Buddhist Beliefs, Government Schemes and Grassroots Collaboration in a Srilankan Village

Omori Motoyoshi

Introduction

A. T. Ariyaratne and the Sarvodaya Sharamadana Movement is a well-known grassroots movement in Sri Lanka. Another less dramatic grassroots movement worth careful attention has been pursued with persistence in Sri Lanka for over a half century. This is the implementation of projects by Rural Development Societies in which the local inhabitants participate voluntarily on a self-help basis in close contact with governmental officials. The Sri Lanka Government extends financial and technological assistance so that the RDS members may pursue their projects most effectively.

The results of these projects are dependent on the volunteer services of villagers. In this article I wish to examine three major variables: local manpower, inherited structures, and outside incentives. These are interwoven in their operation to promote self-help grassroots movements in rural Sri Lanka.

Local manpower heavily relies on community organization, economic activities and rural infrastructure. The family, kin grouping and ward associations inevitably bind individual residents and sometimes hamper the capacity for local community development. A variety of ways of earning a livelihood also narrow the choices in carrying out development projects. The local infrastructure, including schools, exerts a vital influence on the motivation, eagerness and ability of people to undertake grassroots activities.

While doing research in Sri Lanka for three months between 1980 and 1982, I collected information relevant to the improvement of rural communities in the Matara District, in southern Sri Lanka. The direction of my research was focused on agrarian development and conflict concerning rice cultivation, religious performances, and concurrently looked at the village temples and the activities of Rural Development Societies. I also consulted some publications on agrarian research to gain a comparative perspective with other parts of the country (Omori 1983, Omori & Taniguchi 1983 a, 1983 b).

Society and People

The village, Beralapanatara, was located in a hilly inland area. Around four-fifths of the 484 acres of privately owned rice fields was used by more than 100 families,

who owned the lands. The remaining one-fifth, i.e., 100 acres, belonged to the village temple and was leased to 50 tenant families in the vicinity. On account of prevalent joint-ownership and rotational use of rice fields, one could not earn a living without renting someone else's land or being engaged concurrently in certain other economic activities, i.e., tea growing or wage working in a tea-manufacturing factory. In fact, a majority of villagers undertook both rice and tea growing or worked as wage earners.

The Rural Development Society (RDS) was a voluntary, government-assisted organization to improve the standard of life of the villagers (Cf. Nakamura & Sato 1980: I19–121). In 1977 the government encouraged the organization of RDS in the villages. When a RDS was organized, the members elected a chairman and three other staff members. Every member was asked to contribute a small sum of the annual fee, two rupees or so, to the society. The chairman called meetings in which any villager could participate and discuss any problem freely.

The village temples play an important role in promoting community development schemes. A village temple provides a core for the inhabitants' thought and behavior. Periodic performances both at the temple and at a society member's home established long standing ties and mutual reliance between the priests and the inhabitants in a village. Not only the religious performances, but also some secular activities such as the occasional meetings of temple membership organizations, tutorial classes and Sunday school were all held in the temple building.

The activities connected with the village temple and Rural Development Societies functioned as an integrating factor for a village as a whole. They caused those who remained to be more closely attached to the locality, allowing for mental as well as material satisfaction. The temple festivals and lessons offered once every month gave an opportunity for the residents to assemble together at one place, observing the same conduct and thus to intensify their feeling of a collective attachment to their village, even though the occasion also reaffirmed the people's recognition of conventional caste affiliations. In a similar way, by attending a Rural Development Society's meeting and activities, any villager could freely express his opinion on the problems undertaken at the moment. One could, then, fully commit oneself to the decision making process of the community development schemes. No one would be "alienated", i.e., ignored or isolated by the members of the rural society.

Beralapanatara Village is located in a hilly land about three hundred meters in elevation. As the land is within the Wet Zone, abundant rainfall enables the farmers to grow two crops of rice per year, i.e., in both Maha and Yala seasons, Although the main crop was rice, few villagers (roughly ten percent of the total population) owned their own paddy land. Others owned only residential site and garden plots around their houses, but were leased one or two acres of the government land where they planted coconut trees, bananas, breadfruit and jackfruit, manioc etc. These agrarian crops did not meet the demands of the large population of 6,100 (1981 Census) living there,[1)] for most of the fifty-four square kilometers of village territory consisted of hills and paddies, and the other plants, except for tea trees, could be planted only at

narrow, winding bottom-lands between the hill ranges. For their subsistence, the majority of the residents had to rely on tea or rubber plantation and tea manufacturing industries.

