

CHAPTER - III

INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT : A STUDY OF ITS ORGANIZATION

Section 3.1 Organisational Structure : Its basic features

The conceptual thinking developed shows significant relationship between management, organizational growth and development activities in the rural sector. These in turn depend upon the efficiency, and dedication of the implementing agencies. But experience demonstrate that the success and failure of organizations set up for rural development is greatly dependent on participation of the rural mass. Any Rural Organization requires leaders of strong conviction, clarify and honest commitment to the needs of the local people. Has such leadership developed? Has the concerning IRDPs set up, helped to generate local participation? What are its obstacles towards enlisting popular participation? The focus of this chapter is to answer these questions.

We must commemorate that any programmes of rural development constitutes a "socio-politic economic process which is naturally beset with incongruities and contradictions"¹. Further the political system of any society is a basic part of its organization and thus has propound impact on its economic life².

The importance of organisations, can be traced back to the days when the Pharaohs used organisation to build the pyramids. The Emperors of China used organisation thousand years ago to construct great irrigation systems. And the first Popes created a universal Church to serve a world religion³. We, living in this modern age, cannot even conceive our existence, without organisation. Especially a least developed country like Nepal which is constrained with physical, social and economical barriers requires strong and effective organisations for its development. Amitai Etzioni aptly remarks that "modern civilisation depends largely on

organisation as the most rational and efficient form of social grouping known. By co-ordinating a large number of human activities, the organisation creates a powerful social tool. It combines its personnel with its resources, weaving together leaders, experts, workers, machines and raw materials. At the same time it continually evaluates how well it is performing and tries to adjust itself accordingly in order to achieve its goals"⁴. Fermon E. Kast and James E. Rosenzwing argue that organisations are imperative in human societies. The tendency to organise interdependent relationships is inherent in human nature.

In Kenn Wang states that broadly speaking, the purpose of an organisation is to provide a continuing mechanism for the pursuit of some interest or interests of its members as collectively identified by them or as may be so identified by them in the course of organised activity⁶.

The foregoing views presented by these scholars brings out the important characteristics of an organisation. They are : (1) It does not involve individual human actions but group actions. Hence any action is the responsibility of all in the group, (2) Since it involves collective work it presupposes coordination between the groups. (3) Organisation stands for actions, this then involves functions which in turn is a harmonious combination of Man and Nature (raw materials). (4) This harmonious combination is a continuous process, firstly because past actions may not be suitable for the present conditions and secondly new horizons open up for application of knowledge and technology which may lead to higher levels of

développement. So adjustment is essential for effective organisations. (5) Lastly, all human actions are done for some specific goals. Hence an organisations first and the last work is to establish clear cut and definite goals and then collectively pursue to achieve these goals.

The Integrated Rural Development Programmes, as the name stands represents the collective actions or efforts involving groups of politicians, leaders, economists technicians, administrators and local rural people for achieving one broad goal. That goal being the alleviation of poverty deep-rooted in the rural sector of Nepal. The IRDP has all the ingredients of an organisation except one, that is continuity. The countries that have adopted IRD as a programme or as a project, may be regarded as a temporary action. It is not that all organisations must be permanent; there are different organisations some temporary and others permanent, but in the context of rural poverty continuity would be a better option. In Nepal this has been adhered to. There is a general agreement between politicians and planners that, though IRDPs have not lived up to the expectations of the rural people it should not be dropped down; instead the whole country should be covered by these programmes. Initially Nepal started only with one IRDP covering two districts (1975) now it has eleven projects covering thirtyfour districts out of its seventy five districts.

The goals of organisation serve many functions. They provide orientation by depicting a future state of affairs which the organisation strives to realize. Thus, they set down guidelines for

organisational activity. Goals also constitute a source of legitimacy which justifies the activities of an organisation. Moreover, goals serve as a standard by which members of an organisation and outsiders can assess the success of the organisation"⁷. It should be noted that the nature of goals and the setting up of goals may impede the functioning of an organisation. This may result in failure of the organisation. For example, when a fund raising organisation spends more money on staff, building and publicity than on the charity itself, for which funds are raised organisation then reduce the service to their initial goals in order to satisfy their acquired need, rather than adjust the service of their acquired needs to that of their ^{real} goals⁸. This holds quite true for the IRDP in Nepal, which we shall refer later. It is, therefore, necessary to keep in mind the real goals of I.R.D.P.

The major goal of all IRDP, irrespective of the country which they are functioning is, eradication of poverty. This objective calls forth the interplay of multisectoral programmes having multipurpose goals. But limits of an organisational ability to serve multipurpose goals should also be remembered. There may be loss of effectiveness in achievements. Conflict may arise over the amount of means, time and energy to be allotted to achieve each goal. Instead of integration of different components or programmes of IRD, there may be disintegration. Furthermore, serving numerous goals, may create strains for personnel. And there is much possibility that one goal may completely subordinate the other and sometimes more primary one.

Goal setting is an important aspect of an organisation. Generally, all organisations have formal, explicitly recognised, sometimes legally specified organ for setting up the initial goals and for their modification. But in practice, we find that goals are often set in a complicated power-play involving various individuals and groups within and without the organisation, and by reference to values which govern behaviour in general, and the specific behaviour of the relevant individuals and groups in a particular society⁹. Améltai Etzioni points out that the main factor that enters into the struggle to determine organisation goals are organisational department or divisions, personalities of a strong leader occupying the key position and environmental forces. How the environmental forces limit the effectiveness of organisation may be illustrated by a prison to reform criminal to a measure deemed helpful in the shift from the goal of custody (keep them in)¹⁰ to that of rehabilitations (change them while they are in). The establishment of peoples communes in China, can also be cited as an example of how the forces referred above, play important role. In order to make China strong and powerful, it was felt necessary to achieve rapid economic advancement. The commune system was considered as the magic solution to their problems by which they could keep all their other goals intact, and still achieve commensurate agricultural development to keep the economy rapidly moving forward. Clearly, therefore, the decision to organise peoples communes was as much a political decision as an economic one¹¹.

The structure of Integrated Rural Development Organisation, especially the Indian and the Nepalese are so formed (members are

peoples political representation, class representatives and administrative bureaucrat and technocrats) that groups, individual and environmental forces seem to have profound influence in setting up of goals. This seems to have created ample snags for effective working of IRDPs. It is, therefore, imperative if the rural society is to be developed, major roles should be given to local ruler leaders individuals, or/and institutions within the IRDP organisations.

The effective utilisation of man power, capital/finance and natural resources is the next requirement for the success of organisations. This **then** involves the planning process. Without planning, purposive and co-ordinated effort is not possible, instead the result is chaos, confusion and wastage of resources. Fayol observed that "planning includes, ... the line of actions to be followed, the stages to go through and methods to be used. It is a kind of future picture and it entails the running of business as foreseen and provided against over a definite period"¹². R.D. Agrawal points out that planning elements respond to the questions as (1) what will be done (2) what resources will be required (3) how will it be done (4) who will do it (5) when will it be done?¹³. While Nathaniel, Lichfield and Haim D. Drakin remarked that planning includes plan-making, plan implementation and plan review... Further more they raise the question : are plans meant for implementation? If so, they have suggested the following factors responsible for success and failures (when absent) in plan implementation : (a) Technical inadequacy of plan; (b) Insufficient legal framework;

(c) Inadequate institutions. (d) Not in accord with high or lower-level authorities.... (e) Inadequacy or mal-distribution of economic resources ... (f) Inadequacy of financial resources for compensations ... (g) Lack of political backing (h) Lack of public backing¹⁴.

