
CHAPTER - I

RURAL DEVELOPMENT : AN INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER - I

RURAL DEVELOPMENT : AN INTRODUCTION

This work deals with Integrated Rural Development programme. Therefore, it will be appropriate to understand the meaning of the terms “Development” and “Rural development”. In the following section an attempt has been made to understand the terms “Development” and “Rural development”.

I. ‘DEVELOPMENT’ AND ‘RURAL DEVELOPMENT’

“Development” is one of the most widely used terms in the contemporary world. It is frequently used not only by the academicians but also by the planners, administrators, policy makers, social workers, politicians, journalists and even by common people in day-to-day life. Surprisingly, however development means different things to different people .

The term Development has been described as a ‘generic’ ‘umbrella’ term. The concept of development is a broad concept and as pointed out earlier, there is no agreement upon the definition of the concept of development. However, in a very broad and general sense, development refers to a change in desired a direction (Baviskar, 1980; Gupta and Srivastva, 1989).

It has been observed that the term ‘development’ has gained currency especially after second world war. Initially, in the absence of a clear definition of the term, it was used analogously with some other terms such as “growth” and “progress” to denote transformation in progressive direction. The economists equated development with economic growth which they conceived in terms of total and per capita income and Gross National Product (GNP).

However, this concept of development was felt to be inadequate since it ignored social and political aspects of societal transformation in the direction of improvement. Subsequently, “growth” was conceived as something stimulated from within, the process which is self-generating and of gradual evolution. Development on the other hand is believed to be an engineered process primarily initiated by the government machinery and characterised by the social, economic and political overtones, its underlying philosophy being the welfare of the poor people (Rao, 1992). Thus the term development has emerged as a broad concept. A study of some of the definitions of the term development will help to enrich our understanding of this concept.

According to Furtado, “development includes things like efficiency of production system, satisfaction of basic needs and attainment of the objectives sought by various groups in a society which are linked to use of scarce resources” (Ambekar, 1991:40).

[Noorjahan Bava has pointed out that “Development is an umbrella concept, it is multi-dimensional; it is total, it is both qualitative and quantitative in nature. It has social, economic, political, administrative, cultural, rural, urban, national and international, micro and macro, temporal and spatial aspects. It is not just economic development or growth that is increase in national income or Gross National Product per capita as the classical economists think, it is growth with social justice.” Also, in the opinion of J.N. Khosla “Development needs to be conceived as a dynamic process directed towards transforming an entire society enmeshing together its economic, social, political and administrative aspect for an all-round balanced upward change.” (Nandini, 1992:31)

Dr. K. Venkanta Reddy defines Development as an “activity or process of both qualitative and quantitative change in the existing system, aiming at immediate improvement of living conditions of the people or increase the potential for betterment of living condition in future”. (Reddy, 1988: 23).

The above mentioned definitions suggest the following : (1) The term development is a broad concept, (2) Development is something more than economic growth measured in terms of G.N. P., (3) Development refers to the continuous process of transformation of society in the desirable direction , (4) It refers to both the qualitative and quantitative changes in various spheres of human life such as economic, social, cultural and political, (5) Development means all-round balanced societal growth with social justice.

After having discussed the concept of ‘Development’, let us now try to understand the term “Rural Development”. In recent years “rural development” has acquired special significance in developing as well as underdeveloped countries. Not only academicians but also planners , policy makers, and administrators are interested in the rural development .A study of some definitions of the term ‘rural development’ will enrich our understanding of the concept of rural development .

Rural development refers to the development of rural areas. According to Bose and Vashit rural area is that area which is “characterised by non-urban style of living, occupational structure, social organisation and settlement pattern. Rural is essentially an agricultural connotation and its settlement system consist of villages. Socially, it connotes greater interdependence among people, more deeply rooted community life and slow moving rhythm of life built around nature and natural phenomena; and occupationally it is highly

dependent on crop farming, animal enterprises, tree crops and related activities like plantation, agriculture, modern dairy, sheep rearing and host of others which require industrial organisation but agricultural in the sense that they pertain to plant and animal life” (Nandini, 1992: 47-48) .

According to the Census of India Report, 1981, “place with human habitation of 5000 or below, with agriculture as the main economic activities, and with density of population less than 400 per sq. Km.” may be described as rural area. (Reddy, 1988:6)

The term “rural development” is comprehensive and multi-dimensional concept. It is used in different ways in vastly divergent contexts. As in the case of the concept of development, there is no universally accepted definition of the concept of “rural development”. According to some scholars, the concept connotes overall development of rural area. For example, in the opinion of Dr. H.D.Dwarakanath the term ‘rural development’ is a broader concept it is concerned with the total development of the rural economy as a whole (Dwarakanath, 1995:443).

