

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

The socio-economic and politico-cultural exclusion of the historically deprived and marginalised social groups has been a problem of enduring significance and relevance, not only in Karnataka and India, it is also a universal problem. The problem has been manifesting itself in the form of unjust socio-economic inequalities. The present report, meant to providing input for the formulation of Multi-sectoral Development Projects (MDPs) for improving the overall living conditions of the religious minorities such as Muslims, Buddhists, Christians, Jains, Sikhs, and Parsis.

The contextual relevance of MSDPs in some select peripheral villages/village clusters surrounding the three blocks, four TMCs and four CMCs is based on two important reasons: First, despite a number of measures instituted by the Government since independence in 1947, these social groups of minorities continue to constitute the locus classicus of deprivation. Second, social justice demands that on the principle of “affirmative discrimination and discriminatory policies” provided in the egalitarian constitution of India, the government is obliged to provide an enabling environment in which the deprived groups are enabled to acquire the capabilities to avail the development opportunities. And, another reason for the preferential treatment of minorities is that the inherited antecedent socio-economic inequalities are getting exacerbated by the ongoing mega process of globalisation.

In Karnataka, among the minorities, some suffer-from capability-deprivation, some from opportunity-deprivation, and some from both. This does not mean that nothing significant has been achieved in this area.

However, it does mean that what has been achieved is significant, but that which remains to be achieved is more significant.

It is contextually relevant to make reference to Sachar Committee Report. This High Level Committee on Social, Economic and Educational Status of Muslim Community in India, headed by Justice Rajinder Sachar observes: “The Indian Constitution is committed to the equality of citizens and the responsibility of the State to preserve, protect and assure the rights of the minorities in matters of language, religion and culture It has been successful in reducing poverty and improving crucial human development indicators such as level of literacy, education, and health. There are indicators, however, that not all religious communities and social groups have shared equally the benefits of the growth process”. And with a view to ensuring justice to the minorities, following the recommendations of the Sachar Committee and on the suggestion of the Government of India, the State Government of Karnataka has selected some districts in North Karnataka Region for the implementation of the Sachar Committee-recommended MSDPs during the 11th and 12th Five Year Plans. Accordingly, as a first step, the Minority Welfare Department of Karnataka entrusted the responsibility of carrying out a base-line survey of the minorities in the minority concentration villages of the three blocks – Bidar, Humnabad and Chittapur – and in the wards of the four TMCs (Haveri, Jamakhandi, Koppal and Sindhanur) and in the four CMCs (Bagalakote, Gangavathi Hosapete and Raichur) to the CSSEIP of the National Law School of India University, Bangalore. And the CSSEIP submitted its report “Multi-Sector Development Programme for Minorities in Select Districts of Karnataka: A Study of Gaps, Needs and Strategies” in the year 2015.

The present study is a thematic sequel to the above study, but with a difference. No doubt, the present study covers the same three blocks and eight urban local bodies – 4 TMCs and 4 CMCs. But it differs from the earlier study. The focus of the present study is to carry out a base-line survey of the minority concentration peripheral villages and village clusters surrounding the same three blocks and eight urban local bodies.

With these prefatory observations, let us move on to the constitutive components of this Chapter. The Chapter is split into seven sections (including the introductory section). The second section lists the objectives of the study. The matters pertaining to the identification of minority concentration villages are discussed in the third section. The fourth section deals with the identification of Gaps and the methodology adopted for it. The focus of the fifth section is on the nature, scope, importance and limitations of the study. The sixth and seventh sections deal with the methodology adopted and the chapter scheme respectively.

1.2. Objectives of the Present Study

The objectives of the present study are based on and derived from the objective of the MSDP and from the nature of the problems of the study on hand. The principal objective of MSDP in general is: “The programme aims at improving the socio-economic conditions of minorities and providing amenities to them for improving the quality of life of people and reducing imbalances in the minority concentration areas during the 12th Five Year Plan..... The objective of the scheme would be to fill the gaps in the existing schemes of the Government of India by providing additional resources and to take up non-gap-filling projects (innovative projects) for the welfare of the minorities”.

The main objective of our study, based on the core objective of MSDP, and on the basis of the development problems of minority concentration areas selected for the present study, is to identify, on the basis of the felt needs and aspirations of the minorities, the gap-filling as well as non-gap filling projects in the minority concentration villages/village clusters peripheral to the three selected blocks and eight urban local bodies. More specifically, the objectives of the present study are:

- a) to identify the peripheral villages/village clusters with a minority population of 25 per cent and above related to the three blocks selected for the present study;
- b) to identify peripheral villages/village clusters with a minority population of 25 per cent and above related to the eight urban local bodies selected for the study;
- c) to identify the felt needs and aspirations of the minorities in these selected peripheral villages and thereby to identify the gap-filling and non-gap-filling projects of development; and
- d) above all, to provide information required for the government to formulate appropriate MSDPs for bringing about perceptible improvement in the quality of life of the minorities inhabiting the selected villages and village clusters.