Jobs in the public services, including cooperatives and corporations, were also recruited by the government agencies in the local government.[2)] However, a qualification, i.e., General Certificate of Education (Ordinary Level), was indispensable when applying for vacant posts or for employment in government service. One could sit for the examination to gain G.C.E. (O) after ten years of schooling. The examination was tough and those who failed could not help but remain in the village seeking jobs in the local tea or rubber industries.

Major cleavages appeared to be the result of the caste system, different standards of living, and political antagonism between supporters of two acutely opposing parties, i.e., the Sri Lanka Freedom Party and the United National Party which was in power continuously after 1977. The political conflict did not emerge during our stay in the village, but its influence was actually felt underlying the network of contacts between the village members.

Local Level Buddhism

A clear integration of the village as a whole was recognized in the religious activities centering on the Baralapanarata Temple. The residents of the village periodically assembled for the sermons on *Poya* nights. They served meals in turn to Lord Buddha, the temple priests and the servants. The priests regularly paid visits to the member families on the memorial days of the deceased or on occasions when requested. No cleavages mentioned above could interfere in these activities.

The Beralapanarata Temple was located near the Bazaal. There were five buildings on a low hilltop: a *dagoba* (stupa), a main building for the Lord Buddha and Hindu deities, a *nirvana* hall, a preaching hall and a residence for the priests. The first two were said to be built two hundred years ago. All the buildings except for the first had whitewashed mud walls, plastered floors and tiled roofs. Elaborate engravings and paintings were seen on the *nirvana* hall. A middle-aged priest, Rev. Guraratana, who had been there since 1974 as the high priest, and two other "brother priests" permanently resided in the temple.

Every full moon day (*poya*) is a national holiday, when devoted Buddhists are expected to abstain from secular activity and assemble at a temple. They are supposed to spend the whole day and night at a temple, praying to Buddha, listening to the sermons and joining in the chorus reciting the sacred scriptures. In August 1982 some hundreds of villagers were observed to have attended the temple of Beralapanatara to participate in the *Poya* program throughout the entire day and night.

The priests not only served the Lord Buddha at the main building, but also took care of the "member families" of the temple. There were about eight hundred member families in the village. Priests were asked to pay a visit to the families on such occasions as funerals and succeeding commemorative days for the deceased (seventh day,

three months later, one year after, and every anniversary), weddings (the day before), and house construction.

Individual members of the organization also prepared daily meals to serve Buddha, the priests and their servants at the temple. On an assigned date, the family head brought cooked food and tea to the temple in the early morning, again before noon and in the afternoon (tea only). Everybody willingly fulfilled this obligation. Moreover, on many occasions, the priests paid visits to the members' houses and were served meals (*dana*). This had to be done at anniversaries of the deceased family members, at weddings, at funerals, at the building of houses and at any other occasion when those malicious spirits called preta were supposed to threaten the family (Omori & Taniguchi 1983 b: 65–66).

A closer and much more frequent contact between the priests and the member families might be seen in the intricate interdependence between the priest and a Hindu specialist, *kapurala*. In the temple main building there was a room for Hindu deities, i.e., *devalaya*. These deities could allegedly heal diseases and remove misfortunes from the worshippers. A sufferer first came to the temple priest to talk over his problem and the priest would give a piece of paper to the sufferer, on which verses (*kavi*) were written by the priest to appeal to a Hindu deity. The sufferer, having received the paper from the Buddhist priest, then brought it to a *kapurala*. The *kapurala*, who had lived three miles away from the temple, went to the *devalaya* in Beralapanatara temple to read the verses repeatedly and deposited the paper into the hand of a Hindu deity, i.e., Visnu or Kataragama[3)].

Economic connections were also discerned between the temple and the villagers. Beralapanatara Temple owns one hundred acres of rice fields which was leased to fifty families in the village. Despite the richness of the temple, donations for repairing and maintenance costs were commonly requested by the chief priest from the temple membership organization. Each of the eight hundred families donated Rs. 5 or 10 for such purposes. Any donation to a priest or to the temple was believed to be an act of accumulating merit for the sake of afterlife.

