

**SURPLUS LAND ACQUISITION AND
SOCIAL MOBILITY IN
RURAL HARYANA**

THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN THE FACULTY OF ARTS

1995

AJIT SINGH SAROHA
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
PANJAB UNIVERSITY
CHANDIGARH

SURPLUS LAND ACQUISITION AND
SOCIAL MOBILITY IN
RURAL HARYANA

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯ
ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯ ಗ್ರಂಥಾಲಯ
ಗಾ.ಕೃ.ವಿ.ಲೆ, ಬೀದರ-65
28 MAR 2008
ID. 9026
ಅನುಕ್ರಮ ಸಂ.....
ಪ. ಸಂ.....

FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE FACULTY OF ARTS
1995

ALIT SINGH SAROHA
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
PANJAB UNIVERSITY
CHANDIGARH

DEDICATED TO
MY
GRAND PARENTS
(BABA - BAJI)

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Anything that may impress the reader is solely because of the able and expert guidance of Prof.P.N.Pimply while the mistakes could straightway be attributed to my personal deliberations. Prof. P.N. Pimply besides being an ideal teacher is a man of great and practical human values. He has not only guided me throughout but has also been a strong moral support to me.

I shall convey my deep regards and appreciation for Prof.(Mrs.) K.P.Singh, Chairperson, Department of Sociology for her kind affection and cooperation. Prof.K.Gopal Iyer deserves a special and big thanks for his occasional help in bringing out this study.

The ones whom I cannot dare to thank are: My father Ch.Lehna Singh Saroha, my wife Jyoti, my brothers -Capt.Yashpal Saroha and Er. Sachinder Saroha and last but not the least my son Utkrisht; all of whom stood by me in all odds.

My friends - Brij Mohan Vashishtha, Daljit Singh Arya, Neelam Singh Sambyal, Sagar Preet Hooda and Hoshier Singh (alias Sagar) have often lend a helping hand in my bad times.

Lastly, Mr. Harinder Singh Thandi (Harbans Reprographic Aids) needs a special appreciation for his skilled computer operations.


(AJIT SINGH SAROHA)

CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	
LIST OF TABLES	I
CHAPTER I	
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II	
METHODOLOGY	46
CHAPTER III	
A PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS	62
CHAPTER IV	
TOTAL SUBMISSION AND SOCIAL MOBILITY	78
CHAPTER V	
PARTIAL PROTECTION AND SOCIAL MOBILITY	105
CHAPTER VI	
TOTAL PROTECTION AND SOCIAL MOBILITY	131
CHAPTER VII	
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	162
<i>BIBLIOGRAPHY</i>	175
<i>ANNEXURE</i>	183

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	TITLE	PAGE
1.1	CONCENTRATION RATIO OF OWNERSHIP HOLDINGS BY STATES	12
1.2	INTERSE DISTRIBUTION OF OPERATIONAL HOLDINGS ACCORDING TO SIZE GROUPS OF FARMS (ALL INDIA)	14
1.3	INTEREST DISTRIBUTION OF OPERATIONAL HOLDINGS AND CULTIVATED AREA IN PUNJAB	14
1.4	CEILING LIMITS FIXED DURING THE FIRST PHASE (1952-72)	21
1.5	CEILING LIMITS OF AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS AS IMPOSED AFTER 1972	23
1.6	PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REVISED CEILING LAWS (AS ON FEB., 1984)	25
1.7	AREA CULTIVATED (PUNJAB)	40
1.8	INFORMATION REGARDING DISTRICT WISE ALLOTMENT OF SURPLUS LAND ALONGWITH THE NUMBER OF BENEFICIARIES	43
1.9	AREA LOCKED IN LITIGATIONS	44
2.1	PROFILE OF THE SAMPLE DISTRICTS	53
3.1	DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY AGE	63
3.2	DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY CASTE/RELIGION	64

3.3	DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY EDUCATION	66
3.4	DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY OCCUPATION	67
3.5	DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY LAND- OWNERSHIP	68
3.6	DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS	70
3.7	DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY NUMBER OF COPARCENERS	71
3.8	DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY HOUSE-TYPE	72
3.9	DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY HOUSE-SIZE	72
3.10	DISTRIBUTION BY THE GENERATION OF SURPLUS FOOD-GRAINS	73
3.11	DISTRIBUTION THE VALUE OF ASSETS OTHER THAN LAND	75
3.12	DISTRIBUTION BY POLITICAL AND OTHER POSITIONS HELD	76

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER-I

INTRODUCTION

India is a predominantly agrarian country where about three-fourths of the population depends directly or indirectly on agriculture. It is not surprising that the 'peasantry' constitutes the most important 'class' in this country. The problems of this class have always been highlighted for, but little has really been done to mitigate them.

Any attempt to solve the problems of poor peasantry fall in the realm of 'Agrarian reforms'. In a paper about land reforms, the United Nations (1951) have defined it as "An integrated programme with aim to remove barriers for economic and social development, which follow from the defects in agrarian structure". In 1970, the U.N. have proposed 'structural reform' as a more appropriate term (Bergmann, 1984; p 3).

Soon after Independence an attempt to reform the agrarian structure was made by the newly elected Congress Party. In order to relieve the toiling millions from the exploitative hands of the 'Zamindars' (Landowners), a manifold programme was proposed. The two parts of this programme which had an important bearing upon the poorer rural sections were: the abolition of intermediary tenures and fixation of the Ceiling on agricultural land and redistribution. In simple terms, the land was taken from the richer sections for its redistribution to the poorer ones. It is quite obvious that the losers would attempt to block the effort. But, still a considerable number of landowners were over-riden in their attempt to save their estates. The present study deals with the alteration in the social standing of these targetted landowners. The study takes up the cases in detail to give their actual status positions (including economic and political aspects) with respect to the

Ceiling legislations in particular. In the present chapter, I will review the literature, initiating with a broader aspect of 'Agrarian reforms' and then nucleating down to the Ceiling Laws enacted in two phases.

Agrarian reform may be defined as a method, more or less controlled, to bring about changes in the existing ways of land ownership and operation that involve not only the diffusion of wealth, income and productivity in the economy, but also increased productivity, income and employment. It includes reforms in the system of land tenure such as abolition of intermediaries, fixation of Ceilings on land-holdings and redistribution of surplus land among landless or semi-landless peasants and abolition or regulation of tenancy besides any special measure(s) (i) to consolidate fragmented land-holdings, and (ii) to improve the socio-economic conditions of agricultural labourers and small and marginal farmers, fall within the scope of agrarian reform. Thus, agrarian reform is a much broader concept than that of land reform which limits itself to the questions of abolition of intermediaries, regulation or abolition of tenancy and land redistribution only (Haque; Sirohi, 1986; p 3).

Haque and Sirohi further describe that there are three distinct phases in the evolution of agrarian reforms policy in India. First; land policy during 1822 to 1931 was intended to mitigate the unfavourable consequences of the permanent settlement of Cornwallis and correcting the past mistakes. On the whole, however, the land policy of British government upto 1931 did not ensure either efficient cultivation or harmony in land relations. Although a series of reform measures were undertaken during this period, the gains of legislation accrued mainly to intermediaries and the actual cultivators failed to receive any incentive or encouragement to cultivate land

efficiently. Second, the period between 1931 and 1947 was one of preparation and development of new ideas on land policy, owing primarily to the emergence of Indian National Congress as the major political force in the country (The Congress in 1935 officially inscribed Agrarian reforms in its programme and later demanded more radical transformations in Agrarian Structure). Finally, in the third phase Agrarian reform policies took concrete shape after Independence as a result of important recommendations made by various committees and panels set up by the Government of India from time to time. Besides, the Five Year Plans provided valuable guidelines. The main features of the post-independence agrarian reforms policy are:

- a) Abolition of intermediaries.
- b) Abolition or regulation of tenancy.
- c) Fixation of Ceilings on land-holdings.
- d) Consolidation of land-holdings.
- e) Choice of appropriate farm organisation.

The agrarian relations on which the above mentioned reforms were to work can be classified into three categories, viz.;

- a) Relations of labour to land including the relation when labourers work as tenants.
- b) Relations of owners to land including the relation when owners are not producers and producers are either labourers working as tenants or capitalists working as tenants.
- c) Relations of state to land (An ICSSR working group report, 1980).

At the time of independence, India inherited from the British a feudal agrarian structure which was marked on one hand by the concentration of landownership in the hands of a parasitic class who played no positive role in production and on the other, the divorce from landownership of the vast mass of peasants who were the actual cultivators. According to the National Commission on agriculture (in

4

Haque and Sirohi 1986; p 6), this became the root cause of the state of chronic crisis in which Indian agricultural economy was enmeshed before the attainment of freedom.

As the British had introduced three different types of revenue settlement patterns (Zamindari, Ryotwari and Mahalwari) in the country, the emerging agrarian relations also varied. Zamindari system was greatly exploitative and asymmetrical in nature with the landlords controlling vast holdings at one end and an ever increasing number of landless agricultural labourers at the other. In between, in varying degrees of sub-infeudation were numerous intermediaries tenants, poor peasants, share croppers etc. Revenue was collected by the 'Zamindar' who acquired the status of a landlord. This system was most widespread covering 57% of the privately owned agricultural land in British India. This system was prevalent in Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, U.P., A.P., Rajasthan and parts of M.P. where statutory landlordism was created by the British in the latter part of the 18th century. Although the adverse effect of landlordism on agricultural production was most profound in the states of U.P., Bihar, West Bengal and Orissa, other states under ryotwari and mahalwari systems also witnessed the growth of a large number of the intermediary tenures. The U.P. Zamindari Abolition Committee (ibid., 1986; p 7) estimated that 1.5% of all zamindars in the state held 50% of the total land. Eight hundred and four of the biggest landowners of the state held 25% of the total land. The concentration of landownership in Bihar, Orissa and West Bengal was more or less of a similar order.

The ryotwari and mahalwari systems did not legally recognise any kind of intermediary between the cultivator and the state and covered 38% and 5% of the privately owned agricultural land respectively. Under the ryotwari system the occupiers of small independent holdings paid revenue directly to the state. This system

was initially introduced in Madras and later extended to Bombay and some parts of Bihar, East Punjab, Assam and Coorg, gave individual ryots full rights regarding sale, transfer and leasing of land. Similarly, the mahalwari system which was predominant in parts of Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Agra and Avadh treated the whole village as a unit for land revenue. But, due to infiltration of traders and moneylenders into agriculture and lease by them of their lands to tenants, intermediaries of the 'Zamindari type' could be seen even in areas where the ryotwari and mahalwari systems prevailed.

The former Bombay state was under the ryotwari system, but only 8% of the landholders at the top bracket (holding 10 hectares or more) owned 40% of the land in state. Under the mahalwari system in Punjab, holdings upto 4 hectares accounted for nearly 50% of the holdings covering only about 21% of the total land (ibid, 1986; p 7).

In Haryana and Punjab, although there were no zamindari settlements made at any stage of history, some big landlords used to get their lands cultivated by occupancy and non-occupancy tenants. At the time of independence nearly 50% of the total cultivated area of the erstwhile Punjab state (which included Haryana before 1966) came to be cultivated by tenants-at-will (Malaviya, 1954; p 163, in ibid, 1986; p 33).

After Independence, between 1952 and 1954, state governments enacted a number of important legislations to abolish intermediary rights and all such rights stood abolished in Haryana except for the insignificant area of 33 hectares in Mahendragarh. In Punjab, 6,47,740 occupancy tenants obtained proprietary rights over an area of 1.85 million acres (Report of National Commission on Agriculture, 1976; pp 107-108, in ibid, 1986; p 33).

However, as the right of purchase was restricted to tenants who were in continuous possession of land for six years, a majority of tenants who were 'tenants-at-will', did not benefit from the Law.

The legislative measures for the abolition of intermediaries achieved varying degrees of success in different regions. While in West Bengal, J&K, Kerala and Telengana region of A.P., the social, economic and political powers of large intermediaries were greatly reduced, other regions of the country witnessed only a marginal change. Taking a closer look at erstwhile Punjab, these measures had minimal impact, as mahalwari system prevailed in most of the Punjab. Even the Ceiling on land holdings, perhaps, could have little effect on the overall agrarian structure of the state.

The 'Abolition of intermediaries' was the most important part of our copious land legislations; the other notable parts were 'Ceilings on land holdings' and 'consolidation of land holdings'. Consolidation of land holdings which were fragmented and had resulted in very low production, was a positive effort and was appreciated and acknowledged by eminent economists of the calibre of Minhas (1970) and Dandekar and Rath (1971). The fixation of a low Ceiling limit to the amount of land a person or family can hold, is and had been an issue of debate. One school of thought {Ladejinsky (1969), Prasad (1973), Appu (1973), Bergmann (1984) and others} holds that land reform in the sense of "Land to the tiller" is one measure that is needed for an enduring solution to the problem of rural poverty. The second school of thought {Minhas (1970), Ahluwalia (1984), Dandekar and Rath (1971), Dantwala (1960) and others} does not really support it. Consolidation for them is more a solution of rural poverty than Ceiling and redistribution of land.

Agrarian reforms may influence the proces of economic development in a number of ways. Firstly, the imposition of Ceilings

on landholdings exerts new pressure on the big landowning class to work more intensively on and off the farms for maintaining their past standard of living and social status. Secondly, redistribution of surplus land among a large number of landless and semi-landless tenants or agriculture labourers creates new incentives and opportunities for more work and investment, and thereby help improve the economic condition of rural poor. Thirdly, abolition of intermediaries and the system of cultivation by tenants-at-will followed by the creation of peasant proprietorship would improve the prospects of raising farm productivity, income and employment due to closer and stronger man-land relationship. Fourthly, it is difficult to adopt modern farm practices, if the land is not consolidated in one parcel. Consolidation of holdings increases farm efficiency by enabling farmers to bring about land improvement through leveling, bunding and construction of irrigation canals, etc. at low cost. Fifthly, it is impossible to think how small and marginal farmers in India would improve their economic position without having consolidation of holdings and some kind of cooperative farming arrangement. Internal economies of scale in agriculture cease to be important beyond a farm size that fully employs the labour of the family. But the position is different with regard to external economies (large scale machinery, fertilizers and seeds, credit, processing and marketing) which require group or cooperation action (Haque; Sirohi, 1986; pp 4- 5).

On the other hand, some critics of Agrarian reforms hold that in a developing economy like India, economic development requires movement of population out of agriculture into a growing industrial sector, for raising the levels of both aggregate income and employment in the economy. According to Dandekar (1962), creation of new peasant proprietorship would impede such a movement

whereas large production units, because they involve looser man-land relationships facilitate this withdrawal.

According to Bergmann (1984, pp 18 to 30), some results and effects of agrarian reforms are disputed, e.g.:

- i) Is the division and fragmentation of intensively cultivated large holdings useful?
- ii) Can production be promoted by agrarian reforms alone?
- iii) How can the conflicting objectives of a rural population, that yearns for land and an urban population, that is hungry for food, be met simultaneously?

He adds that after Independence, national unity against colonial rule was pushed into the background; internal, social and economic issues took the forefront. The struggle for redistribution of land, fulfillment of the promises of the Congress Party about the radical agrarian reforms became a central issue in Indian politics. Three forms of land reform can be distinguished:

- i) By legislation and administration.
- ii) By voluntary land-donation of large proprietors.
- iii) By self-activity and self-help of the landless and small cultivators.

Indian reality is too multivarious for a general description; a generalisation is necessary though. Essentially, all government attempts at agrarian reform in the first three decades were abortive. The central government can only formulate general guidelines on this issue and push the state governments by declarations of intent. The competence for implementing agrarian reform is vested in the states. "The more Indian parliamentary democracy approaches village reality, the more it is dominated by the large landlords, their friends and representatives." With a few exceptions, most of the then 23 state

governments had done little for an efficient distribution of land (Bergmann, 1984; p 30).

According to some economists deep-going social changes cause transitory, passing disturbances in investment, production and market deliveries. Therefore, they propose the following substitute measures:

- i) Gradualist approach.
- ii) Taxation.
- iii) Waste land reclamation and settlement of landless.
- iv) Voluntary land donations (Bhoodan, Gramdan, etc.).
- v) Green revolution (In Bergmann, 1984; pp 14-15).

Agrarian reform is too broad a concept for the scope of this study. Henceforth, land reforms and then the study specific concept of Land Ceiling is reviewed. The review also includes the retrospection of the policy of land reform in general and land Ceiling in particular.

Land reforms in India are more than a century old. Its history is replete with twists and turns, ranging from the early attempts to protect the cultivator's rights in the land to "the land to the tiller idea" to "cooperativization" of agriculture and back to such fundamentals as security of tenure and controlled rents (Ladejinsky; 1977, p 369). One of the basic reform objectives was to reduce the number of tenants and increase the number of owner farmers. Its main tool is the well tried and tested "land Ceiling".

The motive behind the land reform measures in Indian states was the distribution of surplus land among the tenants and the landless, as it was visualised that it would abolish or at least bring under control the social and economic inequalities which were the

Lorenz Curve showing inequality in the distribution of ownership holdings in India during 1953-54 and 1971-72 (Based on 8th and 26th rounds of the National Sample Survey, cited in Haque and Sirohi, 1986; p 145).

The concentration ratios of ownership holdings have varied not only over time, but also between regions. While, the concentration ratios of ownership holdings have witnessed a marginal decline in most of the regions, in the technologically developed region of Punjab, the concentration ratio has increased from 0.749 in 1961 to 0.776 in 1971. As in 1971, the concentration ratio ranged between 0.607 in Jammu and Kashmir and 0.776 in Punjab. In Bihar, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal also, the concentration ratio showed a slightly upward trend.

Table 1.1

Concentration ratio of ownership holdings by states

State	1961	1971
Andhra Pradesh	0.764	0.732
Bihar	0.701	0.712
Gujrat	0.683	0.683
Kerala	0.756	0.702
Madhya Pradesh	0.632	0.621
Maharashtra	0.707	0.682
Karnataka	0.663	0.663
Orissa	0.684	0.645
Punjab and Haryana	0.749	0.776
Rajasthan	0.654	0.607
Tamil Nadu	0.749	0.751
Uttar Pradesh	0.621	0.631
West Bengal	0.666	0.672
All India	0.720	0.710

{Source: Based on 17th and 26th Rounds of N.S.S. quoted from Shah, 1976, p 77. in *ibid* (1986); p 146}.

The influence of technological change on the concentration of land-holdings in many regions may not be ruled out. The introduction of the new production technology in the mid-sixties made self-cultivation of land by the landowners a profitable proposition and, therefore, in some technologically developed regions of the country, large and medium farmers converted their erstwhile leased-out lands into self-operated ones. In addition, many large and medium farms are found to be leasing-in land from the small and marginal farms and the system of commercial tenancy is underway. Moreover, there are instances of land transfer from one farmer to another through sales or mortgages. In Punjab, for example, the biggest category of operators, i.e. 30 acres and above accounted for 66 percent of the total land transacted between 1966 and 1981 (Grewal and Rangil, 1981; p 181).

Nevertheless, since small and marginal farms have relatively larger share in the total tenanted area, considering the country as a whole, the concentration of operational holdings is slightly less than that of ownership holdings.

The effect of the Ceiling Acts on operational holdings could be seen in these distributions:

Table 1.2

Interse distribution of operational holdings according to size groups of farm (All India)

Size Class	1950 - 51		1970 - 71		1976 - 77	
	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area
Less than 1 hectare	38.4%	6.0%	50.9%	9.0%	54.6%	10.7%
1-2 hectares	21.7%	10.2%	18.9%	11.9%	18.0%	12.8%
2-4 hectares	19.2%	18.2%	15.0%	18.5%	14.3%	19.9%
4-10 hectares	15.3%	31.6%	11.4%	29.7%	10.1%	30.4%
Above 10 hectares	5.4%	34.0%	3.8%	30.9%	3.0%	26.2%

Table 1.3

Interse distribution of operational holdings and cultivated area in Punjab

Size class	1950 - 51		1970 - 71		1976 - 77	
	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area
Less than 1 hectare	10.7%	1.0%	37.6%	5.7%	42.4%	6.3%
1-2 hectares	11.6%	3.3%	18.9%	9.4%	18.1%	9.6%
2-4 hectares	24.9%	14.2%	20.4%	20.0%	18.5%	19.8%
4-10 hectares	42.6%	51.5%	18.0%	38.1%	16.8%	30.1%
Above 10 hectares	10.2%	30.0%	5.0%	26.9%	4.1%	26.2%

Source:

1. First Agricultural Labour Inquiry, 1950-51, Govt.of India, New Delhi.
2. All India Agricultural Census, 1970-71, Govt.of India, New Delhi.
3. All India Agricultural Census, 1976-77, Govt.of India, New Delhi (quoted in ibid ,(1986); pp.146 and 148).

The high concentration of ownership and operational holdings, brought to forefront the need for fixation of Ceilings on the amount of land that one can hold. The decreased concentration in 1970-71 and 1976-77 shows the effect that the Ceiling acts passed by the government had on the land held by the landowners (See Table 1.1 to 1.3).

Although, the effects of the reform legislations are debatable but evidently enough, there is a change in the agrarian structures before and after reforms. The farmer, whatever is his ownership, big or small is relatively more at ease now than in any of the Zamindari, Ryotwari or Mahalwari tenures. But the Ceiling Acts had much to do with the relatively big landowners and the marginal or landless peasants.

LAND CEILINGS IN INDIA:

The term 'Ceiling on Landholdings' refers to the legally stipulated maximum size beyond which no individual farmer or farm household can hold any land. Like all other land reform measures, the objective of such Ceiling is to promote economic growth and social justice. It has been duly recognized by India's planners and policy makers that beyond a point any large scale farming in Indian situation becomes not only uneconomic but also unjust.

The first specific proposal for 'Ceiling' as a measure of redistributing landholdings appears to have emerged from the National Congress Committee. The report of the Committee outlined that:

UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
GKVK, BANSHIPORE-560 065.

TL 9025

"Land should be held for use as a source of employment; the maximum size of holding should be fixed and the surplus land over such a maximum should be acquired and placed at the disposal of village cooperatives".

This was soon followed by the appointment of the Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee under the Chairmanship of J.C.Kumarappa. Stressing the need for an upper as well as lower limit for individual farming, the Committee said that:

"To avoid social injustice there should be reasonable relationship between the economic holding and the maximum size of a holding which an individual peasant can be allowed to cultivate"(Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee, 1951; p 22). Joshi (1960; pp 508-509) supports the view of the Congress Committee in remarking-

"Land owning classes specially those having super land rights and substantial holdings who stand higher in the caste hierarchy keep away from productive labour. They often let out their holdings to tenants or share croppers recruited from lower castes. Subsisting thus, primarily on rental income, they siphon away the surplus which could otherwise have been invested in land by the actual tiller for agricultural improvements".

In January, 1959, at the Nagpur Conference of the Indian National Congress, it was resolved that agrarian legislation to cover restrictions on the size of landholdings must be implemented in all states by the end of 1959. The idea was to reduce the degree of inequality in the ownership of land. Moreover, when the supply of land was limited as compared to the demand for it, its proper rationing and distribution was considered highly conducive to agricultural growth with employment.

According to Rao (1972; p A-6) small farms offer more opportunities for employment as compared to large farms. Therefore, even if large farms are shown to produce relatively more output per acre, they cannot be considered more efficient in a situation of widespread unemployment and under-employment as obtains in this country. Besides, the social inequalities and exploitation cannot be eliminated unless Ceilings are imposed on land holdings and the surplus land redistributed among the landless or semi-landless workers.

