

The Higher Bureaucracy and Culture of Policy Making in South Asia: From Ancient to the First Decade of Pakistan

By

Khizar Jawad

Assistant Professor, Department of History/Pakistan Studies, Forman Christian College University, Lahore

Abstract

The word “bureaucracy” stems from the word “bureau”, used from the early 18th century in Western Europe not just to refer to a writing desk, but to an office, i.e., a workplace, where officials worked. The original French meaning of the word bureau was the baize used to cover desks. The term bureaucracy came into use shortly before the French Revolution of 1789 and from there rapidly spread to other countries. State is composed of many different institutions as like parliament, judiciary, army and bureaucracy which are interdependent and interrelated. Many social scientists consider bureaucracy as the public administrative system which aims to develop and regulate the decision-making process in the most effective way.

Key Words

1 INTRODUCTION

After independence Pakistan inherited the British-Indian bureaucratic structure. The Civil Services of Pakistan (CSP), like the Indian Civil Services (ICS), was autonomous. It was the lineal descendant of the ICS and shared the values and orientation of its predecessors. The method of training was the same, which made the CSP a tightly knit group of officers who were not answerable to anyone. Gradually they became more assertive, frequently gaining their steadily increasing power at the expense of the political elite. So, some erstwhile bureaucrats were able to occupy the political positions of the Governor General and the Prime Minister in the history of Pakistan. Before the military coup of 1958, Pakistan described as a bureaucratic polity as bureaucracy assumed greater significance in post-colonial societies, where given its necessary know-how and expertise, it was expected to play a major role in the task of nation building.

The present research is significant from both theoretical and practical standpoints. Theoretically, the study endeavors to contribute to the universality of the application of the concept of bureaucracy and administration in policy making and implementation. Since the notion of bureaucracy is perceived in the context of modern state, its application to study and reinterpret the bureaucratic and administrative history of South Asia and its relevance in the first decade in the history of Pakistan when as a bureaucratic polity, may hopefully enhance our understanding of the concept. Various studies on the administrative history of South Asia have viewed it only from political perspectives, reducing the role of

The Higher Bureaucracy and Culture ...

bureaucracy to specific areas. But there is hardly any comparative study on the higher bureaucracy and administration, covering the structural dynamics, culture of policy making/implementation as well its relevance in the embryonic stage of Pakistani culture of power. Therefore, practically or empirically, the study contributes to the bureaucratic literature of these eras by revisiting their history, using both primary and secondary sources. It seeks to locate the basic problems of higher bureaucracy and administration of those times. These problems are relevant and identical as the time marked out for the present study stretches from Indus Valley Civilization to 1958 in the history of Pakistan.

1.1. Structure of Administrative Machinery in Early India

As the early pre-history of India, South Asians are descendants of the who first migrants from Africa.¹ What were their socio-economic lifestyle, governance and urban civilization? In the absence of contemporary written records, the answers are still unclear although research in this era is much in progress with the help of archaeological methods. The Indus Valley Civilization was the culmination of a long and sustained cultural evolution that took place in the plains, valleys, and surrounding regions of a mighty river, The Indus in the north-west of Subcontinent. The natural phase of the Harappan civilization, especially the urban phase, lasted between about 2600 and 1900 BC. The mature numerous settlements have been identified in Sindh, Balochistan, Rajasthan, Indian Gujrat and the Cholistan desert in the Bahawalpur.

There were only two cities of outstanding size and presumably in some manner metropolitan: first Harappa in the Punjab and secondly Mohenjo-Daro in Sindh. They were something like three miles in circumference. But the capital city was Mohenjo-Daro, and many government offices were situated and functioned there. For example certain municipal organizations looked after the city even at night.² The economy of the Indus civilization, as of all Eastern civilizations was based on intensive farming in an environment that required large scale co-operation of bureaucracy in water reserve projects, considering the size of the population, the great granaries, a full scale irrigation and maintained livestock and farming.³ The Indus Valley Civilization was “probably a continental bureaucratic empire”.⁴ There was normal trend of the aristocratic or bureaucratic king and priest ridden society.⁵ Discovered square, and stamp seals lead us to assume that, the discovery of an Indus system of rank and title would have obvious implications for both political and social organization.⁶ The officials controlled the administration from single or dual capitals. The higher bureaucracy of that time was “presumably responsible for managing the agricultural cycle, maintaining order, collecting taxes and supervising large scale construction activities. The economic and social status of the bureaucracy corresponded to its power and privileges.”⁷

