CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Regional problems and policies to solve them, have invited world-wide interest since the middle of the twentieth century. They are engaging the attention of all the countries in the world, capitalistic or socialistic. Removing economic inequalities among regions has become as important now as removing economic inequalities among individuals.

The defining and demarcating of a region to tackle its problems may differ according to the circumstances and conditions. There are several approaches to identify depressed regions, the first being based on homogeneities, nodality or administrative convenience. They are also categorised as metropolitan regions, or developmental axes which are elongated corridors along principal transport routes linking metropolitan regions, or frontier regions contiguous to old development regions. Based on planning requirements, regions sometimes are classified as highly industrialised regions, agricultural regions, industrial-cum-agricultural regions and regions with tourist attraction. But the most compelling factor for
spatial considerations in many countries is the feeling of separateness by the people of the region based on language, religion, race or tribe and traditional memory of things done to them or suffered by them. These factors are responsible for producing regional boundaries that have very little pure economic validity.

Whatever may be factors that are taken into consideration for identifying regions as backward, the reasons for their backwardness wherever they are, are common. Their backwardness is due to excess population, lack of basic employment, lack of locational advantages, lack of economies of scale and the existence of glaring chasm in the capital-output ratio. A misguided policy of public finance is also responsible for making a region more depressed. If, due to declining local revenues, the public authorities increase the local taxation rates, what little industry there is, will go elsewhere. Similarly there may be outward migration from the region, of the young and energetic families leaving the old and infirm, behind. Emigration of the able bodied from a region and their immigration into another region with their skills and capacities are also responsible for the emergence of regional disparities in several countries.
To identify any region as backward, there are three important indicators. (1) The people in a distressed region have lower average incomes than in the other regions of a country. (2) The unemployment rates are very high because of lot of people are subjected to the risk of relatively short average periods of unemployment or a relatively small number, face the prospect of long periods of unemployment. (3) The emigration of young and educated will be higher from the region due to lack of total opportunities and due to conditions of distress prevailing there.

If the falling levels of income and employment and rising rates of emigration continue in a particular region or regions, the "regional dualism" or the existence of regions as rich and poor may create not only economic problems but political problems that threaten the unity of a country. Any Government should not allow such tendencies to grow but should take immediate steps to bridge the gap between the prosperous and distressed regions. There are several ways for the Government to intervene to realise that objective. But criticism of Government intervention in regional matters is not wanting. The critics say that free-market forces are capable of restoring economic equilibrium among the regions and any Government intervention
tantamounts to reward failure and punish success. That argument can be rebutted by giving examples of the existence of regional disparities in capitalist countries where free-market mechanism operates. There, the governments are encouraging the expanding firms located in prosperous areas to set up branches in depressed areas by offering them substantial grants, loans at lower rates of interest and all types of tax concessions. It is definitely not punishing the success and rewarding the failure. So, government intervention is necessary to restore economic equilibrium among the regions, to raise the national output by raising the regional output, and to make the party in power, reap political advantage of winning the elections.

The intervention by the government to set right the Regional imbalances is otherwise known as Regional Policy. It attempts to assess the strength of regional economic forces and to channel them for the achievement of social and economic goals. The important instruments of a sound regional development policy is the control of over agglomeration of cities. The next important thing to do is providing the employment opportunities in the region itself. If not, people will go to other regions where work is available. It will lead to antagonism between them and the old residents. If people go to cities
from villages in search of work, it is much worse because it will make the former more congested and create socially and politically undesirable problems. So, the best regional policy should consist of the principle of "taking work to the workers" and not "workers to the work". Growth points also can be selected in an agricultural or mining area for the development of a region. One more instrument of regional policy is, establishing industrial complex in public sector if private sector is hesitating to invest. To encourage location of industries and attract private enterprise the Government can provide infrastructure facilities and cash-incentives in the form of cheap loans, tax remissions and capital grants. But as cash incentives operate more favourably on capital intensive industries, it is suggested to provide subsidies on employment, in the regions having surplus labour. In addition, the quality of labour can be improved by providing educational and training facilities. Apart from these, the main means of getting enterprise to a depressed region is, by adopting a proper licensing policy and imposing restrictions on the size of the floor area and buildings of major industries.

Regional development policy should be the responsibility of the Centre and if left to the States, it may result in the breakup of nations. One cannot expect to produce quick results through a regional policy and it cannot be given up after trying for some time. It should be a long and continuous process being adopted in accordance to the changing conditions of the regions. Regional development policy is linked with regional growth which means an increase in the total real value of income in a region. Even though growth is interpreted as an increase in the welfare, it is not accepted as a suitable variable because, welfare in something vague and cannot be measured. Growth is therefore interpreted as increase in the output of a region and increase in the set of final commodities which are available to the region. The first stage of economic growth of a region is self sufficient subsistence economy in which there is little investment or trade. The next stage is the starting of simple village industries by the farmers and labourers from the materials available in the region and the market furnished by the agricultural population. The third stage consists of the developments of inter-regional trade with the inhabitants taking to dairy farming, poultry keeping, horticulture, sericulture and other commercial occupations. The fourth is, that when
agriculture begins yielding diminishing returns and with the increase in population, industrialisation is started on a large scale.

