

AGRA UNIVERSITY EXTENSION LECTURES



PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION YESTERDAY AND TODAY

DELIVERED BY
Dr. Satish Chandra Seth
M. A., B. Sc., Ph.D. (Agra),
Ph. D. (Manchester), 'Sahitya Visharad'.

AT
D. S. College, Aligarh (U. P.)

ON
January 28 & 29, 1965.



350
Se 75 A

AGRA UNIVERSITY
AGRA
1965

Se 75A



**INDIAN INSTITUTE OF
ADVANCED STUDY
LIBRARY SIMLA**

To

P. D. Gupta

Orator, Educationist, Administrator

 Library IAS, Shimla



00055340

FOREWORD

For historical reasons administrators have come to occupy a special position in our society. Daily exercise of authority and work among the people have turned them into an obvious instrument of public policy. The makers of policy do not, however, yet seem to realise fully to what further extent this instrument could be profitably used. As the most organised part of our elite, our administrators are capable of bringing about much faster changes in many fields provided they are urged by a philosophy of commitment to these changes. Public administration in India is yet to be persuaded effectively in such a philosophy.

2. It is true that public administration today is carrying out not only the traditional tasks of maintaining civil order, administering law and raising revenue for the state, but is also actively engaged in promoting public welfare and economic development. But it is not yet given the responsibility of bringing about pervasive social change which, to my mind, is the most important task before public administration in this country today and tomorrow.

3. Social change comprehends many things. It presupposes new anthropological configurations, sociological regroupings with greater diffusion of power and a changed industrial psychology with new motivations and attitudes towards work and leisure. In short, it is nothing but an index of a cultural transformation. Public administration in India has yet to be geared to this complicated task of cultural transformation.

4. Giving this task to our administrators would itself presuppose a change in our outlook. For in that event they could no longer be regarded as bureaucrats, tied to a desk, a routine and a smug acceptance of the existing order of things.

They would then have to be treated as dynamic, cultural agents. The sooner we take this view of our administrators the better for us.

5. Dr. S. C. Seth's Agra University extension lectures entitled "Public Administration Yesterday and Today" would seem to clear the ground for a discussion of this aspect of our public administration. Compressing a lot of material in a remarkably short space, he makes it possible to reach an understanding of the requirements of tomorrow. I therefore commend his book to our reading public in the hope that it will move them to think about this matter in a meaningful manner.

ASHOKA MEHTA

PREFACE

In the following pages lies the text of Agra University Extension Lectures delivered by me at D. S. College, Aligarh in January, 1965. For various reasons I had chosen 'Public Administration—Yesterday & Today' as the theme of my lectures. The most important of them, perhaps, has been the growing awareness of the fact that today this country needs a greater understanding than ever before of the purposes and processes of Public Administration.

For long the discipline of Public Administration has been taught the world over as an appendage of Political Science. The process of its liberation as a subject, meriting a specialized study, which commenced in the West long back, has in Indian Universities been only a post-Independence phenomenon and a grudging concession. In its professional side also, Public Administration has been feared more than understood. Our bureaucracy has won international fame but at home it has still to gain a sympathetic status in the eyes of the Indian people. It is criticised by one and all bringing into fore the supreme need for the correction of its public image.

It is high time that no opportunity should be lost to explain the growth and development of public administration both in its academic and professional sense. The national demand for a rapid economic development of the country, of safeguarding our external boundaries, of maintaining high standard of internal law and order, and, of fostering greater international cooperation, can be met with only if we have a much more perfected administrative instrument than we possess presently.

These lectures while capturing a panoramic view of the evolution of public administration since the days of Egyptian Bureaucracy to our own times try to highlight the principles

that should guide the teaching and efforts of administrative reform in India. Such a sweeping survey is bound to suffer from certain limitations both of detail and of emphasis. If, however, these lectures could stimulate a more sympathetic attitude towards Public Administration, I shall see therein the reward of the labour done here. Finally, I offer my sincere thanks to the University of Agra and the staff and students of D. S. College, Aligarh in without whose trust and Cooperation these lectures would not have become possible.

New Delhi

S. C. SETH

CONTENTS

Part I—Public Administration—Yesterday.

Public Administration—definition; Types of Authority; Categories of administration; Traditional Forms; Feudalism & Patrimonialism; Modern Forms: Imperial, Industrial & Welfare; Historical Illustrations; Egyptian Bureaucracy—Structural & Functional Developments; Roman Empire & Administrative Refinements; Moslem Feudalism; Ottoman Hierarchy; Indian Medieval Patterns; Singleness of Civilian & Defence Functions; Conclusion: Key Characteristics.

Part II—Public Administration—Today.

Factors leading to the Emergence of the Modern Category; European Developments (1600-1900); Pure Type of Legal Authority; characteristics; Weberian Typology of Bureaucracy; Church Administration; Ecclesiastical Structure; Structural Changes in Military Administration; Industrial Revolution; Growth of Technique & Specialization; Segregation of Civilian and Defence Functions.

Part III—The Indian Administrative Developments—Then & Now :

Imperial and Colonial Patterns; From Whiteman's Burden to the Welfare Model; East India Company and the Growth of Indian Civil Service; Indian Bureaucracy: Quantitative and Qualitative Changes: New Trends and New Problems—Politico-Constitutional, Functional, Organisational, Procedural, and Academic; Conclusion—Administrative Issues & Realities; An Administrative Panchsheel for Future Reform.

Tables:

Appendices:

PART I

Public Administration—Yesterday

DEFINITION AND CATEGORIES.

The term "Public Administration" is conspicuous by its absence both from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and *Americana*. Nevertheless it has come to be defined variously and it would perhaps be hard to choose in between them. But one could point out to some of these definitions as advanced by a British, an American and an Indian. E. N. Gladden who has been a British Civil Servant has suggested that Public Administration in a broad sense means "the management of affairs by public bodies: the arts of policy-making, of legislation and of adjudication belong to the wider sphere of politics and government, of which public administration is but one sector". "Thus", he adds, "Public Administration is concerned with the administrative activities of government. 'Administration' is a long and slightly pompous word, but it has a humble meaning, for it means to care for or to look after people, to manage affairs: the administrator is a servant and not a master".¹

The definition of Public Administration as advanced by Prof. L. D. White, an American, points out another dimension of it. He says "administration" is "co-extensive with the organized Government" and, therefore, Public Administration as a branch of political science deals with "the art and science of management applied to the affairs of the State".² At another place he defines Public Administration as "the fulfilment or enforcement of public policy".

-
1. Gladden, E. N. *An Introduction to Public Administration* (London Staples Press), 2nd ed., 1952, p. 18.
 2. White, L. D. "Public Administration" (*New York: Encyclopaedia of the Social Science*, vol. I, 1954 Edition, p. 440. *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration* (New York; Macmillan), 1948, p. 3.

The most appealing definition advanced by an Indian comes from the late Dr. Rajendra Prasad who said that:—

“Public Administration, as I view it, as a layman is a pragmatic science, by which I mean that human experience and our day-to-day needs and requirements are the main spring from which its aims and rules of procedure are drawn. In a sense, therefore, the principles of Public Administration reflect the spirit of the age.”

He added, “We read with considerable interest the accounts of the working of public administrations in ancient times, the middle ages and the beginning of the modern era from the pen of historians and travellers. Those accounts do give us an idea of the State of social and public affairs prevailing in those times. But gradually, as the tempo of social life has gone on mounting as a result of the advances in knowledge and the multiplication of human needs public administration has gone on acquiring a more and more complicated complexion. Today we have reached a stage when the smooth working of administration whether at the governmental or business level, cannot fail to be reflected in the day to day affairs of the people. That is because public administration has made inroads into every department of life so that anything like a vacuum from the point of view of administration has ceased to exist.” In conclusion, he observed, ‘Public administration in order to be useful or at any rate above criticism has to keep itself in close touch with all sections of the public, for it is from public opinion and popular action and reaction that it draws the material on which to build, to correct and to reshape itself’.³

Evidently, the definitions given above make a reference to three elements which when put together describe the meaning of the term public administration and what it stands for. These elements are namely, the political character of the State,

3. Address delivered at the Indian Institute of Public Administration New Delhi (January 1959).

the collectivity of individuals organised to perform certain duties, and a continuous process of public participation. Empirically speaking, therefore, public administration is a politico-Constitutional phenomena carried out by a band of organized workers to discharge certain well-defined functions, working within a given structure and a legal network of rules and regulations, with and for a section of people in a well-defined territory.

It need not be said that a change in either of these elements would also affect the character of public administration and thus generate new trends as also new problems. Public Administration has everywhere thus been both an instrument and a product of the social, economic, cultural and political change. And with the march of time it has changed its own character. What it was yesterday, it is not today. We shall, therefore, in the first instance, examine the characteristics of the Administrative processes of the past and see how it has gradually evolved itself from traditional pattern to what we now consider as its modern form particularly as it has grown in India in our own times.

Administration, as stated earlier, is not a recent phenomenon; it is as old as the history of mankind. In fact, administration is 'co-extensive with the organized government'. It has marched through centuries through the traditional form of government to our own times, when the governments are being run in a highly specialized way.

The historical analysis of the patterns of administration, as are available to us today, reveal infinite variety. These variations have been caused due to the physical basis of the state organization at a given period of history; the prevailing level of social and cultural organization; the development of technology; the theory of the functions of the state; and due to more immediate governmental and political traditions and ideals pursued by a given people.⁴ Nevertheless, as we shall see, there is also a semblance of unity in the structural

4. White, *op. cit.*, p. 440.

and functional sense. All administrative systems working for an organized body known as government have displayed three major characteristics; namely, there should be people who are:—

1. *The Holders of Authority*

This authority could be vested in a single individual say, a tribal chief, a prince, or a constitutional monarch, etc.; this authority may, on the other hand, be vested in a limited number of people; say, groups consisting of preponderantly wealthy people, or, intellectuals; this authority, on the other hand, may be vested in an assembly of people convened at a given time for a short period or a body which assembles time and again in the life of the people.

However, in all these above variations more commonly described as the monarchical, aristocratic and democratic type of governments, we have to have a specific description of those who hold authority.

2. *The Executors of Authority*

This body of people commonly known as officials constitute the back-bone of administrative structure. The way they are organized, the way they are selected, the way they discharge their responsibilities, even the way they are themselves discharged and removed from the Government, and other connected matters, such as the decision making process, or, the problem of human relations etc., is what constitutes, the major elements in the study of Public Administration. By and large, such individuals are known as the civilian Bureaucrates.

3. *The Preservers of Authority*

This group of people are, however, those who are trained to protect a definite "power structure" raised round the holders of authority. They operate in times of internal chaos and disorder, external threat and invasion. Such personnel is basically military or police as opposed to the civilians. It is,

however, true that civilians can also perform the military duties as and when necessary and vice-versa.

It is in the context of these three elements, that we can study the history of Public Administration.

Any attempt to classify history in terms of distinct periods connoting types of Public Administration that marked those periods defeats itself in many ways. Nevertheless, each period is marked by certain dominant trends, which can be safely distinguished. One such categorisation of Public Administration can be made by dividing the history of its evolution into two broad categories, namely, the traditional category and the modern category.

The traditional category cannot be said to have ceased to dominate the administrative practices of the various countries, just as we cannot say exactly, how modern the administrative structure of a modernized country is? These are relative terms. Nevertheless, as we shall see, we do find that towards the second half of the seventeenth century the character of Public Administration in Europe begins to shape itself on certain non-traditional lines. This then is the beginning of the modern category of Public Administration which forms the subject matter of the Public Administration of today. The modern category also has its own shades and variants such as the Imperial, the Industrial and the Welfare Categories of Public Administration.

The Imperial Category is best illustrated by the type of administration which came to be evolved under the aegis of the British Empire and such other colonial administrations as the European countries came to set up during the course of the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries. The Imperial Category again presents two sets of administrative values. The one set of value or administrative methods belonged to the Home Government of the Imperial power. The other set of values and administrative practices and traditions

belonged to the Imperial extension of administrations that were set up in the various Dominions, colonies and territories that the Imperial power came to acquire from time to time. These Governments in the beginning were only a kind of field office of the home government. It need not be emphasised that in the due course of time these disparities or double standards, as they came to be applied to the governmental process at home, say in London, and in the colonial administrations, say in New Delhi (in a sense India was not a colony, it was an Empire within an Empire) gradually diminished. But it was a long drawn process.

The Industrial Category refers to the another sub-type of a modern category of administration which came to be evolved in countries like the United Kingdom, the continental states such as France and Germany and the United States of America. This category can be further sub-divided into three sub-types, namely, *industrially oriented Public Administration*, as in Canada, or the United States of America; *industrially sensitive administration*, such as in the United Kingdom and France; and *industrially indifferent public administration* such as in Spain and Portugal. This distinction arises out of the difference in degree to which the apparatus of Public Administration in these countries had grown under the conscious influence of the traditions and style of the business administration of these countries.