In the sixth century B.C. Aryans had well established and sufficiently well-developed political organization, headed by Rajan or king. Purohita, Senani, and Gramina were three chief officials or bureaucrats who assisted the king and ruled with the help of the higher bureaucracy.⁸ The two centuries later, Nanda dynasty established the kingdom of Magahda in the Indo-Gangetic plains. Nanda rulers were cruel and did not try to keep their subjects happy. In 322 BC the

Maurya Empire was founded by Chandragupta Maurya, who had overthrown the Nanda dynasty. He had the guidance and co-operation of his prime minister, Chanakya or Kautilya, the famous author of Arthshastra, ⁹ who was also disgraced by the last Nanda ruler. The Mauryan Empire was widespread as well as so well administered that till the death of Ashoka no invader had the courage to invade India. There are several sources which provide sufficient information about the unified administration of Mauryan dynasty. The most important and the most authentic account of that period is Kautilya's Arthshastra, which was written sometime between the 4th century BC and 150 AD. It is an ancient Indian treatise on economics and administration. It also offers an outline of the entire legal and bureaucratic framework for administering the kingdom. It was again due to the efforts of Kautilya that Maurya expanded his empire as well as maintained an excellent administrative system. He lived in a cottage from where he ran state administration. It is very important to note that whatever Kautilya set about every state institution in theory, all such was put into practice by Maurya. According to Kautilya, the king could not perform his responsibilities single handedly. So, it was necessary that he should have the active cooperation of the bureaucrats. He had the state council which consisted of the higher bureaucracy who had to keep themselves in contact with general masses. Sanabhartri was the chancellor of exchequer, who was responsible for the collection of revenues and keeping a check on weights and measures. Anantya and Adhyaksha were very important officials in the higher bureaucracy of the king. The higher bureaucracy was consisted of wise people and was appointed on merit to all high dignitaries. We can also say that "the ideocratic complex of the Kautilyan continental bureaucratic empire comprised the familiar combination of an official religious establishment and a bureaucratic intelligentsia," and was centralized absolute monarchy with divine right of kings.¹⁰

Another great ruler of Maurya dynasty was Ashoka who changed his religion from Hinduism to Buddhism. The edicts of Ashoka are a primary source of written record for the administration of that time. In administration, he followed the policy of his predecessors but now to him religion (ethics) and politics could be combined. Dharm Mahamantras were appointed for the administration as well as spreading dharma (religion). It was a Buddhist ideocratic higher bureaucracy with new goals and patterns, fulfilling the religious legacy of dynastic rule. After Ashoka's death, the Maurya Empire gradually declined because of the weak successors, a fiscal crisis and the financial burden of a costly bureaucracy. The last ruler of the Maurya dynasty was Brihadratha who died in a palace coup in around 185 BC and the subcontinent divided into Sanga, Satavahana and Saka dynasties. Each dynasty ruled with the help of the higher bureaucracy, following their predecessors. In the history of administration of India, Gupta period (320-475 A.D.) has a very important position. After a long time, the Guptas gave political unity to the country. Whole administration of the country was divided into several departments consisting of bureaucrats and headed by a minister with direct control of the king. The Gupta rulers continued the administration with traditional bureaucratic system but the whole bureaucratic machinery was run in a way that became very efficient. The vast empire was divided into the provinces headed by a Bhogpati who had power to appoint subordinate officers. The provinces were divided into Visayas or districts, headed by Visayapati who also officials had to assist him. The higher bureaucracy in the "empires of Ancient

The Higher Bureaucracy and Culture ...

