
UNIT 02 RELATIONSHIP AMONG THE STATE, SOCIETY AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Structure

- 2.0 Learning Outcome
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Defining the Concepts
- 2.3 Public Administration and Society
- 2.4 Societal Culture and Public Administration
- 2.5 Society-Administration Relationship: Marxist Conceptualisation
- 2.6 Max Weber on Society-Administration Relationship
- 2.7 Riggsian Contribution to Society-Administration Relationship
- 2.8 Contemporary Developments
- 2.9 Conclusion
- 2.10 Key Concepts
- 2.11 References and Further Reading
- 2.12 Activities

2.0 LEARNING OUTCOME

After reading this Unit, you will be able to:

- Follow the close relationship that exists between society and public administration
- Understand the concept of 'society', 'State', and 'public administration'
- Discuss the interrelationships between these concepts
- Bring out the views of Marx, Weber and Riggs on society and administration; and
- Explain the recent developments in the relationship among the State, society and public administration.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The society as an association of human beings has historically evolved its own rules and regulations in the interest of maintenance of social order and avoidance of conflicts and disorder. In this sense, 'government' and 'society' are twins. Emergence of formal government as a regular and professional arm of the State took a long time in history. When, in the course of social evolution, State emerged as the sovereign public authority superseding and overseeing all other social formations (family, church, guilds etc.), formal government appeared as the State's enforcing agency. What is now known as 'bureaucracy' — usually a group of civil servants recruited on merit and serving under contract with stipulated conditions of service — is a late arrival in social history? The bureaucratic State came to regulate and even 'dominate' society. With the emergence of democracy later in history, social freedom and bureaucratic regulation grew up in an uneasy association with each other. There has always been an undercurrent of tension between the democratic impulses of a society and the rule imposing functioning of bureaucracy as a social regulator.

It is well known that 'government' is the action arm of the State. Government in action is public administration. Society affects and is affected by what the government does or

does not do. This Unit will focus on the basic notions of society, State, and administration. The purpose is to introduce you to the basic concepts of 'society', 'State', and 'public administration', and help you to understand their interrelationships - particularly the interrelationship between society and administration. As the interrelationship between the State and public administration has been discussed in the introductory Unit and as Unit 14 will also deal with it in detail, this Unit will focus more on the relationship between the society and administration.

As you study this Unit, you will get to know how, in course of social evolution, the society, State and public administration have evolved and struck relationships among themselves. Their interrelationships have been conceptualised by eminent social philosophers like Karl Marx, Max Weber and Fred Riggs, to name a few. You will be introduced to their signal contribution in this regard. Also, with changing notions of the State - society relationship in recent times, the role of public administration in social regulation is under review now. You will be able to understand this aspect on studying this Unit.

2.2 DEFINING THE CONCEPTS

Our starting point for discussion is the concept of society. We talk of Eskimo society, tribal society, Tamil society and so on and so forth. In all these expressions, society stands for a group of people tied together by some norms and rules spontaneously evolved, and living a more or less ordered collective life. As against voluntarism in social order, the State as an institution created in the process of social evolution is a monopolist of coercion, regulating all other social institutions through formal laws, rules and regulations. The main attributes of a State, as we have read in the previous Unit, are territory, population, government and sovereignty or the supreme authority superseding all other social forms and institutions.

Government is the action arm of the State, which is otherwise an abstraction. Legislation or rule-making, execution or enforcement of rules, and adjudication in cases of disputes and conflicts of interests are the three capital functions of the government. Legislation is the function of the legislature. Execution or enforcement of laws and rules is the job of the executive. Judiciary is the other specialised organ that resolves disputes and dispenses justice on the basis of laws framed by the Legislature. Public administration is usually associated with the executive organ of the government. Bureaucracy is a specially recruited and organised arm of government functioning as the centrepiece of public administration.

