

CHAPTER-I

CHAPTER-I

Bureaucracy: Theoretical Background, Origins and Evolution

(i) Concept of Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy is an idea as well as an embodiment of a structural arrangement. It has been defended as a necessity and at the same time vigorously condemned¹. As a result of controversies surrounding it bureaucracy, has come to mean different things to different people. To a layman it means the contribution of red tape, inefficiency and abuse of power in the contact of official client relationship within an organization or established structured setup. To a sociologist a bureaucratic organization is one which does not learn from its own mistake and repeats them often because of its static and inflexible nature. To a political scientist bureaucracy can mean a system of government where departmental officials at upper levels have these voices heard and given due consideration.².

Bureaucracy is not a new phenomenon. It existed in elaborate forms thousands of years ago in Egypt and Rome and in rather sophisticated forms in China and India in ancient times. With the dawn of modern era, the trend towards the process of bureaucratization had greatly accelerated.

In contemporary society, bureaucracy has become a dominant institution indeed; the institution that epitomizes the modern era³.

Today especially in the eyes of the uninitiated, the term continues to be one of abuse, even if it is in a mild intensity. Not so infrequently, this term is used in a derogatory sense and is supposed to connote mindless application of the letters of the rules without any compassion, judgement or empathy.

Bureaucracy has emerged as a dominant feature in the contemporary world. Virtually, everywhere in public or large private organizations, developed or developing nations, bureaucratic structures are the universal phenomenon. As Hans Rosenberg has rightly observed that, “for good or evil, as essential part of the present structure of government consist of its far-flung system of professionalized administration and its hierarchy of appointed officials upon whom society is thoroughly dependent. Whether we live under the most totalitarian despotism or in the most liberal democracy, we are governed to a considerable extent by a bureaucracy of some kind”⁴.

The term bureaucracy is being used with different meanings to signify different things. There is no precise definition of ‘bureaucracy’. It is used variously to identify an institution or a caste, a mode of

production, an ideology, a way of viewing and organizing society, a way of life, a social category etc. Taking into consideration the variety in its nature and ambiguity in meaning. It can rightly be considered as the most controversial word of our age. Abrahamsson, in order to explain this concept, takes the example from Nordic Folklore where one encounters the mythical being 'huldra', a beautiful young woman who tempts the forest wanderers to approach her and then suddenly vanishes by turning her back on them. He says that, in social sciences, the concept of bureaucracy has played a role similar to that of huldra fascinating and seductive, but evading capture at the very moment when the observer analyst believes he has grasped its true character⁵.

In a more traditional sense, the term 'bureaucracy' is derived from the Latin word 'bureau' which means 'desk' and Greek word 'cracy' which means 'rule'. Thus, it means desk rule or desk government. In French 'La Bure' means a cloth used on table of public authorities. From tablecloth, the table covered by cloth got the name 'bureau' later 'bureau' began to be used for the office room where table is kept. Thus, by 18th century the term began to be used to refer to a place where officials work. The suffix 'cratic, is derived from the Greek word which means 'rules'. Thus, 'bureaucracy' refers to rule by officials⁶.

A bureaucratic system is monastic with a single line of command and control. It is characterized by a hierarchy of superior and subordinate relations in which a person at the top assumes all authority and issues general orders to initiate actions. Orders reach to the lowest subordinates through a series of layers or rungs. A status and reward system closely follows these hierarchies⁷.

The Bureaucracy consists of paid officials serving in a government administrative department. These officials receive specialized knowledge of administration and they receive high salaries from the states governments. They are called public servants or Civil servants. It is the duty of a good civil servant to provide all amenities and help of every sort to the people. The public servants are called 'bureaucrats' because they follows rules and procedures two strictly⁸.

The modern state is a welfare state, which has to make an arrangement for education, health, housing and various others amenities for the people. With the expansion of the activities of the state, bureaucracy has also expanded the spheres of administration of a country depending upon the caliber and integrity of the bureaucracy. Actually, Bureaucracy is the professional class of technically skilled persons who

are organized in a hierarchical way and serve the state in an important manner⁹.

There is no doubt that bureaucracy plays an important role in modern government. The term bureaucracy is being increasingly used to denote the dominance of the civil service cadre. In all modern states the business of government is so complex that it is mostly managed by officials who have the knowledge and competence to handle problems and complicity of administration.

A bureaucracy is an activity by a group of officials arranged on the basis of activity to be performed in an accountable & responsible manner. It is a hierarchical chain organized vertically, disciplined and depending on the degree of centralization. In essence, Bureaucracy is a rational distribution of activities in which there is a complete authority to issue the command and in a manner lay down by the rules, written documents and files are important elements in Bureaucracy. Bureaucracy is a system, which induces officials to be methodical, prudent and disciplined, and whose behavior is highly reliable. The obligation of an office and the relationship among officials are impersonal.¹⁰

Definitions of Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy was originally conceived as negative or perverse concept. It was a Frenchman de Gurney, who first coined the term 'Bureaucracy' in the middle of the 18th century. It seems that de Gurney used the term in a criticizing tone. This is evident when he said that "officials are not appointed to perform public interests, but public interest is established so that offices might exist". The important conceptual innovation by de Gurney was identification of group of rules and method of governing¹¹.

Before we reach to an acceptable definition of the term, let us consider some of the definitions given by the eminent writers on the topic. In the words of H.J. Laski, "Bureaucracy" is a term usually applied to a system of Government, the control of which is so completely in the hands of few officials that their power jeopardizes the liberties of the ordinary citizens¹². Marshall E. Dimock identified Bureaucracy, "with institutions and large scale organization in society¹³".

