

EVOLVING HORIZONS

An Interdisciplinary International Journal of Education,
Humanities, Social And Behavioral Sciences
(An International Peer Reviewed Journal)
Volume 13 • November 2024 • ISSN : 2319 - 6521

FLAWS AND LIMITATIONS OF MAX WEBER'S IDEAL BUREAUCRACY IN THE CONTEXT OF SOUTH ASIAN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.

Suchetana Dhar¹

Abstract

Bureaucracy is organised and formalised highly with impersonal nature. It can be said as a system of government with large number of officials using power through and from the decisions made in the writing desk. The objectives of the study is to focus on firstly the basic understanding and the concept of Max Weber's Ideal form of Bureaucracy and also to identify the criticisms from various other epistemologies and mainly will try to look at the flaws of this Ideal Type in its application in developing countries' administration. The qualitative method was applied for this study through analysis of various primary and secondary sources and mainly analysing the case studies of different developing countries' like China, Pakistan, Liberia, Indonesia etc.

This paper is an attempt to look at whether Max Weber's model of Ideal Bureaucracy is suitable for the governmental operations in the developing countries or not. The case studies shown in this paper from different South Asian democratic countries like China, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia, India etc. reflect the fact that the currently fashionable public value approaches of different environments of countries and neoliberalism down the rational authorized bureaucracy in some fields. It was found that Weber's Ideal type of Bureaucratic Model is extremely westernised and formal in nature. Professionalism and technical rule bound ethical personality is highly needed to follow this model.

Keywords: Bureaucracy, developing countries, ideal bureaucracy, Max Weber

1. P. G. Student, SPRCE, SET & NET Qualified, Email id: dhar.suchetana24@gmail.com

Introduction

What is bureaucracy? The old French Word “Bureau” refers to writing desk and Latin word “Cracy” means power, so in one line bureaucracy can be said as a system of government with large number of officials using power through and from the decisions made in the writing desk. The German sociologist, Max Weber says that bureaucracy is an institution that is organised and formalised highly with impersonal nature. How does this bureaucracy work? Weber has his own unique model and theory through which he is claiming his model of bureaucracy is ideal and universal in nature. But in many cases it can be traced that the applied mode of classical theory of Weberian Bureaucratic model seems to be unfit with the changing nature of democracies in modern politico-administration of different developing countries causing lots of problems mainly corruption and imbalance in the working of the government. In reality, in the developing countries mainly in South Asia where Spectrum of new public management, postmodern administration, and good governance are playing pivot role, in this environment the model of strictly rule adhered, rigid bureaucracy is acting severely problematic.

The work will specifically focus on the reason of the bulky and complicated nature of bureaucratic corruption in India, possibly generated from the unfitted model of bureaucracy, and also how this is enabled by the ground level citizens of India at every level, for smoothing their daily life rather than fighting with this epidemic. Thus, the

pledge, taken in the Preamble of the Constitution of India on 26th November, 1949, is in a stake now.

Objectives:

The objectives of the present work are as follow:

- i) To focus on firstly the basic understanding and the concept of Max weber’s idea form of Bureaucracy.
- ii) To identify the criticisms from various other epistemologies.
- iii) To look at the flaws of this ideal Type in its application in developing countries’ administration.

Methodology

The use of qualitative method was applied through analysis of primary resources and secondary data as well and mainly analysing the case studies of different developing countries’(like China, Pakistan, Liberia, Indonesia etc.) administration based on the primary and secondary written documents and finally comparing those countries’ bureaucratic features with Weber’s claim of ideal features and to see whether those countries’ administration is following Weber perfectly or not. This study will also attempt to explore the Sala Model given by Fred Riggs as an alternative bureaucratic system workable in the selected developing countries and will also refer the other possible alternative models of bureaucracy that will work better in the developing countries especially in India.

Ideal Bureaucracy of MAX WEBER

German Sociologists Max Weber who is the pioneer of bureaucracy theory of management and established a connection of bureaucracy as an administrative organisation with politics and society. He developed a technical definition with the importance of mode and types of administration. Weber named his model of bureaucracy as Ideal Type in nature that criticised the distinction between bureaucracy and democracy given by Michel. Famous Indian scholar of Public Administration, Mohit Bhattacharya rightly said in his *New Horizons of Public Administration* that "In Weberian formulation, bureaucracy is not be confused with the civil service. It refers to the sociological concept of rationalisation of collective activities." Weber's idea of bureaucracy is closely related to his ideas on legitimacy of authority. For Weber Authority was identical with "authoritarian power of command". (Weber, 1987)

