PART - 1 (Section - 2)

CHAPTER - IV

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME IN INDIA AS WELL AS IN ASSAM

(1) C.D. Programme in India:

With gaining experiences in the previous programmes, during the Planning era, the Government of India was launched a most integrated and intensive programme which was called the Community Development Programme.

It has been noticed in the previous programmes that the programmes were not unified in various matters of development works. They were worked independently without common objectives in pre-Independence era. In the mean time, India got her Independence in 1947. At that time, the country's economic and social structure was badly suffered from hunger, illiteracy and unemployment etc. As such, the very first duty of the government was to fight against the war of the poverty and stagnation. Therefore, the immediate steps of the government had to set-up a national programme for rural India with the participation of masses. To reach the desired goal, the Planning Commission was set-up in 1950, which came into force in 1951. Moreover, the government declared the objective of the Nation was to establish a 'Welfare State' through her
new constitution which came into effect January 26, 1950.

Soon, after Independence, India had to import food from U.S.A. to meet the internal scarcity of food. Side by side, the government of India appointed the Grow-More-Food Enquiry Committee in 1952 to enquire the performance of Grow-More-Food campaign. The Committee submitted the report with a suggestion of a model of Development Blocks, each consisting 100 to 120 villages. In this context, the Committee's view was that "No plan can have any chance of success unless the millions of small farmers in the country accept its objective, share in its making regard it as their own, and are prepared to make the sacrifices necessary for implementing it. ... It is only by placing the ideas of bringing about an appreciable improvement in the standard of rural life and making it fuller and richer before the country and ensuring that the energies of the entire administration machinery of the states and the best non-official leadership are directed to plans for its realisation that we can awaken mass enthusiasm and enlist the active interest and support of the millions of families living in the country side in the immense task of bettering their own condition."1

1. First Five Year Plan, Government of India, p. 231
The Committee had emphasised a modern approach of development which would induce the villagers to change their old traditional attitude. Besides, the involvement of the people in the programme for their self-help had been given more priority.

By this time, the Indo-American technical agreement was made. As a result, in early 1952, 15 Pilot Project were started with the help of Ford Foundation of U.S.A. to examine the people's response to the programme. The U.S.A. Government provided the necessary technical staff and fund for the projects.

But without awaiting for the results of these projects, the Government of India had decided to launch the Community Development Programme on the basis of the G.M.F. Enquiry Committee's Report. Hence, the ambitious Community Development Programme was launched on Second October, 1952, the birthday of greatman, Mahatma Gandhi.

The birthday gift was presented to the nation by establishing fifty-five Community Development Projects which were functioning from that auspicious date. Thus, the national movement for rural development began in the whole country for the upliftment of rural poor as a mark to 'Bapujee' from second October, 1952.
The Community Development Programme is a landmark in the history of Rural Development. The National Extension Services were started from second October, 1953. Thus, since 1953, the above two programmes were run concurrently. Of course the objectives of the National Extension Services was to render the agency's work for implementing the Community Development Programme. As such, according to the Planning Commission "Community Development is the method and the rural extension is the agency through which the Five Year Plan seeks to initiate a process of transformation of the social and economic life of the villages.\(^2\)

Hence, these programmes were come into force as an outcome of passed efforts. In these programmes, the people's participation with their co-operative spirits for their self-help were most important than the government efforts. The common people have a right to live and to know how to live was the main criterion of the programme. It created an understanding between the government and the people for their own and area development. In fact, they should have to come forward by contributing cash and kinds voluntarily to carry out the programme for the reconstruction of the rural India.

2. First Five Year Plan, p. 223
The programme was a broad based programme which included all sectors of development. But, the more attention was given upon the Agricultural development. Although, the major share of the Pilot Projects were covered by the agriculture and its allied sectors, nevertheless, the development of infrastructure improvement of social works, education and rural health were significantly considered. Each project had to function within a Block, consisting of about 100 to 120 villages with a population of 50000 nearly.

