

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**  
and  
**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**Part IIA**

**A Case Study of  
The Ghosi Community Development Block  
Uttar Pradesh, India**

**309.25  
Ec 74 C; 1**



**UNITED NATIONS**

309.2  
Ec74c

# COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT and ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Part IIA: A Case Study of  
The Ghosi Community Development Block  
Uttar Pradesh, India

*Study prepared by*

*ECAFE/FAO Agriculture Division*

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE FAR EAST**



**UNITED NATIONS**

**DATA ENTERED**

**Bangkok, 1960**



Library IAS, Shimla  
309.25 Ec 74 C; 1



26034

E/CN.11/541

26034  
19.9.68

UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATION

Sales No.: 60. II.F. 6 (Part IIA)

Price: \$U.S. 1.00  
(or equivalent in other currencies)

31.15.5

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Preface .. .. .	<i>ix</i>
 <i>Chapter</i>	
1. Evolution of the community development programme in India	1
2. Scope of study and methodology .. .. .	5
3. Changes in agricultural practices and output .. .. .	10
4. Credit and indebtedness among cultivators .. .. .	24
5. Capital formation .. .. .	29
6. Levels of living of cultivators .. .. .	35
7. Economic and social life of cultivators .. .. .	40
8. Development of village industries .. .. .	50
9. Recapitulation and conclusions .. .. .	60
 <i>Appendix</i>	
1. Community development in India: General statistical tables	69
2. The schedules used	76
3. Some background information on Ghosi Block and non-Block areas .. .. .	77
4. Special tables relating to the field study ..	89

## LIST OF TABLES

	<i>Page</i>
1. Agricultural development activities in the Blocks .. .. .	4
2. Progress in the Ghosi Development Block .. .. .	12
3. Percentage area under improved seed .. .. .	15
4. Percentage area under main crops covered with manures and fertilizers .. .. .	18
5. Average per hectare yields .. .. .	21
6. Percentage rates of interest per annum .. .. .	26
7. Loans taken and repaid per indebted household of cultivators	26
8. Capital expenditure per hectare of land, 1955-1958 .. ..	30
9. People's contribution for community work, Ghosi Block, 1956-1958 .. .. .	33
10. People's contribution in the six selected villages, Ghosi Block, 1957/58 .. .. .	34
11. Consumption per capita per week .. .. .	36
12. Expenditure on non-food items .. .. .	38
13. Leadership cases cited and age-groups .. .. .	47
14. Number of rural artisans trained in various crafts, Ghosi, 1955-1958 .. .. .	54

### Appendix 1

1. Development Blocks in operation in India, January 1959 ..	69
2. Distribution of planned outlay on community development and national extension, 1956/57 to 1960/61 .. .. .	69
3. Budget pattern of a rural community project ..	70
4. Strength of personnel engaged in a community project ..	71
5. Budget of National Extension Service Block ..	72

	<i>Page</i>
6. Personnel for a National Extension Service Block .. ..	72
7. Budget for intensive development Block .. .. .	73
8. Block budget—pre-extension phase .. .. .	73
9. Expenditure incurred on Ghosi Block, 1952-1958 .. .. .	74
10. Expenditure on agriculture in Ghosi Block .. .. .	75

### **Appendix 3**

1. Population and density .. .. .	78
2. Cultivated and irrigated area .. .. .	79
3. Crops grown .. .. .	79
4. Economic status of household members .. .. .	84
5. Average size of household and cultivation holdings .. ..	84
6. Population and number of households .. ..	85
7. Principal occupation of the heads of households .. .. .	85
8. Cultivating households, by subsidiary occupation ..	85
9. Average size of holding .. .. .	86
10. Percentage distribution of population, by age groups in selected households of cultivators .. .. .	87
11. Sex composition in selected households of cultivators .. ..	87
12. Population of selected villages, by caste and religion ..	88
13. Number of plots per holding of selected cultivators ..	88

### **Appendix 4**

1. Area cropped in selected villages, 1954-1958 ..	89
2. Adoption of plant protection measures .. .. .	89
3. Use of iron plough, Japanese method of paddy cultivation and green manuring .. .. .	90
4. Use of artificial insemination centre and veterinary services by cultivators .. .. .	90

	<i>Page</i>
5. Services rendered by village level workers .. .. .	91
6. Area commanded by irrigation in selected villages ..	91
7. Loans taken for various purposes .. .. .	92
8. Loans taken from various sources by selected cultivators ..	92
9. The position of co-operative societies in selected villages ..	92
10. The general position of co-operative societies	93
11. Capital expenditure per household .. .. .	93
12. Non-monetary capital formation per household .. ..	94
13. Capital formation in agriculture, monetary and non-monetary	94
14. Disposal of agricultural assets per household	95
15. Over-all net capital expenditure per household ..	95
16. Progress of community works in the Block, 1954-1958 ..	96
17. Expenditure on different non-food items, 1957/58 ..	97
18. Average expenditure per participating household on social ceremonies .. .. .	97
19. Number and percentage of households possessing utensils, cots and other materials .. .. .	98
20. Literacy, class of cultivators and sex ..	98
21. Important ways of improving social status .. .. .	99
22. Attempts made to increase income during the past 3 or 4 years	99
23. Attendance at co-operative society meetings .. ..	99
24. Recruitment of new members in co-operative society ..	100
25. Leadership cases classified according to caste	100
26. Leadership and some social virtues ..	100

## EXPLANATORY NOTE

The following symbols have been used in the tables and figures throughout the report:

Three dots (...) indicate that data are not available or are not separately reported.

A dash (—) indicates that the amount is nil or negligible.

A full stop (.) is used to indicate decimals.

A comma (,) is used to distinguish thousands and millions.

A hyphen (-) between dates representing years, e.g. 1950-1958, is used to signify the full period involved, including the beginning and end years.

A slash (/) indicates a crop year or fiscal year e.g., 1957/58.

References to “tons” indicate metric tons.



## P R E F A C E

This case study, relating to the impact of community development programmes on agricultural development in particular and on economic development in general, has been prepared as part of the work programme of the joint ECAFE/FAO Agriculture Division (project 11-02 c) — a programme agreed upon by the Executive Secretary, of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) and the Director General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and approved by the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East at its eleventh session (*Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Twentieth Session, Supplement No. 5, E/2712 — E/CN.11/407*). FAO and the Bureau of Social Affairs of United Nations Headquarters have collaborated closely in this work.

The present study embodies the findings of field investigations undertaken in six selected villages of Ghosi Community Development Block, (Uttar Pradesh, India) and six selected villages in a similar area not covered by community development activities. It studies the extent of acceptance of improved agricultural practices, as also changes in output, levels of living and capital formation associated with community development activities. Changes in outlook and leadership pattern and the formation of village institutions that are likely to have an impact on economic situation of cultivators have been studied, and evidence sought regarding their relationship, if any, to community development activities. Some light has also been thrown on the present position of development work concerning village industries. In a final chapter, an attempt has been made to take stock of the findings and to highlight some general observations that might be of wider interest.

The field work for this study was undertaken by the Planning Research and Action Institute, Lucknow (Uttar Pradesh, India) under the sponsorship of the secretariat of ECAFE. The Institute made available to the secretariat a draft preliminary report embodying the results of its investigations, and also, supplied subsequently a considerable amount of additional information. The willing co-operation of the Director and staff of the Institute in all stages of the enquiry is gratefully acknowledged. However, the responsibility for the final version, the conclusions and views expressed in this report which relies heavily on the preliminary report and other material supplied by that Institute, is entirely of the ECAFE secretariat.

## Chapter 1

# EVOLUTION OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME IN INDIA

### *Concepts and objectives*

The community development programme was inaugurated, on an all-India basis, on 2 October 1952. According to the concept originally outlined in the first five-year plan of India, "Community development is the method and rural extension the agency through which the five-year plan seeks to initiate a process of transformation of the social and economic life of the village". The objectives of the programme, as spelled out at the National Conference on Community Development, were:

- (a) to promote the all-sided development of the village community;
- (b) to develop a spirit of community life amongst the people;
- (c) to develop self-reliance in the individuals and cohesion in the community so that the village people are able to manage their affairs themselves and to make the villages self-governing units of the larger Indian democracy."<sup>1</sup>

In this context, it is worth noting that the present community development programme, which envisages a broadly similar working pattern in the whole country, aims at all-sided development of rural life through its own administrative machinery backed by government financial and technical assistance, but drawing heavily on people's co-operation and participation on an aided self-help basis.<sup>2</sup>

### *Content and patterns of administrative organization*

The main directions of work envisaged under the programme have been spelled out as follow:

"First, increased employment and increased production by the application of scientific methods of agriculture, including horticulture, animal husbandry, fisheries, etc. and the establishment of subsidiary

---

<sup>1</sup> Government of India, Ministry of Community Development: *Annual Conference on Community Development, Mount Abu, Main Recommendations and Conclusions*, pp. 73-74.

<sup>2</sup> *Report of the Committee for Evaluation and on Public Participation*, (Uttar Pradesh, 1959), pp. 7-8.

and cottage industries; secondly, self-help and self-reliance and the largest possible extension of the principle of co-operation; and thirdly, the need for devoting a portion of the vast unutilized time and energy in the countryside for the benefit of the community."<sup>3</sup>

For the implementation of the programme, an elaborate organizational structure has been gradually evolved. Originally, the administrative unit was defined as a Community Project consisting of 3 basic operational units known as Community Development Blocks.<sup>4</sup> Each Development Block covered on an average 100 villages having a population of 60,000 to 70,000 and an area of 388 to 440 square kilometres. Thus, fifty-five Community Development Projects or 165 Community Development Blocks were established in the first year of the programme beginning 2 October 1952. The budget allotment per Block was Rs 2.2 million for a three-year period.<sup>5</sup> Each Community Development Block had a complement of about 38 persons for field work and supervision (appendix 1, table 4). Of the total budget allotment of Rs 2.2 million for the first three years, nearly Rs 1.4 million was to be non-recurring, and was to cover construction, (canals, tanks, culverts, storage godowns, reclamation of waste land, housing for staff) and equipment such as tractors, jeeps (appendix 1, table 3). After three years, these Blocks passed into the Post-Intensive or Normalized Phase. The basic change was a sharp reduction in the funds available to the Community Development Block organization on the assumption that many of their activities would be taken over by the normal development departments or by the people.

In October 1953, a National Extension Service (NES) organization was established with the objective of providing extension service facilities to the entire country. The initial goal was to cover about one-fourth of the country with National Extension Service Blocks in the period covered by the first five-year plan. Originally, the budget for each NES Block for a three-year period was Rs 750,000 (appendix 1, table 5) or about one-third of the budget for the first series of Community Development Blocks inaugurated in 1952/53. (This budget provision included Rs 300,000 for short-term loans to be channelled through co-operative societies). The National Extension Service Blocks had a normal complement of 22 persons<sup>6</sup> as against about 38 in the first series of Community Development Blocks, and the funds available for construction, equipment and local works were

<sup>3</sup> See the article "The National Extension Movement" by the Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission, in *Kuruk Shetra*—A Symposium on Community Development in India.

<sup>4</sup> These Development Blocks were to be contiguous areas according to planners but in actual practice the idea of contiguity was not strictly adhered to.

<sup>5</sup> In addition to these Blocks, 53 Blocks were started with a 3-year budget provision in each case of Rs 1.5 million.

<sup>6</sup> The deficiency was in respect of stockmen, community organizers and health services.

appreciably smaller. It should be noted, however, that so far as agriculture is concerned, the supervisory staff available in a National Extension Service Block was similar to that of Community Development Blocks, but village level workers were about 50 per cent less (appendix 1, table 6). Thus, while agricultural extension work was somewhat less intensive in National Extension Blocks, the emphasis on other community development activities was much less.

After three years, a National Extension Service Block passed into a three-year intensive development phase. The budget of an Intensive Development Block for a three-year period amounted to Rs 1.5 million including a non-recurring expenditure of Rs 1.07 million (appendix 1, table 7). Nearly Rs 0.5 million of the non-recurring expenditure was in respect of funds made available to the Block for advancing loans to cultivators for minor irrigation works, reclamation, etc. and the balance for equipment and construction (appendix I, table 7). It should be noted, incidentally, that the budget provision for a National Extension Service Block for the first three years, plus the budget provision for the following three years of the Intensive Development Phase, nearly equalled the provision for the first series of Community Development Blocks for their first three years. After three years of the Intensive Development Phase, these blocks were converted into Normalized Blocks with sharply reduced budgetary allotments.

The third pattern of development, which has recently been evolved, envisages the covering of new areas by a pre-extension phase of one year, followed by a five-year period of Stage I and a five-year period of Stage II. The pre-extension phase provides for an expenditure of Rs 18,800 for a year (appendix 1, table 8) covering the services of a Block development officer, one agricultural extension officer and five village level workers; the main activity during this period will be agricultural extension. This will be followed by a phase of increased activity for five years (Stage I) with an average annual budget allotment of Rs 0.24 million, or about the same as in the case of the NES Blocks. The number of extension officers during this phase is expected to be larger than for an NES Block; the increases will be in respect of *panchayats*, rural industries and programmes for women and children. More important perhaps is the fact that Stage I Blocks envisage, in the case of agricultural development, a sustained high level of activity over a five-year period, as contrasted with a very high level of activity for three years (under the original Community Development Intensive Development Blocks) followed by a very sharp decline in the Post-Intensive or Normalized Phase. In the following five years (Stage II), the average annual budget allotment will be a little less than half of the allotment for Stage I. However, the strength of extension officers is to be

maintained at the same level as in Stage I, and the funds available for agricultural extension during Stage II are also expected to remain at the level of the previous five years.<sup>7</sup>

### *Coverage and financial outlay*

The number of Development Blocks and the population covered have increased steadily since October 1952. By 1 January 1959, 2,405 Development Blocks were functioning. These covered a little less than 303,000 villages (out of a total of 558,000 villages) and a population of 165 million (appendix 1, table 1). According to present plans, the whole country will be covered by Development Blocks by October 1963, or two years later than the original time table envisaged in the second five-year plan. The slowing down of expansion follows the recommendation of the Committee on Plan Projects of the Indian Planning Commission and is attributable to financial limitations and shortage of trained personnel (particularly technical and supervisory).

During the first five-year plan (1951/1952 to 1955/60), the actual expenditure on national extension and community development was Rs 460 million. For the second five-year plan, the planned outlay is Rs 2,000 million. Of this 30 per cent is for agriculture (agricultural extension, irrigation, etc.) and rural arts and crafts, 26 per cent for personnel and equipment, and the rest for other activities (appendix 1, table 2).

Some idea of the agricultural development activities under these programmes can be formed from the table below:

**Table 1.**  
**AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN THE BLOCKS**

<i>Activity</i>	<i>1955/56</i>	<i>1956/57</i>	<i>1957/58</i>
1. Fertilizers distributed (tons) . . . . .	277,747	408,373	517,273
2. Improved seed distributed (tons) . . . . .	116,555	176,568	181,051
3. Agricultural demonstrations held (numbers) . . . . .	994,000	1,653,000	1,840,000
4. Area brought under fruits (hectares) . . . . .	36,421	49,776	...
5. Area brought under vegetables (hectares) . . . . .	112,096	111,287	...
6. Additional area brought under irrigation (hectares) . . . . .	520,418	498,161	
7. Key village, artificial insemination and breeding centres started (numbers) . . . . .	1,473	2,513	...
8. Pedigree animals supplied (numbers) . . . . .	13,000	12,000	14,000
9. Pedigree birds supplied (numbers) . . . . .	102,000	138,000	205,000

*Note:* The annual figures cover the period October to September except for items 3-5 in the first two years, for which the periods covered are years ending June 1956 and June 1957.

*Source:* Government of India, Ministry of Community Development: *Report, 1957/58* and *Report, 1958/59*.

<sup>7</sup> The provision of loan funds for irrigation and land reclamation and improvement in Stage II is Rs 75,000, as against Rs 300,000 in Stage I. To some extent the reduction might reflect the expectation that there will be fewer projects in these fields in the second five years.

## Chapter 2

### SCOPE OF STUDY AND METHODOLOGY

The basic idea underlying the present case study was to ascertain, through intensive field investigations, the impact of community development programmes on economic development, especially agricultural development. In the selection of areas to be studied, two considerations were kept in view. One was the need to ensure that the areas selected for study should be from a zone where agricultural economic conditions would resemble those in many other parts of Asia in at least two major respects, namely, the predominance of rice cultivation and the existence of a relatively high density of population. Second, there was the need to select an area where community development programmes had functioned for a reasonably long time and thus could justify the undertaking of a study of this type.

In the light of these two considerations, the Ghosi Community Development Block (Azamgarh district of the state of Uttar Pradesh), which was then in the post-intensive stage of development, was selected for study. This Block covers a predominantly rice-producing and consuming area, and is one of the oldest community development blocks, having been in operation for over five years prior to commencement of the field study. It lies in a relatively under-developed and poorer part of the state which is subject to frequent floods and droughts.<sup>8</sup> Largely with a view to offsetting these natural disadvantages, the development departments received some special allocations for flood control and irrigation works. Considering, however, the poverty of the region and the magnitude of the problems, it seemed unlikely that these relatively larger allocations for development could have resulted in a quicker pace of development in this area compared to other parts of the state. Moreover, so far as the community development programme as such is concerned, the initial 3-year budget allotment for the Ghosi Block (which originally covered 288 villages and a population of 120,000) was Rs 2.2 million, or the same as for an average Block with 100 villages and a population of 60,000 to 70,000. In other words, the allotment for the Ghosi Block, considered in relation to the population covered, was nearly one-half of the allotment for an average Block. The actual expenditure in the first three years was about one-fourth less than the budgeted amount.

---

<sup>8</sup> A detailed description of the general background conditions and resources in the Ghosi Development Block is given in appendix 3.

In assessing the impact of the community development programme, the study relies largely on a comparison of the economic and social conditions in the selected villages of the Ghosi Block area with the conditions obtaining in similar adjacent villages where community development work has not been hitherto started. In addition, the study also seeks to assess, to the extent possible, the changes in the Block area over a period of time (three years) and to ascertain the relationship of these to the activities of the community development programme.

### *Selection of villages*

The villages in the selected Block were listed and classified into three groups on the basis of population, *viz.*, small, medium, and large. Villages with a population of below 300 and above 1,500 were left out, on the grounds that these were either too small or too large, and as such not representative. The villages were stratified according to the following population ranges:—

<i>Village size</i>	<i>Population</i>
Small .. .. .	300 to 499
Medium .. .. .	500 to 799
Large .. .. .	800 to 1,499

Two villages were selected at random from each of the strata, with probability proportional to population, making a total sample of six villages for the Block area.

### *Selection of households*

The listing of all the households in the selected villages was done with a view to collecting information about caste, principal occupation and size of cultivation holding of each of the households.

All the households in the village were grouped according to the principal occupation of the head of the household. The three main occupational groups in each village were cultivators, agricultural labourers and craftsmen, the largest number of households being those of the cultivators. Thereafter, households having cultivation as their main occupation in each village were grouped into three strata, namely, small, medium, and large, on the basis of size of cultivation holdings. The sizes of landholdings used for this classification were as follows:

1. Small cultivators .. .. 1 to 4 acres (0.40 to 1.62 hectares)
2. Medium cultivators .. 4.1 to 7 acres (1.63 to 2.83 hectares)
3. Large cultivators .. .. Above 7 acres (above 2.83 hectares)

From each of the three strata of cultivators in each village, 6 cultivators were selected at random.

### *Households of agricultural labourers and craftsmen*

In addition to households of 18 cultivators, efforts were made to select from each village two households of agricultural labourers and at least 6 households of craftsmen (wherever available), 2 each from weavers, oil-crushers and potters.

### *Selection of non-Block area*

In selecting the villages in a non-Block area, i.e. an area not yet exposed to community development, the following criteria were kept in view:—

- (a) The villages should preferably be located in the same revenue sub-division where the selected Block is situated.
- (b) The area where these villages are located should be at a distance of at least about 16 kilometres (10 miles) from the outer boundary of a Community Development Block.
- (c) The non-Block area should be broadly similar in respect of soil-type, climate, land utilization and cropping pattern to the selected Block.

The non-Block area was selected from the Shadow Block<sup>9</sup> Fatehpur Mandaon<sup>10</sup> which also lies in the Ghosi *tehsil* (subdivision) of the Azamgarh district. Six villages and more or less the same number of households were selected from this area in a manner similar to that applied in respect of the Block area.

The similarities and minor differences between basic resource patterns in the selected Block and non-Block areas are examined in appendix 3. These are such that the two sets of villages may be regarded as initially

<sup>9</sup> In a Shadow Block, the area where the programme would be subsequently launched, is only demarcated. It is the pre-activity phase during which only a skeleton staff and nominal budget are sanctioned.

<sup>10</sup> The Shadow Block activities in Fatehpur Mandaon area were started from 1956/57, and since then Rs 30,000/- grants-in-aid only are spent each year.



sufficiently alike for cross-section comparisons to be used to facilitate the assessment of present differences that might be associated with the operation of the community development programme in the Ghosi Block since 1952.

### *Total number of households selected*

Although the design of the survey envisaged selection of 18 households of cultivators per selected village (six from each of the three strata—large, medium and small) in respect of the Block and non-Block areas, the number of households actually selected was 97 from the Block area because, in certain selected villages, the households belonging to the large or medium categories were less than six. The total number of households selected from the non-Block area was 107. In addition, 12 households of agricultural labourers from each of the Block and non-Block areas<sup>11</sup> and 15 households of craftsmen from the Block area were selected. In the non-Block area, there were no households depending primarily on these crafts.

The numbers of households included in the sample for study from both the areas were as follows:

<i>Occupational groups</i>	<i>Block</i>	<i>Non-Block</i>
<i>Cultivators:</i>		
Small .. .. .	38	35
Medium .. .. .	31	36
Large .. .. .	28	36
Craftsmen .. .. .	15	—

### *Schedules used in the inquiry*

The investigation consisted of collecting data in accordance with nine schedules (appendix 2) by direct inquiry, observation or from revenue or other official records wherever necessary.

In addition, data of interest relating to economic and social conditions of Block and non-Block areas were also obtained through general notes prepared by the investigators.

### *Collection of data and field organization*

For the collection of data regarding each of the selected households, the personal interview method was adopted. For the actual investigation

<sup>11</sup> Owing to the small size of sample for agricultural labourers and the absence of any direct community development programme benefiting this group, it was decided subsequently not to publish the results.

---

in the villages, four investigators (including one senior) were employed, and adequate arrangements were made for supervision and direction.

Detailed instructions were prepared for the guidance of the investigators and the supervisory staff. The basic concepts were also carefully defined. Actual job-training of investigators was undertaken in the field during the pretesting phase, as well as just prior to the starting of field work. With a view to ensuring uniformity in the techniques for the field investigation, frequent discussions were held at the field level to clarify many of the points that arose in the process of field work.

Pretesting of schedules and selection of non-Block area were completed in February 1958.

The Planning Research and Action Institute undertook the field investigations between March and June 1958, and prepared a preliminary report, which, together with other available information, forms the basis of the present version of the study.

## Chapter 3

### CHANGES IN AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES AND OUTPUT

Following closely the all-India pattern, community development programmes in the Ghosi Block cover a wide range of activities, including agricultural extension and animal husbandry, improvement (or increased provision) of facilities for public health, education, social education, communication and rural arts. However, agricultural programmes, as a whole, received relatively greater attention, and between 1952/53 and 1955/56 accounted for 53 per cent of the total expenditure on programmes (appendix 1, table 10). In the following two years (which represented the normalized phase), the expenditure on programmes from the Block budget amounted to about 13 per cent of the 1955/56 expenditure, partly because in the normalized phase the budgets of the development departments were expected to provide for the expenditure on programmes, and partly because about one-half of the area of the Block was detached to form a new block.

In line with the general pattern in India, the agricultural programme in the Ghosi Block has covered the introduction of improved varieties of seed, use of chemical fertilizer, adoption of the Japanese method of paddy cultivation, line sowing, increased use of farmyard manure, new crops, as well as increase in the area commanded by irrigation. The special emphasis on some items of the agricultural programme—particularly improved seed varieties and fertilizers—is attributable to the fact that these are known techniques of improvement, that the people desire increases in production, and the results of these techniques can be demonstrated in a relatively short period, and can thus help build up the confidence of the people in the programme.<sup>12</sup>

It may be noted here that, while the general pattern of the development programme is laid down by central and state experts, the precise content of the programme in respect of each Project and (or) Block, particularly the degree of emphasis on different aspects, is decided upon by local officials in consultation with experts at the state level. For instance, in deciding upon the improved varieties of seed to be recommended to the cultivators, the Project or the Block officials must know from the officials of the Agriculture Department, the types of new seeds likely to be available for distribution as also an indication of the likely supplies. And the likely

---

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *Pilot Project, India*, by Mayer, Marriot, Park.

demand for these has also to be ascertained. In this latter task, the Block Development Officer depends on his judgement and, at his discretion, on the advice of his co-workers.<sup>13</sup> In practice, the role of the Block level specialists in formulating their respective programmes is very limited.<sup>14</sup> Recently, however, efforts have been initiated to associate the village councils with these tasks (to the extent possible in the existing circumstances).