The third category is the welfare category. The welfare category of public administration can be seen in the newly developing countries. These countries present varying degrees of modernization. They are trying to grow out of the colonial era and they are also sensitive towards the industrial growth and industrial techniques. Nevertheless, public administration, as it is still practiced in these countries, can and does show strong mark of the traditional elements of Public Administration. However, they are all committed to the functions of "welfare".

THE TRADITIONAL CATEGORY AND ITS FORMS

Historians and the Political analysts have recorded Feudalism and Patrimonialism as the two most important variations of the traditional form of authority. It is interesting to recall the observation of Machiavelli made in his classic work "The Prince". Describing the modes of the traditional authority, he wrote "Kingdoms known to history have been governed in two ways; either by a prince and his servants, who as ministers by his grace and permission, assist in governing the realm; or by a prince and by barons, who hold their positions not by favour of the ruler but by antiquity or blood".⁵

Max Weber also treated patrimonialism and feudalism as the two major variants of the traditional authority. "Patrimonial government", as Benedix explains, "is an extension of the rulers' household in which the relation between the ruler and his officials remain on the basis of paternal authority and filial dependence."⁶ The patrimonial set up, according to him, changes into the feudal type of government "when the paternal relationship is replaced by a contractually fixed fealty on the basis of kingly militarism."⁷

Benedix, however, warns that this definition is clear only so long as it is formulated in abstract terms. Since patrimonial officials require personal independence on the basis of hereditary land grants, high-landed notables who possess this independence may lose it. "These political structures" he further adds, "that arise from the enlargement and transformation of the patriarchal household merge imperceptibly with political structures that arise from the partial centralization of independent status groups under stress of war, conquest or other contingencies."⁸

Clearly, some amalgamations of the two systems have taken place at various stages of history. Max Weber also maintained

5. Nicolo Machiavelli; The Modern Library, New York, (1940), p. 50.

6. Reinhard Bendix, Max Weber. An Intellectual Portrait (London Heinemann, 1960), p. 359.

7. Ibid, p. 359.

8. Ibid, p. 359.

that at the institutional level the contrast between the patrimonial form of authority and the feudal form of authority was not much. "Patrimonial Governments", he wrote, "have a 'feudal' aspect wherever territorial rights are granted by the ruler - or appropriated by a landed aristocracy on a hereditary basis. and feudal regimes have a 'patrimonial' aspect wherever a field system.....is combined with the same degree of central administration."⁹

Max Weber gives further illustrations in support; such as the division of the military forces of Turkey into the Janizaria, who represented the personal troops of the ruler, and the cavalry who were benefice-holders of a quasi-feudal type. Similarly, amongst the Rajputs in North West India territorial rights were granted to the members of the leading clan by the clan elder in return for military service and other duties; any failures thereof were met by a threat of forfeiture. Here paternal and feudal elements were combined directly. James Tod, famous Historian of Rajasthan records, an illustration, wherein the mutual relation of the prince and the marwari chiefs was described as follows :—

"When our services are acceptable, then is he our lord; when not, we are again his brothers and kindred, claimants and laying claim to the land."¹⁰

Evidently in both types of the traditional authority, one finds certain things in common, particularly, that we have to have a ruler who grants rights in return either for the military service or for the administrative service. Under feudal form of government, we have, a relationship where "the superior individual granted his protection and diverse material advantage that assured a subsistence to the dependent directly or indirectly; the inferior pledged various prestations or various services

9. Ibid, p. 367.

10. James Tod, Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, Annals, I, xxvi p. 139.

and was under a general obligation to render aid".¹¹ On the whole the entire relationship between the authority and the subordinate in this system conceives of an "idea of the personal bond, hierarchic and synallagmatic in character".¹²

In Feudalism the administrative functions are of a limited nature. This is primarily due to the contractual basis of the relationship between the lord and the vassal. This contractual system very clearly defined the nature of social, economic, political and administrative obligations. Here, "from the point of view of its duties it was a contractual system whereby the Nation represented by the king, let out its lands to individuals who paid rent by doing military service and civil suit", and as regards its rights it was a land system whereby in Stubbs's phrase "every lord judged, taxed, and commanded the class next below him".¹³

It is also important to point out that in the feudal form of government the training and education of the subordinates laid emphasis on the element of "game as a serious pursuit", the "individual artistry", the "idealization of heroic virtues", and the "heroic sense of honour".¹⁴ Feudalism was thus opposed to "the matter of fact attitude and to business routine".¹⁵

In the patrimonial form of government, however, one finds the domination of a ruler over certain officials whom he needs for the exercise of his authority in his own discretion. Although he depends on the good will of his officials, nevertheless, he brooks no delimitation of his authority and is against the emergence of any privileged status group, distribution of

11. Marc Bloch: "European Feudalism" (New York: Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences Vol. V. 1954 ed.) p. 204. Also See: Marc Bloch: Feudal Society (tr. from French by L. A. Manyon). (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd. 1961).

12. *Ibid*, p. 204.

13. See W. Stubbs, Constitutional History of England, Vol. I (Ed. 1897).

14. Bendix, *op. cit.*, p. 364.

15. *Ibid*, p. 364

property or the continuation of any landed aristocracy, as was possible in the case of the feudal form of government. He saw to the welfare of his subjects; in fact, the legitimacy of his rule conceived of the idea of a "welfare state", which is the "legend of patrimonialism in contrast to the feudal image of a free camaraderie of warriors pledged in loyalty to their leader".¹⁶

The patrimonial regime, in fact, emphasises more on administrative functions since, "Under patrimonialism every new administrative function provides additional benefices for the officials, and this may add to the power position and symbolic significance of the ruler."¹⁷

Education under patrimonial rule was primarily an aid for the administrative service. Examples can be given of the Chinese literati who was an officialdom based on literary learning. In the ancient Near-East and in the medieval Europe we come across another kind of group of officials, priests, who control the education and specialize in the skills of "writing and reckoning". Another type commonly mentioned is that of the secular legal education as was given in the universities of medieval Europe. According to Bendix "this education is also literary, but through a process of rationalization it may become the basis of the modern professionalized bureaucracy".¹⁸

These characteristics are in a sense the salient features of the Public Administration as it came to be evolved under the domination of the traditional authority. The variations, if any, were local and came about due to the exigencies of time in which these administrations had worked. If we glance through the history of some of the administrative systems of the past we can clearly notice the aforesaid characteristics of the traditional form in actual operation.

16. *Ibid*, P. 364

17. *Ibid*, P. 356

18. *Ibid*, P. 365

One of the oldest bureaucratic structure on record goes back to the 30th century before Christ when in the Old Kingdom of Egypt (3400-2475 BC) one comes across "an elaborate development of state functions under local officials, such as was not found in Europe until far down in the history of the Roman Empire."¹⁹ The famous historian James Henry Breasted remarks that this administration consisted of "a closely centralized body of local officials, each a centre for all the organs of the local government, which in each nome (district) were thus focussed in the local governor before converging upon the palace. A Pharaoh of power, force and ability, and loyal governors in the nomes, meant the strong state; but let the Pharaoh betray signs of weakness and the governors might gain an independence which would threaten the dissolution of the whole."²⁰

Even in the middle Kingdom (2000-1558 BC), the Egyptian administration is characteristically feudal in nature. Here, there is a slight variation in the bureaucratic structure, in that the local nobles known as Nomarchs were neither the officials nor servants of Pharaoh. The nomarchs, Breasted opines, "had indeed become a miniature Pharaoh in his little realm."²¹ They ruled over the entire nome and owed allegiance to the Pharaoh. The rule of Amenemhet had established "a feudal state not essentially different from that of later Europe."²²

"On a less Sumptuous scale his residence was surrounded by a personnel not unlike that of the Pharaonic court and harem; while his government demanded a chief treasurer, a court of justice, with offices, scribes and functionaries, and all the essential machinery of government which we find at the royal residence. The nomarch by means of this organi-

19. Breasted, James Henry A History of Egypt (From the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest), Hodder & Stoughtan, London, 1905, (1956 ed.) p. 83.

20. *Ibid*, p. 83.

21. *Ibid*, p. 158.

22. *Ibid* (I 408), p. 160

zation himself collected the revenues of his domain, was high priest or head of the sacerdotal organization, and commanded the militia of his realm which was permanently organized. His powers were considerable. . . . Such lords were able to build temples and erect public buildings in their principal towns. They taught the crafts and encouraged industries and their immediate interest and direct personal oversight resulted in a period of unprecedented economic development."²³ It is interesting to find that where the patrimonial and feudal system merge, the element of 'welfare' also creeps in. From the tomb inscriptions of this period of Egypt we get ample evidence in support. One of the Siut nomarchs of the heracleopolitan domination, for instance, is quoted as having said:

"I was rich in grain. When the land was in need, I maintained the city with kha and heket (grain measures), I allowed the citizen to fetch for himself grain; and his wife, the widow and her son. I remitted all imposts (unpaid arrears) which I found counted by my fathers. I filled tin pasture with cattle, every man had many breeds, the cows brought forth twofold, the folds were full of calves."²⁴

The faithful officials of the nomarchs show the same solicitude for the welfare of the community over which they were placed. Another inscription describes an Assistant Treasurer in the Theban nome residing at Gebelen in the Eleventh dynasty, in the following words:—

"I sustained Gebelen during unfruitful years, there being four hundred men in distress. But I took not the daughter of a man, I took not his field. I made ten herds of goats, with people in charge of each herd; I made two herds of cattle and a herd of asses. I raised all kinds of small cattle. I made thirty ships and then thirty more ships and I bought grain for Esneh and Tuphium after Gebelen

23. *Ibid*, pp. 159-60 (I 637 & I 638)

24. *Ibid*, p. 160.

was sustained. The nome of Thebes went upstream (to gebelen for supplies). Never did Gebelen send upstream or down stream to another district (for supplies)”²⁵

We find, therefore, that the Nomarch thus devoted himself to the interests of the people and was concerned to leave to posterity a reputation of a merciful and beneficent ruler. Another tomb inscription, for instance, also supports this view; in it another Nomarch by name Ameni, the ruler of Oryx Nome, is quoted having said that:

“There was no citizen’s daughter whom I misused, there was no widow whom I oppressed... I did not collect the arrears of the field.”²⁶

These illustrations do establish the paternal character of the local ruler. Breasted is of the opinion that “after making all due allowance for the natural desire of the Nomarch to record the most favourable aspects of his government, it is evident that the paternal character of his local and personal rule, in a community of limited numbers, with which he was acquainted by almost daily contact, had proved an untold blessing to the country and population at large.”²⁷

As time changes, we find that continued pressure of a series of battles turned the Egyptian Kingdom into a military state in the 18th dynasty (1530-1350). It is in this period that we come across a well-defined administrative hierarchy with Pharaoh at the apex and a series of officials below him. Pharaoh was assisted by a Vazir and a Chief Treasurer. The Vazir, amongst other functions of the civil administration, was the head of the judicial administration. The Chief Treasurer headed the Treasury.

For administrative purposes, the country was divided into irregular districts; small towns had a town ruler and large

25. *Ibid* (I. 459) p. 160.

26. *Ibid* (I. 523) p. 161.

27. *Ibid*, p. 161.

towns a Mayor or a governor. The chief objective of the government was to make "the country externally strong, and productive and to achieve this it reverted to feudalism". The Pharaoh entrusted some of his lands, now chiefly owned by the officials, to them on a permanent basis and some others as individual fiefs to his favourite nobles, his partisans and relatives.

It is also important to point out that for the purpose of taxation, all lands and other property of the crown except that owned by the temples were recorded in the tax-registers of the White House, as the Treasury, was still called. For this work, the state employed various scribes. It is here again that we find that the officers of Administration are also officers who dispense justice. They constantly serve in a judicial capacity. There was no judicial service as such operating in those times. But Breasted observes, "every man of important administrative rank is thoroughly versed in the law and is ready at any moment to serve as judge. The Vazir is no exception".²⁸ It need not be pointed out here that even today in many parts of our country the executive and the judicial functions are vested in one and the same officer who is also responsible for the collection of taxes.

It will be equally interesting to examine the functional-structural aspects of an imperial administration of a Government belonging to the traditional category. Here, we cannot help describing certain characteristics of the Roman Empire. We all know that the aristocratic Senate of Rome was an "administrative body". It had enough power to direct the policies of the state. Curiously enough, the Senators were mostly a group of ex-Magistrates, once elected to office, by popular vote. Polybius, an intelligent Greek Statesman, who had lived for years at Rome first as a political hostage, then as a friend of Scipios, while writing his impressions of the Roman Government records two important things: first, the element of "checks and balances" whereby the

28. *Ibid*, p. 240.

autocratic executive power was controlled by the aristocratic Senate which was, in turn, controlled by the democratic assemblies (second, the fact that "the Romans had slowly built (unconsciously perhaps) some kind of classification by function". As an illustration, he refers to the separation of the praetorship from the consular office in 336 B.C. He felt that the Romans had somehow discovered that the judicial and executive functions were and should be kept distinct. The supervision by the Senate, consisting of ex-magistrates, of the foreign policy and its growth into an administrative body separate from the executive as well as the legislative group was a significant example to which Polybius alluded. In thus highlighting the separation theory had Polybius been more careful, some historians opine, than he might have forestalled Montesquieu.