So in forming IRDP plans ^{the} above these factors should be considered. In the introduction chapter we have given views of IRDP propounded by different scholars. So here we will only recollect and summarise. These plans must have the following aspects.

- (1) It must ensure the optimal utilisation of local resources and the schemes must have a maximum multiplier effect.
- (2) Correct the disparities which have been generated by past development efforts.
- (3) The plan must cover in a decentralised way the whole of rural-urban continuum offering progressively more specialised services and employment from village upward.
- (4) It must provide for efficient marketing both in the field of agriculture and small and cottage industry calling forth the development of infrastructure.
- (5) Another important field would be the flow of credit and other inputs. Hence the spectrum of activities to be covered will be banks, co-operatives, distribution centres, etc.
- (6) Besides the economic activities which directly contribute to production, plans must provide for community facilities such as education, health, sanitations, environmental improvements and better housing.
- (7) Planning must lay great stress on detailed exercise on administration and implementation.

(8) The plan should also indicate in-built mechanism for feed back, evolution and if need be for the revision of the plan¹⁶.

Besides plans should try to involve maximum participation of local people (the beneficiaries)¹⁶. Development does not merely mean an increase in gross natural production or per capita income. The increased income should be so distributed as to reduce the inequalities in income as well as wealth. Further in such plans the socio-cultural factors must be taken in to account in formulation and implementation of plans. And the adoption of technology for development should be guided by the social structure pertaining to the region¹⁷.

The effectiveness of IRDPs organisation lies not only in sound clear-cut goals and good planning but also in implementation. Rather it is the implementation factor that holds the key to success. This can be illustrated by the IRDP working in Nepal. Here the objectives laid down and the plans formulated are quite scientific. But the flaw lies in the implementation of these programmes. There are many constraints that hamper the smooth working of the responsible agents. Shortage of agricultural extension personnels and the delay in the release of funds are two important ~~constraints~~ often mentioned in this regard. While the objective of IRDP is to increase participation of the local villagers in planning and implementation, in practice they are not even consulted and enlightened about the benefits of IRDP. At the higher level the coordination problem between the line agencies is voiced, recurring^{ly} but actually they hardly keep in touch with each other. These are some of the flaws in the implementation of IRDP.

So besides the above elements as planning, the management sector should be given due importance. For this the personnels (executors) should be made competent, ample scope should be provided for planning communications. Motivation of the employees, assignment of responsibility of delegation of Authority along with development of committed local leadership are some of the important aspects of organisational behaviour. In addition, it is necessary that implementation machinery should break the inertia of the people (the rural mass). Proliferation of bureaucracy should be limited as far as possible¹⁸.

In the light of the above we shall now be able to analyse and see how the rural programmes have been effective in its historical perspective.

3.2 Evolution of the organisation for rural development

- : Pre-Rana Regime (till 1955)
- : Plan Period (beginning from 1956)

In a small country like Nepal pressed with the problem of numerous races, caste, and high illiteracy, it becomes difficult to seek mass participation for rural development. But we are perhaps forgetting that, there is ample proof of a glorious past, where societies were self-sufficient and institutions were well organised. The form of Hinduism in Nepal is 'entirely untainted by communal prejudices'. 'Religious tolerance contributed in making society comparatively free from ritual and caste prejudices'¹⁹. The Nepalese tradition-bound society has many religious and social institutions as Dhikuri, Guthi, Tharukalyan Samities, Tuki, Propkar Sanstha, which have been performing social, religious and productive activities²⁰.

Even in the present we find the principle of co-operation, strictly followed in the form of labour exchange in agriculture and constructing activities.

Similarly, tracing back even to the days of pre-unification of Nepal, (1772 A.D.) as in the Kirates, Licchavi or medieval periods local institutions as panchayats working as local corporates were well established. These bodies were given extensive duties and responsibilities and powers granted to them were very liberal²¹. They enjoyed the powers of the state within their sphere of activities. The development functions were the public works they included, provision of irrigation, establishment of mines, factory, maintenance of preserves and grazing grounds, highways, water ways and facilities of communication. These public works also included the management and repair of temples, roads, guest houses etc. There was due care-taker for the health and sanitation of the people. Provision of hospitals and preventive measures of diseases were provided by these panchayats. The management of these works were done by the whole body or through number of separate committees²².

Then in the early modern era in the period of the Rana regime (1846-1951) power was highly centralised; hence local bodies as the panchayat powers were limited. Bhola Chatterjee labelled this period where "government as it is understood in any civilised country was totally unknown. Depraving poverty, rampant illiteracy and despotic politics were the hall marks of Nepalese society"²³. And administrative policy was progressively revenue oriented²⁴. Little attention was paid to the improvement of the state of the

peasants. The merits of the personnel were determined by their capacity to make a surplus of income over expenditure²⁵. However the main drawback of Rana Prime Minister (who stood at the apex of all powers) was that he was responsible neither to the king nor to the people²⁶.

But though the regime's demerits weigh heavy there were some merits (in politics economic and social) that can be said to have at least, paved the path for Nepal's future. It was the regimes diplomatic policy that Nepal was able to retain, its sovereignty, during the British regime. Establishment of Chandra Nahar, Sundarijal Hydel Project, match, cigarette factories, Darbar High School, Trichandra College, Bir Hospital and pipe water supply in Patan, Kathmandu, Dhankuta and Pokhara are some examples in the economic and social front²⁷. Even in the administration system there was a host of departments, headed by Director Generalship for performing different functions. These in a modern term could be assumed as civil services²⁸. For efficient administration the whole country was divided into East, West, South and North regions and into 35 districts. The head of the district was known as Bada Hakim (District Magistrate) who enjoyed in practice the status of king in the District and Village level, mainly due to geographical constraints²⁹. Further, it was during this period that modern era of panchayat as local institution was reorganised (1926 A.D.). These panchayats were organised on the discretion of Bada Hakim. They were formed firstly in Kathmandu Valley (1930 A.D.). Later on, the satisfactory working of panchayats led the Govt. to extend its jurisdiction and formation in the Tarai (1936 to 1946 A.D.). The panchayats were

composed of eight members, of which seven were elected by the people while one was the nominee of the govt. Then again, it was during this period that the first (1949 A.D.) comprehensive Act for village panchayat was enforced. The detailed functions were classified into regular and optional. The regular functions were development and maintenance, health and sanitation activities, while the optional were aforestation, formulation of co-operatives etc.³⁰

Irresistible conclusions that can be drawn from these two periods are: first, there existed local institutions as panchayats for local or village development. Secondly, whatever the real objectives may be there was distinct functions and powers given to the panchayat. Thirdly, these institutions were formed as local peoples representatives. Fourthly, the only difference between the two was that in the ancient period the general tendency was to curb the powers of the state (centre) officials "in order to allow a broad canvas for the activities of the local institutions"³¹. In the Rana period such autonomy was not granted, and there was tight official control.

