

102/5
Cto

102/5
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

FIFTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE

ADMINISTRATION AND THE CITIZEN

(New Delhi, August 27, 1961)

2/5
10



3
2/5
10

INDRAPRASTHA ESTATE
RING ROAD
NEW DELHI-1

THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

FIFTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE

ADMINISTRATION AND THE CITIZEN

(New Delhi, August 27, 1961)

COMPUTTERISED



IIPA LIBRARY



GR5212

INDRAPRASTHA ESTATE
RING ROAD
NEW DELHI-1

Indian Institute of Public Administration
Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi.

Acc. No. 62-5212
Class No. B3/In2/5/C. 10.

The book was issued from the Library
on the date last stamped. It is due back
within 15 days of its date of issue, if not
recalled earlier.

Gratis
self

THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

B3

In 2/5

C-10

FIFTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE

ADMINISTRATION AND THE CITIZEN

(New Delhi August 25, 1961)

COMMITTEE



INDRAPRASTHA ESTATE
RING ROAD
NEW DELHI-1

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Programme of Meetings	v
2. List of Participants	vii
3. Discussions at the Conference	1
4. Appendix	
I Working paper prepared in the Institute	47
Papers submitted by members	
II Shri N.H. Athreya	55
III Shri B.D. Dua	57
IV Shri D.P. Ghai	63
V Shri M.P. Goel	68
VI Shri R.J. Kolhekar	74
VII Shri C.L. Sharma	78
VIII Shri D.P. Verma	82

CONTENTS

1	Programme of Meetings	1
2	List of Participants	2
3	Discussions at the Conference	3
4	Appendix	4
5	Working paper prepared in the Institute	5
6	Papers submitted by members	6
7	I. Shri N.H. Adiga	7
8	II. Shri R.D. Das	8
9	III. Shri D.P. Ghai	9
10	IV. Shri M.R. Gosh	10
11	V. Shri R.L. Kulkarni	11
12	VI. Shri C.L. Sharma	12
13	VII. Shri D.P. Verma	13

PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS

August 27, 1961

"Administration and the Citizen"

10. a.m. Morning Session (till coffee break)

Chairman : *Shri V.T. Krishnamachari*,
Chairman,
Executive Council, I.I.P.A.

Rest of the Session (morning and afternoon)

Chairman : *Prof. S.V. Kogekar*,
Principal,
Fergusson College,
Poona.

PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS

August 17, 1961
"Administration and the Citizen"
10 a.m. Meeting Session (100 seats approx.)
Chairman: Shri M.T. Keshavnagar
Executive Council, I.I.T.A.
rest of the Session (morning and afternoon)
Chairman: Prof. S.N. Keshavnagar
Principal,
Patna College,
Patna

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

- Shri N.H. Athreya, Director, Modern Management Counsel Consultants, Bombay.
Shri B.D. Dua, Head of the Department of Public Administration, D.A.V. College, Ambala.
Shri P.R. Dubhashi, I.A.S., Director of Youth and Deputy Development Commissioner, Planning and Development Department, Government of Mysore, Bangalore.
Dr. M.H. Faruqi, Member, Public Service Commission, U.P., Allahabad.
Shri M.P. Goel, Training Supervisor (Elec.), Sindri Fertilizers, Sindri.
Shri Chetkar Jha, Lecturer in Political Science, Patna University, Patna.
Shri K.C. Madappa, I.A.S., Agent, Government of Andhra Pradesh, New Delhi.
Shri D.L. Mazumdar, I.C.S., Secretary, Company Law Administration, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India, New Delhi.
Shri P.Y. Mehta, Branch Manager, Life Insurance Corporation of India, Bombay.
Dr. H.K. Paranjape, Assistant Professor, The Indian School of Public Administration, New Delhi.
Shri H.M. Patel, Chairman, Charutar Vidya Mandal, Vallabh Vidyanagar (Maharashtra State).
Shri C.L. Sharma, Headmaster, Government Normal School, Baraut (Meerut).
Shri Sri Ram Sharma, Principal, D. A. V. College, Chandigarh.
Shri Gajadhar Singh, Deputy Revenue Officer (retd.), Khurja (Aligarh).
Prof. J.P. Suda, Vijay Mandir, Civil Lines, Meerut City.
Shri B.S. Suryanarayana, No. 2, Fifth Road, Chamrajpet, Bangalore.
Shri E.H. Valsan, Lecturer, Nagpur University, Nagpur.
Shri D.P. Verma, 25, Model Town, Hoshiarpur.

DISCUSSIONS AT THE CONFERENCE

(August 27, 1961 : 10 a.m.)

"ADMINISTRATION AND THE CITIZEN"

Shri V.T. Krishnamachari, Chairman for the Session (and Chairman of the Institute's Executive Council), opening the discussion, said:

"Today we are inaugurating a conference on a very important subject, 'Administration and the Citizen'. In modern governments, with the acceptance of the objective of full employment and adoption of social security schemes and other similar measures, the range of governmental functions has become very wide. In the old days, before the War, if you went to England you never came across a government servant in your ordinary life. You never felt that a government existed. Occasionally you saw a postman delivering mails. But, except the municipal people, you never felt that there was a Central Government which had an impact on the people. In England and other countries similarly situated, owing to the welfare state having come into existence, the governments have taken on an infinite variety of functions which make it necessary for them to come into contact with many millions of people. This has posed a very difficult problem of relationships between the administration and the citizen.

"Interest has recently been shown in England and other countries in the system of 'Ombudsman', that is, an authority responsible to Parliament whose function is to protect the rights of citizens in a widely expanding government like the modern ones. In England, this question of having a similar functionary has been discussed and they have evolved a system by which all delegated legislation is examined, and the action taken by government under delegated legislation is subjected to a careful scrutiny. Other governments in Europe have other systems. There is

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

- Shri N.H. Ashraf, Director, Modern Management, Council
- Consultants, Bombay
- Shri B.D. Das, Head of the Department of Public Administration, D.A.V. College, Amalgaon
- Shri P.R. Dubash, I.A.S., Director of Youth and Development Commission, Planning and Development Department, Government of Mysore, Bangalore
- Dr. M.H. Farooq, Member, Public Service Commission, U.P., Allahabad
- Shri M.P. Gode, Training supervisor (Tech), Shri Lalit, Bihar
- Shri G. Govind, Lecturer in Political Science, Patna Univ., Bihar
- Shri K.C. Madhuprat, I.A.S., Agent, Government of Andhra Pradesh, New Delhi
- Shri D.L. Misra, Member, F.P.S. Society, Company Law Administration, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India, New Delhi
- Shri F.Y. Mehta, Branch Manager, Life Insurance Corporation of India, Bombay
- Dr. H.K. Paragade, Assistant Professor, The Indian School of Public Administration, New Delhi
- Shri H.M. Patel, Chairman, Charitra Vigya Mandala, Vallabh Vidyanagar (Maharashtra State)
- Shri C.T. Sharma, Headmaster, Government Normal School, Baran (Madhya)
- Shri S.R. Sharma, Professor, D.A.V. College, Chandigarh
- Shri G. Venkatesh, Deputy Revenue Officer (Tech.), Kharaj (A.P.)
- Prof. J.P. Singh, Vidyamandir, Civil Lines, Meerut City
- Shri B.S. Suresh, No. 2, Fifth Road, Chhatrapati Shivaji, Bangalore
- Shri E.H. Varma, Lecturer, Nagpur University, Nagpur
- Shri D.P. Verma, 22, Model Town, Hoshiarpur

a provision for a functionary like this in the West German Government. All these trends show that there is a strong feeling that the relationship between the governments and citizens has changed radically and that efforts should be made to see that the rights of individuals are protected against any encroachment by governments.

"In India, this problem is somewhat different. The relationship between the administration and the citizen can be divided into a number of categories. In a very important section of our economy, which may be called rural economy, which covers about 80 per cent of the people of the country, the question is how is the administration going to train the citizen in responsibility of improving his own standards of living by his own efforts, the responsibilities of self-government in Panchayats at all levels. This is the basic problem in rural India. We are committed in this country to the concept of community development; it has several elements in it.

"The first is that all aspects of rural life are inter-related and you cannot improve one part of it unless you regard rural life as one and indivisible and seek to improve all aspects of it.

"The second element is self-help and co-operation. The people through their own efforts organise Panchayats and co-operatives, seek to bring about improvement in their own standards of living.

"A programme like this which has to touch about 17 million families in the country-side means a totally radically different conception of the relations between administration and the citizen from what has hitherto been prevalent. We need to realise the immensity of this problem. There are extension agricultural services, advisory services in other countries. In the United States, there are 6 or 7 million families cultivating about 700 million acres of land. The extension services have to establish contacts with 6 or 7 million families. In India, we have got 65 to 70 million families cultivating about 320 million acres and our extension services have to maintain contacts with 65 to 70 million

families. This task, for complexity, has no parallel anywhere else in the world. This means that we have to organise a campaign of education for 70 to 100 million people, train them in the art of running Panchayats, co-operatives and in the use of irrigation facilities. By and large, we have to train them in the duties, in the responsibilities imposed on them by Plans of large-scale social and economic development. This is an important aspect of the relationship between the administration and the citizen in India.

"The administration has to train the people to undertake the task of improving their own social and economic conditions. In the Third Five Year Plan we talk of training 6 to 7 million people in the running of co-operatives; 2 to 3 million people being trained as secretaries to co-operatives. All this kind of training programme, which is conducted in India under non-official auspices, sponsored by the administration, naturally forms a very important aspect of the relations between the administration and the citizen in our country.

"Similarly, there is the urban problem. We have small towns, large towns and cities in which municipal bodies have a wide range of functions and we want to see that the citizens take an intelligent interest in them and are associated with them. In my opinion, we can get best results in this only if in towns and cities we organise small communities in which an active citizenship can be built up. In other words, the community development principles have to be extended to urban areas. Every citizen should take an intelligent interest in the affairs of his town and he should realise that municipal government is not merely one of rights but of responsibilities too. The whole aspect of community development is self-help—the realisation of the responsibilities imposed on the community by the very large Plans of improvement to which the country is committed.

"No Plans of social and economic development can be successful in India unless we bring about radical changes in the attitudes and outlook, what is usually called 'Social Change'. Take one small aspect of the subject of social

change, attitude towards work. In rural India, owing to seasonal and other conditions, employment in agricultural occupations is possible only for a few months in the year. For the rest of the year throughout India millions of families cannot, even if they want to, carry on intensive work. The result is, over centuries, we have had people who had been only partially employed and that has left social and other consequences which are very deleterious in their effect on the national life. We have got to introduce a change towards this—an attitude towards method. It is only from hard work and sustained work throughout the year the country can improve the economic and social position. 'How do we do this?' is a question that has to be solved by the community development movement and by social change.

"Then we have got to produce through the co-operative movement the sense of social responsibility and social cohesion that the entire village is one and that all sections of the village flourish equally. We cannot have prosperity for 4 to 10 per cent of the people while others remain in a precarious economic condition. It is through working in these ways that the administration can bring about conditions by which the people of India can accept the responsibilities imposed on them by our Five Year Plans.

"This is a very difficult function that the administration has got. The word 'administration' here implies not merely civil services. It implies political chiefs as well as the civil servants, which means the non-official members of the Panchayat as well as the administrators and technical officers. It is the government as a whole that has all this responsibility.

"The Institute should study this subject in great detail in the coming year and make arrangements to publish the results of its studies so that they might be of practical value to the Central and State Governments.

"I now invite Members to give their views on the subject for discussion."

Shri N. H. Athreya, speaking as a citizen and as one supposed to be on the other side of the table, pointed out that the citizen and the administration in his opinion were not at cross-purposes. Both had the same objective of raising the standard of living of their countrymen in the shortest time. What really mattered for the citizen was freedom to do things for his countrymen in a constructive way. *Shri Athreya* was doubtful whether the administration also thought in those terms.

The citizen had to fend for himself and, though anxious to contribute to the common cause did not know how to go about it.

Shri Athreya felt that, whereas the 'citizen' reacted as a human being, the 'administration' functioned mostly as a machinery. It was desirable to evolve a new concept of administration, to make it more humane and purposeful. The people actually behind the administration were what really mattered. Citing an example, he said that the administration was not as anxious to help as the citizen; it took seven months before an industrialist could export goods worth rupees three lakhs, though the leaders of the country, time and again, would tell the industrialists, 'why don't you export?' Even though the administration and the citizen had the same purpose, whenever a citizen went with a suggestion the administration wondered what was he up to. This troubled the citizen considerably. The citizen thought that he was not dealing with one government but many administrations. Hence the growth of public relations men, contact men,—what they call experts. The result was, though the citizen wished to, he could not operate by himself. It called for a change of heart; and if it took place, then the citizen would go ahead and the administration would be made effective. He, therefore, emphasised that the administration, whenever it dealt with the citizens, should make things clear by the manner of its doing things more than by talk or on paper. The administration should treat the citizen as a responsible man equally interested in the country. As they were a handful compared to the body of citizens,

the administrators should be the first to adopt such an attitude; it would make a big difference in achieving results.

Shri B. D. Dua, referring to the relations between the administration and the citizen, pointed out that there should be a genuine desire on the part of administration to communicate with the people, for whom they were operating, about purposes as also the methods which they were using for achieving those purposes. Unless the public were vigilant, it would be impossible to make headway in the matter of administrative reforms. He thought that the old-world idea of the administrator considering that administration was something of a mystery, which should be preserved as a mystery, and not being revealed to the citizen, still dominated the minds of the administrators. This was not quite consistent with the developmental activities which were being undertaken by the administration in ever greater measure. When it was a question of merely maintaining law and order, it had some advantage; but it was not possible to evoke a proper response from the citizen in a developmental administration under that kind of mystification. He emphasised that the administration should have greater desire to communicate with the people and to go out of the way to put the citizen wise about what the administration was doing. Citing the mishap to two dams in his home town—Poona—which burst, causing untold suffering to the citizens and rendering 80,000 people homeless, *Shri Dua* pointed out that the administration should have known full well what was likely to happen, but kept the people in the dark about the grave emergency which was threatening the very life of that city.

The speaker did not know whether the administrators were afraid of some sort of panic arising if the information was given. If properly given, there should not be any panic, and the administration trained in dealing with the law and order situation for years and years should not find it beyond its capacity to prevent the panic getting out of control. If keeping back of vital information from the people happened in the case of an emergency, the same thing, he said,

would happen when there was no emergency, except when some big national task had to be performed on the basis of co-operation between the administration and the citizen. In other countries, they went out of the way to bring home to the people what was happening. They put out advertisements and literature within easy reach of the people. Here, he pointed out, the Central Government, the Publications Division, if written to, would hardly give a reply and if it replied, it would be in very vague and evasive terms.

Shri Dua further stressed the need for creating an agency to go out and see what the public must be told. He hoped that something would be done in this direction early. The administration apparently believed that it was the duty of the public to find out what they wanted to know. This was hardly an attitude of mind which could be justified when the administration needed the co-operation of the public. The aspect of communication between the administration and the citizen had not received the attention that it deserved. Severe loss and damage had been caused in Poona just because of the lack of communication between the administration and the citizen.

Dealing with another aspect, *Shri Dua* observed that the administration looked upon the legitimate demands of the citizens who came to them as if they were approaching them for undeserved favours, with something up their sleeves. This was not a healthy attitude in a democratic set-up like the one India had. The administrators should be prepared to give everything they were capable of giving to the citizen just like academicians who gave everything they had to give to their students. The administrators should not primarily interest themselves in building their own careers, but should rather think in terms of giving the best they were capable of to the community which they were intended to serve and from whom they derived their sustenance.

Shri K. C. Madappa, stating from his experience with the training of probationers of the Indian Administrative Service and the Indian Foreign Service, observed that once, as an experiment, the probationers were asked to go with

open minds to the villages around Delhi, where the community development programme was being implemented, to find out the aspirations of the people, what worked in their minds, what they thought of the administration, etc. with regard to the programme. The villagers were told that they could tell these boys everything without fear or favour and they were not government inspectors. It was found that there existed some kind of resistance, curiously enough, on the side of the citizens. The citizens were sceptical of the programme and asked: if they were officials with no power, why did they come to them? Was it a guise to find out what taxes were due to be collected from them?

As the experiment proceeded, it was found that some of the villagers got to talking to these boys but, beyond telling them how after passing out of the training school the probationers would become very important people, the villagers would not come out with their difficulties and problems. This was indeed disappointing. Later, however, the probationers by mixing and moving with the villagers gradually got into their minds and the villagers placed their difficulties and problems before them about the health office, their getting manure, etc. The incident anyhow highlighted the lack of co-ordination and understanding between the two sections of the Indian people (the administrator and the citizen).

Shri Madappa emphasised that the administrator after retirement would become a citizen. The two roles were completely interchangeable. There was prejudice on either side and that was rather difficult to shed. He was sure that it was possible, by a bold step, to get rid of prejudices of this sort on either side. It would be all to the good.

The next speaker, *Shri D. P. Verma*, pointed out that the attitude of the people towards the administration differed from one country to another, and reflected the underlying philosophy of the society and state. In India, the British power which set up the administrative machinery had kept the administrators aloof from the people. The main function of the administrative set-up was to maintain the *status quo*. The administrators were drawn mostly from the

upper middle classes and from certain aristocratic sections of society. With Independence, things had somewhat changed. But, in spite of the fact that the present administrative set-up represented a cross-section of Indian society and was more broadbased, the tradition of distrust of the administration by the citizen continued. Although conditions and situations had changed, the tradition of aloofness, of arrogance, of isolation of the civil servant continued and the distance between the citizen and the administration had not diminished. The charges that were often levelled against the administration were due to the fact that the administrative set-up lacked any type of idealism. The administrators were too individualistic and were not enthused by the ideals that the community had accepted. If they were enthused by the ideals, there would never be any charge of dishonesty, corruption and nepotism. They were also subjected to group pressure or individual pressure, and there was a widespread feeling that without some such pressure one could not get any work done by the administrator.