### *Organization and techniques for agricultural development*

Organizationally, the responsibility for introducing improvements in agriculture at the village level devolves on ten village level workers of the Ghosi Block who have received training in the various aspects of community development work with special emphasis on agriculture. Each village level worker covers, on an average, ten villages comprising a population of five to six thousand and a net cultivated area of approximately 1,250 hectares. In their technical work, the village level workers receive guidance from one Assistant Development Officer (agriculture) stationed at Block headquarters. Besides, the Assistance Development Officer (social education) is expected to assist in extension work by preparing the people in the villages for the acceptance of improved practices, and the other Assistant Development Officers, who are in charge of *panchayats*, Women's Welfare etc. also, at times, lend a helping hand in agricultural work (e.g. distribution of supplies).

In addition to the staff of the Community Development Block, the other development departments (agriculture, co-operative etc.) also maintain some technical staff in the area, who assists the Block authorities in some specified developmental activities (e.g. assistance in procurement and distribution of improved seed), but whose jurisdiction is not co-terminous with the boundary of the Block. This staff is administratively under the control of its respective departments.

In the introduction of new crops or improved agricultural practices, the main problem is one of convincing the cultivator of the economic benefits likely to accrue from the adoption of improved practices. Thus, in recommending cultivation of new crops such as sesame, sweet potato, groundnuts, the village level workers of the Block point out the possibility of increasing income through utilization of fallow lands, or through substitution of higher priced crops (e.g. groundnuts) for relatively cheaper crops like small millets. When the extension worker recommends the adoption of improved seed varieties, the cultivator has to be satisfied that

<sup>13</sup> The procedure followed in formulating local constructional programmes (e.g. link roads, community centres etc.) involves the ascertaining of felt needs and resources on an individual village basis, and will be discussed in detail in dealing with these programmes.

<sup>14</sup> Government of India, Planning Commission, Programme Evaluation Organization: *The Fifth Evaluation Report, Summary and Conclusions, 1958*, p. 12.

higher yields will result. And, generally, the most effective way of convincing the farmer is to show him the results of the adoption of improved practices through field demonstrations.

Emphasis has been laid on field demonstrations in order to convince the farmer of the superiority of new practices recommended. In the villages investigated, each village level worker laid out, on an average, around 17 demonstrations in the two crop seasons of 1957/58. In addition, the village level workers try to contact individuals or groups, either directly or through the agricultural sub-committees of *Panchayats* (village councils). Each village level worker is expected to make 20 night halts per month outside his village headquarters. The Assistant Development Officer (agriculture) is also expected to spend about 20 days per month visiting villages. In practice, the contacts with the villages are probably much less frequent. For instance, a recent all-India inquiry covering several Blocks reveals that the village level worker spends about two-thirds of the nights in a month at his headquarter village. Moreover, about 45 per cent of the non-headquarters villages are visited less than once a month.<sup>15</sup>

These efforts are supplemented by arranging for the supply of fertilizers, improved seeds, etc., to cultivators. In many cases, supplies are made available on credit.

Some idea of the efforts made in the Block, as a whole, under the aegis of the community development programme, is given in table 2.

Table 2.  
PROGRESS IN THE GHOSI DEVELOPMENT BLOCK

Activity	October 1952 to March 1954	1954/55	1955/56	1956/57	1957/58	October 1952 to March 1958
	(Intensive development activity phase)		(Normalized activity phase)			
1. Fertilizers distributed (tons)	101	42	166	103	161	573
2. Improved seed distributed (tons)	193	381	235	519	215	1,543
3. Agricultural demonstrations held (numbers)	2,248	1,298	1,008	566	939	6,059
4. Area brought under vegetables (hectares)	16	59	74	78	—	227
5. Area brought under fruits (hectares)	7	2	53	53	—	115
6. Pedigree animals supplied (numbers)	86	74	31	234	21	446
7. Pedigree birds supplied (numbers)	100	242	138	60	5	545
8. Additional area brought under irrigation (hectares)	2,918	1,594	465	206	771	5,953

Note: 1954/55, 1955/56 etc. refer to fiscal years covering the period March to April.

Source: Records of Ghosi Block.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

## IMPACT OF IMPROVED PRACTICES

With a view to ascertaining the impact of community development activities on agriculture in the Ghosi Development Block, field studies have been undertaken in the selected villages on changes in cropping patterns, adoption of improved practices, changes in output, and so on.

*Cropping pattern*

In the villages studied, the pressure of population is heavy, the holdings are small, and the first aim of the cultivator is to assure himself of adequate supplies of foodgrains. Consequently, the major part of the area sown (about four-fifths) is accounted for by foodcrops.<sup>16</sup> If the holding is relatively bigger and weather conditions have been satisfactory, the cultivator may have some surplus foodgrains to sell. In the autumn season, he may sell some rice (preferably the relatively higher priced late variety) while retaining millets and early paddy for domestic consumption. In the spring season, the cultivator may sell a sizable part of his wheat crop while retaining the major part of his barley for domestic consumption.

On the whole, however, foodcrops are grown primarily to meet domestic consumption needs, and the quantities marketed are small, except in the case of wheat, which is more or less a cash crop in this district.

Cash crops (i.e. crops grown primarily for sale) generally account for a fifth or less of the sown area. Changes in the relative importance of food *vis-a-vis* cash crops are not frequent, but there is some evidence of new crops having been introduced. The increase, if any, in the area sown to a cash crop may, however, occur at the expense of some other cash crop, and not generally at the cost of foodcrops.

With a view to ascertaining changes in cropping patterns which might have occurred as a result of the efforts made by community development workers, or as a result of general economic development, the area sown to main crops in the two groups of selected villages has been studied on the basis of data available through land revenue records (appendix 4, table 1). The main changes are discussed below.

In the selected villages of the Block, the area sown to rice (especially the late variety) appears to have increased, apparently at the expense of millets. On the other hand, in the non-Block villages the area under

<sup>16</sup> This is true of India as a whole also.

millets showed a relatively small decline in 1955/56 and 1956/57, but increased sharply in the following year. The increase in the rice area in the Block might be due to the availability of improved varieties of rice seed and the consequent increase in its profitability *vis-a-vis* millets.

A second observation is that the area sown to sugarcane in the Block has increased by over 35 per cent in the four years ending 1957/58. This increase is attributable, partly to the introduction by the community development workers of a high yielding disease-resistant variety which has increased the profitability of sugarcane, and partly to the increased opportunity for profitable disposal of sugarcane in the Block area, following the setting up of a co-operative sugar factory under the auspices of the Block development authorities. Another contributory factor might have been the imposition of a ban (6 or 7 years ago) on poppy cultivation (formerly an important cash crop) and the consequent switch over of some of the former poppy area to sugarcane. Since many of these factors—availability of improved seed,<sup>17</sup> existence of a private sugar factory in the vicinity, ban on poppy cultivation—operated in the non-Block area also, the area sown to sugarcane in the non-Block area increased by over 66 per cent between 1954/55 to 1957/58.

Modest increases have also occurred in the areas sown to some other cash crops in the Block area—sesame and groundnut—and these increases are associated with the efforts of community development workers. The non-Block area does not show any corresponding increases in respect of these crops.

The growing of vegetables and fruits has been popularized by the community development workers; 39 per cent of the large cultivators in the Block area, 48 per cent of the medium cultivators and 24 per cent of the small cultivators reported having started the growing of vegetables or fruits during the last three or four years. In the non-Block area, the percentage of cultivators who reported the growing of vegetables or fruits was very much smaller, being 14 per cent, 8 per cent and 3 per cent respectively for large, medium and small cultivators. Generally vegetables or fruits are grown for domestic consumption, though in a few cases they are also being sold.

As indicated earlier, changes in crops are slow, and take place within certain broad limits. Nevertheless, during the 3 or 4 years preceding the field investigations in 1958, limited changes in the crops sown have occurred in the Block area. Some credit for these can be claimed for the extension activities of the Block.

<sup>17</sup> Through normal Agriculture Department staff in the non-Block area.

*Use of improved seed*

In order to increase the output of crops, the community development authorities have tried to popularize improved high yielding varieties of paddy, wheat, barley, pea, sugarcane, etc. The responsibility for ensuring adequate supplies of seed of improved varieties rests largely with the Department of Agriculture who distribute stock seed to registered growers, and ensure procurement of improved seed for the three co-operative seed stores functioning in the Block area. These seed stores are managed by co-operative unions, and the Co-operative Department has provided three trained workers to facilitate the efficient functioning of these seed stores. Information about the availability of high yielding varieties of seed is given to the cultivator by village level workers in the development Block. Field demonstrations are held to convince the cultivators of the superiority of new varieties, and group meetings are also organized. These extension efforts are supported by making available to the cultivator seeds of improved varieties on a credit basis. The cultivator is required to return, at the end of the harvest, 25 per cent more of the seed, in addition to the quantity borrowed.

In the non-Block area, the information of the existence of improved varieties is provided to the cultivators by an Assistant Inspector of the Agriculture Department. However, the intensity of extension work in the non-Block area is extremely low as compared to the Block area.

Field investigations were made in order to ascertain the extent to which cultivators have started using improved seeds in the Block and non-Block areas. The results are presented in table 3.

**Table 3.**  
**PERCENTAGE AREA UNDER IMPROVED SEED**

<i>Crops</i>	<i>Block cultivators</i>			<i>Non Block cultivators</i>		
	<i>Small</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Large</i>	<i>Small</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Large</i>
<i>Autumn, 1957</i>						
Rice (early) . . . . .	45	64	49	—	3	2
Rice (late) . . . . .	29	19	35	—	—	—
<i>Spring, 1958</i>						
Wheat . . . . .	61	66	76	30	14	24
Barley . . . . .	22	37	31	—	4	2
Gram . . . . .	23	47	25	—	—	8
Pea . . . . .	60	60	57	2	1	9



These figures reflect important achievements, particularly since the major part of the foodcrop area has hitherto been covered with low yielding varieties. For a proper appreciation of these figures, the following points deserve attention.

First, these figures hide wide variations not only as between the different strata of farmers in a particular village, but also as between different villages. For instance, while in some villages the major part of the area under a crop might have been covered with improved varieties, another village might hardly have made a beginning. Incidentally, variations in the degree of coverage reflect differences in the intensity of extension work, and are a feature of the programme for the popularization of improved agricultural practices in India as a whole.<sup>18</sup>

Second, in the case of early paddy, which accounts for a little less than one-fourth of the total paddy area in the Block, nearly half of the total area has been covered with improved seed. In the case of the late variety of paddy, which covers over three-fourths of the total paddy area, probably less than 30 per cent has been covered with improved seed. On the whole, therefore, only about one-third of the total paddy area has probably been covered with improved seed.

Third, with reference only to the holdings from which some marketable surplus comes (medium and large cultivators), less than one-fifth of the paddy area has probably been covered.

Fourth, in the case of spring crops, which account for a smaller proportion of the total area sown to foodcrops in the Block, the area covered with improved seed is much greater. This is particularly the case with wheat. It has to be remembered, however, that wheat is a cash crop in this area<sup>19</sup> and peas and grams (which are important pulses) are also partly sold.

Fifth, since no improved varieties for millets have hitherto been issued to the cultivators, it is safe to infer that only about one-third of the total area under foodgrains has been covered with improved varieties. And, in

<sup>18</sup> Government of India, Planning Commission. Programme Evaluation Organization; *Fourth Evaluation Report on the Working of Community Projects and NES Blocks*, pp. 134-36.

<sup>19</sup> The cultivators appear to show greater responsiveness to the introduction of improved varieties of cash crops than in the case of foodcrops. Consequently, the major portion of the sugarcane area in both the Block and non-Block area is covered with improved varieties, even though the intensity of extension work in the non-Block area has been far less than in the Block area.

the case of the medium and large cultivators, the over-all percentage of area covered with improved varieties is probably less than one-fourth. As against this, the area covered with improved varieties in the non-Block area is negligible.

#### *Use of chemical fertilizers and farmyard manure*

Inasmuch as lack of soil nutrients is an important factor for the low productivity of crops in this area (as in India as a whole), considerable efforts are being made to popularize the use of chemical fertilizers and to bring about an increased use of farmyard manure.

The field investigations show that the practice of farmyard manuring is known, both in the Block and non-Block areas, though the proportion of the area covered varies with the crop and the quantity used is generally small. Crops grown primarily for sale are more heavily manured except where the nature of the soil does not require heavy manuring. For instance, a major part of the sugarcane area of the large cultivators in the non-Block area lies in the flood belt of a river and benefits from annual deposit of silt, thereby reducing the need for manure. Again, late paddy is usually sown in low-lying fields which benefit from silt deposits. Moreover, these fields are cropped only once a year. On the whole, however, a relatively greater proportion of the sown area in the development Block is manured than in the non-Block area.

Chemical fertilizers are used to a greater extent in the Block area than in the non-Block area, owing to the concentrated extension efforts of the community development workers. A factor contributing to the increased use of fertilizer is its availability on credit. Hitherto, about 85 per cent of the supplies of fertilizer have been made available to cultivators on credit, and only about 15 per cent have been sold on a cash basis. In the non-Block area, chemical fertilizers were used for the first time in 1957/58 by large and medium cultivators on some of the area sown to chillies, which is an important cash crop.

The information available relates to the area of main crops to which manure or fertilizer was applied, and this is summarized in table 4. The first figure against each crop shows the percentage of total area manured (i.e. covered with farmyard manure), while the second figure refers to the area receiving chemical fertilizer.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Information on quantities of farmyard manures and chemical fertilizers applied on individual holdings was sought in the field inquiries, but the data obtained were not considered reliable enough to justify detailed analysis.

**Table 4.**  
**PERCENTAGE AREA UNDER MAIN CROPS COVERED WITH**  
**MANURES AND FERTILIZERS**

<i>Crops</i>	<i>Block cultivators</i>			<i>Non-Block cultivators</i>		
	<i>Small</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Large</i>	<i>Small</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Large</i>
<i>Autumn, 1957</i>						
Rice (early) .....	34 (5)	48 (8)	29 (10)	9	21	28
Rice (late) .....	6	8 (2)	0.7 (1.6)	—	15	3
Sugarcane .....	7	82	100	81	77	56
<i>Spring, 1958</i>						
Wheat .....	95 (10)	87 (13)	87 (8)	86	96	61
Wheat plus barley .....	64	97 (9)	73 (27)	67	36	64
Barley .....	69 (3)	60 (16)	77	51	65	36
Pea .....	57	40	61 (3)	33	28	24 (1)

In this context, it should be noted that, while about 15-23 per cent of the medium and large cultivators and 5 per cent of small cultivators reported the use of chemical fertilizers during the past four years, the percentage of the total foodcrop area covered with chemical fertilizers during 1957/58 probably did not exceed 2 per cent.

So far as efforts to popularize, the use of compost in the Block areas are concerned, success has not been very encouraging, because of the use of cattle dung for fuel, the non-availability of suitable land for compost pits, and the insufficient extension effort.<sup>21</sup> These observations, originally made in relation to the state of Uttar Pradesh, generally hold good for the Ghosi Development Block as well.

#### *Plant protection measures*

Considerable damage occurs every year to crops because of disease or insect pests. The community development workers therefore try to come to the help of the farmer by informing him of the possibilities of controlling pests and diseases through the use of insecticides and fungicides.

<sup>21</sup> *Report of the Committee for Evaluation and Public Participation, (Uttar Pradesh, 1959), p. 114.*

In the non-Block area, some cultivators acquire this knowledge through contacts with cultivators in the Block area, or through the limited normal staff of the Department of Agriculture. The field investigations revealed that, while the reported incidence of insect attack and plant diseases was quite high in both areas, a larger proportion of cultivators in the Block area used insecticides and fungicides (appendix 4, table 2). This is apparently attributable to the greater intensity of extension work in the Block area.

### *Changes in other cultural practices*

As noted previously, the community development workers have tried to introduce several other improved practices. Field investigations were undertaken to study the impact of three of these, namely, the use of the iron plough, the Japanese method of paddy cultivation, and the use of green manure. The information collected shows (appendix 4, table 3) that the use of the iron plough has increased to a small extent among the large cultivators and the percentage of increase in the Block area does not differ materially from that in the non-Block area. It should be noted in this context that in most of the development Blocks of Uttar Pradesh the programme for the introduction of improved implements has met with limited success because it has generally not been supported with arrangements for repairs, supplies of spare parts and loans.<sup>22</sup> In the case of the Japanese method of paddy cultivation, the extent of adoption has been extremely small. (According to a selected all-India study, also, only a small proportion of the relevant households—15 per cent—have adopted the Japanese method of paddy cultivation. The most common factor explaining non-adoption is unfamiliarity with the method).<sup>23</sup> In the case of green manure, the practice seems to have been adopted by about 21 per cent of the large cultivators in the Block area and about 3 per cent in the non-Block area. In the case of medium and small cultivators, the impact has been very small, owing, among other things, to the fact that these cultivators can hardly afford to spare any land for growing a green manure crop.

### *Use of improved animal husbandry practices*

The quality of cattle in the Block area leaves much to be desired. The authorities are trying to deal with the situation by providing bulls of improved breed and facilities for artificial insemination. There is, however, only one veterinary centre (hospital) at the Block headquarters to cater for these needs.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 115.

<sup>23</sup> Government of India, Planning Commission, Programme Evaluation Organization, *The Fifth Evaluation Report, Summary and Conclusions*, p. 30.

Castration of calves by modern methods is also one of the facilities provided at the centre. Table 4 in appendix 4 throws some light on the acceptance of improved animal husbandry practices. It will be noticed that the use of artificial insemination, the castration of calves and the treatment of cattle by veterinarians are much more common in the Block area. This might be due to the relatively easy access of these areas to the hospital in the Block and also probably to the greater awareness of the Block cultivators regarding the advantages of these services.

#### *Improved practices and the village level worker*

With a view to ascertaining the role of the village level worker in introducing improved practices and the reliance being placed on him by the villagers, the field investigators inquired about the actual services rendered by village level workers for the respondents.

A study of table 5 in appendix 4, which shows the cultivator's experience of the services rendered by the village level worker in the previous two years, indicates that only 14 per cent of the large cultivators and 16 per cent of the medium cultivators consulted the village level worker for advice regarding improved agricultural practices. Even if the percentage of those who consulted the village level worker for plant protection measures is also taken into account, only 21 per cent of the large cultivators and 26 per cent of the medium cultivators consulted the village level worker regarding improved practices. By far the most important fact which emerges from this table is that the main assistance which is being rendered by the village level worker relates to the supply of improved seeds and fertilizers. Here also, it is the large cultivators who benefit most. Beneficiaries of this assistance and recipients of loans and grants-in-aid amount to over 78 per cent of the large cultivators, and the corresponding percentages of the medium and small cultivators are 39 and 29. A very large proportion, (55 per cent of small cultivators and 48 per cent of the medium) reported receiving no direct assistance from the village level worker. The percentage of those of the large cultivators who did not report any direct assistance is only 36 per cent. Thus, the main beneficiaries from the village level worker appear to be the large and medium cultivators. One reason for this state of affairs may be that the large and medium cultivators are quicker to take up new seed varieties and fertilizers, partly because their relatively bigger holdings make it less risky for them to experiment with new material and partly because they are better 'educated'.

## FARM OUTPUT

*Average yield rates of main crops*

An attempt was made to collect information about the out-turn of main crops in the spring of 1958 and autumn of 1957 by interrogating the selected cultivators. Inquiries were made in the months of April and May 1958, i.e. soon after the spring harvest of 1958 and five to six months after the autumn harvest of 1957. The replies of the cultivators were based on their guess estimates, because the produce is not weighed. Moreover, it was noticed, during the field work, that cultivators, particularly large and medium, were inclined to give under-estimate of their gross out-turn. In view of these facts, the data collected by questioning the cultivators were not considered reliable.

In the spring of 1959 crop cutting experiments were made on the fields of some of the selected cultivators to get reliable estimates of yield per hectare and the results are given in the table below. Similar experiments were planned for the autumn crop of 1958, but, owing to extensive damage to the crop by insect pests, it was not possible to undertake the work.

Table 5.  
AVERAGE PER HECTARE YIELDS

<i>Crops</i> (1)	<i>Block area</i> <i>yield rates</i> (Kg) (2)	<i>Percentage</i> <i>sampling</i> <i>error</i> (3)	<i>Non-Block area</i> <i>yield rates</i> (Kg) (4)	<i>Percentage</i> <i>sampling</i> <i>error</i> (5)
Wheat . . . . .	935	10.3	575	13.8
Barley . . . . .	903	8.9	790	10.6
Gram . . . . .	887		901	
Sugarcane . . . . .	40,693		29,015	

*Note:* The non-Block area is specially suitable for gram production.

The available information shows that, while the difference between wheat yield rates in the Block and non-Block areas is 'statistically significant', its magnitude cannot be indicated precisely. A sizable part of this difference might be due to the use of improved seed and chemical fertilizer in the Block area. In the case of barley, the yield rates do not seem to be statistically significant.

However, these spring-crops (wheat and barley) account for less than one-fourth of the total foodcrop area. As indicated earlier, probably less than one-third of the total foodgrain area in the Block has been covered with improved seed, and, therefore, the additional production resulting from seed would be around 3 per cent. So far as chemical fertilizer is concerned, the quantity distributed in the Block amounted on an average to about 100 tons per annum. On the basis of optimum dosage, it could have covered about 436 hectares as against a total net cultivated area of over 12,000 hectares in the Block. If we use the conventional relationship between inputs and outputs, the combined additional production capacity in the Block area as a whole resulting from distribution of improved seed and fertilizer could be put at 6 to 7 per cent.<sup>24</sup> The net area commanded by irrigation has decreased in the four years ending 1957/58 (appendix 4, table 6), indicating that the new works constructed were largely of a protective nature, and probably did not contribute much to increase in production in normal years.

In this context, it may be noted that any significant real increase in net irrigated area would have been reflected in the intensity of land use. Precise information for the Block area is not available. However, in the Ghosi subdivision, which covers both the Block and non-Block areas the index of double cropping (*i.e.* gross cropped area expressed as percentage of net cultivated area) for the three years ending 1957/58 did not differ materially from the 1953/54 figure of 128.

It should be noted here that the additional production capacity in community development and NES Blocks (from inception to March 1957) has been estimated by an expert committee at 10.7 per cent for Uttar Pradesh and 10.8 per cent for India<sup>25</sup> on the basis of inputs made.

### *Production of livestock products*

Inquiries were also made to ascertain whether the production of livestock and livestock products had increased in the Block and non-Block areas. 10 to 16 per cent of the small and medium cultivators reported that their production of fish, poultry and livestock products had increased. Some of the cultivators in the Block area were utilizing the increased production to augment their incomes. The relative importance of these cultivators,

<sup>24</sup> Estimated by using the conventional relationships between inputs and outputs of the Indian Ministry of Food and Agriculture.

<sup>25</sup> Committee on Plan Projects, New Delhi: *Report of the Team for the Study of Community Projects and National Extension Service*. Vol. III (Part 1), pp. 246-47.

who were able to increase their income through the sale of livestock products, was greater in the Block area, probably because of better communication facilities, though the general education activities in the Block may also have been a contributory factor.

To sum up, about one-third of the foodgrain area in the Block has been covered with improved varieties, while the corresponding increase in the non-Block area is negligible. The growing of vegetables and some cash crops (oilseeds) has been introduced in the Block area through the efforts of community development workers, while the non-Block area hardly shows any progress in this direction. Use of chemical fertilizers, particularly on foodcrops, has made some headway in the Block area while, in the non-Block area, its use is negligible. On the whole, the use of improved seed and chemical fertilizer in the Block area as a whole could have contributed (under normal conditions) to an additional production capacity of 6-7 per cent till 1957/1958. More important than this small increase in production capacity is the fact that the cultivator has started accepting certain improved practices and, in due course, their contribution to over-all increases in production may expand appreciably.



## Chapter 4

### CREDIT AND INDEBTEDNESS AMONG CULTIVATORS

Owing to the heavy pressure of population on land and the small size of holdings in the villages of the Ghosi Block,<sup>26</sup> the majority of the cultivators cannot manage without recourse to borrowing. However, the reasons for borrowing, and the extent and duration of loans, vary with the different classes of cultivators. In the case of small cultivators, the produce from their land does not provide for more than two to three months after a harvest, and thereafter they have to borrow for subsistence, which is their most pressing need.

