



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

LIBRARY
CURRENT SERIAL RECORD

DEC 17 1957

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

(Organ of the Indian Society of Agricultural Economics)

Vol. XII

JULY—SEPTEMBER 1957

No. 3

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

- Foodgrains Prices, Controls and the Plan .. *B. R. Shenoy*
- Comparative Standards in Farm Management
Appraisal *A. A. El Tonbary*
- Population Movement in Sweden from Rural to
Urban Districts—Causes and Effects *Sven Holmstrom*
- Agricultural Co-operatives in Yugoslavia .. *C. Minderovic*
- The Place of Co-operative Credit in American
Agriculture *B. L. Agrawal*
- Agriculture and Economic Development in India

NOTES AND NEWS

- Dr. L. C. Jain
- Capital Investments of Collective Farms.. .. *M. Shepilov*
- Economic Backwardness and Labour Force .. *N. A. Mujumdar*
- Integrated Scheme of Rural Credit in Pilot Projects *V. M. Jakhade*
- Geography of Food Production *M. L. Dantwala and
C. H. Shah*
- Co-operative Farming *R. K. Hazari*
- Post-War Agriculture in Japan
- The Rafi Ahmed Kidwai Memorial Prizes for
Agricultural Research

GLEANINGS

BOOK REVIEWS (see inside cover)

Rs. 4-00

BOOK REVIEWS

Schiller, Otto	<i>Co-operative Farming and Individual Farming on Co-operative Lines</i>	J. C. Ryan	76
Programme Evaluation Organization	<i>Studies in Co-operative Farming (Report of 22 Co-operative Farming Societies)</i>	M. V. Hate	78
Bellerby, J. R.	<i>Agriculture and Industry Relative Income</i>	S. B. Mahabal	79
Madras, Govt. of	<i>Report of the Committee on Co-operation in Madras</i>	S. Thirumalai	81
Patel, J.	<i>Village Planning</i>	S.M.S.	84
Ensminger, D.	<i>A Guide to Community Development</i>	(Mrs.) Indira A. Iyer	87

EDITORIAL BOARD

Prof. M. L. Dantwala (Chairman and Editor)

Dr. G. D. Agrawal

Shri V. M. Jakhade

Prof. G. B. Kulkarni

Dr. M. B. Desai

The copyright and all rights of reproduction and translation of articles, book reviews and correspondence published in THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS are reserved by the Society. Application for permission to translate or reproduce any material contained in it should be made to the Honorary Secretary, The Indian Society of Agricultural Economics, 46-48, Esplanade Mansions, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Fort, Bombay-1.

BOOK REVIEWS

Co-operative Farming and Individual Farming on Co-operative Lines, Dr. Otto Schiller, All India Co-operative Union, New Delhi, 1957. Pp. ix+93. Rs. 5.50.

This small book of scarcely a hundred pages is a fine contribution to our ideas on co-operative farming at a time when planning circles in India are seriously thinking of establishing numerous co-operative farms in the country. The author is a Professor of Agricultural Economics in the Stuttgart University in West Germany. He served in West Punjab (Pakistan) for three terms between 1953 and 1956 on behalf of the Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations as an expert in co-operative farming. During his assignments in West Punjab, he visited some of the Indian States and studied agricultural conditions there. The central recommendation of his book is that co-operative farming can also be done on an individual basis and that, in this form, it can perhaps be usefully adapted to Indian conditions.

The author treats co-operative farming as a form of farm management. In this sense, he distinguishes between three kinds of co-operative farming: (1) *Co-operative joint farming*, where the ownership of the land, which is pooled together, is preserved as a title and the value of the land contributed is one of the factors which is taken into account when the income is shared; (2) *Co-operative collective farming*, where, in addition to land, all other resources of the members are pooled together and the ownership of land disappears in so far as the farm income is divided among the members only according to the work done by each member; and (3) *Co-operative farming with individual use of land*, where most of the farming procedures are carried out co-operatively, as for instance, in the planning of crops, in the distribution of seeds, fertilizers and small agricultural implements, in the organisation of irrigation facilities, in the provision of credit, in the hiring out of heavy agricultural implements, in the marketing of agricultural produce, etc. He rules out collective farming done in the *Kolkhoz* farms in Communist countries as not fit to be called co-operative farming because membership in the society is not voluntary and because the administration of the society is not in accordance with democratic principles; but he recognises the collective farming done in Israel and Italy as a form of co-operative farming.

