



Rural-Urban Partnership For Inclusive Growth In India

Amar Kumar Chaudhary

Registrar, Ranchi University, Ranchi, India

Abstract:

It is rightly appropriate that the academicians, policy makers, professionals, NGOs and the concerned public take up a serious discussion of rural-urban partnership development and explore options in forging sustainable alliance between them. Unfortunately, there is a tendency to separate ‘rural and urban’ as opposed to each other and one sector snatching away what is due to others. It is the time to recognize these two as complementary to each other and strengthen the rural-urban partnership. This paper highlights the need of rural-urban partnership for inclusive growth in India.

Keywords: *Rural-Urban Partnership Development, Sustainable Alliance, Rural-Urban Migration, Inclusive Growth.*

1.Introduction

Even after 55 years of planned economic development, there exists a wide gap between the level of development of rural and urban areas. Large masses of rural population remain undeveloped whereas the urban people have easy access to everything. This has resulted in large-scale rural urban migration causing overcrowding in big cities. Urban population which was 17.3% of the total population in 1951 has increased to 27.8% in 2001. In absolute numbers the total urban population of India was 62 million in 1951 which shot up to 285 million in 2001, recording an increase of 357%. This has created several urban problems due to over population in big cities and growth of slums. The prime factor of rural urban migration is the inadequate employment opportunities in rural sector compelling the rural people to move towards urban areas in search of livelihood. However, there are other factors which also act as the driving force of rural people to urban areas e.g. availability of roads, electricity, education, health and medical facilities etc.

The present economic policy of the Government needs revision. There is a need of serious debate regarding the merit of rural-urban partnership among the academicians, so as to provide innovative inputs for policy-making, planning and development interventions. It is worthwhile to explore the scope of integrating schemes, redefining institutions, developing innovative delivery system, resource mapping forging new alliances etc., for sustainable rural urban partnership. There is a need to review rural and urban development programmes and strengthening of institutions/instruments. Co-operative enterprises, dairy, sugar and handlooms are considered successful model of rural-urban partnership. Technology dissemination, training, quality management, infrastructure development, marketing support etc. may promote industries like handicraft, garment making, agro-processing ancillary production etc. which may be centered in village clusters and properly linked to urban centers within the framework of rural-urban partnership development. So the planners and policy makers should pay serious attention to the dominant consideration of rural-urban partnership development.

The term 'urbanization' implies the movement of people to urban areas from rural. It is a process of population concentration. It means an increasing shift from agriculture to industrial or service and distributive occupations. In brief, urbanization involves the following:-

- Urbanization involves an increase in the number of points of population concentration.

- A growth in the size of these points.
- Transfer of people from agriculture to non-agriculture occupations.

Thus, urbanization takes place mainly by three ways:-

- Natural increase in population;
- Reclassification of rural and urban place, so that some rural areas treated as urban; and
- When net rural urban migration occurs;

This net rural-urban migration has become the major component of urbanization. The simple cause of rural-urban migration is the disparity. The widening disparities between rural and urban centers will accelerate the migration to cities and rapid expansion of urban slum areas. India's urban population is expected to increase from 28% to 40% of the total population by 2020. This increasing strain hampers the country's urban infrastructure. This unplanned growth increases the urban pollution, crime and absence of the required infrastructure like access to drinking water, sanitation, roads, and footpaths for pedestrians and public spaces, parks and greenery. This makes urban life hell.

2. Inequality, Unemployment And Poverty Are Main Cause Of Urbanization

Before we take up new strategies for linking villages with urban areas, it would be meaningful to see the current trends inequality, consumption, poverty, performance of income/employment generation programme etc. at the macro level. Poverty and inequality has widened to a great extent in recent years. Poor becomes poorer and rich becomes richer. In between 1993-94 to 2000-01, top 20% of rural and urban population increases their per capita consumption by 20% and 40% respectively. In comparison to this, the rest 80% of the rural people's per capita consumption has increased by only 3%. In both rural and urban areas the poverty ratio and absolute number of poor increased significantly.

The growth of employment was 2.67% in 1993-94 whereas it fell to 1.07% between 1993-2000. However, the areas of agriculture, faced much worse sinking from 2.2% to 0.02%. The employment programmes are not performing well as in many states. There is only 50% utilization is reported in the case of S.G.S.Y. There is also enough evidence about the slow pace of PRIs, the failure of Panchayati Raj and urban local Governments in addressing poverty, inequality and regional disparity. Thus, the problem of regional

imbalance, rural-urban divide and poverty continue to be a major concern, despite nearly 50 years of economic planning over a decade of economic reforms and democratic centralization.