Ladejinsky (1969) stated that the problem in India is worse because one third or so have no stake in land of any kind. The worst exploiters were not landlords, the people who actually owned the land, but secondary groups who are called tenants but who do not cultivate the land. They who sublet the land to the real cultivators.

Prasad (1973) argues that land reform in the sense of "Land to the tiller" is the one measure that is needed for the solution of the problem of rural poverty. Ceiling on 'Agricultural land' is needed to break the power of rural oligarchy and initiate the process of rapid agricultural and rural development apart from providing a good infrastructure. Looking at the facts more closely, we find that if the decline in proportion of rural poor has been low, it is not because the "trickle down modified thesis" is not valid in the Indian situation, but because agricultural production has been low and is heavily dependent upon the vagaries of nature. Thus, land Ceiling and redistribution, (so as to do away with the stranglehold of semifeudal production relations) and technological development constitute between themselves the necessary and sufficient conditions for rapid agricultural growth and eradication of poverty at a faster rate than have been achieved so far. There seems to be no other option (World Bank staff working paper, Nov.1978).

Bergmann (1984) apprehends that the notion of "land to the tiller" - the rationale of abolition of outdated land tenure was and is a heavily disputed political, economic and social problem, affecting the basic strategy of the country's economic development conditions varying widely over the vast country and its federal structure.

The dispute is attested further by the following authors who hold the contrary;

Dantwala's contention is that:

"The amount of land which would be available through the imposition of Ceiling would be relatively so small that its redistribution will be far too inadequate for appeasing land hunger which appears to be the major objective of the proposal. Moreover, if this surplus land is redistributed in small fragments among landless labourers, it will only accentuate the problem of small holdings"(Dantwala, 1960,p 9).

Subramoniam (1959) indicates:

"This class (landless agricultural labourers) roughly forms 30 percent of the rural population, which is so high and therefore the idea to provide them with adequate land is beyond the realm of feasibility even if the entire cultivated area is to be made available. Nevertheless, if the size is to be adequate enough to provide the holder with minimum subsistence, only a small number could be satisfied in which case the reform will not be worthwhile" (Subramoniam, 1959, p10).

The Ford Foundation sponsored study by Dandekar and Rath ("Poverty in India", 1971, p 86) maintains that the very low Ceiling which any sizeable programme of redistribution will require, cannot be justified on sound economic considerations or rational calculations. They further add that "It is futile to try to resolve the

problem of rural poverty in an overpopulated state, by redistribution of land which is in short supply."

Krishna Raj feels that:

"These new small holdings are not likely to produce much, at least for some years, even if the massive aid required by them is organized in their farms and the incentive of new ownership comes into full play. All the new allottees of land may not turn out to be efficient independent farmers" (Krishna Raj, 1959, p 309).

Gadgil (1954) holding the same view is more concerned about defining and imposing a floor on the farm holdings.

Thorner (1956) reports that the Ceiling legislation can be easily circumvented.

Gupta (1956) outlines certain difficulties in evolving the objective procedures for land redistribution.

Minhas (1970) also suggested consolidation of land holdings rather than radical land distribution and land Ceiling for eradication of poverty.

Ahluwalia (1984) analysed and showed that at the all India level there is a strong support for the hypothesis that the incidence of rural poverty is inversely related to agricultural performance.

The debate still holds goods, but one thing is evident that big landowners like ANOKHI DEVI of Bihar who still holds around 3,700 acres of land should have surrendered their land considerably for the benefit of good number of poor peasants. There are studies which show that around 30% of the land of big landowners is taken over and partly redistributed (Singh, 1964). Even if this estimation is correct, the idea of land to the tiller does not seem to be fully achieved.

REVIEW OF CEILING LEGISLATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION IN THE FIRST PHASE (1952-1972):

The Ceiling legislations were enacted and enforced in India in two phases - the first phase covering the period from 1952 to 1972 before the National guidelines were laid down and the second phase - since 1972 after the adoption of National guidelines and, therefore, a detailed inquiry into the working of Ceiling legislations in the country during these two phases of the history of land reform would be highly useful.

The legislations on Ceiling of agricultural land were delayed in most parts of the country except for West Bengal and Jammu & Kashmir where Laws for fixation of Ceilings on landholdings were passed simultaneously with the Laws for abolition of intermediaries by the early fifties.

In the erstwhile Punjab and Pepsu, the Laws to this effect were passed around mid fifties, but much time was spent in elaborating the rules and instructions for their application in practice which enabled the big landowners to take steps to evict tenants and divide up their estates. Till 1958, the maximum size of landholdings could not be stipulated in Uttar Pradesh. The impact of Nagpur Resolution of 1959, however, was significant as various State governments immediately took to the passing of fresh Ceiling legislations in early sixties. Thus, the Gujarat Agricultural Lands Ceiling Act, 1960; The Madhya Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Act, 1960; The Bihar Land Reforms (Fixation of Ceiling Area and Acquisition of Surplus Land) Act, 1961; The Karnataka Land Reforms Act, 1961; The Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) Act, 1961; The Tamil Nadu Land Reforms Act (Fixation of Ceiling on Land) Act, 1961 and The Kerala Land Reforms Act, 1963 were some of the results of the Nagpur Resolution on Land Reform. However, the Ceilings imposed in various states during the first phase, varied widely both in

- respect of the unit of application and the acreage fixed. The Ceiling varied between 4 hectares in parts of Gujarat to 136 hectares in parts of Rajasthan.

Table 1.4

Ceiling Limits fixed during the first phase (1952 to 1972)

	State	Level of Ceiling (Hectares)
1.	ANDHRA PRADESH	10.93 to 131.12
2.	ASSAM	20.23
3.	BIHAR	9.71 to 29.14
4.	GUJARAT	4.05 to 53.14
5.	HIMACHAL PRADESH	12.14 in Chamba district and Land assessed to Rs.125 in other areas.
6.	HARYANA	12.14 to 24.28
7.	JAMMU & KASHMIR	9.21
8.	KERALA	6.07 to 15.18
9.	MADHYA PRADESH	10.12
10.	ORISSA	8.09 to 32.37
11.	PUNJAB	12.14 to 24.28
12.	RAJASTHAN	8.90 to 135.97
13.	TAMIL NADU	12.14 to 48.56
14.	UTTAR PRADESH	16.19 to 32.37
15.	WEST BENGAL	0.12

(Source: *ibid*, 1988; p 81)

While individual was the unit of application for Ceiling in the states of Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Orissa, Punjab, Uttar Pradesh and West

Bengal, family as the unit of application was followed in Gujarat, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu. Besides, around 40 categories of Land (like land under orchards, under forests, commercial sites, under factory, etc.) were exempted from Ceiling Laws. These exemptions as provided in the Ceiling legislations gave rise to the problem of Law evasion through the devices of changing the classification of land etc., thereby dissipating the surplus. Infact, all of these factors led to the setting up of the Central Land Reforms Committee in 1972 to review the agrarian situation on the basis of which the Chief Ministers' Conference held in July, 1972 laid down the National Guidelines for future legislations on land Ceilings.

REVIEW OF CEILING LEGISLATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION IN THE SECOND PHASE (SINCE 1972) :

The National Guidelines were laid down in 1972, following which the state governments amended their Ceiling Laws, decreasing the Ceiling limits and making the legislation uniform (more or less) throughout the country. In the new legislations, 'family' was taken as the unit of application. The Ceiling limits in various states are compiled in the following table:-

Table 1.5:

**Ceiling Limits of Agricultural Landholdings
as imposed after 1972**

	State	Level of Ceiling (Hectares)
1.	Andhra Pradesh	4.05 to 21.85
2.	Assam	6.75*
3.	Bihar	6.07 to 18.21
4.	Gujarat	4.05 to 21.85
5.	Haryana	7.25 to 21.85
6.	Himachal Pradesh	4.05 to 12.14**
7.	Jammu and Kashmir	3.68 to 7.77***
8.	Karnataka	4.05 to 21.85
9.	Kerala	4.86 to 6.07
10.	Madhya Pradesh	4.05 to 21.85
11.	Orissa	4.05 to 18.21
12.	Punjab	7.00 to 21.80
13.	Rajasthan	7.25 to 21.85****
14.	Tamil Nadu	4.86 to 24.28
15.	Tripura	4.00 to 12.00
16.	Uttar Pradesh	7.30 to 18.25
17.	West Bengal	5.00 to 7.00

- * implies: Additional area under orchard subject to maximum of 21.02 hectares above Ceiling is permissible.
- ** implies: In certain specified areas upto 28.33 hectares.
- *** implies: Orchards in excess of Ceiling limit is permissible, subject to an annual tax.
- **** implies: In certain specified areas upto 70.82 hectares. (Source: *ibid*, 1986; p 84)

Thus, when we compare the Ceiling limits in the two phases of Ceiling legislations in the country, the second phase appears to have undoubtedly improved and rationalised the situation. However, certain categories of land continue to be exempted from Ceiling and thus, again left scope for Law evasion through the device of shifting land-use to the exempted categories. Lands held by religious, charitable and educational institutions, lands for special cultivation of tea, land held by a cooperative farming society for feeding a sugarcane factory (Assam), land under plantations, private forests (Kerala), land belonging to primary cooperative societies (Himachal Pradesh) and land possessed by commercial undertakings (Tamil Nadu) have been exempted from Ceiling Laws. Secondly, although family is now the basis for determining the level of Ceiling, the term 'family' has been used with different meaning in different states and the major sons have been allowed a separate Ceiling unit in almost all the states. In short, since the new Ceiling Laws do not seem to have attacked the various sources of Law evasion, the question of proper Ceiling legislation and its implementation has not been solved even after the National Guidelines.

The Planning Commission estimated a possible surplus of about 37 million acres at one time. Krishna Raj (1961; p 229) assessed: "this would be 90 percent of the area required to give any/every landless family a minimum basic holding or 42 percent of the area required to increase sub-basic holdings to basic holdings".

The basic holding was assumed to be 2.5 acres for one state, 5 acres for seven states, and 10 acres for ten states. But in reality, our past achievement in this regard is not very encouraging and on 21.2.84, the estimated surplus area was only 2.10 million hectares, the area declared surplus was 1.74 million hectares and the area distributed uptill then was only 0.85 million hectares. Table 1.6

further indicates that performance of even the left dominated states of West Bengal and Kerala where the beneficiaries of such legislations are said to be politically organised, have not been very impressive in this regard, as less than 70 per cent of the area declared surplus could be taken over by these states and the area distributed as percentage of the area taken possession, constituted 67 percent and 59 percent respectively in Kerala and West Bengal. It is true that surplus land as percentage of total cultivable land is as high as 6.7 percent in West Bengal, but a major part of this surplus (about 92 percent) became available mainly through the implementation of Estate Acquisition Act, 1953 and only about 8 percent resulted from the Land Reforms Act (Agro-Economic Research Centre, Viswa Bharti, 1980; p 7).

The total area declared surplus at present constitutes only 1.2 percent of the net cultivated area in the country. Of the land distributed so far, scheduled castes and scheduled tribes account for about 52 percent. The average area of land distributed per beneficiary works out to 0.53 hectare.

Table 1.6:

Progress in the implementation of the revised Ceiling Laws (as on February 1984)

State	Area estimated to be surplus (000' acre)	Area declared surplus as % of estimated surplus	Area taken possession of as % of area declared surplus	Area distributed as % taken possession	Area distributed to schedule castes as % of total area distributed	Area distributed to schedule tribes as % of total area distributed
Andhra Pradesh	1002.83	100.0	44.5	72.4	45.8	18.7
Assam	450.92	100.0	83.5	84.5	7.3	9.5
Bihar	300.00	89.2	61.1	96.7	54.3	13.0

Contd.....

Madhya Pradesh. These states were estimated under the Ceiling Act.

If we look at the actual distribution of the surplus land according to Table 1.6, we can find that in West Bengal, the results are satisfactory, only when compared to the All India results. The estimated surplus land was 1,72,470 acres out of which 99.4% was declared surplus, 69.8% of this area was taken possession of and 59.4% of it has been distributed to the landless labourers. The states of Bihar and Orissa also yielded almost the same results. U.P. seems to be the most successful one where 2,93,900 acres of land was estimated to be surplus, all of it was declared surplus, 91.4% out of which was taken possession of and 89.4% of this taken over area was redistributed (cf. Singh, Charan in his book *Economic Nightmare in India*). These results sound more encouraging because a considerable part of U.P. (Agra and Avadh) was under Mahalwari System. The other states under this system, i.e. Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan gave negative results. In Andhra Pradesh, 10,02,830 acres of land was estimated as surplus, all of which was declared surplus but only 44.5% of this area could be taken possession of. Whereas in Rajasthan, 7,94,000 acres of land was estimated to be surplus but only 32.5% of it was declared as surplus. Lastly, Madhya Pradesh where this system was prevalent in some parts, also didn't give positive results. Here too, the area taken possession of, was as low as 57.1%.

Ryotwari System:

This system prevailed over about 38% of the cultivated area. In this system the Ceiling legislations were not expected to furnish enthusiastic results. But still, the states of Maharashtra and Assam provided much more land as surplus, even more than the national average. In both the states about 80% of the land estimated to be surplus was taken over and redistributed. In Tamil Nadu, just about

latter would voluntarily surrender all rights on any remaining land in their occupancy.

Dantwala (1971) confirms that at 25 acre Ceiling, 11 million hectares should be surplus but only 0.35 million hectares was surplus and 0.16 million hectares was acquired for redistribution as per the First Acts.

National Sample Survey reported findings at variance from the above in the VIIIth and XVIIth rounds. According to these rounds of N.S.S. from 1953-54 to 1960-61, the landowners with holdings 30 acre and above lost around 30% of their land increasing the owners in category 0-5 acres by 25% and reducing the landless peasants to nearly half.

Another study that needs a special mention is done by Land Reforms Unit of Lal Bahadur Shastri Academy of Administration, Mussoorie in 1989-90. It covered 418 big landowners in 17 states of India. Average land identified per landowner was the largest in the states of Bihar, Rajasthan, Assam and Gujarat which were 236.26, 171.06, 116.18 and 92.87 hectares respectively. In the states of Haryana, Maharashtra, Orissa, U.P., Tripura and Punjab, it was below 30 hectares per landowner. Lowest was in Kerala, i.e. 11.93 hectares. All India average per landowner was 47.73 hectares. According to this study, the administrative machinery has been able to catch only a few cases because the landowners were able to dispose-off considerable area before the cut-off date, thereby circumventing the legislations.

Kerala and West Bengal experienced convulsions from below because of the presence of socialist ideas, whereas in Karnataka it was the initiative from above that sharpened the teeth of the administration and implemented the land Ceiling legislations with moderate success. On the other hand, the states of Andhra Pradesh

and Bihar present an enigmatic situation. Both the states have witnessed strong peasant movements and yet are cases of lack of success either from below or from above (cf. p 30). At the All India level the declared surplus land to the net sown area is only 2.08%. The states of Haryana, M.P., Tripura, H.P. and Karnataka emerge as the least successful ones with percentage hovering from 0.23% to 1.25%. Most successful being West Bengal where the land of widows, children and Gowshalas was acquired, thus percentage per net sown area being as high as 9%. It is more disappointing when we see the actual distribution at All India level. It is a mere 1.32% (ibid, 1989-90).

The report of the Task Force (1973) on agrarian relations under the Chairmanship of the Land Reforms Commissioner, P.S. Appu, is a strikingly candid document. Going through it the only conclusion that can be reached is that genuine and radical land reforms are simply not possible within the established social and political order. The report gave lack of political will as one of the major causes of the failure of legislation. The task force says that if the slogan, "Land to the tiller" is to be meaningfully and honestly implemented, the land should go to those who perform the various operations like ploughing, sowing, transplanting, harvesting, etc. Appu (1973) further recommends certain degree of politicization of peasants along militant lines and that the Act should be covered by some other measures like- land owned should not be in more than one village, land left uncultivated for any one season be taken over by the Government, etc.

Khusro (1977) found that although the peasants hungered for land or to remain on land securely on reasonable terms, they neither fought nor agitated for their 'economic liberation' in post-independence days. The reforms in India are not a result of popular

demand but rather the brainchild of the intellectuals of the Congress Party.

Hence, it becomes difficult for a scholar to draw any authentic conclusion regarding the applicability, perception and implementation of Ceiling legislation on the basis of above mentioned studies.

APPRAISAL OF CEILING LEGISLATIONS:

The first round of Ceiling legislation began in 1948 in Jammu and Kashmir and by 1960-61 almost all states had passed their own Ceiling Laws. Reviewing the Ceiling policy of the Government of India as presented in the first five year plans, Dandekar and Rath (1971) observed that it was advocated with little conviction and less purpose.

As the distribution of land was skewed, there were ample reasons for using Ceilings on landholdings as a mechanism for redressing the imbalance caused by the extreme maldistribution of land. In India, the abolition of intermediaries and tenancy legislation on the one hand, and Laws to reduce the concentration of land on the other, comprised two separate stages of land reforms. The separation of two processes enabled the landlords to bring as much land as possible under their possession, and thus defeat the aims of legislation {Third Five Year Plan (1961-66); p 229}.

Radhakrishnan (1989) finds in Kerala that the poor performance has been the result of a combination of factors. Bogus transfers and large scale conversion of lands into plantations were the two main factors besides the political and other factors. Yet, the overall impact of the 'three schemes' is massive and structurally very significant.

Gough (1989) writes about Tamil Nadu that the Ceiling Acts failed to divide large estates into small or *medium family farms* and to

distribute substantial land to the landless as they were ostensibly intended to do. As the small farmer strategy gave place to the campaign for 'green revolution farming', most were able to enrich themselves further through government and foreign loans and subsidies. Although land reforms failed in their ostensible objectives, they unquestionably have changed the agrarian structure.

Thimmaiah and Aziz (1984) have attributed the poor achievement of land reforms in Karnataka to vested interests of politicians, corrupt bureaucracy, and economic and political domination of landlords (in Rajapurohit, ed., 1984).

Bhat (in *ibid*, 1984) accounts the loopholes in the legislation, the revenue recording system, the implementing machinery as making the land reforms in the real sense ineffective, the lack of organized militant struggle making the situation worse. Beteille (1983) remarks that there is no significant alteration in the economic situation of the weakest section.

The various criticisms for the Ceiling legislation can be summarized as:

- a) Fixation of high Ceilings.
- b) Lack of well defined and comprehensive Ceiling legislation.
- c) Judicial delays.
- d) Influence of landlords on local land Tribunals.
- e) Lack of organisation of the potential beneficiaries.
- f) Manipulative changes in the classification of land.
- g) Lack of up-to-date records.
- h) Inferior quality of land taken in possession.

LAND REFORMS ABROAD; A GLIMPSE:

The main forms of agrarian structural change are:

- i) Adaptation to agrarian structure,
- ii) Agrarian reform, and
- iii) Agrarian revolution.

These three forms are not mutually exclusive categories. They rather differ by their degree of radicality and the pace of implementation. Agrarian reforms, for example, in Sweden around 1800, East Germany in 1807 and Enclosures in Britain imply legal coercion, often expropriation of the poorer rural sections, land distribution with the objective of creating viable peasant holdings. "Agrarian revolutions finally produce a radical transformation of traditional tenure systems, redistribution of land, abolition of all unproductive payments for old debts or for compensation". Such agrarian reforms can well be implemented in steps as for example in China or with collectivization in Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic (Bergmann, 1984; pp 6-7).

Pradhan (1973) remarks that the only success story of eradication of poverty and rapid development are from Japan, South Korea and Taiwan where most radical land reforms (outside the socialist block) were implemented during 1940's and 50's. In South Korea strict provisions were enacted and implemented during the period, to prevent re-emergence of disequalising tendency with a low Ceiling of 3 hectares per family and thereby destroying the stranglehold of the traditional rural oligarchy.

LAND CEILINGS IN HARYANA:

The land Ceiling legislations were implemented in two phases in erstwhile Punjab (including Haryana and the then Kangra and Simla districts of Himachal Pradesh). In phase I, The Punjab Security of Land Tenures Act, 1953 (Punjab Act no. X of 1953) governed the Ceiling in the entire province of joint Punjab.

History of the Act: In a predominantly agricultural state like Punjab, the solution of the land problem was of prime importance. To give effect to the policy of Government regarding abolition of intermediaries and regulation of tenancy of agricultural lands, the first piece of legislation taken up by the Punjab legislature was the Punjab Tenants (Security of Tenure) Act XXII of 1950, to give relief to 'tenants-at-will' where tenancies are for a term not exceeding four years. Its scope, however, limited to tenants of landowners owning more than 200 acres of land or 100 standard acres of land other than the land occupied by occupancy tenants. Even such a landowner was entitled under that Act to reserve 100 standard acres of his land for self cultivation and the tenants of such reserved area were excluded from the benefits of the Act. The Act amended about a year after its enactment by the Punjab Tenants (Security of Tenure) Amendment Act No. V of 1951 which reduced the limit of ownership of a landowner from 200 ordinary acres or 100 standard acres of land to 100 ordinary acres or 50 standard acres respectively. It also enhanced the minimum period of a tenancy from four to five years and also gave other concessions and privileges to tenants.

Both, the Act of 1950 and the amending Act of 1951 have been repealed by the Punjab Security of land tenures Act, 1953 (Punjab Act No. X of 1953), the object of which was stated thus, "The bill seeks to consolidate and amend the Law relating to land tenures in Punjab. It is a consolidating measure replacing the Punjab tenants (Security of Tenure) Act XXII of 1950 and the President's Act of 1951 in the light of administrative difficulties and experience gained as a result of the working of two Acts such of the provisions as were considered inexpedient have been removed and others for which provision was considered necessary included. This measure will now apply also to the land allotted under the Administration of Evacuee

Property Act 1950 (vide statement of objects and reasons of Punjab Gazette Extraordinary, 22 Nov, 1952, p 137)".

The Act has been subsequently amended by the Punjab Security of land tenures Amendment Act No. LVII of 1953 and to a very large extent by the Punjab Security of land tenures Amendment Act No. XI of 1955. The main objects of the last enactment are.

- i) To prevent large scale ejection of tenants;
- ii) To extend the concept of "permissible area" over tenancies;
- iii) To introduce the new concept of "Surplus area" and its utilisation by the state governments for the resettlement of ejected tenants;
- iv) To control and regulate the ejection of tenants and to co-ordinate the ejections of tenants with their resettlement on surplus areas.
- v) To provide a quick and effective procedure for the recovery of rent from defaulting tenants and for the settlement of disputes between landlords and tenants in matters pertaining to the quantum of rent, their payment and other ancillary measures.
- vi) To prevent sales and other dis-positions of land adversely affecting the continuance of tenancies and the extent of the available surplus area.
- vii) To reduce the period entitling a tenant to purchase the land comprised in his tenancy and to provide for easier terms of purchase, and
- viii) Other incidental matters (Vide statement of objects and reasons published in the Punjab Gazette Extraordinary, dated- April 16, 1955).

Purpose:

The objective behind getting declaration of surplus area from big landlords does not mean that they cease to be the owner of the land declared to be surplus. The land declared surplus area shall be utilized only by the State Government for the resettlement of tenants who become tenants of such landowner with right to purchase their tenancies under section-18 of the Act. The landlord loses his

right to settle tenants on the surplus area, or to till it by himself.
Objects and Scope of new Amendment Act. XI of 1955:

The Punjab Security of Land Tenures Act No.X of 1953 went a long way to check absentee landlordism which was the bane of our agriculture, and constituted a serious threat to social and economic stability.

