

FOURTH SEMESTER (Major)

Unit III - Development Administration

GU Syllabus Structure of the Unit

- Concept of Development Administration
- Contribution of Fred W Riggs
- Bureaucracy and Development

Organisation of Conceptual Notes (CN)

- 1) Concept of Development Administration (CN-1)
 - Background
 - Origin of the Sub-Discipline
 - Meaning and Scope of Development Administration
- 2) Contribution of Fred W. Riggs-I (CN-2)
 - Evolution of his idea
 - Structure of Riggs Argument
 - *Agraria, Industria and Transitia*
- 3) Fred Riggs-II (CN-3)
 - Fused Societies
 - Prismatic Societies, and
 - Diffracted Societies
- 4) Fred Riggs-III (CN-4)
 - Sala Model
 - Bazar-Canteen Model
 - Summary
- 5) Bureaucracy and Development (CN-5)
 - Understanding Bureaucracy
 - The Needs of Development
 - Bureaucratic Traits Necessary for Development
- 6) Bureaucracy and Development: The Indian Experience (CN-6)
 - The Indian Condition
 - The Functioning of Indian Bureaucracy
 - Its Critiques

N.B. These notes will be further updated with the availability of new sources.

CONCEPTUAL NOTES - 1

Background

The emergence of development administration as a sub-discipline of public administration roughly coincides with that of development economics in the discipline of economics. Both ideational and material conditions led to their emergence. Ideationally, the emergence of Keynesian economics in the aftermath of the Great Depression led to a period of welfare capitalism in the western world. This marked a significant departure from the previous *Laissez Faire* model which restricted the role of the state only to maintenance of law and order and preservation of contracts signed. Welfare capitalism significantly broadened the role of the state beyond its traditionally assigned role to areas of public welfare. As a consequence, the notion of BIG GOVERNMENTS emerged. Faith on Big Governments were not unfounded, as states played critical role in the rebuilding of war devastated Europe through expanded public works (Esman 1988).

Materially, it was the emergence of independent states, more specifically in the continents of Asia and Africa¹ that led to the growth of development administration (and development economics). These erstwhile colonial countries almost uniformly shared similar socio-economic and political structures. For these countries, if growth and development² became a buzzword in the economic realm, modernisation became the buzzword in the social and political realm. Modernisation of the socio-economic structures necessitated active intervention of the state to transform these structures. As a result, the administrative machinery of these new states were mandated to adopt policies, programmes, and strategies to transform structural rigidities within the society and economy through enhanced administrative intervention.

Material conditions were also provided by the dependent countries of Latin America. Though independent in the nineteenth century, the entire Latin American region remained dependent on the markets of Europe and North America for their economic survival. In fact, many countries converted themselves into mono export economies, thereby increasing their dependence on Europe and the US. As a consequence, dependent socio-economic structures crept up. The 'Dependency School' argued that economic dependency has led to loss of political autonomy for many Latin America countries. The emergence of development administration, it was expected,

¹ Some textbooks also include Latin America as the third continent where new countries emerged after the Second World War. But as a matter of historical fact, almost all Latin American counties, as we know them today, became independent in the 19th century itself. One of the important factor being that the colonising countries of Iberian Peninsula, namely Spain and Portugal, were too weak both economically and militarily to keep their colonies in the new world intact. What was similar, however, among most Latin American countries with that of the newly emergent post WW-II independent countries was their socio-economic and political structures.

² The concept of development itself has undergone significant change since its inception. From 'trickle down' to enhancing 'human capabilities', the concept has expanded widely to accommodate new areas. What has not changed, however, is the perception that economic growth should precede all other concerns of development.

would enable these countries to transform their dependent structures and make their societies, politically and economically independent.

However, experiences of the above mentioned countries varied significantly. Countries which were able to place more efficient administrative structures paced ahead with economic growth whereas those who failed to reform their administrative apparatus were on the verge of being categorised as 'failed states' by the early 21st century. Within this broad continuum, the Indian administrative structure occupies a middle ground as more than sixty years of planning led to the creation of a burgeoning administrative apparatus that have facilitated India's socio-economic transformation, yet much more needs to be achieved.

Origin of the Sub-Discipline

The emergence of development administration is closely tied to the formation of Comparative Administrative Group (CAG) of 1963. Noted scholars associated with this group like John Montgomery, Ferrel Heady, Fred W Riggs and others, laid the basis for the emergence of development administration through their comparative analyses. The group operated with the three broad objectives of : a) encouraging research and b) encouraging teaching in comparative public administration, and c) formulating policy in the field of development administration (Avasthi and Maheshwari 2017: 79). Emphasis on the third objective that led to the emergence of development administration. Moreover, attempts made by the newly formed independent countries towards modernisation and industrialisation provided the empirical testing points for comparative analysis.

Meaning and Scope of Development Administration

The term development administration is used in a dual sense: a) enhancing the capabilities of the administrative structure, and b) administering development programmes. Both these sense are best expressed in Jean Claude Garcia Zamor's words, who defined it (development administration) as, "...the bureaucratic process that facilitates or stimulates the achievement of socio-economic progress through the utilisation of talents and expertise of bureaucrats. It involves the mobilisation of bureaucratic skills for speeding up the development process" (Zamor 1973, quoted in Avasthi and Maheshwari 2017: 86).

