

CHAPTER I

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

I. Introduction

The philosophy of development that emerged in India after independence emphasised the involvement of the members of the national community into a web of relationships and institutions that would enable them to actively participate in the process of decision-making, affecting their welfare and progress. This philosophy called for an institutional design to sustain and support the nation-building process with its emphasis on democracy and development. The search for an institutional design was on in 1952 and Community Development Project was launched as a move to diffuse power to grass-roots bodies with government being the principal planner and executer, marginalising the vast magnitude of

rural populace for whom the entire effort was directed to. The much drum-beating and fanfare with which the programme was launched died down very quickly because of its ad hocism and failure to arouse people to the occasion. The Community Development Programme, notwithstanding its commitment to ameliorate the conditions of the rural people in the villages, drove home the point that official agencies by themselves can not carry out even a modest programme of development of our countryside and failed to ensure greater degree of initiative and popular participation in the process of nation-building. This necessitated, a complete reorientation of the concept of administration in rural areas with its proper emphasis on democracy and development, and yet another a search for better conceptual, structural and financial parameters to initiate a process of rural development. This led to the establishment of Panchayati Raj Institutions promoting democratisation process both in the economic as well as in political fields. And as a matter of fact, in India, the objective of development is to raise the standards of living and to open out new opportunities for a richer and more varied life for the people living in 5,53,668 villages in India.

Panchayati Raj, since its birth, remained, despite occasional ups and downs, the epitome of India's commitment to democracy, development and decentralisation in a paradigmatic sense¹. This new paradigm with its conceptual,

structural and financial parameters proposed a tremendous metamorphosis in the whole gamut of administration of rural development. It required an adoption and implementation of development programmes in such a way as to transfer the quality of the village life, meaning thereby, the dawning of consciousness among the rural masses, a better world to live in, building up of forward looking, self-helping and action-oriented bent of mind². And above all, 'conscientise' the rural poor to make them aware of their rights conferred under existing laws and regulations³. Without these no administration and no provisions of resources, however effective, can translate the schemes of rural development into a creative reality⁴.

To implement these changed objectives and to diffuse powers to the grass-roots, the institution of Panchayati Raj incorporating the idea of democratic decentralisation was introduced in district administration and has been described not only as an innovation⁵ but a revolution⁶. Panchayati Raj, to quote the Third Plan document, "constitutes fundamental and far reaching change in the structure of district administration and in the pattern of rural development"⁷. The Panchayati Raj Institutions are looked upon as agents to enhance political awakening and accelerate development⁸.

The idea of Panchayati Raj, as a corrective to the fall-out of the Community Development Programme, spearheaded

the idea of planned development in rural India in general and reorganisation of district administration keeping in view the recommendation of the Second Five Year Plan for organically linking the Village Panchayats with popular organisations at a higher level so that the entire general and development administration at district and sub-district levels could be entrusted to such democratic institutions⁹. Subsequently Balwantray Mahta Committee was appointed to go into the details^{of} the problems connected with reorganisation of district administration on the basis of general conclusions outlined in the Second Five Year Plan¹⁰, and looked upon as an instrument of nation-building in economic sphere. The uniqueness of Panchayati Raj Institutions was thought to lie in their development-orientation in the specific context of planned economic change and also in their treating the elected representatives of the people as motivating power and instrument behind this development¹¹. Panchayati Raj in the initial years of its ascendancy recorded some of the spectacular gains of decentralised democracy in political, administrative and socio-cultural fields¹². It became a democratic seed-drilling in the Indian soil by making an average citizen more conscious of his rights. It bridged the gulf between the bureaucratic elite and the people and also generated a new leadership which was relatively young in age, modernistic and pro-social change. From developmental point of view as well, it helped the rural people to

cultivate a developmental psyche¹³.

But the euphoria of the initial years of Panchayati Raj did not produce a lasting impact on the Indian socio-political and economic scene. Several factors seemed to have contributed to the weakening of Panchayati Raj in India. Mention has been made by the scholars in the form of structural inadequacies, the role of bureaucracy, factionalism, corruption and lack of adequate resources to mention few among many others. But the most important being the dominance of the economically or socially privileged sections of society in the Panchayati Raj Institutions resulting in the problem of leakages¹⁴ meaning thereby the benefits were accrued by the affluent class in rural society. In other words, the Panchayati Raj Institutions became the instruments of feudal and capitalist modes of oppression and exploitation.

On the policy plane, the Panchayati Raj Institutions became the first casualty over the issue of 'techno-economic' aspect of development which started from the days of Community Development Programme and to the issue of 'institution-building' for which the Panchayati Raj Institutions itself stand, as an approach to the development of rural India. The Panchayati Raj Institutions were gradually and systematically elbowed out of their main functional arena not only by the State Governments of Indian Union but

also by a host of special purpose organisations chartered to execute specific programmes for the benefit of the specified target groups, like SFDA, ITDP and CAD etc. For the upliftment of the rural poor these special organisations did not maintain even a token linkage with the Panchayati Raj Institutions which is meant for all-round development of the weaker sections in society. The unfortunate fact about these organisations is that the impulse for forming them has invariably come from exogenous forces such as World Bank and Union Government¹⁵. The Union Government condescending to such exogenous forces crippled the indigenous organisation of Panchayati Raj and hampered the orchestration of development effort in its totality. This situation was the product of pseudo experience of some states of Indian Union that Panchayati Raj Institutions can not be expected to play any effective role in execution of the planned developmental programmes as they are ill-equipped, possessing neither the requisite financial resources and technical apparatus. But the fact of the matter is that the Panchayati Raj Institutions has not been given a chance to serve as a vanguard of development and wherever they have been given the responsibility, to whatever limited extent, as in Maharashtra and Gujrat, they have done well¹⁶. But the fact that stands out of the above scenario is that Panchayati Raj in India did not exactly record a sustained success mainly

due to policy direction and due to perceptible erosion of political faith in the efficacy of democratic decentralisation both at the Union as well as the State level.

The establishment of the first-ever non-congress government at the Union level dedicated to the belief in a polity that ensures decentralisation of economic and political power, has provided yet another opportunity for re-invigoration of local self-government in India so as to make it a suitable vehicle for democratic management of politico-economic programmes for nation-building¹⁷. Asoka Mehta Committee was appointed by the ruling Janata Party¹⁸ in 1977 to learn from past experience and to sketch new perspectives for structural reform in the patterns of grassroots democracy in the country¹⁹. The Committee went to enquire into the working of the Panchayati Raj Institutions, and to suggest measure to strengthen them, so as to enable a decentralised system of planning and development to be effective²⁰. The term of reference of the Committee, inter alia, required to examine the working of the Panchayati Raj Institutions in regard to mobilisation of resources as also planning and implementation of scheme of rural development in an objective and optimal manner, and looking after the interest of the weaker sections of the society²¹. The Asoka Mehta Committee on Panchayati Raj in a word, tried to enlist of popular support for rural development in an institutionalised way through the revamping of Panchayati

Raj Institutions and through de-bureaucratisation of development administration²². The emphasis was definitely on rural institution-building at a sub-state level and comprehensive rural development.

Conceptually, rural development, in our context, is a process towards improving the living standard of the rural poor²³. As Uma Lele writes in the African context, such development effort has three important features :

- a) mobilisation and allocation of resources so as to reach desirable balance over time between the welfare and productive services available to the subsistence rural sector;
- b) mass participation to make sure that resources are allocated to the target group and that the productive and social services actually reach the group; and
- c) making the development process self-sustaining in terms of development of appropriate skills and implementing capacity, and of institutions at different levels to ensure effective use of existing resources and foster mobilisation of additional financial and human resources²⁴.

