



How Long Would the Dalits Continue to be Deprived of Their Due Shares?

A Case Study on the Special Component Plan
Budgets in Rajasthan

Subrata Dutta

Budget Analysis Rajasthan Centre (BARC)

BARC Working Paper No. 6
December 2007

How Long Would the Dalits Continue to be Deprived of Their Due Shares?

A Case Study on the Special Component Plan Budgets in Rajasthan

Subrata Dutta



Budget Analysis Rajasthan Centre (BARC)

P-1, Tilak Marg, C-Scheme, Jaipur - 302 005

Tel. / Fax : (0141) 238 5254

E-mail : info@barcjaipur.org

Website : www.barcjaipur.org

© Budget Analysis Rajasthan Centre

First Edition : December, 2007

Published by : Budget Analysis Rajasthan Centre

Printed at : Kalpana Offset,
Sanganer-Jaipur M. : 98281-50395

Content

1. Who are the Dalits?	4
2. What is Special Component Plan (SCP)?	7
3. The Data	8
4. Anomalies in Funding	8
5. The Budget Heads under Which SCP Allocations are Missing	13
6. Diversion of SCP Funds	13
7. Attempting to Kill SCP?	14
8. References	16

Rajasthan has been allocating/spending only around 2 per cent of its Plan Size for the dalits through the Special Component Plan (SCP) while SCP was formulated to ensure 17 per cent allocation of the total Plan Size for the dalits, since there are 17 per cent dalit population in the state. The SCP norm is grossly violated in Rajasthan.

1. Who are the Dalits?

For simplification, most of the people often refer to Scheduled Caste (SC) people as dalit and Scheduled Tribe (ST) people as adivasi. But some people prefer to term both of them as dalit as the term broadly includes the whole set of [historically] deprived population. Our objective in this paper is not to focus on the debate relating to the definitions of dalits or the distinctions between dalits and adivasis. But at the outset we can try to develop a simplified and very brief perception about dalits based on the existing literature. Let us now confine to that and gradually we will move to examine public expenditures for them.

The Aryans, a set of highly self-conscious tribes sharing a common language and religion, began their invasion of India from the north-west in around 1500 B.C. For centuries they remained in seemingly constant conflict with the indigenous peoples, whom they looked down upon because they thought they were culturally superior to the indigenous people and also shunned the local people because they considered the indigenous people ritually unclean (Michael, 1999). But the Dravidian civilisation was not an inferior one at all; rather, according to several leading historians, the Indus Valley Civilization, or the Harappan Culture, which was developed by the indigenous Dravidians, formed the earliest urban civilization on the Indian sub-continent, and one of the earliest in the world. Some tried to preach and prove that the Indus Valley Civilization had been developed by the Aryans. But they were not successful to prove their point on several grounds. For example, nomadic Aryans' were pastoral, agricultural people who lived in villages whereas well-established urban foundation (e.g. houses of brick equipped with adequate sanitation, bathrooms, wells, and other amenities) had been found in the ruins of the Indus Valley Civilization. The metals which the Indo-Aryans used in the time of the Rigveda are gold and copper or bronze; but a little later, in the time of the Yajurveda and Atharvaveda, these metals are supplemented by silver and iron. Among the Indus people silver is commoner than gold, and utensils and vessels are sometimes made of stone -- a relic of the Neolithic Age (New Stone Age) -- as well as of copper and

bronze. There was no sign of iron. See, for more evidences, Marshall (1973: 109-112). Aryans had come to the Indus Valley and slaughtered indigenous Dravidians. Michael (1999) stated that once conquered by superior military technology, some of these indigenous peoples moved to regions as yet unoccupied by the Aryans, while others lived as separate and inferior castes within Aryan-dominated society. People who had started living around jungles (unconquered by the Aryans) depending on hunting and forest produce are called adivasi and those who had remained within Aryan society are called dalit. While the former was totally isolated for ages from the Aryan society, the latter was denied access to the mainstream socio-cultural-religious life of the Aryans. It was only in the period between 600 B.C. and 200 A.D. when untouchability appeared in India (Michael, 1999).

The Hindu varna system clearly assigned different works to different social groups. Brahmins were allowed to acquire education and knowledge; Kshatriyas were assigned to run administration and take part in wars, Vaishyas were allowed to accomplish trade and business; and Shudras were given the task to provide the above three groups with menial services. The Shudras had been deprived of the three basic qualities of human life -- developing intellectuality through gathering knowledge and information, acquiring ruling right as well as administrative power, and accumulating wealth (Gupta, 1988).

Since a section of the Indian population remained deprived of many basic things of life they needed to be properly identified and listed so that some specific developmental programmes could be formulated for, and routed towards, them. A few castes and tribes in each state, generally grouped as "depressed classes" were listed in a 'Schedule' for the first time in 1930, so that the government could have an accurate estimate of their numbers and make provisions for educational and employment facilities for them. But it was only in 1950 that separate lists were drawn up for 'Castes' and 'Tribes' which were later modified after the

Table 1: Literacy Rate, Dropout Rate and Poverty Rate of SC Population in India

Literacy rate		Dropout rate before matriculation		Population living below the poverty line (in %)	
Dalit	Adivasi	Dalit	Adivasi	Dalit	Adivasi
30.1	23.8	49.4	62.5	41.5	49.5

Source: Maharatna (2005), cited in Guha (2007)

Reorganisation in 1956. The castes and tribes included in the 'Schedule' have come to be commonly known as 'Scheduled' castes and 'Scheduled' tribes respectively. Ramachandra Guha (2007) has recently written that the adivasis are even more deprived than the dalits. This is quite true but Dalit's situation has also not reached the satisfactory level (see Table 1). In this paper, we would like to confine ourselves to a question whether or not the dalits have been getting their due share through public spending, considering the fact that the dalits have been deprived of basic things in India for ages.