Discussing the prospects of co-operative farming in new settlements and in old villages, the author says that nearly all examples of the first two varieties of co-operative farming, outside the communistic orbit, are found where new settlers have settled down on the land as a co-operative group. There are hardly any examples in any country where, in old villages of the traditional peasant structure, they voluntarily, *i.e.*, without interference from above, gave up their individual ownership of land and pooled their land together for joint farming. He considers that farmers in India are to a high degree individualists as most farmers in other parts of the world, and feels that co-operative farming in the form of joint or collective use of land may therefore have little chance of being adopted in the old villages. He admits that experiments made in India in co-operative farming in new settlements are functioning satisfactorily in a few cases; but, he says, that they do not retain their joint character for long. There are examples of refugee-farmers, tied together by a common destiny, who have settled as a group on land

which was jointly reclaimed by them. In the first years their mutual ties were strong enough to allow cultivation on a joint basis and to share in the profits of the farm without recording each member's work. However, they soon found that equal shares diminished individual interest in the work. Then they divided up the co-operative farm into a number of groups sharing in the profits according to the yields of their respective sections.

The author enters into the root of the matter when he compares the achievements of co-operative farming and individual farming in the non-communistic world, as for instance, in Mexico, Israel, Italy, U.S.A., and even England and Germany. The results of these co-operative farms, he says, are not very encouraging. They show that, under normal economic and psychological conditions and without outside help, co-operative farming has not proved its superiority as compared with individual farming. He also draws attention to the fact that it is often claimed that in the long run only large-scale farms can provide the necessary requirements of food for a growing urban population and indicates that, on the other hand, the examples of Japan and some European countries show that the productivity per acre in small holdings can be as high if not higher than in large farms. To those who say that agriculture must be mechanised so as to grow more food to sustain an increasing population, his answer is that the pressure of population on the land will not be diminished by co-operative farming itself. Bigger field units and modern techniques may curtail the demand for human labour. Conditions in India are quite different from those existing in Soviet Russia nearly 30 years ago, where one of the reasons for the introduction of collective farming was the belief that it was a pre-requisite for the execution of a huge programme of industrialization with its increasing demand for human labour.

All these considerations lead the author to recommend that instead of co-operative farming of the first two kinds, namely, with joint or collective use of land, the third type of farming may be advocated, namely, individual farming on co-operative lines. Accordingly, he proposes in Part B of the book a new type of co-operative society which may be called a Co-operative Society for Improved Individual Farming. He, however, takes care to say that this should not be looked upon as an inflexible scheme ; but should be adapted to local conditions. He suggests model by-laws for this type of society as also the constitution of a Special Farming Development Fund for financing these societies. The by-laws he has framed could be improved upon so as to fit into the co-operative law in force in each of the States in India. But the need for a separate Farming Development Fund is not clear. He visualises the fund to be built up in the form of loans from the co-operative financing banks and Government and in the form of subsidies from Government and donations from other institutions. Out of this fund, loans are to be given to these societies for working capital and capital expenditure. But under the existing system of financing in co-operative societies, there is nothing to prevent Government and financing banks providing loans for these societies and for Government giving them subsidies, as the title to the land will remain with the individual members of the society. They can mortgage the land for obtaining medium-term loans for land improvement and working capital loans could be given on the security of one or more sureties. In addition, in the initial stages, Government guarantee may be available to the financing banks.