Development Schemes by the Government

In the preceding era *paraveni/pamunu* and *ande* were the widely practiced "forms of land use." *Paraveni* lands could be acquired through a king's grant, an individual's purchase, or an individual's inheritance (Abeysinghe 1978: 61). *Ande* was, on the other hand, a type of land lease in which the owner was paid half or even two-thirds of the yield (ibid., p. 61).

In order to cope with urgent problems, i.e., rapid increase in the youth population and consequent unemployment, the government enacted the Land Reform Law in 1972. The law fixed an upper limit on individual land ownership at 25 acres of rice fields or 50 acres of lands for other agricultural products. Nearly 563,411 acres of lands were taken from the 5,160 individual owners and redistributed to the governmental institutions such as corporations and cooperatives, and to organizations for

resettlement schemes (ibid., pp. 46–48). The Land Reform Law was amended in 1975 and 417,957 parcels of arable land were newly confiscated by the government from 232 public companies, which had been exempted from the earlier takeover in 1972 (ibid., pp. 48–49).[4)]

Eventually by 1979 the government had taken 18 percent of all the land in the country under its management; 38.7 percent (229,852 acres) of tea farms, 19.0 percent (123,173 acres) of rubber forests, 6.1 percent (69,990 acres) of coconuts groves, and 1.1 percent (21,782 acres) of rice fields (ibid., p. 121). Among these confiscated land, the rice fields were mainly vested to those organizations formed by cultivators themselves such as the Agricultural Productivity Committees and so forth (ibid., pp. 79–83, 116–119, AGRICOLA 1975: 67, 70–74).

An amendment of the Paddy Lands Act in 1958 brought two noticeable achievements; stronger tenantships and the establishment of new Cultivation Committees. The law for the first time conferred "full proprietary rights on the existing tenant-cultivators of paddy lands, subject only to payment of rent to the landlords" (ibid., p. 34). It also established the Cultivation Committees that consisted of farmers planning and pursuing effective improvement of rice cultivation. Under the amended law no tenant or hired laborer was deprived of the right to use the land, interfered with, or made to pay excessive rent.

The Agrarian Services Act was promulgated in 1979. This law fixed a favorable rate of paddy land rent, secured the tenantship of rice fields and bestowed the authority of dispute settlement to the Cultivation Officers (Abeysinghe 1979: 147–149). An owner of paddy land was then able to charge either six bushels of rice per acre or one-fifth of the crop in each growing season. Every rice cultivator was to be registered at a Cultivation Officer's office and his tenantship was firmly protected by the government. No paddy landowner could expel or replace his tenant for another without following legal procedure.

The co-operative movement spread throughout Sri Lanka after 1911, and by 1970 it was reported that 5,818 Co-operative Societies were in action. These multi-purpose co-operatives were pursued to improve agricultural production, marketing commodities and provision of credit. In 1971 the government condensed these 5,818 co-operatives into 372 primary multipurpose co-operatives. Each primary multi-purpose co-operative covered one Assistant Government Agent Division,[5)] and some 10,000 branches of these primary multi-purpose co-operatives were further established to carry out efficient functions (MARGA 1974a: 27, 42, 44).

The local inhabitants could also participate in the activities of the co-operatives at their terminals. Each branch co-operative was located in an individual village and was supervised by a committee. The committee was consisted of nine representatives from the village residents, who directed the activities of the branch co-operative, proposed some development projects and examined loan applications (MARGA 1974a: 40).

The reformation of the co-operative organization aimed principally at the provision

of commodities for rural consumers, giving loans for daily use, supplying effective means and instructions for the increase of yields, and activating the agricultural market (Wanigesekera 1977: 47).[6] However, some of its main functions were later taken over by other organizations with the enactment of new laws.