All regions do not have even growth. It is because some are endowed with natural advantages such as facilities for raw materials and cheap power. They have the "backwash effect" of attracting capital and labour from the rest of the economy and the "spread effect" of spilling over its development benefits to the adjoining areas. The other regions, denied of such advantages become comparatively less and less developed. The disparity among regions can also be attributed to the emergence of growth poles and the tendency of concentration of economic activity in certain centres due to the availability of skilled labour and transport, communications, banking and other facilities. The uneven growth of the regions has become the cause of great concern of modern Governments. They have taken to Regional Planning as a panacea for spatial inequalities.

Regional planning is spatial or local planning. It is drawn up having due regard to the problems of the region and the needs as ascertained by systematically assessing them. A regional approach to planning is be-
coming inevitable because we cannot ignore the reality of
the existence of space in which human beings live and work.
Besides, the resources are space-bounded and planning for
resource development has to be spatial planning. As there
is maldistribution of human and natural resources planning
must be attempted at many territorial levels to develop
the economy of the country as well as of each region.
Therefore regional planning and national planning are not
contradictory but complementary to each other.

The scope of regional planning differs from coun-
try to country and from region to region within the coun-
try depending upon differences in natural resource endow-
ment, locational advantage and other factors. However
when formulating a regional plan we must make sure that
each region contributes to the national growth process in
accordance with its natural and human resources through
its own optimum development.

Any effective regional planning has to be attem-
pied at three levels. The first is at national level
where policy revisions on the rate of growth of the na-
tional product, become basic inputs in any spatial analysis.
Next is, regional economic planning proper. It involves
an understanding of the operation of individual regional economic policies. The third level of planning is town and country planning concerned largely with determining the layout of urban areas, designing of transport network and public utility services on a local basis. From the regional point of view all three levels should be coordinated.

Next important aspect of regional planning is what should be the appropriate unit of regional planning? It need not be delimited by natural geographical boundaries or administration boundaries, but according to need or purpose in relation to a particular area depending on social, economic or political considerations.

Regional planning can be adoptive or developmental. Adoptive type is based primarily on a recognition of the impact of general trends of development on the spatial system. Development type seeks to achieve a sustained process of rapid economic development. It is a long-term phenomenon that should be adopted to the existing trends of development.

Regional planning involves several issues. For the planner, ecological regional studies are of an utmost
importance in framing his strategy, defining his objectives, and appreciating the limits of intervention by the State. He has to understand specific problems chiefly affecting the depressed areas or metropolitan regions suffering from congestion and its concomitant problems. Regional planning now has become a country-wide exercise and not confined to particular problems of specific areas. Often times, the concept of a region cuts across the boundaries of these areas. They emerge as geographical regions, agricultural regions and so on. The planner should adopt a particular planning approach that should be related to their problems. In regional planning there should be a study of the spill-over effects or economic development of any centre or region. In some cases those effects are limited only to the confines or surrounding area, but in other cases they spread far into the hinterland as seen in the growth of vegetables and farming in areas distant from Bombay. As Prof. D.R. Gadgil rightly observes in certain areas of India "imitation is quick and innovation spreads quickly. In other areas, this does not happen to anything like the same extent. The Planner, if he is in fact, attempting to do regional planning, has to take account of them". As the planner looks to a fairly

distant future he has to study the existing situation in relation to ultimate objectives and ability that he possesses to transform the situation in the desired direction.

The important aims of regional planning are the promotion of overall progress of national economy without neglecting the needs of the depressed regions, maintenance and encouragement of the social and cultural basis of the life of regional populations, reduction of economic imbalances between regions and developing infrastructure consistent with the national and regional aims and with the economic resources available. Regional planning is therefore essentially an exercise in coordination aimed at both improving the economic foundations of a region and meeting its physical and social needs within the framework of national needs, priorities and potential.

To realize the aims and objectives of regional planning there should be a proper strategy. The first step towards it is, taking an inventory of local resources and indicating a strategy of development of the region within the overall strategy of development for the nation as a whole. The next step is working out the plan within the physical and financial constraints and finalising its scope
after consultation with the people's representatives and also at various levels.

The regional planning should take into account the differences in production costs in different regions, the differences in transportation costs, and the differences in income targets that reflect different regional interests. It should be preceded by proper surveys of the region, preparation of maps, and collection of adequate statistical data. The formulation of the planning may be from above to prevent incorrect decisions with regard to the optimum use of scarce resources or from below to infuse regional initiative and a sense of participation among the people. There can be interaction of both wherever necessary.

Regional planning has important tasks like coordinating locational decisions, coordinating national and regional targets. For all these purposes, there should be proper research in regional planning to uncover the laws, principles and processes underlying human behavioural patterns. To the regional planning, the term "development" must be added as it not only attempts to bring about structural change in social and economic spheres but also
seeks to maximise the exploitation of natural resources.