Dr. A. R. Desai has also attached the same meaning. According to him, rural development means development of entire rural population enveloping all the facets of transformation of rural India as a part of economic growth and modernisation of the entire society (Desai, 1995:32).

Rural development, according to World Bank document, “is a strategy designed to improve the economic and social life of a specific group of people, viz., rural poor .” (Lea and Chaudhari, 1986:12).

According to the Planning Commission, rural development implies the economic and social development of rural area with an increase in the income levels and quality of life of the rural people (GOI, Annual Plan, Planning Commission, July, 1993:131).

• NABARD has defined the concept of rural development as “promotion of agriculture, small industry, cottage and village industry, handicrafts and other rural crafts, and other allied agricultural activities in rural area with a view to promoting integrated rural development and securing the prosperity (Desai, 1988: 8).

In the words of Katar Singh, rural development is a process of developing and utilising natural and human resources, technologies, infrastructure facilities, institutions and organisations and government policies and programmes to encourage and speed up economic growth in rural areas, to provide jobs and to improve the quality of rural life towards self-sustenance.” (Singh, 1986 : 18-19)

According to Dr. D. M. Nanjundappa, “Rural development refers to integrated multisectorial activity which include the development of agriculture and social overhead facilities”. (Upadyay, 1989:11)

As is evident from the above quoted definitions, the concept of rural development is a broad concept . Rural development includes not only economic development of rural areas but it also means improvement of quality of life of the people living in rural areas, specially of the rural poor. Rural development programmes in recent years are aimed at improving the condition of poor people. A large majority of rural people still continue to live in poverty. “Rural poverty is multi-dimensional. Half of the rural population are poor in food consumption,

poor in health, live in mud house, illiterate, ignorant, suppressed as well as exploited by the well-to do kinsmen. Unemployment is rampant, per capita income is lowest. So also per capita consumption, that is, more people below the poverty line in rural areas are multiplying at a higher rate, inspite of higher infant mortality and death rate. While emphasizing the need to help poor people, father of the nation, Mr. M. K. Gandhi asked,” Recall the face of the poorest and most helpless man whom you have seen and ask yourself if the step you contemplate is going to be of any use to him. Will he be able to gain anything by it? Will it restore him control over his own life and destiny? In other words, will it lead in to Swaraj or self-rule for the hungry and also spiritually starved members of our countrymen?”. (Vasant Desai, 1991:1)

The anti-poverty and target group oriented programmes like I.R.D.P. aim at the improvement of socio- economic conditions of rural poor. The objective evaluation of such programmes is not only desirable but also necessary.

II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

IN INDIA

This section attempts to present a brief sketch of the rural development programmes in pre and post independent India.

(A) PRE-INDEPENDENCE EXPERIMENTS :

The importance of rural development in India was recognised long back. Some isolated experiments for rural development during pre-independent India are noted below.

CHRISTIAN SETTLEMENT (1860-1920) :

In the beginning, Christian Missionaries initiated definite organised steps for the economic and social uplift of their converts by organising them into village peasant settlements, employing them in factories / workshops and training them in certain simple trades to enable them to earn their livelihood.

The Christian Settlements were model villages created out of necessity to support the converts. These settlements were the pioneer attempts in social and economic planning which tested human determination and character and required qualities of organisation and management. Where men were able to meet their conditions, the settlements proved to be a source of rural leadership and economic prosperity (Padhye, 1986: 4-19).

SRINIKETAN EXPERIMENT (1921) :

Next notable experiment was undertaken by Shri Rabinadranath Tagore. He set-up rural development projects at 8 villages in the Kalingram Pargana of West-Bengal in 1908. Later on he founded Shantinikethan in 1921. He aimed at all round transformation of villages through development of agriculture, live stock, co-operatives and improvement in village sanitation. This experiment is popularly known as 'Sriniketan Rural Reconstruction Programme'. The

programme was not very successful and can only be described as rural welfare work. The absence of market facilities, professional guidance, lack of co-ordination between implementing authority and improper incentives for workers made the task more difficult and desired results could not be achieved (Reddy, 1988:53; Singh, 1996 :3).

GANDHIAN EXPERIMENTS (1915-1942) :

The father of the nation, Mahatma Gandhiji, devoted himself to the upliftment of the Indian villagers, popularising among them hand spinning (the Charka) as a remedy for their poverty and unemployment. He started Khadi Movement in 1915 at Sabarmati Ashram. In 1917 he fought against the Indigo planters at Champaran. In 1920 he initiated different schemes for rural upliftment at Savagram in Maharashtra. In 1938, he trained workers for upliftment of poor and weaker sections. Along with rural sanitation and women's welfare, "Sarvodaya Scheme" was started in 1942 at Bombay to inculcate in the villagers the spirit of self-help and mutual help.