Rural Development Officers gave advice and instruction to Rural Development Societies, which were not governmental organizations and whose members were not appointed by the government. Rural Development Societies were formed on the basis of the villagers' voluntary cooperation with their principal aim being to activate efforts to improve the standard of living in each locality (Wanigesekera 1977: 48, Morrison et al., eds. 1979: 173–174). The government trained some youths as workers and leaders for the Rural Development Societies at several Training Centers.[7] It also offered financial aid as well as technical assistance to the self-developing projects of the Rural Development Societies. Financial help was given for provision of infrastructure such as public roads or wells, and for construction of community buildings such as schools, libraries or conference halls. Between 1971 and 1972, Rs. 19 million was requested from the government and Rs. 3.9 million was granted to self-development projects.

There were 6,676 Rural Development Societies comprised of men and 1,500 comprised of women in 1973. However, around one-third of the total 8,176 Societies were active and another one-third were occasionally operative (MARGA 1974b: 153–154). On account of their spontaneous character, a positive initiative by certain members was a prerequisite to the activities of the Societies. When this was possible, the Societies were able to make remarkable contributions to the rural developing program. For instance, one of the Rural Development Societies at a Dry Zone village constructed five roads, built a school building, completed three large wells and developed a co-operative shop in the village between 1963 and 1972 (Lebbe et al., 1977: 26–27. Cf. Obeyesekere 1967: 295). In contrast with this, no comparable achievement could be obtained in the other villages, except for clearing public wells and public paths (ARTI, RS 38, 1980a: 61, ARTI, RS 42, 1980b: 54. Cf. Robinson 1975: 87).

In 1981 there were five Rural Development Societies composed of men and two composed of women at Beralapamatara South Village. During that year. Galbokka Rural Development Society had repaired a public road. Pothotuwa Thanabima Rural Development Society was constructing a well for drinking water and Nagoda Rural Development Society had dug a well.

On the other hand, one of the women's Rural Development Societies named Visaka Kantha had been granted Rs. 5,000 from the Swedish Government to purchase materials for batik work. Twenty of the women members periodically assembled to undertake their working at the village temple. They continued the batik work activity for at least four years until 1981. Another of the women's Societies. Vijayagama Kantha, had not yet performed any activity because of its recent formation in 1980. However, the most remarkable achievements were observed with Uduhupitiya &

Kandakumbura Society, a Rural Development Society in Beralapanatara North Village in 1982.

Achievement of a Grassroots Movement

The Uduhupitiya & Kandakumbura Society took its name from the two hamlets of which it was comprised and became active in October 1977. There were three officials in the Uduhupitiya and Kandakumbura Society; a chairman, a secretary and a treasurer. The chairman was Rev. Dhammananda who was born in the Uduhupitiya Hamlet and who also served as a resident priest at the Beralapanatara Temple. He was approximately forty years of age in 1982. Sirisena Gunawardena, thirty-two years old at that time, was the secretary and P.S.Y. Gunawardena was the treasurer. In principle all of these officials had to be newly elected at the annual general meeting of the Rural Development Society. However, these three persons occupied their posts continuously since the first establishment of the Society in 1977. Both Gunawardena were paternal cousins and were inhabitants of the Uduhupitiya Hamlet.[8)]

The Uduhupitiya & Kandakumbura Society consisted of 160 homesteads, out of which there were 76 permanent members, i.e., those who paid an annual fee of Rs. 2 to the Society and who participated in its activities more positively than the others. However, any inhabitant in either of the two hamlets was eligible to attend the Society's meetings and to join its activities without any restriction. Thus, there was no substantial difference between the permanent and the non-permanent members.

Several meetings were held during each year. In 1981, the Society's minutes were recorded for its three meetings which were held in January, May and October. The major items which were discussed and voted on were: elections of major officials held in October of each year, proposed projects of development which would be sent to the government for financial assistance, and schedules for undertaking projects which had already been granted some financial aid. The members usually met either at the temple or at the primary school of Beralapanatara.

When any business matter was brought up for discussion, a government officer was invited to the Society's assembly. Either a Rural Development Officer or an Assistant Rural Development Officer would attend the meetings to give advice so that the Society might adopt the most adequate motion, which would later be forwarded, to the Department of Rural Development with recommendations from its officers. Any awarded subsidy had to be spent in favor of the society's members, i.e., no members could receive any money as reward for their labor services.

