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Institutionalizing Reform:

Abstract

by

SHILPA C. DAMLE

The period after World War II was the high point for American Foundations abroad. This was especially true for the Ford Foundation, which was just emerging on the international stage, ready to use the benefits of American modernization techniques and institutional strategies for the newly independent nations in Asia. They believed that poverty caused instability and a rise in radical ideologies, which were a threat to democracies around the world. The Cold War heightened the Foundation’s concern towards these outcomes. Consequently, the Ford Foundation decided to support the development programs of governments, especially in nascent democracies like India, in the 1950s. Foundation actions are criticized or lauded by scholars who primarily focus on Foundation motivation and expectations, not taking the recipients’ realities and context into consideration. This study expands the study of Foundation programs in developing countries by adding the recipient’s history and culture to the analysis thereby providing a fuller understanding of Ford Foundation’s institutionalizing strategies in India and its expectations of these institutions in the area of administrative reform between 1950 and 1970.
Due to the circumstances surrounding Indian independence, nationalist leaders decided to situate the new Indian nationalism in the centralized State and its development program. Consequently, they decided to continue the centralized bureaucratic structure of the colonial government. However, Prime Minister Nehru realized that this system needed to be reformed and asked the Ford Foundation and Paul Appleby to study India’s administration and suggest changes. Given the constraints of the centralized administrative structure and Appleby’s own beliefs, he recommended the setting up of an Institute of Public Administration, serving as a professional society for academic Public Administration and as a forum for scholars to study administrative problems and discuss possible solutions with administrators, leading to better practices. The Foundation helped create the Indian Institute of Public Administration (I.I.P.A.). However, due to changes in political environment, the Ford Foundation altered its expectation of the Institute and pushed it to become more aggressive pursuing administrative reforms. The Institute, however, did not change its essential character and continued to serve as a professional society thereby frustrating Foundation expectations.
Chapter 1

Introduction

The period after the Second World War was the pinnacle of the power of American Foundations abroad. Although small and large philanthropies, all through American history, had always contributed to different socio-political and scientific causes around the world for a wide array of reasons, at no point in time before the end of World War II had they been so well organized, playing an international role so important. At the end of the War, the mighty European powers lay defeated and in serious disarray, their colonies in Asia and Africa were demanding and winning their independence and the only entities left fairly intact at war’s end and in a position to help restore stability and provide guidance to a war-ravaged world were the United States and Russia. However, the ensuing enmity and competing visions these countries provided ended up creating two rival nuclear powered camps fighting a seemingly never-ending cold war. Both these powers tried to influence the new states (former colonies of the European powers) in Asia and Africa in an attempt to bring them over to their side. The American Foundations, at this time, served as the non-governmental beacon of western institutional modernity encompassing the free market and democratic alternative to the Soviet communist one. They advised and funded projects for governments around the world

providing an apparently non-controversial and safe alternative to American state funding, garnering incredible influence with world leaders and lawmakers in the process.²

The course of advising and creating solutions to persistent developmental problems in different countries is often an exercise in cultural interaction. And cultures, in turn, are usually products of the unique historical experiences that have shaped developments and created specific ways of operation in individual countries. Also, relationships between different cultures are never static and develop with time based on their evolving historical circumstance. It is in this context then that cross-cultural human contact, especially one that analyzes the adaptation and functioning of western institutions in non-western settings, needs to be understood. And considering the work of private American foundations in developing countries serves a useful purpose towards that end.

After the end of the Second World War, large American Foundations offered and were invited by different countries around the world to help guide nascent governments to develop indigenous socio-economic and political capabilities. They brought with them modern science and technology and institutional strategies to transform the underdeveloped or developing nations. The intent of my dissertation is to study the attempt of the Ford Foundation to institutionalize the sphere of administrative reform in post-independence India (1950-1970). In doing so, the dissertation will seek to engage more particularly with the body of work that deals with the influence and work of American Foundations abroad, especially in developing countries. Additionally, this study will contribute, more generally, toward increasing our knowledge of the role of

American Foundations in expanding modernization through “professionalization” of academic disciplines in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War, while supporting formal American foreign policy ideals in the newly decolonized countries of Asia. Also, being a cross-national and cross-cultural study of institutional development, this work will contextualize the effort of the Ford Foundation within the broader developments of Indian history and American foreign policy during the Cold War.

The dissertation will analyze the relationship between the two entities (donor and beneficiary), using historical analysis of change over time thereby providing a fuller and deeper understanding of the topic. The scrutiny of American Foundations and their work overseas has been the object of several cross-disciplinary studies. Some social scientists and historians have attempted to understand this association either from the standpoint of a single program at a certain point in time or have skewed their investigation by focusing exclusively on the Foundations and their motivation. My dissertation will not just bring in the realities of the recipients to the story but also challenge the notion that Foundations themselves are monolithic by shining the spotlight on the role of individual Foundation consultants in the outcome of Foundation programs. While some historians have lauded the benevolent foundations for bringing scientific and technological advancements to the poorer nations around the globe- some out of

---

plain altruism or out of a religious impulse—others have criticized them for being instruments of class domination and purveyors of the State Department’s policies. This is in stark contrast to those that deny the Cold War had anything to do with the programs of Foundations in the ‘1950s and 60s. Although facets of this view might be true, they do not portray the entire picture. The primary problem with all these interpretations of cross-cultural analyses is that they preclude the fuller understanding of Foundation programs by slanting their inquiry toward donor motivation. These studies assume that the foundations are all-powerful and can carry out their will by manipulating the recipients through careful control of funds and expertise. According to some historians, the wealthy foundations formulated ideology in the United States during the Progressive era to maintain status quo and deflect socialist alternatives to maintain the interests of the capitalist class. They

---


5 Arnove, Robert F., “The Ford Foundation and ‘Competence Building’ overseas: Assumptions, Approaches and Outcomes” Studies in Comparative International Development, 1977, 12(3): 100-126; Berman, Edward H., The Ideology of Philanthropy: The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford and Rockefeller Foundation on American Foreign Policy, (Albany: State University of New York, 1983); Krige, John. “The Ford Foundation, European Physics and the Cold War”, Historical Studies in the Physical and Biological Sciences, 29:2 (1999), Kathleen McCarthy “From Cold War to Cultural Development: The International activities of the Ford Foundation, 1950-1980” Daedalus, 116 (Winter1987): 93-117. McCarthy does not criticize the foundations, but believes that there was an emphasis on cold war realities by philanthropies while funding some cultural programs during the 1950s. She argues, “Ford’s arts and humanities grants were cast in ideological terms, weapons in the Cold War quest for the hearts and minds of men.” However, she also accepts that Ford did this in India only after discussions with “Asian scholars, government officials, and cultural leaders.” In addition she also writes, “Few countries were as culturally conscious as India, with its well developed archeological survey inherited from the British Raj, its sophisticated institutional resources, its growing private cultural support exemplified by the public-spirited Tata clan, and its increasing government outlays.” Also see Zunz, Oliver, Philanthropy in America: A History (Princeton, N.J., : Princeton University Press, 2012), pp.137-168.


shaped and supported major academic disciplines and indeed have had a major role in professionalizing Public Administration in America\textsuperscript{8}, all to control and dominate the social, intellectual and the policy debate.\textsuperscript{9} These interpretations attribute unlimited agency to the American elites within the United States that many scholars then reproduced at the international level. Others attribute the failure of the American Foundations to influence native populations of developing countries, to the non-performance of their programs.\textsuperscript{10} This dissertation will “problematize” the one-sided focus by the previous studies by including the recipients and their contexts to the narrative. Some recent work done by scholars of Foundation history has presented a more balanced view of the contact between American philanthropies and governments and intellectuals in developing countries.\textsuperscript{11} This dissertation will use their approach and showcase not just the motivation of the Foundations and their changing enthusiasm toward programs but also the recipients and their particular history in shaping the outcome of this relationship.


\textsuperscript{11} Cueto, Marcus (ed.). Missionaries of Science: Rockefeller Foundation and Latin America, (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994), Wheatley, Steven. The Politics of Philanthropy: Abraham Flexner and Medical Education, (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988), Wheatley does not explicitly deal with the developing countries but he highlights the relevance of the milieu and that surrounding factors have to be given due consideration. Ma, Qiusha. “The Rockefeller Foundation and Modern Medical Education in China, 1915-1951.” Ph.D., Dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1995.
The overarching argument of this dissertation is that the Ford Foundation set up the Indian Institute of Public Administration as the means of using principles of academic public administration to spur research and provide a meeting ground between administrators and academicians to discuss and generate solutions to real and critical administrative problems. This approach is a very cautious and tentative one as compared to what many other scholars posit in context to other countries. They did this because they wanted to support the Indian government backed programs. The Foundation and its experts are also very careful in not appearing to provide an “American” alternative for the Indians to emulate. All of this was the result of the unique and momentous post-colonial period in which the Ford Foundation came to India and was faced with the changes, not just of the Indian environment, but of the international setting as well. Till such time as the Ford Foundation officials believed this to be the basic mission of the IIPA, the relations between the Foundation functionaries and the Institute officers remained friendly and cooperative. As the Institute was formed and stabilized, however, the Foundation officials and experts expected it to become more activist as a change agent and that belief clashed directly with the IIPA management’s vision of the Institute’s mission and the accepted norms of administrative reforms in general in India and the position of the bureaucracy within the Indian government hierarchy. As a result, the Indian Institute of Public Administration continued as a professional organization for academic public administration and not what the Foundation hoped for it to become ultimately- an institutional force for administrative reform. This altered expectation by the Ford Foundation also mirrors the shifting outlook
toward India by the United States during the Cold War, India’s domestic problems, and the transformation of Ford’s internal funding policies. For instance, the Cold War during the latter part of the 1950s and 1960s intensified and created areas of dissonance between the United States and India. One of the most important being India refusing military alliance with the United States making it less important as an ally against the Communist bloc. Also, as time went on, the United States became more assured of India’s commitment to democracy versus any totalitarian alternative even after Prime Minister Nehru’s demise. Meanwhile Ford Foundation too changed its overall bias for funding through governments in favor of small, private, program centric Non-Government Organizations (NGOs). My dissertation explores the first two decades (1950-1970) of the Indian Institute of Public Administration’s (IIPA) existence as a backdrop of this evolving relationship between the Ford Foundation officials and the institution they helped create. Because this period forms the formative years of the IIPA, we can get a clearer picture of the Institute’s trajectory and how it came to have its present focus.

**Administrative Reforms in India**

Post–independence India was faced with every conceivable developmental challenge possible. In response to this situation the Indian leadership under Prime Minister Nehru adopted the planned economy model to promote the welfare of the Indian people. Prime Minister Nehru, apart from his own socialist inclination, recognized the county’s limited resources, the desire of the Indian people to progress materially, and the future of prosperity promised by the nationalist leadership during the freedom struggle.
Also, post independence, Nehru and others within the government, struggled to preserve the ephemeral unity of the Indian people achieved during the fight against colonialism. During the freedom struggle the Congress leadership led by Gandhi and Nehru, among others, created a national identity by building a multi-class, caste and religious coalition against the British rule. This oppositional identity served its purpose by forging a groundswell of effort against the colonial government. As a consequence, despite the heterogeneous society and polity of India, the people were able to come together and win freedom from the British. However, the oppositional identity, post-independence, had to be made into an inclusive one since the end of colonialism threatened to revive all the socio-political and regional divisions that existed in India. Therefore, a new location of nationalism, which was readily identifiable and appropriated by most groups had to be created. The leadership of the country decided that the new nationalism of India was to be institutionalized in the nation state and expressed through the program of planned socio-economic development.

As a result, the welfare state became institutionalized in India. Partha Chatterjee, noted political scientist and an early member of the Subaltern Studies Collective,12 contends that the sweep of governmental powers was felt not only through progressive taxation of personal and corporate incomes but also in the

---

12 Subaltern Studies Collective were a group of South Asian scholars in Britain who focused on the culture of the subaltern or marginalized groups in pre-independence India as an interpretive framework to analyze and explain historical events in the sub-continent. They did this because they believed that the prevailing trends in historical scholarship, dominated by elite oriented nationalist histories and primarily economic-class oriented Marxist approaches, were not adequate to explain the complex socio-economic, political and religious realities of India. These historians began publishing their work in a series of books titled *Subaltern Studies*, edited by Ranajit Guha.
provision of public services such as education, health and transportation. Consequently, governmental machinery had to be geared to take on all these developmental challenges with efficiency and speed. Two factors, however, precluded this from happening. First, the Indian leadership decided to continue the colonial bureaucracy in the post-independence period, which was adept at two very basic functions: maintenance of law and order and revenue collection for the state. Second, no administrative reforms to effect any change in the functioning of the bureaucracy could alter the structure and the important position of the All India Services, which was enshrined in the Indian Constitution. As a result, administrative reforms, by anybody, were constrained in what they could modify.

Governmental administration is the most important tool of every welfare state in the world. Indian leaders, during the struggle for freedom from colonialism, realized that they needed a responsive and competent bureaucracy to effect modernization and development. However, as is the case with most new states, there were a slew of immediate and basic problems that the government had to contend with following independence and the bureaucrats were the only group in government who had any experience of administration at that time. This situation left the politicians dependent on the civil servants to administer the country, especially during the difficult period following independence and partition. As a result the old colonial bureaucracy continued in the post independence period.

---

13 Chatterjee, Partha. (ed.) State and Politics in India, (Delhi, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997)
14 The All India Services are certain select elite civil services that operate all over India. Officers of these services are generalists who are recruited by the Central/Federal government through a competitive exam and assigned to the states. They occupy all top State and Central government administrative jobs but their conditions of service are controlled only by the Central government. Furthermore, the nature of these services is enshrined in the Indian Constitution.
Nevertheless, this system had many problems. It was created to administer essential services like maintaining law and order and collecting revenue and preserving the primacy of the colonial government. Apart from that, Indian leadership also felt that the old bureaucracy was too entrenched in the colonial mores and customs and reminded people of the colonial administration they fought to end. Also, a system such as this was ideal to maintain status quo, not administer development programs, which the government had put forth as the new identity of the young nation. Consequently administrative reform was put forth as the solution to alter the old bureaucracy to fit their new role.

The task of administrative improvement in India refers to, as M.A. Muttalib describes, “the process of change with complete transformation in terms of structure and behavior, ... a form of creative destruction in that the old order is broken down to pave the way for a new order.”15 The “old order” in Indian administration was the Indian Civil Service and its post-Independence version, the Indian Administrative Service (I.A.S) - the policy elite in India. They were generalists recruited by the Central/Federal government by means of a competitive exam and subsequently appointed to top administrative positions in government, both state and central. Their power and prestige did not stem from any particular expertise in public administration but from their success in the competitive exams which made them members of a select, elite policy making group – an administrative class.

Although the competitive exam replaced the practice of appointment by patronage,

---

it did not make the civil servants functional specialists like their American counterparts.

However, all attempts at administrative reform had not touched the power and prestige of the Indian Administrative Service. This was so because all measures of reforms never questioned the suitability of the centralized administrative structure to manage and direct development programs. They could never de-couple the developmental functions from their basic law and order and revenue functions. The leaders of the freedom struggle and post-colonial India believed that a unified administrative structure was vitally important to keep the integrity of a centralized governmental set up and hence the unity of the country. They did this because of the choices they made to locate post-colonial nationalism within the planned developmental regime of the central government. Consequently, the centralized civil service was given a privileged position in this organization. Their structure and functions were preserved in the Indian constitution making them very difficult to change. As a result administrative reforms in India, following freedom from colonial rule, were limited to making small incremental changes, which did not affect the structure of the bureaucracy or their powers. On the contrary, A.D. Gorwalla, an ex-ICS officer who headed a commission to study Public Administration in India before Paul Appleby advocated greater freedom and power for the bureaucrats to improve the functioning of governmental departments.¹⁶

In the early 1950s, the Government of India asked Paul H. Appleby, Consultant in Public Administration to the Ford Foundation, to study its

---

administrative system and present his findings to the government. Any assessment of the administrative capabilities of the country and attempts to improve it would definitely put the spotlight on the working of the bureaucracy and the civil service and disturb old power structures. In a carefully worded report, Appleby detailed the steps that the Indian government should take to make administration client-oriented. One of Appleby’s recommendations dealt with the setting up of the Indian Institute of Public Administration. This institution would house an “Indian Society for Public Administration”.\(^{17}\) Appleby believed that study of academic public administration through targeted research of problem areas in the Indian administrative system could help civil service officers improve governance. The Institute of Public Administration could provide the meeting ground for academic researchers and practitioners of public administration where they could influence each other. Appleby, as mentioned in his report, was already impressed with the Indian administration and officers of the Indian Administrative Service. He believed that these men and women only needed another perspective (provided by academic research) and that the officers could arrive at their own conclusions about what changes they should make in their method of operation. Appleby’s description of the institute amalgamated a traditional think tank function with an academic professional society. The Ford Foundation, to whom Appleby served as a consultant, gave the necessary funds and resources towards setting up this new Indian Institute of Public Administration popularly known as the I.I.P.A.

---

Administrative Reform and the Indian Institute of Public Administration as Case Study

As mentioned earlier, administration was charged with developmental duties for a newly independent nation. The difference between how and at what rate the country progressed and the quality of life the citizens enjoyed hinged upon the effectiveness of the administrative machinery. Hence, administrative reform was not just important, but critical for India. However, Indian leadership, prior to inviting the Ford Foundation to India had already made decisions about the nature of the polity and economy of the country. These decisions had imposed limits on the types of changes administrative reforms could effect, shaping the future modifications to the governmental structure and functions.

The Ford Foundation came to India with the intention of helping the government of India modernize, develop and improve its capacity to provide services to its people. Besides the obvious goal of helping countries develop, the Foundation leaders also felt that the seeds of Communism lay in the misery of material deprivation. The trustees of the Ford Foundation agreed with Paul Hoffman, the president of the Foundation, when he identified poverty, ignorance and backwardness as the biggest threats and dangers to democracy and hence, world peace. The Ford Foundation described democracy as “the belief in personal freedom, equality of rights, justice and opportunity; in freedom of speech, religion, and association; and in self-government as the best form of government.”18. In addition, the economic expression of such a democratic polity, according to the Ford

---

Foundation’s Gaither Report, was a system that “permits maximum individual freedom of choice and action. This requires practical equality of opportunity for all individuals to pursue the vocation or profession of their choice, to change jobs, to move from place to place and to advance in their chosen career according to their capabilities. This end can be served in two ways: first, by providing the most favorable possible climate for new small business units; and second, by enhancing individual opportunities in large business organizations.”  

In other words, the Foundation believed that economic benefits in a democratic society and polity accrued through free competition. However, they also recognized the role of government in economy in maintaining freedom of competition, and individual access to economic opportunity. This belief led them to help government programs in a democracy, primarily because people ultimately control democratic governments and therefore government decisions are subject to popular oversight. They contrasted this approach with the Communist system, which they believed was a totalitarian method and did not respond to popular will. Hence, they felt that Communism as an operating philosophy of any government will ultimately not help or benefit society because it did not acknowledge the rights and welfare of the individual. The Foundation wanted to use all tools of modernization, i.e., scientific knowledge and methods, technological advancements, expert guidance and capital to provide a democratic option to economic development as compared to Communism. India was important for the Ford Foundation at the time since China,

---

20 Ibid, p. 36.
21 Ibid, p. 21.
which had some of the same problems as India; agricultural economy, large population and hierarchical society, had just turned communist. They also believed that despite Prime Minister Nehru’s socialism, he was committed to democracy and helping him consolidate the country was vitally important. In light of all these concerns, administrative reforms were seen as crucial for the success of Nehru’s Five Year Plans and alleviating the country’s problems. He made a personal request for a survey of the Indian administration and suggestions for changes to the Ford Foundation, signaling its importance to the Indian leadership. Thus the field of administrative reform provides a canvas to observe interactions between Indian political and administrative leadership with the top Ford Foundation officers.

In particular, the setting up and functioning of the IIPA is a good example of how an institutional strategy works out in a different historical and cultural context. Under this broad rubric we can study the interaction between groups of individuals within the parameters set by historical forces. The IIPA was set up to create a collegial atmosphere, giving rise to free discussion of administrative issues and the Civil Service officers would not feel that they were being targeted and could embrace research findings leading to administrative change. As time went on, however, the Institute continued to operate as a professional society and less of a research institute. The difference between the Ford Foundation approach and the IIPA officers’ approach defined the relationship between the two and provides us with a useful case study for cross-cultural interaction.

**Professionalization of Academic Public Administration and Reform in America**
Professionalism in the United States is a product of the Progressive era. Described variously as “an age of organization”, and a period of “democratic renaissance”, the progressive age gave rise to the notion of the “expert”. Weibe attributes this emphasis on expertise to a “search for order”. He argues that American society “for much of the nineteenth century was composed of autonomous and semiautonomous island communities”. After the 1880s, technological and economic forces disrupted the normal functioning of these communities and caused confusion and dislocation. The resultant “search for order” created a new emphasis on organization and a new middle class “tied together by their conviction that their expertise and occupational cohesiveness provided the means of ordering a fragmented society”. 22

Weibe’s argument emphasizes two aspects. First, that Professionalism was the legitimate outcome of the turmoil of modernization and second, that the middle classes were at the vanguard of that phenomenon - the new elite, perhaps? It was this new class that was responsible for the change in ideas and social understanding that occurred in the 1890s. American social thought, according to Haskell, changed when Weibe’s “island communities” integrated. Individualistic explanations of social events produced by amateur thinkers and members of the traditional professions changed to impersonal explanations by social scientists. This led to the creation of modern disciplines housed in modern universities with professional

communities. Bledstein, on the other hand, attributes this culture of professionalism to the search for self-identity by the middle class.

These modern disciplines, especially the social sciences, were strongly influenced by science. The belief that all human endeavors could be subject to natural laws and hence amenable to control permeated the epistemological revolution during this period. Also, attempts were being made by the new professionals to attribute the ability to control destiny and change to the ideology of American ‘exceptionalism’. However, scholars like Samuel Haber believe that American professions transmitted a sense of honor and authority akin to the class positions and occupational prescriptions of eighteenth century English gentlemen. In other words, Professionalism was a nineteenth century version of old elitism. It had all the features of the past elites and any reference to them being modern was only a sham.

Whatever the nature of professionalism, there is no doubt that it created and propagated present day academic disciplines. Public Administration as an organized field of inquiry was born during the “high noon” of the Professionalization era – the Progressive period. The municipal reformers or the “bureau men” were the precursors of the modern day public administrators. These “progressives” were responsible for applying scientific planning and management methods to

---

26 Haber, Samuel. , *The Quest for Authority and Honor in the American Professions, 1750-1900*, (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1991)
government activity. It was from within this process that the field of Public Administration was born. And, as Stivers mentions, this focus on science and objectivity removed agency and initiative from individuals. It also removed public administration as an activity from the field of politics. Practitioners of a profession whose content was decided and institutionalized in universities and training schools replaced women social workers of the past. Consequently, administrative reform then became the preserve of a profession rather than disjointed acts of individuals. “The agenda for building a new American state was defined by an intellectual vanguard of university trained professionals”. The drive towards administrative rationality became grounded in scientific principles of public administration.

A strong feature of Professionalization was the existence of professional associations. These bodies were “the arbiters of professional competence and attainment”. They were also means by which control could be exercised upon individual professions. They have even been accused of autocracy – a closed house that allowed no outsiders. In addition, Larson accuses professional associations of monopolizing professional education and standards and making the pursuit of vocations exclusive to the members of their society. A phenomenon, she says, was the logical outcome of the shift from competitive capitalism to corporate capitalism.

Oleson and Voss, however, respond by saying that the exclusiveness of specialist organizations like the professional associations was tempered by and reconciled with American democratic impulses by the creation of the modern university, which juxtaposed research and specialization with teaching. In any event, the associations in the United States served as forums where new possibilities in civic management were discussed. In other words, they were at the cutting edge of administrative reform at the turn of the century.

**Ford Foundation, the Cold War and the IIPA**

At the end of the Second World War, Europe was destroyed, and many of the colonies controlled by the European countries were granted their freedom. Equally momentous, was the rise of Soviet Russia as a communist superpower at war’s end. This set the United States on the path of influencing countries to embrace democracy and freedom in all forms, while opposing Russian power in Asia and Europe. However, the conditions created by the war, and the widespread poverty and underdevelopment that existed in the newly independent nations of Asia and Africa were attractive forces for the communist ideology to thrive. The promise of basic necessities was a good enough reason for the people to surrender their freedoms and embrace Communism. China was firmly in Communist control by 1949 and was threatening to influence, if not control, its neighbors.

---

Recognizing this threat, The Ford Foundation, decided to play a large role in strengthening democracies around the world. In 1949, The Ford Foundation came out with its “Report of the Study For The Ford Foundation on Policy and Program”, which contained the blue print for their activities abroad. “The aim of The Ford Foundation is to advance human welfare”, the report opened. That human welfare contained ‘personal freedom and rights, political freedom and rights and social responsibility and the duty of service along with the democratic ideals.’ This indicated, some scholars believed, that the Foundation expected to shape world events.\textsuperscript{34} The Foundation was trying to put forth a clear alternative to the soviet model.

India became important to the Ford Foundation and the United States for those very reasons. If successful, India could also stand out in sharp relief to China showing the world the possibilities of the non-communist approach. The Ford Foundation, however, could not achieve this task alone even with their large, albeit limited, funds. They also needed to operate in countries where they had no legal or political protection. Therefore they needed to function and work through governments, which were legitimately elected/appointed by the people of that country. Also, the resources, material and otherwise, available to governments could not be duplicated by foundations. In addition, the success of democratic governments in fulfilling the needs and ambitions of their people was the only way to ensure their longevity.

In India, The Ford Foundation found a democratic partner in Prime Minister Nehru and his popularly elected government. The nationalist leadership under Nehru had decided to opt for a planned economy and centralized government. However, the Indian

The Nehru government, especially Prime Minister Nehru, was keenly aware of that fact and approached The Ford Foundation with his very first request. He asked for Dr. Paul Appleby to study the Indian administration and suggest changes to it to make it efficient in implementing development programs outlined in the Five Year Plans.

Dr. Appleby and The Ford Foundation had realized the importance of reforming the bureaucracy if the Five Year Plans were to be a success. However, both of them were not interested in radically altering any prevailing system for their own reasons. Appleby generally believed in the notion of the generalist administrator with experts being “on tap” to advise the bureaucrats on specialized matters. Indian civil service was a generalist service, which Appleby believed, for its traditional purposes, was working quite well. Whereas, The Ford Foundation did not want to create any instability or problems for the Nehru government, making him vulnerable to political attacks. The culmination of both approaches was the creation of The Indian Institute of Public Administration. The Ford Foundation had sponsored such institutes in the United States and believed, like Appleby, who was also associated with academic societies that the civil service needed to get fresh perspectives to inform and speed up reform without any ensuing instability. The IIPA could bring this about by creating a close bond and association between the two groups – academic researchers and practitioners of public administration.

The IIPA started out as a meeting ground for academicians and the civil service officers in India. The Institute held meetings between the two groups, organized
seminars and conferences, created a very good library and a journal of Public Administration that showcased scholarly work by academicians and civil service officers alike. However, the twain never did meet. In other words, the close social and professional association between the two groups leading to influence and ultimately changes in the administrative system never materialized. As India stabilized, the fear of its government abandoning democracy and embracing Communism - as the Americans initially feared - decreased. However, it never fully disappeared (some states elected communist governments). The planned objectives of the Government of India were not achieved and bureaucracy was blamed for that failure. In addition, new leaders who wanted better association with the Soviet Union, strained relationship with the United States Government. This altered the political landscape for the IIPA and the Ford Foundation. Other realities like development of universities and their research programs threatened to reduce IIPA’s importance in the field of administrative research. To make the IIPA relevant in the area of administrative reforms, the Ford Foundation leaders and experts started pushing the Institute’s leadership to focus all its resources to study administrative problems and create and advertise that expertise to government. This dissertation will explore this period and shed light on the role of the Ford Foundation in altering the focus of the IIPA. Its inability to do so still defines the IIPA as a professional society and not an instrument of administrative change. In India today corruption and bureaucratic shortcomings animate and dominate public discourse. Frustrated citizens

35 It is important to note that even though some States elected Communist governments, they were just seen as a political party competing for power with several others. They had to work within the parameters of the Indian Constitution, which was firmly democratic, and had to uphold Indian laws. They could not be seen as taking any “guidance” from the Soviet Union.
are willing to go to great lengths to reform administration. An attempt to study this topic in light of its historical background is therefore very important in these times.

**A Note on Sources**

The background chapter on Indian administration was very wide and spanned a long period of time. As a result, multiple primary sources like newspapers of the time, transcripts of Parliamentary debates, and books written by various contemporary thinkers and reformers were used. However, the chapter mainly describes the importance of acts and reform measures passed by the British during the Colonial period. The Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances, Government of India, made the reform bills available in their original format. Similarly, the third chapter describes the period immediately after Indian independence and the decisions made by the central leadership to opt for an alternate site for Indian nationalism in the State's centralized development program, thus continuing the colonial civil service in Independent India constraining sweeping reforms. Consequently, a mix of primary resources was used to support the argument. Oral histories of important civil service officers, speeches, letters and books of prominent politicians and newspaper reporting and analysis formed the majority of the evidence.

The chapter on the Ford Foundation’s entry into India and their motivation for coming to India and their ideas and mode of working relied heavily on the documents, reports, memos, from the early years of the Foundation as an international organization. These documents are located in the Ford Foundation Archives (FFA) and the staff of the FFA made them available for this study. Paul H.
Appleby, the focus of the fifth chapter, was the author of the Appleby Report and the dean of the Maxwell School of Public Affairs at Syracuse University. The school maintains his papers in their archives. These documents give us an insight into the motivation of the man who suggested setting up the IIPA. His academic publications, personal letters, travel diaries and professional discussions with colleagues and officers of the Ford Foundation form the basis of this chapter. Columbia Oral History project had recorded an interview with Paul Appleby, which was also used for this chapter.

The Sixth and the Seventh chapters tell the story of the interaction between the IIPA and the Ford Foundation. To understand the recipients of foundation wealth and their motivation and attitudes toward administrative reform and the mission of the IIPA, it is essential to show the politics and attitudes between key elite groups, like politicians and bureaucrats, within India. Responses of each of these groups towards the setting up and functioning of the IIPA are important to determine the ultimate form and importance of the institute toward the key question of administrative reform. It is vital in this entire narrative to clarify the expectations of the Ford Foundation experts in setting up the IIPA for the purpose of administrative reform in India. These chapters draws upon material from the Ford Foundation archives in New York, to find out whether their prescriptions for the IIPA were met or not. Papers housed in these archives give indication of the mindset of the Foundation officers in India and their counterparts in the United States at the time of the setting up of the IIPA. Renewal of grants for the IIPA often necessitated progress reviews performed by foundation officers. These reviews are filed and maintained at the Ford Foundation archives in their “Field Office Files.”
The Indian Institute of Public Administration’s library maintains the collection of reports of the internal reforms of the IIPA and opinions of the individuals associated with its functioning. Looking at this archival material gives us a sense of the functioning of the institute and how it fared vis-à-vis the American professional organizations promoted by the Ford Foundation. In addition, the IIPA reports also help in understanding how the Indians thought of the Institute and its mission and what they believed would help make it better. Among the primary sources used for the dissertation are also the Appleby Report, which is available from the Government of India press and the Oral History of Douglas Ensminger, Ford Foundation Representative in India during the period of study.

**Chapter Organization**

The dissertation begins with the Introduction. It outlines the historiography of the work of foundations in developing nations in the twentieth century and the major arguments that have defined this field. The Introduction focuses on the original contribution of this dissertation to the field of foundation history in particular and to the complexity of cross-cultural exchange in general. It also describes the organization of the dissertation and sources used to make the major arguments in it.

Present day Indian administration originated with the rule of the East India Company. The second chapter argues that concerted administrative reforms to modernize the bureaucracy and make it rule oriented and efficient in carrying out their colonial obligations made them (the bureaucracy) more exclusive and respected in the colonial hierarchy adding a level of legitimacy that continued in the post-independence period. In time these reforms admitted more Indians and it
became the only recognizable institution of power during the turmoil of independence and partition. It also became an exclusive and closed club where entry was strictly controlled through a rigorous exam. This chapter serves as the pre-story to the period discussed in the dissertation.

The next chapter contextualizes post-colonial administrative reforms in Indian history. The nationalist leadership had decided to privilege centralization over decentralization and located the new Indian identity in the Central government in the sphere of development through the Five Year Plans. The centralized bureaucracy was not just allowed to continue in the post-independence period, their pre-eminent position was enshrined in the constitution. As a result any administrative reform was severely limited in what they could change.

The Ford Foundation’s motivation to come to India had much to do with the Cold War. All Ford’s international programs after The Second World War were based on the idea that underdevelopment and poor living conditions created the necessary conditions for communism to thrive. They believed democratic governments around the world needed support for combating this condition. The Foundation’s domestic support for modernization and institution building was extended to their international programs. However, the Foundation decided to use all this expertise to support the recipient governments’ development programs and not follow a separate agenda. The Fourth chapter will explore the genesis and salient features of this approach.

The Indian government led by Prime Minister Nehru asked the Ford Foundation and Paul Appleby, who was the consultant to the Foundation, to conduct
a survey of Indian administrative structures and functions and suggest ways to improve them. Appleby made a few suggestions of which one was the setting up of the IIPA. The fifth chapter argues that Appleby's personal and professional experiences helped shape his ideas about administrative reform and led him to suggest the creation of the IIPA.

The next chapter will focus on the process of creating and settling this institution especially during the first decade of its existence. During this period the IIPA became very active as a professional body creating the apparatus to attract academicians and practitioners in conferences and seminars with very important and powerful policy makers in India. Many important American academicians and experts visited the Institute to interact with the Indian membership of the IIPA. This brought the Institute a lot of publicity. However, toward the end of the first decade The Ford Foundation experts and officers were complaining about the functioning of the IIPA, its path, and its inability to influence reform.

The 1960s finally brought the wide divergence between The Ford Foundation and The IIPA officials into the open. The Ford Foundation was pushing the Institute to influence administrative reforms through targeted academic research. The Institute would not let go of its theoretical and academic approach in favor of applied research to influence the closed civil service. Finally Ford stopped funding the Institute. The Foundation even lobbied Indian politicians in government to partner with the Institute to aid research efforts of the newly created Administrative Reforms Commission (ARC). They revived financial aid to the IIPA as long as it was doing ARC driven research. However, the Institute went back to its
old ways after the ARC winded up, frustrating Foundation officers. The Ford Foundation gradually decreased funding till they finally changed their policy to aid big government sponsored institutions.

Finally, the Conclusion will sum up the story line, major arguments and important findings of the dissertation. It will reiterate the conclusions and help understand the problem of administrative reforms in present day India through a historic lens and also assess the contribution and efforts of the Ford Foundation in shaping and influencing that field. All this is evaluated in the context of Cold War politics and its changing impact on Foundation programs overseas.
Chapter 2

History of Administrative Reforms in India before Independence: A Pre-Story

The Indian Civil Service, popularly known as the ICS, was recognized as the steel frame of the British Empire. Officers of the ICS were credited for administering far flung corners of the Indian subcontinent and maintaining the reach and authority of the British Raj. While romanticized by authors like Kipling, the job of the ICS officer was often hard and dangerous. However, they were the unquestioned power center in the districts they administered and symbols of absolute colonial authority. Just before Indian independence, there were, roughly, around 1,157 officers in the ICS, of which about 608 were British. This had prompted Josef Stalin to remark that it was ‘ridiculous that a few hundred Englishmen should dominate India.’

While some say that Indians did much of the work of the British Empire and the ICS officers were just cutting deals with local officials to get things done, the authority of the British Empire vested in them was never in doubt, even to their Indian collaborators. The colonial bureaucracy, however, was a work in progress and had steadily changed from a patronage centric, mercantile oriented system, to its colonial form along with the expanding British power in India. Every administrative reform passed in the colonial period, molded the bureaucracy, shaped its character and made it into a dependable tool of administrative influence and control.

---

This chapter will contextualize major administrative reforms enacted during the British era that fashioned the bureaucracy into an exclusive, centralized, reasonably efficient law and order mechanism, and an extremely powerful instrument of the colonial government. Ironically, despite their protestations, these characteristics made the Indian Civil Service very attractive to the post-independence Indian leadership.\(^\text{39}\) The ICS was allowed to continue by leaders of independent India regardless of its incompatibility with a democratic welfare state. The central government under Nehru recognized the ICS’s strong centralizing tendency and stabilizing influence and believed that whatever they lacked in flexibility and development-oriented ness could be remedied, in time, by well-crafted reforms.\(^\text{40}\)

The description of the evolving nature of the civil service and the political context in which it developed is essential to show us its rooted ness in the colonizing mission and in Indian political complexities. It also fashioned the colonial bureaucracy to carry out centralized demands in Indian conditions. In other words, it established authority of the central government over a very complex and heterogeneous socio-political system in pre-independence India. That created stable networks of colonial power, which helped carry out the basic functions of the administrative state. Conversely, it also privileged certain sections and classes of the Indian population and institutionalized inflexibility, among other features, making post-independence reforms harder to carry out.\(^\text{41}\) All of this happened through purposefully enacted administrative changes, created to deal with political demands and the changing course of British power in India.


Historians have written extensively on the freedom movement and its response to British efforts at political and administrative reforms. However, scholars of Indian administrative history have, for the most part, never considered administrative reforms during the British period in developing specific characteristics of the Indian civil services. Most studies have looked at reforms in the political context and how they affected the trajectory of the freedom movement. Although historians like B.B. Misra have considered the role of administrative reforms in developing the structure of the civil service in India, he has not focused on the character and behavioral traits those reforms engendered. Bradford Spangenberg comes closest to analyzing the functioning and character of the members of the Indian Civil Service. He argued that there was a lot of mythology created around the supposed superiority of the ICS in the late nineteenth century. Spangenberg de-mystifies the colonial service and argues that their members, contrary to the prevailing wisdom, were not all that well educated, devoted to the people of India, and efficient in their work. Rather, they were selfish, focused on their status and position within the government hierarchy and given to petty squabbles. The Colonial Government created a mythology of bureaucratic excellence and service to help ICS recruitment in England and counter rising criticism against them by the Indian

---

43 Maheshwari, Sriram, *Indian Administration-An Historical Account*, (New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers and Distributors, 1994). Potter David C., *India’s Political Administrators: From ICS to IAS*, (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1996); Potter discusses the content of the tradition that defined the ICS and continued on into the post-independence period but he does not do it in the context of the reforms passed from time to time by the British. His main aim is to explain the persistence of the ICS tradition in independent India.  
nationalists. Others contend that in the early twentieth century, however, members of the ICS had varied views of themselves and their role and duties in a fast changing political environment. This meant that the mythology of the ICS in the late nineteenth century was considerably altered. Some historians argued, in a similar vein, that ICS officers were not monoliths and varied in their notions of self and the service based on their upbringing and early influences. While these studies aim at dispelling the myths and beliefs around the ICS, they do not analyze the structural base supporting those assumptions. Grudging praise by Viceroys and other colonial leaders and self-promotion by in-service and retired ICS officers was not enough to maintain the mythology. The reforms enacted by the colonial government during its rule of India created permanent basis for that mythology to be believed and buttressed. All the studies thus far treat reforms only tangentially and not as the main component in shaping the character of the ICS.

Reforms, then, were at the heart of the conceptualization of the Indian Civil Service. The later day ICS had its beginning in the patronage dominated East India Company’s administration, which was put together hastily for the purpose of governance. Created with the sole intention of trading with India, the British East India Company was faced with administering parts of the Indian territory after they won the right to collect land revenue of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa following a battle with a local ruler in Bengal.

49 The British East India Company (EIC) won the right to collect land revenue after they won the Battle of Plassey (1757). Prior to that the EIC was purely a trading company with fully commercial operations. However, they found themselves constantly battling other colonial traders like the French, Portuguese and
The first administrative machinery created by the East India Company was put together from the trading bureaucracy existing at the time in India. Thus started the process of creating the structure of the present civil service through a series of reform acts.

In the course of the first few acts starting in 1773, the East India Company created a centralized structure making their leadership and settlement in Bengal preeminent among their other settlements in India. This became the template of the Colonial bureaucracy. Later reforms furthered this feature but could not change the commercial nature of the bureaucracy. Officers of the East India Company’s administration saw themselves as traders and merchants and not rulers responsible for the welfare of the Indians. Their unregulated power made them extremely rich. The young men sent to India to work in the civil service of the East India Company were all patronage appointees with no prior training in government administration. They immediately started enriching themselves at the Company’s expense by indulging in personal trade rather than working on behalf of the East India Company.\(^{50}\)

In addition, the quality of the people being sent to India in the commercial settlements of the Company left much to be desired. The Directors of the Company, who made the appointments, frequently sold these positions for a lot of money or indulged in nepotism.\(^{51}\) This became especially rampant after the civilians in India returned home Dutch trading companies. As a result, the EIC fought proxy wars in India against other European powers by attacking their Indian supporters. Many local rulers would allot trading rights and privileges to one company exclusively without needing to pay any duties or taxes to the ruler. The European company that was allotted those powers then gave their unconditional support to the local ruler. The other companies would then fight these local powers to win exclusive trading rights and install rulers who would be friendly to them. All the three provinces that provided the British with land revenue were in northeastern India.


very rich. However, Lord Clive, the Governor General for the East India Company in India believed that offering the “Writers” or civil service officers high salaries would take care of corruption in the bureaucracy.\textsuperscript{52} The general view, nevertheless, remained pessimistic about the caliber of British officers in India.\textsuperscript{53} The first raft of legislation and reforms were aimed to remedy this situation. In doing so, the East India Company and the proponents of merit versus patronage appointments in the Indian civil service sought to privilege liberal university education over family connections and money. This also meant that to attract the ‘right’ sort of recruit, the East India Company would have to make service conditions in India extremely attractive.

Along with reforming the recruitment procedure of the civil services, the East India Company also had to deal with their dispersed territorial acquisitions in India. This meant bringing them under some type of unified administrative structure. As a result, in addition to bringing in college-educated civilians, the Company had to centralize their administrative system whereby the authority of a central government would take precedence over all other English settlements. The reforms that brought about this change were affected due to many reasons. The Company was now acquiring much more territory than before because it was in their commercial interest to actually control the administration of land than just trade there. This move was also necessitated because other European trading companies had started operations in India, especially the French, and they had started entering special alliances with local rulers to trade exclusively with them. In addition, the East India Company in London and later the British Government

wanted a unified control over the affairs of their Indian territories by creating a line of control from the top tier in London to the lowest level in India.

By 1858, the Indian possessions of the East India Company were transferred to the Crown and the British government formally took over the administration of the country. The purpose of the bureaucracy at this time was to provide efficient administration, firm control over resources and maintenance of law and order. This meant that they were responsible for the civil and judicial administration of the land. However, to establish the unquestioned authority of the colonial government, the judicial and administrative powers were vested in the bureaucrat at the district level. This was done to encourage officers to gain an in depth knowledge of their districts and quick control of problems, civil or criminal. Above all, the reformers hoped that the bureaucrats would remain above the fray of local politics (Indian and British provincial) if the central authority controlled their conditions of service.

A big part of the reforms process was the gradual association of Indians with the civil service. The inclusion of Indians in all aspects of the administration was announced when the Crown took over in 1858. However, in actuality the bureaucracy remained exclusively European for a very long time after that. In addition, inclusion in the civil service was held up as an ultimate aim of the British recognition of native capabilities of self-government. Racially separate, the Indian Civil Service created an aura of being incorruptible, efficient and above the fray in India. As a result, reforming the bureaucracy to make it more inclusive was at the heart of the nationalist demand at the beginning of the freedom struggle. However, the higher civil service always remained
very exclusive and every effort at including the Indians was met with a lot of resistance from the British officers of the bureaucracy.

**From Patronage to Open Competition**

When the East India Company got the “Diwani” (right to collect taxes) of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa from the Mughal emperor in 1765, it was a unique agreement. In it the British company could collect land revenue from all these three territories without bearing the basic responsibilities of administration. Those were still borne by the local authorities that had always controlled the administration, albeit without access to the revenues that were available to them earlier. As Burke lamented, “England had erected no churches, no hospitals, no palaces, no schools (the paltry foundation of Calcutta excepted); England had built no bridges, made no high roads, cut no navigations, dug no reservoirs. Every other conqueror of every other description had left some monument of either state or beneficence behind him; but were we to be driven out of India this day, nothing would remain to tell that it had been possessed, during the inglorious period of our dominion, by any thing better that the [O]urang-[O]utang or the tiger.”

The Company also saw the effect this had on the lowly paid commercial officers of the East India Company. They felt that the young civilians believed this was the best way to make a fortune and return back to England to live a life of luxury. In the process they indulged in personal trade and treated themselves to the revenues of the East India Company. Additionally, the Indian officers appointed by the local rulers in charge of collecting revenues and dispensing justice were caught between two masters. As a result they saw a unique opportunity to enrich themselves as well. They colluded with the

---

Company’s civil servants to skim off revenues. Overall the East India Company was left to deal with widespread corruption with no easy alternatives.\textsuperscript{56} While tales of official corruption in India were legion, the British government deemed it to be the problem of a private trading company and did not intervene.

The general approach of the company management toward their officers was to avoid punitive measures because it would demoralize and further de-motivate young men from signing up to work in India. The following poem published in \textit{The Times} by an officer of the East India Company underscored the nature of the civilian’s job, which required officers to be away from home for long stretches of time, thereby making recruitment difficult:

\begin{quote}
``How sweet the hour to those who roam,
When many a weary wand’ring past,
Their native fields and tranquil home,
Salute their longing eyes at last….
And now to pain my pleasures rise,
When near my long forsaken home,
I hear the voice of glad surprise;
Proclaim aloud, “He’s come, he’s come”''.\textsuperscript{57}
\end{quote}

Also, top leaders like Robert Clive, one of the most celebrated general and administrator of the East India Company in India was concerned about the quality of the

civil service recruits. He was alarmed at the lack of integrity in company servants, evident through their corrupt collusion with local Indian officers. The Company’s Directors were unhappy about their commercial enterprise’s loss of revenues. However, Clive believed that their Indian operations were important enough to be manned by the best and honest officers. In doing so, he decided to make the civilians’ terms of service attractive enough to dissuade them from corruption. Clive wanted to get written covenants from the Company officers promising that they would not indulge in personal trade or collusion with Indian officers to steal official revenues in exchange for big salary increases.  

58 This was considered one of Clive’s big administrative reforms.

However, this change did not materialize as expected. The Company administrators in India were aware that their salaries, however large, were not equal to the money they could make profiteering. The Company expenses were rising and the revenues to offset it were dropping. The East India Company’s troubles were transparent to the British public and government and all of them were blamed on the civil servants in India.  

59 The Company was running a sizeable debt for some time and was forced to rely on borrowings from the Bank of England. However, after the Seven Years War, and the ensuing credit crunch, the central bank in London was hesitant to lend money freely. Lack of funds soon put the East India Company on the verge of bankruptcy. The Directors approached the British Parliament for a loan of about one million pounds. Agreeing to loan the money to the Company, the British government decided to rein in

---

the civil servants in India.\textsuperscript{60} In 1773, they passed the Regulating Act wherein they decided to oversee the administration of the East India Company in Britain and in India.

According to this act, the civil servants of the East India Company were prohibited from engaging in private trade or accepting bribes from natives. It elevated the status of the Governor of Bengal [one of the settlements or trading centers] making him the Governor-General of India, subsuming the authority of the governors of Bombay and Madras, the two other important British settlements in India. This act also created a council of four to help the Governor General administer the East India Company’s business and set up a Supreme Court, based on western jurisprudence. All these provisions together created the first kernel of the British colonial administration. This reform shaped the first centralized government structure of the later day administration.\textsuperscript{61} And although Robert Clive had earlier tried to elevate the civil servants of the Company from traders to administrators, this act formally codified their status. However, the parliament could not pass laws and force the civil servants to follow them from a distance, especially when the conditions of their service were still controlled by the East India Company and not the politicians. The problem, they also believed was the quality of men who formed the civil service.

All the civil service officers, at the heart of the East India Company’s problems in India, were patronage appointees. The Company’s Directors appointed these men based on family connections and regional kinship.\textsuperscript{62} According to this system each of the twenty-four Directors, based on their seniority, could nominate a certain number of

\textsuperscript{60} Bowen, H.V., \textit{The Business of Empire: The East India Company and Imperial Britain, 1756-1833}, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp 35-36.


applicants to the various positions to be filled in India. They used this perk to strengthen their social and economic networks. Even a loyal Company man like Lord Clive encouraged the Directors to be very cautious and careful when nominating individuals for positions in the civil service. Although the recruits were not criminals or other ‘undesirables’, the administrative mismanagement in India certainly gave ammunition to the East India Company’s detractors to stop this system altogether.

