
Generalists vs. Specialists in Indian Administration: *Need for Administrative Reforms*

Dr. Md.Reyaz Ahmad

*Research Associate, CSSEIP Co-cordinator, Department of Public Administration
Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow*

ABSTRACT

The generalists and specialists are two broad functional categories in the Government. They play a very important role in rendering advice to the political executives, policy making and in implementation of policies. The contemporary administration has become more specialized and technical and hence requires different types of personnel with necessary skills, knowledge and qualities to discharge its functions. The controversy between these two groups of functionaries, is however age old and still one of the fiery fought out issues of Public Administration.

There is urgent need for reforms and overhauling of the bureaucratic system in India. A number of ways have been discussed to bring about changes with regard to each and every problems existing in the system. This paper deals with a peculiar problem of Indian administration, which is inherently a systemic problem, which also has a psychological inclination to it and more over reforms on this particular issue could be a basis for all other changes, which are to be undertaken as a part of wider exercise of administrative Reforms. The issue is between the Indian Administrative Service and other Services. In other words the issue is between 'the Generalist' and 'the Specialist' within the administrative system in India.

Keywords: *'The Generalist', 'the Specialist', administrative Reforms, political executives, policy making and implementation of policies.*

INTRODUCTION:

The generalists and specialists are two broad functional categories in the Government. They play a very important role in rendering advice to the political executives, with regards to policy making and in implementation of policies. The contemporary administration has become more specialized and technical and hence requires different types of personnel with necessary skills, knowledge and qualities to discharge its functions. The controversy between these two groups of functionaries is however age old and still one of the fiery fought out issues of Public Administration. As early as in 1958, James Fesler recorded the revival of the controversy in England. After a decade, in the year of 1968, the Fulton Report on Civil Services opened the issue afresh and provoked debate.¹ Today the generalist-specialist controversy has posed a serious problem in Indian Administration. It has emerged as the knottiest internal problem facing the country's civil service today, as is evident from the dangerously mounting frequency and intensity of agitations on the part of various groups of

specialists, especially engineers and doctors.ⁱⁱ The thorny issue in the controversy is whether in a democratic set up, the policy formulation should be done by the generalist-administrator or the specialist, or alternatively would it not be better if the political executive be advised by the two parallel hierarchies- one of the specialists to guide it on technical points, and the other the generalist administrators, to acquaint it with the public reaction to whatever policy that is under consideration?

There is urgent need for reforms and overhauling of the bureaucratic system in India. A number of ways have been discussed to bring about changes with regard to each and every problems existing in the system.

THE STATEMENT OF PROBLEM:

This paper deals with a peculiar problem of Indian administration, which is inherently a systemic problem, which also has a psychological inclination to it and more over reforms on this particular issue could be a basis for all other changes, which are to be undertaken as a part of wider exercise of administrative Reforms. The issue is between the Indian Administrative Service and other Services. In other words the issue is between 'the Generalist' and 'the Specialist' within the administrative system in India. Which need to be reforms? Due to the process of globalisation and its impact on the higher civil services, their merits and demerits gained prominence roles in the process of Governance, Hence, what could be the need and necessities of administrative reforms in the present scenario, to make Indian civil services more accountable, people- friendly and an efficient system to fulfill people aspirations and achieve the national goals in a democratic manner?

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY:

To understand and analyse the various aspects of the Generalist and Specialist, What are arguments for their respective roles in Indian administration?

To discuss and evaluate the various recommendations made by different committee/commission to overcome, from this conflicting situations.

To outline brief suggestive methods/solutions in present administrative context.

METHODOLOGY:

The study would be based on secondary sources that are various journals, books, articles and other source of secondary sources.