The C.D. Programme was a larger in scope and contents than the Pilot Projects. It enriched with vast material and human resources as well as covered a larger area of operations. It encompassed all the development works of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, Irrigation, Co-operation, Public Health, Education and Social Education, Communications, Village Industries, Panchayats and Local Self-government and all aspects of rural life. Hence, it's objective was all round development programme to wipe out the multi-million problems of the country side.

Inasmuch, "The programme aimed at achieving all-round socio-economic transformation of rural people."³

³ Indian Council of Agricultural Research, A Hand Book of Agriculture, p. 690
In the words of S.K. Dey, "Community Development is a war against hunger, disease and ignorance. The war began on 2nd October, 1952. The war's aim was to establish the 'right to live' for men. It was directed against the triple enemies of hunger, disease and ignorance."  

In fact, the intention of the programme was to awaken the people of the country side to their obligation to the welfare state, the country was pledged to build-up. Its tenets of faith were: (1) Muscles can do it, (ii) Muscles can be trained to do it and (iii) condition can be created to do it. It means, the programme had given emphasised on physical efforts and on change of outlook so that the 'mountain of inertia' had been removed. Thus, it was a people's programme of a silent revolution build-up a new India.

The creator of the Indian Constitution had laid down the economic policy which aim was to establish an egalitarian society. However, the supra-structure development had been creating a spatial dichotomy i.e., rural and urban. But, in a predominantly agrarian country without alienation of urban


sector industry in to the rural sector, the goal of the Indian Constitution cannot be achieved. As such, for upliftment of rural poor, the major task was to implement the various development programmes in the countryside. Beginning with the Community Development Programme, the government has been implementing various sectoral programmes for rural development but significant result is still to be fulfilled.

The Community Development Programme was a 'war against the poverty'. To fight in the war, the chief of the Army was government, and soldiers were the people. The success of war was completely depended upon the soldiers. Hence, the people participation in the programme was a Constitutional responsibility upon the masses.

As regards to the people's participation in the programme V.T. Krishnamachari once said "what is essential is that everywhere villagers should be enabled to take their own decisions, become members of Co-operative Societies in their own right and contribute as much voluntary labour as they can to works of benefit to the entire community. It is only thus that improvement can become possible on the scale we desire." 6

---

II. **Change of strategies of Development**

Although, the Rural Development Programme was started specially for the development of the rural poor, yet, the benefits of the programme did not reach the target group due to mal-practices of rural elites. In spite of multi-dimensional development works taken in the programme, the disparities between the "have" and "have-nots" did not reduce to a desire extent. As such, re-thinking was given during the sixty decade.

As a result, a new Ministry of Rural Reconstruction, formerly, a department in the Ministry of Agriculture, was formed in August 1979. This new ministry was to co-ordinate all the rural development programmes into most integrated programme which is now functioning all over India, known as Integrated Rural Development Programme, the other side of the same coin.

It is a direct poverty alleviating programme which main aim is to bring the downtrodden sections into the mainstream of economic growth. The programme is conceptually different from the sectoral growth approach. It is a combination of all the programme for rural development. Regarding the programme,
the World Bank Report remarked, the objectives of rural development cannot be confined to a particular sector. Its aim at enhancing the levels of productivity and employment leading to higher incomes of target groups, besides minimum acceptable levels of food, shelter, education and health.  

This new approach has created a new atmosphere of development in the rural areas. Because self-development by means of cash and kinds is getting more importance than the community development as a whole. In these programmes, the role of government is more critical than the role of people. Contrarily, in case of community development programme, the success of the programmes is mostly depended upon the people. As such, increasing popularity in the Integrated Rural Development programme has adversely affected in the executing the community development programme. However, the essentiaity of the new approach was felt necessary during the late seventy decade due to failure of I.D. Programme to uplift the poor into a level of development.