Hence, Public administration and bureaucracy are often used in equivalent terms. Government being the action arm of the State is visible and explicit in the functioning of Public Administration. Thus, taxation, traffic regulation, construction of roads and highways, maintenance of law and order, and defence against foreign aggression are some of the activities of government that are seen as visible signs of the State action. These activities are performed by the executive arm of government. Public administration subsumes all the three organs of government: the legislature, the executive and the judiciary. But, in day-to-day social living experience, it is the executive or the bureaucracy that appears to the people as 'government'.

2.3 PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND SOCIETY

Social change and progress create situations that impel collective action or government interventions through public administrative agencies. In political philosophy, the celebrated social contract theory, which we owe originally to three

great philosophers – Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau – imagined a pre-political ‘state of nature’ out of which the State and government as a common social regulating agency was born. Underlying this very influential theory is the belief that political structure and the legitimacy of agreement by individual human beings to surrender some or all of their private rights in order to secure the protection and security of an effective Social contract theory lies in the first intellectual effort – suggesting the man-made character of political institutions. Broadening (as also occasional shrinking) of the boundaries of the field of Public Administration has historically been contingent on the evolving nature of interaction between the State and society.

As Dwight Waldo has rightly observed: Public Administration is government’s central instrument for dealing with general social problems. In the western democracies, great expansions in governmental programmes in the last century can be traced to the emergence of new social problems such as urbanisation, social welfare considerations, social structural changes and so on. The problems of caring for the aged, for instance, had to be looked into by the government agencies, as their families had been less willing or able to look after them. Breakdown of family life, in many instances, has impelled adoption of new government programmes for single mothers, disturbed and delinquent youths and others affected by this change in the social structure.

Similarly in the developing countries, particularly those (like India) coming out of long colonial rule, the State had to intervene in many aspects of social life to bring about radical socio-economic development. Rural development (as most people live in rural areas), social development with emphasis on health, nutrition and education, industrial development and most ‘development’ activities had, at least initially, been the responsibility of the State (which means in reality ‘government’), resulting in considerable administrative expansion.

As society progresses, the processes of societal change throw up new themes and challenges that widen the scope of public administrative studies. Environment and ecology, for instance, is a major concern calling for action at both international and national levels. Pollution monitoring and anti-pollution measures, conservation programmes for our forests, river and water bodies, and bio-diversity generally are important items today for imaginative policy and administrative responses.

Another important theme is the ‘gender’ issue in public administration. Female participation in work force has been increasing over the years, calling for administrative changes in compensation and welfare policies and other related issues (e.g. sexual harassment at workplace). In the context of the developing countries, ‘engendering’ development by involving more and more women in development activities, has now been accepted as a general policy by the donor agencies and the respective country governments. Again, issues like prevention and abolition of child labour, untouchability, bonded labour, and other obnoxious social practices are increasingly claiming administrative action, especially in the developing countries, resulting in the widening of the scope of public administration in these countries.

2.4 SOCIETAL CULTURE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

B. Guy Peters (2001) has discussed at length several aspects of societal culture that affect administrative performance. First, the basic issue of general acceptability of ‘bureaucracy’ as a means of running large-scale organisation — be it public or private — has deep roots in societal culture. As Peters points out in this context, Reinhardt Bendix made a distinction between “entrepreneurial” and “bureaucratic” societies. Using Great Britain as representative of the former type, Bendix observed that the

management of British enterprise had traditionally been through entrepreneurial action: the style of management had been personal. The administration of public policy in Great Britain has been “Through personal bargaining and negotiation as much as through the bureaucratic imposition of authority”.

By contrast, Germany provides a good example of institutionalised bureaucratic style of administration. This is “A common stereotype of the culture of Germany: bureaucracy has been a dominant form of social organisation in the public and private sectors in Germany”. Guy Peters points out that contemporary societies appear to be developing a third type, which may be called the ‘participatory organisation’. “Rather than relying on the entrepreneurial actions of one or a few individuals, or the authority of rules and structures, a participatory organisation derives its energy from its members and their active involvement”. Participation serves the purpose of harnessing the power of informal patterns of relationships that exist within an organisation. Also, participation of citizens in local development activities brings about a convergence of governmental and societal efforts.