After discussing the two periods we shall now try to assess the historical period in the light of the five year plan period of Nepal. But we shall deal with only those changes that have brought forward the Integrated Rural Development programme, as a strategy for rural development. The advent of democracy, with the overthrow of the Rana regime (1951) initiated the need for all round development which was brought about by systematic and scientific planning process. Such consciousness led to the introduction of the first rural development programme (1952) known as the Tribhuvan Gram Vikas

Yojana. This programme was undertaken with the assistance of U.S. Government and Indian Technical Assistance Programme. It was based on the community Development Model similar to that of India's Community Development programme with the objective of carrying out various village development programmes. The programmes was regarded to have had insignificant impact on the area. This was noted to be a failure because of lack of socio-economic overheads, trained personnel, technological know-how and institutional framework³². But still it was instrumental in mobilizing the rural mass in basic infrastructure building, improvement in agriculture, introduction of new ideas and some new technologies and new institution building. "In the areas served by the block, the people seemed stirred with some fresh activities and hope for a better future"³³. This awakened in the mind of political leaders, planners and administrators that village development should be the central focus for a comprehensive national development plan in Nepal³⁴.

Plan Period (beginning from 1956)

As a result of the preceding conceptions, we find that, with the introduction of the plan era 1955/60, specific objectives and institutional development required for all round rural development was stressed. The first five year plan (1955/60) laid down a detailed chapter for village Development Programmes. The community Development model of Tribhuvan Gram Vikash Yojana was followed as the basis of the programme. A systematic structural administrative hierarchy was created. The village Development Board (more or less autonomous) was the most important institutional body at the centre. It came under the Ministry of Planning and Development, headed by its

secretary and comprising directors of concerned sectoral departments as well as foreign experts and advisors. The village Development Board was responsible for all annual planning formulation execution, co-ordination and evaluation of Village Development Programme. At the district level the Badahakim (district magistrate) assisted by district development officer of each district was responsible for implementation of these programmes. And finally at the lowest level the Block Development Officer (BDO) with number of village development workers in each block were responsible agents. For the operationalization of the programme, the whole country was divided into 159 blocks. A district had one or more blocks depending on the size of the district. And each block consisted of about 200 villages covering 10,000 to 13,000 families. The block was the basic operational unit³⁵.

The programme described as a pragmatic approach was to be implemented in three stages³⁶. First the minimal level development activity (creating infrastructures as schools, tubewells, paths etc.). Second the middle level, was supporting agricultural investment activities. The third was intensive village development or higher development as the extension of scientific modes of production, High School development, cottage industry, market facilities, co-operative establishment etc. The important feature to be noted of this provision was that the first level execution of each programme called forth the participation of the local people as a must.

The other important programme towards rural development, was the Rapti Valley Development Project. It was a multipurpose scheme. This place is situated 90 miles south west of Kathmandu. It

was before a malaria infested uninhabited jungle, stretching upto an area of 600 square miles. Landless families were rehabilitated there and provided with equitable land and supported services for farming. Social services as health, education, and co-operatives, cottage industries for non-farmers were incorporated in a self-help attitude.

Besides these programmes, mention should also be made of those attempts of the government as Tenancy Rights 1951, Land Reform Act 1957, Birta Abolition Act 1959 and co-operative establishment in 1953. These steps were enforced in order to remove the exploitation of rural people and especially the tenants, from the landlords and money lenders.

According to Nepalese economists there were minor and insignificant developments in natural perspective. But we can not agree with the comment of Br. Prachand Pradhan where he concludes that the first 5 years plan "was nothing more than an estimate of income and expenditure for a five year period"³⁷. Visualizing the time in which the plan was initiated with so many constrain, such as, lack of technical personnel, lack of experience, lack of basic essential data. How could we expect more results? So we should satisfy ourselves by the fact that, at least attitudes of the Nepalese towards aspiration and expectation were changed.

Then a turning point came in rural development programme after the end of Parliamentary system and the introduction of party-less panchayat system. The Royal palace note August 30, 1964 listed the causes of the termination of the Parliamentary system in Nepal.

They were : some political instability, mutual leg pulling, exploitation of poverty and ignorance of the people to further party interest etc.³⁸ The four tier partyless Panchayat system was set up envisaging a bottom-up approach for diffusing democracy and economic development throughout the country. Hence, the lowest body, the village panchayat, was made the responsible institution for development activities, through peoples participation while the district level worked as the co-ordinating body of the village panchayat.

This change of political system led to a different approach to local development. The Community Development model for village development programme was dropped. The reason attributed by Second Five Year Plan (1962-65) was (1) limited coverage (2) lack of peoples participation (3) the difference between the U.S. Aided and Indian Aided programmes. Rural development was treated as synonymous with agriculture development. Hence, the emphasis was shifted from the programme-oriented area approach to the sectoral or regional development approach. This policy focussed on two types of schemes for rural development. The first referred as 'general approach' laid down general socio-economic reforms on a equitable basis on all village panchayats such as primary school per village, a health centre per district and a government hospital, multipurpose school, an agricultural extension office per zone and cottage industry training centre. The second scheme termed as specific approach, centred on the introduction of multipurpose or integrated programme in some specific localities as a model for other places (if successful). The regional plan had been further emphasised in the third plan (1965-70). It enunciated a regional specialization programme

in agriculture with livestock development in the mountains, horticulture in the mid-hills and cereals plus cash crop in the terai. In order to make panchayat bodies viable, the third plan upgraded the Panchayat programme to a fullfledged sector, distinct from the public and private sector³⁹. Hence allocation of resources in each sector was directly laid down.

During these two plan period (second and third) drastic administrative reforms took place. In line with two basic principles of the panchayat system i.e. democratization and decentralisation. The Local Administration Act 1966 was promulgated. The whole country was divided into 75 districts and 14 zones. Except for four or three zones each zone covers the three geographical regions namely the terai, hills and the mountains. This division was done to facilitate administrative and development works. Local Administration units were created "to coincide with the units of different tiers of the panchayats"⁴⁰.

The Zonal Commissioner, instead of Bada Hakim was appointed in each zone (directly appointed by the king). At the district level Second Class gazetted officers of the Nepalese Administrative Service was appointed as the Chief of the district (CDD) with the responsibility of the local development works. He also worked as the Secretary of the District Panchayat.

The period also witnessed the continuous efforts to make improvements in the working of the panchayat system. The concern was how to make panchayats (peoples representatives) hierarchy, and the administrative hierarchy work in unision. These efforts were made by the Administrative Decentralisation Commission (1963) which

was chaired by Viswabandhu Thapa. The important recommendation was administrative reorganisation and phase-wise decentralisation. To create village and district panchayats based on the principle of self reliance, self-sufficient and self respect. In the lowest tier of the panchayat system the village Assembly was to work in the village as the National Panchayat (at the apex) and village panchayats as council of ministers in the centre. The administrative body or bureaucracy was suggested to perform the functions of a guide, co-ordinator, trainer, supervisor and as a technician to assist the local panchayats in exercising the delegated powers.

