

BHARTIYA BHASHA, SIKSHA, SAHITYA EVAM SHODH

भारतीय भाषा, शिक्षा, साहित्य एवं शोध



ISSN 2321 – 9726

An Internationally Indexed Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal

WWW.BHARTIYASHODH.COM
www.isarasolutions.com

Published by iSaRa Solutions

POLITICAL NEUTRALITY IN TIMES OF FADING POLITICS- ADMINISTRATION DICHOTOMY

By

ANJALI SINGH

*Doctoral Research Scholar (SRF), Department of Public Administration,
University of Lucknow, U.P., India*

ABSTRACT

The doctrine of dichotomy of politics and administration which was propounded by Woodrow Wilson in the last decades of 19th century and which was nourished by several renowned scholars including Goodnow is waning into oblivion in the present times when the administrators are not only responsible for implementation of public policies and programmes but are equally crucial in formulation of the public policies by sharing desks with their political bosses too. Practicing political neutrality would have been much easier if the spheres of both politics and administration would have been explicitly defined and separated as was traditionally conceived. However, in a country like India having a parliamentary form of government, the dichotomy of politics and administration has turned meaningless. With the overlapping role of administrators and the politicians in tasks of nation building and development, the observance of political neutrality by the administrators has come under question today. What was the traditional doctrine of politics-administration dichotomy? Why has dichotomy turned meaningless later? What are the numerous modes and areas of interaction between the administrators and the political elites including the ministers today? Why it has become difficult to observe the canons of political neutrality by the administrators these days? All these questions will probably be addressed in the subsequent sections. This research paper is an attempt thereby to obtain a clear perspective about the state of political neutrality at a time when the works of the political heads and the administrative officers are intricately woven and require to be done with mutual support. It will also focus on finding concrete solutions to ensure that the bureaucrats remain committed to their professional duties while being staunchly neutral to any party politics or ideology.

KEYWORDS

Dichotomy, Politics, Administration, Political Neutrality, Delegated Legislation, Commitment

INTRODUCTION

The primitive writings during the course of evolution of public administration as a separate discipline, made a clear distinction between 'politics' and 'administration' in terms of ends and means. This was termed as dichotomy of politics and administration. **Woodrow Wilson**, the father of public administration, conceptualized the idea of this dichotomy initially in his famous essay- 'The Study of Administration' which was published in 1887 in Political Science

Quarterly. Where on one hand 'politics' was regarded to be concerned with all the process and activities related with policy decisions, on the other hand, the role of administration was to come up after the role of politics. The task of administration was conceived to fulfill the laid policy objectives. Woodrow Wilson stated following to delineate the area of politics and administration precisely: "The field of administration is a field of business. It is detached from the hurry and strife of politics; it stands apart even from the debatable ground of constitutional study. It is part of political life only as the methods of the counting house are part of the life of society; as machinery is part of the manufactured product"¹. He further adds, "Administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics. Administrative questions are not political questions. Although the politics sets the task for administration it should not be suffered to manipulate its offices."²To make the matter more clear, Wilson quoted **Bluntschli** and said, "Politics is a state activity in things great and universal while administration on the other hand, is the activity of the state in individual and small things..... Politics is thus a special province of a statesman and administration of the technical officer."³ This dichotomy propounded by Wilson was supported by other scholars such as professor **Frank J. Goodnow, W. F. Willoughby, Albert Stickney, Pfiffner** and alike. In 1900 **Goodnow** came up with his work "Politics and Administration" through which he made a technical distinction between politics and administration by saying that "politics is the expression of will of the state and administration as the execution of that will"⁴ **Willoughby** went to another extent by giving a separate status to the administration. He designated it as not only separate from politics but a fourth branch of government, other three being the legislature, the executive and judiciary. To this **Albert Lepawsky** remarked, "Willoughby's recognition of administration as a fourth branch of government is the most extreme but undoubtedly the most logical result of the extreme separation of politics and administration initiated by Woodrow Wilson."⁵ Other advocates along with Wilson accepted the dichotomy of politics and administration because they were greatly impacted by the spoils politics and resulting government inefficiency. They regarded that this dichotomy could act as a panacea to all the existing governmental inefficiencies. At such point, observance of political neutrality, i.e. the neutrality of the administrative officers with the party politics and the ideology of political parties to which the politicians are aligned, becomes easy. However, soon the dichotomy of the politics and administration began to be challenged.