However, the project was not without its drawbacks. In the first place, it maintained people at a very low standard of life. Secondly, he could not raise a dedicated cadre to work out his programme on all India basis, his rural development projects degenerated into formal rituals because of the absence of dedicated local leadership. (Reddy, 1988 : 39; Singh, 1996:4).

GURGAON EXPERIMENT (1920) :

The Deputy Commissioner of Gurgaon District of Panjab, Mr. F. L. Brayne and some British administrators initiated rural development experiment in 1920. It is popularly known as the "Gargaon Scheme". The efforts were made to remove poverty through mass movement. It aimed at improvement of agriculture, women's education, health and sanitation. The main reason of the failure of this project was that the reforms were imposed on the people rather than initiated by themselves. It increased gap between haves and havenots. (Padhye, 1986 : 26; Singh, 1996 :4).

MARTANDAM EXPERIMENT (1921) :

The Martandam Experiment was another such programme initiated by Mrs. Spencer Hatch and Dr. D. S. Hatch of young Men's Christian Association at Martandam in South Trivancore of Kerala. The main stress in this programme was on the principle that people should not depend on the government for support. Because when concessions and help in any field are not given, the people develop in them a feeling of self-help and self reliance. To reduce the burden of farmers, the introduction of improved seeds, pesticides and tools was advised. This allowed the farmers to make the best use of the resources available to them. Co-operative societies were established and weekly demonstrations were held. Therefore, every possible effort was made to widespread the Martandam programme. Main drawbacks of this programme were : Hindus looked at with suspicion, programme neglected women's organisation and lacked adequate attention towards agricultural development. (Padhye, 1986 : 21; Singh, 1996 : 4).

VEDCHHI PROJECT (1924) :

The Vedchhi experiment was introduced at Vedchhi in Surat district of Gujarat. It was introduced for improvement of Adivasis. Jugatram Dave was moving spirit behind this experiment. The adivasis were too backward economically and socially. The main cause for their backwardness was illiteracy and habitual consumption of liquor. Initially, Khadi centres were established in 1924 and later on in 1929 educational institutions were opened. In 1946 Khadi movement was dropped from the Vedchhi.

RASULIA EXPERIMENT (1934) :

Rasulia experiment was initiated at the outskirts of Hoshangabad in Madhya Pradesh, with pioneering efforts of Hildar Cashimose, Ranjit Chetsingh. Donald and Erica Grooms. This experiment received financial aid from British Government and Religious Society. The programme was aimed at educational improvement, farming, well-digging and cement sunk work. It emphasised the value of group work and community organisation. The economic and social betterment of the people did not make its mark on the pattern of living. It could not found any considerable success (Padhye, 1986 : 24).

FIRKA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME OF MADRAS (1946) :

The Firka Development Scheme initially emerged with 10 Firka (development area) in 1943. Later on, in 1946, it was extended to another 34 Firka centers in Madras State. The object of the scheme was to attack the different rural problems through certain short-term as well long term plans. The different developmental schemes were implemented through a Firka Development Committee under the direct supervision of a Firka Development officer with

reputation as a distinguished social worker. The scheme aimed at giving an opportunity to the villagers to develop both as an individual and as a unit of well-integrated society. Firka Development Scheme had become a model to Government and this scheme was later merged with the National Extension Services. (Reddy, 1988 : 58).

These early attempts could not yield desired results for various reasons. These programmes lacked adequate financial support and encouragement from the government. The primary concern of the administration was the maintenance of law and order and collection of revenue, it was least concerned with the problem of rural development. Moreover, these programmes were initiated according to the interests and inclination of individuals who were either political leaders or social workers. They were able to carry on some minimum development works coaching a few aspects, covering only certain sections of the rural populations who were local and influential in the village community. The programmes lacked an overall rural development approach as there was undue emphasis on the development of agriculture and its allied sectors. Further, because of the absence of any government support, these programmes lacked an organised and long term planning for successful implementation. The British rulers were not interested in India's rural development, therefore, they left it for individual leaders, social workers and voluntary organisations to look after such endeavours. Many of these programmes covered very wide areas. In many cases, the areas proposed to be covered by the programme were not properly scrutinized for the suitability of programme before the initiation of the same. The resultant unsuitability of the place and people often led to the ineffective implementation of the programmes.

(Singh, 1996: 5).

(B) POST-INDEPENDENCE EFFORTS

ETAWAH PROJECT (1948):

After Independence, in 1948 the first 'pilot project' was started in an area of 64 villages scattered in the vicinity of Mahewa, located at a distance of about 8 miles from the Head quarters of Etawah district in Uttar Pradesh. An American engineer, Albert Mayor, planned and introduced this project. Main aim of this project was to see what degree of production and social improvement as well as initiative, self-confidence and co-operation could be developed among the rural people. It introduced improved variety of seeds, chemical fertilizers, irrigation systems, improved implements, plant protection measures, soil conservation, improvement of animal husbandry and co-operatives.