One of the important stipulations made by the author in this new type of society is the demarcation of lands as "farming units." Generally, for East Punjab, 10 acres could probably be fixed as the minimum farming unit, taking into account the present intensity of agriculture. In other areas, the minimum may be lower than 10 acres. In some cases, two, three or even four smaller cultivators may have to be combined together in one farming unit with their separate plots, called sub-units, which they may or may not cultivate co-operatively. Each farming unit should be operated as far as possible under one cropping scheme and with one pair of bullocks. The units should be adhered to in case of tenancy agreement or other agreements in farming operations so that greater stability may be achieved with regard to cultivation rights. In general, where consolidation of holdings has been done he feels that the consolidated plots could be recognised as farming units. In other cases where the holdings have not been consolidated and lie in small scattered bits he suggests that the lands may be leased to the society by the present owners and taken back from them on sub-lease as farming units.

One more suggestion relating to the farming units is that they should be maintained for farming operations irrespective of customary sub-division of land by inheritance. He seeks to give effect to this suggestion by providing for it in the by-laws of the society. It is doubtful if the by-laws can override the general laws in force. It may be indicated, however, that in Madras, where the co-operative land colonisation societies have been given lands by Government for cultivation, they are divided among the members in plots, each of which constitutes an economic unit. Each member is given complete occupancy rights which he can, under the by-laws, pass on to only one member of the family nominated by him as heir.

In conclusion, it may be said that Dr. Schiller's book draws out clearly that increased production can be attained by family farming which retains all incentives for production and obtains assistance from a co-operative farming society only in shape of goods, credit and services.

J. C. RYAN

Studies in Co-operative Farming, Programme Evaluation Organization, Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi, December, 1956. Pp. 250.

The book gives a detailed and interesting account of 22 case studies of selected co-operative farming societies in different parts of the country. The studies were arranged by the Programme Evaluation Organization, Planning Commission, in connection with the work of the 'Re-organization Committee of the Panel on Land Reforms.' The information was collected on certain definite lines and subsequently checked and substantiated by means of an 'on-the-spot' study of conditions. Particulars relating to a farming society are given in each case history under the heads of general and economic conditions of the village, members' rights in land, their liabilities, organization and management of the society, its finances including state assistance, distribution of income, land development and other achievements of the society, etc. Most of the studies are appended with a copy of the latest balance sheet of the society, its profit and loss account

and statement of receipts and disbursements which help to give a good idea of a society's general working and financial position.

These studies should prove useful as a valuable source of first hand information in these days of bitter controversy about co-operative farming. There is one body of opinion who is strongly in favour of introducing this mode of farming on a large scale throughout the country and there is yet another body who is vehemently opposed to this idea. The former feels that co-operative farming offers the best solution to develop small holdings handicapped by inadequate resources whereas the latter doubts the practicability of this method of farming for several reasons, one of which is the deep attachment of the Indian peasant to his holding and hence his unwillingness to part with it to the rural co-operative society or even to cultivate it in common with other members and another is lack of sufficient outside help, financial and otherwise, in the absence of which one of the principal objects of co-operative farming, *viz.*, raising the productivity of land, is often frustrated. A perusal, therefore, of this book will give to such as are interested a clearer insight into the problem of co-operative farming.

M. V. HATE

Agriculture and Industry Relative Income, J. R. Bellerby in association with others, Macmillan and Co. Ltd., London, 1956. Pp. xii+368. 30sh.

The subject of enquiry in this study made by several economists led by Mr. J. R. Bellerby is the relative income ratio between agriculture and industry. Till very recent years, it was the general experience of almost all countries that the income level in agriculture was markedly below that in industry. There were of course short spells of prosperity as in the times of war when the relative income ratio in agriculture was not so depressing. On the whole, however, the past experience was that there were long-term influences in the dynamics of economic activity which asserted themselves by and large and tended to depress the income in agriculture in relation to that in industry. It was generally felt therefore that as soon as the short-term agricultural boom generated by the conditions of World War II was spent out, the income ratio in agriculture would lapse back to its depressed level once again. It was this feeling that prompted this study into the factors that are responsible for keeping the income ratio to the disadvantage of agriculture. The object was to discover these factors and assess their relative importance with a view to enable corrective measures.