Basic Features of Ideal Type of Bureaucracy by Max Weber

- Division of Labour
- Hierarchy of authority (Legal Rational)
- Formal Selection based on qualification
- Impersonality
- Specific salary system from state fund
- Career orientation

- Strict adherence to Rules Regulations and Procedures
- Record Keeping through written documents
- Technical competence
- Specification efficiency and effectiveness.
- Neutrality

Weber in his scholarly work *The Theory of Social and Economic Organisation* (later translated in English by Talcott Parsons and A.M. Handerson in 1987) designed his legal rational bureaucracy that has some strict rigid characteristics. Firstly, the bureaucrats are allowed to use their authority only in the boundaries of their official capacities after that in their personal sphere they are totally free. It also means bureaucrats cannot take decision based on their own skill and intellects in their official sphere for implementation of policies rather they are totally rule bound. Secondly, a strict division of labour is present in Weber's ideal type where there is a clear structure that organized civil servants in a sharp defined hierarchical shape of offices. Every lower division's work of the department is instructed to be controlled and supervised under the higher division office of the department. Thirdly, each office of administration has a clear specific sphere where super competence has to be shown in the legal sense. It also includes a mind-set of strong obligations that tied the hands of officers and they perform their functions that has been already marked off in legal handbook. The provision of the incumbent with the nec-

essary need are authorized to carry out this functions. The office is designed by a free contractual impersonal relationship. In principal there is no free selection. The officials will be selected strictly on the basis of technical qualification which is tested by examinations and also guaranteed by diplomas certifying technical training and intellectualities or both but in the official sphere they do not at all have the freedom to use those. They are appointed by a fixed commission and not elected by people or anybody. That's why they are non-political executives. The officials are authorized and remunerated to have fixed salaries and they also enjoy the right to pensions. The officers are always free to resign from their post if they feel to do so and their appointment can also be terminated by the employing authority under certain circumstances of corruption, incompetency, inefficiency, personal partiality etc. The salary scale of the officers is primarily structured through the grade system according to their rank in the hierarchy, but in addition to this their responsibility of the position and the requirements of their incumbent's social status are also be taken into account seriously. Every officer should treat their office as their sole occupation of the incumbent that they call as their "Duty". Weber's theory of ideal type can be considered as a choice of career of administration as civil servants with the fascinating system of promotion based on seniority the hierarchy and official efficiency and achievement. Here, promotion is partially dependent on the judgement of superiors and his/her competency. The officers will

keep their administrative roles separate from the ownership of the production of the office, refraining from exploiting their positions for personals gain. The officers are strictly trained to be strong in the decision making process and their approach of doing so should be systematic and disciplined and the conduct of the office will be totally concentrated in the control of the bureaucrats. (Weber, 1987)

Ideal Bureaucratic model: Under a critical lenses:

So, from the above analysis of Weber's Ideal type of Bureaucratic Model, it can be said that it is extremely westernised and formal in nature. Professionalism and technical rule bound ethical personality is highly needed to follow this model. Here, this essay tries to focus some flaws of this theory.

Firstly the claim to be an Ideal type is itself not ideal at all but a utopia. Well! "What is Ideal?" Is not it a subjective issue? We all know ideal type is a mentally constructed map depends person to person, situation to situation, environment to environment. In reality, empirically saying, it cannot be found anywhere. This essay discusses several other flaws in Weberian model. Another problem of this theory are identified that it is not actually possessed by all kinds of formal associations. A 12 inch ruler kind of bureaucratic model is only applicable for stable government, with stagnant routine, not for changing environmental conditions. Thirdly, this is completely a closed system model because it did not give any

importance into the interaction between environment and organizations. In the application of Weber's theory, the presence of creativity and innovation is zero here. Fourthly, Weberian bureaucratic model due to its obsession with rules, engenders inability to cope with changing conditions of those post-colonial states that just got freedom from western colonialism. Trained incapacity is very much reflected here. This bureaucratic structure is only suitable for routine and repetitive jobs. That's why Mohit Bhattacharya rightfully said that Weber's bureaucracy should not be confused with civil service, it is a sociological concept or rationalisation of collective units. But using this model to design and structure the civil service institution in the developing countries leads to the problems in the operation of those institution. This theory has excessive concern with formal structure of the organization and that neglects human dimensions totally. That's why it can be characterised as Machine Theory.

Robert Presthus said that Weberian model as a product of alien culture which is fairly inadequate for imposition in developing countries. Weberian Bureaucracy is suited for developed nations where there was more informality and less welfare work.

