on the
discharge of duties of the officials etc. have been pointed
out as being of vital importance in accounting for differen-
tial performance of bureaucratic officials in the two
districts. It has also been pointed out that specificity
and narrow excellence can be counter-productive, if there
is no awareness of the wider goals and the net works in
which one has to function. Hierarchy, status and authority
were also deemed ^{thought} to be important particularly as far as
clientele was concerned and that is why at the field level
delegation of financial power was deemed to be more important.
As pointed out in the earlier study, higher officials can
afford to be more innovative. Importance of field level
activity and sustained contact has been brought out again
and again and that is where the contrast between operation
of this factor in Kernal significantly and its absence in

Gorakhpur counts for the differences in success or otherwise of developmental activity. Further, meaningful contact with the various strata of cultivators is also very important which is again exemplified by the results of the study, because as indicated in the earlier study, development bureaucracy has to function as an agent of ~~shen~~ social change in the sense that he or she has to try to be a level ^{ling} agent and has to cater demonstrably and convincingly to the needs of smaller cultivators. Programme planning and implementing is very necessary for ensuring success of development activity which is again borne out by the comparative study of two districts. Change in the style of functioning of bureaucracy as a system in the sense that it is more democratic rather than authoritarian, not to say autocratic, is another important variable which explains the differential development in these two districts. Thus, in Kernal, officials were given to persuasion and discussion rather than disciplinary action. Similarly, freedom of expression of views and forgetting hierarchical barriers is also very important for facilitating development. Likewise, inter-departmental co-ordination also facilitates. As pointed out ^{in the} ~~earlier~~ study, result orientedness gives rise to the neglect of the weakest section of society which is again borne out by the present study, in the sense that scheduled caste cultivators who were

owners of very small farms did not receive as much attention and services. The extent of literacy and awareness of the clientele also accounts for greater demands made on development bureaucracy and its greater contribution to the success of development programmes which is again exemplified. Instead of merely emphasizing target fulfilment, prevalence of the positive attitude to help the cultivators seems to be more important. In fact, the existence of proper feed-back mechanism and mutual appreciation of each others bonafides, concerns and problems seems to be congenial for ensuring development. This reiterates forcefully the emphasis placed on the behavioural dimension of development bureaucracy in the earlier study. Rules and regulations after all are not important in themselves, but have an instrumental value and as such necessitate modifications according to the circumstances and if this is done, the task of development becomes easier. Apart from the professional higher qualifications and technical competence, responsiveness of bureaucracy is very important as exemplified by the present study. The present study thus suggests concrete modifications to the classical model of bureaucracy particularly in operational terms and very rightly emphasizes the change from within a bureaucratic system and also from without. In short, continuous appraisal and reappraisal of the role and the ensuing structural

is vital for ^{rendering} ~~running~~ bureaucracy a dynamic factor rather than the static factor which more often than not impedes the process of development. Ofcourse, the present study also emphasizes the point that given the utmost reliance on development bureaucracy for attaining the goals of development, there are both theoretical and policy implications. The meticulous testing of theory of bureaucracy in a field setting by rigorous use of the ^{method of} ~~agreement~~ and difference, the study has contributed to better understanding of the role of bureaucracy and necessary modifications needed both for theory and policy. If development bureaucracy is completely manned by political parties and their functionaries, then it would call for a different framework altogether. However, such a possibility is remote, but even then, the intervention of the political system in the functioning of bureaucracy is very important.

✓ Bureaucrats and the political system particularly the political leaders :

Under the changed circumstances, bureaucrats have to work not only for the people, but with the people, even more so with their elected representatives, since the elected representatives are regarded to be mainly responsible for guarding the interests of the electorate and particularly to ensure that the demands for various developmental activities are made with explicitly, honestly and continuously.

Bureaucrats, after an initial resistance or even the opposition have now accepted the legitimacy of their being guided by the authority of political leadership. Ofcourse, as pointed out earlier, political leaders also make an adroit use of the bureaucratic machinery so as to ensure smooth functioning of government and even more so to facilitate the implementation of policies and programmes of development. Even while granting that this is a new situation which is developed in the post-independence period, as pointed out by the two States mentioned above, there is no denying the fact that particularly at the field level continuous interaction has to take place between the bureaucrats and the people, through their representatives, which also gives rise to rapproachment and mutual acceptability even complete acceptance. The Officers of higher rank have displayed greater plasticity and resilience to meet the challenge of developmental activity by setting aside the rigid rules and regulations and also by making themselves more amenable to contact with the people and ofcourse their representatives. Thus, in a way, to harp upon the contradictions and confrontations between the bureaucrats and political leaders as representatives of the people and also the common people, would not be doing justice to reality. Most of the studies regarding lead official inter-relationship are confined

to the situation as it operates at the block and village level. " It has already been reported that many politicians claim it to be their duty to look into administrative decisions, mainly on the grounds of protecting public good. This duty they perform quite frequently, that too on account of public good." (Leader) and 'Bureaucracy in developmental process', by S.N.Tawale, P.N.Limaye, V.K. Kshire and N.R.Inamdar (p.124), published at Oxford, I.B.H.Co. Centre for Policy Research New Delhi, 1985.)

Village officials on their part have also mentioned that they do not mind initiative of leaders if it is according to rules or if it is beneficial to their career. Leaders have also pointed out that they have^{to}/do so because of procedural delays accepted by the working of bureaucratic system. By and large, interference by political leaders amounts to their taking up the matter with higher officials particularly if there are public complaints, which has been ⁿvalidated both by the political leaders as well as the officials. Leaders perceive that because of their intervention, administration becomes partisan in the sense of becoming more responsive. Officials feel that undue interference by leaders poses challenge to them which is occasionally resisted by them. Political leaders, however, maintain that official decisions are changed either through mutual consultation or at higher administrative level, which

in a way, means that there is an avoidance of confrontation. As one would expect, there is a higher percentage of rich political leaders being able to affect changes in decisions and ofcourse those who are poor were not at all effective in getting decisions changed. By and large, it is admitted that politicians concerned are guided by personal and parochial considerations and as such officials view that intervention by political leaders is not necessarily in the public interest.' Politicians extract compliance from officials. Officials comply demands of politicians mainly because they know that politicians have the power to distribute rewards and inflict penalty, such as threat of transfer, creation of trouble in service by political leaders and possibility of unpopularity. Officials do not want to displease leaders to the tune of 80 percent at the village level and to the tune of 48 percent at the district or taluka level. Afterall, officials have to get things done, both in respect of their personal career and well-being as well as from the point of view of meeting targets from the leaders. Various modalities are used to bring pressure like gheraos, demonstrations etc. What emerges out of this study is the blurring of line between the jurisdiction of officials and the ~~the~~ leaders which certainly calls for greater flexibility and accommoda-

tion as well as understanding on the part of both these components. Similar findings have been reported by Prof.Y.B. Damle and Prof.Mrs. Ramanamma in ^{their} ~~his~~ study on "Bureaucracy and Agricultural Development" Maharashtra State, 1972. At the village level, the status of the officials, which is very low, is mainly responsible for their being subjected to pressures from political leaders which can be successfully withstood by officials at the district level and ofcourse at the State level, not to mention the cabinet level. It has also been brought out that the competition and rivalry amongst various political parties at the village level also adds to the complications and, therefore, pious hope has been expressed regarding the non-partison (political) functioning of various organisations at the Panchayat level. One of the implications of such studies has been the relative neglect of the weaker sections, both by the officials and non-officials which has ~~xx~~ come up time and again in various studies.