As the study proceeded, however, it looked as though the conditions prevailing in the period after the World War II belied past experience that influences depressing the relative income level in agriculture reassert themselves after a war-time boom. Several new factors seemed to work in favour of the income ratio in agriculture. Though the Second World War was over, the huge defence expenditure continued in major countries of the world as a result of the uncertain international political situation. This tended to bolster up the demand for agricultural products. The massive economic aid that the U.S. made available to war-damaged European countries and the needy Asian countries served the same purpose. The active interest taken by most of the Governments in planned economic development after the Second World War, the growth of national monopoly

in the marketing of farm produce and the high rate of urbanisation witnessed in most of the countries were all factors which strengthened the relative income of agriculture *vis-a-vis* the industry.

On a cursory view, these new factors would seem to have knocked out the bottom of this inquiry inasmuch as the past experience of the sagging relative income in agriculture was not repeated. But as Mr. Bellerby points out, the new factors necessitated only an adjustment in the nature of the inquiry. In an orderly working of an economy, whether in a capitalist or socialist set up, there will have to be a striving to attain and keep up an optimum size of agriculture that will be in alignment with other sectors of the economy. It will also be necessary to know what income ratio between agriculture and industry will favour the attainment of the optimum. An inquiry into the factors that affect the relative income ratio would thus be a necessary instrument in the hands of the planning authority.

For purposes of this inquiry, a comparison is made between the 'incentive income' in agriculture and industry. The authors regard that the suitable basis of comparison is not the total return to an agriculturist for all functions, but only the return for human effort and enterprise, called the 'incentive income.' The aggregate 'incentive income' of the agriculturists-group is ascertained by estimating the total factor income of agriculture and subtracting from it agricultural net rent, interest, and the wages and salaries of farm employees. The incentive income per man-equivalent is found by dividing this residual aggregate by the adjusted number of farmers. The incentive income ratio is the ratio of this incentive income per man equivalent in agriculture to similar incentive income in non-farming enterprise.

On a study of statistical data in a number of countries, it is revealed that the relative incentive income ratio for agriculture ranges from 50 to 70 per cent to the disadvantage of agriculture. It is higher in countries like Australia and New Zealand where agriculture is expanding and absorbing a greater number of the population as a result of its strong international position. In countries, however, where the migration of population is away from agriculture to industry because of the greater economic importance of industry, the incentive income ratio is low. This has been traced to the inelastic supply of and demand for agricultural products.

On the supply side, four factors, or groups of factors are found to drag the supply price in agriculture to lower levels. In order of their importance, they are judged to be (i) occupational immobility for emigration from agriculture, associated with mobility towards the direction of agriculture, (ii) social immobility, (iii) personal immobility and inertia and (iv) psychological attractions, including the security arising from self-supply and cheapness of living due to conditions other than low retail prices.

In the changed conditions after the Second World War, some factors have emerged to counter-act the working of the above causes. Occupational mobility away from agriculture has increased as farmers on the strength of their sustained prosperity have been able to educate their sons to take up non-farming pro-

fessions and skills. The capacity to expand the size of holding and the general scale of business has increased. Urban life is becoming increasingly attractive and the concern for the security obtainable through subsistence farming is on the wane. These new factors are no doubt tending to raise the supply price of agriculture and thus strengthen the incentive income ratio from the point of agriculture. It is not, however, likely that their effect will be so overwhelming as to bring the incentive income in agriculture on par with that in industry.

The study ends by indicating four conditions necessary for preventing a renewed persistent decline in the incentive income ratio. They are (i) avoidance of world depression, (ii) assuming (i), avoidance of the accumulation of world stocks of agricultural products, (iii) increased occupational mobility of members of farm families and (iv) development of agriculture as a profession.

The analysis and conclusions are unexceptionable. The problem has been neatly posed and the depressing state of agriculture convincingly diagonalised. But one feels a certain sense of dissatisfaction as one lays down the book. The dissatisfaction is that one learns not much that is not generally known. Moreover, one fails to find the answer to the question posed earlier by the authors themselves, *viz.*, what income ratio between agriculture and industry will favour the attainment of the optimum size of agriculture in a planned or orderly scheme of the economy? Moreover, even if an optimum incentive ratio is arrived at for a country, we are still left without any definite prescription for attaining and holding on to that optimum incentive income ratio. Remedies like avoidance of world depression are not very helpful, at least from the point of an individual country.

