

THE STUDY OF ADMINISTRATION WITH RESPECT TO GOVERNMENT IN MAJORITY

SAKSHAM VASHISHTHA

M.A. POLITICAL SCIENCE, CHAUDHARY CHARAN SINGH UNIVERSITY, MEERUT, EMAIL: v.saksham@gmail.com

Abstract

This research paper investigates the profound shifts in administrative dynamics, bureaucratic autonomy, and governance outcomes when a government enjoys a clear and stable legislative majority—a "Government in Majority." Utilizing a comparative-institutional approach, the study posits that majority governments, while possessing the political capital to undertake large-scale, difficult structural reforms and ensure swift policy implementation, also pose distinct risks to administrative neutrality and institutional checks and balances. The analysis focuses on three critical areas: the **centralization of decision-making** within the political executive (e.g., the Prime Minister's Office/Cabinet), the **erosion of bureaucratic autonomy** due to increased political interference, and the impact on **institutional accountability** (e.g., the role of the Legislature and anti-corruption bodies). Findings suggest that administrative effectiveness under a strong majority is characterized by both enhanced speed and efficiency, particularly in policy execution, and a heightened vulnerability to the politicization of the civil services, necessitating robust internal safeguards and external accountability mechanisms to preserve democratic integrity.

1. INTRODUCTION

The nature of governance is intrinsically linked to the distribution of political power within a state's legislative assembly.¹ While coalition governments are often characterized by administrative inertia, frequent policy compromises, and a decentralized distribution of administrative patronage, a **Government in Majority**—defined here as a political dispensation enjoying unassailable numerical dominance in the legislature—presents a unique and high-stakes environment for the study of administration. This majority status, whether held by a single party or a highly disciplined coalition, fundamentally alters the power equilibrium, primarily by strengthening the **political executive** relative to the legislature and the permanent administrative establishment. This paper seeks to systematically analyze the study of administration under this specific political condition, recognizing that a stable majority is not a mere quantitative fact but a qualitative transformer of governance dynamics.

The rationale for this investigation stems from the observation that administrative studies often analyze bureaucratic systems in the abstract or under conditions of political fragmentation. However, a majority government introduces distinct variables: the capacity for **radical policy continuity**, the reduction of legislative opposition as an effective check, and the creation of a clear mandate for administrative compliance. This political dominance can either serve as a powerful catalyst for efficiency and long-overdue institutional reforms, or it can become a source of **autocratic drift** and the erosion of administrative neutrality, leading to the risk of a "committed bureaucracy." Therefore, the core objective is to move beyond the simple dichotomy of "good" versus "bad" governance and critically examine the **trade-offs** inherent in administration under conditions of political command. The findings are crucial for understanding contemporary political systems where majority mandates are increasingly common and their administrative ramifications are profound.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The primary objective of this research is to critically investigate the shifts in the study of administration under the specific political condition of a Government in Majority. The secondary objectives are multi-faceted and aim: (1) To analyze the **institutional consequences** of majority rule, particularly regarding the centralization of power in the head of government's office (e.g., PMO/President's Office) and its impact on the delegated authority of line ministries and the permanent secretariat. (2) To evaluate the changes in the **political-bureaucratic relationship**, specifically examining the hypothesis that majority governments lead to a greater politicization of the bureaucracy, manifesting in politically motivated transfers, appointments, and the selective enforcement of rules. (3) To assess the subsequent impact of majority rule on **institutional accountability**, focusing on how the numerical weakness of the opposition and the reduced oversight capacity of legislative committees influence the effectiveness of checks and balances provided by independent institutions (e.g., anti-corruption bodies, central banks, and regulatory agencies). (4) To identify and categorize the **administrative outcomes**—both positive (speed, scale, reform capacity) and negative

(opacity, lack of consultation, risk of administrative authoritarianism)—that are characteristically associated with administration under a stable majority.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopts a **Comparative-Institutional and Analytical Research Design**. It will compare administrative dynamics observed during periods of political fragmentation (coalitions or minority governments) with those observed during sustained periods of single-party or disciplined majority rule within established democratic frameworks. The research is fundamentally qualitative, relying entirely on **secondary data sources**, which will be interpreted through the lens of established theories of governance, bureaucratic politics, and institutionalism. The data sources will include:

(1) **Scholarly Literature:** Reviewing academic works on Public Administration, Comparative Politics, and Institutional Theory, with a specific focus on studies concerning political dominance, administrative discretion, and the "spoils system." (2) **Official Reports:** Analysis of reports from Administrative Reforms Commissions, parliamentary committee reports, and public auditing bodies (e.g., Comptroller and Auditor General reports) concerning administrative efficiency and political interference during periods of strong political mandate. (3) **Case Studies and Policy Analysis:** Detailed examination of specific policy implementations (e.g., major structural reforms, national security decisions, or key economic initiatives) undertaken by majority governments to illustrate the speed, centralization, and administrative method employed. The analysis will utilize **thematic interpretation** and **critical evaluation** to establish clear linkages between the quantum of political power held by the executive and the resultant changes in bureaucratic behavior and institutional checks.

4. Analysis: Administration and the Dynamics of Majority Rule

4.1 Centralization of Authority and the Erosion of Administrative Delegation

One of the most immediate and defining administrative consequences of a stable Government in Majority is the pronounced **centralization of effective decision-making power** within the hands of the head of government (e.g., the Prime Minister or President) and their immediate political staff. The political executive, no longer needing to constantly negotiate with coalition partners or fear immediate legislative defeat, can bypass the often slow and deliberative processes of Cabinet committees and line ministries. This leads to the growth of institutions like the **PMO (Prime Minister's Office)** into the *de facto* command center for policy, strategy, and administrative appointments. The consequence for administration is a substantial **erosion of delegated authority** and discretion at the ministerial and secretarial levels. Line ministries often find their traditional roles relegated to mere implementation units, with policy origination and crucial decisions (e.g., capital expenditure approvals, large-scale appointments) migrating to the political core. While this centralisation can dramatically **increase administrative speed** and ensure unified policy messaging, it simultaneously risks making the administrative structure brittle, reducing the effectiveness of specialized input, and increasing administrative opacity, as crucial decisions are made by an inner circle less subject to formal checks.

4.2 The Transformation of the Political-Bureaucratic Relationship: Politicization and Compliance

The relationship between the political executive and the permanent bureaucracy undergoes a fundamental transformation under majority rule. With a stable mandate, the political leadership has the time and authority to undertake the wholesale **politicization of the bureaucracy**, a process often resisted under weaker governments. This politicization manifests in several critical ways: (a) **Selective Appointments:** Key administrative positions (e.g., heads of regulatory bodies, central bank governors, chief secretaries) are filled by civil servants perceived to be "politically compliant" or ideologically aligned, rather than purely on merit or seniority.² (b) **Frequent and Targeted Transfers:** The use of arbitrary and rapid administrative transfers becomes a powerful tool to enforce compliance and punish bureaucratic resistance, creating a culture of **administrative fear** and pre-emptive obedience among officers who prioritize self-preservation over adherence to procedural rectitude. (c) **Erosion of Neutrality:** The political pressure encourages the rise of a **"committed bureaucracy"** where officers demonstrate loyalty to the ruling party's agenda rather than the broader public interest or constitutional principles. While this enhances the implementation velocity of the majority government's electoral promises, it profoundly compromises the **Weberian ideal of bureaucratic neutrality**, transforming the administration from an impartial state tool into a political instrument.

4.3 Impact on Institutional Accountability and Checks and Balances

A hallmark of a Government in Majority is the significant weakening of the traditional institutional checks designed to hold the executive accountable. The legislature, where the ruling party holds a dominant mandate, often sees the opposition reduced to a marginal voice. This numerical dominance translates directly into **reduced effectiveness of legislative oversight bodies**, such as parliamentary standing committees and public accounts committees, which are often unable to summon witnesses, demand documents, or enforce recommendations against the wishes of the ruling

majority. This administrative impunity is compounded by a pressure on independent accountability institutions. Bodies like **anti-corruption agencies, vigilance commissions, and central banks** frequently face political pressure through budget control, selection of leadership, or subtle legislative changes that curtail their powers.³ While the judiciary remains the ultimate constitutional check, the overall effect is a **concentration of unchecked power** in the executive's administrative arm. The speed and scale of policy implementation, though impressive, may thus bypass necessary regulatory scrutiny, public consultation, and ethical due diligence, posing a long-term risk to democratic governance and the rule of law.