Merely the appointment of a few Public Relations Officers in each district or a Director of Public Relations in each State, or exhibition of newsreels or distributing literature could not help to establish the proper contact with the people. The real purpose of the contact would be to make the people understand that they were partners in the work of administration, and were as much important as the administrator in the government of their country. Public co-operation was necessary before anything worth while could be achieved. Quoting Prof. Robson's opinion, Shri Verma observed that the public should be kept regularly informed about the working of the departments, the results achieved, the difficulties experienced and mistakes made, if any. Frankness in the acknowledgement of error was a sign of strength, and not of weakness. Apart from the Prime Minister, we did not hear of admission by officials of mistakes committed by government. If something could be done in this respect, the public would have greater confidence in administrators.

In the opinion of Shri Verma, as far as social administration was concerned, there existed a double standard: The law, enforced for the eradication of social evils like abolition of the dowry system, prohibition, etc. should be made applicable both for the common man and the persons imposing such laws. The administrators should never be arrogant and fickle-minded; these qualities in an administrator had been condemned by Kautilya. The citizen who had been granted a particular status in society should never regard the administration as 'ma-baap'. The reverse attitude should be prevalent.

Lastly, some type of machinery as the "Ombudsman", referred to by the Chairman earlier, should be set up to enable the citizen to approach the administration without fear. Such an institution, in his opinion, would go a long way to bring the people and the administrator together closely and help in solving many of the difficulties of the former.

Referring to the gap that existed between the administration and the citizen, *Shri B.S. Suryanarayana* observed that there was no longer any controversy that the objectives of the present administration were quite different from the objectives of the government previously. Now that Panchayati Raj and community projects had come into existence, the question that engaged attention was: how should they be profitably worked? How were we going to bridge the gap that still existed between the administration and the citizen? He felt that perfect co-ordination existed between the various departments of the administration and cited the example of the Revenue Department which, though primarily interested in the collection of revenue, had been mainly responsible for the many beneficial acts that the government did. He further pointed out that it would not be practicable to inculcate the high ideals which the nation had accepted throughout the hierarchy, especially when new departments were coming into being. In the former administration, apart from the Acts and the Rules, there used to be Codes and Manuals. They filled in the sort of gaps to which earlier speakers had referred.

Administration was managed by human beings who had their own imperfections and idiosyncrasies. So long as human beings had to man the administration, it was very necessary to curtail the limit of their discretion by laying down proper procedures. This required constant research. The procedures, if properly laid down, would enable the administrator to know how far he was acting according to rules, and the citizen would know how he stood. It would be good if the Institute started some research on the procedures that were necessary to implement the various aspects of the present-day government objectives.

Speaking next, *Prof. Sri Ram Sharma* stated that the citizens were not informed fully about what the administration was trying to achieve. The citizen was not interested in various projects that lay far away but was interested in what was being done for him. How to deal with the citizen was the real problem. So far as the problem of defining the objective was concerned, there were Plans, which often created difficulty, amusement and bewilderment among the people. Quoting the example of a State, he stated that, when the roofs of a school building had blown off, there was no attempt for six months to repair those roofs, as the building was not in the Plan.

Hence, the problem, was to define the total objective the administration had in view and to place things before the people in an intelligible way. He quoted the instance of the discussion that took place in a District Development Council when it was considering a proposal with regard to the Third Five Year Plan. Curiously enough, the Council discussed about various things to be undertaken but not a word was spoken about the social service side, roads and railways to be built, tanks to be repaired, social security or adult education or anything else which had to do with the work of the people. He added that the citizen was interested in what was being done to him and where he stood.

As regards the officials who implemented Plan schemes, *Prof. Sri Ram Sharma* was of the opinion that they did not appreciate the importance of the Plan schemes for the

simple reason they did not try to relate it to whatever might have been the objective in the view of those who framed the Plan; as a result, a lot of confusion was created. When they came back, they reported that nothing was possible. This was due to the officials confining themselves to what had been put to them in general terms, without thinking for themselves. Hence, the administration should define the objectives in short-term goals. This would create interest in the citizen in what was being done for him at the moment, and how that would be done.

Another desirable step in this direction, according to Prof. Sharma, was to convert the officials of yesterday into public servants of today. Citing the example of the recent coal shortage, he observed that he was given to understand that if he approached somebody in the administrative set-up, he would get the coal. He also cited another example how certain people could in his village formerly get kerosene more easily than others. As a result, the citizen thought that one was treated differently from the other. Thus, the differentiation destroyed the equality of opportunity bestowed upon the citizen by the Constitution and the whole idea of democratic government was given the go-bye.

Citing another example out of his experience in Bombay with regard to ration cards, Prof. Sharma said that the card was made available to him early, and the attitude of those who were in the administrative set-up was responsible for expediting the distribution of such cards. He cited another experience of his regarding getting cement for his college which he could not get, even though he had a permit, until one of his teachers got someone to speak to the right person. He then referred to his village post office. The Sub-Postmaster always made people feel that he was bestowing a favour on them whenever they went to buy stamps.

Prof. Sharma pointed out that officials nowadays had become courtiers as well. By and large, they refused to exercise the discretionary powers vested in them, because government had given instructions of a different type. Several cases of this kind had gone to the Supreme Court, but everyone could not go to that Court.

Talking of public co-operation, he said that the effect of entrusting the entire development functions to Panchayat Samitis had been to ignore the need to enlist the co-operation of the people in general matters. Enlisting the co-operation of the political parties rather than of making people participate as citizens might result in a process of appeasement. The man without political affiliations had no place in the new set-up.

Citing yet another instance, Prof. Sri Ram Sharma pointed out that when the Education Adviser to the Government of Bombay visited Sholapur, he called a meeting of all the educational officers there, and it was found that the officers did not know that all of them were doing similar work. There was no attempt on their part to know what they were doing and how best they could achieve it. This resulted, in his opinion, in duplication of administrative effort, and it became rather difficult for the work to be done cheaply or efficiently.

Narrating the experience he had with a group of persons who were coming to Delhi to hold an exhibition about the Third Five Year Plan, Prof. Sharma said that he was surprised to find that they were actually interested in a particular type of drama, dance or other cultural programmes but not to tell the people what the Plan was. They judged their performance by the number of people they were able to attract to the cultural programme they provided, though nothing very much was gained thereby so far as the Third Five Year Plan was concerned. Though there was a good deal of talk about the contemporary period in Indian history as a war period, and of austerity, money was spent on publicity and public relations, because money was available for the department even if it served no purpose whatsoever.

Prof. Sharma stated that, some time back, an American came to meet him and started talking about the community projects and the lead the Government had taken in the matter. When the American was questioned by him as to whether the community projects in the United States were government-inspired and controlled, the visitor replied in the

negative. Prof. Sharma also cited the case of a road, constructed by school boys in a village. When a Minister came to declare the road open and distribute prizes, he asked the engineer by his side what the cost of construction would have been if done departmentally. The reply was that it would have cost half if done departmentally. The idea was to impress the students and to give them something to do for their country. If they discovered that what they did was a waste, it would affect them the other way, and not much could be achieved in that fashion.

(The Chairman, Shri V.T. Krishnamachari, requested Prof. S. V. Kogekar to take the chair in his absence after coffee-break.)

Prof. S.V. Kogekar, taking the chair, said that he hoped the session would end in the morning itself, and would therefore request the speaker to be as brief as possible.

Conceding the difficulties and the deficiencies of the administration, *Shri D.L. Mazumdar* observed that he was not there to argue or explain why the difficulties or deficiencies existed. Discussing the problem of reciprocal attitudes between the administrator and the community, he felt that administrator was as much a citizen as any member of the rest of the community. The general attitude of the citizen to the administrator was not above reproach after 14 years of Independence; it had not been possible to find out the reasons for administrative deficiencies, lack of understanding and appreciation, and the hiatus between the community as it functioned today and the rest of the community; and the Institute would do well to undertake some research into the aspects of this problem. If the administrator was governed by bad motivation or functioned crookedly in a manner which did not do honour to his profession, the question should be asked was: How did the rest of the community function?

Shri Mazumdar drew attention to the comments, as reported in the newspapers, made by Dr. Kunzru, an esteemed leader, on certain findings of the Aligarh University Report, which deeply shocked those who believed in the

best traditions of university administration. Dr. Kunzru had stated that in no university was selection to the post of a Reader made according to merit. Similarly, one might say that, within the ambit of the administration, selections to minor posts were not made according to merit.

Shri Mazumdar wondered whether the same was not true with the rest of the community, the private business world, etc. Actually, there did not exist any difference between business administration and official administration. He asked: Was business functioning better than the administration? He was not sure. He recognised that this did not help the conclusions that some of the speakers wished to arrive at. He urged that a serious effort should be made to restore the standards which the administration was legitimately expected to maintain. All he was suggesting was that the existing low standards would be a fit subject for research and study.

It might be a fact, Shri Mazumdar added, that in India the people still lived in a traditional, authoritarian and, in a part, feudal society, and that the democratic process had not made any progress except in the very limited and narrow field of politics. No sector of the community could be immune from the basic pulls and pressures which appeared in such a society. The Indian society was not being democratised at all. That was perhaps why university administrators, business administrators, political administrators, all functioned in the same fashion. It was just as bad in the Panchayat as it was in the Secretariat of the Government of India.

Shri Mazumdar suggested that those that were not politicians should not necessarily take a short-term view. They should concentrate on long-term problems and on long-term research on the motivations of administration. That might throw some light and provide a more comprehensive explanation rather than a partial explanation in terms of fragmentary impulses and reactions to these impulses.

Dealing with the problem of communication between the administration and the citizen, Shri Mazumdar went on to say that as a result of the expansion of welfare activities

the government had undertaken, the problem had become infinitely more difficult. In his opinion, the irritations to which the various speakers had given expression were partly due to this factor. When the administration was compact, it was easy for the head of the administration to look into all that was happening, much more than what was possible now to do. It was impracticable for the big ministries in the Government of India, like the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, to know what was happening in departments below. In his opinion, an important single factor in the decline of the administration had been the growth of the big organisations, and there could not be any secrecy about that. The fact of size, in his opinion, was inescapable, and it might be possible through some organisational methods to arrange the business of the administration in such a way that these large organisations got cut up in proper sizes, and at the same time to arrange for their co-ordination.

It was a fallacious reasoning that for co-ordination the organisation should be big. Problems of co-ordination were not so directly related to size. However, the problem of the largeness of the machinery of government, in his opinion, had to be tackled, and he understood that this was receiving the attention of the Institute.

Shri Mazumdar pointed out that his own experience for the last 30 years was that the top administration did not suffer from any lack of desire on its part to communicate to the citizen what it was doing, though some earlier speakers had mentioned lack of desire on the part of administrators. The real difficulty was not the lack of desire but in communication; the average citizen was not trained enough and educated enough to communicate, and there was a deplorable lack of emphasis in the Third Five Year Plan on this problem of education. This was as important as production and output, and as important as foreign exchange. Unless the citizen was adequately educated to absorb quickly what he was being told, there was always the danger that, in communicating through intermediaries in administrative terms, all that was wished to be achieved through communication would not be achieved. Policies and

programmes would be distorted, misused, misapplied, and it was not merely a theoretical danger. The whole issue was how to tackle this problem in a short period of time.

Some people thought that the problem could be tackled by decentralisation; but Shri Mazumdar was not sure if that was the right solution. He was sceptical of contemporary thinking in this regard and felt that the problem required careful and deep thought. It should not be treated as an issue of the administrator *versus* the citizen or the rest of the community. That would be a wrong view and a wrong perspective. While short-term methods like publicity, etc. might be adopted, the problem should be ceaselessly considered for long-term solutions, even though this might take the lifetime of one or two generations.

About the hiatus between the declaration of objectives as embodied in the Constitution and the practical realities which faced the citizens, Shri Mazumdar pointed out that the implications of it were seldom understood even though the Prime Minister and other Ministers referred to it frequently. These ideas must seep into the minds of the people, not merely of those who administered but also those of who were administered. For that, there should be a plan of action, a programme for many many years, and probably some long-term aspect of it might well be taken up by the Institute.

The next speaker, *Prof. J.P. Suda*, observed that the future of democracy in India largely depended on a proper solution of the question of the relationship between the administration and the citizen. Mutual distrust existed between the administration and the citizen in India and the relations between the two were not what they ought to be. It was very important to study and find out the causes of such a distrust. This mutual distrust was, to a certain extent, a legacy from the past. The country secured its freedom in a non-violent way. Had there been a revolution, possibly the old system might have been swept off completely. But it was not so and the old administrative system had been retained; not only the old structure was more or less there but the spirit also persisted to a certain

extent, and the administrators inherited the tendencies and sentiments of the civil servants of the past. The Institute could take up an investigation as to the best way in which the desired objective of removing the mutual distrust could be attained. One of the reasons for the distrust by the people of the administrators, in his opinion, was that the latter did not deal out even-handed justice to the former. A privileged class existed in the society which had pulls and could exert pressures on the authority. If the aim was to establish some sort of socialism, this privileged class should not be allowed to exist. The pressures that were brought on the administrators by the members of the legislature and office-bearers of the ruling party should be discouraged. It was regrettable that no steps were being taken to eradicate the evil effects of such pulls and pressures. So long as nepotism and corruption were not eradicated the administration could not win over the sympathies, the trust, and the love and affection of the people.

Referring to controls, Prof. Suda pointed out that they were largely responsible for creating a very big gulf between the people and the administration. Controls gave opportunity to the administrators to show favours to the citizens, and when a citizen went to an official, the official thought that the citizen had something up his sleeves and wanted some favour. The paradox was that a socialist pattern of society demanded control over production and distribution, and planned economy was impossible without controls.

Referring to the Chairman's remarks that India had become a welfare state, and that the business of the administration was to raise the standards of living of the millions and millions of families that inhabited it, Prof. Suda felt that it was an uphill task. No government in the world could raise the standards of living of the people by itself. What the government could do was to help the people to raise their standards. The administration in the country was trying to raise the standards of living of the people by establishing community projects, etc. The reason why the Community Development programme had not been as successful as it could have been was due to its having been

imposed from above. People had not taken to it in the real spirit. Block Development Officers went to villages in a jeep, dressed themselves in trousers, bushshirts, hat and tie. Naturally there was a great gulf between the Block Development Officers and the masses. Block Development Officers should take a lesson from Mahatma Gandhi's life, who identified himself with the poor. They must go to the people as one among them, and not as a superior class and impose themselves upon the people.

Citing an example, Prof. Suda pointed out that one of his students, who was a Block Development Officer, had told him informally, as an old student, that the government had not achieved any tangible results out of the community development schemes, but on paper everything appeared excellent. This sort of thing, that what appeared on paper did not exist in reality, created distrust.

As regards the solution for improving the relationship between the administrator and the citizen, Prof. Suda observed that the administrators should take up their work not merely as a means of earning their livelihood but as a vocation, and devote themselves to the work in a spirit of service and dedication to the people. To make democracy a success, the society as a whole should be imbued with the principle "each one for all; and no one for himself". This spirit could be cultivated only by a re-orientation of the present values of life. Man was born for a nobler purpose than to make money and lead a comfortable and luxurious life. The greatest contribution of the Mahatma was spiritualisation of politics. If administrators could take up a spiritual view of the universe, if they could adopt the vocational attitude towards life, things would be different.

Shri H.M. Patel, speaking next, said that, in discussing the relations between the administration and the citizen, one should be clear which particular administration and which citizen he had in mind. The citizens were everywhere, in the districts, in the rural areas, and in the urban areas. Only a certain section of citizens understood, or were interested, in particular policy-making techniques and procedures at the Centre. One thought, all the time, of only the

limited section of citizens who had to do with Delhi, whereas one ought to think really of the vast masses in the country in rural areas. The farmer, for instance, was not concerned with the major policies framed in Delhi. He was concerned with how the common man was affected by the administration, and the way the administration put across to the citizen whatever it was trying to do for him.

The community development organisation, Shri Patel pointed out, was there to carry out the message of the Central Government policy in regard to the rural development. But it was the considered opinion of a great many persons that the organisation had failed in getting down to the small man. The community development organisation undoubtedly benefited the well-to-do farmers who were capable of utilising the facilities it brought to them. But the much larger group of people, the twenty-five million odd small holders, who held an acre or less, were not in most cases approached by the community development organisation. Of course, there were men of outstanding ability and education in the community development organisation, and where such men existed, a great deal of very good work was done. If the administration was functioning satisfactorily, it ought to be able to put across whatever it wanted to do and actually to do things for the small men. The community development organisation, if it was to be vitalised, ought to be made to do this.

Referring to the earlier speaker, who had emphasised the need for idealism and the spirit of dedication on the part of administrators, Shri Patel pointed out that it would be wise to proceed from the basis that all were not idealists. The administrators were just average men, subject to all the weaknesses of the average human being and ready to succumb to all the normal temptations to which a normal human being was susceptible. In his opinion, it was given only to a few to be idealists to the degree the previous speaker desired, and all might wish, but it was something unrealistic to hope for. All had a certain stock of idealism, and it might be that it was given to a great person like Mahatma Gandhi to light a spark within men and make them far more

idealistic than they were. But that was not likely to be something that everybody could do, and could not be expected to be achieved by the average administrator whether he was a Block Development Officer or any higher officer.