Despite organizing the governance of the East India Company through the legislation in 1773, the British government still left the Company in charge of day-to-day operations with no executive oversight. The Parliament corrected this situation via the Pitts India Act in 1784. This measure created a Board of Control, which would be responsible to the Parliament and the Executive about East India Company affairs. According to the act, the Company was still running its internal affairs but had to subject themselves to oversight from the Board of Control. Curiously, however, the patronage system was left untouched.

Despite all the objections to continuing patronage appointments to civil and armed services positions in India, the British government continued the system even after they started monitoring the inner working of the East India Company. Directors of the Company exercised their patronage but the Board of Control regulated the appointments. Through these selections, politicians saw an avenue to favor their constituents with jobs in order to remain popular. Henry Dundas, the famed Scottish politician and member of

---


the Board of Control, was known to use patronage appointments freely to benefit friends and family.\textsuperscript{65}

This meant that most, if not all, patronage appointees were either not well educated or generally dependent on their appointments to make any money, or not from aristocratic families. This drove John Malcolm, a diplomat and administrator in India from 1783-1830, to observe the following, “Those who enter the Indian service are seldom men of high family connexion….Riches are attained in India, as elsewhere, by commercial men, by agents, and by some few of the servants of the Company, who make that their chief or sole object. But it is a remarkable fact, that, amongst all who have been most distinguished during the last forty years, there is not one who possesses a fortune which can be deemed more than a competence; and several of them, after more than thirty years’ service, have not acquired that.”\textsuperscript{66} In addition, the lures of India, which included social intimacy with the locals and relations with Indian women, were making young British lads corrupt and it needed to be stopped.\textsuperscript{67}

To remedy the situation where young Writers and other officers of the Company were appointed through patronage and sent to India without any formal training or education in the duties they were expected to perform, the East India Company opened the Haileybury College in 1806. An earlier attempt by the Governor-General, Lord Wellesley, to open a training institution in Calcutta was dismissed by the Court of Directors. They thought that impressionable young men should be not be sent to India

before eighteen years of age and should be trained in England in “Classics, Arithmetic and Mathematics, Elements of General Law…and Oriental Learning.” Interestingly, the Fort William College in India was allowed to train junior officers employed in India. The recruits to the higher civil service were considered to be different than others and were trained in that fashion. The civil service in India was already beginning to acquire a status reserved for the upper echelons of colonial employment. This also made the service attractive to the upper classes in England. However, if the best and the brightest had to be attracted to the higher civil service in India, as desired by the reformers, patronage appointment would have to end and members of the educated classes attracted to the service.

John Malcolm also made a strong correlation between being moneyed or not being motivated by wealth, and being distinguished in the civil services. This stemmed from his argument that the traits needed for a good civil servant had to be inculcated over a period of time. Men of means, generally, could invest that time without needing to be bothered by monetary gains. It was hoped that this premise would tilt recruitment in favor of those with means or sufficient interest, to combat widespread corruption and profiteering. After the East India Company came under the purview of Parliament, talk of ending patronage altogether started gaining momentum. Although some politicians were not in favor of ending it, the gradual domination of the Whig philosophy and the efforts of reformers like Edmund Burke, became the basis for the movement for civil service reform, primarily ending patronage.

By the end of the eighteenth century, The East India Company had become a ruler, among many, in India. They had, however, not given up their profit motives,
which proved to be devastating for Indians. The rapaciousness of company servants and armed forces made them the most undesirable force in the country. As a result, there was movement among many Whig leaders, like Burke, to make the government take a more active role in administering the Company’s territorial possessions. The wider belief among Whigs was that people’s control over the activities of individual entities like the East India Company was the legitimate and desirable check over base tendencies. They believed that the Company signified unregulated greed of a commercial organization leading to degeneracy and indulgence.

This was not the hallmark of a civilized society and that traditional institutions, such as aristocracy, were the keepers of civilized living. Operating in a climate of apprehension after the French Revolution, Whig politicians were concerned about the longevity of British institutions, especially the aristocracy. An important aspect of this strain of thought was that the intrinsic character of a morally superior civilized society like the British, had to be equated with something that could not be acquired by money. The civil service reformers believed that the aristocracy was the legitimate seat of all things noble in the British character. This led to the Whig project of recruiting aristocrats in the administration of India by eliminating patronage and replacing it by competition.

The emphasis on recruitment by competitive exam aimed to secure a hierarchy within the civil service much like the social and educational hierarchy in the country. The reformers intended to associate the latter two with the civil service. In other words, by making the higher civil service exclusive and in many respects open only to those who had achieved a level of excellence in the intellectual sphere, the reformers could draw the

---

69 *Ibid*, p.32.
social elite into work that would be otherwise shunned by most of them. Since the aristocratic families pursued university education, the competitive avenue of recruitment would obtain the best and brightest among them for jobs in the higher civil service.\textsuperscript{70}

Some historians argued that civil service reformers felt that the universities served as centers of excellence in cultivating high moral character, reliability and loyalty and wanted to take advantage of recruiting such individuals in the higher civil service.\textsuperscript{71}

Gladstone, the British Prime Minister, believed that if there were a demarcation between mechanical and intellectual work in the civil service, the aristocrats would certainly prove their superiority.\textsuperscript{72}

Thus the civil service reformers started creating a permanent structure for recruitment to the higher civil service in India and separating them from the mundane and mechanical aspects of bureaucracy. They decided to change the current system of recruitment through patronage to a competitive process, through legislation. Thomas Macaulay led the charge for this change in the British Parliament. During a debate on legislation aimed to improve the governance in India in 1833, he talked about the most common criticism against selecting administrators through competitive exam. “It is said, I know, that examinations in Latin, in Greek, and in mathematics are no tests of what men will prove to be in life,” he conceded. “I am perfectly aware that they are not infallible tests: but they are tests I confidently maintain. Look at every walk of life, at this House, at the other House, at the Bar, at the Bench, at the Church, and see whether


that it be not true that those who attain high distinction in the world were generally men who were distinguished in their academic career.”  

However, the pull of patronage among the East India Company’s Directors was very strong and despite parliamentary speeches the lobbying against competition was robust. In 1836, the following letter to The Times, reflected fears of an end to the demand for competition in the civil service. “ you will not be surprised to hear….that Leadenhall-street is moving heaven and earth to bring back the ‘good old times,’ when every director’s son, nephew, cousin, or creditor, however, inferior in talent, was sure of an appointment; but you will be surprised to hear that the Whig-Government, which in 1833 felt ‘a strong doubt whether the principle of competition ought not to be carried to a greater extent,’ is now lending itself, according to a general rumor, not only to narrow the principle, but destroy it altogether; and that a bill is in preparation with the sanction of the Board of Control (certain considerations moving it thereunto), in which though professedly for other purposes, a clause will be inserted to obtain this object and so insidiously inserted, as probably to escape the attention of members not quite ready to turn their backs upon themselves. I trust, however, the plot will be defeated by your powerful aid, willing as you have always been to promote the best interests of our Eastern possessions.”

The idea of the competitive exam, however, was not given up. Rather, it was taken further by Charles Trevelyan, the Assistant Secretary at the Treasury, and Sir Stafford Northcote, a noted politician. They penned a report named, “The Organization

---

of the Permanent Civil Service,” that recommended the end of the patronage system in 1853. Trevelyan, who was long associated with the British administration, in various positions, was responsible for the principle of separating the mechanical aspects of the civil servant’s job from its intellectual ones when he wrote his report on the colonial office. However, there was a lot of resistance to introducing competition in civil services from the opposition liberal party, which was against it for a number of reasons. A letter to a national newspaper illustrates a few of these objections. “The proposal of a better organization of the permanent civil service has been criticized and ridiculed by what is commonly supposed to be the liberal and reforming party, because, it is argued, such a reform would naturally bring this country to the same state in which we find other countries such as France, or Prussia, or China, where the organization of the civil service is based on principles similar to those recommended for adoption by the present Government.” The fear being expressed by the opposition members was not just suspicion of foreign systems, although they were not comfortable with that either, but the fact that civilians, not appointed by politicians or the Board of Directors, would be less susceptible to be influenced by public opinion and therefore could become autocratic.

Much newsprint was dedicated to this concern. “Just reflect for one moment what it is that you propose to do by a competitive examination!” The Economist argued. “You propose to give to a board of examiners, acting on a fixed plan and bound by certain rules- for, whatever latitude or discretion you allow, such rules there must be- the power of dictating to Ministers whom and whom only they shall employ in the highest, most

---

responsible, and most delicate functions of the Civil Service.” The same article goes on to assuage these widely expressed fears in the most sanguine way. “Now this is obviously not what you wish to do- not what the interests of the country require should be done. What is wanted is not that the victors in an Olympic race or an intellectual gymnasium shall be rewarded by posts under the Crown but that none shall be appointed to such posts who are not provably and provedly competent to discharge its duties as the public interests require that they should be discharged. You do not desire to deprive Ministers of the power of appointment: you can only insist upon depriving them of the power of appointing the incapable, the unworthy, or the unfit. You do not desire to abolish the patronage which naturally attaches to their high place and their heavy responsibilities: you only demand security that this patronage shall not be recklessly or mischievously exercised.”

Whatever the opponents of the competitive exams felt, the proponents of the reform always talked about the new system bringing in equality, meritocracy and an end to nepotism and favoritism. While this seemed desirable to the public at large, who saw a chipping away at privilege and establishing effective government, the promoters of this reform hoped for an in built exclusivity in the civil services because access to higher education, which was the precondition to entrance into the higher civil service, was within reach only to the cultural and educational elite. In England, these were frequently members of the aristocracy. As Stafford Northcote remarked, “I would add that the advantages which an University training would give in the competition would almost insure the selection of a large majority from among those who have received it; & there is no kind of education, so likely to make a gentleman. It is an important advantage to him

to have access to refined Society at that early age. It is better that he should dance polkas than smoke cigars and drink gin; for assuredly he will do one or the other. In short, I would have Gentlemen in the public offices and I believe they can be obtained only by being elected as at present."

With the general public behind it and the Whig politicians making a strong case for its acceptance, the reform was passed in the form of the Charter Act of 1853. The occasion to extend the charter of the East India Company by the parliament was used to effect this change. The measure abolished patronage as a method of recruitment to the Indian civil services. Instead a competitive exam system, open to all British citizens, was adopted. A committee was created under the chairmanship of Thomas Macaulay, a strong proponent of the competitive exams, to draw up the structure and rules for working the new schema. The recommendations of the Macaulay Committee, formally known as the Committee on Consideration of the Subjects of the Examination of Candidates for the Civil Service of the East India Company, came up with all the means to create a generalist and exclusive service.

The candidates were to be selected “by superiority in intellectual competition.” Because “early superiority in science and literature generally indicates the existence of some qualities which are securities against vice- industry, self-denial, a taste for pleasures not sensual, a laudable desire of honorable distinction, a still more laudable desire to obtain the approbation of friends and relations.” In addition, they were to be recruited young, but not so young that the alien and foreign cultures can influence them. Although,

---

79 The Government Regulations For The Examinations of Candidates For Appointments to the Civil Service of The East India Company to Which is Appended Two Reports to the Commissioners For the Affairs of India by the Committee Appointed For That Purpose, (London: Edward Stanford, 1855), pp 23-24.
youth as young as 18 could enter the service, according to the committee, Macaulay was confident “that except in very rare and extraordinary cases, no lad of 18 will have any chance of being admitted….We hope and believe,” he elaborated, “that among the successful competitors will frequently be young men who have obtained the highest honors of Oxford and Cambridge.”

In addition, the committee held that the civil service officers appointed to the higher posts in India should be generalists. This was done so that “no candidate who may fail shall, to whatever calling he may betake himself, have any reason to regret the time and labour which he spent in preparing himself to be examined. Nor do we think that we should render any service to India by inducing her future rulers to neglect, in their earlier years, European literature and science, for studies especially Indian. We believe that men who have been engaged, up to one or two and twenty, in studies which have no immediate connexion with the business of any profession, and of which the effect is merely to open, to invigorate, and to enrich the mind, will generally be found, in the business of every profession, superior to men who have, at 18 or 19, devoted themselves to the special duties of their calling.”

These basic ideas formed the foundation of recruitment to the civil service. They did not change with time and have continued to guide civil service employment to this day. The criteria for attracting talent were very specific for this committee. The reformers insisted on bringing into the service young men from well-heeled and educated families who had all the advantages of a generalized European education. These individuals would be of a caliber, the reformers hoped, that would be good enough to

---
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enter any honorable profession in British society, thereby conferring an air of respectability to the Indian government and its administration.

**Centralization**

Among all the British legacies of the Indian bureaucracy, the centralized structure of the ICS was most useful to the post-independence Indian leadership. It quickly provided control, law and order and essential services to the far-flung corners of India by the central government in Delhi during the violence and chaos of the post-partition period. However, centralization was not the natural order of the British system in India but was carefully created and calibrated through a series of reform acts. The East India Company had different settlements in India and each operated independent of each other. That situation created its own problems and the British authorities had to intervene to create solutions.

The first problem arose when the Company was granted the right to collect land revenue in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. As mentioned earlier, the Company servants were amassing a lot of wealth and returning back to England as rich men. The British government saw the fiscal mismanagement and corruption and the utter helplessness of the Directors of the East India Company in dealing with the errant officers. Many saw this as the cause of the great famine of Bengal in 1770-71.82 In addition, politicians in parliament wanted to get a share of the company largesse, which was being pilfered by Company employees bringing it to the brink of bankruptcy.83 The problems in India

---

were also compounded by the different Company settlements in the country. Although Bengal was the biggest and most powerful location of the East India Company’s trading posts (having earned the right to collect local land revenue), the other two outposts in Madras and Bombay, were also important, in their own right and conducted their affairs (wars, peace treaties and alliances) independent of the Bengal leadership.

In 1773, the Parliament passed the Regulating Act to deal with this situation. Among other measures, this Act focused on centralizing the structure of Company governance. This meant rationalizing power and authority at all levels. A Secretary of State for India was appointed by Parliament to oversee East India Company’s business. Minor adjustments were made to the terms of the Directors of the East India Company. However, the biggest changes were made to the governing structure in India. The Governor of Bengal was made the Governor General of India, bringing the Bombay and Madras settlements under his unified control. This meant that all major decisions regarding war, peace, treaties and alliances needed to be approved by the Governor General and his council. The Governor-General’s Council was appointed by the Parliament and all decisions were to be made by a simple majority. These decisions were binding on the Governor-General even if he did not approve of them. This Act also created a Supreme Court with a Chief Justice in India, which dealt with all judicial issues arising out of the Company affairs in India.85

As soon as the Regulating Act was passed, its weaknesses became apparent to the legislators in England. It was, arguably, not centralizing enough to deal with all the practical issues coming out of Indian administration. The Governor-General believed the
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new council members sent from England were constantly obstructing him. He also felt he was hamstrung without the right to veto decisions made by the council. The Presidencies of Madras and Bombay were citing emergencies to make their own decisions and the Court of Directors was becoming an oligarchy. Parliament felt it still lacked control over the affairs of the East India Company and the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court was not clarified. All of this created confusion and blurred a clear line of authority and control.

The Pitts India Act remedied this in 1784. First, the parliamentarians decided to establish complete control over the Court of Directors. They created a Board of Control headed by the Secretary of State (created by the Regulating Act) and comprising of the Chancellor of Exchequer (Finance Minister) with other members or commissioners appointed by the British government. Their powers, as the act stated, was “from time to time, to superintend, direct, and control, all acts, operations, and concerns, which in any wise relate to the civil or military government or revenues of the British territorial possessions in the East Indies, in the manner hereinafter directed. And, to the intent that the said Board may be duly informed of all transactions of the said Company, in respect to the management of their concerns in the East Indies.” The control over the Company’s affairs was total and open ended.

In India, the Act gave the Governor General the veto to override the decision of his Council. In addition, “the Governor General and the Council of Fort William [Bengal], aforesaid shall have power and authority to superintend, control, and direct the

---

87 East India Company Act, 1784, Ibid, pp. 96-97.
several presidencies and governments now or hereafter to be erected or established in the East Indies by the said United Company….And in order to prevent the embarrassment and difficulty which may arise from any question, whether the orders or instructions of the Governor-General and the Council of Fort William relate to other points than those aforesaid, be it further enacted, that notwithstanding any doubt which may be entertained by the said presidencies or settlements to whom such orders or instructions shall be given, respecting the power of the Governor General and Council to give such orders, yet the said presidencies or settlements shall be bound to obey such orders and directions of the said Governor General and Council in all cases whatever.”

Furthermore, the right of the presidencies to conduct war, peace or enter into treaties with local rulers on their own accord without prior permission from the government in Bengal was banned.

With these structures in place Warren Hastings, the Governor General of India started rationalizing British administration in India. First, he removed all local tax collectors appointed by the Indian rulers and appointed British revenue officers in each district called ‘collectors’, thus ending the dual governance system and integrating revenue functions under the British hierarchy. The Mughal-era officer that the Collectors replaced was semi-autonomous and exercised a lot of discretionary powers as the sole representative of the central authority in the district. The Court of Directors, in 1786, made the Collector, like his Indian predecessor, ultimately responsible for all administrative activities in the district including dispensing petty criminal and civil justice. However, in the early days of creating this office, the central authority did not have much control over the Collector’s activities, especially since methods of communication, like telegraphs and railways were not developed and government

---

regulations around proper exercise of his powers were not created. Also, no specialized services of experts operated in districts to fetter the Collector’s decisions.

Lord Cornwallis, who followed Hastings as the Governor-General, was a firm believer in the Whig philosophy of government. He felt that power had a deeply corrupting influence on government and it had to be kept in check by spreading it out among different arms of administration, creating a countervailing force between them.\(^{89}\) Cornwallis believed that especially about the Collector. “Such power, vested in an individual, and at great distance from the seat of supreme control, excites terror in the minds of the people, instead of inspiring them with confidence in its protection; and as they can form no judgment of our Government, but as it is shown to them in our representative, the Collector, there is little encouragement for them when oppressed to rely upon our justice for relief.”\(^{90}\)

Cornwallis’ concerns about the Collector’s powers prompted his famed reforms of 1793, which curtailed some authority of the District Collector. He was no longer responsible for adjudicating civil and criminal justice at the district level. In addition, the procedural codes for conducting administrative business to promote efficiency and uniformity severely handicapped the discretionary powers of the Collector. He was also made personally liable for all official acts before ordinary courts of law. These actions changed the arbitrary nature of the Collector’s office and put a break from the old Mughal tradition of an absolutist district officer. This also meant that the district came


under firmer, more comprehensive control of the central government because the Collector was now liable for carrying out orders of the government in Bengal or be punished with fines or dismissal if he chose otherwise. The Company administration in England was keen on establishing direct executive control over the districts through the centralized authority in Bengal through the Collector. As a result the Collector’s position as the sole representative of the central government did not change. This format continued even after more legislative control and oversight of the executive was introduced.  

Apart from the Regulating Act and the Pitts India Act, which tried to create a more unified line of control of official business in India, the Charter Act of 1813, removed the Company’s monopoly for trade with India, before ending it entirely in 1833. Bowing to pressure from different merchant groups in England, the British Parliament removed the East India Company’s trading privileges, thereby reducing its commercial presence in the country and forcing it to maintain separate commercial and territorial accounts. However, the act also made it responsible for improving the life of Indians, thus trying to change the character of the Company’s rule in India. To expand the power of the British administration in India, the Act of 1813 extended the reach of the three provincial governments over all aspects of law and order and civil administration in India. The British courts in India had to recognize the law making capacity of all three Presidencies thereby enhancing the authority of the executive in the country.  

In 1833, the British Parliament formally ended the East India Company’s business dealings in the country, making it wholly responsible for territorial administration. They

---

became an extension of the British government and, as Macaulay noted, administered India as a trustee of the Crown. Macaulay and the liberal wing of British politicians believed that India should operate under a strong central executive who worked within the framework of a legislative authority. In other words, they wanted a limited government in India.  Despite these beliefs, the central executive remained more powerful and the supposed legislative oversight continued in an advisory capacity. In 1833, the first attempt to control the executive authority was tried. However, the Governor General was empowered to overrule his council, which operated only in an advisory capacity. Finally, in 1853, the last charter act was passed by the Parliament. In light of the expanding territorial acquisitions and the administrative scope of the Company, the British government decided to make further changes to the structure of the government in India. First, they separated the executive and the legislative functions by creating a separate legislative council and including representatives of the different provinces. They could ask questions of the Governor General and expect answers from the executive; however, the primacy of the executive remained unchanged. This act also created a central government that was separate from the provincial government. For instance, the Governor General of Bengal had responsibility for the province of Bengal as well as the central government. According to the provisions of the new act, the Governor General was to be the chief executive for British India and Bengal was assigned to a new

Lieutenant Governor.\textsuperscript{95} As a result, the lines of administrative authority were clarified, and more centralized.

With the passing of the charter acts, however, the British parliament kept the Company in charge of the administration of India and made some incremental changes in the system of governance. However, in 1858, just after the upheaval of 1857, the Crown finally took over the entire administration of the country.\textsuperscript{96} British lawmakers had realized that mere oversight of the Company was not sufficient to administer India and that the government needed to take complete responsibility for it. A new cabinet position of Secretary of State for India was created along with Council of India. The majority of Council members were individuals who had served in India, especially held high office there. Most of them were members of the Indian civil service and advised the Secretary of State on Indian affairs. However, given the new role of the British Parliament in Indian matters through the Secretary of State, questions about the importance and autonomy of the central authority of the Governor-General in India were raised. Was he to be only a conduit in the long line of power points from the districts to the home government in London or was he more important than that?

Strachey, a civil service officer, considered the Governor-General a very powerful force in Indian administration. The changes brought on by the Act of 1858 did not mean

\textsuperscript{95} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{96} In 1857, some Indian troops in the East India Company’s army revolted against the use of a particular casing around bullet cartridges, which they needed to bite off before loading into guns, because they believed it contained the fat of cows and pigs. Ingesting this substance, they argued, was against the tenets of their religion (Hinduism and Islam respectively). Local rulers who had lost their kingdoms to the British egged them on and this created a full-blown war against the Company rule. Historians are divided in their characterization of this conflict. Some term it as a ‘sepoy mutiny’, which meant that it was limited to the revolt of disgruntled soldiers and others refer to it as the first war for Indian independence. Nevertheless, it was ruthlessly suppressed by the British forces that had to scramble troops from other parts of the country. This was the first time that Indians had risen up against British rule in a substantial manner, underscoring their (British) minority status in India and the need to create administrative unity and a better command and control structure. It was also argued in some political circles in England that provincial autonomy (not needing central government’s permission to act), might have helped in responding better to the uprising.
that the home government interfered in everything relating to Indian affairs. “The action of the Secretary of State [Home Government],” Strachey argued, “is mainly confined to answering references made to him by the Government of India, and, apart from great political or financial questions, the number and nature of those references mainly depend on the character of the Governor-General for the time being. Some men in that position like to minimize personal responsibilities, and to ask for the orders of the Home Government before taking action. Others prefer to act on their own judgment and on that of their councilors. The Secretary of State initiates almost nothing. …So long as the Government of India is content to carry on the administration without largely increasing the cost of existing establishments, and without incurring new and heavy charges, it is practically almost independent, so far as its action in the internal affairs of India is concerned.”

The next two sets of Acts passed by the Secretary of State and the India Council in 1861 and 1892, focused on the legislative aspects of governance in India. The Indian Councils Act in 1861 provided for the expansion of the Governor-General’s council and the Provincial councils headed by the Governor’s of the Presidencies. In addition, in 1892, the Governor-General and the Governors were permitted to nominate non-official members to their legislative councils and also to the civil service despite them not having passed the entrance examinations. This was the way to get some prominent Indian elite into the legislative process. This, according to Anil Seal, a prominent historian of the Cambridge school of historiography, was essential for revenue collection and maintaining

---

law and order in the far corners of India. He argued that in order to achieve British imperial aims (extending influence in the Indian Ocean region and in other parts of the world and maintenance of the British administrative and military system in India) through Indian revenues, the control from the highest power in London to that of the Governor-General had to be absolute. However, at the local levels, collaboration with the local elites was important to extract the maximum amount of money through land revenues and maintain basic law and order. Hence to ensure their cooperation and collaboration in the larger aims of the British colonial project, the local elites were nominated to councils so that they could appear to be ones in charge of collecting revenue and maintaining order. “The British built the framework; the Indians fitted into it.”

The general trend toward decentralization in the political sphere continued in the first two decades of the twentieth century. However, along with the former, administrative unity and centralization persisted and strengthened as well. This is evident in the note of the Governor General Curzon circulated among different departments in the Government of India in 1905. “A well organized Department has only one mind, which is not necessarily, or usually, the mind of any single person. The duty of each officer, from the Chief to his junior subordinate, is to consider not what he would himself like to say, but what the Department has to say.” Curzon wanted a unified administrative chain of command and communication, with clearly identified centers of power and decision-making. He wanted single departmental policies, not several opinions so that it

99 Anil Seal, “Imperialism and Nationalism in India”, *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 3 (1973), pp 321-347, p.328. The Cambridge School of historiography, so named because historians at Cambridge University developed it, interprets Indian nationalism from the viewpoint of British imperialists. They argue that British rule of India would be improbable if it were not for the Indian self-seekers and collaborators. They especially focus on the cooperation between the British and Indians at the local level.
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would be easy for vertical integration of administration. And despite the publicly stated policy of involving Indians with the administration of their country, their role at this time was limited to consultation through the limited legislative process. There was no doubt that if decentralization was to happen in the political sphere, the writ of the imperial administration had to be absolute and would have to reach every corner of the empire to maintain control. As a result vertical lines of authority would have to be strengthened.

In 1885, with the establishment of the Indian National Congress, there was great pressure on the British government to decentralize and include more Indians in the management and control of India. In 1909 and 1919, two measures were passed by the British parliament to give greater provincial autonomy and inclusion of Indians in governance. ‘The Royal Commission Upon Decentralization’ (appointed in 1907 and submitted its report in 1909) tried to decentralize the financial and administrative relations between the Government of India and the provincial governments and between the provincial government and the subordinate authorities. They felt that too much power and authority was being vested in the central authorities versus the lower levels. However, much of this critique was limited to the amount of interference by the superior authority of the subordinate one in administrative details. Despite appearing to encourage provincial autonomy, the Commission was not actually dismantling a centralized structure. They were advocating for an efficient disposal of administrative work by making the provinces take responsibility for work they were already doing. This

would free up the center to do more broad policy guidance rather than be involved in
details. Albeit, they also noted that “what is normally a detail, properly left to the local
government, may, at a period of political stress or under altered circumstances, become a
matter in which the Government of India and even the Secretary of State, must assert
their responsibilities.”103 Also, by advocating a strict enforcement of the tenure system in
the civil service, the Commission was ensuring that the district problems and issues were
well represented at the center, thereby establishing a better line of contact between the
center and the lowest rung of administration.104

Similarly, in the ‘Report on Constitutional Reforms of India’ in 1918, greater
legislative involvement of Indian elites and some measure of elective input from educated
and moneyed individuals were sought. In that respect, greater legislative autonomy was
recommended. These suggested reforms became part of the Government of India Act in
1919. In this act dual government or ‘dyarchy’, as it was called, was set up in the
Provinces.105 However, as far as administrative unity and hierarchy was concerned, the
report had this to say: “We recognize that, in so far as the provincial Governments of the
future will still remain partly bureaucratic in character, there can be no logical reason for
relaxing the control of superior official authority over them nor indeed would any general
relaxation be approved by Indian opinion; and that in this respect the utmost that can be

103 Ibid., p.24.
104 The central government in the Indian administrative system did/does not have its own cadre of higher
civil service officers. Rather, senior officers from the provinces staff the central secretariat (the central
government administrative hub). This is the tenure system in the Indian government and was initiated so
that there would be better understanding of issues/problems of the lowest administrative unit. This system
continues till date. Sometimes civil service officers’ are/were deputed to the center and they continue/d
there beyond the time they are supposed to stay. This caused the Commission in 1907-09 to ensure
firmness in enforcing tenure requirements and limits.
105 Dyarchy was the system wherein the subjects of administration in the provinces were divided in two
lists: Reserved and Transferred. The reserved subjects like land revenue, justice, police etc., were to be
exclusively controlled by the Governor of the province and his executive council. The transferred subjects
like education, libraries, museums etc., were administered by the governor with the help of ministers
responsible to the legislative council composed mainly of elected members.
justified is such modification of present methods of control as aims at getting rid of interference in minor matters, which might very well be left to the decision of the authority which is most closely acquainted with the facts.”

The provinces and the local governments continued to be the locus of greater involvement of Indians in the administration of their country. The Indian National Congress made demands for provincial autonomy and was accepted by the British government in small measures. However, the colonial administration remained absolutely centralized and no concessions in that regard were entertained or accepted. This system continued with minor variations till independence and was in existence when Nehru took office after independence.

“Indianization” of a Colonial Administration

As mentioned earlier, the colonial administration at the time of Indian independence was a product of incremental changes brought about by carefully constructed laws and acts. These efforts reflected either the prevailing ideology of the times or proactive changes to the system by the British government. However, through all these modifications, one aspect was always emphasized. The administration of India had to be essentially British in character. This was so because of poor British opinion of Indian rulers and people, in general. Lord Clive described his impressions as such: “Indostan [Hindustan, which was another name for India], was always an absolute despotic government. The inhabitants, especially in Bengal, in inferior stations are servile, mean, submissive and humble. In superior stations they are luxurious,

---

effeminate, tyrannical, treacherous, venal, cruel." Macaulay expressed similar views. In his essay on Lord Clive, Macaulay criticized the Mughal Empire that ruled India (directly and indirectly) at the beginning of British commercial activities there. “There can be no doubt” Macaulay argued, “that this great empire, powerful and prosperous as it appears on a superficial view, was yet, even in its best days, far worse governed than the worse governed parts of Europe now are. The administration was tainted with all the vices of oriental despotism, and all the vices inseparable from the domination of race over race.”

Yet, the British relied on many local officials from the Mughal administration for routine administrative jobs like maintaining civil accounts and revenue collection. However, the civil service reformers and intellectuals, like Macaulay, were convinced of the inferiority of the native administration and believed that it was the moral duty of the British government to provide the oppressed masses of India a superior European system. To that end, he also suggested that recruitment to the civil service of the East India Company ought to be from among the graduates of the finest British Universities because that would ensure selection of young men of high character, with loyalty to their work and the State. In the long term Macaulay knew that natives would have to be ‘schooled’ through proper English education to appreciate British administrative principles. The Colonial administration needed many lower level workers. In addition, he suggested creating a class of intermediaries. In his famous ‘Minute on Indian

---

Education,’ in 1835, Macaulay expressed this sentiment. “….It is impossible for us, with our limited means, to attempt to educate the body of the people.” Macaulay admitted, “We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect.”

Soon after, in 1853, parliament passed the Government of India Act replacing patronage recruitment by competitive exams. Candidates for the higher civil service in India would be tested in European languages and subjects taught at the top British universities. Successful applicants would be trained appropriately and admitted into the civil service. However, the Act of 1853 also mentioned, for the first time, that this exam will be open to all British subjects (including Indians). The reformers believed that Indians who can master European subjects and literature enough to clear the civil services exam should be welcomed in the bureaucracy. They would be part of the group, Macaulay hoped, of intermediaries for the British in India. The establishment of the merit based competitive system was an enticement to middle class Indians to aspire to work for a British system of administration and they were only too happy to get in.

Macaulay, however, was not trying to make it convenient for Indians to enter the service. In 1854, a commission, led by Macaulay, was appointed to carve out a plan to conduct the civil services exam. In its report, formally termed as “Report on the Indian Civil Service”, the Macaulay commission proposed the age limit for entry to the civil service be fixed at twenty-five. This late age was suggested because “it is desirable that

---

he [the civil service officer] should have received the best, the most liberal, the most
finished education that his native country affords.” In addition, they wanted the
candidates to have “taken the first degree in arts at Oxford or Cambridge.”113 By
including Sanskrit and Arabic amongst two optional languages in the exam, however, the
committee made a token gesture to any native Indian desirous of entering the civil
service. Regardless of any concessions the rules were very clear: they wanted a
classically trained, ‘Oxbridge’ graduate from an elite background.

Regardless, however, of what the reformers wanted, the finest university educated
men in Britain were not keen on serving in the far corners of the Empire.114 In addition,
the exam system devised by Macaulay did not help the Oxford and Cambridge graduates
who specialized in a few subjects and were tested intensively at the University. The civil
service exam had a much more superficial approach and needed Oxbridge graduates to
gain working knowledge of many subjects instead of mastery over one. As a result, most
successful civil service officers came from ‘crammers’ rather than the best universities in
Britain.115 In 1858, after the Crown took over the administration of the country, the
Queen proclaimed to her Indian citizens that they would be treated equally with British
citizens for employment in all government services. As a result, the English educated
Indians (trained through Macaulay’s new education scheme) by the 1860s were also
looking to appear for the exam but were weighed down by the preconditions imposed by
the examiners. Going to London to cram and appear for the test was not possible for

---
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Crammers were exam preparatory institutions, which helped candidates prepare for the civil service exams.
many in India. The rising number of educated Indians wanting to appear for the civil services exam and the fact that the Colonial government was finding it difficult to attract and retain the best candidates from the home country prompted the institution of many committees to look into recruiting Indians into the higher civil services.116

The new situation led to a serious quandary among British lawmakers. Would the much-hyped competitive system bring in a questionable lot of civilians? Some of the committees constituted for looking into this issue by the British government did not help in controlling the situation. The Special Committee on Civil Salaries, in its report in 1860, suggested holding simultaneous exams in India and England with similar question papers. The successful candidates from both venues should be put together in a single merit list and trained for their jobs. Most of these recommendations seemed academic to English policy makers till the first Indian, Satyendranath Tagore, was successful in clearing the exam in 1863. After this, all the committees started devising ways to make the exam harder to pass for the Indians.117 The maximum age limit for appearing in the examination was lowered to twenty-two even before Tagore’s success (1860). After it, however, it was further lowered to twenty-one in 1865 and the minimum age was also reduced to seventeen at the same time. In addition, the maximum number of points allotted to ‘oriental’ languages was also reduced. This back and forth over changing age limits and subjects offered for the exam was confusing. The Indian middle classes and elites had started objecting to these changes leading to a general feeling of dissatisfaction among the groups supporting British rule in India. Also many civilians started

questioning whether the exam would be able to gauge the hardy temperament needed for an officer’s job as well as the ‘gentlemanly’ qualities necessary to comport himself before natives of India.\textsuperscript{118}

In 1874, Liddell, the Dean of Christ Church College (Oxford), indicated to Lord Salisbury, the Secretary of State for India, that he was willing to make changes in school requirements to allow greater number of their graduates to enter the civil service. The Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge also indicated that greater number of Cambridge men needed to be in the civil service because of their superior ‘moral and mental training.’\textsuperscript{119}

In 1876, Liddell chaired the ‘The Committee on the Selection and Training of Candidates for the Indian Civil Service’, which suggested the lowering of the maximum age of entry to the civil service to be 19 years. Despite criticism from some quarters, Greek and Latin garnered the maximum points between them, and men selected in the competitive were required to spend two years at university during probation, before leaving for India. The administrators of Oxford and Cambridge hoped this would help get more of their graduates into the services. These requirements, however, were extremely debilitating for Indians. Traveling to England, finding a suitable ‘crammer’ and if they were successful in passing the civil service exam, spending the probationary years at a specified university was very difficult; as a result, hardly any Indian candidates were able to get through the examination. With that in mind, many Indian elites and professionals came together to form an association to plead their case to the British government. In 1885, they created the Indian National Congress (INC) to lobby the government to make

\textsuperscript{118} Bannerjee (2010), p. 162. Similar sentiments were expressed by Dr. George Birdwood in his paper entitled “On Competition and the Indian Civil Service” at the meeting of the East India Association on May 21, 1872, reproduced in \textit{Journal of the East India Association}, Vol. VI. 1872.
conditions easier for Indian candidates to appear for the ICS exam. At the very first meeting of the INC in Bombay, members passed a resolution asking the Government to hold simultaneous civil services exam in India and England and prepare a single merit list for filling positions in the higher bureaucracy.\(^{120}\)

In 1886, the Government appointed the Public Service Commission under the chairmanship of Sir Charles Aitchison, the Lieutenant Governor of Punjab, to look into the “employment of Natives of India not only in appointments ordinarily reserved by law for members of the Covenanted Civil Service but also in the Uncovenanted Service generally, including in that term the lower administrative appointments, executive and judicial, and all special departments connected with the civil administration of the country.”\(^{121}\) On the all-important issue of stopping the recruitment of Covenanted civil service through open competitive exam, the Commission was resolute. “As the Covenanted Civil Service may be said to represent the only permanent English official element in India, the importance of recruiting that service with reference to the maintenance of English principles and methods of government cannot, in the opinion of the Commission be overrated. Any uncertain note of policy in this respect might produce undesirable results.”\(^{122}\) In addition, the Commission also declined holding simultaneous civil service exam in England and India, with the following reasoning: “The object of the Government of India in recruiting in England a limited staff of officers, who after training in India might be entrusted with the more important executive and judicial


charges, was *(inter alia)*, to secure an administration conducted so far as possible on principles and methods in harmony with modern civilization….and from the time the competitive system was introduced, it has been understood that the examination was to bear a distinctively English character, and to constitute a test of English qualifications.”

Implicit in the above is the association of modernity with the English character. Also, as Mrinalini Sinha assesses, the report of the Public Service Commission, in its attempt to increase native employment in the higher civil services, ended up making it even more exclusive by dividing up the bureaucracy in three levels. The ICS manned the exclusive upper echelons controlled by the central government; a provincial service was created at the provincial level controlled by the provincial authority and a still lower clerical service was created to man the lowest reaches of administration. Sinha contends that notions of colonial masculinity pervaded the Commission’s scheme of division. The ‘manly’ ICS officer had to be of a hardy British stock, while ‘effeminate’ Bengalis and South Indians could populate the provincial and clerical service. Furthermore, the characterization of Indians from the various parts of the country into stereotypes (martial Punjabi), served as the reason for not simultaneously holding the exam in London and India- it would only benefit some regions of the country where education was more valued. This distinction was crucial in the later years because it bred regional differences and stereotypes and plagued post-independence nationalism. However, for the present, the Commission, by making the ICS even more exclusive and difficult to

---

123 Ibid., p. 40.
enter, heightened the desire of educated Indians to enter the service and they lobbied even harder to level the playing field.

While the question of increasing the number of Indians in the ICS remained and was constantly brought up by the leaders of Indian political parties, the British government decided to make the lower levels of administration more attractive to middle class Indians by enhancing their pay and conditions of service. The Government of India appointed a Clerks’ Salaries Committee in 1908 and increased the power and independence of the provincial services through the Royal Commission Upon Decentralization in 1909.125 They, however, had to face up to the pressure put upon them for increasing the number of Indians in the ICS and relented by appointing the Royal Commission on the Public Services in India under the chairmanship of Baron Islington in 1912. This body recommended recruiting twenty five percent of the total strength of the ICS through promotions from the provincial service. They believed this would take care of additional Indian recruitment into the superior services but refused to recommend the simultaneous exams in England and India. In addition, those who had been appointed into the ICS would have to undergo the same probationary requirements as that of the direct recruits.126 This still meant probationers had to spend time at an eminent British University for three years. The Commission was also clear about its preference for where the bulk of the recruitment for its premier services should happen. “In the first should be placed the Indian Civil Service and the police department, in which it should be

125 Maheshwari, S.R., Indian Administration: An Historical Account
recognized that a preponderating proportion of officers should be recruited in Europe.”

This report, however, was not published until 1917, due to the World War and so was not considered by the Government of India. In addition, the Government of India released the Report on Constitutional Reforms penned by Edwin Montague and Chelmsford in 1919 that upended the previous report.

The ‘MontFord’ Report recognized the displeasure of Indians with the reforms suggested by the earlier report and proposed that in light of a new approach toward responsible government in India, greater number of Indians ought to be brought into positions of power. Again, the committee stressed the importance of certain traits that were the hallmarks of the ICS, like “courage, leadership, decision, fixity of purpose, detached judgment and integrity”. Also, they felt that “there should be no such sudden swamping of any service with any new element that its whole character suffers a rapid alteration.” The commission recommended the long sought after Indian demand of recruitment in India for all the services exclusively recruited in England and finally a simultaneous civil service exam was held in England and India in 1923. However, only twenty-five percent of the total numbers of officers were to be recruited in India. Also of interest was the Committee’s recommendation that Europeans should be paid attractive salaries to entice them to join the services since greater numbers of European service members are essential to keep up the character of the superior positions.128

By 1923, the nature of Indian discontent and the demands of the freedom movement had far exceeded the previous desire of ‘natives’ to be just associated with

127 Ibid., p. 257.
their administration. Now the Indian National Congress, under the leadership of Gandhi, had adopted the mass mobilization method, rather than the old petitioning route to get their message across. Also, the moderates in the party who were more interested in getting jobs in the British administration were gradually being edged out in favor of those with a more ambitious plan of getting freedom from British rule altogether. This was apparent in the ‘Report of the Royal Commission on Superior Services’ in 1924. The Report noted that members of the Indian Civil Service were being singled out for attack in the press and political platforms for being subservient to the Secretary of State in England rather than the Government of India. All of this, the Report believed, was done because Indians felt that the rate of Indianization was too slow.\textsuperscript{129} The Commission recommended the continuation of the Secretary of State’s control of the ICS but argued for an increase in the number of Indian officers into the ICS by promotion from the Provincial Services such that the total proportion of Indian to European officers in the ICS should be fifty fifty.\textsuperscript{130} It also asked for the setting up of a centralized Public Service Commission to help recruit candidates for the ICS and other All India Services. This Report was criticized severely by the British officers for reducing the number of Europeans in the Services to Indians and also rejected by Indians for not going far enough.

\textbf{Conclusion: An Elitist Administration, Centralized and “Indianized”}

Finally, in 1928, under pressure from the growing political unrest, the British Government appointed the Indian Statutory Commission, under the leadership of Sir John


\textsuperscript{130} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 18.
Simon to investigate the possibility of granting greater autonomy to Provinces and establishing a more responsible government at all levels of administration. The Commission proposed an almost responsible government at the provincial level (exceptions were made for law and order issues and protection of minority rights) while keeping the central government untouched. The European civil service officers were free to accept premature retirement if they did not wish to serve under an Indian Minister responsible to an Indian legislature. In addition the central services would enjoy considerable career safeguards through the Secretary of State so that ‘men of the right type’ continued to enter the Indian bureaucracy.\textsuperscript{131}

Thus began the conundrum of the colonial era services transitioning into hitherto unknown area of representative government. The specter of an English educated, university trained civil service officer, ‘Indian in blood and colour and English in taste, opinion, morals and intellect’, whose career was controlled by the central authority but worked in the provinces for popularly elected Indian politicians and who could be criticized by Indian legislators was coming to pass. “Persistent criticism of this kind inevitably had a discouraging effect on services accustomed to a traditional respect”, the Simon Commission complained.\textsuperscript{132} In time, as the freedom movement carried on, this ‘respect’ became the source of disagreement between the Indian politicians and British administrators. However, there can be no doubt that the Indian civil service forged and shaped by every reform since the days of the East India Company turned out to be the most enduring Colonial institution. Ironically, the leaders of the independence movement hated the prestige and elitism of the services and yet held it up as reason to continue it.

\textsuperscript{132} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 266.
Vallabhbhai Patel, the first Home Minister of independent India said on behalf of the men of the ICS, “They are men who prefer honor, dignity, prestige and deserve the affection of the people.” Whether they got the affection of the people is debatable but the post-independence leadership quickly pledged to undo the characteristics built into the services by centuries of carefully constructed reforms.

---

Chapter 3

State Nationalism, Centralized Development and Administrative Change in Post-Colonial India.

Colonialism, and the nationalism it spawned, attempted to define the social, economic and political contours of independent India.\(^{134}\) It created paradigms and ways to consider and converse about all things Indian: to identify, define, classify and evaluate life in India. Some scholars of Indian history have argued that colonialism brought intellectual frameworks of difference to South Asia through which India was ‘essentialized,’ including our understanding of the past and visions of the future, and through these frameworks the subjugation of a sub-continent was justified.\(^{135}\) It was through these parameters, according to these commentators, that

\(^{134}\) The start of the British rule in India around 1776 was broadly accepted as the start of the ‘modern period’ in Indian history. This was so because it allowed study of western concepts of modernity in the Indian context. Newer work on Modern India has started to question this classification and “periodization”.\(^{135}\) Several historians have used this broad framework to undergird their studies. The creator of this framework was Said, Edward, *Orientalism*, (New York: Vintage, 1979). Saidian framework made it possible for historians of India to use culture as a distinct category of power and domination and has generally informed the Subaltern school of analysis in Indian history. Dirks, Nicholas, *Colonialism and Culture* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1992), pp. 1-25, argues that cultural distinctions between the metropole and the colonies were the means for both defining and controlling the Indian people. The dichotomies between them, for instance, the colonizers were modern, scientific, rational, whereas the colonized were archaic/medieval, traditional and rooted in the occult/non rational, were emphasized and gave the more modern cultures a right and duty to direct the development of the more traditional ones. Bernard Cohn in his book, Cohn, Bernard S., *Colonialism And Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India*, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996), also elaborates this theme. However, historians like Sugata Bose, object to thinking of culture as a pure and uncontested terrain. He argues against the subaltern historians like Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments*, (Princeton, 1993), and Gyanendra Pandey, “In Defence of the Fragment” in *Representations*, 1992, (Winter), pp.27-55. “The celebration of the fragment in a post-modern vein against monolithic modern structures of state and economy may draw attention to the evils of the modern. It does not expose to the full glare of criticism the inequities concealed within the fragment.” In other words, Bose is exhorting readers to remember that traditional societies also institutionalized inequities and power structures and those evils of the traditional should not be forgotten while pointing out the evils of the modern. Sugata Bose and Ayesha Jalal, “Nationalism, Democracy and Development”, in Bose, Sugata and Jalal, Ayesha, (eds.) *Nationalism, Democracy and Development: State and Politics in India*, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998), p.4. As does Gyan Prakash in his essay, “Writing Post-Orientalist Histories of the Third World: Perspectives from Indian Historiography”, In addition, Ashis Nandy, in his book, Nandy Ashis, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism* (Oxford, 1983) lays out the theoretical and ideological underpinnings of colonialism based on the contrived east/west difference.
Indian nationalist leaders understood modernity, development and culture and used it to resist their domination. 136 Others argue that colonialism was a phenomenon of global capitalism, in the Marxist vein, and nationalism was the fight between the colonial capitalists (including the Indian elite) and economically repressed Indian masses.137 Either way, Indian nationalists and their adaptation of a post-independence identity were strongly influenced by the centralized colonial state and its tools of control.

Nehru, during the freedom struggle, wanted science and technology to be the new creed of an independent India replacing all other affiliations.138 He and the other leaders of the freedom movement had to create a new nationalism, a single national identity, apart from all the conflict-ridden traditional identities, which could be appropriated by all. They decided to enshrine that identification in the centralized state and in its distinctive function: development. In trying to merge the two: a centralized administration and socio-economic development in a democratic set up, the Indian leadership had to continue the old colonial civil service, which was centralized and performed the basic bureaucratic functions very well, but needed to reform it enough to carry out the new role of development. Nehru believed that just as reform had molded and shaped the colonial bureaucracy in the colonial era for their purposes, so also could post-independence reform change Indian administration into the inimitable institution nationalist leadership desired.139 In

139 Nehru, J., ‘A Word to the Services’, Indian Journal of Public Administration I. 4 (1955) 289-302: this is the text of a speech Nehru made to the civil service officers in Kurnool in the state of Andhra Pradesh on
effect the leaders of the freedom struggle wanted to create their own unique bureaucracy to match their state-centered ‘official nationalism’ to maintain popular enthusiasm.\textsuperscript{140}

This chapter argues that post-colonial administrative reform was constrained and circumscribed by nationalist leaders’ early decision to identify the new Indian nationalism with the State’s centralized development programs.\textsuperscript{141} This cemented the centralized polity of the Indian State and its bureaucracy and enshrined it in the Indian constitution, creating a structure, which could not be altered by administrative reforms.\textsuperscript{142} This also contextualizes the developmental trajectory of the IIPA in its formative years. The limited nature of administrative reform meant there could be no alteration of the structure or functions of the civil services allowing the closed nature of the bureaucracy to continue in the post-independence period. This had also had a profound effect on the conception, creation, development and functioning of the IIPA.