1.3. Identification of Minority Concentration Villages/Village Clusters

This piece of research proceeded as follows: As far as the selection of villages/village clusters is concerned, initially we gathered information and data from the CDPO Offices concerned and Census Reports.

For the three blocks – Bidar, Humnabad and Chittapur – we were able to identify 40 villages with a minority population of 25 per cent and above. They were formed into 12 clusters. Of the 12 clusters, Bidar block

has 4 clusters comprising 21 villages, Humnabad block has 3 clusters comprising 10 villages, and Chitapur block has 5 clusters comprising 9 villages.

As far as the 8 urban local bodies – 4 CMCs (Raichur, Gangavathi, Hosapete and Bagalakote) – we initially carried out survey in 46 villages (9 peripheral villages surrounding each of the 4 CMCs). But we could select only 10 villages and formed them into 4 clusters, based on the concentration of minorities ranging from 15 per cent and above instead of 25 per cent and above, for want of adequate minority population in the peripheral villages of the 4 CMCs. Of the four Clusters, each CMC has one cluster. And of the 10 villages, 3 are in Raichur, 4 in Gangavathi, 2 in Hosapete and 1 in Bagalakote.

In respect of the 4 TMCs (Haveri, Jamakhandi, Koppala and Sindhanur), we could select only 9 villages with a minority population of 15 per cent and above. Of the 9 villages, 3 are in Haveri (with a minority population of 25 per cent and above), 2 each in Koppala and Sindhanur (with a minority population between 15 and 20 per cent).

1.4. Identification of Gaps at the Village/Cluster Level

One of the important objectives of the present inquiry is to identify the nature and extent of gaps in the existing development-promoting facilities currently available to the minorities in the selected villages. The study is also expected to identify the non-gap-filling facilities (innovative projects) based on the actual needs and aspirations of the minorities. The former exercise was undertaken in the selected peripheral villages of the three blocks and eight urban local bodies with reference to the government programmes such as IAY, AWCs, Drinking Water, Health Care, Sanitation,

Schools, Classrooms, Hostels, New Courses like Computer Education and so on.

The existing gaps were identified by using the norms set by the Government of Karnataka. For example, one PHC is the ideal requirement for a population of 35,000. In cases where such norms are not available, generally the State average of the facilities concerned were considered norms for the purpose of identifying the gaps – the difference between the facilities required as per the norms and the facilities actually available.

In the latter exercise (non-gap filling or innovative projects), the required data and information were gathered by the investigators by holding formal and informal interactions with the stakeholders of MSDPs including the administrative officers who were implementing development programmes in the study area. This exercise also involved the prospective beneficiaries of MSDPs. Our investigators also held focus group discussions with the relatively knowledgeable and articulate individuals to acquire information about the new requirements (innovative projects) and the rationale behind them. The elected representatives of the related GPs, TPs, and ZPs were also included in the focus group discussions.

Apart from identifying the gap-filling and non-gap-filling exercises, our investigators identified the functional gaps in facilities, by using the participatory observation method, with a view to assessing the functionality, non-functionality and dis-functionality of the available facilities so that MSDPs can take effective measures to ensure functionality.

1.5. Nature, Scope, Importance and Limitations of the Study

The present study is basically an empirical inquiry based on the baseline survey carried out in the selected peripheral villages (not covered in the earlier study: 2015) surrounding the three blocks and eight urban

local bodies. The baseline survey has been done in such a way as to capture the socio-economic conditions of the minorities living in the selected peripheral villages. In all, the baseline survey was carried out in 59 minority concentration villages. Of which, 40 villages are related to the three blocks, and 19 to the eight urban local bodies.

Thematically, the study's focus is on the gaps - existing as well as innovative projects - which have direct as well as indirect bearing on the capabilities of the minorities, such as educational facilities, health care facilities, housing, skill-training, sanitation etc. It also identifies functional gaps in facilities.

The study claims its importance, *inter alia*, by providing the operationally useful input to the government to formulate and implement the MSDPs for improving the quality of life of the historically deprived and disadvantaged minorities.

