

**CHANGING CONTOURS OF BUREAUCRATIC PERSONALITY
IN INDIA : A SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY**

*Dissertation Submitted to the Jawaharlal Nehru University
in fulfillment of the requirements for the
award of the Degree of*

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

MANISH KUMAR JHA



**CENTRE FOR STUDY OF SOCIAL SYSTEMS
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI – 110067**

INDIA

2004



जवाहरलाल नेहरू विश्वविद्यालय
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI 110 067

Centre for the Study of Social Systems
School of Social Sciences

21st July, 2004

Certificate

This is to certify that the dissertation entitled “**CHANGING CONTOURS OF BUREAUCRATIC PERSONALITY IN INDIA : A SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY**” submitted by Manish Kumar Jha in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Philosophy of this University, has not been previously submitted for the reward of any degree to this or any other University. This is a bonafide work.

We recommend this dissertation to be placed before the examiners for evaluation.

Prof. Anand Kumar
CHAIRPERSON

Dr. Avijit Pathak
SUPERVISOR

PREFACE

In an 'organization society' it is difficult to remain indifferent or immune to the world of bureaucracy. It inspires awe, and it also invites contempt. We might hate it or admire it but we can't ignore it. Every one of us, at one point or the other, in our life, has been at the receiving end of the highhandedness of bureaucracy. The bureaucrat sitting on the other side of the table has always intrigued me. Apart from looking at him as a cog in the vast hierarchical structure, I have also viewed him, always, as a part of the system that exists and operates within the society. I don't believe that they are a 'species' different from us, living in their own world, that is far removed from our society.

My interest is principally in the personality make-up of the bureaucrat. I want to know that how does he feel to be the part of the system that is considered to be an established failure. How it feels to be the favourite 'whipping boys', being accused of, all the ills that exist in the country today. How do they view their career, the challenges and opportunities associated with it in the changing context of liberalization and globalization. How Indian is he actually, in his thinking and spirit. These are the issues and questions with which I went to the field for this dissertation.

The idea of this dissertation came, almost in flash, while I was attending a seminar presented by Professor Yogendra Singh. In the seminar he urged the young researchers to find out "how young talents, coming fresh from universities, with full of ideas and innovative thinking, values and principles, get jinxed and fail to deliver after they enter into the system". This dissertation owes a lot to him for seeing the light of the day. The course on Society, Culture and Personality also helped me a great deal in giving definite shape to my ideas. A visit to the academy was definitely handy in giving me new insights into the world of bureaucrats.

Writing this dissertation has been a learning process. And the process has been by and large a smooth one, thanks to the patient, relaxed and yet methodical approach of my guide and ‘guru’ Dr. Avijit Pathak. His dialogic and reflexive approach to teaching reminds me of the ‘*guru tradition*’ which is gradually fading away from the academia. He has always encouraged me to reflect upon the issues sociologically and have faith in my thinking and belief. I have learnt from him that essence of intellectual pursuit is simplicity, humility and innocence. I will remain indebted to my *guru* for teaching me certain basic values of life.

This dissertation is a tribute to my father’s unflinching and unwavering faith in my abilities, even at those times, when I have found myself wanting. My mother’s courage has given me the strength to face adversities in life with aplomb. I also owe a lot to my brothers – my loving ‘Bhaiya’ and dear ‘Tinku’ for their encouraging support in all my endeavors.

Words fail me to express my gratitude and thanks for Amrita. Her involved interest and knowledge about ‘The Men Who Ruled India’ has helped me a great deal in refining my ideas and thinking on the subject. She has been there, helping me in all possible ways, despite being under pressure to meet her own obligations.

I am also thankful to all the IAS officers and probationers who took their valuable time out to talk to me and share their ideas, thinking and feelings, despite being busy with their job. I cannot thank less to all my friends – Preeti, Shreeniwas, Shishir, Deepu, Newmei and Sudhanshu, for having helped me in their own ways in the course of the dissertation.

Manish Kumar Jha

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1-12
1. SOCIAL TRAJECTORY OF BUREAUCRACY	13-56
1.1 Bureaucracy : Its History and Evolution	13
1.2 Democracy and Bureaucratic Norms : Universality and Neutrality	24
1.3 Bureaucracy, 'Expertized' Knowledge and Technocracy,	31
1.4 Making Sense of Bureaucratic Structure	35
1.5 Understanding Bureaucratic Personality	45
2. Bureaucratic Personality in India : A Socio- Historical Perspective	57-93
2.1 Colonialism and Domination : Racial – Cultural Superiority	57
2.2 Colonial Bureaucrat : Domination, Distance and Alienation	66
2.3 Sociology of Indian Civil Service	75
2.4 Independent India : Spirit of Decolonization; Redefining Bureaucracy	81
2.5 Recruitment and Training	85
3 Bureaucracy as Lived Experience : Select Biographies	94-130
3.1 Life History of Select Bureaucrats	94
i) <i>Honesty is his forte</i>	95
ii) <i>Beginning a new life through Civil Services</i>	99
iii) <i>Building a responsive Civil Service</i>	103
iv) <i>Delivering things is my priority</i>	105
v) <i>An Edifice of Integrity and Sincerity</i>	106
vi) <i>We are no longer the 'Sahib'</i>	108
vii) <i>Idealism in the 'chosen one'</i>	111
viii) <i>This Professional is here to Serve</i>	114
ix) <i>Performing a man's job with élan</i>	117
x) <i>Scaling heights with perseverance</i>	119
3.2 Lived Experience at the Academy	122
3.3 Reflecting upon the findings	124
Conclusion	131-139
Bibliography	140-147

Introduction

The ubiquitous presence and penetrating scope of bureaucracy- right from the cradle to the grave- amazes, baffles and intrigues every one of us in our day-to-day existence. Its pervading power has always been an issue of debate in public discourse since the last century. While the political approach towards bureaucracy concentrates on state and the power structure associated with it, the sociological approach situates bureaucracy as well as state in a wider context of the society.

Pioneered by Max Weber, sociological approach sees bureaucracy as a form of organization in modern industrial society. Organisations have become a dominant feature of this society. Every activity of our life - birth, child - rearing, education, play, work, worship etc. – takes place in an organizational setting. Organizations with clearly defined roles and goals co-ordinate and direct the specialized division of labour in industrial society. Such direction requires rules, regulations, hierarchy and authority and in this way a particular form of organization- bureaucracy gets formed.

Defining bureaucracy has never been an easy task. Lack of conceptual clarity and strong emotive, pejorative overtones and elusive connotations associated with it have always made the task of defining bureaucracy fraught with danger. Even the pioneer in the study of bureaucracy did not take the risk of defining it. He just enumerated the elements of 'ideal type'¹ bureaucracy. But for a common understanding one can safely say that "Bureaucracy means a centrally directed, systematically organized and hierarchically structured staff devoted to the regular, routine and efficient carrying out of large scale administrative tasks".²

Rule-orientation, functional-specialization, hierarchy, impersonality, centralized system of control and discipline - these are the characteristic features

¹ For the model of ideal type bureaucracy see Weber, M. (1947), *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Translated by A.N. Handerson & T. Parsons, New York : Free Press.

² Kamenka, E. (1989), *Bureaucracy*, Oxford : Basil Blackwel Ltd., p. 1.

that one associates with it. Going beyond the technical and theoretical perspective, the popular notion of bureaucracy sees it as red-tapism, dilatory, fetish to rules and norms, reluctance to take decisions. The pejorative connotation and exaggeration notwithstanding, there is an element of truth in it.

Sociological understanding of bureaucracy is rooted in the organizational theory. No organization exists in a vacuum. Elaborate structures of organizations are embedded in socio-political environment of the society. In order to understand any form of organisation, it has to be situated in the wider societal context and this is true for the understanding of bureaucracy as well. The prevalent cultural ethos, human attitudes and relationships - all these have a bearing on the functioning of bureaucracy. This takes our attention away from the structure to the context in which the structure operates and the interface between the structure and the context.

Apart from the societal context, the functioning of the organization also depends upon the people who man the organization. The credit to shift the focus from the organization to the man in organization goes to the **Human Relations School**.³ This approach talked about the 'social needs' such as friendship, group-support, acceptance, approval, recognition which ought to be fulfilled, so that the worker could contribute effectively and fruitfully. It also talked about the development of individual's talents, creativity and personality in order to enhance his level of participation for the benefit of both.

In the field of study of bureaucracy, it was Robert Merton who first dealt with the interface between the structure and the individual in the bureaucracy and the way it affects the individual's personality. He pointed out that human attitudes and relationships can't be ignored altogether in bureaucracy. He explained that certain norms like impersonality might come in conflict when the bureaucrat tries

³ This approach talks about the influence of socio-psycho. Factors on work situation. It draws attention towards informal work-group in formal organizations. For details see Henry, N. (1975), *Public Administration and Public Affairs*, Prentice-Hall, p. 43-45.

to address the needs of the citizens and this might render him inefficient. It might lead to friction between officials and public, giving the former a bad image of not being efficient. Pioneering the idea of bureaucratic personality in an unambiguous way, he put forward the view that the logic of work in a bureaucratic organization fosters or perhaps creates a typical disposition which an individual might not be born with. An individual's work role becomes so important that the experiences, feelings, ideas, and traits he acquires in his capacity as an official of the organization also begin to predispose him in certain typical ways in his other social roles. Excessive rule-orientation, conformist, hierarchical, disciplined status-quoist, impersonal, aloof, haughty, arrogant, abrupt - these are certain personality traits that he associates with a typical bureaucrat under the influence of certain aspects of organizational life.

This dissertation is an attempt to understand such a bureaucratic personality. Does there exist a bureaucratic personality in such manner as Merton talks about it? First of all, it is important to be conceptually clear about the term 'personality' in the context of this study. By personality, one means attitudinal dispositions which determine one's behaviour and constitute an organized reality. In sociological terms, personality relates not to the psychology of an individual but to the embedded individual as a member of society, belonging to social groups and in social relationship with others. It refers to a disposition that pertains to a collectivity.

As Talcott Parsons puts it, personality system is embedded and integrated into the social system by the mechanisms of socialization and social control involving role-expectations and interpersonal gestures and sanctions.⁴ Hence, any study of personality can't be dissociated from with the societal context which greatly determines its formation. Hence this dissertation tries to understand the bureaucratic personality within the framework of Indian society.

⁴ Parsons, T. (1951), *The Social System*, New York : Free Press.

The dissertation tries to trace the changing contours of bureaucratic personality in India. The study tries to track the social history of the Indian bureaucrat. Once in an interview, the then Prime Minister of India, Indira Gandhi was asked by the famous novelist Barbara Cartland, “what you think is the most important contribution of the Britishers to India”? Pat came the reply from Mrs. Gandhi “Indian Civil Services! Without which we couldn’t have run the government successfully”. Even as one tries to unravel the bureaucratic personality in India, one can’t overlook the colonial legacy that laid the seed of modern bureaucratic culture in India and also shaped the personality-structure of the Indian bureaucrats initially when they got entry into the civil services during colonial rule.

Even as one acknowledges the colonial legacy of the civil service, the inheritance that has been passed on to the bureaucrats of the independent India, one is bound to ask whether they have been able to shed the relics of colonial legacy and have evolved into an Indian character anchored in the socio-cultural ethos, the expectations and aspirations of its people in a newly independent decolonized sovereign republic. The dissertation tries to find out how Indian actually is the Indian Civil Services and the Indian bureaucrat?

Any attempt to find out the ‘indianness’ of the Indian bureaucrat must start with situating itself in the agenda of post-independent India. At the time of Independence, there was a general anxiety among the political leaders about the nature and character of the Indian Civil Services which was rooted firmly in its colonial inheritance. As the leaders set about the task of Nation-building, based on the ideals invoked in the preamble of the constitution to constitute India into a sovereign democratic republic and to secure for all its citizens socio-economic and political justice and to provide them equality of status and opportunity, the administrative structure of India in the form of civil service posed before them a dilemma of inheritance.

On the one hand, they were not sure whether these civil servants inherited by the independent India would be able to shed their colonial character and the relics of past colonial heritage, and on the other but they also knew very well that in order to bring large scale economic and social change, their skill and expertise was *sine qua non*. Therefore, despite the hesitation and skepticism, they had to be made partners in the dream of nation-building. They had to be entrusted with the responsibility of steering India along a new path of development and progress.

But for this the least that was expected and needed to be done, was to 'decolonize' the character and spirit of Indian bureaucrat. The indianization of civil services was deemed as the prime agenda of the independent India. How far this agenda has been successful? Right from the recruitment to the mode of training and the style of its functioning; in its attitude and thinking- how much has the Indian bureaucrat changed in these regards. Does the old notion of 'saheb' and 'mai bap', wielding enormous influence and eliciting complete reverence, still exist among the civil servants of independent India today? This dissertation is an earnest attempt to find answer to some of these questions.

Talking about the change in the character of bureaucratic personality in India takes us to the question of socio-economic background of civil servants in our country. The elitist, exclusivist and status-quoist character of civil services in colonial period and much of the early part of post-independence period ensured that people belonging to high class and upper caste with convent education and social sophistication could only enter into the civil services which further perpetuated its elitist character. There has been some serious efforts on the part of Indian government to of alter this elitist background of Indian bureaucracy. The implementation of Kothari Committee report (1976) has played a great role in levelling the arena. It sought to alter the recruitment pattern by giving the candidates a choice to write the mains examination in any language mentioned in the eight schedule of the constitution or in English. Making the writing of exam-

papers in English as optional, it ensured that candidates not belonging to 'convent background' could also aspire to enter into the civil services despite being weak in the language gifted to us by our colonial masters. Subsequently Satish Chandra committee report (1989) was also an attempt to give wider representation to people in the services.

Now the question arises whether all these noble intentions have paid off or not? The study wishes to find out whether there has been any change in the background profile of civil services? And if yes, how it has changed the character of bureaucratic personality? The study tries to address some basic questions like-

- How does a civil servant belonging to a humble background feel while interacting with the 'elites' within the services?
- How do civil servants cope-up reciprocally with the changing character of new recruits?
- Does there exist any 'elite-circle' within the elites?

The study wishes to explore the interaction pattern and the sub-group culture that exists within bureaucracy.

Another area of enquiry that the dissertation attempts to address is the notion of power and authority that is so integrally entailed with bureaucracy.

How the bureaucrat engages with the notion of power along with certain features of bureaucracy like hierarchy and command forms on important focus of the study. One would like to know-

- What is the nature of this power?
- How does the rational, legal authority enjoyed by the bureaucrat by virtue of his official position get transformed into the personalised sense of power? How it has impacted his personality?

- For a bureaucrat, what is the meaning and character of this power? Is there any shift in the power-axis in the changing socio-political situation in India?

Personality-structure depends a great deal on the role-perception. In an organizational set-up, the way an individual perceives his role has a considerable impact on his personality. One's behavioural disposition towards one's job depends a great deal on how it is perceived and evaluated by an individual or a group. How does a bureaucrat think about his role and status in the society? This question assumes greater importance in the changing context of politics and economics of Indian society. As the process of liberalization, privatization and globalization catches up and people are talking about 'nailing-in' bureaucracy, reducing its size, power and clout, how does the bureaucrat respond to such changed perception about his role and how does it affect his personality. These are some critical issues the dissertation wishes to raise.

The interface between bureaucratic culture and bureaucratic personality forms another focus area of the study. All of us would agree that the make-up of personality depends a great deal upon the culture and society in which it has been nurtured. Bureaucratic personality in India, also, in its conception and evolution, must have been moulded greatly by the bureaucratic culture and societal values which pervade in India. This interface needs to be studied in detail.

As bureaucratic culture forms a sub-set of political culture, the issue gets directed towards examining the pattern of interaction between the administrators and the socio-political environment in which they operate. This in turn also takes our attention to the relation between the bureaucrat and the political leaders in the prevailing political milieu. Tracing through history, the study proposes to see the way this relation has evolved and changed through these years. Does a civil servant feel motivated enough to serve efficiently in the prevailing bureaucratic culture in India?

In this context only, the interaction between bureaucrat and citizen; his engagement with people and his participation in wider civil society - these are the issues the study would attempt to address.

Relevance of the Study:

In the 21st century, the era of globalization, the bureaucracy finds itself at the crossroads as the meaning of governance and administration is witnessing a change. The expectations and aspirations of citizens across the world are changing and accordingly bureaucracy is expected to re-orient itself in terms of structure, process as well as behavioural attitude. With the upsurge of global-liberal economies in greater part of the world, 'good-governance', 'citizen-charter', 'entrepreneurial government' - all these have become the buzz-words acting as propellants of change in the bureaucratic world.

In such a changing global scenario, in terms of geo-political and socio-economic reality, a study dealing with bureaucratic personality assumes importance in order to find out whether the Indian bureaucracy, the civil servants in particular, is competent in its attitudinal disposition to take up the challenge which new facets of administration and governance are throwing up.

The study also becomes relevant as it takes a departure from the general focus, which normally has been on the bureaucratic structure and process. The study shifts the focus on to the bureaucrat - the man who matters the most in the system. It makes an attempt to look into the 'inner world', the social psyche of the bureaucrat. It is the study about the bureaucrat in the bureaucracy.

Methodology

While studying the bureaucratic personality, the following methods have been used.

- i) **Observation :-** In this study principally non-participant observation was resorted to for collecting the data. A visit was made to the Academy as well as various government offices to observe how these civil servants function and behave in general, with people as well as amongst themselves. In the Academy, activities like seminar, presentations and interactive sessions were observed at close quarters. Leisure activities like having lunch in the mess and playing chess, table-tennis, playing guitar, piano – all these were observed at close quarters.
- ii) **Interactive Interviews :-** This formed the principal source of data collection. Views of bureaucrats on various issues like training, group-culture, relations with politicians, service-experience, corruption, changing profile, status and role were elicited. It was a blend of structured interview as well as freewheeling talk. While most of the interviews were conducted at the Academy with the newly recruit trainees coming to the Academy after or the job training and officers with 15-16 yrs. of job experience who were there on mid-career training, some interviews were also conducted in Delhi in various govt. offices.
- iii) **Case-studies :-** Life histories of 10 subjects were randomly selected to be presented as case studies of them were selected as subjects for case-study. Their socio-economic background was found; detailed interview was conducted with them and their various activities were observed at close-quarters.
- iv) **Secondary Resources :-** To make oneself aware of the recent issues and trends, to find out the historical trajectory of bureaucracy and Indian bureaucrats in particular, and to get a clear-cut theoretical perspective on the subject, secondary resources were used. Various books, journals, reports, articles were referred to in the course of study.

Limitations of the Study:

It is important to acknowledge the limitations of the study so that it can be seen in a proper light. To start with, very easily an objection can be raised about the fact that in the entire course of study, the bureaucracy in India has been equated with the All-India Civil Services and Central Services. State-Services have been kept out of the ambit of study. When asked, a bureaucrat pointed out very aptly- "which bureaucratic personality you are talking about? Even a clerk, the peon is also a bureaucrat". Naturally the personality of a clerk differs vastly from the personality of an IAS despite being the part of the same structure. But the study limits the enquiry of bureaucratic personality to the civil servants belonging to the IAS, IPS, and some other Central Services. Two considerations went in adopting such a strategy. One was to make the study manageable in its canvas and scope; to maintain some sort of unity in gathering the data. It also came from the belief that they, being at the top, are the principal determinants of the character of Indian bureaucracy, the attitude it adopts towards issues concerning our society is going to be determined greatly by these officials at the top only.

Another limitation of the study is the number of interviewees approached for the study. Altogether some 20-25 officials were approached, with some giving scattered views on few issues here and there. Detailed interviews were conducted with some 10-12 civil servants of various services out of which majority became the subjects of case-studies.

Eliciting an honest, true and forthcoming response from the top echelons of bureaucracy hasn't been easy. Here, one remembers Malinowsky who brought out the difficulties in field-studies explaining that there is a difference between i) What people think, ii) What people do and iii) what they think they do.

One also can't deny completely that at times, the analysis, views or observations wont have been coloured by a bit of favourable attitude towards the bureaucrat. Looking at their world at such close quarters, through their own eyes and spending considerable time with them might have caused such a flaw.

Structure of the Dissertation: The Chapters

The entire dissertation has been accommodated and structured in 3 chapters.

Chapter I : Social Trajectory of Bureaucracy

This chapter carries a theoretical perspective on bureaucracy and bureaucratic personality. Establishing that bureaucracy simply as a form of administration has been there since ancient times, the chapter focusses on the new notion of bureaucracy in the context of modern industrial society. It goes on to deal with emerging bureaucratic norms relating it with the context of democracy. Further, an attempt has been made to understand the bureaucratic structure and personality. Then the interface between bureaucracy, people and politics has been dealt with. In the end, it tries to bring out the inherent contradiction of between bureaucracy and technocracy.

Chapter II: Bureaucratic Personality in India : A Socio - Historical Perspective

To start with, the chapter deals with racial- cultural logic of domination in colonial India and its impact on Indian psyche. Then it tries to bring out the personality traits of colonial bureaucrats in a colonized country. The central focus of the chapter is taken by sociology of Indian civil service. Dealing with the agenda of decolonization in independent India, it tries to bring out the changing aspirations and expectations of people from the Indian bureaucrat. Through the study of reports and documents, it tries to evaluate the indianization of Indian Civil Service.

Chapter III: Bureaucracy as Lived Experience: Select Biographies

This chapter talks about the experience at the Academy. It tries to reflect on certain things like socio-economic background, service experience, training programme, sub-group culture, power, authority and engagement with people in order to assess how much the agenda of decolonization has been achieved.

The dissertation concludes with the analysis of the image of Indian bureaucratic personality that comes out through case-studies and the course of study.

Chapter – I

SOCIAL TRAJECTORY OF BUREAUCRACY

This chapter begins with an attempt to trace the socio-historical antecedents of bureaucracy. Certain features of modern day bureaucracy can be seen even in ancient administration as well, but there are some essential differences between the two. The chapter tries to bring out that difference in the context of modernity and industrial society. This section also deals with the evolution of bureaucratic norms and tries to situate it in the context of democracy. It also tries to highlight the inherent contradiction between the democracy and the bureaucracy. Then, there will be an attempt to make sense of the bureaucratic structure and the personality that evolves out of working within such structural framework. The chapter also deals with the gradual transformation of bureaucracy in to technocracy and the inherent tensions within the process.

1.1 Bureaucracy : Its history and Evolution

Bureaucracy, in its present structural form, might be considered as a modern phenomenon, having emerged with the beginning of industrial society; yet generally as an institutionalized activity of administration, it has been there in various societies since very early times.

According to Alfred Weber, “History of all great civilizations begins with the formation of bureaucracy which supports and shapes men’s whole existence”¹. Bureaucratic system gets developed in all such instances where large group of men exist in large areas, creating the need for a central agency to deal with problems.

¹ Jacoby, H. (1973), *The Bureaucratization of the world*, Los Angeles: University of California Press, p. 9.

A glance at the history of great civilizations will prove the point made earlier. One comes across the traces of some form of organized administration even as early as in ancient Mesopotamia. There, industrial production was carried out by great organizations of temple and king's household. They used to collect taxes, maintain public buildings, organize labour, distribute materials and rations to worker and people and supervise military organization.

We also find an elaborate administrative hierarchy, organized around temple economy, in Sumerian Civilization (around 3,000 B.C.). It has been mentioned in historical sources that a vast bureaucracy was set up by UR dynasty around 2,100 B.C. in order to collect taxes and tribute, and expand the system of irrigation and flood control. We find traces of legal authority and paid public service in king Hammurabi's proclamation around 2000B.C.

One can't imagine that monumental activities like erecting pyramids, constructing dykes and basins could have been achieved in Egypt (3,000 – 2,200 B.C.) without organizing large bodies of workmen within a strong centralized government.

But true moorings of bureaucracy can be seen in China, some as early as two millennia before, where the society was 'philosophically' governed and the day-to-day administration was supervised by its scholar-officials, the literati called 'mandarins'. Their socio-political affairs were conducted by rational principles. They had a highly organized Civil Service entrusted with the task of public works like building long canals and mighty tombs. Great Wall of China is a magnificent example of such a highly specialised network of administration.

Eugene Kamenka describes the bureaucratic society of China in following words:—

“The society was bureaucratic because the social pyramid ... was capped and characterized by its apex : the mandarin. ... All administrative functions were carried out by scholar officials. They prepared the calendar. They organized the transport and exchange, they supervised the construction of roads, canals, dykes and dams. They were in charge of all public works. Their social role was of one and at the same time, that of architect, engineer, teacher, administrator and ruler. .. The concept of civil service, as well as written examination for recruitment was introduced by China to the enlightened Europe of 17th and 18th century.”²

Certain features of administrative structure pertaining to 7th century China had striking similarities to the modern day bureaucracy.

“The Chinese bureaucrat depended for his professional advancement upon his evaluation by other officials on the basis of relatively objective criteria: grades obtained in examinations, experience in seniority voluminous records of his performance in office and merit-ratings. The central government kept itself informed of local conditions by means of various systems of inspection, reports and statistics. It estimated its income and budgeted its expenditures.”³

Even in Indian context, way back in 4th century B.C., we see the establishment of a highly centralized and bureaucratized Mauryan Empire [321 – 185 B.C.] Arthashastra, a treatise on statecraft and Economics written by Kautilya gives us a detailed account of an elaborate system of taxation and administration. It talks about separate ‘superintendents’ for

² Kamenka, E.(1989), *Bureaucracy*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, p.24.

³ Ibid, p.31

various departments like agriculture, commerce, weights and measures, storehouse, infantry, chariots, slaughter-house, prostitutes etc. It also talks about an array of officials dealing with public works like constructing dams, irrigation canals, roads, wells and rest houses.

A cursory look at the Mauryan administration would tell us that even though it was a highly elaborate organized and efficient system of administration, nevertheless, it was highly personalized form of administration, depending entirely upon the ruler and his ability. It failed to create a depersonalized administrative structure where officials would be loyal to the institution rather than the king in person.

In the preceding pages, it has been shown that ancient societies also incorporated elaborate and remarkably developed administrative structure which inherited rational bureaucratic procedures and administrative ideologies. It was pivotal in the socio-political and economic life of these societies and guided the development of these societies.

Now the question arises that how truly these societies were bureaucratic in their approach to administration. How close were they to certain structural features which mark modern bureaucracies? Under what circumstances did the modern bureaucracies emerge? What changes took place in society which prompted a change in the notion of governance?

In order to understand modern bureaucracy it is important to be aware of the essential difference – the departure point, between the ancient and modern bureaucracy.

It is true that all these bureaucracies described in the last few pages were elaborate, sophisticated and efficient. Yet they were heavily dependent on the patrimonial ruler – the king. The ruler enjoyed

paternalistic and traditional authority and there was no separation between the personal and official. Hence, as Weber says, “these societies may develop bureaucratic features but fully fledged ‘rational’ bureaucracy and bureaucratic institutions came into their own only with the development of rationalism modern state and money economy.”⁴

How these changes came about? To trace the social history of the emergence of modern bureaucracies, which began with western Europe, one has to situate these developments in the context of the changing nature of society.

