

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264545265>

# Bureaucratic Policy making in Pakistan

Article · March 2013

---

CITATIONS

4

READS

11,942

1 author:



[Sumrin Kalia](#)

The London School of Economics and Political Science

3 PUBLICATIONS 6 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

# **Bureaucratic Policy Making in Pakistan**

Sumrin Kalia\*

## **Abstract**

*Bureaucracy forms life blood of any government and it serves as a black box where the public demands and supports are transformed into actions and policies. This paper analyzes the role of Pakistan's bureaucracy in policy issues and the various elements that have shaped its character in the country's governance. Dynamics of policy making have been discussed, followed by the configuration and nature of Pakistan's bureaucracy under different regimes. Through historical study, evidential examination and observation; current role of bureaucracy in policy matters has been argued.*

**Keywords:** Bureaucracy, Policy-making, Pakistan

## **Methodology**

This paper attempts to identify various contributing factors that control policy processes, power tilts and their impact on the Policy Process. The focus is to study the role of bureaucracy in policy issues and contributing factors in the context of Pakistan. Among countless factors that come into play; the most dominant ones are the; structure and evolution of bureaucracy, impact of governing regime and vested interests of the players involved.

A method of grounded theory is used as this allows theories to be analyzed and extended. Since the study is still in the descriptive phase effort is made to enhance the knowledge of the topic in context of Pakistan. Since Pakistan is a developing nation with not much of data to validate the ideas but an effort has been made to use historical trends, notable events, content analysis and observations. Research Journal articles, newspaper articles, books on Pakistan's history and politics, opinions gathered through unstructured interviews of some bureaucrats are some of the sources of data.

## **Introduction**

Governments are key elements of our social lives and their actions routinely shape the lives of individuals. Governments, which ever political systems they belong to; are not a single entity rather are

---

\* Sumrin Kalia, M.Phil Student, Department of Public Administration, University of Karachi, Karachi. Email: sumrin.imran@gmail.com

composed of many departments, institutions and agencies; which jointly work together to ensure smooth running of society. Today the concept of governance carries an important ground. It is the use of political authority and use of control over policy matters to achieve the goal of people's welfare.

The objective of good governance is to achieve harmony of society, rule of law, economic stability and improved life standards of people and this is done by devising policies. Policy is taken as a choice made by the individuals or groups of individuals that define a line of action. Therefore it includes decisions and strategies to accomplish specific as well as broader tasks. The task of policy making is highly dependent upon the governing system. A democratic system will ideally render this task to the elected representatives who are the politicians. The task of implementation however remains attributed to the bureaucratic machinery which forms the lifeblood of administration. However this is not as simple as it sounds. There are many grey areas where the boundaries between the two overlap.<sup>1</sup> The bureaucrats who function at either grass root level or even at senior levels routinely have to devise strategies and take decisions.

Bureaucracies form an integral part of the government and they do a lot more than just execution of policies. A bureaucrat can be the secretary of a ministry, the CEO of a state enterprise, Director General or a street level bureaucrat such as welfare departments, lower courts, legal services offices, and other agencies. To which ever cadre they belong, bureaucrats have a crucial role to play in delivering governance. Policies can either be made in top-floor suites of high-ranking officials as well as crowded offices and daily encounters of a street level bureaucrat. While we realize the importance of their role in delivering results we also know that actually goal-setting has to be done by the elected representative; the politicians. Thus the relationship between the two carries an utmost importance as far as governance is concerned. Both are entangled in a web of decision making where, who does what is difficult to identify.

While studying the public bureaucracy we have greater information of the developed countries rather than those of less developed nations. There is a huge variation in the ecology of these countries too. Thailand for example maintained its national identity without interruptions and then there are countries with long colonial histories such as Pakistan and the Philippines. In case of most developing countries the political systems have been plagued by frequent disruptions in democratic regimes by military take over. An ideal democracy with multiple party politics poses accountability as a major control factor for both politicians as well as bureaucrats but in situations where military

regimes have longer tenures; there is greater ambiguity in distinguishing the role of bureaucracy in the policy process.