ANALYSIS OF THE STUDY:

Indian administration of today, by and large is the gift of the British. As imperial power the British felt the need to have some system or a group of people that would help them in the administration of such a vast country. They also wanted to overcome the language & cultural barriers. Therefore, they first started with an educational system based on Lord Macauley's

Report. This education provided knowledge about European History, Society, Polity, Christian Morality, western ideals and English language, which were presented as of highest quality and Indian history, society, religion, values and traditions were looked down upon as inferior. This way the British produced men who were Indian by birth, but British in outlook or in thinking. These men came handy for the British to work in their offices as clerks. They understood the language & heart of their Masters, they could also interact with the native people and understand their demands and ultimately obey their Master's orders faithfully. Later the burden of administration increased and the British felt the need to recruit top-ranking officials also from amongst Indians. There was also growing demand from the freedom fighters for greater representations for the Indians in Legislature as well as in administration. So, the British allowed Indians to appear for the British Civil Services examination. Later, the same was modified and introduced as Indian Civil Service exclusively for the Indians. Its features were: specific educational qualifications, competitive examination and personal interview for entry, training before posting, strict adherence to service rules & code of conduct, security of service & time-bound promotions, wide policy-making powers and immunities & amenities.

UNDERSTANDING THE “GENERALIST” AND THE “SPECIALIST”

What we understand with the terms 'generalist' and 'specialist'? According to L.D. White, "General administration is understood to mean those duties which are concerned with the formulation of policy; with the co-ordination and improvement of Government machinery and with the general management and control of the departments".ⁱⁱⁱ Thus the generalist administrator is concerned with all types of administrative process, indicated by the word POSDCORB i.e. Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting and Budgeting. In a Purely negative sense he is a person, who is not an expert or scientist. That is why he is often referred to somewhat disdainfully as amateur or "all-rounder" Presthus defines, " The generalist means an amateur administrator who has been educated in linguistics, poise and leadership, good intuitive judgment, right feelings and a broad background rather than in narrowly specialized knowledge and skill."^{iv} But in a positive sense, this notion of a generalist is applicable to an administrator who is called a professional or career administrator, if administration is to be regarded as field and a profession, as that of teaching, law engineering or medicine. In his professional capacity a generalist possesses, the skill and technique of a manager. As a manager, he is entrusted with the responsibility of getting things done.

The Second Hoover Commission of the USA identifies generalist as Senior civil Service or a rank-in-man-corps' of highly experienced administrative specialist or career executives who are available for flexible assignments capable of furnishing essential administrative advice and necessary policy support. Thus, the members of executive and administrative class, who make policies, co-ordinate, supervise and control the administration are known as 'generalists'.

The administrative functions, in general consists of two different aspects i.e. policy making and policy execution. Administration is very largely confined to these two activities. (i)the analysis and co-ordination of ideas and proposals, the relations of these to political and economic conditions; (ii)and the expression of proposals and decisions in a form in which

they can be assimilated and carried out by the government machine. The administrator has, thus, to assess and bring together a large number of different factors in governmental decisions- technical, financial, organizational and perhaps above all, political and then to balance them with the interests of affected groups. He has to reconcile conflicting interest and evolve a policy which would subserve common good, even by sacrificing, if necessary, technical experience. Thus, the simplest case for the generalist is that the administrative function does not depend on any single form of technical expertise and that the specialist, therefore, has no particular qualifications for this sort of work. A seasoned generalist, by virtue of his experience, is, therefore, not a 'generalist' or 'amateur' but as R.C.S. Sarkar observed, 'professional administrator as fully as any of the other services'.^v

A specialist is one who has special knowledge in some particular field. Specialist in Government are those who are recruited to posts for which professional, Scientific, Technical or other qualifications are essential and includes engineers, doctors, lawyers, Economics, Statistician, and other technical people. To qualify as specialist the basic requirement should be an 'institutional' specialty, 'that is to say, one must have pre-employment spell of either techno-professional academic education and/or pre entry vocational or occupational training.

DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN GENERALIST AND SPECIALISTS

Distinctions can be drawn between generalists and specialists.^{vi} The general are recruited from candidates with liberal educational background, while the specialists would have received vocational and technical education. The candidates for the generalist positions are subjected to a long written examination followed by a personality test, the selection of specialists is generally on the basis of their performance in the interviews. While immediately after recruitment, the specialists are put on the job, the generalists are to undergo long term probationary training. The specialists generally spent their entire career in their parent departments entailing the employment of their skill or knowledge. On the other hand the generalists are called 'all-rounders' and the concept of parent department is almost alien to them. The generalists often move from one department to the other and at times to a public enterprise or even a semi-government institution. The specialist has to submit to the finality of decisions taken by the generalists on issues that have an important bearing on his field of specialization. Not only is the specialist placed in an inferior position as regards decision making, but also in matters of status, emoluments and prestige. The specialists as a group are not on par with the generalists. In such a situation, the very fact that a man is specialist relegates him permanently to a position of subordination to the generalist whose distinctive quality is not more intelligence or more experience but, in fact, a greater ignorance about the subject he is dealing with than the specialists in that subject.^{vii}

Role of Specialists in Administration: Arguments in Favour

1. A developing country like India requires scientific and not an administrative outlook; the specialists consider IAS generalists to be pen-pushers bound by rules and lacking in scientific temper which planned development needs; they also claim that they have to abide by the decisions of the generalists even on matters in which they possess superior knowledge, their demand, therefore, is that they should be 'at the top' and not long 'on tap'.

2. Specialist inputs are required in tackling the complex and technical problems of modern administration which have become quite technical. Also the various areas in administration call for varied skills, expertise and experience. 'Planning' and 'development' in a scientific world demand that policy making be entrusted to experts.
3. Ministration in future is going to be characterized by new developments in the fields of science and technology, social and behavioural sciences, decision-making, human relations in administration etc. Each of these areas required professionalistic intervention.
4. New type of assignment to a civil servant demands competence, not obtainable over night, academic requisites and specialized training may impart it. Every sphere of administration - economic, social, industrial, agricultural - has its own body of academic requirements plus technical skill. Therefore, provision for formal knowledge followed by intensive training relating to particular area of administration for a considerable period of time is essential for acquiring such knowledge i.e. professionalism. Emphasizing this the ARC observed, "the contemporary need is for the purposive development of professionalism....".
5. It is argued that the generalists are unable to assist the ministers properly. Mr. C. Subramaniam, the former Union Finance Minister observes, "Civil servants were unable to assist the minister properly on the question of taking decisions because they themselves did not know the subject". In a department the political head, i.e.. The Minister is not supposed to be an expert. He is assisted by a civil servant who tenders advice in policy formulation and administration. But if the head of a technical department also is not an expert, then we are likely to fail in coming to grips with the problems.

BhabaniSen Gupta critically observes, "The planning Commission has a battalion of 'advisors' with high academic degrees. Their actual role is to give consent to what the higher bureaucrats do rather than tender their own expert advice to the extent of risking the displeasure of the top bosses. L.K. Jha had made an effort in the early 1980s to induct specialists into the bureaucracy offering them higher salary and perks. It did not work; Academic specialists have not survived for long even in the Finance Ministry. India has score of outstanding internationally reputed economists. Their contribution to the government's economic and fiscal policies had been no more than marginal. On the other hand, the IAS top brass have been given the task of looking after economic policies, macro-management of fiscal issues, control and regulation of currency, banking and insurance, financial institutions, municipalities and corporations, Universities, public sector industries, electricity boards, huge government run-training corporations, scientific and technological research - almost the entire gamut of nation's life. The political leadership have given little thought to what this bureaucratic supremacy has cost the country. It has alienated many of the best and brightest products of higher institutions of learning. Some have alleged that as many as 70 per cent of graduates of the four prestigious Indian institutes of Technology have migrated to the west, particularly to the United States. So is the case with the best products of the schools of science and bio- technology'.^{viii}

Role of Generalists in Administration: Arguments in favour

The following arguments are advanced by the 'generalists' in support of their claim to man the top posts in administration:

