CHAPTER – II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Regional Imbalances in development has been a very widely discussed subject. In the process of economic development in India, we find that some states are very much developed and other states have remained backward in all respect, therefore balanced regional development has became a great concern on the part of policy framers.

An attempt is made here to take a review of the various earlier studies pertaining to the regional imbalances in the development. There are various approaches to study of the regional Imbalances; various people have taken different indicators of regional imbalances such as Net State domestic products (NSDP). Some of them have also taken per capita Net State Domestic Product as a indicator as regional disparity 1) Dr. Kurian made an extensive studies of widening regional disparity in India wherein he has indicated that, more than two thirds of investment has gone in the forward states like Maharashtra, Gujarat, Tamilnadu, Andhra Pradesh etc. some other studies particularly in recent times after the period of economic reforms have been undertaken they can be cited such as, 2) Das and Barua, 1996, Ghosh, 3) Marjit and Neogi, 4) Rao and Kalirajan, 5) Das Gupta, 6) Shand and Bhide, 7) Nagraj, etc. are some of the important studies, which have studied the trends, nature, and causes of regional imbalances in India.
Not only this but few other studies in recent times can also be mentioned such as 8) Kalirajan and Takihiro, 9) Shetty, Bhattacharya and Sakthivel they have also highlighted the nature and causes of the disparities in India. These studies are of recent origin particularly after the period of economic reforms.

Coming to Maharashtra state there are also various studies related to regional imbalances.

The imbalances across the state in different regions have not only attracted the attention Of Government but these imbalances have given birth to the discontent also. The famous Nagpur agreement referred above is a testimony to it.

The third five year plan. (1) of Government of Maharashtra has also pointed out the deficiencies in the development of the state; particularly it has pointed out that within the state also there are regions like Marathwada and Vidarbha wherein the education Infrastructure, Irrigation , Electrification, needs to be developed this documents has highlighted several indicators showing the disparities such as the average value of per hectare agricultural product; the percentage of land irrigated; railway per sq. KM, the Consumption of electricity etc.

There is another study known as techno economic survey of Maharashtra (10) which has highlighted the existing disparities the report was published in 1963. Immediately in the very next year i.e. in 1964, Mr.A.K.Mitra (11) has also studied the disparities existed at district level. He has taken thirty five
indicators to decide the Backwardness of a district. Mr. Mitra has also taken a review of Maharashtra State and showed the relative levels of development of various districts. He has classified

The district on the basis of their level of development in four categories. He has pointed out that there were eleven districts, at the top and there were seven districts in the second level of development, and the third category includes seven districts and in the last lowest category there was only one district named Ratanagari. While discussing the same he has also pointed out that in the period of 1961 to 1971, backward regions have remained more backward and developed regions have developed much more.

There are other studies which should be mentioned with reference to the backwardness of various regions is known as Pande Committee. (12) This committee was appointed in 1968; this committee was appointed to study, as to which regions are industrially backward? the Government of India and planning commission has accepted the Pande Committee’s report and because of that new Principle of giving subsidy was accepted this committee has pointed out that there were thirteen backward districts in Maharashtra they were Dhule, Jalgaon, Ratanagiri, Raigad, Chandrapur, Buldhana, Yavtamil, Bhandara, Aurangabad, Nanded, Beed, Osmanabad, Latur, and Parbhani. In short there were two backward districts from konkan and all the five districts of them Marathwada. There after immediately in 1975 Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics Pune (13) has studied the backwardness of various districts in Maharashtra
according to this study they have taken thirty one criteria’s to study the backwardness, at that time there were only four divisions of Maharashtra state which have been studied by the Institute. Mr.Sakhalkar (14) has also stated in his study that Aurangabad division is the most backward region in the state and he has blamed the Government policies for the backwardness. The centre for monitoring Indian economy has also published basic statistics of Indian economy in the year 1980. There were two volumes the second volume consists the basic statistical information of various districts he has also published a book in 1981. In his book the order of developed district shows that Greater Mumbai occupied first position Pune was second Thane was third Ahmednagar was fourth, Nagpur was fifth, Kolhapur was sixth, where as Raigad was Seventh, Jalgaon on eight number, Satara was on ninth number so also on number tenth was Sohalalpur, eleventh was Sangali, number twelfth was Amaravati, on thirteenth number was Aurangabad, fourteenth was Nasik, fifteen was Vardha, sixteen was Dhule, seventeen was Buldhana, eighteen was Bhandara, nineteen was Osmanabad, twentieth was Akola, twenty first was Nanded, twenty second was Yeovtamal, twenty third Beed, twenty fourth was Parbhani, twenty fifth was Chandrapur, and twenty sixth was Ratanagiri.