### **Background**

Government is a realm of strategies, procedures and techniques and is composed of a multitude of connections between the aspiration of authorities and the activities of the institutions. However it is not just about the implementation of ideal schemes and plans, nor the extension of control from the *seats* of power into the smallest of procedures. Rather it is a complex assemblage of many forces- Legal, professional, architectural, administrative, financial, and judgmental- such that aspect of decisions and actions are understood in the perspective of authoritarian rule.

Policy making therefore is a complex process involving multitude of variables and power to make a decision lies in the agent's- whether political or administrative in its ability to mobilize people, procedures and resource in the pursuit of its goals. In considering the power balance between the state apparatus and political leadership we must understand the roots of power. Considering the ideal model of Weberian bureaucracy the legal-rational bureaucracy is focused to compliance to the direction from the political representatives of the people. However this is a very idealistic notion and for more productive outcomes it is important that the civil services be empowered to execute the policies and result in productive outcomes. Those countries which have attracted, retained and motivated Civil Servants of high professional caliber and moral integrity allowing them the authority and powers to act in the larger interest of the public have been quite successful in ensuring good governance. Examples include Singapore and Malaysia. In case of Pakistan where politics is a function of Patronage, bureaucracy remains plagued with institutional decline and their compliance generally comes from coercive (in case of autocratic regimes) and negotiable (in case of democratic regimes) means.

Pakistani political system is a system of clientelism and throughout Pakistan's history we see that narrowly-based political elite that was feudal or tribal in origin has sustained its supremacy. Oriented to more benefit than policy their patronage is essentially about recruiting and managing familial and clan networks<sup>2</sup>. Therefore when any government in Pakistan comes it initiates a mass level of employments in public sector to fulfill their promises to small parties or individuals or even bureaucrats in return for their political support. This is brutal tampering with the administrative machinery which becomes not only politicized but also highly ineffective. Despite all this politicization and

erosion of power the bureaucracy of Pakistan has managed to exist as an authority and social elite.

### **Structure and Origin of Pakistani Bureaucracy**

Nature and function of bureaucracy depends majorly on level of socio-economic development and political system of the society. Traditionally the bureaucracy is expected to ensure continuity of policies, political order, uphold rule of law and promote economic development. However these expectations change with changing local scenario. Under many countries with colonial histories, they are likely to have imitative bureaucratic structures with huge resemblance with their parent administrations.

In case of Pakistan the British system of government was more authoritarian, elitist and aloof, with huge gaps between the ruler and the ruled. Result is the rise of bureaucracy which has existed as social elite despite continual manipulation. They have far greater staying power than we are willing to concede and they manage to keep it for decades despite scandals and proven incompetence.

Throughout history we have seen that former bureaucrats like Ghulam Mohammad and Iskanadar Mirza brutally intervened in political and constitutional infrastructure. This was because the new state inherited a strong bureaucratic elite and weak political base with severe lack of quality and competent leadership. As time passed the repeated martial laws and uncertain political setup influenced the composition of bureaucracy. The political parties that led the political arena of Pakistan did not understand that bureaucratic procedures play a key role in shaping public perception of the government's performance and therefore they continued to use it for their own advantages. This led to rise of a clientelist type of political system, which resulted in the bureaucratic elite to enjoy power and prestige despite the fact that it has undergone institutional turn down and crises of moral authority.

Report published by International crises group has identified the four channels through which recruitments have been made in the bureaucracy:

- “Direct recruitment: Candidates can enter the bureaucracy through the Central Superior Services (CSS) examination, an annual nationwide competition conducted by the FPSC and PCS;
- Direct induction of military officers: Since the Zia regime in the 1980s, there has been an annual 10 per cent induction of military officers, generally at the rank of captain and equivalent ranks from the navy and air force. Military inductees do not have to take the CSS examination or any other entry test, and are instead simply nominated by their respective military;

- Advertisements against listed vacancies in ministries and departments;
- Ad hoc recruitment by departments or ministries for temporary vacancies.”<sup>3</sup>

During initial first three decades of Pakistan’s formation, bureaucracy used to attract the best of talent but they now prefer the private and business sector. Since 1990’s the recruitment has shifted from upper middle class to lower middle class who in pursuit of personal advancement and social uplift enter the civil services. They are highly conscious of the power vested in them and upon selection they consider themselves the members of the “elite governmental club”. This plays a major role in their behaviors and conduct. Also important is to note that since the children of the government servants, professionals, business groups, agriculturists/ landlords, civil servants and defense officers have better access to education they take and qualify the examination in larger numbers and hence a network is formed which connects the political elite to the bureaucratic elite.<sup>4</sup>

