

**PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW**

**JOURNAL OF NIPA LAHORE**

**JAN-JUN 1984 PP 30-51**

## Some Implications of Self-Reliance Masood Hasan \*

*The author believes that self-reliance should be the corner-stone of our national effort. Several leading questions regarding the various factors and aspects of self-reliance and the necessary implications are presented to the reader as food for thought.*

### INTRODUCTION

What does self-reliance mean? Is it having sufficient financial resources at one's command so that one can buy, as it were, anything, at the snap of one's fingers. If this is the position then countries flushed with oil money should have no problems of self-reliance. However, things do not work out as simply as that. Does self-reliance mean having technologically competent manpower? If this is so then Pakistan should have no problems, but we do, because our technologically competent people are really more productive outside the country, fitting in at the tactical level very efficiently, but as part of an alien strategy. So it appears there may be some other factors that affect self-reliance. Does self-reliance mean having a large supply of minerals if this is so, then Zaire should be self-reliant, but it is not. Now let us look at Japan it has no petroleum or other mineral wealth, it is woefully short of grain, importing millions of tons each year to feed its people and it does have competent technologists and an almost nil illiteracy rate. Germany provides a close parallel with Japan including the wholesale destruction of its physical facilities during World War II. So self-reliance may not may not have anything to do with

- money
- mineral wealth or
- availability of technologists

The examples given of Japan and Germany can on reflection provide us with pointers or guidelines on the road to self-reliance. North Korea defines self-reliance in terms of being able to manufacture 80% of anything. This means self-reliance may not be a 100% achievement in any field. On the contrary, self-reliance appears to mean greater and greater interdependencies. And the rule for the most productive independent

---

\* Mr. Masood Hasan is Managing Director, EMMAY Associates Limited, Lahore.

arrangements are that, those concerned should measure up organizationally with each other, if they do not, then there is little of a productive nature that the weaker of the two parties will achieve, unless the weaker puts up a fight based on principle along with adequate publicity, in this fashion a 30-40% batting average may be achieved, and for a beginning that is good enough.

So it appears that by no stretch of imagination can self-reliance be looked upon as a simple matter, howsoever, much we may wish it. We are aware that while dexterous Pakistanis can hand tailor almost anything, say a jeep or an average electronic system but when it becomes to large scale manufacture we do not measure up to the problems that size/complexity throw up.

It is common knowledge that the *strength of a chain is determined by its weakest link*. It may, therefore, be that there is a weak link in the chain of interlinked activities required to achieve self-reliance. Let us look at the vehicle that takes care of man-made activities (which are not one-man shows) i.e. "the organization" whose output should be organized activity.

### **PREDICTABILITY**

A few years ago the write made a helicopter journey from Tarbela Dam to Rawalpindi. The terrain is of low hills, while skimming the hill-tops farmers could be seen leveling the land for agricultural purposes which has been going on for centuries. To be sure, there must have been failure of rain even for two seasons in succession, but because of the farmers' faith in the predictability of the eco-system: that if there is no rain this year there is bound to be some the next, they continue to tend their land lovingly as their forefathers did. Of course, there is no possibility, despite the proximity of Tarbela, to convey irrigation water up to the hill-top farmers.

Now let us look at our man-made organizations, with all their built-in inpredictabilities. In order to get a measure of the above we must first appreciate our administrative inheritance. The objective of our Victorian legacy was to ensure law and order using the eminently practical technique of divide and rule with non-interference at the tactical level. The time horizons of a law and order or penal approach, quite obviously must be short termed and be individual centered, further the review of the goings-on have to be procedurally oriented because one is dealing with historical evidence i.e post-mortems for

which there was plenty of time. After all worrying about something that was going to happen the next day or within the hour did not take up too much time. In any case looking further into the future was fraught with too much risk. Curzon's policy of masterly non-intervention held the day. The time for crossing bridges was when you goy them. These attitudes need revision when the emphasis is on development otherwise the development effort has to be inefficient and hence wasteful.

This approach is what we find in governments method of "control of rupees" which was basically inspired by the work of Mr. Foster and Mr. Whiffin who recommended in 1863, single entry cash accounting system. This method is entirely satisfactory for highly predictable rupee movement not involving carry overs from one accounting period to another and includes items such as salaries, rents, rates, TA and DA. Control through the audit function is also centered on dealing with historical evidence. So whether we look at legal or audit intervention concerning a murder or embezzlement of the *investigating procedure* reigns supreme, and indeed it must. There should be little of innovation in audit or judicial procedures.