1. The first and foremost of these arguments is the belief that the high caliber of the recruits to the IAS and the varied experience gained as a result of their postings to a diverse variety of jobs equip them with qualities needed for the performance of the senior management jobs.
2. The generalists are of the view that though technical soundness of a scheme or project can only be determined by the specialists, but mere technical soundness is not enough. It is argued that a scheme should not only be technically sound but has also to be examined from various other points of view, its financial and legal implications, administrative feasibility, political justifiability and whether it should be acceptable to Parliament and public. Very often other departments of the government and even outside organizations have to be consulted. The advisor must know the whole range of problems and should have the ability to look at them in their entirety and in their relationship with other inter-connected factors. R.C.S. Sarkar, a former Chairman of the UPSC, writes, "He must understand the interplay of political, economic and social factors and should have the ability to reconcile conflicting interests and bring together experts from different fields and evolve a policy which will subserve to the common good, even by sacrificing, if necessary technical excellence. The policy that finally emerges may be different from that as originally conceived."^{ix} It is argued that the adviser must have experience of organization, management, programme planning, field administration and of working within a framework of political, sociological and economic constraints. As Ridley puts it, "Thus the simplest case for the generalist is that the administrative function does not depend on any single form of technical expertise and that the specialist, therefore, has no particular qualification for this sort of work."^x
3. The Generalists argue that administration has become so complex that it requires a high degree of managerial skill including man-management and it has developed into a technique which can be learnt partly by training but largely by experience over the years. Administration today is as much a profession as law or medicine²⁴. Keeping in view the changing pattern of government functions, the founding fathers of the Constitution created an All India Service of professional administrators who, with proper training and experience, would acquire the necessary administrative expertise. They gain firsthand knowledge of the conditions in the field by serving at sub-divisional and district levels where they see interplay of political, economic and social forces and such experience is very useful for the development of qualities of co-ordination, human understanding and man-management. They do not acquire mastery over any subject but move from post to post which broadens their outlook and helps them in understanding the inter connection of government functions. R.C.S. Sarkar remarks, "It would be inappropriate to describe a seasons member of the IAS as a 'generalist' or 'amateur'. He is a specialist or professional in administration as fully as anyone of the other services'."^{xi}

4. The generalists also play a dominant role in problem solving sphere. Since most important techno-professional work in the governmental organizations has become inter disciplinary, one arbiter in the form of a generalist administrator is needed to articulate a rational, cost effective, most beneficial alternative solution. R.G.S. Brown (an ex generalist of the British Administrative Class turned academic) observes, "A more demanding role for the general administrator is that of a 'mediator': The task of the mediator is to link the specialist to the rest of the system by discovering what the limits are and trying to persuade him to work within them - The good mediator can talk several languages simultaneously and this is not a task in which the professional civil servant will easily feel at home".^{xii}
5. The generalists also argue that the effectiveness of a technical expert depends on his specialization in dept in a particular field and not on broad outlook. He know more and more of less and less. His outlook tends to be narrow and sectarian. He has an exaggerated notion of his own subject and is over-enthusiastic about his own particular subject and therefore lacks wider perspective. There should be somebody to see the totality of the situation. It is necessary not only to co-ordinate the activities of the different departments but also to integrate the activities of all of them. As to the suggestion of inducting specialists to Secretariat and make them an integral part of the decision making apparatus, Asoka Chanda observes, "But this alternative has its snags. If a specialist is placed in the Ministry controlling his department, the chances are that he will continue to more in the same narrow departmental groove and fail to rise above departmental prejudices".^{xiii} Even R.C.S. Sarkar remarks, "The very nature of work and training of a technical expert is a handicap for assuming policy making and administrative responsibilities". Sarkar submits by appointing an eminent surgeon as Health Secretary, the country will lose his services as a surgeon and he may not also turn out to be an able administrator.

CONCLUSIVE AND SUGGESTIVE REMARKS:

Today, in India a generalist, i.e.: an IAS officer is the head of every department of the government. He is the boss of many specialists working in those departments. For example; Director General of Police is from IPS, but his boss in the home ministry is an IAS. A Collector is IAS, who also performs magisterial duties of maintenance of Law & Order over and above the S.P or City Police Commissioner, who is from IPS. Similarly, the Director of Medical Education, Director of Technical Education, Director of Higher Education, Conservator of Forests, Director of Archives, etc. are all technical & specialist officers who are answerable to the generalist IAS Secretaries in their respective ministries. The technical departments like Mines, Coal, Steel, Labour, Communications, Electricity, Information & Broadcasting, Defence, Petroleum, etc. are headed by IAS officers, sidelining the specialists in those areas. The IAS bosses many times overrule the technical suggestions or advice of the specialists. Service rules also make discrimination between the Generalists and the Specialists. This creates ill feelings between these two categories. This creates psychological rifts and affects the working atmosphere.