This could be seen by the trends of rural urban income disparity in India in Table-1 and Table-2 of urban population to total population.

Particulars	1971-71		1980-81		1993-94		1992-2000	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Share in NDP at Factor Cost(%)	62.35	37.65	58.88	41.12	54.27	45.73	48.09	51.91
Share in Population	80.22	19.78	76.88	23.12	73.51	26.49	72.53	27.47
Per Capita Current Prices (Rs.)	529	1294	1245	2888	5783	13525	10606	30217
Ratio of Urban Income to rural Income	—	2.45	—	2.32	—	2.34	—	2.85

Table 1: Trends in Rural-Urban Income Disparity in India

Source: Government of India, National Accounts Statistics 2007, CSO, New Delhi

Although a major percentage of workforce dependent on agriculture has declined in 2001, the absolute number has increased from 185 million in 1993 to 2001. The share of agriculture in the GDP declined sharply from 34.93 per cent in 1990-91 to about 18.5 per cent in 2006-07. The widening gap between GDP per worker in agriculture and non-agricultural sectors provides a clear indication of marginalization of agricultural workforce and widening gap between the rural and urban areas. The ratio is above 5 in Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu. Punjab, Kerala, West Bengal and Assam have a relatively lower magnitude of ratios. In brief, the share of rural areas in national income is now falling to a lower magnitude of ratios. In brief, the share of rural areas in national income is now falling faster than its share in population. This has led to widen the rural urban per capita income in the 1990s.

Table-1 shows trends in rural-urban income disparity in India. CSO does not compile rural and urban break up of GDP on annual basis. But it makes periodical estimation.

The latest data is available up to 1999-2000. It is significant to note that the share of rural areas in the NDP at factor cost has steeply declined from 62.35 percent in 1970-71 to 48.09 percent in 1999-2000, whereas the corresponding percentage for urban areas has remarkably increased, as is indicated by the table. Today the urban population may earn near about three fifth of the national income. Thus, in terms of generation of GDP, the center of gravity in the Indian economy has shifted from rural to urban areas, whereas the majority of people still earn their livelihood in rural areas.

If we look at the rural share in the total population, we find that over 70 percent of Indian people live in rural areas, while they get only 40 percent of national income. The table also shows the per capita differential between the rural and the urban sector. In 1990-2000, as against per capita income of Rs. 30217.00 in urban location, it was only Rs. 1066.00 in the rural location. Since 1980-81, the ratio of urban-rural per capita income has been increasing. In 1999-2000, the ratio was 2.85 indicating that the per capita income in urban location is almost three times that of the rural location.

Table-2 presented below shows large numbers of people migrating from rural areas to urban areas in search of employment. This has put great strain on the civic infrastructure of the cities leading to problems like congestion, unauthorized construction, slums, waste disposal and the like and this has also adversely affected the law and order situation. Cities have now reached their saturation limit and are unable to absorb further migration. Quality of urban life has degenerated and the entire urban system is on the verge of collapse.

India	2001	2026
City Slickers	27.8	38.2
Tamil Nadu	44.0	74.8
Maharashtra	42.4	61.0
Gujarat	37.4	53.0
Punjab	33.9	52.5
Karnataka	34.0	49.3
Haryana	28.9	46.3
Uttarakhand	25.7	37.3

TRULY RURAL:		
India	2001	2026
Himchal Pradesh	09.8	13.6
Assam	12.9	18.4
Orissa	15.0	21.2
Uttar Pradesh	20.8	27.2
Jharkhand	22.2	28.8
Rajasthan	23.4	29.1

Table 2: % of Urban Population to Total Population

Source: Census of India, 2001

3.Rural Urban Partnership For Inclusive Growth

The main attraction of rural-urban migration is business opportunities, employment, better education, training and entertainment etc. 'Rural wages' rate is very important as it becomes the cause of rural-urban migration. Excess labour supply in rural areas results into poor wage rates that act as an important push factor for wage earners to go to urban areas to earn higher wages. Unequal distribution of resource (usually land) encourages migration. The rich and the poor both migrates more than medium resource holders. However, poor migrate temporarily as rich shift permanently.

There exists a symbiotic relationship between the rural hinterland and the urban area i.e. both feed each other. The urban economy should have a two-way traffic with rural areas so that development of both the sectors reinforce each other through multiple linkage. The town should have an economic base; either independent industrial activities which promote agriculture and other types of developments in the hinterland which in their turn forever promote urban growth.