With the fall of Roman Empire and emergence of feudalism, the overtowering power of the king stood diminished. Due to constant struggle and feud, and also the lack of finance, the king was prevented from hiring salaried functionaries. Instead, he had only hereditary vassals over whom his authority was limited to the oath of fidelity given to him by them. Even as military power of king depended heavily upon vassals, the king was regarded just as first among peers having largest feudal estate. “By the 16th century, the emperor was just one of the number of European potentates involved in frequent wars and shifting alliances with each other.”⁵

Inner contradictions inherent in feudalism used to get manifested in constant feudal strife and military conflict, and it necessitated the emergence of a centralized authority of state in the form of monarchy. At the same time, as commodity economy was changing into money economy and wealth came to depend more and more on commerce which centred around towns and cities, the emerging burgesses tried to be independent of feudal lords, as well as of the restrictions and control of the guilds. As the

⁴ Ibid, p.1.

⁵ Kamenka, E. (1979), *Ideas and Ideologies: Bureaucracy*, London : Arnold - Hienemann, p. 9.

production of goods shifted its orientation from specific customer to anonymous market, cities became increasingly interested in development of central authority for the security of traffic and market; control and regulation of currency, weights and measures. Business oriented burgesses provided the state with a basis for funding a standing army for proper functioning of government system.

Thus, principal task of the state came to be that of protecting the business interests of emerging bourgeoisie class. While subsidies were given to certain enterprises and trade monopolies were distributed, guild regulations were discontinued. Roads and canals were built, improved and maintained in order to facilitate trade and commerce. Certain erstwhile independent functions now came under the jurisdiction of state. As the business of burgess was concerned with administration of finance, law, trade, crafts, they constituted the group of people from which government officials emerged. They became the dependable body of people helping the monarchy to wield autonomous power. Their position in society was not determined by heredity but by the office and fulfillment of assigned duties.

Here, it is important to point that all these developments followed only after the emergence of state and of the powerful ruler – the monarch. King became sovereign over all the nobility and only he could issue edicts. He was now the overall in-charge of all the churches and all worldly justice was now in his hands. Thus, it can be inferred that the development of bureaucratic power and bureaucratic castes in history is an integral part of the emergence of the state and of the powerful ruler. State has been the most visible carrier and developer of bureaucratic organization and power.

Another factor that contributed to its rise to prominence was the severing of economic bonds of feudalism. Along with it, decay in

autonomous social institutional saw a sea of jobless, penniless mass of people on one side and self-interested entrepreneurs on the other side. Hence, a control by central authority was imminent. Moreover, with the emergence of the new economic man – the ‘homo- economicus’ and new legal concepts like property rights being disposable, there was a need to curb the economic self-interest developing in society as well as the acquisitive instinct and its imminent chaos.

Hence, bureaucracy took upon the responsibility to prevent the anarchy which was coming to grip the industrial society. It used the dual system of force and welfare to establish order in the confusion resulting from the economic transformation of Europe.

In modern commercial industrial Europe, the authority of custom and tradition, family ties, communal sentiments and obligations were being swept away by a new commercial individualism. It elevated the impersonal, the traditionless. The city drove out the country calculation replaced natural affection, operation of law replaced custom and personal authority. The society saw the march of progress and rationality. There was a distinct shift from ‘authority of origin’ to ‘authority of end’⁶: from dependence on ‘status’ to the freedom, self-determination and equality of ‘contract’. In the new industrial society everything was a saleable commodity. The emerging capitalism liberated economic man from the social, moral and political restraint. Property also became free from feudal and traditional restraints. ‘Its social role as a tangible basis of social production and social responsibility was destroyed’.

Henry Maine describes this visible shift in social relations in terms of shift from ‘status’ to ‘contract’ while Tonnies calls it a shift from

⁶ Ibid,p.13.

‘*gemeinschaft*’ society to a ‘*gesseleschaft*’ society.⁷ While the former refers to the internal, organic, spontaneous community – a total sharing of life where ties of kinship, blood, neighbourhood, village and household are very important; the latter incorporates external, formal, public association. It is a rational coming together for ends that remain individual. Here contract, ties of transaction, money-measure mark the network of social relationship.

While the concepts might not describe accurately the two different kinds of societies, as they are just ‘ideal types’ – models of social relations logically connected they nevertheless depict the nature of shift in the society in a state of flux.

Along with the shift in the network of social relations, we also see a similar shift in public administration of western Europe in the late 18th and early 19th century. Patronage, local status, primacy of personal relations in government jobs were replaced with impersonal duties, defined official tasks and graded examinations. The office was increasingly viewed as separate from its holder as a person. There was a shift from the ‘whole man’ to ‘specialized and efficient functionary’.

Political transformation of Europe played a vital role in the emergence of new structural notions of bureaucracy. Till 16th century, Europe consisted of several hundred independent political units. The king was also just one of the many potentates. But by 19th century, it (Europe) consolidated into twenty odd states. In this process of consolidation, Henry I and Henry II (England), Philip II (France) and Frederick II (Sicily) made important contributions. Thus, by 19th century we see the emergence of modern European nation state with national administration imbued with

⁷ Kamenka, op. cit., p.78.

the spirit of nationalism. And co-terminus with it was the growth of powerful hierarchical and centralized administrative institutions. The central administrative structure consisted of stable, worked over offices, rules of procedures and regulations. The officials advised the king on policy decisions and were principally concerned with revenue collection. With their active help, the monarch was able to subordinate church, estates and corporations, local aristocrats, provincial capitals and far-flung colonies to central tower (of which India is a suitable example).

Despite not being highly efficient to start with, these royal officials provided power to the king and to a great extent also protected people better than any other administrative structure. Still as there was no clear conception of state or nation state separate from the person of the king, these officials were the king's servants and not the nation's. Public offices and government posts were still private property of royal officials.

It is only after the French Revolution that we see a clear 'disengagement of the state'⁸. After the revolution, a spirit of rationalism gained popularity and public officials were now regarded as servants of nation rather than of the ruler-in person. Nation now became the source of all sovereignty. 'Any individual or body of men are not entitled to any authority which is not expressly derived from the nation'. (Declaration of Rights of Man and Citizens)⁹. Thus, bureaucracy acquired a modern sense where public servants were getting paid regular salaries and were answerable to the state.

In this modernization process, Napoleon's contribution is worth mentioning as he radically reorganized, recentralized and rationalized the

⁸ Barker, E.(1945), *The Development of Public Services in Western Europe 1660-1930*, London :Arnold Hienemann, p. 22-47

⁹ Kamenka, op.

Diss
302.350954
J559 Ch

Th11649



TH-11649

administrative structure. In Prussia, (today's Germany) this task was achieved by Fredrick II. His legal code of 1794 subjected even the monarch to the binding rules in personnel administration, curbed his power by placing him under the law. Royal servants were now regarded as professional officials of the state.

Moreover, the range of socio-political and economic changes and difficulties faced by European states to meet the new challenges in the 19th century necessitated the expansion of bureaucracy. As the population grew from 187 million (in 1800) to 401 million (1900) in one century, performing traditional tasks now required great number of officials. As the new areas of human endeavour expanded, stimulated by industrial, economic and technological developments, tasks which were earlier performed by other as well as these new tasks like road construction, canal, bridges, railways, post and telegraph, telecommunication – development of all these required a corps of officials with a certain degree of training. Even as old areas like education, commerce, industry, ecclesiastical affairs saw expansion ad growth of bureaucracy, social problems related to modern industry-inspection, working condition, compensation, insurance, public housing and public health called for administrative personnel on large scale.

In all these developments the emergence of nation-state, expansion of the role of state and role of prevailing political thought were very important. Talking about the role of political thought, with the onset of second half of 18th century, there emerged a dynamic conception of state in political discourse. As government was now not regarded simply as incarnate in the ruler, the quality of administration became a public concern. Disengagement of state and the ruler changed the status of public

servants. "The state or nation, not to mention the people, might remain excluded from politics and administration but administration and tutelage was to be exercised on their behalf."¹⁰

Edmund Burke explained this new dimension. "All political power or privileges are all in the strictest sense a trust and it is of the very essence of every trust to be rendered accountable And even totally to cease, when it substantially varies from the purposes for which alone it could have a lawful existence"¹¹.

This new conception of government was connected with the shift in views of government from 'authority of origin' to 'authority of ends'. In the new scheme of thinking, success in achieving public goals rather than their divine claims became the measure of assessing governments. Achieving happiness, welfare and prosperity for the citizens became the ultimate end.

Bentham in 1776 propounded the principle of 'greatest happiness'¹². It meant that the goal of society was the whole sum of happiness and enjoyment possible for humanity.

In order that bureaucracy fulfils its duty, laws and rules which were centrally made and directed became very important. Simple, rational and codified laws emanating from the sovereign was regarded as essential for effective governance. Uniform applicability and its effectiveness became the central concern. And again, in formulation as well as execution of these laws and rules, the role of bureaucracy became indispensable.

¹⁰ Kamenka, op. cit., p.12.

¹¹ See Stanlis, P.J. (1963), *Selected Writings and Speeches*, New York: NY Publications, p.370-371.

¹² Kamenka, op.cit., p.16.

1.2 Democracy and Bureaucratic Norms : Universality and Neutrality

The nineteenth century saw the growth of industrial society, along with its ills and evils, giving rise to a host of social problems; there was also an increasing demand for democracy and correcting these social ills. It was thought that as the bureaucracy only had the expertise, knowledge and skills to solve these social problems, it must be laced with public responsibility to take adequate measures for general social welfare. Growing demands for democracy was not centered around executive government by the people or having direct participation in governance. Rather, it meant accountability of government and its officials to the people or their representatives and entrusting the policy making power to peoples' representatives or Parliament itself. The traditional aristocratic bureaucracy based on advantages of birth or connections, thriving on patronage and riddled with corruption was considered inimical to the growing demands of democracy. In this context, as the concept of welfare state became popular, with its emphasis on socio-economic welfare of its citizens, there was an imminent need to modernize and professionalize the bureaucracy, making it more responsible and answerable to the people.

This newly found democratic spirit and aspiration was reflected in abolition of patronage and initiating the practice of open competitive examinations for recruitment. As aristocracy lost its hold over bureaucracy, universal criteria of merit rather than particular values and ascribed status became the new requisite for entry into bureaucracy.

The new thinking regarding bureaucracy and public office advocated that as public office is a 'relation of trust between the citizen and government',¹³ there has to be a universal rule and procedure of work

¹³ Kamenka,op.cit.,p.127.

and the public authority must be exercised lawfully in the common interest of people. Official discretion shouldn't have any role in decision making which should be strictly by the rules and procedures. It was also believed that it was the right of the citizens to have the worthiest of officials filling the offices and the privileges; honours and profits of office should appertain equally to every citizen in proportion to his measure of character and capacity which qualify him for such service. Personal merits of the candidate are, in themselves, the highest claim upon an office which can only be ascertained by open competitive examinations. All these norms regarding public offices or bureaucracy were principally guided by the spirit of democracy based on equal rights of citizen and common justice to one and all.

As bureaucracy has all the expertise, knowledge and information at its disposal and it exercises public authority, it has an inherent tendency to accumulate power. Advocates of democracy have always been apprehensive about such tendency and possibility and have been eager to propose limitations on bureaucracy. Laski writes, "Bureaucracy a system of government the control of which is so completely in the hands of officials that their power jeopardizes the liberty of ordinary citizens In extreme cases, the members of a bureaucracy may become a hereditary caste manipulating the government to their own advantage"¹⁴. In a democracy, where the interests of an ordinary citizen gain pre-eminence, checking this tendency of power-accumulation and self-aggrandization becomes important. Even Max Weber despite advocating its efficiency was concerned with placing limitations on bureaucracy. "It had to be prevented from controlling the policy and action of the state or organization it was

¹⁴ Laski, H. (1930), *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, F.R.A. Seligman (ed.) Vol. 3, p. 70.

supposed to serve”¹⁵. He also considered a number of mechanisms to limit the power-wielding scope of bureaucracy. Apart from collegiality, separation of powers, amateur administration, direct democracy, Weber came to see modern parliamentary democracy as providing the greatest possibility of check on bureaucracy. He thought that the political leaders would be able to exercise real control over the state administration to steer the society. Through their representatives, citizens would be exercising control over bureaucracy. – Here, it is important to point out that while initially it was the democratic spirit which facilitated the growth of rational – legal authority which the bureaucracy inheres, but as of today we find certain inherent tensions between the bureaucracy and democracy.

While democratic spirit pleads for equality, plurality, liberty, openness and assumption that all citizens are qualified to participate in politics, bureaucracy characterizes hierarchy, command, unity, secretness – all those which are in complete contradiction with the democratic ethos. While the former believes in election the latter relies on selection. Going by the structure, it seems very difficult to imbibe and nurture the democratic spirit while working in a bureaucratic organization.

In the third world developing country like India, such contradictions emerge even more sharply. The rational legal model and the norms that it advocates come in sharp conflict with primordial loyalties and identities which have a considerable say in the functioning of democracy. Various social pulls and pressures which guide the democracies in ‘prismatic societies’, where the ministers have to cater to their constituencies, also put pressure on the bureaucracy to act in extra-procedural way. Again, the interface between people’s representatives in parliamentary democracy and

¹⁵ Albrow, M. (1970), *Bureaucracy*, London: MacMillan and Company Ltd., p.47-49.

bureaucracy is fraught with inherent contradictions which will be dealt with later in this chapter.

Traditionally, administration has been seen as only concerned with the execution and implementation of public policy. The domain of policy making was, to begin with, restricted to the political elements-the kings or the leaders. In principle, it was based on the philosophy of separation of politics and administration. But as the idea of welfare state gained acceptance, and the nature and scope of public administration became wider and wider, it was no longer desirable to separate or exclude administration from the domain of policy making. Being the custodian of all the information, knowledge and having the skill and expertise, its contribution in policy making was now considered invaluable in designing apt policies for people's welfare and national development.

Now that bureaucracy was incorporated in the domain of policy-making via its expert advice, detailed information and 'delegated legislation', it was assumed that naturally, it would now have had a stake in politics. Moreover, its tendency to become a power-centre made the interface between politics and bureaucracy an interesting issue of debate.

One of the most fundamental source of any political standing or political stake is-the people, their support and their favourable attitude. In a parliamentary democracy like England and India, generally, this element of direct contact between people and bureaucracy in political context has been kept away by the dictum that 'bureaucrat should be sensed and felt; neither seen nor heard.' It meant that bureaucracy has been shielded from the common public opinion or criticism; they have not been made answerable to people directly.

The entanglement of bureaucracy with politics is more direct in the case of American bureaucracy. Here, intrusion of politics in bureaucracy began with political parties 'using administrative jobs as building blocks to build party organizations'¹⁶. Later on, due to ineffectiveness of political parties, bureaucracy was forced to develop its own basis of political support, negotiating alliances in and out of government with a variety of groups that could be used to advance bureaucratic objectives. These agencies e.g. – F.B.I cultivate public support by creating favourable attitude toward themselves in the public at large and building strength with "attentive" public groups or interest groups having stake in their work.

However, in a parliamentary democracy, bureaucracy is entwined with politics not directly but through the political leaders. Moreover it is assumed in principle, that bureaucracy won't let its vested interests, personal biases or prejudices come in the way of making policies or while giving suggestions to their political masters. In a parliamentary democracy, the bureaucracy has to accept the supremacy of elected people's representatives-the ministers. To make sure that the two don't work at cross-purposes and to maintain the continuity in administration amidst the changing political parties of different ideologies at the seat of power, the concept of 'neutrality' has been mooted in the context of democracy.

It was advocated that in a parliamentary democracy, political parties with different, at times completely opposite ideologies, philosophies, programmes and agenda might come and go at the seat of power. In that case, neutrality of service is required to maintain continuity. Same set of civil servants should be able to work with governments committed to

¹⁶ Rourke, F.E.(1969), *Bureaucracy, Politics and Public Policy*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, p. .59.

different agenda. While politics may change, the administration must remain a continuing link.

Here, it is important to clarify that 'neutrality' doesn't mean a 'political vacuum' in a bureaucrat's thinking. It is not as if a civil servant can't have a political point of view, can't have an ideology of his own. But it is his duty not to let it colour his sense of judgment or analytical faculty. He shouldn't become politically partisan, nor should he engage in political activities except secret ballot voting. Neutrality also doesn't mean that one has to prove himself a loyal instrument to party in political power, or become a 'yes man'; rather it means being objective, impersonal in one's sense of judgment and being able to serve all the governments with equal loyalty. Here, loyalty has to be oriented towards the spirit and philosophy of the constitution and adhering strictly to rules and procedures while giving advice.

The essence of political neutrality gets reflected aptly in the Indian context where its base was laid strongly in such a way that those very civil servants who served the colonial masters could also work under the Indian leaders, whom they might have put even in jails during the freedom struggle, with equal loyalty.

However, also in the Indian context as in all developing countries, this notion of political neutrality has been questioned. The Indian experience has shown that the notion of neutrality works well till the political leaders as well as the bureaucrats both have similar socio-economic backgrounds and they share certain basic value-dispositions and have some meeting ground in terms of political orientation but if there is a disjunction between the elected representative and selected officials on these indicators, then there is a problem of adjustment between the two.

Moreover, in a developing country like India the political leaders have certain duties towards their primordial, particularistic loyalties-their castes, regions, state, the kith and kin – meeting their socio-political demands and aspirations. They have to cater to the needs of their constituency. On the other hand, the structure of bureaucracy is based on secular, universal principles. Hence, there is a problem of reconciliation between the political demands of the minister and safeguarding the observance of rules and regulations by the official. This problem becomes more acute if both have different socio-political orientations. In Indian context, this problem became more visible after the nature of political parties changed in the wake of Green Revolution and the monolith of Congress broke down. Things came to such a pass that even the then Prime Minister of India, Indira Gandhi, getting frustrated on being unable to push forward her socialist welfare agenda, commented that “We need a committed bureaucracy”¹⁷. Being criticized on advocating for a more placatory and subservient bureaucracy, later on, she clarified that by committed bureaucracy she meant commitment to the goals and values enshrined in the constitution and it needed not be inconsistent with the idea of neutrality. In this sense, commitment refers to the enthusiasm and dedication for the task, being keen to appreciate the goals, policies, objectives and programmes of the government; being committed to public popular good.

This last point brings us to another interface between bureaucracy and people. While earlier, a distance was deliberately created between the two with notions like ‘impersonality’ and formality. But as the idea of citizenship started gaining currency and people have become the new focus in the framework of developmental policies, certain structural changes are required in bureaucracy. Accountability to people, being responsive and

¹⁷ See “Committed Bureaucracy”, (1969), *The Hindustan Times*, Dec.1. also see *The Hindustan Times*, Nov.17, 1969.

effective in implementing public policies-these have become a common measure of the utility of bureaucratic system. Bureaucracy now requires to be more sensitive, and be socially conscious to the people's needs and their aspirations in order to maintain that 'trust' which is reposed by people in public offices.

1.3 Bureaucracy, 'Expertized' Knowledge and Technocracy

One of the primary reasons why bureaucracy wields considerable influence in policy-decisions is the expertized knowledge at its disposal. The input that they give in the form of advice by compiling informations, data, statistics and detailed analysis of the implications of a policy also becomes an important source of bureaucratic power. Their skill and expertise makes them indispensable and their indispensability makes them the 'power elite'.

Max Weber also attributed the enormous influence of bureaucracy in modern government to this very factor.

"The decisive reason for advancement of bureaucratic organization has always been its purely technical superiority over any other form of organization ... under normal conditions the power positions of a fully developed bureaucracy is always overtowering. The "political master" finds himself in a position of the "dilettante" who stands opposite the "expert" facing the trained official who stands within the management of administration."¹⁸

Now the question arises that how does bureaucracy acquire expertise? As Francis Rourke puts it, "large organization, in itself, is a

¹⁸ Kamenka op.cit.,p.40.

mechanism for enhancing human competence. Organic division of labour ensures that complex organizations accomplish complex tasks, which an ordinary individual can never do. Breaking complex work into simpler and simpler tasks, they make it manageable. The division of labour also allows employees to acquire specialized expertise. Concentrated attention to specific problems also helps them in getting expertise by getting practical knowledge and experience about the task. This sustained attention to specific problems definitely gives bureaucrats a decided advantage in framing policies vis-à-vis the political representatives who tackle them sporadically. A near monopolistic control over the facts also becomes an added source of their expertise.”¹⁹

Saint Simon²⁰ is considered to be the pioneering exponent of government by technically trained specialists. He expressed firm confidence in the value of rational analysis of social problems along with reservations about traditional political authorities. For him, the object of politics was the system of planning that could be most favourable to production.

He proposed that Parliament should be of 3 chambers-

- i) Policy Invention – incorporating Engineers and Artists
- ii) Policy Examination – constituted by Scientist
- iii) Policy Execution – having representatives from Industry

He was of the opinion that the job of establishing the budget should be taken by industrialists. As they are the producers, they must occupy highest posts and take decisions. In his views, we see a glimpse of industrial technocracy.

¹⁹ Rourke, op.cit., p.40.

²⁰ See Meynaud, J. (1968), *Technocracy*, New York: The Free Press, p.195-196.

As the concept of welfare state increased the scope of public administration, it also increased the areas in which state had power. The growing complexity of social life, with new problems of complicated nature cropping up on a daily basis, requires special problem solving skills from administrative agencies. Advancement of technology and penetration of science and technology in our day-to-day lives: all these have necessitated the service of experts in public offices. This new emphasis on technical consideration in taking government decisions has laid the basis of technocracy.

It is a form of government which is characterized by ascendancy of the specialists and the application of specialized technologies in the administration of human affairs. Beginning with Economics and military strategy, it has now spread gradually to all spheres of government.

In technocracy, the large problems of socio-economic life are depoliticized and technology encroaches on to all spheres of public life. Technical imperative guides all human activities with emphasis on work-specialisation. It is preoccupied with efficiency and technical rationalizing. Specialised knowledge in a particular field is encouraged.

While there can't be any dispute about its claims to efficiency and it being in tune with the changing needs of time; yet there is a contradiction between democracy and technocracy. In contrary to the rules of representative democracy where the control of public life is undertaken by citizens or their elected representatives, in technocracy, the political leader simply becomes a man carrying out the wishes of the expert. These experts acquire independent power, independent of government and public. It becomes a case of authority without political responsibility. Politicians make complete intellectual surrender to the expert by completely handing

him over the freedom of judgment. Armed with technical knowledge, the technocrats rise to prominent positions of power, thus undermining the conventional supremacy of elected representatives. Moreover, they are contemptuous of popular reaction and show scant respect to their needs and aspirations. They also lack a sense of political values and are also not accustomed to the pulls and pressures of democratic politics. As politics can't be reduced to technique, an amateur is better suited than an expert at the helm of policy making. In order to facilitate an understanding between an amateur elected representative-the minister and the official, it is desirable that the official advising him on policy matters is able to convey his points in simple language and not in technical jargons. Hence, the amateur generalist has an advantage in this matter than the specialist.

In the name of efficiency, technocracy is seen as promoting and extending bureaucracy. Competence, skill and specialized expertise give it moral authority to acquire power through bureaucratic centres. Technocracy adds a factor of power and prestige to bureaucracy. But at the same time, it causes certain conflicts within the bureaucracy between the 'specialist' technocrat and 'generalist' bureaucrat. As in the coming time, solutions related to socio-economic problems would warrant more and more use of science and technology, it is being urged that people with technical skills and specialized knowledge should be involved more and more with policy formation at the apex of administrative structure. But this idea is countered by the generalists that socio-political problems needn't be seen in compartmentalized view, but rather in a holistic perspective, which only they, having the general ideas about all the facets of administration, possess. Their general refrain is that specialists become too involved with their own area of specialization, and miss the complete picture. 'They miss the woods for the trees' – this is a common argument given in support of generalists.

This conflict between general perspective and technical expertise always has its impact on *esprit de corps* of bureaucracy where the specialists feel cornered by the generalists.

1.4 Making sense of Bureaucratic Structure :-

Any attempt towards making sense of bureaucratic structure must begin with the critical appraisal of Weberian model²¹ of ideal-typical bureaucratic organization. Considering that his work on bureaucracy is a pioneering as well as seminal one, it makes sense to do a detailed overview of his model.

He presented his ideas on bureaucracy within the broader formulations of Power, Authority and Legitimacy. While a detailed discourse on these themes are not the focus of this study, nevertheless, it is important to point out that Weber differentiated between power and authority on the basis of legitimacy. If the individuals on whom the power (influence even against their will) is exercised deem it as proper or appropriate, it becomes legitimate and takes the form of authority. He differentiated authority into :-

1. Traditional Authority
2. Charismatic Authority
3. Legal- Rational Authority

He formulated that each of these authorities gives rise to a particular organizational structure and it is the legal rational authority which becomes the basis of a bureaucratic organization.

²¹ This model has been taken from *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Translated by Parsons and Handerson New York: Free Press.

It is to be noted that Weber never defined bureaucracy, rather, he outlined the essential features of an 'ideal type' bureaucratic organization. These essential characteristics are as following :-

- ❖ Obedience to legal norms established by agreement or imposition.
- ❖ A system of abstract rules; applying these rules in particular cases while administering law; and rational pursuit of interest.
- ❖ Person in authority occupies an "office". His actions are oriented to impersonal order.
- ❖ Obeying authority not as a private individual but as an official member of the corporate group. Obedience not to an individual but rather to an impersonal order.
- ❖ Official functions are organized by rules.
- ❖ A specified sphere of competence involving a clear systematic division of labour.
- ❖ Organisation of office following a principle of hierarchy where the lower office is under the supervision and control of higher one.
- ❖ Conduct of office is dictated by technical rules or norms. For such purpose, specialized training is necessary.
- ❖ Property of organization is separated from the property of individuals. Any or every use of official property (money or kind) is to be accounted.
- ❖ Official position can't be appropriated by the incumbent.
- ❖ Administrative acts, rules and decisions are to be formulated in writing.

He regarded the bureaucratic administrative staff as the purest embodiment of legal rational authority and outlined their essential characteristics :-

- ❖ They are personally free; subject to authority only in official capacity.
- ❖ They are organized in hierarchy of offices.
- ❖ Their sphere of competence is well defined and specified.
- ❖ It is a free contractual relationship. In principle, there is free selection on the basis of technical qualifications. Officials are selected and not elected.
- ❖ Office is their primary occupation.
- ❖ They get fixed remuneration in terms of salary.
- ❖ Office constitutes a career, there is a system of promotion based on the criteria of merit or seniority.
- ❖ They are subject to strict discipline and control.

Extolling the virtues of bureaucratic organizations based on legal rational authority, he said, “the primary source of the superiority lies in the role of technical knowledge which, through the development of modern technology and business methods in the production of goods, has become completely indispensable.”²²

For him, specialized bureaucracy is important in order to be efficient, be it capitalistic or socialistic economic systems.

²² Kamenka, op.cit., p.40.