Two facets characterized Indian nationalism: oppositional and inclusive. Under colonialism resistance to the British rule created the location of the oppositional anti-colonial nationalism. However, the mass movement forged by Gandhi to contest the British rule was based on a more inclusive multi-class, caste and religious strategy and hence was the base of the more comprehensive

---


\textsuperscript{141} This argument is based on the generally accepted notion in post-colonial historiography that Indian nationalism was imagined in the nation state and expressed in development programs. See Bose and Jalal, \textit{Nationalism, Democracy & Development} and Srirupa Roy, \textit{Beyond Belief}. 

---

Dec 9, 1955. In it he talked about the old service traditions that served the colonial government well but needed to be reformed to function in a democracy.
nationalism. Yet, the mobilization of the various sections of the Indian population to fight against British rule was never an easy task and the tentative coalition of socio-economic and religious alliances often broke down. For instance, the restive subaltern groups\textsuperscript{143} were often difficult to control and frequently exceeded the nationalist agenda of fighting the British by also attacking the oppressive Indian landed aristocracy.\textsuperscript{144} In addition, subaltern historians documented the parallel consciousness\textsuperscript{145} displayed by the non-elite during the colonial and post-colonial periods.\textsuperscript{146} However, it would also be pre-mature to assume the subaltern faction as being a monolith. Within the marginalized sections, coalitions were constantly being made and re-made to oppose the British and the Indian leadership.\textsuperscript{147}

\textsuperscript{143} The term “subaltern” is used by scholars of colonial Indian history to specifically mean people from the marginalized sections of Indian society. Ranajit Guha, the originator of the term and the analytical framework of the same name, meant the subaltern classes to comprise of the dominant Indian and foreign groups. The foreign groups included all British colonial officers, foreign industrial leaders, merchants, financiers, planters, landlords and missionaries. Among the Indian subset of this group were all classes and interests operating at two levels, regional and national. Any regional group that was just a single social level below the other groups were also classified as dominant by the subaltern historians if they acted in the interests of the dominant all India groups even when their own interests are not allied with the latter. See Guha, Ranajit, and Spivak, Gayatri C., (eds.) Selected Subaltern Studies, (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p.44.

\textsuperscript{144} See Pandey, Gyanendra, The Ascendancy of the Congress in Uttar Pradesh, 1926-1934: A Study in Imperfect Mobilization, (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1978) and Hardiman, David, Peasant Nationalists of Gujarat: Kheda District, (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1981). Ranajit Guha, the originator of the Subaltern Studies Combine, argues that the control by the national elites over the marginalized groups was domination not hegemony. Which meant that subaltern groups were never fully encompassed with the nationalist mainstream.

\textsuperscript{145} Term popularly used by Subaltern historians to describe a parallel world and identity of the subaltern classes, which consists of their unique culture, traditions, norms and politics. This identity is untouched by the elite culture and nationalist politics.

\textsuperscript{146} Ranajit Guha, the founder of the subaltern studies approach, describes the non-elite or ‘subaltern’ population in India as thus: “The demographic difference between the total Indian population and all those whom we have described as elite.” The elites were “the dominant groups, foreign as well as indigenous. The foreign groups were the colonial rulers, business people and planters.” The Indian groups consisted of “all-India feudal magnates, the most important representatives of the industrial and mercantile bourgeoisie and native recruits of the upper-most levels of the bureaucracy.” For more on this see Guha, Ranajit and Spivak, Gayatri C., Selected Subaltern Studies, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), p 44.

\textsuperscript{147} In Sarkar, Sumit, and Pati, Biswamoy, Issues in Modern Indian History: For Sumit Sarkar, (Mumbai: Popular Prakashan, 2000), and in Sarkar, Sumit, Modern India (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1989), Sarkar and other authors detail the motivation and makeup of various uprisings of the marginalized sections of Indian society during colonialism. Each one had a different motivation and demographic underpinning. Although
Equally, some scholars contend that the leaders of the all-India nationalist movement were themselves very local and regional in their origins and orientation. Also, the leaders of the Indian National Congress, unified under the broad umbrella of the nationalist party, were individuals of different social, economic, political and religious background. Their motivations for opposing the British rule in India were also different from each other. It was very difficult to conceive of a unified elite group.

As a result, the oppositional identity of the freedom movement proved to be far easier to mobilize than the internal- across all castes, classes, regions and religions- one. The leaders of the freedom struggle, scholars contend, had themselves divided their world into two distinct domains. The outer world was that of modernity, science and technology and western institutions of organizing the economy and polity- the inner world belonged to Indian traditions, which served as the basis for a unique cultural identity. They inhabited the world of western modernity and used the language of liberalism to contend with their colonial masters and, historians argued, appropriated their inner world to establish a distinctive connection with the Indian people to galvanize the nation against British Sarkar emphasizes the economic character of each of these revolts, he also portrays the different social and traditional inspirations for each.

This line of argument characterizes the ‘Cambridge School’ of Indian historiography. The more famous scholars of this interpretation were Anil Seal, John Gallagher and Gordon Johnson, among others. Anil Seal, “Imperialism and Nationalism in India”, Modern Asian Studies, Vol. 7. No. 3, pp 321-347, p. 322. And their combined effort, Gallagher, John, Johnson, Gordon, and Seal Anil, (eds.) Locality, Province and Nation: Essays on Indian Politics 1870-1940, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1973) provides a good example of this interpretive framework.


rule.\footnote{Chakrabarty, Dipesh, \textit{Habitations of Modernity: Essays in the Wake of Subaltern Studies}, (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2002), pp. 22-23.} However, while this inner world was uniquely Indian and traditional it was also divided into different contentious social and communal groups. Some historians also argue that the inner-outer space distinction was not always well defined. Even in the outer sphere, traditions were not always dispensed with entirely in favor of modern ideas. Modern methods burnished many traditional norms enabling them to survive and even flourish in post-independence India. In other words, Indian leadership at the moment of independence enabled a very peculiar form of modernity.\footnote{Misra, Maria, \textit{ Vishnu’s Crowded Temple: India Since the Great Rebellion} (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 2007), p xxvi. Misra believed that neither the Marxist, Subaltern or Liberal approaches could comprehensively explain India’s current social, economic and political form. She argued that all three of them contribute towards understanding some but not all facets of a very complex pattern of assimilation, evolution and development of present day India. Rudolph, Lloyd I. and Rudolph, Susanne Hoeber. \textit{Modernity of Tradition: Political Development in India}, (Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1967) make the same observation. They contend that the capacity of the post-colonial leadership in the form of the Congress Party to accommodate the traditional helped India to maintain democracy with incremental change toward modernity. Myron Weiner, in his book, \textit{Party Building in a New Nation: The Indian National Congress} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967) indicated that the accommodating nature of the Indian National Congress, of the myriad differences that existed among the people of India and the gradual redirection of the party leadership to focus on a secular identity of development was the reason that democracy continued in India while neighboring countries were saddled with less tolerant forms of government.} It was after all this very notion of development that

However, after independence, the Indian nationalists, especially Nehru, pitched a less contentious, more generally acceptable nationalism. Nehru argued for an alternate site and form for the new nationalism- the centralized developmental state. Marshaling the western methodology of the colonial masters in the secular world of socio-economic development, Nehru used it to fashion their new nationalism- development.\footnote{Visvesvaraya, M, \textit{Reconstructing India}, (London, 1920), pp. 284-86. Visveshvaraya was one of the leading figures of the post-independence development effort along with Prime Minister Nehru. He believed that Indians must deserve their freedom by working for it. That work must entail rapid industrialization and acceptance of western modernity. Manu Goswami argues that anti-colonial
the English had used to justify their colonial rule.\textsuperscript{154} The British used measurement, 
enumeration, classification and numerous other scientific and rationalistic 
techniques to understand their subjects in totality.\textsuperscript{155} They used their improved understanding of the colonized to control and administer their countries.

The bureaucrats of the Indian Civil Service were the institutional backbone that helped the British to understand and manage India. They applied a carefully conceived and elaborate web of rules and regulations designed to measure all aspects of the country important to the British government. Their work helped maintain law and order and collect revenue for the colonial government in India.

The post-colonial Indian leadership embraced these very methods of modern governance. It employed institutional tools very like those used by the British to create the Five-Year plans intended to promote economic and social development.\textsuperscript{156} Leaders like Nehru believed that modernity and its methods were instruments, which, if pressed in service of the country, could yield benefits,
impacting the lives of all, and holding the new nation together.\footnote{157} Nehru held that the British had employed modern techniques only to control and exploit India. Unlike the British colonizers, he believed, India’s nationalist leaders aimed to use the tools of science and research to reach and mold all aspects of Indian life for the benefit of the people. This entailed reshaping aspects of Indian life that even the British had left alone.\footnote{158} This is evident in the aims and prescriptions of the First Five-year plan.\footnote{159}

To achieve their ambitious purpose, Nehru and his associates hoped to use the colonial bureaucracy created by the British to achieve two results. First, it would help hold the politically fragile country together by maintaining and reinforcing the power of the central government over the provinces. In this role, India’s civil servants would have to employ all aspects of the classic colonial bureaucracy. They would remain apart from provincial politics, focus on the maintenance of law and order and on the enforcement of central government laws, and would continue to gather reliable information. However, they would also have to take on new responsibilities. It would be their task to promote socio-economic development- and for this purpose they would have to be flexible, service oriented and highly responsive to the local population. Under the British, India’s civil

\footnote{157} It is important to point out that Nehru’s version of modernity was more in line with that of western democracies. The use of science and technology to advance material benefit of the citizens while maintaining their rights and freedoms was key to Nehru’s vision of the modern state.

\footnote{158} Maria Misra states that Nehru’s notions of Indian social and religious identity were highly selective and simplistic. He believed in all that was positive within the religious sphere and in keeping with India’s new modernity could and would be retained, while any problematic notions of it [religious identity] could be rectified through application of liberal and rational solutions. Misra, Maria Vishnu’s Crowded Temple: India Since the Great Rebellion, (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 2007), pp 268-270

\footnote{159} “The economic condition of the country at any given time is the product of the broader social environment, and economic planning has to be viewed as an integral part of a wider process aiming not merely at the development of the human faculties and the building up of an institutional framework adequate to the needs and aspirations of the people.” The First Five Year Plan, p.7.
servants had worked to maintain the status quo, their new role required them to promote change.\textsuperscript{160}

The new nationalism and centralized developmental models generated these contradictory demands on the new civil service and created problems for enacting administrative reforms.\textsuperscript{161} Since the politicians never dismantled the old bureaucratic structure to create a new system, which would purposefully assimilate both jobs of the bureaucracy harmoniously, the civil servants tacked on the new functions to their old jobs in an ad-hoc way.

The bureaucratic elites were clearly interested in retaining their prominent and influential position in the government and society they held through the colonial service. But now they had to operate in a vastly different political climate.\textsuperscript{162} The demands of Indian politics created a new type of civil service. It continued the elite status of the centralized bureaucracy to largely provide traditional services of keeping the country intact and its systems stable but also operate in a representative democracy responsible for socio-economic development. The new bureaucrats achieved this compromise by embracing their new roles but carrying them out using their old methods conceived during the days of the Raj.

\textit{Creating the Centralized State}

\textsuperscript{160} Atul Kohli argues that the development functions of the State were essentially added on to a core structure of a ‘law and order’ bureaucracy. In Kohli, Atul, \textit{State-Directed Development: Political Power and Industrialization in the Global Periphery}, (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 263.

\textsuperscript{161} Srirupa Roy argues that planned “developmentalism” within state institutions was seen as the remedy for a deeply divided Indian society and polity. Roy, Srirupa, \textit{Beyond Belief: India and the Politics of Post-Colonial Nationalism}, (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2007).

\textsuperscript{162} See Potter, David C., \textit{India’s Political Administrators}, for how Indian administrators made concerted efforts to continue colonial traditions for the post-independence bureaucracy.
The British ruled India through a complex network of highly centralized administrative structures as well as through indigenous local institutions. Some territories they ruled directly through official colonial instruments, others they ruled indirectly by means of treaties with local rulers. Overall, for the years of British rule, the Colonial officials managed to persuade most Indians, most of the time, to accept their authority. The biggest portion of Indian land was ruled directly by the Colonial Government. However, the Princely States also controlled a significant portion of Indian Territory.¹⁶³ The native princes who ruled these areas maintained legal freedom and had control of their constituents so long as they accepted the directives of the British emissary placed in their court.¹⁶⁴

Although the freedom movement attracted and enlisted people who lived in the Princely territories, at the time of freedom from the British rule, their native rulers still controlled their land and future.¹⁶⁵ This position proved to be an impediment to creating the national unified legal entity in post-colonial India. The

¹⁶³ The Princely States covered 500,000 sq miles of land covering 2/5th of the area and 86.5 million people or quarter of the population at the time of Indian independence from Great Britain. This information and more on integration of princely states into modern day India can be found in Chapman, Graham, *The Geopolitics of South Asia: From Early Empires to the Nuclear Age*, (England: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2003), p. 211.
¹⁶⁴ In 1857-when the British Indian army revolted against them- the Colonial government relied on the Indian Princes to help them quell the uprising. As a result, instead of absorbing around 600 small princely states into the British Indian Empire, the British created separate agreements with each one of them specifying their relationship with the colonial government. This was known as indirect rule. Many states negotiated a lot of autonomy in daily administration and judicial matters. However, the British usually controlled external affairs, defense and communication. More in Copeland, Ian, *The Princes of India in the Endgame of Empire, 1917-1947*, (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 15-18.
¹⁶⁵ The Indian Princely States, because of their exclusive treaties with the British depending on the size of their states, either had very elaborate administrative systems or very basic ones. They mostly maintained very traditional systems largely because their power and prestige depended upon older social linkages. Either way, the people who lived in these States were dependent on the ruler and his administration for their welfare. Some of the administrative and judicial structures created by the Princes are discussed at length in Sadasivan, S.N., *Political and Administrative Integration of Princely States*, (New Delhi: Mittal Publications, 2005). A good overall read on the topic is Ramusack, Barbara N., *The Indian Princes and their States*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004). Ramusack argues that the Indian rulers were not simply puppets of the British administration but were able to exercise a fair amount of power.
newly independent state had to put together these different princely states (making the Princes give up their positions and merge their kingdoms with India) along with the old British Indian territories. It was only after this fact that a federal polity was created and enshrined in the constitution.

The job of integrating the princely states into the Indian Union was assigned to Vallabhbhai Patel, who also vociferously supported the continuation of the colonial civil service. Despite popular sentiment that strongly favored integration, the rulers did not sign on voluntarily. A letter from Patel cajoling the ruler of Bhopal in central India to integrate his state with the Union of India bears testament to this fact. In it he wrote:

“I feel, however, that the demand of the people for the integration of the State has come to stay, and in so far as it may lie at the root of any political unrest in your State the only effective – and if I might add also honourable – way of dealing with it would be for Your Highness to take the right decision, which unpleasant as it may look in its immediate perspective, will not only promote the well-being of your people but also ensure for you a period of peace and contentment to which you have looked forward.”

While most kingdoms acceded to the Indian Union, there were few (Jammu and Kashmir, Hyderabad state and Junagad to name a few) that wanted to either remain independent or to merge with Pakistan despite the
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166 India got its independence from the British and that entailed only one legal exchange and understanding. This meant that the British would transfer only the land that they administered directly to Indian control. The Indian princes and rulers were considered free and independent units and that leaders of independent India would have to deal with these entities separate from the British.

geographical difficulty of that outcome. All were eventually forced to unify and merge with India. Despite that effort, the integration of Jammu and Kashmir still remains an unresolved dispute between India and Pakistan.

Assimilation necessarily involved the unification of administrative systems, so that national policies could be implemented uniformly and that the new state could extend equal protection to all citizens. At the time of independence, the civil services employed by the local rulers administered many small states. They had very parochial loyalties and were often unreliable in implementing central government directives. This was particularly apparent during the sectarian violence that preceded the partition of British India into two separate nations. For instance, J.B. D’Souza, who was a new recruit to the central Indian Administrative Service at the time of the India-Pakistan partition riots said: “As far as I could gather, the [local] police were not very helpful in protecting Muslim refugees. Generally the tendency was to rely on military protection, rather than on police protection for Muslim refugees. Partly because I think most of the units which I saw in action were units from the southern parts of the country rather than local units.”168 The higher levels of the local civil service were also complicit in this act. “What was evident in the higher ranks of the Civil Service”, D’Souza says, “was a general sense of apathy towards the Muslim refugees particularly.”169

However, his account of the partition experience was striking because it highlighted the position, prestige and power of the Indian Civil Service (ICS),
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established by the British colonial authority, among the common people of India. D’Souza mentions that during his time as the officer dealing with the logistics of human transition all through the partition of India and Pakistan, he sometimes assumed the title given to ICS officers for effectiveness. “One of the devices we used”, D’Souza mentions, was to assume the title of Assistant Commissioner for refugee work and even at times to call ourselves ICS officers because it was only the ICS that was really known and feared in these areas.”

In addition, D’Souza also alludes to the magnitude of the human exodus from India to Pakistan and vice-versa and the inadequacy of the Indian government in dealing with this challenge. He goes on to say: “It was obvious from what I saw that the Government had never anticipated what a huge upsurge there would be and to what extent the migration of the minority communities on both sides would go.”

Given the Herculean task of resettling all the refugees coming in from Pakistan, quelling all violent episodes between the Hindu and Muslim communities and physical protection of the minority community as well as undertaking massive socio-economic development the national leadership was under pressure to deploy institutions that were familiar to the people at large.

Two Models of Development: Centralized and Decentralized

Post-colonial India, as stated earlier, was physically and legally put together by leaders of the nationalist struggle. Although they had developed the necessary momentum amongst the Indian population to force the British out of India, they needed to replace it with something that could bind all forces in Indian politics. The
Indian polity was heterogeneous as well as parochial in its outlook. As a result, socio-economic development served as the means to rally people to a new nationalism. This nationalism was government sponsored. In other words, government would create plans, allocate resources, and be responsible for the general welfare of the population. However, the central government was the driver and controller of this effort, not the state governments. This meant that if the development effort were the new nationalism, then its location would be the national government. And if the government had the pre-eminent position in the nation's economy and society, then the bureaucracy was in control of enforcing this change. This put the centralized civil service in a very enviable position in the new system leading them to burnish their already important position. However, this led the members of the civil service to straddle two very different roles with two different demands and skill sets leading to a schizophrenic bureaucracy. Although government driven development privileged the center and provided, according to Nehru, the necessary glue to bind the country together. It put the bureaucracy in the driver’s seat but created ambivalence about the main role of the civil service, which the bureaucrats responded by enhancing their own powers.

Nehru’s conviction about the use of modern science and technology to improve India’s economy was not the only developmental model discussed in the public sphere in the pre and post independence period. Gandhi’s decentralized village-centered, cottage industry dominated model was also being pitched as an alternative. Nehru wrote, “The congress, under Gandhiji’s leadership, had long championed the revival of village industries, especially hand-spinning and hand-
weaving.”\textsuperscript{172} Describing Gandhi’s stand on this economic model, Nehru elaborated, “The vast difference between the few rich and the poverty stricken masses seemed to him [Gandhi] due to two principal causes: foreign rule and the exploitation that accompanied it, and the capitalist industrial civilization of the West as embodied in the big machine. He reacted against both. He looked back with yearning to the days of the old autonomous and more-or-less self-contained village community where there had been an automatic balance between production, distribution and consumption; where political or economic power was spread out and not concentrated as it is today; where a kind of simple democracy prevailed; where the gulf between the rich and the poor was not so marked; where the evil of great cities were absent and people lived in contact with the life-giving soil and breathed the pure air of the open spaces.”\textsuperscript{173}

It appeared from Nehru’s reading of Gandhi’s ideas and hopes for India’s development that they were idyllic and not practical enough to realize India’s future needs. “I am all for tractors and big machinery”, Nehru declared, “and I am convinced that the rapid industrialization of India is essential to relieve the pressure on land, to combat poverty and raise standards of living, for defense and a variety of other purposes.”\textsuperscript{174} In addition, the three essential requirements of the modern economy that he envisaged were, “a heavy engineering and machine making industry, scientific research institutes, and electric power.”\textsuperscript{175} All aspects that Gandhi decried in his vision for independent India. However, Nehru realized that

\textsuperscript{172} Discovery of India, p 444.
\textsuperscript{173} Discovery, p 446.
\textsuperscript{174} Ibid., p 448.
\textsuperscript{175} Ibid., p 452.
Gandhi’s model cannot be entirely dismissed and the chance that rapid industrialization may result in lopsided development leaving many out of the benefits of economic growth certainly existed. He wrote, “I am equally convinced that the most careful planning and adjustment are necessary if we are to reap the full benefit of industrialization and avoid many of its dangers. This planning is necessary today in all countries of arrested growth, like China and India, which have strong traditions of their own.”

Marxist historians like Sugata Bose argue that development models like the one advocated by Nehru were not the basic problem. The issue lay with the fact that development under these models were carried out by “insufficiently decolonized, centralized state structures” which used development as a source of self-justification. The belief that colonial constructs like bureaucracy were continued to push for socio-economic change led Marxists in India to decry planning as ‘bureaucratic authoritarianism’ and its adherents as colonial capitalists incapable of bringing about real change. As a result, Nehru was not going to let apathy towards decolonizing the civil service be a source of criticism of his government from the Left.

Nothing short of a sea change in vision and strong force of government were needed, according to Nehru, to overcome the burden of hard-to-change traditions. Although Nehru was a strong democrat at heart, he wistfully looked at the Soviet Union and the progress they had made in a short time. In a debate on the Appleby

\[176\] Ibid., p 448.

Report in Parliament, Nehru talked about the advantages and disadvantages of working in a democratic system. “The other way of doing it,” Nehru remarked, “is the Soviet way where in the course of a generation or a generation and a half, they have made tremendous progress industrially, scientifically and economically by establishing a certain structure and pursuing certain methods which are not normally called democratic, which involved a power at the top imposing its will on the people – maybe for the good of the people ultimately”. However, Nehru was committed to following a “unique path”. He rejected the Soviet method, which he considered, “non-democratic”, as well as his understanding of the British method “of slow progress with political freedom.” He goes on to say, …our problems are rather unique and the future will show how far we succeed in solving them in our way, in a democratic way. But at the same time we have to see how far this democratic way has to be adjusted to these ends.”

Either way, the state, under Nehru, dominated a large portion of the Indian economy through the planning process, leading some in the press to sound the alarm.

Such an emphasis on India’s unique problems never prompted Nehru or other nationalist leaders to modify or substantially alter any inherited colonial institutional structures. This led historians to argue that the centralizing tendencies of colonial institutions continued into the post-independence period under the same
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180 “The Middle Way” The Hindustan Times, Sunday July 8, 1951. This piece in a leading national daily expressed the following sentiment: “There is no doubt, however, that the Government’s intervention in the spheres of business and industry has hindered rather than helped economic development.”
nationalist leadership who opposed it so strongly during colonial rule.\textsuperscript{181} Perhaps this was Gandhi’s main idea in opposing the development model as instituted by Nehru. He believed, much to the dislike of the modernizing elites like Nehru, that extreme decentralization with a traditional emphasis on enlightened rule of the local social and economic elites would be the best model for post-colonial India. In addition, Gandhi saw the Indian Civil Service as an inalienable arm of imperialism. If the British were expected to leave the country by the nationalists then so should their constructs.\textsuperscript{182} However, it is naïve to assume that the traditional model had a lot of backing within the Indian population or leadership.\textsuperscript{183} In addition, B.R. Nanda contends that the Nehruvian model of economic planning and state directed development was not unique to India but was adopted by many countries emerging from colonial rule at that time.\textsuperscript{184} In fact Gandhi himself complained that “Whatever the Congress decides will be done; nothing will be according to what I say. My writ runs no more....I am a small man.”\textsuperscript{185}

By the time India gained independence, any discourse on development or the way forward for a post-colonial state was couched in modernist language. Even the Gandhians were held to that standard.\textsuperscript{186} Gandhi’s argument against a centralized industrializing model of development, advocated by Nehru and the socialists, was

\textsuperscript{182} “Gandhi Against India Civil Service” in The Telegraph, August 19, 1931.
\textsuperscript{184} Nanda, B.R. Three Statesmen: Gokhale, Gandhi and Nehru, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2004), p 211.
\textsuperscript{185} Speech at prayer Meeting, New Delhi, April 1, 1947, Collected Works, vol. 87 p 187.
not that it was modern and that the Gandhian alternative was traditional and non-modern, but that the former was less effective in achieving the socio-economic aims than the latter. The Gandhians accused the congress leadership supporting the industrialization of the country of not backing modernity per se but a distinctly “western” brand of modernity. Herein lay their main objection to the entire post-colonial enterprise of development, particularly the instruments of development, which they believed were overwhelmingly western at best, and imperialist at worst. The new regime’s decision to continue the colonial civil service post-independence was cited as an important example in that direction.

Partha Chatterjee describes Nehru’s philosophy as “an ideology of which the central organizing principle is the autonomy of the state; the legitimizing principle is the conception of social justice...Social justice for all cannot be provided within the old framework because it is antiquated, decadent and incapable of dynamism. What is necessary is to create a new framework of institutions, which can embody the spirit of progress or, a synonym, modernity. Progress or modernity, according to the terms of the 20th century, means giving primacy to the sphere of the economic, because it is only by a thorough reorganization of the systems of economic production and distribution that enough wealth can be created to ensure social justice for all. But the latest knowledge built up by the modern social sciences shows clearly that it is not possible to undertake an effective reorganization of the economic structures of society if the state does not assume a central coordinating and directing role....Once established, this state will stand above the narrow
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187 Bapu to Kumarappa, 12 August, 1941, J. C. Kumarappa Papers, Nehru Museum and Library, New Delhi. Subject File No.5, f.75.
interests of groups and classes in society, take an overall view of the matter and, in accordance with the best scientific procedures, plan and direct the economic processes in order to create enough social wealth to ensure welfare and justice for all.”

The centralizing and all-powerful role of the state was not just alien to Gandhi but also meaningless. “Let us not be obsessed with catch words and seductive slogans imported from the West. Have we not our own distinct Eastern traditions? Are we not capable of finding our own solutions to the questions of capital and labour?...Let us study our Eastern institutions in that spirit of scientific inquiry and we shall evolve a truer socialism and a truer communism than the world has yet dreamed of. It is surely wrong to presume that Western socialism or communism is the last word on the question of mass poverty.” Gandhi’s idealizing the villages, the role of peasants and the lower classes in the new India was seen by the subaltern historians as a way of mobilizing them into a popular movement against the British. However, in Gandhi, the subaltern classes saw a leader capable of bringing the traditional into the national discourse and giving them symbols they can rally around. The Pioneer newspaper describes this phenomenon as such: “Mr. Gandhi is beginning to reap the penalty of having allowed himself to be unofficially canonized (as we shall say in the West) by his adoring

189 Gandhi thought of the centralized state as a distinct western/colonial creation, which was patently unfit for Indian society. Also, he believed that centralized state usurped the people’s will and lulled them into giving up their sovereignty. In Johnson, Richard L., (ed.), *Gandhi’s Experiment’s With Truth: Essential Writings By and About Mahatma Gandhi*, (Oxford, UK: Lexington Books, 2006), p. 206
countrymen. We say ‘reap the penalty’, because it is inconceivable that a man of his transparent candour [candor] and scrupulous regard for truth should hear without chagrin the myths which are being associated with him as a worker of miracles...In the ‘Swadesh’, a paper published in Gorakhpur, four miracles were quoted last month as being popularly attributable to Mr. Gandhi.” 191 The subaltern historians attribute this use of Gandhi by the peasantry to couch the popular peasant consciousness. The freedom movement, according to them, became organized at the grassroots level not because the subaltern classes suddenly started believing in modernity as espoused by the Congress leadership led by Nehru and other nationalists, but because they remade the fight for freedom using their sensibilities, which are classified by western observers as pre modern or traditional. 192

Gandhi used the traditional features of this subaltern language to express his preferences. For instance, Gandhi expressed his belief in a highly decentralized power structure by saying “I know on the contrary that many would have India become a first-class military power and wish for India to have a strong center and build the whole structure round it. In the medley of these conflicts I know that if India is to be a leader in clean action based on clean thought, God will confound the wisdom of these big men and will provide the villages with the power to express themselves as they should.” Explicit in this remark are two central subaltern notions. First, the idea of a decentralized polity allowed local control of resources and power, and removed nationalist elite from making decisions at the

191 *Pioneer*, April 23, 1921, p 1.
local level. Second, the language used to appeal to the Congress leadership is distinctly religious.

However, when pressed for a better idea of his ideal village, Gandhi remarked, “My ideal village will contain intelligent human beings. They will not live in dirt and darkness as animals. Men and women will be free and able to hold their own against any one in the world. There will be neither plague, nor cholera nor small pox; no one will be idle, no one will wallow in luxury.” He goes on to say that “It is possible to envisage railways, post and telegraph offices etc. For me it is material to obtain the real article and the rest will fit into the picture afterwards.”

It almost seemed that Gandhi was arguing in favor of the aims of modernity he claimed were so destructive to the true fabric of Indian culture. For instance the absence of disease in his ideal world would necessitate development of modern medicine and mass production of pharmaceuticals with government coordination of these services. In addition, the infrastructure that Gandhi yearns for is a heavy industry intensive project with vast government outlays.

Also, it would not surprise many to know that Gandhi had no role for the Indian Civil Service in his idealized village republic. His general opinion of the colonial bureaucracy was as follows: “Yes, many members of the Indian Civil Service are most decidedly overbearing. They are tyrannical, at times-thoughtless. Many other adjectives may be used. I grant all these things and I grant also that after having lived in India for certain number of years some of them became somewhat

degraded.” He did not blame the individual officers per se for the general behavior of the members of the Indian Civil Service but the colonial system, which gave these individuals so much power and prestige that such behavior became inevitable. In 1950, few years after Gandhi’s assassination, when talk of setting up a centralized planning commission to draw up five year plans dominated the national conversation, Gandhians came up with their own socio-economic plan using the village as the primary unit of organization. Calling it the “Sarvodaya Plan”, these followers of the Gandhian worldview advocated the creation of a rural civil service. A thoroughly decentralized service wherein officers would make their home with the villagers they served, knowing and understanding first hand the needs of the people and coming up with solutions to solve their problems.

Such an idealized world-view without a very well laid out plan on how to achieve it was becoming very difficult for the Congress leadership, under Nehru, to endorse. Nehru replied to this utopia with a thoroughly dismissive summation of village-life, as he believed, existed at the time of the freedom struggle. He wrote, “A village, normally speaking, is backward intellectually and culturally and no progress can be made from a backward environment. Narrow minded people are much more likely to be untruthful and violent.” As a result, when the structure for a newly independent India was created, through the constitution, western modernity was written into the fabric of Indian democracy by the Congress leadership and other
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195 “REALIZATION OF NON-VIOLENT SOCIETY: SARVODAYA PLAN RELEASED” The Indian Express, Jan 31, 1950, p.6. Members of the commission that drew up this plan were quite prominent national leaders themselves. However, they were always known as Gandhi’s close associates.
members of the Constituent Assembly. The instruments of this modernity were the institutions created by the Colonial government and continued in post-independence India. Some of them, Nehru conceded, were not ones he would like to have continued but decisions made by the national leadership like the nature of Indian socio-economic development and political problems of integration and governance compelled the framers of the Indian constitution to rely on these foundations.

**Continuing the Centralized All-India Services in Independent India and Reform**

The national leaders, then, wanted the centralized civil service apparatus to continue, as it did during the colonial period, to provide the service they were created to perform- maintaining law and order and collection of revenue. While the second was not very critical in the days and months after partition of colonial India, the first, maintaining law and order and providing protection to all civilians, turned out to be critical in controlling communal violence. Sardar Patel’s eloquent speech on the floor of the Constituent Assembly asking for Constitutional guarantees for All-India Services bears testimony to his conviction of their importance to the future of India. While chiding his colleagues for their criticism of the colonial civil services, Patel asked them to offer constitutional guarantees to the higher civil service. In response to criticism made by senior legislators he said, “I am distressed that a senior member…. a responsible member of this house, who is the Deputy Speaker of the Assembly considers and expresses the opinion that the members of the service were carrying on a very difficult administration for the last two or three years, and
[yet] at the same time harbors the feeling that they are enemies of our country.”

Patel warned the assembly, "You will not have a united India if you do not have a good all India service...If you remove them I see nothing but a picture of chaos all over the country.”

The colonial ICS continued in independent India under a new name: Indian Administrative Service (IAS). This new service was not just backed up by legal validity but also popular legitimacy that the old system lacked. The members of this all-India group were not just given constitutional guarantees of service (vociferously opposed by some members of the Constituent Assembly for being non-democratic) but also the authority of working on behalf of the sovereign people of India since the constitution was the only document that expressed that power. Protected with this authority, the IAS proceeded to establish the administrative centralization that existed during the days of the British Raj. Members of this service were recruited by the Central government and assigned to work with State governments at the highest level. Their conditions of service were, however, controlled by the Center. They were agents of the federal government working in the state administrations.

After formally enshrining the rights and privileges of the civil service within the constitution of India, Sardar Patel wrote to the premiers of the states to recognize the importance of the senior bureaucracy. “The morale of the services has been considerably weakened on account of the persistent attacks on the part of ill-informed critics. The guarantee provisions have served to restore that morale and I
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would particularly appeal to you to see that this improvement in morale is
maintained. At all times, an efficient Civil Service is necessary; in the present
formative and difficult stage through which we are passing, such need is even more
pronounced.”\textsuperscript{199} It is important to note that Nehru went along with these
guarantees to the civil service grudgingly. In a letter written to the Chief Ministers
or executives of state governments, he wrote, “In the British period, one might well
say that the State was essentially a Service State or rather a State in which the
services played a predominant part and where their interests were specially
safeguarded. We have continued those guarantees, though they hardly fit into the
democratic structure.”\textsuperscript{200}

The administration of the centralized development programs necessitated
this development. The federal government was responsible for creating and
implementing planned development programs through the IAS officers in the states.
This situation led to friction between the center and state governments, who wanted
to have control over the development programs and the conditions of service of the
IAS officers. However, they could never alter this basic structure and this impacted
the amount and type of reforms that government at any level could affect. In
addition, the structure and functions of the centralized administration were so
difficult to understand or change without impacting the plans and politics of the
government that Prime Minister Nehru was often confused about the nature of
administrative reforms he should adopt.

\textsuperscript{199} Letter To Premiers by Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel in Das, Durga, (ed.) \textit{Sardar Patel's Correspondence},
\textsuperscript{200} Parthasarthy, G., \textit{Jawaharlal Nehru: Letters to the Chief Ministers 1914-1964}, (New Delhi: Oxford
Nehru, however, was aware that even though the old civil service was needed to carry out basic governmental functions in the aftermath of independence and partition of India, the development goals envisaged by the new political leadership would require a new outlook towards their work by government officers. He was deeply divided about the suitability of this service to the welfare of the country but realized, albeit reluctantly, the importance of keeping it in place. In a note prepared by Nehru to all his cabinet colleagues, he relayed Ford Foundation’s Public Administration consultant’s advice.\textsuperscript{201} Nehru wrote, “Mr. Appleby lays considerable stress on the Indian governmental structure being based essentially on conditions prevailing prior to Independence. He points out the virtues of this structure and at the same time emphasizes the obvious drawbacks and weaknesses, which are bound to grow. In other words, he thought that this structure, and more especially the outlook governing this structure, requires a basic change to suit a modern democratic State.”\textsuperscript{202}

However, in trying to urge for administrative reform, Nehru was quite committed to the overall structure of the Services. The centralization of administration, Nehru realized, was “intimately connected with any scheme of National Planning. There can be no National Planning unless there is a certain national cohesion in broad policies as between the Center and the States.” Nehru

\textsuperscript{201} Dean Paul Appleby was the Ford Foundation consultant/expert who came to India in 1953 and 1956 on the request of the Indian Government to study Indian administration and then present his findings of shortcomings and strengths of government systems to Nehru. Based on his recommendation, the Indian Government decided to set up the Indian Institute of Public Administration in New Delhi in 1954. Nehru was very impressed with the Appleby Report in general and quoted from it liberally when speaking in private and public fora.

\textsuperscript{202} Note, 14\textsuperscript{th} September, 1953. JN Collection. This note is published in Prasad, H.Y., Kumar, Ravindra, (eds.) Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru, Second Series, Vol. 23. P. 155.
commented. However, Nehru’s dilemma or political fine-tuning, was palpable in the very next paragraph of his note when he calibrates his approach to centralization. “I do not like the idea of what might be called full centralization. I do not think that a completely unitary form of government can function satisfactorily in a large country like India, and certainly it will not suit India like it is...Nevertheless, I feel that a certain effective measure of centralization is quite inevitable.”

Nehru believed in a modernizing state with a highly rationalistic ideology. The receptacle of all that was desirable for creating India into a modern and controlled state was vested in the center or central government. This was done because the modernizing elite, of which Nehru was the unquestioned leader, believed that the traditional society and all its outmoded practices existed at the local levels. If these levels were not carefully controlled, none of the aims of the modern nation state could be accomplished. He believed that state structures being essentially modern and rational and organized would prevail over disorganized societal traditions, which could then be manipulated by science and technology into a homogeneous population.

Nehru’s dilemma was that under the prevailing circumstances in India he could not dismantle the old structure of the bureaucracy. On the other hand, he also needed to have a much more agile and democratic civil service apparatus. However, he was running into many political roadblocks over reforming the bureaucracy because doing so, in some cases, would undercut the influence of certain ministries, politicians and senior bureaucrats. In a letter to his finance minister, C.D.
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Deshmukh, who had threatened to resign over suggestions that the overwhelming powers of his ministry be curtailed in the interest of efficiency and speed, Nehru urged patience: “This subject [that of efficiency and speed in bureaucratic procedures] has been often before us and more especially when we considered the Appleby Report. In fact our consideration of the Appleby Report was not quite completed at that time. I have jumped to no conclusion yet, as you suggest, except that our administrative procedures should be fully examined with a view to improvement. Surely no one can say that they are perfect. I believe in many other countries procedures are different and have changes from time to time. Each of these matters no doubt should be considered carefully in some detail as soon as we have the full picture before us.” In a plea to the Minister, Nehru urges calm, “Let us consider these matters quietly and at leisure and then come to such conclusions as we think right and proper. That is the least we owe each other.”

Nehru was convinced that radical and quick changes to the bureaucracy would prove to be counter-productive, especially in the near term and would undermine the authority of the central government. However, he was aware of the need for administrative change, not just from the point of view of achieving the aims of the socio-economic plans but also being viewed by the public as a leader who understood the types of changes needed and being seen as making them. While trying to explain his attempts at this endeavor, Nehru, would often mention the Indian Institute of Public Administration and its role in producing actionable reform.

proposals in public forums.\textsuperscript{206} In doing so, Nehru was trying to diffuse the anxiety and apprehension being caused by talk of reform and change within the bureaucratic and political establishment. He held up the IIPA as an institution given to a well thought out and studied approach and not a hasty one. In fact when Nehru talked about Paul Appleby in his speeches he would refer to Appleby's non-ideological and practical approach to problems. “You must read it [The Appleby Report] because it is a first rate document from a first-rate man coming from America, with no revolutionary ideas in his head, but just a competent man who had dealt with the subject not from the point of view of this ‘ism’ or that ‘ism’ but purely from the point of view of an expert in the subject.”\textsuperscript{207} Also, by removing the purview of administrative reforms from the political sphere, Nehru tried to reduce the passions and emotions that surround questions of change. In doing so, he hoped that the IIPA could gain legitimacy as an impartial, non-political institution that considered questions of efficiency in administration at the process level rather than at a fundamental and ideological level.

\textbf{Dual-Role Bureaucracy and the Nature of Administrative Reforms.}

Given the nature of the post-colonial state and the tasks set out for the civil service by the nationalist agenda, the bureaucracy was put, at first, in an unenviable situation. The role that they were most accustomed to was the traditional law and order and revenue collection one. The Indian Civil Service during the colonial


period also presided over some large infrastructure and public works projects. However, these schemes were always meant to serve the larger and more immediate benefits of the colonial power. Hence, the bureaucracy had no reason to consider particular issues that the common people faced in the completion of these mammoth undertakings and what effect they would have on the lives of the people. This was so because controlling Indians through any means was their primary aim.\footnote{Cohn, Bernard S., \textit{Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge}, (Princeton N.J: Princeton University Press, 1996)} Moreover, the fundamental rationale of colonialism was that Europeans knew what was in the best interests of the colonized.\footnote{Metcalf, Thomas, \textit{Ideologies of the Raj}, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), Outlines in detail the ideology of racial difference and the inherent inferiority of the indigenous culture and the administrative methodology with which such racist ideas were implemented.} The main point is that these government bureaucrats were not operating in a democratic polity, which would require them to be responsible and responsive to the people they served. Rather, they could imagine their subjects as being children, at best, and completely inanimate, at worst, and craft strategies that treated them as such.\footnote{Loomba, Ania, \textit{Colonialism/Post colonialism: The New Critical Idiom}, (London:Routledge, 1998) pp 104-133.}

It is therefore important to note that the two biggest changes facing newly independent India, and ones that had an immediate bearing on the nature of bureaucracy were the location of the new nationalism and its expression and the adoption of universal democracy. The planned centralized development programs conceived and implemented by the central government were the locus of the new nationalism and that this change took place with the consent and permission of the general public. The impact of this on the nature and spirit of administrative reforms that the country and its political leadership would pursue was deep. The historical
forces and fundamental problem of creating and continuing the nationalist spirit into the post-independence period necessitated maintenance of all centralizing colonial institutions.

However, putting members of these institutions in charge of the development programs in a full-fledged democracy meant drastic changes in how these institutions operated. Yet, no administrative reforms could alter the basic all-powerful centralizing nature of the administrative system whose primary duty was maintenance of law and order and collection of revenue for the state. As a result administrative reforms, suggested by foreign experts or indigenous ones, always touched on the procedural and behavioral aspects of government delivery systems and never fundamentally or ideologically altered them.211

The inevitability of administrative reform was already taking up news space in national dailies before independence. It was being mentioned as an important item on the post-colonial list of promises made by the national leadership to the people of India.212 However, it was striking that the same editorial recognized that some type of uniformity in approach toward these important national issues had to be adopted. The idea that a single centralized structure operating systematically all over the nation and implementing programs uniformly was seen as the ultimate goal. The notion that only the center was capable of this effort and that there was a distinct advantage in deferring to the nationalized institutions and their programs

212 “Message of Hope”, *The Indian Express*, Madras, Tuesday, January 1, 1946.
was gaining ground. This was a big change from the colonial times when the same newspaper decried the meddlesome ways of the central bureaucracy.\(^{213}\)

The law and order and revenue collecting bureaucracy of the British times comfortably moved into occupying the new role of a developmental bureaucracy. Members of this colonial institution were used to being responsible to a remote power while managing affairs in their localities. How did the British government monitor their administrators in far-flung areas of the sub-continent? The answer lay in the careful bureaucratic adherence to the official rulebook and this followed in the post independence period as well.\(^{214}\) However, rule following and adherence to proper procedure was cumbersome and better suited for the traditional responsibilities of the civil service. With the development functions foisted on the old structure, the slow moving administrative apparatus became the obvious and most visible target of reform.

The Congress ministries, starting from the time of the limited experiment in democracy during the British Raj, under the Government of India Act in 1935, had experienced the “proper rule-following” strictures of the colonial bureaucracy\(^{215}\). For instance, an Indian ICS officer reminisced about his time as a junior civil servant

\(^{213}\) “SELF GOVERNMENT” IN THE PROVINCES’ *The Indian Express*, Madras, January 29, 1943, p. 10.


\(^{215}\) Responding to the mounting pressure from the nationalists for responsible, democratic administration, the British Government passed the Government of India Act in 1935. Under this act, elections were held to man the provincial assemblies and form government there. The Congress party won these elections quite easily and formed ministries to administer the provinces. This situation created a very peculiar condition wherein the elected leaders were responsible to the people that elected them and the bureaucrats to the colonial authority that appointed them. In some cases the bureaucrats even worked to undercut the Congress leaders to undermine their authority in the provinces. A good analysis of the situation leading up to the Act and the polity under its scheme is discussed in Muldoon, Andrew, *Empire, Politics and the Creation of the 1935 Act: The Last Act of the Raj*, (Surrey, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009) and Bridge, Carl, *Holding India to the Empire: The British Conservative Party and the 1935 Constitution*, (New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1986).
during the rule of the Congress ministries in the provinces. He said, "We all [at the] time knew that their [Indian politicians] ways will be different from those of the British and we were prepared for it. The only thing was that we had also learnt certain basic principles of administration...and it was our task as the members of the senior service to bring to the notice of the new rulers those basic principles of administration."\textsuperscript{216}

It is important to understand that following the principles of administration meant that a unifying administrative link was to be maintained. K. L. Panjabi, another senior ICS officer, remembered telling his ICS colleague about his working relationship with the Indian Ministers after independence that "after the formation of the Congress Ministry the Secretaries relied much more on persuading the Ministers to give due weight to the rules and procedures."\textsuperscript{217} Nehru, in his disgust at problems facing the country under British rule, lashed out at the administrators saying, "They had proved worthless as administrators, but were very able policemen."\textsuperscript{218} While some of what Nehru said was for public consumption, the excessive rule bound mentality also managed to irk some members of the Indian Civil Services themselves appointed at the district level.\textsuperscript{219}

However, most of the Indian Civil Service officers never acknowledged this issue in public statements. For instance, one member of the senior civil service actually credits personal bonds between superiors and subordinates to get work

\textsuperscript{216} Dharam Vira Oral History, Center of South Asian Studies, Oral History Collection University of Cambridge, p.16.
\textsuperscript{218} “NO MORE TOLERATION OF BRITISH RULE: Nehru on Attitude of Nation”, \textit{The Indian Express}, Nov 5, 1945.
done. In his words, “Well, they [British senior ICS officers] knew their men and they stood by them, making allowances for the personal idiosyncrasies, since people are different and they don’t all conform to a pattern. On the whole the system worked because it was based on close, personal knowledge, not only of members of the senior services but also of the other services.” Hence, it is fair to note, from the above discussion, that following rules and regulations while annoying and tedious was easier to follow in a largely bureaucratic limited centralized state- with even some measure of flexibility- but proved to be more difficult in a developmental democracy.

Whatever the actual experience of the individual members of the ICS, there was no doubt that following procedure was the hallmark of the British bureaucracy and that this scheme functioned for a peculiar system that colonialism had created. However, in the post-colonial period when talk of change to the administrative system emerged, there was no consideration of creating a different system for developmental functions. Individual members of the civil service were expected to oscillate between routine aspects of their work and carry out innovative development schemes. The immediate buzz around administrative reform then was to create efficiency and integrity within the inherited system.

A.D. Gorwala, an ex-ICS officer voiced the idea of working with the same system, making small improvements, when asked to suggest changes to the administrative system by the newly established Planning Commission. A national daily paraphrased his report to the Planning Commission as such, “The best

---
220 R. Dayal Oral History, Center of South Asian Studies, Oral History Collection, University of Cambridge, p. 5.
approach to the problem, according to Mr. Gorwala would be to give first place to first things and make the best use of the best people. In other words, allot priorities for political and personnel. He would also insist on standards of integrity, implicit and explicit not only the reality of integrity but also the demonstrable appearance of integrity. Lastly, his recommendations would so reorganize the machine as to ensure greater speed, effectiveness and responsiveness, inter alia, by rearranging proper training for the short term as well as for long-term...”

Implicit in this explanation is the notion that the same structure and personnel can be adjusted to achieve new tasks. All that is needed is personal integrity and good long and short and long term training to create efficiency among those manning the structure. Similarly, when the First Five Year Plan was released to the public, it included a section on revamping the administrative system. No new ideas were advanced. Gorwala’s basic premise of reforming the bureaucracy through recruitment of ‘good people’ and inculcating efficiency in them through training was amplified in the First Five year Plan.222

The media diffused this notion among the population by editorializing the sentiment. “. It is easy to conclude that the staff and the methods inherited from the previous system of government have established their value, and it is not possible to make abrupt changes, though many are called for.” The editorial continued, “The observance of procedure did not prevent the public administration from dedicating

---

221 “Efficient Working of Administration: Gorwala Lays Stress on Standards of Integrity”, The Hindustan Times, Tuesday, July 17, 1951.
222 First Five Year Plan, (New Delhi: The Planning Commission, 1951), Part II. Ch. 6.
itself to the ideal of the welfare state.”

However, some did doubt whether administrative reforms would be possible with government insiders suggesting change. A particularly critical observation was printed in a national daily.