ABANDONEMENT OF DICHOTOMY

John M. Gauss was of the opinion that in his times the theory of public administration would come to mean a theory of politics too. **Leslie Lipson** was of the view that, "Government is a continuing process. It is true that the process contains phrases. One phase is legislation and the other is administration. However these are emerged together and at certain points become vague"⁶. Soon it was considered that administration is a part of political process because the officers act politically in numerous ways such as in formulation of legislation, dealing with various pressure groups and other institutions. **Fesler** reinterpreted the idea of Wilson. He said that "Wilson also opined that the lines of demarcation setting apart administrative functions from non-administrative ones....run up hill and down dale, over dizzy heights of distinction and

through dense jungles of statutory enactment, hither and thither, around 'ifs' and 'buts'; 'whens' and 'howevers', until they become all together lost to the common eye."⁷ It can be thus said that the dichotomy between administration and policy is frictional and Wilson new it to be. So his goal was to call attention to the need for efficient administration and to keep it out of partisan politics. Many of the scholars declared the politics-administration dichotomy as misleading. In fact **Waldo** concluded by connoting this irrelevant distinction between politics and administration as of becoming an "outworn credo"⁸. Division between politics and administration is not a water-tight compartment. There is overspill of administrative actions in the field of policy making and direct and indirect intervention of politicians in the area of administration. The objectives of the state can only be fulfilled if they act complementary to each other. With the increasing role of government and expanding public policies, politics and administration have become thoroughly intertwined. "The 'first level' or 'foundation policies' on 'climate setting policies' are still the primary concern of politicians, presidents, cabinets. But since such policies fall a long way short of settling all the vital questions which have to be decided, it is the higher civil servants in different administrative agencies who extend and supplement 'foundation' level policies or laws which they have to enforce"⁹

POLITICAL NEUTRALITY AT THE PRETEXT OF GROWING PROXIMITY BETWEEN POLITICS AND ADMINISTRATION

According to **Weberian** model of 'Ideal type of Bureaucracy', the administrator is expected to be politically neutral. Neutrality means a kind of political sterilization where the officers remain unaffected by the changes in the run of politics. Despite changes in the political leadership the civil servant would be unfailingly offering 'technical' advice to the political master keeping himself detached from the politics of the day. To summarise, 'political neutrality' of the administrator can be viewed in following two perspectives:

- First, that the public servant must abstain from participating in the affairs of political parties while simultaneously retaining the right of private discussion of political issues and of voting as he may like.
- Second that the civil servant must remain ethically and morally bound to administer the policy decisions of whichever party that happens to be in power with equal zeal and determination.

"The bureaucracy has does been portrayed as a universal and permanent institution unadulterated by the infirmities and frivolities of politics."¹⁰

As the dichotomy between the Politics and Administration has turned to be meaningless in a parliamentary setup of India, the spheres of both cannot be easily distinguished today. The administrators are required to assume comprehensive roles along with their political bosses and sit at the fountain head of the public policy making. Not only they render advice and suggestions emanated from their field experience and expertise but they have also been shouldered the responsibility of 'delegated legislation'. Since the political masters and the legislators are short of adequate time and also lack relevant technical proficiency, they simply draw a 'skeleton' of public policy specifying broad objectives and goals. Rest of the task is entrusted on the

administrators to give 'life-blood' to the concerned policy. In specific, the administrative machinery is delegated legislative powers too these days and this trend has been on increase. In such circumstances it will be futile to expect that bureaucracy will observe austere detachment with the political setup. What is more needed is strong Code of Ethics and Code of Conduct to regulate the relations of the administrators and the politician. Also, the politicians interact with the bureaucracy in different forums in various ways. According to **Peter Self**, there are four important areas of interaction between the politicians and administrators¹¹. These are:

- **Policy making:** As legislators, the politicians take part in various debates and discussions on the floor of legislature and become active members of many committees too. As ministers, they head the government departments and manage administrative works. The civil servants have their own reservation for swaying the policy making by virtue of their long years of experience. They also possess specialized skills to put ideas into practice. When the ministers are busy in managing their constituency or doing external politics, the bureaucrats initiate the policies and get them approved.
- **The arbitration of interest:** Politicians often play the role of brokerage by acting as mediators between interest groups and the administration. Individual politicians, the political party and the legislature engage in arbitration function. The parties aggregate and synthesize group interests. On the other hand different interest groups often sneak in their interests through the parties and senior echelons of civil services. The administrators get themselves involved in the interest group politics both directly and indirectly.
- **The treatment of individual and localized claims.**
- **The balance between political accountability and administrative discretion:** there is an unavoidable point of skirmish between the needs and interests of these two groups.