In order to engage meaningfully and critically with Weber, it is important to take note of the dilemmas and ambivalence inherent in Weber's approach towards bureaucracy. Even though he appreciated the technical advantage of bureaucracy, its superiority, he was also aware of the pitfalls. He recognized that the uniform and rational procedures of bureaucracy largely prevented spontaneity, creativity and individual initiative. He wrote

“Imagine the consequences of that comprehensive bureaucratization and rationalization which already today we see approaching, each man becomes a cog in the machine, and aware of this his one preoccupation is whether he can become bigger. It is horrible to think that the world would one day be filled with nothing but those little cogs. Little men clinging to little jobs and striving towards bigger ones This passion for bureaucracy is enough to drive one to despair As if we were to deliberately become men who need ‘order’ and nothing but order, who becomes nervous and cowardly if for one moment this order wavers, and helpless if they are torn away from their total incorporation into it.”²³

To him, the process of rationalization of which bureaucracy is the prime expression, is basically irrational. It is ultimately aimless as it tends to destroy the traditional values which give meaning and purpose to life. For him, the process of rationalization getting manifested in bureaucracy is only formally rational, where there is a technical and systematic orientation to means and ends, but substantially it is not rational as it doesn't take into account values and ethical norms in decision making. Weber, in spite of being sure about the efficiency of bureaucracy as it was based on established rules and procedures, was aware that such a structure

²³ See Katz, E. and Danet, B.(1973),*Bureaucracy and the Public*, New York : Basic Books Inc.,p.22.

won't be effective in a situation of crisis. The iron cage of bureaucracy stifles the innovative and imaginative spirit by giving total emphasis on established rules and procedures. As a result, in a crisis situation they are not able to respond as there is no set precedence or procedure for it.

Another inherent danger of which he was suspicious was that bureaucracy might start serving the interest of capitalists and bourgeoisie class, and thus fail to serve its real purpose.

His ambivalence as well as the pathos are so apparent in his writings that one is constrained to ponder whether he was advocating its technical superiority for being rational and efficient or in reality he was ruminating over its inevitability and indispensability. He writes, "the great question is therefore not that how we can promote and hasten it, but what can we oppose to this machinery in order to keep a portion of mankind free from parcelling out of the soul from this supreme mastery of the bureaucratic way of life"²⁴.

Weber was also worried about the inherent tendency of bureaucracy to accumulate power and become a power centre due to its control over state apparatus. It has a tendency to control the policy and action of the state or organization it was supposed to serve. He had seen how Germany, under Bismarck, became weak as officials occupied all the key positions. He could also see how non-bureaucratic classes couldn't express itself under the complete hold of bureaucracy.

²⁴ Ibid,p.23

He was constantly preoccupied with the idea of how to place limitations on bureaucracy. He considered various mechanisms to check its authority. They have been summarized by Albrow²⁵ into five categories –

- (i) Collegiality – making decision making a plural process
- (ii) Separation of powers between two or more bodies
- (iii) Amateur administration
- (iv) Direct democracy
- (v) Parliamentary Democracy

Weber believed that Parliamentary Democracy was the best way to keep a leash on unbridled authority of bureaucracy.

Apart from dilemmas and apprehensions expressed by Weber himself about the bureaucratic structure of modern organizations, there are certain other contradictions which he failed to grasp, inherent in the ideal type of bureaucracy.

But before we look at the structural contradictions of bureaucracy, it is important to understand that bureaucracy is not only about ideal-typical structure. Such a crude structural approach makes it appear atemporal. Such a narrow view overlooks specific traditions and social conflicts in which it evolves. It ignores the circumstances, which vary from one place to other, in which it operates. To make the point clear, in real bureaucracies, at times, it becomes difficult to demarcate clearly the personal and impersonal, the rule and discretion; actual bureaucracies generally have both the features in variously mixed proportions.

²⁵ Albrow op. cit.,p.26-50.

Now coming to the structural contradictions of the ideal typical model, certain structural characteristics enumerated by Weber are mutually inconsistent. As pointed out by Gouldner²⁶, there is an in built tension between the claim of 'expertise' and the claim of 'obedience' based on discipline. It is very easily possible that people who have an expertise, who know how to do things would find themselves stifled by unnecessarily submitting themselves to the dictates of rules and procedures slammed upon them by their superiors.

Even Talcott Parsons²⁷ talked about the inherent conflict within bureaucracy since it is not possible always to ensure that high position in the hierarchy will be matched by equivalent professional skill. Again, hierarchy and initiative as well as '*esprit de corps*' are mutually inconsistent. Rigid adherence to the principle of hierarchy kills the spirit of initiative. To take an example, even a single draft written by a clerk goes through three or four ladders of supervision, where the supervisors at times justly, and at times, unnecessarily put 'notes' in the draft. In either case, whether the draft gets approved without any corrections or if the entire purport of the draft is changed, the process questions the ability of the clerk to draft a letter, the job for which he has been appointed. It also results in mutual suspicion and mutual distrust. It results in authoritarianism of the superiors which can be detrimental to the team spirit of the organization.

The rationality of the model, which was Weber's prime claim, has also been questioned. Robert Merton²⁸ explains how certain structural features like hierarchy and strict adherence to rules produce certain

²⁶ Gouldner, A.(1954),*Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*, Glencoe: Free Press, see ch.2.

²⁷ Parsons, T. *Structure and Process in Modern Societies*, Glencoe: Free Press.

²⁸ Merton, R. (1952), *Reader in Bureaucracy*, New York: Free Press, see ch. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality."

'dysfunctional consequences'. Ultimately, they harm the objectives of the organization. The tendency of adhering to the rules turns means into ends. The instrumental and formalistic aspects like rules, procedures, norms become more important-an end in themselves, rather than the substantive ones which is essentially serving the people in getting the task done. Consequently, the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization suffers.

Another critic, Claus Offe²⁹ points out that the rule-bound bureaucracy also implies that premises of action are not at the disposal of the actors themselves. They simply, blindly and mechanically adhere to the rules. This unadulterated realization of norms results in 'organizational rationality' but it falls short of 'systemic rationality' - that is to fulfil the functional requirement of societal environment.

This point becomes more relevant in the third world context. Organizational rationality - the determinate administrative action trends to freeze administrative autonomy. In uncertain and rapidly changing conditions, results achieving objectives are more important than adhering to rules. Rules must be deemed as resources, to be weighed from the point of view of their adequacy for specific tasks. In the complex task of social reconstruction, organizational rationality is at loggerheads with systemic rationality. Societal expectations of programmes and results should be the main driving force of a government organization and not the rules, norms and procedures.

Again, in the context of third world developing countries, the structural characteristic of 'formalistic impersonality' is not suitable as the need to fulfill developmental programmes, are more urgent. What requires

²⁹ See Bhattacharya, M.(2000), *New Horizons of Public Administration*, New Delhi: J awahar Publishers and Distributors,p.56.

here is not impersonality but rather identifying with the purpose, the goals and the people for whom these development programmes have been designed. One needs to be socially sensitive to the cause of poor, marginalized, downtrodden sections of society and a little bit of personal touch in delivery of the services would be more desirable.

Behavioural dispositions must be adopted according to the changing context of cultural milieu. People in these developing countries are still guided by primordial loyalties and particularistic identity. It doesn't mean bureaucracy should discard its universalistic norms and procedures to accomplish the task, for that would undermine the very ethos of bureaucracy. But, it can definitely adopt a more humanist posture, shed off its mechanistic dispositions in order to establish a positive vibe with the people whom it is meant to serve.

LaPalombara³⁰ points out that as an instrument of economic change, the structural model is not fit for developing countries. Taking the example of India, bureaucrats need to be 'developmental entrepreneurs' and not rigidly tied to bureaucratic status, hierarchy and impersonality. They must have certain allegiance to the cherished goals and ideals of the constitution and the policies, programmes, and objectives of government for the welfare of backward section of society.

Philip Selznick³¹ points out the organizational paradox in the structure of bureaucracy. The goals, the responsibilities, the powers need to be delegated to sub-systems by the central system in order to accomplish the task but in due course, these sub-units or sub-systems set up their own

³⁰ LaPalombara, J.(1967), *An Overview of Bureaucracy and Political Development*, Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press,p.12.

³¹ Selznick, P.(1948), "Foundations of the Theory of Organizations", *American Sociological Review*, Vol.13 (Feb),p.25-35.

goals which may be in conflict with the real purpose of the organization. It leads to bifurcation of interest as well as conflict between the central system and sub units.

Practical experiences of the style of functioning and organizational pattern show that bureaucracy is not only about formal structure. Hierarchy, rules, sphere of competence - all these tell only half the truth about the way bureaucracy or for that matter, any other modern organization works. An organization doesn't function only through the formal structure but there also operates in every organization the informal structure which works in tandem with, and also at times at variance with, the formal structure. As Peter Blau³² points out "this informal structure is a more cohesive and co-operative group". People in an organization or bureaucracy are not only linked with each other through official channels and links; they also share their life situation, happiness, sorrows, dreams, aspirations as the office constitutes a mini-world for them. This informal connection infuses a different sense of camaraderie where apart from formal procedures, they also resort to informal, 'mouth to mouth' procedures. Existence of the informal structure can work both ways for the bureaucratic organization. It can increase the efficiency of the organization as unnecessary official hurdles are surpassed by informal links, but at the same time, this informal structure can be detrimental to the organization if it starts functioning with cross-purposes and sets up its own goals and objectives.

Finally, looking at the Weberian structural model of ideal-type bureaucracy, one is forced to infer that the structure depends a lot on the socio-cultural context in which it operates, the people and the officials who

³² Blau, P.(1962),*Bureaucracy in Modern Society*, New York: Random House,p.36.

man the structure and the circumstances in which they operate. If the structure is universal and secular but it has to operate in a society where people are governed by primordial identities, it would fail to serve the purpose and remain largely ineffective despite being efficient. This appears true particularly in the context of Indian society.

1.5 Making sense of Bureaucratic Personality

The focus, approach and scope of studies related to bureaucracy have been widely different in various social sciences. Political Science and Sociology are the two major disciplines with profound studies on the subject. While the former has mainly concentrated on the role of state and the power structure of bureaucracy within the political system, the latter has given primacy to inter-personal orientation of bureaucracy and organizational culture, studying variety of formal organization within the ambit of bureaucracy from state employment agency to mental hospitals.

The man within the organization is equally important as the organization. With this premise, sociologists have given due importance to the interface between organization and the men within it. Specifically the focus has been on relation between officials within the organization, relation between clients (public) and the officials of the organization. Also, with the emergence of Human Relations school of thought, studies on moral, motivation, leadership etc. have been abound and all these have benefited in great deal in their endeavour from Sociology. But still, another area of enquiry which perhaps hasn't got due attention, and merits greater in-depth and analytical study is — the impact of bureaucracy on the personality of individual. By personality, one refers to “the dispositions in the person that help to determine his behaviour and that differ from one person to another. These dispositions of personality constitute an organized reality. It is an enduring

structure that interacts with the environment”³⁵ studied in the context of bureaucracy it refers to shared dispositions of collectivities of people.

As this area of enquiry forms the basic, principal structure of this work, here I would like to talk about it in detail.

Formulation of ideas on this theme begins with certain basic premises. The moment we talk about bureaucracy and its impact on the personality at once emerge certain structural elements which need to be weaved in one thread in order to understand the issue. They are —

- The nature of work and its impact on personality.
- Organisational structure or the bureaucratic structure and its impact on personality.
- Inter relation among officials and the way it affects the personality.
- External factors i.e. the relation between public officials, prevailing political culture and the way it influences official’s personality.

Any discussion on the impact of bureaucracy on official’s personality must begin with the phenomenology of the work itself. What is the relationship between man and work? Does the nature of work shape or reshape an individual’s identity?

For Marx, the development of consciousness in men, the particular outlook of men stems from the organization of labour. It is a major factor that separates men from animals. “They begin to distinguish themselves, from animals as soon as they begin to produce their means of subsistence the materials production is linked with the production of ideas and nature of consciousness.”³⁶

³⁵ See Merton, R.K. (1952), “Bureaucratic Structure and Personality”, Robert Merton (ed.) *Reader in Bureaucracy*, New York : Free Press.

³⁶ Marx, K. (1947), *The German Ideology*, New York : International Publishers, p. 29-31.

Thus, work not only gives a sense of consciousness to an individual, it also gives him identity and constitutes his 'primary sense of reality'. Through work only, he gets connected to the outer world. It reestablishes the relationship between his mental processes and external world.

Schutz writes "... the stratum of the world of working which the individual experiences as the kernel of his reality is the world within his reach ... the world of working as a whole stands out as paramount over against the many sub-universes of reality. It is the world of physical things including my body by my working act" I gear into the outer world. I change it"³⁵

Whereas earlier the work was accomplished within the family structure and the kinship network, man could see the manifestation of his true self in his work. His work role was intimately and integrally connected with his other social roles in society. But with the onset of industrial revolution, the nature of work changed and so changed the relationship between man and his work. Now, in order to work he must be employed by an organization. He no longer owned the tools and the instruments of production. Now the tools and equipments were available only with the bureaucracy. Now a man's work role became one of the main roles through which he experiences not only the quality of society but his own identity as well.

Capturing the essence of this change, Parsons writes, "... relatively isolated conjugal family which is primarily dependent for its status of one member, the husband and father. This role is however segregated from the family structure itself, unlike the role of peasant father. Work is normally done in separate premises, other members of the family don't co-operate in the work process and

³⁵ Schutz, A (1967), *The Phenomenology of the Social World*, Evanston World : North Western University Press, p. 55-60.

above all, status is based on individual qualities and achievements which specifically can't be shared by other members of the family unit"³⁶.

Thus, in industrial society, bureaucracy constitutes the central space as workplace. It becomes significant in moulding the attitudes of people, their personality dispositions.

Now, if we look into the nature of work within the bureaucratic structure, we find that generally, it entails routine work for which they have been specially trained in the sense that they have been told that there is only one best way of accomplishing the task. The work procedures to their last minutest detail have been well defined spelt and outlined, thus leaving little scope for creativity, initiative and ingenuity in the sphere of work. This definitely leads the formation of certain attitudinal dispositions towards work. Here, it is important to remember once again that one is referring to shared disposition of collectivities of people which comes from a shared condition of work.

Now, the impact of such an orientation towards work is that generally, it makes them too concerned with details and they fail to take not taking into account the larger picture. Veblen refers to this as 'trained incapacity'³⁷ where the ability acquired for functioning itself becomes an inadequacy, a handicap in accomplishing the goal. Their inflexibility in a changed situation renders them inefficient. The sound training that they get during work procedure, rather unquestioningly monotonously and disinterestedly grips them with a sense of inertia leading to adoption of wrong working procedures. "People may be unfitted by being fit in an unfit fitness"³⁸

Apart from this, they come to acquire special preferences, antipathies, discriminations and emphases during the course of work which Dewey calls

³⁶ Partons, T. (1971), *The System of Modern Societies*, New Jersey : Prentice Hall

³⁷ Merton, op.cit.

‘occupational psychosis’³⁹ – a pronounced character of mind which develops through demands put on the individual by occupational role.

In the discipline of Sociology, it was Robert Merton⁴⁰ who first put forward the idea, in an unambiguous way, that there certainly exists a bureaucratic personality. He was of the view that despite not being born with a typical disposition as such the logic of work in a bureaucratic organization tends to foster or perhaps create such an outlook. An individual’s work role becomes so important that the experiences, feelings, ideas and traits that he acquires in his capacity as an official of the organization also begin to predispose him in certain typical ways in his other social roles.

Moreover, formalistic impersonality along with tendency to apply general rules tends to produce conflict in bureaucrat’s contact with the public. He gives us the impression of being insensitive, arrogant, haughty and abrupt. On the flip side, the sanctified norm of impersonality ensures that any deviation from such norm is regarded as favouritism and nepotism. Talking in the context of bureaucratic organization, he said “in a large complex organization, operators tend to value means over ends. They worry more about the right rule than achieving the ultimate goal, which leads to goal-displacement, where instrumental values become terminal values”⁴¹.

Certain aspects of organizational life – like repeated routine work, excessive orientation to rule, tenure-security make people averse to taking risk or resistant to changes. “They are caught up in a web of constraints so complex that any change is likely to rouse the ire of some important constituency”⁴².

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ For his ideas on the subject see Merton, R.K. (1952), Reader in Bureaucracy.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid.

Apart from the nature of work, the bureaucratic structure, i.e. hierarchy, discipline, rule orientation, supervision and co-ordination – all these exert a constant pressure on the official to be methodical, prudent and disciplined. The shift of emphasis from goals to means leads to a transference of aims onto the particular details of behaviour required by the roles.

As the bureaucrat's official life is planned in terms of a graded career, he is induced by devices of incentives i.e. increment, promotion etc. to conform to official regulations. He adapts his thoughts, feelings and actions to the prospect of his career. But these very devices which make him conformist also lead to an over concern with strict adherence to regulations which induces timidity, conservatism and technicism.

Another structural component '*esprit de corps*' has an important impact upon the personality of a bureaucrat. There is a sense of common destiny which along with informal social organization within the bureaucracy leads to the fact that bureaucratic officials affectively identify themselves with their way of life. This sense of identification predisposes them to defend their entrenched interests than to assist their clientele (serve the public) and elected higher official (the ministers). But this sense of camaraderie, the '*esprit de corps*' should not be seen in a monolithic way. In an organization where people have similar goals and aspirations of moving up in the ladder of hierarchy and gaining in the sphere of competence, it also leads to constant conflicts of interests and clash of egos between officials. While on the one hand, it affects the organizational goals and objectives, it also leads to dislocation of attitudinal dispositions among the officials as well. In terms of Indian bureaucracy, right since its foundational days of the ICS, we find 'endemic personal struggles among the civilians, inter-service rivalries individual vendettas affecting the internal unity and fraternal loyalty of

the ICS and also affecting the morals of the civilians'⁴³. Even after Independence the change of nomenclature from ICS to IAS has not changed these tendencies. Still we find bureaucrats, in order to pursue their individual self interest of career advancement, working at cross purposes against each other.

Bureaucratic structure endows the bureaucrat with a definite legal authority. But this impersonal, rational-legal authority at times, is personalized by the bureaucrat leading to a seemingly domineering attitude. This tendency gets heightened more so in third world developing countries where in spite of having accepted the secular, modern structure, people who fill these structures are still governed by primordial loyalties and individualized identities. This (mis) appropriation of authority in the form of personalized power highlights the discrepancy between the ideal and real situation. This attitude is also exaggerated due to a discrepancy between his position within the hierarchy and his position with reference to the public. To take an example, a clerk is a very lowly ranked official in the bureaucratic hierarchy who always has to obey orders, be at the beck and call of the officers and also has to face the music of his superior's ire. But when common people approach the office they first get to see this clerk only. Disgusted with his rank and position in the office, he presents himself as the omnipotent – omniscient official in front of the people and never fails to make them realize that he is the real boss as far as they are concerned. Thus, we see a situation where government servants held to be the servants of the people are usually super ordinate to them. Social superiority of the client (public) becomes meaningless to the official who takes on a dominant posture at the moment. This leads to a conflict between the official and the clientele.

Thus we see the emergence of a bureaucratic personality which responds cheerfully and respectfully to the authority of superiors and exercises authority

⁴³ Spangenberg, B. (1976), *British Bureaucracy in India*, New Delhi : Manohar, p. 341.

firmly and fairly over subordinates. He blindly accepts rules as legitimate without questioning why things are the way they are.

But the way the bureaucratic structure fosters a typical personality trait among individuals, comes in sharp contradiction with the needs of the individual as a social being embedded in society, in his capacity of social roles in the network of social relationships. This basic contradiction between the organizational needs and individual's needs has been highlighted by Argyris and Presthus⁴⁴. They say that while the individuals require opportunities of self-actualization, autonomy, creativity initiative; the organizations require conformity, deference, subversiveness. And this contradiction has a telling effect on the personality of individuals to the extent that they consider as misfits in either role. A certain sense of emotional attachment with bureaucratic symbols and affective involvement with their sphere of competence and authority ensures that there develops an attitude of moral legitimacy.

Apart from the organizational structure, the personality of the bureaucrat also gets moulded by the goals, tasks, objectives set up the organization, the way it envisions its role in society and in turn, the role of its employees and officials in the scheme of things. For any distinct bureaucratic unit, these factors combine to produce an 'organizational culture' – a distinct way of viewing and reacting to the bureaucratic world. This culture becomes the source of attitude formation for individuals working in it. Whether there is a high client (public) orientation, whether it exists to serve the society as a whole – all these influence greatly the attitudinal dispositions of the official vis-à-vis the organization as well as the public in general. For example, in case of government agencies, the manuals the procedural codes are not clear in terms of reflecting their goals and objectives. The goals remain unambiguous as are the manuals. The result is a lack of agreement on

⁴⁴ See Argyris, (1964), *Integrating the Individual and the Organisation*, New York : Wiley, p. 3-19.

their meanings and their purpose. Various possible rational interpretations ensure that there is no agreement on goals – leaving them vague and thus difficult to achieve. This leads to a sense of inertia in the people who operate through these manuals.

The nature of service to be provided, mandatory or commercial, the nature of supervision, the nature of relationships among the officials-all these have a great impact on the personality of an individual in a bureaucratic organization. Generally, it is seen that if the officials are well-integrated with their peer groups, they are more secure, and assured vis-à-vis clients.

Moving away from the organization and its structure, external factors like environmental and cultural factors also dictate the nature of official – client interface and in turn, shape the personality of an official. Different cultural values influence the interface between bureaucracy and public differently. Values appropriate to bureaucratic functioning are not equally available in all cultures. While some cultures are more attuned to values implicit in bureaucratic structure, e.g. – universalism, specificity, affective neutrality centralized authority etc., certain sub-groups and communities as well are better prepared than others to cope up with bureaucracy. On the other hand, there are some cultures – the value system of such societies is not tuned to the ideals of bureaucratic structure. For example, in third world countries secular hierarchies and ritual hierarchies might come in conflict. To make this point clear in Indian context in a bureaucratic unit, high caste individual wouldn't approve of being ordered by a scheduled caste official notwithstanding that in the official hierarchy, the latter is superior to the former. Ideas of achievement and advancement based on merit are prerequisite values, as is acceptance of principle of hierarchical authority for survival of bureaucracy.

A distinct 'bureaucratic culture'⁴⁵ of society also has an impact on the personality of the bureaucrat. By bureaucratic culture one refers to 'distinct pattern of disposition towards the bureaucratization of public life that exists among the citizens and bureaucrats'. How citizens as well as bureaucrats are cognitively, affectively and evaluatively oriented towards bureaucracy, towards each other – this orientation definitely shapes a distinct bureaucratic personality.

Situational factors also play a role in moulding bureaucratic personality while interacting with people. The extent of consensus in the expectations the official and client have from each other plays a decisive part. If both come from different background with different expectations from each other, the communication and co-operation becomes difficult.

Gouldner talk about 'latent social identity'⁴⁶ while explaining that to what extent do roles which are officially irrelevant to the interaction in question come into play. If the client is of a higher status than the official, the interaction would be different then otherwise. Under certain circumstances, officials in their behaviour get influenced by common identities like kinship, caste, religion, linguistic affiliation etc.

One's perception of one's role in an organizational set-up has a considerable impact on one's personality. How one behaves towards one's job depends a great deal on how one perceives it and evaluates it. Role-perception and role-evaluation guide our behaviour, but in the process, they also get shaped by the rewards and penalties, incentives and disincentives associated with alternative courses of action.

How a bureaucrat perceives his role in an organization would depend upon

⁴⁵ See Bhatnagar, D. (1989), *Bureaucratic Culture in India*, Jaipur : Rawat Publications, p. 1-12.

⁴⁶ See Katz, E. & Danet, B. (ed.) (1974), *Bureaucracy and the Public*, New York : Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, p. 25-30.

- (a) His prior experiences – As the official working in an organization is not a blank-slate, he must be having prior experiences related to earlier occupations and social life.
- (b) Professional norms – various professions like law, medicine, engineering imply various norms which guide one's behaviour.
- (c) Ideology – it impacts the routinized, highly – structured roles thus giving a sense of motivation.

To highlight the impact of role perception on personality formation in bureaucrats, Leonard Reisman in his study 'A study of Role Conceptions in Bureaucracy' discovers 4 types of bureaucrats⁴⁷.

- (d) Functional Bureaucrat – Seeking recognition from a given professional group outside bureaucracy. Measuring success in terms of professional standards rather than in terms of satisfying bureaucracy. Oriented towards and away from bureaucratic structure.
- (e) Specialist Bureaucrats – Greater sense of identification with the bureaucracy despite professional orientation. Seeking bureaucratic as well as professional recognition.
- (f) Service Bureaucrats – Utilizing bureaucracy to realize personally held goals.
- (g) Job Bureaucrats – Immersed entirely within the structure seeking recognition along departmental rather than professional lines. Aspiring for increased status via his position in structure.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 23-29.

Another typology developed by Anthony Downs in 'Inside Bureaucracy' classifies bureaucrats into⁴⁸-

1. Climbers – seeking to maximize power, prestige and income.
2. Conservers – Seeking to maximize security and convenience; avoiding change.
3. Zealots – Acting as though pursuit of the public interest means promotion of very specific policy goals. Has a narrow focus.
4. Statesmen – Larger focus of public interest as well as laws and procedures to be followed.

Thus we see that organizational structure, cultural milieu, situations, circumstances, role perceptions etc. definitely give a distinctive shape to an official's personality. A bureaucrat experiencing the rigours of job at hand and the organizational structure and norms never remains the same individual as he was before joining the organization. A definite change and shift takes place in his personality. This bureaucratic personality, how it operates in Indian cultural milieu and the changes that it goes through will be elaborated in the chapter dealing specifically with Indian bureaucrats.

⁴⁸ Downs, A. (1967), Inside Bureaucracy, Boston : Little, Brown and Company, p. 15-20.

Chapter – II

Bureaucratic Personality in India : A Socio- Historical Perspective

2.1 Colonial Domination : Racial–Cultural Superiority

*Take up the white man's burden?
Send-forth the best ye bread
Go, bind your sons to exile
To serve your captives' need;
To wait, in heavy harness
On fluttered folk and wild
Your new caught sullen peoples
Half devil and half – child*

— Rudyard Kipling¹

Generally, colonialism is identified with economic gains and political power where the colony's economic structure and society is subordinated to the needs, demands and interests of the colonizers. It refers to an unequal exchange and internal disarticulation of economy under the imperial hegemony.² But there is more to the process of colonization than simply the economic domination of resources, labour and markets. Even though the political economy of colonization is well documented, described, researched and analysed in the colonial discourse, it is the psychology of colonialism which takes the central focus of this concern.

As Ashish Nandy puts it, "Apart from political economy, the crudity and inanity of colonization are principally expressed in the sphere of psychology..... colonialism is a state of mind, a psychological state rooted in the social consciousness

¹ Kipling, R. (1899), *The White Man's Burden*, Vol. 72, Feb. 1899, New York : McClures, the poem was written in context of Spanish-American war. It represented the European view that non European cultures are demonic and people of European descent have an obligation to dominate them until they take their place in the world.

