E-ISSN: 3048-6041 | Volume- 3, Issue- 8 | August 2026

Erosion of Administrative Neutrality and Public Well-being: A Study of the Forced Sterilization Campaign during India's Emergency (1975–1977)

Dr Manisha Misra[1], Ms. Suryanshi Singh[2]
[1]Assistant Professor of Political Science, Vasanta College for Women, Varanasi, BHU
[2]M.A. in Political Science, Vasanta College for Women, Varanasi, BHU

Abstract

The Emergency in India (June 25, 1975-March 21, 1977) was a period of censorship, imprisonment, and the suspension of civil liberties. It also witnessed the systematic erosion of democratic norms. The bureaucracy turned into an instrument of political authority rather than serving the public interest. Core principles of fairness and impartiality were ignored. Administrative neutrality—the principle of functioning without political bias—was compromised, weakening the bureaucracy's ethical commitment to public well-being in a culturally diverse democracy like India. This study examines the effects of this loss of neutrality through the coercive sterilization programme that disproportionately targeted men and caused trauma, deaths, and fear. Drawing on case studies from Muzaffarnagar (Uttar Pradesh) and Uttawar (Haryana), the research shows how the politicization of the bureaucracy turned a population-control effort into a coercive fear-driven process. Comparative examples from other countries further illustrate how maintaining neutrality in implementation either improved or harmed outcomes. Ultimately, the study demonstrates that the erosion of administrative neutrality during the Emergency had detrimental effects on public well-being and contributed to the coercive and harmful effects of the forced sterilization programme.

Keywords – emergency, bureaucracy, administrative neutrality, forced sterilization, public welfare

Introduction

The Emergency (June 25, 1975–March 21, 1977), proclaimed by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi under Article 352 of the Indian Constitution, remains one of the most debated periods in Indian Constitutional, political, and administrative history. The fiftieth anniversary of the Emergency, commemorated during 2025-2026, has renewed public and scholarly attention to its legacy. This has been followed by efforts to revisit not only the suspension of civil liberties but also the erosion of administrative neutrality and its consequences for public welfare. Reflecting this renewed engagement, the Government of India has designated 25 June as “Samvidhan Hatya Diwas, to commemorate the proclamation of emergency and to

Published: 17 August 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70558/SPIJSH.2026.v3.i8.45873

promote awareness of its implications. (Ministry of Culture, 2025)

The period witnessed the systematic subversion of democratic and bureaucratic norms, including the undermining of the judiciary, media censorship, constitutional amendments, and the Supreme Court's decision in *ADM Jabalpur v. Shivkant Shukla* (1976), which denied citizens the ability to enforce the right to life and personal liberty during the Emergency. A culture of sycophancy was promoted; the idea was that insincere praise of powerful people served the whims of the political elite, ignoring bureaucratic norms to carry out coercive campaigns.

The principle of administrative neutrality, which focuses on impartiality, impersonality, and a non-partisan attitude among bureaucrats, was undermined as bureaucratic loyalty increasingly reflected the influence of unelected centres of political power. One such example of this breakdown was the Forced Sterilization programme - a brutally implemented, disproportionate, and coercive population control measure that targeted poor, marginalized communities, leading to forced vasectomies and, in many cases, death. Although the emergency has been extensively examined and studied from constitutional, political, administrative, and human rights perspectives, comparatively little attention is given to determining how the erosion of administrative neutrality shaped bureaucratic conduct in the implementation of the forced sterilization programme. While primary attention has been given to constitutional amendments, judicial precedents, and political developments, analysis of bureaucratic politicization in producing coercive policy implementation has garnered insufficient attention. The study seeks to address that gap.

Objectives:

The study has the following Objectives:

1. To examine the concept and significance of administrative neutrality within the broader framework of modern bureaucracy and democratic governance.
2. To analyze how political interference during the Emergency (1975–1977) undermined administrative neutrality and transformed bureaucratic functioning.
3. To evaluate the implementation of the forced sterilization programme through selected case studies and assess its implications for public well-being.

