SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS
The present dissertation undertook the task of discerning the development process in the Indian state of Haryana which attained statehood some 25 years back in 1966.

There were three basic points of inquiry (i) the differential impact of reorganisation on the economic, social, political and ecological aspects of the development process in the state; (ii) the trends in regional disparities; and (iii) theory, if any, that could be gleaned from the Haryana experience in respect of the development impact of any administrative reorganisation of space.

The present study looked into the change in the course of development in a territory which earlier formed a periphery in the space of economy of a relatively developed state. The newly formed state had to begin with a heritage of underdevelopment. In which way it redefined its priorities and redesigned strategies, and all this with what success - is the focus of the present dissertation.

The study intended to test some basic hypotheses, as listed below:

i) The formation of Haryana as a separate state is a factor of overriding importance in giving a spurt to its development process. The event marks a revolutionary change in its spatial context from that of a periphery of a relatively developed state to one of a new autonomous administrative entity.
ii) As a consequence of rapid development, the regional disparities in the state should have been reduced. The new political dispensation is expected to be more sympathetic to the problems of the backward areas.

iii) In the context of developing countries, formation of new states out of the peripheral parts of the big states will be beneficial. This will reduce the scope for operation of backwash effects within a state system. Small size of a state in itself will be more conducive to better development management.

Methodology that has been adopted was in consonance with the basic objectives of the study and the hypotheses that have been framed for testing. A regular comparison was made between the Haryana territory as a part of old Punjab and Haryana as a new state after its formation in 1966.

The Haryana territory was a more rural, agricultural and illiterate part of the old Punjab. It presented a picture of neglect in the provision of economic and infrastructural facilities. Most of its villages did not have the basic facilities of safe drinking water supply, electrification and link road. Subsistence agriculture was pervasive. Productivity was low. Industry was developed in a small measure and that too was confined to a few districts, nay only to some places within these. Natives in the services were few to count. Even the representation of this territory in the council of ministers was meagre.
The territory is not much favourably placed in terms of its physical resource base. Inadequacy of fresh water in general, presence of brackish water over a large part, and low and variable rainfall are its basic problems. A major difficulty arose from the fact that only limited efforts were made to utilise even the scarce resources available. Much less was done to tackle its problems.

The above observations are not meant to imply that things were just stagnating. Some initial change had started taking place. This was associated with:

(i) introduction of canal irrigation in the northern and western parts of the state,
(ii) emergence of the national capital of Delhi as a powerful growth pole impacting on the growth process in its surrounding area,
(iii) formulation of a state policy to promote industry around Delhi. The rehabilitation of displaced persons from Pakistan was also a factor in bringing some transformation. This group of people was enterprising and progressive. They enriched the human capital of the state.

The formation of the new state led to an interesting mix of things. On the one hand, it generated the most essential psychological climate for correcting the historical distortion of underdevelopment; on the other hand, instability became the hallmark of the new political dispensation. Political forces got realigned on caste and subregional lines. Quite frequently political survival
became more crucial to the party in power than the question of administering its development programmes.

Fortunately, the burden of events was in favour of faster development of the state. A massive effort at extending the basic infrastructure to every area, particularly the disadvantaged ones, was undertaken. There was a distinct spatial spread of infrastructural facilities and regional disparity declined in this respect. For the necessary investment, the new state was successful in appropriating relatively large size of funds from the Central government.

Priority was accorded to the economy in any scheme of things. Within it, agriculture and its related aspects, such as crop husbandry, livestock raising and dairying, were the major focus since the ministration was more rural based. Disparities in agricultural infrastructure, such as irrigation, use of fertilizer and adoption of high yielding variety seeds, declined. Agricultural productivity levels improved even in areas which suffered from physical constraints. All this, however, could not ameliorate the disparity situation. Productivity rise was more pronounced in areas which were already at a higher level assisted by both physical and technical factors.

The riparian character of the state vis-a-vis Indus river systems got lost and there are difficulties in getting additional water for thirsty lands over large parts of
Haryana. Prospects in near future are not promising. This is the most adverse outcome of the reorganisation for the state.

Like agriculture, industry picked up momentum mainly after the formation of the state. Industry was promoted by the state government through establishment of several new industrial estates, identification of industrially backward areas for special incentives, and opening of quite many industrial units in public sector. There has been deliberate attempt on the part of the government to take benefit of the state's propinquity to Delhi.

The pace of Haryana's industrial development has been faster than that of its sister state of Punjab. Its industrial structure has not only expanded in size over time but also got diversified in composition. It has, however, concentrated over space. Regional disparities in industrialisation have widened. Large and medium scale industry, taken separately, did disperse but failed to convert the overall pattern of industrial concentration. Industry gravitated mainly to areas peripheral to the national capital, the national highways, and the main rail routes.