² Chandra, B. (1979), *Nationalism and Colonialism in Modern India*, Delhi : Orient Longman, p. 3.

of in both the colonizers as well as the colonized”³ In order to make this point clear, particularly in Indian context, it is important to know that, even though colonial political economy began to operate much earlier, colonialism in its true essence can be said to have begun only when both the sides began to ascribe cultural meanings to the British domination.

By ascribing cultural meanings to domination, one means that on the one hand, where the colonizers perpetuate the idea that they have been able to colonize because of inherent superior racial-cultural attributes, on the other hand the colonized start believing that they have been colonized because they don't have the 'natural' qualities of the colonizer, the attributes of a superior civilization.

Franz Fanon in his book 'The Wretched of the Earth' writes, "It does political, psychological and moral damage to the colonized..."⁴ Colonialism not only colonizes the body but also the mind in a manner that the oppressed starts identifying himself with the oppressor. As Fanon puts it, "Black Man stops being an actional person for only the white man can represent his self-esteem."⁵

Ironically, it becomes a shared culture where both the ruler as well the ruled believe in the same ideology, both 'internalize the colonial rule definitions', and start 'speaking the language of homology.'⁶ In the shared culture, both are bound in a dyadic relationship where the cultural priorities of the latter are dictated by the former. Even the voices of opposition, terms of fight against the oppressor are dictated within the psychological limits set by the latter. In Indian context, while the Raj saw Indians as barbarians who needed to further civilize themselves, many Indians saw the British rule as an agent of progress. They saw their salvation in

³ Nandy, Ashish (1983), *Intimate Enemy : Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*, New Delhi : Oxford University Press, p. 4.

⁴ Fanon, F. (1963), *The Wretched of the Earth*, New York : Grove Press, p. 30-45.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Nandy, op.cit., p. 6

becoming more like British. They started believing that they were colonized because they didn't have British qualities – masculinity, power, fierce competitiveness etc.

Even the Indian Renaissance – the socio-cultural reform movements, reflected this psychology of the proponents who felt that India was colonized because of cultural regression. From 'let's go back to Vedas' of Arya Samaj praising the Aryan qualities, to the rational scientific humanist urge of Brahma Samaj movement – they all represented an image of the colonial self. A selfhood that was politically and culturally designed by their colonial masters and it was believed to be a depreciated, immoralized weak self whose only recourse to redemption was looking up to the colonizers – 'the west'. Then. The west represented by the British didn't remain only a geographical temporal entity but rather a psychological order. It is to be seen everywhere – within the west and outside; in structures and minds.⁷

Colonialism as a cultural ideology, is given legitimacy by projecting it as a civilizational mission. A civilizational mission is constituted by first categorizing non – European cultures as 'child like', 'barbarian', 'human and not wholly human'⁸ and then they profess to take on the mantle of missionaries, the 'white-man's burden'⁹ – an obligation to civilize them, dominate and guide them until they can take their place in the world.

Without this civilizational missionary zeal colonialism is not colonialism. It handicaps the colonizer much more than the colonized. It is given a missionary sense to overcome the guilt produced by the disjunctions between their actions and true values. By claiming to bring the fruits of progress and modernity to the subject people, colonizers give themselves a sense of 'self-legitimation'. This was based on the colonial logic that people who were different were inferior, and they had to be made similar and hence equal by civilizing them.

⁷ Ibid., p. 7.

⁸ Ibid., p. 11.

⁹ Kipling, op. cit., p. 1.

But in the context of British colonialism in India, this colonial logic had a fundamental ideological problem. The problem ensued from the fact that India had a civilization, howsoever strange it might have been by the European standards. It had a tradition of civic living of nearly a millennium at least, it had a well developed literati tradition, and attractive tradition of philosophy; art and science which often attracted the best of minds of Europe. Even colonial administrators like Warren Hastings claimed that “we have much to learn from India in the field of art, literature and philosophy”¹⁰. India’s rich cultural tradition, its living past mocked at the colonial logic of ‘a civilizing mission’.

In order to be legitimised and justified, they needed to project the cultural and political degradation of Indian civilization and explain it in causative terms as well. This problem was tackled by the colonial ideology by postulating that there was a clear disjunction, break and rupture between India’s past and present. Indians were told that civilized India was a bygone past and present India was only nominally related to history. Even an indophile like Max Mueller believed that the India that was living was not the true India and the true India had to be but dead.¹¹ It was also postulated that their degradation was not due to colonial rule, but rather due to aspects of traditional Indian culture which in spite of some good virtues, carried the seeds of its cultural downfall. ‘India’s culture was living through a debilitating senility’¹².

By this logic, a sense of inferiority was infused. Everything that was oriental and native was mocked at in comparison to the west. This social-cultural domination acquired a cultural consensus where both the British as well as the Indians started feeling that the former as a race, culture and civilization was superior and the latter an inferior one. The (in) famous Macaulay minute of 1835, typically shows the

¹⁰ Mason, P. (1985), *The Men Who Ruled India*, New Delhi : Rupa & Co., p. 46.

¹¹ Nandy, op. cit., p. 17.

¹² Ibid.

arrogance of cultural superiority of a colonial hegemonic power and is worth quoting at length...

“A single shelf of good European library is worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia. The intrinsic superiority of the western literature is indeed fully admitted by those who support the oriental plan of education.

.... No exaggeration to say that all the historical information which has been collected from all the books written in Sanskrit language is less valuable than what may be found in petty abridgements used at preparatory schools in England. In every branch of physical or moral philosophy, the relative position of the two is some.... We must employ them in teaching what is but worth-knowing, that English is better worth-knowing than Sanskrit needs no further illustration. Natives are desirous to be taught English and are not desirous to be taught Sanskrit or Arabic. Neither as language of law nor as language of religion have the Sanskrit or Arabic any peculiar claim to our encouragement. It is good to make natives of this country thoroughly good English scholars.”¹³

The excerpts from the Macaulay’s minute bear testimony to the fact that how deep the penetration of the racial ideology of colonialism was. Apart from the broad contours of culture it also penetrated into language, art, philosophy and learning. Even the education pattern, the languages to be learnt, and not be learnt as well, were

¹³ See, Mason, op. cit., p. 126.

dictated by the colonial rulers on the basis of racial ideology. Not only that, their custom, manners and moral character was also on attack Charles Grantin taking account of Indian morals and manners in his book 'Observation on the State of Society Among the Asiatic Subjects of Great Britain [1992] observed that –

“a race of men lamentably degenerate and base, retaining but a feeble sense of moral obligation; yet obstinate in their disregard of what they know to be right, governed by malevolent and licentious passions. Strongly exemplifying the effects produced on society by a great and general corruption of manners, and sunk in misery by their vices... Expansion of company rule in India required a system of 'interpellation', a reform of manners that would provide the colonial with a sense of personal identity, as we know it. It requires a partial diffusion of Christianity and partial influence of moral improvements which will construct a particularly appropriate form of colonial subjectivity.”¹⁴

The real pathology of such an ideology comes to the fore as it assumes consensual proportion in a way that even the colonized started conceding that their language, their mode of learning, their customs and manners, their moral character are inferior. Indian middle class, which was at the forefront of the socio-cultural renaissance was an ardent advocate of English language education and even life-style. Many of them became more anglophile than British themselves. Believing that their own native self is depreciated, they tried to emulate the colonizer's self. And the real irony was that this led to an image of a 'fractured self'. It is said that the father of Indian socio-cultural renaissance, Raja Ram Mohan Ray used to have two houses. 'In one house there was everything Indian except him and in the other house there was

¹⁴ See Dewey, C. (1996), *The Mind of the Indian Civil Service*, Delhi : Oxford University Press, p. 31.

everything English except him'.¹⁵ Jawaharlal Nehru, in his autobiography has talked about such an experience of identity crisis.¹⁶

Apart from the racial cultural ideology of civilizational mission, colonialism in order to accomplish its project of political-economic and socio-cultural domination also needed some strategic, sound and detailed ground work. Apart from brute force and military technology, it also needed to employ cultural technology to establish complete control.

By 'cultural technology'¹⁷ one refers to knowledge about people, their culture, their language, customs, mores, literature, philosophy, art, artifacts etc. It is not strange that much of what we now know about India today is through British encyclopaedias and their ethnographic accounts. On their arrival to India, British found that nature was stacked against them. Everything was so disconcertingly alien, the topography, the geography, the climate, the people, their language, their customs, their culture – it was an altogether a different civilization itself. They realized that in order to control India they needed to know India. And this led them to do some extensive field work. No wonder, we find that all the earlier colonial administrators were also good ethnographers.

They made an account of everything. The population; the races; the castes and tribes; languages; customs; literature; art; artifacts etc. And very soon they came to know India better than Indians. Indians would know about their own land and their own country through alien rulers. They only knew what they were told and what they weren't told, they didn't know.

¹⁵ Verma, P. K. (1998), *The Great Indian Middle Class*, New Delhi : Viking, p. 153.

¹⁶ Cohn, B. S. (1987), *Colonialism and its form of knowledge*, New Delhi : Oxford University Press, see p. 42-49 .

¹⁷ Ibid.

The vast array of information they gathered, the knowledge they acquired was used to establish complete control and domination. It was a classical case of what Michael Foucault calls, 'knowledge linked to power.'¹⁸

Recognising this vital link between knowledge and colonialism Bernard Cohn in his book 'Colonialism and its form of knowledge' observes.....

“Colonialism was all about knowledge. It was a cultural project of control... cultural forms in traditional societies were reconstructed and transformed by and through this knowledge.¹⁹

It was very important for them to acquire working knowledge of Sanskrit and Persian so that they could issue commands, collect information in order to assess and collect tax and maintain law and order. They used language as an instrument of rule. By understanding the manners, customs, prejudices better they could use it for better control of colonial subjects. They also used it to create a categorical divide between India and the west, locating their institutions on an evaluative scale of progress and decay. Cohn further writes, “Efforts by orientalist to study Indian language was not part of a collaborative effort for a renaissance but rather an important part of colonial project of control and demand..... antiquarian collections, archaeology, photographic forays were in fact form of constructing an India that could be better packaged, subsumed and ruled.”²⁰

They used history, documentation, certification and representation as state modalities to transform knowledge into power.²¹ India's past was controlled, represented and reconstructed through documentation and codification and this formed the basis of colonizers' capacity to govern. They effectively used statistical

¹⁸ Foucault, M. (1980), *Selected Interviews and other writings*, 1972 – 77, Sussex : The Harvester Press.

¹⁹ Cohn, op. cit. p. 45

²⁰ Ibid., p. 46.

²¹ Ibid., p. 49.

data and facts in order to consolidate administrative power. In the process, "India was objectified rendering it easily available for colonization"²².

Till now, the chapter has focussed upon the pathology of colonialism only from the point of view of the 'colonized self.' As mentioned earlier, the colonial logic and ideology binds the colonized as well as the colonizer in an intricate web of dyadic relationship. Hence any account of colonialism would remain incomplete if it doesn't talk about the 'self' of the colonizer, how it gets affected in the civilizational mission of colonialism.

It is important to note that colonialism doesn't cause only the colonized subject communities to suffer but also the colonizers. Oppressed as well as the oppressor both get affected as the pathos of colonialism is not felt unidirectionally but rather in both the societies. It is true that impact of colonialism was deep on the Indian society in the form of economic exploitation, cultural disruption and psychological uprooting but the vastness of Indian geography, its cultural diversity and political heterogeneity helped in diffusing the impact, restricting the impact of cultural imperialism to its urban centres, upper and middle class and the traditional elites. But for the rulers coming from a small island, the experience of being colonial rulers of such a vast, entirely different society was quite overwhelming and unsettling. It caused a long term cultural damage to there society.

The project of colonialism produced a false sense of cultural homogeneity in Britain. As it opened an alternative channel of social mobility, the society tried to ignore and overlook the basic social divisions that were getting stronger in society. 'It froze social consciousness, discouraging the basic cultural criticism that might have come from growing intellectual sensitivity'²³. Social deviants, unhappy with the prevalent social-order were shunted off to colonies; thus suppressing the expressions of cultural criticism. The tragedy of colonialism was also the tragedy of younger

²² Ibid.

²³ Nandy, op. cit., p. 21.

sons, delinquents, the women and all the etcetras and so forths of Britain. Women and femininity were rendered irrelevant in the new discourse of public sphere. Institutionalised violence was justified in the name of values such as competition, achievement, control and productivity. In a certain sense it was a 'de-civilization of the colonizer'²⁴ – as Ashish Nandy puts it.

Even as the colonizers were imbued with a sense of omnipotence and permanence, the pathology between the ideas and feelings, the disjunctions between their actions and true values that they vouched for engendered a dislocated, alienated self. As E.M. Forster puts it, "there was the undeveloped heart in the British self which separated them not only from the Indians but also from each other"²⁵.

2.2 Colonial Bureaucrats: Domination; Distance and Alienation –

After dealing with the ideology and pathology of colonialism in India, the focus now shifts to the people who were the torch-bearers of such an ideology – people who had come on the mythical civilizational mission; people who had come to rule India. They were the protagonists of the theatre of the British Raj. – the colonial bureaucrats; the 'British mandarins'. The focus of this section is not the British bureaucracy in India and hence it doesn't deal with a detailed description or the history of British bureaucracy as an institution; it will not talk about the evolutionary unfolding of British bureaucracy from the Covenant Service²⁶ of East India company to the Indian Civil Services of 'the Raj', rather, the focus will be the people who manned the institution of bureaucracy. It is about the people who mattered in the Raj. Their socio-cultural interface and experiences with Indian society; the impact these experiences had on them and the way they impacted the Indian society.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 23.

²⁵ See Nandy, op. cit. p. 16.

²⁶ see Misra, B.B. (1977), *The Bureaucracy in India*, Delhi : Oxford University Press.

In order to understand the colonial bureaucrat and to get an insight into the true character of civil officials who came to India, it is important to place them in a situation of paradoxical dilemma that stared at them. Here, it is important to know that India and people having any connections with it were not regarded highly in higher echelons of aristocracy in England.

“... any close connection with India appears to have carried a definite stigma in the thinking of aristocracy. (they regarded) anyone who shipped off to India, no matter how promising or how talented as somehow inferior (except the viceroys)... These groups had a strong tendency to think disparagingly both of India and of Englishman who ruled it.”²⁷

Generally, it is a myth propagated by definitely those who benefited from it, that Indian Civil Services was popular among the people in Britain. On the contrary, Indian services of any sort, including the highest echelon positions filled by non-civilians, was widely regarded as an enterprise solely for second-rate minds and middle class citizens.

“the lowly image of Indian service was clearly reflected in difficulties of recruiting young men from the desired back grounds.... A substantial number of candidates and recruits didn't hold B.A. degrees from Oxford or Cambridge, as originally desired, and a surprising portion of candidates had not attended any university, a phenomenon that become increasingly evident in later competitions.”²⁸

Even lowering the age – limit couldn't attract the desired talent into the service. While the aristocracy was never notably represented in the ICS in the era of open competition days, even the percentage of 'Oxbridge' candidates declined from a high of 62% in 1858 to 8.2% in 1874²⁹. Towards the last quarter of 19th century, it got recruits mainly from middle and lower middle classes, who never had a notable

²⁷ Spanenberg, B. (1976), *British Bureaucracy in India*, New Delhi : Manohar, p. 14-15.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 16.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 19.

university education but got success in the competitive examination by 'cramming. These newly recruits in the ICS the middle class 'crammers' were "socially and academically ostracized from the mainstream of university life"³⁰.

Now, it is clear that as a career ICS was never really popular in Britain and the recruits, the civil officials who came to serve in India were not regarded highly in their own land. Now, from here starts the paradoxical dilemma. Regarded inferior in their own native society, the moment they come to India they became 'the Sahib' – representing the British imperial authority. They needed to be projected as an epitome, an embodiment of British virtues – a race culturally and morally superior which gave them the legitimacy to rule. Everything – their body, their manners, their disposition was supposed to reflect the superiority of a superior race, which they may or may not have possessed in reality. They had to act out the romantic myth of courage and pluck. They needed to display vigour, robustness, mental as well as physical toughness.

Here, it is important to get back to the debate of racial-cultural ideology in order to understand why the physical appearance and disposition of 'the Sahib' was so important in the imperial discourse. British rule justified itself as the 'guardian' guiding (for which colonial rule was a 'necessary evil') people incapable of physical and moral progress. Now that it fixed the Indian in the position of inferiority, the racial justification demanded that Anglo-Indian official should epitomize the ideal Englishman of Anglo-Saxon heritage reflecting the superiority of British race. Body was regarded as 'physical outer map of moral inner man'³¹ – a manifestation of moral integrity and character. Body was treated as a road map to racial as well as cultural and moral characteristics.

Hence the imperial body of 'the Sahib' was typified as 'handsome features... grace of the aristocrat, broad forehead indicating intellect, strong features reflecting

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Collingham, E. M. (2001), *Imperial Bodies*, Cambridge : Polity Press, p. 122.

gentlemanliness, rude health and vigour, love for sports., hunting noble animals, riding a horse; determination energy and moral character of his class: possessing innate abilities to govern – skill, courage, patience demonstrating racial superiority'³². The ideal image was nonetheless difficult to separate but it became part of the colonial bureaucratic discourse. It laid emphasis on masculinity, honesty, uprightness, courage, endurance; observing rules, loyalty and sense of fairplay.

Even though the middle class civil official might not have possessed those virtues and attitudes, when he landed in India he had to portray this ideal mythical image of Sahib. He had to act out this role, in 'the Raj'. Failing which, he could invite criticisms back at home for not being truly English of noble birth and moral character. Thus, he was as much as a victim of racial-cultural ideology and the myth of the superior race.

Riddled with these contradictions and paradoxes, when a civil official landed in India, it appeared to him that he had landed in an altogether different civilization. It was so difficult for him to understand India. It was so alien so diverse and so immense. A distinct officer might know a little about his district. No one could know it all. In the words of a civil official who visited India for the first time, "There were more than 200 languages, and more than 3,000 castes. Tribes were also legions. The Indo-Aryan language in the north had nothing in common with the Dravidian languages of the South. Hindi was as different to Tamil as was English. A caste might have contained a hundred people a hundred thousand. A survey of different agrarian system could run to half a million words, a census of agriculture would have produced scores of distinct farming types. Everything ran into extremes – the terrain, the culture, the economy. Drought stricken deserts merged into waterlogged deltas;

³² Ibid., p. 125.

Stone-age trickled into huge industrial complexes; primitive animists co-existed with noble laureates”³³.

And this land of such immense diversities and contradictions the colonial official had to govern. Definitely, in India they were Plato’s ‘guardians’. They constituted a ruling class, a class apart and above. They formed a tiny cadre of a little over a thousand and they were supposed to rule over more than 300,000,00 Indians - almost the fifth of the human race. Each civilian had on an average 300,000 subjects. They were supposed to penetrate every corner of their subjects’ lives, as they (ICS) directed every activity of the colonial Anglo-Indian state. They collected the revenue; allocated land-rights; drafted laws; investigated crimes; judged law suits; inspected municipalities, schools, hospitals; improved agriculture; relieved famines; built public works and suppressed revolts – the list of their activities is endless.

An ordinary day in the life of a civilian is described by a civil official himself in a letter written to his family member.

“I get up between five and six, mount my horse for a ride. Return about seven, bathe and dress for breakfast to which I sit down about nine o’clock. (I) am in court from eleven till four, five or six according to the season of the year. On leaving court I take a ride or drive or lounge until the light begins to fade, when I dress for dinner. I get into my Tonga and go wherever Dinner may be and get to bed again by eleven o’clock. ... a country life in India is dull, gloomy, spiritless and solitary”³⁴.

They had to do real hard work cramping their body over a desk for hours as public duty in a trying, debilitating hot climate. The burden of paperwork from morning till night marked a civilian’s life. Walter Lawrence, Assistant Commissioner at Lahore in 1880, wrote to his father – “I breakfast at 10:30 and don’t eat anything till 7:30. This is now 5:30 and I have been hard at work since 7:30 am. – so my life is

³³ Dewey, op. cit., p. 3.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 5.

not a bed of roses and my dreams of oriental luxury and repose have rudely awakened”³⁵.

Looking at their tough life at work in one of the most trying conditions one is forced to think that what was it that drove them on. What was the source of their spirited hard-work? What was the belief, the ideology that pushed them on?

Clive Dewey in his book, ‘The British Mandarins’ writes that. “It was the two rival ideologies – the ideology of upliftment and the cult of cultural humanism which drove them to hard work in India for Indians”³⁶. He elaborates that one set of civilians was imbued with the evangelical spirit which definitely ensued from the racial-cultural ideology of civilizing the people. They thought that Indians were sunk in sin; their poverty was due to their indolence and extravagance. They had joined the ICS to improve the peasants’ morals, as they (peasants) lacked the self discipline to prosper they needed a crusade for their moral regeneration; civilians worked with a missionary spirit for upliftment of the society. The other set of civilians was guided by the spirit of friendship and humanism. They were horrified by social hatred found in India which poisoned personal relations. They believed that as Indians yearned for affection, love sensitivity and imagination could reconcile Indians to the Raj. Dewey concludes that ICS veered between these two poles of assimilation and preservation.

While Dewey’s conclusion can be debated, as we will see later how they (civilians) would maintain a measure of distance, haughtiness and ensure prestigious deference from Indians in many instances, it is true that seeing the direct impact of their work on people’s lives did push them spiritedly. The personalized aspect of work, occasions of making personal, on the spot decision at times – it reconciled them to the other wise routine work. They were seen as ‘mai-baap’ of their people, touching each and every aspect of their life. Be it saving an ordinary folk from the landlords, the moneylenders and the traders, building canals and roads for them, they

³⁵ Mason, op. cit., p. 64.

³⁶ Dewey, op. cit., see Introduction.

could see the fruitful impact of their action and it definitely made them believe that they were the 'chosen ones'. A civilian wrote back home:

“There was hard work but it seemed worth doing: it was always concerned with people's lives. In the hot weather.... there was a feeling that you were in the front line; it was a braced, tense life in which there was the continual pressure of responsible decision”³⁷.

Even though the rising tide of routine administration, excessive bureaucratization leading to proliferation of rules and procedures, manuals, codes, handbooks, circulars etc. – all these did reduce their authority and scope of personal discretion considerably, rendering them a mere cog in that vast colonial bureaucratic machine and denting heavily their 'mai-baap' image, but still they saw themselves as ruling the country on the ground; which was a source of their pride.

There was a sort of ambivalence which marked the attitude of these civilians towards India and its people. On the one hand they were aware that they were on a mission, doing something which was of historical importance. It involved an element of mythical romanticism knowing that they were serving in one of the most 'cherished jewels' of the British Empire, causing in their own way and sense upliftment of its people. They were definitely moved and affected by the complete faith affection deference and dependence that the ordinary Indian would show to them – “They turned suddenly into human beings who would squat on the ground to tell you their troubles, people childish no doubt, cunning but simple, laughable stubborn people, affectionate, callous and gentle, people for whom you too felt a real affection as you sat on a string cot in the village street and drank buffalo milk in which sugar had been stirred by a dirty finger. It was an affection that would survive the next hot weather”³⁸.

³⁷ Collinghan, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

³⁸ Mason, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

And yet despite this sense of humanism, being a representative of imperial power deriving their authority from British monarch they were expected to maintain a show of haughtiness and a measure of distanciation which was considered necessary to sustain domination. Every act of their's – right from horse riding and shooting to playing cricket – was meant to display the physical and moral superiority of their race and invoke deference from the local people. For every civilian who would come to India, the stage would be set and he was just supposed to slip into his role. A role which was aided by the props of his official position – white skin, Anglo-Saxon physique, British clothing, distinctive Sala Topi, authoritative manner and tone which at once elicited deference. And if the deferential attitude was not forthcoming naturally from the Indians, it was forcefully 'manufactured' by imposing codes of behaviour. In the context of face to face interaction, everything right from customs, manners and dressing to the proper form of salutation was defined for Indians and any deviation from that was taken as a challenge – an act to be punished. It was common to assault respectable Indians because when passing on the road they wouldn't have dismounted from their horses in token of their inferiority. Definitely, this idea of prestige and deference was entailed with or rather ensued from the belief in racial superiority.

Such belief and attitude also led them to maintain a measure of distance, at times, by deliberate separation and segregation. One of the foremost examples of this prestige – display and act of segregation was Indian Railways. Describing it, Collingham in his book 'Imperial Bodies' writes that –

“British in India would always travel in the first class, which was ‘a self-contained sphere of comfort’ luxurious in comparison to their own utilitarian trains at home. Even though they might prefer to save money in train tickets at home, in India anyone who travelled any less than in luxury was seen as letting the side down”³⁹.

³⁹ Collingham, op. cit., p. 145.

Further he quotes an official –

“European in India is a Sahib, a member of ruling race, must not lower his position by traveling in anything less than second class, that too when your financial position absolutely prohibits the luxury of the first”⁴⁰.

Being aware that railways might become a site and reason of their free mixing with Indians and anxious to avoid contact and maintain distance, every station had separate dining rooms for Hindus, Muslims and Europeans. Many towns had separate stations – one for Indian town and one for European station or cantonment. Trains were divided into first and second class mail trains (which ran on time) and third class and good trains. Indians were not allowed to travel first class despite the fact that officially they were entitled to it.

‘Physical and cultural incompatibility’, ‘starkly different manners’ – these were the reasons given to justify this segregation, but at the root of it was definitely the ideology of being racially and culturally superior. It was not as if Indians were not disgusted by certain aspects of British bodily behaviour but the balance of power meant that they had to accommodate and adjust to British tastes rather than otherwise.

This practice was not only limited to their interface with common folks but rather with the kings and princes as well. Another site of prestige – display, act of deference and segregation was the Imperial Durbar⁴¹. Symbolically, till 1857, in the era of Mughal Empire, durbars were the place of cementing relationship which was marked by a ‘warm hug’ and ‘embrace’ between the Mughal emperor and English – symbolizing physical intimacy; a bond of equality, respect and affection between them. But after 1857, as British got their authority from their monarch and not the mughal emperor, they realized that now they occupied a place in the social hierarchy above Indian kings and princes. Significantly in the Imperial Durbar held in 1877,

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 147.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 136.

1903 and 1911 the status of Indian princes was reconfigured and they had to express their allegiance to British. Earlier acts of two-way exchange of gifts, physical act of embracing and hand-holding were done away with. In a symbolic gesture, which finds description in Collingham's 'Imperial Bodies.' – "Lord Curzon in a Durbar is seen as asserting his authority by maintaining physical distance – occupying a dais up which the Nawab of Bhawalpur has to climb in order to pay his respect by shaking hands. In 1911, Indian princes actually knelt before the king emperor in the homage tent. Thus, signifying the reality of an altered relationship – from incorporation, equality and respect, to obsequiousness and obescience⁴².