Interestingly, Peters has presented two contrasting societal cultures: (i) Rationalist or deductive culture, and (ii) Pragmatic or empirical culture. The former is typical of ‘developed’ countries (especially of Continental Europe), where the style of decision-making is ‘bureaucratic’ in the sense that “The decision about an individual case is made on the basis of deductive reasoning from a legal premise”.

Pragmatic culture, according to Peters, is characteristic of the United Kingdom and much of northern Europe. “In these cultures, generalities are derived from a series of individual decisions” which is best typified by English (and American) common law practice that has evolved over the centuries from individual case decisions. How culture impacts on administrative action, in the context of the developing countries will be discussed in more details later as we would be referring to the contribution of Fred Riggs to the study of administration in the developing countries.

2.5 SOCIETY- ADMINISTRATION RELATIONSHIP: MARXIST CONCEPTUALISATION

The society-administration relationship has been dealt with by most writers on public administration. But the contributions of Karl Marx, Max Weber, and Fred Riggs deserve special mention in this context. While trying, to develop a critique of the political economy of Capitalism in 19th century Europe, Marx had been a sensitive and keen observer of contemporary European public administrative organisations. His writings on 'administration' are scattered over numerous books, monographs, letters, and editorial comments.

Marx's ideas on bureaucracy and administration need to be situated within his ideas on sociology of politics. Scientific treatment of bureaucracy is generally attributed to Max Weber. But much before him, Marx wrote very incisively on the bureaucratic structure and behaviour, and the relationship of bureaucracy with the State and the society. In the evolution of Marx's own thoughts, the encounter with politico-administrative realities of his time provoked these writings on different administrative situations. Taking over as Chief Editor of *Die Rheinische Zeitung*, he wrote articles in the newspaper on free press and State censorship, and on the ‘law on thefts of wood’. Marx pointed out the repressive character of bureaucracy's censorship of the press and the contrast between the apparent role of the legislature as a framer of ‘universal laws’ and its real role of promoting particular social interests. Censorship, he commented, is a bureaucratic instrument for maintaining politics as a private and reserved domain of a particular class. Commenting on the legislative debate over ‘thefts of wood’, Marx

observed that the customary rights of poor peasants to take dead wood from the forests were sought to be criminalised to defend the property rights of private owners of the forests. The political system thus appeared clearly as an instrument of the private interest, as against universal interest.

It is in his critique of Hegel's "Philosophy of Right" that Marx (1843) came out openly questioning Hegel's basic political theory and the idolisation of the State. Conceiving bureaucracy as a bridge between the State and the civil society, Hegel regarded bureaucracy as the medium through which particular interests were translated into general interests. Controverting Hegel's assumption that bureaucracy has the insight and the will of the universal, Marx argued that bureaucracy does not know better, since hierarchical and functional differentiation leads to a mere combination and mutual reinforcement of incompetence. The superior does not know the specifics of the case, the subordinate does not know the general principles; and none can appreciate the totality of a situation: Bureaucracy as a whole has a corporate particular interest to defend against other specific corporations and classes in society. So, the external relations of bureaucracy are of a conflictual and 'private' nature. Within bureaucracy, the relations form an interplay of particular strategies. Information and other resources are manipulated to serve the private ambitions of individual careerists and competition for power among rival bureaucratic cliques. In sum, bureaucracy symbolises the particularisation or privatisation of the civil society. It is a bearer of private interests and a reinforcer of the private spirit.