The top level of administration is usually a waning point of politics-administration dichotomy. The power and authority is directed from the top most level. Here the minister shares a close relationship with his secretary and other top advisors in the course of problem identification and framing of relevant public policies. Thus the political executives and the professional civil servants work in close collaboration with each other at the highest level. With such growing proximities the practicing of political neutrality by the civil servant becomes very difficult as the domains of both the politics and the administration has got intermingled. The administrators are no longer only the passive implementers of public policy but they are aggressively involved in policy making too while sharing the table with the political leadership. The bureaucracy has been politicized to a large extent as a side repercussion.

Before independence the bureaucracy was well organized and all powerful that framed policies and enforced them with all support of the Imperial power. However the roles got reversed after independence. Under the parliamentary system of government, the superiority of the minister and subordination of the secretary are obvious. "It has been a painfully long-drawn-out learning experience for the high-ranking bureaucrats to unlearn their bygone roles and accept the politician as their boss and master. In practice the civil servant regard the politician as power

usurpers and unwanted elements. The psychology of avoidance and latent hatred has also been promoted by institutional arrangements.”¹²

O.P. Dwivedi and **R.B. Jain** conceptualize four broad categories of bureaucracy as per their degree of politicization: ¹³

1. Depoliticised Bureaucracy -

- This type of bureaucracy is neutral, apolitical and anonymous.
- There is absence of any political interference in the recruitment process and promotion of civil servants, which is purely based on merit.

2. Semi-politicised Bureaucracy

- The political executives dominate bureaucracy to take decisions on party lines.
- Public servants can opt to join any political party after resignation or retirement.

3. Committed Bureaucracy

- This type of bureaucracy is committed to the programmes of the political party in power.
- Civil servants are allowed to gain membership of any political party and attend their meetings too

4. Fully Politicised Bureaucracy-

- Their existence is found in single-party authoritarian structures.
- Huge power is yielded by bureaucracy to serve the ends of the political party
- Hardly any distinction exists between the structures of the party and those of the government, they are interchangeable.
- The recruitment of the bureaucracy is done from the party ‘cadres’

With blurring lines of dichotomy, political factors are given much importance in making recruitment, transfers and career advancement. As a wrong precedent, the one with strong political tie-up often climbs the stairs of success soon while the other upright bureaucrats who refuse to dance to the tune of the politicians are too often given punishment postings and remain neglected. Their spirit of service is often crushed under the feet of petty politicians who themselves come to hold power in an undemocratic manner. Countless case studies have made headlines in newspapers and magazines where the nexus of corrupt administrators, politicians and the criminals have taken a toll on the developmental tasks of the modern governments.

No clear demarcation of each other’s sphere has also resulted in frequent role clashes between the political leaders and the practicing bureaucrats. This has been successfully demonstrated by a study conducted by **Professor Shanti Kothari**, former Member of Parliament and **Ramashray Roy** (under the banner of Indian Institute of Public Administration and the Centre of Applied Politics) with the title ‘Relations between Politicians and Administrators at the District Level’. They both attempted to explore the relation between the politicians and the administrators in a greater depth within the limited geographical region of a district. The findings of the authors clearly note that “the actors, influenced by prejudices in role perception owing to the position, do not clearly distinguish between policy decisions and its execution. As a consequence, both tend to encroach upon each other’s sphere of responsibility.....there is utter lack of respect and

appreciation for each other's work, an absence of understanding of each other's role and utter use of pressure by both against each other. If the bureaucrats try to give more preference to the requirements of their own work performance ignoring the complementary role of the political elites, the political leaders in turn fail to appreciate the constraints under which civil servants work.....Both politicians and administrators show a very little degree of consciousness of systematic goals and each of them is moved more by the consideration of role requirement of his own. The overall impact of all these factors is that the accomplishment of these stated goals eventually suffers"¹⁴