An attempt to perfect the Roman Administration was made by the Emperor Augustus. He followed the patrimonial system of recruitment by employing the trusted servants of his own household as Secretaries and Treasurers of the temporary departments of the state. He separated tax gathering department from the administration in order to minimise any abuse of power. He chose his officials known as *legati* for indefinite terms from the senatorial class. They administered the affairs of the province and commanded the garrison.

It might be interesting to refer here to the army administration of his time. The core of the army of over 100,000 men was made of citizen legions. These were supported by equal number of provincial auxiliaries who were given citizenship at the close of the service. A number of legions were posted at the various frontiers. During the first two centuries, one does not record great army casualties since policy of the empire was preservation of its frontiers and not its extension.

Another important feature of the Roman period is the absence of any conscious introduction of feudal order under the Roman Empire. It is attributed to the fact that the

Roman Government did not concern itself with the national social organization so long as a tribute was forthcoming normally. Economic forces gradually divided the natives into large land holders and renters. It would be unnecessary to go into other details in describing the administrative efficiency that prevailed during the "liberal monarchy" of Augustus and the "oppressive bureaucracy" of Diocletian's absolutism.²⁹ Political scientists record these times as worth studying—by one and all students of administration. It is sufficient to indicate that the remarkable "political aristocracy of Rome" survived for hundreds of years. Based primarily upon unpaid distinct civil service, it stands out as one of the striking phenomena of the Roman society.

Rome provided several interesting examples of governmental forms. It is also an example of society, observes Tenny

-
29. See Gibbon Edward : *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. I (180 A.D.—395 A.D.), (The Modern Library, New York). On the rule of the two Emperors, Edward Gibbon makes the following interesting remarks :

"Like the modesty affected by Augustus, the state maintained by Diocletian was a theatrical representation, but it must be confessed that, of the two comedies, the former was of a much more liberal and manly character than the latter. It was the aim of the one to disguise, and the object of the other to display, the unbounded power which emperors possessed over the Roman World". (*Ibid.* p. 332).

Edward Gibbon, while referring to the two principles : 'Ostentation and 'Division' that characterize Diocletian's administration defends his rule from the charge of oppression. He agrees that the system of Diocletian was "a more expensive establishment, and consequently it led to an increase of taxes, and the oppression of the people". He adds, however, that "during his reign the growing evil was confined within the bounds of modesty and discretion, and he deserves the reproach of establishing pernicious precedents rather than of exercising actual oppression. It may be added, that his revenues were managed with prudent economy, and that, after all the current expenses were discharged, there still remained in the Imperial Treasury an ample provision either for judicious liberality or for any emergency of the State."

Frank that "submitting to the severest discipline for the common good, a discipline that brought into being the Roman legion, that insisted upon durable roads, aqueducts and public buildings, and that took its share in the exacting civil service of Trajan's day—this record constitutes one of Rome's most lasting contributions to civilization".³⁰

Finally, it is necessary to point out how under this administration one of the most important functions of the traditional administration came to be established, *viz.*, creating in the society a respect for "law and order". It was under the domination of the Roman Empire that the individual was given a legal status and one of the functions of the State was supposed to be "a giver and protector of law to citizens". The contribution of Rome in the field of law is too well known to be reiterated here. The permanence of their work is apparent when we consider that in the judicial administration of today "most of the basic principles of the Anglo-American law of Admiralty, Wills, Successions, Obligations, Contracts, Easements, Liens Mortgages, Adverse possession, Corporations, Judgements and Evidence come from the survival or revival of Roman Law in English law. The fundamental conceptions of Habeas Corpus and Trial by Jury as well as many principles of the law of Torts are of Roman origin."³¹ They even devised through the fetial law, "the customary rules of what was permissible behaviour between nations in war and peace—a set of customs known as *jus gentium*."³²

It is equally fruitful to refer to the characteristics of the traditional governments that grew in the muslim countries in the Middle East and through conquests and administrative organization in the Indian sub-continent in the middle ages.

30. Tenny Frank, "The Roman World" (New York : Encyclopedia of the Social Science, Vol. I-ii), p. 59.

31. Sherman, C. P. Roman Law in the Modern World, 3 Vols., (Boston: Vol. I, 1917), p. 387.

32. *Ibid*, p. 387.

The Historians are of the view that the Moslem feudalism of the 9th century, "by reason partly of geography and climate, partly of Arab traditions embodying looser organization and partly of Moslem allegiance to the central government as succeeding to the authority of Mohammed, never developed the close knit and durable hierarchy of western feudalism. The complexity of feudal dues, prestations, succession and marriage fees did not approach that of the west."³³ However, Saracen feudalism was superseded in time by the feudal system of the Ottoman Turks. The rule of the Ottoman Turks and its prototypes in Arab was characteristically feudal in nature with visible patrimonial trends. The Ottoman Sultan from the very beginning rented land in return for military service. This established a system which affected the Seljuk disintegration and continued through five centuries.

It is in this period of the feudal administration that one comes across the establishment of a hierarchy of officers who belonged to the sultan slave family. The line of hierarchy ran as follows—The Sipahis, the fief-holders, were commanded by Subbassi, who in time of peace governed the towns and whose rank in the army resembled that of Captain. Next were the Alai-beys or Colonels and above these the Sanjak-beys or Brigadier Generals who governed the important citizens and held superior position over the district, which were allotted to them. The Sanjak-beys were under the rule of the Beylerbey or Mirimirans comparable to the Major-Generals. At the head of the entire military organizations were the Sultans.

This hierarchy of the 19th Century, in fact, gives an interesting example of how the civil and military functions came to be performed by the same set of people. As a Historian remarks, "In its fully developed form, this system produced two great territorial armies, one in Asia and one

33. Lyber: Albert M. "Feudalism : Saracen and Ottoman" (New York: Encyclopaedia of Social Science, Vol. V 1964 ed.) p. 211.

in Europe *all of whose officers lived from the lands held in fief and in time of peace exercised functions of local government.*"³⁴

In the Muslim Period commonly referred to as the years of the sultanate of Delhi, one finds an incoherent development of the patrimonial and feudal forms of Government. The Historians are divided on the issue if at all the dynasty of the "Slave Kings" was feudal. The writings of Kovalevski,¹ a Russian Historian, suggests that "the core of the feudalization process from the twelfth to the fifteenth century... was the effort of the holders of Iqtas to make their prerogatives hereditary and independent of the Sultan of Delhi's will."³⁵ He illustrates this point by referring to such iqtadars who refused to perform military service on the grounds that "their grants were not conditional but hereditary and unconditional."³⁶

On the other hand, the English Historian, W. H. Moreland, summarily rejects the idea of feudalism. He writes that it is, "quite impossible to think of such a nobility in terms of a feudal system with a king merely first among his territorial vassals: what we see is a royal household full of slaves, who could rise, by merit or favour, from servile duties to the charge of a province or even of a kingdom—essentially a bureaucracy of the normal Asiatic type."³⁷ Moreland points out that the 'Muqtis', as 'Iqta' come to be known, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, had no territorial possession of their own. The King could post them anywhere at any time. They could be removed or even transferred for any reason whatsoever. "Such arrangements", Moreland sug-

34. *Ibid*, p. 212. (italics mine)
35. Kovalevski, *Obshchinnoye Zzemlevladyenie, Prichini, Khodi Posled, Stviya eva Razlozheniya* (Communal Landholding: Causes, Course and Results of Its Disintegration), Moscow, 1879, Chapter VI. Quoted from: *Feudalism in History* (Ed.) Rushton Coulborn. Chapter VII "Feudalism in India" by Daniel Thorner, p. 144.
36. *Ibid*, p. 145.
37. Moreland, W. H. *Agrarian System of Moslem India* (Camb. England, 1929) p. 218.

gests, "are the antithesis of anything which can be properly described as a feudal system."³⁸ According to him the Muqti's post was purely that of an administrator; his duties were to govern; if he failed, he could be fined or dismissed. Among his important functions was one of maintaining a body of troops, whose strength and pay were set by the king. The Muqti paid the troops out of the revenues raised in the area under his charge; but he had also to replenish a considerable amount to the King's treasury. The Muqti's financial affairs were subject to audit by the Ministry of Revenue of the Sultanate of Delhi; any defaulter being subject to severe punishment.

It is in the time of the Mughal that one comes across the growth of much more elaborate administrative machinery. The Mughal Emperor was "the fountain of all honours, the source of all administrative power, and the supreme dispenser of Justice".³⁹ "These were not empty phrases", observes an Historian, "The Mughal emperors were very hard working administrators; working harder than most public servants are supposed to work today; they kept longer hours and observed fewer holidays".⁴⁰

The character of the state was clearly a combination of the patrimonial and feudal forms of governments. During the rule of Akbar, Jahangir, Shajahan and Aurangzeb, one finds an enormous growth of an administrative machinery mainly bureaucratic bureaucracy. The Akbar's reign is notable for having set up the Mansabari System under which the salary of every official was determined according to "his rank in the service settled by his numerical designation". This salary an officer was supposed to use to maintain a certain number of horses elephants, other beasts of burden and means of conveyance. Thus, "a commander of 5,000 (strength of his unit)

38. *Ibid*, p. 218.

39. Sharma, S. R.: *Mughal Government and Administration*, Hind Kitabs Ltd., Bombay (1951), P. 28.

40. *Ibid*, p. 28.

had to maintain 3,700 horses, 100 elephants, 400 camels, 100 mules and 160 carts".⁴¹ Each man was given a proper rank in accordance with "a number of men to be posted at his Division by the Emperor". These men were required to render military service as and when necessary. In other words a Mansabdar as an officer became "a contractor for military labour".⁴² It must, however, be mentioned that Mansabs were not merely army commanders but they also served in other capacities such as the executive officers, the Governors, the kotwals and the like. In certain posts therefore, they were not supposed to maintain contingents of troops. It appears that even men of letters, painters and even cooks had held Mansabs. It is interesting to note that the public service under the control of Akbar was divided into 30 grades of officers who varied from the number of men they controlled. This strength of Mansabdaries, however, varied from one Emperor to another and was open to both the Hindus and the Muslims.

The recruitment of Mansabs was based on patrimonial system. They were recruited by the Emperor direct. In this matter the Emperor also gave importance to the recommendation of the leaders of military expedition and other high officials. There were no public examinations or interviews held to select these officers. The increments in rank and salary usually followed "the two new year festivities, the Royal birthday festivities and the termination or beginning of an expedition. Besides successful service, the presents made to the Emperor also played some part in deciding promotion. This practice of the patrimonial form of government is not necessarily something ancient and done with. In the United Kingdom till today we come across the announcement of Honours list, conferring titles on the outstanding civil servants being issued on the occasion of the King or the Queen's day of birth.

41. *Ibid*, p. 104.

42. *Ibid*, p. 105.

We need not emphasise that the Mughal Administration once again illustrates how the civilian and the military functions came to be combined in one and the same official. The Mansabdari system was clearly a method of organising the royal military forces. It was also a kind of bureaucracy which helped to transact the business of the State. Even though the selection and promotion followed the patrimonial system nevertheless, the provision of the military aid and army by the Mansabdars is symptomatic of feudalism. In fact, like the medieval Europe, the feudal element under the Mughal also came to acquire an hereditary aspect. The descendents of the Mansabdars were usually appointed or absorbed by the State. Historians are, however, divided on this point. Some, particularly Bernier, is of the opinion that the system of 'Zabti' did not make the public service under the Mughals hereditary. It is also worth mentioning that the Mughal Public Servants were paid enormous salary and they enjoyed great social prestige.

This historic survey can be carried out in greater details drawing examples from countries other than those illustrated here. However, irrespective of land and people in the traditional pattern of administration whether of the patrimonial form or of the feudal form, one can notice the presence of the following five elements, *viz.*

1. The presence of a supreme authority whether in the form of a king, a feudal lord or noble man who controls the social, economic and political power and is capable of delegating this power to other individuals.

2. The presence of such individuals who either through a contract or otherwise owe allegiance to the supreme authority and are required to perform certain definite functions as ascribed from time to time by their ruler.

- These functions were to be performed both in times of peace and in times of war. In other words, under the patrimonial and the feudal form of governments, there is a lack of clear cut distinction between the civil and military

functions. The civilians could perform military duties and vice-versa.

3. The presence of a hierarchical relationship in which the subordinates had a right to appeal, but not the right of enforcement of justice. The legal aspect of the hierarchical relationship, if any, was more customary than justiceable through any written code.

