

Bureaucracy and Development; The Role of Public Administration in National Development: The Indian Perspective

Dr. V.Pardha Saradhi

Post Doctoral Fellow

(Indian council for social science research New Delhi)

Department of Public Administration,

Osmania University, Hyderabad, Telangana State.

Received Sept. 09, 2017

Accepted Oct. 9, 2017

ABSTRACT

This article explores the temperament of the Indian state and of the Indian bureaucracy, it was voluminously presumed that the Indian bureaucracy epitomized as a dominant class. The metamorphosis of public bureaucracy generally synchronized the vocation of a state to amplify its reach. The conglomerate of a full-time administrative cadre was a gesticulation of a government's administrative coherence and its capacity to effectuate its writ. Most bureaucracies are pioneered to address some discern social problems and provide conclusion.

Key words: Bureaucracy, Government, Policy, Development.

Bureaucracy, distinctive form of organization circumscribed by impenetrability, division of labour, permanence, professional management, hierarchical coordination and control, strict chain of command, and legal authority. It is somber from informal and collegial organizations.

Bureaucracy as a commune is expected to interlude a indispensable role, in accomplishment of development. Bureaucracy patronaged industrialized developed nations to garner their objectives. State bureaucracy is contemplation to bolster development and good governance by apportioning fair mechanisms for social provision in the third world.

Indian bureaucracy has also been admonished for its deficiency of determination to developmental ipso facto and programs. While development visitation for progressiveness and vivaciousness on the part of bureaucracy, bureaucracy continuously took anchorage under conservative neutrality. Bureaucracies have been chided as being hamstrung, convoluted, or too immutable to individuals

DEFINITION

"Bureaucracy means the civil servants, the administrative functionaries who are professionally trained for the public service and who enjoy permanency of tenure, promotion within service-partly by seniority and partly by merit." -**Garner**

There are two main maneuvering views on the quest of bureaucracy; particularly the Weberian and Marxian. According to the former, bureaucracy is viewed as a large-scale, complex, hierarchical and specialized organization

arranged to attain coherent genuine objectives in the most convincing and effective manner.

Max Weber espoused that bureaucracy epitomizes the most consummate, and rational way in which one can codify the human activity and that methodical processes and standardized hierarchies are indispensable to maintain order, maximize efficiency, and eliminate favoritism. Max Weber was the first to champion bureaucracy as a peremptory feature of modernity, and by the late 19th century bureaucratic forms had begun their gamut from government to sundry large-scale institutions

On the other hand, Karl Marx conjectured bureaucracy as an instrument of oppression, exploitation and damnation in the hands of the dominant class who clutch and hoodwink the state and its apparatus in the society. More concretely, bureaucracy is contemplated as instrument queerly, employed by the ruling class to multiply, wealth and maintain their imperium and administration of the state.

A bureaucracy is ostensible to be impersonal. This predominantly, means that a bureaucrat is anticipated, to be guided by objective premeditation while ensuing rules and regulations in the scheme of implementing opalescent policy measures and directives. In other words, a bureaucrat or a civil servant or a government official regardless name we choose to call him by – is not putative to be guided by his idiosyncratic whims and fancies, biases and prejudices in the dispensation of his official duties. As approbation, the 'faceless' aspect, perhaps people are apprehensive of the fact that any civilian bureaucracy is subordinate to the political executive. The political leadership is the face of

the administration, while the bureaucracy works behind the scenes.

Bureaucracy, meticulously is also professed to be apolitical. This basically insinuate that a bureaucrat is not to have a political agenda of his own but preferably, faithfully effectuate the policies of the government of the day. It also has another and presumably more important meaning and that is: a civil servants allegiance and adherence should be to the constitution of the land and not to any political party, politician, etc.

Public bureaucracy is a very invigorate element of the development process. Bureaucratic capacity adjudicate, what will get done, when it will get done, and how well it will get done. The dexterous capacity of the bureaucracy to implement labyrinthine economic and social development plans, the higher the development potential of that society.

The teetotal administration of Indian state is under the control of bureaucracy. In parliamentary system the ministers are at the top of the administrative structure, but the real work is done by the bureaucrats. Administrator requires experience, efficiency and technical knowledge.

The public bureaucracy has been entrusted with the mission of course, the progression of development in the districts requirements to take place with the backing of the neighborhood political leadership. As far as this subject of development is apropos one cannot see a preeminence between the role of the administrator and the role of the politician and the penultimate wants to subjugate all the activities in the expansive areas of development, and this, in fact, is a dilemma and nobody knows whose decisions are to triumph on the matter. The ubiquitous, view was that development in all societies led to the emergence of a new class of managers, who, of course, are bureaucrats, who are said to be a new class of rulers. They, however, are not as powerful as the politicians who constitute the ruling political class and they invariably belong to the ruling elite.

THE CONCEPT OF BUREAUCRACY

Bureaucracy is the euphemism used to vignette the system of authority relationships that abide between men, offices and methods that government uses to effectuate its programmes. It does not conceal political appointee such as ministers and Advisers or members of the judiciary at the federal, state and local

government tiers of government. The sovereign function of civil servants is to prognosticate the political executives or appointees on all dimensions of governmental activities to vouch formulation of the policy which is eurythmic with the objectives of the government of the day. Admonition in the context of policy formulation or initiation necessary insinuate the repertoire of relevant data, together with gingerly considered alternatives, which would habilitate policy decisions to be made by the political heads.