Other important scholarly opinions in this regard are in the book *Social Theory and Social Structure* (1957) by Robert K. Merton, where in the chapter "*Bureaucratic structure and personality*" he analysed Weberian Ideal type bureaucracy and underlined four major limitations in the context of developing countries. One of the most

important limitations he depicted that Weber neglected informal relationship totally that play unprecedented pivot role in any human organizations of developing countries. The dehumanization and tensed relationship with democracy are being spreader throughout Ideal type of Bureaucracy in every inch of developing countries. According to Merton, Weberian model gives more emphasize on rules and regulations than goals and objectives.

Peter M. Blau in his book *Bureaucracy in Modern Society* said that in a changing environment, the attainment of organisational objectives depends on the perpetual change in the bureaucratic structure. He also emphasized that a fresh look has to be adopted at the concept of rational administration in correlation with the different paradigms of third world countries.

Lloyd Rudolph and Susanne Rudolph argued in their article *Transforming the Boundaries of Political Science*, that the formal rationality and technology of Weberian model can contribute to organisation insufficiency. Because the source of alienation and resistance fuels the struggle for power against authority. The presence of patrimonial elements in bureaucratic administration mitigates the struggle as the presence of bureaucratic elements in the patrimonial administration enhances its efficiency. (Rudolph, 1979) Thus they both have challenged the central theme of Weber's model as the most rational type which is capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency.

Another important article by Warren Bennis, who is the founding chairman of the Leadership Institute at the University of Southern California, in his book *"Beyond Bureaucracy: essays on the development and evolution of human organization"* (1973) said that Max Weber's bureaucratic model has become outmoded in various developing societies. He gave a proper assessment of classical theories of organizations and its modern real practice with its far reaching examination of causes and consequences. He discussed the dysfunctions of the Ideal bureaucratic model, including those dealing with division of labour and specialization, uniform rules and procedures, hierarchy of authority, impersonality in interpersonal relations, and life-long career and loyalty to the organization and gives a clear distinctive discussion on emerging models, which are the antithesis of ideal bureaucracy, including system 4 design, school-based management, transformational leadership, total quality management, and restructuring focused on student achievement (C.Lunenburg, 2010)

Simon and Barnard said that Weber developed his thesis on the basis of structural approach. Hence, the model made by him cuts down the efficiency of administration, that can be enhanced through informal relations and unofficial practices.

Talcott Parsons questioned the internal consistency of the ideal type of bureaucracy.

H. Zafarullah in his book *"Understanding Bureaucracy"* (1992) showed how the po-

litical powers are totally mixed up with administration in various developing countries unlike western developed nations where bureaucracy still remains structurally subordinate to politics, and vice versa the bureaucrats also have excessive impact on governance because of their ability to mobilize political support and to deny their administrative skills and technical practice. So the essence of his book has been summed up by saying that Ideal type bureaucracy is devoted to present the lack of neutrality of bureaucrats in policy implementation in the hands of politicians.

Reinhard Bendix, a famous intellectual biographer of Max Weber in his book entitled as *Higher Civil Servants in American Society* (1974), argued against the belief that it is possible to adhere to a rule without the intrusion of general social and political values. He felt that all the rulers have to be applied to particular cases. The officials have to decide whether a case falls under a rule or not. In making such decisions, they are influenced by their attitudes.

According to Weber in his book *"The Economy and Society"* (1968), Modern legal rational bureaucracy, organizations are rule bound, specialized, hierarchical, and meritocratic and all the civil officials are "salaried" from state budget. Exploiting the prerogatives of office for personal gain, such as by taking bribes or pocketing public revenue is severe corruption as depicted by Weber. In Weber's terms, modern public officials are not allowed to have "ownership of the means of production or administration"

Here the question that naturally emerges is: Is Max Weber's Ideal form of bureaucratic model is ideal especially for developing countries in reality? This essay replies with resounding no. However if we consider Weberian model of ideal bureaucracy as universal, then we cannot able to identify the many other alternatives organizational models of developing countries that do not follow Weberian prescriptions.

Case Study of China

One of the important examples of this alternative models is, China's Bureau Franchising Model. Yuen Yuen Ang, professor of Department of Political Science at University of Michigan, in his article Beyond Weber: Conceptualizing an alternative ideal type of bureaucracy in developing context, gave an extremely different and fascinating organizational model of "Bureau-Franchising" that is a paradigm shift in bureaucratic governance, practiced in Contemporary People's Republic of China that criticises the full state funded bureaucratic system designed by Weber. In the realm of public administration, Max Weber's ideal bureaucracy has long been regarded as the gold standard. However, the limitations of this model have become increasingly apparent, particularly in developing countries where resource constraints and budgetary shortages are endemic. In response to these challenges, China has pioneered an innovative approach to bureaucratic governance: the Bureau Franchising Model. This ground breaking framework combines the hierarchical structure of traditional bureaucracy with the high-powered incentives of fran-

chising, yielding a unique and dynamic system that is redefining the contours of public administration.

