AJANTA

Ajanta Prakashan

☙ CONTENTS OF ENGLISH PART - I ❧

12. Unity in Diversity and Rural Incredible India

Mr. Shaikh Gafoor Ahmed

Asst. Prof. in Political Science, Milliya Arts Science and Management Science College, Beed.

Abstract

Four decades on from the first Habitat Conference on housing and human settlements, the economic, political, and social dimensions of development have all been acknowledged and, to a greater or lesser extent, understood by the international community. In contrast, the cultural dimension of development is still too often misunderstood or undervalued, or seen as an optional extra to be added when the hard work of 'real' development is done. This policy paper provides an overview of the evolving recognition of culture in sustainable development and attempts to bust the myths surrounding what culture is and what it can do. Finally, it gives recommendations on how to operationalize culture at the local level as a contribution to the positioning of local and regional governments.In 1996, Habitat II, the "City Summit," brought culture into global debates on urbanization. Culture was recognized as an integral part of people's well-being, and local development and equity were linked with acknowledging diversity in cultural heritages and values.

Keywords: Objectives, Hypothesis, Religion and tolerance, Effect of Political Intolerance, Ignorance on rural development, Poverty Eradication, Crash Scheme for Rural Employment, Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme, Rural Industrialization,Girl Child Initiative, Outcomes, Conclusion, References.

Objectives

- To apply new agricultural technology in the tribal areas.
- To sell their produce to buy their necessities.
- To examine the bonds and mechanisms of unity in India.
- To provide an explanation to our option for a composite culture model rather than a uniformity model of unity.

Hypothesis

- Tradition of Accommodation.
- Social Structure Rural and Urban.
- The culture of pilgrimage.
- Collective concept of Uniformity.

> Political ignorance for rural development.

Introduction

As many reports have documented, cities and towns are hubs of innovation in the economic, cultural, andsocial realms. The goal of re-humanizing the city through culture-sensitive urban strategies is underpinnedby principles and inclusive processes of access, representation, and participation. In the context of defininga new people-centered and planet-sensitive sustainable development agenda, cities are transformativeplatforms. However, the transformative potential of cities has not yet been fully harnessed by international agencies, national governments, or local authorities.

To create a new culturally sensitive urban development model, the role of cultural practices and values in sustainable development must be explicitly recognized, supported, and integrated into planning and policy in a systematic and comprehensive way. In the context of Habitat III and the implementation of the Global Sustainable Development Goals, this policy paper proposes ways to integrate and operationalize culture in the sustainable development of cities, and aims to identify pathways to include culture in integrated sustainability planning and implementation processes.[1]

In 1996, Habitat II, the "City Summit," brought culture into global debates on urbanization. Culture was recognized as an integral part of people's well-being, and local development and equity were linked with acknowledging diversity in cultural heritages and values. Through the Habitat II Agenda goal of "Sustainable Human Settlements in an Urbanizing World," national heads of state and governments committed themselves to developing societies that make efficient use of resources within the carrying capacity of ecosystems. At they same time they also committed to provide all people, in particular those belonging to vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, equal opportunities for a healthy, safe, and productive life in harmony with nature and their cultural heritage, and their spiritual and cultural values; and a life that ensures economic and social development and environmental protection, thereby contributing to the achievement of national sustainable development.[2]

From the point of view of demography, India is the second largest country (population over a billion) after China. Its population is composed of diverse social, cultural and ethnic elements spread throughout the length and breadth of the country.Integrate the Incredible India campaign into a holistic campaign that includes not only print but also other channels, such as digital, social, placement, review sites and global media – and that focuses on the positives of visitor-created content, while addressing the challenges these visitors report.

Religion and Tolerance

If all of us hold uniform views, where then is the scope for this generous virtue of tolerance? However, this search for uniformity is as futile as looking for flowers in the sky. Hence, the only possible alternative for us is to tolerate one another's views.

"Political tolerance" refers to the willingness of citizens to support the ex- tension of rights of citizenship to all members of the polity—that is, to allow political freedoms to those who are politically different. Thus, "tolerance im- plies a willingness to 'put up with' those things that one rejects. Politically, it implies a willingness to permit the expression of those ideas or interests that one opposes. A tolerant regime, then, like a tolerant individual, is one that allows a wide berth to those ideas that challenge its way of life" . Political tolerance includes support for insti- tutional guarantees of the right to oppose the existing regime, including the rights to vote, to participate in political parties, to organize politically, and to attempt political persuasion.[3]

The simple linkage hypothesis, as stated earlier, is that where the mass pub- lic is more intolerant, state public policy is more repressive. Though the hy- pothesis is simple, deriving measures of mass intolerance is by no means un- complicated. Indeed, the study of state politics continually confronts the difficulty of measuring public opinion at the state level.

Effect of Political Intolerance

The relationships are not at all as predicted. Where mass opinion was more tolerant, public policy was more repressive. The re- lationship is moderately strong. At the same time, there is a weaker relation- ship between elite opinion and policy, but it is still in the wrong direction. Interference in campus affairs seems not to have stemmed directly from either mass or elite opinion. Thus, we are confronted with a paradox: even in the states with more repressive mass and elite opinion in the 1970s, there was not more political repression than in states with less repressive opinion.[4]

What conclusions about the elitist theory of democracy and the theory of pluralistic intolerance does this analysis support? Most important, I have dis- covered little evidence that political repression in the United States stems from demands from ordinary citizens to curtail the rights and activities of un- popular political minorities. The finding is not predicted by the elitist theory of democracy.

Ignorance on Rural Development

Development of rural areas and alleviation of rural poverty came to be recognized as the sinequa-non for the national development and social welfare. Thus any strategy of socio-economic development in India that neglect rural people and rural areas cannot be successful where more than 600 million people live in rural areas. The concept of rural development is not

marketers should look beyond questions of success or otherwise of the campaign to question the role of such campaigns in the wider development agenda of the nations in question.

References

1. UNESCO for United Nations Task Team on Habitat III, 2015.

2. parag. 42, Habitat II Agenda.

3. Sullivan, Piere- son, and Marcus, 1979, p. 784.

4. McCutcheon, Allan L. 1985. A Latent Class Analysis of Tolerance for Nonconformity in the American Public. Public Opinion Quarterly, 49:474-88.

5. N.N.Gosh, Early History 1 of India. The Indian Press, Allahabad, 1964,p.77

6. Planning Commission, Govt, of India, Draft of Five Year Plans, 1978 – 1983

7. Padhy, K.C., (1986), Rural Development in Modern India. B.R. Publishing Corporations, NewDelhi, pp.86-96.

8. Government of India, (1989), Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development, Manual on National Rural Employment Programme (NREP) & Rural LandlessEmployment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP), October, p. 16.

9. Mehta, M.L., (1983), Partners in development, in Population poverty and Hope(ed) PranChopra, New Delhi.

10. Incredible India: Endless Possibilities, Cosn Senior Delegation To India: November 12- 23, 2015 P – 5.