In a huge country like India, with its extensive administration, one could only work with administrators who were just as humane as anybody else. The administrators received a certain type of training which made them do certain things in a certain way. They inherited certain traditions which went with the service to which they belonged. That kept them from succumbing to certain types of temptation, and to rise above them. Nevertheless, they were all ordinary human beings, and it was for that reason that much importance had to be given to the training of officers and staff recruited to the public service. It was said that once a person became a civil servant, at whatever level, he began to think that he was above the average citizen. That sometimes happened, but everyday one came across public servants of all kinds. Some were extremely courteous and helpful officers, but there were others who were not so very helpful.

Shri Patel felt that improvement on the part of administration could not be brought about unless and until the citizen himself was very vigilant. In a democracy, it was wrong to think that it was only the duty of the civil servants to do all that they were required to do or of the government. Citizens were still nostalgic about the past and thought that it was the business of the government to do everything and not for the citizens to help themselves to many things which the governmental policies made it possible for them. If the citizen was vigilant, he would complain to the authorities about those who were not doing their duties properly. Public speeches alone could not help improve the administration. Every citizen should consider it his right, duty and privilege to take up anything wrong that had happened within his knowledge and bring it to the notice of the authorities. Even if no action was taken sometimes, if sufficient number of citizens were vigilant and were prepared to take

this trouble, the administration was bound to wake up and take notice.

Shri Patel, in illustration of his point that the citizen was not vigilant or vocal, nor even the civil servant, referred to what in local parlance was called the "murderous mile" along the road which went past Safdarjung Airport along Vinaynagar (in New Delhi). Many of the officers, including Ministers, should have gone past that road, but it was doubtful if any of them had really set down and taken notice of this highly undesirable situation. The rate of accidents along that "murderous mile" was very high. That was why it had acquired that name. The time that the traffic was held up by the local train which crossed it was very considerable, and often people had to wait as much as 15 minutes or half an hour. There was also the airport. When an aircraft was due to come in, again traffic was held up. A matter like this affected not any one individual but a large number. This showed that, unless the citizen himself was prepared to give himself the trouble, no administration could improve.

It was essential that when a citizen went to a Tehsildar's or Mamlatdar's office and had to wait for hours before he got attended to, he should take up the matter with higher authorities. Usually, this was not done as he was afraid of the subsequent consequences, which very often existed only in his imagination. He would not like to suffer at all, but he would also not bring himself to take up that time and trouble to write a factual letter of the situation. Hence, it was the citizen who had a vital role to play in improving the administration and in keeping it up to the mark. The society as such should have a mental view of what the standard should be, and then to see that the standard of administration was in fact available to it.

Shri Patel further observed that moving up from district administration to state administration one found that the same kind of thing happened even in the case of the latter. He had known cases where complaints had been made and brought to the notice of the Minister, and his reaction simply was that the staff was not as efficient as it should be

and it might take some time. In his opinion, the Minister's attitude ought to be one of much greater indignation, as he was not like others who could merely indulge in futile theorising. The Minister was placed in a position where he could give effect to his indignation, see to it that the particular matter was set right, and also, in conjunction and in consultation with his staff, he should work out and think out how such things might not be allowed to recur. Unless there was a continuous effort of that nature, no administration could be improved. It was not possible to anticipate all manner of situations in which administration might function efficiently or inefficiently, but if there was a degree of vigilance on the part of the citizens and a desire on the part of the administration to put things right when brought to their notice, there was really hope to see the kind of improvement which all desired. There was really no such thing as a civil servant's attitude, at any stage, to be high and mighty and not to be of any help. The civil servant of the older generation was brought up with a very high sense of duty. It was continuously impressed upon him to maintain a degree of integrity which was vital, and which would make him unassailable whatever the nature of his decision.

Shri Patel explained that in a democracy there had to be greater contact with the public, and with that contact came dangers also. The intellectual quality of the newer civil servant, about whom many had been uncomplimentary, according to him, was in no way inferior to what it was before. What was inferior today was the type of training that the newer civil servants received. This, Shri Patel made it clear, should not in any way be taken as a criticism of the existing Administrative Training Schools, or anything of that kind. One did receive in those schools quite a good training. But the civil servant received the real training at his work in the districts; and there was a degree of laxity and interference from persons who should not be allowed to intervene but do intervene and get away with it. The civil servant, therefore, thought it was better for him not to run counter to the authority. His decisions, or in other words

his judgment, then tended to be influenced by considerations which should never influence his decisions or judgment. It was too much to expect the civil servant to ignore his future; and he would naturally think in terms of how his future was going to be affected.

The top administrators, who set the tone, should see that the conditions in which the civil servants worked were right, and their work was not interfered with by political leaders of any kind, by social workers, district workers, etc., at the district level. They should also be given full protection and support so long as they did their work properly according to the procedures and rules laid down. That, in the prevailing circumstances, in his opinion, was a great thing to be hoped for. Such high standards, set by the top people, would go a long way in the improvement of administration. Recalling the reference by one of the previous speakers to bushshirts, trousers, etc. he observed that these externals did not matter very much; what really mattered was the attitude of the political leaders, the Ministers and others, when they came to the districts. It was these people who had to set standards. They did not mix with people, and an average man could not go to them. They did not go and walk on their feet and see things for themselves. If they did that, the local man would not be slack in his duty.

Concluding, Shri Patel said that, if the administrators were to do their task well and competently, they should be watched vigilantly by their masters from the top; that was one set of masters, and by the other masters, i.e., the citizens at the receiving end. If both those groups did their duties, he was sure that the country would have a first-rate administration.

The next speaker, *Shri C.L. Sharma*, said with a note of optimism that the relations between the administrator and the citizen were not as bleak or desperate or hopeless as they were sometimes made out to be. Since Independence, there had been a consistent and conscious awareness of the fact that the administrator existed for the citizen, and his utility towards the citizen was measured by the benefit and

convenience he could bring to the citizen. The administrator's consciousness that he should be useful to the citizen was always there. Whether one talked of training institutions, or district training or of the directions from the top, there was this consciousness. As it took two to fight and two to make love, there should be equal awareness on the part of the citizen and the administrators. Vinoba Bhave, when once asked about the student indiscipline, pointed out that it was a surprise that students had that much discipline even when they came from a society that was altogether undisciplined. As the administrators were also brought up and educated along with the public, they carried to their positions some of the defects that they had inculcated from the citizens themselves. This clearly showed that there was a need for a two-way education both for the administrator and the citizen.

Shri Sharma was of the opinion that though sufficient attention had been paid to the education of the administrator, the same was not true of the education of the citizen. There was no training institution for legislators, or a training camp for Ministers, to impart them training before their taking up positions of responsibility. If attention was given to such training, there would be more of understanding and less of interference from them.

Secondly, the administration was too much bound by rules and regulations, and, if a public servant acted according to the rules and regulations and found that he was unable to help the citizens, the latter thought that he lacked the necessary sympathy for them. Though the public servant was not always unsympathetic, often the rules and regulations were such as made him look involuntarily unsympathetic. Therefore, efforts should be made to simplify them.

Thirdly, the Public Servants' Conduct Rules debarred a Government servant from attending and addressing a public meeting, and that kept him off from a very effective source of public contact. Undoubtedly, the public servants should not criticise as such the confirmed policies of the government, but the officers at the lower level, who came into real contact with the masses, were restricted from

informing the people about the policies and programmes and intentions of the government. Shri Sharma cited the rules which stated that nobody should be posted in his home district. This was all right when it was a regulatory state, but needed to be relaxed now to a certain extent. In his opinion, there would not be any harm in putting administrators, who were well known for their high integrity and character, in the district from which they came so that they might have greater touch with the people. Without claiming any finality, Shri Sharma thought it should be examined whether the above apparently outmoded notions should continue to find a place in the Public Servants' Conduct Rules.

Shri Sharma pointed out the inconveniences experienced by citizens for want of points of composite delivery. If a person wanted to get a licence for his car or gun, often he had to go from place to place and from office to office. This was resented by the citizen. If he had to be served effectively, there should exist a much larger number of composite contacts, where he could get his things done, at least at lower levels. Actions involved in a particular transaction should not be dealt with by scattered offices but at one point, so that the goods might be finally delivered at that point.

Lastly, Shri Sharma criticised the reference to 'ma-baap' administration, and the use of terms like "My Lord" and "Your Lordship". Though all sorts of "lordism" had been abolished, the use of these phrases had continued as a tradition. It was high time that it should be removed in all formal procedures.

Dr. Faruqi, speaking next, observed that the earlier speakers had not explained as to what had led to the present conditions, and how they could be improved. He said that a fire, however small, was a danger, and a conflagration was implicit in the smallest of fires, and, likewise, injustice in a tiny insignificant corner might lead to a process of mutual distrust and create a hopeless state of affairs so far as the citizens were concerned. This, mainly, was the problem before the administration. It was not only necessary that justice should be done, but also that justice should seem to be done so that confidence might be created in the

minds of the people. There was lack of public conscience in the country. Facts should be faced, and mistakes, if any, should boldly be admitted. Citizens were interested in their own little world oblivious to their surroundings and to the problems that faced the country. They did not share the anxiety of taking the country up as a whole, and such lack of public conscience led to all little and big disasters in the various spheres of life. This deficiency was due to the fact that home training and school training were not good. There were no Public Schools, there was no inculcation of character, and no curriculum to improve the character of the individual. The schools and universities imparted only theoretical education. The problem needed to be tackled at the base and remedial measures should not be rushed through. A start should be made from infancy, from the school stage. Twenty, thirty or fifty years was a small period in the life of a nation. It was not merely a problem of administration and the citizen, it was equally a problem of the citizen and the administration. It was a problem of mutual give and take, mutual responsibility. The citizen, in his opinion, thought he had no responsibility, and responsibility was on the shoulders of the administration. This was a wrong notion and, unless the citizen extended his full co-operation, the administrative machinery could not run properly and efficiently. It was, therefore, necessary that there should be proper education of the citizen before a good balance between the citizen and the administration could be expected.

Dr. Faruqi cited the example of a questionnaire that was sent to him by the Government asking for his suggestion to stop corruption. He answered that corruption could not be wiped out at least for another twenty years, and efforts should start from the school. He did not mean that man was dishonest by nature, but somehow or other he was so self-interested that he would not appreciate the other man's point of view. That was the reason for his complaining against the administration, and the administration in turn complaining against him. Both the administration and the citizen did not understand fully each other's position.

Concluding, Dr. Faruqi emphasised that efforts should first be made to set things right by education from infancy and then only could the administration be improved. In other words, in his opinion, it was not possible to start off with an ideal administration in the conditions that obtained at present.

Shri P.R. Dubhashi observed that in the field of education it was possible to find teachers who were remembered for long by their students, so also there had been administrators in the districts who were remembered for many years long after they had left the districts for the little acts of kindness and service they had rendered. Therefore, after all, there was not everything "rotten in the state of Denmark".

Shri Dubhashi thought that it was necessary that there should be intimate contacts with the public. At the same time, as pointed out by *Shri Patel*, excessive public contacts sometimes turned into contamination. If proper justice had to be given, it should be impartial. If administration had to deliver the goods, particularly in the field of developmental administration, it was necessary for administration to be impartial.

Regarding pressure groups in a democracy mentioned by *Shri Sri Ram Sharma*, he said that if administration had to steer clear of various pressure groups, a degree of disinterestedness, of impartiality and aloofness was required. As had been pointed out by *Shri Patel* and *Shri Mazumdar*, it would be a mistake to consider the men in the administration as a band of self-seeking maniacs. They were a part of society and, having regard to certain established, well-recognised and appropriate methods of recruitment, it was obvious that this section was particularly the more educated, and therefore likely to be of a better standard than the average of standards of character or responsibility. It was a much better approach to talk of improvements in the system of administration than to indulge in uncritical condemnation or commendation. Mere exhortation for a change of heart would serve little purpose. It was necessary to suggest certain concrete methods for the improvement in the system. The administration, if it was

to be responsive to the public, had to be accessible and communicative. This might be achieved either by devolution or by decentralisation or deconcentration or dispersal. Whatever might be the manners of carrying it out, it was necessary to have delegation all along.

In the field of rural administration, the National Extension Service had by and large brought the administration to the very door of the peasant. What was now necessary was to render it more efficient. It had to be rendered communicative, by dissemination of literature and by other ways. By mere production of literature and distributing it freely in all parts of the country, administration or dissemination of administrative knowledge could not really be spread. Free literature was sometimes taken to be not worth while at all. It was necessary for administration to make use of the more popular media of dissemination. Unfortunately, the more popular media of dissemination usually gave only a garbled version of administration. It was, therefore, necessary for the leaders of public opinion or public discussion to make common cause with men in administration, to see that the most popular media of communication were rightly used for propagating knowledge about the purposes, the objectives and the methods of administration.

Administration was said to be a mystery. With the expansion of functions, and with the proliferation of delegated legislation on a large scale, administration had come to be confronted more and more with the mystery of law and legislation. It should be remembered that law was made for man, and after law was made, man was made for law. The law represented the common consensus of opinion in the country, and efficient implementation of the law was the function of the administrative processes. Therefore, once laws were made, they should be carried out effectively. The simplification of laws and procedures was obviously a necessary pre-condition for their communication. Together with decentralisation and accessibility and communicativeness, there was a great deal of need for simplification.

The most direct way of bringing administration into touch with people was to provide opportunities to large sections of the people for participation in the processes of administration. But the common man was so much overwhelmed in his day-to-day life that he had neither the time nor the energy nor the patience to participate in the processes of administration. Opportunities for such participation were given to him by the creation of advisory committees, local self-government, and voluntary institutions, etc. but sometimes it was found that only the career type of citizens got into these processes and exploited them for sectional advantage. Thus a large majority of the citizens still remained away from the processes of administration. Often the opportunities were not used by the best non-official leadership. It was as much the responsibility of the leaders of public opinion, academic institutions and voluntary organisations, to give their best possible contribution using the day-to-day opportunities that were made available for the public to participate in the processes of administration.

Shri Dubhashi pointed out that the response of the citizens to the processes of public administration was more direct in the rural areas than in the urban areas. The people in the villages had a degree of cohesion, which made them immediately responsive as a whole to the challenges or opportunities that were thrown open to them by the administrative system or organisation. But, in urban areas, with a large concentration of people, bigness of organisation, etc. it became difficult to get a cohesive response from the people towards the processes of administration. As suggested by the Chairman, programmes of urban community development should make it possible for groups of people with common backgrounds, to associate themselves with the several processes of administration.

Shri Dubhashi, recalling the reference to the privileges of government servants, said that with privileges there were privations. The members of the civil service were all wage-earners and, with galloping inflation, there had been a growing pauperisation of the fixed income groups, and civil servants were no exception to it. Sociologically, they

came from a group of people who were educated but not affluent. They were really very much a part of the common man today, and as had been pointed out about the "murderous mile", the administrator himself, beyond the realm in which he was an administrator, was as much a citizen as anyone else. It was, therefore, for the enlightened leaders of public opinion and for the members of administration to forget the barriers between the so-called administrators and the so-called people, and to consider administration as a common effort for the realisation of common purposes.

Shri P. Y. Mehta, speaking next, posed the question: Who was the administrator and who was the citizen? While travelling from Bombay to Delhi across Mahim station, he had come across a sheet of hutments and a five-storeyed building which was no more than the 'chawl' of a middle class family. There were many other places also in the same city. He would like to ask himself the question: Was the chawl-dweller a citizen, was the university man a citizen, was the businessman a citizen, the professor, the mill worker, the fisherman, and so on? The obvious answer was they were all citizens. But its implications were not as obvious. Referring to the warring camp of societies, Shri Mehta asked the participants in the conference to visualise the mill worker distrusting the mill management, the students in revolt against the Principal, and the professors of the university against the Senate, the domestic servant in high revolt, mentally and sometimes physically, against the poor middle class employer. A unity of hearts between the employee and the employer did not exist any longer and both the parties were getting into an unrest of an unprecedented nature, and they would not be able to forget that unrest any more than the ostrich by closing their eyes to it.

Shri Mehta further asked: What was meant by 'administrator'? Was he the gentleman in Secretariat? Was he the Director of an Institute, or the Principal of a college? Was he the Dean? Was he the Commissioner of Police, the Judge, the Collector, the Municipal Inspector, etc.? The common concept was that he was a man in authority. The

administration did more than touch the fringe of the people's pockets through the Finance Minister's budget and the Income-Tax Department. But, could the administration penetrate through the problems of the socio-economic crisis that the nation was facing? Without a further realisation we were compressing the industrial revolutions of the Western countries within the course of five, ten or fifteen years, and the maladjustments that arose out of them were tremendous from the point of view of the concept of administration and of the role of administration in a democratic state.

The controversial question was: "Was it one of the purposes of administration to bring about an emotional integration within socio-economic structure which it sought to serve, or was it enough for administration to carry out the orders it received from its own hierarchy with efficiency, and leave the problem of social integration to the social welfare worker or to the politician?" This was the basic issue, and Shri Mehta thought that its comprehension should widen the horizon of the discussions at the conference on the role of the administrator and the citizen. India was a socialistic, democratic republic, and all its people cherished the goal of an egalitarian society with equality of opportunity in all aspects of human life. There was an urgent need to evolve an administration that would penetrate into the fisherman's hutments, across the Mahim railway lines mentioned earlier, and interpret the feelings and thoughts of every class and stratum of society, that would rob the fear complex from the minds of almost all those who lived as citizens in this country—rich or poor, tradesman or serviceman, landlord or landless labourer. The administrator and the citizen were all humans with the same impulses of love and fear, selfishness and generosity and should build up a unified society, working unitedly, and not at a chess-board of cross-purposes. Unless the administration accepted its creative role in relation to the citizen it sought to serve, it would do no more than exemplify Parkinson's law. The barrier between the citizen and the administration should be broken. In fact, the administrator and the citizen were one and the same. Every citizen should recognise administration

as its own offspring, "flesh of its flesh, and blood of its blood". But here, as elsewhere, it was the educated citizen who should give the lead.