According to Kingsley and Stahle, "Bureaucracy is characterized by a hierarchical administrative structure in which each official acts like a cog in complex machine. In this organization, nothing is left to change. All important relationships are defined in advance and the pyramid of

authority is divided horizontally into levels of responsibilities ¹⁴. However, amongst all, Martin Albow has given a comprehensive definition of the term. He has brought competing concept of bureaucracy under seven broad categories. Those are (as follows)

- (i) Bureaucracy as rational organization.
- (ii) Bureaucracy as organization efficiency.
- (iii) Bureaucracy as rule by officials.
- (iv) Bureaucracy as public administration.
- (v) Bureaucracy as administration by officials.
- (vi) Bureaucracy as the organization and,
- (vii) Bureaucracy as modern society.

The idea of the relationship was adopted by Max on whom Peter Balue comments, “Weber concerned Bureaucracy as social mechanism that tends towards the inefficiency and also as a form of social organization with special characteristics. Both these ideas cannot be a part of definition since the relationship between the attributes of social institutions and their consequences, is a question of empirical verification and not a matter of definition¹⁶. He goes on to define Bureaucracy as an organization that maximizes efficiency in administration.

Francis and Stone pointed out to the make of organization which is especially adapted to maintaining stability and efficiency in bodies that are large and complex. In the same way Peter Leonard called it a rational and clearly defined arrangement of activities, which are directed towards fulfilling the purpose of organization. The idea of efficiency has appealed to many people.

The concept of Bureaucracy as inefficient organization needs no scholarly treatment. Marshall Dimock has used the concept as the anti-thesis of administration vitality and managerial activity offer the growth of factors, which make it a hallmark of inefficiency viz (a) Big size (b) proliferation of rules (c) Group introversion (d) to great emphasis on age and security¹⁷. Inefficiency is inherent in the structure and functioning of big organization. The symptom includes over or emphasis devotion low precedent, lack of initiatives, proliferation of performance, duplication of work and departmentalization. Crosier in his book "the Bureaucratic phenomenon" describes it as behaviour by lending from its error.

Rule by official is said to be the original concept of bureaucracy. It was in this sense that deGourney and Mill called this bureau mania, an illness of Fiancé, which bids fair to play havoc with the people. He went to complain "the offices, the clerk, the secretaries the inspector, are not

appointed to benefit the public interests”, indeed the public interest appears to have been established so that officer might exist¹⁸. Democracy has been viewed not as a rule for the good of the people. In the scheme, bureaucracy is shown to be compatible with or even necessary to democracy. The concept, rule of officials has been extremely used. Herald Laski says, “Bureaucracy” is the term usually applied to a system of government. The control of which so completely in the hands of officials that their power jeopardizes the liberties of ordinary citizens¹⁹. A student of the French Civil service. S.R. Sharp called it the exercise of power by professional administration.

In his essay, “How Bureaucracy develop and Functions?” Arnold Brecht defines bureaucracy, “as government by officials²⁰. He separates two types, the legal right to give orders and the power to get something done. These two types of power are possessed wherever there are officials, they have these in small or big measures. At the heart of the government apparatus are the officials. Martin Albrow thinks that seeing public Administration in power complex is only a partial view.

Bureaucracy as an organizational structure was a Fascist’s programme which kept the state above the society. Hence the emphasis was upon the group discharging function rather than on the function

themselves. BF Heselitz emphasizing on the pressure group activity of bureaucracy has observed: A civil services is engaged in meeting the systematic goals of society as a whole. Bureaucratic apparatus is one of the institutions through which goal gratification activity is performed²¹.

The activities are not visible but the group is identifiable. Some authors have classified bureaucracy into classes such as: Caste bureaucracy, where the recruitment is confined to classes; Merit bureaucracy where the recruitment is through competitions. The French and the British have developed a deep sense of corporate identity and each in a striking manners several a correspondent between the character of bureaucracy and the political traditions of society.

Max Weber's concept of bureaucracy was confined to public administration, The idea of office, hierarchy, appointment, prestige, and social stratification are the central part of the concept of bureaucracy²². Riggs has analyzed public administration in a framework. He concludes that the idea of administration in accordance with the policies laid down by a legislature is too limited to industrial societies. He suggests a definition of public administrative system, as structure for allocating goods and services in a government. In the administration of the developing countries like India, bureaucrats are government officials. The

characteristics of complex and large administration are hierarchy of authority, rule system of records and specialization. But some authors have found bureaucracy as much outside as inside the government.

In common sense, it is normal to talk of any large organization. On bureaucracy, Tolcott Persons, in his "structure and process in modern societies, says, one of the most salient structural characteristics of such a society is the main part of relatively large scale organizations with specialized functions, what rather loosely tend to be called bureaucracy²³.

Bureaucrats and political executives are not much different. The institutions they control have the same behavioral pattern. James Burnham makes no distinction between bureaucrats and officials. The societies where the dominant working class having specified organizational role exists the whole structure may be seen as bureaucracy. Karl Mamherm has argued that change in the social structure in the twentieth century have made opposition of the concept of state and society outdated as he saw no differences between private and public organizations in respect of power, method of recruitment and public responsibility that is necessary in the whole structure at the same level. S.N. Eisenstadt makes a distinction between the growth of bureaucracy and bureaucratization of parts of environment. The growth of the organization involves in

bureaucratization of society and that is the necessary thing for society becoming bureaucracy²⁴. Some times the term is applied with an opprobrious connotation and symbolizes a man eminent for experience, knowledge, responsibilities and neutrality. The term bureaucracy is considered to be eager in usurping more and more power and encroaching upon individual liberty.

Harold Laski in an often-quoted passage adopted many features of the popular concepts as characteristics of the bureaucratic phenomenon which according to him basically derives from rule by officials, as he puts it.

“Bureaucracy is the term usually applied to a system of government, the control of which is so completely in the hands of officials, that their power jeopardizes the liberties of ordinary citizens. The characteristics of such a regime are a passion for routine in administration; the sacrifices of flexibility to rule, delay in the making of decision and a refusal to embark upon experiment. In extreme case the number of a bureaucracy may become a caste manipulating government to their own advantage²⁵ .

