CHAPTER-I
SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT:
A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

1.1. INTRODUCTION:
The present study is a modest attempt to measure the level of social development of a Muslim community called ‘Surjapuri’. Social development is a process of enlarging people’s choices. The most critical of these wide ranging choices are to live a long and healthy life, to be educated, and to have access to resources needed for a decent standard of living. Additional choices include political freedom, guaranteed human rights, and personal self-respect. Development enables people to have these choices. Social development thus, concerns more than the formation of human capabilities such as improved health or knowledge. It also concerns the use of these qualities.

Social development is the end—economic growth a means. So the purpose of growth should be to enrich people’s lives. This is a new paradigm and recognizes that development has many dimensions—access to income and wealth is one of these. Economic growth though necessary, is not enough for improving the quality of life of all sections of the population. Growth has to be successfully translated into improvements i.e., into the factors contributing to the quality of life.

The Human Development Report that is published annually by the United Nations Development Programme, presents many different types of national level Human Development Parameters of which the Human Development Index (HDI) is noteworthy. This is a composite index encompassing selected information on literacy and
education, expectation of life at birth and measures of material wellbeing. Such indices are not normally computed at micro levels. One sure method of understanding various aspects of social development of quality of life is to know the relative levels of various components of social development. For example, the various components of 'knowledge' are levels of literacy, school enrollment, causes for not enrollment and dropping out of school, duration of schooling, costs of schooling and accessibility to schools. Similarly, 'longevity' can be well understood on the basis of information on prevalence of morbidity and mortality, disability, under nutrition, health care utilization, costs of seeking health care, and the efficacy of public health programmes. The 'material wellbeing' component can be further disaggregated to encompass various aspects such as level and source of household income, and asset ownership, work opportunities, employment and wage stability, money and real wages and so on. The quality of life in developing countries such as, India is also linked with social institutions and public programs mean to provide for the basic needs of the poor and vulnerable sections of the society.

Behind the blaring headlines of the worlds' many conflicts and emergencies, there lies a silent crisis- a crisis of under development, of global poverty, of ever-mounting population pressures, of thoughtless degradation of environment. This is not a crisis that will respond to emergency relief or to fitful policy interventions. It requires a long, quiet process of sustainable social development.

Social development is development that not only generates economic growth but also distributes its benefits equitably; that regenerates the environment rather than destroying it; that empowers
people rather than marginalizing them. It is development that gives priority to poor, enlarging their choices and opportunities and providing for their participation in decisions that affect their lives. It is development that is pro-people, pro-nature, pro-jobs and pro-women.

In many countries world over, there are striking contrasts and disparities between and within regions and communities. During the past Five decades, world income increased seven fold and income per person more than tripled. But this gain has been spread very unequally-locally, nationally and internationally and the inequality is increasing. These contrasts and disparities are much more striking in developing countries. This is clearly reflected in the very unequal opportunity to participate in the process of social development. The excessive concentration of growth in a few centres/pockets or communities is accompanied by acute disparities in the levels of income and development between various regions and communities respectively. In majority of the cases, the positive economic effects attributable to polarization have been far outstripped by the adverse effects, particularly, the aggravation of social system problems. As regional and community polarization intensifies, regional disequilibrium and group disharmony tends to strengthen and sharpen.

In order to undertake the development of any region or any community, it is essential to measure its levels of development, and to work towards reducing disparities. Before evolving programmes towards this objective, it is essential that we first assess the extent of disparities such as the degree of disparities and the factors, which are responsible for these disparities in the process of social development.
Although, considerable amount of work has been done to study the regional disparities in the social development both at the national and international levels, hardly any systematic attempt has yet been made in this field at the district and community level.

Religion has been a major factor in Social stratification. Though predominantly Hindu, India has large Muslim population. In addition to theological differences, there are variations in lifestyles and political and historical factors that would have created differentials in education, occupation and other economic conditions among populations belonging to various religions.

Degree of discrimination on account of religion may be attributable, at least in part, to cultural and historical factors and hence could differ from region to region or state to state. Besides, in the multi-tiered structure of governance in India, it is the state government, rather than the central government that has a major responsibility in social sector. Therefore, the policies and programmes of the state governments are expected to play an important role in social development. The delivery system as well as the efficiency of programme administration could also vary across states.

Thus, inter-state variations in both the level and the social group differentials in human development are plausibly caused by differences in natural resources, cultural and historical factors and state specific policies and programmes. From, a policy angle, it is necessary to assess to what extent the inter-state variations in both the level and differentials in human development are caused by differences in programme approaches, delivery systems and overall efficiency. However, to establish a cause-effect relationship between
such factors and social development differentials and to measure the quantum of the effect is an enormous task. Such an effort would require trends in differentials and a comprehensive evaluation of policies and programmes in addition to an assessment of development levels and differentials. This work addresses a more modest objective to examine the extent and nature of social group differentials in social development among Surjapuri Muslims in the district of Kishanganj and Uttar Dinajpur of Bihar and West Bengal respectively. In that sense, the study is exploratory.

1.2. THE PROBLEM:

Social development refers to the improvement in the capabilities of the people. It enables them to enlarge their choices, which are numberous. The most important of these choices are long and healthy life, knowledge and access to the resources required for the decent standard of living. These choices are basic and non-fulfillment of these choices prevents the people to accomplish many other choices, which also play a significant role in the comprehensive development of human lives. Some of the additional choices may be stated as political freedom, guaranteed human rights and self-respect.

There are the two sides and both of them must grow in a balancing manner in order to avoid considerable human frustration. These two sides are:

(a) Formation of human capabilities such as better health, knowledge and skills.

(b) Opportunities for appropriate utilization of these improved capabilities for productive activities.

It is important to note that income which forms an important aspect of human development is not an end and it is only an option.
Therefore, development should mean more than mere rise in national income. Its focus should be the human development. Mahboobul Haq rightly pointed out that we are not only interested in the growth of national income but also in its contents. Amartya Sen has won the noble prize of 1998 for his outstanding contribution to social justice. The main cause of famines is not poverty of foods but the poverty of entitlements. It must be understood that human development should be the end objective of every society and economic growth is the means which are deployed to improve the competence of the people, make them productive and lead a respectable life.

The Eastern region, comprising the major states of Bihar, Orrissa, West Bengal and Assam, Seven smaller states and two Union Territories. Region-wise this is the most backward region of India. States belonging to Eastern India are poor and many of their people are below the poverty line. The Eastern region has emerged as the most deprived region of India. The extent of human deprivation in this region is widespread. It is unfortunate that even the rudimentary health facilities are not available, drinking water is not accessible, basic sanitation facilities unavailable, and large number of people are without meals everyday.

This study is an attempt to examine empirically the progress made by the Surjapuri Muslims in the districts of Kishanganj (Bihar) and that of Uttar Dinajpur (West Bengal) for the improvement of the lives of their people. The main thrust will be on provision of health, education and the access of the people to the resources as they are considered the most important component of the Social Development.
1.3. CONCEPT OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT:

Social development deals with the process, which creates the conditions for improving the competence of the people and enlarging their choices. It had been thought before that Social development is required to make people more productive as being the agent of production. The production of the commodities and services may be increased by enhancing the quality of human life.

It is the earlier approach of considering the human being as an instrument of raising the commodity production. According to the recent approach running in terms of the welfare of the people, Social development is treated in broader terms signifying its importance not only furthering the production but also meeting the end objective of development that is the well being of the people.

The end objective is not met automatically. It needs strategies on the part of people at the helm of affairs for linking the fruits of development to the welfare of the people. It depends upon the manner, the growing income is spent. There are examples that certain countries such as Brazil, Oman and Saudi Arabia with higher GNP per Capita could achieve only modest human development while the countries like Sri Lanka, Jamaica and Costa Rica with modest GNP per Capita could be able to achieve higher human development in terms of life expectancy and adult literacy ratio. It is to be realized that the expansion of output and wealth is the mere means, which are to be put to the appropriate uses for the overall benefits of the people. Social development in its new perspective is concerned with the supply side as well as the distributive justice.

Normally, the term “Social Development” is studied concerning with the process of evaluating Human choices. The important
consideration should be to envisage the level of welfare enjoyed by
the people. The numbers of Human choices are infinite varying from
time to time depending upon the stage of development. "But at all
levels of development, the three essential ones are for people to lead
a long and healthy life, to acquire knowledge and to have access to
resources needed for a decent standard of living. If these essential
choices are not available many other opportunities remain in-
accessible. It may further be pointed out that "human development
does not end there. Additional choices highly valued by many
people, range from political, economic and social freedom to
opportunities for being creative and productive and enjoying
personal self respect and guaranteed human rights. Development
enables people to have the choices. Social development thus
concerns more than the formation of human capabilities such as
Improved health and Knowledge. It also concerns the use of these
capabilities.

1.4. THE RELEVANCE OF THE PROBLEM:

The usefulness of studying the disparities at the regional and
community levels is justified by the following factors:

(1) By proper inter-regional and community wise allocation of
investment, the region and the community can maximize its total
welfare because the marginal utility of income in the backward
region and backward community is generally higher than that in
the developed regions and advanced communities.

(2) Large gaps between advanced and backward regions and
communities are not conducive for any kind of social and
political stability.
(3) The concentration of investment in the progressive regions and advanced communities pulls out a disproportionately large amount of resources and talent from the backward areas and backward communities, which hamper permanently long run potentiality and profitability of backward regions, and backward communities.

(4) It has also been realized that unless spatial and group problems creating the disparities in regions and between communities are studied and assessed for practical action, the overall development of the country as a whole remains a paradox.

(5) Development has to be seen within the context of a major set of problems such as poverty, inequality, unemployment, population growth, environmental decay and rural stagnation.

(6) The generation of more information on socio-economic development according to religion may clear the common misconceptions relate to the much-published concept of 'appeasement' to Muslims.

(7) The availability of information on caste and religious lines would facilitate the government to easily identify the groups most in need of state intervention and support.

1.5.IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT:

The importance of social development lies in the growth resulting of human efforts. Undoubtedly, the economic development of a country depends upon the skills and efficiency of its manpower. As a matter of fact, economic development is not a mechanical process. It is a human enterprise whose progress depends upon the competence of the people and its utilization in proper directions. In
this way, investment in human capital is to be treated as real investment in economic development for the benefit of the people. Unless and until social development takes place, economic growth remains stagnated and inequalities in the income distribution are strengthened. The Social development as input would enable a country to raise its productive capacity and by the adoption of suitable poverty alleviation measures, it may succeed reducing inequalities in income distribution.

The Industrially advanced countries could develop their economies by investing a large amount in Social Development. The underdeveloped countries could not improve the capabilities of their people due to inappropriate planning of developing human capital. Therefore, what is needed in the underdeveloped countries is to raise the skills of their people and provide employment for the utilization of these skills so that human capital is not wasted. It requires appropriate policies to be adopted on the part of underdeveloped countries to plan and manage the development of their human resources for the acceleration of economic development which should further be related to the benefits of the people who are the end objective of economic development.

Resources are generally classified into three categories: Physical, Natural and Human. All these resources play complementary role and are highly important for the economic, social and political development of a country. Out of these resources, human capital appears to be more strategic and critical. In the words of Mehta "A country may possess abundant and inexhaustible natural and physical resources and the necessary machinery and capital equipment, but unless there are men who can mobilize, organize and
harness nature’s beautiful resources for the production of goods and services, the country cannot make rapid strides towards economic and social advancements”. In this respect, it would be relevant to quote Pokshishevsky. “Man transforms virgin geographic landscape into cultural ones. He carries chances into effect the geographic division of labour which determines commercial ties, development transport system, growth of towns and areas of specific production. He is the principal productive force of the society. Therefore, Human Development is not only an important agent of economic development but it is also the end objective of all the development programmes.

The economic growth is attributed more to Human Development rather than physical and natural capital. The Human Development contributes more to the economic development through the promotion of science and technology and its application to the productive process, encouraging Research and Development, training the workers in different technological skills and motivating the people to have positive attitudes and high moral values conducive to greater production. It has been supported by a World Bank Study of 192 countries that the efforts to improve human capabilities through better education, health and nutrition can help the transformation of the society and create prospects for higher rate of economic growth especially in the low human development countries. The World Bank Study concluded that only 16 percent of growth takes place due to physical capital (machinery, buildings and physical infrastructure) whereas 20 percent rises from the natural capital But, the most important part is that 64 percent of growth occurs from the human and social capital”. 
1.6. HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The interest in Social Development is not new. It is long time before that the philosophers and economists treated the rise in wealth as a means for improving the well being of the people. Aristotle wrote that “Wealth is evidently not the good we are seeking, for it is merely useful and for the sake of something else”. A similar view was taken by the early founders of quantitative economics and the pioneers of political economy. Adam Smith showed his concern that economic development should enable persons to mix freely with others without being “ashamed to appear in the Public”. Throughout the early period, the income and its growth was treated as a means for providing a better life to the people.

