

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND

FINDINGS

Introduction

Rural development has acquired special significance in the third world nations. It is observed that more than half the people in these nations live in the villages. In the pre-Independence era of these countries, the rural area were neglected by the colonists. India is one of the country among these. So, after Independence Indian Government has made a number of strategies of development and implemented a series of anti poverty programmes in order to eradicate poverty from rural India from the point of view of rural development, the period since independence be divided in to three phases.

First phase community Development programmes (C.D.P.) 1952 to 1967, Second phase – Green Revolution (1968-1978), and Third phase – Integrated Rural Development programmes (IRDP – 1978 to 2001). Recently a new rural development programme called as “Gram Vikas Yojana”, “Pradhanmantri Self-employment Yojna” etc. has been launched by B.J.P. Government.

According to many scientists and thinkers all these programmes and schemes have failed to materialize. It is also true that, all benefits of these programmes have been achieved by better-off section in agrarian society. But small, marginal peasants, landless labourer, artisans, are far away from benefits of these programmes, it is not a guess, number of social-scientiest proved it, i.e.

At first Dube (1958) identified the failure of C.D.P., after that Epstein (1962), A Mehta (1978), Dak (1982) etc. also proved it. A number of studies have reported mainly negative consequences of “Green-Revolution, such as greater instability in agricultural production (Rao et al. 1988); Socio economic

inequity (Bagchi, 1982; Dhanagare, 1984, 1987) and no increase in the rate of growth of food-grain production over the period preceding it (Bhatia, 1988). In order to compensate the longlasting neglect of the interest of rural poor a new policy thrust of rural development emerged in 1978, with the appearance of the integrated Rural Development Programmes [IRDP]. Minocha (1988 : 904) has criticized IRDP for its inefficiency and corruption, and he characterized it as an “Anti development strategy”. While, Dantwala (1985) has criticized it for its ‘incapability’ to pull out the vast rural poor out of the poverty trap. Similarly, Rao and Eruppa (1987a-159) called it as an “Inefficient programmes”. Like Tripathi (1987) and Sharma (1989) number of scholars have pointed out, unintended and non-economic consequences of IRDP and other programmes earlier.

Thus there is a great need of systematically study of the impact of programmes effect on peasants. This present research work is a small effort towards it. Our intention is to concentrate on the peasant families in the KAVATHE village. We are interested not only in studing the socio economic condition of peasant families, but also impact of government agricultural development programmes on peasants, from different caste groups in the study village. For getting a fair idea of this research we shall turn to conceptual Framework And Methodology of the study, which has been given in the SECNOD Chapter of this work.

Conceptual Framework of Development, Rural Development and Peasant

“Development” –

The use of the term ‘development’ is legitimate when we consider development as a change process that is multidimensional and interdependent. The multidimensional character of this change process has been emphasized by many scholars. For instance, Michal P. Todaro Writes that, “development” is not purely an economic phenomenon. In an ultimate sense, it must encompass more than the material and financial side of people’s lives. Development should, therefore, be perceived as a multi-dimensional process involving the reorganization and reorientation of entire economic and social systems.

“Rural Development”

A conceptual understanding of rural development is warranted in view of the fact that this concept has come to signify a whole set of policies, programmes and strategies broadly covering the field of rural reconstruction. The World Bank defines rural development as, “A strategy designed to improve the economic and social life of specific group of people – the rural poor, rural development involves extending the benefits of development of the poorest among those who seek livelihood in rural area. The group includes small scale farmers, tenants and the landless.”

“Peasant”

From the beginning social anthropologists have defined peasants by their cultural attachment to tradition, Robert Redfield who identified his ideal type concept of ‘Folk Society’ with the primitive tribal and contrasted it with the peasant society on the one side and the town society on the other side, following A.L. Kroeber he defined peasants as “part society and part culture” to distinguish peasants from farmers who produce for the market ‘Wolf’ defined peasant with giving three characteristics as,

- I) Peasants as agricultural producers
- II) They retain effective control over the land
- III) They aim at substantive farming and not at profit with investment motive.

Methodology of the study :

The main reason behind choosing this subject for research investigation is that, the researcher, himself comes from small peasant family. He is dweller of the study village so he will be an insider researcher. The main objectives of the study are 1) To Know Socio-economic condition of peasants 2) To understand impact of Government Development programmes on peasants of the study village.

From the total 298 peasant households we selected 50 peasant households, using purposive sampling method, out of them 20 households are beneficiaries of different Government Agricultural Development Programmes.

In this present work 'case-study' along with Comparative method of research is to be used. In order to make the study qualitative data were collected through primary and secondary sources 'Interview Schedule' was the main technique of data collection. After the collection of data, I had manually processed and tables were prepared. After tabulation, made the analysis and interpretation of the data were made.

Field-work of this investigation was carried out during 25th July to 30th August 2002.

The major thrust of **FORTH CHAPTER** is analysis and interpretation of collected data in tabulated forms. On the basis of that here **FINDINGS** of this work have been presented.