The next speaker, *Shri M.P. Goel*, said that while public vigilance was good from the academic point of view, from the practical point of view such vigilance was a necessary nuisance. If a complaint which was adequately supplemented by proofs, documentary and otherwise, was not enquired into and suitable action taken, people would have little faith in administrative justice. Vested interests were very much powerful in Indian society. If the administrator was a man of high integrity and had the desire to do right things and was sincerely approached, he would stand on his grounds and would not succumb to such pressures. He was an independent citizen with certain independent rights, and a citizen first and last, and an administrator only for a moment and for the time being. Each individual should re-value himself, judge his standards of conduct, and create faith in himself. This was more important than all glib talk about social standards, sincerity of purpose, honesty of approach, and integrity in conduct to create and win respect.

Speaking next, *Shri Valsan*, quoting Aristotle, said the guest was the better judge of the feast than the cook. The people were a better judge of the administration than the administrators. Referring to the role of the politician in bringing the administration and citizen together, Shri Valsan observed that some attempts had been made to show how citizens were to be trained to play a role in the art of administration. In most of the States, particularly in the most literate states of our country, political parties had failed to educate the masses so far as the art of administration was concerned. The result was that they went on talking about their own political problems, and whenever a party was in power, it tried to tell the people something regarding administrative problems. Citing the instance of the Minister's explanation for the rise in the price of sugar, he said that no citizen knew what was exactly the reason for the rise. The ruling party members would not endeavour to give any sort of explanation to the citizens regarding its cause. Similarly,

the opposition parties made it out as a matter exploiting the common man, with the result that the citizen was left in a state of confusion. Perhaps, it might be due to ignorance, but often it was a matter of education. When such a problem came before the citizen, he believed that it was the policy of the state that goods should not be cheap.

Referring to Kerala State, which was a political laboratory, Shri Valsan remarked that whenever a particular party was ruling, it was found that it was eager to tell the people that there were innumerable problems of administration. When the Communists came to power, they started talking to the electorate in the same strain. They also did not do well to explain fully to the people the different aspects of the problem of administration. They started saying that the First Five Year Plan was an American Plan. Even the framers of the Plan failed to prescribe certain codes of conduct for the political parties. Much more could be done in this direction. The Institute might organise a seminar with the representatives of the political parties in the country, either region-wise or even at the national level, seeking to evoke their constructive attitudes towards the particular policies of the government regarding the Third Five Year Plan, decentralisation, etc.

Shri Valsan added that a drive for the education of the masses should be undertaken so that the masses would not be in a state of confusion. In his opinion, journalism also could do a little better in this respect. In the particular State, to which he referred, unless one read five newspapers at a time and discounted 75 per cent of the news given, one might not be able to reach somewhat objective conclusions regarding the political developments or even economic developments. This situation could be studied by organising some discussions and seminars and inviting some of the representatives of the Press in the country. During the vacation, the teachers of Public Administration, Politics and Economics might undertake educating the public in the art of citizenship.

Concluding, Shri Valsan said that government, just as religious teachers, should tell the people about its various

activities. In every district, and in every village, there should be some objective-minded teachers to go round and educate the people, without talking in favour of one party or the other, about the need for developing an objective outlook regarding citizenship.

* * *

At the resumed discussions in the afternoon, *Shri Chetkar Jha* stated that there was a long catalogue of the symptoms of a malady which determined the pattern of relationship between the government and the citizen. It had been stated that all was not well with those citizens who were in possession of power and authority. Similarly, all was not well with those who were outside the government. If the basic malady which afflicted Indian society could be diagnosed the symptoms of which had been mentioned by several speakers, it might perhaps be possible to think of the treatment of the disease or the malady. It was found that the citizens, wherever they were associated with the administrative apparatus or institutions, were irresponsible. The same was also true of many civil servants. Such a sense of irresponsibility was perhaps a basic malady which afflicted Indian society in modern times. It was found that there was an attempt on the part of the average citizen always to circumvent the law, like ticketless travelling and breaches of ordinary laws, etc. which might be a manifestation of an inherent trait of animosity to organised civil life. It might be due to living in conditions of political slavery for centuries during the British period and centuries spent under some sort of totalitarian rule. Some rulers like Asoka the Great, and Akbar the Great, were benevolent despots at best, and the people did not have much to do with administration. Then Society, because of the rigidity in the caste system, had gradually broken up and it was no longer a cohesive community in the sense that socialists understood it. Because of the many barriers that existed, many kinds of pressures that were exerted, it was felt that a most important element in the community was absent—socio-economic cohesion. The recent efforts made for uplifting and improving the economic conditions had introduced a period of

uncertainty, because forms of brotherhood were changing very fast. It was not known, except vaguely, what would be the pattern of relationships among individuals and different groups in the society, in days to come. On account of all these factors, people were even now truly individualistic. In the language of the psychologist, the ego-structure of every individual was composed of two or three elements. First, because of the uncertainty, everybody wanted to grab power, or amass wealth, or do something which he could leave behind for his sons, daughters and others. Those who were able to control themselves and tried to behave as rationally as possible perhaps did so, but quite a lot were not able to do so due to insufficient moral stamina.

The second element was that of individualism. It was not able to merge or integrate its structure with the ego-structure of the community as a whole, and that was perhaps the malady. It could be treated, but what kind of therapy or treatment would be most effective was the problem. The malady could perhaps be due to greater industrialisation which had brought in its wake a period of disturbance. Unless the period could be shortened, the people might have to suffer from its consequences for quite some time. How the period to be shortened to reach a stage of social and economic development, when the feeling of assurance and certainty would come into being, was a problem which did not admit of any easy solution. Certainly the problem of shortening the period by accelerating the pace of economic and social development called for a certain improvement in the machinery of administration, particularly in the sphere of communications to which many references had been made at the conference. Here the difficulty had been that Indian society was divided into two groups. In the language of the socialists, there were two such bodies—one the mobilised sector, and the other and larger, immobilised sector. He did not mean them in the linguistic sense. Even though both the sectors might speak the same language, they understood differently from the same language.

Shri Jha drew attention to a chapter in George Orwell's novel "1984", where slavery was freedom and war was

peace. A similar juxtaposition of words and phrases was in vogue in India also. For example, people talked of democratic decentralisation. Anyone who considered that scheme in detail, knowing what democracy really was, would say not democratic decentralisation but democratic devolution. But democratic decentralisation was a very popular phrase which had almost become a slogan. The person who was concerned with public relations used the language which was understood in different ways in different terms by the common people. The language used in government reports was unintelligible. Shri Jha here cited the case of a circular on firing issued by the Chief Secretary of a State Government. The first sentence said that government policy on 'firing' was absolutely precise and clear—(1) there should be absolutely no hesitation in opening fire if circumstances warranted; (2) all efforts should be made in the beginning not to allow the situation to deteriorate so as to necessitate firing. That way it went on for two pages. When reading the whole, one came to the conclusion that the man on the spot had to decide everything, and the instructions of that two-page circular did not guide him at all.

Communication within the government itself had two aspects, and unless it was set right, communication with the outside, with the people, could not be perfect. As to communication by word of mouth, one could tell everything as well as nothing. Communication of this type had certainly been very defective but, at the same time, the problem was how to deal with an average citizen. In a power-starved community, behaviour was likely to be more erratic than rational. A team of sociologists, psychologists and political scientists might, with an inter-disciplinary approach, study the problem of how to rectify the need-structure of an individual belonging to a power-starved community, a community which had not yet quite integrated and did not form one homogeneous unit because of the so many barriers that existed.

Shri Gajadhar Singh, speaking next from his experience as a voluntary organiser of the Bharat Sewak Samaj, observed that he had often to visit the authorities in

connection with the difficulties of the people. It was there that he had come across a defeatist mentality among the masses. He suggested that the Institute might take up the suggestions that were the outcome of the day's discussion in right earnest and carry out research so that it might be in a position not only to spot the disease symptoms but also the cure. The Institute, which had the best brains and some devoted young workers could really devote time and attention to this problem which was eating into the very vitals of the nation.

Shri Gajadhar Singh pointed out that the people suffered from the hands of the lower level administration and it was necessary to evolve certain devices to overcome this. Here the proper education of the people was an absolute necessity. The education given even at higher level did not sufficiently give encouragement on account of its too high cost, and the graduates and post-graduates felt that they could not take up any job unless it carried very high emoluments, and that was not possible in a poor country like India. There should be at least some people with missionary spirit of service, willing to lead a life of honesty with, of course, reasonable emoluments.

Education from the primary level up to the university stage was also important not only with regard to those who were in the administration but also to those upon whom fell the responsibility of supervising the work of these officials as members of the legislatures and Parliament. Although there was no provision in the Constitution with regard to the education of legislators, it was absolutely necessary that these very people, after they had been elected, should be given training for a couple of weeks or a month or two, so that they might know their duties and responsibilities in a much better way. Sometimes, instead of helping the administration, many of them were found interfering with the administration and doing things which were very unbecoming of members of the legislature.

As regards young men, it was essential that they should try to lead a simple life, although a salary of Rs. 1,000 today was actually worth only Rs. 200 of former days. Yet, they

were better off than the common man. It was inadvisable for them, therefore, to still go on thinking in terms of money and money alone. There was also a tendency to waste time in office on some excuse or other when there was plenty of work to be done.

Shri Gajadhar Singh further observed that, on account of indifference on the part of the officials, the Panchayats were also suffering. The village Secretaries, attached to the Panchayats, sometimes did not turn up even for two months in the villages, although it had been ordered that they would hold monthly meetings in every village. Many of them did not live in the villages allotted to them, and had moved to towns after a few years' service. Unless they came in contact with the people, they were not going to be benefited. The Panchayati Raj Inspectors, who had been ordered by higher authorities to tour the villages for about twenty days in a month, actually did so for only a few days. But, often, they might be moving all right on paper for twenty days. Unless the standard of national character was raised, there was no way out of the dilemma. Even the officers at the top had an indifferent attitude to such complaints.

Referring to the remarks that the public should be vigilant, Shri Singh said that there were some vigilant bodies, and they were trying to bring the defects of the administration to the notice of the authorities concerned, but without much success. After carefully examining the different problems, and discussing them with the ordinary people of the villages or the representatives of the Panchayats, to whom he often spoke, the speaker had come to the conclusion that too much security of service was responsible for the indifferent attitude of government officials. The removal of those who had faltered in their duty would have a healthy effect in raising the standard of responsibility towards the people and would also relieve the problem of unemployment to a limited extent. The Government Servants' Conduct Rules had been prepared by the Britishers, who had provided so many safeguards for the services that it was impossible now to do away with the defaulting civil servants easily. A concerted effort should be made to improve the standard of work of the

administration before it was too late. The people generally complained about the arrogant attitude of the government officers and this aspect of the problem also needed urgent attention.

The Journal of the Institute, published once in three months, might be brought out at least once a month, so that the good articles might be circulated or a gist given to the general public by translation and talks by voluntary workers. The Institute should take up this question in right earnest. As Swami Vivekananda had observed, it was not enough to cherish high ideals in the abstract, they should be made articles of faith and allowed to influence one's daily life, if they were to be of any use to the people and the country.

Dr. H.K. Paranjape, taking the floor next, observed that his contribution to the discussions might seem rather theoretical and academic in character. But, as he had no administrative experience, he could to a certain extent understand the ordinary man's point of view. Different kinds of citizens come into contact with different kinds of administrators. But there were certain common types of resentment that many citizens felt, sometimes reasonable and sometimes unreasonable. One such feeling was that the administrator, on the whole, was discourteous and disrespectful to the citizen with whom he was dealing. But this happened much more in the case of the contacts between low level administrative officials and the common citizens, rather than between the high administrative officials and the small number of citizens who came into touch with them.

Dr. Paranjape pointed out that when one spoke of the relationship between administrators and citizens, one should never forget the fact that for the common citizen it was not the Secretary to Government, it was not even generally the Collector, who represented the administration but it was some official at a much lower level, might be the ordinary policeman in the street, the postman or the postal clerk, the telephone operator, the income-tax officer, the municipal official or the tax collector from the municipality. It was these people who represented to the average citizen

the administration, and that citizen's view of the administration, his approach to administration, was bound to be very much coloured by what he thought these people's attitudes were. And there was not the slightest doubt—he was not saying that the citizens might not be at fault—that the citizen felt that the officials did not care for him; they were discourteous, disrespectful, and not interested in helping the citizen. There was a certain callousness in the approach of officials to the needs of the common citizens, not in policies as much as in day-to-day implementation.

Taking as an instance the hold-up of traffic for a V.I.P. to pass, Dr. Paranjape explained that a person wanting to reach his office or doctor or market might not be able to do so in time as certain roads had been blocked without prior notice. The administration functioned on the principle that it did not matter, as long as government business was served, if the ordinary citizen suffered. If such things came to the notice of the topmost officials, they might not like it, but in the way orders were implemented there was a callousness about the requirements, the necessities and the feelings of the ordinary citizens.

A good deal of resentment among the public was also due to delay in attending to the citizen, e.g. in a post office or in replying letters to the administration. There might be good reasons for the delay. But the general feeling was that the organisation did not bother. Many of the public service agencies were organised in such a way that the approach seemed to be that the people who were really important, who really mattered, would not deal with them directly. No person of any importance would go himself to the post office or to the bank to cash a cheque, but would send his peon. This kind of approach made the organisation even less careful, because people of less importance were to be dealt with by these public services personally. This was not only the feeling of an individual citizen, but of schools also, which had to wait for grants till the end of the financial year. Social welfare centres, which had inmates in their hostels, might find it difficult to provide them with food, because of late receipt of grants. A letter sent to the Secretary,

Welfare Board, or Government, might not be answered for months. There might be reasons for it. The Finance Ministry might not have given its sanction or some particular point might have to be tackled, but in the meantime people found that their work had got delayed.

There was also the feeling that without some type of palm-greasing one could not get one's work done. Some people thought that this had come in with the war-time controls and specially after independence. In Dr. Paranjape's opinion, this was not true. Bribery and corruption had been there for a very long time. He did not think that a village patwari was more honest in the British regime than he was now, or the police official in the village. There was a long tradition behind it; but people felt that really nothing much had happened to eradicate it; and without influence and without money things could not be got done normally.

People had also a grouse that there was insufficient consultation. Though there was a formal democratic system in the country, it did not really mean that the people were consulted about major matters of policy that affected them. The assumption seemed to be that if there was a democratic system, automatically the people were consulted. The latest approach seemed to be that if Panchayats or some such institutions were established, then people would not feel that they were not being consulted. Dr. Paranjape thought, there was something wrong in this whole approach whether one took the Panchayat Samiti or Zila Parishad or State legislature or the Parliament. By and large, except in an assembly of the whole village there were bound to be representative legislatures of some sort, and these representatives would be elected more on political party platforms. People would vote for a certain party, and once a party was elected, it had its own mandate to carry out its programmes on all sorts of matters,—programmes not only on major matters on which there would have been a controversy at the time of elections, but even on matters on which there was no clear verdict from the electorate, just because it had the authority of the people's support for whatever it wanted

to do. This was not the way in which a democratic system should function. Dr. Paranjape observed that Prof. Menon had spoken of the infra-structure. It was not merely the Parliaments that constituted the democratic venue of discussion in a Western democracy; it was the whole infra-structure of institutions of all types—clubs, universities, and all types of voluntary institutions. Generally, the tradition built up by good democracies, e.g., Sweden, the U.K., or even America, was that these various bodies would be consulted and the opinion that prevailed in these bodies would by and large be reflected by the government in policies that were not directly affected by political controversies.

Certain sections of citizens, because of their interest, professional competence and special studies, were vocal in pointing out what they thought should be the proper policies. But, somehow, a situation had arisen wherein the approach was that the political representatives in the Parliament could decide on all matter of things. For example, educational policies might be decided by the Education Minister, acting under the dictates of a political party without carrying with him any support for his policy in significant sections of educationists. The State Governments might force a change in the University Acts, though all universities might be opposed to that particular type of legislation, just because the State legislature was a sovereign body. Basic education might be introduced, even while quite a large number of educationists were opposed to the idea of basic education.

To a certain extent, the interests which were powerful, and could influence voters, or which wielded financial power, might be consulted. Ordinarily, major chambers of commerce would always be consulted, increasingly trade unions would also be consulted, but bodies not well-organised tended to get ignored. In matters of social reform, sociologists might be ignored. It was not that a politician knew much better what was good by way of social reform than the group of persons who had been studying the subject. This created in the most vital sections of the community a feeling of resentment that they had been kept out, and also led to a

general feeling of unrest in society. These sections were vocal, and thought that the administration was being run by people who really were not interested in finding out what was good for the community or would be considered rational.

One of the reasons why this had happened was that traditionally in India there had been a chasm between the rulers and the ruled, between the educated and the uneducated, between the literate and the illiterate. Even in the pre-British time, there was a chasm between the learned Brahmin or the higher caste and the caste which was kept out of learning. The British perpetuated it further, and unfortunately that tradition was being further perpetuated. Elected administrators took to the approach of the former administrators, that is, superior by virtue of his position and power. They took to this approach as a duck took to water, and there was a tendency for power to go to the head quickly. The educated and elite in the country, Dr. Paranjape thought, had always accepted the dictum, "nobody else is important but the person who is in power".

Another reason for this in Dr. Paranjape's opinion was that the people at the bottommost level were not given any training, while most of the top people were trained. Most people were not trained in public relations. Many at the lower levels found that they were never consulted in matters which affected them in their official work. Generally, they were not only kept out of all policy decisions but also from discussions relating to their office. That resentment they brought to bear on the people they dealt with. If a person got kicks from above, he would like to have someone at whom he could kick. Thus, the kick started from above was ultimately passed on to the citizen at the bottom.