This project suffered from inadequacy of personnel, unattainable speed of opening new projects and lack of training. It became paper plan and it failed to achieve any considerable success (Reddy, 1988: 59; Padhy, 1986:69-75).

NILOKHERI PROJECT (1948):

The Nilokheri project was another such experiment which was introduced to rehabilitate 7000 displaced persons coming from Pakistan due to partition of the country, by developing a new township at Nilokheri. Shri. S.K. Day was moving spirit behind this project. S.K. Day wanted the refugees to be actively engaged in constructive programmes assuring them the right to live, right to work for a living and the right to receive what is earned. This project also popularly known as

Mazdoor Manjil because of its principle, “He who would not work, neither shall he eat” or ‘Aram Haram Hai’. It organised dairy, poultry, tannery, printing press, engineering workshops etc. on co-operative basis. S.K. Day himself admitted that the project had many mistakes and errors. He said, it was easy for people to suspect him of dishonesty in the handling of government funds, but main cause for failure was the lack of experience and immature idealism (Padhye, 1988 : 77).

THE BHOODAN MOVEMENT (1951):

Acharya Vinoba Bhave launched this programme in 1951. He received a gift of land for distribution among the landless poor. Initially it was started by many state governments. Bhoodan does not mean only distribution of land but also leveling up the mental values of the society. It was symbolic in the sense that it was an all comprehensive movement designed to perform all walks of life, Gramdan is a logical consequence of the Bhoodan. However, several studies revealed that its impact was too little to solve the enormous problem of rural poverty. The distribution of land took an unusual long time on account of the different legal hurdles and impediments. Moreover, the land given in charity was barren in most of the cases and non-availability of financial help made it difficult to improve its quality (Padhye, 1988 ; 49: Singh, 1996: 6).

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (1952):

India achieved its independence in 1947, but no concrete and comprehensive programme was introduced until 1952. After independence, Etawah and Nilokheri Schemes inspired the government. Therefore, government of India launched the Community Development Programme (CDP),

on October 2nd 1952, under the Indo-American technical co-operation Agreement. The United States offered the necessary finance, equipment and technical personnel, initially. Step by step, the programme was extended to cover the entire country. In order to ensure active participation of the people in the rural development, C.D.P. designed to build community assets like village roads, school-buildings, wells by involving the rural people. The basic intention of the C.D.P. was to serve the rural people and to reach as large a number of them as possible. The underlying ideology of the programme was to prepare the people to help themselves. But it failed to increase agricultural production, removing illiteracy, and tackling problem of unemployment etc. According to the Balawant Rai Mehta Committee Report, the programmes could not ignite popular sentiments and peoples participation (Singh , 1996 : 8).

NATIONAL EXTENSION SERVICE (1953):

Initially, commencement of the C.D.P. had very good response from the people. It is reported that, in several development projects good results were achieved. Therefore, government decided to extend this programme in the name of National Extension Service, in 1953. Objectives of the C.D.P. became objectives of NES. According to first five year plan, C.D.P. is a method and NES is the agency through which the five year plan seeks to initiate a process of transformation of the social and economic life of the villages. But NES achieved quite negligible success and workers were themselves in a some what chastened mood as the miracle they had hoped to perform eluded them. (Singh, 1996 : 8; Reddy, 1988 : 65).

PANCHAYAT RAJ SYSTEM (1959):

Panchayat Raj System was accepted as the institutional pattern for rural development in 1959. An attempt was made not only to decentralise the administration at the district and the block level, but also to promote the establishment of a three - tier system of Gram Panchayat, Gram Samitis and Zilla Parishad at the village, block and district level respectively. No doubt, the Panchayat Raj institutions, as envisaged in Balawant Rai Mehta Committee Report, were assigned the task of rural development. But unfortunately, without resources at their command to implement these schemes, the major drawback of this programme was the dominance of Panchayats by big land-lords, money-lenders, musclemen and influential persons of the village. All those persons had vested interests in protecting the exploitative power structure of the society. Instead of preparing the ground for social equality and justice, those institutions had institutionalised injustice, favouritism and factionalism in life which had impeded the growth of system on sound lines (Singh, 1996: 8).

THE INTENSIVE AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT PROGRAMME (IADP) AND INTENSIVE AGRICULTURE AREA PROGRAMME (IAAP).