Even as they retreated into a reserved distance and wooden posture, expecting Indians to adopt bodily demeanour of deference, their own personal self was reduced to symbols of formal dignity and protocol. Somewhere in this entire process of play of imperial authority and Indian submission, they felt that they were merely the actors, the puppets on the stage not leading a real life but rather a role where the scripts are written already even before their arrival on the scene and they simply have to act their role out. Their own individual self was getting lost in this whole drama of regalia, show and splendour. The world around them seemed to be stage-managed, hiding the reality of a churning unrest. Despite the anxiety, the insecurity lurking within, they were supposed to believe in and propagate the myth of omnipotence and permanence. All this led to a considerable social dislocation, an unsettling and alienating experience for the civilian himself.

2.3 Sociology of Indian Civil Service

Even as we examine the changing contours of bureaucratic personality it is pertinent to underscore once again the relevance of sociological enquiry into the Indian Civil Service. Any institution has to be studied in the context of society in

⁴² Ibid., p. 130.

which it operates and the life and culture of the people whom it is designed to serve. Even the people who man the institution work within a particular social-milieu, a socio-political structure, which decisively impacts their functioning. Hence, in the context of Indian bureaucracy, colonial India and its socio-political structure within which the colonial bureaucrat operated formed the starting point of this chapter.

Within the same context, 1947 – the year when India got independence constitutes the breaking point. In order to understand the underlining importance of this transition we will have to appreciate the changing contours of Indian society and place the bureaucracy as well as the bureaucrat within that context.

It is not as if the bureaucracy in India became indianised overnight at one stroke. Rather it was a slow process that reached its culmination and qualitative difference as India got independence. Here, it is important to remember that Indianisation of bureaucracy, the Indian Civil Services, was an important issue even in the freedom struggle. Even as early as in 1877-79, the newly established Indian Association had organized a national agitation on the issue of Indian civil service. The Indian National Congress, in its very first session of 1885, took up the cause of reducing the age limit from 21 to 19. Apart from it, their demands, in the form of protests and representations, ranged from – demanding simultaneous examination for the Indian civil service (in India along with England), fixing the upper age limit at 23 and greater representation of Indians in the service⁴³.

Not going into the historic details of the Indianization of the Indian civil service in the pre-independence colonial India as it doesn't constitute the focus of the study, it suffices to state that due to relentless campaign by the Congress, and the changing geo-political context where even British saw that they couldn't completely keep the Indians out of bureaucracy, a little measure of Indianisation was achieved. But this Indianisation was only in a limited measure that too in content and not in

⁴³ Misra, B.B. (1970), *The Administrative History of India 1834-1947*, London : Oxford University Press, p. 42-45.

spirit. Even the Indians who were recruited were completely indoctrinated into being a loyal servant of the colonial empire.

This explains the fact that why certain people like Surendra Nath Banerjee, R.C. Dutt, and S.C. Bose couldn't continue in the service. Moreover, Indians were generally excluded from higher posts of the service. Even in terms of content, the hollowness of Indianisation and the British monopoly over the civil services can be gauged from the fact that at time of the first world war in 1914, Indians held only 5% of the total number of posts in the Indian Civil Service⁴⁴. The exclusion of Indians was justified on the premise that "the highest ranks of civil employment in India, those in the Imperial Civil Service (later known as Indian Civil Service) as a general rule be held by the Englishmen for the reason that they possess, partly by heredity, partly by upbringing and partly by education, the knowledge of the principles of government, the habits of mind and vigour of character which are essential for the task"⁴⁵. It was also added that the rule of India being a British rule, the tone and standard should be set by those who had created and are responsible for it. To take an example, M.G. Ranade's appointment as joint judge of Thana in 1880 was rejected, even though 'it was inconsistent with the provisions of 1879'. Rules were re-interpreted in order to reject Ranade's nomination. Even Lord Ripon, the then viceroy to India, unable to defend this deliberate attempt of exclusion could only say that "the feeling in council against [Ranade's] selection was unanimous"⁴⁶.

Thus it becomes clear that in spite of all the protests and representations by the Congress, demanding the Indianisation of the service and subsequent commissions [Aitchinson Commission – 1886; Islington Commission – 1912; Lee

⁴⁴ Ibid.,

⁴⁵ Spangenberg, op. cit., p. 3.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 315.

Commission – 1924]⁴⁷ and their reports, the indianisation of the civil services was only formal and not substantial.

Hence, we can, in our study of Indian bureaucracy, assume Independence as a qualitative break in order to understand the character of Indian bureaucracy and the Indian bureaucrat. As it is an important breaking point in terms of the context that it provided to bureaucracy, it is pertinent to take stock of the prevalent situation and the contextual framework within which the Indian bureaucracy was expected to operate henceforth.

As India got Independence, the contextual framework, the character as well as the role of government underwent a significant change. John Seely underlines this changing character by terming it as ‘organic and free government’⁴⁸. In an organic government, those who govern and those who are governed belong to the same social or racial group. A free government means that government not merely belongs to the same community as the governed but also that the government is elected by the people and hence represents their common will. An organic government which is also free is based on nationalism and democracy. After Independence in India, we had an organic and free government – a national democratic government.

British rule showed little faith in the virtues of those whom it governed due to its ideology of racial-cultural superiority. Hence, despite being able and efficient to a certain extent, it had little desire to inspire self confidence in Indians. Psychology always constitutes a decisive element in governance in terms of relations between people and government. After Independence, this psychology changed marking a shift in the relationship between people and government. Now, people became conscious that they had a voice in their own destiny and that it could be fulfilled by their own exertions.

⁴⁷ See Misra, op. cit.

⁴⁸ Mathai, John (1959), “Administration : Then and now”, *IJPA*, Vol. 5, No. 1, p. 36.

Administration largely depends upon the purpose of the state, its politico-economic philosophy and the functions it wishes to discharge. In order to eradicate the backwardness, poverty, illiteracy and mal-nourishment of the masses, a positive role of government was envisaged for the new dispensation. For a newly independent third world country, the progressive changes needed to be 'induced' rather than waiting for it to happen. It had to take the task of nation – building. C.P. Bhambhri talks about this new envisaged role in his book. –

'Governments in under developed countries, in order to achieve the goals of national development, and implement its programme needs developed and differentiated political and administrative structures. To achieve the task of directed and planned change, it requires cluster of institutions, structures of rule making, rule implementation and rule adjudication. But the scarcity of such structures compels the ruling elite in these societies to fall back upon public bureaucracies in order for them to act as reliable instrument of social change and economic development'⁴⁹.

In the case of India as well a new role for the bureaucracy was envisaged – the task of national reconstruction. It was conceived as an instrument of social change and nation building.

Here it is important to pause, ask and examine – was Indian bureaucracy, in terms of its structural and attitudinal disposition, ready to don its new role and perform the challenging task it was required to perform?

Lets us first examine the character of Indian bureaucracy at the time of independence, the way we inherited it. In terms of role it had a limited focus of guarding the trade and commercial interests of colonial rule for which internal law and order and external security was needed. Thus, maintaining law and order; preparing land records, assessing and collecting revenues, and settling litigations were their principal tasks. A bureaucrat, even though being looked upon as 'mai-

⁴⁹ Bhambhri, C.P. (1972), *Administrators in Chaning Societies* , Delhi : National Publishing House, p. 1.

baap', was a benevolent autocrat who invoked a sense of fear and awe by his pompous show of authority. In terms of contact with people, it was minimal as the colonial bureaucrat deliberately created distance to invoke prestige and fear. 'The Economist' reported once in its article.

"The Civil Services has seemed to become a closer corporation in proportion to the need of it to be more open..... a combination of choice and circumstance has cut many of them off from their folkman beyond the pale. They work long hours in the offices: they dine only with their colleagues. The hours they keep have killed their outside interest.... The burden of secret knowledge they carry or in some cases, the even heavier burden of knowing that they alone really understand the complex issues with which public be sports itself - inhibits the freedom of conversation with the layman"⁵⁰.

Apart from being aloof and distanced, the colonial bureaucrat was also elitist and loyalty to the colonial empire was the only virtue he required to possess in order to be rewarded. Moreover, he was not accountable or answerable to the people's representatives. It is important to go back and take into account these imperatives in order to underline the complete contrasting role it was asked to don as well as carry out from what it was accustomed and designed to do. These dilemmas need to be highlighted in order to point out how the inherited structure and the prevalent disposition of the bureaucrat was ill suited for the new role envisaged for him in the changing context of democratic government with an agenda of nation-building and goals of development.

⁵⁰ See Punjabi, K.L. (1965), *The Civil Servant in India*, Bombay : Bhartiya Vidya Bhawan, p. 69.

Newly independent India, imbued with the spirit of decolonization, faced the dilemma of 'getting on' with the colonial structure and attitudinal disposition, a relic of the British Raj. More so, ascribing to it the new role of national reconstruction, vexed our politicians a great deal.

2.4 Independent India : Spirit of Decolonization; People's Governance; Redefining bureaucracy

We find articulation of such vexation in the thinking of Nehru who was very skeptical as well as critical of the role of bureaucrats in nation-building and development. He referred to them as "an expensive luxury"⁵¹. He asserted that they lived in a circumscribed world of their own – an Anglo-India, surrounded by sycophants and unaware of the dynamics of the Indian social scene. He said, "But of one thing I am quite sure, that no new order can be built up in India so long as the spirit of ICS pervades our administration and public services. That spirit of authoritarianism is the ally of imperialism and it can not co-exist with freedom. It will either succeed in crushing freedom or will be swept away itself. Only with one type of state it is likely to fit in and that is fascist type. Therefore it seems quite essential that the I.C.S and similar services must disappear completely as such before we can start real work on a new order"⁵².

Nehru's vision of India as a society based on socialist pattern hinged greatly on the planned development. For him, the real dilemma was that he knew that the role of bureaucracy was indispensable and inevitable and yet, he was skeptical whether structurally or attitudinally it was suited to the job it was required to do.

⁵¹ Nehru, J.L. (1936), *An Autobiography*, New Delhi : Oxford University Press, p. 441.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 445

On the other end of this political spectrum was Sardar Patel a staunch supporter of the old-structure bureaucracy and great believer in its ability to accomplish any task it was asked to do –

“We have only a small number of civil servants left. Many people say that they are working in their old way. But those who have any experience of administration know under what circumstances and how much they are working. Outsiders can’t appreciate their work. Many of them, loyal workers and patriots, are working with us day and night. All that we have been able to achieve is because of their loyalty and whole hearted support”⁵³. Casting all doubts and apprehensions aside, the then Home minister put up a convincing case –

“I need hardly emphasize that an efficient, disciplined, contented service assured of its prospects as a result of honest and diligent work is a sine qua non of sound administration under a democratic regime even more than under an authoritarian rule”⁵⁴...

He fought tooth and nail within the Parliament to provide constitutional guarantee to the services under Art. 311.

In order to understand why the future of ICS generated such vigorous debates within the Parliament and among the political elites, we need to go into the question of relationship between political leaders and administrators in a transition society, which Fred Riggs calls ‘prismatic society’⁵⁵, more deeply.

Taking India as a representative example of a society in transition, a ‘prismatic’ society, we see that the logic of colonial rule dictated that traditionally bureaucracy was not answerable to political leaders. Policy formation, implementation as well as its adjudication was the monopoly of bureaucracy. But as

⁵³ See Constituent Assembly Debates, Vol. X, No. 1, Oct. 1949, p. 45-60.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Riggs, F. W. (1962), “For Ecological Approach : The Sala Model”, Ferrel Heady and S. Stokes (eds.), *Papers in Comparative Public Administration*, The University of Michigan.

India got independence and changed from an autocratic colonial regime to a democracy, the equations changed. Now, bureaucracy had to operate within the overall context of democracy. It had to be guided as well as controlled by peoples' representatives – the political leaders. The political element was now supposed to lay down the public policies, define the task of bureaucracy and supervise their implementation. The bureaucracy now needed to adjust to the demands and needs of a democratic political system. From here ensued the problem of adjustment between the political leaders and the administrators. Mutual suspicion, in this changed order, ruled their mind. Neither of them believed in the changing role of each other.

In Indian context, Indian Civil Services suffered from a political disrepute also because it was a symbol of foreign domination. Being seen as servant of colonial masters, it was ironical that now they were supposed to work under those Indian leaders whom they might have even put in jails and more so, many of the high-handedness of colonial regime on the leaders of independence movement were identified with civil administrators.

Moreover, these political leaders also questioned the structural assumption of 'neutrality', which according to them was anyway just a garb for unflinching loyalty to their colonial masters. They raised doubts about the usefulness of civil servants as administrators of socialist policies, programmes and activities. They advocated that government committed to socialist philosophy also required civil servants committed to socialistic order of society. [However it appeared untenable as coming to power of a non-socialist government with agenda of privatization would have required a complete change again in the bureaucratic set up, which was not feasible].

It is not as if the grudge was only from the side of political leaders. Even civil servants were apprehensive about their role and role-adjustment with political leaders in the new dispensation. They were yet to come to terms with the supremacy of

political leadership. They also had doubts about the administrative capabilities of their political masters. This mutual distrust is highlighted by Kothari and Roy —

“... the interaction between administrators and political leaders is likely to be characterized by tensions and conflicts not only because of different normative commitments but also because of position-specific bias in role conceptions”⁵⁶.

To sum it up, it was a case of natural contradiction between the democratic philosophy of competition and alternative political parties with various philosophies and ideologies vying for acceptance and a neutral and permanent civil service, in a transitional, ‘prismatic society’.

It was a challenge of adjustment for both the sides. On one hand, ICS with its depleted strength – at the time of Independence in 1947 there were 1,064 ICS officials after partition the number reduced drastically to 451 officials who stayed back⁵⁷. In spite of all the assurances and guarantees to safeguard their interests and promises of adequate compensations, almost all European members of the ICS voluntarily retired (254 in total) and the majority of Muslim civil servants opted for Pakistan. Thus there was acute shortage of good, experienced personnel and with this depleted strength bureaucracy had to face some immediate challenges like – maintaining law and order, communal peace and harmony, integration of princely states into Indian union, and giving inputs to the new policies of national development. But above all, the paramount challenge before them was to adjust to the demands of democratic polity and new political masters possessing different views, ideologies and at times, coming from altogether different social background as well. On the other hand, the challenge before the political leaders was to be able to work with these civil servants whom they traditionally saw as adversaries and agents of colonialism. Now, they had to guide and motivate these civil servants to work for

⁶ Kothari, S. and Roy, R. (1969), “*Relation Between Politicians and Administrators at the District Level*”, New Delhi : IIPA, p. 167-168.

⁷ Braibanti , R. (1963), ‘Reflections on Bureaucratic Reform in India’, *Administration and Economic Development in India*, Durham : Duke University Press.

nation-building; to achieve the task of development. They also needed to mould the character of bureaucracy by structural and attitudinal changes through new policies of training and recruitment.

In these last few pages we have taken stock of the situation just after Independence in the context of Indian bureaucracy. It was necessary in order to know what the challenges were before the bureaucracy as well as political leaders while laying a new foundation of independent democratic India. What were the 'dilemmas of inheritance'⁵⁸ before a sovereign, democratic, republic wanting itself to establish on a socialistic pattern; what were the natural inherent contradiction which dogged the political leadership as well as the bureaucracy. This stock taking will help us in examining the steps taken, particularly the immediate one (as in this section we are focussing on the period of transition), which were taken to meet these challenges. Whether the structural changes required to tune in the bureaucracy were made or not, or what steps were taken to mould their attitude. These questions would also take us to the issue of recruitment and training which form the focus of the next section.

Recruitment and Training:

Despite many leaders expressing their doubts about the usefulness of ICS in independent democratic India and questioning the structural assumptions and attitudinal values, their suitability for the developmental agenda, it is interesting to note that there was no radical change in the general administrative structure. 'No revolutionary departure from the past was envisaged. The process (of change) was one of evolution rather than of revolution'⁵⁹. Precipitating events after the independence – partition, communal riots, law and order problems also ensured that stability, order and continuity with the past were given primacy over structural and attitudinal changes.

⁵⁸ Bhambhri, op. cit., p. 3.

⁵⁹ Prasad, B. (1968), *The Indian Administrative Service*, New Delhi : S. Chand & Co., p. 47.

To start with, certain structural assumptions like neutrality, hierarchy, chain of command, written rules, permanency and security of service despite being questioned and doubted were not altered. They remained unchanged.

Keeping the broad nature of All India Services intact, the only change made was that of name. It was now called **Indian Administrative Service** instead of Indian Civil Service.

The recruitment pattern also didn't see any substantial change. In order to fill the acute shortage of officials, apart from open competitive examination, suitable officers from provincial government were promoted and officials were also recruited from 'open-market'⁶⁰.

But after few initial years, open-competition system became the main channel of recruitment. As a result of these measures, within a decade the strength of civil servants almost doubled from 1,064 to 2,010.

Even though the recruitment policy was not substantially altered to facilitate the entry of wider section of society in the IAS with greater representation of backward section of society, yet open competition and fomenting economic-political aspirations saw a subtle change in the socio-economic background of new entrants as more and more people from different classes found their way to IAS.

Trivedi and Rao conducted a study of 615 probationers recruited during 1948-1960 and came to the conclusion that,

“the rigid exclusivity of the ICS maintained by recruitment and their common background of education was not the characteristic of IAS. Homogeneity of ICS was lost”⁶¹.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Trivedi, R. and Rao, D.N. (1960), “Regular Recruits to the IAS : A Study”, *Journal of National Academy of Administration*, Vol. V, p. 50-80.

Out of 1830 officers in IAS in 1960, they carefully studied the socio-economic background of 598 direct recruits [32%] and 255 emergency recruits from states [14%], as these two sections would indicate the trend of coming years. In their study they found that,

- 44.5% recruits came from families which already had a member in government service. Of the rest, the data goes as follows –
- 15% - teachers 10 % - businessman; 5% - physician.
- 10% - lawyers 8 % - agriculturists;

They saw an increasing trend in number of agriculturists, which indicated an egalitarian tendency.

On the basis of criteria of wealth, they found that

- 50% recruits came from families of middle class with monthly income of Rs. 300/- to Rs. 800/-
- There was a marked increase in entrants from families with income less than Rs. 300/- [24%]
- Recruits coming from families with monthly income more than Rs. 800/- p.m. – 32%, but their strength was stable.

Their research also showed that half of the entrants (50%) were the university graduates with the best of academic records. Only 10% of the recruits were educated in expensive Indian public schools or foreign universities.

Their findings indicate that the elitist, exclusivist homogeneity of ICS was definitely disturbed in its new avatar of IAS. Despite the fact that no drastic, clearly defined break with the past occurred, the new composition of fresh recruits indicated an egalitarian leavening. As the grip of ICS tradition was weakened, new traditions, ethos and point of view emerged. Fewer than half of the cadre in 1960 came in direct contact with the traditions of ICS. It also softened the elitist fraternal bonds, the

hallmark of ICS. 'Economical development and political modernization seemed to have captured the imagination of the new IAS and the traditions of the ICS seem to have been pushed to background of historical almost antiquarian interest'⁶².

This new change that subtly came, also changed the power and prestige relationship of bureaucracy with other sectors of society. It reconstructed the value-system so that other sectors could successfully challenge the power of bureaucracy. As low income group entrants got recruited, its leverage of power became more even with traditional as well as other emerging elites. It ensured a balance in power-relationship.

Training becomes an important component of administration as the candidates are recruited on general merit with no special skills attained beforehand which is required for the job. It is only through training that skills are imparted and even more importantly, attitudes are moulded in order to a tune the recruit for the job.

As the newly independent India was imbued with the spirit of decolonization, it was believed that it was the training during which the bureaucrat acquired his 'bureaucratic attributes'. Along with a narrow base of recruitment, it was training which actually imparted the ICS its elitist, exclusivist and colonial character. Hence, it was thought that the 'decolonization of training' was essential to instill true values which were required in a sovereign, democratic country.

Hence, we see the first marked change from the pattern of pre 1947 ICS, in the field of training. Training in English universities for the probationers was abruptly terminated. Earlier, they were required to be trained in English universities studying law, history, culture and other liberal arts subjects in order to get first hand experience of British culture, society and administration. In reality, it was designed in order to condition the attitude of ICS. Even the Indian recruits, as they came into intimate contact with English intellectual and social life, made real effort to perfect

⁶² Braibanti, op. cit., p. 56.

the use of English language in order to enhance their self respect, pride, poise, and commanding presence. It helped them to forge a bond of common experience with British ICS colleagues. Immersed into the stream of British life, the training period detached them from the realities of Indian life. The training conducted them to become arrogant and they developed a kind of disdain for Indian customs. Being snobbish, they lived in an exclusive world of their own, unaware of the dynamics of the Indian social scene.

Hence there was an eminent need to decolonize this alienating training. It was a bold step to discontinue the old module, for it was tried and tested and it also required a new training programme which was to be developed on the basis of social-cultural ethos of Indian society, and that too by Indians themselves. The previous philosophy of training which suited the colonial logic now needed to be replaced.

Participating in a symposium of the IAS training school, S.B. Bapat, the second principal of the school described the new philosophy of training...

“Finally and what is perhaps the most important sense, training implies what the good gardener does to the growing sapling pruning off the unwanted bits, supporting the weaker limbs, generally giving shape and direction but otherwise leaving the plant free to grow to its full normal mature stature. While all other aspects of training were duly allowed for, it was this last named aspect which has been most emphasised in the pattern evolved for the basic training of IAS probationers⁶³.

Guided by the new philosophy and outlook, training programmes, courses and modules were designed completely by eminent academicians, public administrators and intellectuals taking into account the needs and changing demands of a developing society from its civil servants. Training was given adequate importance; it can be gauged from the fact that eminent scholars from all walks of life gave their inputs in designing the courses. A.N. Jha, an eminent Sanskrit Scholar, with wide knowledge

⁶³ Bapat, S.B. (1955), “The Training of Indian Administrative Service”, *IJPA*, Vol. I, No. 2, p. 122.

on culture, literature and art was appointed as the first director of National Academy of Administration, Mussorie in 1959. Before that, in the initial years after Independence, the civil servants were trained at Metcalfe House, in New Delhi. But it is only after the establishment of National Academy at Mussorie that a new curriculum took shape and a new point of view of IAS emerged.

At the academy, these new recruits, belonging to all non-technical union Class I services were trained for five months in foundational courses followed by a seven months course which was only for IAS probationers. Training all the recruits to Class I services in foundational courses is another major departure from colonial ICS days. Earlier, the ICS officer never participated or competed in any training with any other cadre throughout his career as it was considered to be exclusive and elitist cadre. Now, probationers of 10 different services were trained simultaneously, in the same institution, in the foundation courses. In these five months, probationers of all the cadres, including IAS, were allowed to mix freely. They shared the room while staying, participated in assignments together. This was designed to dissolve the artificial boundaries between services and engender attitudes of mutual respect which would have subsequently affected patterns of co-ordination in Indian government.

In their foundational course, apart from studying tool subjects like Economics, Administrative History of India, Criminal law and procedure, General Administration – the emphasis was given on learning the cultural and artistic heritage of India. They helped in developing a sense of nationalism and pride-attitudes which are crucial to the development of states. In a heterogeneous diverse culture, mutual respect is enhanced for internal cultural differences if we are aware of it – this seemed to be the thinking behind the emphasis given to the study of cultural heritage. Moreover, broader cultural understanding was considered to be directly relevant in order to appreciate the problems of administration in terms of development of political values. IAS probationers were also required to learn the language of the state to which they

would get posted. This was deemed necessary to understand and appreciate the niceties, subtleties, and the true meaning of its idioms, adages and slang.

These probationers were also required to get some practical training. Starting with physical exercise at 7:30 in the morning, they were also given instructions in riding, musketry and motor driving.

Horse-riding was given special attention as all the probationers had to pass a qualifying test of 100 marks, which was also added in the final result determining their rank. It also included learning every part of it. –trotting, mounting and dismounting, saddling and bridling, cantering, jumping a hedge hurdle and points were allotted separately for these. Horse-riding, being a typical relic of colonial ICS days, generated a great debate – whether it was useful in daily life of an IAS official or not.

Practical training through village tours were held to learn various aspects of community development work in which they were made to study on–the –spot village problems. To summarise, the programme for one year of the training was designed to be like this –

- a) Foundational course – 150 days.
- b) Army attachment – 30 days.
- c) Bharat Darshan – 45 days.
- d) Visit to Delhi – 15 days.
- e) Study at Academy – 120 days.

After one year of training, probationers dispersed to report to the states of their allotment. This second phase of training was marked by – a) purely on the job training and; b) a mixture of institutional and practical on the job training. This period used to be from 10 to 25 months in different states.

Not going into the details of the training programme as that doesn't form the focus of the section, it is pertinent to critically review the training programme from the point of view of its underlying philosophy. It is true that some really genuine attempts were made to decolonize the training programme by designing courses indigenously and training them in India only. These courses and practical training were meant to infuse in the probationers leadership qualities, firmness of character and intellectual power to grasp the situation as a whole. An all-round development in their personality-physical as well as mental, was envisaged in the training. The philosophy and the purpose of the training supposedly were to acquire knowledge, develop skills and inculcate those attitudes which are essential for democracy, economic development, planning and a welfare state.

As a departure from ICS days, an overview of training programme indicates that they were designed to develop a 'generalist' administrator, with a wide-range of knowledge about various fields rather than having intensive knowledge and skills, specialising in any particular fields. Moreover, it seems that earlier there was a greater emphasis on practical training where the probationer spent a considerable time under the tutelage of District officer and tried to grasp the problem at close quarters on the ground for quite a longer period of time than in the post-independence years.

Looking at the training procedures, one gets an idea about the manner in which the agenda of decolonizing the civil services was attempted. It was a project of giving Indian bureaucracy as well as the Indian bureaucrat a new image. This new bureaucrat was designed, moulded and trained to be substantially different from his colonial counterpart. He was supposed to be 'our bureaucrat', who would take on the responsibilities of national building, development and progress. This bureaucrat was not supposed to be concerned with serving the commercial interests of the colonial empire, rather he was supposed to work for the impoverished and mal-nourished masses with sensitivity, concern and democratic spirit. This bureaucrat was not meant

to be a benevolent autocrat, rather he was supposed to be a development entrepreneur. It was hoped and expected that they would work with a sense of purpose and would show the urgency and eagerness to deliver.

It is important to get reminded again that this section was devoted to the initial transition years after Independence and the focus generally was on the decade after the independence. It was examined to see what the challenges were before the bureaucracy and government in the changed, democratic context and how it planned to deal with it in order to develop and mould a bureaucrat from a colonial bureaucrat to a public servant. Was the bureaucrat able to grasp the demand of his new role and how in these years has he responded to his role – perception? How far the hopes and expectations, that the nation had from them, at the time of independence, have been realized? How far the agenda of the decolonizing the services has paid off? The next chapter is devoted to find out the answers to these questions. An attempt would be made to look for these answers through the eyes of the men in question – the bureaucrats themselves. How do they feel, think and respond to the accusation of having belied the hopes of the people reposed in them. It is important to look at the trajectory of post independent India through their view point, by studying their life history in detail. It will help us to get the other side of the story, which would give us a more balanced view.