The chief characteristics of the programme is that the 'target group' and the 'area development' are suitably integrated. Although the programme is called Integrated Rural Development Sector, Paper, World Bank Report, 1975, p. 3
Development Programme, however, the programme has been renamed as District Rural Development Agency (DRDA). The programme is an anti-poverty scheme with wider scope for all-round development. The 'target group' was consisted of rural poor. The Sixth Plan pointed out that "of the 350 million people below the poverty line in the country, around 300 million are in rural areas. These consist largely of the landless labourers, small and marginal farmers, rural artisans, and other workers".

Since 1952, special emphasis had been laid on rural development. The various special programmes and strategies for rural development adopted from time to time in the successive Five year Plans may be summarised in three-fold categories.

(a) the programmes for increasing agricultural production.

(b) area development programmes

and

(c) programme for target groups.


9. The Sixth Five Year Plan, p. 170
Planning Commission, Govt. of India.

From Community Development to National Rural Employment Programme (NRDP), it has been realised that the concept of Rural Development has undergone a considerable change over the last 39 years of development. During the First Four Plans, there was much emphasis on increasing production both in agriculture and industrial segments. The IADP and HYVP were started in this respect. During Fifth Five Year Plan, the approach was changed from area development to target approach. SFDA, MFAL and CADA etc. were started to cope with the situations. During the Sixth Plan, instead of functioning single oriented programme, the SFDA, MFAL, DAAP and CADP were merged into a single programme which was called IRD programme. During the Seventh Plan, the emphasis has been shifted to minimum needs of rural poor and National Rural Employment Programme. Jawahar Rozgar Yojana and Panchayati Raj Programme would play a vital role in the coming Eight Plan for uniform development of rural areas.

III. Financial outlay under the plans:

Growth with social justice is the primary objective of the Indian economic planning. But the compulsions of the economic situation made pursuit of the growth aspect more
imperative than the social justice aspect of development programme. From the experiences of the different programmes for rural development, it has been observed that the sectoral programmes did not able to bring any lasting solution to the agrarian economic and social problems.

The investment of the plan had led to the creation of physical and institutional infra-structure of socio-economic development of the country side. As such, from the beginning of the planning era, the emphasis had been placed for raising the level of standard of people. To achieve this goal, the Planning Commission had been fixing the financial outlay in the Five Year Plans on priority basis. The distribution of public sector outlay in the different plans has been shown in the table No. 4.1
Table 4.1: Public Sector outlay in Five Year Plans in India (1951-80)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Community Development</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major and Medium Irrigation</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village and Small Industries</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industries and Minerals</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8150</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Communication</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2350</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services and Miscellaneous</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 1,660 100 4,982 100 11,072 100 15,120 100 35,932 100 97,500 100 1,80,000 100

IV. Content of the C.D. Programme

The area of operation of C.D. Programme was so wide in scope that it would not be possible for government agencies alone, to implement the programme of these character in all over India with a limited financial and trained human resources. Therefore, people's contribution in cash and kinds was indispensable for rapid implementation of the programme. Hence, a substantial part of the development fell on the shoulders of the villagers themselves and government agency would be guided in every stage of the operational activities. As such, the programme was called as people's programme.

To attain the self-sufficiency in economic development, the programme was implemented with the active participation of the people on priority basis. The priorities were given on the following basis:

(a) **Agriculture and its Allied fields**:

Its included such as reclamation of available virgin and waste lands, the introduction of improved varieties use of fertilisers, improvement in cropping pattern, improved implements and provision for irrigation facilities. Moreover, emphasis was given on development of fisheries, fruits and vegetables, cultivation etc.
(b) **Communication** :

Second priority was given on good means of transport. Hence, construction of roads and development of transport services were felt indispensable for the development of the countryside.

(c) **Education** :

Illiteracy was the major obstacle for the quickest development of the country. The real intention of the programme was to spread the education as soon as possible so that the necessary consciousness and attitude among the people can be created about the modern method of development.