The role of regional planning should not be limited to any particular level of region. It should deal with all the regional levels - macro, meso and micro which make up the spatial hierarchical system. Finally, there should be integration of inter-regional, intra-regional, and rural and urban development in any systematic regional planning.

Before tracing the evolution of regional development planning in relation to Rayalaseema, a brief review of how it evolved at national level may make our study more broad-based. India being a vast country with significant variations in environment, climate, language, religion and culture, it is necessary to have multilevel planning as an integral part of national planning. But India's first five Year Plan (1951-56), the first of its kind of planning at national level could not even think in terms of regional development. The two important problems that obsessed the minds of the Planners at that time were to provide housing for millions of refugees from Pakistan, and to raise irrigational potentialities to make good the canal system that was lost to Pakistan. The second Five Year Plan on the other hand laid emphasis on
the development of industries. Agricultural and industrial development being a basic necessity for any backward country to build up its economy on a solid foundation it is no wonder that sectors of agriculture and industry found a rightful place in the First and Second Five Year Plans. It was only the Third Five Year Plan (1961-66) that directed its attention for the first time to spatial problems. But it viewed regional planning with suspicion and wanted to guard against its becoming antithetical to national planning.

The Fourth Five Year Plan (1969-74) however gave up of this half-hearted approach and adopted a bold policy. It said in clear terms that balanced regional development and dispersal of economic activity were closely related and that planning at regional level and at national level should be integrated to realise an overall economic progress of the nation. Accordingly regional planning was initiated during the Fourth Five Year Plan under the name of "area development".

The Fifth Five Year Plan (1974-79) firmly believed that accelerated development of backward areas
should be the responsibility of both the State and the Centre and they should make their combined contribution in accordance with a well-formulated and integrated plan of action. It that direction, it introduced sub-plan approach for the development of tribal and hill areas and minimum-needs programme to ameliorate the conditions of the weaker sections of the community in specific regions.

The Sixth Five Year Plan (1980-85) has as its objective the progressive reduction of regional inequalities, through (1) the diffusion of skills and technology to the backward areas. (2) strengthening of specific programmes meant to deal with the deficiencies of scanty rainfall, frequency of floods, difficult terrain, desert conditions and so on and (3) transferring of resources to areas afflicted with backwardness.

The foregoing brief analysis gives a theoretical background for the core of the thesis for which the source of inspiration was the observation made by Professors Brown and Burrows:

"like all economic problems that are important in practice, regional economic problems
are matters that worry people or Governments in connection with the ordinary business of earning a living, or sometimes in political or social connections related to it. What makes them "regional" is simply their being concerned predominantly with a major division of a country, or with the relations between the affairs of different major divisions of it. Most commonly they arise from economic grievances that are felt by the people or by important sections of the people in such major divisions; that is to say in particular regions. Less often they spring, not so much from the worries of people in particular regions, as from a more general concern of national opinion, or the central Government, with the distribution of economic activity and population between regions. They are economic problems with a spatial basis of the particular kind that we normally call regional.3

The problem region of Rayalaseema has a history of regional planning which is traced back to the year 1938 when the then British Government appointed the Famine Code Revision Committee (FCRC) to formulate proposals for

---

the development of the region. Based on its recommendations the Ceded Districts Economic Development Board (CDEDB) was formed in March, 1941.

In the following paragraphs the most important observations made in the study are summarised.

The CDEDB was constituted with the member of the Board of Revenue in charge of famine as the Chairman. The size of the Board was fixed. In addition to the Chairman there were 12 members of whom 5 were officials of the rank of Heads of Departments of irrigation etc., 6 were non-officials and one was a full-time Secretary of the rank of a Deputy Collector whose duty was to supervise and to ensure successful implementation of the programmes.

The CDEDB was only an advisory body with no executive powers and funds at its disposal. There was no regularity in the meetings held by the Board. Sometimes the members met in about a month after the previous meeting and there were occasions when the interval between one meeting and another exceeded 7 months. It was either due to the transfers of the Chairmen or due to their pre-occupation as members of the Board of Revenue. That the
Chairmen were frequently transferred is evident from the fact that in 7 years of the functioning of the CDEDB there were 10 of them. Another interesting feature of the Board was, that out of 10 chairmen 8 were foreigners and 2 were Indians, but these two did not belong to the region of Rayalaseema. Therefore the greatest criticism levelled against CDEDB was that with no executive powers, with no funds and with Chairmen, not belonging to the region and having transfers even within a year of appointment it was inherently incapable of producing any results.⁴

The position of the Chairman of the CDEDB was the greatest weakness of the system. For any regional body to be effective, the chairman, if he is an official should not be subject to frequent transfers. If he is a non-official should be a man belonging to the region. In addition to that, enough funds should be kept at his disposal for the execution of the proposals made by the members.