Lastly, Dr. Paranjape pointed out that the convenience of administrative organisations was given far more importance than the service of the people. It was a commonplace fact in economic discussion that the capitalist could take care of himself so also the worker through his union, and the farmers through their organisations; but the consumer was one who went unrepresented. To a certain extent, the same thing happened in administration also. The staff

increasingly took care of themselves. But, if a citizen was not properly treated, nothing was done about it.

One solution of the problem would be that, when a man's confidential record was being considered for promotion, the public complaints against him should be taken into account. The public complaints might not be substantiated and proved; but the fact that a particular official's action or dealing with the public had led to a great deal of complaints should always mean that the official was considered to be unsuitable for certain types of work. No private firm would keep a man in positions where he had to deal with the public when there were a number of complaints against him. The belief in the administration seemed to be that it should be fair to the official; whether it was fair enough to the citizen was not considered as important.

Shri N.H. Athreya, speaking for the second time, observed that the subject had till then been discussed mainly from the point of view of students of Public Administration. To talk about administration did not mean to talk against it.

After hearing the various speeches, he had begun to wonder whether there was such a bad state of affairs as it had been made out. It looked to him that, whether one thought in terms of administration or the citizen, things were in pretty good shape. The administrators particularly young men, by and large, were helpful, polite, dynamic and well-mannered, and this should not be taken as a reflection on the older generation of administrators. Having once been used, for one reason or another, to a certain pattern of relations, it would naturally take them some time to change over to a new pattern of relationship with the citizens. Every citizen was helpful, and he was anxious to contribute to the overall objectives of the nation. The troubles, therefore, seemed to arise in certain restricted circles where two or three per cent of abnormal behaviour was visible. Corruption was often talked of, having read about it in the few publications that were very popular. He did not know the reason for the popularity of those publications.

The problem was confined to a very small portion, both of the administrative sector and the citizen sector. Here

were the social lepers. Fortunately, very few of this type existed, but unfortunately nothing was done about them. Perhaps, what was the need of the hour was 'still better administration' and as an earnest student one should always think in terms of 'still better'. Efforts should be concentrated to rehabilitate this small section to which adequate attention was not paid. Even if adequate attention was paid, conscious sympathetic attention was not paid.

Recalling the speech made by him at the morning session of the conference, Shri Athreya observed that the citizen was anxious to extend his co-operation and was prepared to be an unpaid partner with administration, because the cost was common; when the citizen wanted an opportunity for himself or to give himself a training, he sought spiritual satisfaction, but often felt cheated. This resulted in his preaching fatalism. Therefore, if administration took the initiative to organise things, the citizens would participate. It only required the administration to provide the machinery through which people could assist and participate, but it should be an organised machinery and without many 'ifs' and 'buts'. To enable the citizen to participate in a big way, there should be an organised machinery so that his energies might be channelised and mobilised, thereby increasing his morale. Once morale was raised, administration would not be merely more effective but would run much smoother.

Concluding the discussion, the Chairman, Prof. S.V. Kogekar, said that the discussions at the conference had been highly illuminating and thought-provoking, as both sides—the administrators and the citizens—were equally well represented. Even more than the conclusions the purpose had been to focus attention on certain features of the relationship between the citizen and the administration. The task had, in his opinion, been well done, and he was sure that the Institute was very grateful to all those who had contributed papers and also to those who had taken part in the deliberations. As many as 18 speakers had spoken, and that was as good a response as one could hope for any conference of the kind.

APPENDIX

I

ADMINISTRATION AND THE CITIZEN

Working Paper prepared in the Institute

With the establishment of a democratic welfare state in India, the average citizen comes into contact with administration at an ever increasing number of 'delivery-ends'. While the political, constitutional and socio-economic set-up provides a framework for the formulation of public policies and functioning of the administrative process, the quality and efficiency of administration has a significant impact on the development of high standards of citizenship and the extent and effectiveness of people's co-operation and participation in the implementation of programmes.

The citizen's contact with administration arises in one or more of the following capacities:

- (i) As a beneficiary of the institutional framework and as an enjoyer of political, civil, and economic rights thereof;
- (ii) As a general user of civic amenities and public utilities; and
- (iii) As a member of a clientele group.

All rights and benefits accruing therefrom involve corresponding duties; the citizen is obliged to conform to certain laws, rules, and regulations, relating to a particular benefit. Political, economic, and social freedoms and benefits have thus their own corresponding obligations. It is necessary to bear in mind both of these two sides of the relationship between the citizen and the administration. Many times, the complaints of the citizens against the government and the administration and the grumbles of the administration about the citizen are based on an inadequate appreciation of the other side of the picture.

II

Underlying all the types of rights and benefits, for which the citizen looks up to the administration, is a certain common denominator of expectations. Before we discuss these common factors, it would be worth while to take note of the common complaints which are generally put forward by the citizen against

the administration. Some of the complaints frequently heard are:

- (1) Lack of a sense of urgency, slow pace, and consequent delays.
- (2) Lack of regard for the convenience and comfort of the citizen; long and complicated rules and procedures involving repeated visits to administrative agencies; lack or inadequacy of clear and precise information about and guidance for compliance with these rules and procedures; inadequacy of facilities for waiting, etc.
- (3) Lack of normal courtesy on the part of government officials.
- (4) Disregard of public interest or the rights of a certain individual or group under the influence of group pressures, party intrigues, and cliques or private individuals with political, economic, or social power.
- (5) Lack of enthusiasm in work and lack of a sense of mission for the achievement of administrative tasks and goals.
- (6) Lack of adequate machinery for the redress of grievances and complaints; virtual absence of machinery for gauging public reactions and opinions in respect to particular policies, programmes or activities.

If we were to translate the above common complaints into positive expectations, what the citizen normally desires from the administration may be summed up as follows:

- (1) An understanding of the objectives of the activities and administrative policies of a particular government department or agency.
- (2) An assurance about and confidence in the major policies followed by an administrative agency for the fulfilment of its objectives, uninfluenced by consideration of party, group, or private benefits.
- (3) High standards of competence and efficiency in performance.
- (4) Proper maintenance of offices and adequate and proper facilities both for employees and visiting citizens.
- (5) Friendly, helpful, and productive contacts between citizens and officials.

III

Closely allied with the question of what the citizen expects of administration is the basic issue of public interest, which is the primary objective of all administrative activity in government. Public interest generally connotes two things:

- (i) The interest of a particular public, or a large number of publics, which an administrative agency is supposed to serve; or
- (ii) The interest of the great mass of the citizens as one integrated community or nation. In the latter context, as Dean Appleby puts it "In a democracy, *everybody's* business quite properly takes precedence over *anybody's* business. This is confusing, because *anybody* knows anybody's business and *nobody* can really understand everybody's business."^{*}

The attainment of Independence, the establishment of a democratic welfare state, and the acceptance of a socialist pattern of society as the national goal, have raised the expectations of the public from the administration to heights which know no bounds. The administration in India is being continually and increasingly oriented towards the achievement of what the citizens want, citizens being the real sovereign; but the administration can obviously take note only of such wishes and expectations of the citizens as come to it through their elected representatives at the local, state, and central levels of government. There are some who believe that democracy through elected representatives cannot meet the real needs of the citizen; these can only be met through the establishment of small self-governing communities of citizens.

Citizens being sovereign and with the political awakening proceeding at a rapid pace in India, the public expect much higher standards of integrity and performance from the administration than what they themselves live up to. At times, the citizen will confuse his personal interests or convenience with public interest and would little realise what public interest in that particular context really means. Some of the loose talk about lack of integrity and inefficiency in administration arises from this mixing up of personal and public interest, as also from lack of fuller confidence in administrative and political leadership due to inadequate and misdirected public relations most of the administrative agencies. There is also the hangover of

^{*}Public lecture on "The Politician and the Administrator" delivered on March 14, 1961, at the Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi.

the British regime—to look up to administration for everything and to do very little on one's own as a citizen. There is as well the problem of effective and two-way communication. What the government and the administration say, many times means one thing to them and quite another to the general public. These are some of the basic difficulties and factors which are at present responsible for the existing frustrations both among the citizens and the administration in regard to their mutual relationship.

IV

There are several directions in which a concerted effort can be made to improve the present tone and quality of relationship between the citizen and the administration. More important among these are discussed below:

1. *Institutional Arrangements*: The experiment in democratic decentralisation which has been started in recent years is based on the philosophy that the rural people should directly share the responsibility for managing and directing developmental programmes in their areas. The community development programme also provides a similar framework for the growth and development of self-effort among the rural people. The problem of integration of the regular administration with the developmental administration at the district level and below was posed in the Second Five Year Plan, and the final shape of things is yet to emerge.

Programmes of urban community development are still in a state of infancy. The creation of ward development councils, or committees, or two or three tiers of urban government, may help in enlarging the area and improving the quality of citizen's participation in urban government and administration.

The network of advisory bodies which has come up at the state and central levels needs some rationalisation to make citizen's participation in and association with the administrative process more effective and fruitful.

2. *Methods and Procedures*: Though a considerable effort has been directed in recent years at the central and state levels to rationalise work methods and procedures, much leeway remains to be made up in this matter at the level of local administration, which touches the citizen's everyday life at innumerable points. The simplification of procedures should take into account the following five basic considerations:

- (i) Regard for public comfort and convenience; the number of visits which a citizen should be expected to make to administrative agencies should be reduced

to the minimum, and adequate facilities for his comfort and convenience should be provided for the short time he spends at the administrative agencies or offices.

- (ii) Supply of adequate and fuller information to the citizen as to how he is to set about to receive a certain benefit or approval from the administration; and detailed instructions and guidance for facilitating compliance by the citizen with the different rules and regulations concerned.
- (iii) Speed in disposal of the citizen's requests and applications and the fixation of time limits for such disposal.
- (iv) The growing feeling that the benefit to which the citizen may be entitled will not accrue to him automatically unless he has some influence brought to bear on his request demands serious attention; and an early solution of this problem should be found if frustration is not to swamp the good sense of the common citizen.
- (v) Formulation of programmes and plans for public participation in clear and concrete terms, so that the citizen knows fully what contribution he can make and how.

3. *Attitudes of Public Employees*: The common citizen today (whether rightly or wrongly, that point is immaterial) is very critical about the discourteous and high-brow attitudes of public employees in general. There is considerable scope for training in public relations of government employees of all types in general and those who come in touch with the public frequently in particular. As citizens are real sovereigns, the public employee should be indoctrinated even to develop enough patience to bear with a certain amount of incorrect or unjustified public criticism and to explain the point of view of the department in polite and courteous but firm language.

There is a feeling in some quarters within the administration that the administrators know better what the citizens really want, or is good for the citizens, rather than the citizens themselves. This belief and feeling is based on a misunderstanding of the very basis of parliamentary democracy. What is important is not whether the citizen is right or wrong, but whether his demands and wishes, as put through his elected representative, are promptly and fully considered by the administration or not. Dean Appleby has rightly emphasised that "In nearly all administrative decisions the sense of virtuous performance is to be

pursued by attempting to inject some increased allowance for the more public interest and some increased concern for those citizens not immediately present or heard"... "In this pursuit there must be care not to confuse one's professional viewpoint, functional preoccupation, or personal prejudices with the public interest."*

In recent years, there has been a good deal of talk about the development of a sense of mission—dedication to public interest and specific goals of an administrative agency—among the public employees. Such a sense of mission can perhaps be better developed through the establishment of high professional standards rather than through appeals to the intellect or emotions. The solution lies in raising standards of group behaviour among public employees rather than standards of individual employees.

4. *Administrative Competence and Integrity*: From the point of view of the citizen, the two most important things are: (1) that the public employees are selected and promoted on the basis of competence for the job and not on any other considerations; and, (2) that the decisions they take are based solely on considerations of public interest, uninfluenced by the pressure of any private individual, interest group, or party.

Both these requirements, in the last analysis, call for higher standards of political and administrative leadership and discipline, and the development of a code of professional ethics among public employees.

5. *Public Relations*: The public relations set-up and programmes of government departments and agencies today are generally directed towards two broad purposes:

- (i) Supply of general information to the citizen; and
- (ii) Explaining to the citizen the programme of a particular department or agency and at times also to explain why a particular policy or programme is being followed by it, or why a particular action was taken by the department.

Some public relations officers do try to take note of public grievances ventilated through newspapers and periodicals and bring it to the notice of the administration, but no significant effort seems to have been made to elicit public reactions through the agency of opinion surveys or polls and similar other devices. Government publicity under such circumstances is generally taken up by the citizen as an effort made by the government to sell

**Morality and Administration in Democratic Government*; Baton Rouge, 1952, p. 176.

its own policies and ideas rather than to find out the complaints and reactions of the citizen. The public relations programmes badly need a reorientation towards the latter purpose. Another important contribution which they can make to remove the citizen's growing sense of frustration about the activities of the government departments is to help the citizen know, by giving detailed information and guidance, as to how to obtain a certain benefit, service or sanction from the government departments concerned. In other words, the emphasis in public relations policies and programmes should, in the context of planning for development, be increasingly shifted in favour of informing the government rather than the citizen and towards helping the citizen in the matter of his requests and demands on the government department.

Measures for institutional, procedural, and attitudinal improvements in administration alone will not suffice to improve the relations between the citizen and the administration. It is equally important to prepare and train the citizens for new adjustments to the growing demands of administration for compliance with rules and regulations and for co-operation and collaboration in the implementation of the programmes of different departments. Training in citizenship should not be narrowly conceived; it should extend from the ordinary citizen to the highest political leader. It would obviously include the following:

- Education of the rank and file of the citizenry.
- Education of the leaders and workers of citizens' voluntary associations and groups.
- Education of elected representatives to popular bodies at the local, district, state, and central levels.

* * *

Professional research institutions and voluntary organisations can help considerably in improving the tone of relationship between the citizen and the administration by providing empirical data through objective surveys. Much of the present misunderstanding between the administration and the citizen is due to the lack of such empirical data. At times, administrative policies have to be formulated without an empirical basis; and not infrequently the citizen's complaints and grievances arise from the lack of understanding about the factual basis underlying the departments' objectives, policies and programmes.

* * *

In brief, the real problem is one of greater responsiveness by the administration to the citizen's needs and desires and

more effective compliance by the citizen with rules and regulations, fuller co-operation and collaboration in the implementation of programmes, and increased appreciation and confidence by him in the departmental policies. The solution of the problem depends, in the last analysis, on the quality of political and administrative leadership at the different levels—local, district, state, and centre. If this leadership does not rise to the new demands of the developing economy, administrative reforms by themselves cannot be of much avail.

II

ADMINISTRATION AND THE CITIZEN

Paper by

N. H. ATHREYA

One aspect of THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE CITIZEN is 'The citizen and the administration'.

The average citizen is both willing and anxious to make his humble contribution to the common objectives of the nation—economic, social, and other objectives.

Does the administration make it *easy* for the citizen to do this? How far is it true to say that the administration is really making it *difficult* for the citizen to do this?

The word 'administration' makes sense only when we keep in mind the human content of administration—the people that make it, and their attitudes, values, their sense of objectives, their sense of urgency, and their sense of the implications of what they do and how they do.

In this paper, I shall make reference to only a few of the facets. It is true that in a huge set-up like ours, it is difficult to go by the spirit of the law; the administration will have to go by the letter.

This, however, puts a premium on the clever devil. The ultra-selfish and the anti-social elements as also the highly organised ones either achieve proficiency or hire proficient people to get by in the process defeating the common objectives of the nation at times.

The citizen who is not well-versed in the letter of the law and the citizen who cannot hire help, gets handicapped; he is unable to make his contribution: the administration stands in the way, though not deliberately.

The administration does produce literature for the citizen, but it is done in such an impersonal manner that the purpose of serving the average citizen gets defeated. The gobble-de-gook language, the 'out of stock' story and 'we don't care what is said in a publication' attitude are some of the things worth mentioning. Why not get a good journalist write it all in readable language and publish it in all the newspapers as a serial, a citizen fails to understand.

The first step the administration should consider so that the average citizen may do the things that are expected of him in the way it is expected of him is to help him with generous and "ready for use" information.

The second facet of this aspect refers to the way the average citizen is treated by the average administrator. One gets the impression the citizen is not treated with common courtesy, understanding, or helpfulness. One also gets the impression that to move the administration one should be backed by big money and all that it can do.

The citizen outside an office and the citizen inside an office are both citizens with different roles but with common aims: this situation did not obtain in 1946 and understandably; and this situation does not obtain in 1961 and this is not understandable.

The third facet is that the administration being impersonal is impersonal. The average citizen does not see in the administration a sense of urgency. *Time is the essence* of achievement; and achievement is what the average citizen seeks because only achievement will raise the general standard of living, including his own.

When the citizen feels a sense of urgency and the administration does not, one wonders whether the existing administration set-up trends are conducive to achievement.

The final facet I wish to touch upon is the worm's-eye view the administration tends to take and the hill-top view the citizen is urged to take. The average citizen gets the impression that he is dealing not with one administration but scores of administrations, all at cross-purposes with each other.

If the administration takes a whole view of any problem instead of that little section that affects his day-to-day work, in other words, if the administration is citizen-centred and achievement-centred, the picture will become much brighter overnight.

I submit the average citizen is prevented from making his contribution to the administration today, and this is done by the administration itself. Maybe not deliberately, but in effect. The administration should turn the searchlight on itself.