(d) **Health** :

The programmes had a aim at the improvement of environmental hygiene besides the personal welfares. Hence, the provision was made for Sanitation and Public health measures, medical aid for the ailing. Control of epidemic diseases, proper disposal of human and animal wastes, water supply and improved nutritions.

(e) **Training** :

Training facilities were provided for imparting improved techniques to existing artisans, agriculturists, extension assistants, health workers and executive officers.
(f) Employment:

The unemployed and under employed persons and disguised unemployment in the rural areas were to be provided with gainful employment by the development of cottage and smallscale industries and through the trade and welfare services.

(g) Housing:

Provisions were kept to provide demonstration and training in improved techniques and designs for rural housing.

(h) Social Welfare:

There was a provision of community entertainment based on local talents and culture, audio-visual aid for instruction and recreation, organisation of sports activities, meals and Co-operatives and self-help movement.

V. Objective of the Programme:

Community Development Programme was a modern dynamo to bring about an all-round development of rural areas. The main objective of the movement was to create a stronghold rural society into an utopia of rural masses. Its aim was "unity is strength, disruption is ruin" and the "self-help is the best help". Although, the die is cast by the government, but people were the internal forces to carry out the people's
programme. According to Douglas Ensmlnger, the broad objective of C.D. and N.E.S. Programmes is "to assist each village in planning and carrying out an integrated, multiphased family and village plan directed toward increasing agriculture productions; improving existing village crafts and organizing new ones; providing minimum essential health services and improving health practices; providing required educational facilities for children and an adult education programme; providing recreational facilities and programmes, improving housing and family living conditions and providing programmes for village women and youth."11 As such, it was a multi-purpose programme covering all aspects of development to build up a new India.

The significance of the programme was to take a concerted attack on the rural problems for creating the "welfare state" visualised in the constitution. As such, Pandit Nehru believed that "Community projects are of vital importance not only for material achievements, they will bring about, but much more so because they seek to build-up the community and the individual, and to make the latter a builder not only of his own village

11. Ensmlnger, Douglas: "The Guide to Community Development" New Delhi, Govt. of India, 1957, p. 3
Centre but in a larger sense of Indian. In fact, the increasing agricultural production was not the only pre-requisite of the programme. The focus of the programme was to develop the countryside in such a way that it could able to build up a progressive India.

According to B. Mukherjee, "the objectives of the C.D. Programme are synonymous with those of the five year plans. Whereas the five year plans aim at bringing about an all-round development of the country in a planned democratic manner, the Community Development Programme is to take care of the rural sector of development. The same basic objectives and policies govern both the five year plans and the C.D. Programme. These, very broadly described, are economic development, social justice and democratic growth."

Thus, the basic objectives of the C.D. Programme are almost resembled with the plan's objectives. Only difference is that the operational area is dissimilar. However, the concise objectives are summarised below:

12. John W. Mellor Thomas and F. Weaver: "Development of Rural India", p. 35
(i) To acquire the economic freedom of the masses.

(ii) To educate the people about the development techniques of self-sufficiency.

(iii) To seek the co-operation of the people in the process of national reconstructions.

(iv) To secure the fullest development in the multi-sectors of social and economic structure in the field of agriculture, education, employment, communication, health and basic amenities for minimum need.

(v) To utilise the vast human and natural resources for their own development by means of 'self-help' and "self-reliance."

(vi) To create an atmosphere at the grass roots level for the people participation in the programme.

(vii) To change the mental attitude of the people for a better living by means of innovatory process.

VI. **Panchayati Raj as an agent of C.D.P.**

During the second five year plan, the third phase of the Community Development movement was begun by launching the Panchayati Raj system for village administration in India. It was the foundation of economic planning and development and an effective means for the implementation of the C.D. Programme.
Panchayati Raj, its technical meaning is a body of five
selected Panch or members, who would guide the villagers in
socio-economic development decision and work as judicial court
for any minor disputes among the locality. It is a people's
body for the management of their own affairs by selecting the
priorities and solving the problems according to their own suit.