On account of our long association with systems of "control" that deal with short future time horizons and no value added, the judicial and audit processes form our sole methods of determining the accountability of individuals who make decisions. When little or no attention is paid either to equity or propriety, it means the decision-maker is forced to follow the letter of the procedure so as to preserve himself. Because man-made procedures cannot take care of all situations, it takes a person of less than average intelligence to find loopholes for avoidance, hence there is no evasion and everything is just fine. This also explains why an honest boss and dishonest subordinate (and vice versa) can get on swimmingly, since both follow the same procedures faithfully, though each is aware of how the other works! The honest boss can be called an honest blinkered bureaucrat. No man-made rules can encompass all the permutations and combinations of variables, and no-one can legislate to take care of all the possible outcomes.

### **QUALITATIVE SHIFT**

why does simple work generate, over the years complex problems? It is of interest to have a look at some of our operations. We will observe that in performing work, at least the mid and lower levels of organizations, the results obtained are not the same as, say 20

years ago eg the same type of crane unloads the same type of crates, gunnies or drums at Karachi port, for the crane driver, the recording clerk etc the work is much the same. The railways transport human beings from, say Lahore to Karachi; for the ticket clerk, the engine driver, the cashier etc the work is much the same. Considering electricity distributed to a customer; for the meter reader, the maintenance technician, the complaints clerk etc the work is much the same. Considering pension cases the procedure for retiring employees is much the same yet in the examples given above we are all very well aware of a general deterioration over the years. Why is this so, after all the basic work of shifting levers/recording reading/salaries, cash, receiving/disbursing, recording complaints/records has **not** altered at all ie at the level where the physical transactions actually take place, which is also where the productive work gets done, which is also where the overall successes/failures of an organization are well and truly laid. To put it in another way why is it that the methods used in the 1950s for solving problems are no longer delivering the goods today? Is this not thrown up in many ways, culminating in frustration or even exasperation eg even though the route mileage of the railways has not really increased but through much more intensive use of the facilities over the years new problems have been generated and thrown up that have been so difficult to resolve. Also consider our internal revenue system, under the four heads – excise duty, Sea Customs, Sales Tax and Income Tax, the total annual turnover in 1948 was about Rs 20 crores, today under the same heads it amounts to over a 100 times the 1948 figure, and we are aware short term curative actions at least on three occasions were supposed to have set this system right. Has it? Consider our telephone bills, who does not have bitter experience on that topic? Hardly a telephone subscriber does not have pungent views yet month after one hopes for improvement....And, of course, several other examples could be given.

An analogy might be some assistance, as this is one way of approaching the unknown from the known. Supposing it is necessary to move stones from point A to point B and time is of no consideration. It could take 30, 40 or even 50 years. A contractor could employ 5, 10, 100, 200 or even 250 labourers to do the job. If the number of labourers were to exceed 250 he would find it very difficult to remember all their names. However, up to this number he could at a glance know at all times who was absent without leave,

who was working very efficiently, who was malingering, who was a victim of domestic trouble : : : in dealing with up to 250 individuals, because of the small size of the effort, all problems could be fully and efficiently encompassed by a single brain which ensures perfect knowledge of all the physical transactions. Hence control is as efficient as could be. However, if the same stones had to be shifted in a few months, may be 100,000 labourers would be required, may be 50,000, may be 5,000. If the contractor attempted to use the same methods as he had previously used he would never be able to accomplish the task, in fact it doesn't take much to see that he would very quickly fall flat on his face. He may have to put up a temporary labour colony (with all that goes with it). He may have to run a transportation service (with all the workshop and maintenance and procurement/stocking complications). All the thousands of workers would have to clock in for work (which would require comparatively sophisticated arrangements), may be 3 shifts 7 days a week. Again, who would report to whom, additionally, there would be problems of hygiene, as well as catering problems.

However, in both the above cases the expected results required are exactly the same, ie stones at point A must end up at point B, yet the problems thrown up in achieving the same results are of a totally different nature ie a qualitative shift has taken place in the nature of the difficulties doing exactly the same type of work ie shifting the stones. This shift really affects the higher hierarchical levels, not the lower. At what stage this qualitative shift took place, as the size of the effort intensified, no one can say but most certainly it did. One can jump across a small drain in one's stride, but try jumping across a river and that too if one can't swim. To carry this similitude somewhat further, if the stones have to be crushed, graded and cemented we may be talking of a Mangla or Tarbela dam.