Such borrowing is much less important in the case of medium cultivators, while in the case of large cultivators it is uncommon. Loans are also taken for productive purposes (purchase of seed, fertilizer, work animals, etc.) and for the expenses of socio-religious ceremonies. Borrowings for these two purposes are relatively more important in the case of medium and large cultivators.

With a view to examining the importance of borrowing for different purposes, the heads of the selected households were interviewed. The results are presented in appendix 4, table 7. When we examine these figures, two limitations have to be kept in view. One is that the respondents are averse to disclose their position of indebtedness, and considerable time and effort are required to probe into the matter. Second, despite these efforts, the information obtained may not be reliable. For, being generally illiterate, the cultivator may not remember the total amount of grain loans that are taken, usually in several small instalments, or he might not consider these as 'loan'.<sup>27</sup>

#### *Main sources of credit*

The traditional sources of finance in the villages are the money-lenders, shop-keepers, or prosperous cultivators. The village shop-keeper usually supplies daily necessities on credit, while the village money-lender or the prosperous cultivators provide cash loans. Money-lenders from other villages are usually approached for loans of amounts larger than those available locally.

<sup>26</sup> This holds good for most parts of India.

<sup>27</sup> It is usually free of interest if the period does not exceed three months.

The institutional sources of finance are the village co-operative credit society and government. However, the number of co-operatives and their membership is limited. Thus, of the villages studied in the Block, only three have co-operative credit societies, of which two have been functioning since May 1956, while, in the third village, a co-operative has been organized recently, but it has hardly started functioning. Government loans are available for the purchase of fertilizer, seed, insecticides, and for minor irrigation works. In the event of crop failures, special government loans (known as *taqqavi* loans) are also available.

From the economic standpoint, the loans for current production (purchase of improved seed, fertilizer, insecticide, etc.) available through co-operatives or the government and the loans available from the government for the construction of minor irrigation works are particularly important. However, institutional finance is available only to a limited extent, and exclusively to the creditworthy (or relatively better off) cultivators.

Some idea of the relative importance of different sources of finance in the selected villages can be formed from table 8 in appendix 4. Two points emerging from this table deserve mention here. One is that, in consonance with the general position in India, the major part of rural credit is obtained through non-institutional sources such as village money-lenders, shop-keepers. Second, the amount, and the relative importance of loans, available through co-operatives is tending to increase. This increase is associated with the general policy of the Reserve Bank of India to provide large crop production loans to primary co-operative societies through district and provincial co-operative banks. Thus, in the selected villages of the Ghosi Block, loans received per society from the District Co-operative Bank more than doubled between 1955/56 and 1958/59, and the corresponding increase for the non-Block villages was eightfold (table 9, appendix 4).

#### *Terms and conditions of credit*

Non-institutional sources of finance: Grain loans are generally given without any security. In the case of cash loans, also, no security is demanded when the borrower is known and reliable. However, when security is demanded, it generally takes the form of land or silver ornaments. Usually, to obtain a loan of Rs 100, the borrower has to mortgage about 0.13 hectare of land, the creditor having the cultivating possession of the land. However, the borrower has the right to harvest any crop sown prior to mortgaging. It has to be noted here that since holdings of small cultivators are very small and mortgaging of land means an inroad into means of livelihood, it is resorted to only in extremity. Another point worth noting is that, since mortgaging of land is not legally permissible, transactions involving land mortgage are not reduced to writing.

**Institutional sources:** In the case of loans from co-operative societies, loans are obtained on the furnishing of two personal sureties, and the amount is determined by the assessed creditworthiness of the cultivator or, in practice, the land owned.

The rates of interest charged vary with the source of finance, as does the security offered. The rates are summarized in table 6.

**Table 6.**  
**PERCENTAGE RATES OF INTEREST PER ANNUM**

Source	Type of loan	Security	Interest rate	
			Block	Non-Block
Money-lender	Cash	land	25	25
	Cash	gold ornaments	25	25
	Cash	silver ornaments	40	40
	Kind	personal	25*	25*
Co-operative	Kind	personal	25*	25*
Government	cash	2 personal sureties	9	9
	Cash		6	6

*Note:* These cash government loans are generally given through the Block authority and involve only the issuing of purchase authorizations for fertilizers, insecticides and other agricultural requisites up to the sanctioned amount of loan. *Taqqavi* loans are given in times of scarcity i.e. crop failure.

\* Per agricultural season.

### *Extent of indebtedness*

Field investigations were made to find out the burden of indebtedness and the changes therein in the three years ending 1957/58. The results are summarized in table 7.

**Table 7.**  
**LOANS TAKEN AND REPAYD PER INDEBTED HOUSEHOLD OF CULTIVATORS**  
**(In rupees)**

Period and loan	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
<b>1955/56</b>						
Loan taken	81	109	145	85	115	181
Loan repaid	55	70	111	59	79	167
<b>1956/57</b>						
Loan taken	84	99	205	140	155	309
Loan repaid	46	67	84	98	123	224
<b>1957/58</b>						
Loan taken . . . . .	100	159	274	128	250	334
Loan repaid . . . . .	42	61	66	44	81	129

Bearing in mind the difficulties involved in obtaining reliable information on indebtedness, the main point which emerges is that, during the period under review, the borrowings of all classes of cultivators have tended to increase in both the Block and the non-Block areas. This is partly attributable to some bad agricultural seasons.

General impressions gathered from discussions with cultivators and money-lenders have shown that long-term loans for a period exceeding two to three years are not available. With a few exceptions, most of the debts incurred are paid within two to three years by utilizing sale proceeds of harvests and earnings of family members who migrate to collieries or industrial centres.

### *Community development and credit*

Under the auspices of community development programmes, steps have been taken to promote the development of co-operative credit societies through individual and group contacts of extension workers, through the social education programme utilizing audio-visual aids and through the co-operative member education programme.

In the non-Block area, development work has also been undertaken by the co-operative department officials working independently.

The problem of developing the co-operatives is not only one of increasing the coverage and finances of societies but also one of placing their operations on a sound footing. This latter aspect includes the winding up of moribund societies and the strengthening of certain others by amalgamation, increase of share capital or other measures. In the Ghosi Development Block, this latter aspect was provably more important. Thus, between 1956/57 and 1958/59, the number of co-operative credit societies in the Block area decreased by about one-fifth, and the corresponding reductions in membership and share capital were 2.6 per cent and 7 per cent respectively (appendix 4, table 10). On the other hand, in the non-Block area, the number of co-operative credit societies increased by about one-fifth between 1956/57 and 1958/59, and the corresponding increases in membership and share capital amounted to 23 and 55 per cent respectively. In spite of the increase in co-operative societies in the non-Block area, the total membership of co-operatives in the Block area was somewhat greater in 1958/59. More important perhaps (and indicative of a healthier trend) was the fact that, in the Block area, membership per society was about one-fifth greater, and share capital per society was nearly 50 per cent greater.

The co-operative credit societies provide production loans at a very much lower rate than the professional money-lender. Inquiries made in the Block area show that owing to the competition of cheap co-operative credit, the terms of the money-lender have become somewhat less onerous. While cheap production credit available through co-operatives and government loans for purchase of seed, fertilizer and other agricultural requisites are useful additions, it has to be recognized that the amount of such credit is very small, and it is available mainly to 'creditworthy cultivators'. The small cultivators, who need credit most, do not generally benefit from institutional finance. Moreover, a good deal of organizational effort is still required to ensure the healthy functioning of the existing co-operatives, particularly through the active participation of members in their working.

To sum up. The debt per indebted household has tended to increase during the three years ending 1957/58 in both of the areas, reflecting probably the crop losses due to natural vicissitudes. For each class of cultivators, the debt per indebted household is greater in the non-Block area than in the Block area. This might be due partly to the relatively greater losses suffered by the cultivators in the non-Block area, particularly in low-lying lands, susceptible to floods, though it could also indicate that the cultivators in the Block area are somewhat better off.

While efforts have been made to develop co-operatives in both the areas, and, in the Block area, the loans available through government sources for the purchase of agricultural requisites have also increased, institutional finance, as a whole, covers probably less than one-fifth of the credit needs in both areas, and is available mainly to creditworthy farmers.

The small cultivators, who need cheap credit most, do not benefit much from institutional finance. Moreover, the main organizational channel for institutional finance, namely co-operatives, needs strengthening in both of the areas.

## Chapter 5

### CAPITAL FORMATION

#### CULTIVATORS

In the villages studied (and in India as a whole), agriculture is the mainstay of the rural population. In considering productive investments, the people attach a high priority to investments that help increase the size of the holdings, not only because of economic considerations but also because of the prestige attached to the possession of bigger holdings. However, owing to the small incomes of the majority of the cultivators, the scope for investment in land is rather limited. Besides, the acquisition of more land by an individual cultivator generally means the transference from another cultivator, because in the villages studied (and in many others in India) there is not much scope for bringing virgin land under cultivation. And, while such acquisition is regarded as capital expenditure from the point of view of the individual cultivator, it does not reflect any capital gain from the point of view of the community as a whole.

Another important form of productive investment is the provision of irrigation facilities. In this context, two points deserve notice. One is that the main responsibility for capital expenditure in this field has been assumed by the Government, which is undertaking the construction of canals and tubewells for the supply of irrigation water to cultivators. A canal has already been constructed in the Block area, but it has not yet started supplying water because of delay in the construction of the headworks. Some tubewells constructed by the Government are already operating.

Second, while individual cultivators can construct wells to irrigate their individual fields and the Government gives loans to facilitate this work, the scope for it is limited because of the excessive fragmentation of holdings. This situation will, however, change when the programme for consolidation of holdings, at present under consideration, is implemented.<sup>28</sup>

The acquisition of plough cattle is another important form of capital expenditure, and normally it adds to the productive efficiency of agriculture. However, in this area, plough cattle are often purchased in the beginning of the agricultural year, and are sold following the spring harvest in order to save the maintenance cost in the off season and to reduce the risk of

---

<sup>28</sup> These considerations hold good for India as a whole.

losses through theft, diseases, etc. The extent of any net increase in working cattle over a period is negligible. There is hardly any livestock industry in this area. In fact, there are prejudices against the keeping of certain types of livestock<sup>29</sup> (e.g. pigs or poultry).

Of the non-agricultural items on which capital expenditure is incurred, by far the most important is the construction, improvement or extension of residential buildings. This item has fairly high prestige value and often competes with investments in land, particularly where the existing holdings come up to a reasonable size.

Table 11 in appendix 4 summarizes the expenditure per household on the acquisition of agricultural assets. As noted earlier, however, the acquisition and sale of plough cattle are generally a recurring feature of the situation. In studying trends, we can exclude these figures. The purchase of land also represents merely the transference of assets from one cultivator to another, and does not represent a net gain from the point of view of the community. Therefore, the main items that might be taken into consideration are land reclamation, land improvement (bunding, terracing, etc.) digging of wells, tanks etc., laying of orchards, construction of farm buildings, acquisition of agricultural implements and agricultural machinery (including pumps, water-lifts) and bullock carts.

It will be noticed from table 11 appendix 4 (or the summary figures in table 13, appendix 4) that significant capital investments in agriculture (excluding land and livestock) are made only by medium and large cultivators, while in the case of small cultivators capital expenditure is extremely small.

With a view to studying the trends of capital expenditure in agriculture in the Block and non-Block areas, weighted averages of expenditure per hectare of land have been worked out and are presented below.

Table 8.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PER HECTARE OF LAND, 1955-1958  
(Agricultural, excluding land and livestock)  
(In rupees)

Year	Block area	Non-Block area
1955/56 . . . . .	6.5	5.2
1956/57 . . . . .	9.5	1.9
1957/58 . . . . .	6.0	2.5

<sup>29</sup> Generally, it is only the lower caste Hindus who can keep pigs or poultry owing to the absence, in such cases, of caste taboos on the keeping of this livestock.

It will be noticed from the table given above that the capital expenditure per hectare of cultivated land, though small, was appreciably higher in the Block area as compared with the non-Block area, reflecting probably higher incomes and greater economic awareness on the part of the cultivators in the former area. For the acquisition of assets occurred primarily through purchase, and 40 to 50 per cent of purchases were financed from earnings, about 20 per cent from loans and the balance through the sale of capital assets.

In addition to capital expenditure in agriculture, there is also some non-monetary capital formation; the main items involved are land improvement, laying of orchards, etc. Although, theoretically, there is very large scope for non-monetary capital formation in agriculture,<sup>30</sup> in actual practice its contribution is small, as indicated in table 12 of appendix 4. (This small contribution may be attributable partly to the fact that land available for reclamation is negligible; small and scattered plots constitute a holding, the scope for land improvement, bunding, terracing or laying of orchards is limited.) The addition of non-monetary capital formation to the figure of monetary capital expenditure raises the total capital expenditure in the Block area to Rs 6.25 per hectare. And this figure does not differ materially from the corresponding figure for monetary expenditure in agriculture.<sup>31</sup>

Assets are disposed of to meet a variety of needs, including subsistence, repayment of loans, or the replacement of worn out tools and implements. During the period under review, about 50 per cent of the receipts derived from such disposals were used for subsistence, and (except for a small percentage used for repayment of debt) the balance of sale proceeds was used for the acquisition of some other capital assets. Table 14 in appendix 4 summarizes the available information regarding assets sold.

For an appreciation of the over-all position regarding the addition to cultivators' assets, we have to consider the net expenditure on the acquisition of capital assets (both agricultural and non-agricultural) after allowing for disposal of assets. This information is summarized in table 15, appendix 4.

Three points may be mentioned in this context. One is that total net capital expenditure increases with the size of holding. Second, a greater proportion of total net capital expenditure is accounted for on the average

<sup>30</sup> There is also some non-monetary capital formation in the non-agricultural field. The main items are construction and repairs to residential buildings. If repairs are excluded, the amount of capital formation will be extremely small.

<sup>31</sup> The available figures of the estimated value of produce are not considered reliable. However, by using these, the rate of capital formation in agriculture (monetary and non-monetary) works out to only 1.8 per cent in the Block area.



by non-agricultural items than by agriculture. Thus, 65 per cent of the average net capital expenditure of medium cultivators in the Block area is accounted for by non-agricultural items, and the corresponding figure for large cultivators is 55 per cent. The main items in the 'non-agricultural' category are the construction of residential buildings, and the acquisition of bicycles and other business assets. Third, the average capital expenditure per household for 1957/58 comes to Rs. 12.5 in the Block area, and Rs 14.7 in the non-Block area.

### CAPITAL FORMATION THROUGH COMMUNITY ACTION

The mobilization of the voluntary labour of village people for building community assets such as roads, culverts, wells, tanks, schools and hospitals is potentially a very important activity under the community development programme. Another activity that offers considerable potential scope for joint participation of cultivators, under the programme, is the construction and maintenance of village irrigation channels.

The philosophy underlying the voluntary contribution of labour, for the creation of utilities of common benefit, is that the village people contribute labour for the constructional activity, and the community project administration provides technical guidance and grants-in-aid for the needed materials, e.g., steel, cement, pipes, etc.

In the planning of such works, the felt need of the people is the important determining factor. Thus, in connection with the formulation of the second five-year plan, the village level workers or secretaries of village councils prepared draft five-year programmes covering such activities. In doing so, they took into account the felt needs of the people and the available resources as revealed by village surveys made earlier, and the possibility of securing state grants to the extent of Rs 2,000/- (over the plan period) in respect of each village. These programmes were discussed in the village council meetings, cleared with the general body of the village, and submitted to the Block Advisory Committee (consisting of non-officials and officials) for scrutiny. This committee also approved priorities for different items of work, and annual goals worked out by Block officials. In turn, the Block Plan was scrutinized and co-ordinated at the project level by the Project Advisory Committee (consisting of non-officials and officials).

In the Ghosi Community Development Block, the common types of constructional work that were completed through the voluntary contribution of the people during two years under review were (i) making of new roads, (ii) repairs to old roads, (iii) construction of drinking water wells, (iv)

construction of soakage pits, (v) construction of manure pits, and (vi) construction of pits for planting trees. Besides contributing labour, some of the villagers also contributed cash and materials in kind.

Table 9 gives the people's contribution in the form of labour,<sup>32</sup> cash and kind, for the years 1956/57 and 1957/58. The figures relate to the Block as a whole.

Table 9.

PEOPLE'S CONTRIBUTION FOR COMMUNITY WORK, GHOSI BLOCK, 1956-1958  
(Value in rupees)

Year	Labour	Cash and kind
1956/57 .	86,010	31,909
1957/58 . . . . .	172,351	25,509

Source: Records of Ghosi Block.

It will be noted that the volume of the people's contribution in terms of labour, cash and kind during 1957/58 was almost twice that of 1956/57, owing mainly to a much higher amount of repair work in the latter year. On a *per capita* basis, the total voluntary contribution of the people comes to Rs 2.8 for 1957/58 as against Rs 1.7 for 1956/57.

The yearwise figures of community works completed in the Ghosi Block during the four years ending 1957/58 are given in appendix 4, table 16.

The information relating to non-monetary capital formation through community action in the six selected villages of the Block area was available for 1957/58 only. Similar information for the selected villages of non-Block area was not available, although some work along these lines was reported to have been undertaken under the auspices of Panchayat Secretaries.<sup>33</sup> Another factor that deserves mention is that most of these community works are joint ventures of two or more villages, and records were maintained constructionwise instead of villagewise. Therefore, some difficulties were experienced in compiling villagewise information, and only for 1957/58 was it found possible to do so. The relevant figures are given in table 10.

<sup>32</sup> Labour contributed is usually of the unskilled type. It is valued according to the schedule of rates of Public Works Department and on the volume of earth work done.

<sup>33</sup> Government functionary at the village level who supervises the working of village councils.

Table 10.  
PEOPLE'S CONTRIBUTION IN THE SIX SELECTED VILLAGES  
GHOSI BLOCK, 1957/58

<i>Item of work (New construction only)</i>	<i>Units</i>	<i>Value in rupee</i>
1. Drinking water wells . . . . .	5	1,049
2. New roads . . . . .	...	299
3. Soakage pits . . . . .	41	10
4. Manure pits . . . . .	30	20
5. Pits for tree plantation . . . . .	120	42
		TOTAL 1,420

*Note:* Government gave a grant amounting to Rs 502 for item 1.

*Source:* The data are from records of Development Block.

The most important item of work was the construction of drinking water wells. On a *per capita* basis, the voluntary contribution amounted to less than 0.4 rupee. And only about one-fourth of the total was devoted to works that contribute directly to production.

Programmes involving the use of voluntary labour in India have not hitherto attached much importance to agricultural improvement works. Besides, *shramdan* (voluntary labour) activities in general have lost much of their initial tempo, and at present the contribution of labour per adult does not generally exceed one day per year as against two or three days in earlier years.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>34</sup>United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs: *Report of a Community Development Evaluation Mission in India* (1959), p. 23.

## Chapter 6

### LEVELS OF LIVING OF CULTIVATORS

In the preceding chapters, the evidence brought together shows that community development programmes have succeeded in bringing about acceptance of certain improved practices and, as a consequence, the capacity of land to produce larger output (under normal conditions) has increased. It has also been brought out that capital formation in agriculture per hectare of agricultural land is relatively larger in the Block area. This may be due partly to relatively larger incomes. While precise estimates of incomes of cultivators in the Block and non-Block areas are not available, it is proposed to ascertain whether any differences in levels of living in the two areas can be observed to provide further indirect evidence in this respect.

#### *Food consumption*

As is well-known, in the majority of cases, the main problem facing the cultivator is one of providing enough foodgrains for the consumption needs of the household. And the primary source for this is the produce from the holding of the cultivator. In the villages studied (as elsewhere in India), the items of food and the quantities consumed vary from season to season. Thus, after the rice harvest, rice is the principal cereal consumed, and the intake of cereals is also pretty high. With the depletion of domestic rice stocks, the daily intake of rice among medium and small cultivators goes down. To some extent, it is made up by other cereals but, in the case of poorer cultivators, the total consumption also declines until the beginning of the spring harvest. Thereafter, spring crops—wheat, barley, peas, gram—are the main foodgrains consumed, and the intake of foodgrains is again high until the domestic stocks of spring harvests start declining.

A common feature of diets in Indian villages is the predominance of cereals and the low consumption of proteins. Protective foods such as vegetables, milk and milk products are taken only to a very limited extent. Although the people in the villages are not aware of the importance of proteins, minerals and vitamins, these do find a place in their food in the form of pulses, vegetables and fruits during the different seasons. Vegetables are consumed (when in season) because they make the food tasty. Similarly, pulses are consumed as a regular item of food because

this is the only thing, in most cases, which goes with the cereals. However, it is a common practice among the labourers and poor class of cultivators to take cereals only with chillies, onions, and salt. Owing to the shortage of fodder for cattle, there is a shortage of milk and milk products also. These commodities are rare, and only a few people consume them. Consumption of meat and fish is limited to a few households. Eggs are not popular with the majority of village people.

### *Quantities of foodstuffs consumed*

Consumption data relating to various food articles for a period of one week were recorded for each of the selected households during the survey period, *viz.*, April to June 1958. As indicated earlier in this chapter, there are seasonal variations in the types of foodgrains consumed, and by April the major part of the rice supplies available from the previous two harvests (early and late paddy) have already been consumed. Consequently, the foodgrains consumed during the survey period were mainly wheat, barley, pea and gram, which are the principal food crops harvested during the months of March and April. Table 11 indicates the consumption *per capita*.

Table 11.  
CONSUMPTION PER CAPITA PER WEEK  
(Based on data of one sample week)

(In grams)

Foodstuff	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
1. Cereals:						
Rice . . . . .	192	302	505	90	90	465
Wheat and barley . . .	1,486	1,661	1,808	1,106	1,784	2,033
Millets including gram flour and peas . . . .	1,506	1,343	820	1,837	1,384	1,033
TOTAL	3,184	3,306	3,133	3,033	3,258	3,531
2. Proteins:						
Pulses	478	563	735	449	433	572
Fish . . . . .	—	4	8	8	1	16
Meat . . . . .	—	4	1	2	3	24
3. Fats:						
Ghee . . . . .	3	2	1	1	1	8
Vegetable oil	37	33	78	49	57	47
4. Vegetables . . . . .	200	245	526	114	286	376
5. Sugar (Gur) . . . . .	788	849	869	653	808	751

Three points deserve notice. One is that, although the survey period coincided with the consumption season for foodgrains harvested in the spring season (wheat, barley, gram, peas), rice was still being consumed, and its consumption was relatively greater among large landholding classes. A comparison between Block and non-Block areas indicates that *per capita* consumption of rice during the sample week was higher in the Block than in non-Block area in respect of all three categories of cultivators. This may be primarily due to the larger area under late paddy in the Block area. Second, the weighted average of *per capita* weekly consumption of cereals is about 3.20 kilogrammes in the Block area as against 3.16 kilogrammes in the non-Blocks area. Third, the *per capita* weekly consumption of pulses (the main source of protein supply) was higher in the Block than in the non-Block area. It appears that consumption of pulses rises with the size of holding.

The *per capita* consumption of vegetables was more in the Block area, as was the consumption of raw sugar (gur). On the whole, the *per capita* consumption of food during the sample week was somewhat higher in the Block area.

#### *Annual expenditure on non-food items*

The annual expenditure incurred on non-food items was obtained through direct inquiry from the head of each selected household. To facilitate recollection of expenditure incurred by respondents, the local calendar year was divided into five seasons, in keeping with the seasons of the locality.

Table 17 in appendix 4 brings out average and percentage (of the total) expenditure per household on various non-food items during 1957/58. That table indicates that the expenditure on non-food items increases with landholding, among large holding groups, it is about five times as high as that of the small cultivators. On the other hand, the figure for medium cultivators is about twice as high as that of the small cultivators. This trend holds good for both the areas. The expenditure per household of small and medium cultivators was somewhat more in the Block area, but, in the case of large cultivators, the expenditure was higher in the non-Block area. This increase among the large landholders of the non-Block area seems primarily due to the higher percentage of expenditure on social and religious ceremonies, on ornaments and litigation. If these items are excluded from the expenditure list, the total annual expenditure on non-food items is shown in table 12.

**Table 12.**  
**EXPENDITURE ON NON-FOOD ITEMS**  
*(In rupees)*

Item	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
Per household . . . . .	84	156	322	83	143	317
Per Capita . . . . .	13	18	32	12	20	30

*Note:* The figures given in this table exclude expenditure on social ceremonies, on ornaments and litigation.