However, reforms suggested by ex-officers were becoming the accepted standard. Members of Parliament criticized the government. “The Government was running in the old bureaucratic routine and red tape.” “He” [the M.P.] inquired, “whether Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar’s report had been shelved.”

There was confusion over whether rule following was desirable or not! No one really knew whether following rules and regulations according to established norms was the right practice or caused delay and red tape. A particularly interesting case in the newspaper highlights this dilemma. An officer of the Indian Civil Service was accused of impropriety because he chose not to follow certain rules in doing his job. His defense was that he used vigorous effort and an active sense of duty to “see that public business was dealt with the minimum of delay and maximum of convenience to the public.” The ICS officer was pleading his innocence by saying that he dispensed with rule following to provide speedy service for the public.

Ex-civil service officers were also not clear about the proper duty of the civil service and what administrative reforms need to be enacted. N.R. Pillai, an ex-ICS officer wrote, “.. public servant [should not] denigrate into a “yes-man”. But it does

---

224 “POLITICAL DIARY BY ‘INSAF’” *The Hindustan Times*, Wednesday, August 8, 1951.
225 “AMENDMENTS TO PRESIDENT’S SPEECH”, *The Indian Express*, Madras, February 2, 1950. Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar’s was yet another report on administrative reorganization made in response to the Government’s preoccupation with efficiency.
mean that he should on no account be a “no-man”, the man who can only see snags and pitfalls and whose instinctive reaction to external stimulus is one of obstruction. The yes-man tries to please others, the no-man pleases himself; the yes-man does not reveal his mind, the no-man has no mind to reveal. Both species are a danger to any organization, but the no type is a greater danger at a time of growth and development.”

Most reform commissions at this time were emphasizing personal qualities and individual discretion of officers to create efficiency and official integrity. However, no reform commission mentioned structural issues being responsible for a sluggish administration or dismantling the excessive centralization of the bureaucracy.

Much was also changing in the so-called impartial and efficient elite world of the civil services after independence. The lower castes and classes also wanted to join in the hallowed ICS tradition and the pre-eminence of the upper classes and castes in the civil services was soon challenged. Dr. Ambedkar, the principal drafter of India’s constitution and himself a member of the lower caste, was emphatic in securing a piece of the elite services pie for the backward castes/scheduled castes of India by reserving seats for them in the top services. He explained his rationale in a letter he wrote to a Nehru. In it he argued, “What they

229 The lower castes or “Scheduled Castes”, as they were referred to in official British parlance, were the lowest levels in the Hindu social hierarchy. These lower castes were entered into a schedule or official list of the colonial government. Also referred to by many derogatory names (untouchables or polluted), by upper caste Hindus, the lower castes were, however, most commonly known as the Scheduled Castes. The British Government had reserved some electoral seats and such for them during the colonial period. A structural overview of the Reservation policy in India can be obtained through Vakil, A.K., *Reservation Policy and Scheduled Castes in India*, (New Delhi: Ashish Publishing House, 1985). And Subramaniam, V. *Social Background of India’s Administrators: A Socio-Economic Study of the Higher Civil Services of India*, (New Delhi: Publications Division, 1971) is the most widely cited study in the social makeup of the higher civil services of India post-independence.
[backward castes] had to fear about was bad administration. This bad administration was due to the absence of men belonging to the scheduled castes [another name for backward castes] in the administration. The administration was unsympathetic to the scheduled castes because it was manned wholly by upper caste Hindu officers who were partial to the caste Hindus in the villages...and practiced upon them tyranny and oppression day in and day out. This tyranny and oppression could be averted only if more of the scheduled castes could find a place in the Civil Services. This can be done better by being inside the Government rather than remaining outside.”

Instead of asking for a more devolved system, Dr. Ambedkar believed that the backward classes needed to wield the power of the centralized administrative structure to even out social inequities. In other words a representative makeup of the bureaucracy could alleviate the ills of its operation.

**Expert Institution for Administrative Reforms**

While there was talk and attempts at administrative reform in the half decade following independence in 1947, much of what was being recommended was ad-hoc and piecemeal. And while all of these efforts were steps toward reform, they did not satisfy Prime Minister Nehru’s inherent impatience with the rate or pace of improvement. The changes within government were increasing

---


231 The major attempts at administrative reform before the two Appleby Reports were as follows: The Bajpai Committee(Secretariat Reorganization Committee) in 1947, The Economy Committee in 1948, Report of Reorganization of the Machinery of Government, led by Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar (ex-ICS officer) in 1949, Review of the Ayyangar Report by another ICS officer, R.A, Gopalaswami, and Gorwala Report made to the Planning Commission. Next in line were the two reports by Appleby. Also, all these committees were either headed by an ex-Indian Civil Service officer or had several of them in their membership.

and the administration was growing, at an alarming rate, for the Prime Minister to comprehend. In a note regarding administrative reform proposals, Nehru remarked, "I have feeling that we should avoid, as far as possible, any development which leads to this increase in and the intricacy of the administrative machinery. As it is, it is far too unwieldy and difficult to control."\(^{233}\) In addition, going forward, there were many areas of the common man's life that government would control. Nehru would keep talking about reform in public and private forums. However, in most of his utterances there seemed dissatisfaction with the mechanism of administrative reform or the recommended reforms themselves.\(^{234}\) In a note to the cabinet, Nehru mentions the possibility of permanent mechanism dedicated toward the study of administrative reforms. “The whole system of public administration is changing and growing under the impact of democratic institutions and the urgent necessity of development. I think that there should be continuous study of this, and for this purpose, an Institute of Public Administration should be established.”\(^{235}\)

Jawaharlal Nehru was the great institution builder of India. Just like he encouraged the creation of the Planning Commission to consider systematically how best to use scarce resources and come up with a blue print for socio-economic development, he supported the idea of the Institute for Public Administration to consider systematically or “scientifically” issues of administrative reform.\(^{236}\) This


\(^{234}\) Ibid.

\(^{235}\) Ibid, p. 156

meant that academic research in public administration would create ‘authoritative’ solutions to problems facing the bureaucracy.\textsuperscript{237} This Institute would be a partner to the practitioners of administration. The collaborative spirit would encourage both entities (civil service officers and the academic researchers of the Institute) to create deep bonds and rely on the processes of the Institute to have a system where the whims of politics would be replaced by steady and rational outcomes. Also, these institutions would endure beyond the lifetime of individual visionaries and create a lasting process for change.

The main point, of course, remained. The existing structure and machinery of the administration, which continued in the post-colonial period, due to the decisions made by Nehru and his colleagues, would stay intact. The introduction of academic administrative expertise in understanding organizational problems of government was yet another dimension of the earlier attempts at reform by individual ICS officers. Making a speech on the measures of administrative reform initiated by his government, Nehru gave equal importance to reform recommendations made by individuals as well as the establishment of institutions.\textsuperscript{238} The only difference for Nehru and his cabinet, which took the decision to set up the Institute of Administrative Reform, would be the permanency of such a forum. Some, however, believed that institutionalization of reforms through diffusing administrative knowledge by experts was a masterful move by

\textsuperscript{237} Ibid.
Appleby and Nehru to break the control and domination over administrative knowledge by bureaucrats and members of the Indian Administrative Service.239

In the case of administrative reforms, however, the challenge for the academic experts and researchers was not just whether they could study the problems faced by the administrators but if they could gain their trust and influence them to approach the Institute with live problems and then work with them to solve them.240 Central to this difficulty were the lack of authority for these institutions and the permanency of the colonial structure. In addition, and perhaps analogous to this problem, was the dilemma in defining the role of the Institute. Nehru, in his speech in the Indian Parliament, said, “The Institute of Public Administration will bring together officers engaged in administrative processes as well as citizens affected by them, set up joint teams for detailed study of the different aspects of public administration, and thus promote cooperation and understanding of each other’s needs and difficulties.”241 The media dubbed the Institute as a training organization.242 The popular perception of the Institute was that that it was an official government society, which had no contact with the public.243 All in all, the climate or environment for change, even in the era of expert institutes of public

240 Mohit Bhattacharya laments the notion that the Institutes of Public Administration have had to move away from their theoretical base and become technicians rather than academicians. Read Mohit Bhattacharya, “Crisis of Public Administration as a Discipline in India”, Economic and Political Weekly (EPW), Vol. 22, No. 48. Nov 28, 1987.
243 “Public Services”, (Editorial), Indian Express, May 21, 1954
administration, was circumscribed by the need for maintaining a centralized colonial apparatus.

**Conclusion**

When, Dharma Vira, an ex-ICS officer was asked in his oral history interview about Prime Minister Nehru’s opinion of the ICS as “an expensive luxury and a kept class who lived in a circumscribed world of their own, an Anglo-Indian surmounted by sycophants and unaware of the dynamics of the Indian social scene”, he replied “With due deference to Panditji”\(^{244}\) I must point out that all this was written before Panditji came into actual intimate contact with the members of the Indian Civil Service. But I have the feeling that his view changed very greatly and radically when he became Prime Minister of India....I hope I am not mistaken in believing that when Panditji came in closer contact with the members of the Indian Civil Service he changed his ideas in the matter considerably.”\(^{245}\) In fact it has been recorded that he was not opposed to the individuals in the Indian Civil Service; he had many relatives in the elite administrative service.\(^{246}\) However, he was not convinced of their suitability for the new tasks at hand.\(^{247}\) On the contrary, he frequently complained of their preoccupation with self-preservation and self-aggrandizement in public forums.

---

\(^{244}\) Pandit is an honorary title indicating a learned person. The suffix *ji* is also a term of respect. In this case Mr. Dharma Vira is referring to Prime Minister Nehru as ‘Panditji’.

\(^{245}\) Dharma Vira Oral History P. 17.


\(^{247}\) Morris-Jones, W.H., *The Government and Politics of India*, (London: Hutchinson University Library, 1964) believed that Indians, in general, believed that the ICS was a very efficient machine of government but was resented because it served the narrow and limited aims of the foreign rulers.
However, continuation of the old structure was a necessity that the development and nationalism project brought onto the central Congress leadership. Some believed that Nehru and his centralized revolutionary party were not so radical to begin with. Relations with landlords and capitalists were not merely maintained but these two groups were an integral part of the Congress coalition. In addition, given the multiplicity of the caste and class hierarchies and regional and communal differences, the Congress leadership aimed more soundly toward maintaining status quo between different groups. To create an alternate site of nationalism-away from the more traditional areas of identity like social and regional divisions- and use centralized development as a new Indian identity, Indian nationalist leaders continued the old civil service structure despite being fully aware of its shortcomings. To ensure that the basic emphasis on the centrality of administration was maintained, the preeminence of the bureaucratic structure was written into the Constitution of India.

Hence, the political leadership found a very small area of bureaucratic functions they could change. Regardless, administrative reform was held before the public as the panacea to bureaucracy’s ills. Reform of inherited structures was put forth as the means to sharpen the public delivery of planned developmental objectives. Knowledgeable individuals, and expert commissions and institutions

were created to suggest reform proposals to the government to implement. However, they all had one limitation. They could not touch the basic structure and functions of the bureaucracy. Its preeminent and centralized top down nature could not be altered. All administrative reform had to operate within this framework. This was so because the centralized nature of the civil service was necessary to work the centralized nature of the socio-economic plans wherein laid the genesis of post-colonial nationalism.
Chapter 4

Ford Foundation In India: Democracy and Development

In 1936, Henry and Edsel Ford created a small foundation in Detroit, Michigan, as a means to offset any increase in estate tax brought on by the newly legislated Revenue Act of 1935. This nascent foundation remained, at first, wedded to local causes in the tradition of family foundations, largely reflecting their benefactors’ limited interests. However, in the late 40s and early 50s, after cash infusion from Henry and Edsel Ford’s bequests made it the beneficiary of ninety percent of the Ford Motor Company’s stock equity, The Ford Foundation decided to expand its activities. This enormous amount of money had to be spent as per the condition of the Federal Revenue Code. To do so in an orderly and deliberate fashion, Henry Ford II and the board of trustees of The Ford Foundation, on the advice of Karl Compton- the President of MIT, set up a committee under the leadership of H. Rowan Gaither to design the way forward for this newly significant entrant in the world of American philanthropy.

This team came up with the Report of the Study For the Ford Foundation on Policy and Program. The Gaither Report- so named for its author- systematically laid out the rationale behind launching the Ford Foundation’s international programs. In it they boldly stated, “The Aim of The Ford Foundation is to advance

---

254 The Gaither Report was so called because it was chaired by H. Rowan Gaither, who was the assistant director of MIT’s Radiation Laboratory during the Second World War and then had helped to convert the Air Force’s research institute into The Rand Corporation, an independent think-tank.
human welfare”. More formally, the committee’s mission was to make
“recommendations based upon the best available thought concerning the ways in
which The Ford Foundation can most effectively and intelligently put its resources
to work for human welfare.”255 This broad emphasis on advancing the human
condition, especially during the cold war, as the means to combat the spread of
communist ideology in underdeveloped parts of the world, prompted them to
internationalize their efforts to improve living standards across the globe. That
conviction laid the foundation for Ford’s foreign development program, through
which they supported the developmental efforts of governments in various
countries.

The geo-political situation at the time, however, made the Foundation’s task
of achieving human welfare in different nations a fine balancing act. While The Ford
Foundation focused on using all the strategies and instruments of modern science
and technology to help democratic governments alleviate poverty and ignorance
and bring change in recipient countries, they had to appear free of the influence of
the American government and its foreign policy establishment, to the recipients. On
the other hand, they also wanted to embrace a key American foreign policy tenet, at
the time, to buttress established government systems in emerging nations to avoid
confusion and instability that could ultimately benefit revolutionary elements

Gaither, who was trained as a lawyer, and touched by the New Deal policies ultimately found himself
working as the liaison between scientists at MIT’s Radiation Laboratory and the military during
World War II. Gaither chose to bring the approach he learned during the war at MIT and later at the
RAND Corporation to the programs of the Ford Foundation.

within these countries. Some scholars, however, argue that geo-politics, specifically the cold war, as a reason for American Foundations’ involvement in India is overblown and that they were “highly flexible transnational agents who, in an ambitious combination of philanthropic motives, institutional interests, and trust in the power of science, diagnosed political problems and developed methods to overcome them in order to reduce global inequality.” While it is important to note that the American Foundations, especially the Ford Foundation, were firm believers in the modernizing mission and used the benefits of science and technology, through the institutional model, to alleviate human problems, and did not see every issue through the lens of communist paranoia, the importance of the ferment caused by the post-second world war geo-political conditions as well as cold war politics cannot be underestimated either. It provided the historical context, which played an important role in Ford’s approach to problems.

The idea, however, behind the aims of the Ford Foundation were to use American techniques of modernity to promote a democratic developmental model against the communist alternative. This chapter will deal with the motivation and intention of the initial Ford Foundation programs in India. Specifically, it will detail how the early focus of Ford Foundation’s policy to promote democracy and prevent communism from gaining a foothold in Asia, led them to support the development plans of recipient governments. The Foundation’s strategy to help democracy

---

258 Waldemar A. Nielsen, “Overseas Development Program”, 1955, Report # 012621. FFA Nielsen wrote that recipient governments, at the time, were the only effective power in these nations and so going through
succeed in India was predicated on creating positive and perceptible change in peoples’ lives through their democratically elected government. In doing this, they chose to follow a couple of approaches: short-term and a long-term institutional one. In the quest to promote recipient governments, they encouraged achieving tangible change through smaller targeted programs and created a developmental infrastructure through institutional tools that would emphasize the permanency of the developmental regime and build long-term political and professional coalitions in the nations they served. This, they believed, would keep nations firmly within the democratic fold.

Although the short-term programs also required establishing links with the local government, the Foundation officers had greater input and control in creating and evaluating the program, making any changes mid-way to achieve desired ends. However, there was always emphasis within the Ford Foundation to promote change without immediate disruption of local systems, creating programs that can find roots and financing in local government and can complement their program objectives. In addition, they also aimed to supplement Point IV funds from the American government, while still appearing independent of them, to the host country.

the government was the only way for Foundations to help emerging nations. While that is effectively correct, the Ford Foundation was also interested in helping democratic governments with their money and knowledge. The aim of helping nations so that they can establish and continue democratic governments was as important to the Ford Foundation as finding a power center through which to help humanity.  

259 “MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA AND THE FORD FOUNDATION COVERING ASSISTANCE BY THE FORD FOUNDATION TO A PROGRAMME OF RURAL VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT”, Report #000525. Pp 5-8. Ford Foundation Archives (FFA). The Ford Foundation entered into contracts for operation with the Indian government wherein all details of procedure and targeted outcomes were agreed upon and signed by both parties. If programs did not operate according to plan, the Foundation had the freedom, per signed contract, to take corrective measures. In addition, the outcomes for these short-term programs were always defined.
Although this analysis is country-specific in relation to Ford Foundation’s work internationally, it provides a more nuanced understanding of the foundations’ motivation and success, generally, in developing countries during the cold war, especially in the vital decades of the fifties and sixties than other studies. While the arguments in this chapter will reflect the position of some Foundation scholars who argue that the big American foundations were motivated to slow the pace of communism, if not stop it entirely, leaders at the Ford Foundation understood the enormity and complexity of that undertaking. Also, the Ford Foundation was acutely aware of its limitations with money and influence. It is important to note that while The Ford Foundation was motivated by the propagation of democracy, it always worked through the indigenous governments and funded their plans and objectives. More generally, outcomes of all foundation programs in different countries depended, to a large extent, upon the local governments and their political and cultural histories. Because each country has its own distinct history and cultural development, the experiences and successes of the Foundations were also varied. When recipient countries had well-established government systems and relatively stable polities, as was the case in India, the foundations control over any aspect of the development schemes they advised and funded tended to be limited


261 Marcus Cueto, in *Missionaries of Science*, makes this point in reference to The Rockefeller Foundation’s work in Latin America. However, the distinction between the operating philosophies of the big American foundations and the local conditions they faced overseas made a bigger impact on the outcome of their programs. Ma, Qiusha, in her dissertation, “The Rockefeller Foundation and Modern Medical Education in China”, makes a similar point.

262 This is apparent even in the work of Cueto and Ma (cited above).
and achieved largely through partnerships. The Ford Foundation, in this case, simply became one of the actors in a larger group of entities responsible for development. As a result, they were unable to have an unregulated and absolute influence over the people and governments of the countries they helped to develop.263

For the Ford Foundation, the concern about human welfare was cast within the broader structure of democracy. It was extremely important for them to maintain and continue the arrangement of any existing indigenous democratic institutions around the world while propagating change, to avoid instability. The Geither report observed, “A great new foundation can thus most appropriately make its entrance into human affairs with a reaffirmation of democratic ideals and with the expressed intention of assisting democracy to meet that challenge and to realize its ideals.” Because “The crisis in the world today requires that democracy do more than restate its principles and ideals; they must be translated into action. We must,” asserted the committee, “take affirmative action toward the elimination of the basic causes of war, the advancement of democracy on a broad front, and the strengthening of its institutions and processes. National conduct based solely upon fear of communism, upon reaction to totalitarian tactics, or upon the immediate exigencies of avoiding war, is defensive and negative.”264

Immediately after the internal publication of this committee report, Gaither himself wrote to Paul Hoffman, the newly appointed President of the Ford

263 Robert Arnove, argues in his book, Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism, that the big American Foundations had enormous power and influence and due to the sheer size of their endowments and that they could carry out their will at home and abroad without any hindrance.
Foundation, with suggestions on funding a host of international programs.\(^{265}\) Hoffman, whose considerable government, foreign affairs and private sector experience made him receptive to such ideas, was ready to take the Ford Foundation in this general direction. In addition to his belief in spreading the broad principles of democracy, Hoffman also felt that the Ford Foundation should strengthen and support American government programs because he firmly advocated the Foundation's help in improving the government's ability to wage peace and to prevail if war began.\(^{266}\) This course was very evident when Hoffman, after his first visit to Asia as president of the foundation, remarked that Asia can still be saved from communism but it had to be done carefully and without appearing to be imperialistic.\(^{267}\) To do so, The Ford Foundation had to cultivate, at least in the mind of recipient governments, an image of independence of any foreign political authority.

The central aspect of this policy involved the leadership of the Ford Foundation, which advocated peace and freedom through development, to reach out to governments of newly independent nations and offer them the means to fulfill promises made to their people. This meant that Foundations had to strengthen the capacity of indigenous governments to conceptualize and administer their own development programs. This policy was very important to show the world, especially people of de-colonized nations, that democratic governments could

\(^{265}\) Personal correspondence from Rowan Gaither to Paul Hoffman, Jan 2, 1951, Hoffman Papers, Box 43. Truman Library.

\(^{266}\) Paul Hoffman to the Ford Foundation Trustees, Jan 29, 1951, Hoffman Papers, Box 44. *Ibid.*

\(^{267}\) John B. Howard, Oral History, Feb 13, 1973, p.6, Ford Foundation Archives (FFA), and Ford Foundation press release, August 24, 1951, FFA.
provide for the needs of their people as well as, if not better than, their communist counterparts. Ford offered these governments’ American expertise, institutional solutions and methods to solve their problems. However, the Foundation had to guard against the illusion of development without real and substantial change occurring in the lives of the people. Hence, Ford functionaries felt the need to control and push for tangible change.

**Helping Governments Through American Expertise**

The Ford Foundation found it useful, and fairly easy, to concern themselves with the development plans of recipient governments for a few important reasons. First, the approach of working behind the scenes with government officials and political leaders offered a wider reach as well as a level of anonymity for Foundation consultants that they would not have if they started programs on their own, possibly opening them to the charge of foreign intrusion in India. Second, the planning technique, employed by the Government of India, involved deploying a professional and technical approach to solving vexing developmental issues. The Foundations had some experience with this method in America and were comfortable exporting this technique to other countries.

During the Progressive era in American history, a period of tumultuous change in American social, economic and political life, the philanthropy of private foundations converged with the aims of modernizing reformers. They made early

---

268 See the Gaither Report and Chapter 1: Introduction, of this dissertation to understand how the Ford Foundation conceptualized democracy, and the economic system of a democracy and that Communism was a totalitarian system which did not allow individual freedom and initiative.

grants to modern research institutions involved in improving government.\textsuperscript{270} The use of academic knowledge and research outside of educational institutions to help bring about socio-economic and political change became synonymous with American modernity through the early part of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{271} Since then and especially through this period of transformation, the professionals took over the running of government and business.\textsuperscript{272} Perkin details the efforts by the two sets of professionals, i.e., business and government to control the political and economic landscape. The business interests were in favor of low taxes, little or no regulation and less government spending, while advocates of strong government believed in public spending and government involvement in the socio-economic lives of ordinary citizens.

Either way, American policy makers, whether in business or government, always viewed this rationalization in the context of the inevitable advent of capitalism and progress in a democracy.\textsuperscript{273} Many American scholars, housed within universities, government and private research institutions, believed that this feature of American capitalism could be exported with equal success to underdeveloped countries thereby keeping them within the non-communist group of nations. This was especially true about Ford’s India program. Their internal guide gave

\begin{footnotesize}
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Foundation officials visiting India the rationale behind this methodology. “The
Foundation has given a high priority to India because of its conviction that stability
in India and the development of India's capacity for self-government are important
if India is to remain part of the free world. It believes also that better understanding
between the United States and India and improvement of the deteriorating relations
between them are important for world peace.”274

Indian planners and the Ford Foundation programs used techniques of
science and technology as the basis of Indian development. Both desired modernity
of society and economy. The Ford Foundation, however, worked under the
assumption that introducing modernity through its programs in India would make
the country and its people more familiar with the western progressive value system
enough to spurn communist alternatives. The values, which the Foundation
promoted, were based on democracy and free enterprise. And The Ford Foundation
believed their job was to diffuse those ideals. The Gaither Report reasoned, “As the
tide of communism mounts in Asia and Europe, the position of the United States is
crucial. We are striving at great cost to strengthen free peoples everywhere. The
needs of such peoples, particularly in underdeveloped areas, are vast and seemingly
endless, yet their eventual well being may prove essential to our own security. To
improve their living standards they must import and use knowledge, guidance, and
capital. The United States appears to be the only country able to provide even a part
of the urgently needed assistance.”275 The Indians, on the other hand, always viewed

274 Howard, “Summary Guides For The Use of Ensminger, Moyer And Howard In India And Pakistan”,
October 22, 1951, p. 3. Report # 012093. FFA
275 The Gaither Report, p 26 & 27.
this association from an economic standpoint. Their aim was to progress economically so that they can be independent of all foreign powers politically.\textsuperscript{276}

Ultimately, The Ford Foundation and the Indian government, both believed that democratic planning, using all the tools of science and technology, was the best way to advance the developmental agenda for creating and sustaining prosperity. The authors of the Gaither Report hoped for the most desirable combination, “The maintenance of democratic control over concentrations of public and private power, while at the same time preserving freedom for scientific and technological endeavor, economic initiative and cultural development.”\textsuperscript{277} Paul Hoffman, the President of the Foundation, held that to have that success in Asia, generally, Americans had to convince Asians that they were not taking the place of their old western colonizers but protecting the region from totalitarian and oppressive forces. He felt that political wisdom was a far better tool in creating and expanding ties in Asia than the use of American military and money.\textsuperscript{278}

\textbf{Achieving Multiple Aims Through Funding Government Plans}

At the end of the Second World War, Truman addressed his fellow Americans with the following thought: “More than half of the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate, they are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas. For the first time in


\textsuperscript{277} The Gaither Report, p. 62.

\textsuperscript{278} Personal correspondence from Hoffman to Volney Hurd, Jan 9, 1951, Hoffman Papers, box 61; Personal Correspondence from Hoffman to Barbara Lucas, September, 7, 1951, Hoffman Papers, box 5.
history humanity possesses the knowledge and the skill to relieve the suffering of these people...I believe that we should make available to peace-loving peoples the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life.”

The partnership between technical experts and policy makers or between scientists and military planners, as witnessed by Gaither when he worked for the government, was what Truman wanted expanded to the development problems of the world in order to create opportunities for a better life for the people of the poorer nations across the globe. This was the second step of the Truman foreign policy after his administration had already helped to rebuild Europe through the European Recovery Program, better known as the Marshall Plan. The Ford Foundation under Paul Hoffman, the Marshall Plan administrator, aimed to deliver for the rest of the underdeveloped world just what the Marshall Plan had done for Europe.

In addition, Paul Hoffman’s new ties with the government leaders in India were important to the American policy making establishment and they was not averse to using them. Initially, Hoffman, as President of The Ford Foundation, reached out to the Indian diplomats in the US and expressed a desire to help India’s developmental efforts. In a few years, after Ford opened its office in India, Hoffman was approached by Eisenhower to use his informal ties with government leaders, especially Prime Minister Nehru, to ascertain his personal views on the

279 Truman Inaugural Address, January 20, 1949.
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Kashmir issue- a vexing foreign policy problem between India and Pakistan.\textsuperscript{282} The notion that Nehru would speak informally with Hoffman on that topic versus a US diplomat was vitally important to the foreign policy establishment in America.

In addition to helping India develop economically, The Ford Foundation wanted to help fill the gap that the American government could not fulfill due to political bottlenecks. Helping the Indian government achieve plan objectives aided that effort. Chester Bowles, the US Ambassador to India wrote to Dean Acheson, the Secretary of State, “What India needs is what Europe and Turkey needed in 1947, a guarantee (or as close as any Congress can come to giving a guarantee) that American resources will be available in sufficient quantities to give the Indian government the opportunity to reach its Five Year Plan objectives before the next election, and thus to build a solid political and economic foundation for the future.”\textsuperscript{283} However, The Ford Foundation also wanted to underscore the importance of American aid dollars. Paul Hoffman, the Ford Foundation summary report mentions, “took every occasion to inform his listeners [the recipients] quite bluntly that the resources of the Foundation were minute in comparison with the resources of governments and the enormous needs of these countries for development.”\textsuperscript{284} Hoffman repeated this sentiment in the US as well. “There is consultation”, Hoffman told the Congressional committee, “with Federal agencies, primarily with the State Department, but no competition with them: we simply try

\textsuperscript{283} The Ambassador in India (Bowles) to the Secretary of State, Foreign Relations of the United States, U.S Department of State/ (1952-1954. Africa and South Asia), p.1675.
to fill the gaps." However, he also laid out for the lawmakers the importance of the Foundation’s efforts. “We have no delusions of grandeur of what we can do,” Hoffman remarked disarmingly "but the foundations are able to enter areas which frequently are closed to Government, where they can serve as trigger action for human betterment."285

Also, the programs funded by the Foundation were designed to support American modernizers and the United Nations programs. The Gaither Report gives us some clues to that extent. “This support [material or otherwise] may be tendered in two ways. First, by giving direct assistance on request to those responsible for the formulation or execution of policy- research to develop facts, analyses of the issue at hand, or advice from expert consultants interpreting such data. Second, assistance to responsible officials may be given indirectly, by helping create public awareness and understanding necessary for the execution of policy in a democratic system. To do this, facts must be gathered, interpreted, and made public.”286

The Foundation hoped to impact the lives of the people, in these nations directly and also wanted their programs to be replicated in villages helping people use technology developed by the American scientists and experts. Hence the Foundation chose the path of initiating rural Indian manpower in modernization techniques. “Accordingly,” Ford Foundation’s internal report reasons; “major emphasis has been placed upon training, or upon demonstration and training, which would have an immediate and broad influence in the development of a country’s

human and economic resources.” This would also help the Indian farmers, through scientifically derived techniques, to control their scarce resources and improve the yield of their land.

The Ford Foundation was interested in not only increasing the yield per acre of Indian farms to deal with their food shortages but change social outlook of the people into a modern, scientific and egalitarian one. In the summary guides offered to the top Foundation officials visiting India to set up a firm program profile, said, “The initial program is one of integrated rural development. Although major emphasis is to be placed on agriculture, substantial attention should be given to medical, social and cultural aspects of rural village life. These might include such activities as public health and personal health and personal hygiene, village cooperatives, adult education, community activities, social welfare and home economics. Participation of women should be encouraged.”

The first Ford Foundation team to visit India also envisaged an attack on the caste system in India. “An economic and social development program which will raise standards of life at the village level in India is indispensable if the depressed classes of untouchables are to be relieved and if the poverty, disease and illiteracy which help to perpetuate the caste system are to be eliminated. It is a sobering fact that Buddha, 2400 years before Gandhi, also revolted against the tyranny of caste and preached the doctrine of equality of man. It may be hoped that India's new independence will awaken the national solidarity of the people and impel India

\[\text{Ibid.}\]
\[\text{“Summary Guides For the Use of Ensminger, Moyer and Howard In India and Pakistan.” October 22, 1951. Pp. 4&5. Report # 012093. FFA}\]
forward on the road to economic and social progress.” 289 It is indeed revealing that this passage from the summary of Hoffman's trip to the trustees of the Ford Foundation placed the blame for much that is wrong with the economy and society on the caste system. It dovetailed perfectly with Ambassador Bowles secret analysis to Secretary Acheson. “Although the disabilities of the schedules castes are disappearing in the cities, they are still strong in the villages. The Communist appeal to these “second-class” citizens is increasingly effective.” 290 This problem, they believed, could be remedied through elimination of illiteracy, and poverty. Development programs would bring modernity to the Indian society. The use of science and rationality would help bring about the changes that a traditional society and economy need and the Ford Foundation mission in India would be based upon that premise.

**The Long-Term Approach: The Institutional Strategy**

All efforts at modernization required some level of systemization. Any ad-hoc changes would not have the longevity and the effectiveness that a systematically derived response to a problem would engender. The Ford Foundation group, under the leadership of Hoffman, Ford Foundation's President, were glad to note the institutionalization of developmental efforts under the centralized Planning Commission which was patterned to achieve efficiency and rationalization of scarce resources effectively. They found members of the Planning Commission to be “very able officers”. Mr. Hoffman, immediately emphasized to these members the

289 Ibid. pp. 32.
290 The Ambassador in India (Bowles) to the Secretary of State, Foreign Relations of the United States, U.S Department of State/ (1952-1954. Africa and South Asia), p.1672.
importance of standardization of development programs. Projects, Mr. Hoffman advised, "must be kept at a level which is repeatable and that the danger must be avoided of creating a model village or project which no one could use as a model."^291

Since the Ford Foundation's mission in India was closely related to their desire to curb the rise of communism, it was vitally important for the Foundation to develop a systematic understanding of the Indian people. The development programs aimed to help the Indian government and create a level of standardization would be ineffective if enough knowledge about the people was not ascertained. Hence the Ford Foundation funds created or helped those institutions in India, which scientifically studied the problems of the Indian people and applied that knowledge for improving the effectiveness of the Planning Commission schemes.

The Ford Foundation was careful to not publicly display their imprint on institutions they created or supported. Although these institutions would be known for the Ford Foundation approach to solve human problems, as outlined in the Gaither Report, the Institutions themselves would bear the stamp of Indian programs. This was an effective way of not being in the public eye in foreign countries and let the Institutions carry the Foundation’s welfare objective. In a program letter, Douglas Ensminger, Ford Foundation’s India Representative wrote, “The Foundation takes no part in administering any program of work financed in whole or in part by a Foundation grant. Once it is agreed that a plan of work meets the purpose for which a particular grant was approved, full responsibility for administering that program rests with the institution-the Government of India or

other- receiving the grant.” However, a close watch was maintained over whether the program or the institution was following the purpose of the grant.

Also, if there were instances during the Ford Foundation’s expert evaluation of certain problem areas that need remediation, and an appropriate institution could not be identified to carry out the Foundation’s program forward, the Foundation created institutions that carried out the necessary reforms. Ensminger notes this point in his program letter. “In some cases”, he pointed out, “the Foundation has found that, in a given field in which it has special interest, and where important work needs to be done, no institution or organization exists which might properly and efficaciously carry on the job. In such cases, the Foundation has given funds to initiate and establish an organization which will accomplish what the Foundation feels is the needed task.” This policy reflected the Ford Foundation’s funding of the Indian Institute of Public Administration. Institutionalization of reform efforts was like the Foundation efforts in the United States as well. The Ford Foundation had funded several measures to study human problems, whether they were related to governmental efforts or private initiatives by creating institutions or supporting existing ones. For instance, the Foundation invested heavily in the field of education in the United States by creating two funds - the Fund...
for the advancement of Education and the Fund for Adult Education. These funds, in
turn, invested in institutions like the Institute of Philosophical Research.295

Why did the Ford Foundation operate in such a manner? “The reasons for this policy [are] two-fold.” Douglas Ensminger explained, “First, that the Foundation feels that its funds can be more immediately and effectively put to work in institutions public or private which already are or can be organized to accomplish special task; second, the Foundation wishes to “institutionalize”- that is give a lasting structure to, and thus insure the most permanent benefits from- the activities it supports.”296 Some of this attitude also had much to do with the systemization bias of the Ford Foundation’s funding policy. It was far easier to push for change through institutions devoted to systematic study of problem areas. For instance, the Ford Foundation gave a lot of money, both within and outside the United States, to research organizations. The idea that these institutions will study problems afflicting humans scientifically and provide rational solutions to them was very appealing to the Ford Foundation grant makers.297

Creating institutional structures to channel research to reform Indian society and economy were considered to be not only more permanent, it was also a solution to change an bias of the Indian educational institutions toward theoretical
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297 The permanent staff of the Ford Foundation, responsible for the disbursement of the Foundation millions, was disparagingly called “philanthropoids”. Macdonald describes the jobs of these individuals as screening “the thousands of applications for grants that come in every year; they look into new fields of spending; they think up problems worth solving….and select the institutions or the people to try to solve them.” The suggestion in this description is that these people sat remotely, in Foundation offices, and thought of issues and solutions in isolation and directed Foundation funds to their selected programs. Foundation experts and officers, actually, had varied backgrounds and careers ranging from government to the private sector, and were quite cognizant of the contexts of the problems they were solving. They gave due credence to observations of field officers while making monetary allotments.
The Ford Foundation wanted to support institutions that had a practical bent and created institutions that identified problems and brought scientific research to bear on them. Ensminger talked about the difficulty of doing this in India. “In the early fifties India only had four or five top named economists.” Ensminger lamented, “These men wrote and spoke of their research, but when one examined their research papers, they were in fact papers written to present a theoretical point of view.” The Ford Foundation needed to change this situation if it wanted to use research to solve India’s mammoth problems. The Foundation immediately got to work. They identified strategic Indian institutions to fund and also created some independent institutions to attack Indian developmental issues.

The insistence of the Ford Foundation officers on channeling resources through institutions was also very important to operating in foreign lands. This was true especially in India where notions of being colonized and the need for independence were deeply ingrained in the minds of the people and their leaders. As Ensminger recollects, “In the early years of India’s development Nehru faced up to the necessity of accepting foreign technicians to assist India in applying the borrowed technology and to train India’s own people in applying and managing the borrowed technology. While it was Nehru’s, and only Nehru’s decision, to initially accept foreign technicians, he continually spoke out against the danger of India becoming dependent on foreign technicians…It was this very early and most
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298 Chester Bowles had written the following to Acheson about the Indian education system: “India’s highly classical educational system seems almost designed to turn out frustrated, cynical young people, ill-prepared for the task of building a new country, and easy prey for Communist propaganda. The attitude of many students in India today is similar to that of Chinese students in the 1930s.” FRUS, p. 1672
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important manpower planning that laid the foundation for India’s expansion of engineering colleges, institutes of technology, and agricultural universities.”

The Ford Foundation worked to strengthen these new age institutions through funding and providing expertise because they did not want public visibility to their involvement with Indian government programs. They, however, realized that old institutional structures in India were unable to create such manpower. Ensminger said, “What was particularly significant was the country had to face the need for building new institutions to provide the needed highly trained technical people. The old established universities continued to expand in numbers, but they did not grow in their purpose of serving the needs of the nation by being concerned about the country’s new and most urgent manpower needs.”

In other words, the Foundation wanted to change the basic culture in educational institutions in India from a purely theoretical intellectual focus to a practical research oriented one. In some cases the Foundation identified a few institutions wherein such a change was possible and proceeded to fund and support research programs in these institutions. In other cases they had to work with the Indian leadership and create institutional structures that would give a practical shape to the Ford Foundation approach to reform in India and elsewhere. All in all creating institutional structures let the Ford Foundation accomplish their aims of methodical study of problems, a scientifically derived solution, and the hope of creating prosperity through modernity.

**Ford Foundation's Mission in India and Cold War Considerations**

---
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The American foreign policy establishment and the academic community with the help of American foundations, tried to create a set of ideals that would comprehensively identify a non-communist, free market development course for the newly independent nations of Asia and Africa. When asked about the necessity of tackling development problems in these regions, Douglas Ensminger answers thus: “Mr. Hoffman [President, Ford Foundation] said many people asked him then why he was in such a hurry to take the Ford Foundation outside the United States. Mr. Hoffman’s reply was, while he knew Europe, he knew very little about the Indian sub-continent. It was his reading and his feeling then [that] peace of the world for generations to come might well be determined by what happened in India. Mr. Hoffman said, since one of the objectives of the Ford Foundation was to contribute to the conditions of peace, he wanted to find out for himself whether or not there was a role for the Ford Foundation in India.”

The peace, and the fact that India and other newly independent former colonies, remained in the democratic fold was key to keeping people of these nations satisfied with their democratic leadership. This was not something that the Ford Foundation wanted to achieve by creating ‘yes men’ and forcing them to accept American style capitalism. Instead the Ford Foundation policy in India centered on reinforcing and funding the plans espoused by national leaders and supported through their democratic process. Douglas Ensminger reasoned: “As I reflect on Nehru’s initial interest in having the Foundation assist on a village development

---

program, I think I understand Nehru’s mind at that time and later in talking to him I feel confident he saw in village development an opportunity to fulfill the various promises he, Gandhi and other leaders had made to the people of India in the long struggle for independence.”

Even the American Ambassador Chester Bowles believed that supporting leaders like Nehru was in America’s self interest because “The fact that Nehru and most of the leaders of the new nation [India] were educated in British universities and dedicated to Western liberalism further improved the prospect of a peaceful development along lines generally sympathetic to the Western democracies.”

American and Indian policymakers wanted India to move towards the west. However, the American government defined west politically and the Indians conceived of the west in economic terms. In other words, Nehru and other Indian leaders were interested in achieving the prosperity and economic growth attained by the west for their people by following the capitalist model of industrialization and modernization through aid and expertise received from the west. However, they were not willing to follow the American foreign policy through the cold war and take sides and sign a military pact with the western nations. It was in situations like this that the Ford Foundation was seen as an appropriate choice for Prime Minister Nehru to consider. Ensminger asserted, “Responsible Indian leaders in and out of Government were, from the beginning, clear the Ford Foundation was
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completely independent of the U.S. Department of State and had no relations with the CIA. A former consultant to the Rockefeller Foundation had approached the Ford Foundation, under Hoffman, to underwrite covert CIA propaganda. Hoffman refused to do so.

Although scholars of the international programs of American foundations have argued an association between American foreign policy aims and the policy directions of foundations, the Ford Foundation was careful about not exhibiting such an association. The world after World War II was very complex. A connection between the Ford Foundation and American foreign policy would be received unfavorably in Nehru's India. As Nehru remarked:

“Maybe the Communists want us to align ourselves more firmly with the Soviet Union in a military way; maybe some other party wants us to align ourselves with American group in a military way. Now, that is a clear issue on which I should take the electorate of India to express an opinion. They [people of India] want us to align ourselves with some group of nations and go in for military alliances. I am entirely opposed to it for a variety of reasons. I think if we do that, it will be the ruination of India. I think if we do that, we lose our independence of action. I

---

306 Ensminger Oral History A.17 May 9, 1972, FFA, p. 1 This image was not always maintained among all members of the Indian political spectrum. As Ensminger further explained, Indian communists frequently accused all American foundations, and the Ford Foundation in particular, of imperialist designs on Indian aid.


think if we do that, we lose something which is of infinite value to us, our soul of India.”

The Ford Foundation was very careful about maintaining all propriety about being free and independent of all American governmental influence. Such an image could be cultivated only by articulating a development ideology, which matched the aims of the recipient nation. It was in this context that the Ford Foundation insisted on funding government programs rather than directing their aid toward non-government organizations. Also, the Foundation was very careful in describing the development plans of the Indian government as being indigenous and that the Foundation was only supporting endeavors already conceived by the Indian government. While introducing the Foundation supported activities in India, the Foundation report begins thus: “India is today engaged in one of the greatest efforts to further human welfare ever undertaken by a democratic people. The bold insight with which India has conceived its task, the energy and devotion with which it has pursued it, have evoked the admiration of nations, individuals and humanitarian agencies around the world. Many of these, in their public or private capacities, have been moved, as members of the same human family or as members of the family of nations to offer such assistance as might be both helpful and welcome to India in the great task before it. It was in this spirit that the Ford Foundation first proposed some modest financial assistance to the Indian Government and its leaders.”


It is also vital to understand that the Nehru government did not see industrialization negatively. In fact Nehru believed that western development patterns could be achieved without absorbing western culture. In other words he believed that science and technology are not culturally conceived. They are universally defined and each culture has to absorb them as they see fit. In reply to a question about what America can do to help India, Nehru replied, “It is obvious that a highly industrialized and technically efficient nation like the United States can give the greatest help to any underdeveloped country like India... If we have greater resources-technical, financial, or other- our progress will be faster....At the same time, that real progress cannot be superimposed- it has to grow in the country, carrying the people with it.”

Nehru was opposed to ironclad definitions. “Some people mix up democracy with capitalism. Simply because democracy has grown up in some capitalist countries, it does not mean that it is an essential part of capitalism and vice versa. Similarly socialism does not mean authoritarianism. At least in theory it does not; in practice I do not know how the country will develop. Democracy means removal of disparities. That is simple enough.”

In this regard it might be useful to think of Akira Iriye’s work, in which even though modernization was distinctly cultural, in this case American, it could be put into the category of cultural internationalism where ideas and international non-state actors carried these ideas into the realm of development activity within the boundaries of different states. Cultural internationalism was the anti thesis of

---

nationalism. In other words, these were ideas that may have had their origin in some specific states but found acceptance by other countries. Iriye believed that such an acceptance could only be found after the racialist overtones that defined World War II nationalism [and perhaps colonialism] could be removed from these ideas. How these ideas were implemented by different countries and what eventual physical form they took was, however, not always very clear.\textsuperscript{313}

The Ford Foundation’s primary concern as amplified by the internal documents, was maintaining India within the fold of democratic nations with a non-communist growth model. In an internal memo, Ford put forth the efficacy of the democratic development model by India. “Following ten years of independence, completion of its First Five Year Plan, the beginning of a Second Five Year Plan, and two national elections,” the memo states, “India stands today in a significant position in Asia and in world history. It has demonstrated that an underdeveloped nation can, through dynamic leadership and action, and by democratic means, successfully mount a bloodless social, economic and political revolution to advance its economy and its people.”\textsuperscript{314}

The guiding principle of the Foundation’s mission was thus: “The Foundation has given a high priority to India because of its conviction that stability in India and the development of India’s capacity for self government are important if India is to remain part of the free world. It believes also that better understanding between
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the United States and India and improvement of the deteriorating relations between them are important for world peace." In a public statement, Paul Hoffman, Ford Foundation’s President, said that economic aid and expert know how to developing nations should be considered an investment in world peace. “It is my opinion” he suggested “that we might well be on our way towards committing national suicide if we should permit chaotic conditions to develop in the free world through our failure to help people to help themselves”.

Development as expanding individual freedom is an important idea. Nehru certainly believed it, but more importantly, the Ford Foundation took that approach while setting up their office in India. However, the expansion of individual freedoms for the Foundation was inextricably linked to the democratic experience. An internal Foundation report observed, “India is undergoing the world’s largest scale experiment in democracy. It is an ‘experiment’ because it has not yet succeeded. There can be no assurance that it will, though there are grounds for hope... Despite the impressive turnout for the first general election it is doubtful that most people, especially villagers, are yet convinced that it is ‘their government’ in the sense that they have a real voice in it or that it holds their interest uppermost... This gap can be closed only as home rule is strengthened and as people all over India feel the direct impact of present national programs to expand economic output, strengthen education, improve health and the like. If these programs have not shown
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impressive signs of progress by the next general election about four years hence, the present great experiment in democracy may come to an untimely end.”

The path to achieving and expanding individual freedoms and increasing the happiness quotient can be manifold. Amartya Sen contrasts the focusing on human freedoms with narrower views of development, such as industrialization, rise in incomes, better healthcare and education etc. If we follow the Gandhian model, then human happiness and the expansion of individual freedoms is not dependent on the material externalities or well being but by strengthening of one’s spiritual core. The Communist model emphasized the surrender of individual rights for the collective good of the nation. In the nation’s development would the individual find his/her development? The Ford Foundation was not content to sit back. Instead they were performing, as Paul Hoffman told the Congressional Committee investigating subversive activities by tax-exempt organizations, “a rather unique service in furthering our [American] new kind of capitalism based on a free society that is enormously productive and in which the benefits of that production are fairly distributed.” They were willing to put the Ford money into making sure that the developing nations consider the free market alternative and were confident that modernization according to the western development pattern was a far better choice than the alternatives.

In this endeavor they had a strong partner in Prime Minister Nehru. Chester Bowles, the American Ambassador to India, in an op-ed piece, had vigorously
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emphasized that point. “Let us remember,” Bowles wrote, “that whatever our occasional differences with India or Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, India is not only a democracy, but a vigorous, energetic and growing democracy. Both India and America believe in freedom, equality for all nations, in orderly justice and a world at peace. India is deeply opposed, both culturally and politically to totalitarianism. India has already established a democratic system of government and set an enviable record of achievement against enormous obstacles-and with but little foreign aid.”

If the democratic alternative as expressed by Paul Hoffman was to succeed then the democratic leadership of India that supported that option needed to succeed. In the Cold War, “the stakes are high”, Chester Bowles reminded his American readers. “If democracy succeeds in India, hundreds of millions of Asia’s poor, hungry and diseased will turn with fresh and renewed faith to democracy as the means of betterment. They will see democracy not only as the freedom to vote and to worship, but as a means toward freedom from want, freedom to live and to develop as dignified human individuals.”

This approach was interpreted by scholars to mean that the “civilizing mission” spirit toward the developing world was alive in the western hemisphere and that after the demise of the colonial empires post World War II, America essentially filled that gap of western dominance through science and technology telling the post colonial world that they needed to follow the tracks of the American progressive paradigm to attain prosperity and development. The Ford Foundation through its funding capacity then was trying to recreate this western style

---
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domination throughout the developing countries in Asia and Africa. Such an argument does not take into consideration Nehru’s own conviction in creating this prosperity in India. Material well-being was as important to him. “We have achieved political freedom”, Nehru remarked on one of his visits to the USA, “but our revolution is not complete and is still in progress, for political freedom without the assurance of the right to live and to pursue happiness, which economic progress alone can bring, can never satisfy a people. Therefore, our immediate task is to raise the living standards of our people, to remove all that comes in the way of the economic growth of the nation.”