Bureaucracy, as Marx saw it in the feudal-capitalist Prussian situation, is a form of society dominated by the State, and its tendency is to separate itself from the content. It assumes 'formalism' and as such presents itself as a superior 'consciousness' - as the will of the State. Thus, a particular interest lays claim to universality while the general interest is reduced to the status of a special interest. It embodies and furthers the illusion that the State is indispensable and rational. Examinations to recruit bureaucrats are a formality. These do not reflect an objective bond between the individual and the State; rather they stress the need for a dual knowledge -one required for life in civil society and one required for life in the State. "The examination is merely a baptism into bureaucratic knowledge."

In terms of competence, the bureaucrat cannot be a rational actor. The hierarchy of structure means a hierarchy of knowledge. Comprehensive knowledge is not possible in a situation where knowledge is deliberately split up. Reality is conceived in dual terms-one practical and one bureaucratic. The real beings are treated according to bureaucratic perceptions and the image the world of bureaucracy forms of them. "The bureaucracy reserves to itself the rationality condensed in the social world, sets up a monopoly over it, and the consequence is that rationality is changed into its opposite".

Marx's observations on the changing role of bureaucracy can be found eminently in his most brilliant political pamphlet - *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. During and after the French Revolution, the bureaucracy had facilitated the class rule of the bourgeoisie. It continued to be the instrument of the class under the Louis Philippe and the Parliamentary Republic. There was apparent independence of the State under the Second Bonaparte. But, as Marx pointed out, the State power is not suspended in mid-air. Bonaparte represented a class-the most numerous class of French smallholding peasantry. Referring to the huge executive body, in the then France, Marx called it an appalling, parasitic body which enmeshes the body of French society like a net and chokes all its pores. It sprang up in the days of the absolute monarchy, with the decay of the feudal system, which it helped to hasten. Again, when the State power rests on the large mass of smallholding peasants, the situation suits the flourishing of an all-powerful and innumerable bureaucracy, as an apparatus of uniform action from a supreme centre on all points of this uniform mass. Thus, in

Marx's analysis, bureaucracy is integrally connected with the society -particularly with the influential and powerful class whose interests the bureaucracy usually serves.

2.6 MAX WEBER ON SOCIETY- ADMINISTRATION RELATIONSHIP

Max Weber's ideas on 'bureaucracy' need to be placed in the larger framework of his writings on the economic and political structure of society. He traced the impact of religious views on the growth of capitalism and dwelt on the relationship between industrialisation and organisational structure. His thoughts on bureaucracy evolved out of the larger considerations of socio-historical forces that led to the growth of complex organisations. Thus, Weber's ideas on bureaucracy form an integral part of a macro view of history and social theory.

Weber went back into ancient history in order to find out the chief reasons for the rise of bureaucratic government in the modern State. He observed that the avocational system of Roman administration could be traced to Greek practices. There was no colonial officer in Rome despite the vast Roman Empire. Provincial governors were sent out on an annual tenure supported by a very limited staff. Julius Caesar's effort to create a permanent civil service ended in failure. In this respect, Augustus and Hadrian were, to some extent, successful. A full-blown bureaucracy had come into being by the reign of Diocletian. The fall of Rome was as much due to the burgeoning bureaucracy as to the creeping corruption of the ruling class.

The Roman bureaucracy held sway over the weak rulers and rode roughshod over civil liberties. They had compelled imposition of special taxes to oil the wheels of a vast administrative machine. Here, Weber found the clue he was searching for. Bureaucratic administration, he observed, could survive only when there would be a developed money economy capable of sustained economic growth. To quote Weber, "The development of the money economy, in so far as a pecuniary compensation of the officials is concerned, is a presupposition of bureaucracy." This was not the case with Rome and her provinces which were not far removed from a subsistence economy. So, the Romans could not afford a large bureaucratic structure.