The C.D.P. was initiated with the aim of promoting all round development in rural life, and to this end, the activities undertaken were both numerous and diverse. As time passed, it became apparent that agricultural production was not increasing as quickly as was expected. The population of India, on the other hand, was increasing at a much faster rate. The experts of the Ford Foundation

in their report suggested to increase food production. The strategy for rural development was changed and emphasis was laid on increasing food production in the country. In 1961, Intensive Agricultural District Programme (IADP) was launched in one District of each State with application of modern technology and modern management. The selected district for the programme was assured water supply and a least natural hazards and well developed co-operative credit institutions, improved seeds, chemical fertilizers, etc. In 1964, the IADP was extended to other districts of all States in the name of Intensive Agriculture Area programme (IAAP). Basically IAAP followed IADP but its staffing pattern was somewhat reduced. The Government of India appointed expert committee for assessment and evaluation of IADP and IAAP in 1968. The Committee report pointed out that the programme was initiated with in-adequate preparation, assured water supply was not met by the several district selected for the IADP. The selection process was inspired by ascriptive criteria, politics in fact emerged as a variable significant in the selected districts (Reddy, 1988 : 81).

HIGH YIELDING VARIETY PROGRAMME, (1966):

The High yielding variety programme was introduced in 1966. It aimed at securing a break through in agricultural production by means of effective measures of intensification through a massive concentration of modern agricultural inputs and technology. The programmes made significant improvement in agricultural production, but received a set back due to severe droughts during the period 1966-67. The programme withstood the test of time and brought "Green Revolution" in India, making her almost self-sufficient in food grain production. But the overbenefit from the programme was availed of by the better off and

educated farmers. This resulted in the growth of capitalistic farming in India, which created unequal distribution of income. The rich became richer while the poor poorer. (Singh, 1996 : 9).

RURAL WORKS PROGRAMME, (RWP, 1970), AND DROUGHT PRONE AREA PROGRAMME (DPAP, 1972):

Rural Works Programme was launched in 1970 to promote the integrated development of areas which were chronically affected by drought and it depended on an identification of drought prone areas in the country. This was essentially an employment oriented programme and its most prominent feature was its labour intensive character. It covered activities such as soil conservation, afforestation, construction of roads and provision of irrigational facilities. Rural works programme revealed its inadequacy, in terms of employment generation on a regular basis and it realized the need of modification, and RWP was redesigned as the Drought prone Area Programme in 1972. Initial objective of D.P.A.P. was to generate employment opportunities, but soon programme changed its ideology and focused attention on development works so as to provide a more or less permanent solution to the problem of drought prone-area.

Several evaluation studies were conducted to know the working of D.P.A.P. According to Task Force Report, D.P.A.P. was not dovetailed to the district development plan. According to operations research group, Baroda, D.P.A.P. was not beneficiary oriented approach, farm forestry, social forestry and pasture development were neglected, (Maheshwari, 1995 : 118 - 119; Padhye, 1986: 157-158).

**SMALL FARMERS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY (SFDA) AND
MARGINAL FARMERS AND AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS
DEVELOPMENT AGENCY (MFAL) (1970-1971):**

The failure of earlier sixties' growth oriented programmes and the recommendation of All India Rural Credit Review Committee in 1969 encouraged the government for introduction of SFDA and MFAL. in 1970-1971. Government started 46 pilot projects for SFDA and 47 for MFAL. The main objective of the programme SFDA was to assist persons specially identified from target groups and raising their income level, by providing them agricultural inputs, including credit, so as to enable them to acquire improved farm technology and to diversify their activities. Main aim of MFAL was providing institutional credit facilities for undertaking various economic activities like horticulture, animal husbandry, and dairying etc.

The results of various evaluation studies showed that, in several project areas agricultural labourers had no access to co-operative credit. The total scheme did not benefit agricultural labourers. According to programme evaluation organisation study in 1974-75, they were almost totally neglected in the matter of credit. The study further revealed that programme pertaining to 'Minor irrigation' benefited only 3 % farmers in the project areas. Most of the agencies neither exercised proper care in selecting beneficiaries nor in ensuring extension service or supporting facilities (Padhye, 1986 : 186; Reddy, 1988: 110; Singh, 1996:10).

TRIBAL AREA DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (TADP) (1972):

Tribal areas have their specific problems such as small size of holdings, absence of irrigation, lack of improved seeds and fertilizers, heavy debts and

high rate of interest on loans. The shifting cultivation adopted by the tribals has its uses and abuses. It causes deforestation and ecological imbalance. Tribal Area Development Programme was launched in 1972 at six selected tribal areas. The main objective was to develop tribal and backward areas. It is of additive nature and is not intended to replace the normal flow of investment in the tribal areas on the ongoing schemes. The core of economic development pursued by these projects comprises of agricultural development including horticulture, land reclamation, land development, soil conservation and cattle development.

PILOT INTENSIVE RURAL EMPLOYMENT PROJECTS (1972):

The Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Project was introduced in the year 1972, at selected 15 blocks in the country to provide full employment to every one who was willing to work. Maximum employment was created through the construction of roads, supply of drinking water, construction of educational buildings, primary health centers etc. It also aimed to provide employment to persons who were available for work in the area with a view to having the multiplier effect of creating opportunities for continued employment and imparting skill to the workers to increase their employability. It was an action-cum study project. But there were many problems by which programme was suffered: low salary attracted less qualified persons, due to heavy demand on labour there was consequent erosion of discipline.