Chapter - III

Bureaucracy as Lived Experience: Select biographies

3.1 Life – history of select bureaucrats.

Biographies are an important source of data in the field of sociological enquiry. They tell us about the interface between man and society. Biographies tell us about the life experiences which go on to make an impact on the personality structure. They inform us about a number of feelings -joy and sorrow; hopes and aspirations, beliefs and expectations, achievements and disappointments, success and failure--which play a considerable role in shaping and moulding the personality.

As the dissertation tries to unravel the bureaucratic personality, an attempt has been made to understand the attitudinal dispositions of the bureaucrats in general by focussing on certain select biographies of the few. They are in the form of case studies. It can be pointed out that a few select biographies of the bureaucrats might not be sufficient to make a general remark on the personality structure of a whole group. But at the same time, one can't discount the fact that life-histories of individuals when put in aggregate with analytical precision, constitute the social history of a group. Moreover, taking into account the limitations of time and space, a careful study of these select biographies can give us a fair idea of the general.

For the purpose of the study 10 bureaucrats of various central services i.e. – IAS, IFS, IPS, IRS and Excise & Customs were selected on a random basis thus attempting to make it a fairly representative sample. These case-studies are based on the interviews conducted at the Academy as well as at their offices. In these case-studies, an attempt has been made to find out their individual profiles and their socio-economic background; their service experiences, the mode of training and its impact on their personality; the sub-group culture; their interface with people and politicians; their engagement with authority, power and hierarchy.

Honesty is his forte

Mr. Raman Kumar is the Commissioner in the Narcotics Bureau Department. He belongs to Indian Revenue Service [IRS] and is on deputation for the time being in this department. He joined the service in 1988 and has been in the service for the last 24 years. Coming from a middle class background, his father was a judge in the lower court in Allahabad and used to get a salary of Rs. 1500 p.m. when he (Raman) had joined the service. His mother is a housewife. Hailing from an urban background, his schooling had been entirely in government schools which according to him, in those days, were quite good unlike today.

He did his M.A. in philosophy from B.H.U. where he was keenly interested in the pursuit of academic excellence. Being one of those “studious kinds”, he had a research bent of mind and also used to get JRF (fellowship) of Rs. 400/- p.m. Despite being interested in academics, he was pressurized to get into the Civil Services by his father, which he calls a typical disease of feudal BIMARU states.

When asked about his perception of Bureaucratic Personality and whether he actually believes in something called a ‘typical bureaucrat’ he confirmed that he firmly believed in the premise that the job one does infuses a great deal of attitudinal dispositions which go on to make a typical ‘job-oriented personality’. Enumerating the personality traits of a typical bureaucrat, he said that “he would be less talkative; he would be snobbish, reticent, reserved and tactful. He would be capable of handling the pressure and will steer clear of all the pulls and pressures tactfully. He would be very methodical in his work, highly rule-oriented and a firm believer in hierarchy”. He believes that generally bureaucrats are adept at double-talk; they are flexible in their attitude towards superiors which he prefers to call ‘pliable’. “Spinelessness” is another trait which he attributes to bureaucrats saying that “if you bite a dog the least you expect it to do is that it will bite back, but human species and particularly the bureaucrats, are so spineless that even if they get hit badly (symbolically) by their

superiors and political masters still they would remain servile and be at their beck and call to please them”.

While calling himself “substantially unbureaucratic” in terms of the traits enumerated above, he says that despite the fact that his internal values are very much unbureaucratic, yet ‘you have to have them (traits) and I have inculcated some in order to survive in the service. He says that, “I want to kiss my sepoy’s hand, share a meal with my driver but I can’t do it as they are against the norms”.

Talking about his own service experiences, he says, “Even I have become flexible (read pliable) and mellowed down. Earlier, I wouldn’t compromise now I do”. Citing an example of a case, he narrated that he had ordered some operations against a big business house on the instructions of his senior. The entire transaction of this business house was supposed to be audited and investigated. Few days later, he got a message from the same senior to ‘go slow’ on the operation and he slowed down the operation. With a tinge of pinch in his voice he said, “I slowed down without raising any objection. Earlier I wouldn’t have...”.

Talking about his training experience at the Academy in Mussorie he said it was a “trivial exercise and fun altogether”. They would go to trekking, visit villages on study - tour in order to study the problems in rural India. While there used to be an all-encompassing training including physical exercise, lectures, presentations, symposiums, games and cultural activities, he being one of those studious types, would remain immersed in books in the library. For him the foundational courses were useful to only those people who didn’t have a solid grounding in liberal arts subjects whereas for people like him it was ‘a waste of time’. Pointing out one of the major deficiencies of training, he said that in the Academy, everything was presented in a theoretical, predictable way- presenting a rosy picture of everything. “They didn’t expose us to the hard realities which one would face on the job in the field. They didn’t teach us anything about how to handle political pressures in the operation . The real learning begins with on-the-job training. There as one has to take decisions-be it small or big. Taking responsibility one learns quick and fast”

When he was asked about the current batch of bureaucrats- young people who are entering into the service he opined that, “no doubt they are more qualified; intellectually more bright, sharp and smart; techno-savvy; they can impress someone very easily; but one thing that they lack heavily is-integrity to the service. They are not dedicated and the ethical dimension is particularly weak”. He said that it is not that earlier people (bureaucrats) wouldn't take money but it was 'chori-chupke'. Now, for these people money is the most important thing They consider taking bribe as their birth right. “Earlier, after a few years of service, a Maruti 800 at your verandah was considered necessary; now within 2-3 years of service they think it is high time that they should have at least an Alto at their door.

His opinions on recruitment and training in today's context are very clear, informed and precise. He says. “Recruit them just after 10+2. For every other professional course – engineering, medical etc. they are recruited at that age only. Then, why not for the Civil Services? Then their mind is almost like a clean slate. Their attitude and personality can be moulded in a desirable way. Train them for 5 years in a proper army style. Grill them, drill them, and train them hard. Try to impart certain basic values like commitment, integrity, and dedication. Teach them and indoctrinate them to serve people and their nation. He believes that even in the era of liberalization and globalization, a bureaucrat has a lot to offer to the common people of the society. There are many areas where the lives of common people still get affected and depend upon his decision-making. Even in his new avatar of facilitator, he has a lot of scope and great role to play in a developing society like India. Comparing him with his counterpart in the private sector, he opines that the element of pride, satisfaction and honour that is attached with the civil service should compensate any feeling of not being adequately remunerated vis-à-vis his counterpart in the private sector. Even so, to ward off any such feeling and to make the bureaucrats free from the temptations of succumbing to unfair demands, he feels that while on the one hand their emoluments and perks should be increased on the other hand, vigilance should be made even more strict.

When he was asked to identify three ills with the bureaucrats he counted them as –

- (i) corruption
- (ii) lack of sense of nationalism; pride for the nation.
- (iii) lacking sensitivity towards the people of the country.

Corruption is one topic on which he has some really strong views. Having faced the wrath of bureaucracy for being upright and honest, he views it as a ‘moth’ that is eating up the entire bureaucracy. He feels that the bureaucrat as well as his political master both are responsible for the muck. When asked whether the bureaucrat corrupts the system or the system corrupts the bureaucrat, he said that it operates both ways. To start with, generally having few exceptions, every one enters in the office with a noble intention and a sense of integrity but slowly, the pre-established norms of corruption start dictating his terms of operation. While he genuinely tries to resist early, the rotten system ensures that if the will-power to battle it out is not very strong he is swayed by the dictates of the system and becomes susceptible to corruption. Gradually, he becomes the part of that system and contributes, in his own capacity, to the corruptible ways of the system. In his view, the honest officials start to feel the pinch when they see that the corrupt officials get the praise and reward for being ‘efficient’. In a system that is corrupt, naturally, resources and means are easily at the disposal of corrupt officials and they become efficient in operating within the system while the honest officers lag behind.

Social acceptance of corruption, in his view, is also one of the reasons for the current crop of bureaucrats being corrupt. Earlier honesty was considered a virtue in itself but now, if you don’t have those material possessions, goods of comfort, then people around you start seeing you as a failure. He thinks that he has been able to maintain his honesty and integrity because of the unflinching support of his family which, in his view, is very difficult to find in most of the families.

When he was asked whether his bureaucratic personality in any way gets entangled with his familial personality or in other way with his family life, he said

that in spite of his best of efforts to keep them separate, they do get mingled. 'It is not easy to switch off and switch on'. Definitely, the former has some bearing on the latter. His family life has been affected considerably due to his unwavering honesty. At times, the bickering and the bitterness of bureaucratic life do get spilled over into the familial life which causes trouble. But with the support of his family, he has been able to withstand the tide.

Does one get cynical after spending such long years in bureaucracy where the gaps between ideal notion and reality are so stifling? He firmly says. "No. I am a firm believer in the system. Despite many ills, it is still serving its purpose" He always sees a ray of hope in despair. For him, Manmohan Singh becoming the PM of this country is one such ray of hope. A country couldn't have asked for more. An honest, upright civil servant himself has become the PM of this country. This, for him, gives an opportunity to bureaucracy to stand and deliver on its expectations and promise.

[2]

Beginning a new life through Civil Services

Mr. Anurag Sharma is an Asstt. Commissioner in Excise Department. He belongs to IRS. He joined the Civil Services in 1984. He comes from a remote village in Madhubani district in Bihar. He comes from a poor rural background. His father is illiterate and mother is a typical housewife. Coming from such a background, he has literally climbed up the ladders of social hierarchy through Civil Services.

His entire schooling and pre-university education has been in the village. A friend of his who was associated with the JP movement advised him to come to JNU for his M.A. It was here, in JNU, that he chose to get into the Civil Services. The peer pressure, library culture and political awareness gathered at the university helped him a great deal in getting through the exam.

Asked about his choice of civil service as a career he said that he comes from a typical feudal society where the power-structure is rooted in bureaucracy. Thus, despite having the social status of belonging to a Brahmin caste, the economic

insecurity where it was difficult to even get two meals a day prompted him to choose it as a career. For him, getting into the upper echelons of bureaucracy is an avenue of 'Sanskritisation' where you are instantly elevated into an elite-club. In a village where feudal mentality reigns, you become a celebrity overnight from a non-entity. Popular reactions towards the individual changes the moment he becomes a civil servant. It is like an 'Instant coffee' where your dreams are realized soon. Apart from power and money, the diverse challenges associated with the job also make it a lucrative career-option. 'The day one gets into the Civil Services; it constitutes a new beginning in his life... a break from the past'.

When he was asked about his university where generally the cultural milieu and the political overtones are against the bureaucracy and at times professors look down upon those students preparing for Civil Services, how in such an environment he could prepare? He replied that the general attitude of looking down upon bureaucracy (Marxist thinking ruling the roost) is at a very superficial level and the traditional Marxist interpretation of bureaucracy as an agent of state, oppressive towards the proletariat, is not in tune with the time. Bureaucracy, as demonstrated by China, can very well act as agent of social change and social upliftment. If bureaucracy works with a sense of purpose and commitment the impact it can have on the society is beyond imagination. "Market, private-sector, liberalization-all these are for middle classes. For the poor, down-trodden section of society, still, the state and its bureaucracy remains the last straw of hope. He firmly believes in the notion of bureaucratic personality. He feels that he is not the same person in terms of his attitudinal disposition, as he was before he joined the services. The way he talks, the way he dresses up, the way he is generally disposed to in public has changed in these years. These changes definitely point towards a distinctive personality which one acquires while doing a particular nature of job. Identifying a typical bureaucrat, he sees him as- 'formal, sophisticated, to the point, a touch snobbish, a certain sense of strict discipline'".

Asked about his views on the changing profile of the bureaucrats, he sees 1979 as a path breaking year. Earlier, as English language was a compulsory paper it acted as a barrier for people coming from rural, backward and humble background and maintained the elitist, exclusivist character of Civil Services. But that year onwards, with the recommendations of Kothari Committee, English was removed from being a compulsory paper. This single factor played a great role in changing the character and profile of Indian bureaucracy. Now, it was no longer an elitist, exclusivist domain of 'English Babus' but people from vernacular language could also aspire and as well got into Civil Services.

But he still feels that despite doing away with the English language at the entry level, as the language of officialdom, it still rules the roost. And very candidly, he admits that he has been at the receiving end at times for not being proficient in the use of English language. 'Had I known the language better, if I could have been better off with my expressions, I would have gone much higher in the service. If you can write the same thing with precision in two paragraphs which the others write in two pages, it makes a big difference'. But he doesn't see it as a stigma of colonial heritage. He rather sees it as currency of power even in national terms. With the IT revolution, he says that India could exact greater advantage only because we have better professionals who are better equipped with the knowledge of English language. "For this gift, now I think, we must thank the British".

Talking about his training experience at the Academy, he says that it was full of fun and excitement. Intermixing with various people, people coming from diverse culture and different backgrounds-all these help one in broadening one's view and approach towards society. Despite coming from a very humble background, he never felt a sense of inferiority. "It never handicapped me" – he remarks.

He feels a great deal about the 'in-built Brahminism' in the Civil Services. The IAS officers have still not been able to get over the colonial hangover of ICS days. "They think that they are the government. One can feel their discriminating attitude right from the Academy itself. Being close to the political executive, they think that

actually they run the Government. What they think, feel and believe has to be correct. An expert's opinion doesn't count for them".

About the sub-group culture in bureaucracy he thinks that discrimination on caste-lines or region lines is there but in a very subtle way. "It is latent but not blatant". He talks about 'Chitragupta- Samaj' which works very efficiently within closed doors and safeguards the interests of its caste-people in the bureaucracy. But otherwise, for him, it is not yet alarming.

He also feels very strongly about the entry of technocrats – the engineers, doctors and other professionals in bureaucracy. He says that as they are techno savvy, it does a great help to bureaucracy. But on the other hand, their getting into the bureaucracy is a drag on the economy. "All the money spent on their training goes waste". For him, they simply get attracted towards it by the glamour of power, prestige and corruption-money. "They are in a hurry; their ethical dimension is weak".

This leads to his scathing views on the present lot of corrupt officials. "Earlier also there was corruption, but now it has become vulgarly open. Just like *khullam khulla pyar karenge*. Earlier people who were honest were respected. Now people who are more prosperous are more respected, the leftovers in the race are considered as failures".

He thinks that still IAS officers are generally above board, honest and upright. It is the central services like Revenue, Customs, Excise, Railways, and even IPS – where the muck is thicker. And yes he blames the technocrat even more for making the situation worse.

About the notion of power and authority he says, "whenever I work for someone else, benefit someone by virtue of my position, my decisions, I feel a sense of authority. But when I use it for my personal gains which I do at times, it gives me a sense of power". Citing an example he said, "If I help an ordinary pilgrim coming from Haj in waiving his custom duty, within the ambit of rules and regulations about which he is not aware and he can be cheated by petty officials at the airport, and the

moment I see a sense of smile and gratitude on his face, I feel that I used my authority. But when I use the same position for my wife, I sense power”.

While talking to me, he was using his channels and trying his contacts to get his daughter admitted in a college. Perhaps this is what he meant by power and he was exercising it.

[3]

Building a Responsive Civil Service

Mr. N. Srinivasan is an IAS officer. At present, after servicing on various posts and ranks, he is the Deputy Director of Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration. He is the perfect example of how Civil Services, particularly for the IAS cadre, provides ample of opportunities and various avenues to realize one’s interests and likings for different kind of services. This bureaucrat has worked in Public Sector undertakings (PSUs); worked for United Nations; headed the department which supervised the running of NGOs and then went to Sweden for a course in training the recruits and now his is the in charge of the training programme of phase-II probationers at the Academy.

He hails from a small town in Kerala .Without giving the details of his family background he calls it ‘middle-middle class. An IIT, Delhi product he joined the Civil Services in 1985 at the age of 24. When asked why he left the Engineering and joined the Civil Services he replied, “There I felt I was not realizing my full potential. My internal faculty was getting stifled”.

It was an interesting thing to see him giving some valuable tips to two new recruits who had come to seek his advice on some important matter. He was telling them, “Don’t get stuck in routine matters, clearing files, meeting people, addressing day-to-day petty problems – all these are part of your job. But you should not always keep yourself occupied with these things. Set a mechanism to deal with day-to-day matters and attend only to important things. For routine jobs, your have clerks and assistants at your disposal, you should spare time to think something new, something

big. Be original in your approach; try to address fundamental problems; initiate some novel projects, make them marketable so that it catches the imagination of common people”.

Seeing him talking to the trainees gave an insight into the way these recruits are moulded to think and act in bureaucracy. At the very first opportunity, I asked what the philosophy of the training is. What is the core purpose of the training? He replied, “We train these recruits to make them disciplined professionals. We prepare them for job-requirements. Initially, we give them a perspective for 10 yrs. as it is difficult to visualize beyond that in this vast changing world”. Then he drew my attention to the motto of the Academy which is engraved on the statue of Lal Bahadur Shastri. Highlighting the philosophy behind the training it says –

“We seek to promote good governance by providing quality training towards building a professional and responsive civil service in a caring, ethical and transparent framework”.

When I asked him how training made an impact on these recruits coming from various backgrounds, his reply was that one of the biggest impact that it makes is on their discipline. When they come to the Academy, they are not prompt. Initially, when they are asked to submit a report, they take five days instead of the stipulated two days but at the end of it, they submit it on schedule. Apart from the discipline, it always tries to improve their general disposition in terms of the way they dress, the way they speak, the way they carry themselves. Initially many of them have a problem with the language (English) but towards the end of it, they all speak decently and are able to express themselves without inhibition.

As someone coming from a technical background (he is an Engineer), perhaps he was the right person to ask about the debate between the bureaucrat and the technocrat. He said that people coming from professional background do bring certain professional ethos and technical know-how apart from general training, which can't be but good for bureaucracy. As far as being accused of being more corrupt and being the 'men in hurry' is concerned he says that the desire to make money or taking bribe

is not something that is the sole preserve of technocrats only. Moreover, if these people were after money they could have easily earned it, that too legally, by sticking to their professional careers. So when they wish to join bureaucracy, one can safely presume that money is not their concern.

Seeing him teaching the new recruits the importance of values, ethics and morality in public life, one naturally wonders how these people who are taught such noble lessons in their training could turn out to be corrupt bureaucrats after being for some time in the service. And how does he feel about it? – “We don’t teach them to be corrupt. At this age, at times it is very difficult to mould their values and ethical dispositions. Exposure to society, political milieu and their own morality- all these factors play their part”.

As one talked to him and carefully observed him talking to the recruits, one could sense the sincerity and integrity with which the training programme is designed and one also felt that these instructors in the Academy are trying their best to live up to that philosophy of training which is engraved on the statue of Lal Bahadur Shastri in the Academy.

[4]

Delivering things is my priority

Rajan Verma is a probationary IAS officer. At present, he is a phase-II trainee at the Academy, completing his second phase of 4 months training after 1 year of on the job training in the field. He comes from Andhra Pradesh. His father is an agriculturist and his mother is a house-wife. According to him his family income is less than Rs. 1, 00,000 per annum. His entire education has been in an English school.

He definitely believes that there is a shift in the character of bureaucratic personality. He identifies it by situating it in 4 phases. (i) Colonial phase (ii) Post Independence era [1947-[5] (iii) Era of License Permit Raj [1965-85] and (iv) Post-liberalization phase.

According to him, in each of these phases, the personality-structure of the bureaucrat has been greatly influenced by the policies of the government, social milieu and societal expectations. Elaborating on the post Independence era, he says that it was the time to dream, to aspire, and to make lofty ideals for the public services and it got reflected in the attitude of the bureaucrats as they set about the task of nation-building. The era of 1970s, according to him, was an era of License-permit Raj and it accordingly moulded them into being – “authoritarian, flunky.... more concerned with the number of attendants they should have to serve them rather than the job at hand. Again the ethos of post-liberalization era has changed and so has changed their attitude. Now they are... pro-active, going to the people. Reaching out to them, a definite work-orientation is there. Again there is a sense of integrity and service to the people – those who are being left unattended to”.

For him training is very important as far as moulding the attitude of the bureaucrats' towards people and public service is concerned.

For him, the public service and lucrative job offers in the private sector can't be compared as the means as well as the ends pertaining to these differ greatly. While the latter is profit-oriented, caters to materialist desires as far as career prospects are concerned, the former gives you self-esteem and a sense of job-satisfaction.

What changes does he perceive in himself in the last two years? He replies. “I have not changed radically. ... just become a little more disciplined and focussed.... and yes, I have become more patriotic”. The moment he entered the Academy he could feel that now, he has got the chance to bring out the changes in the life of ordinary people. “Delivering things is my priority”. He quips.

[5]

An Edifice of Integrity and Sincerity

Akhil Raj is a retired IPS officer. He retired as the DGP of Uttar Pradesh. He belongs to Lucknow, where his father was a farmer and his mother, a housewife. Coming from a very humble background, he joined the Police Service

at the age of 24 after pursuing a degree in Law. It was the peer pressure as well as the guidance and motivation provided by his professors at Lucknow University which made him write the Civil Services exam and he cleared it in his very first attempt.

Throughout his career, he has handled the responsibilities with utmost integrity and sensitivity. He was the SSP of Bhopal during the Bhopal Gas tragedy and the way he had handled the political pressure at that time earned him great laurels and respect. He keeps on coming to the Academy to deliver guest lectures. Talking to him, one gets an incisive insight into the relations between the politicians and civil servants. He says, "At the time of Independence, our political leaders had a sense of purpose, a definite goal and programme which they were keen to follow. They were earnest, to say the least, in their attempt at nation-building. So, in spite of mutual suspicion about each other's role, there was a sense of respect for each other. That mutual respect seems to have eroded now". Elaborating further, he says. "... now both of them have become profit seekers." Citing this as one of the reasons of growing corruption in bureaucracy, he says "Earlier, one acted as check and balance for the other, now both of them act in collusion." Blaming both of them for the rising corruption and erosion of values and ethics in the public services, he feels that it operates both ways. Politicians not only identify corrupt officials; but they also encourage and proliferate them. They act as the patrons of the corrupt civil officials, who are too happy to please and oblige them in return for securing 'plum posts' and lucrative offers. "Earlier top posts were limited. Now look at the situation in U.P. and Bihar. New posts are created there to accommodate patronized officials." He also blames the erosion of values and morality in our day-to-day social life for this growing menace. "Earlier black sheep were stigmatized, now they are rewarded".

For him, training is very important to apprise the fresh recruits of the challenges, the dilemmas and the contradictions that they are going to face in their

service years. It teaches them how to tackle these with confidence and assurance. Recalling his own experience, he says, "I can't say much about the training at the Academy, but yes, training at Mt. Abu Police Academy was very useful. He remembers an incident when a hawaldar who used to train them in physical exercise said to him, "*Sahib! First class officer to first class discipline. Agar aap discipline main rahenge tabhi to apka district bhi discipline mein rahega*".

But he is quick to point out that training is not always about imparting moral values, ethics and a sense of integrity. At times, they themselves teach 'wrong things' and lay the seed of dishonesty. Recalling a director's preaching to the young recruits, he quotes, "My dear boys and girls, I don't expect you to be *Brahmachari*. But beware of the time, place and opportunity". He then asks, "How can you expect such trainees to turn out to be honest and upright officials?"

Talking about the relation between the IAS and the IPS, which has always been a point of debate in Indian bureaucracy, he says, "Principally, it is a clash of personalities. There have been times when a DM, quite junior to me in terms of years in service, has called me by name. It used to pinch me. I did feel awkward at times but then I realized that it was not a prestige-issue. And then I have been able to work with the IAS officers very smoothly and I can say that I have always enjoyed the respect as well as camaraderie". He believes that if at the personal level, the matter is sorted out, at the functional level there won't be a problem. Then, with a sense of pride and a touch of humour, he says, "In my own family, my daughter is an IPS and my son-in-law is an IAS officer. And I have never seen any problem between them".

[6]

We are no longer the 'Sahib'

Rajesh Awasthi is an IAS officer. He belongs to the Gujarat cadre while hailing originally from Uttar Pradesh. He joined the Civil Services in 1989 at the

age of 26. He calls his background as 'lower middle class' where his father is a clerk in the postal department while the mother is a housewife. His schooling took place in a Tehsil school. He did his graduation and post-graduation from Delhi University. He was motivated and urged by his father to join the services.

Rajesh was here in the Academy for a mid-service training programme. When asked whether these mid-service training programmes are useful and in what way they serve the purpose, he replied that it depends upon the individual's attitude towards these courses. If one comes with a learning attitude with an open frame of mind, one definitely gets to learn something new. While agreeing that at times, the lectures turn out to be quite boring and drab, they do get benefited from the experiences of senior bureaucrats who come here to give guest-lectures. According to him, these mid-service training courses give them a new perspective, finctune them and update them with latest developments in their field. He says. "One of the ills of our bureaucracy is complacency. We don't keep ourselves abreast with recent happenings. Hence these training courses are necessary". He doesn't give much credence to the debate of professionals entering into the bureaucracy. He says. "It is all unnecessarily hyped. To tell you the truth,engineers. lawyers, doctors- all these have been opting for civil services since 1960s itself. This is not a new phenomenon. Perhaps the increasing competition and the professionals cornering more and more seats have made the people coming from general liberal arts background a bit insecure. That is why they are raising this hue and cry. And moreover, when they talk about the waste of government money. I don't think that it is in such a large measure that one needs to unduly worry about it."

Asked whether Civil Service has lost its glamour and sheen in terms of career-option in the post-liberalization era, his view was that the private sector is being unnecessarily glamourized in order to serve the commercial interest of market forces. "The exploitation, the chaos, the way they are made to work, the

job-stress-all these are the grim realities veiled under the glamour of so called 'big-money', which in any case is not commensurable to the hard work that they put it". For him the job-satisfaction one gets out of public services – working for the people, changing their lives can't be measured in terms of money. "Is money everything in life?" he asks.

What about the social prestige and self-esteem? "A serious research should be conducted to know what happens to these people after 20-25 years." Then his tone gets conciliatory..... "I might not be in tune with the changing time. But I still feel civil Services gives you ample scope and opportunities to realize your true potential. I don't see that in private sector".

One change that he has himself perceived in these many years, is the gradual erosion of 'power' in the bureaucracy. "The power that people keep talking about is a myth. It no longer exists". He thinks that the halo and mystique associated with a bureaucrat is gradually waning and this process has been hastened by the liberalization process. "People no longer see us as the 'sahib'. We are just like any other public servants". And he sees this change in a positive light. "People now approach us without hesitating; they treat us like normal individuals and I think that is a good sign".

Talking to him about the sub-group culture, he said, "I would not rule out completely that there is no sub-group culture, caste, region, cadre – these are important considerations in forming a close circle. "People coming from the same background, belonging to the same service feel more comfortable with each other" – he quips.

As far as caste-group is concerned, he thinks that it operates in those states where caste-feeling generally is strong in society "Bihar and UP are definitely infected by this".