Although, the preference for material success began during the days of mercantilism, yet it is only during the 20th century that the economists considered growth more important than opportunities for the people. They paid more attention towards economy rather than the society. It was forgotten that the growth of income does not automatically serve the people unless and until suitable measures adopted for human development. There occurred growth in income but the “trickle down” process failed to transfer the gains from the rising income to the poor people.

Disparities in the income distribution became greater. It was pointed out that income distribution became skewed during the early stages of economic growth benefiting the richer class more. Simon Kunzets said that inequality would rise first as workers left agriculture for industry and falls as industrial production become more widespread. Nicholas Kaldor, emphasized the importance of saving. He argued that the only way to finance growth would be by
channeling the initial benefits into the pockets of rich capitalists. Since they have higher prosperity to save, only they could provide the funds for investment.

The traditional approach that deteriorating income distribution occurs in the early stages of economic growth has been disproved by the recent studies showing a positive correlation between growth and income equality. Japan and East Asian countries are pioneers in the equitable form of development. Other countries namely China, Malaysia and Mauritius are also now following similar pattern of growth with equity. Thus the trend is that an equitable distribution and public resource can enhance the prospects for future growth and both the economic growth and human development strengthens and reinforce each other.

1.7. THE DEVELOPMENT DEBATE:

When we look at the enormous amount of literature on development, one thing becomes amply evident—development seems to define the world’s agenda, divergent ideologies and viewpoints notwithstanding. Development appears to be the key concept, an eminently attractive idiom of the fast modernizing economies and social systems, the world over. The relevant literature offers plentiful models of development, a bewildering variety of approaches and confusing number of assertions and averments. The fact that strikes most is the absence of a world-view, the lack of consensus, to be precise. The evident lack of unanimity on universalistic or particularistic development strategies indeed constitutes the core of the development debate. The critiques on development are of multi-splendoured nature, raising contentious issues of vital significance. The contention range from the very meaning of the term
development too much publicized ideologies, approaches and development paths adopted by different countries, developed and developing. Today the old-fashioned definitions of development are being increasingly questioned conventional models are being assiduously assailed at, and seemingly established Euro-American notions on development have more critics than admirers, especially in the third world countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

Today’s development debate has taken several sharp turns, indicating radical departures from five-decades-old development theories, most of which talked of economic development as the central focus of all development endeavours. Now, when the economic model of development has caused greater disillusionment, the focus of the debate has shifted to social, cultural, political, technological and environmental aspects of development, each with its own rationales and recipes. Accordingly, we are finding an amazing variety of writings which argue in favour of adopting new paradigms of development which suit to the socio-cultural, and politico-economic conditions prevalent in a given society. The critiques of modern development theory are not restricted to alternatives, but are based on normative search for a more satisfactory and indigenous form of development, much different from dominant western paradigm. Gunnar Myrdal offered perhaps one of the earliest and most stringent critique of the economistic bias in the western models of development couched in capitalist rationality. By the late sixties and early seventies the optimism of the western view of development began to fade in the light of the experience gained in the developing countries. One thing became very clear- the development theories based on the western model of
economic growth were found profoundly inadequate, and as such, were subjected to fundamental questioning.

The development debate, especially after the seventies, and more particularly after the eighties, offered strong critiques of all those models of development which emerged supreme following the industrial revolution after the Second World War. These models laid emphasis on industrialization, heavy accent on science and technology, ruthless exploitation of natural (environmental) resources and getting loose of market forces. These models initially captured the attention of non-western economists and development planners, because the models sold the dream of prosperity in bold terms and argued that once there is robust growth of the GNP/GDP, the whole society will develop in all its segments. The non-western economists and political elites in the third world countries paid due obedience to these models and tried to implant them in the development planning.

The attractiveness of these alien westernized models of development did not last long. Soon, many eminent economists and social scientists in the developing countries not only challenged the economic bias of these models, but also rejected several strategic formulations that were presented as recipes for the development of the third world countries. Even some of the western scholars joined the chorus and called for an end to the ideology of growth. The argument raised basically was, and still is, that concept of development should not be equated with growth alone, regardless of the fact that both are sequentially related. The consensus seems to centre around the view that mere growth of the economy should not be designated as a process of development.
The fall-out of the economic growth model is not peculiar to India, it is true for many third world countries. There is an emerging concern that we have gone wrong somewhere along the line and there is need for fundamental reconsideration for our development strategy. Such a realization is rooted in the fact that in spite of the moderate rates of economic growth in the country, a very large segment of our population still lives in utter poverty. The increased GNP benefitted the top echelons whereas the rest of the population remained largely unaffected. Development experts now recognize that while growth is necessary, it is neither a sole nor a sufficient condition of development. Faced with growing contradictions, the development planners tried another gimmick, ‘growth with social justice’. This too created little ripple in the sea of immiserization. The development path that was pursued for long basically remained wedded to economic growth, favouring the strong and depriving the weak.

Strident critiques apart, Manmohan Singh and Yaswant Sinha along their cohorts are still defending the growth model of development as a sheet anchor of development planning. Establishment economists argue that economic development alone is an instrument of social transformation, and that economic development through market mechanisms would ultimately pull the country out of the quagmire of poverty, would prove to be a great leveller and dispeller of social incongruities and, in the long run would benefit everyone in our society. The fact of the matter, however, is that howsoever the critics decry the economic model of development, it still holds its away and continues to colour our thinking. The people who really matter tenaciously hold on to the
belief that economic growth is an indispensable condition, a prerequisite for social development.

The development debate in the early eighties shifted to social aspects of development, as is being currently examined in the social science literature. In recent years there has appeared a lot of literature on social development and the subject has been discussed at length in the World Summit on Social Development held in March 1995 at Copenhagen. The documents arising out of the Summit, when read along with other writings on social development, underscore the fact that social development, while being an old concept has acquired new meanings and messages. It subsumes the latter, but it specifically aims at the attainment of wider social objectives. S.C. Dube however, laments that these objectives have not been precisely defined and the concept has not been rigorously codified. He notes with some satisfaction that the overt and covert dimensions of the concept are now a subject of meaningful debate and some tentative formulations of the indicators of social development, as well as the quality of life are beginning to emerge. 

While Dube’s complaint and satisfaction has relevance in our context, the United Nations thinking on social development is more loud and clear. The UNESCO’s Position Paper for the World Summit on Social Development raises the argument that development is first and foremost social. It says further “Social dimension is to be the starting point of development and should determine to a large extent the priorities of development policies”.

The term social development, as understood in the UN quarters, broadly refers to improvements in human well being, to
development that it not strictly economic or market driven and to improvements in the quantity and quality of public or social services.

The central tenets of social development are:

1. Economic growth is an essential but not sufficient condition to ensure social development, and, strategies of development, in order to be more relevant, should focus on societies and not on economies.

2. Development should be human-centred and broad-based, effecting equal opportunities for all to participate fully and freely in economic, social, cultural and political activities.

3. People are the ends and not the means of economic progress and development.

4. Economic growth should subserve the cause of social development and ensure that development has a human face.

5. Social development and economic progress are mutually reinforcing-social development helps reduce economic inequalities and bolsters economic growth, and equitable growth creates jobs and reduces poverty.

In the light of its central tenets, social development requires modification in the societal conditions with an urgency of real social transformation conducive to eradication of poverty, promotion of productive employment and acceleration of social integration.\(^{18}\) It means policy and programmes to reduce and eliminate polarization of societies, social exclusion, unemployment and poverty and to provide opportunities for the disadvantaged persons and groups to improve their living conditions. The aim of social development is to effect social well being, i.e., the ability of every human being to
satisfy his/her basic needs and achieve a satisfactory quality of life within the environment of equity, social justice and human dignity. 19

Social well-being is also designated to enable each individual to improve his ability to take charge of his destiny by means of fruitful activities in the economic, social, cultural and political fields and to participate in the choices and decisions concerning the society in its collective orientation. To achieve these aims social development policy must focus on the human person, equity, social justice and security together with social cohesion respect for human rights and non-discrimination and finally the participation of the people in the whole range of development policies. Social development calls for strategic investments in health, education and social services, and necessitates access of the underprivileged to means of economic well being.

In connection with social development, two allied concepts, namely, "human development" and "sustainable human development" find frequent mention in the current development debate, especially when the issue of sustainability is raised.

The concept of human development, though not new to social science vocabulary, has now acquired new interpretations, far different from those in conventional usage. A few decades ago, it was used to refer to more investment in human skills. Among management specialists, human development tended to be equated with human resource development—treating human beings as a resource. It is only in recent years that human development has taken on a deeper meaning by recognizing that development is sustainable only when human beings are increasingly capable of taking charge of their destiny. "The essence of human development", says a UNDP
Report, "is to place development at the service of people's well being rather than people at the service of development. In this perspective, human development implies empowering people to make their own choices. 20 It also emphasizes the relevance of local values and knowledge as guidelines and tools for making these choices". The concept of human development implies people-centred development, a development that is focused on people, their needs and aspirations. The ultimate objective of development is to improve human well being and the quality of people's lives.

The concept of sustainable human development lays emphasis on the development of social capital in conjunction with the development of physical capital. The argument is that without social capital other forms of capital cannot be mentioned or used properly. The concept of social capital is helpful because it identifies a function of social structure. Social capital is considered the key to more humane and sustainable form of development, a development that improves the ability of the collectivity to make decisions. The concept of social capital emphasizes the empowerment of the disadvantaged people, suggesting their involvement in decisions affecting their life.

A UNDP Report on the subject puts the concept in its proper perspective:

"Sustainable development is development that not only regenerates economic growth but distributes its benefits equitably; that regenerates the environment rather than destroying it; that empowers people rather than marginalizing them. It gives priority to the poor, enlarging their choices and opportunities and proving their
participation in decisions affecting them. It is development that is pro-poor, pro-nature, pro-jobs and pro-women and pro-children". 21

The concept of sustainable human development seeks to refocus attention on the ultimate objective of development, namely, the increase in opportunities for the people to lead a productive and satisfying life. It seeks to restrengthen the human dimension of development by focusing development strategies and policies on people, putting people first and at the centre of the development process. It seeks to promote a vision of development that centres on people's choices and need of capabilities that does not undermine the need of present or future generations. It is concerned with investing in people by encouraging their participation in the development process and meeting their needs, as well as generating the opportunities for them to pursue their aspirations. It places a marked stress on participatory involvement of people in the design and implementation of human development strategies and programmes.

In the recent years, the development debate has ventured into examining how development affects culture and with what results. The development thinkers and planners in the third world countries are having anxious thoughts on the cultural context of development. This is because of the sweep and momentum generated by a highly technocratic model of development, which is undermining the cultural ethos in these countries. The search for modernization and homogenous process of development over the last few decades has been accompanied by deepening erosion of cultural identities. The western paradigms of development have adversely affected the cultural distinctiveness of these countries. The modernized version of
development has led to the establishment of the cultural hegemony of the west and has rendered difficult the safeguarding of cultural heritage that these countries were proud of. The forces unleashed by technology-oriented model of development have mounted a massive assault on native cultures, which are fast adapting to western cultural value patterns in complete disregard to indigenous valuations of customs; traditions and life-styles. The modern communication technology has brought about an unprecedented change of far-reaching consequences. The print and electronic media, much under the impact of breath-taking innovations in technology, has greatly altered the indigenous and established ways of life, has promoted an ethic of consumerism and has led to the perversion of culture by moulding it to crass materialistic values of the western world. The mass communication agency or the culture industry is seducingly promoting the occidental culture of advanced industrial societies, a culture that does not fit well in the given social fabric of the oriental societies. In the name of information, education and entertainment, the electronic media is catering to violence and vulgarization of much of what people once thought was valuable or sacred.

The issue of cultural change under the impact of modernization has become an important item in the agenda of development debate in as much as it concerns itself to examining the linkage between development and culture. S.C. Dube examined the issue with greater clarity. He does not subscribe to the notion that the failure of the development strategies mainly in the third world countries is because of their immutable and unchanging traditions; meaning that culture and traditions are barriers to change. He rejects all those eastern admonitions and exhortations which say that
traditions and social institutions have to be changed if they stand in the way of attaining the objectives of economic growth. He asserts that not everything in the tradition is evil, and, as such, there should be no unnecessary haste to reject them in order to facilitate the safe passage to forces of gross materialism that emphasizes personal consumption at the cost of social justice. Culture, he said, cannot be dispensed with to promote growth, for, it has critical functions, and development does not offer adequate replacement for it. The policies of economic growth and development have to learn to live with culture, he emphatically observed. The tradition and modernity, he said, can co-exist and a happy convergence of tradition and modernity is not impossible. He warned that a sudden loss of tradition could lead to anomie, rootlessness and alienation. He argued for rethinking on many traditional values and institutional patterns and called for assigning them the place which they rightly deserve in the scheme of alternative future we visualize.