This hierarchy also varied from one phase of history to another. It could be a hierarchy of the social rank. It could also be a hierarchy of authority, without any corresponding social status. In either variation, however, the hierarchy reflected the presence of a bureaucratic structure, though not in every respect, in which, we understand the term bureaucracy today.

4. The mode of recruitment emphasised the element of personal loyalty. In the patrimonial recruitment, the administrative staff consisted of persons who were related to the chief by traditional ties of personal loyalty. Such persons could be kinsmen, slaves, dependents, clients or freed men. Heredity also played a part. In the feudal form the recruitment was done on extrapatrimonial basis. This category included "people in a relation of purely personal loyalty, such as all sorts of 'favourites', people standing in a relation of fealty to their chief——'vassals'—and finally, those who of their own free-will enter into a relation of personal loyalty as officials".

5. There was no documentary basis of the transaction of official business. The paternal rulers did not issue any rules. In feudalism "law had to be sought and discovered in the vast background of social inter-course". Sir Paul Vinogradoff aptly remarks that "in rudimentary unions, in so-called barbaric tribes even in feudal societies rules of conduct are usually established not by strict and general commands but by the cor'lial consultation of opinions and habits. The

historical development of law starts in custom".⁴³ Clearly, the traditional administration tended to be arbitrary.

These characteristics thus constitute the salient features of Public Administration as it came to be evolved under the domination of the traditional authority. Most of the variations, were local and came about due to the exigencies of time during which these administrations had worked. It is also necessary to point out that the presence of the above stated elements of public administration still continue in one form or the other even in the administrations of the modern states. In due course of time, however, the traditional patterns came to be replaced by certain non-traditional trends which we now acknowledge as the Public Administration of to-day, and belonging to the modern category. We now turn to examine the cause and nature of this transformation.

43. See Vinogradoff, P. : *Village in England* (1892) and *English Society in the 11th Century* (1908).

PART II

Public Administration—Today

THE EMERGENCE OF THE MODERN CATEGORY

The emergence of the modern forms of the Public Administration was a slow moving process. The changes in the administrative practices of the traditional category, as and when they took place, however, came from three directions, namely—

1. The depersonalization of the personal character of the supreme authority,
2. The legalization of the State Administration, and
3. the gradual growth of technique and specialization of functions.

The period lasting from the beginning of the 16th century until the end of the 19th century is a very crucial period in the history of the growth of Public Administration. It is a period when the traditional form of governmental organisation gradually begins to modernize itself. It is interesting to recall the fact, that during the period in the countries of the continent, particularly, in France and Prussia, as also in England, many changes took place in the organisation & working methods, of the governmental organization. Sir Ernest Barker considers the year 1960 as the beginning point of modern administration. The reasons for this earmarking were many. "By that year", Ernest Barker writes, "England had decided that she would not follow the lines of an administrative absolutism, acting through the King's Privy Council and its ancillary organizations both central and local, but would be governed—by the King-in-Parliament at Westminster, aided—or sometimes thwarted—by the local justices of the

peace. In 1661 began the personal rule of Louis XIV; and during the next ten years, with the aid of Colbert, the inherited institution of the past were shaped into the French administrative system which, modified and invigorated by Napoleon, still endures. In 1660 Frederick William, the Great Elector, secured for his troubled dominions in northern Germany a period of rest and reorganization; and though the history of Prussian administration is a long story, which began even earlier with Joachim Frederick's organization of a Council of State about 1600, and was to have large chapters written afterwards (by Frederick William I and Frederick the Great in the eighteenth century, and by Stein and his successors in the nineteenth), we may date its continuous progress from the reforms of that crucial period.⁴⁴

Perhaps, it will be too much to look for any rationale in a sequence of historical events of these countries to determine how the modern trends in the public administration begin. But we can certainly find that such medieval concepts, as prevailed in France, in that the State was considered a family, 'the Government of the State' considered as its property, and where the distinction between State and the Society was very little, were notions that gradually change. Referring to these factors, Barker, comments that 'this confusion of the idea of the State with notions of Family, property, and general Society was generally characteristic of Europe about 1660; and the confusion still survived under Louis XIV, and into the eighteenth century. So long as it persists, it complicates and checks the development of a pure and specific administration of public services. The disengaging of the idea of the State, as a service-rendering organization for the protection of rights and enforcement of duties, is the prior condition of such a development. There are two great landmarks in the history of that disengaging. One is the institu-

44. Earnest Barker, *The Development of Public Services in Western Europe 1660-1930*, Oxford University Press, London, 1945, p. 1.

tion of absolutism, as it was inaugurated by Louis XIV. The other is the proclamation of national sovereignty, as it was made in 1789. Both of these movements, opposed as they are, agree in postulating a conception of the State as something separate and *sui generis*; and it is in connexion with these movements that we can best trace the general history of State administration".⁴⁵

Clearly, therefore, this period is characterized by two great facts of history. First: The emergence of the concept of National State in which the role of people as opposed to the role of monarchy increased day by day. This process led to the depersonalization of the kings. The administrative machinery which during the medieval period was considered to be the personal property and the household of the Monarch gradually became different entity. G. E. Aylmer, while describing the civil service under Charles the I, aptly comments, that "the gradual decline of Royal power from the 16th to the 19th century to a large extent preceded the birth of the modern civil service. The outcome of the 17th century constitutional conflict helped to determine the context within which the modern roles of both the crown and the civil service have evolved. It may seem perverse to argue at one and the same time that his servants could not become 'public' officials while the King still ruled as well as reigned, and that the 'enlightened' absolutism might have initiated administrative reforms akin to those which were only fully achieved in the 19th century".⁴⁶

We cannot also overlook the impact of the public opinion of the 18th century on the State machinery. The extra-parliamentary public opinion, the voice of the greatly expanded urban middle class are indeed important factors which from 1780 onwards begin to shape the traditional administration of Great Britain on modern lines. To quote Aylmer again, it was during

45. *Ibid*, pp. 5-6

46. G. E. Aylmer, *The King's Servants. The Civil Service of Charles I (1625-1642)*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London (1961), p. 467.

this period, that “the Crown became depersonalized; executive power passed from the Monarch and his (or her) chosen advisers to a Cabinet selected on a ‘Party’ basis.”⁴⁷

It is important to point out, that the emergence of Cabinet and parties, and the rise of public opinion, were very important factors which gave an altogether different character to the civil servants. The emergence of a non-political civil service of our times can be traced to these various developments.

Another important factor that changed the character of the traditional government lies in the establishment of the “rational-legal authority” of the bureaucratic staff. It is difficult to give any date, or prescribe a particular period of history, when such a thing happened. The characteristics of the change, however, are too obvious. Perhaps the first brilliant analysis of this change, was undertaken by Max Weber. He singled out the factors that characterise the pure type of Legal Authority—with employment of a bureaucratic administrative staff. “The purest type of exercise of legal authority”, he wrote, “is that which employs a bureaucratic administrative staff. Only the supreme chief of the organization occupies his position of authority by virtue of appropriation, of election, or of having been designated for the succession. But even his authority consists in a sphere of legal, “competence”. The whole administrative staff under the Supreme authority” he added, “then consists, in the purest type, of individual officials who are appointed and function according to the following criteria :

1. They are organized in a clearly defined hierarchy of offices and are personally free and subject to authority only with respect to their impersonal official obligations.
2. Each office has a clearly defined sphere of competence in the legal sense.

47. *Ibid*, p. 467.

3. The office is filled by a free contractual relationship. Thus, in principle, there is a free selection.
4. Candidates are selected on the basis of technical qualifications. In the most rational case, this is decided by examination or guaranteed by diplomas certifying technical training or both. They are appointed, not elected.
5. They are remunerated by fixed salaries in money, for the most part with a right to pensions. Only under certain circumstances does the employing authority, especially in private organizations, have a right to terminate the appointment, but the official is always free to resign. The salary scale is primarily graded according to rank in the hierarchy; but in addition to this criterion, the responsibility of the position and the requirements of the incumbent's social status may be taken into account.
6. The office is treated as the sole, or at least the primary, occupation of the incumbent.
7. It constitutes a career. There is a system of 'promotion' according to seniority or to achievement or both. Promotion is dependent on the judgement of superiors.
8. The official works entirely separated from ownership of the means of administration and without appropriation of his position.
9. He is subjected to strict and systematic discipline and control in the conduct of the office.⁴⁸

Curiously enough, the emergence of such characteristics of the legal type of authority can be seen not only in the state machinery, but also in other institutions of Europe, which had some kind of administrative structure. The Historians of

48. Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, Tr. by A.M. Renderson & Talco H Parsons. The Free Press, Glencoc, Illinois, pp. 333-34.

administration refer to the fact that after the Roman Empire crumbled, the Christian Church, "as a hierarchy of power, survived and in some respects supplanted the Roman Government". This ecclesiastical structure which still "exists in its pristine forms—a chief executive, a college of staff advisors, archbishops, bishops, travelling agents, parish, priests, and congregations of the faithful", presents a "continuing example of administrative organization and method".⁴⁹ Weber also regarded the church organisation as typical of the rational-legal authority of the bureaucratic staff.⁵⁰

Finally, one more point may be mentioned concerning this transition of the traditional authority to the modern forms of Government. And here we have to look to the military aspect of the Public Administration. The growth of a professional Standing army can be traced back to the formation of the companies de e' ordonnance du roi by Charles VII of France in 1445-1448. However, it was after the defeat of the Old Spanish army in 1643, at Locroi by the Great', Conde', that "the French army—soon to be reorganised by Lonvoiz set the fashion for all standing armies for over a century".⁵¹ This was a significant change, a change from mercenary fighters to professional armies, à change from Feudalism to modernism. These professional armies, "unlike the earlier type..... were permanently kept on a war footing, and were exclusively at the disposal of their respective sovereigns."⁵²

49. Schulyar Wallace, "The Great Leviathan and the Science of Administration", *Federal Departmentalization, a critic of various organizations*, (Columbia University Press, 1941), pp. 3-4.

50. The Theory op. cit., p. 334—Also see From Max Weber Essays in 'Sociology (Tr. & ed.) by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., (London), Second edition (1952) Ch. VII, 'Bureaucracy'.

51. J. F. C. Fuller, *The conduct of war (1789-1961) A Study of the impact of the French, Industrial, and Russian Revolutions on War & Its conduct* (Eyre and Spottiswood, London (1961)., p. 32.

52. *Ibid*, p. 20.

Oppenheim, an authority on International law, while referring to these new armies comments, that—

“the evolution of the laws and usages of war could not have taken place at all, but for the institution of standing armies The humanizing of the practice of war could have been impossible without (their) discipline; and without them the important distinction between members of armed forces and private individuals could not have arisen.”⁵³

It is here, therefore, that we come across a significant structural functional development in Public Administration in the field of Defence Administration, namely, the separation of civil and military functions, and the growth of a highly elaborate structure of administrative organisation pertaining to defence. Schulyar Wallace in his work entitled, “The Great Leviathan and the Science of Administration” refers to this aspect of Administration. He feels that the West here has inherited a great deal of the Roman Institutions. “After the rather loosely knit feudal array of the early middle ages was supplanted gradually by the small standing army of professional soldiers and officers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries”, he writes. “the organization and direction of armies became perhaps first care of the modern state. For the scattered and more or less independent feudal bands, furnishing most or all of their own supplies, was substituted the single army, with its hierarchy of relationships and power running down from the commander-in-chief through the various gradations of officers to the lowest private in the ranks. In turn the army was now to be supplied by the State with food, clothing and implements of war and this added an enormous burden to the agencies of military administration. It may be said indeed that the first army was the first modern administrative system as effectively organized as the administration of the Roman Empire at its height, and

that some of the greatest talent produced by Western civilization was dedicated to its improvement".⁵¹

The growth of technique and specialization constitutes another important factor, which has contributed a great deal, in modernizing the nature and scope of Public Administration. It is fruitless to recount here the various discoveries and inventions, such as the wireless which revolutionised the process of communication; or the steam engine which elaborated the responsibilities of the State administration in various countries.

The important point to be borne in mind is the fact, that no administrative machinery can live without being influenced, and changed a great deal, by the changes that overtake a given society at a given period of history. The great inventions that distinguish the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries played a very decisive part in creating a new kind of society in Europe. It had ushered what is known as the Industrial Revolution. The Industrial Revolution, a term, invented by French man and made familiar by Arnold Toynbee, is "not too violent a description of the changes it ushered." It was the means of transforming the people with peasant occupations and local markets into an industrial society with world wide connections.

This change has come to different people at different times. The modern economists are of the opinion that all societies living on this planet have been effected by

54. *Ibid*, pp. 3-4.

It might also be pointed out that Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller attributes the separation of the soldier from the Civil to the following reasons:—

- (i) The horror of barbarities civilian had suffered in the "30 years' war".
- (ii) Exhaustion in population, in resources and in the wealth of every country in central Europe, which made the new standing armies small;
- (iii) Indifferent state of Agri. and comm. All these factors led in each country to the formation of a disciplined body of long service troops, set apart from the civilian population and rigorously restricted to its conduct in peace and war.

this change. Some of them are still behind and have not reached even the take-off stage.⁵⁵ It may, however, be pointed out, that since these changes have come to different people at different times, their impact on the traditional pattern of authority, in a functional and structural sense, also varies from one country to another.