Research Questions:

1. How did the erosion of administrative neutrality during the Emergency (1975–1977) influence the implementation of the forced sterilization programme?
2. In what ways did political interference transform the role and functioning of the bureaucracy during the Emergency?
3. What were the implications of the breakdown of administrative neutrality for public welfare, and citizens' trust in state institutions?

To answer these questions, the study adopts a qualitative and descriptive research methodology based on the analysis of secondary sources and case studies, drawing upon

official reports and constitutional and administrative literature, to examine the relationship between administrative neutrality and the implementation of the forced sterilization programme during the Emergency.The paper ultimately argues that administrative neutrality—meant to safeguard citizens through impartial governance—collapsed into political compliance, turning bureaucracy from an impartial institution to an enforcer of coercion and eroding trust in state institutions.

Review of Literature

Existing scholarship on bureaucracy, administrative neutrality, and the Emergency provides the theoretical and empirical foundation for this study. The following review examines key scholarly works and official reports on political interference, bureaucratic conduct, and the implementation of the forced sterilization programme.

Max Weber, in his work *Economy and Society*, presents the ideal bureaucracy under rational-legal authority, the core principles of which lie in impersonality, codified rules, and political neutrality (Weber, 1968, pp. 956–958). Appleby qualifies the Weberian view of a pure, neutral bureaucracy in his work *Public Administration in India*, when he argues that pure neutrality in the Weberian sense is problematic in a developing country like India, where commitment and alignment to broader developmental goals are equally needed (Appleby, 1953, pp. 67–69). The idea of neutrality, impartiality, and integrity in modern governance was reaffirmed in the Second ARC Report (2007), which also recognized how political pressure compromises neutrality in India and argued that impartiality should not merely be procedural and must be accompanied by integrity, accountability, and commitment to constitutional values. (Second Administrative Reforms Commission [ARC], 2007).

While administrative theory emphasizes neutrality, in practice, the functioning of bureaucracy has often been shaped by political pressure, resulting in a departure from rule based impartial administration.

The Shah Commission, formed to investigate the abuses of power and violations during the Emergency, submitted its report in 1978, emphasizing that the bureaucracy, which was supposed to act in a neutral, ethical, and accountable way, instead resorted to intimidation, physical force, coercive administrative practices, and the misuse of official authority, thereby functioning as instruments of political directives from the top (Shah Commission of Inquiry, 1978, Report 3). This is supported by the finding of Paul Brass, who noted that the bureaucratic functioning was marked by patrimonial characteristics, where bureaucrats were rewarded for loyalty and punished for resistance, creating a culture of compliance by abandoning impartiality under the fear of political pressure (Brass, 1994, pp. 35–66).

David Gwatkin, in *Political Will and Family Planning: The Implications of India's Emergency Experience* (1979), examines the scale and numerical extent of sterilizations carried out during the Emergency. Family planning, which would have been a voluntary welfare measure, transformed into a tool of state control in the domain of personal rights and health (Gwatkin, 1979, pp. 29–59). Emma Tarlo documents the realities and lived experiences of those subjected to sterilization, highlighting the trauma and stigma of sterilization and vulnerabilities associated with caste, class, and vulnerability (Tarlo, 2003,

pp. 147–176). Jaffrelot and Anil (2020) characterize the sterilization campaign as a form of "state violence" that demonstrated the coercive reach of the state over society.

While existing literature analyzes the erosion of neutrality in the Indian bureaucracy during the Emergency (Brass, 1994; Shah Commission Report, 1978), along with the examination of the sterilization campaigns and their social consequences (Gwatkin, 1979; Tarlo, 2003), comparatively little attention is given to the erosion of administrative neutrality, which primarily influenced public trust, well-being, and outcomes. The study seeks to address this gap. Collectively, these studies demonstrate that while the Emergency has been examined from constitutional, political, and administrative perspectives, the relationship between administrative neutrality and coercive policy implementation remains relatively under-explored.