Then a change was suggested by the Bhujraj Committee (1967). It stressed a gradualism in implementation of decentralisation schemes. The abolition of grant-in-aid to the panchayats, and its replacement by development materials was suggested. And the authority given to the local panchayats to levy revenue should be replaced by extensive Panchayat Development Land Tax. It also advised that village and district development schemes should come under the national economic plan. Other important reforms were suggested by the Administrative Commission chaired by Bedanand Jha (1968). The commission was formed for making the administrative organisation efficient, competent and economic at different levels. To bring co-ordination among different elements of local administration and mainly to relieve the common man of the abuses of administration⁴¹. The commission gave a detail recommendation on administrative organisation, recruitment and promotion of personnels, austerity of financial matters, establishing corporations, economic planning and development and establishment of an Ombudsmen type agency⁴².

Deploring the non-importance of many management improvement schemes, the commission noted the weaknesses prevalent among political bosses and high civil officers. Therefore, it demarcated the function between the two, keeping bureaucracy out of the political arena, and defined their inter-relationship.⁴³

Lastly, the Jaya Prakash Committee (1969) was constituted to examine the effectiveness of (the working of) the decentralisation work. This committee emphasised the need for co-ordination among various ministries. It recommended the formulation of district level plans by District Panchayat and its implementation by C.D.O.⁴⁴

The various reforms suggested by the commission reports, were not fully implemented. But at the most they paved the way for political and administrative decentralization. It was recognised that economic development commensurate with mobilization of local resource and growth of local leadership. Accordingly, the panchayat institutions were delegated the responsibility for rural or local development. And "thus necessary institutional basis for local development was laid out"⁴⁵.

Besides these steps there were other important institutional changes that effected the rural life in 60's . These were Land Reform Act 1964, the policy changes in resettlement programmes and the liquidation (of non-functional) and formulation of guided co-operatives.

Then in the successive decades, the 70s and 80s witnessed the fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh plan (current plan) introducing important changes in planning, institutional organisation for rural programmes.

The fourth plan (1970-75) initiated the move towards sectoral planning. Though programmes for rural development were chalked out stress was placed more on reducing regional disparities. The plan stated that "Development is highly competitive in its locational aspect which calls for a conscious regional strategy that promotes redistribution of resources, while maximizing economic growth and national welfare"⁴⁶. For the realisation of the goal the country was divided into four macro regions, each having a few promising growth centres selected for specialised and diversified activities such as, location of industries, banking, trading and social service facilities. These would generate growth impulses in the hinterland areas. Thus entire area would be developed. During the plan two rural development projects, (1) the Jiri Multipurpose Development Project. (2) And the Remote Area Development Project were introduced; "with some elements of integrated approach"⁴⁷.

The fifth plan (1975-80) followed the same pattern of balanced regional development for rural development with more focus on the concept of integrated rural development. However, the spatial division of the country was altered. In its place the country was divided into four development regions (later five) namely, far western, western (mid-western) central and eastern with 'growth centres' respectively (Headquarters of the regions) at Surkhet, Pokhara, Kathmandu and Dhankuta. These plans provided the broad macro level regional frame. While to reach ~~the~~ lower level three kinds of programmes were introduced. These were : (a) The Integrated Area Development Programme (IADP) such as Rasuwa/Nuwakot, Sagarmatha,

Rapti etc. (b) The Small Area Development Programmes at the selected Panchayats. (c) The Integrated Panchayat Rural Development (IRDP) in a few selected districts.

The setback that the rural development or local Development received in the second third and fourth plan was retrieved fully by the sixth plan (1980-85). The programmes for local development were as follows: (1) District plan; these were plans submitted by the local panchayats to National Planning Commission and financed by development grants.

(2) Local Development Programme: These were ad hoc projects generated by the availability of aid from agencies like UNICEF, WFP, ILO etc. The programmes consisted of rural drinking water, hill transport, labour intensive, minor irrigation and roofing of school building.

(3) Integrated Rural Development : These were similar to the plans introduced in the 5th Plan.

(4) Remote Area Development Programmes: Conceptually though different names were given, all these programmes covered basically plans for certain rural area development. These were intended in improving the socio-economic conditions of the inhabitants living in those specific places.

The search for effective agency for implementation of plans continued. Hence important institutional changes were also introduced by the local Administration Act 1971 and the District Administration Plan 1973 (DAP). These changes brought about a unified Administration at the district level, with the Chief District

Officer (CDO) as the head. The District Panchayat Secretariat headed by the Panchayat Development Officer (who works as a Secretary of the district panchayat) also came under the unified district office. Separate entities for sectoral planning at the district level were abolished; all of them were amalgamated into the unified District Office. The DAP was conceived to enable the systematic preparation of annual district plan by the district panchayat. This step was thus considered the "first comprehensive move towards decentralisation of development functions"⁴⁹. By making CDO as the Chief Executive Officer of the district, the responsibility for formulation and implementation of DAP rested with him. At the village level the Multipurpose development worker (MDW) came into existence to shoulder the dual responsibility as MDW and as Secretary to the village panchayat as well.

It was noted that the fifth plan was a turning point in the development process of Nepal. Because for the first time the physical infrastructure which dominated the other plans was deemphasised. The plan stated notably that the "People oriented production on one hand and the maximum utilisation of manpower on the other, are the twin objectives"⁵⁰. Hence the policy of the plan was "to integrate the development process with the Panchayat system"⁵¹.

The small area Development Programme introduced in 4th plan had created co-ordination problem among the ministries and Local Development Departments. Hence, the programme of IRDP came into being. To remove the problems in IRDP and other development programmes, two important administration reforms were promulgated.

Bhek Bahadur Thapa Administrative Reform Commission (1975) was formed in order to lessen the legal procedural delays, strengthen planning cells of the ministries and make administrative development oriented. It suggested reform for greater involvement of the districts in development activities. The other step was the introduction of Integrated Panchayat Development Design (1976). It was hoped that his introduction would strengthen the planning and implementing institutional basis of the panchayat system. The design provided a chain of co-ordinating committees at various levels, starting from a cabinet sub-committee to central, zonal, district and village levels.

During these plan periods two other innovations for institutional improvement were introduced. The first was the multi-disciplinary Service Centres in each district for the delivery of services at the village level. Second was the formulation of a new ministry known as the Ministry of Panchayat and Local Development (MPLD). This separate ministry was formed to meet the problem of interministerial co-ordination for rural development, and also to co-ordinate rural development efforts. At the district level the CDO was relieved of the responsibility of development works. Because it was found difficult for him to perform dual work; as of keeping law and order and also to promote development⁵². The post of a Local Development Officer (LDO) as an equivalent rank of the CDO was created. Thus to the present, the LDO became the responsible agent for local development works similar to IRDP. He is also to act as a Secretary of the District Panchayat*.

foundation

*The German For International Development (DSE) strongly recommended the separate ministry and the upgrading of the Panchayat Development Officer (PDO) to that of LDO.

Important supporting policies during this period was the role of banks. The Nepal Rustriya Bank gave directives to the commercial banks to invest at least 5 percent of their total deposit in small sectors (1974). And further stepped upto 7 percent in 'priority sectors' (1976). These included agriculture cottage and small scale industries, all relevant to rural development.