In fact, if we go into the inter-relationship between the methods of administration in business (and the reforms made therein through scientific management movement) and the governmental administration, we might be surprised to find, how the administrations of England and France, who were the pioneer in discovering the industrial techniques, and thus ushered in an era of specialization, are not the countries whose administrations are greatly influenced by the world of business. As is, now well known, in this respect, Public Administration of the United States of America takes a lead, over the rest of the world.

Be it as it may, generally speaking, the growth of technique and the advancement of industry, had its impact on the organisation of public services, and the State responsibilities which gradually increased. The machine age led to an ever increasing emphasis on the principle of division of labour and specialization. The impact of these ideas was considerable: they made the State Administration professional by nature. As functional responsibilities of the State multiplied, its organizational structure began to expand. Civil and defence responsibilities came to be segregated. The departmental form of Government began to receive the highest importance. People began to take to the civil service as a life long avocation. Public Administration thus became a specialized business and amongst other changes, such then was the beginning of a process, that gave the traditional form of administration a modern appearance in most countries. We shall now try to recapture some of these developments in the context of the Indian administration from the times of its colonial beginnings to our own times of the supposed "welfare".

55. W. W. Rostow. *The stages of Economic Growth: a non-Communist manifesto*, Cambridge University Press), 1960.

PART III

The Indian Administrative Developments— Then and Now

The growth and developments in Public Administration in India provide a unique synthesis of the patterns of the modern Public Administration belonging to the Imperial-Colonial, industrial, and Welfare types of administration.

It is well known that the Imperial and the Colonial patterns of Modern Public Administration go hand in hand. Whether it were the Imperial Governments of Europe or that of its large-sized off-shore island, the British Isles—which in fact became, the largest ever, Empire—the process of public administration embraced everything that concerned itself, directly or indirectly with “the constitutional, administrative and economic connections between the mother country and the colonies.”⁵⁶

Thomas Pownall, a former Governor of Massachusetts, after retirement, wrote a book entitled, “The Administration of the colonies”, which concerned itself in the remodelling of the British Government in North America with a clarion call that in this vast region “a grand commercial interest, the basis of a great dominion will be formed and arise.” “The duty of those who govern us,” he exhorted, “was to realize, that our kingdom may be no more considered as the mere kingdom of the isle, with many appendages of provinces, colonies, settlements and other extraneous parts; but as a great marine dominion consisting of our possessions in the Atlantic and in America United into one interest, in one centre where the seat of government is.”⁵⁷

56. Richard Koebner, *Empire* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1961), p. 123.

57. Thomas Pownall. *The Administration of the Colonies*. (London: 1st edition, anonymously published, 1764), pp. 3-6, (quoted from *ibid.*)

Apparently, this endless emphasis on a single seat of government, dictating the regional outposts of administration varying from "that of British Somaliland, where the Governor issued ordinances without the assistance of either an executive or a legislative council, to that of South Rhodesia which, after 1923, was completely self-governing except in external affairs,"⁵⁸ to the Empire of India—an Empire within an Empire do establish the mutual affinity and mutual antagonism that characterised the administrative ingenuity displayed by men at white-hall and in the dependencies. The administrative developments in this era of modernity followed the dictates of such men, whether from Spain, Holland, Portugal, France or England, who were primarily motivated by 'The three GS-Gold. Glory, God.'⁵⁹ A classic expression of the idea of Manifest Destiny was made in Rudyard Kipling's poem 'The White Man's Burden', which first appeared in the London Times on February 4, 1899. (It has been said that the poem appeared at a time when the United States was victorious in the Spanish American War and was, in part an invitation to Americans to join in the task of shouldering the burden). The first stanza of the poem can establish several missing links as also offer a rationale to the various trends that characterized the colonial part of Imperial public Administration. It reads as follows :—

"Take up the white Man's burden—
 Send forth the best ye breed—
 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."⁶⁰

-
58. Paul Knaplund, *Britain Commonwealth and Empire (1901-1955)* London: Hamish Hamilton, 1956), p. 454.
 59. Louis L. Synder, *The Imperialism Reader* (Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Co. Inc. 1962) p. 1.
 60. From: Rudyard Kipling, collected works, 1899.

It will be hard to generalise about the principles that characterized the colonial category of government for, as stated above, these colonies varied from each other in their geographical, cultural and socio-economic setting. Consequently, the main political trends and political principles with which the imperial power had held together the heterogeneous population of these various colonies, alone give us some idea of the nature of Public Administration that prevailed in these territories.

Robert Stokes in an analysis of this kind refers to three great principles which according to him inspired the government of the dependent empire. They were, namely, (1) Western Democracy (2) Trusteeship, (3) Indirect Rule.

“Through all the intricacies of the thousand local policies”, Stokes wrote, “The influence of one or more of these principles may always be traced; and without them the study of political government is indeed an un-navigable sea. They are not mere distant guiding stars of administration, leading of rulers from one objective to another and faintly illuminating the way. They are something altogether more active and intimate in the affairs of government. They mould institutions and policies, and through a whole hierarchy of subordinate people they enter into the minute day-to-day decisions of officials and legislators alike. They impinge on all minds. Governors, planters, missionaries natives, all in various ways feel their force, often unwillingly. They colour almost every aspect or relations of life. In short, it is very largely through them that each dependency is what it is. The first, whatever we may think of it, is a new Imperial ideal and the other two are new in their modern forms”.⁶¹

As we shall notice from the Indian experience, the institutional form of Western democracy as it came to be evolved

61. Robert Stokes, *New Imperial Ideals. A plea for the Association of the Dominions in the Government of the Dependent Empire.* John Murrery (London), 1930., p. 99.

was far from what western democracy meant even in those days. The principle of trusteeship was exploitation in a different way. The indirect rule in no way helped the subject population to feel one with the rulers. The Administration was alien in its fulness. Stokes himself admitted that "fundamentally these three principles are inconsistent with each other. Western democracy is being largely applied in the East, where it is producing results radically different from those which trusteeship is creating in Africa; as between the Simon Report and the Ceylon Report on the one hand, and the Hilton Young Report and Lord Lugard's Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa" on the other, there is a deep gulf fixed".⁶²

He felt that 'the former would fashion in the East communities proudly confronting the world as 'self-government' but within, growling under the tyranny of their own Western dictated classes. The latter presents the prospect of an Africa politically deep and economically faultless to settlers, but benignly administered on behalf of the bulk of its inhabitants. This is a striking contrast". Finally, referring to the third principle, he wrote "the indirect rule, "is inconsistent with the other two, but takes some colour from the surrounding administration."

It was a period when Empire was considered something *eternal*. Naturally, the growth of Public Administration in India could not be anything but authoritarian, and its working, traditional in spirit, even if it was modern in its outer appearance. The institutional character of this kind of administration in India thus began with the rule of the East India Company which became Western spearhead to mould the quantitative and qualitative character of administration in this country.

It would be interesting to recall here how the East India Company came to establish a civil service known as the Covenanted Civil Service. The term covenanted arose out of the practice of the company to require its servants before

62. *Ibid*, pp. 99-100

leaving England, to enter into a covenant wherein their privileges were recited and their obligations defined—a practice which continued even with the members of the Indian Civil Service who were required to enter into a covenant with the Secretary of State for India.

Company's earlier covenanted civil service represented the junior and senior merchants, factors and writers who were employed for purposes of trade by the East India Company, and whose mercantile denominations were continued long after the occupation of trading had ceased to represent more than a subordinate feature in the company's operation. In 1765 the Company acquired the Diwani of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa including the right to collect the revenues and of civil justice, but for some few years afterwards the administration of the revenues and of civil justice was left in Native hands, European supervision being gradually introduced. In 1772 the company began to assume the direct collection of the revenues and the administration of Civil Justice. These duties thus came to be discharged by the body of public officers known as the Indian covenanted civil service. In 1790 and subsequent years the system of civil and criminal justice was entirely remodelled by Lord Cornwallis and the direct administration of all branches of the public service by European officers was placed on a clear and permanent basis. It was followed by such changes as were introduced by the Statute of 1793, which provided for 'Reservation' of appointment for the service; the regulations framed under the statute of 1853, based upon the Report dated November 1854 submitted by a committee headed by Mr. (afterwards Lord) Macaulay which introduced a system, whereby admission to the Indian Civil Service was regulated by the results of open competitive examinations; the statute of 1858, whereby the Government of India was transferred from the company to the crown and thus imposed upon the Secretary of State in council, acting with the advice and assistance of Her Majesty's Civil Service Commissioners in England, the duty of making regulations; the statute of 1861, which amongst

other things, permitted the authorities in India, under special circumstances, to appoint such officers, persons other than covenanted civil servants, subject to certain restrictions; the statute of 1870 whose object was to provide 'additional facilities...for the employment of Natives of India of proved merit and ability, in the civil service of Her Majesty in India'

It was, however, in the year 1886, nearly a century later than the East India Company began to discharge certain administrative duties, that the first Public Service Commission came to be set up under the Presidentship of Sir Aitchison, the then Lt. Governor of Punjab, "to devise a scheme which may reasonably be hoped to possess the necessary elements of finality, and to do full justice to the claims of Natives of India to higher and more extensive employment in the public service". It was also intimated that the investigations of the Commission would be preparatory to a Parliamentary enquiry into Indian affairs. The Commission was debarred from going into the questions connected with the conditions in which English candidates are admitted to the Indian Civil Service Examination in England.

When Aitchison Commission went into the question of civil service the total number of sanctioned charges or offices for covenanted civilians for the whole of British India (excluding Burma, the Hyderabad Assigned Districts and Coorg) and in the Non-Regulation Provinces by Covenanted Civilians, Military officers and uncovenanted officers promoted to the ranks of the several commissions was only 765.⁶³ Half a century later in the year 1939, the total number of employees on the pay-roll of the Central Government alone (exclusive of members of the Armed Forces) was 8·07 lakhs.⁶⁴ In 1951, this had risen to 12·23 lakhs of Employees who served in numerous establishments. The Gazetted staff of these establishments who in Indian administrative system were considered to provide

63. See Table I.

64. 1 lakh=100,000

the leadership on whom alone it was thought that the efficiency of the Government mainly depends, rose from 3,953 in 1939 to 11,017 in 1951.⁶⁵

Since then, that is the year 1886 to the year 1963, this country have had several commissions to look into the affairs of the civil service in India. Mention may be made of the Islington Commission (1912-15), the Lee Commission (1924) before partition and of the Vardachari (1947) and Jagannadha Dass Commission (1957-59), which we set up after India gained Independence. Each of these Commissions had made a reference to the quantitative changes that had since over taken the Bureaucracy in India.

Dass Commission throws light on the rate of expansion of the number of persons serving the central government in the post-Independence period. Accordingly, this number on 1st April, 1948 was 14,45,050 and the number as on 30th June, 1957 had risen to 17,73,570 showing an increase of 23 per cent over 9 years, *i.e.*, an average annual increase of 2.5 per cent.⁶⁶

It may be interesting to note that about 90 per cent of the total staff of the Central Government today is employed by the Railways, the Posts and Telegraph Department and the Civilian staff under the Ministry of Defence. If we look at the growth of Ministries and Departments the change is phenomenal when we recall that in 1763, the East India Company had only two Departments—the Public and the Secret. Today we have ten times more Ministries, with more than two score of Departments and a few dozen of Attached and Sub-ordinate offices, Boards, Commissions, Corporations working on behalf of the Central Government alone, besides the State Secretariats and the local administrations.

The qualitative change in the organization and working of the Indian bureaucratic structure had also occurred in several direction. Complete Indianisation of our services is but one important feature of it. We can, however, refer to two aspects,

65. See Table II

66. See Table III.; For some recent figures see Table IV.

viz., 'power' and the nature of 'work' of today's Civil Service in India.

The criteria of "the power-position of bureaucracy" was first scientifically stated by Max Weber. He wrote:

"The fact that bureaucratic organization is technically the most highly developed means of power in the hands of the man who controls it does not determine, the weight that bureaucracy as such is capable of having in a particular social structure. The ever-increasing 'indispensability' of the officialdom, swollen to millions, is no more decisive for this question than is the view of some representatives of the proletarian movement that the economic indispensability of the proletariat is decisive for the measure of their social and political power position".⁶⁷

Examined against this test, it is obvious that the Quantitative expansion referred to above does not necessarily mean an increase in the powers of the bureaucrat. It is almost common knowledge in India that the erstwhile bureaucracy represented a highly autocratic and paternalistic form of Government. Pre-Independence social structure lived in a state of vacuum of political power. The men who controlled bureaucracy did not represent the society which that bureaucracy served. Today the power of bureaucracy is derived from the people whom it is intended to serve. Today's civil servant works under a kind of 'democratic vigil' at almost all levels and thus no longer holds "absolute" and "over towering" power. We could also refer to certain other aspects as well. Today's bureaucracy, for instance, is more representative of India. It is not constituted on a communal basis except that the members of the scheduled castes, the tribal people and other backward communities have been allotted special concessions for a limited number of years. Selection of personnel to all ranks is based on the merit-system. We have further to admit

67. From Max Weber. *Essays in Sociology*. "The Power Position of Bureaucracy" (ed.) H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd. London), 1957, p. 232.

that these changes have indeed a close relationship with the nature of work which is required of bureaucracy of today.

