ABSTRACT

Bureaucracy is an idea as well as an embodiment of a structural arrangement. It has been defended as a necessity and at the same time vigorously condemned. As a result of controversies surrounding it, bureaucracy, has come to mean different things to different people.

Bureaucracy is not a new phenomenon. It existed in elaborate forms thousands of years ago in Egypt and Rome and in rather sophisticated forms in China and India in ancient times. With the dawn of modern era, the trend towards the process of bureaucratization had greatly accelerated. In contemporary society, bureaucracy has become a dominant institution, indeed the institution that epitomizes the modern era.

In a more traditional sense, the term ‘bureaucracy’ is derived from the Latin word ‘bureau’ which means ‘desk’ and Greek word ‘cracy’ which means ‘rule’. Thus, it means desk rule or desk government. In French ‘La Bure’ means a cloth used on table of public authorities. From tablecloth, the table covered by cloth got the name ‘bureau’ Later ‘bureau’ began to be used for the office room where table is kept. Thus, by 18th century the term began to be used to refer to a place where officials work. The suffix ‘cratic, is derived from the Greek word which means ‘rules’. Thus, ‘bureaucracy’ refers to rule by officials.
A bureaucratic system is monastic with a single line of command and control. It is characterized by a hierarchy of superior and subordinate relations in which a person at the top assumes all authority and issues general orders to initiate actions. Orders reach to the lowest subordinates through a series of layers or ranks. A status and reward system closely follows these hierarchies. A bureaucracy is an activity by a group of officials arranged on the basis of activity to be performed in an accountable & responsible manner. It is a hierarchical chain organized vertically, disciplined and depending on the degree of centralization. In essence, bureaucracy is a rational distribution of activities in which there is a complete authority to issue the command and in a manner laid down by the rules. Written documents and files are important elements in bureaucracy it is a system, which induces officials to be methodical, prudent and disciplined, and whose behavior is highly reliable. The obligation of an office and the relationship among officials are impersonal.

The modern state is a welfare state, which has to make an arrangement for education, health, housing and various others amenities for the people. With the expansion of the activities of the state, bureaucracy has also expanded the spheres of administration of a country depending upon the caliber and integrity of the bureaucracy.
Max Weber (1864-1920) a German Sociologist was the first social scientist to have systematically studied the bureaucracy. He provided a structural identification of the bureaucratic form of organization and discussed facets of its behaviors. In nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century, he drew the picture on studies of ancient bureaucracy in Egypt, Germany, Rome and Europe. For his study, he used an ideal type approach. The ideal type is neither a description of reality nor a statement of normative preference. Max Weber was the first to observe and write on bureaucracy, which developed in Germany during the 19th century. He considered them to be efficient, rational and honest, a big improvement over the haphazard administration that they replaced.

From the perspective of the officials, Weber observed that office holding is a “vocation” that it is a calling, requiring prescribed courses of training for a long period of time and having examinations which are a prerequisite for employment. He is to be loyal to the office he holds, not to a patron. By virtue of his position the officials enjoy high social esteem. The official is appointed by a superior official. He is not elected normally; he works for the agency for life. He receives a salary and pension when he retires. The official pursues a carrier within the bureaucracy, moving up to more responsible positions according to his experience and ability.
Max Weber developed a typology of authority and distinguished three pure types, traditional, charismatic and legal. He regarded bureaucracy sustained, legal, and sanctified by purest type of exercise legal authority as the most effective form of organization.

Weber sets out an ideal type of bureaucracy, characterized by an elaborate hierarchical division of labour directed by explicit rules impersonally applied, staffed by full time life time professionals, who do not in any sense own the means of administration or their jobs or the sources of their funds and live off a salary and not form income derived directly from the performance of their jobs. These features are normally found in the public service in the offices of private firms, universities and so on.

Weber used the method of interpretative understanding for constructing ideal type. These are made use of for comparing complex events and processes. Weber placed his ideal type within a broader framework. He defined sociology as the study of social action. Within this context, power means the ability to enforce one's will on others despite resistance on their part. Authority means legitimate and regular use of power. Thus, the capacity to exercise control is justified and it appears to be fair. Various types of authorities are based on different types of social actions. The traditional authority may be patrimonial or feudal in nature. The charismatic
authority has traits of a revolutionary leader as he changes everything in his own way.