Rural development, as envisaged in the Sixth Plan document has been similarly viewed. To quote the document : "The aim of agricultural and rural development will be growth for social justice, achievement of full employment in the rural areas in a period of ten years and removal of poverty"²⁵.

In order to foster pace of rural development, the Panchayati Raj Institutions have to be defended on the grounds of rural institution-building and local democracy and it is essentially a political value commitment²⁶.

This political value commitment was forthcoming when a Left Front Government came to power in West Bengal restoring the democratic process and made its impact felt the most on the growing movement for decentralisation in the highly centralised political system in India, and at a time when the Panchayati Raj Institutions had been reeling under the pressure of central control, inadequate resources, elite domination, total isolation from the people and stagnation in the field of development²⁷. The new government in West Bengal sprang a surprise on the whole nation by announcing its new policy and commitment to revive the moribund Panchayati Raj Institutions for the purpose of mobilising hundreds and thousands of land-less and land-poor peasantry and village artisans, mobilisation and allocation

of resources and making the development process self-sustaining.

The new Panchayati Raj system, which began its journey in West Bengal prior to the submission of Asoka Mehta Committee Report in August, 1978, carried democratic decentralisation to its logical conclusion. The political environment in West Bengal prevailing at that point of time, looked upon democratic decentralisation through Panchayati Raj as a means to usher a new social order for socio-economic transformation of the rural community in West Bengal. This was accepted as a basic state policy of the government, and was a logical extension and corollary to the persistent demand of the government²⁸. The basic assumption has always been that both from political and socio-developmental angles, it was imperative to decentralise power, planning process and developmental activities below the state level²⁹. While the entire planning periods marked by capitalist economic development, increased the hiatus between an ever-prosperous and exploiting minority and an ever-growing, improvised and exploited majority who suffered unbearable burden of feudal oppression and capitalist exploitation, and led to the problem of the weaker sections in society, democratic decentralisation through the institution of Panchayati Raj can become an effective answer to the ills of the rural society. Devolution of powers and responsibilities could not simply mean a rearrangement of administrative

functions and powers between the centre and the states, but a genuine functional and decision-making power from the administrative headquarters in the state to the districts and from districts to the tiers down below. Devolution becomes meaningful only when preceded and accompanied by people's participation, which again, can be ensured by genuine transfer of more powers and funds to enable the Panchayati Raj Institutions to discharge their developmental tasks independently. True to this spirit, the Panchayati Raj Institutions have been groomed in West Bengal and West Bengal Panchayat Act of 1973 was re-tuned to the new task of rural development.

It appears from the above description, that the government of West Bengal, proceeding from a sense of urgency, sought to apply the old law to a new situation in order to give the system the initial push. Although the West Bengal Panchayat Act of 1973 was not comprehensive and adequate enough to fulfil and realise the ambitions, expectations and demands of the new situations, it supplied the necessary institutional basis and working arrangement for the revived Panchayati Raj system. Theoretically, at least, it provided considerable autonomy and sufficient financial resources to the institutions of Panchayati Raj which could be conducive to the fulfilment of the basic needs of self-government to carry forward the essence of rural development. The Act of

1973 proposed the Zilla Parishad to be an important unit for executing the development programmes at the district level. Conscious of the shortcomings inbuilt in the Act, the government started at the right earnest to bring about the necessary adjustments and readjustments to provide the Zilla Parishad the maximum executive power for overall development in rural areas. The government was eager to see that all major works of various government departments pertaining to rural development be shifted to the Zilla Parishad along with other poverty alleviation programmes like NREP and RLEGP and programmes like water management, minor irrigation, supply of drinking water, cottage and small-scale industries, animal husbandry, pisciculture, rural housing, construction of roads, culverts and bridges and supervision of primary schools and health centres, so on³⁰.

Under the new Panchayati Raj set up in West Bengal, the Zilla Parishad has been entrusted with the task of rural development. The guiding concept of Panchayati Raj in the State is the recognition of the fact that unless the Panchayats are made responsible for development work in the rural areas, they would not grow to their full stature, nor would they be able to develop the initiative and dynamic leadership necessary for a developing society. As a matter of State policy, the Government of West Bengal has made the Zilla Parishad the nodal unit for rural development. The

Zilla Parishad has become the main driving force to carry forward the new ethos of rural development with its new and vibrant leadership. Important powers and functions in the spheres of development are being transferred from bureaucratic to democratic administration. In district administration, government officials are working hand in hand with the elected representatives in the task of rural development under the new administrative set up.

In order to play an effective role in the field of rural development, the Zilla Parishad has to ensure that decentralisation of power is genuine so that the organisation can mobilise resources to harmonise welfare and productive services. Productive services or the development programmes need to be coordinated at the formulation and implementation level and Zilla Parishad has to assume the role of a coordinator of the entire gamut of development programmes at the district level. But above all, the development process has to be self-sustaining in terms of development of appropriate skills and capacity of the organisation entrusted with the gigantic task of rural development. This requires leadership quality of the organisation to ensure mobilisation, mass participation and effective use of existing resources to make it responsible and responsive to the clientele.

Viewed against this theoretical perspective, let us now analyse the key concepts closely associated with the

new institutional setting that emerged on the horizon of district development administration.

Democratic Decentralisation

The creation of a democratic, efficient and viable rural administration is the basic to the development of the country and is an essential part of modernisation. With the ever-expanding functions which the government has to undertake in the areas of welfare and development, the decentralised administration becomes increasingly desirable and, in fact, necessary³¹. Consequently, no developmental functions can, indeed, be effectively implemented without an adequate measure of decentralisation. As a natural corollary, a great measure of responsibility for rural development must squarely be placed on rural local authority.

Thus an organisation at an appropriate level is, indeed, necessary so that the entire programme can be effectively implemented, coordinated and supervised³². It has been commonly held that the first point of decentralisation below the state level should be the district³³. Historically, the district has been the pivot of local administration for centuries³⁴. It is also at the district level that the greatest variation of functions can be

observed and taking into consideration the structural variations, the fact that stands out is that for planning, supervising and coordinating development programmes, administrative and technical competence of requisite calibre is available only at the district level³⁵. The Administrative Reforms Commission, too, unreservedly came to the conclusion that the district should be the unit of planning and that the Zilla Parishad should be solely responsible for the formulation and implementation of central and state schemes within the district³⁶. Moreover, higher level of leadership can also emerge at this level and establish a strong Panchayat tier that can befittingly respond to the new organisational demands within the district and emerging linkage with the State³⁷. There is also another perspective to this phenomenon. The government can also take into account the social cost of administering a number of development programmes from the headquarters for a huge number of territorially dispersed and disadvantaged sections of society³⁸. By transferring a large chunk of responsibility at the district level for implementing development programmes, the State government would also be able to refine the strategies and effect proper modernisation, where necessary, to accomplish the desired economic and social objectives³⁹.