It has almost become a common-place statement that public administration under the British Raj discharged only limited functions. As a contrast the practitioners of the public administration of free India seem to be entrusted with functions of unlimited and varied nature. The chief duty of our bureaucracy in a cumulative sense—consists of taking such steps as would bring about an all round, “development of human and material resources and the elimination of poverty and want”, in order to realise in fullness a “socialistic pattern of society”. Clearly, it is in the fulfilment of this Himalayan “endeavour” that we have to search the new trends in the Public Administration of modern India to which we now turn.

NEW TRENDS NEW PROBLEMS

We have explained earlier how public administration as an instrument of managing the affairs of the state is directly governed by the objectives for which a given state exists. There are two apparent phases of our history that delineate the broad framework as also reflect the main characteristics of our public administration. These are as follows:—

Phase of History	Nature of the Polity		Key-note of Public Administration
1. From Political Slavery to Independence	A Police State belonging to the Imperial Category	(a)	Revenue Collection and the Maintenance of Law & Order
		(b)	Restrained Development
2. From Self-Government to Socialistic Pattern of Society	A Welfare State belonging to the Republican Category	(a)	Planned Exploitation of Socio-Economic Resources
		(b)	Internationally aided administration
		(c)	War-oriented administration

Clearly, the new trends that have emerged in our Public Administration have been caused by the main event of our past history, in main, that of the recent two decades. From the Second World War, shall we say, to the cessation of the Indo-China border hostilities, our administration had faced the problems of large scale manpower development to that of the discharge of civilians and war responsibilities; of coping with famine and acute food shortage, of Partition, large scale exodus and rehabilitation of population, of exchange of offices, and officials and even books and furniture; of constitution making and political integration; of electioneering and parliamentary democracy and parliamentary control; of national planning and economic reconstruction, of democratic decentralization and social welfare; of industrialization and economic development; of rural development and self-sufficiency in food; of public health and hygiene; of education and cultural developments; of national integration and international cooperation; of administrative organization, personnel recruitment and their training; in short of every problem associated with the expanded responsibilities of a welfare-cum-security committed state.

Today's administration is thus a developmental administration. The new trends in Indian Public Administration and the new problems inherent in them could thus be traced from the following five types of changes:

- (i) Politico-Constitutional,
- (ii) Functional,
- (iii) Organisational,
- (iv) Procedural, and
- (v) Academic.

1. Politico-Constitutional Changes

Of the various changes of this nature that have had an impact on public administration, a reference may be made to three important points, First, is the concept of Welfare State as envisaged in the Preamble and the Directive Principles of

State Policy as enumerated in Sixteen Articles (Article 36 to Article 51) of the Constitution of India. The objectives of the Preamble in that "Justice, social, economic and political" be secured to all citizens, can be possible only through a series of administrative actions. Same would be true to make effective the various provision of the Directive Principles, particularly that of Article 38 which enjoins upon the state "to secure and protect a social order which stands for the welfare of the people".

Secondly, the establishment of the Parliamentary democracy and Cabinet Government has completed the long-drawn evolution of the basic principles of Public Administration that were extended and tried by the British in India. These were:⁶⁸

- (i) The growth of an executive which is part and parcel of the legislature and collectively responsible to it;
- (ii) the concept of Ministerial responsibility; that is to say for every action of a Ministry or Department even if it be undertaken by one of its civil servants, the Minister alone would be eventually responsible and accountable; and,
- (iii) the emergence of a politically neutral and loyal civil service.

It need not be added that these three elements were not fully operative under the British Raj, but are so today.

Finally, it is important to point out the republican character and the quasi-federal structure of the Indian Polity. The latter point has great administrative implications from the Union-State relationship point of view. It would be difficult to go into details of this aspect of Republican administration in India; suffice to say that the British Raj-Administration operated in a unitary system and that the distribution of powers, and the provision of a Constitution for the states now, do establish a

68. See Seth S. C. 'Understanding British Governmental system,' in Aspects of Administration (Delhi : Allied Publishers) 1964.

new trend and thus have brought into force the problem of administrative coordination on a nation-wide scale.⁶⁹

2. *Functional Changes*

These changes are far too numerous to be catalogued in terms of the administrative trends caused by them. We could perhaps refer to a vital change of principle. There was a time when every student of Public Administration was taught the subtle distinctions between the private administration and the Public Administration. The distinction still remains in theory and can be found in some of the text-books though it is almost non-existent in practice. Until the other day no one ever had heard in India that one of the functions of the state is to manufacture steel, pencil, aeroplanes, ammonium sulphate, grow potatoes, hatch eggs, and run hotels. Today state is looking into every aspect of our life and is trying to deliver these goods on sound commercial principles characteristic of the private administration. It may be useful here to recall that the authors of the Third Five Year Plan categorically demanded that all state undertakings which are of a commercial nature ought to show "profit". Clearly this is a new trend in our Public Administration.

Talking of functional changes, therefore, reminds us of the role of Planning, the provisions of the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1948 and 1956, and the entire movement commonly known as the Community Development.

It is curious, nevertheless, true that the term Community Development and the associated administrative processes (as also its academic exponents and experts, were non-existent until after the independence when it has almost flooded this country.⁷⁰ This sight is more amusing in Britain where even though one would have to search a rural Britain, nevertheless, out of every seven political scientists and Public Administrative

69. See Santhanam, K. *The Union State Relationship* (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1960)

70. See Balwantray Mehta Report, Vol. I, (Copp), New Delhi.

Pundits one meets at least two of them would claim to be an experts is the scientific in Community Development. However, the significant point development of our rural areas 'through the instrumentality of the Ministry of Community Development at the Central and the state levels; and the operation of thousands of village level workers and other bureaucrats who are making the concept of Democratic Decentralization a reality. Here again we will find the fulfilment of the provisions of Article 42 which directs the State "to organise village panchayats as units of self Government".

In these developments of Public Administration in India one could recount the problem of personnel, its recruitment, placement and training that have arisen on a gigantic scale today. But the most relevant problem pertains to the third element referred to in the definition of Public Administration advanced above, *viz.*, that of "public participation."

A reference may be made here to the views expressed in the Report of the Committee for 'Evaluation and on Public Participation,' set up by the Uttar Pradesh Government. This Committee tried to ascertain whether the Community Development Programme was known to all sections of the general public, the service and the public workers in its true perspective".

The conclusions to which this Committee arrived, were full of despair. It revealed that no administrative measure, particularly of this nature, could be a success without its full understanding and participation of the people. The Committee, for instance, observed that the entire Community Development Programme has been presented "in complete isolation" from its "social background and historical context". Some people felt that it is an alien programme. The "lack of perspective", "ideological bias" have made the programme "mostly spoon fed" and thus it lacks a "momentum of its own". "The people do not feel", the Committee went on, "that they and Government are co-partners. They have to

develop a new relation with the Government and its administrative personnel". The Committee added, "Such a perspective, if developed, would create in every participating individual a national outlook and a broad Community approach so essential for the moulding of any society on socialistic and cooperative pattern".

In conclusion the Committee remarked: "A clear appreciation must come home to the common man that in the successful running of his Village Panchayat, he is laying his foundations of the success of democracy in the country as a whole".⁷¹ It need not be reiterated that this principle would be as much valid for the success of other administrative programmes as for the rural development of our country.

3. *Organizational Changes*

These changes have affected the machinery of Public Administration in India both in respect to its Departmental system, as also of the structural organization of its bureaucracy.

We have already hinted at an ever-increasing role of Planning which is now being looked after by a staff-agency in the Planning Commission of India, and various other Planning Boards, of the different States. We have also seen that the present day number of Ministries/Departments/Boards/Offices etc. have increased manifold. A mention may also be made of the hundreds of Public Undertakings which came to be set up after Independence in the form of the Departmental Undertakings such as: Chitranjan Locomotive Works, Ordinance Factories, Delhi Milk Scheme, Central Tractor Organisation, Opium Factory, Neemuch, Government of India Presses; the Statutory Corporations, such as Air India International Corporation, Bombay, Khadi & Village

71. Report of the Committee for Evaluation and on Public Participation (Chairman: Shri Govind Sahai), Lucknow, (1959), pp. 1-10.

Industries Commission, Bombay, L. I. C., Bombay, Reserve Bank of India and Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Dehra Dun; Government Companies such as the Ashoka Hotels Ltd., New Delhi Eastern Shipping Corporation Ft. Bombay, Heavy Electricals (P) Ltd. Bhopal, Hindustan Steel Ltd., Ranchi etc. This is a unique development considering that before 1947 there were only four statutory corporations and four government companies.

In so far as the organizational problems pertaining to the Ministerial Structure is concerned one could trace them back to the views developed in this connection in the Gopala-swami Ayyangar report on the Machinery of Government of India. He tried to draw a distinction between a Ministry and a Department and suggested a 'Basic Plan' for administrative reorganization. Accordingly, a new trend emerged in our administrative history in that some fresh thinking was done on administrative matters. After all these things were not a normal feature under the British. One cannot forget that the work done in Ayyangar report in 1949 had been gone into a long time back in the U.K. by the Haldane Committee in the year 1919 and could as well have been profitably initiated much earlier.

It may further be pointed out that much of the post-independence thinking on organizational matters came to be done on the reports of the Estimates Committee of the Parliament of India. It was inevitable. During the course of Ministerial investigations they came across various new trends and problems. For instance, the Estimates Committee of the first Lok-Sabha in its ninth report (1953-55) happened to enunciate a new principle of organization which almost reversed the traditional pattern of organization. It stated that hereafter "the nature of activity ought to determine the nature of form an administrative unit should have", that "the secretarial part of the Government should be kept separate from the executive side of the administration" etc. One could quote at length at the entire evolution of 'thought' and 'practice' under this head. That these new trends in the field of organization are still beset with pro-

blems which are indeed a subject of international discussion—can be inferred by a remark of the 80th Estimates Committee in that “the trends are definitely in the direction of creation of more and more public undertakings” and that it is high time, “the lines on which they must be developed” be considered. And thus, the search for better ways is still on.

The problems of bureaucratic organization is equally complex and shows several new trends. The provision of the two All India services the IAS and the IPS was done in the constitution itself; the growth of various new services at the centre *e.g.*, the Indian Foreign Service A and later on the I.F.S.B., Central Legal Service, Central Health Service, Central Information Service, Defence Service, the Central Secretariat Service etc. reveal both a new trend and a new problem in the field of personnel. Should or should not there be so many services? Could we not give up the present mode of recruitment, as also the present classification system, as recommended by the second Pay Commission; and instead adopt the modern methods of job analysis in our Public Services and introduce position-classification in our administration? Should we continue to adopt the traditional system of selection? Would they remain suitable for a period of emergency, such as the country is facing today? Can't we remodel the very hierarchy in our organizational structure; if so in what direction, etc.? These are just a few points—a mere surface scratch in judging the problems of the modern Public Administration in India; and indeed they deserve an answer which has not been made as yet.

4. *Procedural Changes:*

These changes pertain to the day to day working of the administrative machinery. These matters cover a vast range from the method of maintaining a file to the development of a more sophisticated movement, known as the Organization and Methods. A unit responsible to discharge O & M duties was set up at the centre in the year 1954 and has by now undergone

various phases of work. It has done a great deal to improve efficiency and to devise method to speed up the average rate of disposal.

One could also refer to the procedural changes in the field of fiscal administration in matters such as budgeting grants-in-aid, central financial assistance and control, foreign aid utilisation, role of audit etc., where in a great deal of procedural reform is still needed.

The innovation in the field of coordination is another procedural change; and as said earlier still remains as an outstanding problem since it presents itself at both the centralized and decentralized levels.

5. *Academic Changes :*

Here we are concerned with the academics of Public Administration in India both in terms of teaching and research. The new trends in this field are again several though not as strong as one would wish them to be. If we remember that the New York Municipal Bureau of Research was established in 1905, (later merged into the National Institute of Public Administration) and that the Royal Institute of Public Administration, London, came to be set up in 1922, the establishment of the Indian Institute of Public Administration in India in 1954 is truly a historic event and a new trend; so is the establishment of various other training centres and Research bodies.