MINIMUM NEEDS PROGRAMME (MNP) (1974)

The Minimum Needs Programme was introduced in the first year of the fifth plan. The MNP aimed at improving the quality of life and providing infrastructure facilities needed for supporting and supplementing the other beneficiary programmes to help the rural poor. The main components of the MNP

included elementary education, rural health, rural water supply, rural roads, rural electrification, house sites for landless labourers, environmental improvements of urban slums and nutrition. The main drawbacks of this programme were lack of resources, wrong identification of beneficiaries, lack of co-ordination between center, state, district authorities, and block agencies (Reddy, 1988: 112; Padhye, 1986 : 252).

COMMAND AREA DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (CADP) (1974)

The Command Area Development Programme was initiated in order to remove the dichotomy of responsibility between Panchayat Raj bodies and other administrative machinery at the gross-root level. The main focus of this programme had been on the development of irrigation through land leveling, land shaping, construction of field channels, the introduction of the rotational water supply system and the popularization of integrated soil, crop and water management practices. But ineffective organisational arrangements in the command area affected this programme adversely. Ineffective control of the state, planning of resources and execution resulted in a delayed start of the programme. Due to rapid rise in the cost of all items such as labour, material, equipment, spares, land etc. the cost of projects had automatically increased and it was found difficult to complete the projects under this programme with the original amount sanctioned for them (Reddy, 1988:100; Singh, 1996: 12).

HILL AREA DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (HADP) (1974-75).

The socio-economic conditions in the Hill Areas are of a special nature which attracted the attention of the government. In 1974-75, a National Hill Area Development Programme had been launched to ensure planned Integrated Development of Hill Areas. The objective of it was harmonisation of socio-

economic growth with eco-restoration, eco-preservation and eco-development. But it is recognised that lack of skilled manpower is a main constraint in the development of hill areas. Therefore, during the seventh five year plan, it was proposed to undertake manpower planning and to link education to the specific needs of the hill areas. It was proposed to carry out differential developmental programmes in the hill areas with the active involvement of the people and their local organisations including voluntary agencies. (Reddy, 1988 : 85:86; Padhye, 1986: 163-164).

FOOD FOR WORK PROGRAMME (FWP) (1977):

The Food for Work Programme was introduced in 1977 to provide employment to the unemployed and underemployed rural poor during the slack seasons and at the same time to create durable productive capital assets in the form of roads, canals, minor irrigation projects etc. The basic aim was to generate additional employment in rural areas and in the process create durable community assets which would strengthen the rural infrastructure. The workers on the projects were paid partly in cash and partly in kind viz., food grains by utilizing the surplus stock of food grains. In the initial stage, the results were said to be quite encouraging. However, certain shortcomings have been pointed out in its operation resulting in a steep decline in employment in terms of mandays. It is also suffered from planning and implementation of work. In view of this, on October, 1980 the FFWP was reshaped into National Rural Employment Programme. (Reddy, 1988:122; Padhye, 1986:127; Singh, 1996: 13).

DESERT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME : (DDP) (1977) :

The Desert Development Programme was launched in 1977 on the recommendations of the National Commission on Agriculture. Initially, the

scheme got 100 percent finance from the Central Government. With effect from 1979-80, the expenditure was shared by Centre and State in the ratio of 50:50. The objective of the programme was integrated development of desert areas with a view to providing the people of desert areas more employment, opportunities and better incomes. The activities taken up under the D.D.P. included afforestation, water harvesting, rural electrification, animal husbandry etc. It also laid emphasis on arresting desertification through activities which help to restore ecological balance, stabilise sand dunes and facilitate soil and water conservation.

ANTYODAYA PROGRAMME (1971).

The Antyodaya Scheme based on the Gandhian philosophy is intended for the upliftment of the poorest of the poor in the villages. Through this programme it is expected that the fruits of planned development could reach the rural poor without differentiation on the grounds of caste, class and religion. It is because the selection of beneficiaries under this programme solely based on the extent of poverty of the family, the programmes aimed firstly to identify the requirements of the poorest families amongst the poor living below the poverty line and take appropriate steps for their betterment. The programme was intended to help the poor to secure resources for development. This will enhance their status for living and credit worthiness. This in turn will help them to take advantage of different developmental programmes and will gradually become self-reliant. But this programme also suffered due to the absence of technically equipped personnel, doubtful identification of beneficiaries and land hunger was common denominator among Antyoday families of all States (Reddy, 1988: 117-118).

TRAINING FOR RURAL YOUTH AND SELF - EMPLOYMENT

(TRYSEM) (1979).