When we consider the relative importance of various items of expenditure listed in appendix 4 table 17, the following points deserve notice. One is that litigation is an important item of expenditure among medium and large cultivators, both in the Block and non-Block area. Second, the expenditure on social ceremonies figures prominently in the budgets of cultivators in both the Block and non-Block area. However, the average expenditure per ceremony was lower in 1957/58 than in the previous two years (appendix 4, table 18). To some extent, this may be due to a succession of bad harvests. Investigation also showed that, in the Block area, there was a growing feeling, among the enlightened people, that their social status would not be adversely affected by lower expenditure on social ceremonies. In due course, this attitude may begin to influence the majority of the people. Third, the average per household expenditure on clothing, footwear, medicines, house repair and recreation of the small, medium and large cultivators in the Block area exceeded the corresponding figures for the non-Block area by 11, 37 and 16 per cent respectively. This indicates a more effective use of funds by the Block cultivators.

#### *Residential houses etc.*

Houses are mostly made of mud-walls, and have tiled or thatched roofs. Arrangements for ventilation are generally poor. In some of the villages of the Block area, paved lanes and sanitary wells for drinking water are found. There are no paved lanes in any of the villages of the non-Block area. Drainage systems in the village lanes are non-existent.

About 70 to 90 per cent of the houses had earthen walls with tiled roofs. Brick houses were owned mostly by large cultivators. About 40 per cent of the residential houses of the selected small cultivators did not have any plinth, and the corresponding percentage for medium cultivators was about 33. Even 15 to 20 per cent of the large cultivators in both

the areas had houses without any plinth. Where there was a plinth, it was mostly from 15 to 30 centimetres high. Large cultivators were the ones who had houses with higher plinth—30 centimetres or above.

About 50 per cent of the large cultivators in both the areas had separate kitchens. Forty-five per cent of the medium cultivators in the Block area and 25 per cent in the non-Block area also had similar facilities. About 25 per cent of the small cultivators in the Block area had separate kitchens while, in the non-Block area, no household of small cultivators had any such provision. Those households who did not have any separate kitchen used a part of the living space for cooking. The number of households having latrines in their houses was only 2 in the large landholding group of the Block area and 1 each in medium and large categories of the non-Block area.

### *Material possessions*

The average value of material possessions per household among the different categories of cultivators was more or less similar in the two areas. Cooking utensils and cots account for the largest percentage of total value of all the items owned by a household. Other important items are wooden boxes, steel boxes, lamps and, to some extent, bicycles.

Table 19 in appendix 4 indicates the number of families owning different items of household goods. It appears that, so far as material possessions are concerned, the differences between the Block and non-Block villages are small, but there is some evidence that people in the Block area are slightly better off as regards some items in daily use such as cooking pots, cots and hurricane lamps.

To sum up. The *per capita* consumption of cereals, pulses, vegetables and raw sugar is somewhat higher in the Block area as compared with the non-Block area. While houses in the two areas do not differ significantly, paved lanes and sanitary wells for drinking water have been provided in some of the villages of the Block area as a consequence of the efforts of community development workers. In respect of material possessions, the households in the Block area are slightly better off, though the differences are rather small.

On the whole, the available evidence shows that the cultivators in the Block area have slightly better levels of living than those in the non-Block area.



## Chapter 7

### ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL LIFE OF CULTIVATORS

A characteristic feature of rural life in India in the past was the relative isolation of the village, the limited contacts with the outside world and the slow pace of change. The main forces that have so far tended to reduce this isolation are improvements in the means of transport and communication—particularly railway and road transport—which enabled, on the one hand, the village people in search of work to migrate to industrial centres and, on the other, the towns-people—particularly merchants—to sell their goods to villagers. The emigrants to the industrial centres returned periodically and brought money and new ideas and habits.

Owing to the heavy pressure of population on land in the district in which the Block and the non-Block areas lie, migration of labour to industrial centres has been a common feature for the past few decades. The railway that connects this district with the industrial centres in Bihar and West Bengal has been operating for several decades. Nevertheless, this area (and some of the other districts in Eastern Uttar Pradesh) have remained relatively backward, both economically and socially.

During the last decade, the forces responsible for change in these villages have gained momentum, and new forces have started operating. One is the development of a relatively cheap bus transport service that connects the villages of the areas studied with urban centres.

The second is the inauguration in the Block of a community development programme which seeks, among other things, to change the outlook of the village people through increased contacts of the officials of development departments with the villages. The third has been the acceptance by the State of responsibility for free primary education, and the provision of more schools. A fourth factor, and one which has favoured forces responsible for changes in outlook, has been the abolition of landlordism and the associated evils of rack renting and enforced labour, particularly labour without wages or at lower wages. Finally, the functioning of democratic institutions—village councils, state legislatures—with their stress on universal adult franchise have fostered a sense of political equality. In the lower rungs of the village society, this sense of political equality may have released a hitherto dormant desire to improve economic status.

## CHANGE IN ATTITUDES

The field investigations undertaken in the Block and non-Block areas tried to study changes in attitudes towards education, physical labour, and new jobs. The position regarding these is discussed below.

*Education*

The information collected shows that the percentage of literacy increases with the size of landholding per household, and is highest (42 per cent) among the cultivators with large holdings in the Block area (appendix 4, table 20). This feature holds good in the non-Block area also, though the percentage of literates in that area is relatively lower than in the Block area. An analysis of the literacy data according to age, shows that, in both areas, the percentage of literacy in the age group 6-20 is higher than in other age groups.

Another interesting fact revealed by the field investigations is that a larger number of households are anxious to send their children for higher education as against technical education. This seems to reflect their desire to prepare their children for skilled or white collar profession. Over 86 per cent of the cultivators desiring change of occupation for their sons would prefer an office career.

It is interesting to note that, while there is a marked preference for occupations other than agriculture, a sizable percentage of households would still prefer their sons to follow the family occupation.

*Physical labour*

Some of the cultivators, particularly large cultivators, are averse to doing any work except supervision. In the case of some high castes—Thakurs, Brahmins—social usages operate against certain types of physical labour e.g. ploughing. The field investigations show that, as compared with the non-Block area, a relatively larger proportion of medium (100 per cent) and large cultivators (93 per cent) from the Block area were performing various types of physical work. Besides, some of the cultivators in the Block area were now undertaking ploughing when necessary, while they did not do so in the past. Although the relatively greater importance attached to physical labour in the Block area might be due partly to economic factors—higher wages of labour and so on—the stress laid by community development programmes on the donation of physical labour for works of common benefit to the village has also been a favourable influence in this direction.

### *New business, industry or job*

In the villages studied (and in many other parts of India), caste and social usages set broad limits to the occupations that a person can choose, and departures from these are not common.<sup>35</sup> Field investigations revealed that only two persons from medium and large holding groups in the Block and non-Block areas had opened shops.

However, 25-34 per cent of the selected cultivators from the Block area and 11-28 per cent from the non-Block area reported having worked for wages or salary in the past 3-4 years. While, among small cultivators of the Block area, work as labourers was more important (77 per cent of cases), among medium and large cultivators salaried work had relatively greater importance (50 per cent to 71 per cent of cases).

A new development, as noted in preceding chapters, has been the starting of a co-operative sugarcane processing factory of which quite a few cultivators have become members; some find employment in the factory during the crushing season.

### *Saving and investment*

The scope for savings in the villages studied (and in many other parts of India) is small. Nevertheless, some of the cultivators do save something when the harvest is satisfactory. Investment frequently takes the form of purchases of ornaments, though investments of a productive character (particularly on purchase or improvement of land etc.) are also made. For studying savings and investment reliable information is difficult to obtain. Consequently, the main reliance has to be placed on indirect evidence. In this context, three points deserve notice.

To begin with, capital expenditure on agricultural assets per hectare of cultivated land is greater in the Block area than in the non-Block area, as mentioned in chapter 5. And earnings constituted the most important source of financing capital expenditure. Again, there is a tendency (as reported by the local inhabitants in the Block area) for expenditures on socio-religious ceremonies to decline. Finally, as explained in a preceding section, new co-operative industrial units are coming up gradually in the Block area, and the village people are subscribing to the share capital in these new industries. Even from the six selected villages of the Block area, 26 persons had contributed Rs 775 towards the share capital of the Sugarcane Processing Society.

<sup>35</sup> Except in the case of persons who migrate to urban centres.

Two inferences can probably be drawn from the above evidence. One is that investment of a productive character is relatively greater in the Block area. Second, people of the Block are becoming interested in investment in local industry or business. On the other hand, there is no evidence of this nature in the non-Block area.

### SOCIAL VALUES

#### *Improvement of social status*

In the tradition-bound rural society of India, the size of land holding and caste were, until recently, the two main factors influencing social status. Usually, the landlords were also from the higher castes. However, as indicated earlier, during the past ten years or so, several new forces have been operating.

With a view to ascertaining the shifts in social values, if any, in the selected villages, the cultivators were asked to state the best way of improving social status. The replies show that, in the villages of the Block area, 'increase in income' is considered to be by far the most important factor in improving social status, and the people who attach relatively greater importance to it are the 'small cultivators' or the relatively poorer cultivators (appendix 4, table 21). The factors next in importance to this are 'offering hospitality' and 'education of children' in the case of medium and large cultivators. In the case of small cultivators, next in importance to 'increase in income' are 'offering hospitality' and 'increase in land holding.' While in the non-Block area also the most important factor in improving social status is considered to be 'increase in income' by all classes, the factor next in importance is 'increase in land holding' in the case of both small and medium cultivators. In the case of large cultivators, the factors next in importance to 'increase in income' are similar to those in the Block area, though the importance attached to 'increase in land holding' is greater. Since the vast majority of the households belong to the category of small cultivators, one inference which can be drawn is that 'increase in income' is an important way of improving social status (for over 50 per cent of the cultivators) in both areas, though in the non-Block area considerable importance still attaches to land holding.

#### *Economic consciousness*

Inquiries in the selected villages have shown that 71 per cent to 97 per cent of the cultivators in the Block villages tried to increase their incomes through agriculture, while the corresponding range for non-Block villages was 17-58 per cent (appendix 4, table 22). Moreover, over 90

per cent of the cultivators in the Block area who attempted increases in income through agriculture tried improved agricultural practices. In addition a large proportion of cultivators tried to grow cash crops. These are probably indicative of the greater economic awareness of the cultivators of the Block area, and some credit for it can be claimed by the Block development authorities.

#### WORKING OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS

##### *Village panchayats (councils)*

As is well-known, caste *panchayat* is an age-old institution in India, and its vitality is particularly strong among the lower castes. Its functions are, however, of a negative character, inasmuch as it tries to enforce the caste taboos on eating and drinking, and the caste rules regarding marriage and (or) occupations that can be followed.

The village *panchayat* or council is a statutory body at the village level, and has started functioning in several states of India during the past ten years or so. All the adults of the village are members of the general body known as the *Gaon Sabha*. This general body elects an executive committee known as the *panchayat*. It consists of a *pradhan* (headman) and 15 to 20 members. The functions statutorily permissible are many and varied,<sup>36</sup> but the functions actually performed are limited, and vary with the *panchayat*.

In the villages studied, *panchayats* are engaged in various development activities, including framing of programmes of agricultural production, acting as a channel for the provision of government assistance to the village people, development of common lands (waste lands, forests), construction, repair and maintenance of common village buildings, public wells. For the discharge of these functions, a village council may have as many as seven subcommittees.

There is a government functionary at the village level who supervises the functioning of *panchayats*.<sup>37</sup> At the Block headquarters, there is one officer who looks after the work of village councils, and tries to ensure their participation in developmental activities.

In addition to a village *panchayat*, there is also a *nyaya panchayat* (judicial village council) which tries to settle the disputes among village people.

<sup>36</sup> These include administrative, civic, social, economic and judicial functions.

<sup>37</sup> One *panchayat* secretary may look after the work of several *panchayats*.

General inquiries made in three of the selected villages of the Block have brought out three features. One is that competent local leadership has not yet come up at the village level to take over effective direction of the affairs of *panchayats*. The community development authorities are, however, trying to train local leaders by organizing special camps for this purpose, and also by providing suitable literature to the trainees.

Second, the present system of elections to *panchayats* (by show of hands) results in group rivalries coming to the fore, and the general preference seems to be in favour of secret ballot.

Third, the resources of the village councils are rather meagre, and are not sufficient to cope with the expanding development activities.

### *Co-operatives*

Co-operatives, as an institution, have been functioning in India for over five decades. Nevertheless, the coverage of the movement is limited, and the societies are generally weak. Recently, however, special efforts have been made by the Government to strengthen the movement, following the recommendations of the All India Rural Credit Survey Report of the Reserve Bank of India.

In the state of Uttar Pradesh, the number of villages covered by co-operatives (credit or multi-purpose) increased from 42,000 in 1956 to 68,000 in 1958, and membership increased from 1.4 million to over 2.6 million. During the same period, loans advanced increased from Rs 40 million to Rs 107 million. The 88 marketing societies, which have recently been organized, handled 58,000 tons of foodgrains in 1957/58.<sup>38</sup>

In both the Block and non-Block villages, special efforts seem to have been made to set up new societies. However, the societies seem to suffer from a number of shortcomings some of which are of a general character. These are referred to below:

- (i) *Limited sphere of operation.* Hitherto, the societies established at the village level have largely been 'credit co-operatives', and, even when multi-purpose co-operatives have been established, they have in practice catered only for credit needs. The limited activities of these societies, coupled with small membership, make it difficult for many of them to function as 'viable units'. The cultivator has to look to different channels for services other than credit.

<sup>38</sup> Report of the Committee For Evaluation and on Public Participation, Uttar Pradesh (1959), p. 89.

- (ii) *Restricted scope for credit.* Even in respect of credit, there are important limitations regarding the amount, duration and purpose for which loans can be granted. Very often credit is granted on the basis of 'creditworthiness', which in practice means the size of holding. As a consequence, many of the small cultivators, who need credit most, can obtain only nominal loans or none at all.
- (iii) *Lack of resources.* The finances available locally to the societies are limited. Efforts are, however, being made by the Reserve Bank of India to provide short-term finance to co-operatives through District Co-operative Banks.
- (iv) *Lack of active participation of members.* An important short-coming of the co-operatives is the lack of active participation of members in their working.

To study the extent of participation in the co-operatives, detailed inquiries were made regarding (a) attendance at meetings and (b) recruitment of new members.

These inquiries show that only about half of the members in the Block area attend meetings regularly, and the corresponding figure for the non-Block area is somewhat less. Again, about 86 per cent of the small cultivators and 38 and 42 per cent of medium and large cultivators from the Block area did not try to recruit new members for the societies, and the corresponding figures for the non-Block area were higher (appendix 4, tables 23 and 24).

These facts support the general point made above, and indicate the need for increased efforts at 'education of members'.

### *Organization of youth clubs*

In some of the villages of the Block area, Youth Clubs have been formed; on the other hand, no activity along these lines is noticeable in the non-Block villages.

### LEADERSHIP PATTERN

Until a decade or so, leadership in the villages was generally associated with landlords who belonged mostly to high castes. And, other things being equal, the older people were respected and their advice sought. As indicated earlier, several new forces have been operating during recent

years—abolition of landlordism, the institution of statutory village councils, the community development programme, etc. An attempt was therefore made to study, in the selected villages, changes in the leadership pattern.

With this end in view, each of the selected heads of households was asked to name three important persons from his own village. The age, caste and sex<sup>39</sup> of the persons named were noted, and the reasons why each of the persons named was considered important were inquired. The results of the field investigations are discussed below.

### *Leadership and age*

With a view to studying the relationship between age and caste, the leadership cases cited by respondents were grouped into three age groups, viz. up to 30 years, 31-45 years, and above 45 years. The results are presented in table 13.

Table 13.

#### LEADERSHIP CASES CITED AND AGE-GROUPS

<i>Age group (years)</i>	<i>Cited by Block cultivators</i>			<i>Cited by Non-Block cultivators</i>		
	<i>Small</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Large</i>	<i>Small</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Large</i>
	(Percentage)			(Percentage)		
Up to 30	16	18	23	16	14	9
31 to 45	34	31	30	61	51	43
Above 45	50	51	47	23	35	48
Total number of responses	100	68	73	90	91	91

It will be noticed from the above table that, while age is still an important attribute of leadership, leaders from amongst the younger people are also emerging.

### *Leadership and caste*

As indicated earlier, the caste of the person cited as important was also inquired, and the results are presented in appendix 4, table 25.

<sup>39</sup> All cases of leadership cited were confined to males.



One fact worth special mention here is that in both areas over 95 per cent of the leadership cases cited belonged to higher and intermediate castes. However, over 4 per cent of the leadership cases cited in the Block area, and over 3 per cent in the non-Block area, belonged to lower castes. This latter is a healthy development, and may be associated with the working of democratic institutions such as the village *panchayat*.

### *Village leadership and social virtues*

The data regarding the relationship of leadership with social virtues have been tabulated in appendix 4, table 26. These indicate that in the Block villages very high importance is attached to two categories, namely, 'just, old, good etc.' and 'enlightened, helpful etc.' In the non-Block villages also, these categories are relatively more important than the others, but, as compared to the Block areas, the rating of these attributes is somewhat lower.

These indicate that qualities which make an individual socially more useful are preferred in the selection of leaders.

### *Leadership and village institutions*

In the Block area, about 60 per cent of the leadership cases cited had membership in village councils. In the non-Block area, the position is similar, though, in the case of small cultivators, 72 per cent of the leadership cases cited were members of village councils.

As regards co-operatives, 27, 32 and 43 per cent of the cases cited in the Block area by small, medium and large cultivators respectively were members of co-operatives. In the case of non-Block area, the corresponding figures were 31, 26 and 52 per cent for small, medium and large cultivators.

Taking an over-all view, we find that:

- (i) Age is still an important factor in leadership but young leadership is also emerging in both the Block and non-Block villages.
- (ii) Leadership is largely associated with higher and intermediate castes, though leaders from amongst the lower castes are also emerging.

- 
- (iii) Qualities which tend to make an individual socially more useful are rated high in both the areas.
  - (iv) There is a tendency to associate membership in village councils and co-operatives with leadership. In both areas, it is the small cultivators who have shown a relatively higher degree of association between membership of village councils and leadership, apparently because the small cultivators, being in a majority, play a more important role in an institution like the village council.

## Chapter 8

### DEVELOPMENT OF VILLAGE INDUSTRIES

In India, improvement of existing village industries and organization of new ones has received special attention, particularly since the attainment of Independence. According to the Government of India's Second Industrial Policy Resolution dated 30 April 1956, on Small-Scale Industries, "the State has been following a policy of supporting cottage, village and small-scale industries by restricting the volume of production in the large-scale sector, by differential taxation or by direct subsidies. While such measures will continue to be taken, whenever necessary, the aim of the state policy will be to ensure that the decentralized sector acquires sufficient vitality to be self-supporting and its development is integrated with that of large-scale industry. . . .".

The main responsibility for the development of village and small scale industries rests with six all-India Boards—the All-India Khadi and Village Industries Board (now Commission), All-India Handloom Board, the Small-Scale Industries Board, the All-India Handicraft Board, the Silk Board and the Coir Board. Their efforts are supplemented by those of the state governments.

During the major part of the first plan period, the assistance available through the state governments was confined to the training facilities and the provision of loans. Moreover, it was used largely for handloom and Khadi industries which absorbed the major part of the development expenditure of Rs 336 million financed by the Central Government. During the second plan period (1956/57—1960/61), the tempo of development was stepped up following increased financial assistance from the Central Government and the establishment of an Industrial Extension Service, of a National Small Industries Corporation to assist small industries in supplying goods required by the Central Government, and of the Small-Scale Industries Board to co-ordinate the activities of the Central Small Industries Organization and state organizations.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Many of these organizations were established towards the end of the first plan period, but their impact was felt largely in the second plan period.

The over-all programme for the development of small-scale industries includes the promotion of village and cottage industries in community development areas. However, some additional financial assistance is made available to community development Blocks for the promotion of training programmes, and a number of industrial extension officers have been appointed to plan and administer programmes for the development of village and small-scale industries in community development Blocks.

The main directions along which efforts have been made to develop village and small-scale industries are:

- (i) Training of artisans and development of co-operatives;
- (ii) Establishment of pilot projects for industries;
- (iii) Establishment of industrial estates;
- (iv) Establishment of co-ordinating machinery.

#### TRAINING OF ARTISANS AND DEVELOPMENT OF CO-OPERATIVES

Training facilities have been provided by state governments in their Training-Cum-Production Centres<sup>41</sup> and by the Central Government through the Small Industries Service Institutes, the Industrial Extension Centres and the mobile vans of Small Industries Service Institutes. These facilities cover a wide range of village and cottage industries engaged in processing local raw materials for local markets (oil pressing, rope making) handicraft industries representing traditional skills and artistic tastes (metalware, ivory), Khadi and handloom and other small-scale industries. Community development programmes participate in the training activities by providing facilities for the training of artisans and by giving stipends to trainees who are deputed to training institutes outside the Block.

In all, the state governments trained 10,000 persons in their Training Cum Production Centres in the first three years of the second five-year plan. In addition to these, 24,198 persons were trained in the Central institution referred to above. Special efforts have been made by the Central and state governments to foster the development of industrial co-operatives and as a consequence the number of industrial co-operatives increased from 7,105 at the end of June 1951 to 15,333 at the end of June 1956 and to 16,746 by the end of June 1957. Of these, the handloom industry accounts

<sup>41</sup> These are now being reorganized into Training Centres. Production is to be undertaken by industrial co-operatives, or departmentally, pending establishment of these societies.

for 7,883 co-operatives, and Palm Gur Societies number 2,422. In the Community Development Blocks, 1,194 industrial co-operatives were functioning at the end of September 1957, and their membership was over 63,000.

### *Pilot projects for industries*

It was decided in 1956 that one Community Project in each state should be selected to serve as an Industrial Pilot Project, and that a Community Project Officer (Industries)<sup>42</sup> should be appointed to co-ordinate the activities of the various All-India Boards at the project level and to frame and implement schemes for the development of industries in the project area. In the beginning of 1958, the programme was in operation in all the selected projects excepting two.

The objectives and scope of pilot projects were defined as follows:

- (i) Develop cottage and small-scale industries in the pilot projects in a co-ordinated and integrated manner, taking into consideration the various schemes of the six All-India Boards;
- (ii) Develop a pattern of industrial extension service, that would be necessary in undertaking a rural industrial programme in Community Development Blocks and NES areas;
- (iii) Act as laboratories for controlled observations to find possible solutions to problems that have come up in the field of cottage and small-scale industries;
- (iv) Study the possibilities of planning for rural industries with the people's participation;
- (v) Study the possibilities of developing a market for products of cottage industries locally, with the participation of the people and the project staff;
- (vi) Assess the experience of these pilot projects and make use of such experiences in the field of development of cottage and small-scale industries in other Community Development Blocks and NES areas in the country.

---

<sup>42</sup> It should be noted here that, following the abolition of the distinction between NES and Intensive Stage in 1958/59, the new pattern envisaging two stages of development (Stage I and Stage II) has been adopted. Both of these stages envisage the appointment of an Extension Officer (Rural Industries) at the Block level.

Detailed surveys of availability of raw materials, labour, existing and projected demand etc. were initiated in the pilot projects with a view to drawing up comprehensive long-term programmes. It was reported in the beginning of 1958 that survey reports for 12 projects were being finalized and that 11 surveys were under progress. Pending preparation of long-term plans, only *ad hoc* schemes are at present in operation. These pilot projects have brought out some of the bottlenecks in rural industrialization, which include the need for adequate arrangements for marketing.

While a long-term programme for cottage and small-scale industries has to await the completion and review of surveys of industrial potential, the Government of India has recommended to the state governments that a minimum programme for industries be taken up in all the community projects. Towards the close of 1957, this 'minimum programme' was spelled out to include: blacksmithy including tin-smithy, carpentry, brick and tile making, leather goods, tailoring, khadi spinning and weaving, *ghani* (wooden press) oil crushing, soap making, bee keeping, village pottery, handloom weaving, handicrafts. For the implementation of this programme, the state governments were asked to utilize 15 per cent of the state allocation for small-scale industries in the community development areas in 1957/58. These funds were supplemented with a grant of Rs 8.2 million from the Khadi and Village Industries Commission. However, the limitation of financial resources is reported to have stood in the way of the implementation of the minimum programme.

#### *Establishment of industrial estates*

With a view to creating a suitable atmosphere for the orderly growth of village and small-scale industries, steps are being taken to set up 9 small industrial estates in pilot project areas, and 20 rural industrial estates in community development Blocks. In the beginning of 1959, two small industrial estates in pilot project areas had started operating, and the construction of work-sheds for 3 rural industrial estates had been completed.<sup>43</sup>

#### *Co-ordinating machinery*

In order to co-ordinate the efforts to develop cottage industries, a committee was set up at the Centre in the latter half of 1957. The Minister for Commerce and Industry is its Chairman and the Ministry of Community Development, the All-India Boards and the Khadi Commission are represented on it. In the states, similar co-ordination committees were to be set up under the chairmanship of Chief Ministers or Industries Ministers.