India” always fulfilled the “ideocratic and arbitrary will” of the rulers because “the country was the personal state of him.”¹¹ If the ruler was able and good administrator, the higher bureaucracy performed well but whenever “a ruler failed to produce a competent heir, the state would fail and society would be left at the mercy of master-less, fragmenting, arbitrary, and remorselessly selfish, bureaucratic instruments.”¹²

1.2 Structure of Administrative Machinery under Delhi Sultanate

Five dynasties ruled during the era which is called the Sultanate period, but the structure of administrative machinery or the higher bureaucracy during these years, was relatively similar. The Sultans of Delhi also exercised in the ideocratic and arbitrary manners as like continental bureaucratic empires.¹³ They were ‘the shadows of God on the earth’. The Sultan was the head of the state and had pivotal role in administration. The most important post in the civil administration was the minister who had the responsibility of financial organization and administration. He was helped by secretary of minister was general assistant, the Musharif-i-Mumalik was the accountant general and Mustaufi-i-Mumalik was the auditor general of the state. The administration, established by the Sultans was a mixture of Persian, Turks, Islamic and native political ideas and institutions. In that period, Delhi was the most enlightened city of the East and the Muslim world. Thus the Sultanate came to possess expert bureaucracy, consisted Turks, Arabs, Persians, Afghans Central Asians and local nobility. In the province, the governor represented the Sultan and was the head of provincial administration. He administrative unit was the village with its headmen and accountant. Mostly, the local administration was left in the hands of local or indigenous officials.

Turkish rulers of the subcontinent were slaves and also started, recruiting the slaves to their own ranks. These slaves were the integral part of the higher bureaucracy of that era and played very important role. That system of recruiting had clear advantages for the higher bureaucracy. Everyone had to work hard for the promotion and succession the position on total merit.¹⁴ After the death of Ilttmash, forty nobles played very important role in the central authority. They maintained the balance of power among themselves. However Balban broke their power and restored the prestige of the central authority. In structure the Sultanate was a monarchy, partially elective, partially inherited; in reality it was a dictatorial bureaucracy which was totally dependent on the will of Sultan. The major segment of the higher bureaucracy “was not affected by changes of dynasty” but “only a small number of leading officials were affected”.¹⁵ After the defeat of the last Lodhi Sultan Ibrahim, Babur founded the great empire of the Mughals in 1526 A.D. The main cause of the defeat of Ibrahim Lodhi was his divided civil and military higher bureaucracy.

1.3 Structure of Administrative Machinery during the Mughal Period, 1526-1707 AD.

The first two great Mughals, Babur and Humayun took thirty-four years to establish a secure administrative system in the conquered territories of the Subcontinent. Akbar, Jahangir, Shahjahan, and Aurangzeb ruled such a vast area from Kabul to the Deccan, with organized bureaucracy. The Mughal Empire

organized a highly unified and systematized bureaucratic apparatus, known as *Mansabdari* System. The central idea of that system was the *mansabs* or numerical ranks from twenty to ten thousand grades. The *mansabs* defined the status and income of the holder in which he could be posted, appointed, transferred, remunerated, promoted or assigned in almost any branch of administration. The *Mansabdari* System, both civil and military was the steel frame of Mughal's government. In reality, this system was an imperial service which formed the backbone of the empire. Akbar the great (1556-1605) has the credit to introduce that system in the administrative history of India. He was also greatly benefited from the counsel of higher bureaucrats. He was of the view that a monarch could not undertake duties himself. In the Mughal administration the *Wakil* was the head of administrative machinery and was responsible to advise the king on recruitments, appointments, promotions, dismissals, transfers, remunerations and demotions.¹⁶ Between 1595 and 1678, Turks, Persians and Afghans were consisted on the sixty percent of the imperial higher bureaucracy as Rajputs were thirteen percent and Indian Muslims were thirteen percent.¹⁷

Theoretically, there was a dual hierarchy or a chain of officials who were responsible for supervising the collection of revenue as well as law enforcement. This bureaucratic intelligentsia also participated as the educationist elite. Aurangzeb used bureaucratic intelligentsia as religious ideocratic complex as well, but Akbar used them as liberal oriented bureaucracy. So, the policy of Aurangzeb in this context is considered failed policy which destabilized the Timurid Empire in Hindu majority India. Finally, the Mughals were very wise in choosing their bureaucrats and utilized their technical skills to the greatest advantage of the empire. We can say that the Timurid Empire can be defined only as bureaucratic empire.¹⁸ After the disintegration of Timurid Empire; the British "so admired by Enlightenment thinkers such as Voltaire and Montesquieu, took the administrative control of the subcontinent. Now the State of Laws and the continental bureaucratic empire" of the subcontinent "were set to confront each other".¹⁹ These Laws were different from the arbitrary rules of the kings in the continental bureaucratic empire of India. These were formulated commonly for all British bureaucratic machinery in the subcontinent. But here is important to note that the main features of the Mughal administration were also retained by British.²⁰ Next, we have to analyze the British higher bureaucracy in the regional context as well as in the presence of State Laws.