Training for rural youth and Self-employment Programme was started in 1979 as a multi-pronged strategy to combat the problem of rural unemployment and hence poverty. This programme envisaged that after providing free training of their choice to the rural youth, they would be helped by the Government to raise marginal money required for acquiring tools/ equipments and raw materials to set up small industries. Certain deficiencies were found in the programme such as wrong identification of beneficiaries, after completion of training the beneficiaries were not able to get loans from financial institutions. Particularly banks were not coming forward to provide funds to the beneficiaries under the programme. The banks were also reluctant to provide finance to the unmarried girls (Singh, 1996: 13).

At the close of seventies, it was, however, realised that the problem was enormous. The manner in which the problem of rural poverty was tried to be solved left much to be desired both qualitatively and quantitatively. It was only a small fraction of the rural poor (mainly landowners) that was covered effectively by the various anti-poverty programmes. Among the rural poor especially those belonging to the bottom stratum (e.g. landless and rural artisans) were left untouched. The major constraint with these programmes was not of finance but organisational inadequacies and lack of a clear-cut plan of development. Besides, the territorial overlapping of these programmes and their different funding patterns created considerable difficulties not only in effective monitoring but also thwarted achievements of the programme. In view of these, It was decided to combine the programme into one and designate it as the “Integrated Rural Development Programme” (Tewari and Sinha , 1988:8).

INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (IRDP) :

The origin of Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) can be traced in the Karimnagar pilot project which was an attempt to take technology to the villages and apply it to all segments of rural life. The Indian Science Congress held in 1975 decided to discuss a cross-disciplinary theme of “Science and Integrated Rural Development”. The 1971 election slogan of “Garibi Hatao” and the World Bank policy of 1973 in favour of schemes to eliminate rural poverty, all these have also contributed for the evolution of Integrated Rural Development programme.

The Integrated Rural Development Programme was introduced in the year 1978-79 and it was extended to all the 5,011 blocks with effect from 2nd October, 1980. It aims at ameliorating the lot of weaker groups in rural society.

Main objective of IRDP : -

To create self-employment opportunities by providing productive assets and inputs to identified rural poor families to augment their family income on a sustained basis to enable them to cross poverty line.

Scope :

The scope of the programme covered the provision of productive assets and inputs in the primary, secondary or tertiary sector through financial assistance by way of Government subsidy and term credit from financial institutions. All blocks in the country are covered under this programme. 50% of assisted families should be from amongst SCs, STs families, 40% from women and 3% from physically handicapped.

Funding :

Assistance is provided through a mix of subsidy and bank loan. Expenditure on subsidy is shared by the Centre and the State on 50:50 basis. Institutional Credit is made available by Commercial Banks, Co-operative Banks and Regional Rural Banks. Subsidy is limited to 25% of project for small farmers, 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ % for marginal farmers, agricultural labourers and rural artisans and 50% for SCs , STs and physically handicapped.

Eligibility :

Any rural poor family whose income was less than Rs. 3500/- per annum in 1979-80. Now it is increased to Rs. 11,000/- per annum and whose name figures in the below poverty line list approved by the Gram Sabha can be assisted under the programme.

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF IRDP :

The organisational structure of the IRDP is not significantly different from the standard bureaucratic form; the only difference being the establishment at the district level of an autonomous agency called the District Rural Development Agency (DRDA). At the national level, the Department of Rural Development in the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development is responsible for policy planning, direction, coordination, and monitoring of the IRDP. For better implementation of the IRDP different administrative levels of set-up have been made at the centre, state, district and block.

CENTRAL LEVEL :

At the central level, Department of Rural Development in the Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India, New Delhi has the over-all responsibility of policy formulation, monitoring and evaluation of the programme. A Central Committee on IRDP and allied programmes has been set-up under the Chairmanship of Secretary, Department of Rural Development. The functions of this Committee are as follows:

- (i) Framing and revision of guidelines for the programmes under Integrated Rural Development;
- (ii) To ensure effective implementation of guidelines;
- (iii) To review preparation of block plans, district plans, annual plans and credit plans, etc.;
- (iv) To review linkages for supporting services for the beneficiaries of IRDP;
- (v) To consider changes in administrative set up under IRDP and for other rural development programmes;
- (vi) To review the progress of programmes in physical, financial and qualitative terms;
- (vii) To provide a forum of a continuous dialogue with the State governments; and
- (viii) To consider proposals for strengthening of infrastructure of training institutions, establishments of new training institutions, modifications in the norms prescribed for grant of stipend and in the pattern of training institutions, etc.