A developing economy is able to produce a surplus of food and commodities, and this surplus forms the basis of payment of salaries to the members of the civil service. Increasing need for public revenue compels the State to develop a rational system of public finance. To quote Weber, "A stable system of taxation is the precondition for the permanent existence of bureaucratic administration." The developed post-subsistence economy may not automatically lead to the emergence of bureaucratic administration, as the rulers in the newly emerging States may still continue to use privilege as a matter of policy and distribute public services on the basis of personal whim and traditional status. The bourgeoisie wanted security of their newly acquired wealth and property. Stable economy could be guaranteed by stable administration. To the newly emerging middle class, bureaucratic administration with its emphasis on uniform and stable rules and regulations was therefore almost a godsent.

In Weber's view, a second prerequisite of bureaucratic growth was the demand of a larger middle class for the benefits of mass democracy, especially for social and economic equality. Bureaucratic development, as Weber observed, was closely associated with the negation of the practice of according special privileges. To quote Weber, "Bureaucracy inevitably accompanies modern mass democracy.... This results from the characteristic principle of bureaucracy: the abstract regularity of the execution of authority, which is a result of the demand for 'equality' before the law, and the principled rejection of doing business, 'from case to case'."

The development of money economy and the emergence of mass democracy prepared the ground for the rise and growth of bureaucratic administration. But these, in Weber's view, were not the cause of bureaucratic ascendancy in the modern State. The real causes could be traced to the human motivations springing from what Weber called the 'Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism'. According to Weber, the 'Protestant Ethic' was instrumental in bringing about a revolution in human existential condition. A radical transformation took place from an insular feudalism to a worldly asceticism. Protestantism engendered a social psychology supportive of rational planning, personal discipline, technology and bureaucratic organisation. Capitalism advanced on the principle of survival of the fittest in the market place. In the face of fierce economic competition, capitalist enterprises needed a highly efficient organisational form. The bureaucratic principles gave the enterprises the capacity to accomplish economic planning to maintain a stable market for goods and services. It was on the demand of the capitalist enterprises that corporate principles of administration were soon transferred to public agencies. Thus, bureaucratic government and bureaucratic capitalism went hand in hand.

It was Weber's contention that Capitalism and bureaucratic administration were bolstered up by the psychology of work generated by 16th century religious radicalism. Early Monasticism of the Catholic faith laid stress upon a Pope and priests to act as spiritual policemen and to forgive sins. By contrast, the anxiety of worrying about one's fate here on earth, Weber observed, caused the Puritans to work too hard, to devote themselves to a worldly asceticism and to pursue their worldly vocations religiously. The Reformation thus created a spiritual climate for the blossoming of bureaucracy.

Weber was interested in a full-blown discussion on bureaucracy as a sociological phenomenon. His thoughts need to be placed in the more general context of his theory of domination. Domination refers to a power relationship between the rulers and the ruled. In any kind of established authority, there exist a number of beliefs that legitimise the exercise of power in the eyes of the leaders and the led. The other important element in this approach is the notion of the administrative apparatus. Domination when exercised over a large number of people necessitates an administrative staff, which will execute demands and serve as a bridge between the ruler and the ruled. 'The beliefs about legitimation and the administrative apparatus constitute the two important criteria for the Weberian construction of typology of domination.' Weber identified three types of legitimation, each corresponding to a particular type of domination.

Charismatic: Charisma literally means gift of grace. By virtue of possession of charisma or an exceptional quality, a hero or a leader casts a spell over his followers, who accept his domination because of their faith in the person. In such type of domination, the administrative apparatus is very loose and unstable. It usually consists of the most faithful followers or disciples who play the role of the intermediary between the leader and the followers.

Traditional: The legitimation in this form comes from the belief in the goodness of the past, in the appropriateness of traditional ways of doing things. This kind of patrimonial authority receives ready obedience because of a peculiar faith in traditional status and personal loyalty to the dominant person. The administrative apparatus in this kind of domination would consist of the personal retainers, servants and relatives. Under feudal system, the feudal lords, interposed between the king and the people, constituted the administrative apparatus.