Democratic decentralisation has, in the present context, two positive virtues; it is consistent with the democratic

107471

TO FEB 1992

GOVERNMENT LIBRARY
 BANGALORE

trends, and is also the most efficient method of formulating and executing local plans. In administering a democratic country like India, self-governing institutions have their tremendous values on planned rural development. It helps in bridging the gap between the people and the administration. Serving as the basic units for performing their own tasks, they generate the spirit of self-helping and self-generating attitudes which go a long way in the process of nation-building. The fundamental purpose of decentralised democracy in the Indian context should be to train local leadership to assume greater responsibilities and to serve the local people with efficiency and economy⁴⁰.

Thus democratic decentralisation means not merely the creation of a few institutions and revitalising the existing ones to suit the expanding needs of development administration but something more — a total transformation in the outlook regarding the power relationship and a complete reorientation of attitude towards the power structure in the government. As a political concept, the democratic decentralisation aims at widening the area of people's participation, authority and autonomy right up to the grass-roots level.

In the context of democratic decentralisation in Panchayati^{Raj} structure in West Bengal, certain major trends

have surfaced in the administration of development programmes in the district. First, the task of Panchayati Raj Institutions in general and Zilla Parishad in particular, has been tremendously intensified; secondly, enlargement of the scope of the Zilla Parishads' work has been made, making these institutions the main energizer, coordinator and planner; thirdly, more and more resources are being diverted to make the Zilla Parishad an effective 'delivery system'⁴¹.

Coordination

The Zilla Parishad that has emerged as the key unit of Panchayati Raj, as has been pointed out, endowed with a comprehensive range of developmental responsibilities. All developmental functions relating to the district that were being discharged by the State are being entrusted to the Zilla Parishad. In view of the large scale of devolution of functions at this level, coordination at the Zilla Parishad level has assumed greater significance and also new dimensions than ever before.

Coordination, as Cameron has remarked, just does not happen. It has to be achieved and should not be left to chances in the hope ^{that} those particularly concerned in a particular job will remember to bring in all other people

involved⁴². Coordination has to be ensured and it has to be achieved if the purpose of the organisation is to be justified. So coordination is an administrative rather than institutional problem⁴³.

The present study would view coordination as a technical and collaborative system within the organisation. Under the present organisational structure of Zilla Parisad, it is assumed that the technical departments which are the partners in the task of rural development at the district level, would not vie with the elected representatives and an attitude of 'empire-building' would ^{not} be generated.

Moreover, a concept of collaborative mechanism would be adopted in attaining coordination of various and diverse development programmes at the Zilla Parisad level. This aspect has assumed greater significance in the context of dichotomy between State-run field administration and Panchayati Raj functions in the hands of Zilla Parisad. In order to ensure collaborative mechanism, district officers of various departments are now associated as departmental members in the various standing committees of the Zilla Parisad. A mechanism has also been evolved that whenever any schemes of different ^{departments} are entrusted to the Zilla Parisad or to any other Panchayat bodies for execution, the field officers of the respective departments be placed at the disposal of the Zilla Parisad for execution and for rendering

adequate staff support⁴⁴ and, above all, to have better coordination and control by the Zilla Parishad. Again, with a view to involving people in the process of rural development and to secure greater and meaningful coordination both at horizontal and vertical level at Zilla Parishad, district planning cell has been envisaged⁴⁵.

The present study seeks to investigate how the Zilla Parishad coordinates the planning and implementation of development programmes with the various departments involved in the task^{of} rural development, because the best out of Panchayat system can be achieved only when there is greater coordination and understanding between the two sets of partners in the process. It is the nature of coordination that determines the quality of the organisation and under the present context of development this aspect needs to be investigated properly.

Supervision and Control

At the initial stage of Panchayati Raj Institutions, supervision and control was looked on as something not only superfluous but actually antagonistic to the whole of the Panchayat Raj concept⁴⁶. The old techniques of supervision and control over the Panchayat bodies made little contribution to the increase in their performance because they had

seldom been implemented in letter and spirit. The approach was essentially routine and bureaucratic. The techniques were used more in terms of domination or empire-building than in the spirit of cooperation and guidance. Too much government control over the Panchayat bodies presented a naked picture of bureaucracy⁴⁷.

Under the new Panchayati Raj system, the old approach is no longer relevant to the dynamic constructive purpose of government and administration today⁴⁸. If Panchayati Raj units are to achieve their purpose and are to satisfy the needs of the people, they have to be creative and innovative⁴⁹, under the new system.

Structurally, Panchayati Raj is hierarchial and organic. It is hierarchical in this sense that each tier is in some way under the supervision of the higher tiers. The Zilla Parishad under the West Bengal Panchayat Act, 1973, has been given the power of supervision and control over the lower tiers.

Supervision is the function of assessing the activities that are being undertaken in accordance with the plans and programmes. The objective is to supervise action in a manner that would disseminate information, imparting administrative and technical guidance and constantly to improve the skill of the supervised. The objective of supervision and control

in Panchayati Raj should be to see that the Panchayati Raj system is itself growing and the purpose for which these institutions have been created is fulfilled.

In Panchayati Raj administration, we find a dual system of supervision and control. One is inter-institutional i.e., the control exercised by the Government through legislation or through its officers. The other is intra-institutional i.e., the higher body controlling the lower tiers through various statutory provisions.

For the purpose of our study, we would restrict our observation only to intra-institutional supervision and control and also to see how the Zilla Parishad translates the new conception of supervision and control to ensure that the Panchayati Raj Institutions live up to the ideal of democratic decentralisation.

Leadership

Panchayati Raj administration is designed to act as necessary link between the people, on the one hand, and district administration, on the other. It calls for a close cooperation between the popular rural leadership and the official or the bureaucratic mechanism of the district administration. The network of Panchayati Raj aims at

reorienting district administration in such a way as to involve the rural people in the process of planning and development. It also throws the challenge at developing a kind of leadership at the grass-roots level to tone up the district administration according to the necessities of economic development and political modernisation.

The popular leadership at the Panchayat level acts as the interpreter of the needs of the local community and the upholder of the rights of the local people. It was well said by Mr. Justice Brandeis of the United States Supreme Court; "Responsibility is the greater developer of men"⁵⁰. The proper delegation of responsibility can only develop the requisite leadership to implement the development programmes.

The general concept of leadership has undergone a significant change during the present century. In the early stage, it was widely believed that one individual or a small group of individuals were of critical importance in any group efforts⁵¹. In the second phase, the focus shifted from individual leaders to the situations as it was believed that effectiveness of leadership is dependent on the situation.⁵² In the third place, it was the quality and competence of all the members of the group that determines the effectiveness of the group⁵³. So, in recent times, in leadership

studies, emphasis is laid on the problems and processes involved in the working of the group.

Leadership of the Zilla Parishad is viewed in the present study as what is called "mission and role" of the organisation. Leadership refers to a group of persons actively engaged in formulating the programmes of an institution and directing its operation within the environment⁵⁴. In the present study the scope of leadership is restricted to include an organisation directly associated with formulation of policies and programmes. In other words, it means organisational leadership of the Zilla Parishad.

Institutional strategy of Panchayati Raj was designed to create leadership pattern for formulating and implementing developmental plans, mobilizing both human and material resources for development and exercising control over administration for making it responsible for and responsive to the needs and aspiration of the people.

The Ashoka Mehta Committee⁵⁵ (1977) on Panchayati Raj Institutions gave Zilla Parishad preponderant responsibilities and powers to guide the lower tiers⁵⁶. The committee also recommended assignment of all developmental functions relating to district which, until recently, were discharged by the State Government. Broadly, the Zilla Parishad would handle all decentralised functions, State programmes and

plans for them at the district level⁵⁷. All these have made the Zilla Parishad the real leader in the whole plan of development in the district.