It however resulted in the ejection of about 13 to 14 thousand tenants in the state. Considering the total number of tenants who have no land of their own being about four lakhs, the percentage of tenants affected was very small. The Government which is inspired by the desire to establish agrarian economy on efficient progressive and democratic lines could not leave the ejected tenants and others likely to be ejected to their own fate. They set out, therefore, to solve the problem by bringing in Punjab Security of land tenures (Amendment) Act No.XI of 1955. The main objects of the new Amending Act are same as that of the Act No. X of 1953. However, an important consideration in the formulation of the land policy as envisaged in the Amending Act is to combat the increasing menace of unemployment by a more equitable distribution of land holdings and utilisation of the "surplus area". It will not be out of place to mention that the number of big landlords in the state having holdings beyond the permissible limit is very small. Out of a total of over 26 lakh landowners in the state hardly 21,000 or about one percent possess more land than the permissible acreage.

It was only in the fitness of things that this well-to-do section of landowners has been called upon by this Act to help absorption of the ejected tenants in the economy of the state.

Permissible Area : Under the new Amending Act, "Permissible Area" in relation to a landowner or a tenant meant 30 standard acres or 60 ordinary acres. For a displaced person who had

been allotted land in excess of 50 standard acres, the permissible limit was 50 standard acres or 100 ordinary acres. For allotments in excess of 30 standard acres but less than 50 standard acres, the permissible area was to be equal to the allotted area. In cases where land allotted was less than 30 standard acres including any other acres or part there-of, if any, that an allottee owned in addition. If a landlord reserved some land for self cultivation, he had the right to eject a tenant from that land. The tenants could not however be ejected from unreserved land for a period of 10 years.

Displaced person:

Section-2 sub-section-C of the East Punjab Displaced Persons (land Resettlement) Act, 1949 (Act No. XXXVI of 1949) defines the term 'displaced person' as- "Displaced person" means a land- holder in the territories now comprised in the province of West Punjab or a person of Punjab extraction who holds land in the province of North West frontier provinces and Baluchistan or any state adjacent to any of the aforesaid provinces and acceding to the Dominion of Pakistan, and who has since the 1st day of March, 1947 abandoned or been made to abandon his land in the said territories on account of civil disturbances, or the fear of such disturbances, or the partition of the country.

Reserved Area:

Section-3 of the Punjab Tenants (Security of Tenure) Act 1950 (Act XXII of 1950) as amended by the President's Act V of 1951 laid down the procedure for the reservation of land and the same is reproduced here- "Any landowner who has land in excess of the permissible limit may select for self-cultivation, out of his entire land in the state of Punjab held by him as landowner, any parcel or parcels not exceeding, in aggregate area, the permissible limit and reserve it by intimating his selection in the prescribed form and manner to the

Patwari (one who keeps land records) of the estate in which the land reserved is situated or to such other authority as may be prescribed".

Commencement of the Act:

The Punjab Security of Land Tenures Act X of 1953 received the assent of the President on the 15th of April, 1953; as such it came into force from the very date of assent, i.e. the 15th of April, 1953.

Extension of the Act:

This Act extends to the entire state of Punjab which then comprised of 13 districts namely; Ambala, Amritsar, Ferozpur, Gurdaspur, Gurgaon, Hissar, Hoshiarpur, Jullundur, Karnal, Kangra, Ludhiana, Rohtak and Simla.

If a bigger Punjab had been constituted according to the recommendation of the State Reorganization Commission then this Act would have applied to that newly constituted Punjab.

Exceptions:

Some categories of land were kept as exceptions from the provisions of this Act. They are:

- i) Co-operative garden colonies which were registered before the coming into force of this Act;
- ii) Any area under orchard at the commencement of this Act (upto 4 hectares);
- iii) Sugarcane farms;
- iv) Tank fisheries;
- v) Land held by co-operative societies including land mortgage bank or any co-operative new bank as defined in Banking Companies Act;
- vi) Land held by religious, charitable and educational institutions;
- vii) Land awarded for gallantry;
- viii) Land held by sugarcane factories;

- ix) Lands where heavy investment have been made, the breaking up of which is likely to reduce agricultural production;
- x) Land held by State or Central Government;
- xi) Land held by a public sector or industrial or commercial undertaking;
- xii) Land vested in Gram sabha, Bhoodan or Gramdan Committee;
- xiii) Specialised farms engaged in cattle breeding, dairying or wool raising;
- xiv) Land mortgaged to Government or Co-operatives ;
- xv) Land occupied by dwelling houses, tanks, wells together with land necessary for convenient enjoyments of the same;
- xvi) Stud farms;
- xvii) Lands held by public trusts for pinjra pole or gaoshala;
- xviii) Lands leased by Land development Bank or Co-operative Bank;
- xix) Commercial sites;
- xx) Land held by mill, factory or workshop as may be required for the purpose of expansion of such enterprises, such as setting up of schools, dispensaries and roads, but now growing crops for use in mills, factory or workshop;
- xxi) Land exclusively used on the 'appointed date' for grazing cattle of the landholder or on which trees have been raised for better cultivation of Land;
- xxii) Site of buildings for warehouses;
- xxiii) Land assigned or donated by any person to the assignee before the commencement of the Act for the purpose of rendering any of the following services useful to the community, namely, maintenance of water works, lighting, filling of water troughs for cattle.

The unit of application was individual in the entire Punjab as in many other states of India. In the new amending Act (Act no. XI of 1955) the tenants were also to be covered by the definition of 'permissible area'.

Analysis:

Under this Act, the Ceiling limits were fixed so high (30 to 60 acres or 12.14 or 24.28 hectares) that, for all practical purposes, the concentration of land in the hands of big landlords and rich peasants remained almost intact. Also, the Act provided enough scope for manipulations and fictitious transfers, therefore, only about 70,000 hectares of land was secured for redistribution to the poor (Chadha, 1986).

Table-1.7

Area cultivated (Punjab)

	1947	1975
Owner	51.4%	80.7%
Tenants	48.6%	19.3%

(Source-Govt of Punjab, 1975, quoted in Chadha, 1986)

In phase II, as Haryana became a separate state, separate amended Acts were passed in 1972 to plug the loopholes in the earlier Ceiling Laws. For Punjab, the Act came as 'The Punjab Land Reforms Act, 1972', as amended by the Punjab Land Reforms (Amendment) Act, 1973. In the state of Haryana, the Act came under the title, "The Haryana Ceiling on Land Holdings Act, 1972" (Haryana Act No. 26 of 1972 as amended upto 31st July, 1973). The rules came in and as; The Haryana Ceiling on land Holdings Rules, 1973 (Act no. 33) {Sources - 'Haryana Government Gazette (Extraordinary)' 28th September, 1972, p 1189 and Haryana Government Gazette (Extraordinary), 7th March, 1973; p 318}.

The Act specified that it extends to whole of the state of Haryana and declared that this Act is for giving effect to the policy of state towards securing the principles specified in clauses 'b' and 'c' of article 39 of the Constitution of India. According to the Act, the permissible area in relation to a landowner or tenant or mortgagee with possession partly in one capacity and partly in another, of person or family consisting of husband, wife and upto three minor children shall be, in respect of -

- i) Land under assured irrigation capable of growing at least two crops in a year; 7.25 hectares.
- ii) Land under assured irrigation capable of growing at least one crop in a year; 10.9 hectares.
- iii) Land of all other types including land under orchard; 21.8 hectares.

The permissible area shall be increased by one fifth of the permissible area of the primary unit of family for each additional member of family, provided the permissible area shall not exceed twice the area permitted to the primary unit of family. Therefore, the land exceeding this permissible area shall be treated as surplus and would be taken over by the state for redistribution among the landless poor. The compensation to be paid for the surplus land will be ranging from Rs. 200/- to Rs. 2000/- per acre for first 10 hectares, Rs. 160 to Rs. 1760/- per acre for the next 20 hectares and Rs. 150/- to Rs. 1600/- per acre for the remaining land. The appointed day for the implementation of Act means the twenty fourth day of January, 1971.

Analysis:

On the eve of partition, Indian Punjab did not inherit a very promising land relations structure. In 1936-37, 75% of the cultivated area was operated under share cropping. During the British rule, apart from the steadily increasing tenancy, a large number of tenants were

landless because of very stringent legal rules regarding occupancy rights. Illegal extractions under the garb of 'malikana' or 'haqzamindari' or 'dharat', etc. (i.e. types of illegal possession of village common lands, or other types of lands) were a common feature (Chadha, 1986).

Bhalla (1974) in his study on the effects of Green revolution in Haryana in early 1970's found very wide disparities in the distribution of land holdings in Haryana. The first two categories of cultivators with net holdings up to 10 acres of land constitute 56.6% of total cultivating households who are operating on only 25.7% of the aggregate net sown area in the state. On the other hand 17.7% of the cultivating households who farm above 20 acres of land account for as much as 43.1% of the total cultivated area. Since the smaller categories lease-in a much greater proportion of their area, the ownership distribution of land is even more skewed. He adds that the category of 0-5 acres constituting 27.6% of cultivators lives in actual bankruptcy. Another 29% who fall in the second category of 5-10 acres live on the verge of poverty line. The Ginni's concentration ratio of 0.512 confirms the very high concentration of income. The ratio for Punjab being 0.7636. Northern Haryana according to him is better off, followed by central, while southern Haryana lags behind. He reports tenancy as low as 8.3% in the state.

In Punjab till 1975 under the two Acts, land acquired as surplus was 1,88,645 acres out of which only 61,313 acres was distributed. The scene was not very different in Haryana. The surplus land acquired was 72,900 acres, out of which 22,000 acres was actually distributed, i.e. only 30% (Lal, 1981).

A more empirical and updated information is found in a publication by Land Reform unit of Lal Bahadur Shastri Academy of Administration Mussoorie. In the Punjab till Dec. 31st, 1987, 2,53,818

5.	Ambala	5,655	2,091
6.	Yamunanagar	1,579	335
7.	Kaithal	2,537	1,537
8.	Kurukshetra	4,213	1,361
9.	Rohtak	6,235	2,451
10.	Bhiwani	3,133	763
11.	Sirsa	33,776	7,843
12.	Faridabad	2,862	1,251
13.	Narnaul	279	91
14.	Rewari	2,155	96
15.	Jind	8,387	3,701
16.	Sonepat	3,991	1,640
Total		1,13,124	38,048

Table 1.9

Area locked in litigations

S.No.	District	Area Locked in Litigations in Revenue courts (in acres)
1.	Ambala	552
2.	Yamunanagar	37
3.	Kurukshetra	82
4.	Kaithal	354
5.	Karnal	78
6.	Panipat	0
7.	Sonepat	188
8.	Faridabad	22
9.	Gurgaon	33
10.	Rohtak	22

Contd.....

11.	Rewari	104
12.	Narnaul	69
13.	Bhiwani	59
14.	Jind	513
15.	Hisar	489
16.	Sirsa	788
Total		3,390

Besides the area mentioned above, about 4000 acres is locked in civil courts. The total land available as surplus adds upto around 1,20,214 acres (Finance Commissioner, Haryana Sectt., 1992).

After having a look at the secondary data from the tahsil and revenue records, it can easily be discerned that a notable number of landowners were trapped in the Ceiling legislations of the state losing a total of more than 1,20,000 acres of land. The study attempts to see the effect of this loss of an important asset on the social, economic and political position of this class which was one of the time strongest class before the Ceiling Laws were enacted.

In the next chapter the research procedure for this study is discussed.

CHAPTER II

METHODS

CHAPTER-II

METHODOLOGY

Agrarian societies in India and in many other parts of the world are believed to be 'change resisting'. In India the rural societies have exhibited an enormous capacity to absorb, and rebound external shocks. They are perpetuating themselves without much change even after a series of reforms and technological changes attempted by the government. Green revolution facilitated the rural economy to speed-up and the land reform measures gave some jerks to the oligarchic agrarian structure in Haryana and Punjab. The rural societies in Haryana and Punjab accumulated these effects and spontaneously adapted to them showing a very marginal difference in the total structure.

On a broad plane, a society reveals itself in terms of three major elements; Economic relations, Social stratification and Political articulations. Any authentic study would, therefore, demand a coherent collaboration of these elements. Rural masses, on the whole, have become socially more conscious and politically more articulate. In this environment, caste differentiation in rural society is gradually losing its hold and economic relations are gaining precedence over traditional social relations (Chadha, 1986).

Following Joshi's (1975) suggestion, I found a scope of contributing to the literature in agrarian social structure. He found that sociologists and social anthropologists can study the agrarian structure at both macro and micro levels. Macro- sociological studies can provide a dynamic, synthetic and comparative view of the modernization process in Asian societies as reflected at the level of the transformation of the agrarian structure. Social anthropological

studies at the micro-level can contribute a wealth of insights into the variety and complexity of the changing agrarian social structure in the different regions of the country (Joshi, 1975, p 83; cf. Beteille, 1974).

A sociological scrutiny in the realm of 'Status Change' is desirable and is further confirmed by Beteille (1974, p 68). He asserts that the most conspicuous distinctions in rural social structure, particularly in India and also in other agrarian societies, are those relating to 'styles of life'. It is here that agrarian societies differ so much from industrial societies for it is not that differences of property and income do not exist or are unimportant in the latter but that such differences are partly concealed by the tendency for styles of life to become standardized. In agrarian societies by contrast, even minor differences of property and income are reflected in sharply differentiated styles of life. Further, such differences exist even between groups having a similar material position.

A deeper insight into the status hierarchy of the rural masses thus becomes desirable. As discussed at lengths in the introductory chapter, our government had attempted numerous reform measures to check the imbalanced landholding structure in the agrarian society. These measures at least disturbed the agrarian structure even when they were met with stiff resistance by the rich landowning class. The resistance is understandable because in an agrarian society, land is the sole or principal form of wealth and social relations are based largely on rights in land. The structure of this society reflects the way in which numerous interests are accommodated on a scale which reaches from the tiller of the soil to the highest authorities of state (Nair, 1991 quotes Rothermund, 1969, p 38).

Nair (1991) further stresses that land constitutes a factor of production, a status symbol and a source of security and influence.

The land tenure structure is the product of a large variety of inter-related social and economic forces acting jointly.

Thimmaiah and Aziz extended the argument further by saying that the land reform policy in India has all three dimensions- Economic, Social and Political (In Rajapurohit, ed.; 1984, p 18).

SCOPE OF THE STUDY :

The present study has attempted to explore the interrelationship between ceilings on agricultural land and social mobility. This interrelationship could be studied from above and from below. From above - Has the targetted class which lost the land gone down on the social ladder?; and from below -in the sense that whether the beneficiaries or allottees have improved their status or not in the process.

The principal objective of the present study is that how the ceilings on agricultural land have affected the status and prestige (alongwith economic and political facets) of the rich landowning class in the state of Haryana. It also examines, how the class managed to evade the 'Acts' or to what extent it lost the land. Here are the questions that the study attempts to answer: Did they lose land considerably which could lower their standing? Did they diversify their occupations to maintain their status? Have some of them sold land and moved to urban centres in search of better status? How do they perceive the Acts and in what ways are they relevant to their social standing?

Evidently, this is a simple investigation within the field and problematics of "Rural Sociology" in so far as it studies the manifest and latent consequences of the Land Ceiling Acts in relation to the social standing of the rich landowners.

MAJOR CONCEPTS USED IN THE STUDY :

It is worthwhile to explain the major concepts used in the study. It is attempted to explain these concepts as clearly as is possible.

Social Mobility : For Sorokin (1959), 'Social mobility' is understood as any transition of an individual or social object or value - anything that has been created by human activity - from one social position to another. There are two principle types of social mobility, horizontal and vertical. By horizontal mobility or shifting, is meant the transition of an individual or social object from one social group to another situated on the same level. Whereas, vertical mobility means the relations involved in a transition of an individual (or a social object) from one social stratum to another. According to the transition there are two types of vertical social mobility: ascending and descending or social climbing and social sinking or upward and downward social mobility.

According to the nature of the stratification there are ascending and descending currents of economic, political and occupational mobility, not to mention other less important types. The ascending currents exist in two principle forms; as an infiltration of the individuals of a lower stratum into an existing higher one; and as a creation of a new group by such fundamentals, and the insertion of such a group into a higher stratum instead of or side by side with the existing groups of this stratum. Correspondingly, the descending current also has two principle forms : The first consists in a dropping of individuals from a higher social position into an existing lower one, without a degradation or disintegration of the higher group to which they belonged. The second is manifested in a degradation of a social group as a whole, in an abasement of its rank among other groups or in its disintegration as a social unit.

Education, occupation and income are the three dimensions of socio-economic status. Social mobility is measured in terms of movement or change in these dimensions. Other related concepts are: intensiveness or velocity and generality of vertical social mobility (Sorokin, 1959, pp 102-133).

Small, Big and Very Big Farmers : These concepts are strictly contextual. In this study the farmers owning land from 20 acres to 100 acres are taken up as big farmers, others who own above 100 acres are considered as very big farmers. And the farmers who own land below 20 acres (which is approximately the Ceiling limit) are classified as small farmers for the purpose of this study.

Acquired Land: The land secured from the farmers (or households) for the purpose of resettlement (or redistribution) of the landless/ semi-landless agricultural tenants or labourers and that too vis-a-vis the 'Ceiling Acts' passed by the state governments in the two phases will be considered as "Acquired Land".

HARYANA AT A GLANCE:

Haryana is a small state in the Indian context, with an area of 44,212 sq.kms. It is divided into 4 divisions, 16 districts, 39 subdivisions, 55 tahsils, 34 sub-tahsils and 108 blocks. (As on 31.3.93).

The number of inhabited villages in the state are 6,759, the number of towns being only 94. There are 10 Parliamentary and 90 Vidhan Sabha seats for a total population of 16.46 millions (1991 census). The sex ratio in the state is 865 females per thousand males. The rural population of the state is 75.37% of the total population. The net sown area of the state is 35.75 lakh hectares out of which the net irrigated area is only 26 lakh hectares. The state is adjacent to Delhi and is considered as one of the top developing states of the country (Statistical Abstract of Haryana, 1991-92).

2. Rohtak and Karnal from the Rohtak division.
3. Faridabad and Mahendragarh from the Gurgaon division.
4. Hisar and Jind from the Hisar division.

The other eight districts are not included in the study for the reasons that four of these eight districts are newly formed and the land records in their offices are not well kept, and all these eight districts had much in common (e.g., land use pattern, living styles, etc.) with the other eight districts which were included in the study making the sample of districts as representative of the state of Haryana.

PROFILE OF THE SAMPLE DISTRICTS :

The relevant information of the districts taken as our sample has been tabulated as under:

Table 2.1

District	Area in sq. kms.	Population in 000's (1991)	Population (Rural) in 000's (1991)	No. of villages (Total)	Total no. of operational holdings (20 hectares & above)	Total food grains production (000 tonnes)	Net irrigated area (in %)
Ambala	2,385	1,116	719	738	376	461.0	56.8
Kurukshetra	1,217	641	487	396	713	705.4	95.7
Karnal	1,967	885	642	394	472	814.7	98.7
Rohtak	4,411	1,808	1,423	492	619	720.1	69.1
Faridabad	2,105	1,477	759	439	142	405.1	50.3
Mahendragarh	1,683	681	597	371	473	214.1	48.1
Jind	2,736	963	797	305	957	711.5	95.3
Hisar	6,279	1,844	1,455	510	1,675	1,323.0	80.4
Haryana	44,212	16,463	12,408	6,988	8,760 (0.65%)	9,558.7	72.7
India	3,287,263	846,302	628,691	-	-	-	-

Source:

- 1) Director Land Records, Haryana.

- 2) Economic and Statistical Organisation, Planning Department, Haryana (1991-92).

In addition to the above information, we have the percentage of rural to total population as highest in Mahendragarh and lowest in Faridabad district. The state percentage is 75.37% and the national percentage is 74.29%. Hence, more than three fourths of the population is rural even when the state is adequately industrialized.

Further stratifying our sample, four villages from each of these districts were taken in which at least one person has lost land due to the Ceiling legislations passed in 1953 and 1972. These villages were not taken on the basis of definite random sampling technique. This was because of non-availability of the list of all the villages in which the land was acquired as surplus. The data and information provided by the revenue officials was also not always in order. The officials gave the list of as many villages as was possible from their records and memory. This becomes the major limitation of the study. The sample needed in the study was purposive in a sense that the households/individuals who lost relatively more land were required so that a notable effect of land acquisition could be studied, although partial losers and law evaders are also taken up for rigorous study in subsequent chapters.

The sampling procedure is congruent to network sampling, a variant on the snowball method, as it involved some degree of multiplicity and stress was on studying the scope of the phenomenon (cf. Denzin, 1989, refers Sudman and Kalton, 1986, pp 411-13).

Willer (1967) is of the view that if a theory model is to be validated in natural cases, these cases must be selected according to the scope of the phenomenon. Such a selection is termed as 'Scope sample' by him. He defines Scope sample as a number of natural cases fitting the conditions appropriate to the theory model, which are

ranged along the major dimensions of the formal system (Willer, 1967, refers Camilleri, 1962, pp.172ff., and Zetterberg, 1954, pp 55ff.).

Hence, instead of the positivist 'cause-effect' model, the phenomenological 'reasons-action' model of explanation is used, i.e. what did the 'Act' meant to the landowner? and what are the reasons and consequences perceived by him for his/her landloss? Following which a universal sample of all the households/ individuals in these 32 villages who lost land in the revenue records was taken as the final sample to be studied. The final sample comprised of 42 cases in the total of 32 villages in these eight districts of the state. The 42 cases were studied in detail using the case study method .

RESEARCH DESIGN AND OBJECTIVES :

The present study is exploratory in nature as this was an area in which hypotheses have not yet been formulated; the task then is to review the available material with sensitivity to the hypotheses that may be derived from it (cf. Selltiz,et.al., 1959).

The main thrust of the study is on social implications, however, the political and economic facets are also dealt with seriously making the study considerably wide in scope.

The objectives of this study are three-fold:

- i) How effective were the Land Ceilings Acts of 1953 and 1972 in actually taking over land from the big landowners?
- ii) What were the strategies employed by the individuals and families in this category to evade these Acts and how far were they successful?
- iii) Have the Acts lowered the social position or standing of this category of landowners in the long run?

Other questions that run parallel to the above ones and are taken up in the study are:

The answers and other information (if any) were then developed into case studies of all the sampling units.

A general survey of the area was also made and information was gathered from senior Block Development Officers, Tahsildars and Gram sevaks in the state. Secondly, a pretest survey was conducted with the pretest interview schedule to make sure that we get responses to every item. All precautions were taken as the issue was delicate and provocative for the losers.

As the research goals were limited the number of cases taken was considered sufficient (cf. Goode & Hatt, 1952, p 339).

In addition to the primary data, secondary data from revenue and tahsil records, reports of the government and other published materials were also used.

ITEM SELECTION :

The 'Interview Schedule' administered to the landowners/ households consisted of forty five items which were to be answered vis-a-vis the Punjab security of land tenures Act, 1953 and the Haryana Ceiling on landholdings Act, 1972 (Henceforth mentioned as First and Second Ceiling Acts or simply First and Second Acts, whereas, the revenue officials term these Acts as old and new Acts respectively) and the present position. A few items were not answerable with respect to different dates (e.g., Caste/Religion, position of village, etc.) and a few others were answerable with respect to only first two dates, i.e. 1953 and 1972 (e.g., Land lost due to Ceiling Act, what happened to that land etc.). Some other items were further subdivided which needed answers in terms of - Males/females, Irrigated/unirrigated, Inside village area/outside village area and farm work/domestic work (refer Appendix).

The answers to all the items were to be given by the respondents (barring some rare occasions) and if they were unable to do so, the respondents were allowed to take help of others (if they had some difficulty in auditory or any other sense) and also some other means (like confirming from others) were used.

