

10. SOCIAL JUSTICE AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION PROGRAMMES

Integrated Tribal Development Agency (ITDA)

A detailed and comprehensive review of the tribal peoples' problem was taken up on the eve of the Fifth Five Year Plan period. The main objective of ITDA is socio-economic development of tribal communities through income generating schemes allied with Infrastructure Development programmes and protection of the tribal communities against exploitation.

The ITDA project areas are generally contiguous areas of the size of a Tehsil or Block or more in which the ST population is 50% or more of the total. Due to the demographic profile of the tribal people in these regions, however, the ITDPs in Assam, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, and West Bengal may be smaller or not contiguous. Andhra Pradesh and Orissa have opted for an Agency model under the Registration of Societies Act and the ITDPs there are known as ITD Agencies (ITDAs).

So far, 194 ITDPs / ITDAs have been delineated in the country. In Jammu and Kashmir though no ITDP has been delineated yet, the areas having ST Population in the State are treated as covered under the TSP strategy. In eight states having scheduled areas the ITDPs / ITDAs are generally co-terminus with TSP areas. The ITDPs / ITDAs are headed by Project Officers though they may be designated Project Administrators or Project Directors.

Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP)

Genesis

The CDP launched in 1952 could not bring expected change in improving the conditions of rural masses or there was not much achievement in the areas of agricultural development.

The apparent failure of the CDP was the main reason for the evolution of the IRDP. The main drawbacks of the CDP were

- Uneven distribution of the benefits of the programme
- Absence of clearly defined priority in the programmes.

- The inability of the CDP to recognise and solve the inherent conflicts in the inter and intra target groups.
- Lack of mass participation.
- More bureaucratic.

Difference between CDP and IRDP

CDP	IRDP
1. Meant for total development of the Community ex. Road, drinking water, Etc.,	Meant for the individual development, who are below the poverty line.
2. Community approach	Family approach
3. Multi-dimensional and multi-sectorial programme	Integrated programme
4. The felt needs of the beneficiaries were not taken into account.	They are given due consideration
5. Financing is less intensive.	Financing is more intensive.

So, it was considered necessary to go in firstly for a programme directed mainly at agriculture and secondly to attempt the process of development in selected areas. Thus, in 1960 Intensive Agricultural District Programme (IADP) was formed and implemented. In this programme, efforts to boost agricultural production were concentrated in areas with better prospects of higher yields (package programme). The success achieved in increasing agricultural production under IADP, led the Government to extend the programme to other districts with slight modifications under the name of Intensive Agricultural area Programme (IADP) in 1964.

The food situation became alarming, particularly due to successive famines during 1064-67 and this happened despite intensive efforts in selected areas. In order to overcome this crisis,

the GOI launched a new agricultural strategy known as High Yielding Varieties Programme (HYVP) in 1966. The achievement was the single goal of increasing agricultural production.

This unusual shift in the rural development strategy in favour of increasing agricultural production led to the accentuation of regional disparities on one hand and economic inequalities among different sections of the population on the other. Various reports revealed that the gains of intensive development efforts, including institutional credit flow more towards large and resourceful farmers to the neglect of small farmers, landless labourers, tenants and artisans.

On realisation of the above, there was a shift in the rural development strategy. The main purpose of such a change in the approach was to make deliberate efforts to flow development benefits to the poorer sections and the backward areas. Accordingly, Small Farmers Development Agency (SFDA); Marginal Farmers and Agricultural Labourers (MFAL); Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP); Hill Area Development Programme (HADP) etc., were implemented.

The beneficiary-oriented programmes as well as area development programmes, despite some successes could not make much dent into the problem of poverty and unemployment. Considering the magnitude and dimensions of rural poverty, the rural development strategy, therefore, took a major turn in its emphasis, content, coverage and methodology. This resulted in launching of the programme “Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) in 1978-79, covering 2,300 development blocks and extended to all the 5011 blocks in 2nd October, 1980. For implementing the programme, DRDA was set up at district level. IRDP envisages the integration of methodology and approach of both beneficiary oriented programmes as well as area development efforts for the purpose of poverty alleviation as well as increasing productivity.

The goal of poverty alleviation was achieved by having two main instruments.

- (i) a set of self employment schemes for the poor i.e., IRDP and its two sub-programmes of TRYSEM and DWCRA.
- (ii) Wage employment programmes like NREP (1980) and RLEGP (1983). These have now been merged into Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRYO).

While the programmes under set (I) aim at giving the poor family an income generating asset, the latter set (ii) provides direct income to the poor through wage employment.

Objectives of IRDP

The main objectives are creating assets, employment, increased income, removal of poverty and minimising inequality. The guide lines given to achieve the objectives include:

- (i) to provide gainful employment and increase the purchasing power of rural poor.
- (ii) The job opportunities must be provided through the application of science and technology in making optimum use of existing local resources.
- (iii) The programme must be simple enough to operate and be economically viable to ensure quick self-reliance of its beneficiaries.

For achieving its objective of rural poverty alleviation, IRDP aimed at the provision of assets to the identified poor in the form of Government subsidy and bank credit on reasonable rate of interest.

Operation

For managing the programme a corporate governmental agency name as District Rural Development (DRDA) was set up at district level. TH DRDA is guided and directed and supported by a governing council headed by the Project Officer of DRDA. The District Collector, Heads of District Officers, legislators, Panchayat Union Chairmen and some other non-officials from the member.

The existing development block was strengthened to enable it to bear the additional responsibility of implementing DRDA directed and supported programmes. IRDP is a centrally sponsored scheme implemented by DRDA of the states. The scheme is funded on 50:50 basis by the centre and the states.

The integration involves several categories of:

- (i) Spatial integration (integration between areas)
- (ii) Sectoral integration (integration between agriculture, off-farm activities, industries, etc.)
- (iii) Integration in economic and social development.
- (iv) Integration of total area and target group approach.
- (v) Integration of human and other resources.
- (vi) Integration of income generating schemes.
- (vii) Integration of credit with technical services.

Thus IRDP involves integration both in its means and ends.

Shortcomings

Since 1985 the Government has promoted concurrent evaluation of the implementation and impact of the programme. These evaluations have indicated that there has been some increase in income but only a minority of them could cross the newly determined poverty line of 6400 rupees. Various evaluations indicated the followings:

- the resources provided were inadequate in majority of the cases;
- there were large number of over dues due to one reason or the other
- poor quality of assets provided to the beneficiaries in many cases;
- the follow up of the beneficiaries was inadequate;
- delay in provision of assets and preliminary high costs incurred by beneficiaries;
- lacking of training facilities to farmers;
- delay in releasing subsidy;
- bribes taken by various functionaries concerned;
- very inadequate supporting facilities or services;
- non-availability of loans for making capital; and
- lack of guidance about insurance cover.

Selection of beneficiaries the 'very poor' are overlooked, by and large.