The Bureaucratic system was found in Prussia. The Prussian civil services constituted a distinct career like those of army and navy which had a rigid discipline and had adequate provisions for training and formed

separate and privileged class in society. In the nineteenth century British civil service was aristocratic in the sense that there were sharp distinctions between different grades of personal and it was not easy to rise from the lower to the higher grade. Democratic personal system was found in America. The American civil service by traditions has not been a profession. There was no rigidity about age limits and no preference to graduates of particular institutions.

MAX WEBER AND THE CONCEPT OF BUREAUCRACY

Max Weber (1864-1920) a German Sociologist was the first social scientist to have systematically studied the Bureaucracy²⁶. He provided a structural identification of the bureaucratic form of organization and discussed facets of its behaviors. In nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century, he drew the picture on studies of ancient Bureaucracy in Egypt, Germany, Rome and Europe. For his study, he used an ideal type approach. The ideal type is neither a description of reality nor a statement of normative preference²⁷. Max Weber was the first to observe and write on Bureaucracy, which developed in Germany during the 19th century. He considered them to be efficient, rational and honest, a big improvement

over the haphazard administration that they replaced. Weber saw that modern officialdom functioned according to six principles:-

1. Fixed and official jurisdictional areas, which are ordered by rules that is laws and administrative regulations.
2. Hierarchy and levels of graded authority where the lower offices are supervised by the higher ones.
3. Management is based on official documents.
4. The officials have thorough and expert training.
5. It requires the full time work of the officials.
6. Management follows rules²⁸.

From the perspective of the officials. Weber observed that office holding is a "Vocation" that it is a calling, requiring a prescribed course of training for a long period of time and having examinations which are a prerequisite for employment. He is to be loyal to the office he holds, not to a patron. By virtue of his position the officials enjoy high social esteem. The official is appointed by a superior official. He is not elected normally, he works for the agency for life. He receives a salary and pension when he retires. The official pursues a career within the Bureaucracy, moving up to more responsible positions according to his experience and ability²⁹.

According to Weber “A Bureaucracy established a relation between legally installed authorities and there are subordinate officials. Which is characterized by defined rights and duties, prescribed written regulation authority, relations between position which are ordered systematically appointment and promotion based on contractual agreement and regulated accordingly, technical training or experience as a normal condition of employment. Fixed monetary salaries, a strict separation of office and incumbent in the sense that the official does not own the means of administration and cannot appropriate the position and administrative work as full time occupation³⁰ .

Max Weber developed a typology of authority and distinguished three pure types, traditional, charismatic and legal. He regarded bureaucracy sustained, legal, and sanctified by purest type of exercise legal authority as the most effective form of organization. Bureaucracy is a form of organization, which has certain essential characteristics:

1. Separation of office and its incumbent.
2. Selection by merits.
3. The office is subject to discipline and control which performing his official work.
4. Hierarchy of offices.

5. Allocation of authority required to discharge these activities.
6. Strict adherence to rules etc.
7. Fixing remuneration of officials ³¹.

Further more, Weber himself says the present type of exercise of legal authority is that which employs a bureaucratic administrative staff, only the supreme chief of the organization occupies his position of authority by virtue of appropriation of elections or of having designated for the succession. But even his authority consists in a sphere of legal competence. The whole administrative staff under the supreme authority then consists in purest type of individual officials who are appointed and function according the following criteria.

1. They are personally free and subject to authority only with respect to their impersonal officials.
2. They are organized in clearly defined hierarchies of officials.
3. Each office has a clearly defined sphere of the competence in the legal sense.
4. The office is filled by a free contractual relationship. Thus in principles there are free selection.

5. Conditions are selected on the basis of technical qualification. In the most rational case this is tested by the examination, they are appointed not elected.
6. The office is treated at the role or at least the primary occupations of the incumbent.
7. The officials work is entirely separated from the ownership of the means of administration and without appropriation of his position.
8. They are rewarded by fixed salaries in money for the most part with a right to its pension only under certain circumstances does the employing authority specially in private organization have a right to make the appointment but the officials are always free to resign.
9. It constitutes a career. There is a system of promotion according to the seniority or to achievement or both promotions are depended on the judgment of superior.
10. They are subject to strict and systematic discipline and control in the conduct of the officers³².

Bureaucracy is rule conducted from a desk or office, i.e. by the preparation and dispatch of written documents or, these days, their electronic equivalents. The records of communications sent and received

are kept in office in files or archives are consulted in preparing new ones. It is the servant of government a means by which a monarchy, aristocracy, democracy or other forms of government rule. Those who invented this term wanted to suggest that the servant was trying to become the master. Weber is of course aware of this tendency; in fact he attacked the pretensions of the Prussian bureaucracy to be an objective and neutral servant of society, above politics and emphasized that every bureaucracy has interest of its own and connection with other social strata (especially among the upper classes). But formally and in theory the bureaucracy is merely a means and this is largely true also in practice: someone must provide policy direction and back the bureaucrats up with force³³.

In the Middle Ages the most effective kings ruled from horseback: they traveled round the country, armed, accompanied by armed men, and enforced their will. They were prepared, if necessary to enforce their will on their armed companions by personal combat, though their prestige was such that this was seldom required. Clerics accompanied the king also; i.e. clergy, who could read and write, who took along a chest containing records and writing material; the modern bureaucracy has evolved from this earlier practice. In modern countries, the rulers do not fight in person or travel round much. He or she rules by sending messages, through a

bureau. The messages were complied by the people as they are backed by force, by a staff of police or soldier. According to Weber the armies in the world have been bureaucratized in the past. While Napoleon had to watch his battle from horseback, the modern Generals communicate through modern ways of communication. Napoleon had once staff officers who galloped off with written message; the modern army has a general staff, who were in Weber's time regarded with pride. This was one of the key institutions of the German Empire and in Weber's term, it was bureaucracy. He also pointed out that, not only the government services but also political parties, churches, educational institutions, private businesses and many other institutions had bureaucracies. They all have a professional staff for keeping records and sending communications, which are regarded at least by other staff of the same institutions, as authoritative directives. Bureaucracies were found in ancient Egypt, ancient Rome and in the middle ages. Weber believes that bureaucracy is a pervasive feature of modern societies, ever growing in importance³⁴.