Increasing structural capabilities involve enhancing "...administrative capacity and the skills in such areas as personal, finance, accounting, management, taxation, and organisational development for carrying out development plans and achieving development goals in rural and urban areas" (Farazmand 2001: 16). And administering development implies "...carrying out planned change in the economy (agriculture, industry or capital infrastructure) and to a lesser extent in the social services, especially health and education" (Montgomery 1966, quoted in Avasthi and Maheshwari 2017: 86). However, Montgomery's explanation requires a qualifying remark. The

state's intervention in the social sector may not be limited to health and education, For instance, in India, an elaborate system of food distribution programme, to ensure food security, has been developed, and consumer goods like subsidised kerosene and cylinders are also provided to the people.

As is evident from the discussion above, the sub-discipline of development administration emerged as a tool to redress the socio-economic ills that afflicted transitioning or developing countries. As a consequence, it has significantly broadened the horizon of public administration. The following paragraphs covers three broad areas of development administration:

- A) Modernisation of the Economy: The economy was sought to be modernised through an accelerated rate of industrialisation. In the second five year plan, under the tutelage of P.C. Mahalanobis, India embarked upon a path of big projects, building big dams and industries, the latter being termed by Nehru as “temples of modern India”. Reducing dependence on agriculture, diversifying the country's economy, achieving self-sufficiency in capital goods, creating forward linkages with small and medium industries etc. were some of the primary objectives of this industrialisation programme. Embarking upon industrialisation at such a grand scale through the public sector, as the private sector was still at its nascent stage, necessitated the setting up of an elaborate administrative structure which was geared to achieving these economic goals. Development Administration became the tool for achieving this economic transformation.
- B) Modernisation of the Society: Another herculean task before development administration was to bring about societal change. Social change can be introduced either through non-interventionist or through interventionist routes. Most of the western world were able to modernise through the non-interventionist route, i.e. through gradual inter-related processes of modernity where the state played a minimal role. But the newly emergent countries of Asia and Africa did not have the luxury of time. To keep pace with the rest of the world, they required faster societal transformation which was possible only with the active intervention of the state, as the traditional structure continued to resist change. To drive the point home, an example from India could be cited. Soon after assuming power in 2014, the child and family welfare ministry of the NDA government has to launch a programme for the protection and welfare of the female-child in India, succinctly captured in its slogan ‘Beti Bachao, Beti Padhao’. The slogan captures two social evils which continue to afflict Indian society. The first is that of ‘female infanticide’ leading to the broader societal problem of ‘Missing Women in India’³ (Sen 1992). The second is that of depriving female child the right to education, especially in the rural areas, as they are supposed to work indoors and help in household cores. The dismantling of such, what some

³ For further elaboration please refer to Amartya Sen (1998). For a new appraisal of Sen's view please see Klasen, Stephan and Claudia Wink (2003), “Missing Women: Revisiting the Debate”, *Feminist Economics*, 9(2-3): 263-299. This problem, however, is not unique to India. Many Asian societies exhibit strong bias towards the male child, which include, Chinese and Japanese societies among others.

social scientist calls, moth-eaten ideas require active intervention on the part of the state. Again it is only through an active and assertive administrative apparatus that these changes could be made possible.

- C) Modernisation of the Administrative structure: Modernisation of the administrative structure would entail recruitment of personnel on meritorious basis through a competitive and transparent process. Provision of training programme for both new and old recruits. Their proper allocation among various departmental units and making the best use of their administrative skills (Avasthi and Maheshwari 2017: 90). In this regard, the principles of POSDCORB should act as the guiding light. Besides, as the scope of development administration covers broader socio-economic aspects, there should be continuous innovation both at the level of policy formulation and policy execution. Innovative methods and programmes are more desirable at the level of implementation as they would provide ways and means to engage with the public more productively and also facilitate greater co-ordination among the administration and the people.

References:

- Avasthi, Amreshwar and Shriram Maheshwari (1962), *Public Administration*, Agra: Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, reprinted 2017.
- Esman, Milton J. (1988), "The Maturing of Development Administration", *Public Administration and Development*, 8: 125-134.
- Farazmand, Ali (2001), "Comparative and Development Public Administration: Past, Present and Future" in Ali Farazmand (ed) *Handbook of Comparative and Development Public Administration*, New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Montgomery, J. (1966), *Approaches to Development*. Quoted in Avasthi and Maheshwari (2017), *Public Administration*, Agra: Lakshmi Narain Agarwal.
- Sen, A K (1992), "Missing Women", *British Medical Journal*, 304: 587-588.
- Zamor, Jean Claude Garcia (1973), "Micro Bureaucracies and Development Administration", *International Review of Administrative Science*, XXXIX. Quoted in Avasthi and Maheshwari (2017), *Public Administration*, Agra: Lakshmi Narain Agarwal.