1.4 The Higher Bureaucracy of the Subcontinent: The British Administration in India, 1757-1947

The administration of British India can be divided into three broad periods. Firstly, the period which is from the advent of Britishers in India to 1773; secondly the period, which is from 1773 to 1857, when parliamentary supervision was introduced to the East India Company and third from 1858, when the administration of British India came directly under the British Crown.²¹

The Indian Civil Service originates from the East India Company which was a chartered trading corporation. After the weakening of central Mughal

The Higher Bureaucracy and Culture ...

administration, its character changed from trading Company to the ruling authority.²² After that transformation, the servants of the Company also changed from traders to administrators and were called Civil Servants. In 1773, the Company was on the verge of bankruptcy and Parliament found it necessary to pass a Regulation Act, creating a Governor-General, a Council of Five and a Supreme Court in Calcutta. In the new administration, Warren Hasting (1774-85) became the first governor-general. As a company civil servant, he spent much time in India. In administration, he followed the policy of arbitrary rulers of India and expanded the company's territories. "Hastings's own motto may as well have been "When in India, do as the Indians do." Hastings managed the civil service on the pattern of despotic rule than the higher bureaucracy was engaged in the politics of corruption. A "liberal aristocrat" and "product of the Enlightenment" Lord Cornwallis (1785-93) was the successor of Hastings.²³

Before him the key responsibilities of the civil service was the skeleton functions of a slowly emerging police state. At that time the civil services of the Company were the golden jobs because employers founded "Indian politics highly profitable in the receipts, bribes, prize money, and utilization of their employer's commercial rights for their own private trade."²⁴ He built a superstructure of a civil service in the modern sense. In 1790, he remodelled all branches of public service by European officers on a permanent basis. In 1793, he also followed a system of seniority in promotion and tradition was begun to appoint young blood, not more than twenty-three years or less than fifteen years of age. In the same year the charter of the Company was renewed and the principal civil offices were reserved for the member of the Covenanted Civil Service. The Covenanted Civil Servants were the predecessor of the Indian Civil Service (I. C. S.) The strict rules and regulations, in all appointments of all superior officers from the Covenanted Civil Service, originated a professional *spirit de corps*.²⁵ The two most significant developments for training of the future administrator of India, were the establishment of the Fort William College and Haileybury college in 1800 and 1806. In the start of 1829, India was managed in the hierarchy of administrative subunits for example provinces, divisions, districts and sub-districts. They were ruled by "a hierarchy of collector-magistrates with supervisory powers over the police (commissioners) and each district was small enough to be personally inspected by its commissioner".²⁶ In the British administrative system of India commissioner had very important portfolio. He "acted in the classical generalist tradition of other continental bureaucratic empires and" fulfilled all the British interests in India.²⁷

Thomas Babington Macaulay, during his career in India in 1834, greatly influenced the training of Civil Servants. His famous minute of February 2, 1835, placed important reliance on the gradual permeation of Indian culture by Western ideas.

"We must at present do our best [said Macaulay] to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indians in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect. To that class we may leave it to refine the vernacular dialects of the country, to enrich those dialects with terms of science borrowed from the Western

nomenclature, and to render them by degrees fit vehicles for conveying knowledge to the great mass of the population".²⁸