FIELD STUDY :

The field study was done in six phases namely:

- i) Preliminary planning.
- ii) General survey of the area.
- iii) Formulation of research design.
- iv) The pretesting of interview schedule and other research procedures.
- v) The full scale field operation.
- vi) Analysis of the materials (cf. Katz and Festinger (ed.), 1953, p 65).

After an initial planning about the broad area of research, a general survey of three districts was done to make sure that some relation exists between the variables i.e. The landowners/households who lost land in the Ceiling legislation had its bearing on the social prestige or economic or political positions. Thereafter, a research design was formulated and an interview schedule was constructed using all possible variables within the scope of our knowledge which had a relevance to the study at hand. This interview schedule as being the main tool of our research was then tested and retested so that its language is made understandable and less provoking. Some more questions were added and the unimportant ones were deleted after the pretest survey.

When the research tools were adequately sharpened and made understandable to the lay rural folk, I went to the field for the detailed study of my sample. In the field, I did not face many problems as any outsider might have faced. This was because of my

working knowledge in all the dialects spoken in the state (e.g., Brij, Mix of Haryanvi and Punjabi, Haryanvi and Bagdi). Secondly, I come from a remote village in Haryana and basically from a prevalent agricultural caste. Finally, I had my own conveyance and staying in the field for me was not a problem because the respondents took me as an insider and moreover I had my friends and relatives almost in every corner of the state.

The only problem I faced was due to mobilization done by opposition parties against 'GATT' accord in the state. Some of the villagers took me as a representative of the government doing something for the acceptance of the treaty. At a few places in Ambala district, I was not readily welcomed. A few others were afraid that the government might be planning to take away the land again like before. Some of them were found concealing the true information about the land held but it was taken care of with the help of 'Patwari' and other informants.

The macro level information was collected from the office of Finance Commissioner (Land Revenue), District Revenue Officers in the concerned districts, Naib Tahsildars (surplus) and the 'Patwaris' of the villages taken in the study.

The data and information thus available was analysed and arranged so that some conclusions can be drawn and further hypotheses can be formulated.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY :

The major limitations of the present study are mainly due to the inadequate and un-updated records and that too not arranged in some order that can suit a scholar. The records kept with officials are to their own convenience. The language used in these records is not a common language (it is some form of Persian). The government servants in the various departments were quite nice to talk to but were

reluctant to spare sufficient time. They only provided me with the information that was readily available to them. The frequent transfers of the government officials also adds to the problem, as it becomes difficult for them to give their own reliable experiences in the region.

The first major limitation of the study is that sample size is too small. It was because of the limited time and resources at hand. The second valid reason being a small universe that is scattered widely throughout the state.

The second limitation was non-availability of proper sampling frame because of the reasons discussed before hand. Moreover, the purpose of the study was to see the effects of land acquisition on the social status of the targetted landowning households, therefore, the villages in which the land lost was undesirably less were deliberately avoided, as the effect would be negligible on them. Consequently, a randomized sample was neither possible nor desired. The sampling was more or less purposive in nature.

These two main limitations rendered the scope of the study very limited. Further, I will not be in a position to generalize for the whole population. Therefore, any statements made in this study are strictly valid for the sample only and not for the population.

Lastly, a methodological clarification which needs mention is regarding the case-studies. The names of the respondents in the descriptions are fictitious while the names of villages are not mentioned at all. This was done to ensure the confidentiality of the respondents. The remaining information is correct.

Having discussed the research procedure, I will proceed to the next chapter in which the social and demographic profile of the respondents is discussed.

CHAPTER III

A PROFILE
OF THE RESPONDENTS

CHAPTER-III

A PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

The present chapter deals with the demographic, social, educational, occupational (economic) and political attributes of the targetted landowners whose responses towards the Ceiling legislations and the consequent effects are being described and analysed in the form of case-studies in the subsequent chapters. Such an exercise is conventional in social sciences research but at the same time it is very significant from the sociological perspective. The socio-economic and demographic characteristics have a considerable bearing in the formation of individual's responses and attitudes. And these factors, very largely, determine the individual's actions in particular social context. What will be the attitude of an individual, or of a group, towards a particular social phenomenon, either in verbal or in written form, will always be influenced by the respondents knowledge of that particular phenomenon. It is usually easier and most pertinent to base such judgements on individual's verbal or written statements (Lindgreen, 1973).

The literature on Sociology of knowledge provides us with enough explanation to view the social and existential factors as indispensable in understanding the attitudes and actions of human-beings. Therefore, all the variables selected here constitute existential conditions of the landowners since the First Ceiling Act of 1953 which ultimately make some decisive effect on their outlook and actions.

In view of the significance of socio-economic, political and demographic profiles, it can be stated that such an exercise not only

brings out the various characteristics of respondents for the benefit of readers, but also will enable the researcher to analyse their responses, attitudes and actions in a more explicit and meaningful manner.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

The 42 cases have been variously classified under different variables chosen for the present study.

Age : For the purpose of the present study only the eldest male member was sought for interview, which implies that the sample would be over-represented by elderly respondents. Three distinct categories of age-groups have been made. The first category will range from 20-40 years, the second category from 41-60 years and the third category will be 61 years and above. The categories thus formed will be named as young, middle-aged and elders.

TABLE 3.1

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY AGE

Age Category	Age	Frequency	Percentage
Young	20-40 years	5	11.90
Middle-aged	41-60 years	16	38.10
Elders	61 years & above	21	50.00
Total		42	100.00
Mean age-		59.52 years	

The distribution shows that half of the respondents were aged above 61 years. The mean age, i.e. 59.52 also gives the same

indication. 38.1% of the respondents were in middle-aged category and only 11.9% were in the young category.

Sex : In the rural society of the state of Haryana, generally the heads of the household are found to be males. In the sample taken for the study too, all 42 of the households were headed by males. This may be because of the prevalence of patriarchal system in this part of the country. With a very few exceptions, land too is generally inherited by male offsprings.

Marital status : All 42 respondents were married at least once in their life. 6 of the total respondents had two living wives. If the present marital status has something to speak, 9 were widowers and the rest 33 had living wives.

SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS

Caste/Religion: In the small sample of 42 respondents, 9 different castes were found. These castes came from Hindu, Sikh and Muslim religions.

TABLE 3.2

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY CASTE/RELIGION

Caste/Religion	Frequency	Percentage
Jat (Hindu)	21	50.00
Rajput (Hindu)	12	28.58
Brahmin (Hindu)	2	4.76
Khatri (Hindu)	2	4.76
Ahir (Hindu)	1	2.38
Ror (Hindu)	1	2.38
Baniya (Hindu)	1	2.38
Jat (Sikh)	1	2.38
Meo (Muslim)	1	2.38
Total	42	100.00%

Jat (Hindu) is the most prevalent agricultural caste in Haryana which can also be seen from our data, the second most preponderant agricultural caste in Haryana is Rajput (Hindu). Mainly due to this reason Jat and Rajput castes are over-represented in the sample. According to the overall description, it is evident that all of the respondents belonged to the upper caste groups. The domination of upper castes in the 'big' and 'very big' landholdings is due to historical, socio-economic and political factors. Yet, the distribution does not imply the exact stratification system of the Indian society.

Majority/Minority status : The castes of the sampled cases are also viewed in terms of its majority/minority status in the village where the land is predominantly located.

It was found that the castes of 14 cases stood in minority in their villages, while rest of the 28 cases enjoyed a majority status with respect to their castes. This variable has some accountability in deciding whether the possession of land could easily be retained or not.

Family Type : This variable too has a considerable social, economic and political bearing on the status of the family. Out of the total of 42 respondents, 16 lived in joint families and the other 26 lived in extended families (Joint Type). None of the respondents lived in a nuclear family in sociological sense.

Residence of the Family : The majority of the heads of the households lived at their native villages. Precisely, 36 of the heads lived with their families at their native villages and the remaining 6 had migrated out in search of better life. In 7 other cases (out of 36) some part of the family had moved out but the heads stayed in their villages.

ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Occupational Profile : Here we shall deal with the traditional occupation of the targetted families and the diversification of occupation since 1953. It can easily be stated that the targetted families were in general engaged in farming and allied agricultural business (i.e. cattle rearing etc.). The data in Table 3.4 gives an idea of past and present occupations of the sampled families. For consideration, the categories are, farming and cattle rearing (taken as one), farming and tertiary services, farming and business, and farming, business and tertiary services.

Table 3.4

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY OCCUPATION

Occupation	Traditional	Present	Percentage
Farming	42	23	53.76
Farming & business	-	3	7.14
Farming & tertiary services	-	10	23.81
Farming, business & tertiary services	-	6	14.29
Total	42	42	100.00

It is clearly evident from the data in Table 3.4 that all the families were engaged in farming and cattle rearing at the time of the First Ceiling Act (1953). At present, 54.76% of the families are still engaged in their traditional occupation without any diversification. Besides that, 7.14% have gone for some business alongwith farming, another 23.81% of the families have gone for service in private or

government organizations alongwith farming, yet another 14.29% have gone for a combination of the three i.e. farming, business and tertiary services.

Land Ownership: Here, we shall take up the land held in 1953 and the land held at present. The natural devolution is at the moment not taken into account to avoid complications. Under the next sub-heading of this chapter the number of dependents and practical coparceners (i.e. male offsprings) are taken which can jointly tell the actual devolution of the land within the family.

TABLE 3.5

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY LAND-OWNERSHIP

Land holding (in acres)	In 1953	Percentage	At present	Percentage
below 20 (small farmers)	-	-	-	-
20 to 100 (big farmers)	26	61.9	31	73.8
above 100 (very big farmers)	16	38.1	11	26.2
Total	42	100.0	42	100.0

The data in Table 3.5 shows that the owners in the 'big' category have increased from 61.9% to 73.8% whereas on the other hand the very big farmers' category have been reduced from 38.1% to 26.2%. A small effect of the two Ceiling Acts is seen in our sample at

broader level but when if we go at micro levels and see the actual position of landholdings within these families a greater effects of land acquisition is found.

Average land owned in the sample before the First Ceiling Act in the sample was 159.23 acres which is now reduced to 79.87 acres (i.e. nearly halved). The total land held by these 42 families before the First Act was 6,688 acres which is now only 3,354.5 acres.

It will be rational enough to relate this variable to the variable under next subheading.

Dependents and Coparceners : The number of dependents on the land have increased at high rates in rural society. Alongwith it, there is a corresponding increase in number of coparceners reducing the land-holdings per family and thereby lowering the economic status of the family. In the present study land held is studied with respect to the family in 1953. The number of dependents and coparceners then and at present are dealt with separately to give a logical base to the conclusions. In the context of the present study only the male offsprings are treated as coparceners as in general only they are treated as the actual heirs of land in Haryana, whereas, in some cases land is also shared by female offsprings which is mentioned clearly in the respective cases.

The data with respect to the number of dependents and coparceners is tabulated separately in Table-3.6 and Table-3.7.

TABLE 3.6

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS

No.of dependents	Frequency in 1953	Percentage	Frequency in 1993	Percentage
0-5	20	47.62	1	2.38
6-10	13	30.95	4	9.52
11-15	6	14.29	6	14.29
16-20	2	4.76	4	9.52
21-25	1	2.38	27	64.29
Total	42	100.00	42	100.00

There is an obvious drastic increase in the number of dependents on the same holding in the last 40 years. 64.29% of the families in the sample have more than 25 dependents at present, while the percentage in 1953 was only 2.38%. On the other hand 47.62% of the families had less than 5 dependents on their holding in 1953, the percentage now is just 2.38%. The total number of dependents in the total sample in 1953 was 300 which increased to 1074 in 1993. The corresponding averages were 7.14 and 25.57 dependents per family respectively.

TABLE 3.8

DISTRIBUTION BY OWNERSHIP OF HOUSE TYPE

House Type	Frequency in 1953	Percentage	Frequency in 1993	Percentage
Kuchcha	20	47.62	1	2.38
Pucca	22	52.38	41	97.62
Total	42	100.00	42	100.00

In the sample of 42 families 47.62% owned a 'kuchcha' house at the time of First Ceiling Act and the remaining families owned a 'pucca' house at that time. At present except one family in Mahendragarh district, rest of the 41 families own a 'pucca' house.

TABLE 3.9

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY HOUSE SIZE

House size in sq.yds.	Frequency in 1953	Percentage	Frequency in 1993	Percentage
Less than 500	29	69.05	13	30.95
500 to 1000	11	26.19	19	45.24
above 1000	2	4.76	10	23.81
Total	42	100.00	42	100.00

The data informs that besides most of the families have transformed their house from 'kuchcha' to 'pucca' in last forty years,

particular. 20 households have improved their production overtime, while 17 are producing almost no surplus for the last 40 years, yet another 5 households have reduced their surplus production due to range of other reasons than land ceiling.

Approximate Value of Assets other than Land: The assets taken are only with respect to 1993 as almost all the respondents reported to have negligible assets in the past except land. The approximate value of assets is evaluated according to the following estimations.

i)	Value of Tractor	=	Rs. 1 Lakh.
ii)	Value of House Covering 500 sq. yds.	=	Rs. 1 Lakh.
iii)	Value of Buffalo	=	Rs. 10,000.
iv)	Value of Cow	=	Rs. 5,000.
v)	Value of Camel	=	Rs. 10,000.
vi)	Value of twowheeler	=	Rs. 20,000.
vii)	Value of tubewell	=	Rs. 25,000.
viii)	Value of property in urban centre and other assets	=	As per the statement in Interview.

The estimation is done roughly based on above quotations and the responses of the heads of households. At times, the information was confirmed from other residents. The approximate value of assets is tabulated as under:

to decision- making in village matters. The data for this variable is tabulated below.

TABLE 3.12

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENT BY POLITICAL & OTHER POSITIONS HELD

Political/Other positions	Frequency held	Percentage (upto 1993)
None	23	54.76
Sarpanch (atleast once)	8	19.05
Sarpanch (2 to 5 times)	3	7.14
Sarpanch (more than 5 times)	1	2.38
Lumberdar	2	4.76
Zaildar	3	7.14
Chairman (Block samiti)	2	4.76
Total	42	100.00

The data in Table 3.12 show that out of the total sample, 54.76% (more than half) of the families have not attained any political or other influential position. The rest of the families had attained one position or the other.

Finally, a rough idea of the background of the families is ascertained by this chapter and we can now proceed to the next chapter in which the cases, who lost their land due to the First or

CHAPTER III

TOTAL SUBMISSION AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

CHAPTER IV

TOTAL SUBMISSION AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

In the present chapter, the cases taken up are those of the households/families which could not save their 'declared surplus land'. Although in some cases an attempt was made to circumvent the Act by dint of one strategy or the other, yet finally they had lost all of the land which was declared as surplus. The chapter thus excludes the cases which saved a part or whole of their land which was declared as surplus (or should have been declared as surplus). Therefore, the cases included are the ones who could not provide any effective resistance for one reason or another.

At the initial stage of the study, the cases taken up were losers or partial losers as suggested by 'Revenue records'. On going to the field, it was found that a third big category of 'total protectors' came up in our sample. Thus, it was inevitable to make three different categories (dealt with as separate chapters) of total submitters, partial protectors and total protectors. It was finally decided to study the whole continuum of the phenomenon.

The cases which were relevant to this chapter are as follows:

CASE 1

The present head, 'Chhaju Ram', our respondent was also the head in 1953, aged 60 years now, comes from a village located just 5 kms. west of Hodal (a sub-tahsil). Chhaju Ram belongs to Jat (Hindu), a majority caste. He is practically illiterate. The female members of the household were not encouraged to take up education and even now one out of every three females is illiterate. Male members of the family seek at least school education. The family consisted of 5

members at the time of the First Act, including Chhaju Ram, his wife, his brother, mother and his minor son. The number of members increased to 11 in 1972 (Second Act) and at present the family consists of 32 members. The number of coparceners has increased simultaneously from 2 in 1953 to 6 in 1972 and to 17 till date. All of the family members depend solely on agriculture. They are working on farm and live in the same village.

The family owned 150 acres of canal irrigated (Class I) land yielding two crops a year at the time of the First Act. The entire land was ancestral. The land was divided into 5 farms of 5 to 50 acres in size. The family did not lease-in any land, as for them it was difficult to manage. Instead, 100 acres of their distant land was leased-out to poor friends of the same village. Regarding the Act, Chhaju Ram reports that as he was illiterate, he was ignorant of the Act and he was not aware of the "tricks" to circumvent the Act. Just when the Act was implemented, the fellow landlords started trying to save their land through fake transfers. Following them, he adds, he also transferred a part of his land in the name of other relatives but due to factionalism and jealousy in the village, someone informed that to the government. Chhaju Ram conceals the name of the informer. The family did not file any litigation for the recovery of land as it did not perceive any chance of success. Therefore, the family surrendered all 90 acres of land which was declared as surplus due to the First Act. This land was distributed to tenants of 'Chamar', 'Jat' and 'Kumhar' castes. Moreover, as the land was fertile, the allottees did not compromise at all. Finally, in 1954, the family owned just 60 acres of land which was divided into 3 farms of sizes varying from 12 to 25 acres. As the landloss was formidable, the family discontinued the use of its two farm servants and went on to cultivate the remaining land with their own family labour. According to Chhaju Ram, although the productivity of land is doubled overtime, but it does not make much difference as the investment on land has increased and the land is further fragmented within the family in

two halves. The number of members in these two households is many times larger than the joint family of 1953. Chhaju Ram further adds that the acquisition was not done according to the choice of the owner, making the cultivation more difficult for them, as they were left with the distant land.

He finds the repercussions as unbearable. There is an evident loss in other assets too. The family reared around 15 cattle in 1953 which are now reduced to just 8. The family also could not increase the covered area of the house which was 500 sq.yds. in 1953. The two new households own a tractor each but these too are on a loan from the 'society'. The family wants to purchase some more land to regain the lost status but is without the required money.

Chhaju Ram concludes by saying that there is a big difference in the status of a landowner owning 150 acres and that of a landowner owning 60 acres (which too is sub-divided into 2 parts).

DISCUSSION: The family has come down from the 'very big' category to 'big' category of farmers. Moreover, this is a case of clear downward mobility in all its dimensions; social, economic and political. The family is still not able to come out of the trauma of landloss.

CASE 2

Bhan Singh, aged 62 years, was head of the family even at the time of the First Act. His father died at a young age. The head with his family is living in a village (same as Case-1) located 5 kms. west of Hodal (a sub-tahsil). Bhan Singh is illiterate and comes from Jat (Hindu), a majority caste in the village. The number of members in the family was 6 (including an unmarried daughter) in 1953, which rose to 14 in 1972 (around the Second Act) and is 52 till date. The males except

the head are literate but the proportion of literate females is about 60%. The increase in the number of coparceners is from 3 in 1953 to 11 in 1972 and to 26 till today. All of the members rely on agriculture and are working on the farm. All of them reside in the same village.

The family owned 150 acres of land before the First Act, all of which was irrigated by canal. The number of farms was 6 ranging from 15 to 62 acres in size. The entire land was ancestral and no further purchase of land is made. The family used to lease-out 2/3rd of its land to poor tenants who were not related to the family in any sense. The land yielded 2 crops per year even at the time of First Act. Out of the total of 150 acres, the family lost 90 acres of land straightway due to the First Ceiling Act. This case is more or less similar to Chhaju Ram (Case-1). The land was acquired and distributed to poor tenants of different castes belonging to neighbouring villages. The family was physically weak (had less male members) and surrendered its land with least resistance. Bhan Singh informs that 'Patwari' suggested him to transfer the land in other names but it was too late by then. He further adds that the bureaucratic and political influence of the family was negligible, therefore, nobody listened to them. The family was not able to generate enough surplus that could enable them to purchase more land and make up the loss. The family neither went for business nor for service because of scarce money and less access to education.

There was no suit filed for the recovery of land. Bhan Singh is consoled that so many others also have been a victim like him. The family now owns 60 acres of land with 52 dependents (including minors). The family owns a house covering 700 sq.yds. which was only half of its size in 1953. Besides that, 20 full grown cattle and 3 tractors form the assets of the family today as against 16 cattle in 1953. Although the productivity of the land is doubled but everything gets neutralized when it comes to the number of

mouths to be fed. The family also has to marry-off 11 girls (daughters/grand daughters), which is a big liability according to Bhan Singh.

Bhan Singh remarks that they were well-off at one time (before 1953) and now they are almost like scheduled castes and that the government should look at them sympathetically.

DISCUSSION: The family has come down from the 'very big' category to 'big' category. It can be easily discerned that a loss of 90 acres of Class I land is by no means little. The living style of the family did not go down as drastically as they lost the land. This made things more difficult for the family. *The family got fragmented reducing the operational landholding.* The land if divided in all the coparceners comes out as 2 acres or so per coparcener. This shows that natural devolution due to population pressure has magnified the problem several times. The family is a subdivision of a one time same joint family (as in Case-1). But, the land was acquired treating the two as separate units.

CASE 3

The present head of the family Devi Lal, aged 75 years, is the only son of his late father who was illiterate. Devi Lal is educated upto Middle standard. The family comes from Jat (Hindu), a majority caste. The family stays in their village located 5 kms. west of Hodal (a sub-tahsil). Although almost all of the male members are educated upto various levels but the daughters and daughters-in-law are more or less illiterate. At the time of the First Act (1953), the family consisted of 8 members including his own self, mother, wife and five minor sons. In 1972, the family size increased to 15 and today the size is 26. The number of coparceners increased from 3 in 1953 to 10 in 1972 and to 14 till date. The united family has been relying on

agriculture alone. All of the members live in the same village working on the farm. Two full time workers were hired around the time of First Act as the land was more and the family was small but after a few years, family expanded and the need of hired labour was not felt.

Before the First Act was implemented, the family owned 160 acres of land, half of which was canal irrigated and half was unirrigated. The land was divided into 6 farms of sizes varying from 3 to 60 acres. The entire land was ancestral. The family has never leased-in any land but was leasing-out 100 acres or more before the First Act as only 2 'plough unit holdings' could be operated. The land which was at more distance from the village was leased out to friends of same village or even other villages. The unirrigated land usually yielded one crop and the irrigated portion yielded two crops per year. Devi Lal informs that he had also tried to irrigate his land on his own but the water was saline. 100 acres of the total land was declared as surplus and distributed to the tenants (Mujaras) who were mainly of 'Chamar' caste. These tenants were not the original tenants on land. Devi Lal remarks: "We had less muscle power, otherwise we could have saved our land". Devi Lal also approached Tahsildar for help but was denied. He got some guidance from 'Patwaris' to breach the Act but it didn't work. Now, the family is left with 62 acres of land (including 2 acres of land which was purchased in 1986) divided into 3 farms of sizes 3 to 30 acres. There was no litigation filed for the recovery of land as nobody else in the village had done it.

The family had only 3 to 4 cattle as their assets except the land in 1953, which now have increased to 7 cattle, one tractor, two plots of 400 sq.yds. each in Hodal and 2 acres of land that was purchased recently. The family has not increased or modified their house (which covers 400 sq.yds) in the last 50 years. The land productivity has almost doubled but the investment on land also has increased many times according to Devi Lal. The family has had no

bureaucratic or political influence at any time (except that now one son is member of Panchayat).

The family finds a destructive loss in social and economic standing. Devi Lal remarks, "At one time, we were one of the richest families around but now we are just struggling".

DISCUSSION: The family was in the 'very big' category of farmers but are now in the 'big' category. As is clearly evident that a loss of 100 acres of land is by no means ignorable. Moreover, as the family did not diversify their occupation, the loss could never be repaired. Like other cases of the same village (Cases-1 & 2) the family has the consolation that they are not the only losers. It could be taken as an example of downward social and economic mobility.