The Rayalaseema Development Board (RDB), the successor to CDEDB had as its Chairman the Minister for Rayalaseema Development. It had 3 more ministers of

Agriculture, Irrigation and Finance as ex-officio members.
The non-official members consisted of 5 members of Legislature, 5 members of the public taken at the rate of one from each of the 5 districts of Rayalaseema and not more than 5 members of the public of the State who were actively interested in the development of the regions. The official members were 6, with the three Chief Engineers of Irrigation, electricity and Highways, the Registrar of Cooperative Societies, the Director of Agriculture, and the Director of Industries. The Secretary of the RDB was the Development Commissioner of the rank of District Collector and ex-officio Joint Secretary in the Development Department. Altogether the total strength of the RDB was 26 including the Chairman. It was definitely more broad-based than the CDEDB which had only 12 members. The Chairman being the minister for Rayalaseema Development and assisted by three more ministers, RDB was also more powerful. There was also difference in the status of the Secretary of the Board. He was of the rank of a District Collector and was also an ex-officio Joint Secretary in the Development Department. His status made it easy for him to deal with the Heads of the Departments on an equal level, to coordinate the activities of the various
departments and to control the district staff including the Collectors.

The RDB held 14 meetings in which it considered 150 proposals under different sectors for the development of the region. The action taken by the Government is categorised as "accepted", "under consideration" and "not accepted". Of the 150 proposals 34 or 22 per cent were "accepted", 57 or 38 per cent were kept "under consideration" and 59 or 48 per cent were "not accepted". With regard to the earlier body, viz., CDEDB, there was no evidence of the number of proposals made and how many of them were accepted or rejected. In that respect RDB was better organised than the CDEDB. If we take "accepting" and keeping "under consideration" as positive action of the Government it can be said that RDB as a proposal making body lived up to its expectations because both categories form 60 per cent of the proposals. But how far this entire exercise of constituting the RDB, conducting the meetings, and making proposals, contributed to the development of the region? It can be judged from the actual implementation of the schemes. As no funds were placed at the disposal of the Board, many of the recommen-
ations were not sanctioned by the Government. When the Government did not sanction funds to execute the proposals it accepted, the conclusion is inevitable that the RDB was one more futile attempt made to go the same way as CDEDB. Even though the membership of the RDB was double to that of CDEDB, its life span was less than half of the latter. In 1953, when the Andhra State was formed, the RDB was abolished. Thus came the end of one more Board formed with the pious intention of developing the backward region of Rayalaseema.

If any regional development board has to function as an effective instrument, it is not enough that it has a permanent Chairman of the rank of a minister and more persons as members to make proposals. Or, mere acceptance of the proposals as in the case of the RDB, serves no purpose. Only when the Government translates them into action by executing the proposals, there is meaning in constituting a regional body.

In the chequered history of the evolution of regional development in Rayalaseema, the creation of Rayalaseema Planning and Development Board (RPDB) in 1969, is an important event. During the period of 16 years
between 1953 and 1969, i.e., between the abolition of RPDB and the creation of RPDB, the Government did nothing particular to tackle the problem of Rayalaseema. Probably it was due to, two political stalwarts of the region Sri N. Sanjeeva Reddy and Sri D. Sanjeevaiah becoming Chief Ministers of the State one after the other in that period. The people of the region might have felt that there was no need for a separate Body to be created to look into their interests because its creators themselves were their men. But after the Chief ministership passed out of their hands, the legislators of Rayalaseema organised a Convention and agitated for the constitution of a Statutory Board for the development of the region. The outcome of it was the birth of RPDB in 1969.

The RPDB had two constituents (1) General Body (GB) and (2) The Executive Committee (EC). Besides the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, the members of the RPDB consisted of all members of Parliament from Rayalaseema, all members of Legislative Assembly and Council from Rayalaseema, Chairmen of the four Zilla Parishads, Chairman of Tirupati Municipal Council, the Collectors of the four and Districts, all the Heads of the Departments of the Government. The Government decided how many times
the GB and the EC should meet. It also decided what its functions were. The functions of the Board were (1) to prepare a long-term plan for the eradication of famines in Rayalaseema, (2) to suggest schemes for inclusion in the annual plan of 1969-70 and the Fourth Five Year Plan, (3) to recommend further measures if any that may be necessary to accelerate the pace of development of Rayalaseema and (4) to review the progress in respect of development schemes pertaining to Rayalaseema.

The finances of the RPDB were the normal Plan Funds and Special Development Fund. The Plan outlays were allotted between the three regions of the State on the basis of 90 per cent based on population according to 1971 census and the balance of 10 per cent based on the criterion of backwardness in the ratio of 5:3:2 among Telangana, Rayalaseema and Coastal Andhra respectively. The amounts that accrued as the share of Rayalaseema from the expenditure of the State Annual Plans is given below.

Besides the share of the region in the outlays of the normal annual plans, as shown in the table, the Government allocated Rs. 4 crores as Special Development
### Table 1
RAYALASEEMA SHARE OF THE STATE EXPENDITURE OF THE ANNUAL PLANS (Rs. in crores)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State Plan Expenditure</th>
<th>Rayalaseema share of expenditure</th>
<th>Percentage of Column 3 to 2 expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>76.94</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>86.99</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>19.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>105.37</td>
<td>22.49</td>
<td>21.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>96.34</td>
<td>20.48</td>
<td>21.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>365.64</td>
<td>71.96</td>
<td>19.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fund at the rate of one crore for each of the four districts of Rayalaseema.