In 1853, the British Parliament revised the charter of the Company, and it was stressed that the recruitments of the posts of higher bureaucracy should be made on the basis of competitive examinations. These competitive examinations stressed academic knowledge in liberal arts as well as ended the system of patronage by the directors of Company. In 1857, the mutiny of the Sepoy was on full rise and the rule of the East India Company was come to an end. The British Crown took the direct administrative control of the subcontinent from the Company after Queen's declaration in November 1858. It led to the significant changes in the structure and the spirit of the higher bureaucracy of British India. It was re-organized and re-oriented to be an efficient instrument of a liberal colonial power slowly emerged as all strong bureaucracy.²⁹ Now, the Secretary of State for India was the overall incharge of the Indian administration, but the actual powers were in the hands of Governor General or Viceroy and the higher bureaucracy of India. After the uprising of 1857, the usage of extra power and authority, lack of adequate knowledge on the locals and their customs, widened the gulf between the higher bureaucracy and the masses of Subcontinent. All these circumstances provoked the demand of Indianization of the bureaucracy. Then in 1870, the government passed an Act authorizing the appointments of Indians in the higher bureaucracy also without any examination. From 1774 to 1947, the Members of the I. C. S. remained the important part of the executive council of the Viceroy and Governor General in the decision making process. The secretariat had its fundamental place and a system of hierarchy in the British administrative system. Different administrative issues in centre or provinces were co-ordinated by Secretaries and the place where their offices were situated called the Secretariat. Chief Secretary, Additional Chief Secretary, Joint secretary, Deputy Secretary and Under Secretary were key officials of that system and as administrators, had dominant position over the technical experts.

After 1870 to 1947, many Commissions, Acts, Reports and Resolutions were proposed for the reformation of the higher bureaucracy of India, which also gave more powers and participation to the Indians in it but initially the major part was consisted on the British. The British higher bureaucracy of India was different in many aspects from the earlier beaurucracies of the empire. After 1920, the competitive exams started in India which facilitated the Indianization of services. Here is an analytical view of the higher bureaucracy of British India. In which the most important positive aspects were to criticize the rulers, the secularism of the state and there was a bureaucratic intelligentsia but there was no official priesthood.³⁰ The system of accountability within its ranks was also the key factor of that administration. Whereas remaining aspects were the main shortcomings of the British higher bureaucracy of India. Exclusion of natives from all important posts deprived the country from experienced administrative machinery. British government did it to preserve its authority over the administration even in 1933, only one-third part of All-India Services was consisted on Indians. As a result, when subcontinent divided, there was lack of experienced administrative machinery and chaotic conditions were created both in India and Pakistan.

The Higher Bureaucracy and Culture ...

The higher bureaucracy was not legally accountable to the public but it was questionable to the Parliament at the end of the day, so it developed the habit to work independently. Any commission or resolution for the transfer of power to the public representatives was opposed by it. In the few years after Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms in 1919, 345 officers resigned from their jobs because they were not ready to lose unquestioned and unlimited powers and accepting a secondary position.³¹ Relations between the higher bureaucracy and native nationalist politicians remained strained from 1919 onward because politicians stood for the liberation of their country and bureaucracy was the caretaker of the British Imperial rule in India. Bureaucracy always opposed the reform which was proposed by the politicians. In the last phase of the British rule in India, representative assemblies did not get the full powers to rule because the higher bureaucracy was not in that favour and the power remained in its hands. It actively played an important role in policy formulation and implementation in the governance. Adoption of high-sounding titles like Sahib, Sahib Bahadur, Company Bahadur and Janab Sahib Bahadur showed the authoritarian climate of the officials towards the public. So, the human relations between the higher bureaucracy and the public were “in the state of serious sickness”.³² Same case was with the Indian-born bureaucrats who were Indians in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and intellect. During the most part of the British rule in India, the government was predominantly bureaucratic in nature. After the partition of subcontinent, India and Pakistan had option to change the British administrative legacy for new states.

1.5 The Higher Bureaucracy in Pakistan: The Pre-Ayub Era (1947-1958)

After independence Pakistani bureaucracy faced many administrative problems but all were dominated by the problem of refugees. It was not only the problem of feeding and settling them but immediate problem of law and order. Sir Francis Mudie, governor of the Punjab wrote a letter to Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah that he did not have not enough administrators in the province to tackle the situation. It was very difficult to deal the administrative problems with less resources and shattered economy. In start, there were no records, few other physical assets and very little executive talent transferred from India because the higher bureaucracy was predominantly British. At the time of partition, less than 100 out of 1,000 officers of the higher services were Muslims and mostly were inexperienced in which only four officers were on the rank of Secretary. Sharing the administrative burden fifty British officers were requested to remain in the service of Pakistan and at that time about 28 percent of the administrative talent in the higher bureaucracy was British officers. So, in the pre-Ayub era they played very important role, determining the form of bureaucratic system of country. The Civil Service Academy, established in 1948, continued the finest administrative traditions of the ICS. The Quaid did not aim “at reforming the bureaucratic system of the cadre organisation inherited from the British Raj.”³³ He wanted to continue the positive British legacy of “political, neutral, and independent bureaucracy.”³⁴ Though Jinnah did not reform the bureaucratic order of the colonial state, but he was well conscious about the mental make-up of bureaucracy during the colonial rule. Probably, he had no time to attend to this crucial problem systematically after the partition. But the colonial tradition cast its shadow on the post colonial era, and the ‘steel frame’ of colonial bureaucracy remained almost in work after