In the context of Indian conditions, the ineffectiveness of the remedies suggested is seen even more vividly. The incentive income ratio in agriculture is probably very low and none of the remedies suggested would be of much practical help. With a large volume of unemployment both in urban and rural areas, the possibilities of increased mobility from agriculture to industry are not very promising in the near future. As the authors have themselves mentioned in one context, it is the active part played by Government in favour of the agriculturist that is likely to matter, if at all.

S. B. MAHABAL

Report of the Committee on Co-operation in Madras, 1955-56, Government of Madras, Government Press, Madras, 1956. Pp. 508. Rs. 5.25.

The Madras State has been fortunate in possessing a fairly comprehensive review of the working of the co-operative movement from period to period since its inception. The Sir T. Vijayaraghavacharya Committee (1939) was the last one in the pre-war period to conduct an elaborate survey of the movement and make recommendations for broadening the base and enlarging the sphere of activities to enable it to become a powerful instrument of rural reconstruction. Since the implementation of the recommendations of this Committee, at least three major events have had profound effect on the co-operative movement and its possibilities in the State, *viz.*, the World War II, the attainment of Independence by the country and the Partition of the Madras State. The War was fol-

lowed by the scarcity of food resources, rise in prices and the various Government control measures to tackle the emergency conditions. Independence introduced a national spirit and an urge for progress. The Partition opened out opportunities for more intensive economic development of a compact political area.

In this background, the need for assessing the opportunities for progress and the greater service under planning as well as of consolidating the progress made so far in the sphere of co-operation was recognised. The Report of the Committee on Co-operation 1955-56 under review is the result of such recognition.

The main objective of the Committee was to explore the desirable lines on which the co-operative movement can effectively participate in the work of the several new agencies for national development such as the Planning Commission, the National Extension Service, the Community Projects, etc., which are anxious to make increasing use of the co-operative agency in the promotion of the general economic welfare in the country. The Committee also had the advantage of examining the far-reaching recommendations relating to the structure and policies of the co-operative movement in the sphere of agricultural credit and marketing of the Rural Credit Survey Committee of the Reserve Bank of India. Thus, though the report relates to the problems in the working of the movement of a particular State, the implications of the recommendations made are of a general value. The report contains twenty-six chapters giving not only a historical account of the progress of different kinds of societies but a critical analysis of the problems relating to them which are dealt with separately under appropriate sections. It is not obviously possible to do full justice to the various detailed recommendations contained in the report. Some of the fundamental problems examined by the Committee in the development of the co-operative movement are only indicated here in the light of their recommendations.

In the Madras State, in the post-Independence period, the movement which was lop-sided, with credit co-operatives constituting the main sector of co-operation, became more balanced and diversified. The Reserve Bank came to play an increasingly important role in the provision of agricultural finance. Besides, there was a material change in the conception of governmental functions. The ideal of a welfare State began to inform all the activities of Government. It is in this environmental perspective that the Committee examines the problems for the future development of the movement in the State.

The Committee is in general agreement with the recommendations of the Rural Credit Survey for the development of the co-operative movement. On the major question of State participation recommended by the RCS, the Committee observes that "State participation in the light of the changes subsequently accepted may not undermine the democratic character of the movement or impair the sense of responsibility of those who are working in the movement in honorary capacities." However, it considers State participation in its original form as an unhealthy innovation but in the larger interests of the movement it considers that there need be no opposition in principle to State participation. In accepting this general principle, the suggestions made by the Committee are well worth looking into. In its view, the State co-operative bank and central banks are

fairly well established in the State. Therefore, the State, apart from investing token amounts in them in pursuance of the policy of State partnership, need not compel them to receive share capital irrespective of their wishes. There is no tangible advantage to these institutions by way of State partnership except the increased borrowing power accruing on account of the share capital provided by the State. These institutions should also have the option to retire the share capital of Government and the partnership should not continue indefinitely as envisaged by the Rural Credit Survey Committee.