As relationship between the three components i.e. bureaucracy, people and the political leaders in the context of development is affected by historical traditions, new demands and challenges and system of stratification. Therefore, it has been contended in all seriousness by C.P.Bhambri and K.B.Saxena that the social background of the bureaucrats, in the sense that they come from elite sections of society, is counter-productive to development, Although, the studies of ~~pai-pandikar~~

although, the studies of Pai Panandikar mentioned above do not bear this out. Similarly, though at the village and block and district level, officials have by and large to accept the fact of democratic decentralisation atleast for the implementation of development programmes in the sphere of agriculture. (Y.B.Damle 'Bureaucrat and Non-officials -- A study of mutual assessment in Local Government Institutions in Rural India ' (p.285) edited by R.N.Haldipur and V.R.K.Paramahansa, National Institute of Community Development, Hyderabad 30 (1970).^{29 10} In this paper, relationship between bureaucracy and non-officials study of mutual assessment, utilise the mechanism of setting mutual images in order to bring out relationship between the two. Ofcourse, this paper is based on the findings from a study with a limited extent and, therefore, lacks power of generalisation, although it is quite justified. The findings of this paper clearly bring out the working of the political process and the ~~importance~~ enhanced self-consciousness of the people at large and the mounting pressure on the bureaucrats which compels them to depart from the avowed norms of bureaucratic functioning.

(Bracketed portion below: to be properly placed)

.. 132. 131

Assuming that democratic decentralisation has affected not only bureaucratic system but also people at large, we have already pointed out as to how even democratic decentralisation has to function through the elected representatives i.e. elites in whom trust and power is vested. Contrary to the earlier tradition and habit of being ruled by others i.e. rulers -- government officials, there has been a reversal of rôles to some extent which is certainly difficult for both the partners to digest so easily and effect a smooth transition from the earlier pattern to the new pattern. It has been stated by Professor Lasky that 'the whole difference between efficient and inefficient administration lies in the creative use of officials by elected representatives'. Ofcourse this is easier said than done, nor would it be even practically desirable to depend on the letter of the law, ignoring the spirit of rules and regulations, which again means successful, though legitimate deviation from rules and regulations in practice. The expected degree of Bureaucratisation is also difficult to attain. Thus, the new political framework and design has posed problems for both the bureaucrats and the people (and the elected representatives). Lack of proper demarcation of these spheres of two, has naturally added to the complications. Emergence of dynamic, ^{but} power-oriented leadership will

.. 133.

132

only pose problem for the erstwhile officials' supremacy of command. However, as mentioned earlier, wily-nily process of mutual acceptance and trying to work out process of development as efficiently and as smoothly as possible is underway, which is reflected in my findings, and the paper mentioned above.

Tension, management and integration between these two components has acquired vital importance in the changed context and, therefore, a study of mutual images was undertaken. While the officials would like to work untrammelled by exposure to the people, not to say their interference, they have also come to accept the changed reality viz., that their activity and work will be increasingly exposed to public scrutiny. In fact, it is only through such public scrutiny that they could enlist the active co-operation of the leaders and the people in attaining the goal of development. Hence the officials do accord highest priority to the village level activity, even though it made maximum exposure to public scrutiny and even interference. Quite in keeping with this response, the officials also maintain that it was no longer necessary to maintain aloofness between themselves and the people, nor was it necessary for them to entertain any ideas of superiority. Similarly, they were quite sensitive to the needs of the

people, at the same time they accept the fact that they enjoyed higher prestige than that of the common people which in a way is an indicator of their sense of self-esteem resulting confidence and security. It was also mentioned that communication between different rungs of the official hierarchy was quite effective, a fact perceived by non-officials, which can expand the morale amongst officials. All the officers, gramsevaks, samiti members and panchayat members mention that they derived full support from higher officials, colleagues, subordinate staff, political leaders and people. This is very positive pointer in the direction of the high morale experienced by them. It was also mentioned by the officials that they derived support in mobilising financial and human resources for the new agricultural programmes from the leaders as well as people. There was, however, a difference in perception and appreciation of the issues involved in terms of the level of leadership in the sense that these officials mention that Members of Parliament and Members of Legislative Assembly took considerable interest in the development activity as compared with the leaders of lower rank. This observation was not ⁷⁶⁰corporated by the local level non-officials, as one would expect. There was no denying the fact that in their functioning these officials

... to certain pressures from the leaders to
the rules and regulations purely out of
considerations and interest and they also
if deviation from the rules and regula-
e in public interest, they would not mind it.
felt obliged to agree to proper demands,
aders created difficulties in other matters
peration in successful implementation or
transfer. Ofcourse, these responses differ
t. Therefore, in a way, hierarchy within the
aucracy, even to-day, matters. Both officials
is agree that they were devoted to their work.
earlier, the village level is regarded as
for implementation of development programme.
eartening that the non-officials felt that
lower had shifted from officials to non-
ilarly, non-officials were also aware about
its of pressure being exerted on officials,
essarily not in the interest of public policy
Even now non-officials perceived that very
take initiative and many of them follow direc-
a way suggest continuance of the earlier
ureaucracy viz., the inability or refusal to

While officials complain of lack of effective co-ordination amongst the various departments, some of them felt that the lack of interest and involvement in work on the part of some officials was responsible for the failure of the development programme. Similarly, officials' non-co-operation with the people's leaders was also felt to be responsible for the failure. These ofcourse are very candid and honest responses on the part of the officials. As one would expect, red-tapism and lengthy procedures, rigors of village life, pressures from rich farmers, unnecessary interference by political leaders were also mentioned as factors responsible for the failure of the development programme. It is thus clear that while meaningful interaction and dialogue has taken place between the officials, ~~and~~ the non-officials and the people, there is inevitably a certain hang-over of the earlier set-up, further complicated by the new demands and changing equations which has been accepted by both the components. There is no denying the fact that the supreme importance of the participation of the common people and not only leaders has been accepted by both the parties and this underscores the importance of citizen participation in development, where a newly defined dynamic and proper relationship between bureaucracy and the citizens is expected.)

" Citizen and the Administrator in a Developing Democracy "

by Eldersveld, Jagannatham and Barnabas. / The authors above have conducted study of the Citizen and the Administrator in a developing democracy : An empirical study in Delhi State, India, (Scot Foreman & Co.) (1964),^{g. 11} with a view to enquire into the inter-relationship between the citizen and the administrator. While the study is concerned ^{with} ~~to~~ the wider canvas viz, postal services, health services, police, Delhi Transport Undertaking and Community Development, focus is certainly on the emerging interaction and relationship in the context of changing reality. As pointed out earlier, effectiveness of administration depends on efficient use made of the officials by the people and administrators have come to stay as a very important intermediary between Government and the people at large. This is even more so, when government wants to introduce massive innovations on a large scale, which certainly requires commitment on the part of Bureaucracy to the larger goals of the welfare society and to the new norms of bureaucracy. Yet the required degree of meaningful interaction between bureaucracy and the people cannot be taken for granted, for the simple reason of (a) lack of meaningful contact between bureaucracy and the people (b) even more so lack of functional contact between bureaucracy and the people and