III

ADMINISTRATION AND THE CITIZEN

Paper by

B. D. DUA

The importance of the role of administration in the modern states hardly needs any emphasis. The complexities of the modern industrialized and urbanised civilization have resulted in an ever-increasing expansion of the activities of the state; till today, we find the state managing almost the entire life of the community. The individualistic state exists nowhere on this globe, and the welfare of the community is becoming increasingly dependent on the efficient and honest governmental administration. The state has assumed the role of the governor of the machine of civilization and progress. "If our civilization fails", observes Prof. W.B. Donham, "it will be mainly because of a breakdown of the administration." Charles A. Beard rightly declared that "there is no subject more important than the subject of administration. The future of the civilized government and even, I think, of civilization itself rests upon our ability to develop a science and a philosophy and a practice of administration competent to discharge the functions of civilized society."¹

What the administration is called upon to do varies with people's expectations of what they should get from the government. Under the old conception of police state, the functions of the state were limited and confined, and the relation between the citizen and the administration was only that of a servant and the master. The citizens were simply silent recipients of orders and commands of the administrators, and no human relationship existed between the two. The administrators were held in great awe, and were regarded as intruders on the normal life of the people. The people also evinced little—rather negligible—interest in the administrative working of the state.

The rise of democracy has changed the old conception of police state, and replaced it by a newer conception of welfare state. Almost all the states in the modern world, irrespective of the forms of government they have, are busy building and sustaining that universal framework of social order within which the life of man may more freely and more fully develop

1. Quoted A. Lapawsky, *Administration*, p. 17.

itself.² This has led to a wider range of state activities. "With in the last century particularly, governments have taken up new types of obligations. It provides the working plant for the community; express and feeder highways; water, gas, electricity and other utilities; airfields and beacons; dams and irrigation works; establishments for the production of fissionable material. It seeks to protect the population against the hazards of disease, accident, dependency, unemployment, and old age. It facilitates the business of the people by providing the market news; opening up foreign markets, stabilizing production, educating producers, maintaining employment services and conciliating industrial disputes. It intervenes to protect relatively weak groups in the economic struggle; workers versus large employers; consumers versus monopolies; shippers versus railroads; investors versus brokers. It carries on research both for itself and its citizens."³

This change in the conception, as well as in the functions of the state, has necessitated a change in the administrative set-up, so as to conform and correlate it to the altered circumstances. The ever-growing activities of the state continue to burden the administration with more and more responsibilities and this process is bringing the administration nearer and closer to the public. The public have also become administratively conscious, and those 'silent recipients of commands' now refuse to accept things as they come to them. On the contrary, they have become extremely critical—though not co-operative—of every administrative action. This critical attitude on the part of the public has made the task of administrators all the more difficult. "On the one hand, his (administrator's) mandate is to conduct public affairs expeditiously, efficiently, economically; to carry out the will of the people as expressed in the legislative mandate under which he is acting and on the other hand it is equally the role of the public servant to make the citizen feel that his interest is being regarded."⁴ But this difficulty is not insurmountable. The only course that is required is the proper adjustment of public-official relations.

The cordiality of relation between the public and officials needs no emphasis. Shri Nehru, while addressing the Indian Institute of Public Administration last year, rightly remarked: "In any state, ultimately in any democratic state, if it is properly developed, or in any public welfare state, you have to remove the barriers between the administration and the so-called administered. The

2. Maciver, *The Modern State*, p. 149.

3. L.D. White, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, p. 5.

4. Prof. Charles S. Ascher, *Human Relations in Public Administration*, p. 5.

ultimate way to remove them is to make the administered themselves administrators..." And this association of ever larger number of people with the administration of the country—the breaking down of barriers between the administrators and the administered, and at the same time giving everybody a sense of working for common causes—is a good thing, good from many points of view.⁵ The officials should leave this wrong notion that they alone know, that others are ignorant and that they are what Laski called, "an oligarchy of specialists". This calls for human approach in administration. A good and competent administrator may only prove a 'flop', if he loses the human touch.

"Within the framework of Western civilization, two great systems of government administration have developed. One is the Anglo-American, based on a deep-seated preference for self-government, in local communities, wide citizen participation, decentralization of authority, well established responsibility of the administrative system to the legislative body and the responsibility of officials to the ordinary civil courts at the instance of private citizen. This system prevails in Great Britain, in the Dominions and in the U.S.A.

"The other is the French, derived like the Anglo-American from the middle ages and formulated by Napoleon, based on the concentration of executive power, on the dominance of national over local authorities, on the professionalization of the public service and its psychological separation from the body of citizens and on the responsibility of officials to a separate set of administrative courts. The French system prevails not only in the country of its origin, but also in Belgium, Holland, Spain, Italy, the Balkan states etc."⁶ The Russians and the Chinese have their own administrative systems, keeping in view their own form of government and national habits and preferences. The Anglo-American system is generally regarded as healthier and better for its decentralization and wider citizen participation.

India stands wedded to the conception of socialist pattern of society which, in a way, means bringing in evolutionary changes in the economic, social, and political structure of society with the ultimate purpose of promoting justice. "Not only this, it further means an order in which the sense of fellowship is stronger than individual self-seeking in which common interests predominate over like-interests and conflicting or competitive interests."⁷ This is a great departure from the old order of

5. I.I.P.A., *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the General Body*, 1960, p. 21.

6. L.D. White, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-6.

7. *The Tribune*, 31st July, 1961.

things and hence calls for greater efforts both on the part of officials and citizens to accomplish it. But the administrative machinery that we inherited from the predecessor government responds to the needs of a police state. The bureaucratic personnel and tendency at centralization during the foreign regime spread mass discontent and a fear complex in the governed. The machinery was inherently defective and designed for a different set of objectives. Extra responsibilities and newer tasks entrusted to our care and the changed political environment have clearly revealed the unsuitability of the old administrative set-up, and it is now admitted on all hands that something fundamental and far-reaching must be done for overhauling and re-organizing it to meet the needs of changed conditions. There is no doubt that our government is already re-orientating and reforming the administration but something vital is still needed.

With all the small and big changes that have been brought about in our administrative set-up, we must confess that we have not been able to enlist the hearty co-operation of the public. Where lies the fault—with the administration or with the administered?—is a question of vital importance. It is vital because democracy is ultimately the government by the people, and people must feel satisfied in it, and important because no administration is truly successful until the great body of citizens co-operate. There has developed a general apathy on the part of public towards our administration. The public, particularly the lower and middle classes, declare that the administration has failed to discharge its obligations and the distribution of favours still continues cementing our society. Everywhere in India there are complaints of corruption, slackness, inefficiency and of an ever-increasing number of people "that manage public affairs".⁸ The government has definitely failed to deal sternly with anti-social elements and to live up to its socialist professions, to convince the people that public funds are being judiciously and economically used, to provide honest and efficient administration and to suppress corruption. There has been corruption in the services is admitted by many responsible persons, though they also admit their helplessness in the matter. This helplessness is a great source of frustration to the people. The earlier we finish it, the better it is. How far the establishment of an Administrative Tribunal can help us is a polemic issue and I leave it to the readers to decide though I myself do not deny its indispensability.

Lethargy and red-tape were named as twin evils by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri in one of his recent addresses.⁹ Well, so far as these evils are concerned, these are practically universal in

8. *Indian Political Science Association Journal*, p. 79.
9. *The Tribune*, 2nd August, 1961.

nature. As Graham Wallas remarked: "The World is governed by pieces of paper" today and they take their own time to do the work. Need it to say that we should try to simplify our official procedures in the interest of expedient conduct of business? I need hardly emphasise here that much efforts are needed on the part of Ministers to start with.

But more important and urgent than the administrative changes is the moral purification of public life, the deterioration of which constitutes a standing danger to the very existence of democratic institutions and self-government. Rome fell prey to such a deterioration and collapsed. There is a necessity of changing the hearts both of the administrators and the citizens. The officials, whether in the higher or the lower ladder of the administration, should develop a sense of responsibility and moral conscientiousness and "the capacity to move with millions" whom they administer. "A wholesome public service is characterized by a high prestige, a positive morale and integrity"¹⁰ and these are the basic virtues which an entrant to the administration must possess. The citizens should also be made conscious of their responsibilities and duties which democracy and self-government place on their shoulders. This conscientiousness and realization on the part of citizens, I believe, can be easily infused through education. The people of this country have yet to show that they understand the implications of socialism and it is only through education that we can train the masses to develop real socialistic values. "Citizenship has been defined as the contribution of one's instructed judgment to the public good"¹¹ and it is this 'instructed judgment' which is most vitally needed in our country.

In any country and more so in a democratic country, the responsibility of good and honest administration rests on the citizens. But responsibility is a burden which most of us do not carry well, a duty we do not face courageously. To suggest to any elector that he is responsible for the administration of his country, might make him admit that the responsibility is more than he cares to accept, and that perhaps, after all, it would be better to have dictatorship and so ease his mind. It is, however, likely that he would reply that he left that sort of thing to Parliament; he might even express his attitude by saying that he helps to elect law-makers, he does not make laws. Faced with all the matters for which in theory he should be made accountable, the average voter might well recoil in alarm, and ask despairingly: "WHAT CAN I DO?"¹²

10. L.D. White, *op. cit.*, p. 450.
11. H.J. Laski, *Grammar of Politics*.
12. S.H. Cair, *The Responsible Citizen*, p. 10.

Let us consider these millions of "I's" in relation to democracy. Helplessly—"WHAT CAN I DO?" is a confession of failure. These millions are at once the reason and the purpose of government and they form the mathematical basis of democracy. It is these multitudes of "I's" whose helplessness is the cause of corruption and other vices in administration. Until these millions are "be up and doing" and ready to be honest in their duty, no purifier is likely to purify administration. Liberty will not descend to a people. The people must raise themselves to Liberty. Eternal vigilance is the price of Liberty and a sleeping man cannot eat a cake. Giving an account of the vigilance of citizens in the administrative working of America, White says: "There is a readiness to resist or ignore what is thought unreasonable and an appreciation that power can readily be blunted if it appears ridiculous or extreme. In areas where the action of masses is concerned, consent becomes essential; power without consent fades into nullity and frustration."¹³

In the huge task of building for the future, the role of citizens is dominating because it is only through them that any work can be successfully accomplished. They must contribute and participate because the sole responsibility rests on their shoulders. The administrators are simply helpers and advisers.

13. L.D. White, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

IV ADMINISTRATION AND THE CITIZEN

Paper by
D. P. GHAI

Introduction

Administration in general covers up organization, decentralisation, maintenance of law and order, co-ordination, control, recruitment, training and maintaining of efficiency.

Broadly speaking, administration means a machinery or the system for doing certain things. Now a question would arise: what things are most desirable to be done for the society or who should decide what things are to be done? In fact, in a hierarchical organization, delegation of power and responsibilities are devolved according to the status. There are some who are mainly responsible for making policy decisions, and then there are some who execute such decisions.

The conception of Executives first came to India from the time of the East India Company. The Board of Directors of this Company recruited people in England and sent them to India for managing the affairs of their Company according to the policies laid down by them. This legacy continued and we inherited the British system of having Civil Servants who would be outside the party politics. The political party in power may change, but the administrative personnel in civil service would continue in office.

Even after the achievement of Independence in 1947, the same system of administration continued. As it is, administration is the key to all planning. I would go even a little beyond that and would say that management and administration are at the centre of all human affairs, so to say, that all matters connected with the life of the community all matters which are formulated as policies, have to be translated into action and that is the proper field of management and administration.

Democratic Decentralization

Our country presents a clear-cut picture of democratic decentralization. The central administration has its own well-defined duties and responsibilities, the reason being that the Centre in our country is the centre of planning for the whole country,

formulating the policy and rendering all necessary financial assistance for the implementation of all projects and plans. Further, there are a hundred and one things which a citizen has to take up with somebody or the other in the government, and obviously it is the citizen who is the best judge to notice the progress and failure of the implemented policies and plans of the government.

On the whole, our present democratic set-up of administration has brought out considerable changes in the outlook of the British-sponsored official class towards the citizen, and the whole administrative machinery has become a part of the national framework. Also, experiments are being made of entrusting administrative chores to elected bodies of citizens like the village panchayats and the co-operatives. The aim is to create a closer link between the administration and the citizen.

Recruitment, Selection and Placement

The next question involved would be that of recruitment and training. With the shift of the police state to a welfare state, a definite increase in the number of administrative personnel has been noticed, and with the rapid growth of industries, it has all the more become obligatory to find suitable personnel for managing the growing concerns. The present dearth of competent personnel is being badly felt. Scientific methods of recruitment, therefore, is a "must".

Right from the educational institutions and the universities, proper training should be imparted according to the aptitudes of the students. Methods shall have to be devised for promoting to higher posts from the ranks. Departmental training will be equally necessary once proper type of personnel are recruited. For efficiency in administration, recruitment on the merit system should be the prime factor, and the conditions of work should be so created that the personnel remain contented with the conditions of work in order to get the best out of them.

Reliable methods of recruitment are essential for obtaining the services of a right man for the right job. It is unfortunately far more difficult to evolve reliable methods of recruitment of persons fitted for supervisory responsibilities than for manual or clerical work, since the qualifications required are generally less cut and dry and therefore difficult to estimate. Attempts to apply scientific principles to the recruitment of candidates for managerial positions have, however, been made.

A sound system of selection and placement is based on three interconnected functions of management, namely, recruitment of candidates for employment, study of jobs, and selection

procedures. These should normally be under the control of one person, who must be in a position to co-ordinate his work with other aspects of the organization's employment policies. Ordinarily, recruitment procedure should be laid out in the following manner:

- (a) Inviting of applications;
- (b) Filling up of employment forms by the candidates;
- (c) Screening of the filled up application forms by a competent impartial board;
- (d) Calling of suitable candidates for interview;
- (e) Proficiency tests—this could be either practical or theoretical;
- (f) Intelligence tests, aptitude and other psychological tests—the main idea of these tests is to reveal the candidate's natural ability and characteristics of temperament. These tests are more or less a "must" with the Defence Service personnel, viz., the army, the navy, and the air force;
- (g) Medical Examination; and
- (h) Testimonials.

Red-Tapism

The next point which the citizens have every reason to criticise about the administration is the delays involved in the transaction of business, which is generally known as red-tapism. For instance, in a business organization it is easier to get sanction for even a major project like sending a staff member to a foreign country for, say, purchases etc., but in a government organization even for getting taxi fare it takes days to get the sanction from the financial authorities, as a result of which work suffers.

If observed dispassionately, it will be admitted that the public business cannot ever be done at the same speed as private business. For instance, let us suppose that in a statutory research institution a research worker has to go from Ahmedabad to Calcutta for some research assignment. In the ordinary course he would be allowed to go by first class but for exigencies of work he is immediately allowed to proceed by air, thus saving six days of his valuable time in travel, whereas in a similar situation in a government organization under no circumstances he would be allowed to travel by air irrespective of the time involved. This shows the flexibility of private organizations over the government organizations. In a public enterprise, certain laid out rules and procedures have got to be observed and

care is always taken that whatever decision is arrived at must be fair and square. Now, in order to eliminate such delays, better men and better procedures are required. As previously discussed, we have seen that with better methods of recruitment and training better men could be procured. Secondly, more delegation of authority to the lower cadre of personnel will also help. This delegated authority is to be acted at the proper time and without any fear or favour. Further, we may have overlapping delegation of power dealing in one and the same case. A reduction in the number of this type of delegation will not only reduce the time taken to deal with a case but will also lead to a reduction in the total number of administrative personnel. This change will lead to an increase in efficiency though it may not correspondingly reduce the cost of administration since on the other hand we might have to increase the strength of decision-making personnel. Above all, the awareness of the sense of duty is another fundamental factor which is to be ingrained amongst the administrative personnel.

Characteristics of Poor and Good Administration

During the last 14 years of my experience of working for various public and private organizations, I have observed a few salient characteristics of poor and good administration. For example, in my opinion, it is a poor administration where one part of the organization does not know what is going on in the other. In other words, organizations where there is no integration and co-ordination of related works are bound to create confusion among their members. I would also consider it a poor organization where people are unaware of modern methods of administration or improvements except within certain professional limits; and lastly those organizations which consider planned programmes of development and training as expensive accomplishments and of doubtful value for their own people.

Here are some of the characteristics of a good administration. I would consider it a good organization where the structure, the roles and relationships of people are clear-cut, where new functions are carefully planned and implemented without disturbing the equilibrium of the organization; and lastly where emphasis is given to programmes of employee development as an essential part of effective administration.

Broadly speaking, a good administration centres around seven elements of management:

1. Planned objectives;
2. Well-balanced organization;
3. Sound policies and procedures;

4. Qualified personnel;
5. Adequate physical facilities;
6. Performance standard; and
7. Appraisal of results.

On-the-Job Training of Executives

Although formal education for the executives is a "must", but, then, it is not enough. An imaginative administration should insist that all its young and potential executives must participate in comprehensive training in the skills of management and leadership. To begin with, one may have some intensive training for the first line supervisors in terms of their responsibilities and duties in company policies and its objectives. It may include some emphasis on human relationships and how to get people to work together. For higher personnel, the training may include organization, planning, fiscal accounting public relations, and the legal aspects of administration.

Conclusion

In summary, it may be recalled that our government machinery has a very complicated set-up, that it is rigid and many times inflexible. The operations are slow and time-consuming, and many times efforts are very much duplicated. On the other hand, we see that change dominates the world of today. The environment in which the public and the private institutions work is dynamic. This clearly shows that the administrator of tomorrow must always be alert and capable of adapting himself to the challenges which these changes create, and he will be judged how efficiently he serves the day-to-day problems of the citizen.

V
ADMINISTRATION AND THE CITIZEN

Paper by
M. P. GOEL

The origin of administration can be traced right from the time when people lived in caves in small isolated groups. The type of administration then was as primitive as the life of the people. As we carefully look to its historical development, we would discover that administrative procedures were laid as per the requirements of the society. It is a fact, however, that to bring about a change in the structure of a society or the manner in which it is governed is rather difficult, as it requires a concerted effort on the part of those individuals who form the society, and the force that keeps the society going by way of administrative controls.