However, the Indian government was not going to accept American foreign policy aims in exchange for economic and material aid. Nehru’s desire to improve the material condition of the Indian people did not come at the cost of political or cultural surrender to the West. He understood that India was a traditional society but he did not consider that to be incongruous to modernity. “It is true”, Nehru asserted, “that India’s voice is somewhat different; it is not the voice of the old world of Europe but of the older world of Asia. It is the voice of an ancient civilization, distinctive, vital, which at the same time has renewed itself and learned much from you and the other countries of the West. It is, therefore, both old and new. It has roots deep in the past but it also has the dynamic urge of today.” Also, just because he accepted aid from America and the Ford Foundation did not mean Nehru was going to surrender India’s freedom to act in her self interest internationally.

---

323 Ibid, p. 492
The Ford Foundation office in India echoed similar sentiments. While it was the stated mission of the Ford Foundation to secure world peace by modernization of traditional economies, the India program of the Foundation was attuned to the fact that they were not in the country to set policies and design programs. They were going to simply assist the Indian government in achieving pre-determined goals. “The general principle which underlies all of the projects deemed most worthy of Foundation support,” an internal Report suggested, “was that projects undertaken should improve the capability of the people to help themselves in the development of their country.” This was consistent with the guidelines that were created for Foundation officials who went to man the Ford Foundation’s India office. “The program to which the Foundation will contribute is an Indian program. Planning and management are the responsibility of the Indians and not of the Foundation.”

The need to keep the cold war geo-politics out of Indo-American relations was also advocated by Chester Bowles, the US ambassador in India. “Our dollars, machinery and technical advice are essential to India.” Bowles wrote in his op-ed piece for The New York Times, ”But we must have the wisdom and humility to use them, not to force upon India a twentieth century Americanism, but to help India work out her own advancement in ways specifically adapted to Indian needs, customs and culture. What is required in India is grassroots, village-by-village attack upon poverty, directed by and participated in by the Indian people themselves.

---

325 “Summary Guides..” Report # 012093, pp. 3.
The Indian people must feel the success that arises from their own efforts to solve their own problems in their own way.”\textsuperscript{326} However, just like Hoffman knew, the American people would have to be reassured that their money would have to be spent to win the cold war. “For America the stakes are high”, Bowles remarked in the same article. “If democracy succeeds in India, hundreds of millions of Asia’s poor, hungry and diseased will turn with fresh and renewed faith to democracy as the means of betterment. They will see democracy not only as freedom to vote and to worship, but as a means toward freedom from want, freedom to live and to develop as dignified human individuals. They and their governments will become ever stronger members of the community of free nations.”\textsuperscript{327}

It was clear from Bowles’ exhortations that a gentler approach toward India was needed if the American foreign policy establishment ever hoped to get India on their side in the worldwide fight against Communism. This approach was similar to the Ford Foundation’s approach to the Indian developmental problems. Paul Hoffman proposed in October 1951, immediately after his first trip to India, that the United States look toward foreign aid as an investment in world peace. “Hoffman said that the Marshall Plan has been a spectacular demonstration of what economic aid can contribute. He said it would be a folly for Americans to delude themselves into thinking that Russia is the sole source of tension and distress in the world today. The underlying restlessness is the determination of men everywhere to improve their lot, he said.” \textit{The Washington Post} reported.\textsuperscript{328} Hoffman, clearly, was

\textsuperscript{327}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{328}“$ 2 Billion Urged as Investment”, \textit{The Washington Post}, October 25, 1951.
making a connection between economic aid to thwart communism but in a way that did not suggest ramming down American foreign policy agendas in developing nations. To that extent, Hoffman was not against working with the American government filling in the gaps and picking up the programs that were too sensitive or politically risky for the US government to undertake. Hoffman emphasized “From my ECA experience I know there were projects that we could not do for political reasons or that got down in official delays. The Foundation can move quickly. We will talk to people in and out of government and we will go only where we have been invited.”

**India: The Reform Laboratory**

Before Paul Hoffman left for his Europe and Asia trip, he spoke to the press about the Ford Foundation’s policies about funding projects. “He said the foundation was interested only in the type of project that would be ‘a multiplier’ and set the pattern for a thousand others such as the deep wells first drilled by the ECA in Greece.” *The New York Times* reported. It was not clear whether Hoffman meant that a single project could be replicated all over India or within all the developing countries in Asia. This was indeed a unique opportunity that Americans had to preempt the rise of radical alternatives to democracy. However, it was equally important for the population of these countries to see the institutions as their own and not just created and run by the Foundation officials.

First, the Ford Foundation would have to create blueprints for institutions to be replicated on an all-India basis. In this work they were faced with two choices.

---

They could either choose an existing institutional structure to duplicate around the

country or create a new one. The path of development that The Ford Foundation

supported privileged a certain type of institution to support and duplicate around

the country. Early on, the Foundation was very clear about that choice. The Ford

Foundation staff emphasized practical application of ideas versus pure academic

development of concepts bearing no consequence on reform or change in reality.

This was the basis of the Ford ideology and its work in India. This thought is

clarified in an internal memo detailing the reasons for monetary support to the

Allahabad Agricultural Institute. “The Allahabad Agricultural Institute offers many

promises and advantages in this situation.\textsuperscript{330} It is highly respected through

out India and is in a position to act as a pattern setter. It is the accepted agricultural

college of an Indian university yet it has most of the freedom of a private institution.

It offers unusual opportunities for the exercise of influence of American ideas and

practices in agriculture in comparison with the Indian governmental agricultural

colleges.”\textsuperscript{331} These institutions then became involved in carrying out studies for the

government programs funded by the Ford Foundation.

Also, the prospect of using Foundation sponsored Indian welfare

programs in other parts of the region was not a concept unique to the Ford

Foundation. The British had used Indian programs and blue prints of Indian

institutions, whether it was political, legal or bureaucratic, with lasting effect in

\textsuperscript{330} The situation being referred to above is one wherein there is a limited amount of money that needs to be

applied to a program with maximum impact and benefit for the Indian people and the Ford Foundation.

\textsuperscript{331} Memorandum to Mr. John Cowles from Paul G. Hoffman, December 19, 1951. Report # 003456. FFA
different parts of their empire. Here, however, the Ford Foundation was aiming to garner prestige and acceptability for Indian programs and institutions in other countries of the region. For instance, Douglas Ensminger made a pitch to John Howard at the Foundation to support the School of International Studies, by writing: “The Institute [The School of International Studies] would, moreover, be the first of its kind in Asia, and Dr. Radhakrishnan [the President of India] believes that it will attract students from other Asian nations. Since one of the major objectives of the overseas program—one that has received generally far less implementation than others—is to promote interchange and cooperation among nations of the region, the Institute could serve an exceptionally important function.”

It cannot, however, be denied that the Ford Foundation was trying to influence as many countries as they could through this effort. In a program devised by the Foundation to effectively use books for better bilateral relations between America and Asia, India was the first country to be targeted for this venture. “With a collapse of imperial-colonial relationships between the West and Asia”, the Ford Foundation report observed, “the reintegration of these two massive areas on a basis that will command the assent of the Eastern peoples is one of the most urgent of all contemporary problems. It is urgent to the West from every military, political and economic consideration. Beyond that is the even more fundamental fact that voluntary collaboration with a free western economy and polity is basic to the

333 Memorandum to John Howard from Douglas Ensminger, June 21, 1954, pp 2, # 006584, FFA.
future welfare of half of the human race that is embraced in the Asian area.”

In September, of 1952, after a need for such a program was voiced earlier in an internal memo, the Ford Foundation carved out a “Books for India” program. “There is universal agreement on the need for some type of help which will make good books readily available to the intellectuals and new literates of India at a price they can afford to pay. We are all agreed that a “Books-for-India” program should be organized to meet the felt need for more and better literature and not directed toward counteracting the Russian publications program in India.”

Their focus was not to transform traditional societies into their image. Rapid westernization could create an adverse reaction within the traditional communities they sought to change. This could be very de-stabilizing and produce the very opposite result that the Ford Foundation was attempting to bring about. “For we have necessarily agreed that in the final analysis, the democratic vitality, and stability and viability of a nation in the process of development depend on the degree not only to which the nation makes economic and social advances, but to which it simultaneously encourages, strengthens and maintains its cultural cohesion and achieves orderly integrated, cultural growth.”

In addition, maintaining local culture and traditions was also considered as a bulwark against communism. The Ford Foundation Report, however, looked favorably on the changes development would bring about. “A literacy campaign in a formerly illiterate village may lead to sweeping changes that village’s present accepted way of life. The
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334 Memorandum to Paul G. Hoffman from Carl Spaeth and John Howard, March 3, 1952, PA 53-57. FFA.
literate villagers may, for instance, choose wholly new types of village leaders, take different attitudes toward illiterate family elders, toward caste and family ties, toward traditionally accepted village customs and work practices. Similarly, the introduction of women's extension work, which in the narrow context maybe viewed purely as another rural development ‘activity’, may profoundly affect the prestige and status of women in rural society, their participation in family and community decisions, and in village life.”

The idea behind Ford Foundation programs, was bringing about change without the social and cultural upheaval that could destabilize a nascent democracy. The success of their endeavors in India would also go the distance in helping Foundation staff and policy makers to craft programs for other countries in the region with similar cultural and traditional roots.

John Bresnan, the Ford Foundation Assistant Representative in Indonesia, testifies to India’s pre-eminent position in garnering the Foundations funds. He wrote, “The case of India is without parallel. Hoffman personally led the first delegation of the Foundation to India in August 1951, accompanied by an entourage that included a trustee, newspaper publisher John Cowles, and two senior staff members. They were received by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru on arrival, met with him two more times in the course of their visit, and were introduced to a host of new government initiatives from the very start. Hoffman recommended an appropriation of $3.5 million to the Foundation board and committed more than $2 million to several Indian purposes before the year was out….Its [India’s] adherence

\[337\] Ibid. p 1.
to fundamental democratic values in its national political life set it apart from most of Asia from the very beginning. Its sophisticated elite made it the most likely place for the Foundation to enter any field of activity for the first time. It is difficult to think of a substantive interest the foundation has pursued in its history in the developing world that was not represented in its grant list in India before any other country."  

Also, programs that were introduced later in different South East Asian Nations had the Indian imprint on them, whether it was the blue print of programs successfully implemented in India or the use of Indian experts within those programs.  

An internal memo of Ford Foundation involvement in South East Asia pointed out the positives of implementing Indian economic programs in other developing nations like “possible community development projects (like those in India); outside experts in developing an over all development plan (comparable to India’s Five Year Plan).” The Foundation believed that cooperation between developing nations to modernize traditional economies and polities, as opposed to help from an American organization, would be received more favorably by the population of these nations. This idea is at the heart of many Ford Foundation programs in India. Institutions created in India by the Ford Foundation, like the Indian Institute of Public Administration, were also considered by the Foundation staff to serve as points of contact for modernization throughout the Asian region.

---

339 Ibid., p. 134.  
340 Anonymous, “Memorandum on Foundation Group Going to Indonesia and Burma”, Undated, unpaged. File 003265, FFA.
The aim of many Ford Foundation programs in India or in other parts of the Asian region, for which their work in India served as a pattern setter, was to enhance the efficacy of democracy as an alternative to communism. The Foundation acknowledged this fact in their annual report in 1953. “The Foundation supports undertakings only in those nations whose political philosophy and objectives, if sustained or achieved, are incompatible with Communism.”341 The Ford Foundation wanted to overcome the challenge that communism posed to the free world, which was whether they could come to the aid of the poverty stricken masses of the post-colonial nations or allow those countries to languish in misery, ripe for radicals and communists to take over.

**Conclusion**

The Ford Foundation’s work in India in their first two decades there has to be considered in the cold war context. Although the cold war changed in complexity from the 1950s to the 1960s, it under girded the Ford Foundation ideology that socio-economic development and raising the living standards of the people in underdeveloped nations was the best and sometimes the only way to combat the spread of communism around the world. The Foundation and its officers were not unique in thinking along these lines. The American Ambassador to India, Chester Bowles, wrote, “Within the next four years, history in Asia will reach a turning point. It will be a turning point not for Asia alone, but for the whole world. The pivot of this historic point is India. Within these coming four years democratic India must

prove to her own and Asia’s millions whether or not democracy can solve the staggering problem of an Asian people.”

The task then was well defined but difficult to achieve. The Ford Foundation needed to enter these countries without coercion, just the opposite rather, and engage the local population in enforcing development programs aimed to better their socio-economic lot. This job was made even more difficult considering that the countries they needed to help were erstwhile colonies with deep suspicion of the western nations who had enslaved them for centuries and whom they had to fight to get their independence. As a result the Ford Foundation had to find legitimacy to enter such countries – a legitimacy that could be bestowed by popularly elected governments and their development agendas.

“When Mr. Hoffman took over the presidency of the Foundation in January of 1951”, Douglas Ensminger explains the initial contact with Indian leaders, “he made an early contact with India’s Ambassador in Washington, Madam Vijayalaxmi Pandit, Nehru’s sister, and through her relayed to Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Hoffman’s desire to visit India as early as possible. Through this contact and Madam Pandit’s communication with Nehru, an invitation was extended for Mr. Hoffman to visit India in August of 1951.”

It helped the Ford Foundation team that visited India on Nehru’s invitation that modernization programs were already drawn up by the Planning Commission. Certainly, the tenor, scope and manner of implementation of these programs might have differed between the two entities i.e., the Ford Foundation and the Indian

---

343 Douglas Ensminger, Oral History Transcript, October 17, 1971, p. 4. FFA.
government, but the idea of using science and technology and the general principles of modernity to improve the lot of the Indian people was the same. The Ford Foundation had painstakingly cultivated an image for itself in the United States as a progressive modernizer in its domestic program and was intent on using that image in its international program for the cause of keeping the communist ideology from spreading in Asia. 344

Modernization as a defining ideology was buttressed by the fact that the Foundation had no religious or other imperialist bias. As opposed to the Rockefeller Foundation, which had started an international program much before the Ford Foundation and had worked with religious missionaries in China, the Ford Foundation lacked that connection. 345 Douglas Ensminger elaborated this problem: “In looking to private educational institutions one came face to face with the implications of Foundation assistance being interpreted as supporting Christian missionaries’ work...With the early criticism Nehru and his government brought upon the foreign missions, for the Foundation to have entered this field would have been interpreted as being supportive of Christian mission programs in contrast to the Hindu culture and the Hindu way of life.” 346 Happily for the Ford Foundation their aim of keeping India within the fold of free democratic nations after China became communist, through national development programs and the widespread

344 Author unknown, “The Ford Foundation and Foundation Supported Activities in India”, July 1, 1954, p. 11&12. Report # 002724. FFA This report summarized the Ford Foundation programs in the US to reinforce to the Indian decision makers and the Indian public, should they happen to read this report, that the Ford Foundation is a true modernizer, not just in India but also within the United States.
345 Ma, Qiusha, “The Rockefeller Foundation and Modern Medical Education in China
346 Ensminger, Oral History Transcript, June 5, 1972, p. 3-4
use of modern science and technology became very credible, both within the
American foreign policy establishment and with the Indian leadership.

It was often quite difficult to match the aims of these two disparate entities.
The officers of the Ford Foundation, on many occasions had a difficult time
explaining their India programs not just to American policy makers, but also the
senior Ford Foundation leaders operating from New York. Ensminger notes: “There
were many times when it became difficult to interpret Nehru’s socialism to the
people in the United States. I always assumed it important to keep a number of
people, both within and out side the Foundation, informed about India, because it
was through the people who understood India that I had to draw to get the broad-
based support of the Foundation programs and operations in India. To help people
understand and accept Nehru’s socialism was to me essential in order for the
Foundation to play the role in India.” 347 Yet the Ford Foundation in India gathered
enough momentum and acceptability that its name became synonymous with the
Indian development effort. It was “associated with not only the solving of
recognized problems, but to be also known as working on the frontiers of the
emerging problems.” 348

The role of the Ford Foundation in India’s developmental efforts and its role
in maintaining peace and democracy in the world can best be explained by the man
who became the face of the Foundation in India, Douglas Ensminger. “For anyone
who has not seen mass poverty and learned to live with pockets of poverty in their
own country, this might not be thought of as a major issue. But in a country like

---

India where there was and is mass poverty, it is quite clear that as development moves forward, people who have lived without the necessities of life and who have lived with the fear of hunger, will grow in resentment as they see others advancing. The results will be a large percentage of ‘have nots’ who have no opportunity for employment.... So it was on this basis that Nehru and Hoffman both agreed removing conditions of poverty in India would in itself be a major contribution to India achieving a viable economy, a viable democracy, and providing the conditions for peace, not only in India, but in all of Asia.”

349 *Ibid*, November 18, 1971, p. 11
Chapter 5

Paul Appleby: The New Deal Expert

"Today we face the world, influenced very greatly by what has happened in Europe and in America, by the tremendous scientific and industrial development that has taken place here, which we wish to have in our own country, but with the distinctive outlook of India. And I should like you – whenever you have the chance – to seek to understand that outlook." \(^{350}\)

Jawaharlal Nehru.

Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister of independent India was extremely impressed, in general, by the prosperity of the western nations. However, it was his admiration for the achievements of the United States, in particular, that drew forth from him the following observation: “The United States of America have struggled to freedom and unparalleled prosperity during the past century and a half and today they are a great and powerful nation. They have an amazing record of growth in material well-being and scientific and technological advance.” \(^{351}\) Not surprisingly then, Nehru, in his quest to achieve the same rate of progress of the western nations for a newly independent country like India, looked for scientific and technological help from American experts. His desire to reform the inherited Indo-British administrative structures, to lead the new-age government programs, led him to invite Dr. Paul H. Appleby, Dean of the Maxwell School at Syracuse University, to come to India under the auspices of the Ford Foundation and suggest measures to improve India’s governance.


\(^{351}\) *Ibid*, p. 5.
Dr. Appleby enjoyed an eclectic career. He started out as a journalist, and then worked in various positions in government departments including Assistant Director for the US Bureau of Budget and Under Secretary in the US Department of Agriculture. He carried out a study of food shortage issues for the British government and was then invited to head the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University. All through his working life, he built strong associations with his co-workers and superiors and enjoyed close relationships with his ex-colleagues in government, many of whom were involved with the work of American Foundations overseas. This close-knit group had one thing in common. They were consummate “New Dealers”. They believed in the power of government to achieve development goals. They believed in economic planning to help ailing sectors of the economy and industries advance.

Appleby’s motivation to make the Indian government successful in implementing developmental plan objectives dovetailed perfectly with the larger Ford Foundation objectives. However, this was not due to any preconceived ideology, notions or dogmas. This chapter will argue, instead, that Appleby’s background and professional experiences in varied fields, especially during the New Deal period, made him more
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352 George Rosen in his *Western Economists and Eastern Societies: Agents of Change in South Asia, 1950-1970*, (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), p 240-241 contends that economists working as consultants for Ford and Rockefeller Foundations in India during this period were very doctrinaire. They were very academic and believed in the power of economic theory, in general, to alleviate developmental issues in India and Pakistan. Marcus Cueto, (ed.) *Missionaries of Science: The Rockefeller Foundation and Latin America*, (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994), chronicles the findings of a variety of scholars with different conclusions about American consultants working in Latin America for the Rockefeller Foundation. Ranging from western cultural myopia among American scientists to American experts being used as political arsenal by local leaders against their opponents. Edward Berman insists that only scholars who completely agreed with the Foundation’s view of mission and outcomes were used as consultants to the governments of different countries in the period following World War II. Entire argument can be found at Edward H. Berman, “The Extension of Ideology: Foundation Support for Intermediate Organizations and Forums”, in *Comparative Education Review*, Vol. 26, No.1, Feb., 1982, pp 48-68. Finally, Blackmer, Donald M., *The MIT Center for International Studies: The Founding Years, 1951-1969*, (Cambridge, Mass: Center for International Studies, 2002), talks about the role of ideology in technical aid and scholarship.
practical and pragmatic in his policy orientation. This, in turn, shaped the Appleby Report and his recommendations to the Government of India than any predetermined belief to either spread American influence abroad, or superiority of a certain ideology or narrow technical principles. Appleby did not fit the mold of an archetypal foreign consultant or advisor. Typically these specialists were trained in a certain field and were responsible for advising in their narrowly defined area of expertise, wherein they applied American technology and learning abroad. Appleby’s broader perspective on public administration made it difficult to categorize him as conventional. This assertion supports the argument that American consultants cannot be pigeonholed together under a single ideology or method of working. Individual consultants have to be studied independently to ascertain their work in developing countries.

It was Appleby’s experience as a practicing administrator and an academic that led him to consider reforming Indian administration on a lasting basis through the Institute of Public Administration. However, for him, academic principles had to meet

353 The Appleby Report, authored by Paul H. Appleby, presented to the Indian Government in 1953 was a comprehensive study of the administrative structure of the Government of India. This Report made two suggestions to the Government to implement. First, was the establishment of an Institute of Public Administration and second, the creation of an O&M unit within departments. Establishment of the Indian Institute of Public Administration was direct outcome of this Report. The Appleby Report is considered a landmark study in the Indian administrative reforms efforts.


356 This too is a very conventional description of these consultants. Some academicians, seeing the mammoth task of effecting change in underdeveloped countries with huge cultural differences, actually dissuaded the Foundation from entering those fields leaving the job of reform exclusively to the local experts. Jayanth K. Krishnan, “Professor Kingsfield goes to Delhi: American Academics, The Ford Foundation, and the Development of Legal Education in India”, The American Journal of Legal History, Vol. 46, No. 4, Oct., 2004, pp 447-499, p. 498. Others believed that exporting and imitating American methods and solutions was not the right criteria to judge foreign technical assistance at all. Rather, diffusion of technology transfers ought to be the aim of any international aid. Ultimately the recipients will adapt technology as they see fit. In Ralph Braibanti, “The American Experience in Diffusing Administrative Technology”, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 428, (Nov., 1976), pp 65-76.
practical standards to be deemed worthy of acceptance. For instance, Appleby believed that policy formulation and its implementation were so intertwined that they nullified the politics and administration dichotomy view widely held in American academia at the time. This insight was more important for him when he made the trip to India as Ford Foundation consultant. Although most Americans in New Delhi at this period in time socially coalesced around the American embassy – and the Applebys were no exception – he did not bring the American government’s point of view or the Ford Foundation’s mission to bear on his conclusions or believed that he was recruited to create programs aiming to curb communism. Appleby certainly considered democracy to be a better system than communism or totalitarianism. Despite that, he was not interested in creating the Indian government and administration into an image of the American government. His own practical experiences as an administrator shaped his recommendations to the Government of India.

For instance, Appleby placed his confidence in Institutional structures and processes to achieve consensus on solutions to problems. Although Appleby recognized the role of academic research in reforming government and informing policy as being hallmarks of the American political and administrative culture, he did not accord the academic “experts” a pre-eminent position vis-à-vis the government administrator in the Institute. His ideas of reform revolved around a mutual give and take between the elite generalist administrator and the academic expert, which was at odds with the American system of governance since America lacked this class of career administrators.

altogether. However, he disliked the exclusivity built around the career civil service in India, wherein no outside influence was admitted in and no one beyond their exclusive club could be part of their system. In these circumstances, Appleby’s practical orientation became evident and he required bureaucrats to collaborate closely with the Institute academicians so that both groups could get the benefit of each other’s experiences and expertise, creating informal links between the two parties. This, moreover, achieved the Ford Foundation and the American foreign policy plan to maintain established systems and create sustainable change.

Combating communism and promoting democracy through economic development was a stated aim of the Foundation and generally accepted by Appleby. He did not, however, see the need to give a detailed road map to the Indians to follow. He assumed that the practitioners of government administration understood the challenges they faced. Academics, he believed, should support the administrators in carrying out their task more efficiently. Technically specialized officials, in his view, lacked the societal and human touch and so they should play the supporting role.

Dr. Appleby had a complex professional life. His training, as mentioned above, was in various sectors. He had a practical administrator’s viewpoint coupled with an academic’s research bent. While in government, he was an unabashed supporter of strong executive power and an interventionist federal government. He encouraged democratic controls on government power but believed that the role of government in
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359 The only senior career civil service officers in the United States are the career diplomats in the State Department.
361 Dr. Appleby is credited with a number of publications prior to his appointment as Dean of the Maxwell School at Syracuse University. His most famous and well known was, *The Big Democracy*. 
improving the lives of people was key to progress. He was later involved in academics as the Dean of the Maxwell School at Syracuse University. His approach to study and improvement of administration, nonetheless, was not doctrinaire. Unlike many academics, Appleby did not believe that theoretical solutions would improve government systems. He understood that administration needed to be changed but that the Indian administrators and academicians working within institutional structures were in the best position to effect that change.

Appleby’s experiences in American domestic politics, which was never homogeneous and orderly to begin with, also brought a level of political sensitivity to his approach to administration. American policy making, at the state and the federal level, had been a result of negotiation between several groups in society. The political executive, as Appleby was well aware, was in a very delicate position trying to balance these pressures and demands. Similarly, he was cognizant of the difficulty of a foreign analyst critically examining the administrative system of another country and the constraints that would put on the politicians and administrators of that nation in terms of how it was perceived by the local population and how that would affect domestic politics. Equally, he was mindful of the fact that he was an outsider and that if he wanted his work

---

362 George Rosen talks about economists working in India, who brought their knowledge of western economic theories to bear upon Indian developmental problems. Rosen argues that every single economic approach proved incapable of solving India’s problems. It was important, according to Rosen, to understand “the capacity of the political and administrative units to modify the basic structural constraints….“(233). Rosen finally contends that such an understanding of the country’s political, social and administrative problems can be understood by Indians themselves and so there was need to train Indian economists to do the job rather than import foreign consultants. The most important job that these consultants can do, he argues, is to create institutional structures within which such economists can be trained and within which they can operate.

to be considered seriously by the host government he would have to be very skillful in presenting it to them.

A Unique Professional.

The request for Paul Appleby’s services was the very first received by the Ford Foundation from the Government of India. It has been variously argued by scholars that American experts furthered their careers by working in developing countries creating solutions to problems that never materialized and that American technical assistance to nations only boosted the power of the professionals. The Foundations, it was argued, served as frontal organizations for all the policy and technical experts serving different countries. However, in the case of Paul Appleby, this explanation does not suffice to explain the pointed request made by the Indian government for Appleby’s services. The Indians were not just stating problem areas and letting the Foundation select the experts to work on those exclusive issues. The Government of India was closely involved in determining which consultants were invited to work on various problems. As Ensminger recalls, “While Nehru wanted Appleby to take an overview of India’s administrative structure and how it functioned, he mentioned things he specifically wanted Appleby to examine and advice him about.”

---

364 Douglas Ensminger, Oral History, B.6 The Ford Foundation’s Involvement in Public Administration, FFA.
366 Deshmukh, C.D., The Course of My Life, (Bombay: Orient Longman Ltd., 1974), p 216. Dr. Deshmukh, who was the Finance Minister, writes in his memoirs that it was “at his insistence” that Appleby was invited to India.
368 Ensminger, Oral History B.6 p 1. The three areas that Nehru wanted Appleby to examine were: role and functions of the Ministers; definition of the role and functions of the Indian Administrative Service officers and finally, the relationship between the ministers and the civil service officers.
Why did the Indians want Paul Appleby to study Indian administration and suggest changes to better implement economic plans? At least a large part of that answer lies in Appleby’s varied career path. Appleby was attractive to the Indians because he was not a pure theoretician. Nehru was wary of solutions that were unworkable and remained exclusively in the domain of ideas.\footnote{Nehru remarked, “….But there is a danger that our experts, our professors, our economists and others, who are exceedingly good at the particular subject in which they are experts sometimes become rather inexpert in understanding even a single human being, much less a crowd.” Nehru, Jawaharlal, \textit{Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru}, Second Series, Vol. 25, (New Delhi: Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund, 1999), p. 255} Paul Appleby was important on a number of levels. His early experience with journalism put him in touch with critical public issues and the prevalent opinions surrounding those questions. He wrote of his preparation for his subsequent work in government as follows: “….that while attending school I had worked in three different types of stores, in the office of another kind of business enterprise, in newspaper offices, and briefly on two farms. The point is that by the time I went to Washington my equipment was in no way special, but it was highly diverse, earthy experience in close association with the common people of seventeen different communities in seven states in the middle-west, west and southeast.”\footnote{The Reminiscences of Paul H. Appleby, p. 6, in the Oral History Collection of Columbia University.}

Even though Appleby felt unprepared and limited in his experience for government work, as a journalist he knew the pulse of mid west politics. He was aware of what the people were thinking and this knowledge and experience armed him not just for government jobs but also helped shape his career. His approach, as he recollects in his oral history interview, was for “equity” and “order”. Appleby, similar to the Ford Foundation methodology, believed in a gradual change of systems and procedures rather than an immediate and total overhaul. He elucidates this theme further: “Long before, I
had recognized strong drives for improved social equities, but drives along evolutionary
and not revolutionary lines…In a setting where newer objectives were clearly based on
concern for improved equities, my role came more and more to be to search and insist
upon the feasible, the practical, the publicly acceptable, the team-work, organizational
performance.”

This approach was quickly put to work in the Roosevelt administration. Battling
a crippling economic depression, the government was interested in what strategies
worked, and even more important, which ones would be acceptable to the people and
their representatives. On receiving the offer to join the Department of Agriculture in
1933 as Executive Assistant to Henry Wallace, an old acquaintance and Secretary of
Agriculture, Appleby recalls, “I was attracted by Wallace’s offer because I was in spirit
and thought a New Dealer, immediately attracted to Roosevelt.”

Eugene Staples, in his narrative on Ford Foundation’s India program, wrote that
Prime Minister Nehru made the selection of Paul Appleby to review Indian
administration after a close discussion on the matter with Douglas Ensminger, Ford’s
India representative. Ensminger, on the other hand, recalls that it was Nehru’s decision
to invite Paul Appleby to India. On further questioning of his choice, Nehru told
Ensminger that he wanted Appleby’s help to change India’s traditional regulatory
bureaucracy into a development oriented one.371 Douglas Ensminger worked at the US
Agriculture Department from 1939 till 1951. Appleby and he were contemporaries at the
Department and had several common friends.

Foundation Archives. Additionally, C.D., Deshmukh, Nehru’s Finance Minister, in his memoirs writes that
he was instrumental in bringing Appleby to India. It is not clear whether he suggested Appleby’s expertise
In addition, most of the problems with Indian administration that concerned Nehru were in context of the implementation of the Five-Year plans. The First Five Year Plan, in early stages of preparation at that time, concentrated on the agricultural productivity of the country. Appleby, in addition to holding various positions in the Department of Agriculture, had also done an assessment of food management issues for the British government. Although Appleby was invited to study the general preparedness of the Indian administration to implement the development goals of the Five year Plans, his familiarity with agricultural issues was an asset to the immediate implementation of the First Five Year Plan. Prime Minister Nehru did not overlook this very important factor in Appleby’s professional background while considering him as an administration expert.372

Making Nehru’s emphasis on agriculture and the goals of the First Plan a success was a priority for the Ford Foundation as well. A democratic alternative to improving farm productivity was certainly desirable to the Foundation than the communist solution to agricultural issues in neighboring China.373 Mao’s methods of agricultural improvement were spreading beyond China, bolstering the Communists in India. Hence, successful implementation of the First Plan was extremely important to the Indian establishment as well as the Ford Foundation officials. Also, Nehru’s impatience with reform and improvement was very apparent. In his periodic letters to the Chief Ministers

372 S. Gopal, in his very authoritative biography of Nehru, (he was privy to all of Nehru’s official and unofficial papers), writes about Nehru’s insistence on a strong agricultural base. Nehru believed, according to Gopal, that no industry was possible without first building up agricultural productivity. Gopal, S., J awaharlal Nehru: A Biography, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989) p 325.
373 The popular methodology of the Communist revolution in Mao’s China entailed forcible land seizure and purge of landowners. Communists redistributed rather than increasing the volume of the yield of farmland. That does not mean that the Indian government was not in favor of land reforms but a democratic alternative meant that individual rights of farm owners would be recognized. The Indian communists vehemently disagreed with this method.
of all the States in India, Nehru wrote: “In China, recently, there was a great campaign against corruption, nepotism and bureaucratism. From all accounts, this campaign was a rather terrible and ruthless affair. But I confess that I feel rather attracted to any drive against corruption and bureaucratism. Corruption is bad of course. But bureaucratism is perhaps even more insidious as it comes in the way all the time and kills ardour and initiative. In our own way we have to fight against these tendencies.”

The Foundation needed someone who could come in and immediately help the government improve implementation of the economic plans with the given instruments – the generalist administrators. The First Appleby Report, submitted in 1953, did not call for a re-haul of India’s administrative personnel. Appleby, in fact, praised the country’s administration while suggesting means for continuous reform. In his report Appleby rated the Government of India “among the dozen or so most advanced governments of the world.” Improvements in Indian administration, according to Appleby, would be informed by organizations within and outside government to remove administrative bottlenecks.

For Appleby, India’s administrative system was as unique as that of the United States. In his report, Appleby writes, “It must be emphasized also that just as all other governments and their administrative arrangements are unique, so is the government of India essentially different from all others. It is and must be an outgrowth of its own long history and its own rich culture. Probably no practice – certainly none of any importance
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376 In his first report to the Government of India, Appleby suggested setting up an Institute of Public Administration and creating Organization and Management units within various ministries (departments) to study and solve administrative problems.
— can ever be directly copied from one government and simply applied to another. There is value in comparisons, but the value is in stimulating some development, which had nowhere before existed in precisely the same form or manner. The best administration for the United States would not be the best administration for India, and _vice versa_. But the two may well be stimulated by each other.”

This interaction being uppermost in his mind, Appleby suggested to the Government of India, that an Institutional basis for such exchange be created. Recognizing the need for officials from different departments to meet each other and be in touch with reform efforts made in other countries, Appleby suggested that a permanent institutional structure serve as a meeting point and a professional body for the discipline of public administration which would illumine all reform efforts.

The Indian Institute of Public Administration, intended by Appleby to be the meeting point between domestic and foreign professionals, also had a cadre of researchers and a School of Public Administration associated with it. Appleby believed that expertise should be available to the top bureaucrats and ministers when they needed it. In a lecture delivered at the IIPA, in 1961, Appleby suggested that experts “should be on tap not on top.”

He believed, though, that top bureaucrats within any government ought to be generalists. “The point” Appleby elaborates further, “is that any top civil service position requires so much of political competence (in a nonpartisan sense), requires so much of generalist capabilities, that any man in such a post who thinks of himself as an expert is already at a position higher than any he is properly fitted to fill.
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At that level he should be- primarily an administrator and a public servant.” The Institute of Public Administration was that expert body providing senior administrators, which in India’s case were generalist administrators; the benefit of expertise arising out of scientifically conducted research in administrative issues and problems.

It was Appleby’s contention that best results accrue when experts and non-experts exchanged their experience and knowledge to arrive at solutions and the means at better implementation. This was in Appleby’s view a product of the intersection of institutional, social and political wisdom. In a paper entitled “An Administrative View”, Appleby emphasized the usefulness of this interaction using the example of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which was created to provide expert economic advice to the Secretary of Agriculture. However, it was not found to be very useful to the Secretary because it transmitted specialized economic knowledge to the Secretary without translating it into terms readily understandable to the generalist Congress and the public and being able to tackle problems faced by the Secretary. When this specialized information, however, was meshed with the needs of the generalist bureaucracy it became more effective and useful. The idea of having research generated by the Indian Institute of Public Administration to provide solutions to administrative bottlenecks and other issues faced by the bureaucrats by understanding the problems through the civil service officers themselves was a step towards correcting what Appleby saw as a problem with specialized Institutions.
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Appleby was aware that the Indian government was stressing the scientific study of administrative issues in their publicity of the Institute of Public Administration.  

Douglas Ensminger, Ford Foundation’s India Representative, had also mentioned the need for a scientific approach toward civil service jobs by government employees. However, Appleby understood that this scientific study cannot and should not take the place of generalist knowledge. In a paper entitled, “The Intellectuals and Public Policy”, Appleby warned, “….the great and somewhat mystical regard for science should be tempered with frequent reminders of the fundamental limitations of science. …..It is useful, I think, to regard this matter of the application of scientific findings to social action by considering it in terms of decision-making hierarchies.” He goes on to add that “Policy-making, in the specialized administrative hierarchy, in the legislature-like areas, and in the politics of institutions, society and public, is evaluation not merely of scientific data, but of functional interests and attitudes of organizational membership and of environing societies and public. Policy-making is synthesis in these broad terms, and as such it partakes heavily of mediation.” Appleby, as is clear from his views, was convinced of the generality of the work of the top-level bureaucrats and believed that their position as generalists ought to be maintained.
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381 Nehru mentions that the Institute would study the problems facing administration, “not in a casual manner but scientifically, expertly and with knowledge”. Reported in the Hindustan Times, Vol. XXXI. No. 87, March 30th 1954. It was mentioned in newspaper clippings found in Appleby’s papers archived at the Grinnell College archives. In a newspaper clipping (date unknown) of a snippet entitled “Study of Public Administration Institute to be Set Up in New Delhi”, is mentioned that “The Indian Institute of Public Administration, a pioneering autonomous organization for studying public administration on a scientific basis will soon be opened in New Delhi.”


In this sense Appleby differed from the Professionalization spurred by academia in the United States. He made a pointed comment about the shortcomings of the professional culture in the America. “In America,” Appleby writes, “for example, the approach to a self-conscious professionalization of public administration began with the academicians – and almost exclusively with the political scientists among the academicians. As a sequel to this beginning, the efforts to systematize administrative theory were based overwhelmingly on the documentary method. The documents available were chiefly the Constitution, laws, court decisions, formal annual reports of departments and agencies, and hearings before Congressional committees. These things are on the whole peripheral to actual administration; at least, they do not comprehend a very large part of the living and acting reality. Specialized studies, as they come along, had largely to do with financial and personnel administration, and very little to do with the actual conduct of the action programs which are the crucial end-product of public administration.”

What then did Appleby believe was the purpose of the Institute of Public Administration that he was proposing to the Government of India to set up? In Appleby’s view, “In India, the professional movement centers largely with the practitioners. And here the theoretical interest is not confined to personnel in the Indian Civil Service or The Indian Administrative Service. Nor is the academic interest confined to political scientists. A more cosmopolitan and comprehensive approach can be got underway here more rapidly than in any country I know of. And the literature that can be developed will come here more quickly and rapidly from practitioners; this means that it, too, will be more realistic, more penetrating, more descriptive and more
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The Indian Institute of Public Administration, Appleby hoped, would bring the specialization in theory and practice together without pushing the importance of one over the other because, as Appleby writes, he did not want an “over-intellectualizing” of the approach to public administration.

At the same time Appleby believed that it might be useful for practitioners of public administration to gain some perspective from the theoretical formulations of academicians and researchers within the Institute and for the faculty of the institute to cater to the practical problems faced by the administrators. He firmly espoused the interchange of ideas and information. He mentions in his report his hope that “In the course of years I [Appleby] should expect a closer association between officials and university faculties in appropriate fields to be one of the substantial consequences of the existence of the Institute.” He was also aware that in India the ranks within the hierarchy were quite rigid and that younger members of the bureaucracy did not have a ready access to the higher levels of administrators. Appleby hoped that the Institute of Public Administration would break the “barriers between ranks, in the formal handling of public business, which would be minimized in a professional society where members would be freed from preoccupations with specific hard problems requiring responsible decision and where the hierarchy of the work-a-day world would lose significance. Older men here could identify younger men of special promise, and younger men get a stimulation otherwise unavailable to them.”

To Appleby, most of these ideals did not arise out of the abstract. They were a product of his experiences while working in government. In fact, Appleby himself was
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invited to come to Washington by Henry Wallace, the Secretary of Agriculture, to become his executive assistant because of Wallace’s familiarity with Appleby’s work in the field of agricultural journalism. In his reminisces he writes, “On the Des Moines Register and Tribune one of my special editorial fields was the agricultural ‘relief’ cause. In Des Moines I had carried forward an acquaintance with Henry Wallace…Sequentially, a few days after he was sworn in as Secretary of Agriculture, he called me on the telephone and asked me to come to Washington as his executive assistant.”

The Indian system of recruiting was very closed and there was no lateral entry for someone like Paul Appleby to enter into the ranks of the bureaucracy based on his knowledge and acumen. The Institute of Public Administration would serve to, at least, put the lower ranks of bureaucrats in touch with the senior civil servants in an informal setting to let the top officers identify some younger officials with promise and talent. It might have paved the way toward elevating an officer to a higher position based on ability and not just on the basis of seniority which was the core of the promotion policy in the Indian government.

Due to the inherently closed nature of Indian bureaucracy, the value of having non-governmental expert advice was not lost on Appleby. However, that advice needed to be located away from the government hierarchy and not within it. Being in government during the “New Deal” years Appleby became familiar with a number of experts of FDR’s ‘brain trust’. An important member of that clique was Rexford Tugwell, an expert on agricultural policy at Columbia University. Appleby was his colleague at the Department of Agriculture. In his reminisces, Appleby details how inducting Tugwell into the Department did not help the actual working of the government. “Tugwell”, Appleby writes, “suffered from an inherent difficulty of a

second in command position in organizations and didn’t have very substantial function in any clear way in the department.” When Tugwell was offered a line function, he could not interest any of the bureau chiefs within the Department. They believed that “Tugwells interests weren’t rounded interests in their activities.”

A big problem for FDR’s administration was that there was no other place for Roosevelt to position his policy experts other than in the departments. There was no institutional set up for these academicians to work and yet be close to the President. Appleby obviously was a close witness to Roosevelt’s experts working within government departments and saw their discomfort. Although they did not fit into the administrative set up in the line functions of the department, they were essential for the infusion of new ideas in the system. However, Appleby believed that these academicians would be most efficient and their expertise could be put to better use if they were kept separate from the government hierarchy and within Institutions dedicated to helping administrators understand policies and their implications. Appleby believed that experts were essential to policy formulation and implementation because they helped the executive understand issues in all their complexity. Appleby, in his essay “Confronting Complexity”, quotes Professor Harold Lasswell to elucidate this point.

“All Social Science” Laswell wrote, “should be oriented to decision-making. However, it is not the function of social science or the social scientists to solve the problems of the decision makers; it is their [the social scientists’] function to complicate the job of the decision-makers, producing additional insights, freeing the
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decision makers, from the compulsive decisions they otherwise would make, widening their areas of discretion, and thereby enlarging freedom.”  

Keeping this opinion on the forefront, Appleby often used the phrase “experts on tap not on top” to reflect his view on the issue of the importance of expertise in government functioning. Experts, or Analysts, as Arnold J. Meltsner calls them, are not a homogeneous group either. “No single analytical type exists... Because there are different types of analysts, what is a successful analysis for one will be a failure for another.” Appleby believed that experts should be relevant only at the lower levels of the bureaucracy. The policy level or the upper reaches of government departments needed more general skills. The different types of analysts described by Meltsner also play different roles within the organization. “The policy analyst,” Meltsner writes, “sets his own expectations. Technicians feel that they have been a success when their peers like their work. Politicians are happy when their immediate boss or client is happy. Entrepreneurs are not happy unless their efforts change the allocation of resources and people’s lives for the better.”

However, Appleby referred to some of the frustrations of experts and decision makers alike when dealing with problems of public policy. “Social Scientists who attempt to guide top-level decision-makers are characteristically disappointed because actions seem not to reflect their advice, and the decision makers, in turn, are privately very unhappy about the kind of advice the Social Scientists give.” Appleby believed
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that the job of experts was to give the policy makers information so that they can make the best decisions within political and social constraints. The researchers and faculty of the IIPA, Appleby hoped, would give all the necessary information and advice to the government departments and yet remain outside of the formal administrative hierarchy, thereby avoiding any of the attachments with decisions made within government hierarchies.

**Institutional Development**

Appleby deeply believed in the power of institutions to produce the best solutions to vexing problems, whether they are political, administrative or professional. It was his view that individual efforts lead to better results in formal institutions or organizations. The reason, according to Appleby, was to be found in the ever-complicated lives that individuals lead in modern society. Individualism would be quite inadequate if all the elements in society and polity are to be reconciled. “The interactions of diverse institutions and individuals, the interaction of functions and human aspirations, within the discipline of political democracy produce a certain amount of effectiveness. “These interactions,” Appleby further expounds, “provide at the same time much more of the social wisdom possible for specialized and finite men. We need in addition only that guidance which increasing understanding can provide us if we divert more of our thought from specialization to the generality of civilized living”.

To Appleby, the process of applying specialized skills to produce solutions for general problems also required Institutions. He believed that by institutionalizing administrative reforms, India would get the continuous benefit of the institutional wisdom of the Indian Institute of Public Administration. Milton J. Esman, in a recently compiled
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volume of essays dedicated to Paul Appleby writes, “The IIPA was intended by Paul Appleby to be the intellectual spark plug for this transformation throughout the far-flung Indian public services. As administrative improvement is an unending process, every reform uncovers fresh opportunities for further improvement. The mission of the IIPA would be to stimulate and sustain the momentum of reform, drawing upon India’s own experience as well as lessons from other countries.”

In other words, the institutional processes of the IIPA were expected to be the creative impetus for the reform process in India.

What did Appleby mean by Institutional wisdom? Institutional wisdom was a product of Institutional decision-making. Institutional decision-making results from “interaction between persons with different responsibilities, different functions, different experiences, outlooks, and exposures. Every person having a part in institutional life has a specialized responsibility, with specialized knowledge growing out of a peculiar background and experience. Within an institution, no one person comprehends within himself the total experience, or knowledge of all other men, or has exclusive responsibility for everything done. One man may have general responsibility, but not special responsibility, for everything. It follows that no person can, by himself, give expression to all that an institution means and does. Individuals can presume to speak for an institution only after there has been institutional consideration and judgment….. Institutional wisdom is not simply the sum of the wisdom of all those who constitute the institution. It is something more, which emerges from the institution, out of the

interaction of different folk and functions.” It was Appleby’s opinion that an Institutional structure was best suited to bring out all options to a problem, utilize all the talent available within individuals to arrive at the best solutions. The Indian Institute of Public Administration would generate the Institutional wisdom arising from the combined work of the IIPA faculty and its work as a professional society to provide the government of India with best solutions to their administrative problems.

What kind of institutions did Dr. Appleby believe would solve the problems of an ever changing and complex world? The answer to this question lay in his personal experiences shaped by American politics. In an essay entitled “Confronting Complexity”, Appleby observed, “In America especially, insofar as our popular confusion is conscious, it is greatest as people regard government. We have a deep and persistent anti-government sentiment. We were born in revolution against government, nurtured in a most extraordinary pioneer condition of rugged individualism, and indoctrinated by political and organizational illiterates of the Spencerian school.” Appleby clearly disagreed with the small limited local institutions. In Appleby’s opinion, bigger complex institutional structures were the prerequisites of modern society. A more central institutional structure was more efficient and could handle the pressing and important functions of governance. Centralization, in Appleby’s world was civilization. “We all espouse civilization,” Appleby wrote, “We thereby espouse centralization.”

**Importance of Centralized Bureaucracy and Formal Institutions**
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In India, Appleby was most concerned about the growing importance of the local self-government institutions. He feared that the nation would end up relying upon the states and the local governments to carry out essential national development activities.\textsuperscript{400} Indeed the stress and tension between centralization and regionalism has been a recurrent theme in modern Indian politics. Historians, Ayesha Jalal and Sugata Bose have used these competing influences as a framework to build their narrative on modern India.\textsuperscript{401} While other scholars look at the implementation of planned programs at lower levels as an essential way to diffuse political power within states. They lamented that such diffusion of power has not led to the “vision of the self-contained village community. Both in terms of political sufficiency and as an unit of administration and citizen participation, the village is fast ceasing to be a focal point of attention.”\textsuperscript{402} In other words, power is tilted towards a higher central entity, whether it is the federal government or the state government headquarters.

In the United States, the slow and gradual move toward federal power happened between the years 1870 and 1920. Popularly known as the Progressive period in American history, the change from the importance of local communities to the new urban bureaucratic societies was the hallmark of the American modernization process. The new proponents of this order were the middle classes who sought to change American society, polity and economy through organization and process.\textsuperscript{403} Bureaucratic thought and processes marked the reform movement of the Progressives as against those who tried to

\textsuperscript{401} Bose, Sugata, and Jalal, Ayesha, Modern South Asia: History, Culture, Political Economy, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 6
cling onto the preservation of the small town communities. The middle class who was at the vanguard of this revolution was the new professional. So the change from independent small communities to the big urban centers and the dominance of professionalism were underway much before Appleby came to Washington in 1933.