No wonder the economy of the state grew at a faster rate than that of its parent state of Punjab. This was a reversal of the previous spatial pattern. Per capita net state domestic product or income, however, reveals an
increased regional disparity. Growth had taken place in general but its pace was distinctly faster in some favoured areas in terms of either physical resource base or location.

Spatially, while the districts located in the northern part were instrumental in reducing disparities, their southern counterparts were found responsible for widening these. The former group of districts had initially made impressive advancement in agriculture but were not successful in maintaining this momentum due to lack of agro-based industry. The latter group offered two categories of districts: the eastern ones which forged ahead both in agriculture and industry and the western ones which slid down in their relative position due to continuing lack of irrigation with its unfavourable impact upon agriculture.

Social sector received somewhat less of attention. Anyhow an effort was made to extend infrastructural facilities to all parts of the state. Rural development was the focus. Priority was given to link roads, rural electrification and rural drinking water supply. All this promoted rural-urban interaction and also reduced the urban-rural gap.

A trend contrary to the general was observed in the case of those facilities in which private sector was involved in a big way, such as medical services. The private sector opted to locate itself more in the already developed areas.
Despite efforts at breaking the social backwardness through provision of an extensive infrastructure, the pace of social change related to economic forces (urbanisation) has been stronger than that caused by direct social factors (literacy).

The spatial patterns of social development are coterminous with those of economic development. The eastern part of the state excels its western counterpart on both counts. Here a reference may be made to the conventional north-south divide. Haryana boldly displays an east-west divide in place of north-south.

A transition in Haryana's economic development process is visible - higher levels accompanied by enhanced disparity in conformity with Williamson's model. Social development is yet to make a transition. It is at a comparatively low level and, of course, with more of spatial uniformity.

As a special case, Haryana's ecological problems are to be seen as more rooted in its geographic setting than a byproduct of its development process. This is not to deny that resources during the historical and recent times have been used on a nonsustainable basis. Deforestation in the past and introduction of unlined canal irrigation during the recent decades had a deleterious effect. The state's problems of low rainfall and inadequate water resources are, however, the nature's handiwork. A serious concern for ecology is visible now.
The analysis in the dissertation lends support to our first hypothesis which envisaged an acceleration in the development process of Haryana after its formation. Its economic performance, especially in the field of industry, has been superior to that of Punjab. Another accomplishment to its credit was a rapid extension of infrastructural facilities, especially to rural areas. Nevertheless its record on social development is not impressive; on political development it was rather disappointing. An enhanced concern for ecology is certainly a matter of satisfaction.

The second hypothesis relating to the expected reduction in regional disparities is sustained only partially. The system got uplifted to a higher level but this process was accompanied by an accentuated disparity in some spheres. To be more specific, regional disparities widened distinctly in economic terms but narrowed down somewhat in social terms. These differing trends are to be seen against an increased uniformity in provision of infrastructural facilities.

The small size of Haryana facilitated the management of its economic and social development. From political angle, however, the story was different. The state's legislature has only 90 members and a defection by even a small number of legislators was enough to topple a government - an event which has been quite frequent in the post-formation era of the state. The cost of administration
also escalated three times during 1966-86. As such, our third hypothesis received only a partial support.

Now let us enunciate some research questions which emanate from the discussion in the present dissertation. The size of the state vis-a-vis the development process calls for an intensive study for future research. What is the optimum size of a state in the Indian context? The answer to this question is subject to the objectives which are set forth to be achieved. Our hypothesis is that the optimal size of a state is specific to the stage of development. At the initial stage, when extension of the infrastructure is the basic issue and the investible resources are scarce, large states are of greater help. In the transitional stage, in which Haryana finds itself now, a small size is favoured for being conducive to intensification of development process. Later, when small states attain a higher level of development, it may be profitable to consolidate them into bigger ones so as to reap the economies of scale with the help of advanced technology.

The second question for future research pertains to the role of political economy and culture in promoting or constraining development. This requires formulation of new analytical frameworks through which the relative contributions of the state and market forces and of religion and caste can be critically examined. The spatial
correspondence between the contours of political power and of development level calls for a critical examination.

Finally, a parallel study could be conducted for Punjab. How has reorganisation impacted upon its development process? Did it gain or lose in total terms? What happened to the core when it lost its periphery?

Succinctly put, the Haryana experience is a story of socio-economic transformation of an erstwhile periphery constituted into a new state. The new state has its less developed part but not a periphery. Being the centre of political power since the formation of Haryana, the less developed western part did receive a special attention in allocation of infrastructural facilities. There is, of course, a limit to what government can do in uplifting an area subject to physical constraints.