After 15-16 years of service, does he ever think he chose a wrong career seen in the context of changing world. “No, never. Ya, at times I do feel disappointed when I see things are going wrong before me and yet I can’t stop them. But all said and done, I still believe that the system is not as bad as it is made out to be. Overall, I don’t think I am dissatisfied”.

[7]

Idealism in the ‘chosen one’

Saurabh Gupta is an IAS officer on probation. He is a phase-II trainee at the Academy just coming from on-the-job training period in West Bengal the cadre he has been allotted to. He comes from a ‘baniya’ family in Bihar. When asked why he chose civil services as a career option he said, “I come from a feudal state where after a.b.c. the child is taught IAS. It is such that whenever one asks, “Beta, kya banoge?” The child replies – ‘Collector’.

Right since his early student days in Patna, he was clear that he wanted to join Civil Services. But as he came to JNU for his post-graduation, his orientations changed and he became interested in academics. His initial attempts met with failure and this made him turn away from his cherished goal for some time. Being a good debator, quizzier, and holding few scholarships of repute, he started thinking that he was tailor-made for academics and UPSC was not his cup of tea.

He even dabbled with few jobs earlier as lecturer (1 year) and Research Director at IGNOU but still wasn’t satisfied with himself. What used to pinch him was that despite being highly qualified and well-educated, these academicians and professors at IGNOU would themselves be in awe of IAS officers whenever one such officer would visit their office. This made him think again – “What the heck! Let me take one more attempt!” His persistence paid off and he finally got selected for the IAS.

How did he feel then? “Of course, there was a sense of achievement which I never felt earlier despite getting few success here and there. At last, I was able to realize my childhood dreams and could now live those ideas which I have always espoused. As the success came late, naturally it had a mellowing down effect”.

Does he believe in something called Bureaucratic Personality? “Yes, definitely. The context of time and space and the value system of a particular society in which it operates determines it. Elaborating this, he says that at the time of British rule, the Indian bureaucrats were suffering from a sort of ambivalence . “He was the part of the system and yet the system was not his. There was no sense of belonging”.

Then the character of bureaucratic personality, according to him, changed in the post-independence era of license- permit raj in which ‘the public sector was deemed to hold the commanding heights of economy’. He became a controller and commander. He was imbued with a false sense of authority – the power. Just like his colonial counterpart, he was also elitist, exclusivist and far away from people’s reach. But the liberalization era has changed all that once again. “Now we are facilitators. We can’t afford to hold on to our past”.

Asked about his perception of the training programme, he said, “the theoretical part of it which they give in the first 3-4 months is not of much use. At least for those who have studied liberal arts at the university level. But yes, for many of those who come fresh after doing their graduation or come from professional fields, this is of immense help”. In his view, the real training and skills which come to use are those imparted during district training where they get to hold an independent charge : “One week of practical on the job experience teaches you more than those 4-5 months of lectures.”

Sharing his experience of on-the-job training he revealed that West Bengal is a place where people are politically aware and well-informed. The party-

structure has contributed a great deal in making them aware about their rights and entitlements. “You can’t fool them. They know what they want, what are the government schemes and programmes for their benefit and they demand it. You are treated just like an ordinary service-provider and facilitator. Not that demi-god status that you get to see in feudal states”. And he feels this is good for both – the people as well as the bureaucracy and he is really appreciative of it.

Coming new to the service and having just tasted the authority entailed with such high-profile position, does he feel a sense of power? He says that at the training level itself they try their best to deconceptualise and demystify the notion of power. It is hammered inside them that the post or position they hold is of responsibility and service, “of getting work done for the people”. They are always conscientiously aware of it. But yes, at a personal level when one feels that one can make the difference, one can intervene in a situation by virtue of holding a position, a definite sense of power accrues. He says, “the moment I show my I-card and tell people who I am, they listen. And yes, my personal work gets done easily, it doesn’t get stuck. You can say that all this might give one a sense of being something. I do realize it and I am aware of it.”

What are his dreams and aspirations from the service? He replies, “I am a bit of an idealist. The idealism that got inside me from JNU days. I have not left them altogether.for me money is important, one needs money but that stinking money is not required. I feel that we are the ‘chosen ones’ (in a typical biblical sense) to deliver, to serve the people to the best of our capacity and ability and I aspire to do that. Whenever I do something for an ordinary individual and the moment I see a bit of smile on his face, I feel nice and this gives me a sense of achievement”

This Professional is here to serve

Dr. Amar Yadav is an IAS officer. At present, he is SDM in a division of Raigarh district in Chhatisgarh. He joined the civil services at the age of 26 in 1999. Originally belonging to Kanpur, he comes from a middle class background where his father serves in an ordinance factory and his mother is a housewife. One of his bother is a scientist at BARC and the other is a Doctor.

He himself is a Doctor but chose Civil services as his career because of his father's wishes and the 'job-satisfaction' that comes from serving in various capacities in diverse nature of jobs.

What does he think about professionals joining the civil services? Isn't it a craving for power and money? He says that if they would be craving for money they could have struck to their profession and then money wouldn't have been a problem. And as far as power is concerned, in today's context it has started appearing as 'myth' if one compares the services to the licence – permit raj of seventies and early eighties. Definitely, a sense of self-esteem and social prestige is a factor but it is an attractive career option for the challenges that it provides in terms of working for the people against all-odds. "In my batch there were 13 Doctors out of 56 IAS officers. Apart from them, there were engineers, CAs, lawyers etc. People from professional fields have been coming and they will keep coming. This whole debate is an exercise in futile".

About the changing profile of bureaucrats, he says that people are coming from middle and at times lower middle class background, from remote villages and tehsils and that has considerably changed the character of Civil Services. "My wife is also an IAS officer. She comes from a remote village in Jaipur which is 120 km. away from the city. Her brother has also become an IPS officer now. They come from such a humble background that you can't even imagine. Their

entire education has been in vernacular language and Hindi, and yet they could make it to the top. Earlier, this was not possible". There has been a general change, according to him, in the outlook of civil servants. As people are coming from humble backgrounds, they are more sensitive to people's needs. They understand the ground-situation far better and there is a fire in their belly to do something for their people. "These people are not imbued with a sense of power. No doubt, they use it as a channel for their social mobility yet they are more rooted".

How does he feel when bureaucracy is held responsible for all the ills in Indian society? What comes to his mind when everyday newspaper reports lambast the bureaucrats for being inefficient and ineffective? "I don't say that we are not to be blamed. But more often than not, we do make an earnest effort to deliver. But there are times when the system fails us, and at times we fail the system too". He accepts that all is not well with the system but then quickly defends the system, "You must also realize the constraining socio-political situations in which we have to operate". He feels that in spite of all the bickerings and blemishes, it is because of IAS officers that the system is running. "These state promotees – they will otherwise eat up everything". Talking about his own experience he informs us that whenever an IAS is there in the state as SDM, these state-level officials become restless, as the flow of money stops. "They are always waiting and praying for me to go". He strongly believes that still the majority of IAS officers are honest and above board. He informs us that whenever an IAS officer joins the district as SDM, the level of corruption comes down considerably, at least in the initial phases. "I accept that our failure lies in not being able to stem the rot but I tell you we are not the greater part of the muck".

Discussing further the issue of corruption he informed that it is not always that the system corrupts them. There are few people who enter into the service with a corrupt bent of mind. "There are few black sheep at the very beginning of

the service itself... and they are easily identifiable. You get to know them by looking at their attitude on field trips. From the very beginning they will show that attitude of 'being something'. Does it affect the culture of the sub-group? For him, "they are aware of it but they don't acknowledge it or discuss it".

Talking about '*esprit de corps*', an essential feature of bureaucracy he pointed out that initially the interaction in the Academy is mainly on regional basis as they feel comfortable with each other. Initially, people from various cadres intermix and interact freely but as the time passes on and people from other services leave the Academy naturally an 'in-service' bond develops between the officers of same cadre. Sometimes, this is perceived as 'close-networking' amongst the IAS officers. "There is no deliberate attempt by us to discriminate or segregate except for the few. Yes there are few trainees who are the sons or relatives of bureaucrats. They are definitely on the look-out for IAS people only. They form a close-knit group. But now, not many people from such backgrounds are coming".

What does he think about the training programmes at the Academy? "I find them really useful and I don't agree that the lecture classes don't help much. For people like us who come from professional background we do need such orientation programmes". About on-the-job training, he says that it varies from state-to-state. In southern states, on-the-job training is given much importance and impetus and they strictly follow the manual. But there are many states termed as 'deficit-cadres'. They see trainees as their working hands, and in these states the trainee is given independent job and responsibility. Since apprenticeship is denied, one does not get the opportunity to learn under the tutelage of senior officers on one hand; on the other, one gets to learn more by handling tasks independently. How has this job affected his life personally? "Well on ideal terms, I'd like to separate the two. But as my wife is also an IAS officer, at times, the job related problems tend to get discussed at home". He continues, "At times it really

affects us, but with mutual support we tend to tide over it". Does he see any change in his personality after coming to the service? "Yes, I feel more confident. Now when I speak people listen to me. Even though people say that I have become more arrogant. I call it self-assurance which people, in general, find tough to take".

[9]

Performing a 'man's' job with élan

Rita Verma is at present ADM of a district in Rajasthan. Hailing from Delhi, she joined the services at the age of 24 in 1998. Her father is an officer in SBI and mother is a high school teacher. She was motivated by her mother to opt for the civil services as a career.

Her's is an interesting case-study considering the fact that even though women are coming up, still, we don't find many of them in the top echelons. When asked about how does it feel to be a bureaucrat as a lady, she replies, "Not much of a difference to me. Yes, initially people around me do feel a bit uncomfortable. I am posted in Rajasthan, a feudal state where people are generally not used to taking orders from a woman. But gradually, things have become smooth. They look at you with awe and perhaps the respect is even more. That gives me a sense of pride.

Giving her point of view on bureaucratic personality she says. "definitely there exists a certain kind of typical orientation that comes with the job. The way a doctor talks to a patient and behaves in a hospital would be certainly different from the way he would be at his home. As far as I am concerned, people say that I am becoming more like men. But I don't think so. At times, due to the demands of job I have to keep a hardened, formal 'looking at your face posture' but essentially I believe, I have not changed much"

About the changing character of personality, she says that now the bureaucrats, at least the new lots, are more democratic in their attitude. "If I have to look for a file in my chamber, I don't call my orderly unless I am very busy perhaps this was not the case earlier". According to her, the ever increasing influx of women to these top posts would also show its impact. As more and more women are coming in, they bring sensitivity consideration and a sense of service for the poor people and to the bureaucracy.

What is the general attitude of their male-counterparts towards them? She says "Initially, there is a bit of hesitance which comes out as greater show of respect and courtesy but then, with time, a sense of camaraderie develops. But yes, there are few who don't find themselves at ease while working with us. Some also become unduly hostile to us. But at a general level it is cordial."

Does she sense that she has the power for which people crave about and is she conscious about it? "Power in its crude feudal sense-no. But yes, you do feel that element of authority and I must candidly admit that it is more than the vowed rational-legal authority. When I see that I can make the difference to the people's lives, I can intervene when I see something is going wrong-then you do sense that you enjoy the authority which very few people do." She further adds, "When I enter my office, everyone stands up and starts saluting. One gets so used to it that if someone doesn't salute you, you become curious to know who the individual is. I must admit, to start with, it can be intoxicating but slowly one gets used to it". She also concurs that the notion of power attached to bureaucracy is limited to BIMARU states.

About her training days, she remembers fondly that despite the occasional hard work it was fun and excitement. "You get to see people from different states and different backgrounds. Interacting with them, in itself, is a learning experience. "From village study to trek, from symposium to informal discussion, fete, cultural activities, sports, entertainment, recreation – you name it and it was

there”. For her, the training programme contributed a great deal in moulding her personality. When I had joined there I was a shy timid individual but I came out as a more extrovert and confident girl. It makes you a complete person”.

About her on-the-job training she says, “What used to hurt me initially was to see how easily people would make money. I sent an engineer on inspection and he took money from the farmers. I knew it but I couldn’t do anything about it. It really had pinched me hard”.

Talking about the debate between the generalist and specialist where IAS the generalist corners all the top secretarial post she thinks that at times even she feels that they, being the experts, should head the department. But, according to her, there is a flip side to it. These specialists are so much concerned with technical specifications that they fail to gather the overall picture. “Their sense of reasoning is Black and White. They don’t see the grey area. For them, 2+2 is always 4 but we believe that it could be 5 also, depending upon the context. On the other hand, our service experience by that time due to our handling of various jobs and post, becomes so vast and diverse that we acquire a working knowledge of anything and everything in the government. This gives us an advantage”. But yes, she doesn’t see it as a prestige-issue that only IAS officers should be given the top posts at secretary level.

Does she ever think that she could have been better off working in private sector, where there is money and glamour? She firmly says, “No. I have chosen this career after a lot of thinking. And I am enjoying it. The glamour associated with the private sector is more of a mirage and façade”.

[10]

Scaling heights with perserverance

Abhay Pratap, 30, is an IPS officer. At present he is an ASP posted in Rohtak, Haryana. He joined the services in 2000. His father is a zonal manager in

Punjab National Bank and his mother is a housewife. After initial years of schooling in Calcutta, he came to Delhi for his post-graduation. Very clear about his goal to join civil services from the very beginning, he joined the services after some initial years of failure to clear the exam.

What makes one persevere so hard to get into the services, in spite of 2-3 failed attempts? He clarifies, "civil services--getting into it, is considered to be paragon of achievement in our society. It elevates your esteem in people's eyes instantly. The same people who had branded me a failure, started praising me again after I cleared the exam. Moreover, I was determined to get into it. So, I didn't let the failure deter me and in the end I got through".

Though IPS was not his preference to start with, but now he is enjoying it. Does he see any change in his personality after becoming a civil servant? He answers, "I think every job changes an individual. He doesn't remain exactly the same person. I guess I have also changed a bit. Now I am more serious, disciplined and focussed; earlier I used to be a jolly good fellow. People say that I have started using foul languages as well. But I see it as a part of my job. At times, dealing with criminals, you have to use their language.

Much of the changes that have come in him, he attributes it to training. "At the Academy, their approach to training is very serious and disciplined. It is a highly regimented training". He recalls that even if someone reaches 2 minutes late in the P.T. ground or in the lecture room, he is sent a memo and asked to explain. Repeated negligence ensures stricter action".

He explains that at the Police Academy in Hyderabad they are trained so rigorously that at times it affects their health. Talking about horse-riding, does he justify its training at the Academy in the foundation course, that too, to all the bureaucrats? He says that he sees it in a different light. According to him, riding a horse symbolizes control and command. It means being in control of the situation.

“You fall from it, then you rise again and try to mount again. All this teaches perseverance, persisting with pain, yet, getting one’s task done. He quotes Indira Gandhi, “If you can’t control a horse, how can you control a district!” But he points out that the real irony is that they teach an archaic thing like horse-riding but they don’t teach motor-driving which is more useful in today’s context.

Talking about another aspect of training, which is on-the-job training, he informs us that if one works under the guidance of a senior officer, one gets to know the nitty-gritty of it. Moreover, to start with, one can have an outsider’s perspective and look at things objectively and find out the gaps and lacunae. On the other hand, the independent job gives one a greater sense of responsibility. “You learn the ropes of your job requirement yourself. This helps a great deal in terms of confidence and assurance.”

About the general notion that corruption rules the roost in Police Department, he says that it can’t be denied. The nature of their job, according to him, is such that if one is not firmly resolute, one can easily succumb to temptation and threat. “We have to regularly deal with criminals and their patronizing political leaders. At times it becomes a question of life and death and then people with real grit can only overcome such pressure, many of them have no choice but to fall in line”.

Does he feel disillusioned by seeing all this and more so how does he feel when a ruffian political leader, with an established criminal background admonishes him and reminds him of his duty with a veiled threat? He rationalizes that apart from few occasions, it doesn’t effect him much because he realizes that what he has, the other one doesn’t have – the faculty of sound reasoning. He reasons out, “being the leader of the people whom we are meant to serve, they deserve the respect and we give them that respect. At times when we can’t agree to their whims and fancies, we take recourse to legality and rules to safeguard our position.” But he accepts that on many occasions, bureaucrats themselves are too

happy to oblige these politicians for the sake of lucrative postings or out of fear of getting transferred.

“Generally, to start with, they try to measure you up. If you don’t flinch initially, they don’t persist any longer. Rather, they accept you as an honest officer and you will be respected for that as well. Anyway, leaders of disrepute and criminal antecedents are few and far between and one has to learn to adjust with them.”

As far as getting disillusioned is concerned, the initial idealism, he says, does receive a jolt. But this should not be enough to make one disillusioned. One must learn to tone down one’s expectations, modify one’s agenda and revise one’s plans. “In spite of some drawbacks, the system is working to the best of its capacity. I have a great faith in the system. And if we are failing to deliver, it is not only the system and the people within it but also, the society within which it is operating that has to be blamed.

Does his bureaucratic personality come in conflict with his individual self, He replies that while initially, there were few problems but with each growing year in the service he has learnt to adjust. “I can’t afford to let myself be affected so I try to separate the two domain – I don’t know how successful I have been in this attempt”.

3.2 Lived Experience at the Academy- Before going on to analyse the case-histories, I would like to reflect upon the lived experience at the Academy (Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration) where the seeds of bureaucratic personality are laid. In the context of this dissertation this exercise assumes importance for it gives us an insight into the cradle of bureaucracy.

The Academy is situated in Mussorie, away from the din and cacaphony of the city-life, in the lap of nature in its full glory and bloom. To start with, it seems

anachronous that the bureaucrats who are going to face a hectic chaotic life in the field are trained in such a serene, calm and peaceful milieu. As one enters inside the Academy, one gets the first-hand experience at the entrance itself. No one is allowed inside without proper identification and pass. As one ambles through the pathway, one can't stop marvelling at the beautiful structure amidst the glory of nature.

The statue of Lal Bahadur Shastri graces the entrance of the main building. The philosophy, of the training institute is etched on it as it vows to provide quality training and build a professional and responsive civil service.

It seems as if an earnest attempt has been made to decolonize and indianise the overall structural framework. The Academic Block called 'Karmashila' incorporates the seminar halls, Officers' lounge, Gandhi Library and the Officers' mess. The administrative block called 'Dhruvashila' has the Director's Office and the professors' rooms.

As one passes through the corridors of 'Karmashila' one can't stop getting on impression that it tries to convey, in all possible ways, to the trainees that 'they have arrived'. Everything – the mess, the lounge and the library – has a touch of class, elegance and regalia associated with it which one can't stop taking note of. One can sense the subtle existence of imbuing power as one ambles through the corridors. One gets the taste of bureaucracy right in the cradle as one comes to know that one can't see the Director to get his views on the topic of the dissertation without taking prior appointment or permission.

But it seems that the trainees are yet not affected by those notions of power, hierarchy and norms that one associates with bureaucracy. They freely share their views, give their opinion, remain cordial and show courtesy which comes as a pleasant surprise. One also gets the opportunity to sit through a presentation given by one of the trainees on rural poverty and poverty alleviation

programmes in Rajasthan. The power-point presentation, full of facts and figures and incisive analysis, is as impressive as one expects it to be.

Having lunch with them in Officers' mess is also a nice experience where discussions range from the seminar presentation to the nudity in today's movies. The visit to their hostels, which is named after the rivers – Ganga, Kaveri, Narmada, reestablishes the initial impression of their officer – like status in the Academy as well. They are provided with personal computers, telephones and attendants to make them feel comfortable. At every step, one gets the impression that no effort has been withheld to make them aware that they have achieved an elevated status in society.

3.3 Reflecting upon the findings

Talking to these bureaucrats, the newly recruited trainees as well as those with service experience, one gets a completely different picture of bureaucracy. Perhaps this is an image put across by the 'in-group', which contradicts the common man's image of bureaucracy. Formal, impersonal, snobbish, rule-fetish, secretive, uncanny, hierarchical, imbued with power and authority, routinized, efficient but ineffective, elitist, exclusivist, undemocratic, corruptible – these are some of the adjectives popularly associated with bureaucrats in India. But as one talks to them, they paint a completely different picture. Particularly, as one comes across the trainees who perhaps have just tasted but not entirely gulped the passion fruit of power, one is forced to see them in a different light.

To start with, the popular notion of elitism and exclusivism that one associates with Indian bureaucrats in terms of their socio-economic background appears to be a myth. If we look at the biographies of bureaucrats selected for the study, we find that most of them come from middle class backgrounds. Of late people even from humble background have also started entering into the services.

In their interaction, at least, it can be said about the trainees at the Academy, they don't show off that typical bureaucratic attitude of snobbery and aloofness. In their disposition, they appear just like other individuals. As a trainee disclosed it to me, "We are not the brilliant, genius kind of stuff. It is just that we have worked hard to get here and we are here. Tomorrow, even you can be here. Getting here is all about persistence and hard work". There is nothing like natural flair that one can associate with these people. And once this realization dawns upon them that they have reached there not by virtue of some natural in-born attribute but rather by dint of hard work and that anyone else could also be there at their place, the attitude of superiority and snobbery fades out. As disclosed by an intern, the attitude of snobbery and superiority still persists with those trainees who seem to have the ascribed status of being the son or daughter of a bureaucrat. But yes, this can't be said about the bureaucrats who have spent considerable years in service. Each successive rise in rank and authority in the hierarchy, it seems, gives them a feeling of being 'important'. "What we think of as self-assurance is taken as arrogance and attitude by the masses".

As far as training is concerned, almost all of them agree that it plays a considerable role in moulding their personality. While there are some who don't rate the lecture mode of training very highly, particularly those coming from liberal arts background, there is a unanimity in feeling that at the end of it, they come out as a better, more disciplined, more focussed and more motivated persons. "It plays an important role in shaping our overall personality" confided a trainee. There has been a genuine attempt to 'decolonize' the training process as it was desired while establishing the Academy. Even the names of buildings are indianized unlike the practice of naming them after some viceroys or English bureaucrats belonging to colonial era, as one generally finds it in many universities and learning centres.

For imparting skills related to their job, on-the-job training assumes greater importance. Working under the guidance and tutelage of the senior officials, these

trainees get to learn their skills on the field. There, they come face to face with the wide gap between the theoretical standpoint taught to them in the class and the existing ground realities. At times, in the case of deficient cadres they also get to hold independent charges and responsibilities, which hastens the process of learning. The idea behind on-the-job training is also to make them see and assess the problem areas as an objective observer. He is someone who is now going to be part of the system and yet is not completely saddled with it. So, he can have an impartial view of the ground situation. In their second phase of training, these trainees are asked to make a presentation based on their own experience and observation. They are also encouraged to think of the solution to these persisting problems. As an instructor says, "Think big, think original. Don't get preoccupied by routine activities".

Apart from the initial entry-level training, mid-service training is also given adequate importance. Here, it is important to point out that mid-career training with a proper perspective is a recent development as far as Indian bureaucracy is concerned. In this regard, apart from National Academy, Indian Institute of Public Administration has played a great role in imparting skills and attitude that civil servants require in their mid-career jobs. Two-tier training is provided to those IAS and Central Services officers who have completed 5 to 7 years of service and are entering into middle level management position. This course runs for over 3 months. Those civil servants who have completed 12-15 years. of service and are on the verge of entering into senior management positions are given three-tier training course and this course runs for over 5 weeks.

Here the important question is – what is the general attitude of civil servants towards these mid-career training programmes? Talking to them, one got the impression that though they regard these as useful, yet there is a general lack of zeal to learn. They accept that these programmes add to the functional efficiency and broaden their mental horizon, endowing them with a new

perspective; but the job security and the consciousness of being in the position of authority hamper the process of learning. Training can act as a catalyst only if there is an inherent zeal to learn more; otherwise it is just like a paid-up holiday, having a nice time at government expense.

As far as the sub-group culture is concerned, going by the simple observation, one sees a sense of camaraderie and free mixing between the trainees from all the services. But as one probes deeper and talks to various trainees, it appears that generally there is a sort of clique formation of people belonging to the same service. Generally, IAS trainees are accused of forming an 'in-group' and discriminating with trainees belonging to other central services. As a trainee pointed out, "They think that they are the best and we are inferiors". While the officers of IAS cadres do admit, albeit after persistent prodding, that there are some who are interested in forming a 'close-knit' group and do discriminate but mostly, it is latent rather than manifest. They also point out that at times, it is more perceived than actually existing. They reason that this perception gets strong when they see that the teachers and the instructors are also generally from IAS cadre. But in reality, according to them, the initial interaction is based on regional affiliations, later on bonds of friendship and other factors like allocation of similar service or cadre influence the pattern of interaction.

Talking to those bureaucrats who have been in the service for quite some time, one got the impression that networking among the IAS cadre is a reality. They zealously guard their 'clique' as it pays a lot in the longer run in safeguarding their interest. So the *'esprit de corps'* exists but it exists at the level of bureaucrats belonging to the same service or same cadre, and not across the entire bureaucracy as it is desired and envisioned.

One area where there has been a definite shift in the bureaucratic personality is the engagement with wider society. The erstwhile elitism and exclusivism espoused by colonial as well as to some extent, bureaucrats of license-permit raj is slowly

giving its way to a new attitude of 'going to the people', 'respecting the citizens'. In this regard, the attitude of newly recruited bureaucrats is really praiseworthy. While talking, they don't exude that kind of air which is generally associated with them.

These bureaucrats are equally candid about the fact that at a certain level the legal-rational authority does take the form of appropriated personalised power. At times, they are aware of it, are conscious about it but at times, they don't even realize it as the transition is so fluid and smooth. The nature of the job, the societal context in which they operate and the kind of importance, expectation and esteem associated with their job in the eye of common people—all these combine to give them a sense of power. As a bureaucrat puts it philosophically, "The ultimate desire of any individual is to be counted, to make the difference; the moment I see that getting realized I definitely feel a sense of power". One gets so used to using one's official position for personal ends, that one doesn't realize that it is also a manifestation of power. Moreover, the feudal traditions in this country are still so much alive, that people who are closer to the authority of state enjoy the authority relegated to it. Naturally, the perks and benefits associated with it are held in respect and awe. This also contributes to the fluid appropriation of power by the bureaucrats.

The relationship that a bureaucrat, particularly the IAS officer, enjoys with the political leaders is shrouded in mystery and confusion. This is one area where the bureaucrats whom I talked to, were, as their wont is, evasive, trying to be politically correct and not forthcoming. Those officers who are entering into the service have a very ideal view about the issue. They feel that in spite of the fact that the quality of political leadership has declined in India, and the leaders having criminal background are dictating the terms with them, they would not face any problem of adjustment as they know that the people whom they are meant to serve have elected these leaders.

Bureaucrats in their mid-career posts generally try to evade the whole issue by saying that with years of experience, they have learnt to adjust to the demands and whims and fancies of the political leaders. They remain silent on the issue of collusion between bureaucracy and the political leadership which is one of the causes of growing menace of corruption in bureaucracy.

It is only the retired bureaucrats who are more forthcoming in their view that generally there has been a decline in the mutual respect that was there between the two in their time.