We have to accept that this qualitative shift has taken place in several organized activities in Pakistan and elsewhere. Therefore, it would be logical to assume that this shift would call for a corresponding shift in our methods/attitudes towards work, towards our methods of training, towards our methods of evaluation, towards our methods of coordination, towards our methods of control, towards our methods of planning, towards our methods of recruitment and above all towards our methods of acquiring information.

## INFORMATION AND DECISION-MAKING

One will readily note that all these activities are concerned with servicing the system to assist the mid and lower levels to take care of the physical transactions and this has not altered as brought out earlier.... And last but not least in understanding that the more that power (authority) is concentrated at the top of the pyramid the more self-defeating it becomes. The necessity for decentralization becomes paramount. With decentralization the requirements for control alter because no longer does one person in "carry it all in his head." It is here that acceptance of the value of centralizing information through a Management Information System support service leads to confidence in delegation of authority and not abdication! Information is thus singled out for special consideration because in **all** administrative/executive systems officers are only handling information and making decisions and nothing, but nothing else. Of course, the quality of a decision is directly dependent on the quality and timeliness of the relevant information.

In an organization where the qualitative shift has not taken place, ie a small organization, the top man can through personal contact keeps tabs on all the activities. As such, his subordinates can tunnel upwards information that the top man can check/counter check/validate in good time so that corrective action is taken before the veritable horse bolts from the proverbial stable!

In large organizations, we are well aware, the top man has insufficient time to go into all problems in detail. This has, over a period of time (because of a lack of understanding the qualitative shift leading to the absence of information systems), forced subordinate units to decide **in their wisdom** what information should be funneled upwards to the boss, for him to make **his** decisions to discharge his responsibility upwards. Giving the subordinates the best of intentions, it is unfair to expect them to do justice in pushing upwards what is really relevant information ie relevant to the requirements of the higher level. It is the top man in each organization who must decide what he requires and this has, in our existing conditions, become a veritably difficult job. Just as a heavyweight wrestler can lift weights well enough, his ability to design a crane would be suspect. Likewise a good decision maker's ability to **design** an efficient decision making system

could be equally suspect. The expertise required for each activity is different and this has to be accepted.

## **TRAINING**

How can the qualitative shift be taken care of? Since it is the man behind the pen who matters what is where we should concentrate. Training is the answer. To provide the proper training involves consideration of the concept of “professionalization of experience”. By this is meant completion of the loop of theory and experience thus: it is usual in an institution of learning for a teacher to enunciate a law and then give individual examples to prove the general statement. The teacher is thus moving from the general to the particular. When an individual enters professional life he or she is not faced with the laws of motion or of multiple proportions or of marginal utility – but with real live discrete problems required to be solved in good time. Over the years the individual builds up an inventory of several hundred or more decisions. At the proper time the individual should be pulled out from his job and through appropriate means be made to review his several individual decisions. Patterns will emerge and in this fashion the individual will build up his own general statements. Any person who has spent the first seven years of his or her career in one type of activity (or very closely allied activities) would be a suitable candidate for such training exposure. The result is that the general to particular section of the loop obtained in the educational establishment is permitted to complete the circle by moving from the series of particulars (decisions) in real life to the general statement. It is this completion of the loop that leads to professionalization of experience, it helps the individual to distinguish the form from the content of a problem. A corollary to this approach is that it *steers absolutely: clear of the barren specialist/generalist controversy*, by clearly establishing the professional requirements of an executive or administrator, no matter what the original educational background may be. This is important because we have been bedeviled by the wrong concepts far too long.

The above approach leads us on to the concept of what type of training is required. There are two types of training: on-the-job and off-the-job – in each there are two types, either:

- functional or
- general/control/co-ordinative.



Relatively speaking in this country we have more of functional, both on and off-the-job in say, teaching an accountant to book-keep better or a welder to weld better or a gunner to aim better. We also have general/control/co-ordinative training, off-the-job, in staff colleges, institutes of public administration, academies and other in-house institutions.