However, the changes in the realm of teaching of Public Administration is still being tamely handled. In India the Subject of Political Science, still seems to accommodate in its syllabus one or two papers of Public Administration as some thing of a *pariah* or a 'displaced person.' Problems of funds and of imagination and industry could be advanced as retarding factors in a speedy adoption of more specialized and full fledged courses in this discipline. The landscape in this field is perhaps slowly changing for good. The literature in Public Administration by Indian authors continues to be feeble and

is wanting in several respects.⁷² The writings of the foreigners, on our administrative problems are not many. Some useful literature on Problems of Indian Administration amongst others, have been provided by Messrs Paul H. Appleby, W. H. Morris Jones, A. H. Hanson, Allen Gledhill, Park & Tinker, and F. W. Riggs and Norman D. Palmer.⁷³ But these do not necessarily constitute the last word in this field. Much more has yet to come, particularly from the Indians themselves.

Conclusion :

We can now summarise, the entire development of the traditional category of Public Administration of yesterday, as it emerges on modern lines, towards the second half of the nineteenth century until our own times, in today's India. The most significant fact, of course, reveals the continued impor-

72. See Appendix B. Also see: The Studies of Public Administration in Indian Universities. Seminar held in May 11-12, 1956 (An I. I. P. A. Publication).

73. Appleby, Paul H.: Public Administration in India. report of a survey (Delhi, Manager of Publication), 1953.

—Re-examination of India's Administrative system with special reference to administration of Government industrial and commercial enterprises, (Delhi: Cabinet Secretariat, O & M Division), 1956.

—Public Administration for a welfare state (Bombay: Asia Publishing House), 1961.

Hanson, A.H.: Public Enterprise and Economic Development (London: Routledge) 1959.

—Managerial Problems in Public Enterprise (Bombay: Asia Publishing House), 1962.

Morris Jones, W. H.: Parliament in India (London: Longmans Green) 1957.

Gledhill, Allen: Republic of India, the development of its laws and constitution. (London: Stevens), 1951.

Riggs F. W. : The Ecology of Public Administration (Bombay: Asia Publishing House), 1961.

Park, Richard Land Tinker Irene (ed.) Leadership and political institutions in India (Princeton, N. J. Princeton University Press), 1957.

Palmer, Narman D. Indian Political System (London: George Allen and unwin) 1961.

tance of the role of bureaucracy. Whether the term bureaucracy is to be understood as authoritarian officialdom, or, it is to be understood in terms of the civil servants, dedicated to serve the people, the ever increasing role of State administration in the life of human society has come to stay for ever. The power content of the bureaucrats may vary from the traditional to the modern form of authority, But his role as an agent of the Government, assigned with certain specific duties, is basic and unchangeable. We shall not try here to go into the merits or demerits of bureaucracy. What is important for our purposes is a reference to the "more familiarised and more recent" meaning of bureaucracy as applied to an organisational structure. Here it refers to "a type of structure manned by a trained personnel who are grouped in a specific command relationships. Bureaucratic organisation in a sense is equally and conspicuously serviceable for a large variety of public and private purposes in industrial societies."⁷⁴ And this certainly has changed it self both quantitatively and qualitatively; and perhaps for the general good.

Besides, the transition of a traditional form of authority to that of the modern also lead to the emergence of a science of administration. It would be perhaps wrong to say that only in our own times in the nineteenth century an attempt has been made to theorise about State and its affairs. Every age can boast of its political philosophers. There have been astute writers who have even tried to define the true role of States and Princes. Kautailya and Machiavelli are too familiar a name of those who wrote Master-Tretises on State-craft. However, Public Administration as a subject of academic anlysis is a recent phenomenon and is, therefore, symptomatic of the transition, of the traditional pattern of administrative organisation to the modern category.

It will, however, be pertinent to point out that the emergence of this trend again varies from country to country. The

74. See Fritz Morsteir Marz. *The Administrative State, An Introduction to Bureucrary* (Chicago. The University of Chicago Press) 1957, pp. 16-28.

erstwhile colonial administrations were not supposed to be the subject of 'thinking and change'. To-day the fact of change, establishes a good and modern administration.

Finally, the most appropriate concluding remark on this subject in so far as it, pertains to Indian administration can justly be summed up from the scattered criticism of our Public Administration, in the form of certain debatable statements, which if they are affirmed or rejected can give us a better understanding of public administration in India.

These are as follows :—

- (i) That the growth of the functional responsibilities of the Government in India have been too hasty and rapid a development.
- (ii) That there has not been a simultaneous development in its structure on any rational basis; it is too asymmetrical and unscientific marked by overlapping and duplication; both in function and organization.
- (iii) That the new principles of public administration are dominated by the new patterns of Indian economic development creating a sudden and total rupture with the history of the past few decades in India.
- (iv) That the present day changes in the bureaucratic structure do not correspond to the changes necessary to execute new welfare and industrial policies.
- (v) That the administrative innovations reveal a lack of a *priori* approach; they are far too personality dominated.
- (vi) That the developments in the field of academics of Public Administration lacks a clear statement of policy; there is 'imitation', duplication and a desire to 'over do'! The publications in the field show little originality and promise, if any.
- (vii) That so far, barring the two Pay Commissions and a couple of reports, no attempt has been made to investigate into the nature and needs of our

administration. The entire administration requires a thorough over-hauling; there is thus a need to set up a National Commission, with Commissions, Committees started simultaneously at the State and local levels, also to examine the entire theory and profession of Public Administration in India in its every conceivable aspect.

The points raised above have now been acknowledged both by the practitioners and theorists of Public Administration and are worthy of serious attention by one and all. In fact, of late, the question of administrative reform has been very much in the thoughts of the political, academic and administrative leadership in the country, both at the centre and in the various State governments. In partial fulfilment of this desire the Ministry of Home Affairs has now set up an Administrative Reforms Department. Even the Planning Commission has set up an 'Administrative and Management Division' to examine the administrative aspects behind the planning. The staff investigation unit of the Ministry of Finance is also looking at the same question from yet another angle. Various State Governments have already published useful reports which have a great bearing on the need of administrative reform. Some of the autonomous academic research institutes and bodies like the Indian Institute of Public Administration, and its regional counter-parts in the States, have also gone into the question of administrative reforms in a variety of ways.

Even though all this has been done, one still wonders, whether the people have really felt any immediate impact of these attempts towards the reform of public administration in India. Perhaps, it may be a little too early to judge the same, and a decade or so later, the real impact of these administrative changes might become visible. It may be sufficient here to point out that there is still a need for greater coordination of effort amongst the various agencies which are concerned with the question of perfecting administrative machinery. More than that, their

respective recommendations need to be put into actual practice. Perhaps it might become apparent in the very near future that, howsoever imaginative thinking of administrative reforms there may be, yet the Indian Public Administration is not without conservative elements imbedded in it. It is high time that the traditional elements in our Administration is located and replaced by more progressive and modern elements.

To sum up, it might be useful to suggest here :

(1) that the future reformers of the Public Administration in India would have to take into account the following factors :—

(i) that the public administration in India is necessarily public administration in partnership. It is a partnership between the Central Government and State Governments; between the State Governments and District Administrations; between the District Administration and the Panchayati Raj Administration. Not only that, it is also a partnership between the political leadership and the professional administrators on the one hand; the professional administration and the people on the other hand. And finally, it is also a partnership within the administration between the senior civil servants and the rest of the rank and file ;

(ii) that if India is to develop and march ahead along with such other nations of the world, which have acquired socio-economic maturity, then this administration will have to completely overhaul itself. And this overhauling will require greater emphasis on specialisation and mechanization.

It is unfortunate that in the second half of the 20th century our administration has not yet started giving that respect which a 'specialist' civil servant deserves. It is also unfortunate that beyond the telephone, the duplicator and a few calculating machines, there is not enough use made of the mechanical office appliances which are being used in the

offices of the advanced countries of the world. Our reformers of administration must take into account contemporary technological progress and other like developments; and finally.

(iii) that the role of bureaucracy is increasing every day and bureaucracy seems to have become an eternal phenomenon in every society. We have already seen how bureaucracy worked in the bygone days and how it has evolved itself into its modern form. The role of bureaucracy will increase every day. In fact there is not a single aspect of modern life which is not governed by some kind of administrative action. In the days to come, therefore, it will be necessary, not only to have bureaucrats who are not the agents of authority and ruthless power; but instead are a well-informed, and dedicated servants of the society. This cannot be achieved by merely increasing the role of bureaucracy. It will also require a much greater effort, on the part of the leadership of this country, towards correcting the role and image of bureaucracy than is being done today. The bureaucracy of tomorrow will have to be far more representative and responsive to the needs and skills that are needed by our society and the developmental administration.

THE FIVE ADMINISTRATIVE PRINCIPLES

It is not felt necessary here to go into greater details, or to build models of future public administration. Yet one cannot help pointing out that whatever be the future model of public administration in India, we cannot afford but to accept the following five principles, to initiate and to bring about administrative reform in the real sense. These principles are as follows :—

1. *Parity between the conditions of service between the Central Government services and those of the State Governments.*

It is extremely necessary that an immediate reform be made in the present day conditions of service by bringing about parity between the corresponding services of the Central and the State Governments. In fact, this parity should

be extended on a nationwide scale. Even the Universities should have similar conditions of service as that of the public services, of course with necessary modifications and adjustments.

2. *Greater exchange of personnel from academic and business world:*

It is absolutely necessary that more and more officers are drawn not only through the existing competitive examinations, but that we should resort to lateral entry at both the lower and the higher levels of the Government. Our services should also have some scheme of mutual exchange of personnel with the universities and the business world. Government officers should be sent to the universities to refresh themselves with the academic aspects of development in physical and social sciences, and also sent to the world of business, to learn first hand, what is going on there. And at the same time professors, and business executives, should be brought into suitable government posts to know their administrative realities and limitations.

3. *The procedural revolution:*

One of the most essential changes in the administration of tomorrow should be in the direction of office procedure which is bound to be different from the one followed in the present time. This would involve changes of various types all of which would be based on the attempt towards the rationalising of the present system so that the twin objectives of 'speed' and economy are achieved. It would be difficult here to refer to all such changes but a special mention may perhaps be made of the fact, that we must reform our hierarchy which should have less levels through which papers pass, and, consequently, there should be greater delegation of powers to the lower levels, so that quicker decisions may be taken with greater responsibility. Secondly, we must perfect our information technology. At present we are not aware of the modern methods through which information is being gathered to take administrative decisions of vital importance.

It will not be surprising, if the word 'cybernetics' is unknown even to most of the theorists, and the practitioners of Administration in this country. Finally, the training of the civil servants should acquire a new status and be given a modern touch which is lacking in the institutions which are training the civil servants today. Perhaps this responsibility will have to be shared by our universities and colleges alongwith the existing training schools within the Government.

4. *War conscious administration:*

Any attempt towards reform in future must also take into account the fact that the Indian Administration today is perpetually committed to the realities of war. There are various steps that the present day administration would be required to undertake, to overhaul our administration in such a way that it may be easily switched over from the peace-time administration to the war-time administration. This will require not only coordination between the centre and the state governments, civil administration and the defence administration, but also creation of a national mood which may bring about supreme identification and co-operation between the private and public sectors as a whole.⁷⁵

5. *International orientation in the teaching and practice of administration:*

It is indeed necessary to suggest here that our administration today is an internationally oriented administration. This is revealed by the fact of international aid that this country is receiving from various directions. It is also indicated by the Indian participation in various agencies of the United Nations. Whether in peace or in war, we are living in an age where any national attempt, no matter how strongly local in origin and scope it may appear, nevertheless,

75. See Seth, S. C.: "Impact of war on the process of Public Administration in India, the U. K. and the United States of America—A Study in Principles" in *Journal of the Administrative Sciences*, Patna Vol. VIII, No. 3, Sept.-Dec. 1963.

has some kind of international aspect about it. In our schools and colleges teaching of public administration of other countries has to be included in the syllabus in the same way today as the study of history, geography and political systems of other countries. The knowledge of the Administrative practices of other nations is an absolute necessity. This kind of study in comparative government should be given, both through the pre-service and in-service training courses. We have to make our civil servants alive to international practices.

We can reaffirm my faith in the genius of the Indian people. I have no doubt in my mind that it won't be long before we will catch up with other countries. The objectives of setting up a welfare state will acquire meaning only if the administration of our country also gets totally a welfare oriented. This would not happen through poor imitations or by raising slogans; it will come about only by our doing things on the basis of knowledge, information and facts which are indeed the basis of modernism. It is our earnest belief that the aforesaid suggestions, if given a practical shape, will go a long way to effect a smoother transition in our administration from the traditional and sub-modern a status to one which will put the country, not only (as Paul Appleby remarked, "amongst the one dozen best administered countries in the world" but perhaps amongst the topmost, or at any rate amongst the first few well administered nations.