Legal: Legitimation of legal type of domination is based on the belief in the rightness of law. People obey the laws because they believe that these are enacted by a proper,

objective procedure. The typical administrative apparatus corresponding to this kind of domination is bureaucracy. The position of the bureaucrat, his relations with the ruler, the ruled and his colleagues are regulated by impersonal rules. These rules delineate in a rational way the hierarchy, the rights and duties of every position and the methods of recruitment, promotion and other conditions of service.

Thus, one notices two major thrusts in Weber's writings that have consequences for society-administration relationship. These are:

- a) An analysis of social conditions leading to the emergence of 'bureaucracy'; and
- b) A theory of domination (or social authority) that explains the gradual societal acceptance of bureaucratic authority.

2.7 RIGGSIAN CONTRIBUTION TO SOCIETY-ADMINISTRATION RELATIONSHIP

Fred Riggs, unlike Marx and Weber, is a relatively modern social scientist whose basic interest has been in the nature of administration in the 'developing societies'. Riggs is noted for his 'ecological study' of public administration, the basic assumption of which is that public administration operates in different social and environmental settings and adapts itself to environmental conditions in order to achieve a set of social goals. The 'ecological' approach to public administration, which we owe to Riggs, signifies vital interconnections between administrative system and the social system within which public administration is embedded.

Riggs used the concept of 'ecology' by way of analogy to emphasise the significant interactions between the administrative system and its 'environment'. In his view, administrative structure, behaviour and operations constitute an inseparable part of the entire society; their proper understanding is possible only within the context of the web of social relations with which public administration is always in a state of dynamic interaction. The 'content' is to be comprehended only within the 'context' of the social system. To understand administrative behaviour in transitional societies and to further the cause of comparative administrative studies, the Ecological Approach, in the opinion of Riggs, can be profitably used. As he advocated "A systematic effort be made to relate public administration to its environment, in much the same way that the science of ecology is concerned with the mutual relations between organisms and their environment."

Along a continuum between 'agraria and industria', Riggs postulates an inductive typology of administrative systems. A social system is a vast network of inter-related parts, each one of which can be understood in relation to other parts and to the whole system. Administrative structure and behaviour being an inseparable and interacting part of the whole society could be understood in the context of the social system in which it is embedded. Riggs suggested two ideal types of public administration systems in 'agraria and industria' and indicated that similar ideal types could be constructed at various transitional stages between 'agraria and industria'.

In terms of the Structural-functional approach, all societies perform an array of functions such as administrative functions, religious functions, economic functions and so on. Societies usually have a variety of structures that perform the different functions. Thus, the family performs certain social functions, the market performs the economic functions and the legislature and party perform political functions. In traditional societies, one encounters a few structures such as a family or a leader that would be performing a whole host of functions like rule making, rule adjudication,

economic allocation, and even medical and health administration. As society grows and develops, more and more specialised structures appear, each one of which becomes engaged in specific functions. So, differentiation of structures may be looked at as the essence of development.

Using an analogy, Riggs pictures the process of differentiation as sunlight passing through a thunderstorm and appearing as a rainbow. Most traditional societies are like sunlight in its natural condition. A few critical structures perform, in these societies, most of the societal functions. This mixed state of structures is like pure white light – ‘fused’, according to the science of optics. These structures in the traditional societies must be torn apart to make room for more and more specialised functions in the wake of modernisation. To extend the original analogy, the thunderstorm acts as a prism to change the pure white light into a multi-coloured rainbow.

As Riggs puts it, “Traditional agricultural and folk societies (Agraria) approximate the fused model, and modern industrial societies (Industria) approach the refracted model. The former is 'functionally diffuse', the latter 'functionally specific'. Intermediate between these polar extremes is the prismatic model, so-called because of the prism through which fused light passes to become refracted.” The transitional society is continually in the throes of change. As it moves along, it differentiates in terms of specific structures. This also necessitates integrating mechanisms to hold the parts together. Integration becomes very important as the developing society contains within it both old and new structures. Thus, nuclear medicine and the tribal medicine man will be found to exist together in such societies.