The situation mentioned above is not conducive for the developing and welfare country like India. The elite, exclusionist, rule wielding, power-hungry, corrupt, non-accountable,

conservative, yes men and subservient image of Indian bureaucracy needs to be changed by undertaking certain drastic systemic reforms, particularly in the recruitment procedure. A possible scenario is presented below.

Need for Administrative Reforms:

It is high time in India that we do away with the generalist character of recruitment of bureaucracy. Instead we should adapt the French model. In France, the top bureaucrats are selected on the basis of their specialised knowledge of the subjects they would be called upon to handle. They are posted in departments as per their specialisation. They contribute constructively in that department on the basis of their knowledge and also in the process gain sufficient knowledge and experience in that department. When they become senior and gain enough experience and achieve mature & broad outlook to properly position his departmental work in the totality of governmental works, they are posted in the top policy-making positions or generalist posts. For that purpose, some generalist orientation training can also be arranged for him on the eve of their posting to policy-making levels. This way they contribute in other areas also. This has many advantages - specialists can handle complex and difficult situations efficiently, there is better crisis management, the jobs are performed swiftly, the approach is task-oriented & not rules-oriented, positive thinking is developed amongst the bureaucrats and finally this will remove all types of ill feelings and intra cadre rivalries.

Specialist bureaucrats can provide better policy choices and suggest expert alternatives to the ministers, who are in reality the generalist head of every ministry. They are elected representatives of the people and can take better decisions in the interest of the people. Well-known Management expert Peter Drucker has said, "... an organisation should enable everyone to understand the common task, the task of the entire organisation. Each member of the organisation, in order to relate his efforts to the common good, needs to understand how, his task fits in with the task of the whole and, in turn, what the task of the whole implies for his own task.^{xiv} That means a generalist is a specialist who can relate his specialised knowledge to all other areas of knowledge. In other words, a specialist who can see the relation of his area with other departments or issues is a generalist. He can supplement his knowledge to all other areas. So there has to be a combination of lay, elected, political, benevolent, generalist, minister head and a specialist, experienced, mature, well-trained crisis expert, neutral, bureaucrat-civil servants in Indian bureaucracy.

The Constitution Review Commission appointed in February, 2000 A.D. also addressed itself to the issue of Administrative Reforms and in its report submitted in March, 2002, has endorsed the same view expressed above. It says, "Above a certain level - say the Joint Secretary level - all posts should be open for recruitment from a wide variety of sources including the open market. We should *specialize some of the generalists and generalize some of the specialists through proper career management*, which has to be freed from day to day political manipulation and influence peddling."

The Commission also suggests that, "The administrative structure and systems have to be consciously redesigned to give appropriate recognition to the professional and technical services so that they may play their due role in modernizing our economy and society. The *specialist should not be required to play second fiddle to the generalist at the top. Conceptually we need to develop a collegiate style of administrative management*, where the

leader is an energizer and a facilitator, and not an oracle delivering verdicts from a high pedestal."

Following steps are necessary to switch over from the present system to the French Model:

1. The combined recruitment examination of the present should be replaced by separate examinations for each specialised category. Examination should test the specialised knowledge of the candidate in his subject, such as Medicine, Economics, Foreign Policy & Diplomacy, Agriculture, Finance, Planning, Engineering, etc. Along with the papers on specialised subjects, there should be some papers on generalised subjects and languages as well, but they should be of elementary nature. This will create specialised, professional services instead of the present generalized civil services.
2. The new professional service should henceforth manage the respective department from top to bottom. For example, Medical Professional should manage the departments of Health, Family Welfare, Medical Education; Experts in Economics should look after departments of trade, planning and Banking etc., and on so.
3. These new professional bureaucrats shall remain in the same field or department for considerable time, say 18 to 20 years. Thereafter, for the remaining years, say 10-15 years, till their retirement they can be appointed at the top policy-making positions. As said earlier, there should be a comprehensive training before such appointments, so that they can be given generalist orientation suitable for top-most policy making post.
4. The present IAS cadre should be phased out in a time-bound manner. By virtue of their present expertise, training, experience & knowledge their services can be best utilised in the revenue department. The present IAS cadre can manage that field from top to bottom.