History of Panchayat

The Panchayati Raj in India is an old system of village
administration. The existence of Panchayat in ancient India is
a well documentary proof as referred by various well-known
persons viz., H. Tinker — the foundation of local self-govern-
ment in India, Pakistan and Burma, Mahatma Gandhi — Panchayat
and its judicial aspect, Dr. Allister in his book — State and
Government in ancient India and Jawaharlal Nehru — Discovery
of India.

The old Panchayats may be called as little republics or
little Councils or Rural Republics enjoyed all powers of
administrative, civic and judicial matters for the effective
control of village life, better co-ordination among the isola-
ted communities and the development of whole societies. Of
course, the old Panchayats were controlled by a particular
section and poor or low caste had no chance to take part on it. H. Tinker, recorded that "the Panchayat of the past were rarely representative of the village as a whole: They might be drawn from the members of the founding families or from the Brahmins and the superior cultivators. The menials and the landless had almost no say in its affairs, except perhaps in South India."  

The system of village panchayats was greatly affected during the British regime. The Ripon Resolutions of 1882 was introduced for strengthen the district boards by transferring powers to the officers, replacing the traditional powers. Since then, the officers of these boards have been functioning to satisfy the government not the people who are actually benefited.

Panchayats in Post Independence era:

Having seeing the worst effect of the British system, the reformist group, mainly Gandhiji and Nehruji thought deeply over the matter and tried to introduce a system of Panchayat where mass people will get an opportunity to participate in the democracy, to make their own plan for self-

development and to help the government in reconstructing the ruined India.

Gandhijee's idea "the greater the power of Panchayats, the better for the people" was accepted by the government of India. Article 40 in the 'Directive Principles' of the Constitution of India says "The state shall take steps to organise village Panchayats and endow them with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable to function as unit of self government."

As such, although, the concept of Panchayat is an old idea, yet the modern concept was evolved after Independence that was after implementation of C.D. Programme. As per directives, almost all the states started the democratic decentralisation but as there was no clear cut direction regarding the power and pattern. The state's were started the Panchayats according to their own convenience.

The first plan was started since 1950. During that period, the people's participation in development works was not coming forth to the expected level. As such, they felt that speedy development works were impossible without a people organisation at grass-root level.
In the mean time, on second October, 1952, the C.D. Programme was started to initiate the process of transformation of the social and economic life of the countrysides. Although, the programme was sponsored by the Government, nevertheless, it envisaged mass participation of the villagers. Thus, the Government of India recognised the village Panchayats as a "basic unit" for economic planning, as a democratic body for development works and an effective change agent for the implementation of the Community Development Programme.

Meanwhile, in January 1957, a study team on Community Development and National Extension Service was appointed under the Chairmanship of Balwant Rai Mehta. The study group wrote "so long as we do not discover or create a representative and democratic institution which will supply the local interest, supervision and care necessary to ensure that expenditure of money upon local objects conforms with the needs and wishes of the locality, invest it with adequate power and assign to it appropriate finances, we will never be able to evoke local interest and excite local initiative in the field of development."
As per recommendations of the Committee, the government introduced the three-tier Panchayats in all over the India. The pattern of the Democratic Decentralization was: (1) Gram Sabha at the village level, (ii) Panchayat Samities at the block or tehsil level and (iii) Zila Parishad at the district level. However, the different states had adopted different nomenclature suitable to local conditions. Whatever, may be, the form of Panchayats, the basic aim was more or less same to enlist the support of every family for the realisation of social and economic goals of the nation.

In the words of Mr. S.K. Dey, former Minister of Community Development and Chief architect of Panchayat Raj in modern times, "the State legislature will thus travel from state headquarters down through the district and the Block to the village Panchayat. The new institutions as people's organisations are responsible for planning and implementation of programme approved in the state legislature. The Suserainty enjoyed by local agencies is ending."\(^{17}\)

From the above, it has been cleared that Panchayati Raj and Community Development are very closely related. The Community Development was a programme of people and the Panchayat

\(^{17}\) Dey, S.K.; "Community Development: A Bird’s Eye View", pp. 51 to 52.
was an agent through which all development works of rural areas sought to be channelised. In fact, the Panchayat Raj was the means and the Community Development was the ends.