Among dalit population, how many people are looking for jobs, or, in other words, how many people are unemployed? Let us take a look at the Census 2001 data. If we consider the dalit population of age group of 5 to 80+ years, then we find that only 6 per cent of dalits are unemployed or, in census term, "available for work". How reliable is this 6 per cent unemployment figure? To examine this, first we have to check the Census definitions of "workers". The Census has divided the whole SC population of workers in three broad categories: main workers, marginal workers and non-workers. The workers who had worked for the major part of the reference period (i.e. 6 months or more) were termed as main workers. The workers who had not worked for the major part of the reference period (i.e. 6 months or more) were termed as marginal workers. And a person who did not work at all during the reference period was treated as a non-worker. Note that, according to the Census, unemployed people were found only in the last two categories. Since a portion of the marginal workers were not looking for work all through a year and, also, a portion of the non-workers

were not looking for work at all, only a fraction of them can be termed as unemployed. For example, some marginal workers, who just want to be engaged in work for a particular season only, cannot be called as unemployed, and similarly some non-workers who are not eligible for work (e.g. infants, some students, pensioners etc.) and who are voluntarily not willing to work outside the home (e.g. some housewives) cannot also be called unemployed. Thus, the total number of unemployed population accounts for only 6 per cent of the total SC population. Up to this, there is no problem in understanding the proportion of unemployed people among the total number of SC people in Rajasthan. But, now the question arises is: what is the break-down of the 'main worker' group? We have further details of the 'main worker' group, which have been furnished in Table 2. The data, although little dated, are useful to understand the employment situation of the SC main worker group. Cultivators and agricultural labourers together account for about 69 per cent of the total SC main workers in Rajasthan. Landholding SC household members have been considered as main workers, irrespective of the size of land and accessibility to irrigation. But this is not a correct categorisation since we are unable to know as to how many dalit cultivators are small and marginal farmers and whether they have access to irrigation. Not surprisingly, most of the landholding SC households are small and marginal farmers in Rajasthan. It is worth mentioning that small and marginal farmers are hardly able to earn their living for the whole year from their small piece of land in the present competitive world where farming has already become non-viable and non-

profitable business. Moreover, disguised unemployment is a common feature that is attached to the small landholding household.

Let us now critically view the Census concept of 'main worker' from another angle. As mentioned above, according to the Census, a person is a main worker who had worked at least for 6 months in the reference period, i.e., in a particular year. Let us assume that there were some people, if not many, who were found to be working only for 6 months. Is 6-month work enough for a person to maintain her/his cost of living for a year? If not, can we call them 'main worker'? If return from farming is very nominal, or if wage is very low, then it might be difficult for a person to maintain the subsistence level with the earning from six month-work. Even the small

and marginal farmers might face trouble in maintaining the cost of living if they work for the whole year in their farm and get a marginal return at the end of the day. We did not consider natural calamities, such as drought, yet and their consequences. There are several questions that need to be addressed while defining 'main worker'. For example, a 'main worker' was probably not asked [by the Census] a question such as whether s/he was in need of work for the rest of the year when s/he had no work, considering the fact that six-month work is enough for her/him for the whole year. Hence, the legitimacy of showing 6 per cent unemployment figure might be questioned or, rather challenged, since the actual picture in the reality is not better than what may be termed as gloomy.

Table 2: Per Cent Distribution of SC Main Workers, 1991 Census (Selected States and Union Territories)

States / Union Territories	Total Main Workers	Cultivators	Agricultural Laborers	Livestock, Forestry, Fisheries & Allied Activities	Mining & Quarrying	Manufacturing, Processing, Household Industries	Manufacturing, Processing, Other Than Household Industries	Construction	Trade & Commerce	Transport, Storage & Communication	Other Services
Andhra Pradesh	100	27.74	40.87	1.77	0.87	3.36	5.47	1.65	6.69	2.79	8.79
Haryana	100	38.77	19	0.95	0.12	1.53	9.03	2.62	8.63	3.25	16.10
Himachal Pradesh	100	63.25	3.30	2.47	0.26	1.43	3.71	4.85	4.40	1.93	14.40
Karnataka	100	34.21	28.92	3.57	0.67	1.86	8.84	2.47	7.98	2.63	8.85
Orissa	100	44.31	28.68	1.86	0.98	3.13	3.51	0.87	5.38	1.74	9.54
Punjab	100	31.44	23.82	0.81	0.01	1.33	10.95	2.56	10.85	3.83	14.70
Rajasthan	100	58.80	10	1.80	1.03	2.00	5.45	2.42	6.42	2.39	9.69
Tamil Nadu	100	24.84	34.64	2.03	0.30	3.52	10.51	2.15	8.68	3.09	10.24
Uttar Pradesh	100	53.27	18.94	0.72	0.08	2.41	5.34	1.23	6.17	1.86	9.98
West Bengal	100	28.40	24.56	2.75	0.78	3.91	12.06	1.85	10.72	4.22	10.75
Bihar	100	43.58	37.13	0.39	1.25	1.75	2.26	0.63	4.00	1.28	7.72
Madhya Pradesh	100	51.75	23.51	1.39	0.89	2.41	4.40	1.56	4.77	1.70	7.62
Tripura	100	38.09	23.58	2.32	0.29	1.42	3.52	1.47	7.68	2.77	19.06
Chandigarh	100	1.03	0.74	2.65	0.04	0.20	17.74	9.88	21.37	7.11	39.24
Delhi	100	1.12	0.85	0.64	0.24	1.41	23.22	7.80	23.90	8.30	32.52
Average Percentage	100	36.04	21.23	1.74	0.52	2.11	8.40	2.93	9.18	3.26	14.61

Source: National Level Evaluation Study on the Implementation of SCP for SCs, National Commission for SC & ST, Government of India, 2005, p.15.

As a whole, economic conditions of the dalits are not remarkably good. They are also unable to take full advantage of the reservation policy of the government as far as job reservation is concerned, unless they are provided with proper education and health services, among other supports. Public support is necessary.