Weberian model of bureaucracy

Weber sets out an ideal type of bureaucracy, characterized by an elaborate hierarchical division of labour directed by explicit rules impersonally applied, staffed by full time life time professionals, who do

not in any sense own the means of administration or their jobs or the sources of their funds and line off a salary not from income derived directly from the performance of their jobs. These features are normally found in the public service in the offices of private firms, universities and so on³⁵.

Weber used the method of interpretative understanding for constructing ideal type. These are made use of for comparing complex events and processes. Weber placed his ideal type within a broader framework. He defined sociology as the study of social action. Within this context, power means the ability to enforce one's will on others despite resistance on their part. Authority means legitimate and regular use of power. Thus, the capacity to exercise control is justified and it appears to be fair. Various types of authorities are based on different types of social actions. The traditional authority may be patrimonial or feudal in nature. The charismatic authority has traits of a revolutionary leader as he changes everything in his own way³⁶.

Weber's Rational Bureaucracy

Since Weber was a German, he was very familiar with Moltke's development of the General Staff. Furthermore, Germany had been an early leader in developing a civil service. At the same time German

industry was beginning to adopt the organizational method developed in the United States. Surveying this scene; Weber attempted to isolate the elements common to all of these new organizational methods developed in the United States³⁷.

Weber points out that all these new large-scale organizations were similar in their bureaucracy. Today many of us regard bureaucracy as a dirty word, representing red tape, inefficiency and officiousness. Weber's purpose, however was to define the essential feature of new organizations and to indicate why these organizations. So much better than traditional ones. Let us examine the features that were found in bureaucracy³⁹.

For Weber the term bureaucracy was inseparable from the term rationality. Weber noted additional features of rational bureaucracies that are simple extension of the four just outlined. To ensure expert management appointments and promotions are based on merit rather than favoritism and those appointed treat their positions as full time primary careers³⁰. To ensure order in decision-making, business is conducted primarily through written rules, records and communications.

Weber's idea of functional specialization applies both to persons within an organization and to relation between larger units or divisions of the organization. We can see how this is applied to Swift & Co within a

Swift packing plant. Work was broken down into many special tasks and employees were assigned to one or a few such tasks including the tasks involved in coordinating the work of others. (Such coordination is called administration or management). Furthermore, Swift was separated into a number of divisions each specializing in one of the tasks in the elaborate process of bringing meat from the crunch to the consumers. Weber argued that such specialization is essential to rational division from another must be fixed by explicit rules regulations and procedures.

For Weber it was self evident that coordinating the divisions of large organizations requires clear lines of authority organized in a hierarchy. All employees in the organization must know who their Boss is? And each person should always respect the chain of command i.e people should give orders only to their own subordinates and receive orders only through their own immediate superiors. In this way , the people at the top can be sure that directives arrive where they are meant to go and know where responsibilities lie⁴⁰.

Furthermore hierarchical authority is required in bureaucracies so that highly trained experts can be properly used as managers. It does little good to train someone whose training is in advertising. Rational bureaucracies can be operated as Weber argued, only by developing

managers at all levels that have been selected and trained for their specific jobs. Persons picked up for top positions in bureaucracies are often rotated through many divisions of an organization to gain firsthand experience of the many problems that their future subordinates must face.

Finally, Weber stressed that rational bureaucracies must be managed in accordance with carefully developed rules and principles that can be learned and applied and that transactions and decisions must be recorded so that rules can be reviewed. Only with such rules and principles can the activities of hundreds of managers at different levels in the organization be predicted and coordinated⁴¹.

Characteristic of Bureaucracy

The last century saw the perfection of the bureaucracy a form of organization that has been enormously successful and is the result of thousands of years of trial and error evolution. Max Weber outlined the key characteristics of a bureaucracy. Modern officialdom functions in the following specific manner.

1. There is the principle of fixed and official jurisdictional spheres which are generally ordered by rules specified by laws or administration regulations.

- (a) The regular activities required for the purposes of the bureaucratically governed structure, are distributed in affixed way as official duties.
- (b) The authority to give the commands required for the discharge of these duties is distributed in a stable way and is strictly delimited by rules concerning the coercive means, physical, sacerdotal or otherwise which may be placed at the disposal of officials.
- (c) Methodical provision is made for the regular and continuous fulfillment of these duties and for the execution of the corresponding rights; only persons who have the generally regulated qualifications to serve are employed⁴².

In public and lawful government these three elements constitute bureaucratic authority. In private economic domination, they constitute bureaucratic management. Bureaucracy thus understood is fully developed in political and ecclesiastical communities only in the modern state, in the private economy only and in the most advanced institutions of capitalism. Permanent and public office authority with fixed jurisdiction is not the historical rule but rather the exception. This is not even in large political structures such as those of the ancient orient, the Germanic and

Mongolian empires of conquest or of many feudal structures of state. In all these cases the ruler executes the most important measures through *personal trustees, table companions or court servants*. Their commissions and authority are not precisely delimited and are temporarily called into being for each case.

2. The principles of office hierarchy and of levels of graded authority mean a firmly ordered system of super and subordination in which there is a supervision of the lower offices by the higher ones. Such a system offers to govern the possibility of appealing the decision of a lower office to its higher authority in a definitely regulated manner. With the full development of the bureaucratic type, the office hierarchy is monocratically organized. The principles of hierarchical office, authority found in all bureaucratic structure: in state and ecclesiastical structure, as well as in large party organizations and private enterprise. It does not matter for the character of bureaucracy whether its authority is called private or public.