<sup>43</sup> The second plan envisages the construction of 97 industrial estates in the country as a whole and of these, 34 were reported to be functioning by the end of 1959.

## POSITION IN THE GHOSI BLOCK

One fact which will be noticed from the above is that, while comprehensive programmes for the development of cottage industries in the Community Development Blocks are being prepared and some work has also been recently initiated, the present coverage, both by geography and subject matter is limited, and the programme has been in operation for too short a period to permit an accurate assessment of its impact. Nevertheless, a brief account of the existing position in the Block area may be of some interest.

In consonance with the general all-India programme, the main features of the programme for the development of village industries in the Ghosi Development Block have been the establishment of an industrial training-cum-production centre since the initiation of community development activities. In the selection of crafts for the training programme, a survey is made of the available materials and skills and of local needs. Trainees are generally selected from among artisan families and are given intensive theoretical and practical training in the craft for about one year. During this period, the trainees are paid a stipend. At the Ghosi training centre, artisans have hitherto been trained in carpentry, blacksmithy, leathercraft and so on. Industrial co-operatives have been organized for carpenters, blacksmiths and leather workers, and the trained artisans have joined these. During 1957/58, training has been imparted in the making of matches, and two units for making matches have been established in the Block with the assistance of the Khadi and Village Industries Commission. With a view to enabling the village women folk to utilize their spare time, training classes in tailoring, knitting and embroidery were also organized.

Table 14 gives the number of artisans trained in some of the crafts.

Table 14.

NUMBER OF RURAL ARTISANS TRAINED IN VARIOUS CRAFTS,  
GHOSI, 1955-1958

<i>Rural crafts</i>	1955/56	1956/57	1957/58
Carpentry . . . . .	18	5	—
Smithy . . . . .	12	7	7
Ericulture . . . . .	32	32	7
Dari weaving . . . . .	13	—	11
Ladies tailoring . . . . .	—	—	17

Source: Records of Training-cum-Production Centre, Ghosi.

How many of these artisans from the Block were able profitably to utilize the experience thus acquired is not known. However, according to an all-India survey covering 15 projects, "only 37 per cent of the trainees—55 per cent of whom had received stipends—in the 9 crafts selected by us for study, took to their crafts after training, and only 16 per cent joined industrial co-operatives." According to the same survey, only a small proportion of the trainees and the loanees increased their output, and a still smaller proportion their incomes.<sup>44</sup>

In this context, it should also be noted that a small sugar factory was established at Ghosi in 1956 under the aegis of a co-operative sugarcane society. It provides employment for nearly 100 persons, of which 90 are employed seasonally (November—March). More important perhaps is the fact that it enables the cultivators in the vicinity (particularly members) to increase their cash incomes by growing sugarcane and selling it to the factory.

#### *Some village industries in the Ghosi Block*

Some of the village industries in the Ghosi Block are: *jaggery* (raw sugar) manufacture, *biri* (indigenous cigarette) industry, handloom weaving, oilseed crushing, pottery.

*Jaggery* (raw sugar) manufacture is an age old industry in India. Cultivators who grow sugarcane and cannot dispose of it profitably to a sugar factory (or who find it more advantageous to sell it in the form of *jaggery*) undertake to convert their sugarcane into *jaggery*. Persons who do not have a sugarcane crusher of their own rent a fellow cultivator's crusher, and manufacture *jaggery* by boiling the juice. The major part of the work is done by the cultivator himself, though some help may be hired. *Biri* making is also an old village industry in many parts of the country. The process of manufacture consists of wrapping tobacco in a special type of leaf. In two of the villages studied in the Block, there are two small establishments employing about 10 workers on a piece wage system. Generally, a worker is able to earn about three-fourths of a rupee per day. In some other villages of the Block, the *Biri* manufacturing establishments undertake *biri* manufacture for outside merchants who supply the raw materials.

#### *Weaving, oilseed crushing and pottery*

The position of three village industries, namely weaving, oilseed crushing and pottery, which are associated with certain social groups or castes, has been studied in greater detail in the selected villages of the Block.

<sup>44</sup> Government of India, Planning Commission, Programme Evaluation Organization; "The Sixth Evaluation Report, 1959," p. 2.



### Weavers

In the villages covered in the course of field investigations, handloom weaving is the traditional occupation of a homogeneous social group, namely Momin Muslims. Training in the craft, and working equipment, are passed down from father to son. The weaving equipment is simple, and costs about Rs 20 to Rs 25, but replacements of worn out parts cost about Rs 6 per annum.

The average size of a weaver household is 6 with one earner and 1.5 earning dependents. Generally, the head of the household is assisted in his work by the earning dependents. Usually, the weavers obtain yarn on credit from the town merchants and agree, in return, to sell him the finished product. To help them meet their subsistence expenses, the merchant also advances them some cash towards part payment of the finished cloth. These transactions are completed through an intermediary or broker who acts as a guarantor for the weaver and is given by the merchant a commission of Rs 1 to 2 for every transaction. In actual practice, what the weaver obtains from the merchant is weaving charges for the cloth which vary with the type of cloth woven and output. Output per day varies with the season and the type of cloth woven. Thus, during the winter season, the output of fine cloth (*saris* etc.) averages over 9 metres per day, while the output of coarse cloth varies between 6 and 7 metres per day. During the summer season, because of strong winds and high temperatures, working hours are less, and output may be 10 to 20 per cent lower. On an average, one male weaver (with the assistance of household members) can weave about 12 *thans* (bundles) of cloth per month. This brings him an income of Rs 30 to Rs 32.

In the case of the weaver households studied, the average income from weaving amounted to Rs 370 in 1957/58. Their main supplementary sources of income are the output from the small piece of family holding (usually less than 0.4 hectare<sup>45</sup>) and income from wages. The average income per household from agriculture and other sources amounted to Rs 35 and Rs 21 respectively. In other words, the income from subsidiary occupations amounted to less than 15 per cent of total income, and three-fifths of it was from agriculture.

Some primary co-operative societies of weavers have been organized in the villages of the Block area. These are affiliated to a District Weavers Co-operative Union which is supposed to assist them in the purchase of

<sup>45</sup> Three out of the 4 families studied had some land.

raw materials and the sale of finished products as well as in securing cash loans. However, owing mainly to lack of adequate finance, these co-operatives have not functioned well.

Expenditure on social and religious ceremonies is generally financed from borrowings. The percentage of literacy among the weavers is pretty high and about 50 per cent among adult males.

To sum up: Weavers need credit for raw materials and for subsistence during the production period. This is available through the town merchants who also buy the finished products. This linking of credit and marketing functions through the town merchant, and the weak bargaining position of the weaver, have resulted in reducing the weaver to the position of a piece wage worker, and his position is no better than that of a labourer. The problem is not only one of providing credit but also of organizing an efficient system of marketing. The only hope lies in the co-operative institutions catering for these needs. However, co-operatives, unless supported by the state, might not be able to withstand the competition of town merchants, at least in the early stages.

### *Potters*

This occupation is confined to one caste, namely, *Kumhar*, whose main function is to supply earthen vessels for household use. These are replaced on some social or religious occasions. They also prepare tiles for the roofs of residential houses. Generally, payment for earthen vessels is made in kind at the time of harvest, and is determined by custom. Payment for tiles may be in cash. The demand for these products is, however, limited, and pots are prepared only two to three times a year in the villages studied.

The main source of livelihood of the potters, in the villages studied, is income from land. Usually their holdings are bigger than those of other craftsmen, and the size of holdings varies generally from 0.6 to 1.8 hectares.

The average size of the households studied was 5.2 persons, with 1.4 earners and 1.8 earning dependents. The total average income per household per annum amounted to Rs 371. Of this, 56 per cent was from agriculture, 27 per cent from their traditional craft, and 17 per cent from other sources (sale of *ghee*, i.e. clarified butter, wages, hire of cane crushers).

The potters are dependent primarily on agriculture for subsistence, and their levels of living are similar to those of small cultivators.

### *Oilseed crushers*

In the villages studied, the extraction of oil by wooden presses is the traditional occupation of the *teli* caste. The wooden presses are worked with a bullock, and the total cost of a press and bullock comes to about Rs 70.

The main working season lasts from April to June, when the spring harvest of oilseeds is available. In the rest of the year, the press is worked only for 4 to 5 hours per day. Usually, the cultivator pays the *teli* in kind, the wages being one-third of the oil extracted in a day (approximately 2.8 kilogrammes). If paid in cash, he earns about Rs 1.5 per full day (8 to 9 hours work).

The average size of a household is 5.2 persons including 1.3 earners and 0.8 earning dependents. The average total income per household comes to Rs 288 per annum and of this, 36 per cent is derived from the traditional occupation, 17 per cent from agriculture and 47 per cent from other sources (earnings from shop, service, labour). The majority of the households of *telis* (oilseed crushers) studied possess some cultivable land, and the size of the holding varies from 0.4 to 0.8 hectare. Owing to their relatively lower *per capita* income, the levels of living of the oil crushers are lower than those of the other craftsmen studied.

With the establishment of oil crushing machines in marketing centres and even in bigger villages, the indigenous oilseed crushing industry is facing serious competition, partly because of its lower oil extraction ratio and partly because of its relatively higher costs. However, one favourable factor is the preference shown by village people for the oil expelled by wooden presses because of its special taste and also because of the belief that it has higher nutritive value.<sup>46</sup>

To sum up. As indicated earlier, comprehensive programmes for the development of cottage industries in the Community Development Blocks are being prepared. However, the work initiated hitherto is limited in coverage (by geography and subject matter) and the programme has been in operation for too short a period to permit an assessment of its impact. Although, the development programme of the Ghosi Block did not deal directly with weavers, oilseed crushers and potters, these are some of the old village industries, and some account of their present position and problems in the Block area given in the preceding pages may be of interest.

<sup>46</sup> In parts of India, efforts are being made by the Government to popularize the use of an improved type of wooden press in the villages.

---

It has not been possible to institute comparisons with the position in the non-Block areas, as craftsmen with these crafts as their principal means of livelihood were not found in the selected villages of that area.

In the villages studied, there is not much evidence to support the view that the developmental activities of the relevant all-India Boards or Commissions have contributed much towards making some of the village industries, e.g. handloom weaving or village oilseed crushing, efficient units of production. A more important question which deserves attention in this context is whether some of the village industries can become efficient units of production capable of withstanding the competition of factory products unless they are given active and continuing support by the Government. That question is, however, beyond the scope of the present study.

## Chapter 9

### RECAPITULATION AND CONCLUSIONS

#### EVOLUTION AND CONTENT OF THE PROGRAMME

The community development programme was inaugurated in India on 2 October 1952. Since then, the coverage of the programme has increased rapidly. By the beginning of 1959, about 56 per cent of the rural population of India had been covered.

This rapid growth entailed a quick expansion of the organizational framework at the operational level (Development Block) and a concomitant rapid expansion of the needs in trained personnel. Owing to the limitations of financial resources, and to the desire of the authorities to provide quickly the material benefits to as large a proportion of the population as possible as experience was gained, the organizational pattern for development at the operational level underwent some changes. The basic differences between the different patterns related partly to the financial and staff resources available initially, partly to the subject matter coverage and partly to the duration for which special efforts had to be made to ensure enduring results.

It is significant, and perhaps of wider interest, that the present programme in India for covering new areas envisages three phases of development: first, initiation on a modest scale; then, a longer period of expansion and intensification, followed by the maintenance of a fairly high (though slightly reduced) tempo of development for a further period. The three phases of development will take eleven years, thus:

- (a) The pre-extension phase lasting one year during which a skeleton staff attempts to lay the foundations of agricultural extension work. (The advantages of starting with agricultural extension seem to lie in the fact that techniques for improvement are known, that the people desire increases in production, that the techniques can be demonstrated in a short time and can help build up the confidence of the people in the programme).
- (b) During Stage I of development lasting five years, the coverage of activities and the intensity of developmental effort are stepped up.

- (c) During Stage II of development, lasting five years, the strength of extension officers at the Block level remains the same as in Stage I. The financial provision for agricultural extension also remains unchanged at the Stage I level, while the provisions in respect of education and communications are slightly lower.

### *Content of the programme*

As indicated in a preceding chapter, the community development programme aims at the all-sided development of rural life (including improvement of agriculture, education, health, training, provision of increased employment opportunities, social welfare) with administrative machinery and financial and technical resources provided by the Government, but drawing heavily on the people's co-operation and participation.

The economic aspects of development are supplemented by, and associated with, programmes designed to create in the people an urge to improve their lot, particularly through group activity.

In the sphere of agriculture, the development programme aims at introducing improved varieties of seed, popularizing the use of chemical fertilizers, increasing the use of farmyard manure, introducing improved agricultural practices and new crops. It tries to demonstrate to the people the advantage of new techniques, and it makes available to the people the materials needed for improving agriculture. The co-operation of the people may be sought in estimating the extent to which agricultural requisites are needed and in arranging the distribution thereof. More important, the co-operation of the people is needed in popularizing the use of improved techniques for instance, in organizing group visits to demonstration fields.

### THE CASE STUDY

The present case study (covering six selected villages from the Community Development Block Ghosi, Uttar Pradesh, and six similar villages not covered by community development) aims at stressing the impact of the community development programme in the selected villages on agricultural development in particular, and at throwing some light on the contribution of such programmes to economic development in general.

#### *New crops and improved practice*

The agricultural programme at the Ghosi Development Block aimed at introducing new crops as well as new techniques designed to improve productivity. As noted in chapter 3, the average holding is very small,

and the first aim of the cultivator is to grow enough foodgrains to meet domestic needs. This leaves limited scope for other crops. Nevertheless, in the Block area some modest increases have occurred in the areas sown to cash crops such as sesame and groundnut probably at the expense of other cash crops. Some cultivators (24 per cent of those of medium size and 39 per cent of the large) have started growing vegetables and fruits, though primarily for domestic use. Some credit for these changes can be claimed by the community development programme. More important, however, has been the doubling of the area under sugarcane in the Block. However, appreciably increases in the area under sugarcane have occurred in the non-Block area also, because many of the factors contributing to the increase—ban on poppy cultivation, availability of improved seed, existence of a sugar factory in the area—operated there as well. While community development workers did help increase the area under sugarcane—which is an important cash crop—it is possible that much of this increase might have occurred with the normal efforts of development departments.

### *Increases in productivity*

To bring about increases in productivity, the programme aims at introducing higher yielding seeds, chemical fertilizer, and other improved practices (line sowing, Japanese method, etc.) and at increasing the area irrigated.

It is important to note here that the problem of increasing the area under high yielding varieties of foodgrains is basic to the solution of the food problem of the country. For foodcrops occupy around four-fifths of the sown area in the Block (and in India), and cultivators do not take up new varieties of foodcrops as readily as new varieties of commercial crops.<sup>47</sup>

It will be noticed from chapter 3 that only about one-third of the foodcrop area in the Block has probably been covered with improved varieties, and the fertilizer distributed in the Block amounted on an average to a little more than 100 tons per year. The impact of other improved cultural practices has been extremely small (or negligible). On the whole, the additional production capacity in the Block as a whole resulting from the use of improved seed and fertilizer may be put at 6 to 7 per cent. (According to an expert committee, the total additional production potential in Uttar Pradesh, between October 1952 and March 1957, was 10.7 per cent<sup>48</sup>).

<sup>47</sup> Even with the limited amount of extension work prior to the initiation of community development programmes in India, substantial proportions of areas under commercial crops such as sugarcane and cotton were covered with improved varieties.

<sup>48</sup> See chapter 3.

In relation to the magnitude of the problem facing the country, the results hitherto achieved have been rather modest. But could the pace have been quicker? In this context, it is important to remember that the pace of improvement of agriculture depends on three factors, namely, the intensity and thoroughness of extension work, the rate of acceptance of new practices by the people, and the timely and efficient channelling of reasonably priced supplies of needed agricultural requisites to the cultivator. In the early stages of extension work, when the crust of conservatism has to be broken<sup>49</sup> and confidence in the programme has to be built up, progress is invariably slow. During this period, it is essential, if a sound foundation is to be laid for the programme, that the planned pace of progress should keep in step with the likely rate of acceptance of new techniques.<sup>50</sup>

However, it is fairly clear from the field investigations that the agricultural extension work in the villages studied needs improvement, particularly with a view to building up the confidence of the cultivator in the ability of the extension worker to advise him in regard to the adoption of improved agricultural practices. For, at present, very few cultivators seek his advice regarding the adoption of improved practices. While therefore it may be reasonable to infer that, with better arrangements for extension work, improved practices would have been adopted to a greater extent, it is obviously not possible to arrive at quantitative estimates of the consequential increases in production.

As indicated above, the limited use of the village level worker as an extension advisor shows lack of confidence in his advisory ability. According to the Agricultural Personnel Committee of the Planning Commission, "The training (in agriculture) which a village level worker gets at present is very inadequate, and cannot give him the necessary confidence and competence for performing the very heavy and responsible duties that he is called upon to perform".<sup>51</sup> To strengthen extension work, that Committee has made the following recommendations:

---

<sup>49</sup> Some of the major factors that explain the limited impact of improved practices are inadequacy of extension work, insufficient supplies or inadequate credit, fragmentation of holdings etc. see chapter 3.

<sup>50</sup> The field workers are in a relatively better position to indicate the likely rate of acceptance of new techniques in their respective areas than planners at higher rungs of the administrative hierarchy.

<sup>51</sup> *Report of the Agricultural Personnel Committee of the Planning Commission, 1958*, pp. 14-15.



- (i) As an interim measure, the period of training of the village level worker should be raised to 2 years (hitherto a year), and agricultural training should be continued throughout this period. In the long run, however, it would be desirable that the village level worker should possess a degree in agriculture. (It should be noted here that the government of Bihar has already decided to give its village level workers a two-year course in agriculture, leading to a diploma in agriculture, followed by six months' training in extension work. According to the Evaluation Mission in India, the basic agricultural course intended for the village level worker should be of a kind that is recognized as a step towards possible professional advancement, and extension wings of agricultural schools should be attached to a neighbouring Block where practical work can be done by village level workers, and new ideas tested by extension staff.<sup>52</sup>)
- (ii) The area to be covered by a village level worker should be reduced to 5 villages as against 10 villages at present.
- (iii) At the Block level, there should be 5 agricultural graduates (extension officers) each with some specialized training in agriculture, to give advice to the village level worker in his extension work.

While an efficient supply line is essential to the success of an extension programme, it is not essential to keep the village level worker preoccupied with it. It might indeed be more satisfactory from the point of view of the cultivators to channel supplies to them through village councils or co-operatives, and to let the village level worker concentrate on extension work.

With an improvement in his technical competence and with a reduction in the work load (through reduction in the number of villages to be covered and the giving up of activities relating to supplies), the village level worker should be able to concentrate more on agricultural extension work. And by far the most effective method of agricultural extension lies in increasing the emphasis on field demonstrations.

---

<sup>52</sup>United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs: *Report of a Community Development Evaluation Mission in India, 1959* (TAO/IND/31), p. 84.

### *Incomes, levels of living and investment*

Consumption levels in the Block villages are somewhat better than in the non-Block area as judged from *per capita* consumption of foodstuffs. Indebtedness per borrowing family is lower in the Block area than in the non-Block area and capital expenditure per hectare of cultivated land, though small, is distinctly higher in the Block area as compared with the non-Block area. These facts probably reflect relatively higher incomes in the Block area and the better economic awareness of cultivators in the Block. (The loans made available per member through the co-operatives were appreciably greater in the non-Block villages).

An important economic gain has been capital formation through the voluntary contribution of labour for the benefit of the community. During 1956-58, the people's contribution through voluntary labour, in the Block area amounted to nearly Rs 258,000. The works undertaken include community assets such as roads, culverts, wells, tanks, and community centres. Many of the villages in the Block area have been connected with main roads through the construction of link roads of earth. While these roads do mean some improvement in communication, their impact on the agricultural economy of the villages would be felt more strongly if the roads were metalled and transport costs went down significantly. There can, however, be no two opinions about the fact that these gains represent important initial changes in the right direction.

To a limited extent, employment opportunities have also increased, following the establishment of new small-scale industries, *e.g.* sugar factory.

### *Attitudes*

Community development programmes aim, not only at facilitating improvement in the material side of life, but also at changing the outlook of the individual and at promoting the all-sided development of the village community. From this angle, there have been many solid gains in the area studied.

To begin with, the attitudes of the people are changing in directions that favour progress. For instance, the expenditure on social ceremonies is lower in the Block area, while the expenditure on productive investment (in agriculture) is higher. Again, in the Block area the three important ways (in order of importance) of improving social status are: increase in income, being generous in offering hospitality and educating of children.

A relatively larger proportion of cultivators from the Block area tried to increase their incomes through agriculture, and in most cases they tried to realize this objective through the adoption of improved agricultural practices and (or) by increasing the area under cash crops.

In the Block area, there is greater appreciation of the advantages of educating children owing, among other things, to the availability of better facilities for education.

These and other similar changes have in turn often whetted the desires of the villagers for further improvements.<sup>53</sup>

Two other factors deserve notice in this context. One is that some limited changes in the leadership pattern are also noticeable. Thus, while age is still an important attribute of leadership, leaders from the younger age-group are coming up. Again, there is some evidence of the emergence of leaders from among the lower castes. (In as much as community development activities have favoured the strengthening of democratic institutions such as *panchayats* with the accent on political equality, and have favoured the emergence of progressive leaders, some credit for these changes can be claimed for the community development programme.)

Second is the fostering of a spirit for concerted action for the benefit of the group as a whole. Some examples of this are the bringing together of people to undertake, on a voluntary basis, the construction of common facilities such as link roads, and wells for the supply of drinking water. In some cases, new groups (e.g. youth clubs) have also been formed to foster this spirit.

### *Village industries*

So far as village industries are concerned, a comprehensive programme is in the process of being formulated, and the action taken hitherto relates largely to the provision of training facilities. Owing to the limited nature of this action and perhaps also to its short duration, there is not much evidence of any improvement in the position of village industries in the selected villages.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 80.

<sup>54</sup> The question whether some of the village industries can become efficient units of production without radical changes in techniques deserves consideration. However, it is beyond the scope of the present study.

## CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

(I) The community development programme 'which seeks to initiate a process of transformation of the social and economic life of the village community' by bringing together technical 'know-how', material aid and the initiative of the people, is essentially a sound programme. However, in the light of Indian experience, sustained work over a fairly long period is probably required to ensure enduring and significant results—over 10 years is now considered necessary in India.

(II) Inasmuch as these programmes aim at developing the creative interest and capacity of the individuals composing a village community and at channelling these in such a way as to bring about progressive improvements in the social and economic life of the individual, it is essential, if the programme is to develop on sound lines, that the pace of progress on the material side should be in step with the pace of the 'development' of the individuals.

(III) Owing partly to the short period of about five years during which community development programmes have been in operation in the Ghosi Development Block prior to the initiation of the field investigations referred to in this study, and partly to limitations of extension work, the gains noticeable in the sphere of agriculture—acceptance of improved practices, gains in production, capital formation, etc.—have been rather modest though distinct.

(IV) To improve the impact of these programmes on agriculture, it is essential to strengthen and improve the arrangements for agricultural extension. This would entail:

- (a) the placing of better qualified extension workers at the village level;
- (b) the stationing of more agricultural experts at the Block level to guide the village level workers;
- (c) an appreciable reduction in the work load of village level workers; and
- (d) the laying of much greater emphasis on field demonstrations.

(V) There are distinct advantages in channelling supplies to the cultivators through democratic institutions such as village councils or co-operatives.

(VI) From the long-term point of view, the more important gains have been the changes in the outlook of the people. Important indicators of the changes that are in progress (and the potentialities for development)<sup>55</sup> are the adoption of new production techniques in the place of methods that have not changed for ages, the increasing economic awareness of the cultivators as reflected among other things, in increased productive expenditure, the formation of co-operatives for processing agricultural commodities, the recognition of leaders from younger age-groups and lower strata, and, more importantly, the emergence of a new corporate spirit for social and economic betterment of villages through construction of link roads, community centres, wells. The major significance of these changes lies in the fact that they reflect the emergence of a new spirit in the villages which, with adequate government support, will ultimately pave the way for the desired social and economic transformation of the village community.

---

<sup>55</sup> Once new ideas are accepted, their effect tends to multiply under favourable conditions.