Egypt has a very colorful history. The pharaohs were considered divine and they ruled over a highly stratified society. The first pyramid was built in the 27th century B.C. Over the next 500 years the movement only got grander. Monarchical power was at its greatest during the 4th dynasty when Chops and Mycerinus built the Great pyramid of Giza. Pharaonic Egypt was the cradle of bureaucratic systems with levels of hierarchies and division of labor. Under the Pharaohs who considered themselves as endowed with divine attributes, Egypt reached the zenith of its achievements during the old kingdom which began, with the unification of upper Egypt with the lower by Menes. A highly centralized government with the divine Pharaoh at the top assisted by a minister and helped by a ‘government council’ and an elaborate hierarchy which practiced considerable delegation and specialization, was able to create engineering marvels like the pyramids besides controlling and directing the flow of and flooding of the Nile, irrigating the farms and increase the fertility of the soil. In those glorious achievements the officialdom that participated consisted of mixture members of the royal family, Priests holders of various administrative positions. Certain degree of professionalism and training to master reading and writing and arithmetic
was there. Some offices had a tendency to become hereditary and were often subject to purchase. Efficiency must have been the secret of their success. There were also evidence of inefficiency in this period, red tape, abuse, bribery, extortion and laziness. Above all there was the concept of total ownership of the land and the people including the officials by the God King, the pharaoh.

The second most important period of administrative significance was the Arab-Islamic period which began in 639 AD and ended with the Ottomans by the end of the 18th century, which was characterized by an appointed Diwan or a wali, a kind of viceroy ruling on behalf of an external Caliph or sultan. During this period various services began to emerge under the auspices of the state from time to time showing distinct hierarchies of army and other services 'men of sword and men of pen'. During the mamluks the native military hierarchy developed often in conflict with other bureaucrats owing allegiance to the sultan. Allegiance to a civil or a military hierarchy was common, despite the fact that all were in the name of the state and often there was some overlapping. During the Ottoman rule from 1517 AD the rulers and the higher level bureaucracy were controlling large number of Egyptian scribe’s solders and revenue collectors. Centralization of authority and suppression of any initiative from the lower ranks was the
practice as the ruler was virtually far away. Real loyalty and allegiance was to the local hierarchical superior in the employment of an emerging modern state.

The distinct influence of modern European state on the emergence of a state bureaucracy was felt after the short lived Napoleon occupation (1778-1801). A revival of national sentiment with the ideas of political and administrative reform at all levels of the government open to Egyptians on equal footing on the basis of intellectual and ethical criteria was the result of this European exposure.

Mohammed Ali who ruled for years after French occupation first came as a viceroy of the Ottomans and later emerged as the proponent of a developmental nationalism. He was also the initiator of a series of administrative reform. However, like the pharaohs and later rulers, he too felt the need for centralized authority. This was because immediately before his arrival the country was in a state of confusion. Mohammed Ali was able to launch an era of reconstruction, improved irrigation systems and redesigned and rationalized administrative hierarchies all owing allegiance to him.

Mohammad Ali sought to transform rural agricultural Egypt into an industrial society with a modern military apparatus. He mobilized nation’s
human and material resources into his own hands, creating a state controlled economy in the near east with Egypt as its center. To manage his varied enterprises he wanted an efficient but subservient civil service. Detailed division of the country into administrative units under generational jurisdiction with deeper and wider hierarchies took place. His periodic inspections tours of the countryside checking on cultivation, irrigation, conduct of civil servants, public accounts, and every detail of what may be called the beginnings of a development administration in Egypt set the tone for a modern authoritarian state. Administrative responsibilities were carried out by six principal departments (diwans) interior, treasury, marine, public instruction and public works, foreign affairs and commerce. As he launched his industrialization projects a new diwan was appointed to supervise textile industry Extension of industrial revolution to many areas with state initiatives led to the creation of a new class of ‘public sector employees.

In an effort to draw upon the Egyptian population for his technical and administrative staff he set up schools in Egypt and sent several hundred young men to European institutions to study civil administration. Recruitment for higher education on the basis of competition and merit rather than on ethnic origin or religion was emphasized. Training was emphasized especially for technical subjects and specialization, which
became part of the expanding state machinery. Though Mohammad Ali’s vision did not continue after his death, the foundation of an educated merit oriented civil service was laid down firmly during his regime.