CASE 4

The head of the family Lal Singh, aged 75 years, comes from Jat (Hindu), a majority caste in the village. Lal Singh is barely literate. The family lives in the village located 5 kms. west of Hodal (a sub-tahsil), a small town bordering Haryana and Uttar Pradesh.

In 1953, Lal Singh lived with his wife and two minor sons. In 1972, the size of family increased to 6 and today the size of the family is 19. The corresponding increase in the coparceners is from 3 in 1953 to 4 in 1972 and to 9 at present. The literacy aspect is the same as in the other Jat households (Cases-1,2 and 3) in the village i.e., males are going for elementary education and females are deprived of even that. All of the members of the family depend solely on agriculture and reside in the same village. Initially, the family hired one or two full time agricultural labourers, but now that need is not felt.

The family owned 50 acres of land before the First Act all of which was irrigated. The land was in two farms of sizes 10 and 40 acres each. The

family has not leased-in any land at any time but was leasing-out 25 acres of its land before the First Act to its local friends. The family lost 20 acres of its land due to the First Act and was reduced to 30 acres. The remaining land is divided into two farms of sizes 5 and 25 acres each. Out of these 12 acres of the land stands unirrigated because of less water in canal. The acquired land was given to tenants (or Mujaras as they are commonly called in the region). These tenants were not the original tenants on land. The family was not in a position to file any suit or forcibly take back the land as the number of male members in the family was less at that time. So, like their other neighbours in the village, they also surrendered their land without any resistance.

Further, the family could not generate enough resources to purchase any more land, nor could it diversify its occupation as that too needs money. The family lacked any bureaucratic and political influence which it consider as the major factor of their ruin. The average surplus generated is almost the same as it was 40 years back. The reasons being, heavy investment on land and increase in cost of living.

The family owned a house covering 200 sq.yds. around 1953 which is now quadrupled. The number of cattle remains almost the same as it was in 1953 (i.e. 6). Besides that, the family has also taken a tractor on loan.

Lal Singh finds a big loss in social and economic standing. He says that it is a bigger loss than the ones who owned 150 acres and lost 100 out of it.

DISCUSSION: The family remains in 'big' category even after a loss of 40% of its land. But I personally feel that he is at least partially correct in his remark that his loss is bigger than one's owning more and losing more, as he was left with lesser resources to cope with. There is no doubt that the family has gone down on the social ladder but one thing is notable in this case that his sons produced families of smaller size and were aware of natural devolution. This awareness helped them to cope with the ever increasing demands to some extent.

CASE 5

The present head Om Prakash, aged 45 years, is the eldest son of the former head, who died in 1982. Om Prakash is a matriculate whereas his father was just literate. The united family resides in the village located at barely 5 kms. from Hodal (a sub-tahsil). The family comes from Jat (Hindu) caste which enjoys a majority status in the village. The literacy part is common to majority of other Jat households in the village i.e. the males are seeking some elementary education and their female counterparts are deprived of that. The increase in the family size is from 4 in 1953 to 9 in 1972 and to 19 till date. The corresponding increase in the number of coparceners is from 2 in 1953 to 6 in 1972 and to 12 upto now. All of the family members rely solely on agriculture and reside in the same village under the same roof. At the time of the First Act in 1953, this was a small family comprising Om Prakash (a minor), his father, mother and a younger brother. The family owned 100 acres of land consolidated into one farm, one half of which was irrigated and the other unirrigated. The family had never leased-in or leased-out any land long before the First Act. The entire land is ancestral except a recent adjustment (11 acres purchased in lieu of the sale of 11 acres). The irrigated portion of the land yielded 2 crops a year and the unirrigated portion yielded one crop or at times not even that.

The family lost 70 acres of its land due to the First Act. Om Prakash's father transferred the land in the name of his two sons in an attempt to retain his land but he was too late. The land acquired as surplus was the same as the land declared as surplus. The family could not provide any effective resistance due to ignorance like other losers in the village (Cases-1 to 4). The land was distributed to tenants from 'Chamar', 'Brahmin' and other castes. Many of them have sold-out their land but it was sold at a high rate. Moreover, the land acquired was not by the choice of the landowner, rather

it was acquired at random. Still, out of 30 acres of the land that the family possesses, 10 acres is unirrigated yielding one poor crop. This brought great economic loss to them. Om Prakash adds that they could not get any guidance from anybody because of lack of knowledge about the Act and thus were stranded by the government. To compensate for the loss of land the family wants to acquire more land but it is very costly now (Rs.1 lakh/acre).

The family like others in the village could not diversify its occupation. The bureaucratic and political influence of the family has been negligible. The productivity of the land is doubled overtime, but correspondingly the number of persons depending upon the land have increased by four times negating the productivity.

The family owns the same unaltered house covering 500 sq.yds. The number of cattle (i.e. 10) is also the same. The only addition they have made in their assets is a tractor which is on a loan from the bank.

The family finds the loss of the land as a big loss in their prestige, in economic standing and even in its political say. The family was very well-off at the time of the First Act but now survives in a pitiable condition.

DISCUSSION: The family was in the 'very big' category but after the acquisition it is pitted just over the small category. The family is a clear example of downward mobility in all its facets. The case falls among the top losers in the study losing 70% of its land.

CASE 6

The head Ram Singh, aged 75 years, was the head even at the time of the First Act. Ram Singh is illiterate and so was his father. Ram Singh lives with his big joint family in his village located 32 kms. east of Ambala. The village is a tahsil headquarter. Ram Singh belongs to 'Rajput' (Hindu) caste which enjoys a majority status in the village. The number of

members in the family counted 11 in 1953, 15 in 1972 and 21 at present. Except Ram Singh and his wife, almost all of the members have acquired elementary school education. The corresponding increase in the coparceners is from 6 in 1953 to 9 in 1972 and to 14 by now. Out of these members not more than 3 have ever worked on the farm. The other young males only help on farm and do not work full time. Rajput females traditionally do not work outside their house. The family hired 3 full time agricultural labourers in 1953 which it has maintained till now. One of the sons of Ram Singh has recently opened a hardware shop in the village. Rest of the family depends wholly on agriculture. All of the family members live in their native village.

The family owned 70 acres of unirrigated land before the First Act. The land was divided into 3 farms varying from 18 to 30 acres in size. The family has never leased-in or leased-out any land. The land was thus self-cultivated with the help of servants. The land yielded only one crop and sometimes not even that, till it got irrigated. Now, the land yields 2 crops and sometimes one more crop is harvested if weather permits. Due to the First Act, 21 acres of the land that the family owned was declared as surplus and distributed to 'Mujaras' (tenants) of various castes. The family purchased 1.5 acres of land in 1973 to make up some of the landloss. The total land that the family possesses now is 50.5 acres. This land got irrigation by a canal only 10 years back. Except the purchased 1.5 acres, rest of the land is ancestral.

Ram Singh finds ignorance as the major cause of his landloss. He adds that the calculations made were not genuine. Further, he informs that the allottees have sold-out their land to Sikh, Baniya and Brahmin landlords making the Act a futile effort.

The family did not try much to save its land as they had no bureaucratic or political influence. According to Ram Singh, with the help of canal irrigation the productivity of the land has gone up by 3 times but so is the investment.

The family finds the Ceiling Act as a major setback to its social prestige. Ram Singh was a 'Jaildar' (Tax Officer of 25 Villages) and the Act abolishing the intermediary rights made them lose much of their social prestige.

The family owned a 'kuchcha' house (mud house) covering 1000 sq.yds. which was made 'pucca' (house made with baked bricks and cement) in 1975. Besides that, the family reared 15-20 cattle in 1953 which are now reduced to 5. The family purchased a tractor in 1970 and now it owns 2 cars, 1 motor cycle, a shop (worth Rs.1 Lakh) in addition to it.

DISCUSSION: Even after a notable landloss the family remains in the 'big' category. The family is trying to diversify its occupation even though the increase in land productivity has neutralized the economic loss that was borne due to the landloss. Yet, it seems that socially they have gone down. This downgrading is felt more because of lost 'Jaildar status' than because of landloss.

CASE 7

The present head, Satte, aged 60 years, is not the original heir. The land was previously owned by his mother-in-law who had only one daughter to whom he got married. Therefore, the owner and head of the household at the time of the First Act was an illiterate widow. The present illiterate owner Satte lives with his family at his mother-in-law's village where the land is located. This is the same village as in (case-26) located 32 kms. from Ambala. The village is a 'tahsil' headquarter (same as Case-6). The family belongs to the dominant 'Rajput' (Hindu) caste which enjoys a majority status in the village. The number of members in the family was 2 (mother and daughter) in 1953 which increased to 4 in 1972 including mother, her daughter, her son-in-law (Satte) and a grandson. The number mounts to 14 now. While none was literate in the family till recently, now 2 of the sons of the present owner

have attained elementary school education. The family had no practical coparcener (i.e. male) at the time of the First Act. There were two coparceners in 1972 and now the family has 5 coparceners. None of the family members worked on farm at the time of the First Act, the cultivation was done with the help of two full time agricultural workers. The family has neither leased-in nor leased-out any land at any time. One person worked on the farm at the time of the Second Act seeking help from 2 full time paid workers. Now 3 of the male members are working on the farm without any help from agricultural labourers. All of the members live in the village as a united joint family and depend solely on agriculture.

The small family headed by a female owned 60 acres of land at the time of the First Act. As the land was unirrigated and was not well managed, the family was bound to sell or mortgage a total of 36 acres of its land before 1956 to earn its livelihood. 4 acres of the remaining land was declared as surplus due to the First Act and was distributed to 'Chamar' tenants who in turn sold it further to 'Rajput' and 'Brahmin' landlords. Now, the family owns 20 acres of land, all of which is irrigated and yields 2 crops per year. Before the First Act, the land was divided into two farms of 42 and 18 acres of size. The number of farms is still two but the sizes are reduced to 6 acres and 14 acres respectively. The land was previously ancestral, but now inherited by son-in-law in the absence of any male heir.

The family is struggling to maintain its social status, thus, there is no question of purchase of more land or diversification of occupation. Besides, family has had almost no political or bureaucratic influence. The surplus generated by the land has increased but it cannot heal up the loss. The family had a small 'kuchcha' house covering 250 sq.yds. in 1953 which was transformed into 'pucca' in 1978. The other assets have been 5-6 cattle. The family purchased a tractor but had to sell it soon as it was difficult to maintain. The production was negligible at the time of the First Act which increased to

15 tonnes in 1972 and is 30 tonnes at present. Sattu claims to be a hardworking person as most of the land (other than the specified 36 acres) was locked up with rich traders in exchange of loans, much of which he has paid back.

DISCUSSION: The family at one time fell in the upper half of the 'big' category but now it is pitted just over the 'small' category. This is a case of downward mobility partially because of land acquisition and mostly because of poor leadership of the previous head who was a female. Other households in this village also had big farms but they saved it before hand. One more household lost 108 acres of land but he was a Pakistani refugee who sold rest of his land and has migrated to some other place which is unknown to the villagers.

CASE 8

The owner Swaroop Singh, aged 57 years, was the eldest male even at the time of the First Act. Swaroop Singh is married twice but still has a small family. Swaroop Singh is illiterate and comes from Rajput (Hindu), a majority caste in a small village located about 3 kms. from 'Barwala' town in Ambala district. The number of members in the family was 2 in 1953, 3 in 1972 and is 5 uptill now. Upto the time of the Second Act, none of the members was literate. Now young children are seeking education in the village school. The number of coparceners increased from 1 in 1953 to 2 in 1972 and to 4 till date. Only one member of the family is working on the farm taking the help of one full time farm worker. The number of such workers was 3 in 1953 and 2 in 1972. All of the members depend solely on agriculture and have no other occupation.

The family owned 62 acres of unirrigated land in 1953. The land was divided into four farms of sizes varying from 6 to 25 acres. The entire land is ancestral. The family has never leased-in any land but is leasing-out a part

of its land due to scarce family labour. The family had been leasing-out 10-15 acres of its land at the time of the First Act, but now only 4 acres of land is leased-out to local tenants. Usually the distant land is leased-out.

The family lost 7.5 acres due to the First Act. Out of the remaining 54.5 acres, the family also had to sell 15 more acres of its land due to constant illness of Swaroop Singh. He is suffering from 'Tuberculosis' since 1961. Now, the family owns 39.5 acres of land which is divided into 3 farms and most of it is irrigated with the help of tubewells or 'Markanda river' water. 7.5 acres of the land that was declared as surplus was distributed to tenants of 'Jhimmar' caste. These tenants were not the original tenants on land. As the family was weak, it was difficult for it to save the acquired land.

The family had no money to purchase more land or to diversify its occupation. Besides that, the political and bureaucratic influence of the family has been negligible. Swaroop Singh adds that when he was in better health, the family used to generate 50 quintals of surplus food grains but now it is just 20-30 quintals. The family owned a 'kuchcha' house covering 500 sq.yds. which was made 'pucca' in late seventies. Two hundred sq.yds. of area is added to the original one. The family bought a tractor in 1971 but had to sell it in 1974 as it became an additional burden. The family has been rearing 5-6 buffaloes and a horse since long.

Swaroop Singh tells that although the family has gone down because of his own ill-health but the acquired land has acted like a drag to the family's prestige.

DISCUSSION: The family even after the land acquisition and sale of land remains in the 'big' category. It is true that Swaroop Singh's illness has been an impediment in the family's development but the landloss due to Ceiling Act gave an additional drag to the family's possible upward mobility. The other residents feel pity on the position of Swaroop Singh.

CASE 9

The present head Dhanna, aged 67 years, is the eldest of the five sons of the previous owner who died at the age of 92 years in 1979. Dhanna is barely literate while his father was illiterate. The family belongs to 'Khatri' (Hindu) caste which enjoys a majority status in a key village located 16 kms. south-west of Karnal. The family was displaced from Pakistan in 1947 and was in lieu allotted land in this village. Dhanna stays with one of his brother's family in village. One of his brothers is a Lecturer in Delhi and stays with his family there, two of his brothers have moved to a nearby town for business and both of them have sold their land and invested in their business. The number of members in the family was 7 in 1953 which increased to 15 in 1972 and now the number of members is 37 (including the families of the brothers who are not living in village). The proportion of educated members is around 60 percent. Till recently, none of the females was educated, but now 10 of the 14 female members are literate. Three of the brothers have joint ownership of land but they live as separate households. The number of practical coparceners was 6 in 1953, 10 in 1972 and is 18 at present date (in total). All 7 members of the family worked on farm in 1953, the number remained the same in 1972 but is now reduced to only 4. The family hired 2 to 3 full time agricultural labourers upto 1975 but now none is needed. All of the members depended on agriculture upto 1962. After that one of the brothers joined as Lecturer in a college in Delhi and other two opened shops in a nearby town. Still, they are doing their respective occupations.

The family owned 85 acres of land, 55 acres of which was irrigated and the remaining 30 acres was unirrigated. The family has not leased-in any land but was leasing-out 20-22 acres of the irrigated portion of their land in 1953. It was due to scarce labour within the family and was given to local friends. 9 Acres of the total land was declared as surplus in the First Act. This land was acquired and allotted to 'Sainis' and 'Ranghads' of a neighbouring

land was acquired. These changes led to the disintegration of the family, and therefore, have disgraced the family. On a broad plane, the family is not all that enterprising but is placed well on the social ladder.

CASE 10

The present head Tota Ram, aged 65 years, is not the original heir. He is the son-in-law of the former owner who died in 1968 at an age of 70. The former head was survived by his two daughters who were married to Tota Ram and his younger brother. Both of them live in their father-in-law's village located 8 kms. south of Karnal (district headquarters). The family belongs to Jat (Hindu) caste, which is in minority in the village (Kamboj are in majority). Tota Ram and his father-in-law both were illiterate. The number of members in the family was 4 in 1953 (i.e. former head, his wife and two daughters). The two daughters were married to two real brothers increasing the family size to 11 in 1972 and to 22 at present. While none of the members was literate in 1953, 6 males and 3 females got literate in 1972 and all except one male and one female are literate at present. The number of coparceners increased from 2 in 1953 to 9 in 1972 and to 15 by now. While the number of members working on the farm was 4 in 1953, it increased to 6 in 1972 and to 14 till date. The family hired 3 full time agricultural workers in 1953, the number was maintained till 1972 but not afterwards. There is no other occupation in which the family is engaged.

The family owned 47 acres of land in 1953, all of which was irrigated. The land was divided into 3 farms of sizes 10 acres, 16 acres and 21 acres. This land was basically ancestral. The family had not leased-in any land but was leasing-out 21 acres of its irrigated land to some known tenants in 1953. The surplus land was allotted to the same tenants.

The yield of land was 2 crops per year till recently which has now increased to 4 crops per year (two of which are vegetables).

In the First Act 18 acres of the family's land was declared as surplus. The former head died due to the shock. A case was filed and a lot of money was spent on it, but finally, the family lost the case in High Court in 1968. Land exchange with one of the Aunts was tried in order to change the class of the land but it did not work. The family was left with 29 acres of land in 1972. This land was divided into two farms of 8 and 21 acres in size. Besides that, the family inherited 12 acres of land from Tota Ram's family of orientation in 1969. Now, this 41 acres of land is divided into two independent households. The family finds the acquisition of the land as a big loss in prestige and cites illiteracy, lack of muscle power and non-cooperation of relatives and neighbours as the main factors behind it.

Since the productivity was negligible in 1953 and just 30 quintals of food-grains in 1972, there were scant chances of occupational diversification or any other land purchase. Now, the land productivity has gone upto 80 quintals of food-grains besides other cash crops.

The family owned a 200 sq.yds. (semi kuchcha) house in 1953 which was made 'pucca' and doubled by 1972 and still it is the same. Other assets in 1953 were 4 bulls, 5 buffaloes and 4 cows. A tractor and a cart was purchased before 1972 to which only a two wheeler is added till now.

DISCUSSION: As the land was inherited from two families, the landloss does not seem to be apparent. The family falls in the 'big' category. The family, as is evident, did not improve much and it may be due to the landloss and litigations. The emotional aspect of the landloss is evident in the death of the former head. The family lives in inadequate living conditions.

CASE 11

The present head Amar Singh, aged 42 years, is grandson of the head at the time of the First and the Second Acts. Amar Singh's father died at an early age of 42 years in 1973. Amar Singh, who is educated upto middle school, lives with his family in a small village located 6 kms. west of Kurukshetra (district headquarters). The family belongs to 'Ror' (Hindu), an agricultural caste, enjoying a majority status in the village. The number of members in the family was 6 in 1953, out of which none was literate. The number increased to 8 in 1972, out of which 3 males were literate and at present the number of members in the family counts 17, out of which 7 males and only 2 females are literate. The number of coparceners was 5 in 1953, again 5 in 1972 and is 11 at present. The number of members taking up the farm work was 3 in 1953, 8 in 1972 and is 16 at present. The family hired only 1 full time agricultural worker in 1953 as the land was totally unirrigated. The number of such workers rose to 3 in 1972 as the irrigation facilities were extended to whole of the land. Now, the family keeps 4 full time farm workers. Except two males, who are school masters in Kurukshetra, rest of the family is dependent upon agriculture.

The family owned 150 acres of ancestral land, whole of which was unirrigated in 1953. This land was in two divisions of 145 and 5 acres each. The family has never leased-in any land but was leasing-out half of its land (i.e. 75 acres) to known people in 1953. All of the land was unirrigated and it was given because of its distant location. Afterwards, the family started cultivating entire land on its own. The yield of the land increased from 1 crop in 1953 to 2 crops in 1972 and to 3 crops at present. Correspondingly, the surplus food-grains generated increased from 10 quintals in 1953 to 200 quintals in 1972 and to 400 quintals in 1993 besides a cash crop.

80 Acres of the family's land was declared as surplus in the First Act. This land was acquired and distributed to the tenants of many castes (i.e. Jats, Brahmins, Chamars, etc.). Some of these tenants were original tenants on land. 10 acres of land was sold-out by the family due to the prolonged litigations on the surplus land which ended in 1988. The family lost the case in High court. Finally, the family is left with 60 acres of irrigated land.

The family finds a considerable loss in its social prestige because of this landloss. Amar Singh tells that most of the allottees have sold-out their land and he tried to purchase it from them but the factionalism in the village let him down. Even now, the family would like to purchase an acre or two but land is not easily available in the area due to expansion of the city. Amar Singh finds illiteracy and ignorance as the main causes of their landloss. Further, he adds that more land should have been with the family as the number of units was more but the family could not assert itself as the political & bureaucratic power was very less at that time.

The family owned a 'pucca' house covering 250 sq.yds. in 1953. The covered area was doubled in 1978. Other assets of the family were a cart and 30-40 cattle in 1953, a tractor and the same number of cattle in 1972 and two tractors, 4 two-wheelers and the same number of cattle at present.

DISCUSSION: The family belonged to the 'very big' category but after acquisition it came down to 'big' category. Nevertheless, economically the family has coped up by taking its profession more seriously. Therefore, the loss that was incurred due to the Ceiling legislation seems mainly social. The other residents too confirm this.

CASE 12

The present head Khazan, aged 46 years, is the eldest son of the former head who died in 1988 at an age of 55. Khazan is educated upto middle

standard while his father was a primary school dropout. The family comes from Brahmin (Hindu) caste living in minority in a big village located 7 kms. east of Pipli town in Kurukshetra district. The number of members in the family was 5 in 1953, increasing to 22 in 1972 and is 25 at present. In 1953, only one male was literate out of the total number in the family. Since then, all of the members have sought at least elementary education. The number of coparceners was 3 in 1953, 9 in 1972 and is 12 at present. Only one male supervised the farm work in 1953 and 6 males are working on the farm since 1965. The family has been taking help of 2 full time farm workers since 1949. Upto 1976, all the members depended on agriculture for their livelihood but after that family diversified its occupation towards achieving greater economic growth. Now, one members is working in F.C.I. at Kurukshetra, another one is J.E. at Ambala, a few are engaged in food-grains trading and a few others are managing a big rice mill (Estd. 1982) on the national highway near Kurukshetra.

The family owned 35.5 acres of ancestral land in 1953, half of which was irrigated. The family has never leased-in any land but was leasing-out 20 acres of its land in 1953, 10 acres of which was irrigated. This land was given to known people because of scarce labour within the family. The family managed to purchase 7 acres of land in 1956, increasing the total land to 42.5 acres. This land was divided into 4 farms of 5.5 acres, 7 acres, 12 acres and 18 acres in size. 10 Acres of the land that the family owned was declared as surplus soon after the purchase was made. This land was acquired and distributed to 'Ror' and 'Saini' tenants who have disposed it off. The brother-in-law of the former head guided to circumvent the legislation but did not succeed. A suit was also filed but was lost. As the size of family multiplied by four times in 20 years (till 1972), little chances of subsistence were left. The family, according to Khazan, then tried its luck in business and succeeded. He adds that the loss due to the Ceiling legislation was unbearable in all its dimensions and the main cause for that was carelessness of the former head

(because it was enough for him) and the lack of muscle power. The family was thus left with 32.5 acres of land.

The land yielded 1 or 2 crops depending upon the irrigation in 1953. Since then, the crops harvested are not less than 2. Roughly, no surplus was generated in 1953, 100 quintals of food-grains were available as surplus in 1972 and now the land produces around 450 quintals of food-grains.

The family was struggling for subsistence till 1974 but now it is well placed economically, politically and also socially. Khazan is 'Sarpanch' of the village since 1991. Now, the family has a notable bureaucratic influence too.

The family owned 400 sq.yds. of 'pucca' house which is now doubled to 800 sq.yds. The number of cattle reared was 5-7. The assets remained same till 1974. Now, the family owns one tractor, one rice mill, one flat (200 sq.yds.) in Kurukshetra (worth Rs.3 lakh) and the same number of cattle.