When the principle of jurisdictional competency is fully carried through hierarchical subordination—at least in public office does not mean that the higher authority is simply authorized to take over the business of the lower. Indeed the opposite is the rule. Once established having

fulfilled its task an office tend to continue in existence and be held by another incumbent.

3. The management of the modern offices is based upon written documents, which are preserved in their original or draught form. There is therefore a staff of subaltern officials and scribes of all sorts. The body of officials actively engaged in a public office along with the respective apparatus of material implements and the files make up a bureau. In private enterprise the bureau is often called the office.

In principle the modern organization of the civil service separates the bureau from the private domicile of the officials and in general, bureaucracy segregates official activity as something distinct from the sphere of private life. Public monies and equipments are divorced from the private property of the officials. This condition everywhere is the product of a long development. Nowadays it is found in public as well as in private enterprises in the latter the principle extends even to the leading entrepreneur. In principle the executive office is separated from the household, business from private correspondence and business assets from private fortunes. The more consistently the modern type of business management has been carried through the more are these separations the

case⁴¹. The beginnings of this process are to be found as early as the middle ages.

It is the peculiarity of the modern entrepreneur that he conducts himself as the first official of his enterprise, in the same way in which the ruler of a specifically modern bureaucratic state spoke of himself as the first servants of the state. The idea that the bureau activities of the state are intrinsically different in character from the management of private. Economic offices is a continental European nation and by way of contrast is totally foreign to the American way.

4. Office management at least all specialized office management and such management its distinctly modern usually presupposes through and expert training. This increasingly holds for the modern executive and employee of private enterprises in the same manner as it holds for the state official.

5. When the office is fully developed official actively demands the full working capacity of the officials, irrespective of the fact that his obligatory time in the bureau may be firmly delimited. In normal case this is only the product of a long term development, in public as well as in private office. Formerly in all cases the normal state of affairs was reversed: official business was discharged as a secondary activity.

6. The management of the office follows general rules, which are more or less stable more or less exhaustive and which can be learned. Knowledge of these rules represents a special technical learning, which the official possesses. It involves jurisprudence or administrative or business management ⁴².

The reduction of modern office management to rules is deeply embedded in its very nature. The theory of modern public administration for instance assumes that the authority to order certain matters by commands given for each case but only to regulate the matters abstractly. This stands in extreme contrast to the regulation of all relationships through individual privileges and bestowals of favor, which is absolute by dominant in patrimonialism at least in so far as such relationships are not fixed by sacred tradition.

Public bureaucracy

Bureaucracy which is governmental in nature or public in general have a stake in it, is called public bureaucracy for eg. Government departments, public enterprises, government controlled universities etc. for a clear view of the public bureaucracy, private bureaucracy is required to be understood⁴⁵.

Private bureaucracy

Similarly bureaucracy which is private in nature or in which a single person, family or group of persons own and command the overall operation of the organization without the government playing any role in its organizational functioning is called private bureaucracy. For example MNCs well-organized NGOs church bureaucracies etc.

Public bureaucracy differs from private bureaucracy in the following ways:

- a) Public bureaucracy is less business like' and market based.
- b) Public bureaucracy is directly subject to political influence and pressure where as private bureaucracy is not.
- c) There is inevitably more of red taps in public bureaucracy than in private bureaucracy. Public bureaucracy is rigid, controlled by rules and regulations, which limit freedom of action, where as private bureaucracy is flexible in its operation.
- d) Public bureaucracy is more service oriented whereas private bureaucracy is profit oriented.

- e) Activities of public bureaucracy are mandated by constitutional; statutory or executive authority. Private bureaucracy enjoys a much larger measures of freedom of action and behaviors.
- f) Private bureaucracy has more freedom in personal administration elaborately drawn laws, rules and regulations, control personnel in public bureaucracy.
- g) Public bureaucracy is slow to adapt itself to quick change in the environment because of the complexity of the environmental factors, private bureaucracy is more quick to change.
- h) Public bureaucracy necessarily operates in a highly complex social economic and political environment, which makes it very difficult, sometimes nearly impossible to measure programmed effectiveness and organizational performance.
- i) Public bureaucracy is more pervasively subject to concern of ethics, social equity, justice, fair play etc. than private bureaucracy.

- j) Public bureaucracy is engaged in direct performance of activities which are critical for national survival and economic development underpinned by social justice⁴⁶.

These mentioned differences do not remain in isolation in their respective setting of public and private bureaucracies. Along with them also lie similarities between them and some of the thinkers like Henry Fayol, Mary parker, Follet and Urwick, are of the opinion that public and private administration (since public bureaucracy is associated with public administration and private bureaucracy with private administration) both pairs of them of kind⁴⁷. In his address to the second International Congress of Administrative Science, Fayol said:

“The meaning which I have given to the word administration and which has been generally adopted broadens considerably the field of administrative science it embraces not only the public séance, but also private enterprises of every size and description, of every form and every purpose. All undertakings request planning organization, command co-ordination and control and in order to function properly all must observe the same general principles. We are no longer confronted with several

administrative sciences, but with one which can be applied equally well to public and to private and top private affairs⁴⁸.”

There are many skills, techniques and procedures, which are common to both public as well as private bureaucracies. For example accounting statistics, office management and procedures, purchases, disposals and stocking etc. It is evident from the fact; that there is flow of personal from public bureaucracies to private bureaucracies, mostly after retirement and vice versa during nationalization, moreover in ancient times business practice and standards have exercised a profound influence upon public bureaucracies specially in matters like office management and running of the commercial enterprises. The whole idea of the public cooperation and companies is to import into public bureaucracy the organization and management of private bureaucracy like big business organization to have been influenced by governmental practice in such matters as staff welfare, superannuation benefit etc.⁴⁹.