independence. It was the wish of Jinnah that politicians and bureaucracy should work in institutional behaviour. He knew the importance of bureaucracy, especially “in a country where regional values persisted.”³⁵ Addressing the civil officers at the Government House Peshawar on April 14, 1948, Quaid said:

Do your duty as servants to the people and the state, fearlessly and honestly. Service is the backbone of the state.....Try to create an atmosphere and work in such a spirit that everybody gets a fair deal, and justice is done to everybody.³⁶

2 DISCUSSION

Pakistan’s new service was named the Pakistan Administrative Service (PAS) and later in 1950 it was renamed the Civil Service of Pakistan (CSP). The Civil Service of Pakistan enjoyed greatest influence and prestige and as the lineal descendent of the I.C.S, it was an elite corps of executives, exercising many of the most important policy-making functions of government as in 1954, the total strength of the CSP officers was 519 and in 1957, 298 CSPs were holding the higher positions in central or local governments.³⁷ The policy of reserving key posts for a small group of highly trained generalist of CSP had its origin in ICS. The Establishment Division of the Cabinet Secretariat administratively controlled the CSP officers but in the policy making issues they are responsible to their superiors.³⁸ As the main focus of the subject, to address policy making and its execution by the higher bureaucracy of Pakistan, governmental and the administrative system of Pakistan was founded on the rule that policy-making in administration can be sharply differentiated and separated from the execution of policy. In the past administrative tradition, each governmental department would be divided into two sections. The administrative department which was charged with policy formulation was supposed to fall in the sphere of the generalists.³⁹ The executive department or attached department was supposed to belong to the technical specialists. As a result of that policy, the technical specialists were bound to remain under the control and discipline of the generalists. So, any possibility of the technical specialists finding their way up into the top administrative positions was ruled out once. In other words it means that the technical specialist was not considered qualified to become the administrative head of a government department.

The policy of prohibiting the appointment of technical specialists as the administrative heads of government departments had often invited violent criticism from the technocrats. They complained that they were given a secondary place in the processes of policymaking. In the theoretical framework of the democratic government, administration is the joint responsibility of politicians and bureaucrats. In the beginning the bureaucracy was resource in aid of the civilian authority but gradually the political scenario in the country came to be dominated by the higher bureaucracy. In addition to the initial difficulties confronted by the country, the political competition also facilitated the role transformation of the higher bureaucracy. The factional tussles, regional rivalries and personal antagonism among the politicians played a critical role in the bureaucratic interference in the political arena. Immediately after independence, the higher

The Higher Bureaucracy and Culture ...

bureaucracy filled important political offices, and came to occupy a dominant position in the decision making at the centre. The administrative structure was not in better situation, and there was lack of trained and experienced personnel in the country. Therefore, several political positions such as the federal cabinet came to be filled by the higher bureaucracy as bureaucracy was the only organized structure to cope with the difficulties. The higher bureaucracy started establishing its highly centralized rule in the country during the lifetime of Jinnah.

Assessing the circumstances the higher bureaucracy including Malik Ghulam Muhammad,⁴⁰ Chaudhary Muhammad Ali,⁴¹ and Iskandar Mirza⁴² at the centre and the provincial chief secretaries issued the orders and made policies in the name of Jinnah.⁴³ All decisions of political and policy making importance were made by few bureaucrats and bureaucrats turned politicians. Some dominating personalities, like Ghulam Mohammad and Iskandar Mirza, who held the key positions in the decision making process, belonged to the Indian Civil Services, Indian Army Services and Indian Police Services. They monopolized the whole administrative and political system because political leaders were faction-ridden and segmented. On the other hand bureaucrats were constituted and educated, trained, and cohesive group of society which enjoyed vast administrative powers before the partition. They were also completely alienated from the masses. Most of them received Western education and their medium of instruction was English but the majority of the nation could not understand the language of the administrators. In that context the bureaucracy tended to be despotic and a large section of the masses remained outside the orbit of the government's decision-making apparatus.