Compared to the RDB, the RPDB was better organised, and better represented. While the Chairman of the RDB was also the minister in charge of Development of Rayalaseema, the chairman of the RPDB was kept in sole charge with the status of a minister so that he could devote his entire attention, authority for the development of the
region. In addition there was Vice-Chairman also. The RDB, had as its members, three ministers and 5 members of legislature belonging to Rayalaseema, and 5 members of the State who were interested in the welfare of the region. The membership of the RPDB, on the other hand, consisted of all members of Parliament and Legislature elected from the region, all the Chairmen of the Zilla Parishads and Collectors of the four districts, in addition to all the Head of Departments. Besides, the Secretary of the RPDB was the Secretary to Government and the Board was provided with secretarial assistance to coordinate its work.

Another noteworthy feature that distinguishes RPDB from its earlier counterpart was with regard to funds. It could suggest schemes to cover nearly 20 per cent of State Plan allocations and in addition, an annual provision of Rs. 4 crores as Special Development Funds. But like the RDB, RPDB was also a proposal making body without powers to spend the amounts and execute the schemes. That was the burden of the song of the first Chairman in his inaugural address containing these words "It can function affectively and serve its purpose only if it is entrusted with planning, execution, and review". 5

5 Proceedings of the First Meeting of the RPDC from October 27th to 29th, 1969, p. 3.
But how far has it succeeded as a proposal making body forms the next part of the conclusions. Now it is enough to say that the RPDB ceased to exist from January 1973 due to the political turmoil caused by "Jai Andhra" movement demanding bifurcation of the State into Andhra and Telangana and the consequent imposition of the President's Rule.

The Central Government having opposed any more dismemberment of the State, evolved the Six Point Formula which the leaders accepted and withdraw the agitation. One of the six points formula was appointing committees for backward areas of the State. The new ministry which was formed after revoking the President's Rule, constituted, in the beginning of 1974, the Rayalaseema Planning and Development Committee (RPDC) along with two such committees for the development of backward areas in the Telangana and coastal Andhra regions. Thus one more time a regional development body was born out of the ashes of the RPDB.

The RPDC had in its jurisdiction, the districts of Anantapur, Cuddapah, Kurnool and Chittoor. Its membership was compact with 20, out of whom 18 were members
of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs) and 2 were members of the Legislative Council (MLCs). Its Chairman, of the rank of a minister, was also ex-officio member of the State Planning Board. The RPDC had three experts as its members to advise the Committee on matters of development or the region. As the RPDB had too many members to spoil the seriousness of the deliberations, the RPDC was consciously constituted as a compact body to function in a "businesslike manner".

Its functions were also different from those of the RPDB. They were limited mostly to consider and advise the State Planning Board in regard to schemes pertaining to the development of the region as might have been included in the Fifth Five Year Plan. As regards to the finances a specific amount was allotted to be spent within the specific time of March, 1979. The Central Government sanctioned Rs. 90 crores to be spent in five years at the rate of Rs. 18 crores every year for the accelerated development of backward areas in the three regions of Telangana, Rayalaseema and Coastal Andhra in the ratio of 5:3:2 respectively. The share of Rayalaseema worked out to Rs. 5.26 crores out of which Rs. 1.35 crores had to be set apart for the regional
schemes comprising large-scale industries and higher education. It meant, that only Rs. 3.91 crores could be spent on development schemes of the four districts which worked out to less than Rs. 1 crore available to each district annually. Thus, from the angle of financial allocations the RPDB was better placed with a uniform allocation of Rs. 1 crore every year for each district. Even Rs. 3.91 crores, as it was distributed on population basis, each district got different amounts as shown in the table below. But one saving feature was, that the entire financial burden was borne by the Centre.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the District</th>
<th>Population (in lakhs)</th>
<th>Allocations (Rs. in lakhs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Chittoor</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>112.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cuddapah</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>77.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anantapur</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>103.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Kumool</td>
<td>19.28</td>
<td>97.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>390.80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

unlike in the case of Special Development Fund the provision of which was completely a State responsibility.
While the funds were less, and distribution was uneven as given in the above table, the RPDC had to function, confining itself to the guidelines imposed by the Central Government. So in all these respects the RPDC was a more restricted body than the FPDB. But as the amounts were fixed, the targets were fixed and the time before which the allocations to be spent was fixed, the RPDC fulfilled the task more effectively as a proposal making body the details of which follow in the next few pages of the summary. As for as the evolution of regional development in Rayalaseema, it came to an end on March 31, 1979, beyond which the Central Government refused to renew the funds under Six Point Formula. So, the RPDC breathed its last on that day and its successor is yet to be born.