The present study seeks to take a look at the leadership role of the Zilla Parishad in West Bengal. The leadership of Zilla Parishad in the sphere of development means the concerted endeavour of all the members of the group who are willing to participate and cooperate with one another in achieving the goals of the organisation⁵⁸, as organisations are social units which pursue specific goals⁵⁹. The goals of Panchayati Raj Institutions are to bring about and sustain a people-oriented development administration under popular leadership. S.C. Dubey has rightly observed, "accurate identification and effective utilisation of leadership provides the key to the smooth and speedy implementation of development plans"⁶⁰. Thus organisational leadership is the most critical variable in the performance of democratic decentralisation in the district. This crucial task demands special organisational attributes to initiate the task of becoming the leader. These attributes are :

- a. Hierarchical Position,
- b. Status,
- c. Motivation,
- d. Functional Competence,

- e. Organisational Competence,
- f. Continuity, and
- g. Personal Involvement⁶¹.

We would see how the Zilla Parishad with its new found role satisfies these characteristics to achieve administrative leadership significantly.

II. Objectives of the Present Study

Viewed in this perspective, it is clear that the real problem of district development administration is to search for an institution which ensures popular participation with a much greater amount of decentralisation for democratic management of rural development below the state level, so that the entire programme of rural development could be effectively implemented, coordinated and supervised with the high level of leadership of Panchayati Raj Institutions, particularly of the Zilla Parishad.

It is, therefore, of interest to examine how far the present structure of district development administration with the Zilla Parishad at the helm of affairs at the districts helps to implement the development programmes in an well-orchestrated manner. It is to be seen to what extent the Zilla Parishads have become the real energizer,

planner and coordinator, and with this new-found role of the Zilla Parishad, how far it has become the main vehicle of rural development administration with adequate resources and powers. It will also have to be seen what extent the Zilla Parishads have brought about qualitative and quantitative changes in the rural areas how far they have created dynamic and responsible leadership, and also to what extent they have been successful in making the district administration both responsible and responsive to the concept of democracy and development.

In changed perspective, spirit and objectives of district administration require new ethos and new style of functioning to implement a wide variety of development programmes hitherto unknown to the district administration whose work was completely autocratic and was totally segregated from the people. Development was at the periphery and was not at the core of the administration.

The viability and workability of district administration in the changed context, thus, depends to a large extent on the leadership of the Zilla Parishad to usher in a planned, purposive and conscious change from a static social order to a modern, dynamic and rational social order.

Rural development administration in a country like India, where massive programme of social transformation has

been launched, occupies a crucial position in converting plans into action. The structure of rural development administration thus plays a very important role in policy making and its implementation. If the Zilla Parisads which emerged as the undisputed leader both in the Panchayati Raj structure and in the whole gamut of development administration in the district, fail to ^{play} this changed role skillfully and efficiently, the entire development effort is likely to end up in a total fiasco.

No less important is the role of the elected representatives along with the administrators with respect to the task of nation-building and making the administration more responsible and responsive. It is the elected representatives who give direction to development, and are also responsible for diffusion of those norms that give sustenance to democratic political order, and resolving the crisis of participation thereby promoting a structural shift in power distribution⁶¹.

The second set of factors relates to the functioning of the organisation. The performance of the personnel involved in the organisation of the Zilla Parisad, is, to a considerable extent, determined by the way in which the role of the Zilla Parisad is conceived and its goals are defined. The Zilla Parisad, in the changed environmental

context, is considered as the nodal unit of Panchayati Raj with vast areas of statutory functions along with large scale functions of nation-building and modernization. The trust and confidence evinced by the Government towards the organisation of Zilla Parishad has made the organisation a key factor in the whole process of rural development. So the task of organisational leadership of Zilla Parishad is the crucial variable in the performance of democratic decentralisation of the district. It is also important in this context to look at the way an organisation is structured, its authority distributed, coordination effected and decisions made. In other words, the performance of an organisation to a large extent is dependent on the structural attributes, viz; hierarchial position, status, motivation, functional competence, organisational competence, continuity and personal involvement. It is, therefore, important to observe how far these factors operate and help in fulfilling the realisation of the organisational goals.

Structurally, Panchayati Raj in West Bengal is hierarchal and organic. Zilla Parishad being the apex body, the other two lower tiers are under the supervision and control of Zilla Parishad. Efficient supervision implies dissemination of information, effective coordination of efforts imparting administrative and technical guidance and constantly improving the skill of the supervised. This is

particularly true of Zilla Parisad which has been assigned to the role of organisational leadership.

In this study, the Zilla Parisad is viewed as an organisation at a crucial point where the entire programme of development can be effectively implemented, coordinated and supervised and the process of nation-building can be fostered. It is an emerging institution with all the properties of a true leader and befittingly responds both to the organisational needs within the district and to demands of emerging linkages with the State minimizing the social cost of directly administering a number of territorially dispersed and disadvantaged sections of society.

III. An Overview of the Literature

In the light of the preceding analysis of framework of the present study, it would be useful to recount briefly the works done in the field of Panchayati Raj Institutions on the various aspects and of their processes and problems.

In the field of Panchayati Raj, a wide range of studies are available which include numerous central and State Government reports. Studies on all India perspective of Panchayati Raj Institutions are also wide-ranging. But literature on the working of these institutions in the

context of the State of West Bengal, is, to say the least, very scanty. However, we would, for the sake of our study, begin our survey of the available literature on Panchayati Raj system operating in different parts of our country with its various dimensions and problems.

Available literature on Panchayati Raj, for the purpose of our study, could be classified under six categories. The first category⁶²⁻⁷⁰ includes the reports on Panchayati Raj systems. In the second category⁷¹⁻⁹⁰ we may include the theoretical studies which mainly deal with the development of the institutions through various stages and at different levels with the basic concepts of Panchayati Raj. These studies are conceptual and descriptive in nature and trace the historical development of the organisation in our country.

In the third category⁹¹⁻⁹⁴, we may place all those studies which deal mainly with the Panchayati Raj Institutions from all India perspective.

The fourth category⁹⁵⁻⁹⁸ of studies mainly deal with the State Panchayati Raj structures, their powers, their functions and various problems relating to the organisation. These studies could be categorised as studies mainly on the Panchayati Raj systems in different states of the Indian Union. Most of the studies in this category suffer from

the limitation of being mainly structural and functional analysis. They tend to ignore the procedural and contextual factor which have a direct bearing on goal-achievement and the working of the system as a whole.

The fifth⁹⁹⁻¹⁰³ set of studies deals with those made exclusively on Panchayati Raj in the State of West Bengal. There are very few organised and systematic indepth studies dealing with the Panchayati Raj system operating in West Bengal. The existing studies on Panchayati Raj in West Bengal are limited in scope and hardly give any insight into the operational aspect of the system. After the revitalisation of Panchayati Raj in West Bengal in 1978, the working of the Panchayati Raj system, has drawn the attention of the scholars both from India and abroad,

The sixth category¹⁰⁴⁻¹⁰⁷ deals with the Zilla Parisads as a system operating in a socio-political setting for achieving set goals through its leadership. In recent years, there has been a lot of interest in our country in the study of the organisation of Zilla Parisad mainly in view of the fact that the Central and the State Governments are placing much emphasis on the concept of decentralised planning and Zilla Parisad has been chosen as the nodal unit to put this into effect.