Administrative Neutrality: Concept and Ethical Dimensions

Administrative neutrality refers to the principle that the bureaucracy should operate impartially while maintaining an ethical commitment to defend the public interest above political or personal considerations. Administration broadly refers to the management and implementation of public policies and governmental functions. While neutrality, at its core, can be understood as the state of not supporting either side in an argument or a situation. Administrative neutrality combines these two concepts, referring to an ideal in which public administrators implement policies objectively and professionally, without being influenced by political authorities, personal interests, or external pressures. It is therefore characterized by impartiality, expertise, and a clear separation between politics and administration (*Miller*, 2018, pp. 192–210).The concept of administrative neutrality as a feature of rational legal authority has been best described by Max Weber in his seminal work *Economy and Society*, where it is mentioned that the bureaucrats are expected to implement policies without personal bias and political interference, ensuring predictability, efficiency, and legitimacy in governance (*Weber*, 2015, pp. 73–128). Beyond administrative efficiency, neutrality also involves an ethical obligation to uphold constitutional values, ensure equal and fair treatment of citizens, and protect the public interest from arbitrary political interference.

While the universal theoretical framework emphasized bureaucratic impersonality, the practical reality reveals a tension between neutrality and commitment, with special reference to India and other developing nations. That is, while the theory expects civil servants to act without bias, civil servants often face pressure arising from political directives and social expectations, trapping them in a dilemma of conflicting practical demands against adherence to neutrality. Accordingly, the bureaucracy must remain responsive to local socio-political realities while preserving its commitment to impartiality, constitutional principles, and the public interest. It must act as a bridge between policy formulation and implementation, ensuring that the developmental goals result in the welfare of the citizens.

While theory emphasizes neutrality and ethical responsibility, experience illustrates how extraordinary political conditions can challenge the very foundations of administrative neutrality. The period of the Emergency in India (1975–77) provides a striking example of

how administrative neutrality was systematically compromised, leading to profound transformations in administrative behavior and its impact on public welfare.

The Emergency and the Bureaucratic Politicization

In 1975, Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi declared a state of emergency in India, marking a significant shift towards authoritarian governance. This period saw the suspension of civil liberties, the centralization of executive power, and a significant departure from democratic norms, profoundly transforming the functioning of the Indian bureaucracy. This shift had profound implications for the Indian bureaucracy, challenging its neutrality and ethical standards. This was an authoritarian shift as the power got concentrated in the executive, sidelining institutional checks and transforming the bureaucracy into a politically compliant one where they were forced to prioritize political loyalty over public well-being and ethical governance.

During this period, Sanjay Gandhi, Indira Gandhi's younger son, emerged as a central figure, his influence stemming from his closeness to the Prime Minister. Despite holding no constitutional or official position, Sanjay Gandhi promoted an informal Five-Point Programme aimed at social reform, with particular emphasis on population control.

1. Family Planning (implemented through coercive sterilization practices): Though intended as a tool for economic development, it became coercive, targeting poor and marginalized populations.
2. Tree Plantations: Environmental improvement and urban beautification.
3. Ban on Dowry: Targeted social evils associated with marriage.
4. Each-One-Teach-One: Adult education programme.
5. Ending Social Caste Discrimination: Addressed social inequalities.

Among these five points, family planning through sterilization became the central and most aggressively pursued agenda, overshadowing the other components of the programme. The implementation of this programme undermined administrative neutrality and resulted in what we can call a political capture of bureaucracy. Officials were compelled to meet the sterilization quotas, which often became the link to their promotions and salaries. For example, in the states of UP and Bihar, sterilization quotas were aggressively enforced, and commissioners were awarded gold medals for exceeding the targets. The bureaucracy, which in theory is expected to remain impartial and neutral and in practice is entrusted with advancing social welfare, was instead persuaded to act against its professional ethos. Promotions, salary increments, and administrative incentives were strategically used as leverage to secure compliance, transforming public administrators into instruments of political authority rather than guardians of public interest (*Gupte*, 2017).