POLICY MAKING

In progressive democracies like India there are president, prime ministers and ministers at the head of state administration and their chief responsibility; is to formulate policy. But in routine this task is done by the top bureaucrats.

The bureaucracy in India works under the penumbra of ministerial responsibility. For every signature of the government, the minister is accountable to the Parliament. Though the bureaucracy administers government policies, they remain in monstrous anonymity. They do not take part in Parliamentary contemplation nor are they component of political parties. The deeds of the civil servants must be shielded by the minister on the floor of the House. This system coerces the minister to keep a close surveillant on the actions of the bureaucracy and the bureaucracy to demean, in such a way that the minister is not put into discomfort.

The bureaucracy, through acquaintance knows what policy is or is not feasible. Hence the minister hearken to the advice of the top civil servant as to the judiciousness, of a policy from administrative point of view. Thus in a healthy footing, the minister and the bureaucracy are harmoniously, complementary – the minister bestowed the policy decisions and the bureaucracy executing the decisions.

DEVELOPMENT AND BUREAUCRACY

Development is a multidimensional blueprint, that normally connotes metamorphosis from a less to a more bodacious state. It also means maximized economic efficiency and proliferation, of productive capacities, cardinal concern is economic development.

CHANGING ROLE OF BUREAUCRACY

The administration must be beholden to the ipso facto of society, must understands the socio-economic transformation; and urgency of the society.

The contemporary bureaucracy at all levels of government is potent as bureaucrats interpret laws, make policies and promulgate decisions and enwrap in a variety of other activities that have a direct enrapture on the lives of citizens.

Development also warrants coordination among the multihued departments of public administration and also symbiosis between private and public administration. This task is to be executed by officials. In the domain of development public and private administration must work unanimously.

Bureaucratic help, assistance and reinforcement are essential to the political leadership and bureaucrats have many chattels their permanence, freedom from electoral worries, their knowledge of the files, and their hegemony of communication which they can use to get their way in encounters with political masters. Relationship sandwiched between the bureaucracy and the politician's shows that there is a universal trend in the direction of strengthening of bureaucracies vis-a-vis the political structures.

Bureaucracy has to beget about social revolution to construct a caste-ridden stratified society. Bureaucracy has to act as a dynamic force which follows the determination of the people as well as leads it.

The bureaucratic task in India and other developing countries are performed by a multiplicity of institutions. Bureaucracy has also been criticized as urban sloping and elitist in personality having failed to have adjusted to the necessities of rural area where majority of the people live.

Dysfunctional coalesce and actions should be drastically simplified. Development programmes should not be premeditated according to the centrally approved rigid norms and state of affairs but must provide themselves to be accustomed to varying socio-economic and agro- climatic conditions. Bureaucrats have to gain knowledge of man; more skills which development needs.

CONCLUSION

The altering role of Indian bureaucracy and developing nations is the foremost topic in modern times, commenting on the responsibility **T.N. Chaturvedi**, himself a distinguished member

of the IAS says; "The civil service has to undergo radical structural, procedural and attitudinal changes if it has to serve as an effective instrument of change and progress in a developing society."

The progressive bureaucracy should not be old-fashioned but it should have scientific summit of view, progressive, innovative, reformist and revolutionary in nature. The concrete responsibilities of development which the state had to embark on include modernization of agriculture, industrialisation and economic diversification and building of infrastructure including irrigation, electrification, communication, transport, education, health and promotion of science and technology.

REFERENCE

1. Albrow, Martin. Bureaucracy. London: Macmillan, 1970.
2. Kingston, Ralph. Bureaucrats and Bourgeois Society: Office Politics and Individual Credit, 1789–1848. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
3. On Karl Marx: Hal Draper, Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution, Volume 1: State and Bureaucracy. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1979.
4. Du Gay, P. (2000) In Praise of Bureaucracy: Weber, Organization, Ethics (London: Sage)
5. Hood, C. (1991) A Public Management for All Seasons? Public Administration, 69, 3–19.
6. Page, E. C. (2005) The Policy Bureaucracy (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
7. Peters B. G. and J. Pierre (2002) Politicization of the Civil Service in Comparative Perspective (London: Routledge).
8. Torfing, J. and E. Sorenson (2002) Network Politics, Political Capital and Democracy, International Journal of Public Administration 26, 609–634.
9. Thomas, P. (2004) Accountability: Section Introduction, in J. Pierre and B. G. Peters, eds., Handbook of Public Administration (London: Sage), 549–556
10. Goyal, S.K. 1985. Bureaucratic Administration in India. Allahabad: Chugh Publications.
11. Misra, B.B. 1986. Government and Bureaucracy in India: 1947–1976. Delhi: Oxford.
12. Ray, S.K. 1979. Indian Bureaucracy at the Crossroads. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers.
13. Singh, S.R. 1989. Bureaucracy and Rural Development: Policy Making, Planning and Implementation. New Delhi: Mittal.
14. Chaturvedi, H.R. 1977. Bureaucracy and the Local Community: Dynamics of Rural Development. New Delhi: Allied Publisher.