STATE LEVEL:

At the state level, the Department of Rural Development or any other department to which the subject of Rural Development has been allocated is responsible for planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the programme at the State level. A State Level Coordination Committee (SLCC) has been set up to assist this department in discharging these responsibilities. The Chief Secretary or Agricultural Production Commissioner or Development Commissioner is its Chairman. The functions of SLCC are as below:

- (i) To provide leadership and guidance to the DRDAs in the planning, implementation and monitoring of the programme;
- (ii) To secure inter-departmental coordination between various implementing agencies of programmes like Operation Flood, Operation Blackboard, Applied Nutrition Programme, SLBP, SRPP, etc., and to ensure development of strong backward and forward linkages of the programme;
- (iii) To consider needs and changes in the administration set up for the implementation of the programme and approve the establishment pattern and sanction the posts according to them. To fix norms for office expenses, equipment, vehicles, hiring of accommodation etc., where necessary;
- (iv) To review the physical targets of the district keeping in view the overall objectives to provide effective provisions and operation of viable schemes and to modify the targets for the districts accordingly;
- (v) To monitor and evaluate the implementation of the programme with reference to the objective of the programme; and

- (vi) To provide a forum for a meaningful dialogue between the policy-makers at the State level and the implementators at the field level.

DISTRICT LEVEL:

At the district level, the programme is implemented through DRDA. These agencies are registered societies under the Registration of Societies Act. These are generally headed by the Collector or Deputy Commissioner or Chief Secretary or Project Officer or Sabhapati of Zilla Parishad, depending upon the practice prevailing in the State. The functions of the DRDA are as follows:

- (i) To keep the district level agencies and block level agencies informed of the basic parameters, the requirements of the programme and the tasks to be performed by all these agencies;
- (ii) To coordinate and oversee the surveys, preparation of perspective plans and annual plan of the blocks and finally prepare a district plan;
- (iii) To evaluate and monitor the programme to ensure its effectiveness;
- (iv) To secure inter-sectoral and inter-departmental coordination and cooperation;
- (v) To give publicity to the achievements made under the programme and disseminate knowledge and build up awareness about the programme; and
- (vi) To send periodical returns to the State government in the prescribed formats.

BLOCK LEVEL:

At the block level, the Block Development Officer (BDO) is the Chief Co-ordinator for the block. His functions are as follows:

- (i) To prepare perspective plans/annual action plans for the block;
- (ii) To effectively implement the programme as per programme approved; and
- (iii) To provide feedback on the impact of programme.

The BDO is assisted by Extension Officer and the Village Level Workers (VLW). Ordinarily there are ten VLWs for one block and in addition to which at least two women VLWs are also provided to facilitate assistance to women beneficiaries.

At the **village level**, the Gram Sabhas identify the eligible beneficiaries based on the list prepared by VLWs and also discuss and decide the projects to be financed to the beneficiaries. (K. Singh, 1986:243-250; J.Singh, 1996: 97-100).

Thus, this Chapter has dealt with the concepts of 'Development' and 'Rural Development' and the historical background of rural development programmes in India. Against this backdrop, the next Chapter deals with the review of literature on IRDP.

REFERENCES

1. Chauhan S.P. (1997) : "50 years of poverty Alleviation programmes in India", Employment News , 30th August-5th September.
2. David A.M. Lea and D.P. Chaudhri (1986) : "Rural Development and the State" Published by Methuen & Co., New York.
3. Dwarakanath H.D., (1995) : "Rural Development Policy and Programme Implementation - An Evaluation" Social Action Journal, December.
4. Government of India (1993) : Annual Plan, Planning Commission, July.
5. Government of India (1996-97) : Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment Information Brochure, New-Delhi.
6. Gupta R.K. and Srivastava S.P. (1989) : "Action Sociology and Dyanamics of Rural Development" Ajanta Publications, New Delhi.
7. Kothari,R.C. (1991) : "Rural Development Vol. I Strategy for Rural Development", Manak Publications.
8. Maheshwari S.R. (1995) : "Rural Development in India.: A public policy approach", Sage Publications, New Delhi.
9. Mathur Y.B. (1985) : "Rural Development In India 1885 to 1985" , published by National Institute of Rural Development, Hydrabad.
- 10.Mehta S.R. (1984) : "Rural Development Policies and Programmes" A Sociological Perspective. Sage Publication New Delhi.

11. Nandini Durgesh (1992) : “Rural Development Administration” Rawat Publications, New Delhi.
12. Padhye Kishore Chandra (1986) : “Rural Development in Modern India”, B.R. Publication. New Delhi.
13. Rao, B.S.S. (1992) : “Television for Rural Development” Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi.
14. Reddy Venkata (1988) : “Rural Development in India : Poverty and Development”. Himalaya Publishing House, Delhi.
15. Singh Jasbir (1996) : “Working IRDP”, Anomal publications, New-Delhi.
16. Singh Katar (1986) : “Rural Development Principles, Policies and Management” Sage Publications, New Delhi.
17. Tewari R.T. and Sinha R.C. (1988) : “Rural Development in India” , Ashish Publishing House, New - Delhi.