It must be mentioned that the classification of work which has been done for the convenience of our study is

neither exhaustive nor mutually exclusive. As several of these studies mentioned in our overview falling under one or the other area really deal with more than one aspect, we have classified them by their major emphasis.

A good number of reports are available on the various aspects of Panchayati Raj Institutions in general and Zilla Parishad in particular. Balvantray Mehta Report 62 (1957), offered two broad directional thrusts : first, it argued that there should be administrative decentralisation for the effective implementation of the development programme and that the decentralised administrative system should be under the control of elected bodies. As the author of the report would put it, "Development can not progress without responsibility and power". The report is considered as the most important document in the development of local self government in India and it provided the blueprint for the Panchayati Raj system in all the States. It also provided the institutional framework in the form of the three-tier scheme and captured the image of the concept of democratic decentralisation in India.

After the publication of the Balvantray Mehta Committee Report, the state Governments, in order to review the functioning the Panchayati Raj Institutions in the respective States, began to appoint Committees. These committees also dealt a wide range of aspects regarding the functioning

of the institutions. V.P.Naik Committee⁶³ (1961) in Maharashtra, Sadiq Ali Committee⁶⁴ (1964) in Rajasthan, Hardayal Singh⁶⁵ Committee (1965) in Himachal Pradesh, and Ram Murti Committee⁶⁶ (1965) in Uttar Pradesh recommended that the district should be the hub of the development activities and Zilla Parishad would be accorded the prime position in the system of Panchayati Raj system.

V.T.Krishnamachari⁶⁷, in his report on Indian and the State Administrative Services and Problems of District Administration (1962), emphasised the need to invigorate the district as the prime unit of administration of development below the State level.

Ashok Mehta Committee⁶⁸ (1978) in the report endeavoured to lay down a new approach towards the Panchayati Raj Institutions -- not in the usual point-by-point way but rather in concentrical circles, as the various aspects of Panchayati Raj interact and depend on one another. The formulation of structures, functions and the utilisation of financial, administrative and human resources of Panchayati Raj Institutions, the Committee emphasised, be determined on the emerging functional necessity of management of rural development. The Ashok Mehta Committee attached importance to the direction rather than specific on certain items usually done in the various reports. In its recommendation, the committee favoured the district as the key unit of

decentralisation. In recommending the two tier system of Panchayati Raj as against the three tier system, the committee suggested inter alia, the formation of social justice committees in Panchayati Raj Institutions at various levels to safeguard the interests of the weaker sections of the society, allocation of more financial resources; and emphasised the competence of human resources development as an integral part of the developmental process. V.K.R.V.Rao Committee⁶⁹ (1985) also was of the opinion that there should be a significant decentralisation at the District level. The Committee recommended that all the developmental departments with their line information at the district level and below should be brought squarely under the Zilla Parishad. The budgets, non-plan and plan, of these departments and the funds for various special schemes implemented at the district level or below should be transferred to the Zilla Parishad to form the district budget.

L.M. Singhvi Committee⁷⁰ (1986) was of the view that Panchayati Raj Institutions be viewed as institutions of self-government which naturally facilitate the participation of the people in the process of planning and development. The Committee felt that bureaucratic structures and devolutionary strategies can not achieve people's participation in a meaningful manner.

Studies on the theoretical aspects of Panchayati Raj Institutions were attempted by many scholars from India and abroad. P.C.Mathur and Iqbal Narain⁷¹ have dealt with major aspects of the concept of Panchayati Raj, Planning and Democracy and an attempt was made by the authors to build up an adequate institutional model for decentralisation, development and democracy. The problems and challenges of the Panchayati Raj system were also highlighted⁹⁶. In another work, the authors⁷² discussed the problems of supervision and control in the Panchayati Raj system in the States of Rajasthan, Gujrat and Maharashtra with other administrative problems emanating from old bureaucratic control mechanism. Iqbal Narain, Susil Kumar and P.C.Mathur⁷³ emphasised the need for a new orientation in the whole system of Panchayati Raj.

Various human and psychological problems of adjustments in the context of new environment in which two sets of functionaries, i.e., officials and non-officials function, have been brought to limelight by Iqbal Narain⁷⁴. He suggested certain measures to solve the maladjustments that characterised the Panchayati Raj Institutions in the initial years of their operations. Iqbal Narain also showed how the Panchayati Raj system tackled administrative problems which had a pronounced politico-psychological overtone. He hoped that with the stabilisation of the institutions in their

behaviour and functioning, the administrative challenges would be a transitional phenomenon. Henry Maddick⁷⁵, in a wide detail, dealt with the basic concepts of Panchayati Raj and their importance in the field of rural development. Problems of coordination in carrying out various development programmes in the areas below the state level were also discussed. Henry Maddick pointed out that the concept of partnership is crucial between officials and non-officials in execution of the development programmes in the rural areas. In another work, Henry Maddick⁷⁶ discussed the rationale of control, supervision and guidance of Panchayati Raj Institutions. These are necessary, according to the author, to ensure that Panchayati Raj units operate in a way that would establish sound traditions and conventions for themselves to achieve a regard for the equity and honesty of decision-making and subsequent actions, whether by officials or non-officials and, secondly, to supervise the technical performance in the fulfilment of various programmes targets which comprise the national programmes.

S.N. Dubey⁷⁷ has pointed out some organisational dilemmas of the Panchayati Raj system, which according to him, seem to arise from the nature of the organisational relationship among personnel working in the system. Consequently the tensions in the institutions are due to : firstly, the multiple system of control; secondly, supervision of the

technical staff by generalist and lay administrators, and thirdly, conflict between the universalistic and particularistic orientations of the personnel operating at a particular tier. P.R.Dubhasi⁷⁸ presented various issues connected with the Panchayati Raj administration, namely, coordination, control and supervision in rural development and implication and scope of democratic decentralisation. Emphasis was also laid on the role of the functional committees of Panchayati Raj Institutions.

Douglas Ensminger⁷⁹ analyses the challenge of democratic decentralisation. The initiation of Community Development Programme had called for discarding of the traditional way of administration of regulatory mentality and the handing down of orders from the above. It exhorted the administrators to give the necessary leadership in the self-help programmes and demanded a new kind of cooperation among all technical agencies which had the programming responsibilities in rural areas. Ensminger emphasised that the principal challenge facing administration was to realise that Panchayati Raj is a process and that the basic component of the process is the growth of effective and viable institutions.

M. Siviah⁸⁰ has touched upon the various aspects of the relationship between decentralisation and local self-government. He suggested that decentralisation being more complex in dimension, political-cum-administrative. Elected

functionaries enjoying statutorily defined autonomy have a certain political status. For this autonomy to be real, there should be a corresponding degree of administrative autonomy. The enmeshing of administrative structures, with their line hierarchies traced to the State capital has a vital bearing on the functioning of these institutions.

R.N. Haldipur⁸¹ argued that the main ills of the Panchayati Raj system arose out of superimposition of the modern concept of democracy, socialism and secularism on a traditional society which is based on caste, creed and religion. He also pointed out that the unit of planning should be the district with the Zilla Parishad being the hub of developmental activities. The Panchayat bodies, Haldipur argues, would be able to create, amongst the rural population, national impulses through a perception of national goals and reconcile them with local aspirations. Similarly P.C. Mathur⁸² argued that the restructuring of Panchayat Raj system should begin from below with a view to making village Panchayat an operational unit for popular representation as well as planned development.