(c) intervention of the system of stratification --- hierarchy based on resources and power which interferes in bringing about required degree of interaction. As mentioned in my study quoted earlier, citizens' perception of the administrator is very important ~~since~~ stereotypes tend to persist. Whether the administrative system is perceived as sensitive and responsive to the public rather than inflexible and remote and high prestige and status is attached for public employment are very important from the point of view of meaningful interaction. The question really is whether a new image of administrator is evolved and developed in the light of actual experience. The study brings out that it is not only the conduct of the elite with the administrators that matters but that of the common man. On the one hand, there is a growing contact between citizen and the administrative ^{and} cadres at the level of community development programmes, the level of contact is not of the required order. The well-to-do and the affluent thus have better contact with the administrator cadres and as such reap maximum benefit from the programme, leaving the persons lower down in the scale of hierarchy rather high and dry. While government jobs are held as prestigious, a critical attitude ~~is~~ towards performance of administrators is displayed at the same time. The image which persists in our data then is one of citizen acquiescence and support, / as well as actual

and potential dissatisfaction and the educated and relatively wealthy criticize job performance of officials and feel that they are paying more attention than they should, and are ~~stressed~~ ^{critical} or pessimistic about efficacy of citizen action in relation to the bureaucracy. Urban low status groups are less critical but also more pessimistic about efficacy of citizen action, though less well informed about administrative system.' (p.136). On the one hand, Indian administrative system is penetrating into most traditional sectors and areas and yet the reaction of the citizens is slow and faltering. It is only when the relationship is directly functioning with its forthcoming and that of course is confined to involve citizens in the sense mentioned above. As mentioned in the latter study of Dr. Pai Panandikar, those who are already higher up would derive maximum benefit from development programmes.

Dr. H.R. Chaturvedi and S.K. Mitra in their study on "Citizen Participation in Rural Development", ¹⁰ carried out in 1978 in two districts in Gujarat and Orissa also bear testimony to the similar trends and emphasize the supreme importance of institutional network. e.g. nationalist movement, co-operative spirit, added public leadership to accelerate the process of development and to make sure that fruit of development will reach as many people as possible. Thus in Surat, a comparatively developed district of Gujarat,

the process of development acquired momentum due to the history of institutional work, while in Dhenkanal (district in Orissa) a relatively backward district in Orissa, the programme of rural development had hardly made any impact. The emergence of proper ethos and cultural climate for the development of democratic institutions was woefully absent in Dhenkanal, which emphasizes the importance of leadership and people's participation in development. Here (Surat) involving expenditure over several years, leader shares with his followers, a personal, collective stake in the success or failure of the organization. Involvement extending over juniors, dulls the ^{edges} ~~ages~~ of public distrust ~~of~~ of the wielders of power and makes for certain congruences of the private and collective interest. 'Dhenkanal leaders comparatively new to power and patronage, ~~does~~ not have their Surat counterpart's legacy of political responsibility and the consequent legitimacy. Surat Social Economic Organisation is, figuratively speaking, public joint stock company with wide (if not equal) distribution of stocks; the Dhenkanal counterpart in all sense of the word, is 'sacred' society, distrusting and, whose only aim is to agricultural bounties filling into the village from outside. Undoubtedly the respective leadership pattern affect the nature and extent of population participation in development' (p.110)

In a study of citizen participation in rural development and urban administration conducted by Y.B.Damle and Dr.Mrs. Usha Bambavale, ~~University of Poona~~, Department of Sociology, University of Poona, 1978, similar findings were experienced. On the one hand, urban sample was different and apathetic while the rural sample was pessimistic and did not stand to gain from developmental activity.

A certain degree of scepticism not to say pessimism has been voiced in the work of Narendra K.Singhi, "Bureaucracy: Positions and Persons", Abhinav Publications, New Delhi, 1974." ¹⁷ While accepting that recruitment to public bureaucracy maintains higher degree of universalism, there are dysfunctional attributes of the system in public bureaucracy as compared to private bureaucracy. The author observes in the light of the field investigation in Rajasthan ' continuation of the old structure leads to structural lag wherein the structure of sub-system lags behind, while new goals and new aspirations multiply, such structural lag can be considered as dysfunctional to the goals of development and nation building". Likewise, attention has been drawn to the elitist basis of bureaucracy by R.D.Thakur in his book " Elite theory and Administrative System" Sterling Publishers, Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1981. He avers that there is almost a monopoly of the IAS in

civil service. Politicians play in the hands of these bureaucrats who are treated as experts in administration.' (p.340). Even then he accepts that the recruitment to civil service is from the middle class or even middle-middle class, particularly at the field level. The author makes a vague suggestion (populistic) to improve conditions of service of those who are placed lower down in the hierarchy, without substantively providing any hard data. On the other hand, R.B.Jain and P.N.Chaudhari, in a book "Bureaucratic Values in Development" Uppal Publishing House, New Delhi, 1982¹⁵ have raised a pertinent question viz., whether bureaucratic values are inconsistent with the developmental task assigned to them. In the light of their field study in Punjab and Madhya Pradesh, the authors point out that 'in India, while largely remaining wedded to the Weberian model of bureaucratic organization, has in fact adapted to the changing needs of the situation.' (Preface p.VIII). Active involvement of bureaucracy in the development field task is needed and it is also mentioned that such 'officials engaged in developing activities in Punjab showed less attachment to these value orientations (values of caste, class considerations and status consciousness). The officials are also sensitive to the fact of the hinderances provided by higher status clientele to share the benefits of development with those who are not

well-placed. In spite of their possessing the necessary skill and capabilities for developmental work, one-third of the officials express grave doubt about their capacity to meet the challenging situation of the changed environment. The Study, while revealing the importance attached to the rules and regulations by the officials, also emphasizes that the attributes of capability and honesty are very relevant to development. The officials of the so-called non-developing departments tend to be more rule oriented, authority conscious and rational than the officials engaged in developmental task (p. 258). Similarly, incidence of status consciousness tends to be lower in development departments in both the States (p. 261). There is a fusion of the structure of bureaucracy as defined by Weber and also new values which are reflected in their behaviour which atleast do not abstract development. Thus, the finding of this study, though very cautious, is in a way, vindication of the findings of Dr. Pai Panandikar. Thus, therefore, there is no inherent and necessary contradiction between the existing structure evolving and already evolved pattern of behaviour and culture. It would be very pertinent to point out here that proper cognisance needs to be taken of the modifications in the behavioural and cultural pattern which auger well for the process of development in spite of maintaining the structural

format of bureaucracy. Further, there is no escaping the fact that bureaucracy has already been harnessed for the task of development and it would be in the interest of the ruling political elites and other politicians as well as public to properly appreciate the contributions of the bureaucracy to development instead of condemning the very instrument which is used so continuously.

The studies mentioned above about citizens' involvement and participation in development are symptomatic of the great importance of the new pattern of interaction and relationship between citizen --common people and the administrators if developmental activity has to become meaningful and successful. However, what one finds in reality is the differential participation of citizens i.e. elites who participate much more in the developmental activity and stand to gain considerably by developmental activities and programmes, in a way helping the administrators to fulfil the targets, while rendering it difficult the attainment of the egalitarian goal of development.

Important books and monographs have been presented here with a view to highlight the important concepts and theory regarding bureaucracy and development. However, in the next chapter, effort is made to identify the concepts and theories emerging from the lesser known available papers and publications which do not necessarily

present a coherent conceptual framework.