DISCUSSION: The family falls in the category 'big' farmers. The family had a notable standing before the landloss which let the family down till 1976, when the family diversified its occupation. Now, the family is well placed in all dimensions serving as an example of upward mobility.

CASE 13

The present head Sri Chand, aged 80 years, was the eldest male even at the time of the First Act in 1953. Sri Chand is totally illiterate and belongs to Jat (Hindu) caste living in minority in a small remote village located 16 kms. north of Kurukshetra (district headquarters). The number of members in the family was just two (Sri Chand and his first wife) in 1953 which increased to 12 in 1972 and is 46 at present. In 1953, none of the two members was literate. 8 males and 2 females sought elementary school education by 1972 and at present 28 males and 17 females are literate in the family. The

number of coparceners increased from one in 1953 to 11 in 1972 and to 28 by now. While both of the members were working on the farm in 1953, all 12 worked in 1972 and 30 out of the total of 46 members are working on the farm at present. The family also hired 4 full time agricultural workers in 1953 which was reduced to 2 in 1972 and none is needed now. All of the members are staying in the village but 4 members, 2 of whom are drivers on trucks, 1 is a tractor mechanic and 1 who is a manual labour, work at the nearby town of Pipli. The family lives as a united joint family.

The family owned 65 acres of land in 1953, 60 acres of which was irrigated. This land was divided into two farms of 25 acres and 40 acres in size.

The family has never leased-in any land but was leasing-out 10 acres of the irrigated portion to the known tenants till 1974. The land has always yielded two or more crops since 1950. The entire land is ancestral. In the First Act, 5 acres of land that the family possessed was declared as surplus. This land was acquired and allotted to a tenant of the same village who was not the original tenant on the land. He was threatened by Sri Chand, and therefore, he did not claim that land. The land was re-allotted to a Bihari (basically) tenant of Pipli town. He took the possession but was denied a way to his land. A case was filed by Sri Chand in 1962 which went on till 1967, when he finally lost that case. The allottee was frustrated by the owner's family and had to sell that land to some landowner of that village. On the other side, the owner's family was constantly harassed by the police. The family had to spend a lot of money in these quarrels. For that, the family had to sell 10 more acres of its land. Finally, the family was left with 50 acres of irrigated land in 1972 which was divided into two farms of 22 acres and 28 acres in size.

Sri Chand finds the landloss as very embarrassing because he had to sell 10 more acres of land in a bid to save his 5 acres, finally losing all 15 acres. Much before the implementation, one Patwari had suggested the owner to sell a part of his land to which he did not agree. Sri Chand finds lack of financial

resources and the constant harassment by the police as the main factors of his ruin.

The productivity of the land has gone up by more than 5 times since 1953. The family produced 100 quintals of food-grains in 1953 which now has gone upto 500 quintals.

The family has had a less political and bureaucratic influence even though Sri Chand and his son are Ex-Sarpanch. The family owned 300 sq.yds. of a 'kuchcha' house which was renovated in 1968 and some 100 sq.yds. of covered area was added to it in 1975. The other assets of the family in 1953 were 24 cattle, the number of cattle was reduced to 19, but a tractor was added in 1972. At present, the family owns a tractor and 36 cattle.

DISCUSSION: The family has maintained itself in the 'big' category but has certainly borne a big loss. The family is an example of downward mobility partly because of the Ceiling Act and partly because of attempts of circumvention. The manifold increase in the size of the family has further worsened the situation.

CASE 14

The present head Hari Singh, aged 50 years, is the only grandson of the owner who headed the family at the time of the First Act. Hari Singh is a law graduate while his father was a primary school dropout and his grandfather an illiterate. Hari Singh's father and younger brother died young. Hari Singh lives with his small family in a village located 8 kms. east of Kurukshetra (district headquarters). The family comes from Jat (Hindu) caste, enjoying a majority status in the village. The number of members in the family was 4 (including Hari Singh, his mother, his father and his grandfather) at the time of the First Act. The number increased to 5 in 1972 and to 7 by now. Only one person was literate at the time of the First Act (father of Hari

Singh). The number of literate members in the family increased to 4 in 1972 and to 6 by now. The number of coparceners increased from 2 in 1953 to 3 in 1972 and is again 3 at present. The family hired 5 full time agricultural workers at the time of the First Act, the number was reduced to 4 in 1972 and at present, same 4 full time workers are helping in farm as well as domestic work. All of the members are staying in the village and are solely dependent on agriculture. Hari Singh is a non-practising law graduate.

The family owned 100 acres of wholly irrigated land in 1953. This land was divided into 5 farms of sizes varying from 10 to 30 acres. The family has never leased-in or leased-out any land in the remembered past. The land has been yielding 2 or more crops since 1945. The entire land is ancestral. The family lost 70 acres of its land due to the First Act. The family was thus left with 30 acres of land divided into two farms of 10 acres and 20 acres in size. The acquired land was distributed to unknown number of poor tenants.

The family did not try to save its land effectively. No case was filed and no other strategy was employed. Hari Singh gives ingenuine calculations (as he and his father were not treated as separate units), ignorance, simplicity of his father and lack of muscle power as the main factors of their landloss. Hari Singh finds a certain economic and social loss due to the legislation.

Further, the family could not diversify its occupation due to the scarcity of male members and the low production which was not enough to buy more land. The family had a very little of bureaucratic and political influence in the past but now it has some influence.

The productivity of the land has gone up by two times or more. The surplus generated was 2400 quintals of food-grains in 1953 in 100 acres, while

it is 1400 quintals at present in the remaining 30 acres. Therefore, the increased production has not healed up the loss.

The family owned a 'kuchcha' house covering 500 sq.yds. around 1953 which was doubled and renovated by 1972. The other assets of the family were 10-12 cattle in 1953, a tractor and the same number of cattle in 1972 and a tractor, two two-wheelers and 5 buffaloes at present.

DISCUSSION: The family was in the 'very big' category before the acquisition but is now in the lower half of 'big' category. The landloss in the following case was massive but as the population pressure remained less, it was easier for the family to cope up. The social prestige of the family has been hurt due to the loss of land which is a status symbol in the rural society.

In the next chapter is discussed the partial protection and the social mobility of the targetted landowners.

CHAPTER II

PARTIAL PROTECTION AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

CHAPTER V

PARTIAL PROTECTION AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

As has been discussed earlier, we shall study the total continuum of the phenomenon of land acquisition with respect to social mobility. Therefore, in this chapter those cases who were able to protect a part of their declared surplus land (or the land that should have been declared surplus) are cited. Twelve cases have been cited in this chapter who in their attempt to save their declared surplus land, could save only a part of it and not the whole. The cases give all relevant details of the strategies adopted by the targetted families and the repercussions of their actions.

It is to be noted that these cases too, in general, have lost some of their social, political and economic standing.

CASE-15

The present head of the family Sewa Singh, aged 54, comes from Jat(Hindu), a majority caste in a village located at about 18 kms. from Palwal (tahsil headquarters) in Faridabad district. The village is small and remote. Sewa Singh is educated upto middle standard. His father, the owner at the time of the First Act, aged about 44 years then, was also educated upto middle standard. The number of family members at the time of the First Act was 4 out of which one male was educated and that too marginally. At the time of the Second Act the number of family members rose to 16 (excluding married daughters) out of which 5 males were literate. Today, the united joint family comprises 28 members out of which 12 males are literate, but still, not even a single female is literate in the family. There is a corresponding increase in the number

of coparceners from 2 in 1953 to 6 in 1972 and totals 18 at present (1993). In this family, females are engaged in domestic work only and do not work on farm like Rajput caste. While only 2 males worked on the farm around 1953, 12 males work on the farm at present. The family used to hire 2 labourers (full-time) for farm work around 1953. Now, 1 or some times 2 hired labourers are sought for help in farm work and rest of the work is managed and shared by male family members. Except two persons, one of whom is a police constable in Delhi and the other who is a conductor in state transport in Palwal, rest of the family relies on agriculture as its main mode of livelihood. Only the one who is a police constable stays in Delhi, rest of the family stays in the village only.

The family owned 88 acres of land out of which only 9 acres was irrigated at the time of the First Act. In 1972, the family owned 61 acres of land, 40 acres of which was irrigated. Now the land owned is 83 acres and all of this land is irrigated. The land was initially divided into two farms of 61 and 27 acres. The smaller farm was located in a nearby village. Now, the farm sizes are 61 and 22 acres. The entire land is ancestral. The family has never leased-in any land but had been leasing-out 8 to 14 acres of unirrigated land to its friends before 1975. The irrigated land yielded 2 crops and the unirrigated land yielded one crop or sometimes not even that.

As per the First Act, in 1956, 27 acres of the land that family owned was declared surplus and was distributed to Brahmin and Chamar tenants of other villages. These allottees were not the original tenants on land. The land declared surplus was in the nearby village. The land was reduced to 61 acres in 1956. Although the possession was given in respect of all 27 acres, but Sewa Singh's father did not give up. In three attempts, he purchased back 22 acres of that land with the help of bank loans, loans from friends and relatives and personal savings. A loan of Rs. 1 lakh is still out-standing. In the first attempt in 1983, 8 acres of the land was purchased back from the allottees at a rate of

Rs.20,000 per acre. In the second attempt in 1986 11 acres of the remaining land was purchased at a rate of Rs.25,000 per acre. In the last attempt in 1988, 3 more acres of the remaining 8 acres was purchased at a rate of Rs.30,000 per acre. But now, it does not seem that the remaining 5 acres can ever be bought back, because the number of persons in the family have increased and the cost of living has gone up. Not only that, the price of land has also gone upto a phenomenal Rs.1 lakh per acre.

Sewa Singh gives lack of information as one reason and lack of acquaintance with bureaucrats or politicians as the other reason of land loss. Like others, he remarks, they also tried to transfer the surplus land in names of their relatives, but could not do so in time. There was nobody who could guide them to circumvent the ceiling legislation. A case was also filed by Sewa Singh in 1956 but it was soon dismissed. The net loss from the Ceiling Act comes out to be 5 acres but lot of money and energy has been spent to get back 22 out the 27 acres declared as surplus. The family finds a considerable loss in prestige, wealth and social standing except that people still respect them because of their honesty making them politically a sound family in the village. The family is now trying to seek education, service and better methods of agriculture for the well-being of its future generations. The productivity of the land in total has increased upto five times. The increase in the covered area of the house (200 sq.yds. in 1953) is only 500 sq.yds. As the land productivity was low at the time of First Act, the family used to trade in camels, goats and cows (or buffaloes). The family owned 200 cattle before the First Act as their assets. The family has given up that business and now solely depends upon agriculture. They bought a tractor in the early seventies and had some 5 to 6 buffaloes at that time. Now the family owns 2 tractors, 3 two wheelers and 10-12 cattle.

DISCUSSION: This is a case of 'big' category (20 to 100 acres) of farmers.

On a general note, the family has gone down on the social ladders considerably as compared to their position before the First Act. The family is now just struggling to maintain its previous status. The family, no doubt, has secured back most of their acquired land but has lost much in the process. The family has more than one lakh rupees as debt from various friends and relatives. The population pressure has also added to the problem. The level of education which is sought for the siblings uptill now is more or less meaningless.

Ignorance had been the main cause of landloss and finally the social influence of the family helped to secure back major portion of its land.

CASE-16

The eldest male of the family Jai Singh is 54 years of age and is the eldest son of the owner at the time of the First Act. Jai Singh the head, is a school master in a nearby village and lives with his family in his native village located about 8 kms. south west of Ballabgarh. Jai Singh's father was educated upto primary level. The family comes from Jat (Hindu), a majority caste in the village. The family comprised 7 members (3 males and 4 females) in 1953 and 10 members (7 males/3 females) in 1972. Today, the family consists of 30 members out of which 20 males and 10 females are literate whereas only 2 males in 1953 and 7 males in 1972 were literate out of the total number. The number of coparceners has doubled over 20 years. It was 3 in 1953, 7 in 1972 and 16 in 1993. Two members went-in for *subordinate services*, one as a police constable and the other as a school teacher around 1972. Today 5 members are in small services like the ones described above (two are in police, one in Army, 2 are school teachers). One member of the family has changed the place of his residence and rest of them live with their families in the village. They are not living at their work place. The family used to hire two full time labourers at the

time of First Act but now the family has enough manual labour within.

The family owned 82 acres of land, 3 acres of which was irrigated in 1953. In 1972, out of 75 acres, 20% (i.e. 15 acres) was irrigated and now 30% of that land is irrigated by a drain. The land is divided into 4 farms, 3 in the same village and 1 in a neighbouring village of approximately the same sizes. The family has never leased-in any land but was leasing-out 4 to 15 acres of the land in other village to friends. The yield of the land has not been satisfactory because of irrigation by drain which sometimes contains hazardous chemicals. 22 acres of land was acquired as surplus by the state and was distributed to poor tenants with respect to the First Act in 1953. The family purchased back 15 acres of that land at almost the same rate at which it was acquired (i.e. Rs.2500/-per acre). The land was easily available to the family because it was unirrigated and practically uncultivable. The net loss due to the Ceiling Act stands at 7 acres. The land which was allotted to 'Brahmin' tenants was purchased back but the 7 acres which was allotted to 'Chamar' tenants could not be bought back. The family cites lack of guidance and awareness as the main reason of landloss. Jai Singh's father tried to transfer the land in other names but was too late. No case was filed for the retrieval of land. The family went for educating its children rather than investing in the land because the yield was poor and the future was uncertain. Also, the unpredictability of the government policies has disheartened the family. The family has had almost no political or bureaucratic influence at any time. The productivity of land has increased to two and a half times owing to technological advancement but the surplus generated is still negligible.

The assets of the family have increased. The family owned a 'kuchcha house' covering 300 sq. yds. in 1953 which is now increased to 700 sq. yds. The family owned a mere 4-5 buffaloes and a pair of bulls at the time of the First Act. Now it owns, 1 tractor, 1 plot at Ballabgarh worth Rs. 25,000/-,

1 plot in neighbouring village worth Rs. 60,000/-, One house in Faridabad worth Rs.5 lakh, 2 two wheelers and about 6-7 buffaloes.

DISCUSSION: The family remains in the 'big' category. The family had a very good rapport before the First Act. It suffered a setback in economic terms and a considerable loss in social prestige. Although the assets look enough but the land and the assets are divided into four sub-families. Moreover, the assets have been made from the secondary sources like petty services and the like. Jai Singh too terms the Act as derogatory to the rights of the farmers.

CASE-17

The present head of the family Tara Chand, aged 58, lives in a village (same as Case-1) located 5 kms from Hodal (a sub tahsil). Tara Chand is illiterate and so was his father who headed the family at the time of First Act. The family belongs to Brahmin (Hindu) caste which is in minority in the village. The family consisted of 6 members in 1953, the number increased to 13 in 1972 and now the total number of the members amounts to 35. The increase in number of coparceners is from 3 in 1953 to 8 in 1972 and to 20 till date. Education was not preferred fashionable in the family until recently. While none of the family members was literate in 1953, 2 got literate in 1972 and now 20 of the total members are literate. Female literacy is still negligible. Only one female member in the family is literate. All the family members are working on farm except one who is school master for the last 30 years. The entire family resides in the village. The family used to hire 2 or 3 full time labourers around the First Act but afterwards no help was needed.

The family owned a total of around 100 acres of land. The entire land is ancestral and no more land has been purchased recently. The family used to lease-out 75 acres of its land to Chamars, Brahmins, Jats and other

friends before the First Act. Now only 2 or 3 acres of the land is leased-out since the family has increased in size. The land yields 2 crops since a long time before the First Ceiling Act.

The family lost 50 acres due to the First Act and since then is cultivating the remaining 50 acres. Although, the declared surplus land was 70 acres but the family filed a case and was given back 20 acres of that land. The remaining 50 acres of land was acquired and distributed to Jat and Brahmin tenants. The family spells 'illiteracy' and 'ignorance' as the factors for its loss of land. The land was irrigated by a canal but now there is little water in the canal. The family has its own tube-wells now but complains of the decreased ground water. The land was divided into 3 farms ranging from 10 to 58 acres in 1953. Now the sizes of the farms are small but the number of farms is still 3. The family could not generate the surplus that was needed to buy some more land. The family has gone down badly on the social scale. The only condolence they have is that there are other households (Case-1 to 5) in the same village who have lost even more land and atleast they have won the case and received back some of their land. The family has had no political and bureaucratic influence at any time. The family has resorted to education.

The productivity of land has not increased many times because the land was well irrigated in past also and it produced well over the national average even 50 years back. The family owned a 'kuchcha' covering 300 sq. yds. but now it is 'pucca' and the covered area is double. The assets now owned by the family are one tractor and one shop (worth Rs. 60,000) in Hodal, more than what it held in 1953. The family was at one time well positioned owning 100 acres of land but now the family is broken and the land has been further divided to small and marginal holdings.

DISCUSSION: The divided family has been without doubt, dragged to a miserably low status of marginal or small farmers when at one time the family was in the 'very big' category. The loss of 50% of Class I land (irrigated) was irreparable and

mind-blowing. Even today, Tara Chand literally dreams that he is given back his land.

CASE-18

The present head Jaidayal, aged 72 years, is the eldest son of the former head who died in 1973 at an age of 71 years. The present head Jaidayal is a science graduate and he retired as a Superintendent of Police (Haryana). The family is totally literate since they migrated from Pakistan in 1948. The family comes from 'Khatri' (Hindu) caste, living in minority in a village located 10 kms north of Hisar. The number of members in the family increased from 11 in 1953 to 15 in 1972 and to 25 uptill now. The number of coparceners were 3 in 1953, 7 in 1972 and 12 in 1993. 5 of the males worked on the farm till 1972 and now 7 males are working on the farm. The family has maintained 10 full time agricultural labourers since 1948. Upto 1980 only one member (Jaidayal) was in police service who was posted in Chandigarh and the rest depended on agriculture. Now, one of his brothers is working as a Bank Manager in Hisar, the next one is working as a Doctor in Karnal and the other two (including self) are running their own 'Brick Kiln'.

The family owned 1019 acres of unirrigated land before the First Act (including 900 acres that they inherited from their grandaunt). The family has never leased-in any land but it was leasing-out 21 acres of land that was in 'Kharkhoda' because of distance but it was soon sold-off after the First Act. The cropping pattern has been as usual, 2 crops in irrigated and 1 crop in unirrigated land. Most of the land was unirrigated at the time of First Act but in late sixties 80 acres of the total land (194 acres) which the family owns at present got irrigated with the help of tube-wells etc. The land in the native village was divided into two farms in the 2:1 proportion. Entire land was allotted to the family in lieu of its land in Pakistan. As the family was mobile and literate it anticipated the Act and sold-off 825 acres of its land including

21 acres allotted to it in 'Kharkhoda' (Sonepat). Of the remaining 194 acres, 34 acres were declared as surplus in the Second Act. Jaidayal finds 'faulty legislation' as the major cause of their landloss as it did not give rights to girls. Still, the family managed to save or sell much of its land by fake transfers, gifting to daughters and other relatives and such strategies. A litigation is still going on for 6 acres of the family's land. The family did not want to purchase more land as it found better to invest money in other business. Jaidayal also terms it as a loss in the family's prestige but it seems contradictory as the family has fared well in politics too. The younger brother of Jaidayal was Sarpanch for 25 years.

The productivity of the land has tripled due to the irrigation facilities available which is now 300 tonnes of food grains per year as against 100 tonnes in the same land about 20 years back. The assets of the family have also increased several times. At the time of the First Act it had a 'kuchcha' house covering 1,000 sq. yds but now it is pucca and double in area. In addition to that, family owns two cars, 3 two wheelers, 3 tractors, brick kiln and two plots each at Delhi and Rohtak.

DISCUSSION: The family remains in the 'very big' category even after a sale of 825 acres and acquisition of 34 acres. Economically and politically the family stands in a better position than before but socially, as the land is a prime status symbol, there may be some loss in prestige. Jaidayal finds no logic in this legislation as most of the tenants or allottees have sold-off their lands long before. He asks, if nobody has gained, why were we deprived of our land?

CASE-19

The eldest male Pratap Singh, aged 37 years, heads the family. He is eldest son of the former head who died at an age of 65 in 1987. The present head Pratap Singh lives with his family in his small native village located near

'Ramgarh' on state highway in district of Ambala. The family comes from 'Rajput' (Hindu) caste which is in minority in the village. Pratap Singh is a matriculate while his father was illiterate. The number of members in the family were 4 in 1953, 10 in 1972 and are 11 at present. While none of the members was literate in 1953, all of the members except mother and father of the present head were literate in 1972 and now except mother and another female all have attained atleast elementary school education. The number of coparceners in the family has increased from 1 in 1953 to 4 in 1972 and to 5 till now. As is common in the 'Rajput' caste only males are taking up the outdoor work. One male member worked on the farm in 1953, 4 worked in 1972 and 5 are working on the fields at present. Inversely, 3 full time agriculture workers were hired in 1953, 2 of them were maintained in 1972 and now only one worker is hired for help in farmwork. Besides, none of the members of the family has any other occupation than agriculture and thus, all of them are staying in the village.

The family owned 58 acres of land in 1953, out of which 3.5 acres was soon acquired for the construction of highway and 6 acres was sold anticipating the Ceiling Act. Entire land was an ancestral. The land was totally irrigated and divided into 3 farms varying from 11 to 38 acres in size. Besides that, the Rajput families in the village had possession of 'Shamlat deh' (village common lands) upto 1970 which they cultivated by rotation. Now, the malkiyat (ownership) of that land has been abolished and it is now in panchayat's name. As the land was more and the male members less, the family also used to rent out 5 to 10 acres of its irrigated land to known poor tenants. As usual the irrigated land yielded two crops and the portion which is now unirrigated yields one crop. Out of the total of the family's land (i.e., 48.5 acres) more than 6 acres (51 canal 5 marla) was acquired as surplus due to the First Act. Of the declared surplus land, 14 canal has been retained by illegal means. This land is in government's name but family retains the possession. Therefore, the net landloss of the family comes out to be less than 5 acres (37 canal 5 marla).

The family lost only about 5 acres of their land due to Ceiling Act but the declared surplus land was 12.5 acres and actually it should have been more but much of the family's land was 'rehan' (mortgaged to money-lenders) and thus it was saved. The acquired surplus land was allotted to 'Chamars' of the same village.

The family gives illiteracy and ignorance of the former head (father) as the main cause of its landloss. A case was filed for the retrieval of acquired land which is still pending on part of the surplus land (14 canal) that is in family's possession. Pratap Singh tells that with the help of 'Advocates' his father tried only to delay the acquisition. The family had also purchased 2 acres of land in 1982 making the total landholding as 44.5 acres.

The other loss that the family bears is that of decreased irrigation due to which 9 acres of the total of 44.5 acres of land stands unirrigated.

The political and bureaucratic influence of the family is not much, as the former head was only once elected as the 'sarpanch' of the village. The family also did not try to diversify its occupation because of untold reasons.

Pratap Singh feels that this loss has a profound social bearing and as the society is becoming more and more individualistic the situation becomes worse.

The family has always been able to generate some surplus of 40-60 quintals of food-grains. There is no doubt that the production has increased but the landloss and decreased irrigation has countered it. The family owns the same house (750 sq.yds.) which is pucca since 1948. The family owned 20-22 cattle till 1974 but afterwards the number was reduced to 10 buffaloes. A tractor was also purchased 7 years back on a loan from bank.

DISCUSSION: The family remains in the 'big' category even after the land acquisition and sale of a part of its land. Nonetheless, the family has gone down on the social,

economic and political scales. This was partly due to Ceiling Act and partly other factors.