From this perspective, the present study focuses on the government funds that have been channelled for socioeconomic development of the dalits only and examines whether the allocated funds have been spent for the specific purpose or diverted to the benefit of the general caste people. Special Component Plan (SCP) and Tribal Sub-Plan (TSP) are the two main channels through which budgets for dalits and adivasis respectively are routed. This study presents the case of Rajasthan with regard to the SCP (while fund-flow through the TSP can also be an important subject of study but we are not addressing that in this paper).

2. What is Special Component Plan (SCP)?

The Government of India started a scheme in the year 1979 entitled 'Special Component Plan' (SCP) as a strategy for achieving the objective of overall development of the Scheduled Caste (SC) population and to uplift and raise their standard of living -- especially above the poverty line -- in the country. The principal theme of the SCP is to allocate funds at least in the proportion of the SC population to the state's total population. For example, SC population in Rajasthan constitutes 17 per cent of the total population in the state and therefore each department is required to allocate and spend 17 per cent of its total *plan size* for the SC people through the SCP. Note that, according to the Census 2001, the total population of SC in Rajasthan is 96,94,462.

There is a nodal department in each state which is responsible for coordinating the implementation of the SCP. In Rajasthan, the Department of Social Welfare is the nodal department, which is in charge of looking after the implementation of the SCP.

In most of the states in our country, the SCP model has not been properly followed by the departments of the governments. Rajasthan is not an exception. Most of the departments of the Rajasthan Government have been showing great apathy in spending money under the SCP.

In a certain government document (Rajasthan Budget Book, Volume 4B, 2007-08), the SCP allocation figures show marginal funding anomalies which can be depicted as negligible anomalies. For example, as we see in Table 3, 15.6 per cent funds of the total plan-size have been allocated for SCP in 2007-08. The picture is not so different in the previous years too. But when we critically examine the individual head-wise budget allocations and expenditures we find huge anomalies there. We will show this into detail but, before that, let us briefly describe the data sources we are using in this study.

Table 3: Estimated Plan Size 2007-08

Rs. in lakh

Sl. No.	Areas of Planning	Estimated State Plan, 2007-08	Estimated SCP, 2007-08	Share of SCP in the State Plan
1.	Agriculture and allied services	26959.92	3784.64	14.0%
2.	Rural development	69435.66	8780.02	12.6%
3.	Special area programme	4007.01	683.60	17.1%
4.	Irrigation and flood control	99769.28	13161.73	13.2%
5.	Electricity and power	532080.02	91447.53	17.2%
6.	Industry and minerals	16409.02	397.12	2.4%
7.	Transportation	81589.06	10522.53	12.9%
8.	Scientific services	270	0.00	0.0%
9.	Social and community services	300999.73	49161.02	16.3%
10.	Economic services	20244	2291	11.3%
11.	Social services	5122.81	0.00	0.0%
12.	Total	1156886.51	180229.19	15.6%

Source: Rajasthan Budget Book, Volume 4B, 2007-08

3. The Data

The data of total plan size and SCP are available in Volume 4B of Rajasthan Budget Books. Table 3, as presented above, has been taken from this volume. But this data need to be crosschecked further to examine if the government has really allocated about 16 per cent of the plan size for the dalits in 2007-08. For verification, we have used budget-headwise data that have been taken from several other volumes of the Budget Books. For example, volumes of the revenue expenditures and capital expenditures have been thoroughly scanned during investigation. The total “Plan Size” data are also available in a government budget document called “Budget Study” which is published every year. However, the anomalies we found are presented in the following part of this paper.

4. Anomalies in Funding

The public funds are channeled through three services: economic services, social services and general services. Economic activities in the economy are encouraged through spending on economic services. For example, if agriculture, animal husbandry, irrigation, large industry, rural industry, rural development, cooperatives etc. are promoted by the government, size and/or number of economic activities may enhance in the economy and, in turn, there may be some improvement in the quality of life of the people through employment generation and also an increase in government revenue. Spending on social services gives an impetus to the productivity of the people by improving their health/nutrition as well as educational status. Social security gives relief to many people (e.g. elderly people, widows, disabled people etc.) who are in difficult position to find work, or physically unable to work as well. General services include services provided for the maintenance of the general organ of the government like State Legislative Assembly, law and order, judicial administration, Public Service Commission etc. Expenditures under

general services are called non-development expenditures, whereas expenditures under social and economic services are called development expenditures. In the following, we will mainly concentrate in social and economic expenditures and see how much share the dalits are receiving through the budgets.

As per Table 4, the share of the SCP in the plan size of the economic services in 2007-08 is only 0.97 per cent. The share of the SCP in the plan size of the social services in 2007-08 accounts for 3.43 per cent (see Table 5). And the share of the SCP in the total plan size of the 2007-08 budgets is just 1.76 per cent (see Table 6).¹ From Table 6 it is clear that the 2007-08 percentage figure is the lowest among the last several years. In Table 6, we have shown two different figures for SCP shares in selected years. Why did we make two different calculations for each year? In Tables 4 and 5, we have calculated SCP shares on the basis of combined “Plan” and “Centrally Sponsored Schemes” (CSS) data because we did not have the “Plan Size” figure for each separate budget head. In the budget statements of some states in India the term 'Plan' is self explanatory, while in Rajasthan Plan Size is *almost* equivalent to the combined 'Plan' and 'CSS'. In order to remove confusion, we show in Table 6 that in aggregate 'Plan Size' is almost equivalent to Plan *plus* CSS (see the two data rows in Table 6 and compare them with each other). The exact total “Plan Size” figure for the state for each year is available in several budget documents (for Table 6, we have used a document called “Budget Study”). To compare the SCP shares, we have presented two measurements in Table 6 -- one based on the combined “Plan” and “CSS” figures and the other based on the exact total “Plan Size” figures. Now, see that the SCP shares calculated in the two methods do negligibly differ from each other. This confirms that the “Plan Size” is almost equivalent to the Plan *plus* CSS estimates or expenditures. This also confirms that our 'Plan Outlay' figures presented in Tables 4 and 5 (calculated based on the Plan *plus* CSS figures) and the corresponding SCP shares are valid and legitimate. But the sectoral and total SCP shares

¹This total plan size includes expenditures on general services too.

presented in Table 3 are quite misleading as they do not resemble with that of Tables 4 and 5. The government shows us an illusive picture of SCP through Table 3 while our own estimates presented in Tables 4 and 5 (based on official budget data) try to offer somewhat actual picture.