Literally, there have been hundreds of studies of bureaucracy which point out that bureaucratic system is in a large way reflection of existing social stratification. At the same time, it has also been noted that within the higher reaches of bureaucracy there is less emphasis on the observance of hierarchy particularly in respect of inter-personal relations with the subordinates, which again vindicates a trend in the culture and behaviour of bureaucracy. Likewise, informal and personal relations are also considered to be functional which also reflect receding importance to formalism. Even in Studies of Bureaucracy in an industrial organisation where maximum importance is attached to attaining rational results, feeling of ~~tirelessness~~ and alienation seems to be more confined to lower strata. Alienation is not a homogeneous entity particularly in terms of its impact on those who work in a given bureaucratic system. Rural-urban differentials as well as differences on hierarchy and stratification seem to be more important in giving rise to a sense of alienation rather than the bureaucracy as a system. Along with the social system and its role incumbents who are facing the crisis of transformation from the traditional to modern society, bureaucrats are also faced with the same problem and as such are in fact more vulnerable to this problem since

they are entrusted with the task of transforming others at the same time transforming themselves. Therefore, to posit one to one relationship between bureaucracy and alienation in an industrial organization is not warranted. (Ramkunwar Ram Yadav ' Bureaucracy and Alienation in an Industrial Organization ' : Ph.D. thesis in Sociology, Banaras Hindu University, 1977).¹⁶

Apart from these monographs and books which have themselves addressed to the problem of conceptual framework in the context of development, there have been several books, monographs and papers concerning the same theme, although not necessarily confined to Indian social reality. Some of the studies are prescriptive rather than analytical and, therefore, a very brief summary of their contents is presented below :

In addition to several works mentioned above, there are many other publications in the shape of books, monographs and papers which discuss the problem of theory/of bureaucracy in the context of development. Certainly, what is contained in these contributions is worth noting partly to take cognisance of what has been studied and partly to recapitulate the entire position with regard to theory of bureaucracy and the various suggestions made in respect of concepts, correlations etc.

First and foremost, there is a tacit acceptance of the increasing role to be played by the State for administering development and as such the increasing reliance to be placed on bureaucracy for implementing various schemes of development. Thus O.P.Dwivedi and R.B.Jain in their book " India's Administrative Study " Geetanjali Publishing House, New Delhi, 1985, very strongly assert that the State has to meaningfully intervene to ensure development and utilise the services of bureaucrats for the same. Similarly, in the book " Dynamics of Development : International Perspective " edited by Sudesh Kumar Sharma a note has been taken of increasing utilisation of bureaucracy in Asian States for promoting development. Thus the policy of laissez faire has been given a go-bye, emphasizing State as a major component of the theory of

bureaucracy. Utmost importance is attached to efficiency, performance and control over the resources and their management. In Lesli Sawhny Programme Accountability in Development : National and International. How to have development with the least Bureaucracy, Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi 1982,¹⁹ in the context of public enterprises, emphasis has been placed on both efficiency and performance. Similarly, Byron T. Mook, in his book ' A Value and Action in India, Bureaucracy, conclusion '²⁰ mentions that in respect of agricultural development, it is necessary to ensure efficiency as well as control over the situation to promote development by the bureaucracy. Bata K. Dey in his book " Bureaucracy Development and Public Management in India ", Uppal Publishing House, New Delhi, 1978,²¹ certainly pinpoints attention on the professionalisation of civil services including its operational mechanics and recommends an organisational infra-structure for creative thinking in management and the consequent dynamics of administrative reforms movement. In ^{short,} Taylorian approach is strongly recommended. In his paper ' Representative Bureaucracy : a Note for Methodological Reformulation ' published in Indian Journal of Public Administration, vol.27, No.4, Octr. Decr. 1981, p.1019-33, B.G.Sharma lists multifarious variables as important for the effective functioning of bureaucracy in

implementing programmes of development such as (1) determinant of the demand for bureaucrats, (2) determinant of the supply of bureaucrats and (3) gate-keepers or a filtered process. In the same article, emphasis is placed on the demand side rather than supply side. Very rightly, as stressed by Bhambrā C.P., in his article "Bureaucracy in India : Challenges of the Eighties " Indian Journal of Public Administration, Vol. 26, No.3, July-Sept 1980, p. 520-27, ²⁹ perception of the goals of development by bureaucracy are very important which affected the process of development. Bhambrā further mentions that Indian Bureaucracy believes in the politics of modernisation and mixed economy, because of which he expects that the crisis of Bureaucracy in the Eighties would increase, if forces opposed ^{to} the modernisation of India, come to political power. Manipulation of environment smacks of undue control by bureaucracy which may really lead to its playing a dominating role rather than a serving role. In his book 'Bureaucratic Elites in Segmented Economic Growth ' Pakistan and Bangla Desh, University Press Ltd., Bangla Desh, 1980, ²⁴ Emajuddin Ahmed warns, though with reference to the situation in Pakistan and Bangla Desh about the danger of bureaucracy playing a dominating role rather than that of a servant, which cannot be altogether ignored even in the Indian context. In his article 'Public Bureaucracy

in the Post-Colonial Study : Some Questions on Autonomy and Dominance in South Asia in the Journal 'Development and Change' 11(1), Jan. 1980 p.131-48, ²⁴Michael Moore also mentions that in a comparatively historical perspective study, apparatus is relatively elaborate in relation to the under-developed economic base and ~~with~~ that public bureaucracies are more powerful than they ought to be in relation to politicians and, therefore, ideological war has been lost by the politicians. This introduces the question of the analysis of Post-colonial social formations and enormous adjustments which are involved on the part of bureaucracy. Due to the historical reasons, bureaucracy tends to be statis rather than dynamic. In his book " Bureaucracy and Development Administration " Uppal Publishing House, New Delhi, 1979, ²⁵Mohit Bhattacharya, feels that administrative growth is incremental rather than radical and it is statis instead of being dynamic. Similar views are expressed with respect to the American situation where excessive mechanical dimension of bureaucratic structure has also been commented upon and it has been suggested that to counteract the nature of mechanical structure of bureaucracy, parallel voluntary organisations are absolutely necessary to counteract the ill-effects of bureaucratic structure ". (Stein Berry A. & Rosabeth Moss G. Kanter " Building Parallel Organisation Creating Mechanisms for Permanent Quality of Work Life : in the Journal of Applied Behavioural Sciences, Vol.16, No.3, Jul. Aug. Sept. 1980, p.371-388).