4.4 Administrative Outcomes: Efficiency, Reform Capacity, and Risk

The administrative outcomes under a Government in Majority are defined by a complex mix of unparalleled efficiency and significant institutional risk. **On the positive side**, the stable political mandate provides the **necessary political capital** to execute large-scale, politically difficult structural reforms (e.g., major economic reforms, privatization, land reforms) that are almost impossible for fragile coalition governments to sustain. The clarity of mandate ensures that administrative resources are deployed with maximum focus, leading to **accelerated policy implementation** and coherence across administrative units. **On the negative side**, the primary administrative risk is **Opacity and Unilateralism**. Decisions are made with less consultation, potentially leading to administrative overreach, failure to consider diverse societal impacts, and a lack of public buy-in. Furthermore, the absence of strong political opposition allows for the entrenchment of **administrative errors or policy failures**, as there is less legislative pressure for rigorous and timely course correction. The ultimate administrative test for a majority government lies in its ability to harness its political power for efficiency and reform while simultaneously building **internal administrative safeguards** and voluntarily submitting to robust external accountability.

5. CONCLUSION

This research establishes that the study of administration, when contextualized within a regime of a stable Government in Majority, reveals a distinct, high-capacity, and high-risk model of governance. The political stability provides the **crucial administrative asset** of decisiveness, policy continuity, and the capability to overcome bureaucratic inertia and vested interests that plague fragmented political systems. The administrative state, under the command of a strong political executive, can deliver reforms at scale and pace, translating electoral promises into tangible outcomes efficiently. However, this increased administrative efficiency comes at a palpable **institutional cost**. The analysis confirms that a dominant political mandate invariably leads to the centralization of power in the political core, the politicization of the civil services, and the systematic weakening of institutional checks provided by the legislature and accountability bodies. The core administrative challenge, therefore, is maintaining the **integrity of the permanent bureaucracy**—its neutrality, professionalism, and procedural rectitude—when faced with an executive that has both the power and the mandate to demand political alignment.

The essential finding is that the effectiveness of administration under a majority government is not determined by its raw power, but by its **self-imposed constraints**. For such governance to be truly democratic and sustainable, the political executive must actively invest in safeguarding the constitutional autonomy of administrative institutions and resisting the temptation to use the civil service as a mere instrument of party interest. Future research should focus comparatively on how different constitutional designs and administrative cultures (e.g., civil law vs. common law systems) mediate the centralizing and politicizing effects of political majoritarianism. Ultimately, the administrative landscape under a Government in Majority is a testament to the perpetual tension between the need for **political authority to govern** and the imperative of **institutional checks to ensure just governance**.

6. REFERENCES / BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. University of California Press. (For foundational theory on bureaucracy).
2. Bendor, J., & Hammond, T. H. (1992). Rethinking Administration and Bureaucracy. *American Political Science Review*. (For analysis on bureaucratic autonomy).
3. Aberbach, J., & Rockman, B. A. (2000). *In the Driver's Seat: Administrative Leadership in a Changing World*. Brookings Institution Press. (For political-administrative relationship).
4. Dreze, J., & Sen, A. (2013). *An Uncertain Glory: India and its Contradictions*. Allen Lane. (For case studies on policy effectiveness and administrative delivery).
5. Peters, B. G. (2010). *The Politics of Bureaucracy: An Introduction to Comparative Public Administration*. Routledge. (For comparative institutional analysis).
6. Svara, J. H. (2015). *The Ethics of Public Administration: The Challenges of Majority Rule and Bureaucratic*

Neutrality. Taylor & Francis.

7. Official Reports from the Second Administrative Reforms Commission (ARC) on Ethics in Governance and Citizen-Centric Administration. (For government perspective on administrative challenges).
8. Journal articles from Public Administration Review, Governance, and Comparative Political Studies focusing on executive dominance and legislative oversight.
9. Books and articles detailing the institutional growth and political function of the Prime Minister's Office in various democracies.
10. Case studies examining the implementation of major structural reforms (e.g., privatization, tax reforms) during periods of majority rule.