**Table 4: Budget Head-wise Expenditures (Revenue and Capital)
under the Special Component Plan in Economic Services, 2002-03 to 2007-08**

Rs. in thousand

Economic Services	2002-03 AE			2003-04 AE			2004-005 AE			2005-006 AE			2006-007 RE			2007-008 BE		
	Plan Outlay	SCP	% of SCP in Plan Outlay	Plan Outlay	SCP	% of SCP in Plan Outlay	Plan Outlay	SCP	% of SCP in Plan Outlay	Plan Outlay	SCP	% of SCP in Plan Outlay	Plan Outlay	SCP	% of SCP in Plan Outlay	Plan Outlay	SCP	% of SCP in Plan Outlay
Crop Husbandry (Revenue)	425090	44890	10.56%	450268	63866	14.18%	548998	70871	12.91%	2447230	147812	6.04%	1550119	194832	12.57%	1532865	259065	16.90%
Crop Husbandry (Capital)	0	0	0.00%	1279	0	0.00%	6356	0	0.00%	75339	0	0.00%	29850	0	0.00%	49877	0	0.00%
Revenue + Capital	425090	44890	10.56%	451547	63866	14.14%	555354	70871	12.76%	2522569	147812	5.86%	1579969	194832	12.33%	1582742	259065	16.37%
Soil and Water Conservation (Revenue)										447253	0	0.00%	659238	0	0.00%	613916	1	0.00%
Soil and Water Conservation (Capital)										163294	0	0.00%	222547	0	0.00%	127859	1	0.00%
Revenue + Capital										610547	0	0.00%	881785	0	0.00%	741775	2	0.00%
Animal Husbandry (Revenue)	57615	0	0.00%	87778	5949	6.78%	149620	10554	7.05%	173934	21721	12.49%	211063	25000	11.84%	215696	25000	11.59%
Animal Husbandry (Capital)	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1580	0	0.00%	18897	0	0.00%	14475	0	0.00%
Revenue + Capital	57615	0	0.00%	87778	5949	6.78%	149620	10554	7.05%	175514	21721	12.38%	229960	25000	10.87%	230171	25000	10.86%
Fisheries (Revenue)	7542	0	0.00%	1605	45	2.80%	4365	0	0.00%	7829	0	0.00%	14659	350	2.39%	12300	400	3.25%
Fisheries (Capital)	0	0	0.00%	800	0	0.00%	2890	0	0.00%	3486	0	0.00%	3575	0	0.00%	4500	0	0.00%
Revenue + Capital	7542	0	0.00%	2405	45	1.87%	7255	0	0.00%	11315	0	0.00%	18234	350	1.92%	16800	400	2.38%
Forestry and Wild Life (Revenue)																		
Forestry										234577	0	0.00%	276823	0	0.00%	363790	0	0.00%
Environmental forestry and wild life										78556	0	0.00%	390391	0	0.00%	496592	1	0.00%
Total (Revenue)										313133	0	0	667214	0	0	860382	1	0.00%
Forestry and Wild Life (Capital)										781233	0	0.00%	608256	0	0.00%	330549	5002	1.51%
Revenue + Capital										1094366	0	0.00%	1275470	0	0.00%	1190931	5003	0.42%
Other Rural Development Programmes (Revenue)	2536964	0	0.00%	2419402	0	0.00%	4168735	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	1501	0	0.00%
Other Rural Development Programmes (Capital)	1721513	79179	4.60%	2266959	312572	13.79%	2290475	315327	13.77%	2467169	398800	16.16%	2763952	484900	17.54%	1395008	239246	17.15%
Revenue + Capital	4258477	79179	1.86%	4686361	312572	6.67%	6459210	315327	4.88%	2467169	398800	16.16%	2763953	484900	17.54%	1396509	239246	17.13%
Other Special Area Programmes (Revenue)										0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	1501	0	0.00%
Other Special Area Programmes (Capital)										538730	0	0.00%	730436	0	0.00%	454200	59940	13.20%
Revenue + Capital										538730	0	0.00%	730437	0	0.00%	455701	59940	13.15%
Special Programme for Rural Development (Only Revenue, no Capital budget)	347976	16623	4.78%	592628	33526	5.66%												
Rural Employment(Only Revenue, no Capital bud.)	279005	132047	47.33%	247920	124293	50.13%												
Petroleum (Only Revenue, no Capital budget)										3256	0	0.00%	4233	0	0.00%	6023	1	0.02%
Village and Small Industries (Revenue)	29800	0	0.00%	76163	0	0.00%	85509	0	0.00%	171252	0	0.00%	168174	1	0.00%	164603	502	0.30%
Village and Small Industries (Capital)	0	0	0.00%	2580	0	0.00%	19670	0	0.00%									
Revenue + Capital	0	0	0.00%	78743	0	0.00%	105179	0	0.00%	171252	0	0.00%	168174	1	0.00%	164603	502	0.30%