Dube's stout defence of tradition, culture and institutional value patterns has one major weakness. His arguments sound as if he is defending all traditions, good, bad and indifferent in one go. He conveniently ignores the fact that in a fast changing world under the impact of the modernizational ideal, many of our traditions which eulogize inertia, fatalism, superstitions, caste distinctions, gender discriminations, and host of other exploitative and oppressive traditional practices are completely irrelevant and need to be rejected and replaced. He is right to the extent that the modernization ideal, as conceived in the western idiom of economic growth, should not be our preferred ideal at the cost of rejecting the values that are important components of the cognitive and evaluative orientation of
our people, the values that provide us a sense of identity. His rejection of western modernization perspectives of development is well reasoned and his logic for our definition of development commensurate with our social and cultural ethos is quite appealing.

Several other Indian sociologists (D.P.Mukherjee, Ram Krishna Mukherjee, Radha Kamal Mukherjee, to name only few) have echoed their thought on certain great Indian traditions and values that place a premium on pluralism and diversity, tolerance and responsibility, non-violence, solidarity, equity, equality and social justice. These, they said, should not be sacrificed at the altar of the new religion called modernity. It would be real tragedy, if we lose our cultural moorings in the frantic pursuit of economic growth or free market economics of the highly industrialized west, they opined.

The crux of the problem of cultural development and attendant value-disorientation lies in our attempt to catch up with the west in a world being transformed by fast global economic and technological change. The crux then is that, where do we begin our search for cultural development and how do we safeguard our distinct and societally significant values against the onslaught of outside influences?

The development debate in the traditional societies of the developing nation-states now acknowledges that social systems and values that promote permissiveness, bolster consumerism and ignite ignoble desires for the pursuit of worldly goods created by economic growth model, particularly of the North American version, are not necessarily the appropriate models for our version of development. We need cultural alternatives to the dominant western paradigm of development. Sheer pursuit of industrialization and modernization
devoid of the consideration of the social and cultural ethos would not only hamper economic growth, but would also leave us rootless, alienated and without any sense of distinct identity. Writings of D.P. Mukherjee and Ram Krishna Mukherjee warn us against the dangers of westernization and make a fervent plea for paying due regard to the historical, social and cultural context of our society. Strategies of development should therefore be suitably modified and adjusted with our own cultural ethos and cultural factors should be an integral part of all strategies designed to achieve a balanced economic, social and technological development.

But the issue of culture is not simple, as we often tend to believe. In conceptualizing the problems of development in the light of values we cherish and the goals we wish to attain, there arise number of issue-areas on which there is no clearly laid down policy at the moment. The relevance of cultural policy, says Yogendra Singh, assumes significance in this context. He says that the policy should meet the challenge of cultural change unleashed by market capitalism, information technology and pressures of global cultures. Such a policy, he says, will have to be organically linked with policies of our social and economic development. Broadly, such a policy framework must take into account the need to enrich and protect local and regional cultural values, practices and identities in the process of cultural exposure to mega-institutions of mass communication and marketization.

Having moved from GNP/GDP-centred approach to economic development, and having upheld the notion of social development, the development debate voices a new concern—the degradation of environment, preservation of natural resources and finding of
alternatives to present preoccupation of over-exploiting the exhaustible and often non-renewable natural resources. A series of major conferences and seminars and highly publicized reports have sought to infuse environmental dimensions into thinking on international and national strategies of development. The fact of the matter is that a major effort is now underway to build environmental concerns into basic thinking on developmental strategies. The concept of ‘sustainable development’ as proposed by the World Commission on Environment and Development (The Brundtland Commission) in its Report (1987), called Our common Future occupies much space in the development debate now. As currently accepted, “sustainable development is a development that meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs.

This characterization contains within it two concepts:

(1). The concept of needs, especially the needs of the world’s poor to which overriding priority should be given.

(2). The idea of limitations imposed by the state of technology and social organization on the environmental ability to meet the present and future needs.

The concept of sustainable development offers an alternative design for development, which by definition should be environmentally benign and eco-friendly. It implies that productive assets available to future generations should not be unfairly diminished. It highlights symbiotic relationship between consumerist human race and productive national systems. It suggests that a healthy environment is essential to sustainable development and healthy economy. It tells that economic development, which erodes
natural capital, is often not successful. It further implies that environmental mistakes need not be repeated, as past patterns of environmental degradation are not inevitable.

In this backdrop, let us examine our own environmental scenario. A quick look at it reveals that the scenario is too grim on account of reckless depletion and destruction of natural resources, leaving behind an unsettling effect on nature's fine balance. The present patterns of development, says Rajni Kothari, are so wasteful and destructive of natural resources like land, water and entire ecosystems, that they are producing an increasing and exponential growth in desertification, deforestation and soil degradation, which together are leading to an overall erosion of productive process itself. Kothari underscores this point:

"The point at issue is not that of convincing policy-makers of the need to build the environmental concern into development policies, it is not even of perceiving the intimate relationship between the environment and development. It is something far more fundamental; it involves a clear admission of the faulty and inappropriate, wasteful and irrational; inequitous and exploitative and, in the end, highly dangerous and possibly suicidal nature of the present model of development to replace the one now commonly accepted."

The regrettable fact, however, is that in the name of economic development, we are not only paying least attention to an immanent ecological disaster, but are also derisively describing our environmentalists as anti-developmental. We have given little heed to protest of environmental activists who are complaining bitterly against the problems of displacement, desertification, deforestation,
etc. The environmental activists are raising some very fundamental questions: development for whom? Development at what human cost? And development for what ends? They are highlighting the fact that development has failed the poor and helped the rich. For poor people in our midst, all labels of development, sustainable or whatever, do not matter at all; what matters is the safety and security of their livelihood, which is largely dependent on natural resources. The poor in our midst are the direct victims of our environmental degradation, while the rich are its beneficiaries. The poor are the ones who suffer most when forests are felled and when factories and large hydroelectric dams and water reservoirs displace thousands and thousands of such people from their natural surroundings. The problem of project displaced persons has tragic overtones, because the displaced are always the poor people, often without the support of any organized powerful group. The most ridiculous part is the pet argument that displacement and human sacrifices are always unavoidable in economic development.

In view of what is happening to the natural environment of the country, our economists and development planners are only quoting the cleverly phrased homilies from the World Bank/IMF documents. The complex issues of sustainable economic development in unison with good environmental policies are either conveniently ignored or cleverly pushed into the background. The result is that there is precious little in the name of sound environmental management.

The current development debate has moved further to examine the impact of science and technology on development policy and planning. While acknowledging the spectacular advances of science and technology in the fulfillment of human needs, a strong body of
opinion is building up against that sort of science and technology or technocratic progress which is likely to render millions of human beings, especially those in the industrial sectors, obsolete and redundant. Technology issue at stake is not that of the desirability of modern science and technology; the issue, in fact, is its suitability, adaptability and transferability under the given conditions. The question raised in the debate essentially is; can we adopt such technologies that are capital intensive and which destroy jobs, displace human beings, snatch work from people, benefit only a tiny well-off section of society, meet luxury or comfort needs of the rich, produce ecological risks, consume enormous energy, accelerate wasteful ways of human consumption and produce goods and services that are not required for basic needs of the millions of poor people in our midst?

This basic question does not belittle the importance of science and technology in the development process, nor does it suggest the putting on a brake on scientific and technological progress. The question only suggests the need to monitor and assess the impact of science and technology on the society as a whole and not in segments. Nobody argues against the machines; the argument only is that machines should replace people only when it is unavoidable, or, when work cannot be done by human beings. The argument, in essence, is to avoid heavy social costs.

A significant dimension of the debate centres round the view that science and technology has not helped the poor; on the contrary it has marginalized them still further. Because of limited resources the poor have limited access to scientific and technological knowledge and skills (it is understood that less than 20 per cent
people have access to science and technology). The issue of equity in access to the benefits of science and technology still remains unresolved.

The issue of technology transfer is also very complex and bristles with lot of difficulties. The adoption of western technology is a time-consuming process that needs patient innovation involving a great deal of trial and error. The role and motives of multi-nationals—the modern merchants who sell dreams—begs critical examination in reference to technology transfer. There is a feeling that developed countries are selling to developing countries only that technology which has grown obsolete over there. The exorbitant cost of technology transfers also an appropriate issue in the development debate. Those who feel concerned with matter say that technology transfer is not only exceedingly expensive, but is also highly conducive to increasing dependency.

The debate has come around the view that expansion of science and technology is essential, but care has to be taken to import, or, develop only that kind of technology which is suitable or congruous with the indigenous imperatives of development. The need of the hour is to avoid imprudent recourse to such technological inputs, which eliminate jobs, hasten the replacement of certain products and production processes and only enrich a miniscule minority of the already privileged. Technology-induced development of the kind described above, therefore, has to be replaced by an alternative process of development based on sustainability and restraint. Such a model of development is better suited in dealing with problems of poverty, unemployment and inequities. At the
present juncture, we need technology that meets the basic needs of the poor and does not give rise to an ethic of consumerism.

The development debate recognizes the symbiotic relationship between economy and polity. It reaffirms and reiterates the point that development has to be achieved through planned and programmed policies of the state. The debate recognizes that the course of development is decided by the nature of the state and the ideology of growth it pursues. The course of development is also affected when political regimes change. But one viewpoint that emerges supreme is that management of development policies is essentially an exercise of political management and the role of the state and the political elites is of paramount importance. Many development issues are necessarily inside the purview of politics, more so in the developing countries where the state wields immense power over the life of the people. The government’s involvement in the arena of development is of much higher order in the developing countries than in the developed ones.

Consistent with what is happening in the other developing countries, India’s development planning reflected the strong views of the top echelons of political leadership—Nehru in the early phase and Narshima Rao, Manmohan Singh, Pranab Mukherjee and Atal Bihari Bajpai at the present.

The development model rooted in democratic socialism, which Nehruvian economists championed, characterized our development path for long. This development model talked of equity and justice and entailed an ambitious programmes of employment generation through massive industrialization, diverse programmes of poverty alleviation, growth of cities as engines of development, marked
accent on green revolution and agricultural innovation and significant investments in the soft sectors of social development. Good intentions apart, development soon became a political agenda for narrow political ends. It became a vote-catching device and of making populist political promises to the poor and the gullible masses. The real issues of development were hijacked by politicians who exploited the situation of under-development to the hilt. The result was that in the four decades of planning process, only islands of prosperity were created at the detriment of the millions of poor people in the villages and cities. The much touted political goals of equity and social justice, promotion of more equitable distribution productive processes and adequate access to equal opportunities of income and public services remained only in the realm of rhetoric.

The politics of development as pursued by the state resulted in vast divide between the elite and the masses. While the state raised the slogan of democratic decentralization, power, however, crept into the hands of the bureaucrats, businessmen and the political elites. It is they who determined the priorities of development and reaped rich harvests of developmental fruits, howsoever small and inadequate they were. The slogan of development as participatory, plural and decentralized got buried in the cacophony of political noises made during elections. The state placed overwhelming emphasis on centralized control of economy in the process of breeding power elites. The state not only failed in its bounden duty of emerging as a liberator of the least developed and the leveller of social and economic inequities (which increased unabatedly), but it also became increasingly oppressive in character and operation.
The development strategies as being followed today are being shaped under the great leap forward promised by international monetary policies of the developed countries. In the wake of liberalization, globalization and the menacing march of market forces, the state in the developing countries is gradually losing its power to define its development agenda in the way it suits to economy and polity. It appears that international money lending agencies and multinationals of different hues will steal the show to their own advantage. Once caught in the debt trap we might even lose our autonomy to make relevant choices. The fear of the collapse of the Mexican economy, the disintegration of the USSR and the increasing economic servitude of the several developing countries now haunt us. The prophets of the new economic policy in our midst, however, dare say that in the long run we will be the gainers. But the prophets do not say how long will be the long run and what is going to happen till the long run arrives?

To cut short a long debate, it would suffice to say that our development crisis is fundamentally political in character. The state instrumentalities of development are unable to cope with the difficult challenges that have surfaced, largely because the nation-state is being corroded from within and without. The state is unable to hold itself together and the people are getting restive on account of poor performance of the state apparatuses that seek to promote the process of development in a gradualist fashion. The central issue that begs attention is that of an in-depth examination of interlinkages between development and political process. The need of the hour is to highlight the role of the state in the restructuring of socio-economic order, which indeed is a political task. Nothing short of a renewed
political will to reconsider the appropriate development alternatives will help improve the performance of the state in the critical sectors of social and economic development, that the country needs and desires. The best thing would be to give up populist political slogans and concentrate on pragmatic options.

