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2.0 Introduction:
Rural development has a wider view of rural society and its change. There are various aspects dealing with rural areas and its societies, which have been changing since long by many factors. The main characteristic features of society are based on the changes in economic, social, cultural, religion, believes, attitudinal, organizational and even political changes, besides the technological alterations. Therefore, rural development is a multi-faceted phenomenon and a multi-dimension of rural society and its changes. As a result, rural development has a variety of aspects of the development of rural society, which can be viewed and, accordingly, literature on this topic may be reviewed in the following manner.

2.1 Rural Development as Philosophy and Ideas of Rural Masses:
On carrying out review of literature, it is found that there are quite a few books available for the purpose. As early as the middle of nineteenth century, the western Christian Missionaries and social workers initiated spade works of rural reconstruction in India and some of the works were started by individuals. Rambhai (1959) and Pandey (1967) mentioned and categorized the activities of rural development into three well-
differentiated periods, the Missionary Period (1858-1919), the Experimental Period (1920-1947) and the Post-Independent Period.

Development of rural societies in underdeveloped nations and that of the rural societies in developed nations is totally different in its approach and strategy of development. In developing societies, rural people are socially and economically deprived from many factors. They are not just poor and ignorant, but have multiple problems such as poverty, illiteracy, ill-health, unemployment, inequality in income and wealth. These are some of the common phenomena among the rural people, besides lack of infrastructures in the rural areas. Thus, the ultimate aim of rural development is to have an overall development of the rural people as well as of areas by providing infrastructural facilities.

The Ashridge Conference on Social Development emphasized that rural development should be designed to promote better living for all in the whole community with the active participation and initiative of the community. According to Mishra and Sharma (1979), rural development is not merely development of rural areas but also the development of quality of life of the rural masses into self-reliant and self-sustaining modern communities, so that each component of rural lives changes in a desired direction.

Chambers (1983) specifically mentioned that the target group in rural development should include poor men, women and children, poorest of the poor amongst the small-scale farmers, tenants and the landless labourers. He has critically analyzed and
stated that the poorest should be first put in order to narrow down the gap between the rich and the poor.

Singh (1986) pointed out that development is not only an increase in income and infrastructure facilities but it also brings about changes in the attitude of the people. Development is not only implementing government package programmes but it means to develop and to obtain a desirable change of the rural people.

All the above statements, opinion and comments about rural development are focused on the development of rural masses that targets the poor and economically weak persons.

2.2 Rural Development as a Process of Socio-Economic Change:

When development takes place, a change of situation is expected. A desirable change is a change in the people’s attitude traditional and dogmatic beliefs, so that, when the old traditional belief is to be replaced by the new scientific reasoning, there is acceptance for improvement of the situation.

The U.N. Report on Rural Development (1966) had viewed that efforts of the people was emphasized to improve the economic, social and cultural conditions in the life of the nation. It means that this change would bring about a change in their socio-economic status, and improve their living conditions.
The first and foremost aspect of rural development is the availability and use of infrastructure facilities such as better housing, electricity, education, industries and so on (Copp 1972). Myrdal (1972) considers provision of infrastructure as not only necessary but essential too. Pratap (2001) emphasized on the necessity of infrastructure facilities for the development of both agriculture and rural development activities. Zhang & Fan (2001), on the other hand, emphasis that there have been competing arguments about the effectiveness of public infrastructure on productivity in literature but in reality at ground level, situation is different. World Bank (2001) presented the characteristics of rural infrastructure sector and the emerging approaches to infrastructure delivery systems by taking Africa as an example.

Poster (2002) forwards that accessibility and mobility are embedded in the development nexus; it is the means for progress. Field studies of mobility among rural settlement with poor road access in Ghana (Africa) illustrate the frustration and costs of living off road. They are marginalized and invisible even to local administration. State decentralization appears to have had little positive impact on reducing ‘tarmac bias’ and improving rural service delivery. A range of potential interventions from intermediate means of transport to electronic communications is reviewed and the opportunities for building social capital in the off road areas through nurturing improvements in state civil society relations are considered.