to be continued on next page

Industry (Only Revenue, no Capital budget)	125392	904	0.72%	165284	841	0.51%	102928	808	0.79%	119111	953	0.80%	192829	923	0.48%	191243	1375	0.72%
Census Survey and Statistics (Only Revenue)	29800									46184	0	0.00%	26824	0	0.00%	40414	1	0.00%
Major Irrigation (Revenue)	92934	0								0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
Major Irrigation (Capital)	6096228	32328	0.53%							6423308	0	0.00%	5009408		0.00%	5978172	7	0.00%
Revenue + Capital	6189162	32328	0.52%							6423308	0	0.00%	5009408	0	0.00%	5978172	7	0.00%
Minor Irrigation (Revenue)										11361	0		6581			2501		
Minor Irrigation (Capital)										2005053	0	0	1676091	0	0	1703606	1	0.00%
Revenue + Capital										2016414	0	0.00%	1682672	0	0.00%	1706107	1	0.00%
Non-Ferrous Mining and Metallurgical Industries (Revenue)	2481	0		162	0	0	102	0	0.00%	548	0	0	895	0	0	1300	0	0.00%
Non-Ferrous Mining and Metallurgical Industries (Capital)	1692	0	0.00%	107014	0	0.00%	14028	0	0.00%	13990	0	0.00%	48105	1	0.00%	49700	1	0.00%
Revenue + Capital	4173	0	0.00%	107176	0	0.00%	14130	0	0.00%	14538	0	0	49000	1	0.00%	51000	1	0.00%
TOTALS OF THE ABOVE BUDGET HEADS	11731412	305971	2.61%	6419842	541092	8.43%	7393676	397560	5.38%	16214273	569286	3.51%	14612948	706007	4.83%	13752191	590544	4.29%
ECONOMIC SERVICES TOTAL (In this total, the plan outlay under the Economic Services not only includes the above-mentioned budget heads but also the other heads that did not allocate funds for the SCP)	69386193	305971	0.44%	30257905	541092	1.79%	34213065	397560	1.16%	41840721	569286	1.36%	45018161	706007	1.57%	61112816	590544	0.97%

Note: AE = actual expenditure, RE = revised estimate, BE = budget estimate

Source: Rajasthan Budget Book, Volumes 2D and 3A, various years

**Table 5: Budget Head-wise Expenditures (Revenue and Capital)
under the Special Component Plan in Social Services, 2002-03 to 2007-08**

Rs. in thousand

Social Services	2002-03 AE			2003-04 AE			2004-005 AE			2005-006 AE			2006-007 RE			2007-008 BE		
	Plan Outlay	SCP	% of SCP in Plan Outlay	Plan Outlay	SCP	% of SCP in Plan Outlay	Plan Outlay	SCP	% of SCP in Plan Outlay	Plan Outlay	SCP	% of SCP in Plan Outlay	Plan Outlay	SCP	% of SCP in Plan Outlay	Plan Outlay	SCP	% of SCP in Plan Outlay
General Education (Revenue)																		
Primary Education	1315014	0		2088590	29	0.00%	2911012	0	0.00%	4628656	0	0.00%	4150334	1	0.00%	3452488	3001	0.09%
Secondary / Higher Secondary	48351	0		202593	14135	6.98%	548421	339	0.06%	710340	323	0.05%	321900	1470	0.46%	298901	4509	1.51%
Higher Education	32923	0		96571	364	0.38%	73832	0	0.00%	140484	400	0.28%	175204	400	0.23%	149958	600	0.40%
Adult Education	2271	0		3367		0.00%	105855	0	0.00%	88851	0	0.00%	106903	0	0.00%	102100	10081	9.87%
Advancement of languages	12916	0		12964		0.00%	20417	0	0.00%	19730	0	0.00%	33407	1	0.00%	17809	1800	10.11%
Other (general)	84374	0		100946		0.00%	93137	0	0.00%	114244	0	0.00%	185710	0	0.00%	12940	0	0.00%
Total (Revenue)	1495849	0	0.00%	2505031	14528	0.58%	3752674	339	0.01%	5702305	723	0.01%	4973458	1872	0.04%	4034196	19991	0.50%
General Education (Capital)	188382	0		161317	0	0.00%	116677	0		230867	0	0.00%	377176	0	0.00%	393602	0	0.00%
Revenue + Capital	1684231	0	0.00%	2666348	14528	0.54%	3869351	339	0.01%	5933172	723	0.01%	5350634	1872	0.03%	4427798	19991	0.45%
Technical Education (Revenue)	17951	0	0.00%	16738	0	0.00%	27002	0	0.00%	45112	0	0.00%	45002	1	0.00%	68006	2	0.00%
Technical Education (Capital)	4500	0	0.00%	12533	0	0.00%	20836	0	0.00%	148136	0	0.00%	231699	0	0.00%	149898	0	0.00%
Revenue + Capital	22451	0	0.00%	29271	0	0.00%	47838	0	0.00%	193248	0	0.00%	276701	1	0.00%	217904	2	0.00%
Art and Culture (Revenue)										22847	0	0.00%	73101	0	0.00%	48371	1	0.00%