The foregoing survey of the evolution of regional development in relation to Rayalaseema is given in order to highlight certain important aspects to be noted when constituting regional bodies. The chairman must be a permanent one preferably a non-official with the rank of a minister. The membership should be compact to make it an effective proposal making body. However, it is difficult to lay down any hard and fast rules re-

6 See Appendix 5.
garding the exact size of a proposal making body. The size should neither be too small to be dominated by a single or few members, nor too large, so that discussion becomes less effective and gets diffused, serving no purpose. Moreover a fairly large Board or Committee becomes unmanageable. Viewed from this angle the membership of RPDC was of optimum size while that of RPDB was large and unwieldy.

Just like the size, it is difficult to prescribe rules with regard to the composition of these bodies. However, they should have, for purposes of harmony, a proper balance between different interest groups. Keeping in view these requirements, the RPDB compared to RPDC represented a wider cross section consisting as its members, the Ministers, The Legislators, and the Heads of the Departments at the State level and the Chairman of the Zilla Parishads and District Collectors at the District level.

Both the RPDB and the RPDC were constituted by an executive order without any statutory status to function with a certain amount of independence. Therefore they should have been given a statutory status with
powers of planning, execution of schemes and review of their progress. Powers alone cannot do the miracle. They should be matched with allocation of sufficient funds to realise the object with which the regional bodies are constituted.

The core of the thesis is the analysis of the working of the Rayalaseema Planning and Development Board (RPDB) and its successor, the Rayalaseema Planning and Development Committee (RPDC).

The RPDB consisted of two proposal making bodies: the General Body (GB) and the Executive Committee (EC). The EC met 14 times and the GB met 7 times. It is because the stipulation that the GB can meet only once in six months and the EC any number of times with the interval between one meeting and the other not exceeding three months. The meeting of the GB was usually held the next day after the meeting of the EC more than 50 per cent of its meetings were either continued or combined sessions. As the members of the EC were drawn from the GB and both had several of their sittings together or followed by each other, it made no difference in their functioning.
When a regional body is constituted it is therefore unnecessary to make two proposal making units from among the same members. As the members are the same, no new proposals will spring up even though they sit in separate sessions. Again as the sittings are followed one after the other with members, not different and proposals not different, it results in a waste of time. Therefore it is ideal to have a single proposal unit in any regional body unlike in RPDB with GB and EC.

Let us now analyse the number of proposals and nature of proposals made. The EC, in the 14 meetings it held made 126 proposals. The GB met only 7 times but made as many as 111 proposals. It means that the number of proposals by both are more or less equal even though the number of times the EC met is twice to the number of times the GB met. It might be because the number of members in the GB is twice the number of the members of the EC. One interesting feature of the analysis of the meetings is that the number of proposals the GB and EC made in the first few meetings is double the number of proposals made in the rest of the meetings. It can be explained to the fact that the initial spurt of enthusiasm shown by the members has waned as time rolled on. It
does not mean that as the members exhaust making proposals in the first few meetings, no more meetings should be held. It only means that it would be better to have meetings not at regular intervals but only when the occasion demands and the Government feels the necessity.

In the process of analysis developed in the thesis the next important aspect is the sectors in which the proposals are concentrated. Out of ten sectors categorised under the heads of (1) administration and organisation of the Board, (2) agriculture and allied subjects (animal husbandry, dairy development and soil conservation), (3) communications, (4) drought schemes, (5) finance and planning (6) industries and mining, (7) major irrigation, (8) minor irrigation, (9) power and (10) rural water supply, four sectors viz., agriculture and allied subjects, finance and planning, industries and mining, and irrigation have a share of more than 50 per cent of the proposals. The predilection of the members for these sectors can be easily imagined. The region being predominantly agricultural, hit hard by the uncertain monsoons and scanty rainfall, the only escape is, extending irrigation to the arid tracts by
diverting the Krishna waters. Rayalaseema abounds in minerals and the establishment of cement and other large-scale industries is the only means to have a breakthrough from the barrier of agelong economic depression. Any development of agriculture, industry and irrigation is possible only when they are given important place in the annual plans and the Five Year Plans and adequate provision is made from the plan outlays. It is not surprising therefore, that the members harped on this aspect several times and made substantial number of proposals under that category.