Gap between ideal and real : Apart from the classical features of bureaucracy such as rationality, efficiency, performance, what is emphasized in the context of development and the role which the bureaucracy is called upon to perform, are all manners of expectations made of the bureaucrats in respect of their total acceptance of the goals of development, mainly characterised by economic development and prosperity, coupled with social justice to be reflected in the policies of distribution, and ofcourse complete involvement in the policies and programmes formulated to ensure development. This also means that the bureaucrats should accept their new duty of working with the people by refusing to distance themselves from the people and by motivating the people to participate in the programmes of development. As is well-known, the relationship between theory and reality is always dialectical (Y.B.Damle: 'Dialectics between theory and social reality'). This has been observed in the case of other countries also, which has been already commented upon by Merton referred to earlier viz., ' the practice of bureaucracy, more often than not, departs from the classical of bureaucracy and instead of being impersonal and neutral, bureaucrats are selective in their behaviour and are also governed by considerations of solidarities centering round primary groups. Even though, bureaucracies are the link

between local institutions and the nation as a whole, this may not materialise in practice. Then again, the myth of accountability of bureaucrat has also been commented upon by David L. Altheide and John M. Johnson in their book " Bureaucratic Propoganda " Allyn & Bacon Inc., Boston, 1980. Similarly, it has also been noted earlier by Bhambri that Bureaucracy is not neutral but influenced by the ruling dominant elite. (C.P. Bhambri ' Bureaucracy and Politics in India ' Vikas Publications, 1971.) Then again, the important role played by the bureaucracy in policy formulations has also been commented upon by several scholars. The verbalised stances of bureaucracy also need not be taken at their face value. As already pointed out, Michel Crozier also speaks about the importance of bureaucratic culture which influences their day-to-day functioning. Similarly, Mooshall W. Mayer in his book, 'Change in Public Bureaucracies', Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, London, 1979, on the basis of longitudinal study, points out that organisational structures of bureaucracy are much ^{less} stable than the conventional stereotypes, and very rightly further points out that environment of organisation is more important than their structure, because organisations have to ultimately function in a given socio-economic, political

ideological environment. Similar point of view has been expressed by Ellioh Jaques in his book " A General Theory of Bureaucracy " Heinemann, London, 1976, stating that a properly organised bureaucracy is not inevitably monolithic and stultifying but can make a prime contribution to pluralism and general society. The author further points out that bureaucracy can help redress socio-economic inequalities and injustice atleast by controlling, if not eliminating, exploitation. As a matter of fact, it has been very rightly stressed that in the study of bureaucracy one has to adopt the role of a critique and the scientist instead of conforming or accepting the classical model of bureaucracy and the purpose of any theory, as mentioned time and again, is to revise its propositions in the light of new demands, experience and environment in which it functions. Similar observations have been made about the functioning of bureaucracy even in socialist regime which would be pointed out later on. It would also be very unrealistic and unjust to the bureaucrats to consider them as a homogeneous entity and it is very important to mention that the level at which the bureaucracy functions, has important implications for working with the people getting the required feed-back and inducing the people to participate in development. (Awadhesh Prasad, " A Portrait of

Bureaucracy in India : The Block Development Officer, " Associated Book Agency, Patna, 1976). Ofcourse, copious material in this regard has been presented from the studies of Dr. V.A. Pal Panandikar and others. Therefore, particularly in the context of development, classical model of bureaucracy is not applicable.

Nature of Real Politic and Economic constraints on the functioning of bureaucracy and the consequent modifications needed in the theory of bureaucracy :

In the first place, it should be pointed out that financial stringency affects the working of bureaucracy and it is very much here that supply side of economics affects working of bureaucracy, as pointed out by J.D.Sethi in his book " Bureaucracy and Accountability ". Moreover, it is because of financial stringency that the discrepancy between clients needs and aspirations and the performance of the bureaucrats tends to persist and can even assume proportions of a crisis. Similarly the policy of adhocism pursued by bureaucrats further reduces their efficiency and fails to bring about a qualitative change in values and social structure and stresses undue pressure on bureaucracy for obtaining results in their short run by politicians would also give rise to sycophancy, promiscuous responsibility, unashamed parsimony and aggrandizement, as mentioned by K.K.Khanna " Bureaucratic Blunder

World : Behavioural Profile of the Indian Bureaucracy:
(National ^{Management} ~~Amendment~~ Services 3) National Publishing House,
New Delhi 1984. Dwivedi and Jain have already emphasized
the supreme necessity of meaningful interaction between
bureaucracy and people so as to ensure participation of
people in development. Ofcourse, such interaction can be
thwarted by undue dominance of the politicians. For example,
M.A. Mutalik in his study " Democracy, Bureaucracy and
Technocracy : Assumptions of Public Management theory "
Concept Publishing Co., New Delhi, 1980, points out the
danger of collusion between policy, bureaucracy and tech-
nocracy which would not permit the desired and desirable
kind of interaction between bureaucracy and the common
people, would as such thwart the developmental process.
In fact, under this situation, bureaucracy would cease to be
accountable which can be contracted only by concerted
citizen's pressure, as pointed out by several scholars. The
new situation which has arisen out of the conflict between
technocrat and generalist also needs our attention because
of the historical neglect of technical specialists in India
and the domination by the generalists, commented upon
by Prof. D.R.Gadgil and several others. In our concern
for making the theory of bureaucracy realistic and there-
fore relevant in the context of development, special mention

must be made of the importance of mutual co-operation and understanding/between the politicians and the bureaucrats. Bureaucrats must be sensitised. Importance of political change that has come about in India in the wake of its democratic constitution, is pointed out by S.K.Kannan in his work 'Political Change and Bureaucratic Change: a Dissertation submitted to the I.I.P.A. in 1979-80. On the other hand, unless politicians also co-operate with the bureaucrats, substantial changes cannot be effected by the bureaucrats, as pointed out by Kuldeep Mathur in his work 'Bureaucracy and the New Agricultural Set-up', Concept Publishing Co., New Delhi, 1982. In China, for instance, proper relationship between bureaucrats and politicians ensures meaningful co-operation and contributes effectively to developmental activity: (Harry Harding, 'Organising China', Problem of Bureaucracy', 1949-76, Stanford University Press, California, 1981). As mentioned by Bhambri, collusion between politicians, ruling elite and bureaucrats would also undermine the efficacy of bureaucracy in respect of their contribution to development and similarly if there is undue domination ~~in the hands of~~ by the politicians, even then, the efficacy of bureaucracy would be reduced, as already pointed out by Mutalik, A proper

feed-back and co-operation between bureaucracy, politicians and the people is a must for ensuring programmes and policies of development. Thus a triangular/interaction is necessitated which becomes an important component of the theory of bureaucracy in the context of development.

Social Background and Culture of Bureaucracy

It is a common sense of Sociology to refer to the importance of one's place in social hierarchy in analysing one's performance and particularly one's ability to relate particularly to common people. As mentioned time and again, the classical theory of bureaucracy has been already modified in the sense that bureaucrats have now to work with the people and not only arbitrarily. It has also been pointed out that the level at which bureaucrat has to function has assumed cardinal importance in the light of the kind job he or she is expected to perform and also the quantity and quality of interaction he or she has to enter into with his or her clients on day-to-day basis. It is but natural to attach importance to the social background of bureaucrats which would influence their functioning. C.P.Bhambri for instance, has adversely commented upon in " Socio-Economic Background, Attitude and Role of the Higher Echelons of the Indian Bureaucracy ". However, there are various other scholars who have brought out, in the first place, lack of homogeneity in bureaucracy and its personnel and parti-

cularly, the acceptance of new cultural values of participation and interaction with the people so as to ensure the goal of development, reflected in the behavioural level. Thus, Pai Panandikar and others have already forcefully brought out the resulting hiatus between the structure and behaviour (culture of bureaucracy) Rohit Dave, in his Article " Bureaucratization of Power " Commerce, Vol. 141, No. 3619, Nov.1,1980, p.837, suggests the hidden power of bureaucracy which is not fully realised, although several field studies present a different picture. The hiatus referred to, between the structure and behaviour does not diminish the importance of rules and regulations and conventions for the effective functioning of the bureaucratic structure even in the context of development, as pointed out by Venkatasubramanian A.K. " Appropriate Administrative Ideology for Democracy and Development " Indian Journal of Public Administration, 28(2), April-June 1982, p.322-333. Even while emphasizing some of the structural characteristics of bureaucracy, there is a continuing emphasis on modifying and changing its behaviour and culture in an appropriate fashion.