The Panchayati Raj system has been implemented by all the states except Nagaland, Meghalaya, Arunachal and Union Territories, where some sort of local bodies are functioning. With a view to injecting new technological inputs in the rural areas, there are at present, 212246 village Panchayats covering 594837 villages, 4043 Panchayat Samities and 340 Zila Parishad.

Stage of existence:

For last three decades, the working of these institutions have never been satisfactory. The existence of Panchayats, in some states is as a mark of decentralisation. It has no power and resources to carry out any programme also no regular election has been held to elect the representatives. In this regards Ashok Mehta Committee rightly observed that "the story of Panchayat has been a story of ups and downs. It seems to have passed through three phases: the phase of ascendancy 1959-64; the phase of stagnation 1965-69; and the phase of decline 1969-77". But, the recent period from 1978-1989, is

---

a phase of neglect to the P.R.I.

New era to the Panchayati Raj:

Lot of debates upon the Panchayati Raj has been passed for its sorry state of affairs and for revival of these institutions. Many Commissions were appointed to examine the pros and cons of the mixed success of Panchayati Raj since the introduction of Balwant Rai Mehta Report (1957). All the Committees, A Mehta Committee (1977), the G.V.K. Rao Committee (1985), Dr. L.M. Singhri Committee (1986), the Sarkaria Commission (1988) have exercised indepth evaluating the Panchayati Raj and reported a wide area of agreement in basic issue of evolution of Panchayati Raj in 'three-tier Federalism' with new kind of 'Nyaya Panchayat' or 'Gram Nyayalaya' at grass root level.

Whatever may be the ideological and political differences and bureaucratic conflicts, the entire nation has massively welcome or approved the constitutional Amendment (Sixty Fourth) Bill, 1989, which was a revolutionary steps to Constitutional Safeguard to the democratic decentralisation for its revival and an effective measures for the implementation of rural development programmes.
The Community Development Programme was started in Assam on Second October 1952, with the rest of the country. The objectives of the programme were also same as to improve the economic, social and cultural life of the rural communities. The programme had become a part of universal endeavour to tackle the poverty of the rural communities and backwardness of the areas. Besides, to instil the spirit of strive of structural transformation of the rural society, the people participation in the programme was the first and foremost importance.

As a part of the Indian Programmes, two projects (among the 95 Pilot Projects) were allotted to Assam. One of them was located in the Cachar District and the other was in the Darrang District. Further, two development Blocks were also started, one in the Goalpara area of Garo Hills and other was in the Golaghat Mikir Hills area which is now under Karbi Anglong District. The number of Blocks rose to 27 at the end of the First Five Year Plan. By the end of Third Five Year Plan, the entire state was covered by the development blocks. During the Third Five Year Plan, there were 162 Blocks in Assam. But after
the separation of hills areas from Assam, the number of Blocks came down to 130. At present, the number of Blocks have been gone up to 147 which has been shown in table No. 4.2.

Similarly, the Assam government introduced the Panchayati Raj system in the state since 1959. It was implemented in three tier system: Gram Panchayat in village level, Anchalik Panchayat in Block level and Mahkuma Parishad in Sub-divisional level for modest running of the C.D. Programme.

However, the three tier system was repealed in 1972 and two tier system was introduced by abolishing the Anchalik Panchayat at the Block level and vesting the power to the Mahkuma Parishad. Since then, the two tier system has been functioning in the state. The new system has adversely affected in the development works which will be discussed in the chapter 'Review of Policies and Programmes'.