The self-financing mode is sanctioned and even deliberately incentivized by state rules of China. This self-financing and revenue generation gives birth to a new era in public administration.

Although such a model violates several Weberian tenets of "ideal" bureaucracy, it is successful to establish a great organized administration in China that made the Weber's claim of Universal model of bureaucracy, vague and fade here. At its core, the Bureau Franchising Model represents a fundamental departure from the Weberian ideal. Rather than adhering to a rigid, rule-bound framework, this approach emphasizes flexibility, adaptability, and self-sustainability. By granting public officials and agencies a significant degree of autonomy, the model incentivizes them to generate revenue and assume ownership of their operations. This, in turn, fosters a culture of entrepreneurship, innovation, and accountability within the bureaucracy.

One of the defining features of the Bureau Franchising Model is its hybrid structure. By integrating the hierarchical appointments of traditional bureaucracy with the high-powered incentives of franchising, the model creates a unique dynamic that drives performance and efficiency. Public officials and agencies are motivated to excel, as their compensation and career advancement are directly tied to their revenue-generating capabilities. The Bureau

Franchising Model has far-reaching implications for public administration. By empowering public officials and agencies to self-finance their operations, the model reduces dependence on state funding and mitigates the risks associated with budgetary shortages. Moreover, the emphasis on revenue generation encourages public officials to think creatively, develop innovative solutions, and cultivate partnerships with the private sector.

The Bureau Franchising Model is characterized by a bifurcated state structure, comprising a small core of bureaus and a sprawling periphery of extra-bureaucracies. These extra-bureaucracies are authorized to generate non-tax revenue, supplementing their basic budget allocations. Officers within these bureaucracies exercise partial ownership rights over the revenue they generate, further aligning their interests with those of the state.

Of course, in Weberian form of developed industrialized countries the government is able to fully pay its officials. In the western developed countries where an advanced mode of market economies prevails and runs the society, in that context Weber is ideal and right to establish a predictable and non-extractive administration. The Weberian model assumes that public organizations should not retain the income they generate, instead submitting it to the state treasury for reallocation. However, this approach neglects the importance of incentives, entrepreneurship, and self-sustainability in driving bureaucratic performance. Moreover, the Weberian model is

often ill-suited to the needs of developing countries, where resource constraints and budgetary shortages are endemic.

In contrast, the Bureau Franchising Model offers a viable alternative to traditional bureaucratic systems. By combining hierarchy and incentives, the model fosters a culture of entrepreneurship, innovation, and accountability within the bureaucracy. Moreover, the emphasis on self-financing and revenue generation reduces dependence on state funding, mitigates the risks associated with budgetary shortages, and encourages public officials to think creatively.

The Bureau Franchising Model represents a paradigm shift in bureaucratic governance, one that is redefining the contours of public administration. By combining hierarchy and incentives, the model fosters a culture of entrepreneurship, innovation, and accountability within the bureaucracy. As the world grapples with the challenges of globalization, technological disruption, and fiscal austerity, the Bureau Franchising Model offers a compelling alternative to traditional bureaucratic systems.

Case study of Bangladesh

Anishuzzamen, M. in his article *"Democracy in Bangladesh: Bureaucracy Democracy's Rear-Guard"* (2012) shows the example of Bangladesh where bureaucracy experienced several ups and downs throughout British (1757-1947), Pakistan (1947-1971) and independent Bangladesh (1971-till) era. He gave a detailed assessment how the practice of ideal type bureaucracy created various problems like Corruption, Nepo-

tism, Inefficiency, and Lack of accountability within Bangladesh bureaucratic system that proves the limitations of Weberian model in south Asian developing countries. In Bangladesh theoretically the bureaucracy towards the large extent, follows the Weberian Ideal type characteristics such like:

- Division of labour,
- Hierarchy in Bangladesh bureaucracy (Minister-Secretary-Additional secretary- Joint Secretary-Deputy Secretary-Senior Assistant secretary-Assistant Secretary),
- Strict rules and regulations bound behaviours of bureaucrats,
- Attitude of impersonality,
- Management by Administration and all

