

Research Article

Constitutional Obligations, Economic Sovereignty, and the Evolving Role of the Public Sector in India

Dr. Sameer Sharma

Professor & Director, Bhopal Institute of Technology & Management-MBA, Bhopal.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Sameer Sharma.

Abstract

*The genesis of the Indian public sector was intrinsically tied to the foundational vision of the Constitution, acting as the primary institutional vehicle to secure socioeconomic justice, equitable distribution of wealth, and self-reliance. Amid contemporary global economic shifts, financial volatility, and aggressive market-driven paradigms, this paper revisits the rationale behind state-led industrialization. By evaluating historical policy frameworks alongside modern structural developments, the study argues that public enterprises remain an indispensable counterweight to market failures. Furthermore, it **posits** that economic growth must align with constitutional mandates rather than subordinate itself to uncritical globalization.*

Keywords: Public Sector, Economic Sovereignty, Privatization, Mixed Economy, CPSEs, State-led Industrialization, Directive Principles of State Policy, Socioeconomic Justice

1. Introduction: The Constitutional Genesis of the Public Sector

The establishment of the public sector in independent India was the outcome of rigorous legislative and philosophical deliberations. It was conceptualized not merely as an instrument for commercial production, but as a socio-economic vehicle designed to actualize the Directive Principles of State Policy (DPSP) enshrined in the Constitution. Envisioned as the bedrock of a socialist-leaning, democratic framework, state intervention was deemed essential to safeguard national interests against external vulnerabilities and internal structural inequalities.

Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru articulated the three core rationales for championing the public sector:

- **Commanding Heights:** To gain strategic command over critical sectors of the economy, preventing the concentration of economic power.
- **Social Gain over Profit:** To prioritize long-term development, social equity, and strategic value over short-term commercial returns.
- **Capital Generation:** To generate commercial surpluses that could be reinvested to finance future national development cycles.

Historical experience had already demonstrated that unmitigated market forces could exacerbate regional disparities and neglect long-gestation infrastructure projects. Consequently, the Industrial Policy Resolutions of 1948 and 1956 systematically demarcated economic spheres for central and state governments, joint ventures, and private enterprise, establishing a mixed-economy model tailored to India's developmental stage.

2. Core Objectives and Macroeconomic Philosophy

The foundational objectives of the public sector were comprehensive, targeting structural transformations across multiple dimensions:

- **Infrastructure Foundation:** Building foundational infrastructure to facilitate balanced and

diversified industrial growth.

- **Strategic Self-Reliance:** Securing domestic self-reliance in core areas such as heavy engineering, defense production, and energy.
- **Regional Equity:** Mitigating regional imbalances by establishing manufacturing hubs in underdeveloped zones.
- **Equitable Distribution:** Implementing social control mechanisms to prevent wealth monopolization and promote general well-being.
- **Employment Generation:** Expanding formal employment opportunities with structured labor protections.

Periodic reviews were instituted to enable the state to regulate prices, curb inflationary pressures, and expand into mass-consumption goods whenever market anomalies threatened consumer welfare. Despite external global shocks and internal operational challenges, Central Public Sector Enterprises (CPSEs)—exemplified by heavy engineering pioneers like Bharat Heavy Electricals Limited (BHEL)—demonstrated systematic improvements in capacity utilization, materials management, labor productivity, and plant maintenance.

3. Navigating Contemporary Crises: The Search for "Roots"

As the global economy faces frequent structural disruptions, supply chain fragmentations, and macroeconomic volatility, the temptation to abandon state stewardship in favor of blind deregulation has intensified. However, the mandate of the public sector extends beyond balance-sheet profitability; it is anchored in constitutional obligations.

A critical evaluation of India's developmental journey requires adherence to four essential perspectives:

1. **Historical Continuity:** Recognizing the structural path-dependency and historical evolution of the Indian economy.
2. **Constitutional Fidelity:** Maintaining an unwavering commitment to constitutional values, distributive justice, and social equity.
3. **Holistic Temporality:** Adopting an economic outlook that harmonizes past legacies, present realities, and future trajectories.
4. **Global Realism:** Evaluating India's position within a dynamic geopolitical and economic international order.

Failing to anchor economic policy in indigenous realities risks plunging the nation into a cultural and economic vacuum—analogue to the mythological figure of *Trishanku*, suspended insecurely between imitation of Western models and indigenous socio-economic needs. Uncritical adoption of foreign paradigms threatens to widen rural-urban divides and aggravate income inequality.

4. Rethinking Privatization: A Critical Appraisal

The global push toward privatization, championed aggressively through international financial institutions, has frequently overlooked localized socio-economic costs. Nobel laureate Joseph Stiglitz critique highlights how prescriptions by international bodies like the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization (WTO) often exacerbated regional crises—such as the East Asian financial crisis and the disruptive "shock therapy" transitions in the former Soviet bloc (Stiglitz, pp. ix–x).

While proponents point out that privatization waves have encompassed tens of thousands of state-owned entities across more than a hundred countries, standard narratives frequently obscure critical questions:

- What were the employment consequences for displaced workers?
- Who ultimately captured ownership of transferred state assets?
- What external coercive pressures compelled developing governments to divest?

Empirical evidence demonstrates that privatization is not a universal panacea. Glaring system failures—such as massive electrical grid collapses in the United States caused by under-invested private transmission infrastructure, the institutional struggles necessitating the re-nationalization of elements of British rail networks, and governance scandals in post-privatization transition

economies—underscore that private ownership does not automatically guarantee operational efficiency or consumer safety.

Public vs. Private: A Complementary Paradigm

The private sector undeniably excels in operational agility, speed, and profitability due to its singular focus on commercial returns. However, private capital historically hesitates to enter long-gestation infrastructure, foundational research, and high-risk developmental projects, often entering only after the state has absorbed initial capital outlays and established foundational capacity.

Modern economic stability does not require an adversarial stance between the two sectors; rather, it demands a collaborative framework where both public and private entities operate under robust regulatory oversight. Whether managed by public servants or private executives, professional management must be coupled with accountability toward national developmental goals.

5. Conclusion

The Indian public sector remains a vital instrument for fulfilling constitutional promises, safeguarding vulnerable populations, and maintaining strategic economic autonomy. While operational reforms, managerial autonomy, and professionalization are necessary for enhancing the efficiency of public enterprises, dismantling the public sector in pursuit of market fundamentalism is fraught with systemic risk. A resilient Indian economy requires a vibrant, modernized public sector working in tandem with a dynamic private sector, anchored firmly by constitutional obligations and public accountability.

References

1. Stiglitz, Joseph. *Making Globalization Work*. Penguin Books, London, pp. ix–x.
2. Raha, Subir. *Indian Management*, February 2007.
3. Government of India. *Economic Survey 2025–26*. Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs.
4. Department of Public Enterprises (DPE). *Public Enterprises Survey: Performance of Central Public Sector Enterprises*. Ministry of Finance, New Delhi.
5. Austin, Granville. *The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation*. Oxford University Press.

Citation: Dr. Sameer Sharma. 2026. “Constitutional Obligations, Economic Sovereignty, and the Evolving Role of the Public Sector in India”. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 13(3): 227-229.

Copyright: ©2026 Dr. Sameer Sharma. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.