Bureaucracy and Socialist System : As very rightly emphasized by Weber, in a complex society which is industrially and technologically developed, needs to be

managed by a well-trained bureaucracy irrespective of its being a capitalist or a socialist society. Several studies of the functioning of the bureaucracy in socialist societies have proved to the hilt the prophetic observation of Max Weber. Thus, instead of doing away with bureaucracy, socialist societies certainly depend a great deal on active participation in performing developmental tasks. Ofcourse, as already pointed out in a socialist society, twin goals of economic and social transformation are simultaneously emphasized, in fact to the extent that either of them gets neglected, it poses a threat to the very socialist system. The Statism, as already indicated, means responsibility for administering development and as such a great reliance is placed on bureaucracy. In her book on "Bureaucracy and Democracy", Eva Halevi, ⁴⁸ points out the supreme importance of political power even if private ownership of the means of production and property have been dispensed with, because the State elites act in their own interest, specially those of maintaining and augmenting their own power. While commenting upon the contradiction between western democracy and the utilisation of bureaucracy, the author also points out that even under a socialist system, without active pressure of citizens, bureaucracy tends to play

a very dominating role in collusion with the politicians. The bureaucracy is universally important and applicable for attaining the goals of development in particular. Extension of bureaucratic values even in the field of education has been commented upon by some scholars. In his book, " Bureaucracy and Technocracy in the Socialist Countries ", Serge Mallet ^{no} refers to the inevitable consequences brought about by technocratic state ~~of~~ capitalism as exemplified by Soviet Russia. Thus, it is mentioned that technocracy in socialist countries tends to be as meritocratic as in western countries and distances itself from the common people by denying the workers access to economic management itself. In my study of Soviet society (Social Differentiation and Differentiation in Emoluments, 1955), ^{2848 43} I have also pointed out various differentials of income, status and power prevailing in Soviet Russia. As already pointed out ^{, any} ~~in~~-congruence between the political and the economic base is responsible for the process of distancing the bureaucratic technocratic elites from the common citizens. Thus, reliance on utilisation of bureaucratic and technocratic personnel for furthering the process of development is as much a feature of socialist society, as that of any other pattern of society. Moreover, the elitisation of bureaucracy and technocracy is

also both a fact and a very viable possibility.
Therefore, whatever the model of development, the
importance of bureaucracy and, therefore, the necessity
to evolve and modify continuously appropriate theory
of bureaucracy cannot be under-emphasized.

Chapter V

Resume of the Theory

The classical model of bureaucracy as presented by Max Weber and several modifications suggested to the same by Merton¹, Blau², Crozier³ and others have been taken due note of in the foregoing. However, when bureaucracy is used as a major instrument of administering change and development, important modifications to the classical theory become very necessary, as also reflected in the works of Merton, Blau and Crozier. The subject of development bureaucracy came into focus when a large number of developmental programmes were initiated by the Government of India after independence. A major change in the study of bureaucracy of rural area was also introduced when Community Development Programme was launched in 1952. Literature on this theme was generated only after 1960. Pai-Panandikar⁴ in 1964 observed that to meet the developmental objectives, the structural organisational and behavioural elements may have to be carefully assessed, measured and incorporated in the administrative set up. He had very correctly emphasized the necessity of distinction between the structural and the behavioural level and as such suggested certain important concepts as additions to the Weberian theory

of bureaucracy. Following his effort, many writings appeared : Bhalerao ⁵ 1960, Dean ⁶ 1963, Rieger ⁷ 1967, Dube ⁸ 1966, which observed that structures and ethos of bureaucracy are suited more for maintenance of law and order than for massive nation building, and that its ~~responsibility~~ to the emerging milieu has been beset with organizational incompetence, psychological resistance and value conflicts. Recently, Kartinel ⁹ 1981, Jain ¹⁰ 1982, Bhattacharya ¹¹ 1979, Mathur ¹² 1982, Chaturvedi ¹³ 1977, Aurora ¹⁴ 1980, Avasthi ¹⁵ 1976, Syffon ¹⁶ 1966, Deyl ¹⁷ 1978, Roukel ¹⁸ 1969, Pai ¹⁹ Panandikar 1983 etc., have carefully examined the role of bureaucracy in the implementation of developmental programmes in different parts of the world. They note that in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, bureaucracy remained largely unresponsive, even unaware of the aspirations of the poor. They however argued that the failure of developmental programmes can be attributed to conventional bureaucratic structures and procedures. These studies, by and large indicated the weakness of the bureaucratic system, but at the same time suggest ways and means to design a more filtration and effective system of implementation of developmental programmes.

Bureaucratic Adaptation : Even though it is customary to describe bureaucracy as an immovable colossus, there is no doubt that over the years, and particularly in the context of various development programmes undertaken by the Government of India, it has shown resilience, adaptability as well as flexibility which has also been pointed out particularly by Pai-Panandikar, Jain, Chaturvedi and others. Ofcourse, it must be remembered that bureaucracy, as mentioned time and again, is not a homogeneous entity but exists functionally at different levels necessitating participation, involvement and working with the people. Even those like Bhambri, Yats, Kannan, Kramner who have otherwise criticised the functioning of bureaucracy particularly on the basis of ~~the~~ ^{its} elitist character, ~~bureaucracy~~ have offered suggestions as to how to make it more responsive, useful and creative. Everyone of these critics have emphasized the participatory style of bureaucracy, of which evidence has been produced in the various writings referred to in the earlier chapters. The ruler's imperative is to maintain their power and as such they have atleast ^{to} ensure a good measure of performance for which they have to depend on bureaucracy or rather they have to depend on ^{both the efficiency and with} ~~bureaucracy~~ ^{guidance}. In fact, even in socialist States, considerable reliance

is placed on effective role played by bureaucracy in administering economic, socio-cultural transformation. We have already noted as to how several empirical studies have concerned themselves with attitudes, values, ^{perceptions,} ~~perceptives,~~ orientations and behaviour of the people towards bureaucracy and vice-versa, because it is only on the basis of the responsiveness of bureaucracy that the success of the various developmental programmes hinges. It has also been already noted as to how there was a persistence of the hangover of colonial set-up in respect of the character and functioning of bureaucracy although as also pointed out, there have been various changes accruing in the so-called colonial set-up. There is also no denying the fact that any theory only provides a point of departure for any substantive empirical enquiry and the same holds good in the case of the theory of bureaucracy particularly when ^{the} State has undertaken the task of administering social, economic, scientific, technological and industrial transformation in a big way for which, it has to rely on the utilisation of bureaucrats.