Riggs has been primarily interested in social change and in understanding the process of transition which he has termed the prismatic society when structural differentiation goes on alongside efforts toward societal integration. The prismatic society is trapped like light inside a prism. It is not fully fused, nor is it fully diffracted. The new structures are half born and are trying to adjust with the old ones. Modernity and tradition co-exist in an uneasy companionship. Modern structures and procedures might have been formally introduced, but behind the facade of these new structures the old and traditional ways of doing things persist in reality. This discrepancy between formal structures and actual modalities has been called ‘formalism’ by Riggs. On the basis of his empirical research, Riggs has constructed two ideal polar types:

- a) **A refracted society** where every function has a corresponding structure that specialises in its performance; and
- b) **A fused society** in which a single structure performs all the functions.

Riggs conceptualised the ‘prismatic society’ as a midpoint or intermediate form of transitional society between the two ideal types, combining both fused and refracted features that are characterised by ‘heterogeneity’ (the simultaneous presence, side by side, of quite different kinds of systems, practices and viewpoints: ‘formalism’ (the extent to which discrepancy exists between the prescriptive and the descriptive, between the formal and effective power, between impressions and actual practices), and ‘overlapping’ (the extent to which what is described as administrative behaviour is actually determined by non- administrative criteria). The prismatic society has its appropriate administrative system. Riggs has borrowed the Spanish word “Sala” for it, which combines both the pure (fused) chamber and (refracted) office traits.

In the sala model, both administrative rationality and non-administrative considerations are recognised. To quote Riggs, the prismatic-sala model “Enables us to cope with many problems of transitional societies that slip through the net of established social sciences.... whereas it is possible, for example, to speak with some meaningfulness of 'public administration' as a separate institutional sphere and

academic discipline in the American setting, it becomes highly misleading to take such an approach in Iran, Indonesia and Malagasy." Riggs moved away a bit from his original views about the prismatic society in his later publication entitled *Prismatic Society Revisited* (1975). We need not, however, go into the reformulation exercise in this Unit. It is instructive to note that administration and society have been ably woven together in a theoretical framework by Fred Riggs, particularly in the context of the Third World transitional societies.

2.8 CONTEMPORARY DEVELOPMENTS

The relationship between administration and society has never remained static. Emergence of new social situations has always impacted on administration. For instance, the care of the aged (with longer longevity) passed on to local government agencies or NGOs. Similarly, any new administrative attempt to influence or change social behaviour has often evoked varied responses from the society. The recent debate in USA over the banning of marriage between homosexuals is a case in point in this context.

In recent times two major administrative paradigms have opened up anew the relationship between administration and society. One - the Neo-liberal vision -poses what is familiarly known as the State vs. market debate. There has been a realisation of late in the developed West that formal government has over the years taken upon itself more administrative burden than it can actually shoulder. This has resulted in big bureaucracy, more taxation, and overall governmental inefficiency. To get out of this 'governmental overload', the advocacy has been for lean and more performance-oriented government through 'down-sizing' and 'privatisation' of many of the government functions. The market is capable of working more flexibly and cost-effectively; hence, government should reorient itself as an 'enabler' rather than a 'doer'. The New Public Management philosophy that has emerged in recent times favours more market-driven development than State or government-driven development. This is expected to release more social energy and allow for autonomous societal action.