CASE-20

The present head Inder Singh, aged 65 years, was the eldest male even at the time of the First Act (1953). Inder Singh is not the natural heir as he was adopted by a widow in 1940 who owned this property. The descent of the present head is not known. He lives with his two wives and offsprings in Karnal but owns the property in a village located 8 kms south west of Karnal. Inder Singh follows the customs and life styles of 'Rajput' (Hindu) caste which enjoys a majority status in the village. He is educated upto high school. The number of members in the family were 5 in 1953, 12 in 1972 and 21 at present. All the members are literate since 1948 when the original owner died. The number of coparceners were 3 in 1953, 7 in 1972 and are 15 by now. None of the family members is practically working on the farm since 1972. Before 1972, two male members were working on the farm. The family shifted to Karnal in 1972. The family has maintained 4 full time agricultural workers since 1948, one of the sons of Inder Singh is as a Lawyer and the other is a Doctor practising their respective professions at Karnal. Rest of the offsprings are seeking education and are dependent on agriculture.

The family owned 100 acres of land in 1953, half of which was irrigated. This land was divided into 3 farms of sizes 10, 40 and 50 acres each. The family has never leased-in or out any land in the remembered past. 35 acres of this land was acquired due to the First Act and was distributed to the poor tenants of same and other neighbouring villages. But, a litigation on the allotted surplus land is still pending in High Court. The declared surplus land was 70 acres but 35 acres of that was exempted under the categories of 'well managed farm' and 'land under orchards'. The family was left with 65 acres of well irrigated land in 1972. Out of the remaining 65 acres of land, 30 acres of

land was acquired for the construction of 'Madhuban Police Training Complex'. The family was thus left with only 35 acres of land. Inder Singh reports that the family then lost interest in agriculture and shifted to Karnal and built its house there. 5 more acres was sold to build this house.

Inder Singh feels the landloss as a big social degradation as everything (marriages etc.) is based on land-ownerships. He is not convinced with the legislation as it did not even yield the intended results. Most of the tenants have disposed-off their lands. He is also unhappy about the implementors and calls them corrupt. He added that they asked for bribe which he denied. No more land could be purchased as much was spent on the education of his 15 offsprings.

The productivity of the land has gone up by 4 to 5 times and moreover the land used to yield 2 crops in irrigated and 1 crop in unirrigated land in 1953 while the number of crops harvested now are usually 3 or 4 (including vegetables).

It seems that the landloss had no effect on the political standing of the family as Inder Singh was Chairman of Block-Samiti from 1962 to 1972, after that he quit the politics because he had to deal with low caste officers and antisocial politicians and it used to hurt his ego he remarked. This shows the fundamentalism associated with the 'Rajput' caste. The family owned a 'pucca' house covering 1000 sq. yds. in 1953 to which a house covering 500 sq. yds. was added in 1975. Besides that, family owned 15 buffaloes, 7 cows, 10-12 bulls, 2 horses and 2 camels in 1953 to which a tractor was added in 1972. Now the family owns 1 tractor, 1 two wheeler, 1 car, 8 buffaloes and 3 cows.

DISCUSSION: The family fell in the category of 'very big' farmers but now it is in lower half of the 'big' category.

The family has lost 70% of its land, half of which due to Ceiling Act and the remaining due to acquisition for other purposes. This jointly made the family come down on social ladder. The out-migration of the family has

also led to the political degradation. But the living standard of the family is adequate and the achievements in education are also satisfactory.

CASE-21

The head of the family Swami Dayal, aged 75 years, was the eldest male in the family even at the time of the First Act. The family belongs to Aggarwal (Vaisha/Hindu) caste which enjoys a majority status in the tahsil headquarters of Narnaul (Mahendragarh district). Swami Dayal is a graduate living with his joint family on his farms about 3 kms from Narnaul. The number of members totalled 7 in 1953, 13 in 1972 and is 19 at present. The proportion of educated members stand constant at about 30% since 1953. The increase in the member of coparceners is from 5 in 1953 to 6 in 1972 and to 9 till date. The important thing about this case is that Swami Dayal is not the original owner and was an adopted child of the original owner who did not cultivate his land upto 1962. The number of family members working on farm was 'zero' in 1953, 4 in 1972 and still, it is 4. The family hired 2 full-time agricultural labourers for farm work in 1972 and now only 1 is hired. In 1953, none of the family members was engaged in any occupation, the family just enjoyed the rent of its land. In 1970, one of Swami Dayal's son joined a class III service and is working at Hyderabad. Rest of the family is solely dependent on agriculture for its livelihood. The family owned 350 acres of unirrigated land before the Second Act. In 1953, only about 25 acres of the total of 350 acres of land was irrigated by wells and rest of the land remained unirrigated upto 1975 when a canal was dug. The land before acquisition was divided in one farm of 100 acres and 12 other farms scattered over a wide area. The digging of the canal scattered the land into more pieces. The land was ancestral (inherited from the previous owner) and no new purchase has been made so far. The family used to lease-out all of its land in 1953 and a major portion till 1972 to many unrelated but known tenants. 125 acres of the total land was sold anticipating the implementation of the Second Act

(Haryana Ceilings of Land holdings Act, 1972). Out of the remaining 225 acres, 45 acres were declared and acquired as surplus in 1973. This land was distributed to some of the original tenants on the land. After the Second Act, the government dug a canal in the region and for that, 20 more acres of land that the family owned was acquired. Finally, the family was left with 160 acres of land. Still, the family leases-out 60 acres of its irrigated land that is on the other side of the canal. The terms of tenancy have always been oral. The land is yielding two crops a year after the digging of canal in 1975 but before that, it yielded only one crop.

The acquired land is in possession of the allottees and they are working on it. Swami Dayal complains and rightly so, that he and one of his major sons were clubbed together as one unit although other major sons were treated as separate units. Swami Dayal had filed a case in High Court and it is still going on. Swami Dayal is a graduate, and therefore, did not need any guidance. He is well versed with the legislation. The family could not purchase more land as the land is not productive enough and family is left with very less money due to court case.

The family has had almost no political and bureaucratic influence at any time in the remembered past. The family could not diversify much except one member who is in a small service.

The family had a pucca house covering 300 sq.yds. in 1953 and only recently the covered area was increased by 100 sq.yds. The family had negligible assets except land in 1953, had a tractor and a dairy farm (20 buffaloes) in 1972 and has 2 tractors, 2 two wheelers, some agricultural implements and three buffaloes as its assets at present.

Swami Dayal has been doing a review of all the Ceiling Acts passed in other states since he lost the land. There were some indications of his behaviour being abnormal. Other residents of the town say that he is mad.

DISCUSSION: Even after a loss of 45 acres, the family is comfortably placed in the 'very big' category of farmers.

The head of the family is deeply traumatized by the landloss. Although the landloss is neutralized (more or less) by the irrigation facilities provided by the state. This case could be taken as stagnant and not a case of downward mobility.

CASE-22

The present head Daya Singh, aged 62 years, is the only son of his father who died in 1985 at an age of 78. Daya Singh is married twice and comes from Jat (Hindu) caste which is in minority ('Kumhars' are in majority) in the village located 13 kms. northwest of Jalan in Rohtak district. The former head was educated upto primary standard while Daya Singh is educated upto middle standard. The number of members in the family were 5 in 1953, 15 in 1972 and are 23 till date. Out of them, 2 males in 1953, 4 males and 2 females in 1972 and 10 males and 5 females upto now have sought elementary education. All the members have depended solely on agriculture and reside in the village. The increase in the number of coparceners is from 2 in 1953 to 7 in 1972 and to 15 uptill now. The family used to hire 3 full time farm workers around 1953 but not afterwards.

The family owned 900 acres of land at the time of the First Act, out of which only 45 acres were irrigated. The land that the family has possessed is ancestral. The family has never leased-in any land but had been leasing-out 500 acres of their land before 1953 which was far away (in an uninhabited village). This land was unirrigated. The cropping pattern is as usual, i.e. 2 crops in irrigated land and 1 or sometimes 2 crops (one of which was bajra or gram) in unirrigated portion. Daya Singh's father had anticipated the Act and sold-off 500 acres of his land at a low rate of Rs.300/- to Rs.400/- per acre in 1956. This land was located in a distant village near Fatehabad. This farm was

always leased-out by the family to the tenants whom it had settled there, which was an uninhabited village. Land that should have been declared as surplus was 800 acres. The land that was initially declared as surplus came to be 617 acres but 500 acres of it was sold beforehand. Except that, the family gifted 34 acres of its land to some relatives. This land was a part of the family's land in a neighbouring village. There, the family had 50 acres of land divided into 5 farms. Finally the family was left with 350 acres of land in their native village which was divided into two farms and 16 acres in a neighbouring village. From it, 73 acres of land from the bigger farm and 10 acres from the smaller one in the other village was declared and acquired as surplus. This land was distributed to 'kumhars' (potters) of the native and neighbouring villages. As the family according to Daya Singh lacked muscle power it had to surrender this land. Lastly, the family is left with 277 acres of land in their native village and 6 acres in a neighbouring village totalling 283 acres. This land is retained after a series of strategies employed by the former and present heads. The main strategies were gifting of land to relatives, fake divorce and transfer of land in the names of two wives and a number of litigations. The 283 acres that the family holds today is irrigated (Class-II) land while in 1972 only 40% of the land was irrigated.

Daya Singh gives lack of physical power as the main factor of his landloss as the allottees (Kumhars) were in majority in that area. 60 acres out of 283 acres is still in illegal possession of 'kumhar' tenants which Daya Singh does not hope to retrieve. The family has had negligible political and bureaucratic influence at any time. The only help they received was from 'Advocates' who have fought for them till recently. On 18th Oct. 1993, the landowner was defeated in the S.D.M. court, but the decision made is not legally written. The case filed was against the tenants who are not giving any rent to the owner for his above mentioned 60 acres of land.

The family owned a 'kuchcha' house covering 2000 sq.yds. in 1953 which was made 'pucca' in 1962, still the family lives in the same house. The surplus production of food grains was 200 tonnes in 1953, 250 tonnes in 1972 and at present it is 400 tonnes despite the landloss. The family owned a tractor before 1953 and one more tractor was added to the assets in 1965, besides bulls and 16 buffaloes. Now the family has 2 new tractors, 16 tube-wells, 20 cattle and a two wheeler as their assets. Daya Singh finds the landloss a big loss in social and economic standing. There was a lot of loss incurred in attempts to save his land which was his only means of livelihood. He told that at one time they were like 'kings' in that area but now they are just like other poor farmers.

DISCUSSION: Even after a massive reduction in the landholding, the family falls in the 'very big' category of farmers. The family was to lose almost 10 times of the land it has actually lost, but still in the course of time the family had to bear a big financial loss and is left with only 30% its original holding. This has dragged the family considerably back. According to Daya Singh, he had to marry twice to produce a big family, so that no more land is lost in future. Illiteracy and ignorance had added to the misfortunes of the family.

CASE-23

The head of the family Zile Singh, aged 68 years, was head even at the time of the First Act. Zile Singh is married twice and is educated upto higher secondary. The family comes from Jat (Hindu) caste enjoying a majority status in the key village located on the north Delhi border. The head has two separate divisions of his family, one (from the first wife) living in the village and the second (from his second wife) including himself living in Panipat where his wife is working as a nurse in Red Cross hospital. The family is relatively small and educated. In 1953, 4 males out of a total of 5 members were literate. All 6

males and 3 females were literate in a family of 9 members in 1972 and all 6 males and 4 females are literate at present in a family of 10 members. The number of coparceners increased from 2 in 1953 to 6 in 1972 and is still 6 at present. None of the family members has ever worked on the farm, nor they have hired any labour for farm or domestic work. Except the second wife of the head, no one in the family is doing any other work (all unemployed).

The family owned 260 acres of land all of which was irrigated in 1953. The entire land that the family held around 1953 is said to be ancestral and is divided into unknown number of farms located in six villages in the region.

The land normally yielded one crop but the family was interested only in the rent which was quite low as compared to the market rate. The tenants on the land were just known people and were not related to the family in any other sense. 44 acres of the land was donated to a sister of Zile Singh anticipating the implementation of the First Act. But, the donation did not make any difference and thus, 190 acres of the total land was declared as surplus due to the First Act. The remaining 16 acres is also at stake (i.e. it is in possession of old tenants). The declared surplus land is distributed to the 'mujaras' (tenants) of various castes. The family didn't even try to retain their land as Zile Singh is a careless alcoholic and the elder sons are also like that. The family finds the loss as massive social as well as economic loss but not political. One of Zile Singh's cousin is a minister in the state government. Family has always had a strong political and bureaucratic influence. The family has doubled the covered area of its house to 2000 sq.yds. but that was done with Rs. 20,000 which it received as compensation of acquired surplus land. The family has never filed a court case of any type. The family is on the threshold of total bankruptcy and yet does not seem to plan anything constructive.

It is to be noted that Zile Singh's father owned about 2,250 acres of land while now the family has a very low social and economic standing. Only the other branch of the family in which one of the members is a minister, is doing well.

DISCUSSION: The family was among the 'very big' category of farmers but is now struggling almost without any land. This is the greatest example of downward mobility. The living standard of the family is nothing more than a lower middle class family. The main factor for this is alcoholism of Zile Singh and his elder sons. The Land Ceiling has only aggravated the misery.

CASE-24

The present head Daljit Singh, aged 60 years, is the eldest son of the former head who died in 1988 at an age of 71 years. Daljit Singh is educated upto tenth standard while his father was educated upto middle standard. Daljit Singh lives with his family in a remote but big village located 26 kms. north-east of Hisar. The family comes from Jat (Hindu), a majority caste in the village. The number of members in the family was 13 in 1953 out of which all 5 males were literate, 16 in 1972, out of which all 12 males were literate and the number was 21 in 1993, out of which all 14 males and 4 of the 7 females were literate. The number of coparceners were 5 in 1953, 5 in 1972 and are 13 till date. All of the family members except the young school going children work on the farm. The family hired 15 full time farm workers in 1953, 17 in 1972 and the family it hires a phenomenal 25 full-time workers now for their farm work. This was due to the fact that family had a big piece of land and that too wholly irrigated. None of the family members has other occupation than agriculture.

The family owned 375 acres of land at the time of the First Act. This land was almost wholly irrigated. The land before consolidation was divided into 10 to 12 farms of 20 to 100 acres in size. Due to consolidation and the Ceiling Act the number of farms were reduced to 3 of sizes 40, 50 and 60 acres each. The entire land was ancestral. The family has never leased-in any land but was leasing-out some part of their illegally possessed land, half of which was near the village and the other half distant. The family had no relation with those tenants. The tenancy was there upto 1971 but not afterwards. The land yielded 2 crops but the yield is not as good as in Karnal or Kurukshetra districts. 30 acres of the total land was declared as surplus due to the First Act and 210 acres of land was retained illegally, 30 acres of which was later sold off. The illegally possessed land was also recovered by the government in 1973. The declared surplus land was distributed to some of the old tenants of various castes like 'Chamar', 'Nai' etc. Daljit Singh informs that his parents were not clever enough to transfer their land in time, therefore, they lost 30 acres of their land which was enough to hurt their prestige in the village. Now the family is left with only 150 acres of land including 15 acres which the family purchased in Daljit Singh's sister's name. The money paid by the government as compensation was used for this purchase.

The owner seems to be more serious about his loss of 'Lumberdari' than land. He finds the former as a more important factor in social down-grading. The family did not have any notable political or bureaucratic influence. The family has transformed its 'Kuchcha' house covering 500 sq.yds. into 'Pucca' and has also increased the covered area by 50%. Although the productivity of land has increased by 3 times, but it still does not yields any surplus. The family is taming around 20 cattle since long. The family owned 4 tractors in 1972, but now it owns only two tractors.

DISCUSSION: The family continues to belong to the 'very big' category but has lost a big part of its land. The family has certainly gone down in terms of social prestige with some loss

in financial position too. Politically the family does not seem to be active.

CASE-25

The present head Tekram, aged 70 years, is the eldest son of the former head who died in 1968 at an age of 90 years. Tekram had attained primary education while his father was illiterate. The family belongs to Jat (Hindu) caste living in minority in a big village located 7 kms. east of Pipli town in district of Kurukshetra (the same village as in Case-12). The number of members in the family counted 3 in 1953, out of which only one male was literate. The number rose to 5 in 1972, 4 of which were literate (including one female). Now, the total number of members are 13, all of whom are literate. The corresponding increase in the number of coparceners is from 2 in 1963 to 4 in 1972 and to 7 at present. The number of family members working on farm increased from 1 in 1953 to 4 in 1972 and to 7 at present. The family also used to hire 6 full time farm workers upto 1975 and since then, 5 workers are hired for the purpose. All the members, are living in the village and have no other occupation than agriculture.

The family owned 100 acres of land in 1953 out of which only 2 acres was irrigated. This land was divided into 3 farms of 30 acres, 33 acres and 37 acres in size. The entire land was ancestral. The family had been leasing-out 10-20 acres of its unirrigated land which was distant upto 1953. This land was given to known poor tenants. Thereafter, no land was leased-out. Instead, the family is leasing-in 16 acres of irrigated land from known landlords since 1985. 20 acres of land was declared as surplus due to the First Act. This land was acquired and distributed to 'Saini' and 'Jat' tenants. These tenants were not the original tenants on the land. The former head donated another 10 acres to his two daughters. This was done following the suggestion of relatives and Advocates as the family held land more than the permissible

area. The family was thus left with 70 acres of 'half irrigated' land before the Second Act. Yet another 10 acres of land was acquired as surplus due to the Second Act in 1973. This land was allotted to 'Chamar' and 'Jhimmar' tenants. The net landloss due to the Ceiling Acts was thus, 30 acres. Now, the family holds 60 acres of irrigated land (class-I) which is one consolidated farm. The family finds a considerable loss in its assets and social standing. Tekram remarks, "The Ceilings have let us down on all fronts". The head of the family filed a case for the retrieval of land in 1954 which went on till 1976, when the family finally lost the case. Tekram feels that the causes of this loss were his illiteracy, ignorance and that he was alone. As, much of what was earned was spent on litigations there was no question of diversification of occupation or any more purchase of land.

Upto 1975, the land yielded 1 or 2 crops depending upon the irrigation. Now, whole of the land yields 3 or more crops per year. The land yielded 200 quintals of surplus foodgrains in 1953, which increased to 300 quintals of foodgrains around 1972. Now, the family produces 1000 quintals of foodgrains in only 60% of the land that it owned in 1953. Besides that, family owned a 'Pucca' house of 500 sq.yds. in 1953 which was doubled in 1970. The covered area of the house was not increased after that. The other assets in 1953 were 20-30 cattle. The cattle were reduced to 5 but a tractor was added in 1972. Now, the family owns 2 tractors, 4 cattle and some agricultural implements as its movable assets.

DISCUSSION: This case belonged to the 'very big' category but now it falls in the lower half of the 'big category'. Although the landloss was apparent but the family has coped up with that. Tekram feels that the landloss has been a constant impediment to their growth. While objectively, the only harm that is seen in the present case is in social prestige.

CASE-26

The present head Preet Singh, aged 35 years, is grandson of the head at the time of the First Act in 1953. In this family both the former head and his father died at early ages of 46 and 52 years respectively due to some hereditary disease. Preet Singh is staying with his family alongwith his brothers' families in a relatively remote village located 15 kms. east of Ambala. The family belongs to Jat (Sikh) caste which is in minority in the village. The family is totally literate. Even father and grandfather of the present head were graduates. The members in the family counted 4 in 1953, 8 in 1972 and 15 till now. The corresponding increase in the coparceners is from 2 in 1953 to 4 in 1972 and to 6 till date. The number of members working on the farm is even lesser. Only one person took up the farm work in 1953, 2 worked in 1972 and now 4 of the members are engaged practically in agriculture. The family hired 15 full time agricultural workers in 1953 and maintained the same number till 1972. Now only 6 farm workers are hired. Besides that, the family has always kept 2 to 3 domestic servants too. The family as a whole stays in the village and is solely dependent on agriculture and has no other occupation.

The family owned 100 acres of land all of which was unirrigated (Barani) in 1953. This land was divided into 8 subfarms varying from 2 to 25 acres in size. The entire land is claimed to be ancestral.

The family has never leased-in or leased-out any land. The land yielded only one crop or sometimes two till 1978 when it got irrigated. Now it yields 2 or 3 crops per year.

In the First Act, 40 acres of the land in the family's possession was declared as surplus, the possession for which was never given to anybody. A case was filed for this piece of land which remained pending till 1972 when again 70 acres (including the previous 40 acres) of the family's land was declared as surplus. A case was again filed but this time 25 acres could be

saved. The remaining 45 acres was acquired and distributed to the 'mujaras' (tenants) who have disposed-off most of that land. The tenants sold the land at a high rate of Rs.70,000/- to Rs.80,000/- per acre, which made difficult for the original owners to repurchase. Now the family possesses only 55 acres and this piece of land is irrigated by expensive deep submersible pumpsets. This land is divided into 4 farms of 10 to 20 acres in size.

Although Preet Singh finds the landloss as a severe blow to his emotions but is consoled that he was not responsible for that. He holds the carelessness of his parents as the main reason for the landloss. Further, he is happy that atleast they have coped up and are still one of the most respected families in the village. The family didn't diversify its occupation much, but has made a solid political base. The former head of the family was Sarpanch, while Preet Singh is a Sarpanch as well as the district youth president of Samajwadi Janata Party, which is a strong opposition in the state. Once, the family had also entered in wine contracts but very soon gave up that business.

Preet Singh remarks that socially the family is not degraded due to land acquisition, as most of the residents in the village find the Act as non-logical and are sympathetic towards his family.

Till recently, the productivity of the land was low but now the family generates a surplus of 1500 quintals of foodgrains in addition to fodder and some other cash crops. The family has doubled the covered area of the house which was only 1000 sq.yds. in 1953. At the time of the First Act family reared about 50 cattle to which a tractor was added in 1972. Now the family owns 2 tractors, 2 cars, 10 buffaloes and some agricultural implements as its assets.

The family perceives the landloss as an emotional and financial loss but not social or political.

DISCUSSION: The family was in the 'very big' category of farmers but now is left with only about half of its land. Yet the

family is an example of coping-up mechanism. The land of the family is reduced to almost half, but still the family has not given up. Personally, I feel that this is the only family out of which I have interviewed that is living comfortably and in some luxury after such a big landloss. The house had all the amenities that an urban household normally enjoys.

The next chapter deals with the total protection vis-a-vis the social mobility and the cases which fall under this heading are described adequately.

CHAPTER III

TOTAL PROTECTION AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

CHAPTER-VI

TOTAL PROTECTION AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

This chapter deals with the total protectors of their land, who by dint of one strategy or ~~more~~ ^{the other} did not yield even a single acre of their land. Although some of them have no legal stake in part(s) of their land but still they retain the possession. Some of these 16 cases have litigations going on at one level or the another. The chapter also includes the cases who have gone down fighting for their land to which they attach *social, political and economic importance*. Some of these cases are examples of downward mobility, the causes varying from case to case. The cases taken are described as follows:

CASE-27

The present owner Rahim Khan, aged 83, comes from the Meo community (subcaste of Islam) enjoying majority status in a village located 16 kms. west of Ballabgarh in Faridabad district. It is a key village located on the state highway running from Ballabgarh to Sohna. Rahim Khan's father died at an age of 97, two years after the implementation of the Second Ceiling Act of 1972. Rahim Khan is married twice and has a big joint family. He is educated upto primary school but his father was illiterate. At the time of the First Act only one person (ownself) was educated in a family of 5 persons. Around the Second Act, the number of persons in the family increased to 20 (Rahim Khan, his father, 9 sons, 7 daughters and his 2 wives), out of which 8 males were literate and none of the females was literate. Today, the number of family members (excluding married daughters) has risen upto 62, out of which 30 are females. Although all of the

male members of the family are more or less literate but only 3 out of 30 female members are literate in some sense. There is a taboo of the religion of not sending females to schools. The number of coparceners of the property was 2 in 1953, 13 in 1972 and is 32 upto now. Only females are practically working on the farm, the males share only the leadership responsibilities and are involved in village politics. The family hired 7 labourers (full-time) for the farm work in 1953, whereas now the number of farm labourers has increased to 11. Except the two sons, one of whom is in United States and is working there as a Lawyer and the other who is Clerk in Chandigarh, others depend wholly on agriculture. The above mentioned two members have changed their place of residence only 5 to 6 years back.