The most important point which the Committee makes out is that State participation in share capital will not remove the real bottleneck in the rural co-operative finance obtaining in the State. The ultimate limit to the expansion of co-operative credit in rural areas is mainly set by the resources of the agricultural borrowers. The scheme of State participation at various levels certainly does not suggest a solution to this fundamental obstacle to the expansion of co-operative rural credit. The village credit societies should, therefore, be permitted to advance out of the State-derived share capital loans to their members in necessary, and only in necessary cases, towards the part of the share capital to be paid by them in relation to the loans required by them. The balance of the State-derived share capital may be utilised for investment as share capital in the central banks. They also admit that there is ground for the fear of the possibility of over-capitalisation at the level of apex and central banks. Therefore, it is suggested that so far as the share capital of the primary societies channelled through the apex and central banks is concerned, the State should be eligible only for such dividend as is declared by the primary societies which ultimately receive the State's share capital.

These are views which deserve careful examination. One should also agree with the Committee that success in the development of co-operation can be achieved only by the co-ordinated implementation of all the proposals recommended by the RCS and not merely by the application of the principle of State partnership. Even hitherto, the movement has all along been State sponsored and State guided and has been getting the required funds mostly because of State association. In spite of this, the movement is considered to be a failure. Therefore, while State partnership can be considered as an improvement and a necessary prop, the movement must envisage a time when it will be able to stand on its own legs and fulfil its purposes unguided by State partnership.

In regard to this matter, they make the constructive suggestion that a State Co-operative Development Board on the lines of the National Co-operative Development Board should be set up with the Minister in-charge of Co-operation as the Chairman and with members of the Board drawn from representatives of the movement at various levels, one or two eminent non-official co-operators, a representative of the Board of Revenue and the Finance Department, the Directors of Agriculture and Animal Husbandry, etc., with the Registrar as the Member-Secretary of the Board. On the constitution of such a Board, Co-operative Advisory Council should be abolished, its present functions being transferred to the Board. This new body will have to be responsible for working out the programme of the Second Five-Year Plan into a phased pattern of gradual expansion and bringing about the required response from the public. While the

activities of the Board will comprise administration of the schemes under planning, the object is to make it a permanent statutory body, planning and developing the co-operative movement. The suggestion is practical and should be fruitful if fully implemented in integrating the development of co-operatives on a co-ordinated basis with the other agencies of development.

With a view to bringing about an improvement in the working efficiency of the movement and raise the standard of conduct of officials and non-officials jointly engaged, a suggestion is made for the separation of audit from administration. This is a compromise formula which will safeguard the prospects of the audit staff working in the department, at the same time making audit independent and effective.

Ultimately, the co-operative movement can succeed only in the measure in which the individuals composing it bring to play the virtues and qualities so necessary for success and for creating the necessary conditions for public response. The reviewer shares the hope of the Committee that there are good prospects in Madras for working out the movement to satisfy these conditions. The Report is a useful addition to the co-operative literature, from the side of the Government.

S. THIRUMALAI

Village Planning, Jhaverbhai Patel, All India Khadi and Village Industries Board, Ministry of Production, Government of India. Bombay. Pp. 119. Re. 1.00

"Village Planning" which should have been better titled as "The Five Village Plans" is a useful addition to the literature on local planning and workers engaged in the formulation and execution of the plan at the village level will welcome it. Coming as it is from the All India Khadi and Village Industries Board the book will receive wide attention and notice of the constructive workers in particular. The Foreword to the book is written by Dr. Rajendra Prasad. Shri Vaikunthlal Mehta, Chairman, has written the Preface. The objectives of the Intensive Area Scheme, claimed as an innovation in village planning, have been lucidly outlined in the Preface. The manner in which village people are associated with the formulation and the execution of the village plans is also explained.