We, however, lack on-the-job general/control/co-ordinative training – which teaches the individual to get work done through others. It is pertinent to point out that 90% of the development of the manager/administrative, does take place on-the-job, the class-room is indeed just too far away (witness the almost certain failure to introduce any modern management technique by an individual who has learnt it in the class-room. Either his boss tells him where to get off or his subordinates look at him blankly. Result is frustration). It is this type of training which is required in Pakistan to help develop the qualities required for administrative/managerial leadership. This is the type of training which will help generate the organizational process to become more predictable – the administrative eco-system will then generate *faith* in its operations and this is what we are looking for.

It is this predictability that is missing, it is this predictability that helps motivate average persons to achieve above average results, it is this predictability that forms the backdrop to ensuring teamwork that is so conspicuous by its absence. Since this approach is basically preventive and not curative it sets in motion a means to evolve rather than forcing something revolutionary down one's gullet which ultimately is inevitably thrown up in one form or the other.

We may now understand better why information is hoarded. Those working through others are only handling information and making decisions. Indeed they are doing absolutely nothing else at all. Hoarded information led to hoarding authority on the one hand and hoarding wealth on the other. The explosion came in Field Marshal Ayub's time when hoarded wealth and hoarded authority got together. We have yet to recover from this. The biggest self regulating force-organizationally speaking-is exposure. It is *systematic exposure* that helps generate the proper attitudes and not the penal approach of the legal or the audit processes, which are always backward looking.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY**

It is unfortunate that Article 216 of the 1972 provisional constitution never saw its place in the finally accepted constitution. It would have led to the setting up of Administrative courts to look after.

- a) Service matters
- b) Taxation
- c) Actions of government officials which could adversely affect a citizen even in the absence of a contract i.e. the liability of the government.

For purposes of looking into ways and means for improving self-reliance it is 'c' above that needs consideration. Since administrators/managers are quite flexible in their working methods it does not take them very long to find out-given the type of accountability they are subject to that. If the body is not found the crime as not committed. Whatever evidence is available for purposes of reviewing administrative decisions effectively camouflages the body. In any case what would happen if we had innovative judges or auditors, that would mean moving away from their bedrock of precedent and that will not and indeed should not happen in a hurry.

The requirement of an individual heading an administrative court is that he is not an umpire. He has to go into the propriety of an administrative decision and collect information (evidence) through his rapporteurs. There are two ways of obtaining information the first is by questioning individuals in various departments and by on-the-spot investigations for which funds are available. Unless information is acquired by an agency immediately remote from the department in questions, committees it for example are appointed by the Federal Council will be at a disadvantage. One could debate matters regarding known problems, but this would not be a source of disclosure about unknown ones. Persons held accountable should never be in a position to dictate which aspects of their business will be examined. But a committee without an investigating staff is not equipped to hold the initiative which it must if anything worthwhile is to be excepted. The head of the Administrative Court would not only look into the legalities of the case but also the motives – political, social or personal – and the onus of proving bonafides will be on the concerned administrative authority. It is subjective satisfaction that is being sought after, so justification of administrative decisions must be face to face. The

interpretation of administrative procedures will, therefore, be creative and dynamic and will not be bound any established practice or precedent. The objective is to secure a proper ethical and decent standard of administrative behaviour. The head of such a court, would where necessary go far in extending the vicarious liabilities of the State and award damages. All this is very much in keeping with Islamic injunctions and indeed very close to the approach brought out by Hazrat Abu Bakar when he became the fist Caliph, in his address he said that in his eyes the strong would weak and the weak would be strong – the reference is clearly towards ensuring there would be propriety and equity in arriving at decisions so as to permit the natural growth of society on the correct lines.

Our present procedure for obtaining ‘justice’ is that the judge listens to the advocates, the litigants talk to them and ‘justice’ in large measure depends on the skill of advocacy. What is dispensed appears to be hardly relevant, but it is essential that the interpretation of the law be correct. It is not without reason that the late Justice Kayani stated that he was not there to dispense justice but to interpret the law. It remains to be seen how th Ombudsman’s Organization can do what an Administrative Court should be doing.