The development debate has also paid attention to certain forms of crime and deviance, which it says are the by-products of rapid and far-reaching social and economic changes effected by the processes of development. Notwithstanding the fact that development per se is not criminogenic, the general view somehow seems to favour a positive correlation between development and deviance. The evidence in favour of the correlation is drawn from the crime situation of certain developed countries, especially the United State of America, suggesting that the incidence of crime and delinquency has registered an upward trend despite strong measures of crime control. It is said that economic growth has been accompanied by a parallel growth in criminal activities, giving the impression that growth itself is something like a crime agent. The affluence situation in the developed countries produced a surfeit of economic crimes, and economic growth increased the opportunities for illegitimate gains. The western criminologists explain that this is happening under the impact of economic development on society, on people's morals and values, on basic institutional mechanisms of informal social control and, on the texture of basic social networks. Development, these criminologists say, has unleashed forces conducive to the growth of the variety of new crimes aided and abetted by developments in science and technology.
It is difficult to wholly agree with many such western explanations, because several of them are hypothetical and speculative in the absence of rigorously planned and conducted empirical studies of scientific nature. We do not consider development as the villain of piece and do not approve of dumping all our crimes at the doorstep of development. We consider it unfortunate that while the debate on the issue of development and deviance is still incomplete, the word has spread around that development and deviance is still incomplete, the word has spread around that development causes crime. Had that been so, the crime rate of several highly developed countries like Japan, West Germany, France, Sweden and Nordic countries may not have been so low. The case of the American society is, however, an exception because of its melting pot situation and also because of the materialistic values the people over there pursue with plenty of zeal.

The debate to our mind is flawed on a number of considerations. Firstly, in spite of the vital importance of the question, solid factual information about it is essentially lacking. Secondly, there is little empirical research that determines the connection. Thirdly, and we believe most importantly, the patterns and parameters of development that are supposed to be linked detrimentally with crime have not been clearly identified in reference to their role in crime causation. The vague generalizations that persist have reduced the level of the debate to parading of imprecise assumptions, which fall flat when confronted with conflicting evidence. The real problem is that the nexus between crime and development is still a criminological mystery.
Faced with their inability to explain adequately an exceedingly complex crime situation, the criminologists in the developing countries, like their American counterparts, suggest some kind of relationship between economic development and crimes against property. Many forms of crime are being attributed to distortions of development. The rising rates of crime are commonly thought of as resulting from the complexity of developments associated with industrialization and urbanization - the two central attendants of development. Although it is difficult to establish a definite nexus between urbanization /industrialization and crime, most sociological explorations veer around the view that an unprecedented level of social, economic, cultural, political and technological developments are responsible for a marked increase in crime. While there is no denying the fact that certain forms of crime have a bearing with kind of development we are witnessing, the fact however, is that crime is not an inescapable consequence of development. On the contrary, it is true that well-conceived development strategies have a definite impact on crime prevention.

1.8. SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Social development is a broad concept. The World Summit on social development held in March 1995 at Copenhagen discussed this concept at length. The documents arising out of the Summit, when read along with our own writing on social development, underscore the fact that social development while being an old concept has acquired new meanings and messages.

The United Nations thinking on social development is very loud and clear. The UNESCO’s Position Paper for the World Summit on Social Development raises the argument that development is first and
foremost social. It says further “Social dimension is to be the starting point of development and should determine to a large extent the priorities of development policies”.

The term social development, as understood in the UN quarters, broadly refers to improvements in human well-being, to development that is not strictly economic or market driven and to improvements in the quantity and quality of public or social services.

The central tenets of social development are:

1. Economic growth is an essential but not sufficient condition to ensure social development, and, strategies of development, in order to be more relevant, should focus on societies and not on economies.

2. Development should be human-centred and broad-based, effecting equal opportunities for all to participate fully and freely in economic, social, cultural and political activities.

3. People are the ends and not the means of economic progress and development.

4. Economic growth should subserve the cause of social development and ensure that development has a human face.

5. Social development and economic progress are mutually reinforcing—social development helps reduce economic inequalities and bolsters economic growth, and equitable growth creates jobs and reduces poverty.

In the light of its central tenets, social development requires modification in the societal conditions with an urgency of real social transformation conducive to eradication of poverty, promotion of productive employment and acceleration of social integration. It means policy and programmes to reduce and eliminate polarization of societies, social exclusion, unemployment and poverty and to
provide opportunities for the disadvantaged persons and groups to improve their living conditions\textsuperscript{32}. The aim of social development is to effect social well being, i.e., the ability of every human being to satisfy his/her basic needs and achieve a satisfactory quality of life within the environment of equity, social justice and human dignity.

Social well-being is also designated to enable each individual to improve his ability to take charge of his destiny by means of fruitful activities in the economic, social, cultural and political fields and to participate in the choices and decisions concerning the society in its collective orientation. To achieve these aims social development policy must focus on the human person, equity, social justice and security together with social cohesion respect for human rights and non-discrimination and finally the participation of the people in the whole range of development policies. Social development calls for strategic investments in health, education and social services, and necessitates access of the underprivileged to means of economic well being.

In connection with social development, two allied concepts, namely, “human development” and “sustainable human development” find frequent mention.

The concept of human development, though not new to social science vocabulary, has now acquired new interpretations, far different from those in conventional usage. A few decades ago, it was used to refer to more investment in human skills. Among management specialists, human development tended to be equated with human resource development –treating human beings as a resource. It is only in recent years that human development has taken on a deeper meaning by recognizing that development is sustainable only when human beings are increasingly capable of taking charge of
their destiny. “The essence of human development”, says a UNDP Report, “is to place development at the service of people’s well being rather than people at the service of development. In this perspective, human development implies empowering people to make their own choices. It also emphasizes the relevance of local values and knowledge as guidelines and tools for making these choices.” The concept of human development implies people-centred development, a development that is focused on people, their needs and aspirations. The ultimate objective of development is to improve human well being and the quality of people’s lives.

The concept of sustainable human development lays emphasis on the development of social capital in conjunction with the development of physical capital. The argument is that without social capital other forms of capital cannot be mentioned or used properly. The concept of social capital is helpful because it identifies a function of social structure. Social capital is considered the key to more humane and sustainable form of development, a development that improves the ability of the collectivity to make decisions. The concept of social capital emphasizes the empowerment of the disadvantaged people, suggesting their involvement in decisions affecting their life.

A UNDP Report on the subject puts the concept in its proper perspective:

“Sustainable development is development that not only regenerates economic growth but distributes its benefits equitably; that regenerates the environment rather than destroying it; that empowers people rather than marginalizing them. It gives priority to the poor, enlarging their choices and opportunities and proving their
participation in decisions affecting them. It is development that is pro-poor, pro-nature, pro-jobs and pro-women and pro-children”34.

The concept of sustainable human development seeks to refocus attention on the ultimate objective of development, namely, the increase in opportunities for the people to lead a productive and satisfying life. It seeks to restrengthen the human dimension of development by focusing development strategies and policies on people, putting people first and at the centre of the development process. It seeks to promote a vision of development that centres on people’s choices and need of capabilities that does not undermine the need of present or future generations. It is concerned with investing in people by encouraging their participation in the development process and meeting their needs, as well as generating the opportunities for them to pursue their aspirations. It places a marked stress on participatory involvement of people in the design and implementation of human development strategies and programmes.

Thus, Social Development (SD) and Human Development (HD) serve the same purpose as both results in better health and education to improve the welfare of the people. The difference is immaterial, as the outcome of the various programmes is the same. It depends upon the convergence of the needs and priorities pursued by the different governments, international agencies and the experts that they use the term either Social development (SD) or Human Development (HD). In this study the SD has been used in the broader context implying the same meaning and the same purpose as explained by UNDP in the HDRs for the term “Human Development”.
1.9. MEASUREMENT OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

It becomes evident from an overview of development literature that development cannot be measured through income alone. It manifests in a number of dimensions such as in human health, longevity, literacy and a certain level of standard of living that must be incorporated in any measurement exercise. The indicators selected for these dimensions, therefore, must articulate aspects of development that are conventionally missed out. However, there will be difficulties in determining the number of indicators that would adequately capture the shades of meaning associated with development. Indeed, there are parameters such as freedom from fear, freedom of choice, freedom to profess religious duties, freedom of information, freedom to participate in political activities and so on. But getting dependable information on these parameters is difficult. For making the index useful and acceptable in policy making, it would be desirable to include only those indicators that are amenable to measurement and statistical analysis.

Human development indices should attempt to evaluate the achievements of growth and development in terms of improvement in quality of life of masses and overall development of society and environment. The indices can, therefore, be used to assess the level of success of development programs implemented by the national and state governments as well as those proposed the multilateral and bilateral aid agencies and international civil society organisations. The UNDP has spearheaded the initiative to compute the Human Development Index (HDI) which encompasses besides physical income, two other aspects that reflect health and educational development, viz. Life expectancy at birth adult literacy. This has
encouraged efforts to develop human development indicators and indices at sub-regional and local levels (possibly keeping in mind the recent innovations of governance effected through 73rd and 74th constitutional amendments that makes decentralisation mandatory), a part of it being sponsored by the UNDP.

The Human Development Reports (HDRs), published annually by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) since 1990, have brought into focus that the objective of development is not simply to produce more goods and services for material enrichment, but to increase the capabilities of people to lead full, productive and satisfying lives. What is of basic concern is the ability of people to lead a long and healthy life, to have access to knowledge and sufficient income to buy adequate amounts of food, clothing, shelter and other basic amenities.

Keeping in view the objectives of development across countries, the HDRs identified three areas of social concern, viz. Education, health and material well being. For each of these areas, the reports have identified the following suitable indicators to measure progress.

- Life expectancy at birth for health.
- Adult literacy rate for education.
- Per capita income with declining marginal utility for material well being.

The relative performance of a country in an area of concern is measured with reference to the 'maximum' and 'minimum' values of the concerned indicator. Division of the value of the country by the range, viz. The difference between the maximum and the minimum is expected to make it 'scale free'. The scale free values of the three
indexes are then combined, equal weightage is given to each, to get the Human Development Index (HDI) for the country.

The first HDR released in 1990 revealed that there is no automatic link between economic growth and human progress. Modest levels of income in case of several countries were found to be translating into fairly respectable levels of human development. The 1990 HDR, therefore, recommended a social development approach within this framework of popular and non-governmental organisation (NGO) participation. Understandably, some of the conceptual and measurement aspects of the human development index came under criticisms, following the release of the 1990 HDR. The UNDP have responded to these criticisms by making refinements in the indicators as also the methodology of measurement. Notwithstanding all these, the objective of achieving a reasonable level of HDI has brought about reallocation of resources in several countries to match the priorities of human development. 

An important omission frequently pointed out by critics is the dimension of freedom. Dasgupta has criticised the HDI for neglecting human rights: “As a measure of human development, it is quite incomplete; it is oblivious of what is commonplace to call human rights”. It is only in the HDR 2000 that this figures prominently. The second criticism was ignoring aspects of political volatility. The HDI is based on relatively stable indicators, which do not change dramatically from year to year. Political freedom, by contrast, can appear or vanish abruptly. Therefore the HDR 1992 considered political freedom separately, emphasising an adequate methodology for constructing an index of political freedom or of human rights performance.
Table 1.1. Changes in the Choice of Indicators for HDI Estimates Used by the UNDP (1990-2000):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Log of real GDP per capita</td>
<td>Adult Literacy Rate</td>
<td>Life Expectancy at Birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Atkinson formula using real GDP per capita ( W(y) = y ) for ( 0 &lt; y &lt; y^* ) ( = y^* + 2(y-y^<em>)^{1/2} ) for ( y^</em> \leq y &lt; 2y^* ) ( = y^* + 2(y)^{1/2} + 3(y-2y^<em>)^{1/2} ) for ( 2y^</em> &lt; y &lt; 3y^* ) and so on. Where ( Y^* ) is the poverty line and the full income is divided into multiples of poverty line.</td>
<td>Education = ( a^* ) Literacy Rate + ( b^* ) Mean Years of Schooling where ( a=2/3, b=1/3 ).</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>No change in the methodology nor in indicators. Except, the maximum and minimum values have been fixed for the four basic indicators. The threshold value is taken to be the global average real GDP per capita (PPP $40,000 and $200). Adult literacy (100% and 0%). Mean years of schooling (15 and 0 years). Life Expectancy (85 and 25 years).</td>
<td>The indicator mean years of schooling has been replaced by the combined primary, secondary and tertiary enrolment ratios (max value 100% and the min value 0%).</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Minimum value of income has been revised from PPP $200 to PPP $100</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Log of real GDP per capita</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Human Development Report, UNDP, (various years).
For longevity, life expectancy at birth has been widely accepted as an indicator of development. But it has been suggested that infant mortality should complement life expectancy, particularly in developing countries. Further, empirical analyses show that life expectancy fails to discriminate among the industrial countries. Keeping all these in view, UNDP has been in the process of refinement or modification of the index. Although the basic concept of development and the methodological parameters have remained by and large unchanged over time, there have been modifications in the specific indicators. The summary of the changes is presented above.