Contextually, it is necessary to point out one limitation of the study, particularly with reference to the proportion of minority population required to be considered while selecting the villages. In the case of blocks, there is no deviation from the norm of 25 per cent and above. But it is not so in the case of urban local bodies. As far as CMCs are concerned, of the 10 villages selected, only 2 villages have a minority population of 25 per cent and above, 3 villages have a minority population between 20 and 25 per cent, and the remaining 5 villages have a minority population between 15 and 20 per cent. In the case of TMCs, of the 9 villages selected, 7 villages have a minority of 25 per cent and above, and remaining 2 have a minority population between 15 and 20 per cent.

1.6. Methodology Adopted

In this section, the general methodology adopted in the present study is discussed. The problem-specific methodology is discussed in some detail in Section 1.4.

The study has used secondary as well as primary sources. The secondary sources of data and information include the Census Reports, the reports of the Offices of the CDPOs, Anganawadi records, records of the Health Care Centres and those of the Education Offices.

Since the present work is basically a baseline survey (field-work) based inquiry, primary sources take precedence over the secondary sources. Some of the important primary sources which have gone into the report are discussed below:

- 1) The questionnaires used to gather various kinds of information from selected villages were prepared by the Government of India and were sent to us for the guidance of the researchers and investigators in the present study. However, a few modifications were made to make them contextually relevant. These formats were used to gather information necessary for preparing MSDPs. They include data on matters such as: proportion of the minority population; educational facilities; health care facilities; drinking water; housing facilities; skill training and sanitation.
- 2) Another method we employed was the participatory observation method, mainly to evaluate the functionality, non-functionality, and dysfunctionality of the existing facilities. From the point of view of the beneficiaries, it is the functionality of the facilities that matter rather than mere availability of facilities. And this information would be useful in formulating MSDPs.
- 3) Another method adopted was to gather relatively real information from the stakeholders by formal as well as informal interactions. Our investigators interacted with those official functionaries who implement MSDPs in the study area and the prospective beneficiaries of such projects.

4) Yet another method adopted was “Focus Group Discussion”. The research team defined the intent, content and the expected outcomes of the focus group discussions under the guidance of the Project Director. The focus group discussions were held with the knowledgeable and articulate persons in those villages, giving due representation to women. Second, we held such discussion with the elected representatives of the GPs, TPs and ZPs concerned. This exercise would be of use to the planners. After saying so much on Focus Group Discussion, it is pertinent to point out that the outcomes of focus group discussions have been used in finalising the survey findings.

This, in brief, is the methodology adopted in the present study. This is in addition to the problem specific methodology discussed in Section 1.4.

At this juncture, it is quite necessary to say that village-wise and cluster-wise break-ups of the data are given in the Appendix Tables that accompany this report. And the derived tables (aggregate) figure in the text of the report in different chapters.

1.7. Chapter Scheme

Keeping in view the problem of the study and its principal objectives, the report is split into six chapters:

Chapter I is introductory in nature and it strikes the key-note of the entire report. The matters such as, what is proposed to be done, how it is proposed to be done and what is the expected outcome of the inquiry are discussed. It makes the intent and content of the study clear. It also throws light on the nature, scope, importance and limitations of the study. Besides, it discusses matters pertaining to the problem-specific as well as the general methodology used in the study. Above all, it presents the Chapter design.

With a view to providing a backdrop for the present study, Chapter II makes an attempt here to give an over view of the socio-economic profile of the study region comprising three blocks, four CMCs and four TMCs.

Chapter III is devoted for the study of the socio-economic conditions of the minorities inhabiting the selected peripheral villages/clusters surrounding the three blocks, namely, Bidar, Humnabad and Chittapur. It provides the required input in respect of gap-filling and non-gap-filling aspects of development, which is necessary for formulating MSDPs.

Chapter IV content-wise, is sequel to Chapter III, but with a difference. Chapter III is concerned with the development of the peripheral villages/clusters surrounding the three blocks. Whereas, the present Chapter is concerned with the socio-economic development of the minority concentration villages surrounding the four CMCs.

Chapter V is a sequel to Chapter IV, but with a difference. The focus of Chapter IV is on the socio-economic development of the minorities inhabiting minority concentration villages surrounding the four CMCs, namely, Raichur, Gangavathi, Hosapete and Bagalakote. Whereas, the focus of the present Chapter is on the socio-economic development of minorities inhabiting the peripheral minority concentration villages surrounding the four TMCs, namely, Haveri, Jamakhandi, Koppala and Sindhanur.

Chapter VI is the concluding Chapter. Besides giving a succinct summary of the inquiry spread across the preceding five Chapters, it attempts to provide some useful suggestions for the formulation of MSDPs for the selected villages/village clusters surrounding the three blocks, four CMCs, and four TMCs.