There is a certain kind of hierarchy and administration set up both in public and private bureaucracies both have some kind of organizational structures, higher and lower status employee and both have clear demarcation of work, duties and responsibilities. In both the cases we find

that there are people who are responsible in taking policy decision while others, are there to implement them.

Both the branches of administration improve upon procedure and techniques to carry on research work and investigation simultaneously in order to become more effective and to know about the needs and necessities of the people, whom they are required to serve, carry on public relation functions.

However it has been contended by many that the concepts, managerial tools, skills and ideology of private administration may not be imported to public administration, as they are quite dissimilar.

The dissimilarities between public and private bureaucracies are not very insignificant. Indeed there are many that forcefully argue that there are more differences between small and large bureaucracies than between private and public bureaucracy. Also the character of private bureaucracy is no longer such as to distinguish it completely from public bureaucracy. The private component of private administration is seen to be decreasing, thereby narrowing the distance between private and public administration.

TYPES OF BUREAUCRACY:

In spite of its homogeneity, and at different point of tie in history, the bureaucracy has taken different shakes forms based upon social

economic influence. Each bureaucracy is likely to see itself as a type and to behave accordingly in broader outline; it is possible to distinguish at least, several types of bureaucracies depending on the predominance of certain characteristics. Bureaucracy is categorized into four types by Morstein Marx viz. Guardian Bureaucracy, Caste Bureaucracy, Patronage Bureaucracy and Merit Bureaucracy⁵⁰.

1.The Guardian Bureaucracy

The guardian bureaucracy may be defined as a scholastic officialdom twined in right conduct according to the classes". This type of bureaucracy regarded itself as custodian of public interest, independent, incorruptible and right on the one hand but authoritarian on the other. Plato's concepts of the philosopher king is & an example of the guardian bureaucracy such bureaucracy also existed in China before 960 AD and in Prussia between 1648 and 1740 AD. According to Plato, guardians were not simply meant to go about doing things as directed but most important was their capacity for; the essence of the public interest. In this sense they were meant to be custodians of the ideal and assumptions about justice and welfare that held together the city state. The social system of ancient china made its on first duty of each official to demonstrate to example of life, this was a matter of knowledge rather than a judgement. Therefore

bureaucracy was a scholastic officialdom trained in right conduct according to the classes rest on the highest organ of the government, the emperor⁵¹.

2. Caste Bureaucracy

This bureaucracy is the result of class connections of these in this recruitment is made only from one class or caste. An early example of caste bureaucracy can be found in the history of Roman Empire. The last Emperor was a forceful reform of government. The legal fiscal and administrative reforms introduced in between 289 and 304 AD. Enabled the Christian empire after him to line on. But his successors have shown the shadows rather than the substance. Eventually on all pervading public status system pulled down the entire economy⁵².

At first only the officialdom was affected by the spirit of caste. A precisely defined separation of functions degenerated in to a large scheme of ranks and titles, until in the ends of a vastly enlarged bureaucracy spent most of its time inventing and enforcing minister distinction in official standing. As time passed the conversion of private enterprises to public function extended across the entire body of society. The British rulers introduced the class characters in the Indian civil service as well. In ancient Indian, only Brahmins and Kashatriyas could become higher

officials In England, for example aristocratic classes were preferred to the civil service positions. The civil services during the early Roman Empire, Japanese civil services under Majic constitution, French civil services in 1950s are a few example of the caste bureaucracy.

3. Patronage Bureaucracy

Another kind of bureaucracy is patronage bureaucracy. This type of bureaucracy is also called 'spoils system' under this system the protégés of the politicians are nominated to the civil service. Its traditional development began from the U.S.A. and U.K. till the middle of the nineteenth century this type of civil service exists where the public jobs are given as a personal favour or political award. The patronage was an exercise of democracy. The patronage bureaucracy was a dangerously affecting instrument of government at a time, when government has been the instrument of free economy that it was of the most important that the government acquire the expert touch the patronage bureaucracy, stood condemned as an anarchism for its lack of technical competence, its in discipline, its erratic ways its want of spirit⁵³.

4. The Merit Bureaucracy

The merit bureaucracy is simpler than guardian, patronage and caste system. In this system recruitment is based on qualifications and is

governed by objective standards. In merit system intelligence is judged of the people. The merit bureaucracy is control as governed by objective standards specially by the principles of admission on the bases of prescribed qualifications as attested by the outcome of a written examination, thus most qualified and competent candidates having the chance to enter into the public service. They remain free from political pressure; particularly they are left free to devote themselves to the promotion of the common goods.

Therefore, the merit bureaucracy has its base on the merit of public officials and its own efficiency of the civil service. In other words this is an attempt to recruit the best men for the public service. This method is usually used in all civilized countries. Appointments to public service are no longer governed by class consideration. The civil servants in a modern democracy are really officials in the service of the people and are recruited on the basis of prescribed qualifications and tested objectively. The merit bureaucracy also draws compensation on the basis of a salary schedule, this amount concerned by each subordinate or for the various worthy causes including the local party organizations. In modern time merit bureaucracy puts stone emphasis on political control over the administrations system which was not the case in other of bureaucracy.

.This bureaucracy has a distinguished advantage over others due to its sense of rationality in administrative behaviour.⁵⁴

While concluding we may say that the importance of bureaucracy can not be discarded i.e. Only bureaucracy has established the foundation for the administration of a rational law concentually systematized on the basis of such enactment as the latter Roma Impirical period first created with a high degree of technical perfection. During the Middle Ages this law was received alone with the bureaucratization of legal administration with displacement of the old trial procedure which was hound to tradition by the traditionally trained and specialized experts.

MERITS OF BUREAUCRACY:

There are various merits of bureaucracy at the first place its contribution to governmental administration is not insignificant infact it has made administration more efficient rational impartial and consistent than was the case in the earlier time in the words of Herbert Morrison "Bureaucracy is the price of parliamentary democracy".