But in several case studies can be identified where Max weber's Ideal type remain no longer ideal in real practice in the socio-political situation in Bangladesh. The set of norms and rules, control of management to the lower level of organizations hierarchy, establishment of consistent rule bound behaviour – these basic features of ideal bureaucracy are flowed away as Bangladesh does not have no consistent and unified rule of management till now. Political parties, civil societies, several social groups rule the bureaucracy just like other third world countries. Overlapping responsibilities and mixture of public- private life challenged the characteristics of fixed division of labour among bureaucrats. Principal of hierarchy is also getting affected because of politicization of bureaucracy and illegal

relations among bureaucrat and politicians break down the unity of command. According to Weber, recruitments of bureaucrats should be based on qualification, experience and competence of individual but in real practice Bangladesh bureaucracy is more familiar with personal interest and political relations with religious militants in terms of recruitment of officials.

In this situation question arises where are professional bureaucrats in Bangladesh? Can't we see the burning examples of corruption nepotism leaded by unskilled bureaucrats? This essay clearly replies no. Weber's policy of perfect Documentation is also invisible because of lack of accountability, responsibility, weak monitoring and corruption.

Case study of Pakistan

Shaikh, Islam and Jatohi, (2018) in their article *Bureaucracy: Max Weber's Concept and Its Application in Pakistan* shows Max Weber's concept of bureaucracy through the assessment of Pakistan's civil service and administration where military and army administration plays an important crucial role. The study attempts to show how the basic principal function of bureaucracy is to implement the policies of the government like representation of the national interest, particularly when democratically elected, through bureaucratic skills and here this paper will try to know, how this professional, technical skill depicted by Max Weber is absolutely missing in Pakistan. The rigid, not at all flexible, strictly rule oriented, stagnant nature of

the civil servants as predicted by Weber got terrible worsen picture, getting harmed by political and military interferences. The traditional role of civil servants' to provide smooth continuity in governance and daily life, irrespective of the vagaries of changes in government is to be followed. But here in practice the opposite is applied. While often getting involved in their advisory capacity, civil servants are noticed more to be actively involved in policy execution, rather than policy formulation. While to formulate and implement the various policies of the state, they should assist and guide the political leadership of the state based on their expertise, it is strictly adhered that they will not intend to have any decisive or authoritative role steering the ship. The politicians are the only authorized class to formulate policies as the elected representatives of the state. But the study from the grassroots level administrative blocks of Pakistan shows clearly that the military bureaucracy of Pakistan fully transformed with the flow of ideal, conventional bureaucratic civil service became more rigid and inflexible, extreme lack of stifling of innovation and reflection without a trained and selected officers. While here the nepotism between the military and the political leaders on the other side creates high level of corruption, and mechanically rolling on in its functions rather than impeding constructive initiatives and routine business of people's welfare. Therefore, in the moment of reform and improve the existing social system and political operations, bureaucrats of Pakistan are poor players.

Case study of Liberia

The ideal typical biasness of most developing countries is creating a high problem in case of illuminating the problems within public sector management. Liberian bureaucracy is designed with its external and internal boundaries, the relative insignificance of specialized knowledge to bureaucratic roles and above all the idiosyncratic nature of bureaucratic career. These nature of administration certainly very far from Weberian standard of bureaucracy. But still Liberian bureaucracy cannot be entitled as Failed Bureaucracy as it is very much affective with implementations of policies and fixing of goals. Here also the political relations, changing environmental effects that shaped the cultural hegemony of particular state must be taken as an important to analysis bureaucracy rather than strict rule bound stagnant bureaucracy.

Case of Indonesia

MUHADAM LABOLO in his article *Characteristic of Weber Bureaucracy and Its Relevance in Indonesia (2013)* shows that how several characters of Weberian model became outreach day by day in the context of modern organizations in Indonesia, where decentralized administration has emerged as a more effective and prestigious approach. This shift is particularly significant, as it acknowledges the limitations of traditional bureaucratic structures in addressing the complex socio-cultural issues that arise in a rapidly changing environment.

Max Weber's centralization theory, which emphasizes the concentration of authority and decision-making power, has proven ineffective and inadequate in the Indonesian context. The implementation of autonomy and the influence of globalization in neo-liberal Indonesia have created a need for more dynamic, flexible, and responsive bureaucratic systems. However, the essence of bureaucracy, as envisioned by Weber, is often missing in practice.

The principles of seniority and extreme obedience in hierarchy have created significant barriers to the growth and development of young bureaucrats in Indonesia. Seniority is often viewed as a means of perpetuating bureaucratic arrogance, which can stifle innovation, creativity, and competitiveness. This rigid adherence to hierarchy and seniority can result in a bureaucracy that is slow to adapt, arrogant, and resistant to change.