REDIFINING THE DOCTRINE OF POLITICAL NEUTRALITY WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON COMMITMENT

Political neutrality implies that the civil servants should not incline themselves towards any sort of party ideology .They must refrain themselves from any political affiliations .They must instead carry out their duties in maximizing public interest. Every civil servant must observe the canons of impartiality and non-partisanship towards the conflicting philosophies of the government espoused by various political parties. They must discharge their duties with utmost loyalty without succumbing to unwanted political pressures from the party in power or any associated pressure group too. This is in fact considered as the doctrine of political neutrality of the civil servants. With a diminishing gap between the politics and administration, the concept of neutral bureaucracy seems a highly idealised one. In actual, while managing the public affairs, the civil servants especially of the higher levels are professionally involved in political decision making. Reality in administration therefore renounces neutrality. The bureaucracy was condemned by the first prime minister of India **Pt. Nehru** as being "fossilized in their mental outlook"¹⁵ as it is actively involved in the political process having its own ambitions and vested interests **T.N. Seshan**, former Chief Election Commissioner, shook the nation when he connoted the bureaucrats as "polished call girls' at the service of the politicians"¹⁶

Neutrality of the administrators no longer holds any relevance in the modern context. It is the demand of time to establish public oriented administration. Today India is facing challenges to establish goal oriented, task oriented, people oriented and result oriented public administration. It is necessary for the Indian civil services that it shall redefine its doctrine of practicing neutrality with the political activities in the present context. "Since the civil service is expected to accomplish the short term and long term goals and objectives as mentioned in the Constitution of India, leaving neutrality, the bureaucracy must adopt commitment to goals as its fundamental value. Neutrality is not the end, but the means."¹⁷**Indira Gandhi** expected the "government servants with commitment to the development of the country and more personal involvement in the tasks."¹⁸

Now the question lingers as to whom the bureaucracy should be committed? Should it commit itself to the policy of the ruling party where the party is generally wedded to specific political ideology? Should they commit themselves to the views and thinking of the ministers with and under whom they have to work from time to time? Should they have common mind with their minister? It is argued that commitment does not mean identification of the views of a civil

servant with those of his minister. If in the civil servant's opinion, the public interests demands something other than what the minister asks for, the civil servants has that right to record his dissent. In this reference **Sardar Patel** once said, "Today my secretary can write a note opposed to my view. I have given that freedom to my Secretaries. I told them, "If you do not give your honest opinion for fear that it will displease your Minister, please then you had better go. I will bring another secretary! I will never bring displeasure over a frank expression of opinion... you have agreed to share responsibility".¹⁹

L.P. Singh, one of India's reputed civil servants, emphasized the importance of commitment of civil servants to 'professionalism' and not to a party or its policy and programmes. He opined that from whatever perspective one may look at "there can be no doubt that India needs a civil service with professional competence and commitment. Such a service would prove an important instrument for achieving accepted social goals laid down by the Indian Constitution. Professional commitment means dedicated service to the people, the promotion of the happiness and welfare of the citizens, respect for the sentiments and susceptibilities of people and respect towards principles of integrity and fairness in all their works and dealings."²⁰

CONCLUSION

It is important to clearly mention that the political neutrality of the bureaucracy is relevant even today, but its interpretation is new. Since the nearness between the politicians and the administrators is inevitable today, both neutrality and impartiality is die hard required in reference to the process and procedures. The changing political landscape demands neutrality. This neutrality signifies the separation of civil services from narrow minded thought processes and not their separation from the works related to public interest. This neutrality is with the ideology of the political parties and their activities and not with the political principles and the policy directives of the government. If this neutrality would be understood as neutrality of the civil servants from the welfare and public oriented works, then it would surely give birth to administrative passiveness and make it corrupt.

There is lot more to do in a country like India. The pace of development here is hindered by various lacunae which could be handled only by an active and efficient administration committed to the welfare ideology and constitutional directives and who simultaneously keeps himself aloof from any kind of political party. It is important to develop an administrative philosophy by incorporating neutrality with commitment rationally so that by intellectual and emotional contemplation, the solution to various socio-economic problems becomes possible. This neutrality of the civil services should be stopped from interpreting as being passive. Instead, it should be interpreted as fearless and progressive '**civil service activism**'. It is the responsibility of the political leadership at all levels- national, state and local that it shall make the administration "**SMART**"²¹ i.e.