Generally speaking the merits of bureaucracy may be designed as below "

(1) Bureaucracy is efficient

It is helped by men and women who devote full time to their narrow specialties. They have developed a method which beyond question, is technically superior to administration by amateur or dabblers, bureaucrat have the background and know-how to get things done in modern world. There is the universe of large scale organization and centralized control that a money economy has helped to create everywhere.

(2) Bureaucracy is predictable

Since it proceeds from categorical rules and principles, operating from within a content of tight authoritarian discipline and hierarchical status top officials have every reason to expect that order will not be difficult to be carried out.

(3) Bureaucracy is Impersonal

To administer a modern institution is to be objective, not to be influenced by any primary group sentiments, to be emotionally blank. Suib due all personal and biases, at best all personal vagaries and biases, at best to approximate the impartiality of a judge on the bench and thus to be fair.

(4) Bureaucracy is fast

Uniformity of rules makes it possible for the modern administrators to process thousands of cases with general formulas. The speedy disposition of innumerable cases would be impossible if each one had to be considered on its individual merits⁵⁷.

Bureaucracy has both good and bad aspects, in fact it is not in itself a bad thing; some elements of its are indispensable. What is needed is to guard it against its characteristics, defects and to subject it to a continuous stream of instructed and effective criticism. Bureaucracy in brief has to be kept under control. Someone has remarked that Bureaucracy is like fire invaluable as a servant, ruinous when it becomes the master. So it has all the good and bad aspects. It is found in all the civilized countries.

DEMERITS OF BUREAUCRACY:

We can sum up the deficiencies of bureaucracy under the following heads:

1. Unresponsiveness

Bureaucracy is not usually responsive to the public needs. It follows its old standards and rarely reacts to the changing demands and environment. It regards itself a separate and the superior class and close

not recognize the proper relationship between the Governors and the government, which is an essential consciousness in bureaucracy tends to self importance. In the words of pfitter: "Routine procedures breed inflexibility, while a passion for accountability fosters legalism and delay. The officials of necessity becomes specialist, intellectually isolated, oriented towards, techniques rather than people⁵⁸". It also tends to develop a negative psychology perpetually prone to prohibitions. Owing to excessive routine and over emphasis on institutionalized activities the civil servants develop anti-pathies and become mentally myopic.

(2) Red-tapism

Unfortunately; red tape is usually associated with the Bureaucracy, which gives un-due emphasis to procedure through proper channel, and precedents. However, it must be conceded that for providing safety and control, red tapism to a reasonable limit is essential. Strict conformity to the established procedures and legal regulations is required by law of government. Though the prescribed produces are not in its self had put its blind attachment kills, efficiency for the case is decided on the old and out-dated precedent instead of merit. As Bayehot puts it. "It is an inevitable defect and bureaucrats will kill care more for routine than for

results⁵⁹. Or as Burks says, that they will think the substance of business not to be much more important than the forms of it⁶⁰.

(3) Departmentalism

Bureaucracy promotes the splitting of administrative units into further isolated units each pursuing its own ends without adequate coordination with the other. This approach to the problems by modern states is futile. The entries is one unit and pursue end ie. Welfare of the community. Exercise emphasis on departmentalism or fighting for ones own department is an evil.

(4) Self Perpetuating

In bureaucracy “officials make work for each other” and in this way their number steadily rises. As they consider themselves as a class they tend to multiply and expand their class. This necessitates the operation of Parkinson’s laws and makes the administration Hobby sluggish with great loss to public exchequer and an additional burden on the taxpayer. Men of lower caliber and poor quality come into administration and the whole system degenerates. Dilution of standards causes political and economic instability, demoralization and moral and intellectual decline.

(5) Conservationism

Excessive formality is an inherent virtue of bureaucracy which lessens their sense of judgement and initiative and makes them conservative. Their keenness to conform to rules makes them insensitive to the merits of the case.

Although these evils are inherent in bureaucracy but the term is very often used in derogatory sense. The term by itself does not have had connotation .There is the psychological background against this concept. The government as we say is a necessary evil, hence it requires that its rules are to be followed run through they are disliked some time memory of the past when despotism reigned supreme plays some parts in associating present day administrations with its historical evils. Red tanis is always to be disliked particularly when an enthusiastic public servant goes beyond his jurisdiction in promoting public interest and legislature pushed into the background, it is also disliked and desisted by the public. Nobody questions the importance of administration. But that is not all other branches of the government are also important.

There are certain remedies that can cure the evils of bureaucracy if they are applied effectively such as effective political control, decentralization of authority, integration of civil servants in the society, non-official participation in administration etc. Similarly from top to

horror the administration must be given a democratic popular orientation⁶¹.

To sum up we may say that the importance of bureaucracy can not be discarded i.e. only bureaucracy has established the foundation for the administration of rational law conceptually systematized on the basis of such enactments as in the latest roman empirical period first created with a high degree of technical perfection.

During the middle Ages this law was received along with the bureaucratization of legal administration with displacement of the old trial procedure which was bound to tradition by the traditionally trained and specialized experts.

REFERENCES

- (1) Mohammad Mohabbat Khan, "Bureaucracy; theoretical Background Development," Indian Journal of Public Administration, Vol.23-1977 p.218.
- (2) Ibid, p.219.
- (3) Peter, Balu and Marshall W. Maryar, Bureaucracy in Modern Society, New York, Rendom House, 1971,p.10.
- (4) Kyrgic, Martin, State and Bureaucracy in Europe, "in Kamenka Eugene and Kyrgic Martin (ed), The Careero of a concept (New Delhi; Arnold Heineman Publisher, 1979) p.1.
- (5) Abrahameson, B. Bureaucracy or Participation: The Logic or organization (London: Saga publication 1977) p.17.
- (6) Fadia, B.L. and Fadia, K. Public Administration: Administration Theories and Concepts, (New Delhi, Sahitya Bhawan Publiication, 1977) p.344-45 see also International Encyclopedia of social Sciences Vol.12, p.206.
- (7) Nayar, K.B. Leadership Bureaucracy and Planning in India, (New Delhi, 1972). P.17.
- (8) Johri, J.C. Comparative Politics, (New Delhi, Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd. 1972) p.556.