The features and attitudes of the pre-independence bureaucracy, the forerunners of Pakistan's bureaucratic system and the post-independence problems gave rise to the necessity of certain reforms to be brought about with a view to tailor the system according to the norms prevailing in the country and the intellect of the people. They always opposed any reform in the bureaucratic structure which could undermine their institutional interests. Several commissions were formed from time to time to review the streamline the system during 1947-58 i.e. Pay Commission in 1948, Improvement of Public Administration in 1953 and Federal Reorganization Committee in 1956. These reports were buried by the country's weak political leadership as well as powerful higher bureaucracy. It was not surprising that any change in the administrative structure which could snatch the policy making powers of the bureaucracy was not welcomed by the bureaucratic elites in Pakistan.

There were many imbalances in the higher bureaucracy of Pakistan on the regional representation. Un-representation of the East Bengalis in the bureaucracy was an example in that context. That imbalance had not only existed in Eastern and Western wings of the country but existed West Pakistan as well. Only 5% of the total number of the bureaucracy was from Sindh, from NWFP and Balochistan consisted only 7 %, as compared to the 35% Punjabis. Strengthening the politicization of the higher bureaucracy, some of the Punjabi bureaucratic-turned-politicians were also nominated as members of the central cabinet i.e. Chaudhary Muhammad Ali and Malik Ghulam Muhammad. For instance, the conflict between bureaucracy and politicians started, the former were representing the

Punjabis and the later were representing the provincial politicians, including Bengalis.⁴⁴

The interference of the bureaucracy in policymaking increased during the period of Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan dependent on bureaucracy, the cabinet meeting could not start unless Ch. M. Ali reached, the meetings delayed for hours almost. He was a migrant politician from UP and had no constituency in any area of Pakistan. His position was de-graded over his policy to announce cease-fire in Kashmir, which resulted on unrest in the army, known as Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case. In these circumstances he relied much on the higher bureaucracy to overcome his policy crises and to counter the provincial dissidence in undemocratic ways.⁴⁵ In his period there were two invitations from the USSR and the USA for the Prime Minister of newly born state and the invitation from USSR came first during his Iran visit. The higher bureaucracy hadn't ability to set the new demands of independence in the context of international relations. It was better to accept both invitations, but the higher bureaucracy of Pakistan arranged the visit of Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan to the United States of America but not to the USSR. The USA oriented foreign policy of the higher bureaucracy gave many setbacks to the country.

That dominancy of the higher bureaucracy in the initial years can be assessed from the fact that even the political positions of the Governor General and the Prime Minister were occupied by the ex-higher officials. On the death of Liaquat Ali Khan in 1951, Governor General Khwaja Nazimuddin became the Prime Minister, and a bureaucratic-turned-politician and member of central cabinet, Malik Ghulam Muhammad became Governor General. The secretary finance, Chaudhary Muhammad Ali, took the position of the finance minister. It was the peak era of the concrete policy-making powers in the hands of higher bureaucracy. Before it, he was appointed as the Secretary General of the Government of Pakistan from 1947 to 1951. In that era, he exercised considerable influence on the policy formulation and its implementation "finalized by him" and "his word acquired almost the force of law" where "no one in the Secretariat and cabinet dared to cross his path if he wished a plan or proposal to pass through".⁴⁶

The economic and social view of the higher bureaucracy is also very important in the context of policy makers. They generally represented the middle class. In the social hierarchy, those who belonged to the cadres were better paid and enjoy a higher public esteem form part of the upper middle class while those with lower pay scales represented the lower middle class. A vast majority of the higher bureaucracy were drawn from the group of people with an urban background. As compared to the general population, the educational attainment of the higher bureaucracy was very high. A characteristic of that education was that it was generally influenced by the values of Western Europe and North America. After discussing the important characteristics of the higher bureaucracy, here is a question that if the higher bureaucracy of Pakistan of that period following the British legacy? Many administrative scientists agree on this hypothesis that the administrative system of Pakistan after partition was the administrative legacy of the Great Britain. Britain controlled its colonial empire of the subcontinent by the steel frame of the British I.C.S and same tradition was continued by their *brown heirs* CSPs who further worsened and tightened it. There was no change in the

The Higher Bureaucracy and Culture ...

patterns, traditions and attitudes. Finally, that era was strong administrative but weak political traditions.