## Appendix I

### COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN INDIA: GENERAL STATISTICAL TABLES

Table 1.  
DEVELOPMENT BLOCKS IN OPERATION IN INDIA, JANUARY 1959

<i>Series</i>	<i>No. of Blocks</i>	<i>No. of villages covered</i>	<i>Population covered (in millions)</i>
Community Development Blocks including special			
Multi-purpose Blocks:			
1956/57 . . . . .	252.5	36,017	18.59
1957/58 . . . . .	189.5	26,651	11.84
Stage I Blocks:			
1954/55 . . . . .	20.5	2,977	1.83
1955/56 . . . . .	190.5	26,143	13.30
1956/57 . . . . .	491.0	66,815	33.30
1957/58 . . . . .	604.0	65,922	39.95
1958/59 . . . . .	225.0	22,387	14.58
Stage II Blocks:			
1952/53 . . . . .	210.5	26,904	15.35
1953/54 . . . . .	62.0	7,693	3.91
1955/56 . . . . .	159.5	21,438	12.40
TOTAL	2,405 <sup>a</sup>	302,947	165.05

*Source:* Government of India, Ministry of Community Development, *Report*, 1958/59.

<sup>a</sup> Excluding 137 and 145 pre-extension Blocks allotted for April and October, 1959, respectively.

Table 2.  
DISTRIBUTION OF PLANNED OUTLAY ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND NATIONAL EXTENSION (1956/57 to 1960/61)

<i>Item</i>	<i>Rupees (millions)</i>	<i>Percentage of the total</i>
Personnel and equipment at Block headquarters . . . . .	520	26
Agriculture (Animal husbandry and agricultural extension, irrigation and reclamation) . . . . .	550	} 30
Rural arts and crafts . . . . .	50	
Communications . . . . .	180	9
Education . . . . .	120	6
Social education . . . . .	100	5
Health and rural sanitation . . . . .	200	10
Housing (for project staff and rural housing) . . . . .	160	8
Community Development — Miscellaneous (Centre) . . . . .	120	6
TOTAL	2,000	100

*Source:* Government of India, Planning Commission: *Second Five-Year Plan* (1956).

**Table 3.**  
**BUDGET PATTERN OF A RURAL COMMUNITY PROJECT<sup>a</sup>**  
**(3 years)**

(In thousand rupees)

S. No.	Detailed head	Total	Recurring	Non-recurring
1.	Personnel . . . . .	574	574	
	A. Supervisory staff:			
	Agriculture			
	Adult education } . . . . .	274	274	
	B. Field workers:			
	Agriculture			
	Health (including medical officers) }	300	300	
2.	Equipment for personnel . . . . .	195	—	196
	A. Transport: Jeeps 9 . . . . .	129	—	129
	B. Demonstration Equipment . . . . .	69		66
3.	Equipment, construction etc. for 300 villages .	4,675	450	4,225
	A. Irrigation—canal, tank etc. . . . .	2,025	—	2,025
	B. Drinking water supply—two surface wells or other facility per village, at a theoretical cost of Rs 4,000 per village: Only 1/3rd of this need budgeted as one-third can be assumed to exist and one-third can be left till later . . . . .	400	—	400
	C. Drainage . . . . .	100	—	100
	D. Roads theoretical need for one culvert, 2 miles <i>kuchcha</i> road per village at total cost of Rs 10,000 per village plus Rs 500 annual maintenance cost (actually one-third assumed to exist, one-third can be left to initiative of villagers and one-third programmed) . . . . .	1,150	50	1,100
	E. Education . . . . .	700	400	300
	F. Reclamation of culturable waste land at rate of 10% of the cultivated area at Rs 75 per acre is a theoretical requirement of which one-third programmed. . . . .	300		300
4.	Equipments, construction and supplies for three Marketing Centres . . . . .	480	26	454
	A. Housing for staff . . . . .	200	—	200
	B. Dispensaries and Health Units—One per Marketing Centre:			
	Buildings, with 6 beds, at each Centre.	45	—	45
	Equipment for 2 Units . . . . .	45	—	45
	C. Agricultural extension service Sub-head-quarters: Capital cost Rs 2,000 each; recurring cost Rs 2,000/- each per year .	28.5	22.5	6
	D. 4 Tractors with equipment . . . . .	95	—	95
	E. 3 Tractor and jeep service centres . . .	15	—	15
	F. 3 Marketing Centres and storage godown for agricultural produce and fertilizer	45	—	45
	G. Community Recreation Centres 3 at Rs 500 capital cost each and Rs 500 annual recurring charges each . . . . .	6	3	3

Table 3.—(continued)

S. No.	Detailed head	Total	Recurring	Non-recurring
5.	Village arts and crafts-Production-cum- Training centres . . . . .	450	225	225
6.	Animal husbandry-key Village Scheme . . . . .	26	24	2
7.	Contingencies . . . . .	100.5	—	100.5
8.	Total cost of Community Project—(Basic type) . . . . .	6,500	1,299	5,201

Source: Government of India, Community Projects Administration, Community Projects: *A Draft Handbook*, 1954.

\* One Project, as originally planned, comprised three Development Blocks. As such, the total expenditure shown in the budget pattern is for three Development Blocks.

Table 4.  
STRENGTH OF PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN A COMMUNITY PROJECT

Estimated personnel for a rural Community Project (comprising 3 Blocks):—

<i>Administrative</i>	Project Executive Officer . . . . .	1
	Assistant Project Officers . . . . .	2
	TOTAL	3
<i>Agriculture</i>	Agriculture graduates . . . . .	3
	Agriculture graduates with knowledge of animal husbandry . . . . .	3
	Agriculture graduates with experience in co-operation and knowledge of village participation . . . . .	3
	Agricultural engineers or civil mechanical engineers with experience of agricul- tural engineering . . . . .	3
	Civil Overseers . . . . .	3
	Village level workers . . . . .	60
	Stockmen . . . . .	6
	Messengers . . . . .	10
	TOTAL	91
		Plus the requisite ministerial staff:—
<i>Social Education</i>	Community Organisers . . . . .	7
<i>Health</i>	Medical Officers . . . . .	3
	Compounders (Medical Assistants) . . . . .	3
	Sanitary Inspectors . . . . .	3
	Health Visitors . . . . .	3
	Midwives . . . . .	12
TOTAL	24	

Source: Government of India, Community Project Administration: *A Draft Handbook*, 1954.



**Table 5.**  
**BUDGET OF NATIONAL EXTENSION SERVICE BLOCK**  
**(3 years)**

*(In thousand rupees)*

Personnel . . . . .	100
Transport, office equipment, accommodation and furniture, demonstration equipment and other non-recurring contingencies, jeep etc. . . . .	80
Local Works (including roads, culverts, public health, sanitation, drainage etc.) . . . . .	150
Social Education (including prizes etc. for farmers and miscellaneous schemes) . . . . .	20
Loans in respect of minor irrigation schemes . . . . .	100
Loans for providing short-term credit facilities through co-operatives . . . . .	300
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>750</b>

*Source:* Government of Uttar Pradesh, Planning Department, *Second Five-Year Plan, Plan Frame of the Final District Plan, 1955.*

**Table 6.**  
**PERSONNEL FOR A NATIONAL EXTENSION SERVICE BLOCK**

Block development officer . . . . .	1
A.D.O. (Agriculture) . . . . .	1
A.D.O. (Animal husbandry) . . . . .	1
A.D.O. Village organizations (Co-operatives and panchayats) . . . . .	1
A.D.O. (Social education) . . . . .	1
A.D.O. (Works), wherever necessary . . . . .	1
Accountant-cum-store keeper . . . . .	1
Junior clerk . . . . .	1
Driver . . . . .	1
Class IV staff . . . . .	3
Village level workers . . . . .	10

*Note:* A.D.O. stands for Assistant Development Officer.

*Source:* See table 5.

Table 7.  
BUDGET FOR INTENSIVE DEVELOPMENT BLOCK  
(3 years)

(In thousand rupees)

Head	Total	Recurring	Non-recurring
1. Block headquarters:			
Personnel, transport and office equipment . . . . .	223	205	18
2. Animal husbandry and agricultural extension:			
Tractors . . . . .	24	—	24
Demonstration equipment . . . . .	10	—	10
Extension sub-headquarters . . . . .	9	7	2
Repair service centre . . . . .	5	—	5
Marketing centre . . . . .	10	—	10
Key village scheme . . . . .	29	21	8
3. Irrigation (loans) . . . . .	500	—	500
4. Reclamation . . . . .	25	—	25
5. Health and rural sanitation:			
Dispensary:			
Recurring expenditure . . . . .	10	10	—
Building . . . . .	10	—	10
Equipment . . . . .	10	—	10
Drinking water supply . . . . .	50	—	50
Drainage and sanitation . . . . .	25	—	25
6. Education . . . . .	150	100	50
7. Social education (Including audio-visual aids) . . . . .	50	30	20
8. Communications . . . . .	125	—	125
9. Rural arts and crafts . . . . .	125	50	75
10. Housing for project staff and rural housing . . . . .	110	—	110
TOTAL	1,500	423	1,077

Source: See table 5, appendix 7.

Table 8.  
BLOCK BUDGET—PRE-EXTENSION PHASE  
(one year)

(In rupees)

1. Personnel:	
One Block development officer . . . . .	3,600
One agricultural extension officer . . . . .	2,400
Five gram sevaks . . . . .	6,000
One office clerk-typist . . . . .	900
One class IV servant . . . . .	600
Office furniture and fitting, including one typewriter . . . . .	1,500
Rent for office . . . . .	600
Travelling allowance for staff and contingencies . . . . .	1,200
2. Lump-sum provision for agricultural demonstration, etc. . . . .	2,000
TOTAL	18,800

Source: Circular No. C-78/Bud(B)-33-57, dated 12 July 1958 from Development Commissioner, Government of Uttar Pradesh, India.

Table 9.

## EXPENDITURE INCURRED ON GHOSI BLOCK, 1952-1958

(In rupees)

Items	Intensive development phase				Normalized phase			Grand total	
	1952-53 From 2 Oct. 52	1953/54	1954/55	1955/56	Total	1956/57	1957/58		1958 (April-June)
Personnel	72,091	103,689	86,049	51,888	313,717	36,500	41,100	8,258	399,575
Agricultural extension	42,433	279,030	161,549	96,298	579,310	—	—	—	579,310
Animal husbandry	9,878	67,508	34,575	21,975	133,936	—	—	—	133,936
Medical	21,793	17,242	4,486	6,568	50,089	—	—	—	50,089
Public health	20,000	24,676	42,318	17,070	104,066	—	—	—	104,066
Education	12,464	25,386	31,763	13,662	83,275	—	—	—	83,275
Social education	17,125	24,561	15,677	11,258	68,621	5,000	4,200	—	77,821
Communications	35,000	104,370	53,477	37,800	230,647	—	—	—	230,647
Rural arts	10,000	52,250	25,441	17,208	104,899	—	—	—	104,899
Grants-in-aid	—	—	—	—	—	25,000	25,000	—	50,000
TOTAL	240,784	698,712	455,335	273,729	1,668,560	66,500	70,300	8,258	1,813,618
Expenditure on plans and programmes	168,693	595,023	369,286	221,841	1,354,843	30,000	29,200	—	1,414,043

Source: Government of Uttar Pradesh (India), Budget Section of Development Commissioner's Office.

Table 10.  
EXPENDITURE ON AGRICULTURE IN GHOSI BLOCK

(In rupees)

Expenditure	Year	Intensive development phase				Total (2 Oct 1952 to Mar 1956)
		1952/53 (From 2 Oct 1952)	1953/54	1954/55	1955/56	
1. Expenditure on agricultural and animal husbandry programmes . . . . .		52,311	346,538	196,124	118,273	713,246
2. Expenditure on agricultural programmes as percentage of total expenditure on programmes . . . . .		31	58	53	53	53

Source: Derived from table 9, appendix 1.

## Appendix 2

### THE SCHEDULES USED

(A) General village schedules:

- (1) Questionnaire I. — House-listing of all the households in the selected villages along with caste, principal and subsidiary occupation and size of cultivation holding of each household.
- (2) Section No. 8 of Questionnaire II. — General crop pattern of the village for last four years, *viz.* 1954/55 to 1957/58 (To be based on revenue records.)
- (3) Questionnaire V. — Capital formation through community action (To be based on records available at Block headquarters).
- (4) Questionnaire VI. — Institutional credit.
- (5) General observation notes by field workers on each village.

(B) Canvassing of the following schedules for households of cultivators:

- (1) Questionnaire II. — Landholdings, household size, crop pattern, farm output and income, improved practices.
- (2) Questionnaire III. — Levels of living.
- (3) Questionnaire IV. — Capital formation.
- (4) Questionnaire VII. — Economic and social life.

(C) Canvassing of the following schedules for households of craftsmen:

- (1) Questionnaire II. — Landholdings, family size, crop pattern, farm output and income.
- (2) Questionnaire III. — Levels of living.
- (3) Questionnaire IV. — Capital formation. (Relevant sections only).
- (4) Questionnaire VII. — Economic and social life (Relevant sections only)
- (5) Questionnaire IX. — Production and other equipments, Production and sale of products earnings, etc.

---

*Note:* Questionnaire II was used only in the case of those households of craftsmen who owned more than one acre of cultivable land.

## Appendix 3

### SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON GHOSI BLOCK AND NON-BLOCK AREAS

#### THE AREA SELECTED

The area chosen for the present study, Ghosi Block, is situated in the Azamgarh district in the eastern region of the state of Uttar Pradesh. Here rice is the major foodcrop grown, and density of population is rather high. From the point of view of foodgrains production, this area constitutes a "deficit pocket" in the state. Economically, this area is relatively less developed than other parts of the state.

Floods and droughts are frequent in this area, and its problems have been matters of serious concern to the state government for the past several years. Steps for its development have been taken from time to time, and recently the Government has allotted Rs 70 million for various developmental schemes (mainly for flood control and irrigation).

#### *Location of the selected blocks*

The Community Development Block, Ghosi, is situated on an alluvial tract, with the rivers Tons in the south, Ghaghra in the north and Chhoti Sarju in the west. Administratively, it is in the Ghosi *tehsil* (subdivision) of the Azamgarh district.

This Development Block, with 288 villages, was inaugurated on 2 October 1952 with a budget allotment of 2.2 million rupees for a period of three years. This was a phase of intensive development activity, and continued till 31 March 1956.

During this period, the Block covered a total population of about 120,000 and an area of 313 square kilometres. The actual expenditure during this period was Rs 1.67 million. From April 1956, the Block was converted into the Post-Intensive Development Phase, and there was also a reduction in the area and number of villages. At present, the area covered is 181 square kilometres, with 99 villages and a total population of 70,000. It may, however, be noted that some reorganization in delimiting the village boundaries in the state was done during the year 1955/56, and in reality the existing 99 villages of the Block are equivalent to some 166 villages before reorganization (the latter figure is comparable with 288 villages of the old Block).

The non-Block area, namely, Fatehpur Mandaon Shadow Block,<sup>a</sup> is situated in the north-east corner of Ghosi *tehsil* of Azamgarh district. It is surrounded by Ghosi and Kopaganj Blocks on the west and south and by Ballia district on the east. The river Ghaghra flows along the northern boundary of this tract. The villages of the non-Block area lie scattered around a big lake named "Tal Ratoi". This lake has an area of 2,833 hectares and is a vast water reservoir during the rainy season.

Both the Block and non-Block areas lie on a level plain. A part of the non-Block area is situated in the basin of river Ghaghra, and is comparatively more uneven than the rest.

### Soil types

The main soil types are: *Kachhar*<sup>b</sup> and *Bangar*.<sup>c</sup> *Kachhar* soil is mostly riverine alluvium, sandy in character and is liable to frequent alterations owing to changes in the course of rivers. The *Bangar* area represents older alluvial deposits. It includes soils in which the proportions of clay and sand are nearly equal as well as some soils in which the proportion of clay is greater.

Almost the entire area of the Ghosi block falls in the *Bangar* tract, except the western portion where some *Kachhar* tracts are also found. The major part of the non-Block area also lies in the *Bangar* tract, and a part is situated in the river belt which has predominantly *Kachhar* soil. The two areas are therefore basically comparable as regards soil types.

### Area and population

Both the areas are densely populated. The table below summarizes the available information regarding population density.

Table 1.  
POPULATION AND DENSITY

	Population	Number of villages	Total area (sq km)	Density of population (per sq km)
Block (a)	69,693	99	184	380
Non-Block (b)	85,222	91	281	296

Source: (a) Planning Research and Action Institute, Lucknow: Second five-year plan of Azamgarh. district.

(b) *Panchayat* Records of Fatehpur Mandaon.

<sup>a</sup> This term denotes an area not covered by community development work, and is referred to hereafter as the non-Block area.

<sup>b</sup> *Kachhar*: Low area lying within the flood belt of a river.

<sup>c</sup> *Bangar*: Area lying away from a river usually old alluvial deposits.

Agriculturally, the two areas are similar except for the larger proportion of irrigated area in the Block. It should be noted here that the small proportion of area cropped more than once in the Ghosi Block (around 35 per cent in 1958/59) indicates probably that water for irrigation is available largely around the rainy season. The main agricultural characteristics are summarized below.

Table 2.  
CULTIVATED AND IRRIGATED AREA

(In hectares)

	Total area	Area cultivated	Area irrigated	Percentage area under cultivation	Percentage of cultivated area under irrigation
Block (a) . . . .	18,357	12,473	9,591	67.7	77
Non-Block (b) . .	28,106	20,710	9,422	73.7	45

Source: Same as for preceding table.

### Climate and rainfall

In both of the areas, the climate is arid and sub-humid. The summer months are usually very hot, with westerly winds during the day, commonly known as "Loo". On the other hand, the winter months are quite cold. There are broadly three seasons distinguishable in this area: rainy (July to September); winter (October to February); summer (March to June).

The average annual rainfall in both the areas is about 100 to 115 centimetres, and the major part is received during July-September. But the amount and the distribution of rainfall vary considerably from year to year.

### Crop seasons

There are two main crop seasons in this region, *viz.*, *kharij* crops harvested in autumn (October-November) and *rabi* crops harvested in spring (March-April). Besides these, there are *zaid* crops harvested in summer (April-May) that are grown along river banks. These are also known as catch crops. The main crops which are grown during these seasons are as follows:

Table 3.  
CROPS GROWN

Season	Crop
Kharif (autumn) . . . .	Kuari (early) and agahani (late) paddy, sawan and kodo (small millets), maize, sugarcane, Joar and Bajar (millets) <i>arhar</i> and <i>urd</i> (pulses).
Zaid (summer) . . . .	Sweet potato, melons, vegetables and <i>boro</i> paddy.
Rabi (spring) . . . .	Barley, wheat, gram, pea, mustard, linseed and chilli.



### *Land tenure*

At the time India attained independence in August 1947, a large number of intermediaries existed between the legal owners of land and the actual tillers of the soil. The land revenue payable by the landlord formed only a small proportion of the heavy rent paid by the tiller of the soil to the intermediaries. Besides, in many cases, the tiller of the soil hardly enjoyed any security of tenure. The enactment land reforms legislation was taken in hand soon after independence, and, by 31 March 1956, land reforms had been introduced covering 97 per cent of the total area of agricultural holdings in the state.

At present there are two main types of tenure prevalent in this area "Bhumidari" and "Sirdari". A *Bhumidar* has the right to exclusive possession of land and to its use for any purpose whatsoever. A *Sirdar* has also permanent and hereditary interest in his holdings, but is not allowed to use it for any purpose other than those connected with agriculture, horticulture and animal husbandry, nor has he the right to transfer his interest.

Sometimes, however, the owners of relatively bigger holdings rent out a part of their cultivation holdings to small cultivators or to landless labourers on a crop sharing fifty-fifty basis. It is mostly paddy fields which are sublet. However, since subletting is not generally allowed, these transactions are not formalized in writing, and the tenants are changed periodically in order to avoid accrual of tenancy rights through continuous cultivation over a three-year period. The circumstances under which subletting may take place are broadly divisible in four categories. One is that the cultivation of late paddy, which is transplanted, involves heavy labour inputs, and consequently the area that can be cultivated by an owner himself is limited, and any excess over this limit might be sublet. Secondly, if a person, for any reasons, is unable to supervise the cultivation on a part or whole of his holding, he may sublet it. Third, since, according to legislation, any agricultural land which remains fallow for a consecutive period of three agricultural years, can be taken over by the village council and allotted to any other cultivator of the village, a cultivator will try to avoid "loss" of land even if this involves subletting. Four, money is sometimes borrowed by giving the creditor the cultivating possession of land for a specified period. However, as indicated above, subletting in this form is practised only to a small extent.

### *Organization of agriculture*

The unit for agricultural activity is the household. All the members of the family work together in the family's cultivation holding. Among

the low castes, women also work in the fields. Cultivators try to rely on family labour for farm work. Nevertheless, during busy seasons, when it becomes difficult to cope with the work, they usually arrange for help from their fellow cultivators on the basis of mutual exchange of labour known locally as *Bhanj*. This exchange of labour is quite common, and almost all the cultivators resort to this co-operative method during busy seasons. Hired labourers may be employed only when mutual exchange proves inadequate. It is common practice with the large cultivators to employ hired labourers. Labourers are usually employed for weeding, harvesting and irrigation.

### *Livestock*

Work animals in the area are mostly weak and small in size. Fields are ploughed with local wooden ploughs drawn by the bullocks. Usually 1.5 to 2 hectares can be cultivated with an average pair of bullocks, but the size of many cultivators' holdings is considerably less. Consequently, some of these cultivators keep only one bullock, and cultivate their land in co-operation with others who also possess only one work animal. This system is locally known as *Harsaj*. Some cultivators who have only 0.4 hectare or less of land keep no bullock at all. They cultivate on the plan known as *Tijaria* or *Pari*, i.e. by working two days for another cultivator, they get the use of his bullocks in exchange on the third day.

It is a common practice in the area to sell the work animals during the off season in order to save the expenditure on feed and maintenance and to avoid any loss from death. These animals are usually purchased again during the busy agricultural season.

The *Batai* system for rearing cattle is also prevalent in the area. Usually, female young stock—cow, she-buffalo and she-goat—are given to some other person by their owner to rear. In such cases, the milk is utilized by the person looking after the cattle in the first lactation, and the income from births is divided on a fifty and fifty basis. The owner is usually given back the animal after the end of the first lactation.

There are some livestock whose possession is confined to particular castes. For example, pigs are usually possessed by "Dusadh", donkeys by washermen and in some cases by "Chamar" and sheep by "Gadaria"<sup>a</sup> only.

The high caste Hindus, who are often vegetarians, have a prejudice against poultry keeping. Consequently, poultry is kept only in a few villages of the Block area where Muslims predominate.

<sup>a</sup> Dusadh, Chamar and Gadaria are lower castes.

The cattle in this region are usually poor in quality. The cows are not good milk yielders. In quite a few instances, a cultivator maintains a large number of cows only in order to obtain manure from them.

### *Manures*

Bulky organic manure (mostly cow-dung) is used in both areas. This farmyard manure is invariably applied to fields where crops like sugarcane, barley or wheat are grown. But the supply is not adequate, since almost two-thirds of the dung is used as fuel. It is only during the rainy season that it is utilized as manure.

In both areas some cultivators pen cattle or sheep in the field for the purpose of manuring. However, this custom is not widespread and, in fact, is feasible only in those villages where individual cultivators have a considerable number of cattle. Some rich cultivators invite shepherds to pen sheep on their properties against payment.

### *Sources of irrigation*

Wells (mostly masonry), tanks, streams and lakes in both the areas are important sources of irrigation.

A common feature in the block area is that a good number of temporary wells are dug to irrigate the fields, and these usually last for one or two crop seasons. In the non-Block area, this practice is less common. A number of tubewells have also been constructed in the Block area, whereas there is no such facility in the non-Block area. Recently, a canal has been constructed in the Block area, but as yet the head work has not been completed.

There is a great scarcity of irrigation water during the summer months, as tanks and even some of the wells dry up, especially in the non-Block area.

### *Floods and droughts*

Floods and droughts are a common feature in both areas. Every year, some portion of the crop is damaged by these natural calamities. And, in some extreme situations, complete crop failure takes place. A flood protection dam has recently been constructed along the Ghagra river bank to protect these villages from flood water. Droughts are also not less frequent.

*Communication and transport*

There are three metalled roads running through the Block area besides a railway line from Indara to Dohrightat which passes through Ghosi. Over and above this, approach roads (unmetalled) to almost every village in the Block area have been constructed mainly through the voluntary contribution of labour. In the non-Block area, the position is somewhat similar, for a railway line lies at a distance of three to four miles from the boundary of the non-Block area. Besides, there is also one metalled road which passes through the non-Block area. Approach roads to the villages are almost non-existent. During the rainy season, unmetalled roads become difficult to use in both areas.