to be continued on next page

Art and Culture (Capital)										19507	0	0.00%	60990	0	0.00%	140200	0	0.00%
Revenue + Capital										42354	0	0.00%	134091	0	0.00%	188571	1	0.00%
Medical and Public Health (Revenue)																		
Urban health services - Allopathic	29990	0		118582	0	0.00%	311029	0	0.00%	170697	0	0.00%	240396	1	0.00%	279063	1	0.00%
Urban health services (homoeopathy, Ayurveda etc.)	59541	817		20421	3265	15.99%	32720	934	2.85%	79165	1304	1.65%	222915	3300	1.48%	68198	3300	4.84%
Rural health services - Allopathic	400749	0		433335	0	0.00%	434639	0	0.00%	489474	0	0.00%	546558	0	0.00%	219353	0	0.00%
Rural health services (homoeopathy, Ayurveda etc.)	9135	0		13341		0.00%	8613	0	0.00%	18704	0	0.00%	28797	0	0.00%	37720	0	0.00%
Medical education, training and research	556	0		1006		0.00%	8203	0	0.00%	72883	0	0.00%	65084	0	0.00%	97202	6	0.01%
Public health	198532	0		189627		0.00%	268546	0	0.00%	478011	0	0.00%	858488	0	0.00%	1645471	0	0.00%
Total (Revenue)	698503	817	0	776312	3265	0.42%	1063750	934	0.09%	1308934	1304	0.10%	1962238	3301	0.17%	2347007	3307	0.14%
Medical and Public Health (Capital)	140307	0	0	192012	0	0.00%	32914	0	0.00%	656421	0	0.00%	794725	0	0.00%	552415	0	0.00%
Revenue + Capital	838810	817	0.10%	968324	3265	0.34%	1096664	934	0.09%	1965355	1304	0.07%	2756963	3301	0.12%	2899422	3307	0.11%
Family Welfare (Revenue)										1325229	0	0.00%	1673107	0	0.00%	2203607	2	0.00%
Family Welfare (Capital)										0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	12419	0	0.00%
Revenue + Capital										1325229	0	0.00%	1673107	0	0.00%	2216026	2	0.00%
Welfare of Scheduled Caste (SC), Scheduled Tribe (ST) and Other Backward Class (OBC) (Revenue)																		
Welfare of SC	459316	142599	31.05%	703987	202716	28.80%	613372	312172	50.89%	700371	432675	61.78%	1169091	641056	54.83%	1040823	656322	63.06%
Welfare of ST	230798	0	0.00%	328022	0	0.00%	766507	0	0.00%	630304		0.00%	979061	0	0.00%	932865	0	0.00%
Welfare of OBC	716	0	0.00%	23159	0	0.00%	40855	0	0.00%	44744		0.00%	47450	0	0.00%	166207	0	0.00%
Other (general)	0	0	--	0	0	--	0	0	--	350		0.00%	1500	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
Total (Revenue)	690830	142599	20.64%	1055168	202716	19.21%	1420734	312172	21.97%	1375769	432675	31.45%	2197102	641056	29.18%	2139895	656322	30.67%
Welfare of SC, ST and OBC (Capital)	473396	135018	28.52%	550153	200211	36.39%	488501	144834	29.65%	554786	84402	15.21%	948747	162822	17.16%	908361	151805	16.71%
Revenue + Capital	1164226	277617	23.85%	1605321	402927	25.10%	1909235	457006	23.94%	1930555	517077	26.78%	3145849	803878	25.55%	3048256	808127	26.51%
Labour and Employment (Revenue)																		
Labour										2323	0		3800	0		4647	1	0.02%
Employment services										5751	0		5031	0		3999	450	11.25%
Training										9401	0		27690	0		36078	1	0.00%
Total (Only Revenue, no Capital budget)										17475	0	0.00%	36521	0	0.00%	44724	452	1.01%
Social Security and Welfare (Revenue)										299143	0	0.00%	1260347	2	0.00%	768490	2	0.00%
Social Security and Welfare (Capital)										57615	0	0.00%	103903	0	0.00%	90018	0	0.00%
Revenue + Capital										356758	0	0.00%	1364250	2	0.00%	858508	2	0.00%
Nutrition (Revenue)	2027080	296370	14.62%	2295854	319396	13.91%	2416932	352830	14.60%	2547356	272112	10.68%	3179105	502300	15.80%	3913244	570500	14.58%
Nutrition (Capital)	92309	0		0	0	--	7540	0	0.00%	105593	0	0.00%	338929	0	0.00%	175506	0	0.00%
Revenue + Capital	2119389	296370	13.98%	2295854	319396	13.91%	2424472	352830	14.55%	2652949	272112	10.26%	3518034	502300	14.28%	4088750	570500	13.95%
Water supply and sanitation (Revenue)	56009	0	0.00%	51881	0	0.00%	95601	0	0.00%	10328	0	0.00%	127206	0	0.00%	7990	0	0.00%
Water supply and sanitation (Capital)	5855278	16691	0.29%	5566681	67825	1.22%	6096228	26493	0.43%	7882068	44979	0.57%	14026271	40000	0.29%	17046622	40000	0.23%
Revenue + Capital	5911287	16691	0.28%	5618562	67825	1.21%	6191829	26493	0.43%	7892396	44979	0.57%	14153477	40000	0.28%	17046622	40000	0.23%
Urban Development (Revenue)										620226	0	0.00%	1296232	0	0.00%	1252242	0	0.00%
Urban Development (Capital)										7284879	0	0.00%	9758102	0	0.00%	5373501	2	0.00%
Revenue + Capital										7905105	0	0.00%	11054334	0	0.00%	6625743	2	0.00%
TOTALS OF THE ABOVE BUDGET HEADS	11740394	591495	5.04%	13183680	807941	6.13%	15539389	837602	5.39%	30214596	836195	2.77%	43463961	1351354	3.11%	41662324	1442386	3.46%
SOCIAL SERVICES TOTAL (In this total, the plan outlay under the Social Services not only includes the above-mentioned budget heads but also the other heads that did not allocate funds for the SCP)	19153525	591495	3.09%	22426904	807941	3.60%	26483730	837602	3.16%	30522095	836195	2.74%	43955293	1351354	3.07%	42069081	1442386	3.43%

Note: AE = actual expenditure, RE = revised estimate, BE = budget estimate

Source: Rajasthan Budget Book, Volumes 2C and 3A, various years

Table 6: Overall Shares of SCP in the State Plan in Two Different Methods (for selected years)

Rs. in thousand

State Plan and SCP in Two Different Methods	2002-03 AE			2003-04 AE			2004-005 AE			2005-006 AE			2006-007 RE			2007-008 BE		
	State Plan	SCP	% of SCP in the State Plan	State Plan	SCP	% of SCP in the State Plan	State Plan	SCP	% of SCP in the State Plan	State Plan	SCP	% of SCP in the State Plan	State Plan	SCP	% of SCP in the State Plan	State Plan	SCP	% of SCP in the State Plan
State Plan Size = Plan + CSS*; SCP ⇒ summation of the budget head-wise SCP values	42286602	897466	2.12%	53481552	1322033	2.47%	61624643	1235162	2.00%	83646162	1405481	1.68%	90683174	2057361	2.27%	103997657	2032930	1.95%
State Plan Size ⇒ as presented in a Govt. Document called "Budget Study"; SCP ⇒ as same as it is in the above row	44310700	897466	2.0%	60443800	1322033	2.19%	65905500	1235162	1.87%	76998300	1405481	1.83%	87556800	2057361	2.35%	115688651	2032930	1.76%

Note: *Plan and CSS each includes both the revenue and capital expenditures under the three services such as economic services, social services and general services.

Source: Rajasthan Budget Book (Volumes 2C, 2D, 3A); and "Budget Study", Govt. of Rajasthan, various years.