Recently in August 2004, the government is reported to be considering a new scheme of recruitment to the All India Services, which has been put forth with a view to overhauling the administrative system. According to the scheme, a new career institute for Civil Services is proposed on the lines of Medical and Engineering courses or NDA. It is suggested that a new centralized recruitment examination will be held on All-India basis after class 12th. Those who clear it will be admitted to a 5 year course in a national academy (an institute like NDA.) This 5-year course will be divided into 2 modules; the first module of 3-years will consist of a normal graduate programme and the later 2-years will be for a specialized service-specific training. After 3 years the best students will be assigned to the various services on the basis of merit and choice. They will then take up the 2-year module which will train them (just like MBA) especially for the service they have chosen. Those who cannot make it to any service after 3-years will be given a degree and they will be free to pursue any career of their choice anywhere. The basic approach behind this scheme is to catch the boys and girls at the young age and imbibe the values of civil services in them, such as; honesty, integrity and commitment to public service.^{xv} This scheme is at a conceptual stage presently. Contents, curriculum and all other details of the scheme are yet to be worked out. But, no doubt, the motive behind the scheme is noble one, i.e. "to catch them young." Analysis of Civil service

examination of recent years shows that large numbers of engineering & other professionals are aspiring to become IAS. Govt, spends huge amount on the education of Engineers, Doctors & MBAs. This amount is wasted when they enter into civil services and society is deprived of benefit of their education. The proposed scheme will open a new avenue for the young and they can straight away aspire to become civil servant. Secondly, young minds can be inculcated with the spirit of service during this new course. The present careerist orientation of the civil servants can be curbed, which otherwise gets hardened with the advanced age. It is essential to invite expert opinion and suggestions before finalizing the scheme. One suggestion worth considering would be to imbibe moral values along with administrative values in the young minds. Similarly, the course should be designed to eliminate the element of elitism, habitual 'yes manship and political interference. There should be continuous upgradation of skills. There is no dearth of talent available in the country; the only need is of its optimum and constructive use.

There are number of other suggestions by number of people. They are aimed at the specific problems faced by the Indian bureaucracy.

1. For example, all the bureaucrats raise the issue of arbitrary political interference and high-handedness. Transfer is a weapon in the hands of the politician, which scares the bureaucrats and they unwillingly succumb to their pressures. Very few can gather courage to resist such pressures. Former Cabinet Secretary, B. G. Deshmukh, therefore, advocates an act of parliament to lay down rules of transfer and other duties and responsibilities of the bureaucracy.^{xvi}
2. Bureaucrats also express their dissatisfaction about non availability of effective 'Grievances Redressal Forum' for them. They recommend creation of a quasi-judicial authority, with simplified rules & procedures, replacing the present over- burdened, rules-binding administrative tribunals.^{xvii}

These suggestions come from bureaucrats' perspective. They are valid to some extent. But these measures will neither bring about fundamental changes in bureaucratic structure nor change the overall image of the bureaucracy in the eyes of the public. They will not substantially resolve the issues of politicised bureaucracy, corruption, dwindling ethical standards, erosion of public accountability, etc. The Constitution Review Commission has made some valid recommendations in this regard.