The 10 major heads are subdivided again into contents of each head on which the members laid emphasis. Under organisation and administration of the APDB, they wanted to Board to have statutory powers, to supervise the execution of the schemes, and implementation of their proposals. In the agriculture and allied sectors out of 30 proposals 10 relate to dry farming. The members suggested the setting up of Research Centre in the region in dry-farming techniques and demonstration of improved methods of agriculture to the benefits of the farmers. Under communications, converting the metre gauge into broad gauge between the railway stations of Guntakal and
Secunderabad and between Dronachalam and Guntur find a prominent place. Another important suggestion is to convert the airstrip in Cuddapah constructed during the II World War into a regular aerodrome and through it open for public transport. The members insisted on immediate preparation of relief schemes in drought affected areas. They wanted 15 per cent of the total Fourth Five Year Plan outlay to be allocated to the region and Rs. 100 crores to be sanctioned for executing the 15 year Prospective Plan prepared by the RPDB. With regard to industry they suggested setting up paper mill based on the bamboo available in the Nallamala forest with local enterprise and steel, tyre, fertilizer and vanaspati factories in public sector. Under major irrigation the main theme of the proposals was on greater share of the Krishna waters for the regions; under minor irrigation the proposals related to the repairing of abandoned tanks and construction of new tanks and irrigation wells. The major of the proposals under power relate to concessions in electricity rates and investigation into the inclusion of villages for electrification. Acquiring of more rigs and construction of large number of bore wells dominated the proposals under the head of Rural Water Supply.
In the above paragraph, a sample of important schemes contained in the proposals made by the members under the ten sectors of development, is given as it will form the basis of analyzing the action taken by the Government. It is classified as "reply awaited", "under consideration", "accepted", "not accepted" and "not considered". Of the total of 237 proposals made by both the GB and EC, 146 proposals or 61.5 per cent of the proposals were "not considered" at all for any action of the Government. It is because of the impracticable nature of the proposals such as converting RPDB from a proposal making, to a statutory body, requesting the Centre to contribute Rs. 100 crores for implementation of the 15 year Perspective Plan prepared by the Board. The proposals "not accepted" are 28 out of the 237 proposals or 12 per cent of the total proposals. They involved (1) administrative (2) financial and (3) legal complications. Demanding a separate Secretariat for the RPDB, as was considered as administratively impossible, by the Government even though it was a sound suggestion. The request to waive completely the betterment levies under irrigation schemes and to waive even the minimum charges for electrification was financially not acceptable. Suggestion to construct
check-dams across the streams flowing into the neighbouring Madras State illustrated the ignorance of the members of the legal complications involved in the Inter-State relations. The proposals for which the "reply was awaited" was due to the delays in receiving the information from the concerned Heads of the Departments. There are 12 such proposals made by both GB and EC and they form about 0.5 per cent of the total proposals. 11 proposals or another 0.5 per cent of the proposals come under the category of "under consideration" because these proposals were referred to the officials of concerned department to examine them and give their reports about the feasibility of their implementation. After setting apart the proposals that come under these four categories of Governmental actions, there remain 40 or 17 per cent of the total 237 proposals "accepted" by the Government. It is because they are practicable, financially feasible and most suitable for the development of the region.

The time involved in taking action by the Government on the proposals made and inform whether they are accepted, not accepted, etc., also varied. It took 9 months for the Government to inform the GB whether any action was taken or not, whereas the EC was informed of it
in about 3 months from the time they started functioning.
It can be attributed to the DC, meeting once in 6 months
and the EC, meeting in less than 3 months as per the
periods stipulated at the time of the inception of the
RPDB.

How far was it, advisable for the RPDB to con­
stitute sub-committees on (1) Irrigation, (2) Agriculture,
(3) Drinking water, Health and Drought, (4) Industries
and mining and (5) Power? They were asked to submit in
one day, after the inaugural session of the RPDB was over,
to submit proposals for inclusion in the Annual Plan
1969-70 as it was coming to an end. But the Government
expressed its inability to include them in the Plan as it
was already finalised and no alterations could be made
at such a late stage. It is really an amusing situation
in which the Board was placed for which it alone was
responsible.

The same sub-committees were asked to submit pro­
posals for inclusion in the Fourth Five Year Plan. This
time they were given a full month to visit the districts,
discuss with officials and the non-officials to formulate
the schemes. In that respect it was better than the
earlier exercise which had only a day’s time for making
proposals only to be denied or inclusion in that Year’s Plan.
The creation of the Special Development Fund of Rs. 4 crores every year for which the RPDB was asked to suggest allocations gives an insight into priorities, the members had in mind with regard to the development of the region. Out of 23 sectors, Rural electrification got nearly 45 per cent of the Special Development Fund as its share followed by rural water supply schemes with nearly 11 per cent. The remaining 44 per cent of the allotment has to be distributed among the remaining 21 sectors given in table 35 of Chapter V. Rayalaseema being a rain-shadow region the only way of having water for irrigation is to tap the underground resources. It requires energisation of wells on a massive scale to rescue the farmers from regular failure of crops for want of rains.

The RPDB, took into consideration the needs of the region when fixing priorities and there is much truth in what Dr. Y.V. Reddy says "the allocations to various sectors and schemes were made with basic rationality". No doubt, there had been instances of a proposal being unsound, like extension of power to energisation of wells in the areas where there was already over exploitation of ground water. Probably the members would have made pro-

posals with greater care after gaining more knowledge and experience, but that was denied to them with abrupt end of the Board in January 1973 due to violent agitation for splitting the State in Andhra and Telangana and the imposition of the President's rule. But the six point formula, formulated by the Centre was agreed upon, and with the formation of the new ministry, the FPDC came into existence in January, 1974.