For the educational dimension, the 1990 Report used adult literacy rate as the sole indicator. It was, however, argued that functional literacy is often less than recorded literacy, especially in industrial countries. Also, this indicator fails to discriminate among industrial countries. Consequently, ‘mean years of schooling’ was added to adult literacy since 1991. It was nonetheless pointed out that years of schooling does not capture educational achievement since it takes differential efforts to learn different languages. Furthermore, it is difficult to acquire reliable data across countries on years of schooling and it changes slowly over the years. That is why in HDR 1994, mean years of schooling was replaced by ‘combined school enrolment’.

In the first HDR 1990, the economic dimension was included by using the logarithm of income up to a ceiling and giving a zero weight to incomes above that. In later years, a different approach was followed. The modified approach allows for diminishing marginal utility of income. However, above that level, a progressive correction
factor was introduced to take into account diminishing marginal utility of income through a modified Atkinson formula. The formula incorporates the elasticity of the marginal utility of income with respect to income, which discounts income progressively at higher levels. A subsequent adaptation is that the full range of income is divided into multiples of the poverty line. Thus, for per capita income between the poverty line and twice the poverty level, the Atkinson parameter was taken to be one-half; for per capita income between two and three times the poverty line, the elasticity was taken to be two-thirds and so on. The higher the income relative to the poverty line, the more sharply the additional income gets discounted. Income above the poverty line thus has an effect, but not a full dollar-for-dollar effect. This effect although less at higher levels is enough to differentiate among industrial countries. These modifications have been criticised on the following grounds.

- It is more complicated than a simple logarithmic transformation.
- It is based on indicator elasticity function rather than constant elasticity.
- It also reduces the weight of extra income above poverty just as severely as the logarithmic transformation does^{41}.

It has never been suggested that income needs to be supplemented or replaced by another indicator. It has, nonetheless been argued that, conceptually, income overlaps with the other two indicators. Empirically, these indicators are so highly correlated with income that these become almost redundant. However, no change has been incorporated in the HDR 1993 partly to avoid inconvenience caused to the users due to frequent revisions^{42}. 
In the HDR 1994, some changes have been made in the construction of HDI. First, maximum and minimum values have been fixed for all the indicators. Second, the indicator-mean years of schooling – has been replaced by the combined primary, secondary and tertiary enrolment ratios, as noted above. Third, the minimum value of income has been revised from PPP $200 to PPP$100. This revision became necessary because in the construction of the gender-related index, the minimum observed value of female income of PPP $100 was to be used as the lower limit. Importantly, the HDR 1994 introduced a new concept of human security— the security of people in their homes, in their jobs, in their communities and their environments. It identified the policy changes in national and global management, required in keeping with this new concept of human security.

The HDR 1995 considers the HDI to be providing a partial snapshot of human development and therefore has limitations as a comprehensive measure of human development. To give a more complete picture, the HDI should be supplemented with other human indicators and particularly those pertaining to political freedom, environmental sustainability and equity. The basis for the selection of such critical dimensions should be linked to basic capabilities which people must have to participate in and contribute to the society. The concept of human development has, thus, gone beyond its basic premises and presently seeks to cover sustainability of development process. Human development is, thus, being viewed as a process of enlarging people’s choices so that they can decide ways and means to achieve material well being within the context of their socio-political and economic systems. Such enhancement must be for
both present and future generations without sacrificing one for the other. Human development, thus, not only puts people at the centre of development but also advocates protecting the life opportunities of future generations and respecting the natural systems on which all life depends.

Another aspect of the concept is equity of opportunity and standard of living among all sections of the population. All barriers to economic and political opportunities must be eliminated so that people can participate in and benefit from these opportunities. Sustainable human development addresses the issue of equity both within a generation as also between generations. It seeks to limit development process within the carrying capacity of nature, giving high priority to environmental regeneration and protection of opportunities for future generations. Another area of concern is creation of 'enabling environment' so that the potentials of individuals can be optimally utilised. This is compatible with the modern day economic thinking of globalisation, cross border cooperation and scientific temper. The HDR 1995 also states that the most essential component of human development paradigm is 'empowerment' of the people^45.

The HDR 1996 admits that there is no automatic link between economic growth and human development, but when these links are forged with policy and determination, they can be mutually reinforcing and economic growth can effectively improve human development^46.

In HDR 1999, a thorough review of the treatment of income in the HDI was done, based on the work of Anand and Sen^47. Earlier, the average world income was taken as the ceiling and any income
above this level was discounted using Atkinson's formula for the utility of income. The main problem with this formula is that it discounts the income above the threshold level heavily. The new methodology adopted to construct the index of income discounts all income and not just the income above certain level. Further, the middle income countries are not penalised heavily as their relative values rise because of the new discounting formula.

In HDR 1999, a thorough review of the treatment of income in the HDI was done, based on the work of Anand and Sen. Earlier, the average world income was taken as the ceiling and any income above this level was discounted using Atkinson's formula for the utility of income. The main problem with this formula is that it discounts the income above the threshold level heavily. The new methodology adopted to construct the index of income discounts all income and not just the income above certain level. Further, the middle income countries are not penalised heavily as their relative values rise because of the new discounting formula.

There is a drawback with national HDI because the average gives misleading picture of life whereas human development levels differs greatly for different groups distinguished by genders ethnic groups and regions. This type of disadvantage may be eliminated by calculating desegregate HDI for such target groups.

**Human Poverty Index (HPI):-**

The human poverty index (HPI) introduced by the human development report, 1997 considers the deprivation in the same basic components of human life as the progress measured by HDI longevity, knowledge and decent standard of living. The HDI is concerned the progress of the whole society while the HPI focuses on
the number of deprived people of the country. The variable used are
the percentage expected to survive up to age 40 ($P_1$), the percentage
of adults who are illiterate ($P_2$). The deprivation of decent standard of
living is expressed in terms of the percentage of the people without
access to safe water ($P_{31}$), the percentage of the people without
access to health services ($P_{32}$) and the percentage of underweight
children under five ($P_{33}$). It is the composite ($P_3$) of these three
variables. 49

The composite variable $P_3$ is calculated by taking a simple
average of the three variables $P_{31}$, $P_{32}$ and $P_{33}$.

Thus,

$$P_3 = \frac{P_{31} + P_{32} + P_{33}}{3}$$

HPI is calculated as follows

$$HPI = (P_{31} + P_{32} + P_{33} - 3)^{1/3}$$

The human development report, 1997, developed the concept of
human development measures (HDM) on the lives of HPI. The
pertinent point to be considered is that it is the poverty of
opportunity, which is the basic problem. The poverty of income is
not the problem alone 50.

**GENDER RELATED DEVELOPMENT INDEX (GDI):**

The GDI introduced by human development Report, 1995
concentrates on the inequality in achievements between women and
men in life expectancy, educational attainments and income. The
greater are the disparities in the basic human welfare, lower will be
the GDI which in a way is HDI adjusted downward because of the
gender disparity. The HDR, 1995 assumes the maximum and the
minimum values for these essential variables in the same manner as for HDI except the different maximum and minimum values for life expectancy for women and men. The maximum value for women is 85.7 years and minimum values 27.5 years. The corresponding values for men are 82.5 and 22.5 years. It shows the women having some longer life expectancy than the men\textsuperscript{51}

**GENDER EMPOWERMENT MEASUREMENT MEASURE (GEM):**

The GEM also introduced by HDR, 1995 takes into account the participation of women in the active political and economic life. It reflects the involvement of women in the decision making process and showing the gender disparity in these spheres. The difference between the GDI and GEM is that the later represents the gender inequality in basic capability. The GEM shows the gender inequality in the three indices namely the economic and political participation in the decision making and control over economic resources. The maximum value for income assumed to be PPP $40,000 and the minimum PPP $100\textsuperscript{52}. The table 1.2 shows the summary form of HDI, HPI, GDI and GEM.

Table 1.2. HDI, HPI, GDI and GEM – same components, different measurement\textsuperscript{53}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Longevity</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Decent Standard of living</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDI life expectancy at birth</td>
<td>1. Adult literacy rate</td>
<td>Adjusted per capita income in PPP$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Combined enrolment ratio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPI percentage of people not expected to survive to age 40</td>
<td>Illiteracy rate</td>
<td>Disparities in economic provisioning measured by 1. Percentage of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
people without access to water and health services.
2. Percentage of underweight children under five.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GDI female and male life expectancy at birth.</th>
<th>1. Female and male adult literacy rate.</th>
<th>Female and male income shares.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Female and male combined enrolment ratio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEM female and male life expectancy at birth.</th>
<th>1. Female and male adult literacy ratio.</th>
<th>Relative empowerment of women and men.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Female and male combined enrolment ratio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1.10. DIMENSIONS OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Spectacular and dramatic developments in national economics, resources, technologies, and communications and information systems have brought about significant and appreciable transformation in societies, all over the world. All these have, however, not resulted in the materialization of the dream of human well being as a product of development efforts. Amidst an unprecedented rate of economic growth, social improvements are found to be lagging. While higher economic growth induced prosperity, it has also been accompanied by persistent poverty, human deprivation and social backwardness. Concededly, economic development has not been accompanied by sustainable improvements in social well being. Many of the developed and developing countries face disjunction between economic growth and social progress.
There has, therefore, been a vigorous critique of development policies and programmes, which have proved to be incapable of ushering in an era of sustainable human-centred development. Economic development, globally speaking, has fuelled the market forces, which favour the strong and deprive the weak. The idea that a single-minded pursuit to economic development would bring about a desirable transformation in society, or would automatically result in establishing a better social order has proved to be an illusion.

The problem that most of the countries face today is not that of lack of economic development but that of a problem of distorted development. Distorted development has occurred primarily because economic growth has not been accompanied by concomitant improvements in social development. The proponents of social development, therefore, argue that economic growth, which has benefited only a segment of society, is meaningless. The sort of shortsighted economic rationality and an aggressive pursuit of progress viewed exclusively in material terms has been the pivotal point of modern critiques of development initiatives. The predominant perception is that economic trends and policies—including the globalization of economic factors and decisions— are currently unfavourable to social conditions of many people in most societies. The perception of global social crisis at the fag end of the twentieth century has heightened the disbelief in the primacy of economic growth model of development. The questioning of the basic orientations of economic policies, approaches and strategies, has become more and more vociferous, since the perception of impending social crisis has caused worldwide alarm. Behind the causes of the crisis lay the fact that during past decades investments
in development efforts have produced limited results to avert the increasing socio-economic inequity and inequality, both within and amongst nations. Under such conditions there is little chance for sustainable development to succeed. These and several other postulates of economic development critique have provided the world with an unique opportunity of restructuring national and international economic development strategies to focus on people-centred development.

The idea that economic policies should be so fine-tuned to meet the broader social objectives added a new dimension to the development discourse. The policy responses to planning for economic growth relented to increased pressure of scholarly analyses that recognized the specificity of social development. Accordingly, it was argued that economic development and a favourable economic climate are essential, but are not sufficient conditions for the development of society as a whole. And further, the traditional indicators of economic development are not a sufficient measure of sustainable human development.

The consensus that emerged favoured the seminal significance of social considerations as part of economic decision-making. In the same vein it was also accepted that social policies should similarly respond to economic objectives, and social programmes should contribute to useful structural changes and to overall development of society. This, however, did not mean the subordination of economic policy to the imperatives of social policy. It only meant that in the economization of the system, other efforts of social transformation are not to be put on the backburner. In the acceptance of the criticality and cruciality of social development, there prevailed a
world-view that development should be human-centred and broadly based, offering equal opportunities to all men and women to participate fully and freely in economic, social, cultural and political activities. To accomplish this vision of development, it was affirmed that the strategies of development should focus on societies and not just on economies, for, economic development without corresponding social development creates severe imbalance between economic propriety and social well being. The affirmation implied that growth is an insufficient basis for promoting social wellbeing, since growth and equality are more often incompatible objectives.

In view of the limitations and dissatisfactions with economic dimensions of development characterizing early development planning, economists like Gunnar Myrdal argued for a redefinition of development that took social factors into account. Myrdal emphasized the concept of unified socio-economic development and urged upon governments to plan their economies to include social policies that enhance people’s welfare and take steps to redistribute income and wealth. Similarly, the World Bank and UNDP emphasized the importance of social issues in economists argued that development has to be inspired by the populaces of well-known social development philosophies.