Further the Agriculture Development Bank in Nepal (ADB/N) implemented an innovative credit programme known as small Farmer Development Programme (SFDP). The general objective of SFDP was to improve the living standard of the rural poor (especially landless labourer, marginal and small farmers) with an integrated programme of supervised credit through group work plans. Again in the same period (1976) to consolidate and integrate the guided co-operative functions an institutional arrangement called Sajha was created. The 'strategy for Rural Development (1978) states that "The Sajha Movement should be incorporated where possible as the means of channeling basic inputs to development projects"⁵³.

In the present decade, under the Sixth Five Year Plan (1980-85) and the current Seventh Five Year Plan the forms for rural development had been set. The meeting of the local representatives of Nepal Aid Group, arranged by National Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance in 1978 chalked out a 'Strategy for Rural Development', the basic characteristics of which were was : (1) Involvement of the people in the development process; (2) Basic needs orientation in the project components; (3) Planning with reference to intra regional and inter-personal differences alongside with inter-regional disparities⁵⁴. Likewise the sixth plan made peoples' participation, the base for rural development. It intended to involve

the local panchayat in "all aspects of local level development programme from project identification, through implementation to final evaluation"⁵⁵. The plan sought to institutionalise the existing participation of the people through local leadership⁵⁶. On these principles the different Integrated Rural Development Programmes have been launched.

To initiate active participation of the local people it was essential that the principle of decentralisation, the base of the panchayat system, should be made more effective. Hence to guarantee this the New Decentralisation scheme implemented through Decentralisation Act 1982 and decentralisation bye laws 1984 came into existence. Important rural development activities were linked in the local level panchayats in this new scheme. They were planning implementation and evaluation activities, resource mobilisation and personnel arrangement to rural development. The basic problem of decision-making, power sharing was through devaluation of authority, local-level planning and implementation capability, inter-sectoral co-ordination at national and local levels and meaningful peoples' participation through organisation of beneficiaries have remained pronounced.⁵⁷

It should be noted that, from the initiation of Rasuwa/ Nuwakot IRDP the bilateral and multilateral aid to different IRDPs, have been the main source of financial and technical investments. Therefore different organisational set up of IRDP have existed. With the enunciation of the New Decentralisation Act, there has been uniformity in the IRDP organisation structure. Now all IRDPs come under the ministry of Panchayat and Local Development, with the same pattern set by the Act.

The historical review of rural development in the four decades i.e. from 50s to 80s show the following distinctive characteristics.

1. There is a realisation ~~that~~ rural development for the country is a must to march forward in the path of development. Hence, emphasis is given on detailed planning in this sector. Though there had been some set back in the 60s, in the rural development, the momentum has been picked up by the initiation of the IRDP from the late 70s.

2. There has been a shift in the planning policy for rural development programmes. In the 1950s, 1960s and early 70s minimum functional and sectoral norms were laid down for the village, district and central level. Resources were distributed likewise. However, in this approach the main drawbacks were cited as "they were not directly related to the expansion of production and employment in the rural sector"⁵⁸. Consequently from the 70s the multidimensional, approach involving Integrated rural Development Project were introduced.

3. Even prior to the plan period, various aspects of rural life received attention. Emphasis was that our rural policy should consider the traditional and social aspect on which a particular village exists. Efforts was concentrated, then to remove the constraints in the path of development. Finally the object was to modernize the socio-eco structure in order to meet the changing demand of the people. Embracing these we find that the component of rural programme have been activities supporting agriculture, animal husbandry, small and cottage industries, development of infrastructures, as well as health, education and rural institutions. With the introduction of

IRDP the emphasis is more urgent. This approach is to improve production related infrastructure and institutional facilities towards maximum exploitation of available land, water and human resources and to activate the people's participation in development⁵⁹.

4. There has been marked change in the development of supportive institutions responsible for rural development. In the early decades, Government guided co-operatives were formed to supply agricultural inputs at local level. Bureaucracy, posted at different levels was the main responsible agents for the purpose. But with the change of political set up, the responsibility was shifted to the village and district Panchayat bodies and bureaucrats and technocrats were now cast into the role of guide, supervisors and supporting agents to these bodies.

5. The involvement of the local people, the development of their own village or locality, so as to make them self-reliant has been the continuous concern in the plan periods. So programmes are laid down accordingly. But in the initial stages the involvement was pegged to fixed financial labour contribution, in rural development. With the advent of the panchayat system based on the principles of democratization and decentralisation, the involvement of the local people is more pronounced. It took the form of trying to involve the local people and their respective village and district panchayats, in planning, implementing and evaluating the rural development programmes such as IRDPs.

6. Attempts to strengthen and upgrade the administrative structure marked these decades. Different Administration Commissions were formed and Administration Acts enforced to implement rural

programmes more effectively and to bring supportive Service Centres, nearer to the villagers. The policies towards this direction is to adopt a decentralised pattern of administrative structure. And instead of top down, bottom-up planning became the rule.

7. Summing up the institutional set ups and the organisational structure of rural programmes such as IRDP, the following can be noted:

A. Tribhuvan village Development Programme 1952. Its objectives . A multipurpose organisation for effective means for supplying resources to the villagers and forum to voice their needs problems and solution. The programme laid special emphasis on training man power in technical and management fields. The institutions established for the programme was the co-operative services in the centre, Village Development Centres, covering different part of the country and Village Development workers in the villages.

B. Community Development Programme (1958). Later on, India also became interested to assist Nepal in Village Development⁶⁰. The objectives of these programme were similar to that of Community Development Programmes as India's i.e. similar to that of T.V.D.P. Hence the activities undertaken were in the agricultural, cottage industries, and additional programmes such as social Education, Bhajan Mandals etc. The institution developed was the Village Development Board in the Centre. At the local level Blocks, headed by the Block Development Officer (BDO) was the responsible agent. While at the village, Village Development workers were to assist in the implementation of the programme. The programme was supported by India, financially and technically. The main merits of these programmes were

that the planners, leaders and local level people were awakened from their slumber of backwardness. And local people came in contact with advanced inputs to increase the agriculture productions and its allied sectors. Benefits of technical and management training were also received.

But these programmes were dropped because it created rivalry between the two donors (India and America) . This resulted to the termination of assistance by both⁶¹. The area coverage was also limited. Hence benefits were also negligible⁶². Due to administrative constrains and lack of trained manpower, the implementation of the programmes was also poor⁶³. Another main drawback of these two programmes was the subordinate position of the Nepalese counterpart. This killed their initiative and whole hearted participation⁶⁴.

C. Period 1960 onwards: The promulgation of the partyless Panchayat system as the political system of the country, leads to the indigenisation of rural development process⁶⁵. The objective of this change was that, ultimately the village Panchayat and District Panchayat (the lowest level of the Panchayat system) would establish themselves as viable institutions for administration and development at the local level on a self-reliant basis. And emerge as strong local government⁶⁶. Hence the village and District Panchayat became the responsible agents for rural development. Now the whole process of planning and resource allocation required the approval of the National Assembly at the centre, and District Assembly and Village Assembly at the District and Village level for local plans. The bureaucratic administration support was to be provided by P.D.O. instead of B.D.O.