Mohammad Ali proceeded to impose a new order in the first three decades of the nineteenth century. The new order became the basic framework for that country’s drive towards modernity for the next hundred years. It aimed first at the organization of a modern army, and required reform and innovation in several areas of state activity, agriculture, administration, education and industry. Mohammed Ali inaugurated policies that changed the patterns of landownership and agriculture in order to increase productivity and yield greater wealth to the state. He introduced a system of state education in order to provide the trained and skilled manpower required by the service of his state, and especially his armed forces. He reformed the administration in order to secure efficient, strict and economical control over the functions of state and government. He embarked upon an ambitious programme of industrialization which produced the first state factories in Egypt in order to make his armed forces self sufficient in materials and supplies.

Mohammed Ali’s method of government and administration were absolute and strictly centralized. All power delegated by authority of the
Sultan in Egypt was vested in him. Contrary to previous Ottoman governors appointed by Sultan to Egypt, Mohammed Ali appeared original in so far as he imposed his authority over all other power groups in the country. There were no longer such contenders for power with viceroy as the Shaikh-al-Balad, the mamluk chief, or the religious leader from the Azhar. Instead of delegating the command of his troops to Albanian or other officers, Mohammed Ali placed his sons, Tossun, Ibrahim and Ismail at their head. His youngest son Saeed Pasha, commanded the naval forces; his grandson, Abbas was in charge of the Cairo government. Other members of his family filled military and civil administrative positions in the conquered dominions, especially Syria and Hijaz. He centralized the control of the various provinces in Egypt by reorganizing their administration into governors, subgovernors, inspectors and mayors in a chain of command relationship.

It is commonly under said that Europeans began their penetration of Egypt in earnest, by financial manipulation and exploitation of the local ruler's extravagances and ambition. His successors, Ismail did little to alter the administrative habits of Egypt, for he soon became embroiled in international financial controversy to a degree that brought the European powers closer and closer to political control over the country.
British occupation which began in 1882 gradually found the need to produce clerks for the civil service towards which the education system was reoriented. Higher echelons of the bureaucracy excluded Egyptians who were to be content with lower level government positions. Throughout his long tenure of office Lord Comer sedulously kept down every independent Egyptian and filled all the high posts with ciphers, with the result that the natural leaders of the people had no opportunity of leading the people. In 1898 of the 10,600 Egyptians in the Civil Service only 45 received a monthly salary of 70 Egyptians pounds or more. Whereas 47 out of 455 Britons received that much. However unlike in India, the British were satisfied by having a tight control at the center and left the provinces to the Egyptians who were for centuries used to such arrangement.

The growing nationalist movement and the accompanying grants of autonomy meant the steady elimination of foreigners from the civil service and its Egyptianization. This process was accelerated by the British declaration of Egypt's independence in 1922. By the time of independence, Egypt was in full control of most of public employment and the educational system was geared towards producing civil servants for the state. There were conscious efforts to improve the recruitment system which culminated in inviting A.P. Sinker who was the chairman of the British Civil Service
Commission to study the Egyptian system of governance. As a result of his report a Civil Service Commission was established in October, 1951, with a mandate to regulate personnel recruitment.

As far as Egypt is concerned it is probably common place that on the eve of the 1952 Revolution the need for serious administrative reform was widely felt. After the revolution, problems of the bureaucracy became more complicated, since, in addition to its traditional and rather mechanical tasks the administration was now charged with new and increasingly development oriented responsibilities that required flexibility, innovation, and the application of higher levels of technology. The heavy burden of traditions and the rising expectations of the people added to the complexity of the situation and made the need for radical reforms even more urgent.

In 1952, the first step in this direction was the consolidation of the Diwan Al Muwazafin as a central civil service commission. It was given the right to refer to the legislature in case of dispute with the Ministry of Finance to which it was attached, and from which it attempted to gain independence. The Diwan produced several reports of benefit and 1957 and 1958 prepared plan for the classification of posts and for work simplification. To fulfill the latter task a central administration was created by the Diwan to be helped by local committees in all ministers but its
performance was not found satisfactory. To revive this, The whole Diwan was affiliated to the presidency in 1959 and its entire role was reconsidered. It was now called upon not just to confine itself to problems of the implementation of laws and improvement of procedures, but also to proceed to the preparation of able civil servants and the raising of performance rates in the administration.