Appendix 'A'

THE COVENANTED CIVIL SERVICE

TABLE I

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Presidency or Province	Area in Sq. miles (excluding Feudatory States)	Population (excluding Feudatory States)	Total number of Sanc- tioned Convented charges	Proportion of Col. 5 to Col. 3	Proportion of Col. 5 to Col. 4	
						one charges to every
1. Madras	141,001	31,170,631	116	1,215	268,712 of	sq. miles population
2. Bombay and Sind	124,122	16,454,414	127	977	129,562	-do- -do-
3. Bengal	193,198	69,536,861	174	1,110	399,637	-do- -do-
4. North Wes- tern Provin- ces & Oudh	106,111	44,107,869	169	627	260,993	-do- -do-
5. Punjab	106,632	18,850,437	104	1,025	181,254	-do-
6. Central Provinces	84,445	9,838,791	43	1,963	228,809	-do- -do-
7. Assam	46,341	4,881,426	32	1,448	152,544	-do- -do-
Total	801,850	194,840,429	765	1,048	254,693	sq. miles of population

(Taken from : Report of the Public Service Commission,
1886-87) Calcutta.

A—Quadrupling of Central Civil establishment (other than Railway, Postal & Telegraph establishments)

TABLE II

	Gazetted Staff		Non-Gazetted Staff (in lakhs)	
	1939	1951	1939	1951
Railway Establishments	1,752	3,378	6.44	9.01
Postal, Telegraphs (etc.) Establishments	576	1,216	1.18	1.51
Other Civil Establishments	1,622	7,423	0.47	1.62

(Taken from : The machinery of Government—Improvement of efficiency, Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi, 1952)

Employment under the Central Government

TABLE III

Department	1948		1957		Percentage increase or decrease over the period
	Number	Percentage of total	Number	Percentage of total	
Railway	8,50,229	58.8	9,97,262	56.2	+17.3
Posts and Telegraphs Department	1,43,250	9.9	2,04,840	15.3	+42.9
Civilians under the Ministry of Defence	2,94,659	20.4	2,70,912	11.6	-8.0
Other Ministries	1,56,912	10.9	3,00,556	16.9	+91.5
Total	14,45,050	100.0	17,73,570	100.0	+22.7

(Taken from : Commission of Enquiry on emoluments and Conditions of Service of Central Government Employees, 1957-59). Ministry of Finance, Government of India.

*Overall Employment Trend in Public Sector for the Quarter
ended September, 1962*

TABLE IV

Branch of the Public Sector	Total staff employed as on		Change	
	30.6.62	30.9.62	No.	%
1	2	3	4	5
1. Central Govt.	22,06,255	22,32,743	+26,488	+1.2
2. State Govt.	31,15,780	31,41,926	+26,146	+0.8
3. Quasi Govt.	8,91,067	9,23,940	+32,873	+3.7
4. Local Bodies	13,03,747	13,67,402	+63,655	+4.9
Total	75,16,849	76,66,011	+1,49,162	+2.0

(Taken from : Employment in the Public Sector, National Employment Service, Ministry of Labour and Employment, New Delhi)

Appendix B

*(A Bibliography of Books on Public Administration in India
by Indian Writers)*

- Aggarwal, P.P. The System of grants-in-aid in India. Bombay, Asia Pub. House, 1959. 92 Page. Rs. 7/25.
- Avasthi, A. and Maheshwari, Shri Ram, Public Administration. Agra, Lakshmi Narain Aggarwal, 1962. 568 P. Rs. 15/-.
- Avasthi A. & Verma S. N. (ed.) Aspects of Administration Delhi, Allied Publishers, 1964, Rs. 24/-
- Basu, D.D., Commentary on the Constitution of India, 4th ed. Calcutta, S. C. Sarkar, 1961—
- Introduction to the Constitution of India; 2nd ed. Calcutta, S. C. Sarkar, 1962. 461 P. Rs. 12/-.
- Shorter Constitution of India; 3rd ed. Calcutta, S. C. Sarkar, 1960. 767 P. Rs. 20/-.
- Bhambhri, C. P. Parliamentary control over finance in India. Meerut, Jai Prakash Nath, 1959. 168 P. Rs. 4/-
- Parliamentary control over state enterprise in India. Delhi, Metropolitan, 1960. 115 P. Rs. 8/-
- Public Administration (theory and practice). Meerut, Jai Prakash Nath, 1960. 387+133 P. Rs. 12/50.
- Bhargava, R. N. Indian Public Finance. London, Allen & Unwin, 1962. 263 P. Rs. 30/-
- Chand, Gyan. The Financial System of India. London, Kegan Paul, 1926. 444.
- Chanda, Asok. Aspects of Audit Control. Bombay Asia Publishing House, 1960. 80 Rs. 7/50.
- Indian Administration. London, Allen & Unwin, 1958. 274 P. Rs. 25/-

- Das, Nabagopal. *The Public Sector in India*; 2nd. ed. Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1961. 180 P. Rs. 11/25.
- Dey, S. K. *Community Development—A Bird's Eye View*. Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1964, Rs. 7.
- Dube, S. D. *Financial Handbook of the Constitution of India*. Delhi, Metropolitan, 1955. 191 P. Rs. 7/50.
- Gorwala, A. D. *Of Matters Administrative*, Bombay, Popular Book Depot, 1958. 162 P. Rs. 3/-
- The Mysore Administration : Some Observations and Recommendations. Bangalore, Government Press, 1958. 78 P.
- Report on Public Administration. New Delhi, Planning Commission, 1953. 75 P. Rs. 0/75.
- Report on the Efficient Conduct of State Enterprises. New Delhi, Planning Commission, 1951. 35 P. Rs. 0/62.
- The Role of the Administrator: Past, Present and Future. Poona, Gokhale Institute, 1952. 44 P. Rs. 2/-.
- Jaganadham, V. *Social Insurance in India*. Amsterdam, Djambatan, 1954. 100 P. Rs. 9/-.
- Kagzi, Mangal Chandra Jain. *Indian Administrative Law*. Delhi, Metropolitan, 1962. 250 P. Rs. 20/-.
- Khera, S.S. *District Administration in India*. New Delhi, Indian Institute of Public Administration, 1960. 52 P. Rs. 2/-.
- Management and Control in Public Enterprise Bombay, Asia Publishing House (1964) Rs. 16/-.
- Karve, D. G. *Administrative Implication of Planning*. Patna, Institute of Public Administration, Patna University, 1955. 67 P. Rs. 3/50.
- Public Administration in Democracy; Poona, Gokhale Institute, 1950, 61 P. Rs. 2/-.
- Krishnamachari, V. T. *Report on Indian and State Administrative Services and Problems of District Administration*. New Delhi, Planning Commission, 1962, 108 P.

- Lal, A.B, ed. The Indian Parliament. Allahabad, Chaitanya Publishing House, 1956. P. 296. Rs. 15/-.
- More, S.S. Practice and Procedure of Indian Parliament. Bombay, Thacker, 1960. 569. P. Rs. 27/50.
- Remodelling of Democracy for Afro-Asian Nations. Bombay, Allied Publishers, 1962. P. 347. Rs. 22/50.
- Markose, A.T. Judicial Control of Administrative Action in India. Madras, Madras Law Journal Office, 1956. 752. Rs. 20/-.
- Majumdar, B.B., ed. Problems of Public Administration in India. Patna, Pustak Mahal, 1951. 310 Page, Rs. 10/50.
- Misra B.B. The Central Administration of the East India Company (1773-1834) Bombay 1959.
- Murdeswar, Anand K. Administrative Problems relating to Nationalisation, Bombay, Popular Book. Depot, 1957. 330 Page. Rs. 12/50.
- Nigam, Salig Ram. Principles of Public Administration. Allahabad, Kitab Mahal, 1959. 300 Page, Rs. 8/50.
- Paranjape, H.K. The Industrial Management Pool: An Administrative Experiment. New Delhi, Indian Institute of Public Administration, 1962. 127 Page. Rs. 4/-.
- The Planning Commission. A Descriptive Account. I. I. P. A. 1964 216 P. Rs. 5/-.
- Prakash, Om The Theory and Working of State Corporations with Special reference to India. London, Allen & Unwin, 1962. 272 Page. Rs. 30/-.
- Prasad, Parmanand. Some Economic Problems of Public Enterprises in India. Leiden, H.E. Stenfert Kroese, 1957. 244 Page. Rs. 20/-.
- Premchand, A. Control of Public Expenditure in India. Bombay, Allied Publishers, 1963. 480 Page. Rs. 25/-.
- Pylee, M.V. Constitutional Government in India. Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1960. 745 Page. Rs. 32/-.
- India's Constitution. Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1962. 396 Page. Rs. 11/50.

- Ramanadham, V.V. *The Structure of Public Enterprise in India*. Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1961. 267 Page. Rs. 18/-.
- Pricing, Labour and Efficiency in the Public Sector. Hyderabad, Osmania University, 1962. 127 Page. Rs. 5/-.
- Problems on Public Enterprise—Thoughts on British Experience. Chicago, Qudrangle Books, 1959. 176 Page. Rs. 4/75.
- The Finances of Public Enterprises. Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1963.
- The Control of Public Enterprises in India Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1964 Rs. 28/-.
- Roy, Naresh Chandra. *The Civil Service in India*. Calcutta, K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1958. 328 Page. Rs. 15/-.
- Federalism and Linguistic States. Calcutta, K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1962, 279 Page. Rs. 20/-.
- Ruthnaswamy, M. *Principles and Practice of Public Administration*, 4th ed. Allahabad, Central Book Depot, 1962. 332 Page, Rs. 8/75.
- Principles and Practice of Foreign Policy. Bombay, Popular Book Depot, 1961. 384 Page. Rs.20/-.
- Santhanam. K. *Satyagraha and the State*. Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1960. 96 Page. Rs. 6-.
- Union-State Relations in India. Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1960. 71 Page, Rs. 7/50.
- Sastri, K. N. V. *Principles of District Administration in India*. Delhi, Metropolitan, 1957. 102 Page. Rs. 5/-.
- Seth, S. C. *Central Administration in India*. Bombay, Asia Publishing House, (In Press), 1965.
- Sharan, Parmatma. *Public Administration* Agra, 1962. 512 Page Rs. 17/50.
- Sharma, M. P. *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*; 2nd. ed. Allahabad, Kitab Mahal, 1960. 519 Page, Rs. 12/50.

- Sharma, Sri Ram, Some Aspects of Indian Administrative System. Sholapur, Institute of Public Administration, 1957. 160 Page. Rs. 5/-.
- The Supreme Court in the Indian Constitution. Delhi, Rajpal, 1959. 356 Page. Rs. 15/-.
- Shukla, R.C. Administrative Problems of Public Enterprises in India. Delhi, S. Chand, 1959. 232 Page Rs. 10/-.
- Srinivasan, N. Democratic Government in India. Calcutta, World Press, 1954. 404 Page, Rs. 10/-
- Tyagi, A. R. Public Administration—Principles and Practice; 2nd ed. Delhi, Atma Ram, 1962. 488 Page. Rs. 12/50-
- Wattal, P. K. Parliamentary Financial Control in India; 2nd ed. Bombay, Minerva Book Shop, 1962. 329 Page. Rs. 20/-.
- Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi. Organization of the Government of India. Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1958. 416 page. Rs. 20/-.
- Dwarkadas, R. Reflections on Indian Administration. Delhi, Kitab Mahal, 1960. 172 Page. Rs. 10/-.
-

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

First class First in Political Science from the University of Agra, Dr. Seth got Doctorate in Political Science on the subject, 'The growth of communalism in India and the problem of Hindu Muslim Relations' from the same University. Later on as a visiting Research Scholar at the University of Manchester during 1959—62, Dr. Seth obtained another Doctorate in Public Administration. His Doctoral dissertation this time was in the field of Comparative Government entitled "A Comparative Study of the Central Administration Organisation in India, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom."

Doctor Seth has taught Political Science and Public Administration in the post-graduate colleges affiliated to the Universities of Agra and Delhi. He has done extensive lecturing on behalf of the Workers' Educational Association and the Extra-Mural Department of the University of Manchester for over two years. In all he conducted over six courses on International Affairs, Indian Affairs, Indian Religions and the Indian Administration. He also conducted a short course on "Public Administration in India" at the Institute of Social Studies *The Hague*, Netherlands. In 1963-64 Dr. Seth served as a Senior Research Officer at the Indian Institute of Public Administration and conducted a research study of the Staffing Pattern of the Central Administration Organisation in India. His publications include several articles and two books: "Some Aspects of British Governmental System" a contribution in Aspects of Administration (New Delhi, Allied) 1954 and Central Administration Organisation in India and in some Commonwealth Countries—A Historical study in Comparative Government" (in Press, Bombay, Asia Publishing House).

The University of Pennsylvania had also elected Dr. Seth as *George Lieb Harrison Fellow* during 1964-65

Presently, as a member of the Central Secretariat Service, Dr. Seth has served in the Prime Minister's Secretariat (1958) and is now working in the Bureau of School Education of the Union Education Ministry, New Delhi.



Library IAS, Shimla



00055340