K.B. Sukla⁸³ analysed in great details the report of the Asoka Mehta Committee on Panchayati Raj Institutions (1978) and revealed the main aspects of the report which maintained that remodelling of Panchayati Raj Institutions, formulation of their structures, functions and utilisation of financial

and human resources is to be determined on the emerging functional necessity of institutions.

Donald C. Pelz⁸⁴ pointed out the mechanism of coordination in Panchayati Raj organisation, the method of communication, the system of administrative supervision and method of financial sanction. The dual system of control and supervision, the author concluded, hamper coordination at the district level. K. Seshadri⁸⁴ relates to the dynamic and creative aspects of the organisation engaged in rural development in the district to the proper coordination at the appropriate level. He also hinted that the main impediment to the development administration, is the dual dimension of coordination which posed the real problem to the field administration in India. The rationale for participation in Panchayati Raj system was outlined by R.C. Prosad⁸⁶ and the author pointed out the paradox of participation in the form of political nature in the Panchayati Raj Institutions.

Accurate identification and effective utilisation of leadership is considered as the most important variable in the successful implementation of rural development programmes. This was highlighted by S.C. Dubey⁸⁷. He also pointed out the importance of understanding of the patterns and process of leadership in terms of structure, norms and goals of the

group. Emerging patterns of new leadership in the Panchayati structure was discussed by Ziauddin Khan⁸⁸. Like Ziauddin Khan, G.Hargopal⁸⁹ emphasised the need to have, in a Panchayati Raj system, an accurately identified leadership which is singularly most important to understand the process of democratic decentralisation institutionalised in Panchayati Raj. P.K.B.Nayar⁹⁰ also discussed the question of leadership in development administration in terms of structure, norms and goals of the group responsible for carrying out the development programmes to its logical conclusion. He also pointed out that a suitable organisation with the quality of leadership for sustaining planned change.

On the evolution of Panchayati Raj system in India, a large number of studies were conducted. The most remarkable studies are R.V.Jethar⁹¹, M.Venkatrangaia and M.Pattabhiram⁹², R.N.Haldipur and V.R.K.Paramahansa⁹³ and George Jaccob⁹⁴. The authors traced the growth of the institutions with their structures and functions and the problems associated with the institutions.

There are a plethora of literature on the State Panchayati Raj system. In this field some Indian scholars made significant contribution. Notable among them are G.Ram Reddy⁹⁵, Iqbal Narain⁹⁶, N.R.Inamdar⁹⁷ and C.N.Bhalerao⁹⁸. The authors pinpointed various problems of Panchayati Raj Institutions in different States. In the works of the authors

pertaining to different States, nevertheless, had certain common ailments from which the Institutions suffered like lack of coordination, maladjustments between the two sets of functionaries, lack of proper motivation on the part of the functionaries and over bureaucratisation etc. N.R. Inamdar in his study in Maharashtra pointed out the features weighing in favour of Zilla Parishads in the form of delegation of development functions by the State Government, vesting adequate financial resources, pooling of experienced government officers and the spirit of trust the State Government showed to the these institutions. On the leadership question, the author showed how a single caste domination became the hallmark of Maharashtra's Panchayat system. Iqbal Narain identified, in the State of Rajasthan, the intermeshing of politics and democracy resulted in the alienation and split nature of administration in Panchayati Raj system.

While the literature on Panchayati Raj is available in abundance regarding different states, very little work is done in respect of West Bengal. In an exhaustive work, N.C. Roy⁹⁹ traced the history of local self-government institutions in West Bengal. Ashok Mukhopadhyay's¹⁰⁰ work was probably the first full-scale study of Panchayati Raj system in West Bengal. It highlighted the structure, composition and administration of Panchayati Raj in West Bengal. The

author pointed out certain problems of local self-government like bureaucratic control, dual supervision and financial stringencies put forth by the State Government. In another important work, Asit Basu¹⁰¹ discussed the Panchayati Raj system which was introduced in West Bengal after 1977. The author emphasised the need to mobilise resources both material and human to provide a sustained momentum to initiate the pace of rural development under the leadership of Panchayati Raj Institution. Outlining the importance of the new democratic exercise in West Bengal which was introduced in the year 1978, S.N. Ray¹⁰² analysed the need for harnessing human resources for successful implementation of development programmes through Panchayati Raj. The author also highlighted the environment in which the erstwhile Panchayati Raj Institutions were allowed to languish and how the Marxist Government in West Bengal revived the moribund institutions to give them a new lease of life and to entrust them with all development functions under the leadership of Zilla Parishad. On the other hand, K.B. Srivastav¹⁰³ analysed the West Bengal Panchayat Act of 1973 and pointed out the powers and functions of different tiers of Panchayati Raj Institutions in West Bengal.

Arjunrao Darsankar¹⁰⁴ highlighted the new pattern of leadership that emerged with the introduction of Panchayati Raj in the districts of Uttar Pradesh. In an identical

study, V.R.Dutt¹⁰⁵ showed the new pattern of leadership and how it was dominated by the powerful caste group within Panchayati Raj set up. In his article, C.P. Shambri¹⁰⁶ outlined the structural provisions, powers and functions of the Zilla Parishad in collaboration with the district administration, performs various developmental functions. With the introduction of Panchayati Raj system, the rural power balance in Uttar Pradesh has shifted and produced a new kind of leadership. This aspect was highlighted by K.D. Gangrade¹⁰⁷ in his work. He also analysed the socio-economic factors in determining the new patterns of leadership.

The over view of literature on Panchayati Raj Institutions in general and Zilla Parishad in particular suggests that no exclusive work on the functioning of the Zilla Parishad and as a matter of fact on West Bengal have been done by very many scholars. But the institutions of Zilla Parishad has assumed tremendous importance in the field of rural development in West Bengal particularly after 1978. The prime importance put to the Zilla Parishad warrants a serious study and the present work humbly claims to remove the gap in this field.

IV. Significance of the Study

The existing literature on Panchayati Raj amply suggested that a wide gap exists between the promise and performance of the institutions of Panchayati Raj. This gap has in turn left the field for further research in the changed situation, particularly when the Panchayati Raj Institutions in West Bengal have been revitalised. Moreover, any serious studies on Panchayati Raj in West Bengal have remained conspicuously absent. The moribund nature of the Panchayati Raj Institutions in West Bengal did not attract the scholars in this field. It was only in 1978 that the institutions had undergone tremendous metamorphosis in its nature and functions. This offers an ample opportunity to know the system in its totality and also its stresses and strains in the actual working of the Panchayati Raj Institutions in West Bengal, providing a deeper insight into the understanding of the entire system. It is only on the basis of such analysis on rural development, that valid macro-studies can be undertaken which will throw light on the complex process of rural development. What is urgently needed is to build up a body of knowledge on various aspect of Panchayati Raj. And it is the subsequent integration of this body of knowledge that could provide perspectives for policy formulation and an effective strategy for implementation of development programmes.

The present study assumes that any satisfactory performance of Panchayati Raj Institutions would be largely, if not wholly, dependent on structure, behaviour, and norms of the apex tier of the organisation i.e. the Zilla Parishad. From this perspective, the present study has great importance at a critical transitional period when public policy, even at the Central government level, has decisively been directed at the rejuvenation and reorganisation of the Panchayats with a distinct tilt towards decentralisation and popular participation at the grassroots level.