Military governments inducted substantial number of their officers into the civil bureaucracy and during democratic regimes the culture of nepotism led to induction of preferred people who are willing to extend favors to their *sifarshi* politicians. The inexperienced politicians require help and support of the bureaucrats serving under them to achieve their personal interests and as a result the idea of good governance is highly compromised which needs merit based, professionally competent, efficient and non partisan civil service. This has led the civil services to be over staffed. There are presently around 2.4 million regular civil servants for a population of 170 million, or one civil servant for every 67 citizens. In comparison, India has one civil servant for every 110 citizens.<sup>5</sup>

Hence although more than sixty years have passed the bureaucracy of Pakistan retains the stature of ruling class which is neither responsive of its obligations nor accountable for its actions and we can fairly say that Pakistan’s bureaucracy believes that its duty is to rule rather than to serve.

### **Regime Impacts**

Politically neutral bureaucrat is a notion that an ideal governmental system desires. However this is a normative idea and a bureaucrat is always constrained by internal administrative concerns and external political pressures. Since they always have the information and technical advantage their actions affect interest groups and consequently political environment. As a result the political regimes find it both viable and

convenient to shape the bureaucratic organization to their preference. This is also crucial for effective implementation of policies and an alignment of goals of both the delegator and the delegated.

Merle Fainsad has distinguished five types of bureaucracies while discussing the relationship of bureaucracies to the flow of political authority

- Ruler-dominated bureaucracies
- Military-dominated bureaucracies
- Ruling bureaucracies
- Representative bureaucracies
- Party state bureaucracies.<sup>6</sup>

Each of the above exists in a particular political environment. Pakistan as we know has been oscillating from democratic to military regimes, where administrative machinery has been maneuvered repeatedly.

Below is a chronological analysis of Pakistan's political history and its relationship with the bureaucracy I have through use of historical evidences included short debate on the impact on the process of policy making in each era.

### **Post Independence Period**

At its birth, the administrative positions of the country were vacated by former Hindu bureaucrats who were more competent and trained due to the preferences of their colonial masters. The vacancies were filled in by the ill-trained bureaucrats of CSP (Civil Services of Pakistan renamed from ICS) who were given quick promotions. Muslim league lacked professional ability to run administration therefore it greatly relied on these officers for guidance. After death of Liaquat Ali Khan, Ghulam Muhammad became governor general of Pakistan and that was the time when the bureaucratic manipulation of the state structure was at its peak. He not only dismissed Mohd Ali Bogra's cabinet but also integrated four provinces of West Pakistan in one unit. K. B Sayeed in 1958 in his book *The Political Side of Pakistan's Civil Services*, noted: "Today is the government of Pakistan the civil servants often play an even more powerful role than that of their imperial predecessors (British). This ascent of power has been both steady and dramatic."

In 1959 President Ayub Khan appointed a pay and service commission to examine structure and organization of civil services of Pakistan and recommend any changes. This was done just to shape the bureaucracy in such a way that it continues to be a sustaining power for Ayub as his support base was widely reduced.

Executives of this era were members of either civil or military bureaucracy and they had full control of the Pakistani political system

but they could not expand it outside the institutional boundaries. Their control on bureaucracy was also limited because of high dependence and constitutional guarantees of tenure. The land reforms launched by Ayub Khan failed to break the monopoly of the big landlords because of the feudal system and the real benefit of the four-tier basic Democracies System could not permeate down to the roots as the real powers vested in the hands of bureaucrats.

Ayub's era also gave us the constitution of 1962 which was a brainchild of his well nourished bureaucratic advisors. This era hence gave the bureaucrats wide discretionary powers in spheres of policy-making. One of the examples is the Planning commission. Prior to 1958 the commission had only a minor role but later it became a division in President's secretariat and its key posts were held by bureaucrats. Bureaucrats also headed the public corporations like Pakistan Industrial development corporations, Investment Promotion Bureau etc. In short they monopolized all strategic posts. A *Nokarshahi* (bureaucratic rule) imposed a caste system in our society. However we did witness enhanced economic growth in that era, but failure to strengthen institutions based on popular consensus and the determination of civil-military to dominate decision making ensuring exclusion of political elites combined with other factors led us to the sad incident of fall of Dhaka.