The reformers wanted to change the entire machinery of government to reflect the profound overhaul of the economy and society during this very volatile period in American history. They wanted “The drive toward a responsible new democracy organized around executive leadership, the drive toward a new political economy based upon central planning in cooperation with industry, the drive toward administrative rationality grounded in scientific principles of public administration.”\textsuperscript{404} The result, however, was an ad-hoc creation of new institutional power without recalibrating the position of the judiciary and the political parties (the old power centers) to the new and changed environment.\textsuperscript{405} This new institutional power was the new and expanded bureaucracy. The bureaucracy increased exponentially during the New Deal years. Scholars argue that the bureaucratic apparatus turned into an “extra constitutional machine so necessary for the continuous operation of the constitutional system.”\textsuperscript{406} Others, citing this period (New Deal) as the “claimant polity”, argued that the salient feature of this polity was the permissiveness toward use of public power to remedy the problems of society and economy…This transformation increasingly centralized power in the presidency and in the nation’s capital, where professional politicians and
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administrators, many of whom were ambivalent about the moral rationale that once dictated scrupulous adherence to constitutional limitations, managed national affairs.  

It is certain that Paul Appleby thought the bureaucratic process was very important indeed. He called it the ‘eighth political process’. Appleby defines this process as “involving everything done by agencies other than the legislative and judicial ones.”  

It was apparent to Appleby that bureaucracy was all pervading but he justified its burgeoning size to the increasing demand from government for goods and services made by the public. There was danger, however, in the excessive growth of the bureaucratic machine. As an institution, without any direct control by the people, the executive could use it as an instrument of unrestricted power. However, Appleby did not consider the bureaucracy as being opposed to democracy. To him the institution of bureaucracy was a popular process “in which vast numbers of citizens participate, in which assemblages of citizens comprise power units contending with each other, in which various governmental organizations are themselves functional representatives of special interests of many citizens, and in which these organizations themselves contend mightily with each other in the course of working out a consensus that translates into some workable approximation of public interest. This process is as essential to the evolvement of government action as public debate, and closely akin to it. In this process are visible checks and balances not envisaged by our early architects of government.”  

In a democracy, Appleby concluded, bureaucracy becomes the instrument of the people – an institution with sufficient internal checks and balances that it ceases to be a tool of
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coercion and tyranny. Much of this thought centered around Appleby’s belief in the wisdom of institutions and their internal processes.

These processes also led to superior leadership overall. Certainly Appleby preferred any institutional development to be better than haphazard informal organization. However, he especially preferred larger formal institutional structures to smaller associations. Appleby felt that leaders of big organizations can “cause group think to be superior to the sum of the thinking of the same individuals in isolation. It was demonstrated in particular that groups could invent superior solutions to problems, which individuals failed to find and which the skilled leaders did not know or suggest.”

Appleby acknowledged that informal associations existed within formal institutions. However, all decisions of informal organizations needed to be validated by the “formally responsible hierarchy” for them to acquire legitimacy. In terms of Appleby’s thinking behind the creation of the IIPA, was the overall idea of creating legitimacy in a democracy. Gathering informal groups of experts working behind the scenes with politicians and policy makers would circumvent legitimacy and open the Nehru administration to charges of favoritism or worse. A formal organization creates legitimacy and permanence, which also meant that the IIPA would not be treated as a creation of the Nehru government and lose all legitimacy, if or when another party replaced that administration.

In a letter written to Y.N. Sukhtankar, the Indian Cabinet Secretary, Appleby explained the balance he tried to strike while writing his report and making suggestions to the Government of India. “For individuals as for nations, relations across cultural and
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national lines require intellectual and emotional solutions which preserve the integrity of one’s own loyalties and values while sympathetically incorporating values important to the other. We may do this verbally in many cases without too much difficulty, but to do this in the hard business of daily involvement is always full of difficulty.”

Appleby saw the unique solution to the problem of generating ideas for administrative reforms, which in his opinion needed to be institutionalized, in the form of the IIPA and incorporated the values of his hosts by making the Institute as close to the executive as possible.

**Big Government for a Big Democracy**

The necessity of helping out the executive was not just a part of the Ford Foundation strategy in India during the 1950s, but it was one that Appleby believed very seriously. To Appleby “If the ablest administrative specialists in the country should be substituted for the President and his cabinet, popular satisfaction with the government would diminish greatly. The reason is simple: overall, true efficiency would decline.”

However, he was also aware that deep trust of the executive was not common within the population. He felt that “if only people outside of government respected the people in government and assumed that they would do their jobs with reasonable fairness and intelligence, an enormous saving in energy would result.” In this sense he was battling the historical distrust of government in American society and polity.

In addition, he was defending government administrators, who were frequently caricatured and attacked in public by politicians and journalists. In a big
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democracy, administrators, by necessity, have to have big powers to complete their duties. Appleby writes, “Congress and legislatures make policy for the future, but have no monopoly on the determination of what the law is. Administrators are continually laying down rules for the future, and administrators are continually determining what the law is, what it means in terms of action, what the rights of parties are with respect both to transactions in process and transactions in prospect. Administrators make thousands of such decisions to one made by the courts have decided and would be likely to decide, of course, but in considerable degree, also, a reserve power over administration.” This power of the executive branch is not an attempt to aggregate authority to itself at the cost of the legislature or the judiciary. In fact, this power and authority is inherently necessary for the administrators to operate in a big democracy.

Sometimes, Appleby showed unease at the legislative control of the executive. Taking aim at The General Accounting Office, an arm of the Congress, to keep a close watch on executive spending, Appleby argued, “The General Accounting Office is a Congressional creature, with executive control functions of so pervasive a sort as to be thought by many students of government to make the arrangement unconstitutional.” Later, in India, Appleby echoed similar sentiments toward the office of the Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG), setting off a frenzy of opinions in the Indian press. The Indian Express, in a sympathetic editorial, opined, “One can understand Dr. Appleby’s inability to appreciate the fact that parliamentary control and statutory audit are basic features of the constitution and that their rigor must be kept intact over the entire machinery of the government. But the need to relax them for specific purposes and in
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well-defined areas is unquestionable.”

However, there were many who were critical of Appleby’s outlook. “It would appear,” a newspaper editorial argued, “that Mr. Appleby has chosen the wrong party for attack in deploring the prevailing concern with trivialities of expenditure. There is no harm, indeed there is much value, in the Auditor General continuing to turn the search light on all administrative lapses, including those involving trivial sums.”

In a scathing critique of Appleby’s position, Mr. Chanda, the Comptroller and Auditor General, said in an interview, “Mr. Appleby seems allergic to audit which he describes as a ‘highly pedestrian function with a narrow perspective and very limited usefulness.’ This attitude of mind has obviously coloured [colored] his observations on the Indian audit organization. I should have thought that any expert invited to report on a problem must inevitably examine this in detail, undertaking a study of all relevant material. Mr. Appleby has, however, formulated his proposals without an examination and study of the structure, relevant procedures, [and] technical and other rules and regulations of the audit department. He did not consider it even necessary to have any discussion with those in charge of the organization. His report has become a reflection of his prejudices rather than an objective appreciation based on a careful study.”

Appleby’s critiqued the auditing function of Parliament because he believed it was an “inheritance of colonial rule.” The Auditor took a strong exception to this reasoning. In the same interview Mr. Chanda refuted Appleby’s reservations by saying, “I do not know the historical basis of such an observation. I do not know of any colonial
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system, which has or had an analogous post, independent of the Executive with freedom to criticize administrative lapses. The conception of such a post runs counter to that of a colonial or autocratic system."\(^{419}\) Many were quite baffled at Appleby’s critique of this particular form of legislative oversight especially when it existed in the United States as well. Appleby, as is clear in this situation, was mostly bringing to bear ideas of what he considered to be good governance and not necessarily what was a common practice in United States.

Appleby found similarities between popular American and Indian attitudes where government officers were held responsible for all that ailed the country. He stated, “In some respects the Indian political society is peculiarly like that of the United States. Unlike the United Kingdom, there is in India little established respect for the civil service and the systematic processes of governmental administration. The public and the press consequently are much given to complaining about the administration of Government.”\(^{420}\)

One of the reasons, Appleby claims, is that many civil service officers were trained under British rule and so were closely linked with the colonial regime. Whether this attitude was entirely due to the close identification of the civil service with British rule, as Appleby claims, is unclear. However, most newspaper editorials were surprised with Appleby’s defense of the bureaucracy. They were unsparing in their critique of Indian administration.\(^{421}\) Some even quoted British officials to convey their point. For instance, “The late Lord Curzon who was Governor-General of India at the beginning of this

\(^{419}\) Ibid.
century remarked as follows on the system of administration prevailing in India at that time: ‘Thousands of pages, occupying hundreds of hours of valuable time, are written every year by score upon score of officers, to the obfuscation of their own intellects and the detriment of their official work and are then sent up to the Local Governments to be annotated, criticized and reported on by other officers who are similarly neglecting their duty in defense to this absurd tyranny; while finally the conglomeration of unassimilated matter comes up here again to be noted on in the Departments of the Government of India.’

It is important to note that Lord Curzon was among the most disliked Governor-General in British India, yet an Indian newspaper in post-independence India decided to quote him to underscore the weakness of the bureaucracy and its processes is very significant.

However, Appleby’s contention in his second report to the government of India was to loosen controls over the bureaucracy to help create an atmosphere of initiative and ownership of decisions so that Plan targets could be achieved. All manner of scrutiny over officials, Appleby contends, create in them a negative outlook and that affects their ability to execute plans. In a manuscript entitled, “Bureaucracy and the Future”, Appleby wrote, “Most of the common discussions of bureaucracy in our [American] press and in conversation are built around clichés. Of these expressions, one set reflects fear and prejudice affecting government- chiefly fear pointed toward the future rather than to our

423 Lord Curzon is credited with the immensely unpopular partition of Bengal along religious lines in 1905. This was a major step toward dividing the Hindus and the Muslims thereby creating further animosities between the two groups. This ‘divide and rule’ policy of the British finally led to the partition of India in 1947 into two separate nations of India and Pakistan. Nirad C. Choudhuri, a Bengali scholar noted in The Autobiography of An Unknown Indian, (Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 1968,) “I still remember a cartoon in a Bengali newspaper in those far off anti-partition days which showed Lord Curzon sawing a live woman.” (p.218) The woman Curzon is hacking metaphorically is the state of Bengal.
present condition. Another set simply reflects ignorance of social organization. Another may be said to indicate breathlessness because of the tempo of change—largely a product of private phenomena. Still another set reveals nostalgic sentimentality concerning the ‘good old days,’ which we see even more easily than we do our present social reality.”

Appleby was looking at the bureaucracy from the American viewpoint, wherein; bureaucracy was negatively associated with big government and he had taken a stand against such an attitude among the press and public.

He goes on to say, “Centralization, bureaucracy and red tape, have been almost completely ruined as useful words by being converted into invectives—always barriers to thoughtfulness.” In India, however, in his second report, Appleby asks for a loosening of the red tape and control by the top tier bureaucrats on the lower levels so that the lower levels can take decisions at their discretion so that bureaucracy can function more effectively. However, Appleby vociferously objected to the legislative control of administration. This prompted a few editorials to highlight the importance of keeping the money in check and not be used carelessly by the bureaucracy.

In Parliament, however, a colorful debate ensued on the recommendations of the Appleby report. One member was so upset with the report that he launched into a scathing attack on Appleby and the Cabinet Secretariat that presented it to Parliament for discussion.

Mr. Mahanty: “Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Report under discussion, I have the temerity to think, is the product of a bureaucratic clique to rob the sovereign Parliament

---
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of its prerogative. After going through the report, I have been more than convinced that it seeks to demean the Parliament."\(^{427}\)

He then goes on to quote the Appleby Report’s critique of the Parliament:

“Parliament here seems strangely inclined to make too ready concessions to some of the self interest demands of small but influential business interests and to enforce corresponding changes in Government’s decisions.”\(^{428}\) The member was angry, “This is a sort of statement which I cannot imagine that a man of Dr. Appleby’s sense of responsibility should make and that too, the Cabinet Secretariat, without examining the Report, without going through it carefully should lay on the Table of the House. To that extent, I might say that the Cabinet Secretariat should be charged with having breached the privilege of the sovereign Parliament.”\(^{429}\)

Another Member disapproved of Appleby’s impatience with detailed examinations and long procedures. He said “Dr. Appleby is allergic to the Comptroller and Auditor General. It is characteristic of an American that he is impatient of everything that makes for delay. According to him, the Auditor-General is even a greater devil than Parliament.”\(^{430}\)

In his book, *Morality and Administration*, Appleby wrote, “Perfecting the relationship between executive and legislative branches turns upon manner and method of legislative review, and the burden of improvement in these falls first upon the legislature in its need to become equal to its modern task. This is not to suggest that the efficiency of Congress is something to be measured with tools of ‘scientific

\(^{428}\) Ibid.,
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management’. In a large way the efficiency of Congress as a public agent is very high. Its function is not expert but politically representative. Congress stands between all the specialized functions and the still more specialized bodies of experts engaged within the functional agencies on the one hand and the public on the other hand. The effort to make Congress itself expert is, of all reform proposals, the most unconsciously subversive of popular government. It would stall government in continuing warfare between two bureaucracies; much worse, it would substantially deprive the public of crucially important representatives.”

Although Appleby made this observation in context of the American political system, his views about the role of the legislatures are quite clear: legislators are not experts and should not try becoming experts by constantly directing their attention to minor details. Or, as Appleby states; “Maintenance of review appropriate to its level would simplify and improve generally the functional relationship between executive and legislature.”

Appleby was aware that he had the Prime Minister’s trust and confidence while writing his report and making recommendations. He was sympathetic to Nehru’s impatience with attaining plan targets. In his government service, after all, Appleby had always worked on behalf of the executive. In a letter to Appleby, Nehru wrote, “I wonder if you know that I placed a copy of your last report before Parliament. This of course means giving it publicity. We distributed separate copies to all the members of Parliament and to the press as well as to the State Governments. The report has attracted a good deal of attention and there have been many leading articles in the newspapers about it. Probably, some time next month, there will be debate in Parliament on this

431 Appleby, Paul H., Morality and Administration, (Louisiana State University press, 1952), p 115.
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report. What the result of it will be I cannot say, but it is obviously a good thing to stir up people’s minds. You have done that.\textsuperscript{434}

Later, during the debate in Parliament on the Appleby Report, Nehru was true to his word in ‘stirring people’s minds’. The Times of India reported, “The Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, clearly indicated in the Lok Sabha on Monday that the Government favored further administrative reform for the successful implementation of the Second Plan along some of the main lines suggested by Dr. Appleby in his latest report.”\textsuperscript{435} It further went on to add “the Prime Minister also virtually endorsed the American expert’s suggestion that Parliament should ‘elevate its approach to affairs to the appropriate high level of general direction’ and not get bogged down in ‘little things.’”\textsuperscript{436}

One newspaper, in particular, caught on Appleby’s inclination for big government. In an editorial entitled, “Big Democracy”, The Statesman, opined, “If ever a man spoke with authority upon the machinery of expanding officialdom it is Mr. Appleby; whether academically, on the basis of a outstanding career, or practically, on that of a man who has wrestled with the problems in the field. It is also perhaps to be remembered that he was a New Dealer, and an enthusiastic supporter of ‘Big Democracy’ the title of a book he once wrote.”\textsuperscript{437} Later, the editorial said, “Mr. Appleby goes rather further in pointing out that the inevitable expansion of government which earlier critics have often blamed for declining standards is itself a reason for critical reexamination of previous assumptions.”\textsuperscript{438}

\textsuperscript{434} Letter from Prime Minister Nehru to Paul Appleby written on August 25, 1956. Syracuse University Archives,  
\textsuperscript{435} “Further Administrative Reforms favored: Mr. Nehru Defends Appleby Report in Lok Sabha.” The Times of India, September 11, 1956.  
\textsuperscript{436} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{437} “Big Democracy”, The Statesman, Delhi, August 23, 1956, Vol. CXXXII No. 25471  
\textsuperscript{438} Ibid,
Appleby’s oral history also gives us an insight into his conviction for strong executive power. Appleby recalled an incident from a cabinet meeting with President Roosevelt. In it he recollects FDR being extremely upset by some press criticism of his interfering with the military. The President seemed very much disturbed about the criticism of him for interfering with the military - hurt, insulted or something. He was unduly sensitive about it for some reason. He turned to Henry L. Stimson on the one side and to Frank Knox on the other and asked them to say whether they thought he had interfered with the military. Both of them answered very emphatically and very comprehensively, “NO NEVER”. As far as I was concerned, I was shocked because I thought he did in fact and he should have.”

To Appleby, press criticism and legislative oversight were irritants that the executive should not be concerned about while administering the nation.

However, Appleby was a realist. Although he wanted a strong executive, he was aware that there were many countervailing forces to be balanced to achieve that objective. He was also aware that appearances and perceptions made a big difference in the successful implementation of a policy. He learned this fact during his tenure in government and was fully cognizant of it during his trips to India on behalf of the Ford Foundation.

The Outsider.

An editorial in a national daily succinctly summed up the perception problems Appleby faced in India. “The American expert no doubt is a person of high distinction in his field- and the great interest shown in his report shows that this is well understood in this country- but it must be conceded that his relationship to the raw material of his
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studies is in a sense remote and to some extent hurried. If therefore, Dr. Appleby’s report is studied with due recognition of the disadvantages as well as the advantages of the position of an outside observer, some good may result and harm may be avoided. However, sympathetically one may view the report, it is hard to resist the conclusion that Dr. Appleby has oversimplified the problem with which he has had to deal.” 440

Having worked in government, Appleby was very conscious of appearances and perceptions. In his reminiscences, Appleby recollects a time when he served in government, and was accused of being a communist. Chester Davis, a colleague of Appleby’s, who later served in the management of the Ford Foundation, called Appleby a “red” because he had been seen having dinner with an individual considered by Davis to be “erratic”. 441 At a later date, Appleby was asked by Robert Morris, Chief Counsel to the Internal Security Subcommittee to explain his letter to a Congressman Bradley of Michigan, saying, “a man in the employ of the Government has just as much right to be a member of the Communist Party as he has to be a member of the Democrat or Republican Party.” 442

Appleby was also cognizant of the delicacy of the Ford Foundation’s image as an American institution in the Indian sub continent. In keeping the Institute close to the government hierarchy, it would loose all identification as a Foundation program. In a country, which just won its freedom from colonial rule, the specter of an Institute wholly backed by American money would encourage critics to allege US influence in Indian policies. A good example of this situation is illustrated in Appleby’s letter to Carl Bye
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(Dean of Maxwell School) at Syracuse. In it he writes: “We as a school are going to suffer from the current impairment of relations between India and the USA. Nehru feels that it would be impolitic now to approve some of the things the Foundation had in mind to support- things that would have been very important and interesting to us…Personally I seem to be wholly grata, but the government doesn’t like the public-relations aspect of sending its officials formally to the USA just now.”

Despite the delicate nature of the US-India relationship, Appleby believed in the legitimacy of his work and the goodwill he received when he visited there. He expressed these sentiments in a letter to the Indian Cabinet Secretary. “I found it easy to see many great and appealing values in India, and to do my work with an eye quite single to Indian success, without in any way diminishing my loyalty to, belief in and affection for the United States. It was easy in part, of course, because of the warmth and generosity with which I was received, and because under favorable auspices I was able to get a view of India that few foreigners begin to get in the same time. An additional factor was that I carried no responsibility for my government.”

However, Appleby realized that not being in government or at least not being associated with administrative power did hamper what he could do for the cross-pollination of ideas between academics and officials of the United States and India. In a letter to his close friend in India and a Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Home Affairs, describing the reason for the cancellation of some TCM India contracts Appleby writes:
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“The point is simply that the FOA\textsuperscript{445} of the United States Government, of which the TCM\textsuperscript{446} in India is a part, has blacklisted me, and possibly the Maxwell School, so far as the TCM contracts are concerned. This is the step of Harold Stassen himself, as head of the organization, and not of the organization in institutional terms. It is a position described variously as called for by my ‘close and important association with previous Democratic administrations,’ and as dictated by ‘security considerations.’ We shan’t fight it; nothing could be gained in the climate now existing in Washington. This is only one of thousands of similar actions reflecting bitterness toward everything and everybody involved recognizably in the 20 pre-Republican years.”\textsuperscript{447}

However, in this particular letter and another one to Mr. Kabir in the Ministry of Education in the Government of India, Appleby cleared the fact that these hampered domestic relations between Appleby and the Republican administration will not affect all work that he did under the auspices of the Ford Foundation. Herein Appleby establishes his position as a non-partisan non-government person associated with a non-profit Foundation with his Indian clients. In fact it also sounds as though he had no contact with the government of the United States, which was loosing favor in New Delhi.

Conclusion

Douglas Ensminger summed up the importance of the creation of IIPA in the Indian administrative environment as follows: “In the Indian scene, educational institutions and administrative bureaucracy had no provision for interchanging positions whereby a professor would hold a key administrative post and the administrator would

\textsuperscript{445} FOA stands for Foreign Operations Administration.
\textsuperscript{446} TCM were the inter-university contracts between Indian and American universities.
\textsuperscript{447} Letter from Paul Appleby to Mr. S.B. Bapat, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India on June 29, 1954. File: Correspondence, 1954-1956, Appleby papers, Syracuse University Archives
take leave and function as a professor. It was to stimulate the process of interchange between the practitioners- those holding public administrative office in the Government and the professional staff of a center- that Appleby and Nehru saw the need for the center in public administration."

The above-mentioned description also encapsulates Dean Appleby’s career path succinctly. As a newspaperman from the American mid-west, Appleby got his break in administration when friends and colleagues from his days in college and journalism summoned him to help in the Roosevelt administration. As a consummate New Dealer, Appleby took to his job in government with a sense of practicality and purpose. He was most interested in getting things done in administration rather than theorizing. His entry into academia also reflected his concern for improvement in government. In short he was not interested in protecting administrative or academic turf. He believed that both needed to interact in a manner that led to efficiencies in the delivery of products to the population. It was this concern of Dean Appleby, which was shaped by his life experiences that led him to suggest in his first Appleby Report to the Government of India that an Institute be set up.

Appleby wanted to develop the field of Public Administration in India not just to create academic theories but also to aid administrative reforms. To that extent he was not looking at the discipline from a purely academic standpoint. Nor was he interested only in furthering administrative development. He understood that both needed to get relevant input from the other to truly foster administrative reforms. To that end Appleby was a realist and his career experiences were instrumental in bringing about this viewpoint.
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The Indian Institute of Public Administration was a true culmination of Appleby’s ideas and therefore was to serve as a testament to this unique professional.

However, this cross-pollination of ideas between the academicians and the practitioners of public administration never materialized in the IIPA as envisaged by Appleby. Sadly, the two groups held to their turf and the Institute today is far away from what it was conceived to be.
Chapter 6

Ford Foundation and The IIPA: The Formative Years-1953-1963

Paul Appleby, the Ford Foundation consultant in Public Administration, wrote in his carefully worded report to the Government of India, the reason for creating the Indian Institute of Public Administration. “An Institute of Public Administration for India,” he said, would “provide a national, informal focusing of attention on Public Administration as a profession of many facets and elements. The purpose would be to provide for stimulation through association, through the medium of a professional Journal, and through the making of studies and the development of literature recording and expanding administrative learning.”

A layperson could conclude from the above that Appleby was interested in the Institute of Public Administration in being a professional association, involved in developing the discipline of Public Administration in India. However, Dr. Douglas Ensminger, Ford Foundation’s Representative in India, clarified Dr. Appleby’s motivation in proposing the Indian Institute of Public Administration. “Appleby and I, following much deep and penetrating thought on how to assist in this all important field, [public administration] concluded [that] assistance to the Institute as we have presented the programme, [program] was the only best way open, even if other ways presented themselves, the best way open to provide India with the means to help itself and assure bringing about administrative improvement on a sound and lasting basis.”

---
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Appleby was invited by the Indian government to suggest ways to improve Indian administration. He observed, early on, that members of the inherited colonial administration were too conscious of rank and position and tended to operate in a closed house. Although he had a high opinion of the intellect of these officers, and also believed that they had provided reasonably efficient governance in their limited set of duties, he realized that they had operated in a system where welfare of the people was not their primary concern. In addition, their preeminent status within the government hierarchy and the fact that the centralized bureaucracy was retained by political leaders to emphasize the unified nature of Indian administration, made direct changes to their structure and functions extremely difficult. Any attempt to do so would be met with a lot of resistance and likely, failure. The best way to pursue reform then, as Ensminger and Appleby concurred earlier, was through providing alternate perspectives to administrators thereby expanding their horizons.

This chapter contends that Appleby and the Ford Foundation initially intended the Indian Institute of Public Administration to provide influence and support through emphasizing academic public administration, and effecting reform organically from within and not by being activist or aggressive in pushing for it. This meant creating an institutional space wherein administrators were comfortable being open and honest about their job related problems, in an atmosphere of academic curiosity. The research based on these problem areas done by the IIPA faculty would be available for discussion and be incorporated in
training material for government officers. The periodic exchange of American experts and academicians to the Institute would also bring the latest research and thinking in American academia to the problems of the Indian government. This would achieve Ford Foundation’s and Appleby’s twin aims: to provide government officers a different point of view, by bringing them in contact with academic research in public administration, and create stronger links, hence better relations, between American and Indian intellectuals.

It is vital to understand, at this point, why Appleby felt compelled to approach administrative reform through the use of the professional society model and the academic research route. First, Appleby was certain that he detected openness to change and reform within the top officials of Indian administration.451 In addition, he wrote, “In my visit here I have found a widespread and deep interest among officials in public administration as a unique professional field, and as field in which interchange of learnings, reflections and fruits of special studies would be of great usefulness. There is at present time no particular medium for India-wide communication of these matters, and no vehicle especially stimulating efforts to formulate and communicate out of experience and research learnings that would provide something of equivalent learning vicariously for others.” 452 Second, he was generally impressed by the government officers he met during his trips throughout India to study Indian administration for his report and, in the process, made many long-term friendships. He had no doubt that given an opportunity these officials would become catalysts for improvement. Finally,
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nothing short of a full time program devoted to applied research, to change long held beliefs and modes of working, was necessary for reform ideas to emerge. In his report Appleby wrote, “To urge the process of reform I should like to suggest that nothing will be so really fruitful as challenging every long-established belief and custom, by asking frequently what these beliefs and customs are really supposed to achieve, and whether different ways might not serve the ends better.”453 If the administrators were part of the effort of providing research input, Appleby believed, the Institute would provide the stimulus for change. He thought that this was the best way ahead rather than a foreign expert giving the Indian Government a detailed plan for effecting reforms. However, he realized that going through the IIPA for motivating reform would be time consuming. Ensminger recalled Appleby advising Nehru to that effect. “While he [Nehru] must continue to press for needed changes in public administration, changes would be slow and painful in materializing, and Nehru should expect the process to continue over a period of time so that Nehru should be able to achieve his long-range objectives.”

The Ford Foundation experts, in general, always viewed India’s educational and academic system as being too archaic, bearing little or no relation to the practical problems of the country.454 The Indian Institute of Public Administration would have to guard against this pitfall. However, Appleby felt that this Institute would show the way on conducting studies to Indian universities where research was very theoretical. And the way to avoid slipping into the academic trap was the
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continuous involvement of the practicing civil service officers who he believed would push for work coming out of the IIPA to have a practical focus. For the Ford Foundation officers, the money being spent in India had to further their main mission: helping the government deliver on plan objectives. Although the IIPA was deemed a professional society and a forum for exchanging ideas, all Foundation communications highlighted its role in influencing and furthering administrative reforms, which would ultimately help the government improve their services to the people of India.

The ultimate success then of the Indian Institute of Public Administration, as envisaged by the Ford Foundation officers, would have to be measured in two parts. One, whether it created the institutional infrastructure for producing the unhindered interaction between the practitioners and academicians of public administration and if it set up avenues for interaction between western, specifically American, academics and their Indian counterparts through sharing critical research findings. Second, if it was able to- through its association and training of administrators - provide ideas that could be incorporated by administrators in their daily work. The Foundation hoped that this would lead to actual reform. However, if they achieved what they were set up to do: create an apparatus for practitioners and academics of public administration to interact freely, and create an atmosphere of learning, then the actual enacting of reform was incidental to their mission or at least they were not directly responsible for it. Whether their program led to actual administrative reform was not the IIPA’s primary focus. Ford Foundation funded the IIPA because it believed in this
mission: “The program of the Institute seeks to develop the field of Public Administration on a broad and practical base in a short period of time. In general, the Institute regards itself as forum for professional consideration of administrative problems, and as a professional society which will sponsor administrative studies to improve Indian administration.”

The creation and operation of the Indian Institute of Public Administration in the early years was a testament to this approach. The early discussions between various Ford Foundation officers and the Indian government officials were devoted to creating a society of Public Administration. Indians were equally excited about the prospect of creating a well-stocked library, a journal, academic conferences and meeting and interactions with American experts in Public Administration- all signs of a good professional academic society. The government officials would get an opportunity to participate in this structure. In addition, the Institute would create material for training in-service administrators and then through these media offer an alternate method of thinking about administrative problems and their solutions.

The Set Up

In a letter home, Paul Appleby described the newly conceived Institute of Public Administration as a professional society. Expectations of the IIPA, as understood by the Indian government officers related to the project, Paul Appleby
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and Ford Foundation officers were very clear: they wanted to “develop the field of Public Administration on a broad and practical base in a short period of time.” To do this, they would have to “establish a School of Public Administration in conjunction with the University of Delhi,” and to erect a suitable building for the Institute’s offices, for the School of Public Administration, and for a special library collection in this field. It [the IIPA] wishes to send academicians abroad for special teacher training, and to send Indian governmental officials abroad for observations of actual administrative practices. It will also carry on associated activities, such as the publishing of a journal, which are common to professional societies in the United States and elsewhere.”

In addition, this society of public administration was to be kept away from the formal government hierarchy. The Foundation, Appleby and the Government of India did not wish for the Institute to be part of the government. They wanted it to be independent and hence registered it under the Societies Registration Act of 1860. This was critical because the Institute, as the parties involved in its set up believed, would serve as the “agency outside the government to do a great many things which could not be done in a centralized bureaucracy.” They (The Ford Foundation) were not going to be auditing the functions and effectiveness of the bureaucrats from within the government organization creating another power
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458 This was the only time that officials mentioned IIPA’s association with the University of Delhi as a formative thought. It is illustrative that this consideration was included in the document prepared by the field office staff, requesting grant money from the Foundation’s Board of Trustees in New York. Perhaps the idea of an independent School of Public Administration without the association of the local university might have invited questions from the trustees.
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center. This would create antagonism between the two and would be counterproductive. In addition, the Indian Government, on the recommendation of Paul Appleby, had created the office of Organization and Management (O&M) within the government hierarchy, which would try to effect change from within the system. It is noteworthy that government officials associated with that organization were also connected with the IIPA.461

Also, the Ford Foundation, itself, wanted to maintain a safe distance from the direct working of the government so that politicians and reactionaries within the Indian political spectrum could not accuse them of interference with the internal working of a foreign government. “Even in the best of political environments,” Ensminger argued, “the problem of a foreign agency assisting in the internal working of an independent government is a delicate one. In India, which is both proud and sensitive, it would in any case be delicate in the extreme. Under the present generally tense and certainly touchy Indo-American relationships, the problem calls for extra-ordinary finesse and delicate handling.”462 Given these issues, setting up something within the government hierarchy would be counterproductive to Ford’s main mission in India: helping the government with its developmental efforts. This sensitivity is again amplified in an early grant request for the IIPA from within the Foundation. “A Combined Allocation and Grant to the Institute is requested because of special circumstances that surround foreign assistance in the field of government administration,” it
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reasoned. "This field is one of great sensitivity, subject to many of the current
tensions that affect international relations. Both Appleby and Ensminger feel
strongly that the award of a grant by the Foundation at this time would help to
insure that this opportunity is not lost."463 Some of this early promise was realized
when an internal grant memo noted: “In the State of Bihar, for example, a Public
Administration program has been established at the University of Patna. In an
unprecedented move, the State Government has opened its files wide for research
purposes; has agreed to employ academicians to develop the practical side of their
training; and has agreed to make officials available for teaching short courses at
the University.”464

In a letter to Dr. John B. Howard of the Ford Foundation, Douglas
Ensminger, Ford’s India Representative wrote his rationale for Foundation support
for the I.I.P.A. “From India’s point of view”, Ensminger argued, “and looking
squarely at the problems, opportunities and strategic places to concentrate
leadership in Public Administration programmes, the conclusion is clear that a
strong, non-government Institute looms of great importance. Having a strong,
non-government, Institute in Public Administration should provide a reasonably
good guarantee that there will be a continuous forum for discussion and
crystallization of lines of action for reform and improvement of Public
Administration. Such a non-government Institute in Public Administration will
provide balance in a Government presently dominated by internal government
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thinking by enabling people to step on the outside of Government and look critically at Government administration." The early emphasis was to influence active duty civil service officers, who would drive change. However, that would not be possible if the Foundation officers set up a system wherein the competence and policies of the bureaucrats was constantly questioned, making them defensive and ultimately resistant to change.

It is important to note that while it was vital for the Ford Foundation officers to create space from the official government hierarchy, they wanted strong government involvement with the Institute. For instance, they were eager to let government take responsibility for funding some part of the IIPA’s expenses. At every opportunity, The Ford Foundation officers and grant makers emphasized the government’s share in funding the Institute. In fact, they required it. In a letter to the Chairman of the Executive Council of the IIPA, the Ford Foundation officer making grants to the IIPA laid down the condition for the disbursement of money to the Institute. He wrote, “This grant is conditional upon a substantially equal contribution to the Institute by the Government of India.” Furthermore, he pegged the release of the Foundation money on a formal notification by the Government to that effect.

When the government funding came through, Douglas Ensminger enthusiastically conveyed this development to officials at the Home Office. “You will be pleased to know that the Government of India has now substantially underwritten the Indian Institute of Public Administration, including its comprehensive
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programme of building an Institute and School of Public Administration and establishing a Journal, carrying on research, in-service training, and so on...This should be heartening to all of us and assure a ringing success of the programmes in the field of public administration."\textsuperscript{467}

Part of this effort was because the Ford Foundation did not want to be saddled with unlimited financial support for the Institute and that the Indian Government should also be required to underwrite institutions that were essential to their reform efforts. However, the deeper reason was the need for engagement of the Government in the continued vitality of the program and the Institute, which the Foundation wished, would continue long after their own funding stopped. Also, this would mean that the government officials would be more closely aligned with the IIPA, paving way for closer interaction between the two. As Don Price, a Foundation expert opined, “If the Institute is a success, it will help to stir up a great deal of activity, both within the government and within Indian universities. In order to emphasize the full responsibility of the Indians for such developments, I think it is important to require a 50-50 matching of the grant, and not to identify which parts of the program are supported by the Indian government, and which parts by the Ford Foundation.”\textsuperscript{468}

Finally, and perhaps crucially, all Ford Foundation officials realized that an Institution of the nature of the IIPA that required a lot of interaction and goodwill with government officials needed strong political and official patronage.

\textsuperscript{467} Reel Number 885, Grant Number 54-117, Section IV, correspondence/letter from Douglas Ensminger to Kenneth Iverson, October 18, 1954.
\textsuperscript{468} Reel Number 885, Grant Number 54-117, Section IV, Report from Don K. Price to the Program Committee, June 18, 1954, p. 2. FFA
Ensminger took every opportunity to highlight Nehru's deep interest in the activities of the Institute as well as his presidency of it.\textsuperscript{469} Along with Nehru's support the institute enjoyed the backing of “top leaders in and out of government.” A Foundation report boasted, “The Executive Council [of the IIPA], headed by the Prime Minister, included from the beginning as it does today, ministers of highest cabinet rank, and top leaders in Government such as the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, and such non-official leaders as the head of the University Grants Commission.”\textsuperscript{470} Appleby highlighted the importance of the Prime Minister’s involvement as follows: “I know of no other case where a man in that position has so blessed such an organization. It means that his successors in the post will be the best that India can produce, and that the Institute will have a lot of influence.”\textsuperscript{471} In getting this early backing by top Indian leaders, the Ford Foundation was also cementing its relationship with the Government of India through institutions like the IIPA.

In a subsequent Ford Foundation Programme Letter, updating the activities of the Foundation’s India office, Ensminger quoted Appleby saying, “... There are new institutions, new offices and new assignments of persons charged with the business of nurturing administration. The Prime Minister heads the new Institute of Public Administration, and with Foundation support, it will sponsor a School of Public Administration in Delhi, conduct studies directed at improved

\textsuperscript{470} Report # 002531, IX: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, p. 333. FFA.
\textsuperscript{471} Letter from Paul Appleby to Mrs. Elizabeth Lowe, March 13, 1954, File: Correspondence 1954-1956, Appleby Papers, Syracuse University Archives.
administration, and constitute a professional body dedicated to such improvement." Therefore, a vital role for the Institute, closely related to administrative reforms, was uppermost in the minds of its American founders.

The Indian Institute of Public Administration came into existence on 29th March 1954. The Inauguration of this seminal institute also served as the occasion to highlight the expectations of the Indian leadership from this Institute. Prime Minister Nehru, the primary speaker of the inaugural ceremony said, “the Institute of Public Administration would look into the problems that confronted the administration not in a casual manner but scientifically, expertly and with knowledge.” What did he hope the Institute would study? Nehru stressed the need to probe into problems affecting all Indians and their welfare. This action was necessary, according to him, because the Indian civil services had always concerned themselves with self-preservation and not with the welfare of the common man. He went on to say, “It is necessary to emphasize [the above] because I do not think that the old idea has completely ceased to exist.” The Institute, he hoped, would lead the way in understanding administrative problems, in a practical manner, not just theoretical. “Administration in the final analysis, like most things was a human problem,” he said “a problem dealing with human beings and not with mere statistics. Statistics might be helpful in understanding a problem but there was a danger of “pure” administration at the top considering human beings in abstract terms.”

---

Nehru then launched a somewhat scathing attack on the Civil Services during his inaugural speech, hoping to show his dislike for status quo and the difficulty of changing the civil service. He said, "It was right that service people should have attachment to the service, conditions of service, like security etc. Nevertheless, in the past, the administration in the country from top to bottom was a "service administration". The outlook of the administration was a service outlook. The most complicated rules were made for the protection of the services. The functions, which were meant to be achieved by the services, were forgotten. While services had to be protected, the test was not the protection of services for their own sake. The test was human welfare and the welfare of the people whom they had to administer...what I am complaining of is their [Civil Service personnel] mental approach to the problems which we have inherited and which we cannot easily get rid of."\textsuperscript{473} Nehru knew that mere presentation of new ideas to the civil service would not make them change established norms. The Institute would have to work to make the civil service accept those ideas to reform administration. In a later communication to the Foreign Service bureaucrats, however, Nehru softened and clarified his views. "My criticisms of the administrative system, as it is [has] worked in India at present, were not meant to apply to individual officers or others but rather to the system. Indeed, Mr. Appleby gave high praise to the

\textsuperscript{473} Inaugural address, Reported in \textit{The Hindustan Times}. “H-BOMB GRAVE DANGER TO HUMANITY: Mr. Nehru Supports Demand for Ban”. \textit{The Hindustan Times}, Vol. XXXI. No. 87, March 30\textsuperscript{th} 1954
administrative apparatus of India and considered it one of the best in the world.”

This was a little different than what the Ford Foundation and Appleby were hoping for the Institute to achieve. The civil servants, that Nehru was criticizing in his inaugural address as the President of the IIPA, were their allies in creating a practical focus for the Institute’s studies and then bringing those ideas to bear on the working of the government. It was very clear that Indian leaders were not counting on the civil servants to change themselves. Nehru highlighted the difficulty of that position. This underscored the dilemma facing the Ford Foundation, Appleby and the Indian government, who wanted to see real and tangible changes in the civil service. Given the structural constraints the Indian government had created for making any changes in the civil service, the task of effecting meaningful reforms was very difficult for any entity to achieve. It was becoming clear, however, that everyone was expecting something from the IIPA. However, was it realistic for a professional society of an applied discipline, like Public Administration, in a position to make that change?

Mr. V.T. Krishnamachari, the deputy Director of the Planning Commission, whose job was to oversee the successful implementation of the Five-Year plans, and was the other important speaker at the Inaugural ceremony of the Institute, was hopeful that the I.I.P.A. would help the administrators understand their new roles in the context of the changes brought on by India’s independence from the British empire. “Since the attainment of independence, the entire character of
Government had undergone a complete transformation in two directions. A Government responsible to Parliament had replaced the old system of government by civil service responsible to a distant authority outside India. That itself was a great change affecting the administrative system...What I have said to you indicates the enormous amount of readjustment that the administration has to effect – the magnitude of the problems of reconstruction that face it. It is not merely that we want to revise rules or regulations. What is needed is change of outlook, a new philosophy. We feel confident that the Institute will assist in the creation of that outlook.” Although Mr. Krishnamachari went on to suggest that the Institute would aid this process of attitude change by providing a forum for exchange of ideas to improve administration, he expected tangible results from this exchange because “we” as Krishnamachari later said, “in the Planning Commission always say, that it is administrative efficiency more than anything else, that matters for the implementation of the Plan. If there is any single factor which is more important than any other for the successful implementation of the Plan, it is administrative efficiency.”

In early correspondences, Appleby, Ensminger, and the Indian staff of the IIPA emphasized setting up structure that aided the academic and research bent of the Institution. “The Institute is intended to be the highest professional body in the field of public administration for research and study as well for leadership and guidance. Its programme of activities includes the establishment of a high level school of Public Administration, the conduct of in-service short courses of training

---

and orientation, the maintenance of an up-to-date and comprehensive library and information center, the preparation of material for training in public administration, and the training of personnel by deputation abroad and by offering suitable facilities in India."\textsuperscript{476}

Moreover, the Foundation required a signed statement from the officers of the IIPA that they would not influence legislation or engaged in propaganda of any kind. Although that was done to show that the Ford Foundation did not try to influence the political process in the host country through the Institute, it effectively made sure that any ideas of administrative reform by appealing to the Indian politicians on an independent basis through studies that swayed legislation by the IIPA would not be acceptable. As a result, influencing the civil service through the internal mechanism of the institute was the only way open and desirable for the IIPA from Appleby and the Ford Foundation point of view. Rajni Kothari, an Indian commentator observes, "Any design to change that relies on bureaucracy without at the same time vitalizing the political instruments of party and public opinion is unlikely to succeed."\textsuperscript{477}

**Professional Society as Reform Agent**

For the most part, institutions are built around a single mission. For example, they are either professional societies for various academic disciplines or organizations for applied research or training institutes for private or public employees or both, with some exceptions like American institutions of higher

\textsuperscript{476} Reel Number, 885, Grant Number, 54-117, Section IV, Correspondence/Letter from D.G. Karve to Douglas Ensminger, June 15, 1954. FFA.

\textsuperscript{477} Quoted in Awasthi, A., *Administrative Change in India*, (Jaipur, Delhi: Aalekh Publishers, 1974), p viii
learning. Universities in the United States considered teaching, research and consulting functions as being academic in nature and that they extended the main mission of the institution: expanding knowledge.\textsuperscript{478} As a result, their coexistence within the same super structure was not just deemed congruous but highly beneficial.\textsuperscript{479} A legacy of the industrial and progressive revolutions in American history, the research university system, public and- in many cases- private, organized its work in conjunction with industry and the federal government and was associated with civic reform for a long time.\textsuperscript{480} This development was an organic outgrowth of historic forces changing the social, political, economic and intellectual landscape in America after the civil war into the new millennium.\textsuperscript{481} Although Appleby had a diverse background and did not fit the perfect model of a typical American expert,\textsuperscript{482} he was a product of the American system, generally, and believed the notion that there were some advantages to the three-way alliance between professional associations, the state and the universities.\textsuperscript{483}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[482] Brint, Steven, \textit{In an Age of Experts: The Changing Role of Professionals in Politics and Public Life}, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994), p 32. Brint describes the “expert” as possessing specialized knowledge pertaining to his/her profession, which is supported by a body of formal theory and that these specialists were the best judges of that proper practice.
\item[483] \textit{Ibid.}, Brint held that overlapping functions and the interdependence worked well for all three institutions. Appleby also believed that this exchange guarded against the excesses of over-specialization that characterized university departments and democratized specialized knowledge, where it was used for the public good and expert actions were held accountable through legislative responsibility.
\end{footnotes}
In India, however, there was no precedent for the melding of functions. The Indian higher education system, as Douglas Ensminger concluded, was chiefly concerned in turning out drones to man government clerical jobs and was ill suited to remedy the problems of the country. Even after independence from England, Indian leaders continued the old classical style of education prevalent in British India. Ensminger believed making changes in the philosophy and spirit of institutionalized education in India was, at least, an uphill task if not altogether impossible.484 In addition, Public Administration as an applied discipline was virtually non-existent in Indian universities.485 Even where it did exist at a very rudimentary level, it was buried within the political science departments and bringing public administration out as separate discipline and inculcating it with a practical bias was an arduous task, at best. In addition, such an effort would require Appleby’s involvement in education reform, which was a much bigger project than his mandate. As a result, reliance on the local universities to focus on research and training and have the IIPA, in conjunction with the educational institutions, dedicate itself to pushing reforms was not a viable option. In addition, Appleby felt universities, even in America, bred compartmentalization and “syndicalism” and zealously guarded their turf, which was detrimental to good

485 Public Administration as a discipline was taught in the 1930s at Lukhnow University. It was, however, always treated, as part of political science and was extremely theoretical. Full departments of Public Administration were instituted only in the 1960s at select universities in the country. For more, see Singh, Hoshiar and Sachdeva, Pardeep, Public Administration: Theory and Practice, (NOIDA, U.P.: Pearson Education, 2012), p. 16. And Maheshwari, Sriram, A Dictionary of Public Administration (New Delhi: Orient Longman Pvt. Ltd., 2002), p. 398.
administration, especially in a democracy.\textsuperscript{486} He therefore homogenized functions within a single institutional structure hoping that the IIPA would seamlessly integrate research, training and contact between scholars and practitioners of administration, serving as a catalyst for reforms in India. The Ford Foundation officials in New York, however, did try to push for this association when granting a second installment of funds for the Institute. “It might be worthwhile”, George Gant, the Foundation’s officer in New York, wrote, “to look into the Institute’s actual relationship with the University of Delhi. The Institute’s School of Public Administration was to have been formed in conjunction with the University.”\textsuperscript{487} He reminded field officers of their suggestion when requesting for the first IIPA grant.

In addition, Appleby also did this because he felt that many administrators did not have any prior degrees in Public Administration and were unaware of the academic underpinnings of their work. Nehru admired Appleby because he had a balanced approach to administration than a traditional academic expert. While he gave importance to the real-world experience gained from working in administrative posts and learning on the job, he also believed that public administration was an academic discipline in its own right, albeit an applied one, and had a body of literature and theory all its own. He believed that the ‘administration as art versus administration as science’ dichotomy was false and

\textsuperscript{487} Reel Number 885, Grant Number 54-117, Section IV, Correspondence/Letter from George F. Gant to Charles McVicker, Nov1, 1960, p 2. FFA
that true administration incorporated both.\(^{488}\) This Institute, according to Appleby, would remedy that shortcoming. He also felt that some promising student of public administration, not already in the civil service, could be identified for a role in administration, thereby broadening the composition of government administration and allowing new perspectives to be developed within official hierarchies.

However, because of the way it was set up, the IIPA became most identified with the professional society function. Most of what Appleby and the framers hoped to eventually achieve was going to get done, mainly, through the Institute’s academic society role. Professionalizing academic public administration would give the discipline the legitimacy and status it needed to be considered as the bedrock or the foundation for administrators to inform their practical experiences. The regular functions of an academic society, like holding conferences and publishing journals was expected to generate ideas and bring forth research from within Indian and western, specifically American, academia.

It is vital to see how the Ford Foundation described the Institute in their early grant proposals. “In early 1954, following further consultation with Dean Appleby, who returned at the Government’s request in January, the Government drew up a broad program to strengthen and professionalize the services. Its immediate proposal was to sponsor the establishment of an independent Institute of Public Administration, which would act not only as a professional society, but give leadership and broad policy guidance to the program.” It goes on to say, “In

its intensive study of the problem of administrative reform, the Government of India had devoted particular attention to the need for specialized training of public administration personnel, and for professionalization, on a self-conscious level, of public administration in India.... The Government concluded that a central professional body should be created, which would guide and stimulate a broad program of development for India's administrative services. Early in 1954, an Institute of Public Administration was established which would assume leadership in, and give policy direction to such a program." It is quite clear from this description that the Foundation considered professionalizing the civil services and having the IIPA as the top professional body of the discipline as essential to effecting administrative reforms. It assumed that civil servants would become members of the IIPA and attend all the conferences, which discussed new ideas and avail of the training programs of the Institute, which would ultimately sensitize them to change.