In this way as shown above as far as our study area that is konkan and Marathwada regions are concerned there was a vast difference in the levels of development of Thane, Raigad, and Ratanagiri.
Same is the case with the other study area i.e. Marathwada as shown above Aurangabad was on thirteenth number and Beed, Parbhani, where far below of the Aurangabad district.

One of the other important committees which is appointed by the central Government in 1978, was known as Shivraman Committee in fact, this committee has given several reports (15) this committee stated that the concept of backwardness should be very clear and therefore as there are definite standards of development accordingly standards of backwardness should be well defined they have given several other recommendations. (16) Chakaravarty Committee is also one of the important committee this committee has pointed out that Chandrapur and Beed are most backward district the study which must be mentioned here is of Pranav Bardhan. (17) Pranav Bardhan has used the information revealed in national sample survey of twenty fifth, twenty-sixth, twenty seventh, rounds for this purpose the Maharashtra state was divided into six regions in this study also the backwardness of Marathwada region is highlighted. At the national level the Patel Committee has also studied the relative backwardness of talukas of Gujrat state.

The fact finding committee mentioned earlier is another very important committee which was appointed by the Government of Maharashtra to study the relative levels of backwardness in Maharashtra the detail discussion of this committee is given in separate chapter. (18) Mr. Sita Prabhu and Sarkar in their study, which is reported in economic and political weekly in 1992, September,
Has also pointed out that, there were eleven districts in Maharashtra having high level of development, and in medium level development there were only three districts and fifteen districts were having lowest level of development.

As far as our study area is concerned i.e. Kokan and Marathwada, we find that from Kokan there was only Thane district in the high level development and from Marathwada it was Aurangabad district. In the medium level of development only Raigad district was there and all other districts of Kokan (Ratnagiri, Sindhudurg, and from Marathwada Jalna, Beed, Osmanabad, Latur, Parbhani, belong to the lowest level of development).

The important committee which was appointed by state planning board is known as (19) Bhujangrao Kulkarni Committee this committee was appointed to study the development of backward regions of Maharashtra. This Committee has submitted its report in 1993. This has covered several aspects such as backward regions of Maharashtra, reasons of backwardness of each district, the remedies on backwardness of the regions. This committee has also taken into account the social backwardness of the regions and also has given the administrative and financial system of the regions. This committee being of a recent origin an attempt is made here to give a brief idea of the work done by this committee the terms of reference of this committee were as follows.

1. To decide the criteria of economic and social backwardness and on this basis identify the backward district in Maharashtra state.
2. To find out the reasons of the backwardness of such backward district and suggest the measures to remove the backwardness.

3. To guide, to establish basic financial and social infrastructure and raise the level of such backward districts.

4. To identify the sectors of development to develop that particular district to prepare a perspective plan or the economic development of the backward region for ten to fifteen years and suggest the measures for effective implementation.

5. To suggest the policy changes in order to make a speedy development of that particular region.

In this way the Bhujangrao Kulkarni committee was appointed to work on the above mentioned terms of references accordingly the committee has prepared document in details and has submitted its report to the government of Maharashtra in June 1993. As mentioned above
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