But Goulet (1971) finds that development starts from within the social system and touches the individual towards some conditions regarded as humanly better. The development processes do not manipulate from the outsiders and the individuals
would move towards self-sustenance. Therefore, it is a movement towards socio-economic changes. Ball (1974) had similar view that development involved changes in people’s life. Meanwhile, Mc Namara (1973) felt that development would be meaningless unless it touches the individual human being especially the poor people. This strategy also came to be known as ‘growth with justice’ or ‘redistribution with growth’ (Chenery 1974).

Rural Development, according to the World Bank (1975), is a strategy designed to improve the economic and social life of a specific group of people, the rural poor. It involves extending the benefits of development to the poorest among those who seek a livelihood in the rural area. The group includes small-scale farmers, tenants and the landless. The World Bank and other international agencies and institutions placed emphasis on increasing production, raising productivity, increasing employment and mobilizing whatever land, labour and capital factors of production were available. At the same time, rural poverty and inequalities had to be reduced by development involving values and quality of life issues and the participation of the poor people in development activities and in decision-making. Central government has empowered Panchayati Raj institutions and other local-self government to initiate and participate in development activities. International Agencies just concluded ‘World Summit 2002’ on Sustainable Development at Johannesburg, South Africa, which has taken the decision to continue the fight against poverty in the world.
2.3 Rural Development as Government Mandate related to Administrative Setup:

About, three-fourth of the total population in India lives in villages. Gradually, due to the spread of education and political consciousness rural people have started demanding equal share in public funds. Since 1960, rural development is receiving top priority even in fund allocation as well as in the process of planning at the national level. When the country was exercising the Mahalanobis model plans for the country’s economic development, the rural people were the sufferer because the maximum benefit went to the heavy and allied industries and hardly any benefit percolated to the villages.

Planners and policy makers of the country framed various development programmes in such a way that maximum benefits should go to the people. But due to the diversified nature, widening regional disparities and social cultural differences, in many cases, these programmes also became ineffective at the grass root level. Sometimes execution and implementing agencies were also manipulated, and the middlemen siphoned off a large portion of the amount.

Ghosh (1967) finds that close association of the elected representatives in the development activities is recommended. Rural development, on the other hand, is not just a set of government welfare programmes. Each programme has its own aims and targets for development of the people in rural areas. However, Harris (1982), in his experience from a study of agricultural development programme, pointed out that much of the government’s development programmes are wrapped up in an ideology of modernization. In practice, many of the innovations and much of the advice, which are offered, are appropriate only for the rich cultivators.
Maheshwari (1985) ruled that the present administrative system for rural development is inherited from the colonial rulers and it is this system, which is still followed by the officials responsible for rural development programmes. Thus, it would be unrealistic to expect the colonial system to continue along with the new constitutional framework, as it would be subjected to various environmental pressures and forces.

During the early 1980s, Ministry of Rural Development, Govt. of India sponsored/seminars on the involvement of Non-Governmental Organizations in the activities of rural development based on which one may conclude that rural development cannot be possible only within the framework of bureaucratic levels unless mass participation is drawn from different organizations and different sections of the people. Development including planning for development must begin from the grass root level by mobilizing the people’s power as stated by Sachchidananda (1982). Micro-level planning is best suited to tackle the rural problems.

On the other hand, Kothari (1991) said that development programmes had only touched the surface and so called for a micro-planning approach to find out solution to the multi-dimensional problems of rural India.

Sharma and Rajagopal (1995) praised the introduction of Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) in the 1980s, which had thrown a new concept of inter-institutional linkages, which had in fact an important tool for achieving the objectives of economic development in rural areas. Singh (1995) says that rural development has attracted a great deal of attention from all political parties and the
governments both at national and state levels. It is receiving top priority even in the process of planning at the national level. Rural population in almost all the developing countries is enormous, with a high number of people living below the poverty line. In this situation, the attention of the government is very much necessary; otherwise non-governmental organizations have to step into this crisis to educate and to set up welfare measures for development of the people. There is also a need to make a channel between the rural people and the development agencies.