During the five years after its establishment, the Uduhupitiya & Kandakumbura society had completed some remarkable works: i) construction of a public well, ii) building three concrete bridges, iii) rerouting a main drainage system, iv) supplying some useful plants and v) setting out to build a conference hall and a bypass road. These had been done partly under governmental subsidies, but mostly by the inhabitants' voluntary labor services (*sharamadana*) on account of the initiative of the Uduhupitiya & Kandakumbura Society.

Construction of a public well

The society made a contract with the government to construct a public well for the inhabitants of the Uduhupitiya Hamlet on December 19, 1980, and was awarded Rs. 7,500 which was originally granted from the Swedish Government.

The well was dug near the hamlet center of Uduhupitiya. It was six feet wide and twelve feet deep. The inside of the well was covered with piled stones and on top, people set a solid well crib that was made of cement. The well crib was about two feet high above the ground. The materials for construction cost Rs. 7,300 and nothing was paid for the labor services of the inhabitants.

Building the concrete bridges

Three bridges were constructed in the Uduhupitiya Hamlet. The first one was built under a government subsidy amounting to Rs. 24,977. The bridge's contract, made on December 19, 1980, stipulated its size to be approximately ten feet long, sixteen feet wide and eight feet high. The second and the third bridges were constructed with financial aid from the United Nations amounting to Rs. 35,536. The contract for these was signed on January 12, 1981. The size of the second bridge was approximately seven feet long, sixteen feet wide. and eight feet high. The third bridge constructed was much smaller. Any inhabitant who worked for the construction was paid Rs. 20 per day with lunch.

Rerouting the main drainage system

A stream flowed through the valley where the Uduhupitiya Hamlet and paddy fields were located. The stream that wound along the eastern hillside, readily overflowed everywhere along its route. In 1979 the Uduhupitiya & Kandakumbura society applied for a government subsidy for rerouting the stream, and made a contract on November 7, 1979. This time no cash was granted but, with the help of the United Nations, the government supplied wheat flour (1,731 pounds), sugar (55lb.), dhal (163lb.), dried fish (289lb.) to the Society.

In the initial year 250 man-days were spent for the work on the bus road up to the second bridge. Then, in the following year 400 man days completed all the rerouting work to make the drainage almost straight for 1.2 kilometers. No monetary rewards were given to the inhabitants for their labor services, but foodstuffs were distributed.

Concluding Remarks

A prominent result of the government's efforts can be observed in the activities of the Uduhupitiya & Kandakumbura Society. Under the admirable leadership of its officials, the Society has steadily accomplished its works for rural improvement within the local area: essential facilities such as a well, bridges, drainage system and a conference hall, most of which were completed due to a substantial sum of financial aid from the government. Engaged in these works, the Society's members obtained some cash income and foodstuffs to reward their labor services.

Moreover, through their recurrent participation in communal work projects, the Society's members gained confidence in their own ability to deal with problems in daily life. The half-completed conference hall, a rerouted drainage system and widened main road provide evidence of their progress. Their projects might also intensify the members' sense of affiliation with the specific local community, i.e, the Uduhupitiya and Kandakumbura Hamlets respectively, and render them to share in stronger "self-identification."

Active pursuance of these tasks by the Rural Development Societies was also considered highly advantageous to the government. Economically, enhancement of self-reliance and mutual help fostered among the farmers, as well the amelioration of the rural infrastructure, eventually lead to multiplication of agrarian yields. Politically, on the other hand, the government's financial support encouraged the local communities to give their cooperation readily to administrative organizations. The reciprocal link between the central government and its local terminals facilitated permeation of the government's policies into every corner of the state and reinforced the authority and the control of administrative devices.

Immune to political struggle and fully occupied with the pursuance of economic and social improvement, a Rural Development Society was able to ameliorate the rural standard of living by intensifying self-identification and community collaboration. The Societies would, thus, be able to accomplish the establishment of an amicable and reliable link between the farmers and the government, which has helped to enhance nationwide integration.