The other paradigm that has gained currency is 'governance'. The totality of a country's ability to grapple with and solve collective problems is subsumed in the concept of governance. It is an amalgam of formal government, the private sector, and the non-government agencies. In this way, the ambit of public administration is sought to be enlarged. All the traditions and institutions of authority exercised in a society are thus put together to connote the total governing resource that is available to cope with the complex problems of collective problem solving. Also the 'governance' concept, besides extending the boundaries of administration, brings in additional dimensions of 'accountability', 'openness', 'transparency', 'participation', and the notion of ethical administration. What is significant in this characterisation of administration as 'governance' is the newly emerging administration-society relationship under which formal administration is called upon to forge networked functioning to optimise administrative effectiveness. Accountability to people, participative administration, right to information, and transparency and openness are the constituent elements of 'good governance'. The trend now is thus to democratise administration and make it more and more society citizen-friendly.

Another new development in this context that deserves special mention is a major on-going effort to create conditions to bring about a more 'inclusive' public administration, as against an 'exclusive' one. What it means is that there is a fairly widespread concern now to make government more 'decentrlaised', 'participative',

‘gender-sensitive’ and ‘sensitive to the needs of the socially marginalised’. In other words, the traditional insularity of State apparatuses (e.g bureaucracy) from the society is now under question and the trend seems toward closer State-society nexus in the interest of more effective and real democracy deeply embedded in society and faithfully serving its just causes.

2.9 CONCLUSION

This Unit has tried to bring out the basic concepts of State, society, and public administration, and their inter-relationships. The interconnections between society and public administration, particularly between societal culture and have been discussed. The three most important conceptualisations of society-administration relationships by Karl Marx, Max Weber, and Fred Riggs have also been clearly brought out. The Unit has even discussed the recent developments in public administration, particularly the emergence of the two paradigms of ‘New Public Management’ and ‘Governance’-the two broad-gauge ideas that have exerted considerable influence on the scope and contents of Public Administration in recent times. The other point covered in this Unit has been the growing trend in recent times to forge a much closer relationship between State and society in larger public interest and for the enrichment of democracy.

2.10 KEY CONCEPTS

Agraria and Industria Typology

Riggs constructed two models of societies and called the predominantly industrial ‘industria’ and the other predominantly agricultural one called the ‘agraria’ representing contemporary America and Imperial China respectively. The intermediary category between ‘agraria’ and ‘industria’ was called ‘transitia’ or the transitory stage between ‘agraria’ and ‘industria’. Some characteristics of ‘agraria’ are dominance of ascriptive, particularistic and diffused patterns and norms while ‘industria’ has predominantly universalistic, specific and achievement norms. The transitional societies show a mix of ‘industria’ and ‘agraria’ norms.

Reign of Diocletian

Diocletian was a Roman Emperor and persecutor of the Church. As per the Catholic Encyclopedia, the reign of Diocletian (284-305 AD) marked an era both in the military and political history of the Roman Empire. Diocletian undermined the authority of Senate and introduced the servile ceremonial of the Persian Court. Diocletian’s name is associated with the last and most terrible of all the ten persecutions of the early Church, but major portion of his reign was marked by peace and prosperity.

Sala Model

Riggs uses the term ‘Sala’ to describe the administrative office in the prismatic society. In the Sala Office, rationality is ignored and many non-administrative considerations are given importance.

2.11 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

Peters, B. Guy, 1996, *The Politics of Bureaucracy*, Routledge, London

Bhattacharya, Mohit, 2001, (2nd Edition), *New Horizons of Public Administration*, Jawahar, New Delhi.

Waldo, Dwight, 1968, "Scope of the Theory of Public Administration" in Charlesthworth (Ed.), *Theory and Practice of Public Administration*, Philadelphia.

Waldo, Dwight, 1978, "Organsiation Theory: Revisiting the Elephant", *Public Administration Review*, November-December.

Waldo, Dwight, 1984(2nd Edition), *The Administrative State*, Homes and Meir, New York.

2.12 ACTIVITIES

1. Visit any nearby government office and try to pen down your observations on the interpersonal behaviour of its employees in the office as well as and the citizens who come in contact with the employees.
2. Based on Activity One, try to place the inter-relationship that you have observed under the Weberian or Riggsian categories / typology.