Moderately priced, the book contains the results of five surveys in the villages of Raiyan, Sultanpur and Kamelpur in U.P., Karakata in Hyderabad and Borkhadi in Bombay. The Raiyan plan (or survey?) has already been published earlier as 'A Village Plan.' All these villages except Borkhadi, which has a population of 1,874 persons, are small communities. Raiyan has a population of 377, Sultanpur 264, Kamelpur 597 and Karakata 589. These villages differ in their land use patterns, occupational structure and social hierarchy. As far as the position of Harijans is concerned Raiyan and Sultanpur present two different sides of an object. Borkhadi, once a flourishing liquor centre, shows a commendable example of a crusade against social tyranny. In order to understand the motivating forces behind these occurrences it is necessary to understand the functioning of the rural society and its leadership, which is an important agency in creating enthusiasm for the plan. This aspect, however, is not

adequately brought out. The utility of the publication would have been much increased if an attempt was made to co-ordinate and integrate data of the five different types of villages. Six statistical tables on pages 42-45 give the benchmarks and the targets for each of the five villages in respect of their occupational pattern, utilisation of human power, income and expenditure and the degree of self-sufficiency. But the analysis does not go further.

The author mentions that information was collected on the basis of two proforma schedules, one relating to man-power utilisation and the other relating to land distribution and crop pattern (p. 40). We do not find the schedules embodied in the book and hence it is difficult to assess either their content or design. The method of collecting data is also not mentioned except that the village leaders were actively associated in the collection of data, the presumption being that information was collected for the entire village on the basis of the replies of what is known as 'key respondents.' This method is very questionable, especially in arriving at the estimates of man-power utilisation, volume of income, production of crops, etc., for, such an approach gives rise to a large amount of bias rendering the estimates quite unserviceable for building up an 'edifice of any concrete plan, annual or for a longer period. Hence such surveys could not be said to be impersonal in the strictest sense. This, we feel, is one of the major weaknesses of the Five Village Plans presented in the book.

Data have been presented for annual (actual) consumption of various items such as production of crops, man-power utilisation, net income generated from various sources, employment provided, and 'imports' and 'exports' of a village. It is very doubtful whether data presented are reliable to lead to firm conclusions. Perhaps those in charge have looked to the problem in a too simplified manner. There is a feeling that the meaning of the terms and concepts used here are not adequately understood. There is confusion in the use of the term occupation and industry in particular. One is used for the other as if the two were synonymous. (pp. 43, 83, 107). Castes are included under 'community' (p. 61) which a student of sociology would resent. 'Workforce' has been calculated with reference to some norms rather than the fact that a person is offering himself for employment (p. 97). Data on demographic characteristics particularly relating to age groups have been presented very broadly, viz., 6 to 16, 16 to 55 and over 55 years (p. 95).

Under land distribution (pp. 49 and 94) data are presented according to number of families owning land but the area owned by these families is not indicated under various class-intervals. It is thus difficult to get an idea of the concentration of holdings. Figures have been cited for economic holdings in Kamelpur (p. 94), but the economic holding is not defined. Again there is no uniformity in the presentation of data relating to land use, occupations or land holdings. Apart from these deviations in the presentation of material, what is more annoying are the mistakes in spelling and at some places of grammar. The reviewer is constrained to remark that proof reading is very poorly done and the *Errata* is not comprehensive enough.

Certain tables on pages 156, 158, 160 and 161 could very well be presented in the form of sentences rather than statistical statements. Tables are numbered only at places. Titles have not been given to a good number of tables. Figures

contradict each other at several places. For example, total population of Sultanpur has been mentioned as 265 in the text (p. 76), whereas in the tables on the facing page it reads as 264. Land cultivated is mentioned as 532 acres on p. 91, whereas on p. 95 it is mentioned as 531 acres. Landless families are categorised along with families by cultivation holding (p. 78). Calculations of available 'man-power' are based on 300 days of a year in one case (Raiyan, p. 52) whereas in the case of other (Borkhadi, p. 162) it is based on 330 days.