### **CONTROL**

In any case to expect to ‘control’ the executive externally can hardly succeed. Effective controls are always internal, particularly when you are harnessing technology. The late Sarabhai in his Foundation Day Lectures at the Administrative College of India in December 1969 quoted from the US Panel on Technology assessment in regard, to internal and external evaluations thus:

*“Implicit in much of this report has been the distinction between internalized assessment (ie assessment built into the incentive structure, the decision-making process in question) and externalized assessment (ie assessment conducted by an institution deliberately separated from the front-line decision-maker). There has been general agreement in the panel that internalized assessment whenever it can be applied, is far preferable essentially because self regulating close-loop systems are best able to adjust to net variations within the system itself. Externalized assessment separates authority from responsibility tends to re-define responsibility without separating it from authority (and further). However self-regulating systems may be insensitive to externalities and may have to be*

*substituted by externalized open-loop systems. Thus although there are advantages in being on the scene, proximity and commitment tend to generate blind spots. In sum, any scheme devised for improving the assessment and management of technological change should make maximum possible use of the internal decision-making process and should proceed by making these processes more sensitive rather than by imposing external constraints, but it should recognize the necessity for some external assessment and supervision to make the system function properly, ideally, the effort should be made to modify goals and criteria of success without dictating the means of achieving them”.*

Such internal control ie the executive controlling the executive permits evolution of effective methods. This approach is sympathetic to the approximately correct decisions being made at the right time, rather than the correct at the wrong! After all you can correct yourself as you go along. Judicial or audit accountability on account of their external approach must always be concerned more with the sins of commission and not omission. This effectively smothers innovative thinking, resulting in hardly any creative output. Making use of science and technology calls for stepping away from the routine rut and treading new trails because yesterdays precedent may be dangerously misleading and totally irrelevant when applied to todays problems if only on account of the Qualitative Shift (Annex II). This shift also brings out the necessity for considering time as a resource. Neither the law nor audit can be said to be pushed on this core. Very much like thermodynamics which can tell you a lot about a certain process whether it is possible or not but it will not tell you how long it will take to achieve results. The speed of the non-productive activities governs the speed of the productive. The deleterious effects of the non-productive can be reduced by having sound and reliable reporting, sound and good management development programmes and an organization structure that helps moving in the direction of facilitating work flow rather than providing all the hindrances which appear with nagging frequency. Should we not insist on this since it helps positively in generating self-reliance? Removing the deleterious effects of the non-productive is equivalent to the implementation of the design, construction, installation and maintenance of the required administrative fences that will help to reduce outside

interference, the bane of our administrative system. A lush unfenced pasture does indeed attract hungry animals. Fencing will ensure only but a few successfully jump over.

Our procedures, evaluation, reporting and management development programmes certainly do need a little bit more than a retrofit/rejuvenation! It is out of such realization that the proper approach will dawn forming links in the chain of effectiveness: that there is no such thing as a technological gap; it is a managerial gap, this was first said by McNamara at Millsap's College, Jackson (Miss) in Feb. 1967, even though his thoughts were in regard to the gap between highly industrialized European countries and the USA. The Europeans, at that time, were afraid that a kind of technological colonialism was threatening them. The brain drain to the USA represented an effect not of merely advanced technology but the cause, which without question was much more effective administration or management of organizations. Such thoughts can also be applied, albeit at a lower level of sophistication, to the underdeveloped world – some points with money but inadequately qualified manpower and other parts with little money but with a reasonable reservoir of manpower.

#### **TECHNOLOGY AND CHANGE**

Another realization that must crystallize in our minds is that modern advances are firmly based on multi-disciplinary collaboration which has produced a vast array of new organizational tools including amongst others, operations, research, cybernetics, information theory, decision theory, systems and procedures, electronic data processing and autonomies. Logical to this realization is that we move in the direction of self-reliance by introducing flexibility in our method, but using as sheet anchor the scientific, empirical or inductive method, which was first popularized by Islam in a big way thirteen to fourteen centuries ago.

Since it is the man behind the pen that ultimately matters, greater attention must be paid to him in recruitment, in training, in evaluating, in merit rating and in performance appraisal as also in updating his obsolescent knowledge... new methods of training are required to provide the missing link – the bridge between practice and theory (not, presently, the other way around!) and then to strengthen this and then to continuously maintain it. Just as a machine requires maintenance so does the human brain if only because of the shorter time frames in which knowledge is doubling itself, may be two to

three times during the service life of an individual. This personal obsolescence is one of the prime causes of generating inertia in excess of what is required, if results in insistence on maintaining the status quo which many a time helps to solve the wrong problem most efficiently. Or putting it in another way the rapidity of changes in technology ie the problem solving know-how—technical, commercial industrial or administrative – makes past experience not only frequently irrelevant but sometimes dangerously misleading.