In economic services, only through two budget heads about 17 per cent funds have been allocated in 2007-08 (see Table 5). (While observing the SCP shares, we look at the figures that include both the revenue and capital expenditures under each budget head).

They are 'crop husbandry' and 'other rural development programmes'. But these shares represent the estimated shares for 2007-08 and there is no assurance that this will not fall at the end of the year when we will have the actual expenditure figures. In the case of 'crop husbandry', the actual share of SCP in 2005-06 accounted for only 5.86 per cent. In the other years, as presented in Table 5, the share maintained a 12 per cent average level. So, there is a by and large consistent trend in crop husbandry. The SCP share under the budget head called 'other rural development programmes' experienced a robust upward jerk in the year of 2005-06. Prior to that, SCP had been receiving nominal share under this budget-head. 'Other special area programmes' and 'animal husbandry' are found to be two budget heads in which SCP has got about 13 and 11 per cent shares respectively in 2007-

08. It is astonishing that several budget heads have experienced just token allocations. For example, in major and minor irrigations only Rs. 7000 and Rs. 1000 respectively have been allocated for SCP. In proportion to the plan size, they account for zero per cent allocations.

In social services, two important departments, viz. education and health, are found to be reluctant to allocate funds through the SCP (see Table 5). SCP shares in these two departments account for less than one per cent each in 2007-08. It is remarkable that the budget under 'welfare of SC' has offered more than 17 per cent of the plan size to the SCP. In 2007-08, it accounts for 63.06 per cent. But, here, it is worth mentioning that this budget head is actually titled as 'welfare of SC/ST/OBC'. If we consider the gross total of the budgets allocated for these three communities, the SCP share would fall down to 26.51 per cent. SCP share accounts for about 14 per cent in the 'nutrition' budget. Token amounts have been allocated through several departments such as 'technical education', 'art and culture', 'family welfare', 'urban development' etc.

5. The Budget Heads under Which SCP Allocations are Missing

There are a number of budget heads in the budget books of social and economic services, through which even a single penny was not allocated for the SC people through the SCP. The list of those budget heads is given in Box 1. It is observed from the list that there are several budget heads (such as, rural employment, special programme for rural development, housing, medium irrigation, among many others), spending through which would benefit the SC population to combat their poverty.

6. Diversion of SCP Funds

The dalits are continuing to be deprived. They are deprived of their due shares which they are entitled to get through public expenditures. The

discrepancy between Table 3 and 6 represent the fact that the SCP funds are grossly diverted to non-SCP account. While Table 3 (government estimates) projects SCP as 15.6 per cent allocation of the total plan size, Table 6 (our estimates) negates this myth and depicts SCP just as 1.76 per cent allocation in 2007-08. Why does such inconsistency arise? There is a perception in the minds of the bureaucrats and policy makers that since there are 17 per cent SC population in the state, the proportional benefit of every project or expenditure goes to the SCs. How? Let us give an example. When the Public Works Department spent money to construct a road in Jaipur main city they claimed that 17 per cent of the total expenditure was made for the benefit of the dalit population. When asked how this was so, they verbally explained that since the dalit people (which constitute 17 per cent of the total population of Rajasthan) of the state are using this road it was considered that 17 per cent of the total fund have been spent for the benefit of the dalits. Actually, behind the shield of this explanation, SCP funds are diverted to other expenditures.

Box 1: The Budget Heads under Which SCP Allocations are Missing

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Dairy Development | 19. Other General Economic Services |
| 2. Food Storage and Warehousing | 20. Compensation and Assignments to Local Bodies and Panchayati Raj Institutions |
| 3. Agricultural Research and Education | 21. Aid Material and Equipments |
| 4. Cooperative | 22. Sports and Youth Services |
| 5. Other Agricultural Programme | 23. Housing |
| 6. Special Program for Rural Development | 24. Information & Publicity |
| 7. Rural Employment | 25. Relief on Accounts of Natural Calamities |
| 8. Medium Irrigation | 26. Other Social Services |
| 9. Command Area Development | 27. Secretariat Social Services |
| 10. Power | 28. Flood Control Project |
| 11. Non-conventional Sources of Energy | 29. Chemical and Pharmaceutical Industries |
| 12. Civil Aviation | 30. Consumer Industries |
| 13. Road & Bridge | 31. Industries and Minerals |
| 14. Road & Transportation | 32. Scientific and Environmental Research |
| 15. Other Scientific Research | 33. Tourism |
| 16. Ecology & Environment | 34. Investment in General Financial and Trading Institutions |
| 17. Secretariat Economic Services | |
| 18. Civil Supplies | |

This is how the government is fooling dalits. At the same time, it is difficult to ignore that there is an implementation-related problem as to how to spend 17 per cent fund for the specific 17 per cent SC population. Let us offer a suggestion to resolve this problem. There are 2,463 villages, which are called 'Sambal Gram' (see Table 7), in Rajasthan and a majority of the SC population is concentrated in these villages, whereas others are dispersed throughout the whole state. It is not difficult to get the data about how much of the 17 per cent SC population live in these villages. So, why not the state departments accordingly spend money in these villages? For example, in these villages, the Health Department can build hospitals, the Education Department can build Schools and appoint teachers, and so on. If 10 per cent of the dalit population (say, the rest 7 per cent are scattered in the whole state) are living in the *Sambal Grams* then the departments can spend 10 per cent of their Plan Size in these villages!

7. Attempting to Kill SCP?

A National Level Evaluation Study was undertaken on the implementation of Special Component Plan in 2005 by the National Commission for SC and ST, Government of India, under the leadership of Dr. G.S. Somawat. We are now going to take a look at the findings and recommendations that came out of the study. Individual state-wise recommendations were made in the report. Therefore, there are some exclusive recommendations for the state of Rajasthan in the report. The report said much in favour of liberalisation and globalisation. It was expected that the National Commission for SC and ST would bring out some helpful recommendations for the scheduled caste population based on the findings of the study, but conversely many of the recommendations are found to be anti-poor, pro-market economy and pro-liberalisation. Let us now examine the recommendations in the following.