In developing countries like ours, both development efforts and bureaucracy have functioned together since its inception but the role of bureaucracy in the development process has been controversial in many cases, as it does not fit in with the changing socio-economic needs of the society. An effective bureaucracy is coupled with vigorous modernizing elite as a prerequisite for progress.

2.4 Rural Development as a Model for Rural Resource Utilization:

There are many factors that affect the level and pace of rural development such as physical, technological, economic, socio-cultural, institutional, organizational and political factors. These factors operate at all levels – from household to the nation and the world as a whole depends on how they are managed. When we talk about rural resources; man, animal power, natural resources like mineral ores, forest products etc. are abundant in rural areas. The availability of resources, its management systems and the factors affecting the resource management process is to be taken care, as these factors can have both favourable and adverse effects on development.
Infact, proper use of local natural as well as human resources is a main dimension of rural development. There are many studies on human resource planning through which the proper nutrition, health care (medical facilities) and education (school-facilities) of the people are interpreted. Similarly, the studies on natural resource use are equally important for rural development.

Lassey (1977) stated that the focus of rural development should be on preservation of ecological integrity with a view to providing a continuous supply of life supporting resources. He further adds that appropriate land use, healthy living conditions and pleasing environment are to be taken care of beside socio-economic welfare measures.

Singh (1986) states that if the human resources of a country are not properly developed by proper nutrition, health care, education and training and are not productively utilized, these resources become a liability and an obstacle to development. But, if they are properly developed and utilized, they become a great asset and a major factor contributing to development. ‘People are the most important and valuable resource of any nation’ was the theme of the International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo, Egypt, September 5 to 13, 1994. Population resource needs planning at proper time otherwise these resources would add more problems and would raise the demands without productivity.

Both renewable and non-renewable natural resources constitute the bedrock of a nations’ economy, if they are properly utilized. The quantity and quality of
available natural resources along with the intensity and efficiency of their use determine to a considerable extent the level and pace of economic development of a nation.

Maheshwari (1985) holds the view that rural areas have their own natural resources, and science could suggest ways and means of exploiting them with a view to giving additional and fuller employment to the local population. Singh (1988) classified resources into three main categories (i) natural resources (ii) human resource and (iii) land. He has further recommended the importance of integrated development planning for balanced utilization of local resources.

Pradhan (1999) and Uphoff (1999), both emphasized on the importance of local institutions in mobilizing the rural resources. Vimal (2000) presented the problems and prospects of watershed development in India, and recommended the importance of mass involvement in both water and land resource management.

Bekele (1998) shared an Ethiopian experience about the Village Level Resource Management Project. The project started to alleviate the accelerated resource degradation and stabilized the living conditions of the population. Similarly, Morse, et al. (2001) discusses the integration of sustainability indicators by draining upon the result of a 6 years research project based in African villages. The project looked at the issue that comprises livelihood sustainability, and in particular how the villagers themselves view this concept and what they deem to be important within it. Local visions of sustainability were recorded and sustainability indicators metrics applied to the
villages. It is concluded that an element of qualitative integration incorporating value judgments and subjectivity is inevitable with a concept such as sustainability.

The centrally conceived package of the programmes like the IRDP depends crucially on the latitude that they allow for the local level variation as Tenduldharr (1982) asserts. It must be understood that in order to have a successful development, IRDP cannot be based on single model only, since conditions differs from area to area, it should be location-specific for each area. IRDP being the single largest anti-poverty programme in India, the consent of the beneficiaries’ skills and their potentialities is very important. Ruben (2000) presented the importance and issues of real markets and its role in rural development, based on an experience in Central America. Lou Hichi (1999) also presented an experience from the implementation of IRDP in Tunisia and concluded that the project must be based on viability at individual and local levels with transversal development approach.