Notes

1) Sri Larika has long imported rice from India and other countries, although the balance of imported rice to domestic has improved due to efforts to promote rice production (Azia Keizai Kenkyusho: 1980). In 1981, 140 million tons of rice were produced in Sri Lanka while 12 million tons were imported from foreign countries including Indonesia (personal information from Mr. T. Sato, an Agriculture Specialist, JICA). In the wet zone, however, few village households had a surplus of rice to sell every year. And most of the population in Sri Lanka, rural as well as urban, depended on the dry Zone irrigated areas for their rice. For example, all the sample villages except one which are presented in Morrison et al. (1979) failed to produce sufficient rice to feed their villagers. The exceptional village was one of the Dry Zone settlement scheme in the irrigated colony of Minipe.
2) In 1975 there were one hundred and seven public enterprises in Sri Lanka including both of the government enterprises, e.g., strategic large scale industries, and the government/private joint major industries such as textiles, sugar, ceramics and so forth (Azia Keizai Kenkyusho: 1980).
3) Two different interpretative views of the Sinhalese religion seem to be proposed. First, Obeyesekere (1963: 147–148) indicated the unitary character of the "Sinhalese religious tradition," into which not only Buddhism and Hinduism, but also the native horoscope were integrated and utilized concurrently by the indigenous population. Secondly, however, Yalman (1967: 34–35, 316–317) and Evers (1972: 105–106) insisted on the striking difference among these beliefs, practices and ritual specialists. Evers argued that a sort of dynamic equilibrium could be discerned between Buddhism and Hinduism so that they might be kept in balance and be integrated into a larger comprehensive religious system of the Sinhalese people (Omori & Taniguchi: 1983).

4) The 563,411 acres of land confiscated in 1972 consisted of well developed, fertile land of 150,000 acres and the remaining acreage was underdeveloped. The largest portion of the 150,000 acres were tea, rubber and coconut palm farms, while rice fields totaled only 16,270 acres (AGRICOLA 1975: 65,67).
   Out of the 563,411 acres of land, 48,816 acres were turned over to Janawasa. Janawasa was "an organization composed of a group of youths of over 18 years and having co-operative ownership, equal wages and profit-sharing." (Abeysinghe 1979: 99–100) There were 180 Janawasa which had 15,000 youths and 67,058 acres of lands in 1978. But later in the same year 35,164 acres out of its 67,058 acres were transferred to the state plantations and in 1979 the rest of land was handed over to another government organization (ibid., pp. 99, 177).
5) Sri Lanka is divided into provinces and districts. There were 22 districts, each of which is turther subdivided into several divisions comprising a number of villages. Matara District with a population of 587,000 in 1971 contained 7 Assistant Government Agent Divisions, each of which were comprised of from 14 to 35 villages (Grama Sevaka) Divisions. Beralapanatara was one of these villages but was divided into two separate Grama Sevaka Divisions in 1976 on the basis of population increase.
6) A comparative survey which was undertaken at villages in five different districts in 1972 and 1973 revealed a variation of "the farmer's dependence on the co-operatives." Even though membership in the co-operatives was high (from 75 percent to 98 percent) in every village, only 7 percent of the residents borrowed co-operative loans at one village, and, in contrast with this, 58 percent of the inhabitants had applied for loans in another village. In general, the farmers were dependent on the co-operatives to purchase fertilizers and to sell surplus rice and were not dependent for loans or seed paddy (ARTI, RS 11, 1975: 34–35, e.g., Morrison et al., eds., 1979: 77–79, 131, 167, 170).
7) The Community Development Workers were given a small monthly allowance but were not considered government employees. They were trained volunteers selected among the farmers. The government paid all their costs for two-weeks of schooling at the training centers, where the following subjects were taught; development studies, social welfare, personal hygiene and environmental sanitation. During 1971–1972, some 3,500 youths were enrolled in ten training centers (MARGA 1974b: 153–158. 216-217).
8) Mr. S. Gunawardena was the Cultivation Officer in charge of Kattawala Village which was located to the north of Uduhupitiya Hamlet. He served as its Cultivation Officer since April 1977. He was 32 years old in 1982 and qualified as a General Certificate of Education (A level) holder. The certificate was conferred in 1972. He had cultivated his father's 7 acres of rice fields before being appointed to the Cultivation Officer.
   Mr. Y. Gunawardena owned 3 acres of rice fields and 2 acres of tea farms. He was a farmer and had no governmental job.

References

Abeysinghe, A. 1978–1979 *Ancient Land Tenure to Modern Land Reform in Sri Lanka*, 2 vols., Colombo: Centre for Society & Religion.