In many cases, bureaucratic appointments in Indonesia are made based on moral or humanitarian considerations, rather than merit or competence. This approach can lead to inefficiencies and ineffectiveness, as officials may not possess the necessary skills or expertise to perform their duties. The appointment of village secretaries, government officials, and teachers often reflects this trend, where moral and humanitarian considerations take precedence over qualifications.

Weber's ideal type of bureaucracy has been criticized in Indonesian context for neglecting the importance of human cul-

ture and organizational relationships. The practice of direct presidential elections and local government elections in Indonesia has highlighted the vulnerability of bureaucratic systems to political manipulation. At the local level, almost all positions are susceptible to political intervention, which undermines the principles of meritocracy and accountability. The challenges facing bureaucratic systems in Indonesia underscore the need for transformation. As noted by Arif and Putra, efforts to improve the quality of bureaucracy must prioritize morality as a key driver of change. This requires a fundamental shift in the values and principles that underpin bureaucratic systems, one that emphasizes accountability, transparency, and responsiveness to the needs of citizens.

The evolution of bureaucracy in Indonesia reflects the complex interplay between traditional structures, socio-cultural factors, and the demands of a rapidly changing environment. As the country continues to navigate the challenges of globalization, decentralization, and democratization, it is essential to re-examine the principles and practices of bureaucratic systems, with a view to creating more dynamic, responsive, and accountable institutions that serve the needs of all citizens.

Flaws in Weberian Ideal Type; Developing countries' context

This essay attempts to answer the doubts that emerges from the application of Weberian model of Ideal Type of Bureaucracy in the developing countries. The question

that was raised that, is the Weberian Model of Ideal type of Bureaucracy is relevant for Developing countries? If Weber's claim was yes, his model is universally ideal then why the developing countries are suffering from the epidemic of bureaucratic corruption and such a huge amount of mistrust of people to the bureaucratic organisations? This essay observes that as Weber is claiming his model as universal but on the other hand there are several types of limitations that is creating great problem in the application of Ideal Bureaucracy in several developing countries. First the theory of environment cannot be kept aside because Weberian model of ideal type is constructed in the context of highly developed and industrialized western societies and it was fully applied in colonies by the hands of those western colonizers. But after the second world war the high waves of anticolonial movements and achievement of independence shaped the structures of different administrative organizations of developing countries the then whose one and only agenda and challenge was to reform the economic and political structure of newly independent countries. Several political cultural economic and social changes occurred in this context it is impossible for Weberian model of stagnant bureaucracy to work properly. Secondly, Weberian tendency of embalming the other kind of organizations as "corrupted" is proved as a great fault with the successful practice of some different form of bureaucratic models in several countries. Where the attempt to implement Weber's model of bureaucracy forcefully with completely

different paradigms of third world developing countries lead to the corruption at every level of administration, Thirdly, a great gap can be found of ideal bureaucracy in the application in Agrarian modes of societies where there are still high rate of illiteracy, poverty and lack of technicality are prevalent as a great curse. In various developing societies the rural interior areas are still agrarian in nature where we can find lack of functional classification, undifferentiated structures, communication gap, administrative functions are culturally motivated. As an example sometimes the priests or the Imams are controlling the administration with their traditional inscriptive values. In this context Weberian prescription full of division of labour, written documents of technical, hierarchy are actually nothing but UTOPIA and many other aforementioned limitations together prove that the Changing nature or environment of developing countries are still not ready to grasp the Weberian Ideal type model of bureaucracy properly. Weber's claim of universalism is actually a dream in the context of developing countries.

Now the question is what is to do? If the Weberian model of bureaucracy seems to be great misfit to the context of developing countries then how to frame the structure of administration here so that effectiveness will not get harmed and the smooth process of doing welfare of people will not get corrupted. Here this essay will try to focus on Fred Riggs's Sala model as an alternative model of ideal type bureaucracy.

Classical Vs. Developmental

Fred Riggs in his book *Ecology of public administration* (1961) observes the administration of developing countries and also the relevance of Weberian Ideal Bureaucracy in this context he pointed out some crucial flaws of Ideal Bureaucracy in the different socio political environment of developing countries and criticized the Weberian Model.

