
CONCLUSIONS

C O N C L U S I O N

India achieved Independence in the year 1947, a country which was subjected to the Imperialistic policies. As a first Prime Minister Nehru had great responsibilities to be shouldered. With independence came partition which added fuel to the existing problems which the country was facing. It would not be wrong if stated that Nehru's responsibility was to create a ' Nation ' itself; which was not in existence. The task of ' Nation building process ' was not that simple as one criticises the approach of Nehru. Nehru had to make decision in this context, and these decisions had to be implemented through the administrative structure created by the British, which was responsible to serve the interests of the British rule rather than the public interest. In this context he was quite aware of the needs of toning up the administration; by introducing various reforms. Nehru had appointed various Reform Commission i.e. A. D. Gorwala and later on Paul Appleby. The ideas which came forth as recommendations for reformation perhaps had been side tracked by Nehru as this would affect the good will required between the civil service and the government.

Considering the path which Nehru chose, the path of planned economic development he could not disturb the

administration, but one cannot forget that with every plan, there followed administrative reforms which are mentioned in the study. His love for the role to be played by the Public Enterprises, Community Development Projects; and Panchayati Raj though they have not served much of purpose; it is to be noted that there is no alternative to the model of development as Nehru has envisaged. Public Participation in administration as Nehru always emphasised was most wanted. From this experience, the third world countries have or will have to learn a lesson that, it is ultimately not the responsibility of the Government to control administration, but it is public's participation which works as the control of administration. This was Nehru's approach towards administration. From the study it can be inferred that three Five Year Plan's launched under his regime have more or less served the purpose, but during the initial period they had their own defects. It is but natural that 'personnel Administration' lacked both in numbers and quality in the functioning of Public Enterprises.

It is a tribute to Nehru's administrative genius, helped by a band of devoted civil servants that these problems could be met headlong and surmounted a reasonable success within the administrative framework inherited by the national government.

On the eve of independence, the overall economic situation was quite weak and feeble. Agriculture and industry were going through serious phase. To overcome these drawbacks in the Indian economy, Nehru introduced ' Economic Planning on a Socialistic basis! This, as the main element of Nehru's thought on planning can be summarized in the following propositions.

Nehru never doubted that Science and technology could solve the economic problems and overcome poverty. Therefore industrialization was considered as a key to economic progress and industries were always given the top priority especially the basic and heavy industries to overcome the continuing dependence.

Nehru was a staunch believer in a ' Socialistic pattern of society, which could subserve the interest of the society as a whole. He firmly believed that in such a social order, the means of production should be largely owned by the society and operated for its benefit. From this followed that in industry and in its allied fields, the Public Sector should expand absolutely and relatively in comparison with the Private Sector. But the Private Sector should be allowed to function with necessary freedom in its allotted area.

In Nehru's planning, 'Agriculture' constituted as a foundation for economic and technical transformation of India. He thought of planning as a larger entity comprising of community projects, village and small scale industries and co-operatives for planning and development, Nehru relied on a series of the 'Five Year Plans' which were to be undertaken without any break. Besides this continuity, he also stressed on changing the priorities in the plan according to the changing requirements.

Nehru firmly believed that only democracy held the possibilities of development, denied to the other political systems. And he also felt that it was only through democracy, deep conflicts within the society could be resolved by peaceful methods. If we fail to promote freedom and growth of the individual, all the material good achieved through Planned Development might only lead to conflicts of the soul and integration of the social group. By 'Democracy' Nehru also intended popular participation of people in administration, hence he emphasised that effects of planning should reach the grass root level.

Though his approach of Planned economic development between 1950-51 and 1964-65 succeeded partly in certain ways such as job creation, increase in industrial and agricultural

production, the worst aspect of the failure of economic planning was intensification of economic inequality between 1951 to 1964. The P. C. Mahalanobis Committee Report (Feb. 1964) came to the conclusion that there was concentration of economic power and his opinion was dittoed by the ' Monopolies Inquiry Commission Report (Dec. 1965) and Hazari Report (Dec. 1966) Nehru's distrust of monopolies has been distorted into a blind aversion of anything big.