A particularly insightful paragraph from Ford's internal report illustrates the Foundation's expectations of the IIPA's mission. "A major plan," according to this communiqué, "was that the Institute would set up a School of Public Administration jointly housed with the Institute, with an educational program for prospective government administrators and even those already in service. It was hoped too that such a professional body, serving as a forum for discussion of administrative problems for civil servants at many levels, could help bring about not merely a change in administrative procedures but a loosening of the rigid

---
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hierarchical barriers between ranks of the services, and more toward the inner
democratization which so many have seen as the most critical problem and need
for India’s development.”\textsuperscript{490} The route to administrative reform through the IIPA,
in other words, was always circuitous, never straight. The Institute, functioning as
a professional society, was expected to create the conditions for administrative
reform to take place.

In addition, the newspapers of the day were also publicizing the academic
nature of the Institute. An article in \textit{The Times of India}, described the Institute as
necessary to "focus attention on public administration as a profession of many
facets and elements...The proposed Institute will not only serve as a storehouse of
knowledge and literature on the development of public administration in other
countries, but also facilitate exchange of ideas by inviting experienced
administrators and experts and publishing a journal so that comparative study will
help the Government streamline public administration in this country.”\textsuperscript{491}

However, other news reports mentioned the need for setting up the
Institute with the necessity for administrative reforms.\textsuperscript{492} The press, in its
reporting, was conflating the need for professionalizing Public Administration with
tangible administrative reforms missing many important factors that needed to
happen from conceptualizing an idea to its ultimate incorporation as a reform
proposal. Appleby was urging the Indians to set up an organization to facilitate

\textsuperscript{490} Report # 002531, IX: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, p. 332. FFA.
\textsuperscript{491} “Bettering Public Administration- Centre to Set Up Institute”, by K. Subbaroyan, “The Times of India”
News Service, New Delhi, November 21, 1953.
\textsuperscript{492} “Setting Up Institute of Public Administration: Senior Govt. Secretaries To Discuss Issue”, by Special
discussion on public administration. However, the publicity the IIPA received in the national and local press and the involvement of high profile politicians and bureaucrats gave the impression that the Institute was in-charge of spearheading administrative reforms in India, which was not the original intention of Appleby for the Institute.

Also, the early emphasis of IIPA’s leadership, which was largely drawn from the government bureaucracy and Indian academia, as well as Ford Foundation officers and Appleby was on creating the infrastructure to support academic studies like setting up libraries and conferences, and memberships of academic organizations as well as training faculty in the United States. The Ford Foundation also encouraged the Institute to become a member of learned bodies and libraries in the US. This would be in keeping with their professional society and academic functions and one that the Foundation enthusiastically approved.\textsuperscript{493} The Institute’s attempt to move forward on its professional society agenda, like publishing its first journal and establishing a school of Public Administration, was appreciatively highlighted in the Ford Foundation Program Letters.\textsuperscript{494} In addition, The Ford Foundation and Appleby were pushing for this academic bent for the IIPA because they found a number of civil service officers interested in studying Public Administration. Appleby was getting letters from in-service officers asking if the Foundation could sponsor sabbaticals and grants to visit the US to study the

\textsuperscript{493} Reel Number 885, Grant Number, 54-117, Section IV, correspondence/letter from D.G. Karve to Bernard Loshbough, Aug, 6, 1954. FFA
Hence, he felt that an Institute with an academic focus would surely draw the civil service officers to its program.

Everyone involved with the setting up of the IIPA had agreed that the Institute had to be, primarily, a professional society. However, part of the mission of the IIPA was also to train government officials. This was the most direct link between the Institute’s mission and administrative reforms. The task of changing official behavior by influencing government officers through training was considered to be the logical culmination of the IIPA’s job. The Foundation was closely involved in this endeavor. Ford officials supported underwriting the training of able Indian candidates in the United States to head the school and the research wings of the Institute. They were aware that the IIPA could actually make a difference in the administrative reforms arena through these two functions. However, these government officials were going to be trained by the permanent academic faculty of the IIPA, which meant that academicians designed their courses and that this training was to be largely academic.

In the words of the Director of the IIPA, Professor V.K.N. Menon, “The School will not be a training institution for administrators. It will impart academic education in the professional subject of public administration including economic and social administration.” However, in further explaining the role of the School he managed to get to the goal of administrative reforms. “The School is intended

---

495 Correspondence/Letter from V. Dekejia, Secretary, Finance Department, to Paul Appleby, April, 10, 1954. Paul Appleby Papers, (Correspondence 1954-1956), Syracuse University Archives. And Letter from J.B. D’Souza, to Paul Appleby April 13, 1954, Ibid. Letter from Mr. L.P. Singh to Paul Appleby, May 7, 1954. File: Notes, Memoranda, Correspondence, Box 2647. Box 1 of 9. Appleby Papers, Syracuse University Archives and Records Management.
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neither to take the place of a university or other educational institutions nor to serve as a staff college for administrators. Its distinction will be that it will make an attempt to combine the academic with the practical. Its courses of instruction are designed to give the students a broad comprehension of the process of policy making and of the agencies, techniques and tools that facilitate efficient administration.”

This quote is also illustrative of the general policy of the IIPA: the goal of administrative reforms was to be defined broadly and achieved by enlightening the public service officers as well as other members of the IIPA who may not necessarily be civil service officers. As a professional society for the broader discipline of public administration, the IIPA would bring together in-house scholars with all those teaching at universities and doing research and that would help them identify newer trends in the discipline and younger scholars.

**Relationships and Association**

In the field of research and training, the emphasis of the Ford Foundation was always centered on creating relationships with other academic institutions in India so that they have a pool of universities to draw on for personnel and ideas. Initially, however, they wanted close interaction with American universities to set the professional bar of competence. The most obvious one was the association with the Maxwell School of Public Affairs, the academic home of Paul Appleby, IIPA’s founder. In fact senior administrators at Syracuse University, the home of

---
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the Maxwell School, were being actively pursued by Ford Foundation officers to
direct the search for and training of suitable candidates to head the research and
training programs of the IIPA and also to create an exchange program for the IIPA
faculty.\textsuperscript{500} It is noteworthy that the Foundation did not try to bring together
American bureaucrats or government officials with their Indian counterparts
under the auspices of the IIPA. They, instead, sought out academics and
concentrated upon bringing them to the Institute to talk and interact with its
faculty and members.

The IIPA established the strongest ties with scholars in the United States
during the first decade of its existence. Prominent academicians in the field of
Public Administration visited the Institute during this time and many important
conferences were held at the IIPA at the behest of these scholars.\textsuperscript{501} Also, the
Institute, Foundation officials hoped, would serve as a training ground for
academicians and scholars from other developing nations in the region.\textsuperscript{502} It is
also important to note that the Ford Foundation was always very careful in
projecting its image of being a non-political entity in recipient nations by not
pushing for something that was not already approved and championed by the
recipient governments. In the case of the IIPA, it was less politically fraught for the
Foundation to use an academic professional society, also accepted by the Indian
government, to serve as a meeting point for scholars and officials from different

\textsuperscript{500} Reel Number 885, Grant Number 54-117, Section IV, Correspondence/Letter from George F. Gant to
Charles McVicker, Nov 1, 1960, p. 2. FFA
\textsuperscript{501} Prominent scholars in Public Administration like Lt. Col. L.F. Urwick and Margaret Ball delivered
lectures at the Institute. In addition, important conferences on democracy in South and South-East Asia
were convened at the request of notable academic Edward Shils.
\textsuperscript{502} Indian Institute of Public Administration, Annual Report, 1958, p. 9.
countries as a means to champion lines of reform than an overtly activist organization.503

Also, the Foundation hoped that by creating relations with academic organizations in the United States and elsewhere, the Indians professors and researchers leading the IIPA and Indian government officers would engage in a much more collegial interplay of ideas with their counterparts in America. In a letter to Ensminger, Harlan Cleveland, the Dean of Maxwell School discussed two approaches to his organization’s association with the IIPA. “To be very specific,” Cleveland wrote, “there are two clear possibilities. One is a program of “technical assistance” whereby Syracuse undertakes to help the people in India build their research and instruction program. The other is a cooperative program whereby each side helps each other…the first approach has serious defects. It often tends to create a superior-subordinate, master-servant, giver-recipient relationship…On the other hand, a truly cooperative program starts with no built-in dividing line between “superior” and “inferior”, those who know and those who do not know.”504 This was important if the intended style of the Ford Foundation and Appleby for the Institute was to be cooperative and supportive and of increasing the capacity of the Institute to influence civil servants through new ideas and approaches. However, such an approach did not take into consideration whether Indian scholars would accrue any practical benefits from this association, since they studied systems that were unique to their respective countries and worked

504 Reel Number 885, Grant Number 54-117, Section IV, Correspondence/Letter from Harlan Cleveland to Douglas Ensminger, January 16, 1961. FFA
under a very different structure of pedagogical organization and material benefits than their western counterparts.

In 1961, Paul Appleby visited India again at the request of the Ford Foundation to assess and advice the progress and activities of the IIPA. He noted the following in his personal assessment of the Institute: “Up to now, the Institute has had a great success as a professional society- a physical, personal and institutional focus for a special and growing interest in public administration. The size of membership, the number of chapters, the presence of the Prime Minister at annual meetings, the quality of the Journal as attained so quickly and its special role in international seminars of a regional character- all these are most notable.”505 By this time, Appleby clearly saw the IIPA doing well as a professional society. This should not be surprising since all focus from the Ford Foundation and the Indian leadership thus far had been on creating different aspects of a traditional professional society. That was ostensibly the plan since the ideas generated from these conferences and interactions with the scholars were supposed to influence administrators and motivate them to drive change.

**Conclusion: Changing Expectations**

While it was clear that much of the first decade of the IIPA’s existence was devoted to setting up its basic structure and functions, it was also one where the Institute’s identity as a professional society was forged. The results were available for all to see. Paul Appleby, on his second visit to India, felt that the IIPA continued to be successful in this role and its other functions were considered, at least an

---
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outgrowth of this main job. However, toward the end of the first decade, Ford Foundation officials, including Paul Appleby started showing unease over the lagging development of the other aspects of the IIPA’s functioning. For instance, in 1961, Appleby wrote a long and detailed memo to Douglas Ensminger describing the shortcomings of the Institute in fulfilling its mission, as he saw it. While he was happy with the general direction of the IIPA in developing as a professional society, he found research by the Institute to be full of “principles and judgments based upon clichés passing for theory.” In other words, all the literature that came out of the IIPA was too theoretical and not practical enough to be useful as teaching material.\(^{506}\) Appleby’s criticism, while a little unfair given that Indian faculty was never trained in this kind of a system in the Indian universities, was still within the broader ambit of the role and scheme he had envisaged for the Institute.

Douglas Ensminger, on the other hand, had very different expectations of the Institute. At the very beginning of Ford’s involvement in setting up the IIPA, Ensminger had justified financial support to the Institute as follows: “...The Institute is also the chief instrument through which the Government can be brought to initiate all other public administration programmes, such as those referred to in the Appleby report and which the Foundation can support. In other words, in public administration we have to proceed from the hen to the eggs. And the Institute is the hen.” He concluded, “Finally, in our judgment, assistance to the Institute provides for coordination and follow up direction of the various phases or

\(^{506}\) Reel Number 885, Grant Number 54-117, Section IV, Memo/Report from Paul Appleby to Douglas Ensminger, April 20, 1961, p. 6. FFA
sub-projects in Public Administration. The field of Public Administration is one which must move within a coordinated frame of reference.”507 The IIPA, for Ensminger, was to become the place where all government efforts regarding Public Administration had to be concentrated. This idea considerably broadened and obfuscated the main role of the Institute. It also meant that the Institute would be more directly involved in leading administrative reforms than Appleby had envisaged.

Whatever the initial expectations of the IIPA, by the end of the first decade of its existence, The Ford Foundation officials and Paul Appleby had shifted their focus from the Institute’s professional society function to the research and training role. Here, not surprisingly, they found the Institute’s performance to be disappointing. “It should be said in this connection,” Appleby critiqued, “that the research staff of the Institute is now too remote from other parts of the Institute. The research staff needs exactly the same help as the school faculty does in getting worldly experiences and ingress into the administrative reality.”508 Ensminger echoed Appleby’s disapproval. “Because the faculty for the Indian Institute of Public Administration was drawn largely from the academic field and therefore was lacking in practical administrative experience, the faculty was not called upon by Government for counsel in problems of administration,” he said.509

508 Reel Number 885, Grant Number 54-117, Section IV, Memo/Report from Paul Appleby to Douglas Ensminger, April 20, 1961, p. 8. FFA
In this regard, it is important to highlight Ensminger’s Report, written in January 1953, immediately after the presentation of Appleby’s Report to the Government of India. “Related to this development program”, Ensminger wrote, “would be the professionalization in newly self-conscious terms of public administration in India. This would include the organization of an Institute of Public Administration, as an active and comprehensive professional society. The Institute should hold an annual, national meeting, chapter meetings in the state capitals at least quarterly, perhaps bi-monthly, and perhaps monthly; and should publish a journal. The provision of library resources for practitioners in such a way as to maximize its use, ought to be a relatable objective. Journals of societies in other countries ought to be widely available, along with a minimum of 200 different books.”

Bertram Gross, a visiting faculty member of the Maxwell School to the IIPA, also commented on the Institute’s progress in its early years. Writing in 1961, Gross praised the Institute’s active professional association program with a “vigorous journal and a continuing array of interesting conferences.” He was, however, much less satisfied with the research program. In his proposals to ‘strengthen’ the IIPA’s research and educational focus, he advises heavy recruitment of civil service officers as teachers and faculty along with training of mid-level bureaucrats and creating case studies of live administrative problems. All students or younger researchers at the Institute must be suitably trained so as

to gain employment in the central government. None of this was initially outlined as a primary function of the Institute.

It was fairly clear that the emphasis on the IIPA’s professional society role was now, at least, in the background. The focus had shifted to involve high-level civil servants not only in IIPA conferences and programs, as was the plan early on so that they would come into direct contact with new research done by academicians, but to recruit them as teachers and researchers, as Bertram Gross put it, to create corps of ‘Teacher-Administrators’. They would play a much more direct role in influencing the bureaucrats toward administrative reform. It was becoming difficult to ascertain whether Foundation officials and consultants wanted the Institute to become an extension of the Government’s ‘Organization and Management’ office where internal administrative problems were discussed by civil service officers or was it going to remain largely academic in nature and draw on the theoretical principles of the discipline of public administration and apply it to practical problems. This distinction was not clear.

As a result, the IIPA, which was largely seen as an academic professional society created to help academicians and bureaucrats learn from each other, was being pushed into a much more direct engagement with the government hierarchy than was initially contemplated. It is true that the Foundation had never wanted the Institute to be overly theoretical and mirror the shortcomings of the Indian

512 Paul Appleby, in his report to the Government of India, had recommended setting up an Organization and Methods (O&M) office within ministries and departments to monitor performance of that particular organization. This proposal, along with setting up the IIPA, was accepted by the Government and O&M offices were set up in various ministries.
higher education. However, towards the end of the first decade of the IIPA’s operation, the Ford Foundation officials and consultants were pushing the Institute into the realm of administrative reform more strongly than they had originally indicated. Few conclusions can be drawn from the above. First, the IIPA, in the minds of the Foundation officers, was always going to be an activist organization and that the professional society role was only to make that job more streamlined and palatable to the Indian leaders and bureaucrats, or second, the expectation of the Institute changed from their initial professional society bias to a much more activist concern. Either way, the Foundation wanted the Institute to change its mode of operation and they were willing use their financing power to make that transformation.
Chapter 7

After about a decade of IIPA’s operation, there were many questions about the Institute’s achievements and its general direction within the Ford Foundation. Although Paul Appleby, the Institute’s founder, and the Ford Foundation had focused on creating the IIPA as a professional society with a strong academic background, they were now unhappy with its lack of concrete and real world bias. Although Appleby’s idea of the IIPA’s future was predicated upon the study of practical issues in Indian administration rather than an obsolete emphasis on political theory and the Ford Foundation, on the other hand, thought of the IIPA as a long-term institutional and academic answer to administrative reform issues, they were both dissatisfied with its general track.513 For the Indians associated with the founding of the IIPA, however, the goal was to make the Institute “the highest professional body in the field of public administration for research and study.”514 And, although all sides connected with the creation of the IIPA thought of the Institute as a professional body for the discipline of public administration, the Ford Foundation had now developed a much more practical and instrumental interpretation of what that entailed than the Indians and Appleby.

As a result, the initial assumptions about the Institute, that it should operate as a professional society and produce practical literature, helping bureaucrats improve into changing governmental functioning, lost favor within the Foundation.

513 Expectations of the IIPA by the Ford Foundation officials and Paul Appleby are discussed in greater detail in the previous chapter.
514 Reel No. 885. Grant No. 54-117. Section I Correspondence/Letter from D.G. Karve to Douglas Ensminger, June 15, 1954. Ford Foundation Archives (FFA).
Ford Foundation officials now wanted the IIPA to downplay its professional society/academic role and produce literature, advocating vigorous change. The aim was no longer to create an India-centric, realistic body of work to be used for study in academic institutions, as Appleby had wanted, or to influence officers to effect administrative improvement organically, as the Foundation leaders initially desired. Instead, key Ford Foundation leaders now wanted the IIPA to produce work that defined administrative problems and advanced solutions designed to have an immediate impact on the reforms process. After about a decade of the Institute’s operation, the Ford Foundation officers and consultants changed their long-term academic and institutional expectations. They now wanted the Institute to focus on short-term actionable reform studies and proposals. Many in the Foundation had started to believe that expertise in academic Public Administration was not essential to making administration effective and goal oriented. Hence, they now wanted the Institute to drop the subtle and indirect academic approach to administrative change and become directly involved in the reforms process by researching specific problems and indicating possible solutions, which they should use to openly lobby government on issues of administrative development.

The Ford Foundation did not start its India office with a precise blueprint.515 Initially, it adopted what the government of India approved. Primarily, they wanted the democratically elected government of Prime Minister Nehru to succeed, flourish

---

and perpetuate. This was important because India had just achieved freedom and the nascent, democratically elected, government needed broad public support to be successful and continue into the future. Ford Foundation leaders believed that programs supported by the Indian government would have legitimacy and enjoy broader public and political support, hence have a better chance of success. They also thought that foreign organizations should appear supportive of them rather than impose their own independent agenda. In addition, Ford wanted to make the programs successful so that the Nehru administration would be successful and enjoy broad popular support. Hence, they concluded that the Foundation supporting the IIPA was the best option available to the Foundation if it wanted to encourage administrative reforms in India because Nehru's cabinet strongly endorsed it. However, after Nehru's death and the failure of the government to achieve planned targets, and in view of the changed geo-political conditions, they were willing to change tactics, and to pressure the IIPA to help effect reforms in administration so that short term improvements in socio-economic conditions could maintain the legitimacy of the central government. As a result, they wanted the IIPA to follow the Foundation's preferred track.

---

516 This point is discussed in greater detail in chapter 3: “Ford Foundation in India”. P.6. However, the following lines, taken from Douglas Ensminger’s Oral History, sum up the essence of the Ford Foundation’s motivation in India: “It was Mr. Hoffman’s view [Paul Hoffman, the president of the Ford Foundation who was instrumental in getting the Foundation to India] if India could succeed in removing the conditions of poverty through democratic methods, it would provide a strong anchorage in Asia for the democratic form of government with emphasis on individual freedom. Mr. Hoffman and Nehru saw poverty as a threat to peace. Nehru’s interest in the Government of free and independent India devoting itself and its resources to remove the burden of poverty from India’s 550,000 villages challenged Hoffman’s imagination.” Douglas Ensminger, Oral History, A.7 THE FOUNDATION’S OBJECTIVES AND REASONS FOR ITS PRESENCE IN INDIA. P.1. FFA

517 Chapter 3: “Ford Foundation in India,” for further in depth discussion on the matter, especially pages 14, 16 and 24.
However, since the motivation for setting up the IIPA, from the Foundation perspective, was to further the goal of administrative reforms, they were not ready to abandon supporting the IIPA to effect change. Because, as Ensminger put it in his initial recommendation to Foundation officers in New York, reforming and changing administration involved dealing with sensitive areas, and for a foreign agency to suggest specific programs and lines of action would risk criticism for interference in the internal matters of government. The Foundation, he wrote, had to “rely far more on the openings and opportunities made available by the Government itself, and move rapidly to strengthen those programs on which the Government itself has taken initiative.” Setting up the IIPA was the safe option for the Ford Foundation since the Indian Government had already accepted and sanctioned its creation.

However, when Paul Appleby reviewed the IIPA’s activities in 1961, he wrote, “In general, however, I should expect the government’s gains from the Institute to be indirect and rather subtle- resulting from a gain in the perspective and perceptions of its personnel. I am rather skeptical of the direct value to government of Institute researches…. If my view has any validity at all, the Institute should always promise little product directly useful in solving administrator’s problems but should hope to find occasional ways by which to illumine some problem or another.” For Appleby, the IIPA was a professional body for the discipline of Public Administration. But, he always thought of the Institute as a center for public administration as an applied discipline not a subject with an overly theoretical bent. He certainly did not consider making the IIPA into a policy group
for the government and definitely not an organization to spearhead administrative reforms.

Overall, both Appleby and the Ford Foundation wanted the Institute to become more practical. However, they had different notions of the term and what it was meant to achieve. Ultimately, however, the amount of pressure Ford Foundation exerted on the faculty and management of the IIPA depended on whether its leaders believed their aim for the Institute was being met or not. Ford emphasized producing literature, which was not just practical in orientation but dealt with live problems and created realistic solutions to these challenges. However, In Ensminger’s words, “Instead of the research [of the Institute] being oriented towards immediate administrative problems, much of it initially conceived was historical and theoretical.” And he hoped that with Foundation encouragement, and funding leverage, the IIPA would accept responsibility “for a more direct involvement in the administrative affairs of Government.”

Douglas Ensminger and the field officers in the Foundation’s India office had the hardest time changing notions of the IIPA faculty and staff around the Institute’s mission in creating the school of public administration. Initially, leaders from both sides were unclear about what they wanted the school of public administration to accomplish. For instance, in an early activity report, the Foundation publicized the setting up of the school thus: “The Institute would, it was proposed, guide the establishing of a School of Public Administration for graduate and advanced study.

519 Ibid., p.7-8.
of an in-service training program for administrative personnel which would include foreign study, guide extensive and continuing research into administrative procedures, and found a library and journal of public administration."\(^{520}\) This carefully worded report was written in 1954, at the very beginning of the IIPA's formation, for the Indian leadership.\(^{521}\) Similarly, in the first annual report of the Institute, the Executive Council approved a plan for the school of public administration based on conducting Post-graduate study courses and refresher courses; assisting in the development of graduate study programmes in Public Administration at the universities. Both descriptions were broad and general in nature. However, as the years progressed, the Ford Foundation critiqued the functioning of the school and encouraged it to be more practical and reform oriented. Ford Foundation experts now complained that the Institute's faculty and management continued to produce theory laden and general literature rather than more problem-oriented research.

In addition, the Foundation officers were very distressed by the School of Public Administration's Masters degree program. The IIPA faculty and management believed that it was the Institute's job to propagate Public Administration, as a distinct discipline in India. The Institute's Annual Report in 1957 was very explicit about this view. However, Appleby also felt that the School was started prematurely. He thought that the school was not staffed adequately because of a

---

\(^{520}\) "The Ford Foundation and Foundation-Supported Activities in India", July 1, 1954, p. 39, Report # 002724. FFA

\(^{521}\) This Report was carefully written so as not to make the Foundation appear zealous in pushing for any type of change. The Report also has a section called, “The Foundation’s Activities in the United States”, wherein the Foundation’s activities in the US are detailed, reassuring the Indian audience that the American Foundation was not doing anything in India that they are also not doing back home.
lack of government-experienced faculty to teach the students. As a result appropriate country-specific literature was not accessible to teach students relevant aspects of public administration in India. Most of the writing on the subject was generated by experiences of foreign countries making it alien to students and practitioners of public administration in India. It should be pointed out, though, that Appleby was not too far in opinion from the IIPA faculty as far as the notion of the Institute propagating the discipline was concerned. All the research and training material according to Appleby, was to develop the discipline of public administration as an applied field.

The Ford Foundation sought to change governmental administration. And the Foundation felt the Institute lacked in its outreach to government. The Foundation leadership in India, ever alert to the socio-economic and political changes in the country, believed that the quality of administration and administrators had deteriorated and lacked the ability to deliver on planned objectives. In light of the above, Ensminger wrote to Dr. Khosla, the Director of the IIPA in 1964. “Under your leadership,” Ensminger encouraged, “the Indian Institute of Public Administration has a unique opportunity to help India chart and carry forward its urgently needed administrative reforms. As you know, the Government is becoming increasingly interested in seeking major reforms to expedite national developments.”

Moreover, with the death of Nehru in May 1964, the country and the Ford Foundation had entered uncharted territory. Thus far the Ford Foundation and the

---

522 Reel No. 920, Grant Number 62-34, Section IV, Letter from Douglas Ensminger to Dr. J.M. Khosla, March 10, 1964. FFA
IIPA had enjoyed unhindered prime ministerial patronage, but this could not be guaranteed under a new prime minister. Ford Foundation leaders believed that the IIPA would have to prove its usefulness to the Government in critical areas if it hoped to maintain similar access to power. The Institute would not just have to create reform worthy literature but find avenues to apply it to administrative situations in ways that were valuable to a new government. When the IIPA management made no changes, the Foundation suspended its grant to the Institute.

However, the Foundation saw an opportunity to remedy the situation with the Institute and make it relevant to the Americans, when the new Government decided to appoint a commission to review and suggest administrative reforms to deal with all the problems in the bureaucracy. Ensminger assessed that Shastri, Nehru’s successor, was “of a more pragmatic cast. He endorses socialism as a goal, but disclaims dogmatism and favors practicality. It seems certain that Shastri will give added weight to the specifics of overcoming development problems, rather than to generalities”\textsuperscript{523} In light of this evaluation, Ensminger felt that if institutions like the IIPA became more reform oriented, they could be immensely valuable in developing administrative capabilities for the Shastri administration. The Hoover Commission, set up in the United States in 1947 by President Truman to study and recommend changes to the Federal Government, inspired the new Indian Administrative Reforms Commission (ARC), which was set up in 1966. Mr. Morarji Desai, a senior Congressman and an influential national politician, headed the ARC. Douglas Ensminger met Mr. Desai and lobbied him to use the IIPA researchers to set

up study groups and help the ARC write recommendations to the Government. Mr. Desai agreed that if the IIPA focused solely on problem areas and completely abandoned the academic approach, the ARC could use them as their research arm.\footnote{Reel No. 1818, Grant No. 66-389. Section IV. Memo From Douglas Ensminger to George Gant, May 17, 1966, pp 3-4. FFA. And Ensminger Oral History, B.6. “The Ford Foundation’s Involvement in Public Administration, p. 11.}

The Ford Foundation agreed to underwrite the Institute for this effort. This was the most direct and influential attempt Ensminger made to establish the Institute as a spearhead for administrative reforms. However, all his personal effort and the funding power of the Ford Foundation as well as the support offered by Desai, could not alter what they had initially established and had taken root within the academic, political and administrative realities of India.

**Making Research Reform Oriented**

The first inkling of the difference in purpose between the Institute staff and the Ford Foundation came up in March 1961. “I had a good visit with Dr. Menon at the Institute of Public Administration”, Harry Chase wrote to George Gant at the Ford Foundation office in New York, “which was followed up by a session with him and Ensminger in which expansion of the present program of the Institute in various directions was discussed. I was impressed with the fact that all of the new ideas for the program seemed to be coming from the Foundation office rather than from the Institute.”\footnote{Reel Number 885. Grant Number 54-117. Section IV Letter from Harry L. Chase to George Gant. March 8, 1961. FFA Dr. V.K.N. Menon was the first Director of the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA)} The Foundation officials were not happy that the Institute was developing as it was and that the management of the Institute, according to them, was not showing urgency in changing course.
The start of the second decade of the IIPA’s working coincided with a difficult period for India, politically, economically and internationally. On the political front, the Congress party was loosing ground to Indian Communist parties in the States, who offered a much more radical and populist program of land redistribution and government accountability to the people (Communists formed the first non-Congress government in the southern state of Kerala in 1957). Nehru was portrayed as weak and ineffective by his political rivals because the goals of the Second Five Year Plan (1956-61), which was launched with many promises, were not achieved.\textsuperscript{526} In addition, the Chinese aggression and incursion on the Indo-China border in the northeast in 1961-62 sapped Nehru’s popularity. His political opponents criticized him for being weak and ineffective on foreign policy and national defense. The Congress party was losing popular support. To add to all this, corruption within the bureaucracy and politicians was at the highest point since independence.\textsuperscript{527} The Ford Foundation officers felt that something needed to be done to remedy the situation. They started pressing the IIPA to take a lead in administrative reforms.

The best way forward, according to the Foundations officers, was to launch a case-study program in the Institute. The case study method involved a careful study of actual administrative problems and their resolutions. The resulting analysis, they

\textsuperscript{526} Bad monsoon and poor agricultural output in the Plan period and an over emphasis on heavy industry during this time raised commodity prices and inflation causing hard ship for the poor and middle classes. In addition, the Second Plan fell short of the targeted growth rate. It achieved 4.0 per cent, while the Plan aimed for 4.5 percent. See N.A. Sarma “Economic Development in India: The First and Second Five Year Plans”, \textit{Staff Papers-International Monetary Fund}, vol.6, no.2, Apr 1958, pp 180-238, p.200.

\textsuperscript{527} In response to the public outcry against official corruption, Parliament appointed the Santhanam Committee in 1962 and the Das Commission in 1963. A senior minister in the Nehru government had to resign due to the findings of impropriety against him by the Das Commission.
believed, would provide an opportunity to examine alternative methods and approaches to administrative issues and their implementation. Not only would this method make research more practical; it could also make it more reform oriented.

The Ford Foundation sent Edwin Bock, in 1962, to help in preparing vital case studies to create and strengthen the reform-oriented ness of the Institute. “My last week there in mid-March” Bock wrote, “was devoted largely to participating in a fracas which developed inside the Institute over the question of whether the Institute could afford to publish cases as intimate and high level….Our strategy of involving the higher civil servants in the preparation and management of the case program paid off well, for the two leading higher civil servants were battling furiously for the right to publish intimate and high level cases against some elderly gentlemen on the Institute’s executive committee. The higher civil servants were taking a much stronger line on behalf of academic freedom and the need for empirical research than the professors on the committee! After a good deal of politicking- in which Doug Ensminger also participated helpfully- the good team won. (Italics Mine).”

Bock was a visiting officer, who did not necessarily know the internal power dynamics of the IIPA or of the Indian bureaucracy and was making up his mind based on short-term experiences.529

Despite the encouraging report, by 1964 the Ford Foundation representative and officers had become impatient with the leaders of the Institute because it had not changed rapidly enough into a reform-oriented organization. Initially,

528 Reel No. 885. Grant No. 54-117. Section IV. Letter from Edwin A. Bock to Paul Ylvisaker. April 4, 1962. FFA
529 This aspect is dealt with in greater detail in the section: “Ford Foundation and the Turf Wars at the IIPA”, later in the chapter.
Ensminger, who was more supportive of the Institute, wrote an encouraging letter to the newly appointed Director, Dr. Khosla, an academic and diplomat in the Indian Foreign Service.\textsuperscript{530} In the same letter, he also made a direct recommendation to the director to re-orient the Institute. It should “conduct practical research studies of government administration with view to achieving important improvements in administration and providing knowledge and material for training use.”\textsuperscript{531}

However, not much was done to change the direction of the Institute. In January 1965, the Ford Foundation stopped its grant to the IIPA.\textsuperscript{532}

This was indeed a very problematic situation for the Institute. Although a large segment of the operational funding for the IIPA came from the Government of India, the Ford Foundation supported vital activities like foreign training for Institute faculty and government officers and arranging visiting professors and experts to come to India. As the years went on, the Government funding was pegged at 900,000 rupees annually and would pay for recurring expenses only.\textsuperscript{533} All other expenditures were met from the Ford Foundation grant since the annual membership drives were not significant to pay for many non-recurring expenses. Also, members did not always pay their dues on time making the IIPA even more dependent on their big donors. The following excerpt from the 1961 annual report is indicative of membership issues: “The total membership as on March 31, 1962 was, 1,975. The number of Ordinary members, who were in arrears as on 30\textsuperscript{th} July,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{530} Reel Number 920. Grant Number 62-34. Section IV. Letter from Douglas Ensminger to Dr. J.N. Khosla. March 10, 1964. FFA
  \item \textsuperscript{531} Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{532} Reel No. 3790, Grant No. 63-34. Section FO. Letter from Douglas Ensminger to Dr. J.N. Khosla, January 21, 1965. FFA. This letter informed the Director of the IIPA that Ford Foundation has terminated their funding to the Institute.
  \item \textsuperscript{533} Sixth Annual Report, Indian Institute of Public Administration, April 1959-March 1960. P. 27.
\end{itemize}
1962, was 824 as against total Ordinary membership of 1,644. Out of these, 530 had not paid their subscription for two years and over. Other than the big donors, i.e., The Ford Foundation and the Government of India, membership dues, small projects from International agencies and book sales contributed nominal amounts to its annual revenues.

The Following graph shows IIPA’s revenues from the Ford Foundation and the Government of India. The years 1965 and 1966 show that the Foundation had suspended its grant and during this time the IIPA did not receive any money from them. The other years when it appeared that the Foundation did not make a grant represents the period when the IIPA had requested extensions to earlier grants because it had not spent the earmarked money.

**Figure 1: Funding levels by the Indian Government and the Ford Foundation**

Responding to the Foundation displeasure with IIPA’s research emphasis, the IIPA management appointed an Evaluation Committee in 1965 to help make the

---

Institute’s studies practical and reform oriented. The Evaluation Committee, in turn, recommended publishing research done by the Institute’s faculty. One way to highlight the lack of practical and reform-oriented literature by the Institute’s faculty, according to the Committee, was to publicize and critically examine all its research done so far. An important job of the management of any research organization is a periodic review of its work and evaluation of the direction of studies undertaken, the Committee concluded. Yet before 1963, the Institute had not seriously assessed its faculty’s research. “Out of about 60 research projects undertaken in the past decade, only a dozen or so have been printed and about 16 have either been dropped or have not made significant progress....”536 Responding to the Ford Foundation’s demand for effective action, however, the Evaluation Committee also remarked that the IIPA could not by itself, change government administration. “We are conscious that actual improvement in administration depends upon numerous powerful factors not amenable to the exertions of a body like this.”537

The Indian press picked up on the discord between the Foundation and the Institute and started criticizing the IIPA openly. At least one national daily voiced the opinion of the practitioners of public administration after the grant was stopped. “Some I.A.S. officers sent for courses to the Institute are said to have complained in the past that the courses did not add much of any significance to their understanding of the administrative problem.”538 The Ford Foundation hoped that

---

537 Ibid, p. 4.
reports like this could publicly embarrass the Institute into changing its focus. In addition, The Ford Foundation used its funding ability to steer the Institute in a new direction. Foundation officers in India refused to let the IIPA management exercise any flexibility in use of Foundation funds.539

In response to all the criticism of the IIPA by the Ford Foundation, the Director of the IIPA, Dr. Khosla, wrote a blueprint for change of the Institute’s agenda over the next ten years. He sent it to Ford Foundation officials to read and consider giving a fresh loan to the IIPA. The Ford Foundation officers, confirming their belief that Dr. Khosla was not interested in changing direction but interested in getting additional funds from the Foundation, met this particular attempt by the Director with greater skepticism. “It seems to me,” wrote a Foundation officer of Dr. Khosla’s efforts “there may be a need to re-state more precisely the conception and role of the Institute as it confronts the next years. Dr. Khosla has made a valiant merchandizing effort in his mimeograph designed, so it seems and perhaps it must be, to be attractive to the entire Indian community, public and private. It is presented with such elegance that one could easily overlook the general absence of policy and substantive content in several aspects of the Institute’s program as he describes it and the specific emphases to be applied in the short run of the next year or two as well as the longer run of the next ten years.”540

Dr. Khosla’s conception of the IIPA’s role in the coming years made Foundation officers uncomfortable. They were uneasy with any academic look to

539 Reel No. 3790, Grant No. 63-34, Section FO. Letter from Dr. J.N. Khosla to Douglas Ensminger, Dec 30, 1964, p.4. FFA.
540 Reel Number 3790. Grant Number 63-34. Letter from Charles F. Keefer to Douglas Ensminger. November 2, 1964. FFA.
the IIPA’s functions, which the Khosla plan did not address. On the contrary, in the area of research, for instance, they felt that the new plan aimed to perpetuate the academic leanings of the Institute, especially the School. Dr. Khosla wrote, “The Institute should concentrate on collection of administrative intelligence, descriptive and analytical studies and surveys, and development of a case program; the School, on fundamental, critical and creative research on contemporary administrative policies, organization and practices. In other words, the Institute should undertake research of a “servicing” type and the School of a creative nature. Creative research requires first class academic talents and specialists in different areas. Thus, the school provides the institutional framework for promoting the inter-disciplinary approach to research and the cross fertilization of ideas. Besides, the academic climate of the School, where fresh minds can explore all aspects of a subject without inhibition, would be conducive to creative thinking.”

The fragmenting of research into “servicing” and “creative” categories further annoyed the Foundation officers who were trying to get the Institute and School to focus entirely on practical reform-based research which was concerned with government functioning and improvement.

The Foundation officials, as evidenced by their noting in the margins of the Khosla report, disagreed with this approach. According to them, the School should train the officers of the civil services to change government procedures and effect reforms and the research staff of the Institute must operate the School training programs. Comments like: “He [Dr. Khosla] is just a big mixed-up kid”, or “This...
[academic bent to the institute functions] should be nipped in the bud”\textsuperscript{542} bear evidence to the difference in approach to the functions of the Institute between the Foundation officers and the IIPA staff and management.

**Differences in the Idea of Public Administration as a Distinct Profession**

By the second decade of the IIPA’s existence, differences developed between officers in the Foundation’s India office about the notion of Public Administration being a distinct profession with a well-defined body of academic literature. Did practicing administrators necessarily need a Public Administration background for them to become good officers? Opinions for or against this belief were central to how the IIPA’s working was assessed by the Ford Foundation. For instance, if many in the Foundation believed that knowledge of the principles of academic public administration were important for good governance, then the academic mission of the Institute would be integral to IIPA’s functioning and the school of public administration imparting that information would be desirable. However, if Ford Foundation officials were skeptical of such a principle then investing time, effort and money teaching principles of public administration to government officers would be considered counterproductive to the IIPA’s mission. In an internal communiqué, a Foundation official argued, “...successful administrators are influenced rather than trained. A good teacher of history or literature is as apt to influence them, as is teacher of psychology, sociology or organization, subjects that are supposed to be more relevant. The potency of the influence depends upon whether the teacher understands administration at the level of art, i.e., a creative response to the

\textsuperscript{542} Ibid, p. 13.
uniqueness in each situation." In keeping with this sentiment, Foundation officers tried to shift the focus of the Institute and school from academic and theoretical pursuits in public administration to a practical bias wherein real problems facing the Indian government would be studied and analyzed and solutions provided.

In addition, for many working in Ford’s India office in the 1960s, IIPA’s founding conception of public administration being a special field of study was flawed. They believed that civil service officers needed to have a working technical knowledge of the departments they administered rather than knowing principles of public administration to become effective administrators. The cult of the career generalist administrator-moving around from one department to the other with only a general command of public administration, not having any specialized knowledge of the working of that particular department- was not universally accepted in the Ford Foundation. Many believed that such a lack of expertise hampered the implementation of specialized projects in the five-year plans. Some Foundation officers believed that in the United States institutions like the Maxwell School, where Paul Appleby taught, encouraged teaching principles of public administration to civil service officers. Even within the Foundation the Maxwell endeavor was not looked upon with favor. “Some of this kind of thinking

---

543 Reel No. 3790, Grant No. 63-34. Section FO. Letter from Robert Greenleaf to Douglas Ensminger, October 27, 1964. P.2. FFA
544 Reel No. 3790. Grant No. 63-34. Section F.O. Letter from Robert L. Clark to Charles McVicker, March 9, 1964. FFA
545 Reel number 3790. Grant No. 63-34. Section F.O. Letter from Robert L. Clark to Charles P. McVicker. August 4, 1964. FFA
546 Reel No. 3790, Grant No. 63-34, Section FO, Letter from Morton C. Grossman to Charles P. McVicker, October 27, 1964. FFA
existed for a while in the United States, and led to the establishment of the Maxwell School. Thank god it never spread; we had enough trouble with 'The Boys From Syracuse' in Washington. Fortunately, we as a nation knew that engineers, doctors, sociologists, political scientists and operators of haberdasheries became administrators. The important thing was to inculcate in them the principles of administration. The last place on earth where the fallacious concept of the Maxwell School should be fostered is in India which is already hag-ridden with a generalist elite which was sired by caste and dammed by bureaucracy.”

Although the cult of the generalist administrator was not universally accepted by people working within the Ford Foundation in India, it was well understood by them that their mandate was not to transform the structure of the civil service but to improve its working. To continue with the same administrative structure or not was the prerogative of the political leadership of India and the Ford Foundation wanted to steer clear of making any moves in that direction. There were some who believed that with a few tweaks and changes, the Indian system could actually work well. Appleby, for instance, did not think that generalist administrators were a problem. His aim, for the IIPA, rather, was not to replace the career administrators of the Indian Civil Service (ICS and its later

---

547 Reel number 3790. Grant Number 63-34. Section F.O. Letter from Robert L. Clark to Charles P. McVicker, August 4, 1964. FFA. The principles of administration do not imply theoretical knowledge of academic public administration. Instead, it meant a broader understanding of the term administration as a whole and not specifically academic public administration.

548 The administrative structure of the Indian bureaucracy was essentially similar to the colonial administration it replaced. At the top were the All India Services. The officers of these services were recruited, trained and controlled by the Central Government and allotted to the State Governments. Here they occupied all the top administrative positions. Below these levels were the officers of the State services, who were recruited, trained and controlled by the state governments. They could not rise above a certain level and could not occupy the positions reserved for the All India Services. This aspect has always caused a lot of friction and ill feelings between the two. In addition, the functional specialists and technical experts also are barred from occupying the positions reserved for generalists from the All India Services.
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version, the IAS) but to help administrators understand their problems in the context of the principles of academic public administration. Douglas Ensminger actually explained this feature as the prime motivation to set up the IIPA in the first place. “The original idea was to provide a center where the practitioners- those actually engaged in public administration- meaning the ICS and later the IAS officers holding key positions could come together with the professional staff teaching public administration to examine problems and work out alternate strategies for change.”

Foundation officers in the 1960s, however, disparaged the attitude of the Institute officers who aimed to treat generalist administrators, the kind that existed in the Indian government, as a special occupation. They believed that it created a wall around the administrators, precluding outsiders to examine their work practices and suggest changes. Whether it was due to the fact that there was no involvement of academics within government administration or that government officers never took leave to enter academia or because the civil service in India was known as a closed powerhouse, which never allowed outsiders to understand their work and suggest changes to it that the IIPA faculty believed their job was not to review the job practices of the civil service.

The Foundation officers were now not content to make alliances and be deferential to government officers if it meant continuing the status quo. The Ford
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550 Reel No. 3316, Grant No. 66-389, Section FO, Progress Report, IIPA- Feb 1968-June 1969, p. 32. FFA. Specifically important was the following observation: “Consultancy being virtually a new activity for the Institute, there was naturally a measure of resistance in the Institute’s academic faculty….and in the concerned government circles to the Institute’s taking up consultancy work on a standing basis. The civil service tradition in India is averse to inviting outside consultants….“
Foundation, in the mid-1960s, had become much more activist in its approach to funding than the previous years. In addition, the Ford Foundation office in India, by that time had developed a much more activist bent than previous decade. Henry Heald, the Foundation president believed that Ensminger was among the most prominent activist staff members abroad. As far as the India office was concerned, Ensminger was quite mild as compared to some of its other members, who were much more outspoken than he on the progress of the IIPA. In a confidential communication written to a staffer, in the Karachi (Pakistan) office, an India office staffer wrote the following: “I am not sending you copies of our two IIPA grant requests [as requested by the officer in Karachi] because I do not believe they reflect very truthfully the situation as it actually exists at the Institute. Doug [Douglas Ensminger] may consider the following remark somewhat disloyal, nonetheless it is the considered opinion of most of us here that the IIPA needs a pretty thorough overhaul of both its objectives and its methods.”

Some in the Foundation’s office even felt that if the IIPA continued on this path, it should become part of an established Indian university, much like the US, and get out of the training business altogether. And its Director, professors and senior research workers should have a status in the university. Other Foundation officers believed that good administrators come from any background and that
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universities are the best places to influence and train them rather than an Institute like the IIPA.\textsuperscript{555} The teaching function, according to the Foundation officers, properly belonged to the university “where certain administrative, personnel, economic and business courses can be staged to give ‘merging’ knowledge to the senior student.”\textsuperscript{556} To the Foundation officers, the IIPA had a very specialized role to perform and that it should only concentrate on the problem areas in Indian administration and work on providing solutions.

The differences between the conception of the Institute’s function and emphasis were too great for the Ford Foundation officials in India to let go without taking up with the Director of the IIPA. Some internal communications within the Foundation office in India showed that despite meetings between the two sides, considerable differences remained. “Thanks for sending me your note on the conversation with Khosla,” an internal letter between officers of the Foundation said, “There is one further point on which I would like to have my say. This has to do with the proposal to offer a doctorate program at IIPA. This is utter nonsense. It is not that kind of an institution and never will be”. “This proposal,” the letter continued, “is reminiscent of that made by Dr. Merani of the abortive Institute of Labor Research who said that unless we could make the Institute another Brookings

\textsuperscript{555} Reel No. 3790, Grant No. 63-34. Section FO. Letter from Robert Greenleaf to Douglas Ensminger, October 22, 1964. Pp 2-3. FFA
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Institution (with a building constructed by the Foundation) he was not interested in being the Director.”  

Ford Foundation and the Turf Wars at the IIPA

In light of the above observations it is useful to consider how research was organized and whether the academicians at the Institute were somehow responsible for the lack of focus on ‘actionable research’. The Committee of Direction for Research supervised research activities in the Institute. This body was made up of members of the Executive Council and the Director of the Institute. Academic researchers did not have any representation in this body. General administrators, most of who belonged to the Indian Administrative Services and were in government service, dominated this Committee. In other words, bureaucrats working for the government were directing research projects within the I.I.P.A. In the period prior to 1965, this Committee felt that it might be appropriate for a few faculty members to attend the deliberations of this group. However, there was no specific organization within the Institute made up of professional researchers to follow-up on initiated research projects and their completion. As a result, there was a lot of anxiety and annoyance within the academic community in the IIPA about the bureaucrats usurping their role and being blocked out of meaningful leadership positions within the Institute.

This would have ostensibly seemed like a desired outcome for the Ford Foundation wherein the practitioners directed the research and gave it some real
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world emphasis. However, that was not happening at the Institute. Instead, bureaucrats were using their leveraged position in the government hierarchy to garner senior positions within the Institute’s management. There was no feeling of association between the two groups and therefore no interchange of experiences. Instead, this pushed the academics to retreat further into doing studies they were comfortable doing and ones that did not involve close association with the civil service officers. A result of this antagonism was that the research agenda lacked practical focus. An important reason for this, as the Evaluation Committee of the Institute concluded, was the lack of “the full participation of the professional staff of the Institute working on the research side…” “A feeling seems to be widely entertained among Members of the Faculty that they have not had adequate opportunities for such participation. The post of the Chief Research Officer has remained unfilled for several years. There also seems to have been want of certainty and continuity in respect of funds for carrying to completion research projects already undertaken.” 559 As far later as 1969, even Ford Foundation experts acknowledged this situation. “As regards the academic staff of the Institute,” the report said “they developed a feeling that they had been ‘down graded’ by the presence in the Institute of administrators who were drawing much higher emoluments and enjoying better privileges in the matter of travel, per diem allowances, etc.” 560

559 The Evaluation Committee, p 13 & 14.
The Evaluation Committee, aware of the Ford Foundation displeasure of the working of the Institute and very close to cancelling their grant, summed up the problem they were facing. “In spite of this being the specific purpose for which the Institute was established, and in spite of the over-weighting of its governing body with high officials, in practice the Institute has not been able to establish systematic liaison between the academicians of the Institute specializing in the various subjects and the government agencies operating in these areas of administration.”