They candidly admit that both of them are guided by their own self-interests which gets served in keeping each other in good book. The relationship of the bureaucrat with his political leadership requires to be probed at a much deeper level to find out how it actually affects the bureaucrat's personality.

On the issue of corruption, one myth that got falsified in my visit to the Academy is that 'it is always the system which makes the bureaucrat corrupt'. Many of the trainees whom I talked to, feel that, at times, people enter in the services only to make money. 'They are in a hurry'. Political patronage definitely facilitates this process. How people with such bright minds enter in the service only to make money and how their personality responds to the accusations of being branded as corrupt? One got the idea from talking to these people that they develop their own false rationality-structure situating it in the context of society to justify their acts of commissions as well as omissions. The changing societal values and mores, the materialist-consumerist upsurge in society have also played a role in the justification process.

This was a journey into the inner-world of bureaucracy. Through the studies of these select biographies, an effort was made to peep into the social-psyche of bureaucrats as a collectivity. It gave us an idea of the way these people think, the way they view their own responsibilities, the way they act and the way

they operate in a changing society and in doing so, how they get influenced and impacted by the wider socio-political game work in which they function. An effort was made to find out how in this process their personality structure and their attitudinal disposition gets affected.

CONCLUSION

During the course of the dissertation, while I was busy conducting the interviews and the case-studies, I met a professor who asked me about the topic of my dissertation. After I told him the topic and what the study was all about, he asked me pithily, "Has anything changed"? This question kept me preoccupied during the entire course of dissertation. And after going through the entire process, one feels that it can be safely and substantially said that something is changing in the corridor of bureaucracy, at least at the top level.

As the focus of this study has been on the people who occupy the top echelons of this structure, let us begin first with the man who is at the centre of this entire dissertation – the bureaucrat. First of all yes, there is definitely something called bureaucratic personality. The entire dissertation was based on this hypothesis that the nature of work, the organizational culture and the social milieu in which one operates, have definite impact fact on the individual who functions within the framework. Before the individual enters into the bureaucracy, and after he has spent considerable years in it as an official, there is a definite change that takes place in between, in the attitudinal disposition and the behavioural temperament of the person. And this change sweeps across everything that he is concerned with - his nature of work, society in general, people on the roads, his acquaintances, friends and family. In the course of study, it was found that this attitudinal make up is not monochrotic, rather it keeps on changing at different stages of service in the bureaucracy. When the individual just enters into the service, he is full of youthful fervour. Brimming with a sense of achievement that 'he has arrived', there is a definite desire, a strong one rather in majority of cases, to do something for the people. There is an element of idealism which shapes his hopes, dreams and aspirations as he gets ready to perform his job. He views things in a positive light, his role-perception about his job is esteemed and

this positive role perception plays its role in moulding his personality. He is more open, candid, spirited and there is an earnestness to work for the society.

But as he enters the middle rung, years of experience in the service and the harsh realities on the ground tone him down. He becomes watchful, cautious secretive rule-oriented and reluctant in his approach. As a bureaucrat puts it, "He won't rage like a bull of the middle of the road but he will walk on the side pathway cautiously'. Perhaps Merton was talking about this bureaucrat in the middle - rung only while explaining the attributes of bureaucratic personality. Contrast it with a bureaucrat, who just joins the service, "Rules - yes they are important. But they are for the people right at times. I do jump the rule to get the work done if I find someone stranded in my office."

As one reaches at the top level of the hierarchy, a certain sense of smugness creeps in. Aware of his position in hierarchy and importance in the office, he becomes self absorbed, secretive, authoritarian and cryptic. As the Director of a department told me, "How could you think of talking to me for half an hour without taking a prior appointment from my secretary. How can you take me for granted"?

Demands and nature of the job and the way it fosters certain attitudinal attributes in the bureaucrat, at times, comes in sharp conflict with his original nature and core make-up. If the disjunctions are too sharp it leads to alienation and disillusionment and at times people leave the job as well. A positive personality depends upon the way one makes the adjustment between his core personality and the organizational personality. This adjustment is very crucial. This involves, as put forward by an interviewee, "Bringing down one's level of expectations from oneself in the official capacity. Modifying the objectives, goals and tasks that one sets for oneself to achieve'.

It also involves a certain element of 'self-justification' and self-legitimacy. They tell themselves as well as try to convince others that the lack of efficiency and effectiveness on their part is because of the system in which they operate. If they are failing to deliver, it is the socio-political milieu in which they function, has to be blamed.

Tracking the social history of the Indian bureaucrat and the way it has influenced his personality make up was an important area of enquiry in the dissertation. It was found that the Indian bureaucrat is not apologetic about his colonial inheritance. The modern day bureaucrat of the post colonial India tries to engage meaningfully with its colonial past. He is aware of the stigma of being the symbol and agency of colonial power but he also sees certain positive qualities associated with it. The steel-frame, the discipline, the efficiency and urgency to deliver, the senior- junior relationships, uprightness, sense of integrity – these are the positive attributes that he associates with it and wants them to be the continuing link between the two. They are also not apologetic about English being the lingua-franca of civil service, another gift of colonial rulers. As a bureaucrat puts it, "we must be thankful to the English for passing on this language to us for eternity. In the post liberalization global world, we are at an advantage because of our knowledge of English only."

Even those bureaucrats who are not good at it at their entry level, try to master it while being in service.

Even though the common people may like to believe that there has been no change in that 'typical bureaucrat' and the general refrain is that they are still the same in their attitude and outlook – elitist, exclusivist and status-quoist, but the study shows that there is a subtle change in their thinking and attitude. The change might be of little measure only but it is substantial and it has to be appreciated.

To begin with, there has been a profound change in the background profile of these bureaucrats. It is no longer a preserve of convent educated, English-speaking, upper class-caste elite. The implementation of Kothari committee report and Satish Chandra Committee report opened the door of top level civil services to the aspirants of rural, humble backgrounds also who were not comfortable with English language. This has considerably changed the character of Civil Services in India. As more and more people are coming from diverse backgrounds, they bring their own beliefs, experiences, attitudes to the services and this has caused a severance to the monolithic unitary character of civil services. These new lots coming to occupy top-level positions in bureaucracy are more grounded and rooted in local experience and reality. While it is possible that some of them try to forget their past, sever their link from their background and acquire an elitist character, in their approach and life-style, yet many of them remain grounded in their roots and bring sobriety and humanity to this high-flying bureaucracy.

As personalities are embedded in the socio-cultural system in which they get formed, they also get changed with the changing socio-cultural context. In the new millennium, in the era of liberalization and globalization, as the notion of governance is changing rapidly from being controller to facilitator, the bureaucrat finds that his role is being questioned increasingly by the liberal logic of the market. As there is a general drive to nail-in the bureaucracy and to de-bureaucratize our public life, he realizes that he needs to re-orient and re-define his role and attitude in the changing context. He knows that it is a question of change or perish. A change in this regard is attempted at the Academy itself where newly recruit bureaucrats are trained, moulded and oriented for their job. At every stage of the training, a conscious effort is made to re-orient them according to their changing role in society where they are expected to facilitate the civic life. They are made aware that they are people's servants and not their 'mai-baap'. People-friendly, goal oriented, task-oriented approach is attempted to instill in these

bureaucrats. At every step, the myth of power is 'de-conceptualized'. They realize that in the era of science and technology, they can no longer afford to neglect it. While new recruits are generally techno-savvy (or at least they become during the course of training) even those bureaucrats who are in their mid-service also try to be 'techno-friendly', even if they can't be techno-savvy, as they know that they can't do without it.

Apart from their role, how do they perceive their status in the changing socio-economic context? To be precise, how do they situate themselves amidst the growing importance of media, management, computer applications, and other alternative careers in the private sector. Self-esteem, prestige, the challenges associated with various jobs, being in a position to make the difference, power to intervene – these are the attributes that still separates their work and status from others in the society. They accept that it might not have the glamour, glitz and fast-buck associated with those jobs in the private sector, but the work-satisfaction is definitely greater in their job. "When I see that everyday I make difference in people's lives, make at least 4 to 5 people happy and as they look at me with a sense of gratitude, it makes me feel nice about it and I think that this gives me an opportunity to realize my worth". Asking them about the private sector, a senior bureaucrat replied, "Private sector is for middle-class people, poor people in the far flung villages still look up to the government and the bureaucrats to bring change into their lives". Here digressing a little, one just stops to ponder how these people have failed and belied the hope, expectation and the faith of those people which was reposed in them. Continuing with their status in society vis-à-vis the professionals, a bureaucrat pointed out, "What they see is instant-gratification, instant money and flashy life-style. A serious study has to be done about what happens to these people, say, after 20-25 yrs. of service". Another bureaucrat comes with a revelation. "You only see the Rajdeep Sardesais, the Barkha Dutts and the Sabeer Bhatias - but how many are like them? Moreover, they come from

such an elite background themselves. Behind these few, there are the thousands frustrated and exploited". Another comes up with a scathing remark, "These call-centres are destroying our youth. They just make them into cyber-clerks, blinding them with instant money and metro life-style". Corruption is a stigma that has constantly followed and tainted the bureaucratic personality. The situation seems to have gone worse from what it was earlier. Changing moral values, materialist – consumerist culture, societal acceptance and at times, encouragement as well – these are the general rationales that they prop up for this ever-growing menace which has haunted bureaucracy. While everyone agrees that there was corruption even in the pre-colonial era as well as the 60s and 70s, they point out that the difference was – 'it was latent and not blatant like it is today'. The disapproval of the in-group which was present there earlier, is no longer there. The stigma attached earlier to the corrupt officials is giving way to marvel and appreciation for their ingenuity. Honest officials are respected on face, but they are also considered as a hindrance in the free-flow of 'speed-money'.

Here, a new insight was gathered in the course of study from the point of view of bureaucrats. They view that much of the blame for this muck lies with the state bureaucracy. They believe that, "But for the IAS, these state-officials would eat up entire money" it is a general belief that much of the IAS is still honest and above board but while being in state, at every stage, his attempt at cleaning the system is foiled by state level officials. There is a general conflict between the senior state level officials, much older in age, and the young IAS officer who is sent to head the office. In a prismatic society, where the values of achievement have not yet crystallized and ascribed values like age, experience are still considered to be important, there is a natural conflict between a new young official from the centre and old experienced officers in the state. This also reflects the inherent tension of federalism in the arena of bureaucracy.

Another important area where there has been a shift is the relation between the political leaders and the bureaucrat. Initial years after the Independence, there was an air of mutual suspicion and a bit of clash about the perception of each other's roles, but one thing that brought them together was the motivation to work for the upliftment and development of society. The agenda of nation-building provided them with a sense of purpose and one thing that facilitated their working together was the similarity of their background-profile. Both of them generally belonged to upper class and upper-caste; were well-educated and articulate, with the leaders having the vision which they could convey to the civil servants.

A distinct shift in their relationship took place in 70s when the nature of political leadership changed in India. Green Revolution, Backward class movement. – these movements saw the emergence of leaders from rural background and dominant castes. They were not the traditional elites, but had started wielding enormous influence in national politics after the green revolution. Naturally these leaders never felt comfortable with the elitist, exclusivist, convent educated bureaucrat speaking in altogether different language. So, a concerted effort was made to change the character of bureaucracy according to the changing nature of national politics. A bureaucrat remembers Chaudhari Charan Singh saying, “language, class, caste, dress, life-style-these should not become barriers in the way of a common aspirant wanting to become a bureaucrat”.

With late 70s and early 80s, the background profile of bureaucrats coming to civil-services started changing. This change was accompanied by a greater hobnobbing between the politician and the bureaucrat. While the minister started appointing those people as secretaries whom he was comfortable working with, the bureaucrats also became more pliable to the wishes and fancies of the politicians. Another argument of ‘committed bureaucracy’ instead of ‘natural bureaucracy’ was put forward by the leaders to bring them in line with their wishful thinking.

Ostensibly, it meant that bureaucrats should be committed to the ideals of the constitution and the objectives and programmes executed by the government, but in reality, the veiled meaning was to have a particular kind of political orientation which suited the political party in power for its covert and overt objectives.

This politicization of bureaucracy has further problematised the issue of corruption. While earlier, each of them acted as a check and balance for the other, now they are conniving and colluding with each other in their act of commissions and omissions. Politicization of the bureaucracy has also ensured that now the bureaucrat doesn't give free and fair advice, rather, he proposes what the minister wishes. A bureaucrat confirmed, "It is becoming like a patronage bureaucracy. The leaders identify, encourage and proliferate the corrupt officials. Posts are created to accommodate patronized officials".

In this regard, the approach of even newly recruited bureaucrats is striking. They say that they have learnt to respect the leaders even if he happens to be of a criminal background. "He has been elected by the people whom we are meant to serve. He has their mandate. It is a case of personality adjustment and I don't see much of a problem in that" – opined a trainee reflecting the opinion of bureaucrats in general. They might disagree with the leader, but then taking recourse to the law, rules and regulations, they try to make him see the pragmatic view rather than his wishful thinking.

It is not as if all these don't have an impact on their personality as they have to make compromises and adjustments, but in the course of service, most of them learn to cope with it.

It is very easy to put the blame on bureaucracy and the bureaucrat for all the ills that are there in Indian society. Much of the faults picked in their style of functioning, their general attitude towards work and people are correctly brought forward as well, but that, one has to say, is a monocausal and unidimensional way of looking at the problem. This study was an attempt to bring forth another side of

the story. It was an attempt to look at the bureaucracy from the bureaucrat's eye. This study was about the way they feel, think and perceive their role in society and the way it affects their personality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albrow, Martin (1970), *Bureaucracy*, London : MacMillan and Company Ltd.
- Argyris, Chris (1964), *Integrating the Individual and the Organization*, New York : Wiley.
- Barker, E. (1945), *The Development of Public Services in Western Europe 1660-1930*, London : Arnold – Heineman.
- Beatham, David (1974), *Max Weber and the Theory of Modern Politics*, London : George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Bendix, Reinhard (1952), “Bureaucracy and the Problem of Power”, Robert K. Merton et al (eds.), *Readers in Bureaucracy*, New York : The Free Press.
- Bendix, Reinhard (1962), *Max Weber : An Intellectual Portrait*, London Mehtuen & Co.
- Bhambhri, C.P. (1971), *Bureaucracy and Politics in India*, Delhi : Vikas Publications.
- Bhambhri, C.P. (1972), *The Administrators in a Changing Society*, Delhi : National Publishing House.
- Bhatnagar, Damyanti (1989), *Bureaucratic Culture in India*, Jaipur : Rawat Publications.
- Bhattacharya, Mohit (2000), *New Horizons of Public Administration*, New Delhi : Jawahar Publishers & Distributors.
- Blau, Peter M. (1963), *The Dynamics of Bureaucracy*, Chicago : The University of Chicago Press.
- Blau, Peter M. and Meyer, Marshall W. (1971), *Bureaucracy in Modern Society*, Second Edition, New York : Random House, Inc.
- Bottomore, T. B. (1971) “From the Ruling class to the Power Elite”, Kenneth Thompson and Jersy Tunstall (eds.), *Sociological Perspectives*, Aylesbury, Bucks : Hazell Watson & Viney Ltd.
- Bottomore, T.B. (1964), *Elites and Society*, London : C.A. Watts & Co.

- Braibanti, Ralph (1963), *Administration and Economic Development in India*, Durham : Duke University Press.
- Braibanti, Ralph (1966), *Asian Bureaucratic Systems Emergent From the British Imperialist Tradition*, Durham : Duke University Press.
- Burke, E (1963), *Selected Writings and Speeches*, New York.
- Burke, John G. (ed.) (1966), *The New Technology and Human Values*, Belmont, California : Wadsworth Publishing Company Inc.
- Burnham, James (1942), *The Managerial Revolution*, New York & London : Putnam.
- Chettur, S.K. (1962), *The Steel Frame and I : Life in the ICS*, New Delhi : Asia Publication House.
- Cohn, Bernard (1997), *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge*, New Delhi : Oxford University Press.
- Dahl, Robert A. (1969), "The Concept of Power", Roderick Bell. et.al. (eds.), *Political Power : A Reader in Theory and Research*, New Delhi : The Free Press.
- Dar, R.K. (1999), *Governance and the IAS*, New Delhi : Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Company Ltd.
- Das, S.K. (1998), *Civil Service Reform and Structural Adjustment*, Delhi : Oxford University Press.
- Das, S.K. (2001), *Public office, Private Interest : Bureaucracy and Corruption in India*, New Delhi : Oxford University Press.
- Dewey, Clive (1996), *The Mind of the Indian Civil Service*, Delhi : Oxford University Press.
- Downs, Anthony (1967), *Inside Bureaucracy*, Boston : Little, Brown and Company.
- Dube, S.C. (1979), *Public Services and Social Responsibility*, New Delhi : Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
- Eisenstadt, S.N. (1967), "Bureaucracy and Political Development", J. LaPalombara (ed.), *Bureaucracy and Political Development*, Princeton : Princeton University Press.

- Etzioni, Amitai (1972), *Modern Organizations*, New Delhi : Prentice-Hall of India Private Ltd.
- Foucault, M. (1980), *Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, Sussex : The Harvester Press.
- Friedrich, Carl J. (1952), "Some Observations on Weber's Analysis of Bureaucracy". Robert K. Merton, et al (eds.) *Reader in Bureaucracy*, New York : The free Press.
- Galbraith, John Kenneth (1967), *The New Industrial State*, London : Harmish Harmilton Ltd.
- Giddens, Anthony (ed.) (1992), *Human Societies : An Introductory Reader in Sociology*, Cambridge : Polity Press.
- Gouldner, A. (1954), *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*, Glencoe : Free Press.
- Haralambos, M. and Heald, R.M. (1980), *Sociology : Themes and Perspectives*, New Delhi : Oxford University Press.
- Heginbotham, S.T. (1975), *Cultures in Conflict : The four Faces of Indian Bureaucracy*, New York and London: Columbia University Press.
- Hyneman, Charles S. (1950), *Bureaucracy in a Democracy*, New York : Harper.
- Im, Sungham (2001), *Bureaucratic Power, Democracy and Administrative Democracy*, Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Jacoby, Henry (1973), *The Bureaucratization of the World*, Berkeley and Los Angeles : University of California Press.
- Jacques, E. (1976), *A General Theory of Bureaucracy*, London : Heinemann.
- Jain, R.B. and Khator, R. (1999), *Bureaucracy – Citizen Interface*, Delhi : B. R. Publishing Corporation.
- Kamenka, Eugene (1989), *Bureaucracy*, Oxford : Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Kamenka, Eugene (ed.) (1979), *Ideas and Ideologies : Bureaucracy*, Arnold – Hienemann.

- Katz, E. & Danet, B. (ed.) (1974), *Bureaucracy and the Public*, New York : Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.
- Khanna, K.K. (1983), *Behavioural Approach to Bureaucratic Development*, New Delhi : National Publishing House.
- Kramer, Fred A. (1982), *Perspectives on Public Bureaucracy*, Cambridge : Winthrop Publisher, Inc.
- LaPalombara, Joseph (1967), *An overview of Bureaucracy and Political Development*, Princeton : Princeton University Press.
- Lasswell, H.D. (1948), *Power and Personality*, New York : W. W. Norton & Co., Inc.
- Lasswell, H.D. and Kaplan, A (1950), *Power and Society*, New Heaven : Yale University Press.
- Long, Norton (1966), "Power and Administration" Peter Woll (ed.), *Public Administration and Policy*, New York : Harper & Row.
- Marx, F.M. (1975), *The Administrative State*, Chicago : The University of Chicago Press.
- Marx, K. (1947), *The German Ideology*, New York : International Publishers
- Mason, Philip (1985), *The Men Who Ruled India*, New Delhi : Rupa & Co.
- Meynaud, Jean (1968), *Technocracy*, New York: The Free Press.
- Michels, Robert (1972), "The Iron Law of oligarchy", Roy C. Macridis and Bernard E. Brown, *Comparative Politics : Notes and Readings*, Illinois : The Dorsey Press.
- Mills, C. Wright (1968), *The Power Elite*, London: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Misra, B.B. (1970), *The Administrative History of India 1834 – 1947*, London : Oxford University Press.
- Misra, B.B. (1977), *The Bureaucracy in India*, Delhi : Oxford University Press.
- Mosca, Gaetano (1939), *The Ruling Class*, New York : McGraw – Hill.
- Nandy, Ashish (1983), *Intimate Enemy : Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*, New Delhi : Oxford University Press.

- Nehru, Jawaharlal (1936), *An Autobiography*, New Delhi : Oxford University Press.
- Newman, Franz (1952), "Total Bureaucratization and Powerless Individual", Robert K. Merton. et. al (eds.), *Reader in Bureaucracy*, New York : The Free Press.
- O'Malley, L.S.S. (1965), *The Indian Civil Service*, London : Frank Cass and Co. Ltd.
- Parsons, Talcott (1951), *The Social System*, New York : Free Press.
- Parsons, Talcott (1959), *The Structure and Process in Modern Societies*, Glencoe : Free Press.
- Parsons, Talcott (1971), *The System of Modern Societies*, New Jersey : Princeton-Hall
- Perrow, Charles (1970), *Organizational Analysis : A Sociological View*, Belmont, California : Wordworth Publishing company, Inc.
- Prasad, Bishwanath (1968), *The Indian Administrative Service*, New Delhi : S. Chand & Co.
- Punjabi, Kewal L. (1965), *The Civil Servant in India*, Bombay : Bhartiya Vidya Bhawan.
- Ramkrishnayya, M. (1992), *Two Administrators : Interaction Between ICS and IAS*, Hyderabad : Booklinks Corporation.
- Ray, S.K. (1979), *Indian Bureaucracy at the Crossroads*, New Delhi : Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
- Redford, Emmette S. (1969), *Democracy in the Administrative State*, New York : Oxford University Press.
- Riggs, Fred (1964), *Administration in Developing Countries : The Theory of Prismatic Society*, Boston : Houghton Mufflin.
- Riggs, Fred W. (1962), "For Ecological Approach : The Sala Model", Ferel Heady and S. Stokes (eds.), *Papers in Comparative Public Administration*, The University of Michigan.
- Riggs, Fred W. (1964), *Administration in Developing countries : The Theory of Prismatic Society*, Boston : Houghton Mifflin company.

- Riggs, Fred. W. (1967), "Bureaucrats and Political Development: A Paradoxical View", Joseph Lapalombara (ed.), *Bureaucracy and Political Development*, Princeton : Princeton Univ. Press.
- Rourke, Francis R. (1969), *Bureaucracy, Politics and Public Policy*, Boston : Little, Brown and Company.
- Russell, B. (1938), *Power : A New Social Analysis*, London : Allen & Unwin.
- Selznick, Philip (1952), "Co-optation : A Mechanism for Organizational Stability", Robert K. Merton, et al. (eds), *Reader in Bureaucracy*, New York : The Free Press.
- Sharma, B.R. (1986), *Administrative Stress : A Study of Middle Level Govt. Executives in India*, Delhi : IIPA.
- Singh, P. and Bhandarkar, A. (1994), *IAS Profile : Myths and Realities*, New Delhi : Willey Eastern Ltd., New Age International Limited.
- Singhi, N.K. (1974), *Bureaucracy : Positions and Persons*, New Delhi : Abhinav Publications.
- Spangenberg, Bradford (1976), *British Bureaucracy in India*, New Delhi : Manohar
- Strauss, E. (1961), *The Ruling Servants*, London : George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Subramaniam, V. (1972), "Representative Bureaucracy : A Reassessment", R.T. Golembiewski, F. Gibson and G.Y. Cornog (eds.), *Public Administration*, Chicago : Read McNally College Publishing Company.
- Suleiman, Ezra N. (1974), *Politics, Power, and Bureaucracy in France : The Administrative Elite*, New Jersey : Princeton University Press.
- Torstendahl, Rolf (1991), *Bureaucratization in Northwestern Europe*, London and New York : Routledge.
- Tout, T.F. (1952), "The Emergence of Bureaucracy", Robert K. Merton, et al. (eds.), *Reader in Bureaucracy*, New York : The Free Press.
- Turner, Jonathan H. (1987), *The Structure of Social Theory*, Jaipur : Rawat Publications.
- Verma, Pavan K. (1998), *The Great Indian Middle Class*, New Delhi : Viking.

- Verma, Pavan K. (2004), *Being Indian*, New Delhi : Sage Publications.
- Weber, Max (1947), *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, trans. A. N. Henderson & T. Parsons. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Weber, Max (1952), "The Presuppositions and Causes of Bureaucracy", Robert K. Merton, et al. (eds.), *Reader in Bureaucracy*, New York : The Free Press.
- Weber, Max (1971) "Power and Bureaucracy", Kenneth Thompson and Jeremy Tunstall (eds), *Sociological Perspectives*, Aylesbury, Bucks : Hasell Watson and Viney Ltd.
- Whyte, William F.(1956), *Organization Man*, New York : Simon and Schuster.
- Woodruff, Philips (1967), *The Men Who Ruled India*, New York : Shocken Books.

Journals :

- Bapat, S.B. (1955), *The Training of Indian Administrative Service*, Indian Journal for Public Administration, Vol. I, No. 2, p. 120-132.
- *Bureaucracy in India : Image and Reality*, New Delhi : IIPA, Vol. XX, 1974.
- Chavan, V.B. (1979), *Training and Orientation of Civil Service Attitudes*, Indian Journal for Public Administration, Vol. XV, No. 1.
- *Committed Bureaucracy*, The Hindustan Times, New Delhi, Dec. 1, 1969.
- Constituent Assembly Debates, Vol. X, No. 1, Oct., 1949, p. 45-60.
- Gadgil, N.V. (1959), *The New Administrator*, Indian Journal for Public Administration, Vol. V, No. 1. 1959, p. 48-55.
- Jagota, S.P. (1962), *Training of Public Services in a Developing Economy*, Journal of the National Academy of Administration, Vol. VII, No. 2, p. 70-90.
- Kothari, S. & Roy, R. (1969), *Relations between Politicians and Administrators at the District level*, Indian Journal for Public Administration, New Delhi, p. 160-183.
- Mathai, John (1955), *Administration : Then and Now*, Indian Journal for Public Administration, Vol. I, No. 1, p. 8-18.

- Menon. V.K.N. (1963), *Training for the Public Services*, Indian Journal for Public Administration, Vol. IX, No. 3, p. 370-75.
- Mishra, Devendra (2004), "*In Defence of Hierachy*", The Hindu Business Line, June 1.
- Pillai, N.R. (1955), *The New Civil Servant*, Indian Journal for Public Administration, Vol. I, No. 1, p. 2.
- Presthus, Robert (1960) "*Weberian and Welfare Bureaucracy in Traditional Society*", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. VI, No. 1.
- Seligman, F. (1930) (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. III, New York.
- Selznck, P. (1952) "*Foundations of the Theory of Organization*", American Sociological Review, February 13, p. 25-35.
- Trivedi, R.N. and Rao, D.N. (1960), *Regualr Recruits to the IAS : A Study*, Journal of the National Academy of Administration, Vol. V, No. 1, p. 50-80.



Diss
 302.350954
 J559 Ch

 Th11649