For the attainment of the two objectives of the panchayat system, namely decentralisation and democratisation, continuous efforts were made to strengthen the sectoral capacity of the government. Some impressive change was brought about by District Administration Plan 1974 and the Integrated Panchayat Development Design 1978. The former brought forward the planning process of the district development at the village. And an integrated District Development Plan was to be prepared annually, which was to constitute the basis for allocation of resources for each district at the national level. Several subject matter committees were formed under the District plan in which both popular representative and government officials were members who functioned to prepare sectoral district plans. The latter the IPDD (1978) was somewhat an advancement of the former in the sense that it provided for a "coordination mechanism at the level of the Council of Ministers and the permanent Secretaries of the government"⁶⁷.

The implementation lacuna of the two reforms and complexity of the problems faced in co-ordination between inter ministerial and between the centre and local level brought forward the need for establishing a separate ministry of Panchayat and Local Development. At the District level the post of the P.D.O. was upgraded and replaced by Local Development Officer (L.D.O). He was assigned the role of the co-ordinator of programmes at the district level. At the Village level the Multipurpose Development worker was the Secretary of the Village Panchayat and the lowest bureaucratic representative. For the multipurpose support to the village panchayats services centres continued to exist.

3.3 An examination of the organisational structure

With the inception of the Integrated Rural Development design for rural development and to initiate more effective local participation; Sajha (Co-operatives), Small Farmers Development Programme and users committee came to be the main stay of IRDP organisational structure.

However with various attempts for effective organisational structure and for viable local institutions, a wide gap still exists between plans and action and between policies and practices. It is hoped that with recent implementation of the Decentralisation Act 1984 the gravest problems of co-ordinations and diffusion of authority will somewhat be solved.

Now on the basis of the foregoing discussions, and specific evaluation reports of Integrated Rural Development Programmes and supported by our study of the two Rasuwa/Nuwakot and Sagarmatha IRDP; the hypothesis, that there is positive correlation between management, organisational growth and development activities in the rural sector, holds true. The broad objectives of all IRDPs is to eradicate poverty. This recognises the necessity of multifarious activities encompassing the whole life of the rural people. Still the essential point to be noted in laying down goals as of Amitai Etzioni view is that goals should be specific. And much depends on the nature and setting of goals for organisation to be successful. But what we find in IRDP goals of our study, similar to other IRDP is that, there are numerous programmes having wide varieties of goals. Consequently putting constraints on scarce capital, and technical and

administrative manpower. Further it has left ample scope for the line agencies to interpret the objectives or programmes in different ways thus leading to interdepartmental conflicts. Incomprehensible nature of the project goals also has led the beneficiaries to assume the programme as only government duty and responsibility and not their own⁶⁸. The Rasuwa/Nuwakot programme despite five years implementation is still referred to by local people as that NRS 130 million project⁶⁹. The most critical view was given by Bharat Ed. Pradhan. He remarks, "even after about 10 years of operation and with eight IRDPs on going, enough effort has not gone into developing a meaningful framework for formulating an Integrated Rural Development Project. Each project is conceived and formulated in an ad hoc way"⁷⁰. He points out that the wide coverage, the formidable physical constraints, the areas limited infrastructure for development or the de-emphasis on infrastructure seems to counter to the achievement of the objectives of self-sustained development⁷¹. All these has resulted in not only ineffective implementation but also it has self-defeated the main objectives of IRDP⁷².

This then shows that theoretical analysis put forward, and referred by us in our early discussions of planning does not come upto the essential requirements for effective planning. Our observation of the village panchayats discovered that there was not even preliminary record of essential datas that were to be the basis for planning rural development. Among the ten panchayats surveyed only three had records of income source and expenditure allotment. No other records were collected by them. Similar view was put forward by DRC report of Rasuwa/Nuwakot Project. Further the planning officials

of the concerning district panchayats were affirmative of the sursory planning of these projects. They pointed out that the plan formulation was dominated by foreign experts, who had very little or no knowledge of the local socio-economic conditions of the village panchayats, covered by IRDPs. However, our enquiries with the coordinators of these projects revealed that the basis of these plans were also the village and District Panchayat plans. But here again we find that these plans were only amalgamation of priorities of village and district plans. That is we cannot count these as scientific plans. The "annual district plans which were to be the mainstay of planning and resource allocation for the project (R/N) were never undertaken in the real sense⁷³.

The need of sufficient technical and administrative cadres, is the other pre-requisite of good planning. Albert Waterson concurs, noting that implementation of IRDP pre-supposes the availability of adequate number of skilled and semi-skilled technical overseers, Sub-overseers, Junior technical (JT) and Junior Technical Assistant in agriculture. But one of the problem that has hampered the implementation of IRDP is the absence of the requirement of trained man power especially in the technical field⁷⁴. Our findings in the two projects were similar. Though the field personnels educational degree was satisfactory, their experiences and training were poor. This we concluded from our observation (of constructed works of water sources, roads, buildings irrigation source) as well as the remarks of concerned Pradhan panchas and the local beneficiaries.

Further the projects were organised on the basis of existing administrative structure. No additional staff were provided except

for a project co-ordinator and some clerical staff. This naturally strained the existing administrative personnels. "Another weakness in the current investment approach is that without taking into consideration the capacity of the sectoral agencies to deliver the required services, most of the IRDP have assumed that with the provision of funds they would be available..."⁷⁵

According to the proponders, good planning requires sufficient material and financial resources. Now this is also lacking in the concerned IRDPs. However, this shortage of resources is not the cause of unavailability, but is more brought about by remittance and reimbursement problems. The district Panchayat office of the two projects, namely Siraha, Saptari, Udaipur, Rasuwa and Nuwakot, all voiced the same problem. The delay of fund was a severe constrain for these projects. The planning officials have narrated that many times funds were provided at the end of the financial year. This had been one of the causes of incomplete work and the disappearance of contractors of concerned works⁷⁶. Related to this resource obstacle, we find that the evaluation studies especially of Bharat Bd. Pradhan, observe the inappropriate investment approach of these projects. he argues and corroborates the Interim Report of Rasuwa/ Nuwakot project that "the investment in IRDPs has been overly biased towards the infrastructure. Even in the productive sectors like agriculture and cottage industry, a major share of investment is in construction of physical facilities, mainly buildings, comparatively little investment has gone to directly productive activities"⁷⁷. Our observation of the market complex, funded by the IRDP, in our selected village panchayats as Katari and Chaugadha, showed that they were not

utilised at all. The fallacy of building a market shed, where there was non-existence of even a weekly hat bazar points the wrong approach of investment in Chaugadha. While Katari market shed is an example of choosing the wrong site. Further Bharat^{Bd.} Pradhan aptly propounded that, the emphasis on creating facilities, instead of utilizing the existing one is "another fundamental weakness in investment approach as the new panchayat building of Rasuwa/Nuwakot IRDP⁷⁸. Again quoting the Interim Report, there is hardly any scope for the use of high level expertise. For designing a pedestrain suspension bridge, aligning a mule track or constructing a 50 hectare irrigation rproject, engaging an expert costing US \$ 70,000 a year is simply ridiculous. The unnecessary infusion of high level technology will discourage indigenous technology⁷⁹. Our findings also support this view. As for example the Gadkhar irrigation project of Chaugadha and Ramche irrigation does not provide sufficient irrigation facility to the lands, that come under its capacity. The beneficiaries, complained that the responsible persons did not heed their advice while constructing the projects.