### **The 1971 Tragedy**

The imposition of military rule followed by constitutional autocracy of Ayub Khan robbed the Bengalis of the opportunity to correct the imbalance of power through National Elections. They also had little access to the administrative positions as very few appeared in the central services examination as most did not have the requisite educational qualifications needed for these exams. Thus this lack of control added to feelings of mistrust on the side of East Pakistan.

The problems were compounded when Ayub's successor General Yahya Khan abrogated the 1962 constitution and promulgated Martial law on March 25, 1969. In his effort to win public support he formed a civilian cabinet of ten members, in August 1969. The cabinet however remained powerless as the major decision making stayed with the Chief Martial Law Administrator, secretariat and senior bureaucrats. On the other side the civil officials in East Pakistan adopted a posture of obsequiousness to win Mujib's gratifications. His six-point agenda had its charms for the bureaucracy in East Pakistan, which saw it in the prospect of its own advancement.

A year after taking over Yahya Khan announced the conditions under which the next elections would be held. This was done by issuing the Legal Framework Order (LFO) which dissolved the one-unit scheme



and direct ballot replaced the principle of parity. He also delayed the national assembly meeting after the General Elections – December 1970 the results of which had left the military rule in a quandary. Both Mujib and Bhutto involved in a crazy tug of war and situations continued to become menacing. Yahya Khan turned a blind eye to terror and arson by activists of Awami League in East Pakistan from March 1 to March 25, 1971<sup>7</sup>. In an effort to save the federation from breaking apart he launched military crackdown in East Pakistan, which provided sufficient material to India to perform the final act of truncating Pakistan. Power hungry politicians, pliant bureaucracy and erroneous policies of military rule, had led the country to a journey which resulted in its dismemberment.

### **Bhutto's Democracy**

In less than three months after assuming power Bhutto retired 1300 civil servants and later introduced Civil Service Reforms. He integrated Civil services into a single unit with divisions, District Management, Foreign Service, Income tax, Commerce, Information, secretariat, postal services, railways etc. Mobility within these cadres was made possible and specialized academies to train these cadres were established. Bhutto's Nationalizations of financial and industrial institutions also provided ample new opportunities to civil services to increase their circle of influence.

Lateral entry was an idea with good hopes but later it also proved to be a tool to ensure the implementation of Bhutto's policies and gain more control of the bureaucracy, as most of the selectees were backed by politicians and merit criteria proved to be the loyalty to Pakistan People's Party. The 1973 constitution also eradicated the security and guarantees to the Civil Services leaving it further docile and weakened. The old CSP and other service men did not take reform in favor and remained hostile to such changes. They formed semi-functional occupational groups and retrained cohesion amongst themselves. Reforms did not result any radical reorganization as the bureaucrats operated as *de facto* administrators with insignificant commitment to ruling political party.

### **Zia's Martial Law**

In 1977 Zia assumed power and as a military regime always faces legitimacy crises it relies more on civil bureaucracy which results in not only more powers extended to civil bureaucracy but also influx of huge number of military men. Zia not only recruited many officers and placed them in higher ranks of the bureaucracy but he also institutionalized the practice by establishing quotas. Politics suffered a huge blow in this era and bureaucracy coupled with military engaged in depoliticisation of the nation. Zia also ensured that the civilian bureaucracy did not regain its

preeminent position in policy making. His local government system in an effort to cloak the authoritarian rule under the garb of decentralization gave birth to local political elite. Policy-making was largely controlled by Military and its agencies. The country ran at the whims of the army men and all civic institutions, like the press, judiciary, academia, human rights groups remained hapless.