### **BEHAVIOURAL FACTORS**

The prime cause of quick change, therefore, is technological. However, technology considered in isolation of the economic makes it impossible to formulate an adequate strategy. Further, to make use of the results of the technological it is essential to recognize the role of the social sciences. In manipulating change, we need to apply ourselves to people before we can apply ourselves to problems. Moreover, the biggest obstacle to innovation most often rises from social factors within the organization rather than pure technical know-how or equipment. So often this most important fact of life is not acknowledged with results that we by now should be thoroughly familiar with. A number of questions arise as to how is it possible to transfer the social sciences input to a productive activity: such as industry. Should research and development be viewed as capital investment, routine expenditure or overhead? Can the traditional administrative structure, the methods of evaluating human performance and the operating procedures deliver the goods? In government can the finance function play a constructive role in research, development and industry? Should research and development institutions be built around gifted individuals? If it is accepted that there is shortage of competent technical persons is there any merit in setting up new institutions and pulling them out of existing jobs within the country? Would it not result in transferring an asset from one pocket to another without any net increase in effectiveness? Do these difficulties arise out of:

- The fact that do we lack capability to understand or the learning itself?
- Is that even though we have the capability, we do not wish to be burdened by the facts of given situation?

- Is it because we are so used to a particular or familiar (comfortable) way of doing things that any effort not conforming to the 'set' way means countering too much inertia which requires Herculean effort?
- Is it, that there is blind adherence to the status quo on account of fear of the unknown?
- Is it while paying lip service to the use of modern management aids we consciously or unconsciously in practice create conditions, making it virtually impossible for any such effort to succeed?
- Is it because those in authority with 20-25 years experience find that it can take one-third of that time with present-day management education/aids for new entrants to develop equivalent or even better skills for decision-making and this creates built-in resistance?

### **INVENTION**

In USA a study was made in 1965 in an investigation by the Department of Defence to determine what clicked (or didn't) in the 1945-63 era to bring in cost effectiveness in a range of 20 systems which were examined by 13 teams with mixed government, industry and non-profit corporation scientists. They concluded that advancing technology was much more in the area of minor improvements than in major scientific discoveries. This study concentrated on invention itself. Another study indicated that invention arose out of developing knowledge that had been—generated 30 years or earlier including magnetic ferrites, the video tape, oral contraceptive pill, and the electron microscope. This certainly gives hope to an underdeveloped country such as ours that R and D properly organized can help in achieving self-reliance. However, this is another topic. Suffice it to say an R and D policy is insufficient, given our conditions. What is required—a Research, Development and Acquisition (RD and A) policy. This article does not go into this most interesting matter.

### **CONSUMPTION**

On account of our penchant for only taking cognizance of the since of commission and its logical conclusion i.e. maintain the status quo we have found it so much easier to permit almost unrestricted imports to generate high revenues for the government so that a la Parkinson expenditure rises to meet income—more and more resources are going into

consumption. While it is true that the remittances from Pakistanis abroad, which should be around three billion dollars annually, does assist in our balance of payments-just as North Sea Oil does for the UK-it is clear unless we increase our productive investments (this means breaking new ground) on the one hand and increased productivity of existing assets on the other of both agricultural land and industry there can be no hope, given an illiteracy rate of about 75%, to achieve the social justice that we have been hankering after since our late Prime Minister said in presenting the Objectives Resolution to the Assembly, soon after Pakistan came into existence that Islam has a distinct and positive contribution to make in this regard.

### **ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**

How successful or otherwise we have been, is reflected directly by the efficiency or otherwise of our development administration whose effectiveness must be related to the power structure. Let us look at the Indus Basin Treaty, it really was the same or India as was for Pakistan! What happened under Nehru in its implementation across the border and what happened out here? There was acceptance in India by its power structure of the concept or strategy that self-reliance had to be put into practice quickly, and when one wants to move quicker and quicker the more strategy counts. While Indians can design and construct Bhakra-Nangals it appears we in Pakistan have lost the capability of designing and constructing barrages. What is the use of winning a tactical skirmish here or there only to find out our plans have not only a weak, but a missing link, in that there are no means for the assessment of the administrative capability required organizationwise in the two links of execution and control in making the effort to achieve results in our various sector of activity. Please do not forget our technological competence is not in question, our people do very well abroad. As if these aspects can grow up undirected of themselves by themselves. If we do not pay attention to these factors it doesn't mean to say that we cannot have growth. Did we not have it in the 60s? But at what cost-capital formation through tax evasion being accepted as a good thing. Morality took second place and laughed at. At least let us learn a lesson from our failure (though tactically successful, according to our foreign advisor).