In fine, the present study claims to fill a research gap by focussing on the working of the Panchayati Raj Institutions at the district level and hopes to throw light on the complex process of rural development at that level. The study also humbly claims that though limited to two districts of North Bengal, it would have broad based and general implication in the field of rural development and Panchayati Raj not only in the State of West Bengal but in the whole country, variations and diversities notwithstanding.

NOTES AND REFERENCE

1. Mathur, P.C : "Re-Modelling Panchayati Raj in India" in R.B.Jain (eds.), Panchayati Raj (New Delhi:Indian Institute of Public Administration, 1986), p.169.
2. Mathur, M.V and Iqbal Narain (eds) : Panchayati Raj, Planning and Democracy (Bombay : Asia Publishing House, 1969), p.xii.
3. Bhattacharjee, Mohit : "Administrative and Organisational Issues in Rural Development", Indian Journal of Public Administration, Vol.XXIV, No.3 (1978), p.1182.
4. Maddick, Henry : Panchayati Raj — A Study of Rural Local Government in India (London, Orient Longman, 1971), p.36.

5. Committee on Plan Projects, Planning Commission : Report of the Study Team for the Study of Community Development Projects and National Extension Service (New Delhi, Government of India, 1958), p.1.
6. Ibid., p.2.
7. The Third Five Year Plan, (New Delhi, Manager of Publication, 1961), p.130.
8. Maddick, Henry., op.cit., p.305.
9. The Second Five Year Plan, (New Delhi, Manager of Publication, 1956), p.134.
10. The Second Five Year Plan, asserts that, "District Administration is an agency of change towards a new social order. It has to respond to the needs and aspirations of the people. It will be judged both by the practical results it produces and by the methods and institutions of popular association and cooperation which it integrates into the basic structure".
11. Narain, Iqbal et al : Panchayati Raj Administration: Old Controls and New Challenges, (New Delhi, IIPA, 1970), pp.11-12.
12. Shukla, K.B : "Panchayati Raj Revisited" in R.B.Jain (eds), Panchayati Raj (New Delhi, Indian Institute of Public Administration, 1986), p.196.
13. Ibid., p.196.

14. Bhattacharjee, Mohit : op.cit., p.1177.
15. Bhattacharjee, Mohit : op.cit., p.1188.
16. Report of the Committee on Panchayati Raj Institutions.
(New Delhi, Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, Department of Rural Development, 1978), p.4.
17. Mathur, P.C., op.cit., p.170.
18. The Janata Party was a coalition of right-wing and socialist parties and were opposed to Congress(I), which, for the first time in India's post independence constitutional and political history, replaced the Congress Party at the Centre in 1977. The Janata Party voiced their demand, during the 1977 elections in its election manifesto, for greater autonomy for the States and decentralisation of administration and planning process.
19. The Ashoka Mehta Committee on Panchayati Raj Institutions was appointed by the Janata Government in December 1977. The Committee was asked (i) to review the existing situation regarding democratic decentralisation in the States and the Union Territories, and the working of Panchayati Raj Institutions from district to the village levels, so as to identify shortcomings and defects; in particular, to examine the working of these institutions in respect of

(a) mobilisation of resources, (b) planning and implementation of schemes for rural development in an objective and optimal manner, and in looking after the interests of the weaker sections of society; (ii) to examine the method of constituting the Panchayat Institutions, including the system of elections, and to assess their effects on the performance of Panchayati Raj system; (iii) to suggest the role of Panchayati Raj Institutions, and the objectives which could be achieved through them, for integrated rural development in the future; (iv) to suggest measures for reorganising the Panchayati Raj system, and removing the shortcomings and defects, with a view to enable these institutions to fulfil their future role; (v) to recommend the form and content of the relationship that should exist between the Panchayati Raj Institutions, the official administrative machinery, and the cooperative and voluntary institutions involved in rural development; and (vi) to make such other recommendations, including those on financial matters, as may be necessary to ensure adequate availability of funds for the discharge of the responsibilities that may be entrusted to the Panchayati Raj Institutions. The Committee submitted its report in August 1978.

20. Report of the Committee on Panchayati Raj Institutions.
op.cit., p.iii.

21. Shukla, K.B., op.cit., p.195.
22. Bhattacharjee, Mohit., op.cit., 1184.
23. Ibid., p.1173.
24. Lele, Uma., The Design for Rural Development, Lessons from Africa (Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press, 1975), pp.19-20.
25. The Draft Sixth Plan (1978-83), (The Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi, 1977), p.1.
26. Bhattacharjee, Mohit., op.cit., p.1175.
27. Ray, Samirendranath., The New Panchayati Raj Experiment in West Bengal: Harbinger of New Era in Democracy, Decentralisation and Development ? (Santa Barbara, University of California, 1981), p.2 (Mimeo).
28. Ibid., p.9.
29. Nambudripad, E.M.S., dissenting note, in the Report of the Committee on Panchayati Raj Institutions, 1978.
30. Chaudhary, Kalyan., in Economic and Political Weekly, June 24, 1978, p.1016.
31. Report of the Committee on Panchayati Raj Institutions, op.cit., p.9.
32. Ibid., p.28.
33. Ibid., p.28.
34. Ibid., p.37.

35. Ibid., p.37.
36. Ibid., p.30.
37. Ibid., p.28.
38. Ibid., p.29.
39. Ibid., p.29.
40. Report of the Committee on Democratic Decentralisation,
(Department of Cooperation and Rural Development,
Government of Maharashtra), Bombay, 1961, p.52.
41. Report of the Committee on Panchayati Raj Institutions,
op.cit.
42. Findley, R.M., The Art of Administration, (London, Olive
and Broyed, 1952), p.51.
43. Bhattacharjee, Mohit., op.cit., p.1184.
44. Bandopadhyaya, D., "Three Years of Left Front Panchayati
Raj", in Panchayat in West Bengal
(From 1978-81), A Review (Government
of West Bengal, Department of
Panchayats and Community Development,
Calcutta, 1982), p.1.
45. Ibid., p.10.
46. Maddick, Henry, "Control, Supervision and Guidance of
Panchayati Raj Institutions", Indian
Journal of Public Administration
(New Delhi, Vol.viii, No.3, 1962),
p.500.

47. Mahapatra, Balaidas., West Bengal Legislative Assembly Proceedings (Calcutta, Vol. xv., No. 1), p. 427.
48. Maddick, Henry, Op.cit., p. 503.
49. Ibid., p. 503.
50. Quoted in Mac Mohan, A.W., Delegation and Authority (Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1961), p. 19.
51. The early approach was to study leadership from the angle of an individual leader and was known as 'trait approach'. This approach studied the leadership as an entity possessing chaimistic traits occupying rather inertly a status position relative to other individuals who were not too clearly relate to him. See Irving Kricker Bodan, The Analysis of of Leadership, in G.C. Brown and Thomas S. When (eds), The Study of Leadership, (New York, Interstate Publishers and Printers, 1968)
52. This approach emphasised situational factors as critical to the study of Leadership. It was thought qualities, characteristics and skills required in a leader are determined to a large extent, by demands of situation in which he is to function as a leader. See S.J. Fillea, The psychology of Leadership, in J.W. Arian (eds), The Nature of Leadership (Bombay, Lalwani Publishing House, 1969), p. 56. Kerch and Catchfield and Balachy added that emergence of Leadership and its functions in a

group were determined by the structure, situation and the task of the Group. See J.W. Arian (eds), The Nature of Leadership.