As RPDB and RPDC are only different in name a comparison of the working of the two gives an how the one or the other had been better in functioning as a regional body while RPDB had GB and EC as proposal making bodies that distinction was completely removed in RPDC and was constituted as a single proposal making body. It held 14 meetings in the five years of its existence from 1974-79. There was stipulation of time as in the case of RPDB where the GB and EC had to meet in every six months and three months respectively. That is the reason for the minimum period of interval between one meeting and the other being 2 months and the maximum, more than 7 months. But this longest interval also can be explained to the fact that, that was the period when the assembly was dissolved and elections held for the formation of a new Government.
In the sectors under which the members of the RPDC showed interest, Education and Employment find place, in addition to the 10 given under the RPDB. Here the observation made by the Chairman of the RPDC is worth noting. According to him "ultimately only the increase in higher education and knowledge that we possess can increase our incomes manifold even beyond the constraint of natural resources". This view that education is a pace-setter for economic development can be a best example for any regional development body to emulate. In support of that line of thinking, 25 per cent of the six point formula funds were set apart for the development of higher education and large scale industries.

The RPDC made a total of 178 proposals in the 14 meetings it held which is less than the 237 proposals made by both the GB and EC of the RPDB. If we take them separately GB made 111 proposals and EC made 126 proposals which are less than 178 proposals made by the RPDC. This slight difference between the number of proposals made by the RPDB and RPDC makes one to one to conclude that both as proposal making bodies were not at variance with each other.

There is also a similarity between RPDB and RPDC in the interest they have shown and the importance they have given to the sectors. Like the RPDB, the RPDC also made more than 50 per cent of proposals on the four sectors of major irrigation, finance and planning, industries and mining and agriculture and allied subjects. The members of RPDB may be different from the members of the RPDC, but as those belonging to the same region, were aware of the common factors responsible for the backwardness of the region and made proposals which had uniform character.

Whatever may be the uniformity of the nature of proposals made by the RPDB and RPDC, the type of action taken by the Government on the proposals of RPDC is another aspect of interest for the researcher. Of the 178 proposals made by the RPDC 51 or 29 per cent of them were "accepted" by the Government for implementation. In that respect RPDC showed a better performance than the RPDB which had to its credit only 17 per cent under that category. The table below gives a comparative assessment of type of action taken on the proposals of the RPDB and RPDC by showing the percentages under each category.
Table 2

PERCENTAGE OF PROPOSALS OF RPDB AND RPDC THAT FALL UNDER EACH CATEGORY OF THE NATURE OF ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Board</th>
<th>Reply awaited</th>
<th>Under consideration</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Not accepted</th>
<th>Not considered</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPDB</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>17.62</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>64.30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPDC</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>28.65</td>
<td>21.91</td>
<td>28.65</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table clearly depicts that the performance of the RPDC was better because a higher percentage of its proposals were "accepted" for necessary action by the Government. The percentage of proposals "not considered" fell down from 64.30 to 28.65. That regional planning, as an exercise in the economic development of Rayalaseema has started gaining strength as time advanced is evident from the comparison of the nature of action taken on the proposals made by the RPDB and RPDC.

The attendance of the members at the meetings also throws light on the interest shown by them\(^9\). Out of 11 meetings for which the data is available, one member\(^9\) See Appendix 6.
attended only once, another member thrice and 2 members, four times. On the other extremity, there was one member who attended all the meetings of the RPDC, besides the Chairman.

A comparison of the nature of the action taken by the Government on the proposals made by the RPDB and RPDC and interest they have shown in attending the meetings helps us to draw a few more conclusions. Among the proposals most of them were suggestions. Of them about 18 and 29 per cent of the proposals made by the RPDB and RPDC were accepted respectively for taking action by the Government. The others fall under the categories of "reply awaited", "not accepted", "not considered" and so on. To make the suggestions more effective and acceptable for initiating action on them, the members should have examined in detail the nature of the proposals they would be making. In addition, to help them in that regard, as it had been suggested at the inaugural meeting, of the RPDB, a separate Secretariat would have been created, to gather information, to process it, and to supply it for the members for presentation in the meetings. Then the RPDB and RPDC could have become better effective channels of communication between the people and the Government.
The indifference shown by the members in attending the meetings gives a hint that at the time of constituting the committees, it should be stipulated that the members should attend a minimum number of meetings. If any one failed to do so, he would be automatically removed and replaced by another member nominated by the Government. Such a step would eliminate members who are indifferent and have in their place those who are really interested in the welfare of the region.

By way of concluding the observations, it must be made clear, that the RPEB and RPDC, the existence of each of which did not exceed more than five years, have done a good job as only proposal making bodies. They have suggested important sectors for the development of the region which shows their sense of responsibility and awareness of the problems of the region. No doubt this ad-hoc study contains many a lacunae. But considering the stimulating attempts made in constituting the RPEB and RPDC, considering the enthusiasm shown by the members in making the proposals and considering the nature of action taken on them by the Government, whatever remained, could have been carried on better lines, if the life of the last committee had been extended further. Whatever it is,
RPDB and RPDC have paved the way for recognition of economic significance in constituting such regional bodies. To that extent, it can be said that they made a valuable contribution in the direction of tackling the problems of a "problem region".