A significant development took place in February, 1963, when the Presidential Council commissioned a General Committee and a Technical Secretariat to reconsider the structure and functioning of the government machinery and to recommend projects for its reorganization. One of the results merging from the efforts of this team was the creation of a new central body under the name of the Central Agency for Organisation and Administration, (C.A.O.A.) in 1964 which was meant to be more powerful in status and possessing a wider sphere of competence than its predecessor.

In order to be able to carry out these functions CAOA was given the right to supervise the application of laws and statues relating to personnel affairs and the activities of organs engaged in personnel training. It was also granted right to check proposals for organization and reorganization and proposals for budgetary arrangements related to personnel, before their final endorsement. It could also take part in designing organizational charts and
specifying performance rates. It could demand, and inspect, date and statistics from different public bodies.

A new kind of training need however, was becoming increasingly persistent with the Egyptianization and nationalization of the late fifties and early sixties. This was the need to train personnel of the new public bodies in entrepreneurial (or business) administration. For this purpose, the National Institute for Management Development (NIMD) was created in 1961 aiming at conducting training programs in areas related to management development. While its main task was to train business and industrial managers in general and specialized areas, it was also to carry out research and provide consultancy. Three types of training programs were offered by the NIMD, top management programs, specialized programs and sector programs. Until 1969 N.I.M.D. had offered training to 966 administrative officers. A management consultancy section was created to diagnose problem and suggest alternative solutions, and follow them up.

Yet another type of training appeared in the mid sixtees. A committee was created in 1965 to plan and direct Executive Conference Programmes (ECP). These were tailor made programmes drawn up according to the needs and interests of the participants. They dealt with certain Problem area’s through exposition of experts views and discussion of possible solutions.
A Central Agency for training was established in 1967 to supervise technical and vocational training. Training was also offered at the Institute of Labour Administration, the Institute of Banking Studies, the Arabs Society for Business Administration, the Arab Center for Research and Administration, the Public Relation Society and by other professional and associational institutes.

The post revolutionary phase also saw an expansion in the role of bureaucracy as Egypt embarked on a major nationalization drive and the expansion of the public sector. The economic profile before 1952 showed that Egypt’s economy was dominated by agricultural sector. Early attempts at industrialization during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries failed. Foreign indebtedness was a serious problem, and the British power integrated Egypt as an agricultural colonial unit into an international political economic system. By discouraging industrial growth and the conservation of scanty natural resources, foreign occupation and dynastic rule based on vested interests severely handicapped the growth of Egypt’s economy before 1952.

In the beginning of the post revolutionary era the revolutionary government’s economic policies were directed at balanced development and growth of the countries human, agricultural and industrial resources.
Persistently high rates of population growth greatly intensified the demand for basic goods and services such as food products, which constituted a sizable portion of Egypt's import trade and health and educational services, which were declared to be basic rights of all Egyptians. Thus, the expansion of public services and agricultural development was accorded special attention in the 1950's. Success in these sectors, together with improvements in transportation and communication, provided valuable support to the more fundamental goal of developing light and heavy industries.

The first four years of the post revolutionary phase from 1952 to 1956 saw the economy almost entirely in private hands with the state's role limited to infrastructure investments and the provision of social services. From 1957 to 1960, policy options changed and there was a decided new impetus towards progressive nationalization of the economy. In this period the major foreign owned enterprises were nationalized. During the period 1961-1973 infrastructure, mining and basic manufacturing banking and insurance, all imports and three-quarters of exports came under the control of the public sector. Domestic commerce, real estate, construction and light industry remained in the hands of the private sector. An important innovation of this phase, perhaps the one that more than any other would condition subsequent development, was the implementation of a policy of
social welfare devised to govern income distribution and guarantee a minimum subsistence level to the population. During the same period, the Egyptian economy became an almost completely planned system and the private sector was relegated to a marginal role. In this period emphasis was placed on the productive sectors, with priority being given to industry.