It is recognised, as mentioned earlier that planning of IRDP involves the participation of host of line agencies as well as peoples representatives (political and social) and beneficiaries. Then it is essential that they work in unision and in coordination with one another. But the lack of coordination is the most severe obstacle, for the limited impact of these projects. No doubt there are institutions established for coordination mechanism in the centre, zonal and district level. But the problem still persists. To quote Rasuwa/ Nuwakot Final Report "Different coordination mechanisms were tried ...

In spite of these attempts the entire project period was characterised by lack of coordination in policies, planning and implementation which had adverse consequence on the pace of the project"⁸⁰. The coordination problem is so severe that Nepalese Economist Govind Ram Agrawal has labelled the IRDP as Non-Integrated structure⁸¹. One of the causes is too many changes in organisation structure. While Bharat Bd. Pradhan observes this problem as a result of "Inappropriate Institutional Arrangements leading to contradiction in the institution. He remarks that IRD programmes are regarded as "extra burden" on the existing technical and administrative personnels. "It should not therefore be a surprise that IRD projects constitute the lowest priority activities within the sectoral programmes, though they are stated to be high up in the scale of national priorities"⁸². The coordination committees formed at the centre, zonal and district level hardly meet⁸³. Our enquiries in the five districts of R/N and Sagarmatha projects leads us to similar conclusion. In Nuwakot district the committee had met only thrice in 5 years. In Siraha district it met only once. While in other district the concerned officials had no idea of the meetings of such committees.

We now come to the last but not the least important aspect required for good planning. That is participation. In our introductory chapter we have quoted the arguments and remarks put forward by different writers, in relation to the importance of participation. Their observation establishes that unless maximum public backing or/and substantial participation is generated in rural development plans,

success would not be achieved. Therefore in both Rasuwa/Nuwakot and Sagarmatha projects, top priority had been awarded to involve the rural mass in their own development. We also recognise this importance. Hence a separate chapter has been allotted for this aspect.

The conceptual idea put forward by different writers for organisation shows that Rasuwa/Nuwakot. Sagarmatha IRDPs organisation structure embraces all the aspect. That is in these structures, peoples representative of the lowest level and different line agencies bureaucrats and technocrats all are associated. But only sound structure of organisation will not suffice. What is more important is the effective role it plays in achieving the goals. Here the goal is the eradication of poverty. This in turn can be possible when such programmes or organisation can motivate meaningful participation. Our analysis presents that multifarious goals hinder the functioning of organisation. Since IRDP is a multifarious attack on rural poverty it is natural for the programme to have multifarious goals. The question arises as to what is to be done? The best that can be done is to set goals on the priority basis in harmony with the local needs. After setting goals a sound planning for effective organisation is required. Our discussion clearly shows that there has been top-down planning instead of bottom up planning although it is advocated by IRDP. The most essential requisite for planning is feasibility study or preliminary data of socio-economic conditions of the village panchayat. This is the lacuna, as our study has proved. The last aspect of a good organisation is how far it has been able to implement the plans and thus achieve the goals. It is observed that there has

been continuous efforts to reorganise or to improve the implementing machinery proving that the main drawback of IRDP of Nepal is that what is planned is not implemented. This is due to the existence of a several obstacles. Such as defective planning lack and inefficiency of technocrats and administrative staff, delay of funds, personal interest of political leaders etc. This sum up our view on requisite for IRDP organisation.

Next we have tried to see the evolution of IRDP in Nepal. Going through these discussion, we find that from the very beginning (in medieval period) local institution existed for local development. At that time these institutions were given wide power and worked most independently. While the powers of state officials in the centre were curtailed. Gradually in the modern era changes came which brought a setback to these institutions. That is though the responsibility of the local development was given to the Panchayat, their power were curtailed. In other words, instead of power decentralisation, centralisation was the rule. With the overthrow of Rana rulers, democracy dawned which necessitated Nepal to establish diplomatic relations. This brought forth bilateral development aid as the Tribhuvan gram vikash yojana. Correspondingly for the development works bureaucratic hierarchy grew. Gradually local development works became the responsibility of bureaucrats, and local institutions had little say. They became more and more dependent and lost their self-reliant capacity. With the initiation of the partyless panchayat system attempts were revived to strengthen these local institutions. Village development or local development was to be the responsibility

of the lowest level of panchayat system the village panchayat. So IRDP also embraced these institutions. Visualising the various obstacles in shedding off power to the lower level, different reforms came forward. So as to make the administration more efficient and people oriented.

Coming to our study of the two IRDP we have enlightened that there is contradiction between policy and implementation. The programme's several goals has put burden on the scarce capital and technical and administrative personnel. Further since goals are not defined scientifically there has been ample scope of defining it differently by the implementing line agencies. Similarly without taking in consideration the economic-socio situations of the village Panchayats in IRDPs Planning seems to have made the local beneficiaries more reliant on outside resources. Thus negating the principle of the local peoples participation in such programmes. One wonders at what is actually targeted by these programmes. From our study and the evaluation of eminent Nepalese economist it has been seen that instead of uplifting the rural mass from poverty more funds have been invested on infrastructural development. The study of these two projects provides an example of showing that scarcity of funds is not the only problem. It is also questionable whether high level technicians with high pay (\$ 70,000 yearly) is worthwhile for small low level village development works.

Finally we can add that the structure of IRD organisation can be successful only when there is perfect harmony in the working

of the various line agencies and the implementing agencies i.e. there should be co-ordination and frequent rapport between them. This is what is lacking and is the main cause of the existing gap between planning and implementation.

R E F E R E N C E S

1. Pradhan, B.B., Integrated Rural Development in Nepal, Problem and Prospects, Maharagunj, Kathmandu, 1982, p. 99.
2. Eisenstad, S.N., The Political Systems of Empires, New York, Free Press, 1963, p. 3.
3. Etzioni, Amitai, 'Modern Organisations', Prentice-Hall of India, New Delhi, 1981, p. 1.
4. Ibid., p. 1.
5. Agrawal, Govind Ram, Organisational arrangements for Integrated Rural Development in Nepal, CEDA, Kathmandu, 1982, p. 3.
6. Wang, In Kunn, "Some Strategies of Developing the Rural Poor in Integrated Rural Development in Asia", Asian Economic Journal, 1985, Korea, p. 14.
7. Etzioni Amitai, op. cit., p. 5.
8. Ibid., p. 5.
9. Ibid., pp. 7-8.
10. Ibid., p. 8.
11. Dutt, Gangi, Asian Publication, 1967, p. 16.
Rural Communes of China - Organisational Problem.
12. Agrawal, R.D., Organisation and Management, Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing, New Delhi, p. 38.
13. Ibid., p. 38.
14. Nathaniel, Lichtfield and Haim Darindrabkin, 'Urban and Regional Studies' - Land Policy & Planning. George Allen & Unwin Publisher, 1980, p. 26.
15. Arora, R.C., Integrated Rural Development, S. Chand & Company, New Delhi, 1979, pp. 309-310.
16. Madan, G.R., India's Developing Villages, Print House, Lucknow, 1983, p. 92.