- 1) Higher castes respondents got higher education (out of total 3 graduate 2 (66.66%) respondents are from Higher castes), on the contrary all the 3 (100%) scheduled castes and 75% Lower castes respondents are illiterate.
- 2) Out of 15 respondents who are having below 2.5 acre land, majority (46.68%) respondents are from lower & scheduled castes, on the other hand,, 66.66% respondents of Higher castes are having above 15 acer land this means there is great inequality in distribution of land among different castes categories.
- 3) Out of 18 (36.0%) respondents who have pacca house, large majority (88.88%) of respondents are from Higher and Middle castes, on the

contrary, not a single (0%) respondent from Lower and Middle castes has a pacca house.

- 4) Very large majority of (84.0%) respondents are not aware about Government agricultural development programmes.
- 5) All the 6 (100%) beneficiaries of higher castes have made good change in their farming method, on the contrary, 66.66% respondents from scheduled castes can not made any change in their farming method.
- 6) All the 6 (100%) respondents of Higher castes have made good progress in their agricultural production, among them 50% respondents production increase more than double, on the contrary, out of 3 beneficiaries of Lower castes 33.33% respondents did not make any progress in production and remaining 66.67% respondents made very less increment in agricultural production.

PRESENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF PEASANTS IN KAVATHE VILLAGE

In the foregoing chapters, the findings relating to the complex structure of socio-economic life found in KAVATHE village of Solapur district have been presented under various heads, on the basis of collected data and participant observation during the course of the field investigation we can conclude that, Socio-Economic condition of Higher and Middle castes peasants is good, but on the other hand Socio-economic condition of Lower and Scheduled castes peasants is very low level. It is not a guess, we should prove it on the basis of following points :

- 1) Our, 4 (8.0%) respondents annual income is Below Rs. 25,000 out of them 50% respondents are from Scheduled castes but not a single respondent is from Higher castes. On the contrary, there are 3 (6.0%) respondents whomes annual income is above Rs. 1 Lakh, out of them 66.66% respondents belong to Higher castes, but not a single respondent from scheduled castes, have an annual income above Rs. 50,000.
- 2) Womens from 4 households are full time participate in agricultural activities all these (100%) womens are from Lower and scheduled castes, on the contrary, there are 3 households women do not participate in the agricultural activities all these households are from Higher and Middle caste categories.
- 3) There are 7 (14.0%) respondents who have agricultural tools, value of which is below Rs. 10,000/- all these respondents are from Lower, scheduled castes and Muslim community,

but, not a single respondent is from the Higher and Middle castes, on the other hand there are 10 (20.0%) respondents who have agricultural tool of the value of 75,001 to 1 Lakh and all these respondents are from the Higher and Middle castes, but, not a single respondents is from the lower, scheduled castes or mulsim community.

From the above discussion it is clear that socio-economic conditions of Higher castes peasant is better than lower, scheduled castes peasants.

TO WHOME BENEFITS OF DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMMES HAVE GONE

It is generally observed and believed that most of the benefits of government schemes have gone to the people belonging to upper socio-economic strata in the rural area. Therefore, one of the objectives of this study was to examine which benefits of Government agricultural Developemnt programmes have gone to the Lower and scheduled castes people in the village.

From the collected data it was proved that majority (84.0%) of the peasants in Kavathe village don't have any information about the Government developmental programmes, majority (87.5%) of the people are not aware about the development programmes, they all belong to Lower and Scheduled Caste. Further, when we asked them causes of their ignorance about programmes, majority (36.0%) respondents told that, illiteracy was the main

cause of their ignorance. It is also investigated that Panchyat Samiti and Grampanchyat do not hold awareness programmes or do not give personal information to peasants. It is also found that only Higher castes, well educated peasants in the village are well aware about rules, regulations as well as benefits of these programmes. Because of these, 70% beneficiaries in the Kavathe village are only from the Higher and Middle castes and only 30% beneficiaries are from the Lower, scheduled castes and muslim community.

And it is only because of the reservation of these castes. We were surprise to know that these few Lower, scheduled castes beneficiaries can not ~~got~~ real benefits means they do not change their cropping and farming methods or their agricultural production was not increased. Major reason behind it, which were investigated by the researcher is, lower and scheduled castes peasants economic condition is not good, so after getting some help (it may be in instrumental or in finance) by government Development programmes, they do not invest some additional finance or implements in farming, as their quick need, on the contrary they used traditional instruments so their farming method have not change.

It is also investigate during the course of field investigation and on the basis of collected data that, all (100%) Higher and 75% Middle caste beneficiaries have made a prospective change in their farming and cropping method. This means they cultivate crops like as Sugarcane, Cotton, Wheat etc. and they use new advanced technology in their farm. It is possible to them

mainly because their high education, more money, and their political power also.

From the above description it is clear that Higher and Middle castes respondents achieve benefits from Government , on the contrary lower scheduled castes and Muslim respondents are far away from benefits.