We shall now examine the execution of the village plans. The experiment of village plans is first launched in the two laboratory villages which are 'surveyed'. A formulae is evolved and then extended to the rest of the 20 or 30 villages situated in the block. The main targets are in respect of agriculture and animal husbandry, village industries, village remodelling and health, nutrition and sanitation (p.38). The Development Officer of the Intensive Area Scheme is the principal person organising the programme. In all the five villages, plans are executed through 'ad hoc' village agencies such as the *Kshetra Samitis*, the *Gram Vikas Mandals*, etc. The funds for executing the plan are to be met partly from the village itself and the rest from "external" sources. It is gratifying to note that these village plans have raised the morale of the people. In Raiyan, for example, group animosities have been overcome. The plan, it seems to us, concerns itself more for the amenities' programme rather than for building up the institutional leadership and thus stands on a shaky foundation. The planned expenditure on the construction of buildings, wells, bullocks, etc., is much heavy as will be seen from the following table :-

Planned Expenditure in the Five Villages

Village	Total cost (Rs.)	From the Village (Rs.)	External Assistance (Rs.)	Total allocation on building and related programme (Rs.)
Raiyan ..	18,959	6,764	12,495	12,920
Sultanpur ..	26,015	12,905	13,110	20,600
Kamelpur ..	77,275	37,125	40,150	32,000
Karakata ..	64,000	13,400	50,600	26,000
Borkhadi ..	1,29,400	57,250	72,150	1,00,000

Of the total estimated expenditure, about 60 per cent is proposed to be spent on the construction of buildings, drains, etc. External assistance which is 60 per cent of the total cost, taking all villages together, is the main prop of the whole programme. Should this external assistance fail to reach in time—as it happened once in case of Raiyan—will the programme not collapse?

A Guide to Community Development, Douglas Ensminger, Issued by the Ministry of Community Development, Government of India, New Delhi. Pp. 205.

In this publication under review, Dr. Ensminger brings to bear not only his varied and wide knowledge on the subject of community development but also his experiences of the developmental efforts which he has gained during his association with the twin programmes of development in our country ever since their inception. The publication is divided into twenty-seven chapters. It discusses the varied problems of rural development, indicating the methods of approach and suggests the ways to tackle them. The staff at the block level are clearly warned from imposing their diagnosis of rural problems and the solutions to them, but have been advised to comprehend the problem and its solution with the help of villagers, as both community development and national extension are self-help programmes.

The author has laid stress on the need for organising institutional agencies, viz., co-operatives, village panchayats and voluntary organisations so that developmental efforts could be carried on by the people themselves. The block staff would be maintained only for limited periods, and when they are withdrawn, developmental efforts may sag. If this is not to happen both the Departments of Co-operation and Local Self-Government will have to redouble their efforts and pay adequate attention to the development of these institutional agencies.

Sufficient recognition has been given to the problem of training village leaders and village school teachers. The social and economic status of the school teachers should be assured. The pivot on which the programme as a whole hangs, as it were, is the development of leadership from among the villagers. The outlook of the villagers could be changed only through village leaders. Leadership training should be undertaken so that the speed and the intensity of developmental efforts would not be halting and discontinuous. It is gratifying to note that Government have recognised this need and are sponsoring training camps for village leaders shortly.

In the Second Five-Year Plan period, it is proposed to bring the entire countryside under the national extension scheme and nearly over a third of this area under the intensive community development programme. The requirement of trained personnel—the multi-purpose village workers, staff specialists and block officers—would increase tremendously. Suitable arrangements will have to be made to recruit and train such a large personnel. The uneven development of some villages within a block itself is attributable to the lack of sufficient number of *gram sevaks* and technical specialists. The number of technical specialists working in each block should be increased commensurate with the needs, and the departments of the Government have a great responsibility in this regard.

The successful implementation of these programmes, embracing the nation as a whole, would depend upon proper communication up and down the chain and effective co-ordination at various levels. The importance of these have not been realised fully, and we could do well to give sufficient thought and attention to these aspects of administration.

This publication is a welcome addition to the growing literature on the subject as it gives very valuable and useful hints to all those concerned with the successful administration of the programmes of Community Development and National Extension.

(MRS.) INDIRA A. IYER.