- S- Simple
- M- Measurable
- A- Accountable
- R- Responsive

- T- Transparent

This will ensure that civil services would accept commitment as a value and shall establish itself as an executive organ of the government to achieve the objectives of good governance. In the 21st century, the matter of debate is not political neutrality of the bureaucrats vs. their commitment. The debate is mainly concerned with that aspect which is related to ensuring ‘commitment along with neutrality’. The challenge to keep the civil services committed to the constitution and to enhance its activism related to the work of public interest while being neutral from the narrow value politics lingers in front of not only the politicians but before the civil society and the people of the country as well. A politically neutral and professionally committed bureaucracy, the efficient and responsible political leadership and the aware civil society altogether can steer the fortunes of the entire country in the same direction as was conceived by our constitution makers and countless freedom fighters when they embraced the noose smiling, for letting our motherland free from the colonial clutches. The notion of welfare state and the values enshrined in the preamble can be practiced in letter and spirit only when the responsible politicians would work in collaboration with the administration with a joint commitment to achieve the shared national goals and objectives. The actual direction which can be taken into consideration to ensure that the politicians and administrators work in collaboration with each other without getting their respective spheres encroached, could be ascertained by the following remarks of **Sardar Patel**, “I need hardly emphasize that an efficient, disciplined, contented service assured of its prospects as a result of diligent and honest work is a sine qua non of sound administration under a democratic regime even more than under an authoritarian rule. The service must be above party and we should ensure that political considerations, either in its recruitment or in its discipline and control, are reduced to the minimum if not eliminated altogether...Constitutional guarantees and safeguards are the best medium of providing for these services and are likely to prove more lasting”²²

REFERENCES

1. WILSON, WOODROW; ‘THE STUDY OF ADMINISTRATION’, POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY, JUNE 1887, VOL.2, PP. 197-222. SEE MOHIT BHATTACHARYA, NEW HORIZONS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, JAWAHAR PUBLISHERS AND DISTRIBUTORS, PP. 145
2. WILSON, WOODROW; ‘THE STUDY OF ADMINISTRATION’, POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY, JUNE 1887, VOL.2, PP. 197-222. SEE MOHIT BHATTACHARYA, NEW HORIZONS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, JAWAHAR PUBLISHERS AND DISTRIBUTORS, PP. 145
3. FADIA, B.L AND FADIA, KULDEEP; PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, SAHITYA BHAWAN PUBLICATIONS, PP. 91
4. GOODNOW, FRANK J; POLITICS AND ADMINISTRATION, NEW YORK, 1914, P. 22.

5. LEPAWSKY, ALBERT; ADMINISTRATION (THE ART AND SCIENCE OF ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT); OXFORD AND IBH PUBLISHING CO., NEW DELHI, INDIAN EDITION, 1970, P.43
6. FADIA, B.L AND FADIA, KULDEEP; PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, SAHITYA BHAWAN PUBLICATIONS, PP.93.
7. NIGRO, FELIX. A AND NIGRO, LLOYD G; MODERN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, 6TH EDITION, 1984, P.07
8. LEPAWSKY, ALBERT; ADMINISTRATION (THE ART AND SCIENCE OF ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT); OXFORD AND IBH PUBLISHING CO., NEW DELHI, INDIAN EDITION, 1970, P.61
9. HYNEMAN, C.H; BUREAUCRACY IN A DEMOCRACY, P.442
10. BHATTACHARYA MOHIT, NEW HORIZONS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION , JAWAHAR PUBLISHERS & DISTRIBUTORS; 2018; PG. 146
11. JAIN, R.B; “POLITICIZATION OF BUREAUCRACY: A FRAMEWORK FOR COMPARATIVE MEASUREMENT”, THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, VOL. XX, 1974
12. BHATTACHARYA MOHIT, NEW HORIZONS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, JAWAHAR PUBLISHERS & DISTRIBUTORS; 2018; PG. 153
13. SHARMA, M. P, SADANA, B. L, KAUR, HARPREET , PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THEORY AND PRACTICE, KITAB MAHAL PUBLISHERS, 48TH EDITION (2019) P. 353
14. JAIN, R.B , REVIEW ARTICLE – BUREAUCRACY AND POLITICS IN INDIA, THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, VOL. 32, NO 1 (JANUARY- MARCH,1971)P 82-92
 - SHANTI KOTHARI AND RAMASHRAY ROY, RELATIONS BETWEEN POLITICIANS AND ADMINISTRATORS AT THE DISTRICT LEVEL (NEW DELHI, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND CENTER OF APPLIED POLITICS, 1969) P. 215)
15. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, NEW DELHI.
16. THE TIMES OF INDIA, OCTOBER 23, 1993. SEE FADIA, B. L AND FADIA KULDEEP; INDIAN ADMINISTRATION; SAHITYA BHAWAN PUBLICATIONS, AGRA, 2013; P. 865
17. DUBEY, ASHOK KUMAR; *IKKISVI SHATABDI MEIN LOK PRASHASHAN*; TATA MCGRAW-HILL’S, NEW DELHI, 2008, P. 303
18. JAIN, R.B.; CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN INDIAN ADMINISTRATION, VISHAL PUBLICATIONS, DELHI, 1976, PP. 175-176
19. SINGH, L.P; SARDAR PATEL AND THE INDIAN ADMINISTRATION; UPPAL PUBLISHING HOUSE, NEW DELHI. QUOTED FROM INAUGURAL LECTURE IN