The most important weakness of Nehru's administration was regarding implementation of plans, Nehru himself frequently blamed his own executive machinery for the failure to implement the plan. " Our planning is good, but it is only implementation that is not so good." (Lok Sabha Debates : 10.8.63) The reasons for improper implementation were : Nehru's own personality and the age in which he lived and worked. Because of his impulsive poetic and generous nature, he was a better visionary thinker than a doer and administrator. He took more interest and pains in preparing the plans with their minute theoretical details than in executing them at different stages. G. D. Birla, Frank Moraes, P.S. Lokanathan, M. Brecher etc. are unanimous on the point that Nehru was weak as far as the implementation of his ideas were concerned.

Prof. P. S. Lokanathan opines that, ' If only he had been a little more firm and taken a stronger grip over the administration, the results of planning in India would have been very much different and the country would have advanced much further. But so vital is the point that whatever progress has been achieved through planning is primarily due to the efforts of Nehru. There is no doubt that he has been the prime mover in India's massive planning effort. As an architect of planning, he envisaged his practical interest from the stage of preparation to its execution. Consequently the Indian economy grew in depth, diversity and production. It was a great achievement. Mr. K. S. Kesava Iyengar writes, ' The democratic planning in India with about 450 million population, is undoubtedly the most significant experiment without any precedent or parallel any where in the world.

After his death, the planning commission could not function effectively and efficiently due to lack of Nehru's guidance and therefore it was reconstituted in 1967 and 1971. Even then its working has not been very satisfactory. Similar was the case, with the fourth and fifth' Five Year Plan.'

Planning Commission today has been more or less just another governmental department and too often receives a step-motherly treatment from the government. The cynical view is

that while ' Planning Commission ' plods through its five yearly exercise, projects that really need to be pushed are persued beyond its purview ; The Maruti Project, for instance and the huge Asiad investment.

To involve people in to the planning proceess, Community Development programme was introduced, which failed to achieve its objective and hence was merged in Panchayati Raj administration. These administrative institutions made some contribution in decentralizing political power, making popular participation more viable the overall working of these institutions was disappointing. It became part and parcel of a support structure dominated by elites in rural areas and by dominate caste leadership. Thus it is found that Nehru's ideas of participatory administration needs some rethinking,

The Government of India at present has launched Integrated Rural Development Programme under the twenty point programme in this direction. Much depends again on how the administration becomes accountable to the needs of the

people below poverty line, participate in the programmes meant for them. Nehru has laid down the path for the development which only lack public participation and administrative accountability.

Mixed economy with public and Private sector was the basis of Economic Planning. Public Enterprises were expected to fulfill the objective of socialistic society avoiding the pitfalls of both the unbridled competition of the West and the economic totalitarianism of East. It led inevitably to middle of the road concept. But true nature of public enterprise was never spelt out.

The Public sector expanded in every field. The investments in public sector were large, but the returns were low and instances of proper functioning of public sector enterprise were rare. Similarly despite socialistic idiom used by Nehru, Public sector built by him, and the government policies, helped to develop a capitalist economy.

The economic development was not Socialistic in real sense of the term as increasingly its distributive aspects were neglected and Public Sector industries ultimately served the cause of private sector industries and monopoly capital could not be curbed. This was against Nehru's wish, of regulation of private business which was to be protected from the evils of monopoly accumulation.

Nehru chose policy issues but never paid enough attention to organizational areas to make them work. He set up a public sector but laid down no standard of performance. As a result of

which public sector works in a most inefficient way. The new government headed by Rajiv Gandhi seems to bring about radical changes in the administration and powers of the Public enterprises. But how far it will be successful is yet to be seen.

After Independence the established administrative structure was considered out of date ill-suited and inadequate to meet the requirements of newly under developed country which aspired to establish a welfare state. In 1951 Nehru appointed A. D. Gorwala to examine the problem. Again in 1953 Paul Appleby was also asked to examine the Indian administration. The recommendations made by both of them however were not accepted to its full length. If action had been taken on these suggestions the country would have benefited immensely.

Despite of all the limitations and failures it is no doubt that, it was Nehru who laid the sound foundations for economic development and modernization in India, which made it easier to build a strong India, rightly as Nehru believed that once institutions were set up or laws enacted, the results would follow and therefore Nehru thought in terms of ' Miles to go before I sleep. I have promises to keep'.