- Weber's ideal model of bureaucracy is not particularly relevant to the study of developing countries as it assumes a relatively autonomous administrative system.
- In the developed countries like USA, UK and France the administrative structures enjoy sufficient autonomy from other social structures. In contrast, in the developing countries, they are less autonomous.
- Weber's Ideal model does not facilitate the study of interaction between organization and its environment.
- Accordingly, he advocated ECOLOGICAL APPROACH to the study of public administration.

Riggs said Weberian model is not acceptable in developing countries which came up after Second World War. The independence movements and changing political cultural, economic environment shaped the structure of the different administrative organizations' functions. This structure did not enjoy the sufficient autonomy that

Weber basically assumes in his model in the context of developed western countries. Also Riggs showed in his book the in the developing countries (Transitional) the administration is involved greatly with development and upliftment of the society. So it is more important for them act as a welfare organization rather than strict administration. And this welfares cannot fit with Weberian model.

Riggs gave a different model of "transcisa" society and named it as "prismatic society" which is not fully developed and industrial in nature and neither agrarian traditional or in another aspect mixture of both. According to him the developing countries' administration are prismatic in nature where there we can see Poly Functionalism is prevalent. Where Integration is less than Differentiation. The Weberian model is acceptable for western homogeneous society but not in heterogynous structures of administration. Again he said how a permanent stagnant model of bureaucracy cannot deal with the issues and features like Nepotism, Poly-communalism, Bajar- Canteen model of economy, poly normativism those are deeply rooted in the developing countries.

Re-thinking Weber in Indian Context

The "ideal type" bureaucracy can exist as a theoretical analysis in the public administration paper only. Weber's claim to be the most efficient way of running the administration and government is proved severely problematic in Indian perspective also. The largest democracy of the world, India

is carrying huge diversity in terms of race, sex, caste, class, religion, ethnicity etc. where a strict adhered rule bound bureaucracy with impersonal order cannot lead to prosperity of nation. However, in practical ground the administrative machineries cannot smoothly function only through the use of well-established rules and principles. This super emphasis on rules and procedures better known as "System" that follows only the codified of laws and written records; leads to inordinate delays in the administrative work, that we can call as or Red-Tapesm.

Especially, in India where highly dynamic environment is present in the society, civil servants or bureaucrats are expected to be adaptable in the changing social, political economic situation to tackle the challenges of highest order from top to bottom level sensitively.

India, since its birth as an independent nation and a developing country, still struggling to get lifted from the chronic disease of poverty, hunger and illiteracy. Furthermore India is also involved in intense struggle at border with its neighbours like China, Pakistan currently Bangladesh issues to safeguard its sovereignty. Hence, it can be said that the first most priority should be to settle the lower order needs; those are physiological needs, social needs, economic needs and empowerment, safety and security and these have to be satisfied with utmost importance and care.

An alternative bureaucratic model has been suggested especially for India by La

Palambora who advocates the concept of Adhocracy for the Indian Civil Services as he claims this model will bring more flexibility suitable for the huge diverse nation. The model of adhocracy is more flexible, adaptable and informal organizational form that clearly negates the strict boundary of a formal structure. This kind of model operates as an opposite fashion to Ideal bureaucracy. These flexible and alternate characters of bureaucracy allow adhocracy to respond faster than traditional bureaucratic organizations by being more adaptable and welcoming to new ideas.

In India, the ruling party in the central and state governments, opposition parties, mafia rajs, pressure and interest groups always try to influence civil servants for their own personal and political interest. Under this immense pressure of hectic political activity, it is not expected to be possible for any administrator to act neutral and impartial only for the welfare of the people. It is only possible in the theoretical thought process of an "ideal" bureaucracy designed by Max Weber. According to Talcott Parson the administrators are no experts but they are generalists. So, the conflict arises from the theory of Weber, between the obedience of orders claimed by the "Body of experts" as Weber is claiming in his theory and those who possess the legal authority in reality in India.

Blend of Ideal Type with Dynamic Administrative and Bureaucratic Reforms

However, we have to be cautious about the fact that the importance of legal rational

authority is crucial for the safeguard of any democracy. So, it is not possible to entirely write off the legal-rational model of bureaucracy. As it is expected to ensure that the chairpersons of the power will never turn to authoritarian and dictators as it is very much possible in traditional model and charismatic model of authority. In current scenario, the arrival of e-governance strengthened the rigidity of rules and laws, but it has plugged the gap between government and citizens by ensuring transparency in the administrative works (Right to Information Act, 2005) and promoted better Centre-state relations and most importantly it reduced the cancer of bureaucracy that is corruption and thus tries to ensure and deliver the better form of public service and the efficient implementation of welfare policies.