✓ Bureaucracy and its Orientation to Change and development :

Leave aside the socialist centrally planned regimes, in all the new States and nations, there is a very emphatic

demand made on the bureaucrats to be prone to change and development in order to fulfil the aspirations of the people at large and ofcourse also of the ruling elite, who ultimately depend on people's satisfaction with the performance of the rulers. Mere popularity and charisma cannot carry the leaders for a very long period of time and as such we ^{they are} have called upon to acquit themselves satisfactorily sooner or later through their performance for which again they have to utilise administration -- bureaucracy at their command. New public administration seems to be more concerned with change--change designed to make government-bureaucracy more responsive to the environment -- than more traditional view that public administration should emphasize stable relationships with other political and social institutions. Thus, according to Krammer²⁴ " Perspectives of Public Bureaucracy " Winthrop Publishers Inc. Cambridge, Mass. U.S.A. 1975, 'bias of new public administration is the demand for flexibility in policy formulation and administration.' There has been a continuous emphasis on the social environment and its influence on the working of bureaucracy and as such inspite of adherence to the organisational theory, bureaucracy is not regarded as inevitably monolythic and stultifying but can make a prime contribution to pluralism and the open society. In the light

--of the changing demands and requirements, bureaucracy is required to adapt itself to the changing circumstances and modifying its structure, culture as well as personality. It is customary to refer to the dilemma of development inherent in the simultaneous insistence of stability as well as change. However, demand for change has gained upper hand over the demand for stability. As already pointed out, in the study of bureaucracy, it is necessary to be both a critic and scientist in order to be constructively helpful and perceptive enough to suggest modifications. Theory of organisation certainly raises the problem as to whether individual personalities can retain their independence in an organisational set-up. Yet there is no denying the fact that the changing environment certainly makes the demand even on the organisation man. We have already mentioned as to how organisational structures tend to be less stable in their functioning than what they are thought to be or particularly portrayed to be. Even in the most highly technologically developed societies which have more or less given autonomous status to technology, increasing reliance is placed on making organisations more flexible rather than immune to changes, increasing reliance on rationality and the capacity to modify according to the changing environment. There is no doubt that bureaucrats would certainly exert

influence on policy decisions. However, there is no denying the fact that bureaucracy will have to continuously evolve newer and newer equations with the rulers and will have to work in close co-operation with the politicians in order to become effective. On the other hand, if the bureaucrats have undue stake in power, it is bound to result in their conflict with politicians. Separation of the ownership of the means of production from the management can be looked upon as an example of the managerial technocratic supremacy and still the supremacy of the rulers cannot be wished away. If, on the other hand, bureaucrats and the rulers work in collusion, interests of the common people cannot be safeguarded. Therefore, if the State is answerable and accountable to the people, it will naturally try to control the functioning of its bureaucracy. As pointed out earlier, economic development and prosperity and seemingly obvious efforts to ensure distributive justice are the major functions of new bureaucracy. Ofcourse, there is no denying the fact that this delicate balance means considerable tension under which bureaucracy will have to function adding a new dimension to the theory of bureaucracy, which can be best expressed in terms of continuously moving equilibrium. This is not to suggest

uncertainty in the perception of goals of development on the part of bureaucracy, which would be certainly ruinous. As mentioned earlier, pressure by citizens would make bureaucracy more and more aware of the goals of development and the supreme necessity of attaining those goals. Thus, to-day, new bureaucracy requires both efficiency and democracy. What is required is homeostasis, because of which managerial systems (bureaucracy) will be able to restore its balance and strike a proper balance between continuity, stability and innovation as well as responsiveness to change. On the one hand, ~~radical~~ ^{revolutionary} change has to be avoided and on the other monopolisation of new projected services has to be checked effectively from time to time.

Dialectics between theory and Reality : Despite theory of bureaucracy particularly as it has been developed in the west and also tested in the west, it is very clear that there is a gap between theory and reality, even though it has been conceded practically by every author that utilisation of bureaucratic machinery is necessary for administering a complex society and particularly to ensure development in all its ramifications. As mentioned time and again, acceptance of democratic framework creates inevitable tension between bureaucracy and the political rulers. A fine balance has to be maintained between the two,

if the target of development viz., development of the common man is to be realistically attained. Similarly, in its day to-day functioning, bureaucratic organisation need not be unduly stable and stultifying. The objective of efficiency and fair-mindedness on the part of bureaucracy can also be an irritant both to the common man and particularly to the vested interests. It is here that political leaders can play a significant role ~~if~~ by (a) co-operating with the bureaucracy in its proper conduct and its responsibility and (b) by convincing people at large about the fair-mindedness as well as efficiency of the bureaucracy. On the other hand, if the politicians are selfish they would neither be able to enlist co-operation with the people nor allow bureaucracy to function in such ^a manner as to realise the objectives mentioned above. It is only by facilitating constructive tripartite relationship and interaction between politicians, bureaucrats and the people that objectives for which bureaucracy is being utilized for ensuring development, can be realised; otherwise there may be undue conflict between the bureaucrats and the politicians. If the Bureaucrats are subjected to undue pressures it would result in not only alienating bureaucrats from the politicians, but also from the people, since they would

not be allowed to discharge their duties in a fair-minded fashion. If new ideals are to be realised, it is necessary to ensure such a meaningful dialogue and co-operation between the three components. In this context, the sensitivity of bureaucracy to the changing circumstances and demands has to be ensured which means appropriate socialisation or re-socialisation. Similarly bureaucracy has to be made ostensively accountable.

Bureaucracy -- dominating or serving : It is customary to characterise bureaucracy as dominating and one of the circumstances, which makes it so, is weak and unprincipled politicians, who use bureaucracy for their personal aggrandizement. While there is no doubt that imperceptively, though, bureaucrats play a major role in policy formulation apart from its implementation, honest politicians and vigilant citizens can exercise a salutary influence on the bureaucrats. A mention has already been made about the inevitability, not to say advisability, of bureaucracy in any modern complex set of society, it has also been mentioned as to how even in socialist societies, by their collusion with politicians, bureaucrats and technocrats can play a very dominating role. It should not ever be forgotten that bureaucrats are public servants and as such are answerable to public

scrutiny and public wish, ^{as} Temptation of power has to be continuously controlled and for any reason public bureaucrats should not be allowed to be more powerful than they ought to be nor should they be over-autonomous. Ofcourse this can only be done by encouraging citizens parallel organisations to scrutinize and control their their behaviour. Absolutist political control as seen earlier would also corrupt the bureaucrats and render them unanswerable and unaccountable. The only way to prevent this is to scrupulously guard the process of the selection -- election of the politicians and simultaneously to encourage people's organisations to protest against any over-autonomous and the resulting autocratic behaviour particularly on the part of the bureaucrats and also on the part of the politicians.

Hurdles in the functioning of Bureaucracy : Several hurdles in the proper functioning of bureaucracy have been pointed out, such as their lack of awareness of the new ideals and tasks and the changing situation, insensitivity and indifference on their part as far as the working for the common and with the common is concerned, cumbersome procedures, rules and regulations, undue influence of politicians and their pressures, ^{lack of} ~~constructive~~ co-operation from the politicians to implement the

required changes, lack of ideological conviction, over-ambitious programmes and policies of development and unclear societal goals and political situation etc.

In short, to arrive at a meaningful and realistic theory of bureaucracy, positive and negative aspects have to be simultaneously considered and continuous and sustained efforts have to be made to realise the ideal of down-top administration so as to break the barriers of class elitism as well as vested interests.