### **Democratization**

The post Zia civilian governments arose from a weak political arena where both Pakistan People's Party and Nawaz league struggled for power. This struggle has demonstrated very few attributes of modern political contests with battles of ideas and policy alternatives rather have sought to serve the interests of their clientalist bases of support. In 1988 when Ms. Bhutto formed the government, Ghulam Ishaq Khan the acting president actually a consummate bureaucrat had unprecedented influence on the newly formed government. This era marked the greatest of conflict in perceptions of policy between the political forces and the powerful civil-military bureaucracy. Khan's presidency used Eighth Amendment to dismiss the governments of both Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif.

A civil-military bureaucracy that had spawned in Pakistan due to its historical base and technical advantage was still very powerful. This led the Political elements to induct their loyal officials in the services and each regime change was followed by large scale postings and transfers of civil servants both at the policy-making level as well as at the district administration level. This conflict between the political parties left the civil services, polarized, inefficient and interest-driven.

"Bhutto and Sharif both had their own 'team' of civil servants who were patronized and promoted not on merit but on their perceived loyalty to their respective political masters", said a retired bureaucrat, who had served as federal secretary during the 1990s.<sup>8</sup>

Another important thing to note here is that although Pakistan had taken steps towards democracy; the military continued to exercise control through its clandestine agencies thus creating a Praetorian Democracy. An example of this is the Mehrangate scandal under which the former Army chief Aslam Beg is still under trial for use of Inter-Service Intelligence (ISI) to rig the 1990 elections. Blame should not be put entirely on the military as the two prominent political parties too used these agencies in their mutual conflict.

### **Musharraf's Regime**

In 1999 Musharraf gained power in a dramatic way declaring emergency throughout the country. Provisional Constitution Order (PCO) was

promulgated which provided that despite the abeyance of provisions of constitution; Pakistan will be governed as nearly as can be in accordance with the constitution (subject to PCO or other orders by Chief Executive). During his nine year long regime Musharraf faced many challenges specially arising from Judiciary and Media. He manipulated the political system and used their weakness to his benefit. The Muslim League which served as the “King’s Party” was a result of our politicians hunger for *seat* who received their accretion to power by entering the spoils system. His National Accountability Bureau (NAB) was very successful in harassing his political opponents. During his regime the military had full reins of policy making.

Military dominance over the civil sector during Musharraf’s period was also made sure by reemployment of retired or even serving military officials in civil institutions. They also headed universities and state owned corporations. Interesting to note is that he appointed the late Lt. Gen. Gulzar Kiani as a chairman of Federal Public Service Commission (FPSC) which is responsible for recruiting high civil servants.

His devolution plan considerably weakened the provincial bureaucracy by reassigning a large proportion of their functions to the inexperienced elected local bodies. With this they retained complete control of the revenues of the districts. This process of devolving powers remained faulty in most of Pakistan excluding a few metropolis cities, as it caused a return of the feudal to the powers who also contributed in distorting the actual essence of decentralization. It also drew in military into local politics and administration.

The foreign policy also did not remain immune of his grabbing hand and the alliance to US on war on terror post 9/11 left Pakistan faced with severe problem of militancy and consequential collateral damages.<sup>9</sup> It can be safely said that during this period Army monopolized policy-making and had controls over, agencies, foreign policy, economic policy, district management.

### **Democracy Returns**

Elections of 2008 marked the beginning of a new era of governance in Pakistan. Pakistan People’s Party formed government through power sharing with its coalitions. This ascent to power was accompanied by doubts about its capacity to govern at this crucial point of history. Judges were reinstated after the threat of Long March by Nawaz Sharif. The existing Chief of Army Staff General Kayani has withdrawn some 300 serving army officers from civilian posts which is a good sign but many still remain in civil administration specially Ministry of Defense thus still exercising control in that sphere.

However one important point to note here is that despite urbanization, the rural elite still managed to hold the reins of policy-making of the country. Musharraf's era had considerably modernized the state and the nine years witnessed a growth of civil society and a vocal media which served to educate the masses about the dynamics of governance. Notwithstanding that traditional political elite found its way in the corridors of power and the clientelist system was able to sustain itself. This clientelist-based politics has failed to provide public goods and good governance to people of Pakistan owing to the fact that its focus is patronage and not policy-making. This culture of patronage has seeped in the bureaucracy too which is now nothing but a tool of politicians to serve their interests. Merit recruitments have been deterred with, an example is the appointment of Mohammad Jahanzaib Khan DMG officer as Pakistan's ambassador in Paris by the president. The directive was conveyed on phone to the foreign affairs secretary by the secretary general to the president. This appointment was later cancelled as a petition was filed at Islamabad high court against this appointment by 105 civil servants.