What was justified as a population control programme driven by developmental goals transformed into an instrument of bureaucratic transformation; the officials were pressurised to meet the sterilization quotas linked to promotions, salaries, and licenses. Bureaucracy ceased to function as an impartial implementer of public policy and instead became an

instrument of political objectives. This erosion of neutrality was most starkly visible in the forced sterilization campaign, which stands as the clearest illustration of how bureaucratic compliance under political pressure undermined administrative neutrality and public welfare.

Case Study – The Forced Sterilization Campaign

Among the programmes implemented during the Emergency, the forced sterilization campaign most starkly revealed how the erosion of administrative neutrality inflicted lasting trauma, social stigma, and institutional distrust upon citizens. Drawing on Emma Tarlo (2003), the study notes that the common man was compelled to produce sterilization certificates to access basic services: salaries, driving or rickshaw licenses, housing, and even hospital treatments were denied without proof of sterilization. Students whose parents had not undergone the procedure were detained. The most affected were the lower classes, including poor, illiterate individuals, jail inmates, dwellers, bachelors, young married males, and hospital patients – often picked up forcibly from railway stations, bus stops, or from their homes. Tarlo further records that citizens were pressured so intensely that one respondent recalled, "The officers said you could keep your job only if you get sterilized. I didn't have time to think. When I reached my duty, we were told this… I agreed to it because I had to save my job and bring up my family."

Teams of doctors and gynecologists from the Family Planning Association were mobilized to meet government-imposed sterilization targets. In Uttar Pradesh, camps initially performed 331 operations per day, rising to 1,578 and eventually 5,664. Despite widespread reports of coercion, botched surgeries, and deaths, complaints were dismissed as exaggerated, framing dissatisfaction as concern over post-operative follow-ups rather than the coercive nature of the procedures (Singh & Vincent, 2024).

Resistance emerged primarily from the rural poor and minority. Muslim communities, who viewed sterilization as a threat to their livelihoods and identity. Efforts to persuade Muslims involved sending lieutenants to women's groups and mosques, convincing some women of the benefits of smaller families, but men largely resisted. By 1975, Uttar Pradesh alone reported 240 instances of violent resistance. For example, in Narkadih village, Sultanapur district, villagers attacked police sent to enforce sterilization; police opened fire, killing thirteen and injuring many. In Muzaffarnagar, villagers pelted police with stones, resulting in twenty-five deaths. Curfews and police brutality could not suppress resistance, though media censorship delayed reporting until after the Emergency (Gupte, 2017).

The camps were a symbol of administrative overreach. Safety and follow-up care were largely neglected, resulting in deaths caused by rushed, unhygienic procedures. District authorities forcibly transported people to camps, while bureaucrats—including district officers, police superintendents, village council members, tax collectors, teachers, and local leaders—actively motivated citizens to undergo sterilization. Families with two or more children were particularly pressured through monetary incentives and penalties. The administration, which was supposed to serve as a foundation of public trust, instead became an instrument of coercion, enforcing political objectives over citizens' welfare. This marked a clear erosion of administrative neutrality, as the bureaucracy, expected to act impartially, was

complicit in implementing a campaign that violated individual rights and undermined public well-being.

Guha documents numerous deaths as a consequence of botched and unhygienic sterilization procedures. Many cases of unmarried men and individuals of all ages being forcibly sterilized were documented, alongside widespread coercion affecting even the physically incapacitated. Men were primarily targeted because vasectomies were quicker and less invasive than female sterilizations, and because state employees could be threatened through employment, illustrating the politicization of administrative authority.

Specific cases highlight the campaign's use of coercion and red tape. Reports indicate that in Uttawar village, in the Mewat region of northern Haryana, about 56 miles from New Delhi, authorities surrounded the village in November 1976. Police ordered fertile men to gather in a specific area. They were forced onto buses and taken to police stations, where many faced beatings, imprisonment, and pressure to undergo sterilization. Some were even handcuffed during the procedure. Tragically, of the fourteen men who underwent sterilization, only one survived. This illustrates how the bureaucracy shifted from protecting citizens to enforcing political directives through coercion and intimidation.