So it is needless to say that the thought of complete isolation of the administration from the evils is quite impossible but we can take Weber's Ideal model of bureaucracy as a reference and guide to bring our country on the track of progress. We need Weber's bureaucracy as to follow as reference because it gave a rigid structure of organization just like skeleton in body, but on the other hand Adhocracy makes the flexible muscles under which the disease emerges from the traditional limitation of being rule bounded, rigid hierarchy, ivory tower approach, personality detachment etc. can be treated and overcomes easily.

In my opinion, in the developing countries like India, China, Pakistan, Bangladesh, matrix type of organization is highly required

because that allows the rotation between field level officer and secretariat officers on time to time basis, so that the process of policy formulation and its execution will be more real and smooth.

Developing countries especially India has a vast amount of social and human resources. The focus should be on the training and use of this resources that will provide a proper and multi interaction between people and bureaucrats. Involvement of multi actors will also help bureaucrats to have innovative approach confidently with involvement and more importantly the support of common people. System 4 and Theory X type of approach is needed here where there will be a harmony between formal and informal systems and that will face uncertain problems more effectively.

In India, the example of adhocracy can be traced in the governmental structure. ISRO (Indian Space Research Organization) in its initial years worked as an adhocracy. It was realized that the establishment of bureaucratic departments in space research, at its beginning of race, is a complete failure of understanding and that can choke the flow of innovation with its strong rope of red tapes.

As Punchhi Commission rightly observed and recommended that to relief the officers from routine work and promote them for innovative steps for different problems by giving more autonomy and coordination with field level agency and increase more number of front line manager type of officers.

So, finally the essay can conclude with the statement that the complete rejection of Max Weber's Ideal Bureaucracy model is not appropriate. Either accept and implement it forcefully irrespective of the complete different socio political environment or totally reject it; choosing any of these extreme poles will be a naïve approach. In the wave of neo liberalism, globalisation and changing international world order, all across the multipolar world, bureaucracies and administration have been re-invented on the spatial and temporal dynamics through the values of NPM, NPA. Best example of it can be drawn from China and India's example. Moreover, it cannot be ignored that the application of Adhocracy

approach blindly can increase anarchical situation in government and private organizations and also may generate societal entropy which are completely unexpected and antithetical for long term management process.

So, the relevance of bureaucracy and its existence depend on impersonal, fresh political will and frequent administrative reforms with the changing time and relevant with the changing dynamic need of the society contextual basis. The problem of bureaucracy can only be reduced if all the countries will structure their model of bureaucracy as per their immediate and long term goals.

REFERENCES

- Weber, Max. *Economy And Society*. Germany: University Of California Press, December 19, 1978
- Weber, Max. *On Capitalism: Bureaucracy And Religion*. 1983
- Riggs, Fred. *The Ecology Of Public Administration*, London:Asia Pub.House, 196 Bennis, Warren. *Beyond Bureaucracy: Essays On The Development And Human Organisation*: Mc Graw-Hill Co. January 1973
- Merton, Robert. *Social Theory And Social Structure*: Free Press, 1968
- Ang, Yuen Yuen. *Beyond Weber: Conceptualizing An Alternative Ideal Type Of Bureaucracy In Developing Contexts*,
- Clive, Harber, *Prismatic Society Revisited*. (1993). *Theory And Educationl Administration in Developing Countries*, Oxford Review Of Education, 19(4); 485-497):
- Kilker, Emest. Weber. (1984). *On Socialism, Bureaucracy And Freedom*, State, Culture And Society, 1(1); 7695) (Accessed: 07-02-2019 10:55)
- Page, Edward. (2003). *Farewell To The Webareian State? Classical Theiry And Modern Bureaucracy*, Zse/ Journal For Comparative Government And European Policy. 1(4); (Accessed: 07-02-2019 10:57)
- Cheema, A, & Sayeed, A. (2006). *Bureaucracy And Pro Poor Change*. Islamabad: Pakistan Institute of Development Economies.
- Zafarullah, H, Khan, M. M. & Rahman, M.H. (1997). *Civil Setvice Systems: Bangladesh*. Paper Prepared For The Comparative Civil Service Research Consortium. Indiana, In: Indiana University
- Muhadam Labolo. *Characteristics Of Weber Bureaucracy and Its Relevance In Indonesia*: (Accessed: [Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.5539/Ass.V9n2p163](http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.5539/Ass.V9n2p163))
- Anisuzzaman, M. (2012). *Democracy On Bangladesh: Bureaucracy-Democracy's* Rear-Gurd-Edited by Mahafuzul H Chowdhuri. An H Development publishing House. Dhaka