The symbiotic relationship may be further illustrated in rural-urban economic independence e.g. a good return on agriculture this year means arise in rural income which is to be spent on urban products or services like tractor, pumping set, fertilizer, education etc. which raises the income of urban, the income reaches to manufacturer who spend it on raw materials or on wages wherefrom a part of the income flows back to rural areas for raw material or in terms of wages. Thus, expenditure of one paves the way for income of another sector and hence both feed each other.

Rural and urban economics cannot be separated. They are interlinked and dependent on each other. But our urban development authorities are often ignored in it. There is a need to give weightage to urban link with rural hinterland. Purely civic issues such as those relating to the provisions of safe drinking water, solid waste disposal, drainage, sanitation, roads tend to dominate the thinking while the role of an urban centers as a focal point of regional and rural development is often overlooked. The programmes of urbanization are targeted for a particular group of urban people and neglect the larger estimated influx of rural people, so the interdependence of the two may be examined in a number of ways. Some important linkage may be grouped as demographic, economic, religious or social cultural linkage.

4. Feasible Solutions For Reducing The Disparity

The government, NGOs and other development agencies should apply two types of policies to reduce rural-urban disparities. First are of those kinds policies which strengthens the basic economic infrastructure like roads, electricity, water etc. to generate sustained income and employment that will certainly abate the undesirable flow of rural workforce to the urban areas and the second are those kinds of policies that help to raise the socio-economic status of rural population and enlarge their capability to participate actively in the development activities.

There is an urgent need for both qualitative and quantitative development in the rural areas. In quantitative form, it must be reflected in more production, more income and more employment in the form of institutional changes in the area of health, education, environment, transport and social welfare. Economic growth and equitable distribution are more effected in eliminating rural poverty.

To strengthen the rural infrastructure and to tackle this problem, former President Dr. A.P.J. Kalam has proposed the concept of PURA i.e. providing Urban Amenities in Rural Areas in the Vision 2020 Project. Its objective is to make rural areas with all facilities which urban or cities have. Then rural areas too will generate urban style employment and opportunities. For this, the following points are suggested:-

- Top priority should be given to public investment in agriculture, R & D roads extension, irrigation as it has a significant impact on the agricultural productivity;

- Farmers should get the right market from where they can receive the remunerative prices of their quality product. Government should establish a model market. It is also suggested to create a training infrastructure at the block level with a view to human capital of farmers. The farmers should be taught modern farm practices, input management and marketing of agriculture products;
- Facilities for technical up-gradation at minimum cost should be extended to cottage and village industries to improve the quality of their product and make them reasonably competitive;
- A phased programme of rural electrification should be carried out, especially in the backward districts of the country and preferably be completed within another five years and so;
- Basic urban amenities like good school for education, hospital for health and entertainment like cinema, etc. should be provided according to the requirement of PURA;
- Finally a Central place around 20-25 KM. should be pointed out and it should be developed as a semi-urban centre and facilitate all basic amenities of urban. It will help to reduce the gap between the urban and the rural

5.To Sum Up

The present economic policy of the Government needs revision. There is a need of serious debate regarding the merits of rural-urban partnership among the academicians, so as to provide innovative inputs for policy making, planning and development interventions. It is worthwhile to explore the scope of integrating schemes, redefining institutions, developing innovative delivery system, resource mapping, forging new alliances etc. for sustainable rural-urban partnership. There is a need to review of rural and urban development programmes and strengthen institutions/instruments. Co-operative enterprises, dairy, sugar and handlooms are considered successful models of rural-urban partnership. Technology dissemination, training, quality management, infrastructure development, marketing support etc. may promote industries like handicraft, garment making, agro-processing, ancillary production etc. which may be

centered in village clusters and properly linked to urban centers within the framework of rural-urban partnership development. So the planners and policy makers should pay serious attention to the dominant consideration of rural-urban partnership developments.

6.Reference

1. P.N. Sankaran (2004). Rural and Urban Development–A Partnership :, Kurukshekra, vol. 53, No. 2.
2. J.C. Pant (2005). Process of Urbanization and Rural-Urban Linkage – Southern Economist, Vol. 42, No. 22.
3. Eldridge, Hope Tisdale (1956). The Process of Urbanization: J.J., Spendgler and O.O. Duncan (ed): Demographic Analysis, Glenco III, Free Press, p.338.
4. Todaro, M.P.(1971). Education and Rural Urban Migration, Theoretical Constructs and Empirical Evidence from Kenya (Mimeo), P.U.
5. Saxena D.P.(1977). Rural – Urban Migration in India, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, p. 108.