After the 1970s, many development economists viewed development simply as an economic fact. For instance, Todaro, an economist asserted that development in its essence must represent the entire gamut of change by which an entire social system is tuned to meeting the basic needs of the people and altering such conditions of life that are widely perceived as dehumanizing. Similarly, many development sociologists emphasized that development is not merely
an economic activity but involves reorganization of the entire society at a higher level, higher not only in material terms but also in terms of human values\textsuperscript{58}. The sociologists' view of development found support in diverse documents, which explained the purpose of development in terms of providing increased opportunities to all people for a better life. The ultimate purpose of development, according to a UN document, is to bring about a more equitable distribution of income and wealth for promoting social justice; alleviating poverty; maximizing productive employment; and expanding and improving facilities for education, health, nutrition, housing and social welfare for the deprived and disadvantaged individuals, groups and communities\textsuperscript{59}. These objectives the document said, are both the determining factors and the end results of development, and hence be viewed as integrated parts of a dynamic development.

True that too many critiques of economic development made the notion of social development acceptable; the predominant position of economic development model remained unchanged until 1990s. By and large, development continued to be viewed primarily in economic terms. This was evident from the dominant economic concerns underlying development paradigms, development planning strategies and measures of development performance. Social concerns remained, at best of marginal importance\textsuperscript{60}. The realization that high-income societies could be socially underdeveloped societies\textsuperscript{61} made little difference to the prevailing economic conception of development. Since the term 'development' had acquired a strong economic connotation, it continued to be viewed as the only viable paradigm of development and growth. Overstress on
the economic dimensions of development continued at the cost of non-economic dimensions of development. It was all too evident that socio-cultural dimensions of development remained largely a missing dimension in much of the development thought. The scenario seems to be somewhat different after the World Summit for Social Development, which reaffirmed that the idea of economic development cannot solve the critical social problems facing humanity.

The Social Development Summit at Copenhagen in 1995 crystallized the world-view on social development, with governments agreeing to accord social development and human well being the highest priority both now and into the twenty-first century. The Summit recognized that social development is central to the responsibility of the government and all sectors of civil society. The Summit affirmed that the most productive policies and investments are those which empower people to maximize their capacities, resources and opportunities. The Heads of the states and governments committed themselves to a political, ethical and spiritual vision for social development based on human dignity, equality, respect, mutual responsibility and cooperation. They gave high priority to policies and actions for the promotion of social progress and, for the betterment of human condition. To this end, they created a framework for action to:

(a) Place people at the centre of development, and economy at the service of human needs;
(b) Integrate economic and social policies to make them mutually supportive;
(c) Recognize that sound and broad-based economic policies are a necessary foundation to achieve sustained social development;

(d) Promote a more just distribution of income and access to resources through equity and equality of opportunity for people at all levels; and

(e) Recognize that empowering people to strengthen their own capacities is the main objective development and its principal resources.

The specific commitments made to translate this vision of social progress and development referred to creating an enabling economic, political, social, cultural and legal environment that would help people to achieve social development. Actions were recommended to create a framework of sustained economic growth and sustainable development, which inter alia would eradicate poverty, enhance productive employment and foster social integration. The Summit underlined the urgency of the need to address the persisting social problems, especially those arising out of poverty, unemployment and social exclusion. It shared the conviction that social development and social justice are crucial preconditions for the achievement and maintenance of peace and security.

The Summit proposed a renewed conception of social development and made the world understand its great significance. It provided an opportunity for rethinking on developmental goals and strategies amenable and conducive to the promotion of social well being. The political commitment of heads of states and governments to implement the recommendations of the Summit was its biggest achievement. The Summit formulated a new social development agenda based on the principle that people are at the centre of
development and economic policies and social programmes require placing the human person at the centre of all thinking and all decisions. The Summit decisively underscored the point that promotion of social development is fundamental to the life and future of any society. On the one hand, development can contribute to solving social and economic problems, and, on the other, and above all, it is required to release social forces essential for ensuring a harmonious development of societies for the benefit on all. It stressed the humanization of economic planning activities with social policies and programmes. The perception to link expansion of social services with overriding need for economic development was widely favoured. While accepting the notion of 'balanced' or 'unified' economic development, the Summit recommended the integration of economic and social components of development. The Summit averred that purposeful linking of social policies and programmes to an overall strategy of economic development is central to the notion of social development, especially in the context of Third World development.

Like 'development', 'social development' too has several connotations and is often used very broadly to refer to improvements in human well being. It is also used to refer to development that is not strictly economic or market-driven. It includes improvements in the quantity and quality of public social services, such as education, health, sanitation, access to clean water and other goods and services that are to be provided to all people by public institutions. Commenting on the ambiguity in the usage of the terms, Gore observed that the meaning of the term is not clear. The term has been interpreted to mean economic growth with social justice, eradication
of poverty and minimization of economic inequalities, emphasis on human resource development, and development of social services which are inclusive of welfare services but extended also to cover health, education, housing, rehabilitation, etc.

Apart from varied interpretations given to the term social development, most of the available definitions of social development emphasize the idea that social development is a process. Midgley cites two conceptions of social development to illustrate that 'process' is central to all definitions of social development. For example, UNDP viewed social development as a process of widening people’s choice to decide what they should have, be and do to ensure their own livelihood. Paiva viewed social development as a process of enhancing the capacity of individuals to work for their own, as well as for their society’s welfare. Midgley’s own definition views social development as “a process of planned social change designed to promote the well-being of the population as a whole in conjunction with dynamic process of economic development.”

In social work circles, where the term social development has gained considerable popularity, many definitions have been attempted. Salima Omer defined social development as a process concerned with achieving an integrated, balanced and unified social and economic development of society that gives expression to the value of human dignity, equality and social justice. This and several other definitions of social development being currently used in social work circles are too broad, idealistic and unclear about practical matters.

The international agencies and social science academics use the term to refer to social initiatives within the context of economic
development in the developing countries. They usually define social development as a progressive process, which results in a steady improvement in social conditions. A look at the documents released through the UN agencies reveals that most of these tend to view social development both as a process and an approach for promoting the level of 'social well-being'. Though again not defined, social well being is an umbrella concept encompassing equity, social justice and security, together with social cohesion, respect for human rights, non-discrimination and participation and empowerment of the impoverished people. In its literal sense social well being refers to the ability of every human being to satisfy his or her basic needs and to achieve a satisfactory quality of life within an environment of equity, social justice and human dignity. Social well-being is also designated to enable each individual to improve his ability to control his destiny by means of activities in the economic, social, cultural and political fields and to participate in the choices and decisions concerning society. Social wellbeing, many people aver, is the ultimate aim of social development, and the consideration of it can bring the 'human well-being cannot be regarded as a by product solely of economic growth, and hence, human wellbeing ensured through public welfare services and equitable distribution of resources and opportunities of growth are essential for the success of economic planning.

A journey through the relevant development literature reveals that many of the prevailing conceptualizations of social development are too broad to be of much use for development planners. The trouble is that neither the social development summit, nor its proponents have been able to come up with an acceptable
explanation of the concept. The confusion becomes more confounding when policy documents use such terms as ‘human development’, ‘humane development’, and ‘human face to development’. ‘Sustainable human development’, etc., as synonyms of social development. While the conceptual confusion remain more or less intact, working definitions of the term social development (again too broad and idealistic) are being proposed. For example, India’s country Report to the Social Development Summit describes social development as “a multi-dimensional effort meaning literacy, education and good health, and all that goes to make good health possible, like food and nutrition security drinking water, easy availability of medical and health care facilities (both preventive and curative), and full and productive employment. It means life in security under which the individual lives in a manner that suits him, while at the same time not infringing on other people’s rights. Social development obviously also means living in economic security fostered by rapid national economic development accompanied by distributive justice. Social development presupposes the evolution of both the individual and society in a manner that the happiness of both is ensured”.

A look at the Position Papers of several other countries submitted to the World Summit on Social Development reveals that elaborations on the concept of social development make liberal use of the terms and phrases like ‘social progress’; ‘planned and programmed efforts of peaceful social transformation’; ‘elimination of discrimination, exploitation and oppression of the socially and economically marginalized sections of society’; ‘sharing of the benefits of development both by the resourced and unresourced
sections of society'; ‘enhancement of the quality of human life especially of the poor and disadvantaged'; ‘improvements in human well being'; ‘improvements in the quantity and quality of public social services'; ‘focus on society and not on economy'; ‘creation of equal opportunities for all to participate fully and freely in economic social, cultural and political activities'; ‘people are the ends and not means of progress and development'; etc. How far this verbiage on social development carries the conviction of the Heads of the states and governments that gathered in Copenhagen, is apparently the bother of several social development support centres. For one thing is certain that the aforesaid objectives of an idealized version of social development will remain rooted in rhetoric in the absence of robust economic growth. Therefore, any conception of social development as a distinct dimension of development, independent and separate from economic paradigms of developments, has no takers amongst such economists and development planners whose opinions and views indeed matter in national planning processes. It is this backdrop that the nexus between economic and social dimensions of development has to be examined.

Social development as a process and an approach to social well being is not an independent and autonomous concept. A further, social development strategy are not mutually exclusive, but can be integrated to achieve social development goals in conjunction with the dynamic process of economic development. It is in this context of interdependence and strong nexus, that social and economic development should be addressed together, since neither can be achieved in isolation from each other. The declaration of the Social Development Summit clearly underscores this inseparable and
mutually reinforcing relationship. It is rightly said that social development is a necessary foundation for sustainable economic development, and conversely, broad-based and sustained economic development is a prerequisite for social development. Based on the experiences of economic growth in the developing countries, the summit recognized that while economic growth is the prerequisite and foundation of social development, social development requires much more than economic development and should be seen as the goal and intended result of economic growth. Material prosperity is necessary for social development, but is far from being sufficient. In a World Bank document, Birdsall asserted that investment in social development is good economics. Expert opinions favour this idea and come around the view that social values and humanitarian goals must inform the direct the necessary ends and means of economic development. The development think-tanks, throughout the world, now recognize the inseparability of social and economic development and increasingly argue that social development cannot take place without economic development, and economic development is meaningless if it is not accompanied by improvements in social welfare services for the population as a whole. To be successful, economic development should mean an increased well being of the whole society and not for al small segment of the rich, resourceful and property-owning class. Alternatively, the most distinctive feature of social development is its nexus with economic development. And, in that backdrop, social development explicitly seeks to integrate social and economic processes, viewing both elements as supportive to each other.
Having highlighted the mutually reinforcing relationship between social and economic development, this discussion considers the question as to whether the goals of both are different. Here again there are differences. Many of the proponents of economic growth model of development cling to the view that economic development in the newly developing countries must precede and not succeed social development, for, economic development would enable such countries to bring about social development. They argue that social development occurs naturally as a result of economic growth. Furthermore, they argue that there is hardly any contradiction between the goals of economic and social development, since both aim at 'progress' and 'dynamic social change'. Material progress, they say, leads to extinction of human misery and thereby to improvements in the quality of human life.

The proponents of social development, on the contrary, refute some of the basic assumptions regarding the percolation of economic development effects to promotion of social development. The argument advanced is that economic development parameters of development paradigm in the developed as well as in developing countries have resulted in the creation of islands of prosperity in the midst of an ocean of poverty. The growth, in terms of material prosperity, has made 'man' an economic being, blunting his social sensitivities, freezing his finer instincts and emotions, converting him into a self-centred, selfish and self-seeking person oblivious of his social obligations to help all those who are run down in the race of development and whose lives are characterized by fear, insecurity, want, dearth, disease and despair. The trickle-down effects of economic growth hardly reach the mass of pauperized persons. Had
that been so, the developed western nations may not be having a substantial proportion of their population living in poverty.

The awesome and often astonishing implications of an exclusivist growth model, with many disastrous social consequences, dissuade the social development theorists from buying the dream sold by establishment economists. They contend that social development, though related to economic development, stipulates different goals. The goals of social development, they say, require continuous efforts of reducing and eventually eliminating the major sources of social distress. In specific terms, social development goals aim at:

Promotion of social progress and betterment of human condition based on human dignity, equality, respect, mutual responsibility and cooperation.

- Placement of people at the centre of development and the economy at the service of human needs.
- Integration of economic and social policies to make them mutually supportive.
- Recognizing that sound and broad-based economic policies are necessary foundation to achieve sustainable social development.
- Promotion of just distribution of income and access to resources through equity and equality of opportunity at all levels.
- Strengthening of civil society and enabling people to achieve satisfaction of basic needs and to realize their dignity, safety and creativity.
- Empowering people to strengthen own capacities.
The central characteristics of social development revolve round (a) the needs and aspirations of all people; (b) their empowerment to maximize their capacities, resources and opportunities; (c) enhancement of people's rights, resources and potentialities to enable them to lead satisfying lives and contribute to the well-being of their families, their communities and to their society at large; (d) a fair distribution of the benefits of development; (e) facilitation of structural changes; and (f) the promotion of a development perspective in social welfare.

In the context of these goals and characteristics, the policy imperatives of social development emphasize the following:

- Social development is essential to achievement of human-centred economic development.

- The interlocking goals of social development and economic development are necessary to achieve fundamental objectives of sustainable human development.