THE 'SARDAR PATEL MEMORIAL LECTURE SERIES' DELIVERED AT THE SOUTH GUJARAT UNIVERSITY, SURAT, 15 DECEMBER. 1986.

20. SEMINAR, DECEMBER- JANUARY 1973, NO. 168. QUOTED BY FADIA, B. L AND FADIA KULDEEP; INDIAN ADMINISTRATION; SAHITYA BHAWAN PUBLICATIONS, AGRA, 2013; P. 864.
21. DUBEY, ASHOK KUMAR; *IKKISVI SHATABDI MEIN LOK PRASHASHAN*; TATA MCGRAW-HILL'S, NEW DELHI, 2008, P. 307
22. FADIA, B. L AND FADIA KULDEEP; INDIAN ADMINISTRATION; SAHITYA BHAWAN PUBLICATIONS, AGRA, 2013; P. 1111



EARN YOUR MBA

WWW.IIMPS.IN



Accreditation & Ranking



UGC / NCTE Approved.

INFO@IIMPS.IN

☎ 011-41005174

R
S
E
A
R
C
H
G
A
T
E
W
A
Y

STOP PLAGIARISM



Arogyam Ayurveda
Holistic Healing through herbs



A
R
O
G
Y
A
M
O
N
L
I
N
E

PARIVARTAN PSYCHOLOGY CENTER



COLOR PSYCHOLOGY : HOW COLOR AFFECT YOUR CHILD



- BLUE** Calms your Child's Mind & Body
- YELLOW** Promotes Concentration, Stimulates the Memory
- PINK** Evokes Empathy, makes your Child Calm
- RED** Excites and energizes your Child's body
- GREEN** Improves Reading speed and Comprehension

www.parivartan4u.com



Confuse about your children's future?

भारतीय भाषा, शिक्षा, साहित्य एवं शोध

ISSN 2321 – 9726

WWW.BHARTIYASHODH.COM



**INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF
MANAGEMENT SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY**

ISSN – 2250 – 1959 (O) 2348 – 9367 (P)

WWW.IRJMST.COM



**INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF
COMMERCE, ARTS AND SCIENCE**

ISSN 2319 – 9202

WWW.CASIRJ.COM



**INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF
MANAGEMENT SOCIOLOGY & HUMANITIES**

ISSN 2277 – 9809 (O) 2348 - 9359 (P)

WWW.IRJMSSH.COM



**INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF SCIENCE
ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY**

ISSN 2454-3195 (online)

WWW.RJSET.COM



**INTEGRATED RESEARCH JOURNAL OF
MANAGEMENT, SCIENCE AND INNOVATION**

ISSN 2582-5445

WWW.IRJMSSI.COM



**JOURNAL OF LEGAL STUDIES, POLITICS
AND ECONOMICS RESEARCH**

WWW.JLPER.COM

JLPE