AGRICOLA 1975 "The Aftermath of the Take-over: Notes on the Land Reform", *MARGA*, Colombo: MARGA Institute, 2/4, pp. 65–74.

Agrarian Research and Training Institute 1975 *The Agrarian Situation Relating to Paddy Cultivation in Five Selected Districts of Sri Lanka*, Colombo: ARTI, Research Study Series II.

Agrarian Research and Training Institute 1980a *A Study of Five Settlement Schemes Prior to Irrigation Modernization*, Vol. III, Pavatkulam, Research Study Series 38.

Agrarian Research and Training Institute 1980b A *Study of Five Settlement Schemes Prior to Irrigation Modernization*, Vol. IV, Vavunikulam, Research Study Series 42.

Leach, E. R. 1961 *Pul Eliya: A Village in Ceylon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lebbe I., G. Wickramasinghe & G. Krause, 1977 *The Role of Local Groups in Rural Development*, a Case Study. ARTI Research Study Series 22.

Marasinghe, M. L. 1979 "Kandyan Law and British Colonial Law", *Verfassung und Recht in Übersee*, pp. 115–127.
MARGA Institute 1974a *The Co-operative System and Rural Credit in Sri Lanka*. Colombo: MARGA Institute.
MARGA Institute 1974b *Non-formal Education in Sri Lanka*. Colombo: MARGA Institute
Morrison B. M., M. P. Moore & M.U.I. Lebbe (eds.) 1979 *The Disintegrating Village*, Colombo: Lake House Investments.
Nakamura H. & T. Sato. 1980 *Agriculture in Sri Lanka*, (in Japanese), Tokyo: Institute of International Agrarian Collaboration.
Obeyesekere, G. 1963 "The Great Tradition and the Little in the Perspective of Sinhalese Buddhism", *Journal of Asian Studies*, 22/2, pp. 139–154.
Obeyesekere, G. 1967 *Land Tenure in Village Ceylon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Omori, M. 1981 "Employment, Caste and Community in Southern Sri Lanka; Preliminary Report". *Journal of Asian Cultural Studies*, 13, Tokyo: International Christian University, pp. 19–31.
Omori. M. 1983 (1985) "Rural Development Schemes in the Interior of Sri Lanka", *ibid*,. 15, pp. 109–127.
Omori, M. & Y. Taniguchi. 1983a "Viharaya and Devaraya: Syncretism as observed in Southern Sri Lanka (in Japanese)", *Annals of Social Anthropology*, 9, Tokyo: Tokyo Metropolitan University, pp. 25–52.
Omori, M. & Y. Taniguchi. 1983b "Education, Wagework and Social Welfare: Some Variables of Modernization in Rural Sri Lanka", *Journal of Asian Cultural Studies* 14, pp. 63–84.
Robinson, M. S. 1975 *Political Structure in a Changing Sinhalese Village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Taniguchi, Y. 1982 "Tradition, Village and Factory Labor of the Low Country Sinhalese (in Japanese)", *Japanese Journal of Ethnology*, 47/1, Tokyo: Japanese Society of Ethnology, pp. 102–116.
Taniguchi, Y. 1984 "General Attitudes Towards Work and Basic Human Relationship among Sri Lankan Workers", in Chiba (ed.), *Law and Culture in Sri Lanka*, Tokyo: Research Group on Asian Indigenous Law, pp. 103–119.
Taniguchi, Y. 1988 "Big and Small, the Women's Status: from Tradition to Innovation (in Japanese) ", in Chiba (ed.). *Pluralistic Legal System in Sri Lanka*, Tokyo: Seibundo, pp. 341–395.
Wanigesekera, E. 1977 "Popular Participation and Local Level Planning in Sri Lanka", *MARGA*, 4/4, pp. 37–77.
Wijesekera, N. D. 1949 *The People of Celon*, Colombo: Gunasena.
Wilson. A. J. 1979 *Politics in Sri Lanka*, 1947–1979, London: Macmillan.
Yalman, N. 1962 "The Structure of Sinhalese Kindred: A Re-Examination of Dravidian Terminology", *American Anthropologist*, 64, pp. 548–575.
Yalman, N. 1967 *Under the Bo Tree: Studies in Caste, Kinship and Marriage in the Interior of Ceylon*, Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.