The main means of transport are bullock carts, horse carts (ekkas) and donkeys. Bicycles are found in almost all the villages but in a few households only.

## THE SELECTED VILLAGES

The villages selected in the Block area had on an average 110 households and a population of 619. The corresponding figures for the non-Block area were 119 and 678. Socially, about 75 per cent of the households in the Block villages belonged to Thakur, Ahir, Chamar, Koiri and Bhar castes, and about 10 per cent of the households were Muslims. In the non-Block area, the main castes were Brahmin, Bhar and Chamar. About 5 per cent of the households in this area were Muslims.

Cultivation is the principal occupation of over two-thirds of the heads of households in the selected villages. The next important occupation is labour (mainly agricultural). About 40 per cent of the households of cultivators in the Block area do not have any subsidiary occupation. The corresponding figure for non-Block area is over 55 per cent. Work as labourer (mostly agricultural) is the main subsidiary occupation in both the areas.

The average size of a household of cultivators varies between 6.3 and 10.1 in the case of small, medium and large cultivators of the Block area. The corresponding figures for the non-Block area are 7.0 and 10.5. About 25 per cent of the members of households (all classes) in the Block area are earners. The corresponding figure for the non-Block area is about 20 per cent.

Table 4.  
ECONOMIC STATUS OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS

Economic status	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
<i>Size of household</i> . . . . .	6.3	8.8	10.1	7.0	7.5	10.5
1. Earners . . . . .	1.6	2.0	2.5	1.5	1.6	2.0
2. Earning dependent . . . . .	1.2	1.1	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.0
3. Dependent . . . . .	3.5	5.7	6.2	4.0	4.5	7.6
<i>As percentage of size of household</i>						
1. Earners . . . . .	25	23	25	21	21	19
2. Earning dependent . . . . .	19	12	14	22	19	9
3. Dependent . . . . .	56	65	61	57	59	72

### Average holding

About 80 per cent of the holdings in the selected villages of the Block area and about 70 per cent in the non-Block area are small; the respective average sizes are 0.9 hectares and 0.8 hectares. Moreover, those small holdings are made up of several small fragments (see table 13). Bigger holdings are also fragmented.

Table 5 summarizes the data regarding landholding and size of household for the cultivators selected for detailed investigations.

Table 5.  
AVERAGE SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD AND CULTIVATION HOLDINGS

Category	Block			Non-Block		
	Average number of persons per household	Average holding per household (hectares)	Average land per capita (hectares)	Average number of persons per household	Average holding per household (hectares)	Average land per capita (hectares)
Small	6.3	0.99	0.2	7.0	1.0	0.1
Medium	8.7	2.2	0.3	7.3	2.1	0.3
Large . . . . .	10.1	4.5	0.4	10.5	6.1	0.6

### Statistical data

The following tables summarize the basic statistical data.

Table 6.  
POPULATION AND NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS

<i>Block</i>			<i>Non-Block</i>		
<i>Name of village</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>No. of households</i>	<i>Name of village</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>No. of households</i>
Hajipur	901	166	Haibatpur Bati . . . . .	1,304	219
Bibipur . . . . .	857	145	Newada Bopalpur . . . . .	816	163
Barauli Rasoolpur . . . . .	572	79	Ahiroopur . . . . .	523	86
Makhmelpur . . . . .	572	122	Kunwarpurwa . . . . .	690	126
Kalafanpur . . . . .	436	90	Hasanpur . . . . .	394	65
Darybad . . . . .	375	61	Chauhanpur . . . . .	344	57
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>110</b>		<b>678</b>	<b>119</b>

Table 7.  
PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION OF THE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS

<i>Principal occupation</i>	<i>Block</i>	<i>Non-Block</i>
	— Percentage —	
Cultivation . . . . .	73.6	66.8
Labour . . . . .	11.2	17.7
Artisan . . . . .	3.9	1.4
Service . . . . .	7.6	6.8
Business . . . . .	2.3	2.8
Others . . . . .	1.4	4.5

Table 8.  
CULTIVATING HOUSEHOLDS BY SUBSIDIARY OCCUPATION

<i>Subsidiary occupation</i>	<i>Block</i>	<i>Non-Block</i>
	— Percentage of households —	
No subsidiary occupation . . . . .	39.9	55.2
Labour . . . . .	43.4	22.4
Artisan . . . . .	2.5	2.5
Service . . . . .	11.3	12.6
Business . . . . .	2.5	6.9
Others . . . . .	0.4	0.4

Table 9.  
AVERAGE SIZE OF HOLDING<sup>a</sup>

<i>Cultivator</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage to total</i>	<i>Average land holding (hectares)</i>	<i>Range of holdings (hectares)</i>
<i>Block</i>				
Small:				
A <sup>b</sup>	125	20.9	0.2	Up to 0.39
B <sup>c</sup>	360	60.3	0.9	0.4 — 1.6
Medium	64	10.7	2.1	1.6 — 2.8
Large	48	8	4.6	2.8 — 13.9
ALL	597	100	1.20	
<i>Non-Block</i>				
Small:				
A <sup>b</sup>	86	13.7	0.2	Up to 0.39
B <sup>c</sup>	352	56.1	0.8	0.4 — 1.6
Medium	97	15.5	2.2	1.6 — 2.8
Large	92	14.7	5.9	2.8 — 21.6
ALL	627	100	1.7	

<sup>a</sup> The cultivating households owing less than 0.4 hectare of land were not considered for sampling of the cultivating households. Almost all households having a holding below 0.4 hectares had cultivation as their subsidiary means of livelihood, and in most cases, labour was their principal occupation. As such, the small size cultivators were divided into two groups viz., (i) those having less than 0.4 hectare of land and (ii) those having land more than 0.4 hectare, but less than 1.62 hectares.

<sup>b</sup> Cultivators whose main occupation is other than agriculture and have holdings of less than 0.4 hectare each.

<sup>c</sup> Cultivators having agriculture as main occupation and having holdings between 0.40 - 1.6 hectares each.

The average size of landholdings among the selected cultivators were as follows:

<i>Cultivator</i>	<i>Average size of holding (hectares)</i>	
	<i>Block</i>	<i>Non-Block</i>
Small (0.41 to 1.62 hectares)	0.99	1.0
Medium (1.63 to 2.83 hectares)	2.2	2.1
Large (above 2.84 hectares)	4.5	6.1

Table 10.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY AGE GROUPS IN  
SELECTED HOUSEHOLDS OF CULTIVATORS

Age group (years)	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
Below 1	2.9	2.6	2.1	1.6	1.4	2.4
1 — 5	13.3	17.0	15.4	13.0	13.2	15.0
6 — 10	13.8	14.4	14.3	15.0	13.5	13.5
11 — 14	8.3	5.2	4.1	8.9	6.4	5.5
15 — 20	17.5	12.9	15.0	14.2	17.4	17.1
21 — 30	15.4	19.9	20.8	15.0	15.3	19.3
31 — 55	22.1	20.3	20.5	24.8	26.0	19.0
56 — 80	6.3	7.7	7.5	7.3	6.8	8.2
Over 80	0.4	—	0.3	—	—	—
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 11.

## SEX COMPOSITION IN SELECTED HOUSEHOLDS OF CULTIVATORS

Cultivator	Male	Female
<i>Block</i>		
Small	50.4	49.6
Medium	55.0	45.0
Large	52.2	47.8
<i>Non-Block</i>		
Small	52.9	47.2
Medium	57.9	42.1
Large	55.2	44.9



Table 12.  
POPULATION OF SELECTED VILLAGES, BY CASTE AND RELIGION

<i>Religions/Castes<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>Block Percentage</i>	<i>Non-Block Percentage</i>
<i>Hindus</i>		
Brahmin	3.6	7.1
Thakur	15.2	4.9
Ahir	19.6	21.5
Lonía	1.1	2.5
Koiri	8.8	5.5
Bhar	8.5	13.3
Tali	2.4	3.8
Kumhar	2.7	1.3
Chamar	19.9	12.7
Others <sup>b</sup>	8.3	22.5
<i>Muslims</i>	10.0	4.9
<i>Christians</i>	—	0.1
Total number of households . . .	663	716

<sup>a</sup> The castes according to their prominence are listed below:

*High:* Brahmin and Thakur.

*Medium:* Bania, Ahir, Koiri, Lonía, Lonía Kumbhar, Teli, Lohar and Thatera.

*Low:* Kalwar, Dhobi Dharkar, Dusadh, Gadaria, Bhar and Chamar.

<sup>b</sup> Others include Bania, Lohar, Dhobi, Gadaria, Kalwar, Thatera, Dharkar and Dosadh.

Table 13.  
NUMBER OF PLOTS PER HOLDING OF SELECTED CULTIVATORS

<i>Cultivator</i>	<i>Average holding per cultivator (hectares)</i>	<i>Average number of plots per cultivator</i>
<i>Block</i>		
Small	0.99	9.3
Medium	2.2	14.7
Large	4.5	20.6
<i>Non-Block</i>		
Small	1.0	8.4
Medium	2.1	15.9
Large	6.1	23.4

## Appendix 4

### SPECIAL TABLES RELATING TO THE FIELD STUDY

Table 1.  
AREA CROPPED IN SELECTED VILLAGES, 1954-1958  
(Hectares)

Crop	Block area				Non-Block area			
	1954/55	1955/56	1956/57	1957/58	1954/55	1955/56	1956/57	1957/58
<i>Autumn</i>								
Early paddy . . . . .	50.2 (100)	73.7 (147)	48.2 (96)	57.5 (115)	226.6 (100)	246.1 (109)	230.3 (102)	173.6 (77)
Late paddy . . . . .	159.0 (100)	174.4 (110)	167.5 (105)	182.1 (115)	36.4 (100)	31.6 (87)	17.0 (47)	48.2 (132)
Millets . . . . .	110.9 (100)	53.0 (48)	59.1 (53)	67.2 (61)	76.1 (100)	66.8 (88)	66.4 (87)	103.2 (136)
Sugarcane . . . . .	42.9 (100)	38.4 (90)	54.2 (126)	59.1 (135)	68.4 (100)	68.8 (101)	82.2 (120)	113.7 (166)
<i>Spring</i>								
Gojari (Wheat and barley) . . . . .	34.8 (100)	32.0 (92)	20.6 (59)	12.1 (35)	155.8 (100)	163.5 (105)	118.6 (76)	131.9 (85)
Wheat . . . . .	24.7 (100)	31.2 (126)	16.2 (66)	19.0 (77)	50.2 (100)	24.7 (49)	35.6 (71)	28.7 (57)
Barley . . . . .	81.7 (100)	75.7 (93)	87.4 (107)	121.8 (149)	141.6 (100)	182.5 (129)	89.0 (63)	128.7 (91)
Pea . . . . .	93.1 (100)	76.8 (82)	79.7 (86)	94.7 (102)	134.0 (100)	152.6 (114)	138.4 (103)	85.8 (64)

Figures in parentheses represent index numbers.

Source: Tehsil records, Ghosi, district Azamgarh.

Table 2.  
ADOPTION OF PLANT PROTECTION MEASURES  
(Number reporting and percentage in parentheses)

Item	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
Households reporting attack on paddy by Gundhi Bug or Smut during the last 3 or 4 years . . . . .	21 (63)	26 (84)	26 (93)	28 (80)	23 (64)	29 (81)
Households reporting attack on wheat by Rust or Smut . . .	24 (63)	24 (77)	19 (68)	28 (80)	31 (86)	26 (72)
Households reporting use of Gammaxinc, DDT or Agrosan G.N. . . . .	12 (32)	17 (55)	18 (64)	—	6 (17)	9 (25)
Total number of households studied . . . . .	38	31	28	35	36	36

**Table 3.**  
**USE OF IRON PLOUGH, JAPANESE METHOD OF PADDY**  
**CULTIVATION AND GREEN MANURING**  
*(Number reporting and percentage in parentheses)*

Cultural practice	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
Use of iron plough:						
Before Community Development . . . . .	—	—	1 (4)	—	—	1 (3)
Now . . . . .	—	—	6 (21)	—	1 (3)	8 (22)
Japanese method of paddy cultivation						
Now . . . . .	1 (3)	1 (3)	2 (3)	—	—	—
Use of green manure:						
Before Community Development . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—
Now . . . . .	—	2 (6)	6 (21)	—	—	1 (3)

*Note:* Japanese method of paddy cultivation was introduced after initiation of community development programme.

**Table 4.**  
**USE OF ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION CENTRE AND**  
**VETERINARY SERVICES BY CULTIVATORS**  
*(In past 3 years)*  
*(Number reporting and percentage in parentheses)*

Household reporting	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
Use of artificial insemination . . . . .	6 (16)	6 (19)	10 (36)	—	—	—
Inoculation of cattle against diseases . . . . .	34 (89)	29 (94)	27 (96)	28 (80)	32 (89)	34 (94)
Treatment of cattle by veterinarians . . . . .	3 (8)	4 (13)	9 (32)	2 (6)	3 (8)	7 (19)
Castration of calves by trained persons . . . . .	3 (8)	9 (29)	4 (14)	—	—	—

**Table 5.**  
**SERVICES RENDERED BY VILLAGE LEVEL WORKERS**  
*(Multiple response)*  
*(Number reporting and percentage in parentheses)*

Services	Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large
Helped in getting			
(i) seeds and fertilizers	7 (18)	8 (26)	16 (57)
(ii) loans and taqavi	4 (11)	3 (10)	4 (14)
(iii) grants-in-aid	—	1 (3)	1 (4)
(iv) bricks	—	—	1 (4)
Advised regarding agricultural practices .	3 (8)	5 (16)	4 (14)
Plant protection measures	2 (5)	3 (10)	2 (7)
Treatment of cattle	—	1 (3)	—
Vaccination	—	1 (3)	—
Society membership enrolled .	1 (3)	—	—
No direct service .	21 (55)	15 (48)	10 (36)
Total number of respondents . . . . .	38	31	28

**Table 6.**  
**AREA COMMANDED BY IRRIGATION IN SELECTED VILLAGES**  
*(Hectares)*

Source of irrigation	Block village				Non-Block village			
	1954/55	1955/56	1956/57	1957/58	1954/55	1955/56	1956/57	1957/58
(a) <i>Tubewell</i>								
Actual area . . .	—	—	4.9	—	—	—	—	—
Percentage . . .	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—
(b) <i>Wells</i>								
Actual area . . .	204.3	159.4	174.8	169.6	130.3	49.0	23.1	23.1
Percentage . . .	49	50	58	55	46	55	11	10
(c) <i>Tanks</i>								
Actual area . . .	79.7	152.2	66.0	134.0	93.9	35.2	185.3	205.6
Percentage . . .	19	48	22	43	33	40	87	88
(d) <i>Other sources</i>								
Actual area . . .	136.0	8.1	53.0	6.9	61.5	4.1	4.5	4.5
Percentage . . .	32	2	18	2	22	5	2	2
<i>Total, (a) to (d)</i>	420.0	319.7	298.7	310.4	285.7	88.2	212.9	233.1

Source: Tehsil records, Ghosi, District Azamgarh.

Table 7.  
LOANS TAKEN FOR VARIOUS PURPOSES  
(Percentages)

Item	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
<i>1957/58</i>						
Investment in agriculture . . .	45	35	34	29	18	17
Subsistence . . . . .	31	40	38	59	50	48
Non-productive purposes . . .	23	25	27	12	32	31
Repayment of old loans . . .	1	—	1	—	—	4

Table 8.  
LOANS TAKEN FROM VARIOUS SOURCES BY SELECTED CULTIVATORS  
(Percentages)

Source	Block			Non-Block		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
<i>1957/58</i>						
Co-operatives . . . . .	12	24	21	11	18	16
Government . . . . .	2	1	2	1	—	1
Money-lender . . . . .	74	55	50	73	77	64
Relatives . . . . .	4	16	9	—	3	2
Others . . . . .	8	4	18	15	2	17

Table 9.  
THE POSITION OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES IN SELECTED VILLAGES

Item	Block				Non-Block			
	1955/56	1956/57	1957/58	1958/59	1955/56	1956/57	1957/58	1958/59
Number of societies . . . . .	2	2	2	3	3	3	5	5
Membership . . . . .	87	95	100	124	73	126	210	237
Share capital . . . . .	1,743	2,048	2,272	2,834	863	2,084	3,518	4,752
Deposits . . . . .	—	—	8	2	—	1	10	17
Loan advanced to members . . . . .	1,620	3,653	8,046	5,035	1,800	8,120	11,570	21,930
Recovery of loan . . . . .	1,415	2,927	4,960	6,631	—	1,925	9,178	16,184
Loans outstanding with members . . . . .	2,305	3,531	6,723	1,100 <sup>a</sup>	2,376	8,671	11,063	16,808
Loan overdue . . . . .	297	57	973	92	576	576	472	31
Reserve fund . . . . .	341	341	341	341	—	—	—	—
Other funds . . . . .	106	107	107	107	—	—	—	—
Loan received from bank . . . . .	1,620	3,653	8,046	5,035	1,800	8,120	11,570	21,940
Loans (bank) overdue . . . . .	—	—	—	259	698	698	698	—
Own capital . . . . .	2,191	2,497	2,720	3,283	863	2,084	3,518	4,752
Working capital . . . . .	3,696	4,702	8,379	8,418	3,345	10,559	14,856	21,354
Share in Bank . . . . .	799	886	1,051	1,944	705	1,812	2,850	3,935

Note: Excepting number of societies and membership, the other figures give the amount in rupees.

<sup>a</sup> Figure for one society not available.

Table 10.  
THE GENERAL POSITION OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES  
(Block and Non-Block areas)

Item	Ghosi Block			Non-Block area		
	1956/57	1957/58	1958/59	1956/57	1957/58	1958/59
Number of societies . . . . .	106	79	86	86	97	102
Membership . . . . .	5,781	4,310	4,252	3,618	3,937	4,234
Share capital . . . . .	93,077	80,328	86,541	44,617	58,221	69,169
Loans advanced to members . . . . .	208,647	131,208	106,029	79,824	102,179	184,792
Loans overdue . . . . .	83,008	82,969	89,785	25,613	30,607	27,314
Loans received from bank . . . . .	181,120	112,263	86,760	68,673	97,580	182,132
Loans (bank) overdue . . . . .	40,099	27,446	23,188	20,126	19,921	10,082

Note: Excepting of societies and membership, the other figures give the amount in rupees.

Table 11.  
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PER HOUSEHOLD  
(In rupees)

Asset	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
<i>1955/56</i>						
<i>Agricultural assets</i>						
Land . . . . .	17.9	49.3	—	—	3.5	170.3
Livestock . . . . .	37.3	52.6	122.1	43.6	43.1	46.3
Implements . . . . .	1.7	0.5	28.7	0.3	5.5	34.7
Reclamation of land etc. . . . .	5.2	1.7	3.1	0.2	0.1	7.2
Other agricultural assets . . . . .	6.9	—	—	—	—	—
TOTAL	69.0	104.1	153.9	44.1	52.2	258.5
<i>Non-agricultural assets</i> . . . . .	11.1	41.2	50.8	14.9	15.0	24.5
GRAND TOTAL	80.1	145.3	204.7	59.0	67.2	283.0
<i>1956/57</i>						
<i>Agricultural assets</i>						
Land . . . . .	—	—	—	2.9	4.5	20.1
Livestock . . . . .	26.8	54.9	95.9	77.9	53.3	92.8
Implements . . . . .	0.8	12.9	29.3	0.4	0.9	13.6
Reclamation of land etc. . . . .	0.7	17.8	10.9	0.1	0.3	—
Other agricultural assets . . . . .	—	—	1.4	1.5	0.5	—
TOTAL	28.3	85.6	137.5	82.8	59.5	126.5
<i>Non-agricultural assets</i> . . . . .	17.1	52.6	125.0	11.3	6.6	20.4
GRAND TOTAL	45.4	138.2	262.5	94.1	66.1	146.9
<i>1957/58</i>						
<i>Agricultural assets</i>						
Land . . . . .	—	0.7	33.9	—	44.4	10.4
Livestock . . . . .	29.8	79.4	121.2	88.7	99.6	153.5
Implements . . . . .	1.2	5.6	22.7	0.7	10.9	6.9
Reclamation of land etc. . . . .	2.9	3.9	10.7	0.2	3.5	0.5
Other agricultural assets . . . . .	—	—	—	0.5	—	—
TOTAL	33.9	89.6	188.5	90.1	158.4	171.3
<i>Non-agricultural assets</i> . . . . .	8.1	17.8	56.6	8.7	14.8	36.2
GRAND TOTAL	42.0	107.4	245.1	98.8	173.2	207.5

Note: The main items under non-agricultural assets are repair and construction of residential buildings, bicycles and other business assets.

**Table 12.**  
**NON-MONETARY CAPITAL FORMATION PER HOUSEHOLD**  
*(In rupees)*

<i>Item</i>	<i>Block cultivators</i>			<i>Non-Block cultivators</i>		
	<i>Small</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Large</i>	<i>Small</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Large</i>
<i>1955/56</i>						
Agriculture . . .	1.8	2.1	2.9	0.6	—	8.9
Non-agriculture . . .	9.7	15.5	20.7	4.8	5.6	11.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>23.6</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>20.4</b>
<i>1956/57</i>						
Agriculture . . .	0.8	4.2	1.6	0.8	0.1	0.7
Non-agriculture . . .	18.9	61.7	27.2	9.7	12.0	9.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>19.7</b>	<b>65.9</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>9.7</b>
<i>1957/58</i>						
Agriculture . . .	0.2	1.1	8.0	0.8	0.4	1.5
Non-agriculture . . .	12.0	7.2	16.2	4.3	3.4	10.4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12.2</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>24.2</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>11.9</b>

**Table 13.**  
**CAPITAL FORMATION IN AGRICULTURE, MONETARY AND NON-MONETARY**  
*(Excluding land and livestock)*  
*(In rupees)*

<i>Item</i>	<i>Block cultivators</i>			<i>Non-Block cultivators</i>		
	<i>Small</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Large</i>	<i>Small</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Large</i>
<i>1955/56</i>						
Monetary . . .	13.8	2.2	31.8	0.5	5.6	41.9
Non-monetary . . .	1.8	2.1	2.9	0.6	—	8.9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15.6</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>34.7</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>50.8</b>
<i>1956/57</i>						
Monetary . . .	1.5	30.7	41.6	2.0	1.7	13.6
Non-monetary . . .	0.8	4.2	1.6	0.8	0.1	0.7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>34.9</b>	<b>43.2</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>14.3</b>
<i>1957/58</i>						
Monetary . . .	4.1	9.5	33.4	11.4	14.4	7.4
Non-monetary . . .	0.2	1.1	8.0	0.8	0.4	1.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>41.4</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>14.8</b>	<b>8.9</b>

Table 14.  
DISPOSAL OF AGRICULTURAL ASSETS PER HOUSEHOLD  
(Excluding Livestock)

(In rupees)

Asset	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
<b>1955/56</b>						
Land . . . . .	—	4.8	64.3	5.7	0.6	22.8
Implements . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other agricultural assets . . . . .	—	—	0.1	—	—	0.3
TOTAL	—	4.8	64.4	5.7	0.6	23.1
<b>1956/57</b>						
Land . . . . .	0.6	—	35.7	13.4	3.3	18.5
Implements . . . . .	0.1	0.1	0.2	—	—	3.1
Other agricultural assets . . . . .	—	—	28.6	—	—	0.7
TOTAL	0.7	0.1	64.5	13.4	3.3	22.3
<b>1957/58</b>						
Land . . . . .	13.8	—	28.6	1.4	8.6	2.5
Implements . . . . .	0.1	0.1	3.4	—	4.4	0.9
Other agricultural assets . . . . .	3.9	—	—	—	—	—
TOTAL	17.8	0.1	31.0	1.4	13.0	3.4

Table 15.  
OVER-ALL NET CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PER HOUSEHOLD  
(Excluding acquisition and disposal of livestock and land)

(In rupees)

Expenditure	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
<b>1955/56</b>						
Agriculture . . . . .	13.8	2.1	31.7	0.5	5.6	41.6
Non-agriculture . . . . .	3.7	21.1	9.3	13.2	6.7	11.3
TOTAL	17.5	23.2	41.0	13.7	12.3	52.9
<b>1956/57</b>						
Agriculture . . . . .	1.40	30.6	12.8	1.9	1.6	9.8
Non-agriculture . . . . .	0.1	28.7	77.8	9.7	0.5	18.7
TOTAL	1.5	59.3	90.6	11.6	2.1	28.5
<b>1957/58</b>						
Agriculture . . . . .	0.1	9.4	30.0	1.4	10.0	6.5
Non-agriculture . . . . .	3.8	1.7	47.7	6.3	13.7	25.8
TOTAL	3.9	11.1	77.1	7.7	23.7	32.3



**Table 16.**  
**PROGRESS OF COMMUNITY WORKS IN THE BLOCK, 1954-1958**

*(In rupees)*

<i>Item of work</i>	1954/55	1955/56	1956/57	1957/58
Rural latrines constructed (No.)	42	93	8	95
Pucca drains constructed (m)	1,719	390	810	547
Lane paved (m)	—	3,000	224	1,070
Soakage pits (No.)	2	883	604	1,222
New drinking water wells (No.)	231	78	16	16
Repairing of water wells (No.)	276	41	109	92
New kachcha road (km)	64.2	91.1	0.2	4.6
Repairing of kachcha road (km)	25.7	5.9	56.1	104.2
New pucca road (km)	3.8	16.1	—	—
Repairing of pucca road (km)	—	14.3	1.6	—
Co-operative societies organized (Nos.)	a	64	48	2
Members enrolled in co-operative societies (No.)		b	4,031	550
Youth clubs organized (No.)			5	8
Members enrolled in youth club (No.)				169
Village leaders trained	—	—	c	91
Number of meetings held of Block Advisory Committee (No.)			d	10
Construction of culverts (No.)			e	17
Panchayatghar, community centres and school buildings (No.)		11	4	6

*Source:* Block records.