Many Public sector institutions such as WAPDA, PIA, OGDC, Pakistan Railway, Pakistan Steel etc. of the country also suffer from severe deterioration and several questions have been raised about the process of appointments in these institutions.

This politicization has largely compromised the practices of bureaucracy leaving them handicapped. An example is recent fire incident in a factory in Karachi's SITE area. During investigation it was revealed that 90 per cent of factories in Karachi are working against the Factories Act 1934, yet no action has been taken against them because of the political support enjoyed by their owners. The various departments of Karachi Metropolitan Corporation (KMC), such as Fire Brigade, City Warden (formerly known as Community Police) and Community Development are under the influence of a 'specific' political party.

Characterized with low salaries, archaic rules and procedures, rigid hierarchies, heavy reliance on patronage and insecure tenure this era has been the most difficult for the bureaucracy.

### **The Policy Crises**

Good governance in Pakistan has been greatly compromised due to policies made on preferences. Pakistan's politics has principally remained in clutches of interest groups which include a small group of politicians, large businessmen, military and civil officials, and the feudal. This has resulted in an interest-based approach to governance which in turn has failed to build institutional capacities. Personalized decision making, by individuals at the helm of power has displaced and informed

well- thought out institutionalized processes. Moreover the continually changing political regimes have also been quite detrimental in the policy making process. Especially during the 1990's the changing governments abruptly abandoned the predecessor's policies and projects. Policies generally take more time in implementation and therefore discontinuity before they mature causes more of loss rather than benefit <sup>10</sup>

Pakistan's economy has been intermittently faced with instability, high inflation, negative balance of payment, growing unemployment, poor public services and increasing poverty. Political instability has greatly contributed such a repentant situation. Country's Public finance management largely remained in hands of military and its technocrats who eagerly join hands of military and enter the policy-making arenas of the country. Most of them hailing from international financial institutions; their intent is to ensure solving Pakistan's problems, not to ensure public participation. Pakistan's current democracy inherited an overheated economy with haunting pressures of global financial crises and surge in oil prices. A new concoction named "Friends of Democratic Pakistan FoDP" was used to pledge assistance from international community. The floods of 2010 caused widespread hardship and misery and economy has been struggling to make the ends meet. Pakistan has been fortunate enough to have bureaucrats who have served in economic ministries and central bank. If only the prevailing government pays heed to their suggestions and route the policy accordingly.

Our Foreign policy has majorly remained in clutches of military. They monopolize information transfer and the decisions making remains within the GHQ. Both the wars of 1965 and 1971 have their roots in the conflicts aggravated during the military rule. Today the issues of Taliban and shadows of Mumbai attacks pose many diplomatic challenges for the government. The democratic government still heavily relies on military and its agencies to provide information and guidance on issues of foreign policy.

The District administration after an improperly implemented local government ordinance in 2001 has rendered an ambiguity in roles of the provincial and district governments which has led to indecisiveness and failure of implementation.

Energy is one the major drivers of economy. Our country faces energy crises which is also a cause of unrest in lives of people. Steps like Rental power projects have not served to give long lasting answers to the shortages and there is huge vacuum in the research and development in this area which can direct our policy making in this area towards providing sustainable energy sources.

This is only a very brief overview of a few Pakistan's policy making process and its concomitant outcomes. A detailed study will require substantial resources and is beyond the scope of this paper. The analysis above has been done to surmise contemporary bureaucracy's position. It is the job of the bureaucracy to make sure that the political elite devise policies that serve larger interests of the nation and they are continued even if the regime changes. However the historical analysis reveals that civil services at present have become highly incompetent and manipulative. Their politicization has undermined their performance, at many points they even lack required administrative authority such as matters of price controls, removal of encroachments, enforcement of municipal laws.

The ineptitude and lack of training of civil services has also been a foremost cause behind the inappropriate designing and implementation of the policies. They have a tendency to emulate the systems of developed countries which are not modified to the local scenario. There are budgetary, financial, structural, procedural, and relational procedures that are just copied from other systems without evaluating any evidence of their success.