- Integration of social development goals into micro and macro development policies.

- Action to enhance sustainable human development should concentrate on the needs of such people who are most severely disadvantaged or vulnerable.

- Ensuring that all citizens have reasonable access to education, work opportunities, land and financial resources in order to facilitate self-development.

- Ensuring that all citizens have access to a reasonable level of food, water, shelter, clothing, health services and other welfare services.
And finally, the establishment of a human, egalitarian and democratic society where the state remains constantly concerned with issues of human welfare and remains committed to ensuring human well-being in both the material and non-material sense.

A determined actualization of these policy imperatives requires formulation and implementation of such strategies and approaches, which have interdisciplinary focus and draw upon the insights of political economy which suggest the forging of strong linkages between social and economic development goals. In more specific terms the strategies require the active involvement of the state and the civil society in the implementation of pro-poor policies of social and economic development.

Social development discourse in India dates back to the initial years of development planning and the formulation of five-year Plans since 1950. Many writings on social development issues have surfaced much before the World Summit for Social Development (1995). For example, three pre-Summit volumes, viz., Gore (1985), Sharma (1986) and Pimpley, Singh and Mahajan (1989) have dealt with different dimensions of social development, containing many useful insights. A month before the Copenhagen Summit, R.R.Singh (1995) brought together a collection of four essays in a provocatively titled volume-Whither Social Development? The volume offered a competent critique on the Summit’s social development agenda. In 1997, P.D.Kulkarni and Meher C.Nanavatty published a collection of their earlier essays (on social development and allied subjects) in a fourteen-article volume. Between 1987 and 1997, there have appeared many articles and write-ups in national dailies, periodicals and social science journals. Taken together, the writings appear to be
voluminous, throwing issues, offering comments and making suggestions.

A journey through these writings makes one feel like getting a bagful of mixed stuff: of hope and despair, of delight and disappointment, and of accomplishments and failures. On all indicators of social development there is not much to cheer. Social policy documents (prioritizing programmes and projects introduced and implemented in the last fifty years of independence) make rhetorical noise in big, bold and beautiful words. The commitment to promote social development through planned programmes of development sounds excellent in a variety of government documents (including the Country Paper for Social Development Summit); it, however, does not fit well with ground level conditions with regard to poverty eradication, employment generation and promotion of social integration – the three pivotal themes of Social Development Summit.

Our poverty scenario is distressing, to say the least. We still have too many poor despite a gradual reduction in their number. The defiant human face of persisting poverty is extremely demoralizing despite the implementation of a large number of anti-poverty programmes being operated for years to wipe out the scourge of rural and urban poverty. Official claims notwithstanding, a substantial segment of our population (approximately 40%) is not able to satisfy its basic human needs. The situation regarding unemployment is no better. While millions of jobs have been created in the past five decades of development, millions are still unemployed, or under employed. The scenario of ‘jobless-growth’, following economic liberalization has shaken the people’s faith in all such claims, which
promise maximization of productive employment through a liberalized economic regimen. The problem of social exclusion is too evident from its daily manifestations in national life. Caste, communal and ethnic tensions and conflicts threaten the old Indian myth of unity in diversity.

Despite accelerated economic growth in recent years, our human development index compares very unfavourably with many developing countries, much smaller in size, resources and potentials. In all sectors of social development be it education, health, housing, sanitation, and water supply—our performance is far from satisfactory. After fifty years of Independence, we still have too many people who often go to their bed hungry, remain alive or die of malnutrition; have never been to any school, have contracted or died of simple, easily preventable and quickly curable diseases; have little or no access to modern medical facilities; have no means to afford an adequate shelter and have no stable jobs to ensure a reasonable standard of living for themselves, as also for their families. For all these people, 'development' has little meaning. The development we see around us in big cities in terms of wide roads, high-rise buildings, starred hotels, foreign-made cars, luxurious apartments and bungalows, markets and shopping malls full of fancy and expensive consumer goods, gala public functions and noisy private parties in five-star hotels, frequent foreign jaunts of high-flying people; latest marvels of telecommunication technology in hands in houses of sahibs and memsahibs — makes sense only for a miniscule minority of our population. While 10 to 20 per cent people live in prosperity, a staggering 80 per cent lives under conditions of grinding poverty. If this is what we mean by development in a democratic society
wedded to attainment of such goals as equity, equality, human dignity and justice – social, economic and political– only God can forgive us for being foolish. In a nutshell, we had ‘development’ of a very peculiar kind– a development, which helped the privileged few and hurt the pauperized millions. The distortions of development call for a halt now, if the society is to be saved from further degeneration. An accelerated pace of social development in these depressing days perhaps holds a flicker of hope.

The problems of distorted development are not far to seek in India where the chasm between the rich and the poor has grown too wide. India has followed an economic growth model, which has tended to exacerbate inequities. The benefits of development have been captured by the privileged few, both in rural and urban areas. The government has been too slow to recognize equity as an explicit objective of policy action owing to the politically charged nature of the issue. Under the impact of Structural Adjustment Programmes, economic reforms of the past few years have exacted huge social costs. To make things worse, adjustment policies are being implemented without sufficient sensitivity to social consequences. The retreat of the state from discharging its social obligations has complicated the already complex issues of social obligations has complicated the already complex issues of social development. The centrality of the human person in development has taken a backseat in the free interplay of market forces. The IMF and World Bank ‘conditionalities’ or structural adjustment policies have sharply reduced government intervention in the economy, curtailed social expenditures and limited social planning. As a result, the social
initiatives, which were adopted earlier, have been impeded and, in some cases, discontinued.

This baffling backdrop warrants a serious introspection on how to foster a meaningful synthesis between social and economic strategies of development, which may harmonize different viewpoints and accommodate different perspectives. Many insights are already available in the relevant recent literature on development and all of these need not be repeated here. However, the most important ones of these insights do need a mention. First, we need to have a clear vision on social development, beefed and buttressed by a strong commitment to actualize that vision. Second, we need to develop a frame for a well-conceived time bound programmes of action. Third, we have to have an appropriate organizational base to ensure effective implementation of policies and programmes. Fourth, we need to establish a national agency to direct, facilitate and coordinate social development planning and action. Fifth, we have to explore options for financing social development at higher rate than now. Sixth, and last of all, there is need for a strong political will to concretize the country’s commitments made public at the World Summit for Social Development in Copenhagen (1995). Such a commitment will be in conformity with the declaration of the Summit, which says: ‘nothing short of a renewed and massive political will to invest in people and their well being will achieve the objective of social development’.

As we have seen the dimensions of SD include numerous faces of development which may be of physical, social, intellectual, emotional, political, moral and spiritual forms of development. People should be physically sound, healthy and free from diseases,
so that, they may engage themselves efficiently in productive activities. For this purpose they need sufficient and nutritious food and freedom from disease. They become more capable by their intellectual development through the provision of education. Human beings are social animals and therefore, they need an environment where they co-exist with other fellow beings. There is need for political freedom that is the prevalence of democratic system for expressing their thoughts freely and electing the leaders of their choice. At all the same time, they need the moral and spiritual development also in order to led a disciplined and peaceful life. Moral values prevent the people from enjoying the comforts, which become neighbours poison. These various forms of dimensions of SD are not stable. They keep evolving and new dimensions are added to the list. In recent years, a few more dimensions included are participation, sustainability and gender equity. In this way, the concept has become more broadened and deepened. The various dimensions of SD may be summarised as below.

1. **Empowerment**

Empowerment takes place due to the expansion of human capabilities enabling the people to have enlarged choices and freedom from hunger, want and deprivations. People can meet only a few choices if they do not possess sufficient income, literacy and sound health. For instance, everybody is free to buy goods and services in the market but this freedom is not enjoyed by those who are too poor to afford the purchase in the market. Illiterate persons cannot enjoy the freedom to read the newspapers and other literatures. Similarly, the freedom to travel in the country is prevented by the mobility of the people.
2. Cooperation:

Cooperation is another important dimension of SD. People are social beings and they need a cooperative and harmonious environment around them for discharging their duties or supervising the business organisation in a peaceful manner. It requires a positive and cooperative attitude on the part of other fellow-beings. Thus SD is not only concerned with the people but also with their cultural environment which determines their way of life, interacting with each other and providing directions for the cohesive life.

3. Equity:

Generally speaking, equity is thought in terms of income and wealth distribution. In the context of SD, it is more concerned with basic equity in capabilities and opportunities. For achieving such equity, emphasis is to be given and appropriate strategies to be adopted for helping the poor, eliminating gender discrimination and supporting the sick and the disabled people. It requires the planning and the actions for the development of rural areas in the underdeveloped countries in order to bridge the rural-urban gap.

4. Sustainability:

Sustainability emphasis the enjoyment by the present generation not at the cost of the future generations. Its concern is with the intergenerational equity. Hence, the deforestation and the degeneration of environment by the present generation is inflicts cost on the future generations. The issue of sustainability goes beyond the environment in the context of SD. It further requires the creation of social and economic systems, which transmits the opportunities to the future generations. Protection of the rights of future generation
also requires the policy makers of today not to burden the future generation with internal and external financial debts and undemocratic political system where people do not enjoy the freedom of expression.

5. Security:

Security in the context of SD is a wider term encompassing the basic deeds of the people is the “Security of livelihood” as well as the security from unhealthy environment full off evils and various types of illness. Security has normally been treated as military security defending the border of the country from foreign aggression. But SD concern is the security of employment and peaceful working environment.

The various dimensions of SD are highly significant because they can be used to evaluate the quality of growth. The growth of a country would be considered appropriate if it promotes the SD in its all dimension. It should:

- Generate full employment and security of livelihood.
- Fosters people’s freedom and empowerment.
- Distributes benefits equitably.
- Promote social cohesion and cooperation.
- Safeguards future human development.

1.11. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the study are:

(i) To study conceptual framework and basic issues in social development.

(ii) To study the social, economic, historical and linguistic background of the Surjapuri Muslims in the districts of Kishanganj (Bihar) and Uttar Dinajpur (West Bengal).
(iii) To study the politics of territorial reorganization in India and its impact upon the Socio-Cultural Life of Surjapuri Muslims.

(iv) To review the progress made by the Surjapuri Muslims in the field of social development in these two districts.

(v) To study the impact and policies of different political dispensations on the Surjapuri Muslims across the two different states.

(vi) To identify the cause for the slow progress of the Surjapuri Muslims belonging to the two border districts of Kishanganj and Uttar Dinajpur.

(vii) To study and assess Social Development of Surjapuri Muslims vis-a-vis the other communities of the region.

1.12 SURVEY OF LITERATURE:

This section briefly examines the work done in this field. Survey of available literature reveals that besides the documents of state plans prepared by the Governments of Bihar & West Bengal, and occasional studies under taken by the planning commission, Government of India, Some Sporadic attempts were also made by some individual scholars and institutions. Among them the notables are:

(a) National Council of Applied Economic Research, New Delhi: Inter-district and Inter-State Income Differentials.


(c) Planning Commission, Govt. of India, Report of the Working Group of identification of backward areas, New Delhi, 1969.
(1). The pioneering work of Tiwari (1951) provides the estimates of state income by sectors for rural and urban areas. On this basis, the level of economic prosperity of UP was measured. The study describes in detail the methodology used in the estimation of state product. It also gives the sources of data used for preparing the state income estimates.

(2). Kripasharkar (1970) uses such factors as the general feature of the state, its income, agricultural growth, land reforms, progress of irrigation and power, improvement in agricultural practices. Industrial growth, community development and Panchayat, and transport to study economic development of the state. This study also contains a brief summary on "Plans of UP". Important discussions on the sector-wise outlay, per capita outlay and per capita Central assistance, financing of the plans, starting from the first to fourth five year plans are described. The study concludes with suggestions for accelerated growth of the economy. The period of study relates to the years 1950-51 to 1965-66.

(3) Papola's (1979) work-studies on development of U.P. contain six papers based on some of the studies taken by the Staff members of the Giri Institute (Lucknow). The major aspects covered by the study are agriculture and industrial development of U.P. It provides trends and prospects of agricultural growth, Rural employment, Rural industrialisation development and location dispersal of Industries and Industrial entrepreneurship in the state. Although an important contribution to the existing economic literature on Utter Pradesh, it deals only with a part of the whole problem. For example it does not provide any information for the testimony sector, which has already become an important key sector for rapid development of
a region. However, it is a collection of papers prepared with the different objectives.

(4) Tewari (1979) suggests the development priorities for the homogeneous clusters of districts in respect of development levels. This study employs 38 indicators of development. It measures separately the level of development in terms of resource endowments with 14 indicators, Institutional structure with 5 indicators, and economic development with 19 indicators. The technique of Euclidean Cluster Analysis has been employed for identifying cluster of homogeneous districts. All the districts have been classified into highly developed regions, well-developed region, and regions having economic development of medium level –1, region, having development of medium level-2, developing and under developed regions and extremely backward regions. In the end a planning strategy for each district is suggested for improvement and reducing regional disparities.