Indian Experience, analysis and the emerging theory :

No matter whether a given technology or institutional mechanism is borrowed from some other country, yet it has to grow and develop in its own setting which affects its nature, structure as well as culture. This is particularly so in the case of ^{borrowing} ~~hauling~~ of institutional mechanisms like bureaucracy. While the classical theory of bureaucracy is mainly fashioned after Max Weber's seminal contribution, there is no denying the fact that bureaucracy takes peculiar shape and turn according to the environment in which it functions. Ofcourse, as already mentioned, in India, much before the British rule, there was a well developed system of bureaucratic administration, although it tended to be more personal than impersonal and did not emphasize the aspect of training education, not to say rationality, as was done in the west. Nevertheless,

there was a continuing tradition of bureaucratic administration in India on which was superimposed the western bureaucratic tradition by the British rulers, mainly for their own ends and interests, which lent ^a certain degree of homogeneity to administering country through bureaucracy. Ofcourse, it has also been noted as to how during pre-independence period, bureaucracy in India was mainly concerned with maintenance of law and order. After attainment of political independence, there has been a sea-change in respect of the task the bureaucracy should handle and the goals and aims and targets it is expected to meet -- transformation of Indian society by ensuring economic prosperity, industrial, scientific and technological development, social reconstruction, distributive justice and so on. Attention has been mainly focussed on the role of State administration in initiating maintaining and furthering the process of development. It further means that bureaucracy as an instrument of development should no longer be static but dynamic --change oriented, change prone. This demand calls for a change in the theory of bureaucracy if it has to function effectively as an effective and efficient agent of development. Here effectiveness and efficiency is not to be measured only in economic and quantitative terms

but even more so in terms of the modification of the socio-political, cultural fabric in such a matter, as to provide basic minimum amenities and facilities for development of the common man -- deprived and disprivileged sections of society. It is precisely here that there is a considerable addition to the role and function of bureaucracy in the sense of the tremendous demand made on evolving a new personality type, a new culture of bureaucracy as well as a new culture of democracy so as to be able to meet these demands. The constitution of India is that of ^{realising a} dream society, which will be economically developed and prosperous, socially just and secular as well as ensuring freedom of various types to everyone. Naturally, this has set a very high target for achievement particularly by the bureaucracy, since people's expectations have been considerably aroused and as such bureaucracy has to be very responsive ^{to the} Ideas and thinking of the people at large.

Therefore, several scholars have devoted their thinking to the understanding and analysis of development administration -- bureaucracy both from the point of knowing reality in its operation and to make positive

suggestions for the improvement of its functioning, as well as to suggest modifications to the traditional¹ classical theory of bureaucracy. We have already seen numerous suggestions made by scholars on the basis of their empirical studies to improve the functioning of bureaucracy so as to be effective in meeting the targets of development. Similarly, important suggestions have been made in respect of conceptual framework and appropriate modifications in the theory of bureaucracy. First and foremost, ~~of~~ utmost importance has been accorded to efficiency and results. Secondly, the goal of State -- Statism in unleashing bureaucratic machinery to realise goal of development has also been not only well documented but considerably emphasized as ^{an} extremely important variable for the theory of bureaucracy. A very significant distinction has been made between the structure of bureaucracy, which ~~prima-~~ facie continues to conform to the Weberian classical model and yet in terms of its behaviour and culture is quite different from the classical model, which in its turn also means modifications in its structure. This has been brought out practically in all the studies either explicitly or implicitly. Value orientation of bureaucrats also no longer conform to the traditional model but have meant acceptance of new values

of development, proneness to change and acceptance of cardinal importance of people's participation and co-operation. This in its turn means significant change in the personality and culture of bureaucracy which also has changed ^{the} reaction ^{and} of the modification of structure of bureaucracy in its actual functioning. Then again, bureaucracy is no longer looked upon as ^a homogeneous phenomenon, but something which has to be differentiated on the basis of the level at which it operates. It has been already mentioned as to how technical competence, higher education, higher status enables bureaucrats to deviate from time-honoured rules, regulations, not to say restrictions, and to continuously resort to innovative practices. In every sense of the term, operating at the field level, bureaucracy has to be much more ^{perceptive, sensitive to} ~~perceptive and~~ sensitive of the reality. After independence, the political leaders and particularly ruling party has come to occupy a very important position and role and are expected to promote the process of development by keeping proper check on the functioning of bureaucracy and by ensuring people's participation in the process of development. The tripartite interaction between bureaucracy, polity

and people is a significant addition to the theory of bureaucracy, in consonance with those types of interaction. Significant departures have to be made in the process and patterns of communication both within the bureaucracy and between bureaucracy and polity and between bureaucracy and the people. The importance of two-way communication and the continuous feed-back has been brought out again and again which also is an important contribution to the theory. What is most important is the necessity of continuous evaluation of functioning of bureaucracy and its changing relationship with polity and the people and the reformulation necessitated in the concepts of theory of bureaucracy from time to time. Thus, bureaucratic phenomenon is to-day regarded or atleast accepted to be dynamic rather than static. The necessity of re-organising the structure of bureaucracy and to ensure inter-departmental, inter-ministerial, inter-State and Union co-operation has been reiterated. While emphasizing the importance of rationality and efficiency, there is a simultaneous demand made of the utilisation of rationality and efficiency towards public cause i.e. development of the common man. Some of the field studies have also brought out the fact that because of the novelty of the bureaucracy operating at the grass-root level, it could acquire a certain degree of freedom from constraints, since rules and

regulations have not been formulated. Higher status, as mentioned above, has also facilitated introduction of pattern of flexibility. Similarly, dysjunction between structural and behavioural aspects of bureaucracy has also meant change. Thus, ^{the unaccepting ability} ~~no appealing effect~~ of a well-developed and alert leadership making continuous demands on the bureaucracy to increase its effectiveness and the efficiency, which fetch significantly better results is also note-worthy and can be regarded as an important concept. Ofcourse, undue emphasis on attaining results and meeting targets would atleast in the short run mean neglect of weaker section which has been again brought out. In this sense also, the concept of neutrality of bureaucracy tends to be unrealistic. A highly awakened sense of self-respect on the part of the common people can only be ensured by a well-developed tradition of social, political and voluntary organisations which again has been brought out in comparative studies of the functioning of the bureaucracy. The impact of external environment is as important as the system from within, which again brings out the necessity of continuously re-examining and reformulating the relationship and interaction ^{✓ 194271.} between bureaucracy, polity and the people. This can also be considered as an important addition to the conceptual framework. Even in the context of

socialist societies, if, for any reason, there were to occur a collusion between the bureaucrats and the political rulers, bureaucracy would cease to be an effective agent of development particularly from the point of view of distributive justice and even social reconstruction.

This is all the more likely to happen to ^athe country which has accepted democratic framework and this also must be regarded as important addition to the conceptual framework.

All in all, effort of this particular study has been to take cognisance of the theory of bureaucracy both in its classical form and the modifications suggested to it by various scholars like Merton, Blau, ~~Grozier~~, in the light of changing situation. After taking due note of such modifications, our attention has been ^{mainly} focussed on the understanding and the analysis of functioning of bureaucracy in India in the post-independence period and the emerging picture both in terms of reality and the necessary modifications in the conceptual framework and theory. As mentioned earlier, a very significant departure from the classical model is reflected in the clearcut differentiation between structural, behavioural and cultural dimensions of bureaucracy, as it is used for developmental purpose in India. The logic of situation and its crucial

significance has been also brought out again and again which means continuous reappraisal of the functioning of bureaucracy as related and the consequent need for the reappraisal of theory of bureaucracy from time to time. It is certainly heartening that Indian scholars have addressed themselves to this task whether with the avowed purpose of testing the theory or not. In fact, even without avowedly trying to test a given theory considerable food for thought in the shape of concepts and reformulations has been generated.