*Note:* The years cover the period April to March.

<sup>a</sup> Progress up to March 1955 — 134 Nos.

<sup>b</sup> Progress up to March 1956 — 5219 Nos.

<sup>c</sup> Progress up to March 1957 — 1378 Nos.

<sup>d</sup> Progress up to March 1957 — 33 Nos.

<sup>e</sup> Progress up to March 1957 — 95 Nos.

Table 17.  
EXPENDITURE ON DIFFERENT NON-FOOD ITEMS, 1957/58  
(Actual expenditure with percentages in parentheses)  
(In rupees)

Item	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
Tobacco . . . . .	12.2 (11)	13.1 (6)	16.9 (4)	13.8 (13)	15.8 (7)	20.6 (4)
Clothing . . . . .	30.7 (26)	60.8 (27)	125.3 (26)	34.4 (32)	53.6 (24)	88.7 (16)
Footwear . . . . .	1.3 (1)	3.2 (1)	7.2 (2)	1.5 (1)	3.0 (1)	11.0 (2)
Social and religious ceremonies . .	25.3 (22)	26.5 (12)	97.4 (20)	25.0 (23)	57.6 (26)	129.4 (23)
Ornaments . . . . .	5.6 (4)	18.5 (8)	14.3 (3)	1.4 (1)	1.2 (6)	38.7 (7)
Litigation . . . . .	1.0 (1)	22.9 (10)	46.4 (10)	0.3 (0.2)	20.3 (9)	79.2 (14)
Medicines . . . . .	13.2 (11)	14.9 (6)	35.9 (7)	1.5 (1)	5.1 (2)	40.0 (7)
Annual house repair . . . . .	5.4 (5)	16.9 (8)	23.4 (5)	6.2 (6)	8.5 (4)	10.9 (2)
Transport . . . . .	2.6 (2)	5.4 (2)	12.7 (3)	2.6 (2)	5.8 (3)	17.8 (3)
Recreation . . . . .	0.2 (0.2)	0.1 (0.1)	1.1 (3)	0.4 (0.3)	0.3 (0.1)	4.0 (0.7)
Service (wages and customary payments) . . . . .	18.5 (16)	41.7 (18)	99.2 (21)	22.3 (20)	50.8 (22)	124.2 (22)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>116.0</b>	<b>224.0</b>	<b>479.8</b>	<b>109.6</b>	<b>221.6</b>	<b>564.6</b>

Table 18.  
AVERAGE EXPENDITURE PER PARTICIPATING HOUSEHOLDS  
ON SOCIAL CEREMONIES

(In rupees)

Item	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
<i>Births</i>						
Current year . . . . .	4.4	16.0	28.9	10.0	14.0	14.3
Previous two years . . . . .	14.2	19.4	46.4	7.8	22.5	27.0
<i>Marriage</i>						
Current year . . . . .	88.6	159.2	306.7	62.0	255.5	304.9
Previous two years . . . . .	216.4	161.1	482.7	193.1	286.1	1,426.0
<i>Death</i>						
Current year . . . . .	60.0	53.3	46.2	53.3	35.0	50.6
Previous two years . . . . .	41.7	69.5	142.9	105.0	108.0	130.0
<i>Religious and others</i>						
Current year . . . . .	25.2	8.0	35.4	4.6	8.5	24.2
Previous two years . . . . .	9.1	14.4	19.5	42.7	19.6	47.6

Current year = 1957/58

Previous two years = 1955/56 and 1956/57

Table 19.  
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS POSSESSING  
UTENSILS, COTS AND OTHER MATERIALS  
(Percentages are in parentheses)

Article	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
Cooking utensils:						
Up to 2 . . . . .	1 (3)	2 (6)	—	3 (9)	—	—
3-6 . . . . .	17 (45)	4 (13)	—	14 (40)	7 (19)	5 (14)
7-10 . . . . .	12 (32)	9 (29)	1 (4)	15 (43)	17 (47)	4 (11)
Above 10 . . . . .	8 (21)	16 (52)	27 (96)	3 (9)	12 (33)	27 (75)
Cots:						
Up to 2 . . . . .	13 (34)	3 (10)	—	10 (29)	1 (3)	—
3-5 . . . . .	20 (53)	16 (52)	4 (14)	22 (63)	21 (58)	12 (33)
6-8 . . . . .	5 (13)	9 (29)	10 (36)	3 (9)	10 (28)	12 (33)
Above 8 . . . . .	—	3 (10)	14 (50)	—	4 (11)	12 (33)
Wooden box . . . . .	17 (45)	15 (48)	23 (82)	13 (37)	22 (61)	31 (86)
Steel box . . . . .	17 (45)	22 (71)	24 (86)	23 (66)	25 (69)	32 (89)
Hurricane lamp . . . . .	16 (42)	18 (58)	26 (93)	9 (26)	25 (69)	24 (67)
Others . . . . .	1 (3)	2 (6)	18 (64)	1 (3)	4 (11)	11 (31)
Gramophone . . . . .	—	—	2 (7)	—	—	2 (6)
Bicycle . . . . .	1 (3)	1 (3)	7 (25)	—	2 (6)	5 (14)

Table 20.  
LITERACY, CLASS OF CULTIVATORS AND SEX  
(Percentages)

Area	Class of cultivators	Percentage of literate among		
		Males	Females	Both sexes
BLOCK	Small	36.8	2.0	19.1
	Medium	28.7	4.3	23.9
	Large	55.7	27.1	41.7
NON-BLOCK	Small	20.7	1.0	11.4
	Medium	25.5	2.7	15.3
	Large	46.2	15.0	32.3

Table 21.  
IMPORTANT WAYS OF IMPROVING SOCIAL STATUS  
(Percentages of cultivators reporting)

Way	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
Increase in income . . . . .	58	32	31	51	31	42
Increase in landholding . . . . .	10	10	4	20	31	8
Construction of bigger pucca house . . . . .	—	—	—	—	8	—
Educating children . . . . .	5	16	18	3	11	17
More expenditure on dress and jewellery . . . . .	—	3	—	—	6	—
More expenditure on social ceremonies . . . . .	—	3	—	6	—	3
More expenditure on ceremonial feasts . . . . .	3	—	—	—	—	—
Offering hospitality . . . . .	13	26	22	3	2	19
Others . . . . .	11	10	25	17	11	11

Table 22.  
ATTEMPTS MADE TO INCREASE INCOME DURING THE PAST 3 OR 4 YEARS

Attempts	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
	Percentages					
Made . . . . .	71	97	86	17	31	58
Not made . . . . .	29	3	14	83	69	42
Total number of respondents . . . . .	38	31	28	35	36	36

Table 23.  
ATTENDANCE AT CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY MEETINGS  
(Number reporting and percentage in parentheses)

Members attendance	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
Attend regularly . . . . .	4 (57)	4 (50)	6 (50)	2 (40)	5 (33)	7 (37)
Not attend regularly . . . . .	3 (43)	4 (50)	6 (50)	3 (60)	10 (67)	12 (63)
Total number of respondents . . . . .	7	9	12	5	15	19

Table 24.  
RECRUITMENT OF NEW MEMBERS IN CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY  
(Number reporting and percentage in parentheses)

Recruitment	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
Tried to recruit . . . . .	1 (14)	5 (63)	7 (58)	—	8 (53)	7 (37)
Not tried to recruit . . . . .	6 (86)	3 (38)	5 (42)	5 (100)	7 (47)	12 (63)
Total number reporting . . . . .	7	8	12	5	15	9

Table 25.  
LEADERSHIP CASES CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CASTE  
(Multiple responses)  
(Number of responses and percentage in parentheses)

Category of castes	Block	Non-Block
Higher	53 (22)	91 (33)
Intermediate	178 (74)	172 (63)
Lower	10 (4)	9 (3)
Total number of leadership cases cited	241	272

Table 26.  
LEADERSHIP AND SOME SOCIAL VIRTUES  
(Multiple responses)

(Percentages)

Criterion	Block cultivators			Non-Block cultivators		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
A . . . . .	14	7	10	14	23	11
B . . . . .	31	46	41	18	26	20
C . . . . .	37	44	44	33	33	41
D . . . . .	17	7	8	2	1	2
Total number of leadership cases cited . . . . .	100	68	73	90	91	91

A — Rich, money-lender, and big cultivator.

B — Honest, Just, Old, Wise, Good, and Doctor.

C — Educated, Enlightened, Helpful, Well wisher.

D — Pradhan (headman), Members of Panchayat, Co-operative Society.

# WHERE TO BUY UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS AND THE PUBLICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

## AFRICA

**CAMEROON:**  
LIBRAIRIE DU PEUPLE AFRICAIN  
Léonine, P. O. 1137, Yaoundé.  
DIFFUSION INTERNATIONALE CAMEROUNAISE  
DU LIVRE ET DE LA PRESSE, Sangmelime.

**CONGO (Léopoldville):**  
INSTITUT POLITIQUE CONGOLAIS  
P. O. 2307, Léopoldville.

**ETHIOPIA:** INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHING AGENCY  
P. O. Box 120, Addis Ababa.

**GHANA:** UNIVERSITY BOOKSHOP  
Le Jersey College of Ghana, Legon, Accra.

**KENYA:** THE E.S.A. BOOKSHOP, Box 30167, Nairobi.  
P. O. Box 70, Istiklal Street, Benghazi.

**GHANCO:** ALEX BELLES IMAGES  
2 Avenue Mohammed V, Rabat.

**GHANA:** UNIVERSITY BOOKSHOP (NIGERIA) LTD.  
University College, Ibadan.

**NORTHERN RHODESIA:**  
J. BELDING, P. O. Box 750, Mutulwa.

**NYASALAND:** BOOKERS (NYASALAND) LTD.  
Lombia House, P. O. Box 24, Blantyre.

**SOUTH AFRICA:**  
WAN SCHAIK'S BOOKSTORE (PTY) LTD.  
Church Street, Box 724, Pretoria.

**TECHNICAL BOOKS (PTY) LTD., Fareway House,  
P. O. Box 2866, 40 St. George's Street, Cape Town.**

**SOUTHERN RHODESIA:**  
THE BOOK CENTRE, First Street, Salisbury.

**TANZANIA:** DAR ES SALAAM BOOKSELLERS  
P.O. Box 5850, Dar es Salaam.

**UGANDA:** UGANDA BOOKSHOP, P. O. Box 145, Kampala.

**UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC:**  
LIBRAIRIE "LA RENAISSANCE D'EGYPTE"  
9 St. July Parks, Cairo.

**AL NAHDA EL ARABIA BOOKSHOP  
32 Abd-el-Khalek Sarwat St., Cairo.**

## ASIA

**BURMA:** CURATOR, GOVT. BOOK DEPOT, Rangoon.

**CAMBODIA:** ENTREPRISE KHMERE DE LIBRAIRIE  
Imprimerie & Papeterie Sati, Phnom-Penh.

**CEYLON:** LAKE HOUSE BOOKSHOP  
Assoc. Newspapers of Ceylon, P. O. Box 244, Colombo.

**CHINA:**  
THE WORLD BOOK COMPANY, LTD.  
99 Chung King Road, 1st Section, Taipei, Taiwan.

**THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LTD.,  
361 Mohan Road, Singapore.**

**HONG KONG:** THE SWINSON BOOK COMPANY  
25 Nathan Road, Kowloon.

**INDIA:**  
ORIENT LONGMANS  
Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, New Delhi, Hyderabad,  
OXFORD BOOK & STATIONERY COMPANY  
New Delhi and Calcutta.

**INDONESIA:**  
PEMBANGUNAN, LTD., Gunung Sahari B4, Jakarta.

**JAPAN:** MARUZEN COMPANY, LTD.  
6 Tenjichome, Nishi-Kojiki, Tokyo.

**KOREA, REPUBLIC OF:**  
LULYOO PUBLISHING CO., LTD., S. 2-RA, Chongno, Seoul.

**PAKISTAN:**  
THE PAKISTAN CO-OPERATIVE BOOK SOCIETY  
Dacca, East Pakistan.  
PUBLISHERS, H. J. LTD., Lahore.

**TKOMAS & CO., Karachi.**

**PHILIPPINES:**  
PHILIPPINE EDUCATION COMPANY, INC.  
1104 Castilleja, P. O. Box 200, Quezon, Manila.  
POPULAR BOOKSTORE, 1573 Doroteo Jose, Manila.

**SINGAPORE:**  
THE CITY BOOK STORE, LTD., Collyer Quay.

**THAILAND:**  
PRAMUAN MIT, LTD.  
55 Chakrawan Road, Wat Tuk, Bangkok.

**RIKOBOND & CO., LTD.,  
Rene Road, Sibay S'raya Str., Bangkok.**

**SUKSAPAN PANIT,  
Mansion 9, Rajadindran Avenue, Bangkok.**

**VIENTIANE, REPUBLIC OF:**  
LIBRAIRIE PAPETERIE XIEN THU  
185, rue Tuon, P. O. 283, Saisan.

## EUROPE

**AUSTRIA:**  
GEROLD & COMPANY, Graben 31, Wien I.  
GEORG FROMME & CO., Spengergasse 39, Wien, V.

**BELGIUM:**  
AGENCE ET MESSAGERIES DE LA PRESSE, S. A.  
14-22, rue du Fossil, Bruxelles.

**BULGARIA:**  
RZAZOTNOS, I. Tzar Assan, Sofia.

**CYPRUS:** PAN PUBLISHING HOUSE,  
10 Alexander the Great Street, Strovolos.

**CZECHOSLOVAKIA:**  
ARTIA LTD., 30 va Smolach, Praha, 2.

**DENMARK:** LINAR MUNKSGAARD, LTD.  
Nørregade 6, København, K.

**FINLAND:** AKATEMIEN KIRJAKAUPPA  
2 Kesäkatu, Helsinki.

**FRANCE:** EDITIONS A. FEDOHE  
13, rue Soufflot, Paris (V).

**GERMANY, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF:**  
R. EISENSCHMIDT  
Schwanthaler Str. 59, Frankfurt/Main.

**ELWERT UND MEULNER  
Hauptstrasse 101, Berlin-Schöneberg.**

**ALEXANDER HORN, Spiegelsasse 9, Wiesbaden.**

**W. E. SAARBACH, Gertrudenstrasse 30, Köln (1).**

**GREECE:** KAUFFMANN BOOKSHOP  
25 Station Street, Athens.

**HUNGARY:** KULTURA, P. O. Box 149, Budapest 62.

**ICELAND:** BOKAVERZUN SIGFUSAR  
EMUNDSSONAR H. F., Austurstræti 10, Reykjavik.

**IRELAND:** STATIONERY OFFICE, Dublin.

**ITALY:** LIBRERIA COMMISSIONARIA SANSONI  
Via Gina Capponi 26, Firenze.

**and Via Paolo Mercuri 19/B, Roma.**

**AGENZIA E.L.O.U., Via Maravigli 10, Milano.**

**LUXEMBOURG:**  
LIBRAIRIE J. TRAUSSCHUMMER  
Place du Théâtre, Luxembourg.

**NETHERLANDS:** N. V. MARTIUS NIJHOFF  
Langs Voorhout 9, 's-Gravenhage.

**NORWAY:** JOHAN GRUNDT TANUM  
Kar Johansgate, 43, Oslo.

**POLAND:** PAN, Pałac Kultury i Nauki, Warszawa.

**PORTUGAL:** LIVRARIA RODRIGUES Y CIA,  
188 Rua Aurea, Lisboa.

**ROMANIA:** CARTIMEX, Str. Aristide Brând 14-18,  
P. O. Box 134-135, Bucuresti.

**SPAIN:** AGUILAR S. DE EDICIONES  
Juan Bravo 38, Madrid 6.

**LIBRERIA BOSCH  
Ronda Universitat 11, Barcelona.**

**LIBRERIA MUNDI-PRENSA, Castald 37, Madrid.**

**SWEDEN:**  
O. E. FRITZES RINGL, HÖVBOKHANDL A B  
Fredsgatan 2, Stockholm.

**SWITZERLAND:**  
LIBRAIRIE PAYOT, S. A., Lausanne, Genève.  
HANS RAUHARDT, Kutschgasse 17, Zurich 1.

**TURKEY:** LIBRAIRIE HACHETTE  
469 Istiklal Caddesi, Beyoğlu, Istanbul.

**UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS:**  
MEZHHDUNARODNAYA KNIGA  
Smolenskaya Plotschad, Moskva.

**UNITED KINGDOM:**  
H. M. STATIONERY OFFICE, P. O. Box 569, London, S.E. 1  
(and H.M.S.O. branches in Belfast, Birmingham,  
Bristol, Cardiff, Edinburgh, Manchester).

**YUGOSLAVIA:**  
KANJARJEVA ZALOZJA, Lutjuna, Slovenia.

**IZDAVNO PREDIZEE  
Jugoslavenska KNJIGA, Terazije 27/13, Beograd.**

**PROVETA S. S. Trg Brestova i Jedinstva, Zagreb.**

**PROVETA PUBLISHING HOUSE  
Import Export Division, P. O. Box 559,  
Terazije 16/1, Beograd.**

## LATIN AMERICA

**ARGENTINA:** EDITORIAL SUDAMERICANA, S. A.  
Alicia 500, Buenos Aires.

**BOLIVIA:** LIBRERIA SELECCIONES, Casilla 972, La Paz.

**LOS AMIGOS DEL LIBRO  
Calle Perú 502, España, Casilla 450, Cochabamba.**

**BRAZIL:**  
LIVRARIA AGIR  
Rua Mexico 98 B, Caixa Postal 3299, Rio de Janeiro.

**LIVRARIA FREITAS BASTOS, S. A.  
Caixa Postal 899, Rio de Janeiro.**

**LIVRARIA KOSMOS EDITORA  
Rua Rosario 135/137, Rio de Janeiro.**

**CHILE:**  
EDITORIAL DEL PACIFICO, Ahumada 57, Santiago.

**LIBRERIA IVENS, Casilla 205, Santiago.**

**COLUMBIA:**  
LIBRERIA AMERICA, Calle 51 Núm. 49-58, Medellín.

**LIBRERIA BUCHHOLZ, Av. Jiménez de Quesada 8-40, Bogotá.**

**COSTA RICA:** IMPRENTA Y LIBRERIA TRESDES  
Apartado 131, San José.

**CUBA:** CUBARTIMEX, Apartado Postal 65-40, La Habana.

**DOMINICAN REPUBLIC:** LIBRERIA DOMINICANA  
Mercedes 49, Santo Domingo.

**ECUADOR:**  
LIBRERIA CENTIFICA, Casilla 362, Guayaquil.

**LIBRERIA UNIVERSITARIA, Calle García Moreno 739, Quito.**

**EL SALVADOR:**  
LIBRERIA CULTURAL SALVADOREÑA  
2a. Av. Sur, San Salvador.

**MANUEL NAVAS Y CIA.  
1a. Avenida Sur 37, San Salvador.**

**GUATEMALA:**  
LIBRERIA CERVANTES 28 Av. 9-39, Zona 1, Guatemala.

**SOCIEDAD ECONOMICA FINANCIERA  
6a. Av. 14-33, Guatemala.**

**HAITI:** LIBRAIRIE "A LA CARAVELLE", Port-au-Prince.

**HONDURAS:** LIBRERIA PANAMERICANA, Tegucigalpa.

**MEXICO:** EDITORIAL HERMES S. A.  
Ignacio Mariscal 41, México, D. F.

**PANAMA:** JOSE MENENDEZ  
Agencia Internacional de Publicaciones.  
Apartado 2052, Av. BA Sur 21-58, Panamá.

**PARAGUAY:**  
AGENCIA DE LIBRERIAS DE SALVADOR NIZZA  
Calle Pte. Franco No. 39-43, Asunción.

**PERU:**  
LIBRERIA INTERNACIONAL DEL PERU, S. A.  
Casilla 1417, Lima.

**LIBRERIA ESTUDIOS S.A.  
Almirante 939, Apartado 2139, Lima.**

**URUGUAY:** LIBRERIA RAFAEL BARRETT  
Ramón Amador 4030, Montevideo.

**REPRESENTACION DE EDITORIALES,  
PROF. H. DELIA  
Piedra Capataz 1342, 1° piso, Montevideo.**

**VENEZUELA:** LIBRERIA DEL LESTE  
Av. Miranda, No. 52, Edif. Galipán, Caracas.

## MIDDLE EAST

**IRAN:** MEHR AYIN BOOKSHOP  
Abbas Abad Avenue, Isfahan.

**IRAQ:** MACKENZIE'S BOOKSHOP, Baghdad.

**ISRAEL:** BLUMSTEIN'S BOOKSTORES  
35 Albany Rd. and 48 Nachlat Beniamin St., Tel Aviv.

**JORDAN:** JOSEPH I. BAKHUS & CO.  
Dar-ul-Kutub, Box 66, Amman.

**LEBANON:** KHAYAT'S COLLEGE BOOK COOPERATIVE,  
92-94, rue Bliss, Beirut.

## NORTH AMERICA

**CANADA:**  
THE QUEEN'S PRINTER/L'IMPRIMERIE DE LA REINE  
Ottawa, Ontario.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:**  
SALES SECTION, UNITED NATIONS, New York.

**Puerto Rico:**  
PAN AMERICAN BOOK CO., P. O. Box 3511, San Juan 17.  
BOOKSTORE, UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO, Rio Piedras.

## OCEANIA

**AUSTRALIA:**  
U. N. ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA  
McEwan House, 343 Little Collins St., Melbourne C1, Vic.

**WEA BOOKROOM, University, Adelaide, S.A.**

**UNIVERSITY BOOKSHOP, St. Lucia, Brisbane, Qld.**

**THE EDUCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL BOOK AGENCY  
Franklin Shopping Centre, Darwin, N.T.**

**COLLINS BOOK DEPOT PTY. LTD.  
Moonah University, Wellington Road, Clayton, Vic.**

**COLLINS BOOK DEPOT PTY. LTD.  
363 Swanston Street, Melbourne, Vic.**

**THE UNIVERSITY BOOKSHOP, Newcastle, N.S.W.**

**UNIVERSITY BOOKROOM,  
University of Melbourne, Parkville N.2, Vic.**

**UNIVERSITY CO-OPERATIVE BOOKSHOP LIMITED  
Manning Road, University of Sydney, N.S.W.**

**NEW ZEALAND:**  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
Private Bag, Wellington (and Government Bookshops in  
Auckland, Christchurch and Dunedin).

## WEST INDIES

**BERMUDA:** BERMUHA BOOK STORES  
Red and Burnaby Streets, Hamilton.

**BRITISH GUIANA:** BOOKERS STORES, LTD.  
20-23 Church Street, Georgetown.

**CURACAO, N.W.I.:**  
BOLTADELS SALAS, P. O. Box 48.

**JAMAICA:** SANGSTERS BOOK ROOM  
91 Harbour Street, Kingston.

**TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO:**  
CAMPELL, Port-of-Spain.

United Nations publications may be purchased or ordered from booksellers throughout the world and from United Nations, Sales Section, New York, N. Y. 10017, or to United Nations, Sales Section

Printed in Hong Kong—27795—December 1960—3,600

Reprinted in U.N.—27647—December 1964—650

E/CN.11/541

Price: \$U.S. 1.00

(or equivalent in other currency)



Library IAS, Shimla

309 25 Ec 74 C; 1