Inter-service rivalry and jealousy among the civil servants also distracts from policymaking. The federal secretariat, in particular, has become an arena of competition and rivalry among services. I shall quote the opening remarks of the International Crises Groups Report on "Reforming Civil Services in Pakistan" (2010):

*"Decades of mismanagement, political manipulation and corruption have rendered Pakistan's civil service incapable of providing effective governance and basic public services. In public perceptions, the country's 2.4 million civil servants are widely seen as unresponsive and corrupt, and bureaucratic procedures cumbersome and exploitative."<sup>11</sup>*

### **Conclusion**

Pakistan's bureaucracy in the initial two and half decades had competency and capability to take decisions in the interests of the masses. This was because we inherited an iron steel bureaucracy from our colonial masters which also led them to have a mindset of ruler. This led them to be largely alienated from the public and unresponsive to the needs of the population. In the years to follow this machinery turned extremely rusty and incompetent because of the regular interference of the prevailing regimes and the civil institutions remained highly damaged. Politics of interests has left the administrative machinery in an ailing condition.

It is important that this inflated, corrupt and inefficient bureaucracy be transformed. Several reforms have been proposed the latest being the report of national Commission on Government Reform --NCGR which was submitted to Prime Minister Yousuf Raza Gilani in May 2008 but question still remains of right implementation.

It is necessary that best talent of country be attracted to civil services. Since bureaucracy has been so notorious for its political role, most of educated class avoids taking the competitive exam. They instead prefer the private sector and multinational firms as they not only pay well but also do not require dependence on any patronage for career advancement.

For improved policy making process it is necessary that availability of data, access to research facilities, process of regular evaluation of policies and use of technology are important aspects.

A system of accountability and procedural control must also be strengthened. Today accountability has become a tool of reprisal, settling scores with opponents and punishing noncompliant officials. Public Service Commission must be fairly autonomous. Separation of judiciary from the executive is a step forward in direction of greater accountability and transparency, but as we have seen that locus of power has tilted in favor of entrenched interest groups it is imperative to reverse this phenomenon. This requires that a visionary leadership to appear on the face of our politics that is not driven by the politics of electoral cycles and is sincere in its efforts to provide the people of Pakistan their due rights.

## Notes and References

---

- <sup>1</sup> A. Alberto, T. Guido, “Bureaucrats or Politicians?” Working Paper 10241. *National bureau of economic research*, Cambridge (2004): 2
- <sup>2</sup> Dr. Lodhi Maleeha “Beyond the Crises State” in Ed. Lodhi Maleeha. *Pakistan Beyond a crises state* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2011), 54-55
- <sup>3</sup> International Crises Group, “Reforming Pakistan’s Civil Service” Asia Report No185, *ICG Report* (2010)
- <sup>4</sup> Shafqat Saeed. “Pakistani Bureaucracy: Crisis of Governance and Prospects of Reform”, *The Pakistan Development Review* 38:4 Part II. (1999): 995–1017
- <sup>5</sup> Report of the “National Commission for Government Reforms on Reforming the Government in Pakistan”, Prime Minister’s Secretariat, Government of Pakistan, vol. 1, (2008): 201
- <sup>6</sup> Fainsod “Bureaucracy and Modernization” in Heady Ferrel. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, Fifth Edition (New York: Marcel Dekker Inc., 1996), 312
- <sup>7</sup> Brig (Retd) Asif Haroon, *Roots of 1971 Tragedy* (Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications, 2005), 310
- <sup>8</sup> Crises group Interview in International Crises Group, “Reforming Pakistan’s Civil Service” Asia Report No185, *ICG Report* (2010)
- <sup>9</sup> Jamshed Khan, Asmat Ullah Wazir “Civil-Military Imbalance in the Administration of Pakistan: A Case Study of Musharraf Era” *The Dialogue*, Volume: VI, No. 2 (2011): 148-160
- <sup>10</sup> Dr. Hussain Ishrat “Retooling Institutions” in Ed. Lodhi Maleeha. *Pakistan Beyond a crises state*, op.cit., 150
- <sup>11</sup> International Crises Group, “Reforming Pakistan’s Civil Service”, op.cit.