17. Danda, Ajit K., Reviewed International Journal of Asian Studies, New Delhi, 1983, pp. 82-94.
18. Arora, R.C., op. cit., p. 339.
19. Gupta, Anirudha, Sources of Nepalese Nationalism, All India Seminar on Government Politics in Nepal, Banaras Hindu University, March, 1979.
20. Baral Lok Raj, 'Institutional Building in Nepal, A Study of of the working of village Panchayat, Centre for Nepal & Asian Studies, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, 1980, pp. 28-76.
21. Sinha, U.N., 'Development of Panchayat in Nepal, 'The Powers & Functions of Panchayats in Ancient Nepal, P.C. Dwadash Shreni Publishers, Aligarh, p. 34.
22. Ibid., pp. 44-46.
23. Chatterjee, Bhola, 'A Study of Recent Nepalese Politics, World Press, Calcutta, 1967, p. 13.
24. Ragmi, Mahesh C, 'Peasants and Landlords in 19th Century Nepal', 'Thatched Huts and Stucco Palaces', Vikash Publishing, New Delhi, 1978, p. 27.
25. Pradhan Pranchanda, S, "Historical Perspective of Nepalese Bureaucracy", The Phillipines Journal of Public Administration, January, 1973.
26. Joshi, Nanda Lall, Evolution of Public Administration in Nepal, CEDA, 1973, p. 5.
27. Rana, Daman Shamser and Tuladhar, 'Contemporary Nepal Maharaja Bir Shamser', Historical Prelude, Laxmi Publication, Kathmandu, 1955, pp. 34-47.
28. Joshi, Nanda Lall, op. cit., pp. 5-7.
29. Shrestha, Mangal Krishna, Public Administration in Nepal, Educational Enterprises, Kathmandu, 1975, p. 9.
30. Sinha, U.N., op. cit., p. 91.
31. Ibid., p. 34.

32. Shrestha, Bihari, K., Quoted by Upadhya, Kamal Pd. 'Study on Participation of Non-governmental organisations in Planning and Implementation of Integrated Rural Development Programme in Nepal, CEDA, Kathmandu, 1982, p. 20.
33. Sharma, Khagendra Nath, 'Role of Rural Organisations in Rural Development in Nepal; 'Prashasan' The Nepalese Journal of Public Administration, H.M.G.'s Administrative Departments, Kathmandu, Nov. 1977, p. 30.
34. Pokhrel, Tika, Pd. People's participation in Nepal in Rural Development - A Study of three Village Panchayats in Gorkha, CEDA, Kathmandu, 1980, p. 19.
35. Short Draft of First Five Year Plan, National Planning Commission, H.M.G. Kathmandu, Bikram Sambat- 2013 (1955-56), pp. 17-18.
36. Ibid., p. 18.
37. Pradhan, Prachanda, 'Concept of Development, Public Administration in Curriculum Development Nepal, Centre, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, 1976, p. 145.
38. Ibid., 'Ecology of Nepalese Bureaucracy', p. 81.
39. Pradhan, B.B., op. cit., p. 5.
40. Shrestha, Mangal Krishna, Public Administration in Nepal, Educational Enterprise, Kathmandu, 1975, p. 95.
41. Joshi, Nanda Lall, op. cit., p. 42.
42. Ibid., p. 44.
43. Ibid., p. 45.
44. Prakash Jaya, Report of Administrative Reform Commission, Ministry of General Administration, Kathmandu, 1969.
45. Pradhan, B.B., 'Review of Rural Development', op. cit., p. 6.
46. National Planning Commission Report, Nepal, 1970.
47. Haque, A.T.M. Shamsul, CIRDP, State of the Art Integrated of Rural Development in Asia Pacific, on the Pacific, Foreowrd, 1987 Dhaka, p. 63.

48. Paudyal, Sriram, 'Rural Development efforts in Nepal', A Brief 'Appraisal', The Economic Journal of Nepal, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, 1983, p. 36.
49. Pradhan, B.B., op. cit., p. 8.
50. National Planning Commission, H.M.G., Kathmandu, The Fifth Plan in brief, 1975, p. 80.
51. Ibid., 1975, p. 80.
52. Bhatta, Bhim Dev, Upadhaya Mukund Pal, Pant Prakash 'Role of local office in Development Process, CEDA, Kathmandu, 1983, p. 8.
53. Pradhan, B.B., op. cit., p. 14.
54. Ibid., p. 14.
55. Sixth Plan, National Planning Commission; H.M.G. Kathmandu, 1981.
56. Ibid., 1981.
57. Agrawal, G.R., 'Prasashan' Decentralisation for Rural Development'. Lessons of Nepalese experiences. H.M.G., General Administration Department, 49th issue, Kathmandu, 1987, p. 4.
58. Sagarmatha IRDP, Asian Development Bank Appraisal Report, 1978, p. 48.
59. Ibid., p. 48.
60. Shrestha, Bihari, Report of the Colloquium on the Problems and Prospects of Rural Development in Nepal. Agricultural Projects Services Centre, Kathmandu, 1983, p. 75.
61. Ibid., pp. 75-76.
62. Pradhan, B.B., op. cit., p. 4.
63. Upadhyay, Kamal Prasad, Study on Participation of Non-Government Organisation (NNO's) in economic condition, Planning of Integrated Rural Development Programme in Nepal, CEDA, Kathmandu, 1982, pp. 19-22.
64. Shrestha, Beharik, op. cit., p. 75.
65. Ibid., p. 76.
66. Ibid., p. 76.

67. Ibid., p. 81.
68. Ibid., p. 84.
69. Agrawal, G.R. (Quoted from Rajeswar Acharjee's Book Impact of Rasuwa-Nuwakot IRD Project for meeting Basic Human Needs) Development and Administrative Studies, Vol. 4, No. 1-2, CEDA, Kathmandu, 1982, p. 75.
70. Pradhan, B.B., International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) 1985, p. 14.
71. Ibid., p. 16.
72. DRCG Report Rasuwa/Nuwakot Evaluation Report, 1981. Development research communication group, Kathmandu.
73. Rasuwa/Nuwakot Final Report Annexure 17, Agriculture Projects Service Centre, Kathmandu (A Prose), 1983, p. 3.
74. Dhungel, Dwarika Nath, Implementation of Integrated Rural Development. The Nepalese Journal of Public Administration, July 1987, 49 Issue, p. 22.
75. Rasuwa/Nuwakot Final Report, op. cit., p. 67.
76. Source - Project co-ordinator office Rasuwa/Nuwakot and Sagarmatha.
77. Interim Report, D.R.C.G., Kathmandu, 1982.
78. Pradhan, B.B., Rasuwa/Nuwakot, Final Report, Agricultural Service Centre, Kathmandu, 1983.
79. Pradhan, B.B., op. cit., p. 67.
80. Rasuwa/Nuwakot, Final Report, op. cit., p. 3.
81. Agrawal Govind Ram, Institutional Arrangements, p. 21.
82. Pradhan, B.B., op. cit., p. 63.
83. D.R.C.G. Report, op. cit., 1981.