Collectively, these cases reveal that the erosion of neutrality in administration enabled coercion, violence, and unsafe procedures, transforming what could have been a public health effort into a politically driven campaign that violated citizens' rights, harmed public health, and eroded citizen’s trust in state institutions.

Impact on Public Well-being

This coercive sterilization campaign during the Emergency extended beyond demographic objectives and had long-lasting consequences for public well-being. It generated fear, trauma, anxiety, and a breakdown of trust between citizens and the state.

First, the programme made many men feel emasculated for three reasons: (a) the state's enforcement of fertility control took away their ability to decide family size, (b) the threat to their role as providers disrupted their authority, and (c) the invasive nature of vasectomies, along with stigma and fears of sexual dysfunction, deepened this crisis (Singh & Vincent, 2024).

Second, the clear use of coercive methods created a climate of mistrust and violence (Singh & Vincent, 2024). This resulted partly from social anxiety and partly from the loss of trust in the bureaucracy. Parents, fearing sterilization, resisted having more children, particularly sons, which led to demographic concerns and clear backlash. Reports also noted an increase in violence against women, including rape. This suggests that adolescents who witnessed coercion and violence during the Emergency may have internalized these traumas and repeated them later in life.

Third, coercive sterilization campaigns damaged trust in medical institutions. This led to lower vaccination rates and fewer institutional deliveries (Pelras & Renk, 2023). Children born in areas with high sterilization coercion were significantly less likely to receive routine vaccinations or be delivered in hospitals. The resulting mistrust in public health services

pushed people toward private healthcare and weakened preventive health measures, ultimately raising mortality risks. The decline of male sterilization after the Emergency and the shift to female sterilization further illustrate the deep impact on reproductive health policies.

Finally, this incident showcased the decline of neutrality in administration. Instead of maintaining impartiality, bureaucrats enforced coercive policies to meet political demands. Rather than exercising impartial administrative judgement, bureaucrats gave priority to political directives, prioritizing sterilization targets over citizen welfare. As a result, the administration lost credibility, and the state came to be associated with coercion, intimidation, exploitation, and fear rather than welfare and public service.

Comparative and Contemporary Reflection

The erosion of administrative neutrality in administration and the methods of coercion marked the period of Emergency in India. Similar patterns can be observed in population control programmes across different countries, indicating that a lack of neutral administration can result in serious human rights violations.

China's One-Child Policy:

In the 1980s and 1990s, this policy enforced strict birth quotas through a combination of financial incentives, local enforcement, administrative sanctions, and coercive measures. While implementation was more effective in urban areas, rural regions often witnessed resistance. Over time, greater flexibility and local negotiation emerged in some areas. This demonstrates how less coercive, more flexible, and humane approaches can determine whether population policies are socially acceptable or become a source of coercion and public resentment (Kane & Choi, 1999).

Puerto Rico's Sterilization Campaigns (1950s–1970s):

A mix of incentives, medical authority, and lack of informed consent resulted in disproportionately high sterilization rates among poor and minority women. Similar to the Indian Emergency experience, the absence of administrative oversight and fairness contributed to long-term mistrust toward public health institutions (Jones, 2025).

Collectively, these historical cases highlight a common theme: coercion and bureaucratic complicity often weaken public trust and well-being, while careful, non-coercive policies can achieve demographic goals with less social harm.

The debate about neutrality in administration versus political loyalty is still relevant in modern India. Contemporary India continues to grapple with questions of administrative neutrality. While the bureaucracy has demonstrated its service to the public and adherence to principles in implementing large-scale programmes such as disaster response and public health initiatives, concerns regarding politically motivated transfers, executive overreach, and bureaucratic autonomy continue to generate debate. Thus, although the Indian bureaucracy has become considerably more institutionalized since Emergency, the struggle between neutrality and political pressure remains a significant challenge.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that the erosion of neutrality in administration during the Emergency transformed the bureaucracy from an institution committed to public well-being to an instrument of coercive state power. This harmed citizens' well-being and fostered fear, mistrust, and anxiety toward the state and its institutions. The forced sterilization programme illustrates the long-term social, psychological, and institutional effects that can result from the loss of neutrality.