53. The third approach of leadership emphasised the behavioural aspects of the group. It considered leadership as a process of interaction in which the influence between the leader and the follower was mutual in a situation. See The Psychology of Leadership in A.W. Arian, The Nature of Leadership.
54. "The formulation of policy and specification and re-casting of general aim of the organisation so as to adapt them to the requirement of the organisational survival as a leadership role". See Philip Setzinck, Leadership in Administration (New York, 1957).
55. Report of the Committee on Panchayati Raj Institutions is known as Asoka Mehta Committee.
56. Ibid., pp.44-45.
57. Ibid., p.183.
58. Nayar, P.K.B., Leadership, Bureaucracy and Planning in India (New Delhi, Associated Publishing House, 1969), p.1.
59. Ibid., p.43.
60. Dube, S.C., A Framework for the Study of Rural Leadership in Transitional Societies (Hyderabad, National Institution of Rural Development, 1965), p.25.

61. Nayar, P.K.B., op.cit., pp.153-154.
62. Report of the Study Team for the Study of Community Projects and Extension Service, (New Delhi, Government of India, 1957)
63. Naik, V.P., Report of the Committee on Democratic Decentralisation (Bombay, Government of Maharashtra, 1961).
64. Ali, Sadiq., Report of the Study Team on Panchayati Raj, (Rajasthan, 1964.)
65. Singh, Hardayal., Report of the Committee on Panchayati Raj (Himachal Pradesh, 1965).
66. Murti, Ram., Report of the Study Team on Panchayati Raj, (Uttar Pradesh, 1965).
67. Krishnamachari, V.T., Report on Indian and State Administrative Services and Problems of District Administration (New Delhi, Government of India, 1962).
68. Mehta, Ashoka, Report of the Committee on Panchayati Raj Institutions (New Delhi, Government of India, 1978).
69. Rao, V.K.R.V., Report of the Study Team on Panchayati Raj, (New Delhi, Government of India, 1985).
70. Singhvi, L.M., Report of the Committee on Panchayati Raj Institutions (New Delhi, Government of India, 1986).

71. Mathur, M.V. and Iqbal Narain, Panchayati Raj, Planning and Democracy (Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1969).
72. Narain, Iqbal and P.C.Mathur, Old Controls and New Challenges : A Report on the Patterns of Control and Supervision of Panchayati Raj Institutions in Madras, Maharashtra and Rajasthan (Jaipur, University of Rajasthan, 1967).
73. Narain, Iqbal, Susil Kumar and P.C.Mathur., Panchayati Raj Administration : Old Control and New Challenges (New Delhi, Indian Institute of Public Administration, 1970).
74. Narain, Iqbal., "Democratic Decentralisation : The Idea, Image and Reality", The Indian Journal of Public Administration, Vol.9, No.1, 1963.
75. Maddick, Henry., Panchayati Raj : A Study of Rural Local Government in India (London, Longman, 1970).
76. _____., Democracy, Decentralisation and Development (Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1966).

77. Dubey, S.N., "Organisational Analysis of Panchayati Raj Institutions in India", Indian Journal of Publication, New Delhi, Vol.18, No.2, 1972.
78. Dubasi, P.R., Rural Development Administration in India (Bombay, Popular Prakashan, 1970).
79. Ensminger, Douglas., "Democratic Decentralisation : A New Administrative Challenge", Indian Journal of Public Administration, New Delhi, Vol.7, No.3, 1961.
80. Shiviah, M., Panchayati Raj in India (Hyderabad, National Institute of Rural Development, 1978).
81. Haldipur, R.N. and V.R.K. Paramahansa., Local Government Institutions in Rural India (Hyderabad, National Institute of Rural Development, 1970).
82. Mathur, P.C., "Re-Modelling Panchayati Raj Institutions in India", Indian Journal of Public Administration, New Delhi, Vol.24, No.3, 1978.
83. Shukla, K.B., "Panchayati Raj Revisited", Indian Journal of Public Administration, New Delhi, Vol.24, No.4, 1978.
84. Peiz, Donald C., "Coordination and Communication in Agricultural Development", Indian

Journal of Public Administration, New
Delhi, Vol.12, No.1, 1966.

85. Seshadri, K., "Coordination of Development Programmes at Block Level", Indian Journal of Public Administration, New Delhi, Vol.12, No.1, 1966.
86. Prosad, R.C., Democracy and Development (New Delhi, Rachana Prokashan, 1970).
87. Budey, S.C., A Framework for the Study of Rural Leadership in Transitional Societies (Hyderabad, National Institute of Rural Development, 1965).
88. Khan, Ziauddin., Leadership : Emerging Patterns in Panchayati Raj (Jaipur, University of Rajasthan, 1969).
89. Hargopal, G., Administrative Leadership and Rural Development in India (New Delhi, Light and Life Publisher, 1980).
90. Nayar, P.K.B., Leadership, Bureaucracy and Planning in India (New Delhi, Associated Publishing House, 1969).
91. Jather, R.V., Evolution of Panchayati Raj in India (Dharwar, J.S.S. Institute of Economic Research, 1964).

92. Vekatrangaiya, M. and M.Pattaviram (eds)., Local Government in India, (Calcutta, Allied Publisher, 1969).
93. Haldipur, R.N., and V.R.K.Paramahansa., Local Government Institutions in India (Hyderabad, National Institute of Rural Development, 1970).
94. Jaccob, George (eds)., Readings in Panchayati Raj (Hyderabad, National Institute of Community Development, 1967).
95. Ram Reddy, G., (eds), Patterns of Panchayati Raj in India (Madras, Mac-Millan & Co., 1977).
96. Narain, Iqbal. (eds), Panchayati Raj Administration in Rajasthan (Agra, Laxminarayan Agarwall, 1973).
97. Inamdar, N.R., "Panchayati Raj in Maharashtra", (Hyderabad, National Institute of Rural Development, 1975.)
98. Bhalerao, C.N., "Some Social, Political and Administrative Consequence of Panchayati Raj", Asian Survey, Vol.4, No.4, 1964.
99. Roy, N.C., Rural Self-Government in West Bengal (Calcutta, Calcutta University Press, 1936).

100. Mikhopadhy, Ashok., Panchayat Administration in West Bengal (Calcutta, The World Press, 1980).
101. Basu, Asit., Paschim Banger Panchayat Babosthya (in Bengali) (Calcutta, West Bengal Book Board, 1983).
102. Ray, Samirendranath., The New Panchayati Raj in West Bengal : Harbinger of a New Era in Democracy (Santa Barbara, University of California, 1981).
103. Srivastava, K.B., "Panchayati Raj in West Bengal" Panchayati Raj and Community Development, National Institute of Rural Development, 1976.
104. Darsankar, Arjunrao., Leadership in Panchayati Raj : A Study Bird District (Jaipur, Panchasheel Prokashan, 1979).
105. Dutta, V.R., "Emerging Power Pattern at the Zilla Parishad Level : A Study of Varanasi Zilla Parishad", Indian Journal of Political Science, Vol.31, No.3, 1970.

106. Bhamhri, C.P., "Establishment of Zilla Parisad in Rajasthan : A Case Study", Political Science Review, Vol.5, No.2, 1966.
107. Gangarde, K.D., Emerging Patterns of Leadership : Comparative Study of Leadership and Social Structure (New Delhi, Rachana Publications, 1974).