### **OTHER COUNTRIES**



## OTHER COUNTRIES

In the USA problems arose after the 1861-65 events which was a period of quick development, in 1883 a Civil Services Commission was set up and the early 1900s was a muckraking era which led to a merit system which has since had beneficial effects on organizing the business of government. In Sweden a National Personnel Authority was set up in 1947. Further, in Sweden, all public documents (not involving security) are liable to be inspected by the public. This form of institutionalized exposure has had a salutary effect on informal corruption or favouritism. In France during Napoleon's time the institutin of Administrative Courts (Conseil d'Etat and the Droit Administratif) was given sound backing, the results are there for us to see. From 1945 to 1958 there were 23 major political changes, yet because of an efficient administration, that owed a lot to the Napoleonic institution, saw France through. In the UK with an efficient political system because of a bureaucracy which could hide behind the Officials Secrets Act, economically speaking the UK had turbulent troublesome times. It was about a year and a half ago when a computer hardware manufacturer advertised in the *London Economist* that productivity in Czechoslovakia and Spain was higher than in the UK. Could anyone have imagined this a few years ago? A recent study of 42 countries in the Eastern Hemisphere by a Swiss based organization indicated Pakistan third from the bttom i.e 39<sup>th</sup> in the list of productivity.

Exposure is the best self regulating force that organized activity can experience. In its absence inefficiencies must proliferate. And it is true to say that it is as much inefficiency to suffer inefficiency unprotestingly as to be inefficient, and it is slavish sufferers who create a tyrant of the system because when matters have advanced pretty far they can do nothing about it, or at least they think they cannot. This is a great tragedy for where visions fail, nations perish. It becomes impossible for the system to rise in scale so as to permit it to ensure a greater degree of adaptation (the qualitative shift, varying time frames, rising expectations, instant communication . . . ) to ensure productive development. Indeed the living faith of the dead becomes the dead faith of the living. With closed minds i.e lacking the capability to be mindful, to reflect or understand there is little to expect of productive results but certainly of running yourself to a dynamic standstill in tautomeric equilibrium as it were.

Let us look at South Korea where a friend had to produce a feasibility study to set up five cold storages in double quick time. He was oppressed by anxiety to beat the deadline because of the imagined difficulties in obtaining relevant data. He was assured that there would be no difficulty at all and that obtaining authentic data would take less than a few hours. In the afternoon he visited the Statistics Wing of the Ministry of Agriculture and in less than three hours obtained following information:

- the quantity of fruits and vegetables produced in each region including those areas located in remote corners of the country.
- The wholesale prices for the relevant products monthwise for the year.
- The main agencies who were responsible for transacting the purchase and sales of those products.
- The conditions which applied to the sale and purchase of those commodities.

My friend was more than shocked, but this happening is indicative of what self-reliance truly means. To be able to acquire information so quickly instills confidence in a prospective investor, it indicates business-like approach in getting things done. It provides faith in the system.

In summary the following points need our attention:

- What constitutes organization?
- Has the Qualitative Shift really taken place?
- How can the nervous system (information networks) of an organization be exposed?
- Where does training fit into the scheme of things? Are new methods required?
- Can administrative accountability be brought about judicially or auditwise?
- What type of controls can be effective?
- When we wish to harness technology, is it not the 'management of change' that we are talking about?
- Can change be introduced ignoring the social factors?
- What shortcuts are there for underdeveloped countries to ensure the path of most resistance i.e from Research to Development and on to Acquisition is made earlier?

- Is it not through an attitude of accepting the status quo that we find it easier to go in for conspicuous consumption?
- Is there a relationship in being able to achieve results and the structure of an organizational system?
- Can we learn from the experience of other countries?

We are prepared to answer the above questions with good intentions it will provide the beginning of making self-reliance a corner-stone of the national effort. Quite obviously the topic is vast. But let us take a little time off to glance at nature and tickle our faculties of logic and reasoning through observation. Indeed we shall get only what we strive for:

*Va an-laisa lil insaanl illa ma sa-a* (The Holy Quran 53:39).