Let us glance at the history of our social progress right from the primitive age and the corresponding set-up of administrative controls then in vogue.

There was a time when an individual being physically superior would take the lead of some small groups. He by sheer force would get his orders carried out. This was administration by sword.

Later individuals being very clever took the lead by posing themselves as representatives of God, and people used to obey them blindly. This was administration by blind consent.

Gradually came the jagirdars, kings and nawabs who got themselves obeyed due to their might.

All these systems denote definite suppression of individuals and mass exploitation for the benefit of relatively a very few privileged people. These were very undesirable features of the then existing society and their administrative controls.

As the society progressed and men became more conscious of their rights, marked changes slowly manifested themselves. In a welfare state or a socialist state or a democratic state, based on either parliamentary or panchayati raj system, the administration has to be designed to assist the citizen in discharging his obligation towards the nation in an efficient and befitting manner. Any enduring society, any continuously productive industrial organization, must be grained upon a recognition of the motivating

desires of the individual and of the group. The association of the citizen with the administration and *vice versa* has to be well-knit for better and fuller understanding, so as to give a healthy growth followed by everlasting results.

In the recent past, we were ruled by the administrators which meant we had to obey them irrespective of our feelings. Then we were dependent on their charity, personal whims and fancies. Today, we depend on our own creative and productive efforts for the common benefit. It is a complete change in our thinking, attitude and working. The administration has to cope with this change, and has to guide the common efforts of all individuals who are possessed with a common desire to make their society a better place to live.

As such, we should not ignore any administrative set-up howsoever insignificant, it may be connected even with the smallest organization as it directly or indirectly affects the country and its citizens. It is just like the importance of even a small little screw in a giant machine the absence of which may render it unserviceable.

It is, therefore, desirable to view closely the various modes of administration usually present in a country with developing economy and as such linked up with each other.

- (i) Government administration associated with the sole purpose of implementing various policies laid by the Government.
- (ii) Government administration associated with the sole purpose of safeguarding the law of the land.
- (iii) Government, semi-government, or private administration (legally or socially recognised) associated with the purpose of producing wealth for the nation and assisting its citizen in meeting his daily needs.
- (iv) Government or miscellaneous administration associated with all such agencies which are meant to look after education, welfare, and conveniences of the citizen.

Of all the above administrations it is the third category, i.e., administration associated with the production of national wealth, that deserves maximum consideration and attention. Because, if the national wealth is not produced adequately, the necessity of other modes of administration may not arise and even if it did, such an administration was bound to be unstable. This, however, does not mean that the other types of administration could be neglected, but certainly they could be given a little lesser emphasis.

Now, we shall dwell upon those administrative set-ups which are associated with the purpose of producing national wealth. It is under this mode of administration that we come across maximum activity of an individual. It is a fact that each and every individual becomes more and more productive in a group situation when there is ample opportunity for individual expression and development.

If we study an organization, with due emphasis on its management principles, we will see clearly the relationship of administration and the citizen in a planned society. It is similarly pointed out by Mr. F.W. Taylor who says that "the fundamental principles of scientific management are applicable to all kinds of human activities—from our simplest individual acts to the work of our great corporations".

In a developing economy, where people of our country are determined to hammer out a political, industrial and economic order in which individual men—all men as individuals—should be capable of living and working in dignity, freedom and self-respect with an adequate opportunity for the realisation of their full potentialities as human beings—things could be done efficiently, if we had a proper approach to them.

It is the purpose of this paper to indicate how this approach should be devised so as to keep the basic principles of democracy intact, and infuse in our people a desire to give out their best for the production of national wealth more and more, which alone can solve all our problems for good. Broadly, we can serialize the basis of approach as:

(a) Proper human behaviour and human relations—We must realize now that we are talking to or negotiating with respectable citizens of a free country, and not slaves. We have to change and adjust ourselves accordingly. Normally, one may be a sympathetic, kind and understanding officer, but if situation demands one must not hesitate to be firm. It is just like a father trying to tackle his son by persuasion, love and affection, but even then should the child insist it may become imperative to punish him.

(b) Sincere and correct attitude towards fellow workmen to avoid distrust and to foster better feeling and mutual faith.—It is a matter of your correct and clear-cut approach towards the worker which may determine his attitude towards you. One must be genuinely sincere in ones approach and not a hypocrite. If you trust your worker he is very likely to repose all the faith in you, and that alone would create a proper understanding, nice and healthy atmosphere, quite congenial for efficient working.

(c) Simple organization to give each worker his due share of respect, responsibility and power—The structure of the present-day organizational set-up in our industries is rather flimsy and complex, resulting into delayed and uneven actions. I remember an expert remarking: "In India we have modern plants and machinery but manned by ancient people." This is a fact which is well illustrated by the production results of some of our modern industries. I offer a very simple organizational set-up for the learned consideration of this august body.

MANAGING DIRECTOR	(Rs. 2500/- p.m. fixed)
CHIEF (Head of a Deptt.)	(Rs. 1600-2000 p.m.)
DEPUTY CHIEF	(Rs. 1300-60-1600 p.m.)
SECTIONAL HEAD	(Rs. 900-50-1300 p.m.)
SECTION SUPERVISOR	(Rs. 590-30-800 + D.A. p.m.)
SKILLED TECHNICIAN	(Rs. 250-25-500 + D.A. p.m.)
SEMI-SKILLED TECHNICIAN	(Rs. 100-15-250 + D.A. p.m.)
NON-SKILLED LABOUR	(Rs. 75-5-100 + D.A. p.m.)

* In addition with enlarged welfare, educational and social benefits and amenities.

This set-up can well afford to give the worker due respect, responsibility and power. Respect begets respect, and responsibility makes you work. Authorities like Mary Parker Follett and Ordway Tead have elaborately emphasised the necessity of giving the worker his due.

Self-respecting, self-propelling, self-maturing individuals are those who make the most productive workers.

If we believe that what heightens self-respect increases efficiency—we should be on our guard here.

It is the assumption and attitude of responsibility that propels an individual to action.

Persons have to recognise obligations and responsibilities to productive and amicable collaboration.

It seems obvious that we should encourage all the 'power' which tends to increase pride in craft skill.

Interest, responsibility and power are indissoluble partners.

(d) Proper job specifications and selection standards for a uniform approach.—With all earnestness and sincerity of purpose

we must lay down proper job specifications and selection standards in addition to an all-India pattern for promotion and selection rules to be stuck to quite reasonably. It may not be out of place to cite an interesting analysis relating to this aspect of our industrial set-up. As an engineer in the industry, now for some time, I can say that there is not so much of dearth of technical personnel as is generally spoken of. Even if it may be there, the fault is entirely due to wrong approach. As people employed in public undertakings till recently were not allowed to apply elsewhere, this created an artificial gap in the sense that at some places there were engineers under-employed with all their experience and qualifications when at other places much less experienced engineers were very well employed. This motivated the 'flight of technical personnel' from public to private undertakings, since this did not require the applications to be forwarded through proper channel. Later, they returned to public undertakings with a bargaining position, because normally private undertakings pay very well to a suitably qualified and experienced engineer. Several such instances may be found by Dr. H.K. Paraniyappan, who has undertaken to study the various aspects of the 'flight of technical personnel' (*IIPA Newsletter*, May 1961).

(e) Good working conditions with maximum possible freedom to work, amenities and adequate welfare of workmen—Here, again we may quote extensively in favour of good working conditions, etc. The workers should be advised on the value of system in daily life as well as at the work place. There must be sufficient freedom for personal initiative and sharing in the results of such initiative.

(f) Commensurate salaries corresponding to our desire of evolving a socialist pattern of society—I doubt if anyone would feel otherwise about this aspect in particular, as it helps improving the general standards of living and create better citizens.

*(Illustrate organisation chart on page 71 with proposed pay scales.)

Equipped with this background we can reasonably say that an administrator has to be a good citizen first. And a good citizen is one who is conscious of common good—endeavours to help build a better society by his creative-cum-constructive effort. As his is not to be an isolated adventure, he should not think in a purely selfish manner because that is likely to affect his group effort.

Subsequently, an administrator is a guide, leader and controller of group efforts for some common goal. This would require a wholesome personality because sound leadership is now plainly dependent upon statesmanship—a statesmanship which

in its highest sense is a standard for measuring the conduct of those who have responsibility for the activities of other people.

The qualities of a successful officer are negotiating ability rather than highly developed capacity to command; the possession of a broad range of practical knowledge rather than specialized expertise in one field; patience and persistence rather than a tendency towards quick and fixed decisions; a willingness to remain in the background, rather than a desire for personal prominence, loyalty towards the policies and views of superiors. Such men can be found amongst good citizens; and in the conduct of administration they are invaluable.

ADMINISTRATION AND THE CITIZEN

Paper by

R. J. KOLHEKAR

So close is the relation between the administration and the citizen that as there cannot be a train without carriages and a family without the constituent members, there cannot also be an administration without the citizens—its indispensable constituents. Administration, thus, necessarily presupposes the citizens. Their relation is not only close but reciprocal. Administration, in fact, is a self-imposed and voluntarily constituted organ created by men for their well-being and welfare inherently, when they are otherwise engaged in their diverse personal pursuits and activities. It is entrusted with matters of general interest of the people tending to common good of all. It is thus a trustee, and a citizen is its beneficiary.

As an organisation constituted for the good of the community as a whole, an administration is, in essence, for the citizens and as such benefit and welfare of citizens is its fundamental function. All its activities, therefore, need to be so directed that they necessarily tend to the welfare of the people. The very word 'administer' connotes "giving" and "conferring". Those to whom the administration must "give" and "confer" the benefits, are the citizens, its beneficiaries.

Though the aim and object of an administration is to give and confer benefits on the people, there is such a mutual interrelation between the two that without their co-ordination and co-operation no administration can function smoothly and efficiently. Nay, the very success of administration, I should say, depends upon this co-operation and co-ordination.

The objective of an administration, thus, being to secure the fundamental rights of the citizens and look after the welfare of the society as a whole as well as its constituents, its activities must be planned and directed to attain the same. In order that it may be effectively and efficiently achieved, it is of utmost importance that every constituent also should help the administration with a singular sense of understanding, responsibility, and reciprocity.

Just as there is an obligation on the part of an administration to look after the welfare of the people, the people also have an

implicit obligation to behave in such a way as to help the administration in attaining its ideal.

It will be admitted that the administrative organ is inherently the creation of the society of citizens who, through a sense of safety and security, have entrusted to it the function of looking after their welfare and safeguarding and securing their rights. This eventually means that just as the administration has some definite duties and functions to perform in the interest of its citizens, the citizens also have some duties enjoined on them to help the organ in attaining its objective.

In practice, however, it is found that this outlook of a sense of responsibility and duty is entirely lost sight of by the citizen in his enthusiasm to insist on, enforce, and secure his individual rights and benefits. In the body politic an individual is so engrossed in his personal pursuits that he is entirely indifferent to and ignores his duties and responsibilities towards the administration which has to secure the fundamental rights of all the citizens and work for their common good and welfare. He even forgets for a while that he is a constituent of a society and has also to respect the rights of his fellowmen and must have regard for their welfare. By his selfish behaviour he thus impedes the smooth administration and indirectly defeats its object.

Instances are not wanting to show how the citizens themselves not only do not help the smooth functioning of an administration but impede and frustrate its working by their selfish and irresponsible conduct and behaviour. In everyday life, right from matters of personal hygiene and sanitation of the areas in which we live to the use of the public property managed by the administration, we find an absolute lack of sense of responsibility and duty in a large majority of the citizens. Few understand that this want of sense of duty and responsibility is in itself responsible for the unhygienic conditions of the localities, public nuisance and public inconvenience in areas in which they live. When even consequent on their own personal irresponsible behaviour people are confronted with public nuisance and inconvenience, they ultimately blame the administration for neglect of duty and raise a hue and cry against the administration, though the situation is more often a reaction of their own. Insanitation, public nuisance and inconvenience caused by loss of public property, like public taps and consequent waste of water as well as waste of public money in restoration of the lost property and damage of public property, are some of the very common instances of this want of sense of responsibility and regard for public property. Public use of public transport will also contribute numerous instances to prove this beyond doubt.

This irresponsible behaviour of the public has in fact its beginning in the very places where we learn our lessons in civics and civic sense in our early years. The education at this stage is more of a spoon-feeding nature and academic value, and does not seem to have any correlation with the actual practical life, either at school or outside. The environment around is equally sympathetic with the state of affairs. The sense of indiscipline and lack of civic sense in the right perspective have become more acute in the general public, with the result that we find profuse want of co-operation and co-ordination between the administration and the citizens. It is unfortunate that this trend is not invisible even in many concerned directly with the task of administration. It is, therefore, equally important that the administrators also should inculcate and cultivate amongst themselves a keen sense of duty, lacking miserably at all levels. Selfishness, nepotism, self-aggrandizement, corruption, and exploitation are conspicuously responsible for the want of confidence and respect in the citizens for the administration. Demoralisation of any kind thus needs to be seriously and ruthlessly discouraged and eradicated also on either side.

Being for a long time under a foreign rule and trained in discipline of civil disobedience for some time during our struggle for independence, we have perhaps unlearned many of the good ways of behaviour of the real "Ram Raj" of the "Epic Age", and have been very much accustomed to think of our own administration as "foreign" looking through a narrower outlook of party politics.

Introspection will convince that even after more than a decade of our independence we have really not progressed much, though we have always presumed to have done so. Shall we go on in this way? Shall we then stand still and fold our arms in despair? No. The thought should only stimulate and urge us to do what we can, to attain our ideal of "Ram Raj" and welfare state—our rosy ideal. How this lost outlook of a real sense of duty and responsibility is to be regained is, no doubt, a paramount question. The solution, however, is not very difficult to find, if we only introspect.

As constituents of a free nation, we must train our citizens in the art of civic life. Education of the people as a whole is, thus, a matter of primary and utmost importance. I do not want to say that literacy is now so much wanting in our country. Literacy and scholastic education are no doubt developing quite satisfactorily, but side by side with literacy and education of the children, there must also be an intensive effort at education of the people in general making them conscious of their rights as well as their responsibilities and duties towards their own people, of which the administration is a trustee.

With the modern means of propaganda, mass education of the people for making them conversant with their rights and conscious of their obligations towards the people as well as the administration is not at all difficult. We have to, and must necessarily, convert our public platform into a forum of civic education of the people. Our broadcasting centres and film industries, instead of being mere means of recreation and fraud as at present, with the objective of getting a money return for the treat, must now be utilised intensively and extensively as media of civic education of the public.

It will not be out of place to mention here that training of the administrators—I mean the people's elected representatives—in the art of administration and in the knowledge of the laws and working of the administration is also equally important and necessary, so that they may be in a position to discharge the trust imposed on them more efficiently.

This done, it is not at all difficult for us, to my mind, to regain our "LOST PARADISE OF RAM RAJ" and establish a real welfare state—our long-felt dream. We have the tradition of being the torch-bearers of a culture which has been a universally acknowledged characteristic of our country. What is really needed is a sincere urge in the direction on the part of all concerned.

VII
ADMINISTRATION AND THE CITIZEN

Paper by
C. L. SHARMA

I hail from an educational institution. We, as teacher-administrators, have come to realise that the administrative organization in schools should include, as part of our executive, the pupils themselves—the children that are administered should form an integral part of the administration. We respect the personality of the child, and endeavour to manage affairs in such a manner that he may not even for a moment feel alien to the authorities. We take him into confidence and try to sublimate his instincts rather than thwart his efforts. We trust him and give him responsible jobs.

With this I have introduced my topic, and now proceed to ask: "Do we have the same positive attitude everywhere in the country's administration?" and, "Is it not the right approach?" The principles of social and moral evolution have long been accepted to be different from those of the mere biological evolution. Man, as he rose from the beast, might have been goaded and guided by the physical checks and difficulties that nature put upon him, but as societies have formed and governments constituted he has been more and more fascinated by spiritual values. Along with the fulfilling of his biological needs, he has also learnt the value of love, sacrifice, justice, freedom, equity, equality and so on. He has come to realize the spark of that celestial fire within him, which is a source of true well-being and perfection. Evolution is the gradual unfolding of the inner grain in us, and, at the stage of man, this 'grain' best develops by creating a suitable environment for its growth and development, and not by modifying the 'grain' itself in meeting the demands of the environment. The 'self' in man becomes a 'value'. It has to be respected and upheld.

Review of Prevailing Conditions

Democracy in our country, as in others, has been a step in this direction, and it is a right step. But, in India, what we find is that we only have a half-hearted democracy. We give a right to the citizen by one hand and snatch it away by the other. We profess to be governed by the people, but in fact the people are only governed and not allowed to govern at all. Why else

should men sit on judgment over others and treat them as beasts—driving, cajoling and putting them behind the bars. Do not those, who govern in this country, regard the public as a set of scoundrels fitly to be curbed and coerced at each step? Do not yet they make laws only to catch and punish? We have not yet shaken off the old suppressive principles and traditions of government that seem to be with us as a legacy of the British rule. The British were foreigners and as such had objectives and aspirations very different from those that we should have as a free and democratic nation. The British administration was, of necessity, based on fear and distrust. Partly due to their psychological make-up and partly to gain certain political motives, the Britishers could never have faith in the Indians, and they infused them with the same attitude for purposes of administration. They, being born and brought up in a Darwinian atmosphere, thought it most efficacious to exploit the instinct of fear in man and rule by the rod. They did not mind the mortification of the soul within man,—rather they hardly believed in any soul in man—, and indulged in all sorts of suppressive and coercive activities. The undaunted spirits among the Indians startled and disappointed them on many an occasion, but, yet they trained their officers and law-makers to go by the primitive rule of 'check and punish'.