1. The questions of personnel policy including placements, promotions, transfers and fast-track advancements on the basis of forward-looking career management policies and techniques should be managed by Autonomous Personnel Boards for assisting the high level political authorities in making key decisions. Such civil service boards should be constituted under statutory provisions. They should be expected to function like the UPSC. Reputed management experts from institutes of management, well known for their excellence, should be inducted into these boards to provide a broad-based pool of expertise.
2. Social audit of official working would be another way of developing accountability and answerability. Officials, before starting their career, in addition to the taking of an oath of loyalty to the Constitution, should swear to abide by the basic principles of good governance. This would give renewed sense of commitment by the executives to the basic tenets of the Constitution. It is important to recognize that change in existing

policies and procedures will not come from the initiatives of those who stand to benefit from the existing arrangements. It needs the combined efforts of political avant-garde, activists in diverse fields, academic, and civil society institutions to generate pressures for change. Otherwise institutional decay will proceed apace with distressing consequences.

3. There is a general feeling that the bureaucrats are immune from punishments and can easily free themselves due to legal, procedural complexities. The constitutional safeguards under Art. 311 have in practice acted to shield the guilty against swift and certain punishment for abuse of public office for private gain. A major corollary has been erosion of accountability. So, the Commission feels the necessity to revisit the issue of constitutional safeguards under Art. 311 to ensure that the honest and efficient officials are given the requisite protection but the dishonest are not allowed to prosper in office. A comprehensive examination of the entire corpus of administrative jurisprudence needs to be undertaken to rationalize and simplify the procedure of administrative and legal action and to bring the theory and practice of security of tenure in line with the experience of the last more than 50 years.
4. According to the Commission, the present methods of evaluation of performance need drastic reform. At present neither the quantity nor the quality of output of individuals and collective units is properly measured. The result is that the good, the bad and the indifferent are all lumped together. Mostly chronology determines who goes ahead and who does not. The civil service regulations need to be changed radically in the light of contemporary administrative theory to introduce modern evaluation methodology.
5. Another very vital and innovative suggestion of the Commission is that, the professional bodies like the Institution of Engineers, the Chartered Accountants, Medical Council, Bar Council of India, etc. which could have played a vital role in buttressing the role of civil society in governance have been content to act as lobbyists fighting for benefits to their constituency but not much else beyond narrow self-interest. Thus, the Commission is of the view that these professional organisations should also be revamped to make them help in reinforcing the civil service, rather than merely lobbying for narrow group interests.

REFERENCES:

- ⁱ J. Denis Derbyshire and David T. Patterson, An Introduction to Public Administration, 1979, Pp. 140-141
- ⁱⁱ S .R. Maheshwari, Indian Administration, 1979, P.131.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Statement issued by the Confederation of Central Government Officers Association, The Statesman, 13, August 1973
- ^{iv} Rebert Presthus " Decline of the Generalist Myth" Public Administration Review, November- December 1964 Vol. XXIV

^v. RCS Sarkar " Generalist vs Specialist ; A Meaningful Relationship " Weekly Round Table (New Delhi), September 9, 1 973

^{vi}B.M. Chitlangi " The Generalist vs. Specialist : Need for an Indigenous Administrative Culture in India " The Indian Journal of Political Studies, December 1 985

^{vii}Hoshiar Singh & Mohinder Singh Public Administration in India 1989, p.447

^{viii}Bhabani Sen Gupta India : Problems of Governance, 1996, Pp. 113-114

^{ix}CS Sarkar " Specialists and Generalists" Journal of Constitutional and Parliamentary Studies, Vol. VII, No. 2 April-June, 197

^xF.F Ridley (ed.) Specialist and Generalists : A Comparative Study of the Professional Civil Servant Home and Abroad, 1968, p.197

^{xi}CS Sarkar op. cit n. 22

^{xii}RGS Brown, The Administrative Process in Britain 1970, pp. 261

^{xiii} Ashok Chanda " The Decision- Maker : Roles of Generalists and Specialists" The Statesman July 7, 1970

^{xiv}Drucker, Peter F. : "Management - Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices", Allied Publishers, 1 975, p.554.

^{xv}Times of India, Mumbai; Sunday, 22-8 2004.

^{xvi} Morris- Jones, W. H. : Government and Politics of India, OUP (1978); p.1271. quoted in Deshmukh, B. G: "The Steel is No Longer Stainless", Times of India, 23-07-1995.

^{xvii} ibid