Copp (1972) stated that the process is through collective efforts aimed to improve the well being and self-realization of people. He further contends that target should be on people rather than infrastructure and should widen people’s range of choice. Taking into account the local resources should draw up the developmental programmes and the felt needs of the people having growth potentials. Thus from the above statements, it may be concluded that it is essential to have a proper management and utilization of the available resources in rural areas for the development and sustainability of rural people.
2.5 Rural Development in North Eastern Region:

In North Eastern Region and Nagaland in particular, studies on rural development are not numerous. Burman (1984) discussed the objectives and perspectives of poverty alleviation programmes, as because this was the main target of all rural development programmes at that time. He further stressed on the rural problems and its identification in both Nagaland and Manipur.

Saikia and Phukan (1989) have brought various aspects of rural development in the North Eastern Region. Yogi (1991) states that the region differs from the rest of India, only in kind and, not in degree, while the economy of the region is multi-structural as in the rest of the country. But due to the physical geography as well as the social and political conditions prevailing in the region, North East has a backward economy and even though the region covers a bigger area of production than the national average. However, productivity (production per ha) is recorded lesser.

In bringing out the indicators of development in the state of Nagaland, Saleh (1989), an economist, indicated the economic transformation-taking place in the state since 1964. Sahey (1989) based on his paper entitled, ‘Decentralization: The Nagaland Way’ and ‘Nagaland Villages Choose Progress’ asserts that socio-economic changes may be seen in the state. The performance of Nagaland Village Development Board (VDB), which is run purely in a democratic and decentralized manner both in planning processes as well as in execution of the programmes, has been working in its satisfactory manner. The National Institute of Rural Development has also been publishing the literature on rural development of the state.
Imnayondang (1990) has highlighted physiographic personality and historical of the state such as migration and population pressure on geographical land and also levels of development, based on various departmental reports. This geographic study of the area shows the regional pattern of development and pockets of backward areas of the state.

Maithani and Rizwana (1991) carried out a thorough study on VDB and its functioning. They highlighted some of the lacunae in VDB and emphasized the role of VDB and that it’s functioning must be well coordinated with the state government officials. The study was a good piece of work as far as VDB is concerned.

Ao (1993) has examined and analyzed emerging agrarian relation, social structures and rural leadership in the foothill villages of Nagaland. Interestingly, he has carried out his study among multi-ethnic communities. He has also stressed upon the importance of people’s participation in development processes based on the functions of Village Development Board in the state. Bag (2001), in his book on rural transformation, has studied the economic and social changes taking place in the state of Nagaland.

The VDB has played a major role in rural development at grass-root level in Nagaland and can be a role model in other states of the North Eastern Region. However, rural development still has a long way to go and it is dependent on various local factors and to obtain a desirable change there should be mass involvement both on the part of the rural population and the government officials for the upliftment of the rural poor.
2.6 Concluding Remarks:

From referred works and their dimensions of work for the rural development, it may be said that rural development is not only the available infrastructural as well as institutional provisions provided by the government (the central or/ and state) but also the changes in the mind-set of the people living in a specific environment of landscape and struggling with the specificities of physiographic phenomena. Therefore, the rural production processes and their area- and location-specific strategies are required in order to understand the local fabric of resource availability, production demands and technological and infrastructural deficiencies in the area.

Many studies are forwarded on the implementation of rural programmes and the role of institutions in rural development. Resource-based studies are also shown some relevant aspects of rural development especially for the North-eastern areas of the country. However, there is a deficiency of literature on the integrated view of rural development of this area especially for the hill area like Nagaland state, where physiographic is more important, which creates diversified pattern of socio-economic development.

The problems and prospects of rural development in the state of Nagaland may be viewed to analyze the facts regarding its physiographic and socio-cultural diversity evolved in its landscape.
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