3 CONCLUSION

Role of the higher bureaucracy was prominent during the Ancient, medieval, Mughal and British India in policy making and policy implementation. The British not only maintained the previous Mansabdari system but also made the bureaucracy more powerful and authoritative to make the Indian Civil Services, the Steel Frame of Raaj. After the partition of India, British administrative legacy continued in the higher bureaucracy of Pakistan and because of sound structure it enjoyed the peaks of power during 1947 to 1958. Military as strong institution of the country came forward to curtail the bureaucracy in the leadership of Ayub Khan. Ayub declared the martial law on the country and overthrown the civilian dictatorship of Skindar Mirza.

Therefore, the role of higher bureaucracy and administration, its structural dynamics, culture of policy making/implementation are relevant and identical as the time marked out for the present study stretches from Indus Valley Civilization to 1958 in the history of Pakistan.

REFERENCES

Andrees, Beate. "Forced Labour and Trafficking in Europe." International Labour Organization, 2008.

Clift, Stephen, and Simon Carter. *Tourism and Sex: Culture, Commerce, and Coercion*. Pinter, 2000.

Cullen-DuPont, Kathryn. *Human Trafficking*. Foreword by Jessica Neuwirth and Taina Bien-Aimé. United States of America: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data, 2009.

DPKO. *Policy Paper, Human Trafficking and United Nations Peacekeeping*. March 2004.

**Human Rights or Wrong? The Struggle for a Rights-Based Response to Trafficking in Human Beings*. *Gender and Development* 10, no. 1 (2002): 14.

IOM (International Organization for Migration). *Data and Research on Human Trafficking: A Global Survey*. Special Issue of *International Migration*, vol. 43 (1/2), Geneva, 2005.

Jordan, Ann D. "Human Rights or Wrong? The Struggle for a Rights-Based Response to Trafficking in Human Beings." *Gender and Development* 10, no. 1 (2002): 14.

Kashif, Noon. "Human Smuggling and Trafficking in Pakistan." National Initiative against Organized Crime Pakistan, Policy Brief, 2017, 9-10.

Kumar, Chanchal. "Human Trafficking in the South Asian Region: SAARC's Response and Initiatives." *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* 1, no. 1 (2015): 14-31. Accessed <http://www.publicscienceframework.org/journal/jssh>.

Levitt, Michael. *Chai: A Global Fight: Supporting Efforts to Address Sex Trafficking in South Asia*. Report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development, 42nd Parliament, 1st Session, February 2018, 17-19.

Neuman, W. Lawrence. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Pearson Education Limited, 2014, 47-49.

Noon, Kashif. "Human Smuggling and Trafficking in Pakistan." National Initiative Against Organized Crime Pakistan, Policy Brief, 2017, 9-10.

Sahih Bukhari. "Volume 3, Sales and Trade, Book 34, Number 439." Dar ul Fikr, Beirut.

Sahih Bukhari. "Volume 4, Number 464." Dar ul Fikr, Beirut.

Sahih Bukhari. "Volume 8, Good Manners and Form (Al-Adab), Book 73, Number 26."

The Higher Bureaucracy and Culture ...

Sahih Muslim. "Volume 6, Virtues, Book 30, Number 5756."

Shelley, Louise. *Human Trafficking: A Global Perspective*. Cambridge University Press, 2010. Accessed www.cambridge.org, 13.

UNODC. *An Introduction to Human Trafficking: Vulnerability, Impact and Action*. Vienna, 2008, 80-81.

UNODC. *Recent Trends of Human Trafficking and Migrant Smuggling to and from Pakistan*. Report, July 2013.

UNICEF. *South Asia in Action: Preventing and Responding to Child Trafficking, Summary Report*. Advance Version, Florence, August 2008.

Vasileios, G. *Irregular or Illegal Migration in Greece*. International Centre for Migration Policy Development, Pakistan, 2018, 32.