On Nasser’s death his successor, Anwar-Al-Sadat assumed the Presidency of Egypt in 1971. After pledging to continue Nasser’s policies, the new government altered its course towards Sadat's own agenda. The largest change made to government structure was the drafting of the 1971 permanent constitution which laid out Egypt’s future. The constitution defined Egypt as a democratic socialist state based on the alliance of the working forces of the people. It further called on Islamic jurisprudence to be the principle source of legislation in the country, and the President was defined as the most powerful member of the government.

The power of the President stemmed, in great part, from the enormous constitutional authority and customary prerogatives in his office. Perhaps the foremost key to the President’s power in Egypt in his wide powers of appointment and dismissal; most important was the right to appoint the Prime Minister, the cabinet and the Chief of the armed forces, but in a highly bureaucratic society, President patronage extended over a much wider scope
of positions including public sector managers, newspaper editors, judges and party leaders. Sadat’s right to appoint loyal followers to the strategic levers of state power and to dismiss those who incurred his displeasure was a main source of elite dereference to the President. As chief executive the President also stood at the top of a legal chain of command which entitled him to obedience from the civil and military bureaucracies. The Prime Minister was merely the President’s Chief assistant and the Cabinet a ‘staff’ expected to turn his general policy into detailed legislation and executive action.

In 1973 Sadat initiated the famous Open Door Policy the Infitah, wherein the economic policies of the Nasser era were completely reversed. Since the Open Door economic policy was formally adopted in the mid-seventies, the role of the Egyptian public bureaucracy has undergone several changes. Such changes, however, do not amount to a retrenchment of the state as some observers have interpreted them. The state bureaucracy is still large and expanding, both in terms of personnel and expenditure, and the control functions assumed by the bureaucracy have by no means declined. In the economic sphere, the public sector has not really given way to the private sector (except in the special case of commerce and finance), but the state has merely chosen to cooperate with international capital. This has signified a transformation of the state role from a developmental one to a production-
oriented one (seeking profit and cutting down on welfare activities within the joint public sector/ international capital enterprises). However, the welfare functions of the state bureaucracy towards the society at large (education and health, food subsidies, etc.) have not been significantly curtailed although the state has become increasingly dependent on external sources for financing them.

Bureaucracy both in terms of size and the low performance were the new feature of the well entrenched Egyptian bureaucracy. However during the seventies and especially following the war of 1973 quantitative growth and qualitative decline both accelerated simultaneously and to an unprecedented degree that threatens to produce very serious organizational and political repercussions. This situation has, created at least two major ironies. The first is in the fact that the impetus of bureaucratic growth (which acquired sizeable dimensions under Nasser) is now continuing under its own momentum, even though the role of the state especially in the economic field has declined noticeably under the open door policy. The other irony is that, for a variety of organizational and political reasons, the performance of the Egyptian bureaucracy has declined sharply in quality, just at a time when the desire, under unfaith, to encourage investments-especially from Arab and
foreign sources—actually requires a more innovative, flexible and efficient bureaucracy.

It can be concluded that, the open door policy notwithstanding the Egyptian bureaucracy has continued to expand in terms of personnel and expenditure. This expansion, however, has been more remarkable in areas related to the "control" or repressive functions of the state of the state than it has been in areas related to its "service" or socio economic functions. The figures surveyed above confirm that the role of the state bureaucracy has by no means declined, although it has witnessed some important changes.

President Mubarak inherited a complex legacy from the Nasser and Sadat eras, with it mélange of policies and institutions that date back to the period of socialist transformation or else to the days of the open door policy. The social base of the state that Mubarak inherited can not be separated from the realignment of classes that took place under infitah, and which brought to the fore an alliance between elements from the pre-revolutionary semi-aristocracy, the state bourgeoisic of the 1960's and the commercial/financial cliques of the infitah era. Yet it should be clear that the role of the state bourgeoisie has not really been seriously reduced, since the state continues to allocate to itself a significant proportion of national resources. In particular a large expansion in the control and repressive organs of the state
has been taking place since the 1970s as already indicated, e.g. the Central Security Forces. State Security Courts and ‘Morals’ Courts, the Public Prosecutor’s functions as well as the bureaucracy, the armed forces, and the state information machine in general. Furthermore, much of the country’s growth in bureaucratic expenditure in recent years has been directed to the country’s higher political and administrative echelons.