Trying to not blame any group within the Institute, the committee addressed the Foundation’s main grouse in a practical way. The committee believed that the lack of horizontal contact between the Institute and government agencies was largely responsible for a lack of actionable research since academicians were not made aware of the working problems of administering government programs and hence were not concentrating on studying the problem areas. And, because the IIPA faculty did not conduct such problem-oriented studies, they could not help in administrative improvement. This aspect was not surprising since India’s civil service traditions frowned on external evaluation. By the 1960s formalism, excessive dependence on procedure, delay and inaction were inalienably associated with the bureaucracy of India’s government. As a result, the academic researchers were content to focus on studies, which did not involve lengthy fieldwork in government departments, producing theoretical studies with little reform value.
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561 The Evaluation Committee p 15.
In addition, a commonly accepted opinion within the Institute’s faculty and staff was that the Ford Foundation favored the civil service officers at the expense of the academicians. In an internal meeting, there was discussion between Executive Council members about the civil service officers getting all the training funds and trips abroad at the expense of the academicians at the Institute. A member even resigned over the issue. Internal Ford communications revealed that the Foundation officials saw the academicians as the problem plaguing the Institute and keeping it from achieving its full potential. This attitude toward the faculty further entrenched their behavior and made them defensive.

**Differences Over the Master’s Diploma in Public Administration**

There were many differences, over the functioning of the IIPA, between Foundation officers, experts and the Institute’s staff. However, none were as rancorous as the creation and continuance of the Masters Diploma in Public Administration (MDPA) at the School of Public Administration at the Institute. The School had started this course, which was basically an academic degree, and many in the Foundation believed, lacking in content and focus to the immediate work of the attending officers. The faculty, the Evaluation Committee noted, initially believed this program was “misconceived and kept them occupied without much purpose.” However, they changed their view “and stated that the MDPA course had benefited the students though it might not have had a very practical bearing on their immediate functioning.” Douglas Ensminger nonetheless believed that the faculty had a great hand in perpetuating the
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MDPA course and that the Director of the Institute, Dr. Khosla, was unable to get them from changing course and thinking of the IIPA as an applied Institute and not a degree granting one. Various other Foundation consultants, who believed that the IIPA faculty perpetuated this course of action, confirmed him in this view.

There was never any clear-cut understanding between the Foundation officials and the IIPA management about the exact role of the School of Public Administration. The Foundation officials had initially thought that graduates of this school would have a chance to enter government service and that it would “act as a training school both for prospective government administrators and for those already in service.” Appleby had also hoped for this outcome. He was extremely frustrated when the School graduates did not find employment in government service. He felt that the courses could be made a little more practical in orientation. However, in the same report, he cautioned against chastising the IIPA or the School of Public Administration in a public forum. He believed that all actions needed to make the course more practical should be taken discreetly. In time “With the low state of public administration education generally prevailing elsewhere, the Institute’s school might lead the world by 1980.”

Initially, the Foundation officers felt that most of the School’s problems about being too theoretical in its teaching content would be solved by hiring in-service and recently retired civil service officers as faculty. In 1961, the Ford Foundation created a grant for the Institute to deal with this very problem. One of the rationales for the
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monetary allotment was explained in the grant letter. “The Institute needs to augment already ongoing program of study groups and seminars and to bring into its programs administrators of various levels so that the teaching will be a two way channel, bringing to the Institute the practical field problems of administration and giving to the administrators an idea of the newest techniques and methods in administrative research.”

However, specific demands on continuing or discontinuing any program within the Institute were not conveyed. The main idea at that point was strengthening the program generally by bringing in more practically experienced teachers. Also, the Maxwell School at Syracuse University was approached to send in experts to advise Institute management on the affairs of the School of Public Administration.

Although there were instances when Ford Foundation officers expressed dissatisfaction, until 1964, it had been in the form of requests for funds to fix problems at the Institute. The first formal incidence of a Ford Foundation officer openly expressing dissatisfaction over the direction of the IIPA and urging their management to change course was in Douglas Ensminger’s letter to Dr. Khosla, IIPA’s new Director. Prof. Menon, IIPA’s founder Director, was also an academic and was critiqued by Ensminger for not providing leadership on the issue of changing the overly academic focus of the Institute, but he never did so openly and directly. In his letter to Dr. Khosla, however, Ensminger urged him to completely stop the academic orientation of the School’s courses and turn it into a training institution.
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Government of India establishing a new Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms in 1964. Ensminger feared that the IIPA’s role in administrative reforms would not just be diminished, it could be gone altogether. In addition, the Government could see no use for the Institute and stop funding it in the long term.

The Foundation officials believed they could manipulate their grant to the IIPA to make them change course. “The only hold we have on Khosla”, an internal communiqué argued, “to make him see that he must do some forward thinking, not only in terms of specific projects, but more importantly in terms of Institute building, is to refuse to pay him money from the existing grant.”574 They knew that the IIPA Director needed the funds to run the Institute. Ensminger sat down with the Director and Chairman of the IIPA Board, and explained to them that each grant had to be treated separately and that if the Institute and its School did not change course, the Foundation would not continue to fund them.575 It was very clear that Director Khosla was concerned. He wanted the Foundation money but, at the same time, had the unenviable job of convincing the faculty to change course. To persuade both sides, he wrote “The Next Ten Years”.576 This was supposed to be the blueprint, he hoped, which would convince the faculty to make changes and the Foundation to support the Institute.

The document did not have the intended result with the Ford Foundation officials. One general criticism of the report focused on the fine line Khosla was trying to walk in this effort.577 Another criticism was as follows: “The paper which we are asked to read
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has all the right words. It is the jargon which I learned years ago around the Bureau of
the Budget.” He then lambasted the content. “Khosla is in fact proposing to arrogate to
the Institute and its School the functions of the university. His concept of the role of the
School is based on what I consider to be the most dangerous proposal he could make.”

Foundation officers believed that the Director was viewed as being too weak to change
anything at the IIPA. However, they also felt that the IIPA could not continue with its
academic leaning. Consequently, the Foundation decided to suspend all funding to the
IIPA.

This development started a series of discussions within the Institute about the
measures to be taken to reinstate the grant. Since the Foundation had identified the IIPA
faculty as the main cause of the problem, various schemes, to strengthen the faculty were
proposed. Mr. Barve, a Planning Commission member, was asked by the Standing
Committee of the IIPA to look into the problem areas and recommend changes. Mr.
Barve headed the Evaluation Committee appointed in 1965. Ensminger recalls meeting
Barve to talk about what needed to be done at the IIPA. “He and I spent a good many
hours together and saw eye to eye on the need for the Institute giving up its Master’s
program, for dropping its historical and theoretical research and having the focus on
major administrative problems both in its training and research.” Barve realized that
the Foundation wanted the MDPA to end if it was to support the Institute financially.
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The result of this conversation was a scathing indictment of the Master’s Diploma by the Evaluation Committee.

His committee concluded that the course failed on numerous fronts. “The MDPA Course appears to us to fall between two stools. As a purely academic course of instruction in public administration it seems to us to be inadequate in content. On the other hand, as a course of general training for the professional administrator, it would seem to be deficient both in content and focus. It has also no particular merit as an added qualification to the young aspirants to public services in that it is unrelated to any specific improvement in their prospects for employment.”

“The result among diploma holders confirmed the view that the Diploma Course was more liberal education and has little practical or professional utility.”

The Evaluation Committee also criticized the Executive Council of the IIPA for not bothering to keep itself informed about the School alumni. The Institute was spending 5000 Indian Rupees annually on each student. Yet there were no records where the students ended up within the government hierarchy and how they were applying their training. They were also not contacted for follow-up or refresher courses. In short, there was no thought given to what the training programs were meant to achieve. In light of this severe criticism and the Foundation pulling its money away from the IIPA, the future of the MDPA program was looking bleak.

The Institute discontinued the MDPA course in 1967 after blistering criticism of it by the Evaluation Committee and the Ford Foundation. On the evening following the graduation of the final class of students from the MDPA course, Mr. Morarji Desai, the
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head of the Administrative Reforms Commission (ARC), addressed the graduates of the 9th and final class of students. A Foundation official said, “He [Mr. Desai] was pleased that the master’s diploma course had been abolished…and endorsed strongly the Institute’s plans to shift from a degree programs to training programs for senior administrators.”

The Foundation officials were glad that Desai’s views closely mirrored theirs. “In sum”, a Foundation officer observed, “it seems that Mr. Desai’s views of the future organization and role of the Institute very closely coincide with the recommendations of the Barve Report and with our own concepts.”

Evidently, there was too much resistance to the Diploma Course from the Ford Foundation for the IIPA staff and management to continue with it.

While the story from the genesis of the Diploma program to its eventual end may seem straightforward, there was a lot of acrimony and finger pointing along the way. Some at the Institute blamed their collaboration with the Maxwell School and the advice they received from the Maxwell faculty as being directly responsible for the Foundation’s action to terminate the IIPA grant. In addition, some faculty members who had collaborated with visiting Maxwell School professors believed that American faculty members came to the Institute to further their own research work and used IIPA researchers’ work in an unethical manner.

In short, the entire
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experience of the Ford Foundation response to IIPA’s Diploma in Public Administration and its eventual stoppage created an atmosphere in which IIPA faculty and staff lost trust in the Americans with whom they had been working.

**Indian Governance Crisis, Administrative Reforms Commission and the IIPA**

In August 1963, Prime Minister Nehru came to the IIPA to deliver his annual Presidential address. In it he referred to the myriad governance problems facing India. “The administration” Nehru said, “has become somewhat confined in the old frame. This has had an adverse effect on our work. Firstly, decisions are considerably delayed and consequently the implementation is also delayed, which gives rise to increase in expenditure and other undesirable consequences. Secondly, we have a much bigger problem to face- the problem of corruption in public administration and elsewhere about which there are loud complaints...After achieving our Independence, we took to planning and drew up projects. In many cases implementation of these projects was delayed, giving rise to increase in cost...So, you have to ponder over all these problems and perhaps you may have discussed them in your seminars. However, this matter of administration has become very important for us, especially for our plans. It is an essential function of your Institute to interest yourself in this matter and to offer advice, to make suggestions and to work for their acceptance.”

Earlier, under pressure from the public and the opposition parties, Nehru’s government had appointed a committee
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to look into corruption in public services. Impatient with the IIPA’s lack of goal orientation, Ensminger urged that the IIPA respond to the government’s governance crisis by moving to lead the administrative reforms movement.

At the same time, the Ford Foundation let the IIPA know that it would not renew grants for any incomplete projects or for programs the Institute had previously undertaken with Ford assistance. It also demanded from the Institute concrete plans for strengthening the faculty and restructuring research priorities. Geithner, a Foundation officer, wrote that Ford had ended funding the IIPA because the Institute did not change its strong tilt toward general research, rather than applied research. Ensminger later blamed the Institute’s faculty for this situation. “The evidence was very strong the faculty within the Institute was dead set against the Institute being thought of as an applied Institute in Public Administration. The commitments to the theoretical and historical research were also so strong it did not seem possible the Institute would free the staff to take on applied research.”

Others within the Foundation concurred. Writing in 1964, the Ford Foundation’s Robert L. Clark said, “The main burden of my argument about the IIPA is that it is in the stratosphere when India’s problems at this stage are on the ground. What the Institute needs to be doing is applied research— even bread and butter research.”
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In the midst of this turmoil in the relations between the Ford Foundation and the IIPA, Prime Minister Nehru died in May 1964 leaving both, the Institute and the Foundation, without a strong political ally in the Indian government. The Congress Party was losing control over some state governments. In 1957, the southern Indian state of Kerala elected its first non-Congress government by voting in the Communists. Ensminger believed that these changes were happening because Congress administrations failed to deliver on promises made to the people of India. He added that “Nehru always expressed a sense of having personally failed when he saw evidence the people in government were not working together, or when he could himself see that the government administrative people looked down on village people.”\textsuperscript{596} He was convinced that for five year plans to succeed, administration would need to change.

Nehru’s successor was a mild mannered, consensus politician, Lal Bahadur Shastri, who also took over the Presidency of the IIPA after Nehru died. He was a ‘Nehruvian’ socialist and continued almost all of his policies and people in the new administration. However, the administrative problems that plagued India only grew worse during Shastri’s tenure, leading him to consider appointing a reforms commission to look into problem areas using the the two Hoover Commissions in the United States as a template. The person tapped to head the commission was Morarji Desai, one of the power contenders within the Congress Party. An old timer in the party hierarchy, he was sidelined from party leadership.\textsuperscript{597}

\textsuperscript{596} Ensminger Oral History, A.8, p.9.
After Lal Bahadur Shastri died, somewhat suddenly, in 1966, there was a power struggle within the Congress party. Mr. Desai led one of the major factions of the party. Many, however, opposed him for the leadership of the party and the Prime Minister ship. As a result, Mrs. Gandhi, Nehru’s daughter and a novice politician, emerged as the consensus candidate because she was not known to be loyal to any faction. She became the Prime Minister and then effectively distanced all party leaders from the governmental power structure. This commission, consequently, served as Desai’s power center. He completely controlled the commission’s size, functions and status within the government.

From the beginning the Ford Foundation involved itself with the work of the Commission. Within the Foundation some undertook to critique the entire approach, doubting whether India should use the Hoover Commission as guides. Ensminger, however, was most enthusiastic about this prospect. “The job confronting the Commission is,” he wrote in 1966, “to propose ways to set things right. The Commissioners are all senior members of Parliament, and together with the Chairman, Morarji Desai, they constitute an influential body of knowledge and astute individuals.” However, what seemed even more promising to Ensminger was the following: “It is probable that their recommendations will be taken seriously by
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their colleagues in Parliament and the Ministries.” Also, this effort was important because it was very wide ranging and included within its purview, for the first time, the study of the role and functions of the Indian Administrative Service as well.

Ensminger had given the issue of administrative reform in India a lot of thought. He was quite deeply involved in the discussion of the direction of the Commission’s scrutiny. In his memo to Foundation officials in New York, Ensminger wrote the following: “Perhaps a major pitfall in the way of significant outcomes is the easy acceptance of a false analogy. The old saw that once the malady is known, the cure can be supplied may apply to medicine but it is fatal to think it applies to administrative reform. It is quite probable that the members of the Commission could meet alone several times and successfully finger the major administrative problems[,] which exist. I suspect they may already have gone through some exercise. But, from my conversations with them, they are rightly placing major emphasis on seeking solutions, not merely on pointing out deficiencies, which are already common knowledge. I have attempted to encourage them to continue in this vein.”

Ensminger met with Desai to lobby for the IIPA to do some studies for the ARC and perhaps get the Institute out of the business of theoretical studies and into reform related activities. “I was talking about using the Institute’s structure”, Ensminger later explained of his meeting with Desai, “and in the process of putting the Institute to work for the Commission we would be able to remake the Institute
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and when it had completed its work with the Commission, the Institute would then
be staffed by experienced people and, hopefully, have improved itself, capable of
dealing with the live and gutty public administration issues."  

Desai and
Ensminger shared common views about the role of the IIPA. Desai, like Ensminger,
believed that the IIPA was not doing the job it was meant to do. In his meeting with
Desai about the technical assistance needed for the ARC, Ensminger recalls Desai
expressing extreme skepticism about the ability of the IIPA to provide the necessary
expertise.  

The Foundation did not want to miss this opportunity to make the Institute
change its structure and functioning to support the ARC. To overcome Desai’s
objections of the IIPA, The Ford Foundation made a generous grant to the Institute
to cover all expenses toward its work for the ARC.  

In its grant letter, the
Foundation apportioned money to “help ensure the success of the Commission on
Administrative Reforms by strengthening the ability of the Indian Institute of Public
Administration to serve and support the efforts of the Commission."  

However, many of the top Foundation officers in New York doubted whether the Institute
could change course and do what is necessary to help the ARC. Ensminger made a
strong case: “The opportunity to serve as the research arm of the Desai Commission
[ARC] provides the Institute a golden chance to fulfill the kind of role Paul Appleby
foresaw when he recommended its creation,” he argued. “Our initial financial
support to the Institute (grant 54-117) was predicated on the assumption that the
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Institute would one day play a key role as a catalyst and semi-independent force for administrative improvement. To date the Institute has never quite lived up to its promise, although over the past two years it has shown some healthy signs of progress.\textsuperscript{607}

The bigger job, Ensminger thought, was convincing the IIPA officers to change course and be responsive to the needs of the ARC. In order to persuade the Institute staff to do so, Ensminger specifically tied the entire grant from the Ford Foundation to the IIPA’s ARC work. In addition, he enlisted Desai’s help in talking with Dr. Khosla, IIPA’s Director, to change course. Khosla met Ensminger after that meeting with Desai and told him he needed to “prepare” his staff “for an acceptance of a significant role with the Commission on administrative reforms.”\textsuperscript{608} Desai went a step further. In an address to faculty and members of the Executive Council of the IIPA, he “sternly blasted Dr. Khosla’s comments that if the Institute was to render increased service to the Government, it should need more money from the Government. Desai said: ‘as long as this attitude persists, the Institute will never amount to much.’ He then tempered his statement by saying that the government would support the Institute generously for any purpose whenever the Government was satisfied that the return, in terms of service by the Institute, would justify the outlay.”\textsuperscript{609}

After the IIPA was formally asked to conduct research for the ARC, it organized study teams to research several problem areas. These study team reports
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then served as the basis for the Commission’s own reports and recommendations to the Government for improvement. One of the widely discussed reports on personnel administration, which recommended the opening up of the upper echelons of the generalist Indian Administrative Service (IAS) to specialists and members of the lower state administrative services was based on the findings of the conference on personnel administration held at the IIPA. The Ford Foundation sent American experts to consult on the reports. Indian academicians and experts were very complimentary of the resulting work. Ensminger concurred. “Most people who have had an opportunity to examine the working documents of the Administrative Reforms Commission agree they are uniformly of high quality, and the Institute’s performance was very good, many times quite outstanding.” Desai complimented as well: “The Institute turned the corner toward becoming ‘one of our great national Institutes’ with its service to the Administrative Reforms Commission.”

However, in the general elections in 1967, Congress barely won the Center [Federal level]. They lost many states to resurgent regional forces. As a result, in March 1967, in the interest of party unity, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi appointed Morarji Desai as the Deputy Prime Minister. He resigned his chairmanship of the ARC and one of the members, Mr. Hanumanthaiya, took over the job of leading the Commission. Mrs. Gandhi’s relations with Mr. Desai had been adversarial and she had not been a keen supporter of the ARC. Her populist approach to politics, like bank nationalization and

---

abolition of privy purses, had alienated the older wing of the Congress party, which Mr. Desai headed. 614 In his oral history in 1972, Ensminger amplified his opinion on both these policies. He said, “Mrs. Gandhi’s success in getting Parliament to pass legislation abolishing the privy purses of the former Princes was significant only in its identification with India’s poor and looking with scorn on the privileges formally bestowed on India’s former Princes. Nationalization of India’s banks was again a move to have Mrs. Gandhi and her Congress Party identify itself with India’s poor.” 615 Clearly Ensminger had identified the political expediency behind the two decisions and Mrs. Gandhi’s willingness to do what was needed to strengthen her support and cement her position within the party.

Also, the ARC itself would not be able to compel the government to accept the main proposals, especially the ones that would have broken the monopoly of the Indian administrative class. And there was not much political pressure to implement changes suggested by the Commission either. Mrs. Gandhi was not interested in reducing the power and prestige of the Indian Administrative Service (IAS), as much as she wanted to control them. She did not endorse the idea of an independent, politically neutral bureaucracy. She wanted government

614 In 1969 and 1970, Indira Gandhi’s government implemented the bank nationalization and abolition of privy purses policies respectively. Both these actions aimed to solidify Mrs. Gandhi’s popular support since they undercut the privilege and authority of the wealthy and elite in Indian society. Indian banks were privately controlled by large industrial houses and wealthy individuals and were singled out, by Mrs. Gandhi as obstacles to national economic progress. Privy purses were money paid to ex-princes, maharajas and royalty for giving up their right to rule and control their kingdoms at the time of independence so that they could merge into the Indian union. Desai’s wing of old Congress leaders saw that as reneging on promises made to royalty and old supporters, like Indian industrialists, in favor of a hard left ideological tilt. Although these policies were implemented in 1969 and 70, the discussions about their implementation started in 1967. Desai had opposed these policies from the beginning. See *The Story*, pp 243-248.
615 Ensminger Oral History Transcript, A.20, May 12, 1972, p.12. FFA
administration to be committed to the political platform of the Congress Party.\footnote{The Hindustan Times, November 17, 1969.}

This was important since non-Congress governments now held power in many states and the IAS could serve as extension of central executive power in those states. Moreover, the Congress party split in 1969, with Morarji Desai being an important member of the wing that opposed Mrs. Gandhi. With his influence in the party and government vastly reduced, Desai could not be relied on to push for ARC reforms to be accepted by the government.

The IAS officers were not happy with ARC recommendations either. In response to the ARC proposal to specialize the higher civil services and demystify their status, an IAS officer said, that the “elitist concept is the very substance of the IAS, and any arrangement that disturbs this concept also demolishes the service.”

“The more honest course for the Commission,” he further remarks, “would have been to suggest the abolition of the IAS.”\footnote{Mohanty, N. (IAS Orissa), “ARC on Personnel Administration: A Study in Bias”, Indian Journal of Public Administration, xv.4 (1969), 643-4} Not surprisingly, the IAS and other centralized civil services resisted the implementation of all the ARC recommendations, especially the ones that curtailed their power and prestige.\footnote{Potter, David C., India’s Political Administrators: From ICS to IAS, (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 170.}

As a result, the ARC, whose recommendations emphasized political accountability, bureaucratic neutrality in administrative functioning and breaking up monopolies of top positions in government, did not find favor with the Prime Minister and officers of the All India Services.\footnote{An important recommendation of the ARC was appointing an ombudsman, “Lokpal”, who would hold the top bureaucrats and politicians accountable for their actions. This suggestion was not implemented and continues to be a key demand for present day anti-corruption activists as well.}

Consequently the role of the Institute for the follow up of
the ARC reforms was somewhat reduced. The Government did adopt some recommendations of the ARC but they were not the critical and consequential ones.

In addition, behind the overt collaboration between the Foundation experts and their Institute counterparts and all round praise regarding their ARC work, there were complaints about the processes behind creating these studies. Executive Council members at the Institute observed, “There was a widespread belief outside the Institute that the goals and conclusions of the IIPA research studies were determined before hand and were significantly influenced by American ideas and doctrines.” Another member complained, “The two American consultants attached to the Institute had been going around to meet the Secretaries of the Staff Associations of different services in connection with conference on personnel administration [one which resulted in the bold recommendation to break up the power of the IAS and central services] which the Institute was going to organize towards the end of the current month. The two consultants had given the impression that they were acting on behalf of the IIPA. The member added that personnel administration was a most sensitive area and the direct involvement of foreign consultants in a conference or field research in this area was not desirable.”

Complaints were also made about the objectivity of the report of a previous conference on personnel administration. “Some senior officials who attended that conference had disagreed on some particular issues but the report of the conference stated that there was consensus of opinion among participants.”

---

621 Minutes of the 83rd Executive Council Meeting held on August 8, 1969. Pp. 9-10. IIPA.
While there was no evidence of the Foundation advancing any particular policy agenda through the ARC studies conducted by the IIPA, these complaints served to showcase the unhappiness in the Institute about the very large and obvious role of the Ford Foundation consultants in the IIPA study teams. This displeasure may have also arisen from the seemingly radical proposal that came out of the conference held at the IIPA and became a part of the ARC recommendation to the Government, which many administrators disliked. Many administrators expressed their displeasure by critiquing the personnel reforms in articles in the *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, IIPA’s flagship publication.\(^{622}\)

Regardless of the appearance of IIPA studies being dominated by the Foundation, and the ensuing rumblings within the Institute’s faculty, Ensminger continued to map out IIPA’s future in helping the government implement ARC recommendations after it had wound up. “To make sure the Institute did not slip back into its earlier role of being concerned about theoretical matters and training people for Master’s degrees, we in the Ford Foundation along with the Chairman of the Administrative Reforms Commission early conceived of the Institute playing a follow-up role to the work of the Commission, in that there would be need for the Institute to staff up and train people to carry out the new roles conceived and recommended by the Commission as well as to evaluate the progress made by the Government when taking on the new responsibilities as envisaged by the

---

Administrative Reforms Commission. This really assured the Institute would, in fact, stay by its new orientation.\textsuperscript{623}

Mrs. Gandhi decided to dissolve the ARC on June 30\textsuperscript{th} 1970. The Foundation officers were not pleased. “On June 30, 1970, the Government terminated the Administrative Reforms Commission.” A Foundation official reported, “The other members of the Commission protested the action, but the Prime Minister was not moved by their pleas.”\textsuperscript{624} Mrs. Gandhi was not very liked within the Ford Foundation either.\textsuperscript{625}

The Institute, in other words, worked well under structured guidance from an outside entity (ARC). It was easier to do that because the ARC had already determined the research questions. Coming up with problems to research on their own, on the other hand, would be determined by many different variables, like funding, value of studies to government and businesses etc. Writing in 1970, Ross Pollock, a consultant for the Ford Foundation summed up the job before the IIPA researchers as follows: “The most important phase in research is the determining of what questions need to be answered... I have indicated my conviction that the Institute itself needs to ask the broadest questions based on such criteria as urgency, resources, access to data, and the state of public administration.”\textsuperscript{626}

**Altered Political Landscape and the IIPA.**

The ARC formally ended its operations in 1970. Writing in 1970, four years after the Evaluation Committee, and four years of the Institute working for the ARC, Pollock

\textsuperscript{624} Reel No. 3316. Grant No. 66-389. Section FO. Memo from Ross Pollock to For Foundation India, July 3, 1970. FFA
\textsuperscript{625} Reel Number 1817. Grant Number 66-389. Section IV. Letter from Samuel E. Bunker to Edward A. Kieloch, May 11, 1971. FFA.
echoed similar concerns for a specialized role for the IIPA, as the Evaluation Committee had five years earlier. “The issue may soon become:” argues Pollock, “what training can the Indian Institute of Public Administration provide which is superior to that which Government provides itself or through local universities? The universities can provide a richer cross-cultural experience than the Institute. The National Academy of Administration as a full-fledged partner of Government can be expected to be more immediately responsive to its needs than the independent Institute. The time has come for the Director and the Executive Council to consider Institute resources and potential in order to mark out its share of the training field. Vagueness and uncertainty may leave the Institute with crumbs from the training table.”

The National Academy of Administration was the newer training school for all the officers recruited to the All India Services. In other words, they were given their pre-service training at this institution. It was set up in April 1958 to teach a foundation course to all the new recruits of the All India Services (These include all specialized all-India services like Police, Forest, Customs and Central Excise etc and the more generalized Indian Administrative Service) and general training to the IAS. This Institute became the first opportunity to influence and train the future civil service officers of the government.

Meanwhile, The Institute was soon becoming the target for anti-American rhetoric. The Members of the Indian Parliament raised serious objections to sending the Indian Administrative Service officers to the United States for training trips. Members on the left and Prime Minister’s own party were demanding why government employees

---

627 Pollock, p 23
628 The IAS recruits participated in the Foundation Course at the National Academy of Administration and then continued for a further training session specific to their role and position in the Government hierarchy while recruits to the other specialized All-India Services like the Police etc, attended specialized courses dealing with their area of operation in separate academies.
were not being sent to the Soviet Union instead of the United States. The Communist Party Members wanted to know “whether there was prima facie case of C.I.A. penetration.” Finally, one member wanted to know “whether an expert of the Ford Foundation was supervising the entire work of the Institute and whether the Foundation had already established a centre to conduct politically oriented studies to favor the United States.” The IIPA was now being seen as a front for American covert activities in India. It was tough atmosphere in which to fulfill the goals of the Indian Institute of Public Administration.

Ensminger was aware of this aspect of communist propaganda when he signed on to lead the Foundation office in India. “Given India’s sensitivity to the motives of all outside assistance and especially the Communist party’s ever readiness to assume and manufacture ill-conceived motives to all foreign assistance except from Russia, a private American foundation like the Ford Foundation, which owed its existence to the American capitalistic system and was a private enterprise; it is quite understandable that the communists made every effort to find opportunities to relate CIA activities with the Ford Foundation.”

This situation, naturally, made it difficult for the Foundation to push the IIPA into closer proximity with government affairs without incurring political scrutiny.

The IIPA, nevertheless, continued to get political patronage, generally, but the Prime Ministerial Presidency of the Institute had stopped. Despite Nehru’s strong endorsement of the organization through his Presidency of the IIPA, his daughter stayed away from that position, except for a year, thus dashing Ensminger’s hopes. He had believed the opposite. “The post of President of the Institute has been vacant since the

---

death of Lal Bahadur Shastri,” Ensminger observed, “but the expectation is that the Prime Minister will be elected and that she will accept, following the tradition set by her father and continued by Mr. Shastri.”

With the Communists mounting a strong opposition to the Congress in the states and the rise of regional populism, Prime Minister Gandhi started co-opting their message in her governing philosophy, thereby blunting their popular appeal. She displayed very little patience for the institutional improvement of bureaucracy. In her lone Presidential address at the Institute, she said, “In India, because of our own problems and our own economic backwardness, naturally the people are not satisfied with the existing state of affairs. They want a much faster rate of growth. They want more equal distribution of the fruits of our national endeavor. They want greater social justice and greater equality. And I think, it is this general ferment which is at the root of the demand for administrative reform.” Her need for change was immediate and political and her preferred method of reform was to politicize the bureaucracy and put them to work implementing the Congress Party program.

Ensminger, however, had no problem with being activist in pushing for reform as long as it fulfilled the democratically determined socio-political and economic goals. “Congress was returned to power”, Ensminger reasoned, “because it finally decided it must vigorously support reforms and development, or the communists would likely vote themselves in complete charge.” “It is my contention”, he continued, “Mrs. Gandhi must

---

now move to support national public works programs to make possible [that] the unemployed poor have enough income to meet their essential needs, or face growing hostile voters whose numbers are sufficient to either keep Congress in power or vote it out.”

However, Ensminger, indeed the Ford Foundation in India, were institution builders. Making civil servants behave like political party officials would, in the long run, erode public trust and undermine the institution of the public bureaucracy and they did not support it. However, Ensminger also understood that “being long on promises and very short on program implementation” was equally untenable. The answer was to strike a balance. The Foundation was now operating in an uncharted political climate in India. The people of India that the Foundation leaders had surmised in 1950 were ready and impatient for the change they were promised and were also willing to try different political philosophies to attain that end.

In addition, the political relations with the United States were not smooth either. President Johnson had often used his food grain aid to India to control Indian response to Pakistan. This had been a cause of irritation between the two democracies. On a visit to the United States, Mrs. Gandhi very publicly said, “India and the United States should not take each other for granted or allow their relationship to drift.”

Chester Bowles, American Ambassador to India, worried about India’s steady drift toward the Soviet Union after the Indian politicians sensed US tilt toward Pakistan on all contentious issues between the two countries.

This altered political landscape also meant that the Ford

635 Ibid, p 11.
Foundation could not depend on or easily solicit political action in changing IIPA’s mode of operation. The avenues for creating a post-ARC association with the government machinery were more difficult now than it were during the glory days of Nehru’s India. Although Ensminger felt that changed Indo-American relations would not affect the Foundation’s work in India because Nehru had established its non-political credentials,\textsuperscript{638} the political patronage, so necessary in India for programs to succeed, would be somewhat difficult to achieve.

**Conclusion: The Postscript**

At the end of the grant period the Ford Foundation tried to survey what, if anything, had they managed to change at the IIPA. In 1970, after discontinuing the MDPA program for four years, “The Institute had yet to undertake a survey of training needs of executives, managers and supervisors at the Centre or in the States.”\textsuperscript{639} The research within the Institute was not geared to generating training material. The Institute had started short training courses but not corrected the flaws of the Diploma course. Ford’s consultants tried to remedy the situation by making concrete suggestions as to how research and training can be improved. Pollock, for instance, suggested the following:

“In the research field, the staff would [should] be concerned with the improvement of public administration in general but in the training field they would [should] be concerned with the ways in which officers need to be changed to improve administration. For example, the analysis might show that district administration is

\textsuperscript{638} Ensminger, Oral History, A.17, p 6.

\textsuperscript{639} Pollock, p 22
inadequate. The research would be concerned with finding out how it was inadequate and what steps are necessary to overcome the problems…The training would be concerned with (a) communicating the findings of the research as to how to administer better, and (b) in getting participants to share their experiences as to good and inadequate administration or to provide participants experiences which would provide participants experiences which would demonstrate useful and inadequate administration.”

There was concern among Foundation officers that rank and seniority was dominating decisions to send faculty abroad for PhD programs. This was a common problem at the IIPA, which followed the official government policy of giving importance to tenure rather than merit and achievement. In 1976, the situation had not improved very much. In his report to the Ford Foundation, Geithner, wrote that the reason for IIPA’s contribution to research on public policy and to administrative improvement through training and consulting being disappointing was due to ineffective management. “The director’s post,” Geithner contends, “usually has been filled by senior or retired civil servants rather than by younger individuals with strong academic backgrounds. This problem, in turn, has inhibited the development of a strong staff and a working environment conducive to quality output. The chances of IIPA revitalizing itself are not great without major changes in structure, staff and style.”

In 1973, an internal report of the Institute, concluded, “I.I.P.A.’s environment has perforce to be academic in nature. It must also be in a position to provide, in its own set-up, a model of administration and be able to use its own research findings
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for its growth. It must stay clear of being a prototype of that administrative model which it claims to be wasteful; or less effective than necessary. I.I.P.A.’s administration and faculty must show a spirit of experimentation and pioneering. It must inspire among its members a spirit of freedom and desire to learn from experimentation in order to develop models of administration in its field of work.”643

In 1976, Ford’s consultant wrote, “Foundation support helped to encourage more attention to training methods and techniques but was insufficient to make any significant impact on the quantity or quality of the training provided.”644 The reason, as this consultant noted, for the failure for the IIPA to perform successfully in the field of training and research was “the failure to give these and similar institutions sufficient distance from the system they were designed to help change, and the failure to help them broaden their intellectual ties beyond traditional public administration.”645

In conclusion the IIPA was not able to make the shift expected of it by the Ford Foundation. It could not resolve, seamlessly, two different expectations. Despite much effort by the Foundation, the IIPA remained a professional society for academic Public Administration. Geithner, writing in 1976, assessed the situation as forth: “IIPA has been unable to resolve the different and partially conflicting demands of research and training with those of a professional society. IIPA’s structure and system of governance have encouraged continuing conflict – conflict between the Indian Administrative Service

644 Geithner, p 29
645 Geithner, p 31.
(IAS) and the other Central Services, between the membership of the society and the Institute’s academic staff, between the governing council and the Institute’s director.\footnote{Geithner, p 29}
Chapter 8

Conclusion

Two momentous events occurred around the same time in world history. The Second World War ended in 1945 and India gained independence from almost two centuries of British rule 1947. Two other events, equally significant, started around the same time too. The Cold War began and India started its long experiment of democratic socio-economic development through Soviet-style Five Year Plans. However, India had to achieve this using the colonial era bureaucracy, continued into the post-independence period due to constraints set by the crises during independence and partition. For its part, the United States got involved in a Cold War with Soviet Russia, which entailed reducing, or eliminating each other’s influence in countries around the world, especially the newly independent Afro-Asian nations. At the same time many Non-Governmental transnational organizations like the American Foundations also propagated their own effort to promote democracy and thwart communism by removing socio-economic causes of instability in emerging nations. They recognized the need of countries like India for capital, technology and expertise in trying to develop themselves while maintaining pluralistic democracies. In 1952, the Ford Foundation officials visited India and started a long relationship with the Indian government, helping them execute their Five Year plans.

Administrative weakness of India’s inherited bureaucracy - a problem well understood by Prime Minister Nehru- was the biggest obstacle to the implementation of planned projects. He approached the Ford Foundation to request
the services of Paul Appleby, the Dean of the Maxwell School of Public Affairs at Syracuse University, to study India’s administrative system and recommend ways to improve it so that it can be an effective tool for India’s development program. After a comprehensive survey, Appleby made two recommendations. First, he suggested setting up an Organization and Methods unit in different ministries and second, the creation of the Indian Institute of Public Administration. His intention with both these proposals was to develop an institutional approach to administrative reforms. In the case of the setting up of the Institute, Appleby wanted administrative reforms to be studied and incremental. He believed that deeper links and relationship between the professional Institute and the country’s civil service would lead to long term changes in the culture and functioning of the bureaucracy. However, in time, with administrative problems worsening in India, strained relationship with the United States due to geo-political consequences of the Cold War and non-realization of planned objectives, the Ford Foundation pushed the Indian Institute of Public Administration to become more activist in bringing about changes in the administrative system of India. Due to the pressure of shifting expectations from the Ford Foundation and the Institute’s own more pedagogical leanings, it never developed into either a premier research organization or spearheaded administrative reforms in India. It did, however, continue as a professional society for academic Public Administration.

Today, the Indian Institute for Public Administration is known in official and academic circles for having a well-stocked library and being the publisher of an academically respected journal. Its faculty runs a mid-career, skills development
course for mid-level officers from different departments in the Central and State governments. However, it does not play any role in questions and issues of administrative development or reforms. This brings up the important topic of creating and running different programs and institutions across cultural divides and national boundaries and the impact of larger historical factors in determining whether they can be effective or not. It is also vital, in the course of such a study, to examine the relationship between the donor and beneficiary and how that can change over time, in addition to the role of individual consultants and their impact on programs.

In the interaction of the Ford Foundation, which was providing the technical and monetary help to the Government of India, with the leaders of the Indian Government and of the Indian Institute of Public Administration, an institution conceptualized and created by the Ford Foundation, it is easy to see the Foundation as the all important entity. However, the success of the Foundation’s change in emphasis of the Institute’s mission depended on the IIPA management’s acceptance of that goal too. It also depended upon the political leaders’ will and the importance of the United States in the geo-political equations of the cold war. In the very beginning the Ford Foundation and its consultants and experts were aware of this fact and immediately supported Appleby’s recommendation of creating the Institute because the Indian Government championed it. This was important because Appleby understood the limitations of administrative reforms in achieving sweeping changes and chose to recommend an institutional structure to influence small incremental reforms. The Indian political leadership’s decision to continue existing
structures of government prompted this action. As a result, all entities associated with the program accepted the study of academic Public Administration to help in influencing civil servants to effect reforms.

However, over time, the Foundation sensed the Indian public's general dissatisfaction with the functioning of the administration and felt that the IIPA must step into the area of overt administrative reforms, by changing their method of operation and emphasize aspects of their work that most stress change. In other words, they wanted to the IIPA to become more focused on studying problem areas in administration and lobbying for change. This resulted in several disagreements and misunderstandings between the leaders of the IIPA and the Ford Foundation officers. The Foundation used many methods of coercing the Institute to change course. This included periodical review of the Institute’s functions and discontinuing financial support of its activities. When the Foundation could not get the Institute to change course, they stopped funding the IIPA. Despite all this, in the long run, they could not get the IIPA to change course, gradually reducing its involvement in the Institute and moving on to fund the non-governmental sector.

**The Background of Administrative Reforms in India**

The most enduring colonial institution in modern India is the British bureaucracy. It started as a commercial enterprise under the East India Company. Its duties, until 1765, were limited to trading and maintaining accounts of various commercial transactions. In 1765, when the Company won the right to collect land revenue and maintain law and order in Bengal Bihar and Orissa from the Mughal Emperor, Shah Alam II, the Directors had to make changes in the structure and
functions of the administrative system existing at that time in India to combat widespread corruption. They started passing reform acts wherein they slowly and incrementally changed the method of recruiting, remunerating and increasing the powers and functions of the civil servants. Through these measures, they rationalized methods of recruitment by replacing patronage appointments with competitive exams. By doing so they aimed to change the character of the civil service by attracting college educated elites into the system. To unify the scattered settlements of the East India Company they centralized the administrative system under a central authority in Calcutta with complete top-down control. When the British Crown took over the administration of the country in 1857, they continued the old trend of passing acts to maintain the superiority of the Colonial bureaucracy, privileging English education and knowledge of western subjects, and the centralized control over all aspects of administration.

However, they now faced the problem of English educated middle class Indians wanting to serve in the civil services, especially in the storied Indian Civil Service (ICS). The Indianization of the civil services was very slowly achieved through carefully constructed reforms aimed at maintaining the elitism and the British character of the services. At this time administrative reforms were held out as prizes to appease moderate Indian politicians eager to increase Indian recruitment into the civil services against those who wanted complete freedom from the British. At the time of Indian independence, the Indian civil service was a respected, elite meritocracy, which was woven together through a centralized structure where officers working in the far off districts in India were directly
responsible to the central authorities. British lawmakers achieved this over many years through administrative reforms.

The moment of Indian independence was a very chaotic time for the political leadership of the country. The non-violence and restraint of the freedom fight had given way to bloody sectarian riots and mass murders; the country was divided into multitudes of regions and languages and many parts of the country were ruled by kings and princes who had entered into special alliances with the British and with independence had gained their own freedom to rule. The nationalist leaders of independent India had a Herculean task ahead of them. The nation (India) had to be not just created as a physically united entity but the spirit of nationalism achieved during the freedom movement had to be captured and fostered. Due to the multitude of religions, languages, and regions, which had their own nationalisms and identities, the leaders of independent India decided to create a new sense of nationalism located in the State that represented all individuals living in the country and the instrument of this nationalism was centralized development executed through the Five Year Plans. The Indian civil services were the most important aspect of this new nationalism. They were the instruments through which the Central government could not just maintain law and order in far-flung districts in the country, as they did during the violence of partition, but also implement planned programs. As a result, they were not just continued in their pre-independence form, they were also given constitutional protections. Nehru realized that they were a useful institution to continue but also understood that many reforms would be needed to retool this administration for the new phase. However, due to the
continuation of the structure and functions of the civil services, reforms would have to be limited in their scope and incremental in their approach.

**Ford Foundation and Appleby’s Entry into Administrative Reform in India**

The Ford Foundation, started out as a local organization in Detroit Michigan, in 1936, interested in serving its immediate neighborhood. In the late forties and early fifties, it got cash infusion from Henry and Edsel Ford and decided to expand its reach. This was around the same time that the Cold War was starting out and American organizations and policy makers started feeling the pressure of Communist expansion. In light of the increased resources, Ford asked Rowan Gaither to study the Foundation’s scope of activity. Gaither suggested that the Ford Foundation should concentrate its energy and resources on ‘advancing human welfare’. The Foundation, under Paul Hoffman, believed this was also the best way to combat the spread of communism. The strategy devised by the Ford Foundation was to harness the power of American modernity and expertise, honed during the Progressive era, and the insights gained by professionalization of academic disciplines to help indigenous governments to implement their own development plans. The Foundation was very conscious of ensuring that its aid in money and expertise did not appear to recipients as an Americanization of their development programs. They decided to support governments by funding their (recipient governments’) development plans so that they appear more legitimate to local populations. They also used the institutional approach to help nations, which would aid and buttress a slow stable change.
With this approach in mind, The Ford Foundation officials went to India to discuss, with Indian politicians, planners and policymakers, ways that it can help India develop itself. They quickly aligned with the Indian planners to aid agricultural programs. Apart from the technical help in the agricultural field, Prime Minister Nehru requested aid in sizing up the administrative structure of the Indian government and suggest ways to shape it so that it can implement development programs successfully. For this job he specifically requested the services of Paul Appleby, Dean of the Maxwell School at Syracuse University. The Ford Foundation brought in Paul Appleby to study the administrative readiness of the government. Appleby had a wide variety of experiences ranging from service in government to working for a mid-west newspaper and doing big-scale studies for government preparedness for foreign governments. He was perfectly suited for this assignment because he had a lot of practical experience, which he used to create his report.

Appleby's work in government was, perhaps, the most important experience he could draw on for the assignment in India. He was aware of the practical problems of executives and the limitations that legislative oversight places on their power to get things done. Appleby believed in big government and the importance of the central control to maintain uniformity in program implementation. He had deep faith in the power of institutions and their processes to solve problems. Appleby’s most important belief, and one most pertinent to his work in India, however, was his notion of ‘experts on tap not on top’. He believed that best outcomes occurred when the bureaucrats got input from experts but made their
own decisions since they were directly responsible through their chain of command to the people's representatives.

**Setting Up and Functioning of the IIPA**

Finally, the Appleby Report recommended the setting up of the Indian Institute of Public Administration as a means to acquaint bureaucrats and other senior civil service officers of academic insights gained through study and research of administrative problems. This approach would mean that members of administration would openly discuss their problems with academicians and would then be ready to use research insights in their daily work to improve administration overall. This was also a long-term institutional approach. Reforms would happen on a continuous basis through influence and expertise rather than one-time commissions whose recommendations could be ignored because the bureaucrats were not convinced of its usefulness. Appleby also aimed to professionalize the sphere of academic Public Administration but he believed the discipline had a lot to offer policymakers and government officers.

The IIPA came into existence on 29th March 1954. The Ford Foundation and Paul Appleby both intended the Institute to provide support and influence civil service officers through research and study. The Institute was expected to provide influence and support through emphasizing academic public administration, and effecting reform organically from within and not by being activist or aggressive in pushing for it. This meant creating an institutional space wherein administrators were comfortable being open and honest about their job related problems, in an atmosphere of academic curiosity. The research based on these problem areas done
by the IIPA faculty would be available for discussion and be incorporated in training material for government officers. The first decade of the IIPA’s existence was a model of cooperation between the Institute’s management and the Ford Foundation officers. Both sides approached the IIPA’s mission with full understanding of how the Institute was going to achieve reform.

However, during the second decade, a number of changes occurred in India. The government’s plans were very ambitious and targets could not be achieved. The bureaucracy was saddled with too much to do and invested with too much power. This gave rise to corruption and charges of incompetence. The centralized structure of administration, so useful in the early years of independence, was contributing to delays. In addition, Prime Minister Nehru, a strong supporter of the Institute’s mission, died in May 1964 leaving the IIPA with little political support. And the IIPA’s sole monopoly over reforms was challenged when the Government of India created a new Department of Administrative Reforms in 1964. Additionally, the Cold War intensified and the US and the Soviet Union became severely entrenched in their enmity. As a result many in India saw the Institute as a front for CIA activities in the country. All of this caused the Ford Foundation officers to assess the Institute’s mission and believed it was time to make changes.

The Foundation, through their interaction with the Institute’s faculty and management, had come to realize that there was too much emphasis on academic learning and not enough on applied research. Also, they felt that the IIPA was not doing enough to draw in the civil servants and create a stronger relationship. Many in the Foundation believed that principles of academic Public Administration as a
discipline was not important to research and reform. They also did not believe in generalist administrators, as Appleby did. They feared that research in Universities would upend IIPA’s efforts. The Institute, they believed, had to move quickly to lay claim to applied research and get out of pure academic study of Public Administration. To that effect, the Foundation used coercion to get the IIPA to end its Master’s Diploma in Public Administration and close its School of Public Administration. The Foundation also favored the civil service officers at the Institute than the Institute’s faculty, which caused a lot of consternation. Finally, unable to get the Institute to change its focus and functioning, the Foundation stopped its funding of the IIPA.

However, when the Indian Government announced the appointment of the Administrative Reforms Commission, the Foundation saw an opportunity to make the Institute do the research they preferred. Foundation leaders approached the Indian government and offered the IIPA’s services for all studies and research relevant to the commission. To that effect they resumed funding and made new and additional grants to the IIPA. The Institute did function well till they worked for the ARC but on completion of that job, they went back to their academic focus.

**Conclusion**

The ARC reports, while well written, professional, and contained many useful proposals of reforming the Indian bureaucracy, were relegated to the bookshelves. The bureaucrats objected to the proposed changes and a new government and novice Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi, decided to ignore the reports. The sphere of administrative reforms since then has remained the preserve of government
departments and is brandished by politicians making stump speeches to a public desirous of change and a semi-efficient administration. The difficulty in making changes to the Leviathan, which is the Indian bureaucracy, is summed up vividly by Arun Shourie, Minister of Administrative Reform from 1999 to 2002. He said administrative reform was like “hacking a path through the Amazon forest. By the time we have proceeded a hundred yards, the undergrowth takes over again.” However, it is important to remember and study the efforts made toward that seemingly intractable aim of reforming the Indian administration by the Ford Foundation and the early Indian leadership and learn the lessons from their effort to inform present day endeavors.
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