Till this study, the number of Blocks and Panchayats with the population and villages covered have been shown in the table No. 4.2 below:
Table No. 4.2: Progress of Development Blocks and Panchayats in Assam with the population and village covered.
(1987-88)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Name of District</th>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Name of M.P.</th>
<th>No. of Blocks</th>
<th>No. of population</th>
<th>No. of Panchayats</th>
<th>No. of villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kamrup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Guwahati</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>680626</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Rangia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>569290</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nalbari</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nalbari</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>916750</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Barpeta</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Barpeta</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1210260</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Goalpara</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Goalpara</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>546139</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>North Salmara</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>271466</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dhubri</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dhubri</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>700789</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>South Salmara</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>314730</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kokrajhar</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kokrajhar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>698683</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gossaigaon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>219410</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nagaon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nagaon</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1091648</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hojai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>429193</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Marigaon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Marigaon</td>
<td></td>
<td>575405</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tezpur</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>732041</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Biswanath</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>396340</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mongoldai</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mongoldai</td>
<td></td>
<td>594128</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Udalguri</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Udalguri</td>
<td></td>
<td>529638</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sibsagar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sibsagar</td>
<td></td>
<td>560848</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Charaideo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Charaideo</td>
<td></td>
<td>261967</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jorhat</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jorhat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>615322</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Majuli</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Majuli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>136192</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl. No.</td>
<td>Name of District</td>
<td>Sl. No.</td>
<td>Name of M.P.</td>
<td>No. of Blocks</td>
<td>No. of population</td>
<td>No. of Panchayats</td>
<td>No. of Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Golaghat</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Golaghat</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>660993</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Dibrugarh</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Dibrugarh</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>851989</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tinsukia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>652048</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sadiya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82283</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Lakhimpur</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jonai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43277</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Dhemaji</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>376571</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>North Lakhimpur</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>500127</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Cachar</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Silchar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1029326</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Hailakandi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>362776</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Karimganj</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ram Krishna Nagar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>343295</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Karinganj</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>359232</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Plains area(Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1,73,40,295</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>18,473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hill Areas**

1. Karbi Anglong
   1. Dipchu
   2. Hauran
   3. | 4  |
      262908 | District |
   4. | 7  |
      116402 | Council |

2. N.C. Hills
   3. Malbong
   4. Haflong
   3. | 4  |
      76047 | 361     |

|        |        |              | 4          | 15       | 4,56357  | 1,393     |

**Source**: Panchayat and Community Development, Director of Panchayat & Community Development, Assam, Gauhati, 2nd November, 1987.
VIII. Review of Literature:

There are an abundant literature on the evolution and growth of Community Development in India. And, the impact of Community Development Projects have been subjected to analysis by a number of scholars and organizations. Among the most, well-known studies are those of Prof. Wilson, Prof. Carl Taylor, Prof. Oscar Lewis, Prof. Opler and his team, Prof. Dube (1960), Prof. Mandelbaum (1970). Moreover there are a very few organizations who have been doing assessment on the subject. They are the Programme Evaluation Organization, the Bench Mark Surveys and Balwantrai Committee Report.

Nodoubt, none of the scholars or the Committee have been made any efforts, so far, to examine the impact of Community Development Programme in the present study District. Further, a comprehensive study based on intensive field examination of C.D. Programme and its impact on the rural development process has not been undertaken by any of the previous scholars and organisations. Prof. Dube's India's Changing Villages is the Comprehensive and systematic analysis of Community projects. Nevertheless, it is based on a very intensive studies of only two different types of villages of Uttar Pradesh.
A review of the existing literatures reveal that all the scholars and organization have assumed that the Community Development Programme is both desirable and appropriate techniques for reconstructing the agrarian and social economy of the country, provided there must be a proper staff with cleaned hands and dedicated mind. However, no one has examined critically the major postulates of the movement.

It is, therefore, felt that a micro level study on Community Development Programme would be most appropriate to re-examine the impact of it. Hence, a case study of Community Development on Rural Development with special reference to the Golaghat District of Assam has been undertaken as the present theme of the study.