The Commission found that the implementation of SCP in Rajasthan did not produce desired results. What had been expected to be the result of

Table 7: Sambal Gram

Sl. No.	District	Number of <i>Sambal Gram</i> (the villages where dalits are majority)
1.	Ajmer	13
2.	Alwar	81
3.	Banswara	4
4.	Baran	44
5.	Barmer	91
6.	Bharatpur	84
7.	Bhilwara	36
8.	Bikaner	69
9.	Bundi	31
10.	Cittorgarh	62
11.	Churu	64
12.	Dausa	81
13.	Dholpur	61
14.	Dungarpur	2
15.	Hanumangarh	336
16.	Jaipur	83
17.	Jaisalmer	22
18.	Jalore	14
19.	Jhalawar	54
20.	Jhunjhunu	16
21.	Jodhpur	17
22.	Karoli	59
23.	Kota	39
24.	Nagaur	30
25.	Pali	17
26.	Rajsamand	11
27.	Sawai Madhopur	66
28.	Sikar	11
29.	Sirohi	43
30.	Shri Ganganagar	859
31.	Tonk	57
32.	Udaipur	6
	Total	2463

Source: *Prayas ebong Pragati*, Annual Report 2005-06, Social Welfare Department, Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur.

the implementation of SCP at the inception? A large number of dalits were expected to be elevated from their destitute condition to a better life through greater access to health services, education, social securities, employment opportunities etc. The Commission argued that in about 60 per cent cases, the benefits could not generate income of the poor SC people. According to them, both non-income generating and income generating schemes have virtually failed in this regard in Rajasthan. Who are to be blamed for the persistence of the situation? And what is to be done in future to help SCs to overcome their socio-economic problems? Surprisingly, the Commission says that it is very difficult to

offer answers to such questions or to suggest a concrete alternative. But the Commission did not find it difficult to recommend that entrepreneurship needs to be encouraged among the SCs. For becoming an entrepreneur, resource is required. According to the Commission, the SCs have the required resources and therefore it argues the following:

“The study shows that the villagers under study are rich in animal wealth. Some of the SCs have got the cattle wealth through the developmental schemes, but most of them have bought at their own. This means that the poor SCs have inclination towards enhancing their economic condition by their own efforts, which should be further encouraged” (Government of India, 2005: 252).

The study of the Commission suffered from a limitation that it surveyed only 9 villages in Rajasthan. While the Commission has found that most of the SCs have enough purchasing power to buy animal wealth on their own, Table 3 suggests that only about 2 per cent of the SC main workers were engaged in livestock rearing, forestry, fisheries etc. It is not the fact that the Commission did not understand the crux of the problem faced by the SCs because the Commission talked of land reform (allotment of cultivable land among the poor SCs) and of ensuring irrigation facilities for the SC farms. A further clear direction regarding land reform, and specifically regarding accessibility to irrigation, was expected, but not found in the report. Moreover, it said that in a drought-prone state like Rajasthan “animal husbandry type schemes” have failed in the past and would fail in future as well. These finding and prediction are confusing since we know that in drought-prone regions cultivation is found to be difficult due to lack of irrigation, and therefore animal husbandry takes place as an alternative source of income. There are several income generating animals, such as camel, sheep, goat etc., which can survive in adverse hot climate in desert areas, depending on the desert plants. The Commission further goes on, saying that even if the SCs are given some benefits through some schemes, beneficiaries will feel compelled to use it for domestic consumption; and

thus they would neither repay their previous loans nor would be able to create a sustainable economic base. The Commission found that most of the poor SCs want a regular source of income. Daily wage employment provided such a source to the SCs in the village. Hence, the villagers stress that the govt. should give priority to those programmes which provide regular daily employment throughout the year. If the villagers desired so then there is virtually nothing wrong in it. But the Commission recommended that since the earlier and existing developmental schemes and programmes have not yielded any market-driven economic activities among the SCs, “it is advisable to change their direction in a way that the developmental budget does not go waste...” The Commission's another recommendation appears to be a pure neo-liberal voice that pronounces: “The beneficiaries should themselves decide priorities [and] their activities as per the needs of the market and availability of finance at lower rate of interest. Subsidy amount, which has led to the corruption and misutilization, should be phased out or abandoned.”

We found these observations and recommendations very strange. While poor dalits need state support in various ways to improve standard of living, the Commission is recommending the government to push them into the market economy. Instead of 17 per cent, they have been getting around 2 per cent of the Plan Size per year through the SCP. If this 2 per cent is now gone off, then the dalits would receive proper justice. Do you agree with this view? Certainly not.

References

Government of India (2005): *National Level Evaluation Study on the Implementation of Special Component Plan for Scheduled Castes*, Jaipur: National Commission for SCs & STs.

Guha, Ramachandra (2007): "Adivasis, Naxalites and Indian Democracy", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XLII, No. 32, August 11, pp. 3305-3312.

Gupta, Kamala (1988): "Economic Deprivation of Socially Deprived in Uttar Pradesh." In *Development of Scheduled Communities*, ed. K.L. Bhowmick; New Delhi: Inter-India Publications, pp. 143-166.

Maharatna, Arup (2005): *Demographic Perspectives on India's Tribes*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Marshall, Sir John (1973): *Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization, Vol.I*, New Delhi: Indological Book House.

Michael, S.M. (ed.) (1999): *Dalits in Modern India: Vision and Values*; New Delhi: Vistaar Publications.

BARC Team

:

Subrata Dutta
Vijay Goyal
Nagendra Singh Khangarot
Nishtha Sharma
Deepti Kherada
Radha Mohan Jogi

Adviser

:

Dr. Ginny Shrivastava

The Links : Policy to People and People to Policy



Budget Analysis Rajasthan Centre (BARC)

P-1, Tilak Marg, C-Scheme, Jaipur - 302 005

Tel. / Fax : (0141) 238 5254

E-mail : info@barcjaipur.org

Website : www.barcjaipur.org