(5). Singh A.K. (1981) is an abridged and Revised Version of his thesis entitled “Comparative Economic Development of the Eastern and Western Regions of Uttar Pradesh Since 1951”. It presents both empirical and theoretical approaches concerning regional development. Singh discusses the problems of regional disparities in the global setting and provides the experiences of various developed and developing countries. Further, the focuses the Comparative analysis of development for Eastern and Western regions of U.P. Study also provides some analysis at district level. The period of study is between 1951 to 1975. The objectives of the study are to measure inter-regional disparities during planning period. The relationship of the differences in per Capita income with the
difference in economic structure, labour productivity and availability of infrastructure have been examined. The reasons for low level of development and slow rate of growth of Eastern U.P. are mentioned.

The study suggests the policies for eradicating poverty and securing balanced regional development in the State. Among them the important ones are the removal of natural handicaps (such as floods), expansion of capital facilities, modernization of agriculture, and rapid industrialization. In addition, study also prescribes creation of national fund for the financial assistance of the backward areas, constitution of the bodies like Regional Planning and Development Authority (RPDA) and Regional Planning Advisory Council (RPAC) for the identification of problem and framing meaningful policies. Study also advocates grass root planning for balanced regional development.

(6) The National Council of Applied Economic Research in its study entitled ‘Inter-District and Inter State Income Differentials 1955-56, investigate that out of 29 most backward districts in India with a per Capita income of less than Rs. 146, & 11 belong to U.P. In the Second group of 29 Districts with a per Capita income Rs. 147 to 173, 11 are from U.P thus out of 58 poorest District in the country. U.P. has as much as 22 such districts, followed by Bihar 12 Orissa M.P. 5, Karnataka 3, Maharastra 3 and so on.

(7) The study of Area planning Division has been under taken to analyse and evaluate inter-regional and inter-regional disparities in the levels of development, to prepare regional profiles and characterization of regions, to provide an objective basis for regional configuration of the state, to formulate regional development strategy relevant to different regions, and prepare a framework for dis-
aggregating sectoral development profiles taking into consideration their divisibility and viability at various levels of decision making. On this basis the districts of U.P. has been grouped into 12 homogenous groups on the basis of development. This has been done to provide a coordinating link for integrating micro-level plan to that of state original level plan. This study is almost similar to that of Tewari (1970). This study does not provide details about methods and technique used.

All the works described above show that the work done in this area is either too old or very elementary. It does only provide a framework for measuring the level of economic development or the quantum of disparities existing in the regions. Needless to say, these studies on regional disparities are of basic importance for planners and Policy makers.

But there are variations within states and within regions as well. In addition to spatial variations (rural-urban, inter-district, inter-agro-climatic zooms) differentials have been observed across social groups, notably caste and religious group.

Indian society today has become increasingly divided on communal lines. And the idea of ‘appeasement’ to Muslims is strongly embedded in public debate about the privileges that India largest religious minority is supposed to be enjoying. The misplaced notions and lies about appeasement could be dispelled. If there was information about the socio-economic condition of the members of each religious group, in each state by gender and by place of residence.

Unfortunately, until recently such socio-economic data was not generated by government agencies. This is consistent with the refusal
to collect information on caste basis. The basic and false premise is that you can wish away differences by just refusing to measured them. Differences according to religion and caste simply do not exist then. Just as unforgivable is the unwillingness of the Indian Academy community to explore these issues in detail, specially at a time when ‘created’ facts about majority and minority religious community are commonly used in political discourse. The only exceptions are attempts to study the demographic behaviour of religious groups (itself a subject of immense falsification and the root of outlandish fears in the public imagination). Social Science researchers have been irresponsible by refusing to study where the member of India many religious group stand in a variety of social and economic indicators.

The generation of more information on socio-economic status, according to religion and a detailed analysis by researchers may just clear the common misconceptions that are excellent fodder for social and political forces that thrive on creating divisions.

There has been some change in positive direction recently. Some attempts, though, sporadic have been made by a number of scholars and institutions. Notables among them are:


(3). Razzack, Azra and Gumber, Anil, (May,2002),
“Differentials in Human Development: A case for empowerment of Muslims in India”, New Delhi: NCAER.

(4). Deshpande, Satish (The Hindu, Dec. 6 and 7, 2001).

Dr. Deshpande of the Institute of economic growth analysed the cast data compiled by National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO), Ministry of Planning, Government of India, New Delhi. His analysis was published in The Hindu on December 6th and 7th, 2001. According to him NSSO estimates suggest that 90 Per cent of India’s poor are members of the Schedule Castes and Tribes, the Hindu OBCs and Muslims.

(5). Shariff, Abusaleh (Dec. 1999), in his pioneering work “Socio-economic and demographic differentials between Hindus and Muslims in India”, analyses the socio-economic and demographic data according to religion available from various censuses, National Sample Survey and Academic Publication since independence of India. He observed that The Hindus are the significant majority in all states excepting in Jammu and Kashmir and Punjab, where Muslims and Sikhs respectively outnumber them. Among the 14 major states, the Christians are found in substantial percentage only in Kerala. It is found that the growth of Muslims is higher than that of the other religious populations. Muslims are found to be dwelling relatively more in urban areas than the other sets of people. Muslims mare mostly self-employed and their share in regular paid job is low. Hindu population is relatively better employed in regular employment in urban areas. The work participation of Muslim females is extremely low. The land holding is relatively better among the Hindus than the Muslims, and Muslims work on non-agricultural
occupations in substantial proportions in rural parts of India. Muslims by far are least educated when compared with Hindu and Christian populations in India. The scenario is same if one studies the student population both in rural and urban areas as well. Muslim women are the least educated of all the possible categories. Although the Monthly Per Capita Expenditure (MPCE) compares well between the Hindus and Muslims in rural areas, it is highly lopsided favouring Hindus in the urban areas. On the whole the Muslims are socio-economically worse off in all parts of the country.

He concludes by emphasising the need to strengthen the database, which would allow a study of ethnic and religious differentials in socio-economic and educational achievements.


Kulkarni, observes that social groups in India differ considerably in educational achievement and economic conditions. The Scheduled Castes and Tribes fare poorly compared to non-Scheduled Caste/Tribe Hindus. Muslims also do not do as well as non-Scheduled Caste/Tribe Hindus. But there are notable regional variations in the disparities. In some states, notably Kerala, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu, the gap in literacy between Scheduled Castes and other Hindus has declined recently, either due to government efforts or otherwise. But in many states the gap has been very wide and continues as such even in current enrolment. The special schemes for the advancement have apparently not made much impact in these
states. The Scheduled Tribes are not in a disadvantageous position in the North-east and is states like Karnataka and Himachal Pradesh with small Scheduled Tribe populations. But in the Central Indian tribal belt, in which most of the Scheduled Tribe population lives, their position is very poor vis-a-vis non-tribal population. Muslims in the southern-Western States show educational development comparable to Hindus, but in the Northern-eastern region Muslims are educationally backward. Moreover, for women, the relative position has slipped further in the recent past mainly because Hindu women have shown a much faster advance than Muslim women have. However, the regional pattern of Hindu/Muslim disparities in education is not visible in economic indicators.

1.13. THE PRESENT STUDY:

A perusal of various works described above conceptualizes Social Development Differentials of various Social Groups in India at the National level. Therefore, these works are relevant and useful for measuring group differentials at the macro level. But, there are disparities among social groups at the sub-National level and these are not uniform across different states, either in magnitude or indirection and in a few cases go against common perceptions. Macro level studies at National level fail to reveal disparities among population Sub-Groups at the state, district, regional and community levels. It is thus, not useful for policy prescriptions for raising the level of Social Development at the micro level.

This study would like to take up the task of comparing the magnitude and direction of Social Development among the Surjapuri Muslims in the districts of Kishanganj (Bihar) and Uttar Dinajpur
(West Bengal). Since, the Surjapuri Muslims in these two districts cutting across state boundaries shared similar natural resources, cultural and historical experiences, thus, any disparity between the level of development among the Surjapuri Muslims inhabiting these two districts may be construed as a result of the state specific policies of the Government of Bihar and that of the government of West Bengal towards the Muslim minorities.

For this purpose we have provided the conceptual framework and debated the basic issues related to development in the first chapter. Chapter-II deals with the research design of the study. The different techniques of data collection have been elaborated. The sources of secondary data have been explained. This chapter has been concluded with describing the methodology of village studies.

Religion has been major factor in social stratification. Though predominantly Hindu, India has a large Muslim population. In addition to theological differences there are variations in life styles, political and historical factors that would have created differentials in different development conditions among populations belonging to various religions. In Chapter-III, social development differentials according to religion have been analysed in detail taking various aspects of development such as material wellbeing, education and health. Muslims in India suffers from substantial socio-economic deprivation than Hindus. But the degree of disparity is not uniform across states, either in magnitude or in direction. In this Chapter the regional pattern of social development of Muslims in India have also been analysed. By establishing the regional pattern of development, the location of Kishanganj (Bihar) and Uttar Dinajpur (West Bengal) has been identified.
A detail historical account of the Surjapur region and a comprehensive ethnographic profile of Surjapuri Muslims have been provided in Chapter-IV and Chapter-V respectively.

Historically, the Surjapur region was a part of the undivided Purnea district of Bihar. The Surjapuri Muslims occupied eastern third of that district to the east of the river Mahananda. They are said to be of ‘koch origin’ and speak a mixture of Bihari and Bengali, closely resembling the koch-Bengali of Malda. Although in the main, a Bengali dialect, it is written in the Kaithi character, which is one of those used for Bihari. But for the purpose of writing they always used urdu.

At the time of partition of India in 1947, parts of the districts of Dinajpur and Jalpaiguri in the old province of Bengal were allotted to East Pakistan (now Bangla Desh), with the result that the new state of West Bengal severed into two separate physical parts. The West Bengal government, pleaded for the transfer of eastern parts of Purnea district to West Bengal, so that the physical contiguity between the two parts of West Bengal might be established, and, further so that at least the whole length of the National Highway might lie entirely within the territories of West Bengal. But the typical linguistic complexion of the Surjapuri dialect made the region disputed for reorganisation. Thus, claims and counter claims were made by the Bihar and the West Bengal governments. The States Reorganisation Commission found the linguistic complexion of the disputed area quite unclear and hence considered the claim of West Bengal government and recommended the transfer of the area to West Bengal. As a result a sizeable population of Surjapuri Muslims was transferred from the Kishanganj subdivision of Purnea district to
West Dinajpur district of West Bengal. However, an exception was made in respect of Kishanganj town. Recently the district of Kishanganj has been carved out from the Purnea district a couple of years ago. The district of Uttar Dinajpur has been carved out from the West Dinajpur district as an independent district. The Uttar Dinajpur district is largely constituted of the area transferred to West Bengal in 1956. Therefore, the Surjapuri Muslims today, have a predominant population in the districts of Kishanganj (Bihar) and Uttar Dinajpur (West Bengal). Despite being an important agriculturist community of the region, it has hitherto remained unexplored. Therefore, this is an exploratory study of the community, comparing the level of social development in the districts of Kishanganj and Uttar Dinajpur.

In Chapter-VI the development levels of the district of Kishanganj and the district of Uttar Dinajpur has been compared. The level of social development of Surjapuri Muslims in the districts of Kishanganj and Uttar Dinajpur could have been easily analysed, if there was information about the socio-economic condition of each religious group in each state by place of residence. Since, the Surjapuri Muslims have a predominant population in these two districts, it has been inferred that the social development levels of these districts, represent the social development level of Surjapuri Muslims in each district. Assuming this, the social development levels of these two districts have been compared vis-a-vis the development levels of respective states and also between them.

A synthesis of 4 village studies has been provided in Chapter-VII. The basic aim of the village studies is the understanding of ground level realities and providing validity to the community level
comparison of Surjapuri Muslims governed by two different states. The village studies were undertaken to disaggregate the district level data further to the religious group level. Two villages, one predominantly Hindu and one predominantly Muslim were chosen from each district. Through the detailed studies of the villages, conclusions have been drawn.

While the comparison of the level of social development of the Surjapuri Muslims in the districts of Kishanganj (Bihar) and Uttar Dinajpur (West Bengal) appears at many places in Chapter-VI and VII, an attempt is made to demonstrate it cohesively in the conclusion.

Being an exploratory and ethnographic study, we hope it would be relevant, first, in filling up the gap in the literature of Indian Sociology, which has hitherto been paid very little attention to the study of Indian Muslims. Second, its relevance would be in generating data related with various aspects of social development in an unexplored community. These would certainly be useful for those who theorize about Muslims without having sufficient empirical data. Last but not the least, the study would be relevant for the community, which does not have any cohesive written record till today.
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