The Emergency emphasizes that neutrality must extend beyond theory to real-world practice, especially in diverse societies like India. Social, cultural, and economic factors shape citizens' experiences. Although complete neutrality may not be attainable, bureaucrats have an ethical duty to ensure that political directives do not undermine citizens' rights, welfare, or dignity.

Even today, the debate between political loyalty and impartial administration continues. This is evident in bureaucratic transfers and policy enforcement. The sterilization programme from the Emergency serves as a warning about the risks of losing neutrality: citizens' rights and public trust are at stake.

The findings of this study demonstrate that coercive policy implementation in the absence of administrative neutrality not only undermined the objectives of the population control programme but also produced enduring consequences for public trust, institutional legitimacy, and democratic governance. Ultimately, the sterilization programme during the Emergency serves as a stark reminder: when administrative neutrality vanishes, the state's role shifts from protector to oppressor. Maintaining impartial administration is crucial for the health of governance and public trust.

References

Additional District Magistrate, Jabalpur v. Shivkant Shukla, (1976) 2 SCC 521 (Supreme Court of India). https://api.sci.gov.in/jonew/judis/5387.pdf

Appleby, P. H. (1953). *Public Administration in India: Report of a Survey*. Government of India, Cabinet Secretariat, Organisation and Methods Division.

Brass, P. R. (1994). *The politics of India since Independence* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Gupte, P. R. (2017). India: The Emergency and the politics of mass sterilization. *Education About Asia, 22*(3). https://www.asianstudies.org/publications/eaa/archives/india-the-emergency-and-the-politics-of-mass-sterilization/

Gwatkin, D. R. (1979). Political will and family planning: The implications of India's Emergency experience. *Population and Development Review, 5*(1), 29–59. https://doi.org/10.2307/1972317

Jaffrelot, C., & Anil, P. (2020). *India's first dictatorship: The Emergency, 1975–77*. Oxford University Press.

Jones, A. Y. (2025). *The eugenic sterilization of Puerto Rican women: A case of U.S. interests and religious/spiritual freedom* (Master's thesis, Chapman University). Chapman University Digital Commons. https://doi.org/10.36837/chapman.000659

Kane, P., & Choi, C. Y. (1999). China's one-child family policy. *BMJ, 319*(7215), 992–994. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.319.7215.992

Miller, H. T. (2018). Neutrality as it never was: A short treatise on public administration theory. *International Journal of Organination Theory & Behavior, 21*(3), 192–210. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-05-2018-005

Ministry of Culture. (2025, August 4). *Observance of Samvidhan Hatya Diwas*. Press Information Bureau, Government of India. https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2152158&reg=48&lang=2

Pelras, C., & Renk, A. (2023). When sterilizations lower immunizations: The Emergency experience in India (1975–77). *World Development, 170*, Article 106321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2023.106321

Roth, G., & Wittich, C. (Eds.). (1978). Bureaucracy. In *Economy and society: An outline of Interpretive Sociology* (Vol. 2, pp. 956–958). University of California Press.

Second Administrative Reforms Commission. (2007). *Ethics in governance* (4th Report). Government of India.

Shah Commission of Inquiry. (1978). *Report of the Shah Commission of Inquiry* (Report III). Government of India.

Singh, A., & Vincent, S. (2024). *Male sterilization and persistence of violence: Evidence from Emergency in India* (AMSE Working Paper No. 2403). Aix-Marseille School of Economics. https://www.isid.ac.in/~acegd/acegd2024/papers/AditiSingh.pdf

Tarlo, E. (2003). *Unsettling memories: Narratives of the Emergency in Delhi*. University of California Press.

Weber, Max. (1968). *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). Bedminster Press.

Waters, T., & Waters, D. (Eds. & Trans.). (2015). Bureaucracy. In *Weber's rationalism and modern society: New translations on politics, bureaucracy, and social stratification* Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 73–128.