-
- (9) Ibid. ,P.556-557.
- (10) Verma, R.S. Bureaucracy in India, (Bhopal, Progress Publisher, 1973) p.3.
- (11) Fadia, B.L. and Fadia, K. Public Administration: Administration theories and Concepts, (New Delhi, Satiya Bhawan Publication; 1997) p. 344.
- (12) Lapawskey, Albert. Administration and Management (New Delhi, Oxford and I.B.H. Publishing Co., 1960) p.186.
- (13) Ibid. pp.191-92.
- (14) Nasir S.A. Theory and practice of public Administration with special reference to India, (Aligarh, 1970) p.72.
- (15) Mira, B.B. The Bureaucracy in India: A historical Analysis of Development up to 1947, (Delhi, Oxford Univ. Press, 1977)p.9.
- (16) Verma, R.S. Bureaucracy in India, (Bhopal, Progress Publishers, 1973) p.5-6.
- See also Martin Albrow, Bureaucracy, (London, 1978) pp.43-45.
- (17) Ibid.
- (18) Martin, Albrow. Bureaucracy. (London, 1978) pp. 43-45.
- (19) Frederic, Austin ogg. English government and Politics, (New York, 1947) pp 202-203.

-
- (20) Ibid. p.204.
 - (21) Verma, R.S. Bureaucracy in India, (Bhopal progress Publishers, 1973) p.25.
 - (22) Max, Weber. Essay on sociology, and edited with an introduction by H.H. Greth and Mills C, Wright, (London, 1948) p.160.
 - (23) Tolcott, Parsons. Structure and Process in Modern Societies, (London, 1948) p.160.
 - (24) Martin, Albrow. Bureaucracy, (London, 1978) p.47.
 - (25) Martin, B.B. The Bureaucracy in India: A Historical Analysis of Development up to 1947, (Delhi, Oxford Univ. Press, 1977) pp 9-10.
 - (26) Singh, J. "Effectiveness of Bureaucracy" Indian Journal of Public Administration, Vol. 46, No.1-4.
 - (27) Martin Albrow. Bureaucracy, (London, 1978).
 - (28) Singh, J. "Effectiveness of Bureaucracy" Indian journal of Public Administration, Vol. 46 . No.1-4.
 - (29) Avasthi, A. & Maheswari, S. Public Administration (Agra, Educational Publishers, 1962)pp 267-270.

-
- (30) Anuradha, Balram. "Weberian Model of Bureaucracy: The Best fit/Misfit for Development Administration, Indian journal of Public Administration, Vol.46-2000 No.1-4.
- (31) Johari, J.C. Comparative Politics, (New Delhi Starting Publication Pvt. Ltd 1972) pp. 557-558.
- (32) Max, Weber. Characteristic of Bureaucracy, *Wirtschaft and Gesellschaft*; part III, Chap, 6-pp. 650-78.
- (33) Max, Weber. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, edited with an introduction by Talcott parsons; New York, The Free Press, 1947, p.152.
- (34) Chaudhuary, Mustafa. "Weber's Ideal type of Bureaucrcy", Vol.3-1984, p.177.
- (35) Ibid.p.177.
- (36) Gerth, H.H. & Mills, C.W. (trans and ed.) from Max Weber; *Essay in Sociology*, Oxford University press, 1946, p.246.
- (37) Philip, Selznick. "Foundations of the Theory of organizations", New York, Holt Rinehart, Winston, 1961 p.23.
- (38) Ibid., p.25.
- (39) Weber, M. "From Max Weber: *Essay Sociology, 1947*" , H. Gerth & C.W. Mills Routledge & Kegan Paul, Chap. VIII.

- (40) Ibid.
- (41) Peter, M. Blau and Scott, W.R. Formal organization: A comparative Approach San Fransico, Chandler, 1962, p.33.
- (42) Max, Weber. Characteristics of Bureaucracy, Wirtschaft and Gesellschaft, part III Chap 6, pp.650-78.
- (43) Ibid.
- (44) Ibid.
- (45) Shriram, Mahewari. Administrative Theory ; An Introduction, New Delhi, 1998, pp.27-30.
- (46) Fadia, B.L., and Kildip, Public Administrative Theories and concept, Agra 1997, p.31.
- (47) Fayol, Henry. General and Industrial Management, London, 1957.
- (48) Ibid.
- (49) Ayubi, N. N. The State and Public policies in Egypt sice Sadat, Ithaca press, 1991.
- (50) Mortin,M. F. The Administrative state: An Introduction to Bureàucracy, Chicicago: University of Chicicago Press, 1957, pp.54-72.

-
- (51) Marx, F.M. (ed., Elements of public Administration, New Delhi, 1964, pp.60-61.
 - (52) Paul H, Appleby. Report of the Survey, New Delhi, Government of India, 1953 p.4.
 - (53) Max, F.M. (ed;) The Administrative state, London; 1957, p.55.
 - (54) Henderson. A.M. and Talcott, persons. the theory of social and Political Organization, London, 1946, pp.331-335.
 - (55) Shriram, Mahashwari. Administrative Theory: An Introduction, New Delhi, 1998, pp 113-15.
 - (56) Morison, Herbert. speech in the house of Commons, London, Problem of National Industries, 1956, p.82.
 - (57) Max, Weber. Essay in Sociology, New York, Oxford University Press, 1958, p.16.
 - (58) Pfiffner, J.M. Public Administration, New York, 1961,p.65.
 - (59) Ibid.p.66.
 - (60) Ibid:.
 - (61) Gupta, Bhupesh B. Bureaucracy, Needs, Shock, Tratment New Age (N. Delhi), Vol.34, No.1, Jan-June, 1976, p.6.