Positive Approach

I presume there is consensus of opinion on the point that such an administration is detrimental to a sound development of mind and character. Instead, if we have a positive approach, the citizens would develop to ennobling heights. In the place of fear and distrust, let us have faith and love. Let the administrators not be mere checkers of sin and crime, rather let them exploit the goodness in 'man'—the citizen. Let them not overawe and frighten the people under them; rather let them elevate the 'spirit' in them. Every man—citizen for the purpose of this paper—is a man first and a thief, a burglar, a rioter or a miscreant afterwards. So, let us attend to his first needs first. And if we have faith in the idea that man carries a spark of the Heavens within him, there is hardly any room for coercion and violence against him. On the contrary, he stands in need of love and positive guidance. Let him have the scope for his activities, good or evil, and let him develop into the dimensions of his own free choice. Let him not be afraid of the rod of the rulers. Let him not have obstacles in his path, save those that come by way of natural consequences. The laws of the country should help the 'good' in man rather than check the 'evil' in him. The laws thus framed should be put at the top of everything, and men should pass

through ordeals to follow them. The citizen, on his part, should respect 'the law of country' as he does the God within him. He should realize the God within him on an equal basis with others. Let him be the member of a 'Kingdom of ends'.

Difficulties

Such a scheme might seem utopian and impracticable in the world of today, if difficulties of implementation are left unconsidered and apprehensions go unheeded. Taking a lead on me, some one of you may stand and say that if the police are withdrawn from their checking operations, soon there will be broad daylight loot and murder at the corner of every street. To this I answer that 'broad daylight loot and murder' has not stopped in spite of our hundreds of years of police and their checks. Thefts and murders have their causes, which our punitive laws do little to check and stop. Most of them have a psychology behind them, and it is best to treat them psychologically. To be free of criminal violence, 'man' must be free of emotional stress and economic distress. Remove this stress, and this distress, and do not enhance any of them by putting checks and controls. Do not antagonise the spirit in man. Take him into confidence and sublimate the beast in him.

Some others of you may ask: "If there is none to examine our tickets in the trains, how long will it be before they go bankrupt and close down business?" Then, I will do well to remind that in some foreign countries newspaper stalls are left without sellers to receive and count the money, people come, deposit the price and have their papers, and yet none of these stalls has gone bankrupt so far. It is the national character that has to be raised through precept and example. Else, we may go on being vigilant and yet being deceived for an endless period of time.

Offences like trespassing, adultery, violence and riotism have their roots in primitive barbarism and ignorance of enlightened life and behaviour. Meet them with social and moral education in schools and by means of didactic shows, performances and journalism. Educate the masses in the forms of good behaviour and imbibe them with the spirit of love and tolerance. Bribery and adulteration in food and medicine are based on greed, and a false sense of the value of money and wealth. Honour the poor in money, place them even higher than the rich, if they have qualities otherwise useful and beneficial, and the evil of amassing and the craving for wealth will disappear, and with it offences connected with it will also be remedied.

You might yet accuse me of being all too theoretical in my paper and of having evaded practical suggestions to meet some

perplexing situations and, more so, of declining to prescribe specific duties to different constituents of the administration and the society in general. In response, I first hold that theory goes first and practice afterwards. Even the most bizarre pieces of art have had some crude thoughts behind them. Men have always thought first and acted only afterwards. Secondly, if the general principles are sound, specific ways and means can always be deduced from them without there ever being chances of going wrong or astray. It is foolish to judge rules by the results. Practice very often lags behind; but if we have to enable our practice we should not be reluctant to go on and on with our theories. Our basic assumptions being sound, it is reason alone which can immediately and by itself prescribe particular modes of conduct in the field of administration, or any other field for that matter. Our basic assumption in advocating and adopting a positive attitude in administration is that 'man is essentially good'. It is his environment and the circumstances that make him 'evil'. So, check and control the environment, mould the circumstances rather than suppress the 'person' and coerce the 'spirit'.

I do not claim to have put in this paper some very original and novel ideas. I believe, people already know and have faith in most of them. But, they also have doubt and apprehensions lurking somewhere in the recesses of their hearts. They have grave doubts about the practicability of such ideas. They are half-heartedly following them and putting them into practice. Therefore, I have simply reiterated my faith in the principles, and also illustrated certain positive measures to meet practical situations.

to
ed
in

ADMINISTRATION AND THE CITIZEN

Paper by

D. P. VERMA

It is contended that people living under different constitutional set-ups exhibit different attitudes towards the administration. According to Heine, monarchical populations instinctively trust their civil servants and repose faith in their qualities of head and heart. In republican countries, people instinctively mistrust power and regard their public servants with a certain degree of antipathy. "In these countries, authority is the enemy, always trying insidiously to capture new outposts."

Brian Chapman has rightly pointed out that a country's view of public administration reflects its underlying philosophy of society and the state. But a people's attitude to administration can also be conditioned by history and this is true to a great extent as far as our people and our administration are concerned. The modern structure of administration in India was built by the British during the course of their long rule over this country. Theirs was a despotic rule, the administration yielding enormous power in the interest of order and tranquillity only. Their concern was "to prevent war and domestic strife, to keep famine and pestilence at bay, to let wealth grow naturally in the hands of the people..." For all that this administration accomplished, it was not answerable to anyone in India. The traditions of public responsibility were not established during this long period when this steel-frame administration worked to preserve the British rule in this country. But it must be conceded, without the slightest hesitation, that the civil servants of those days—the administrators—did establish some of the highest traditions of honesty, efficiency, integrity, fair play, and justice; a clean and uncorrupt administrative machinery was one great boon bestowed by the British on us. Though the administrators of those days were exposed to the temptations of unbounded power, they more or less maintained high standard of integrity, efficiency and public virtue. However, the public services of those days were associated in people's mind with a concept of British despotism in India, and so a strong undercurrent of antagonism toward the administration ran across the length and breadth of this vast land. The British administrator in India was respected and feared, and admired for certain qualities of

character but as he represented a power-concept, people did not pin their faith in him for bringing a change for the better in their conditions. He was the symbol of the *status quo* and so a chasm between him and his subjects.

II

With Independence, the whole situation has changed; the subjects acquired the status of citizens, and this change called for a complete re-orientation of relationship between the people and the civil servants. The partition of the country resulted in a lot of administrative disorganisation, but, within a very short span of time, the new government was in a position to re-organise the major services; the cracks in the administrative structure were well filled; new cadres succeeded the old ones. The old order represented a rule from above by a selected aristocracy who believed they were acting disinterestedly for the general good. In the new set-up, the administrative services came to be socially broad-based. The higher services ceased to be the monopoly of the upper-middle and aristocratic classes. The Constitution guaranteed equality of opportunity to all citizens in matters relating to employment or appointment to any office under the state; it assured that no citizen shall, on grounds only of religion, race, caste, sex, descent, place of birth, residence or any of them be ineligible for, or discriminated against in respect of, any employment or office under the state. Thus, a larger section of the Indian citizens has come to be represented in our administrative services. This is a great advance from the previous position, and has perhaps been responsible for narrowing the gulf between the two. Though it is true that our administration, even in its higher cadres, represents the cross-section of Indian society, the ordinary citizen still looks at it with suspicion and distrust. The reason perhaps may be found in our very character. We are a traditionalist people. We viewed our old administrators as authoritarian bureaucrats, as "bara sahibs", as dispensers of mercy. This attitude, though greatly whittled down, still persists. The administrators, also being part of the same social set-up, stick on and cling fast to the old bureaucratic traditions laid down by their predecessors; a great majority of them exhibit aristocratic pretensions and a marked degree of ostentation. It is a pity that the modern Indian administrators do not regard themselves as ordinary citizens of the country. They continue to remain rather aloof, viewing themselves as guardians of the public interest. The past mystique remains, though the climate has changed. And so the distrust of authority.

Another peculiarity of our administrative system is that those who are engaged in the so-called public service are not enthused

by any idealism, by any thrill of reaching a goal. This may again be regarded as the hang-over from the previous regime. But the tendency to find excuses for our present ills, with a view to absolving ourselves, will not lead us anywhere. We should have the moral courage to own our faults, even though the past may have some bearing on them. First of all, our administrators lack faith in the democratic ideal itself. It is perhaps a wild charge. Can be! Working under a politically democratic set-up does not by itself mean that the 'engineers of administration' have imbibed the democratic spirit. It is only the ordinary citizen who can testify to their conduct—for it is the wearer who knows where the shoe pinches. If ever our civil servants were inspired by the high ideals which we have set before ourselves, we would never have heard any complaints of falling standards of administration, of lack of integrity, of corruptibility and the like. No goals are attained by dubious routes. Only a handful of individuals in our public life are inspired by, and aspire for, the realisation of democracy. In a democracy, individuals are regarded and dealt with as ends, and the dignity and worth of each individual is respected; a conscious and concerned effort is made to help him realise his personality to the full. It is hardly possible to believe that our civil servants, during the course of their public functions, are inspired by such thoughts. No one wishes the administrators to be doctrinaires. There are enough of these in this land of 'thinkers'. But, to experience the thrill of reaching a certain goal is something else, and the administration in India precisely lacks this thrill. The British and the French are proud of their services—maybe for different reasons. We have to cover a long way before we reach that stage.

III

There is a growing feeling among the citizens that our public services succumb to the group pressures, and that sometimes these are manipulated for party and private advantage. A feeling persists that our higher officers are easily accessible to men of influence and means. To a great extent it is true. If nothing else, this creates a valid suspicion in the mind of the common man that the privileged few in society can manoeuvre things to their own advantage. What has been said for justice is true for administration also. An administration should not only be just and impartial, but it should appear to be so. If the situation is to the contrary, people develop a cynical attitude toward it. Some such thing is being experienced in India today. As far as the charge of administration being manipulated for party advantage is concerned, there may not be much truth in it. But one thing is sure. Today's administrators lack that spirit of

fearlessness, of forthrightness, which their predecessors possessed. It is true that the Minister is responsible for policy formulation, and that the administration is concerned with the task of carrying out that policy. But, as students of Public Administration, we know all this is not so simple. Policy formulation and policy execution, these both call for a closer co-operation between the two halves of government. And today, particularly, the administrator plays a bigger part than that is ordinarily attributed to him and in the present conditions, it should be as it is. There is only one danger that lurks large here. If to further his own selfish ends, he takes on to appease his political master, right or wrong, the public interest will suffer. And such a phenomenon is not unusual in our country now. A bold and straightforward administrator, one who can take his stand, one who can speak his mind clearly before his superiors, is a definite watchdog of the interests of the people. But, perhaps, these days such qualities are not appreciated at higher quarters, and so our civil servants have come to practise the maxim: discretion is the better part of valour. This puts them firmly in the saddle and opens the door of better avenues for them. But the interest of the people demands that the civil servants must not be completely subordinate, and must resist political interference.

Our administration suffers from another drawback. It has failed to establish wide contacts with the people. The functioning of the Public Relations Department leaves much to be desired. It appears that those who are put at the head of these departments—particularly in the districts—lack any understanding of the way in which they are to fulfil their functions. Mere distribution of literature, issued from the headquarters, and the at random tours of villages to exhibit the newsreels produced by the government, and certain similar acts, do not bring the administration and the common man in closer contact with one another. These are sometimes taken for as mere propaganda. The real purpose of establishing contacts with people is that they should feel that they too are the participants in the common venture of reaching the goal that the society has set before itself. In our country, a complaint is usually made that people have developed the tendency to look to the government for even smaller things, and that they show a lack of initiative on their own part. True, but perhaps this is due to the fact that they find themselves to be mere spectators of all that is happening. The administration with its arrogant disposition has failed to take the people into confidence.

The role of the citizens is no longer limited to casting their vote every five years and then fading out of the picture. Today, it is being increasingly realised that the citizens must actively participate in the matters that concern them so intimately; only

by this can they ensure the administration to be efficient, and democracy to succeed. Departmental policies and programmes can be effectively worked if explained properly to the people concerned. Where the active co-operation of the people is needed, in, for example, B.C.G. Vaccination campaign, an effort to reduce railway and road accidents, production of more food and other crops, prevention of food adulteration, suppression of social evils like untouchability, dowry and others, and an effort to clear the slums, not only must the departmental aims and methods be properly explained to the people, but they should be persuaded to give proper response without which such programmes attain little success. As Robson points out: "The public should be kept regularly informed of what departments are doing—the results they have achieved, the difficulties they have encountered, the shortcomings they have experienced and also the mistakes they have made—frankness and the acknowledgement of error is a sign of strength, not of weakness."

The poor results in many of our welfare administrative activities are to be explained to this lack of co-ordination and co-operation between the citizens and the administration. Perhaps, democracy in its classical form still survives in our country.

The civil servants, on account of their high education and training, and the social status that they occupy, can really contribute a good deal to the removal of many a social ill from which a society like ours suffers. Take one typical example. The theory of administration harps on the tune that civil servants execute the policies laid down by the Ministers. In certain States of India, 'prohibition' has been introduced, and it is the intention of the Union as well as State Governments to extend it to the whole country. But most of our higher civil servants do not accept the tenets of this policy. We are not pronouncing any judgment on the soundness or otherwise of this policy, nor are we concerned with the conduct of many a civil servant who violates this law. We are merely pointing out the discrepancy between the policy and the conduct of those who are engaged in the administration of it. Law does not apply to the common man alone. If the civil servants remain outside the purview of such social laws, the people too devise means of escaping from them. Acceptance of dowry is another point that needs to be noticed. This is a widely prevalent social ill. And the higher the official status of a bachelor, the greater is the demand for 'bride-price'. Here the civil servants, by their own exemplary conduct, can exert a tremendous influence on the minds of the conservative and orthodox people. They can be the leaders of a great social revolution, making some abiding contribution to the society. The young administrators without making any fuss of

it, can certainly earn the society's gratitude. Young men know the black-spots in society, and they possess the instinct to improve matters; they can surely be the precursors of change.

IV

The theory of legislative responsibility of government is one of the fundamentals of parliamentary system. But the whole affair has considerably weakened—the initiative has almost slipped into the hands of the executive. According to many eminent thinkers, this situation has led to the rise of despotism. Even if it is not so, and even if the balance has not tilted in favour of the executive, as far as the citizens are concerned they feel quite sceptic about this concept of 'responsibility to the legislature'. And, why should administration's responsibility to the people travel through 'circuitous routes'? Why cannot it be direct and immediate? The administrators in the district, or its subdivisions, look up to the State headquarters; they feel that they are responsible only to authorities in the upper hierarchy. In their entire sphere of administrative activity, they come into closest touch with the people living there, but are not responsible to them. Their responsibility, in an ascending order, first reaches the top and thence it flows down. It is not being suggested that the districts become self-sufficing and autonomous units of administration. The plea only is that in the matter of implementing the policies of the government increasing and active association of the citizens should be secured, and this can become possible only when the administration at these levels is made responsible to the citizens. The old idea of governing or ruling should be obliterated from the minds of the administrators. They should feel to be partners in the common task of improving and enriching the life of the community.

In a democratic administration, feudalistic concepts should not find any place. During the British regime, the administrators, particularly the district officers, were flattered by the use of such terms as '*ma-baap*'. It was a matter of pride for them to be so regarded; they regarded it as a great tribute paid to them by their subjects. Today this '*ma-baap*' concept must disappear from our administrative scene. Most of our administrators in the districts perhaps still parade themselves before the people in the old role; the poor, innocent and illiterate villagers, and others are not conscious enough of the fundamental change that has taken place in the individual-state relationship in our country, particularly since the advent of the Republic. It is a pity to see the ignorant citizens appearing before the administrators, hands folded and half-bent presenting their petitions or grievances. The administrators assume the role of superior

beings, with some arrogance in their tones and pride in their eyes. At such a time, one wonders if the concept of popular sovereignty has any real meaning—more so in our country. Many a time our Prime Minister has told the people to conduct themselves in a dignified manner; he has shown his utter dislike for such habits as of touching the feet. Those who occupy high administrative positions can take a cue from this and help people in realising and understanding their status and position. The administrators have every right to expect the ordinary courtesies from those who come to them, but no more than that. The use of the words '*Hazoor*' and '*mai-baap*' and '*malik*' should be discouraged. These terms smack of slavery, of master-slave relationship. The administrators, by being helpful, can dispel the scare from the minds of the common and innocent citizens; the former can positively help the latter to develop a sense of self-confidence in themselves. Formalities are necessary in every sphere of life and more so in the administrative sphere, but helping the citizen to gain confidence is in no way contradictory to the observance of proper formalities. Here one more thing may be pointed out. The routine and outdated manner in which communications are addressed to the citizens also needs a good deal of change. This old style of addressing the citizens is no longer suited in the present context. The administration should address the free citizens with a great degree of politeness; harsh and authoritative temper of the communications is not conducive to the promotion of better understanding between the two.

Administration in India has earned a great reputation for providing secure and stable conditions, and this has been an asset to us, for we are engaged in the task of building a new social order. But, with every increase in the activities of the welfare state, the citizens are experiencing more and more of interference with their daily life. The growth of the social services inevitably leads to the growth of the bureaucratic machinery. The common man, who has to deal with a host of petty and big officials, fills innumerable forms and copes with a maze of laws, rules and regulations that continue changing every now and then, finds it extremely difficult to defend himself against abuse of power. There is a great need for devising some suitable machinery to protect the citizens against misuse of bureaucratic power. Complaints about abuse of authority are widespread. Public confidence has suffered a setback. It is high time that such a situation is not allowed to drift along. A democratic order and a clean administration must go hand in hand. People feel the need of an inexpensive institution in the Union, in the States and finally in the districts to which they can go with their genuine complaints against the authorities.