The family owned about 140 acres of land distributed in two farms of 100 and 40 acres each. The bigger piece of the land is in native village and 40 acres of land is in a neighbouring village. The land was totally rained around 1953, whereas in 1972, 65 acres of land got irrigated and today, whole of the farm is irrigated either by canals or by tubewells. The entire land is ancestral except a piece of 4 acres which was purchased at a low rate in 1992. Today, the land is subdivided into 12 households and the number of other coparceners excluding daughters amounts to 20. The family has never leased-in any land and has also never formally leased-out any land to tenants, if ever, it was very less and was given to poor friends. The land yielded 1 to 2 crops depending upon the irrigation facilities. Now, the entire land yields two crops a year.

The family was a victim of both the Ceiling Acts (1953 and 1972) but the actual land loss is nil. The land declared surplus due to the First Act was 36 acres but the possession has never been given to anybody. The litigation goes on even today, in Session Court. To retain this land help was

sought from advocates. Further, according to Rahim Khan, the implementation was poor making it easy for the landlords to retain their lands. Again in 1972, due to the Second Act, 4 acres of family's land was declared and acquired as surplus. Same amount of land, i.e. 4 acres, was purchased in 1972 with the amount received as compensation but it was not as expensive as his own land. The net effect on the total land due to the legislation remained zero. But, Rahim Khan terms the effect as a considerable social and economic setback as he had to pay a lot to the advocates, policemen, etc. The family has attempted to diversify the occupation and has recently opened a hatchery-cum-poultry farm but, it has not started giving income. The family is politically and socially sound, but only if it remains united. Three of the close relatives of the family were ministers in various governments. The family owned a pucca house covering 2000 sq.yds. in 1953, which has been multiplied thrice since then. The family as its other assets had 16 cattle and a few goats in 1953. A tractor was also purchased before 1972 and now, although the cattle remain in same numbers, the family owns 5 tractors, 4 two wheelers and a hatchery-cum-poultry farm.

The family is said to have a sound social, political and economic standing in the past but now it has gone down a little. Rahim Khan remarks that politicians are crushing them and are jealous of their position as he was Sarpanch of the village for 25 years and since then his son is Sarpanch for two terms. One of the sons of Rahim Khan was murdered three years back but was shown as a mere accident by the authorities.

DISCUSSION: The case falls in the category of 'very big' farmers. The family seems to have a strong backing and by dint of that, the family has more or less maintained its prestige. Also, they did not lose much due to the Ceiling legislation. But, if the land is devolved to all the eligible coparceners, the situation could be undesirable.

CASE 28

The present head of the family Karan Singh, aged 50 years, is the eldest son of the former head who died at an age of 75 years in 1977. Karan Singh stays in a remote village located 17 kms. south west of Narnaul in Mahendragarh district. He is illiterate and except two children going to primary schools, all others in the family are also illiterate. The family comes from 'Ahir' (Hindu) caste which enjoys a majority status in the village. In 1953, the number of members in family totalled 12. In 1972, the number increased to 15 and now it is 25. The number of coparceners increased from 5 in 1953 to 8 in 1972 and to 16 at present. Almost whole of the family is working on the farm now, as in the past. The family has never felt a need of domestic or farm servant in the remembered past. The family depends solely on agriculture for its survival. The family stays in the village with no exceptions.

The family owned 90 acres of unirrigated land in 1953 which it has maintained upto now. The family has never leased- out any land but had shown Karan Singh's father as a tenant in 1953 to grab some land but failed to get any. The family has also never leased-out its land to anybody. The land yields normally one crop a year as the agriculture is rainfed. Sometimes it yields 2 crops, if the weather permits. 5 Acres of this land was declared as surplus but the possession remains with the family. According to Karan Singh 5 more acres were acquired for digging-up a canal but that too is still with them as the work has not yet started.

Even today not even a single acre of land is irrigated. Agriculture here depends solely on rain (rainfall in the region is an uncertain 25 cms.). The total of 90 acres of land is scattered in 10 pieces of land in sizes varying

from 2 acres to 15 acres (no consolidation is done in this area). The entire land is ancestral.

Karan Singh informs that there was no claimant for their land but other residents and the Sarpanch told that a poor claimant came for possession but was scolded-off.

The family has an inadequate life style and is illiterate and ignorant. The life style of the family approaches the tribal style of life.

The family lives in bankruptcy, so there is no question of improvement in the status. The family has had no political or bureaucratic influence in the last 40 years or even more. There is almost no surplus generated by the land as it is a semi-desert strip. The family occupies the same 'Kuchcha' house covering 200 sq. yds. which was built by its forefathers a long time back (about 60 years).

The family has one tractor purchased on loan from the bank in 1984 and rest of the assets are almost the same as they were in 1953, i.e. a few buffaloes and a camel.

Karan Singh informs that his father was a 'Jaildar' (Revenue officer of 25 villages in British India) and, therefore, they had a better social standing in the past.

DISCUSSION: Although Karan Singh's family falls in the 'big' category of farmers but the living standard does not comply with their counterparts in other parts of Haryana. The family did not lose any land due to Ceiling legislations. But even then there seems to be no change in the social, economic or political standing of the family overtime.

CASE 29

The present head Neelam Singh, aged 62 years, is the eldest son of the former head who died at an age of 78 in 1983. Neelam Singh is functionally literate while his father was illiterate. The family comes from 'Rajput' (Hindu) caste that enjoys a majority status in the village located just 2 kms from Gharaunda in Karnal district. The number of members in the family were 7 in 1953, out of which only one male was literate. The number increased to 18 in 1972, out of which 5 males and 2 females were literate. The total number of members are 21 at present, out of which 14 males and 5 females are literate. The literacy proportion of the family is high, may be, because of urban proximity. The number of coparceners in the family was 3 in 1953, 6 in 1972 and is 15 till now. The number of members of family working on the farm was even less, i.e. 2 of the members worked on farm in 1953, 4 worked in 1972 and now only 3 are practically working on the farm. One of the sons of Neelam Singh is practising as an Advocate in Karnal. The family hired 4 full-time farm workers in 1953 and maintained the number till 1972. Now the number of hired workers is 6.

The family owned 100 acres of land in 1953. 50 acres of this land was irrigated. The land is one consolidated farm. The entire land is ancestral. The land got totally irrigated only in early sixties. The family has never leased-in any land but has been leasing-out part of its land due to scarce labour. The family leased-out 30 irrigated and 35 unirrigated acres of land in 1953, 20 acres of irrigated land in 1972 and is still leasing- out 7 acres of irrigated land to poor friends of the village.

The land was usually yielding 2 crops a year in irrigated portion and one crop a year in unirrigated portion. Now some vegetables are also grown, thereby, increasing the number of crops to 3. 15 acres of the family's land was

declared as surplus out of which 8 acres was exempted following a litigation in 1956. The remaining 7 acres of land was acquired and distributed to 'Mali' tenants who were also the original tenants of the family.

The Rajput family took the acquisition as socially disgracing. Neelam Singh's father purchased 4 acres of land for the allottees in their own village, thereby, saving family's prestige and land in the village. Finally, the family is left with the same 100 acres of irrigated (class-I) land. More land might have been declared as surplus if the family did not own an orchard.

The family gives illiteracy and ignorance as the main cause of the landloss, therefore, now the young ones are persuaded for higher education. The family has not diversified its occupation much and is concentrating on efficient farming. The family is also active in politics. Neelam Singh is an 'ex-sarpanch', his brother is present 'Sarpanch', also a member 'Block Samiti' and has also contested for M.L.A. The family has an adequate political and bureaucratic influence at present. But, still the members feel that they were better-off in the past and that now they are just normal.

The family had been generating only 20 quintals of food-grains as surplus in 1953, 70 quintals in 1972 and now when they are serious about agriculture, the generated surplus is 700 quintals of food-grains in addition to some cash crops. The family owned a 'kuchcha' house covering 200 sq. yds. in 1953. It was made 'pucca' in 1972 and 200 sq. yds. of covered area was added to the original one. In 1953, the other assets of the family were 4 bulls and 5 buffaloes. In 1972, the assets increased to 1 tractor, 7 buffaloes and 4 bulls. Now, the family has 2 tractors, 2 cars, 3 motorcycles, 15 buffaloes and 5 cows.

DISCUSSION: The family could be accounted as a 'very big' farming unit living in considerable comforts. As the land loss was nil and the family was politically, economically and socially sound, it made easier

for it to cope-up and stand in a higher stead. The family is quite enterprising as compared to other Rajput families taken in the study. The family is seeking higher education for its offsprings and is cultivating its land efficiently

CASE 30

The present head Pushkar Singh, aged 45 years, is son of the former head who died at an age of 68 in 1975. Pushkar Singh is functionally literate, while his father was illiterate. The family belongs to Rajput (Hindu), a dominant majority caste in a remote village located 18 kms. north of Mahendragarh. The total number of members in the family in 1953 was 6 including Pushkar Singh, his father, his mother, his grandmother and his two brothers. The number of members increased to 23 in 1972 and to 24 till date. While none of the members was formally educated in past, two young children are going to the village school now. The number of coparceners was 4 in 1953, 7 in 1972 and now the number is 12. Only one member worked on farm in 1953, 5 of the 23 members worked in 1972 and now 10 members are working on the farm at present. In 1953, the family hired 6 full-time agricultural labourers, which reduced to 2 in 1972 and none is needed now. Females do not work outside the four walls of their house in this caste. Even fetching of water from the well is a male's job. All of the members of the family reside in the village except one of Pushkar Singh's brother who has settled at his in-laws' place (Loharu) with his family.

The family owned 180 acres of unirrigated sandy land until the implementation of the Second Act in 1972. This land was divided into 10 farms of 5 to 20 acres in size. The entire land that the family has possessed is ancestral. The family has never leased-in any land but was leasing-out 45 acres of its land to known people before 1972. The land leased-out was located at more distance from the village and was low on production. In the Second Act of 1972, 46 acres of the land that the family owned was declared as surplus.

The family fought all ends out to save its land that was allotted to poor tenants (not the original tenants) of nearby villages. The family fought physically with the allottees and never yielded possession to them. For that, male members of the family were frequently arrested and were harassed by the police. Most interesting thing about this case is that they had to sell 120 acres of their land in their attempt to save 46 acres. They fought the case upto High Court and have won back their land about year and a half back. Finally, the family is left with only 60 acres of land, and that too divided equally in 5 households. If the land is further divided into the eligible coparceners, some of them will get less than two acres. The final 60 acres of land comprises 6 farms of sizes varying from 5 to 20 acres out of which 40 acres of land is unirrigated.

The owners were not in a position to purchase any more land as they were in a state of actual bankruptcy due to the court cases. When asked -why did you fight when you were losing more? Pushkar Singh replied with his brother supporting him that; "when Rajputs fight, they fight till the end".

There was no scope for the diversification of occupation as all of the male members were deeply involved in the matter. There is a negligible improvement in the land productivity as water used for irrigation is saline and is spoiling the land further.

The family owned a 'kuchcha' house (Mud house) upto 1970's which was renovated later but the covered area remained the same (200 sq.yds.). There is no addition in assets except a tractor taken on loan and shared by 4 households. There is no access of the family in bureaucracy or politics.

The family was involved in 6 civil and criminal cases which ended about year and a half back.

The head of the family is now satisfied even when he has lost 120 acres in an attempt to save 46 acres.

DISCUSSION: The family was in 'very big' category but the divided families are all in 'small' category of farmers. The family beared a big loss in this process. Pushkar Singh accepts that they are ruined in the last 20 years. This is a case of clear downward mobility in all its aspects but not due to the landloss with respect to Ceiling legislation but due to a landloss in an attempt to save the declared surplus land.

CASE 31

The present head Gulab Singh, aged 54 years, is the eldest son of the former owner who died at an age of 82 in 1979. Gulab Singh lives with his family in his ancestral village, which is remote but a very big village (population - 15,000 approx.) located 19 kms. north west of Mahendragarh town. Gulab Singh is a matriculate but his father was illiterate. The family comes from a dominant Rajput (Hindu) caste constituting 25% of the village population. The present family is the part of a very big family. Gulab Singh had 18 brothers and 5 sisters from the same parents, out of whom only 6 brothers and 5 sisters are alive. The number of members in the family was 16 in 1953, 26 in 1972 and is reduced to 23 now. The number of literate members was only one (male) in 1953, 2 (males) in 1972 and is 11 (10 males and 1 female) at present. The number of coparceners was 9 in 1953, 17 in 1972 and is reduced to 11 at present. The family was not working on farms in 1953 as the work was done by hired labourers, 10 members (all males) worked in 1972 and 9 members (all males) are working at present. The Rajputs do not allow females to work on farm. The family has never hired a full-time agricultural labour since 1955. All of the members of the family solely depend on agriculture, have no other occupation and reside in the same village.

The family owned 120 acres of land before the first Act. All 120 acres are unirrigated. A well is owned but the water is not useful. If the well water is used it spoils the land. The land is divided into 9 plots of 6 to 26 acres in size. 120 out of 122 acres of the land is ancestral. The family has never leased-in or leased-out any land in their name. The land produces only one crop a year. 26 acres of land was declared as surplus due to the First Act. Gulab Singh and his father managed to retain the better land and offer the Class-IV land (not producing anything - rocky land in hills) to the allottees. The allottees refused to take possession of that land. Gulab Singh's father filed a case in the court seeking guidance from an advocate and won back his land about 20 years back. Now, the family possesses 122 acres (2 acres of land that fell in between the farms of the family was purchased in 1974).

Gulab Singh complains that the land declared surplus was not based on correct calculations. He beholds that it would have been a severe loss in social prestige if the land was taken away from him. Furthermore, the family did not diversify its occupation on a more rational front but is involved in village politics (Gulab Singh is Sarpanch). Now, he claims to have a considerable bureaucratic and political influence.

The land is not yielding any surplus because of lack of water. The family could not add much to its assets except one tractor and the renovation of its 'kuchcha' house that covered the same 600 sq.yds. in 1953.

The family finds a downward mobility in social and economic terms. Gulab Singh's father was well respected as he was kind and big hearted, but now they are not in a position to offer anything to the village poor.

DISCUSSION: The family has maintained its status as a 'very big' farming household. In this case too {as in Pushkar Singh's case (Case-31)}, we find that land is seriously taken as a status symbol and especially so in case of 'Rajput' caste. They never want to part with any piece of land whatever it may be producing. Although the

family has maintained its social and political position but much is spent in the attempt to save its land.

CASE 32

The present head Ramphal, aged 69 years, is the eldest son of the former head of the family. He is educated upto middle standard while his father was illiterate. The family comes from dominant Jat (Hindu) caste enjoying a majority status in a remote village located 20 kms. from Meham (tahsil headquarters) in Rohtak district. The number of members in the family increased slowly (relatively) from 21 in 1953 to 27 in 1972 and to 35 till date. While none of the members was literate in 1953, 5 males and 2 females got literate in 1972 and the numbers increased to 12 and 6 respectively by 1993. The corresponding increase in coparceners is from 11 in 1953 to 14 in 1972 and 28 till now. All of the members were dependent on agriculture until recently when 5 of the young males joined small private jobs (3 in Delhi, 1 in Faridabad and 1 in Hansi). The family has never hired a full-time labour as enough labour was available within the family.

The family owned 21 acres of land in 1953. 30 more acres of land was purchased in 1965 as the land was going cheap. In 1953, only 7 acres out of 21 were irrigated but afterwards all of it was irrigated by tubewells or canal. Before the purchase was made, the land was divided into two farms of 4.5 and 16.5 acres. The purchased land was also divided into two farms of 11 and 19 acres of size, making the number of total farms 4.

The family has been leasing-in some land since long. 10 acres were leased-in around the First Act, 15 acres were taken on oral lease in 1972 and even now family cultivates 8 acres taken on oral terms from friends of the same village. But, the family has not been leasing-out any land. As usual, two crops

are harvested from the irrigated land, but the unirrigated land used to produce one crop when it was so in the past. In the Second Act of 1972, 8.5 acres of land was declared as surplus. The possession is retained by the family and the litigation goes on till now.

Ramphal informs that it was mainly due to the ignorance of the family that a part of its land was declared as surplus, otherwise it did not have any land as surplus, as per the rules. The family had to seek some guidance from the Advocates to file a suit in the revenue court. 30 acres of land was purchased to improve the status but the court cases on surplus land have spoilt the image of the family.

The family does not have a notable bureaucratic and political influence. There is no surplus generated as anything earned is spent on court case. The house that the family owns was 'kuchcha' upto early 70's but then it was renovated and the covered area was doubled to 1000 sq.yds. The number of cattle which was 5 in 1953 has also doubled to 10 and besides that one tractor is also added.

Ramphal remarks that they are still respected in the village because of their behaviour but the litigation on land has definitely let them down.

DISCUSSION: Ramphal's family falls in the 'big' category of farmers and in an attempt to increase the landholding, was trapped into the Ceiling Legislation. As it is evident in some other cases too, the landowner is not ready to give its major means of livelihood. The family is fighting the case since 1973 but has not given up. In this case, as there is no landloss, only social factor of 'honour' is guiding its behaviour.

CASE 33

The present head Tejveer, aged 38 years, is the eldest son of the former head who died in 1988 at an age of 66 years. Tejveer possesses

a post-graduate degree in History while the former head was barely literate. The family comes from Jat (Hindu) caste enjoying a majority status in a village located west of Bahadurgarh in Rohtak district. The village is on midway between Bahadurgarh and Jhajhar. The educational level of the members is high in the family. The family comprised of 3 members out of which one male and a female were literate in 1953. In 1972, the number of members in the family rose upto 8 out of which all 6 males and 2 females were literate. Now again, out of the total of 15 members, all 8 males and 7 females are educated upto graduation or more. The family had only one coparcener (former head) in 1953, 6 in 1972 and 8 till date. All of the members were working on farm till 1978. Now, only 10 members out of 15 are working on the farm. Four of the males are seeking education at urban centres and one is working as a vocational guidance counsellor in Delhi. The family hired 4 full-time workers for farm in 1953 and retained 2 of them in 1972. Now, the family is employing 2 workers, one each for farm and domestic work.

The family owned 125 acres of land before the First Act in 1953. The land was divided into 6 farms of sizes varying from 5 to 50 acres. The entire land was unirrigated. The land was consolidated in 1956 and reduced to 4 farms of 10 to 50 acres in size. 50 acres of which got irrigated in 1970 and now 105 acres of the total land is irrigated. The entire land is ancestral. The family has never leased-in or leased-out any land whatsoever. The cropping pattern is as usual, 2 crops in irrigated and 1 in unirrigated land. 90 acres of the total land was declared as surplus in 1953 due to the First Act. The family retains the possession.

The family sought guidance from Advocates and by dint of that it did not lose the land outrightly as the case is still going on and it is in High Court. The family is very serious about the matter and acknowledges the

possible landloss as a severe setback. The family lived on subsistence till 1974 when canal irrigation was available. Now, about 12 tonnes of surplus food grain is produced. The original 'pucca' house is also doubled to 2000 sq.yds. The family reared 2 or 3 cattle in 1953; added a tractor by 1972; one more tractor, a car and a tyre shop too was added to their assets by 1993.

Tejveer finds a little betterment in the status but the land has been naturally devolved into smaller holdings and if the declared surplus land is lost, the situation may become miserable.

DISCUSSION: Tejveer's family belonged to the 'very big' category of farmers but after devolution the new families belong to the 'big' category of farmers. In this case, we see an upward mobility as there is no net loss in the land possessed. Also, there is an upward trend because family is pursuing higher education since long.

CASE 34

The present head Randhir, aged 65 years, is the only son of the former head who died in 1974 at an age of 62 years. The illiterate head Randhir lives with his family in a remote village located 18 kms. north of district headquarters of Jind. The family comes from Jat (Hindu) caste enjoying a majority status in the village. The family comprised all illiterate 12 members in 1953, reduced to 10 illiterate members in 1972 and now the total number has mounted to 30 of which only 3 males are literate. The corresponding increase in the number of coparceners is from 5 in 1953 to 6 in 1972 and to 22 till now. Almost all of the family members are working on farm except a few young children and a son who is working as a 'Clerk' in Chandigarh. The family hired 5 full-time labourers for farm work in 1953 and 4 since then.

The family owned 60 acres of land before the First Act, all of which was irrigated. The land was divided into two farms of 22 and 38 acres each. One of these farms (bigger one) is in a village located just 2 kms. from the native village. The entire land is ancestral. The family has never leased-in any land but was leasing-out 2 to 4 acres at the time of the First Act. The leased-out land was irrigated, yielding 2 crops per year like rest of the land. 25 acres of the total of 60 acres was declared as surplus due to the First Act. The former head filed a case and won that about one year back. The possession of this land was never given to anybody. In a nearby village, 2 allottees were murdered (see Kanwar Pal of Case-40), therefore, nobody dared to take possession of the surplus land. Some help was sought from 'Patwaris' and 'Advocates' too.

The yield of land has gone up to 4 times, i.e. from 20 tonnes to 80 tonnes for the total land. Randhir is an Ex-Sarpanch but still the political and bureaucratic influence is less. The family owned a pucca house covering 500 sq.yds. in 1953 to which another 200 sq.yds. of covered area is added. The family purchased 1 tractor in early 70's and now has two tractors. Besides that, the family reared about 250 cattle in 1953 reduced to 200 in 1972 and further to only 100 cattle at present.

Randhir finds illiteracy as the main cause of their land being declared surplus. Although possession was not given at any time but the declaration alone has let the family down on the social ladder (according to him).

DISCUSSION: The family belongs to the 'big' category of farmers and has maintained that status except that the other assets have decreased. The family did not let any land go from its possession as it is the prime mode of production and an important element of social prestige.

The original family owned about 120 acres of land out of which 80 acres was irrigated and 40 acres unirrigated. This land was divided into 8 sub-farms of 2 to 24 acres in size but after consolidation the farms were re-united to one big farm. The entire land is inherited from Kewal Singh's father, who in turn inherited this land from his father-in-law. The family has never leased-in or leased-out any piece of land. The cropping pattern is as usual, 2 crops in irrigated land and one crop in unirrigated land.

The family has never given possession of its 9 acres of land which was declared as surplus in 1954. The family did not need to do much for the retention of its land as no claimant seriously came for the possession. The reason was that inferior quality of land was offered to allottees.

The family was not in a position to purchase any more land because surplus generated has been too less. There is no bearing of the Ceiling Act on the social prestige of the family as nobody else knows about it in the village.

The family owns the same 'pucca' house covering 800 sq.yds. as it owned in 1953. The number of cattle has increased from 6 in 1953 to 11 in 1972 and to 15 at present owing to the increase in domestic demand of milk. The family has purchased 3 second hand tractors in last 10 years.

As the family is not basically from that village, it does not have much political standing. The living standard of the family is also not adequate.

DISCUSSION: The family fell in the 'very big' category of farmers but now the land has been devolved and the new independent families are in the 'big' category.

Now, the families live in actual bankruptcy not because of land acquisition but because of natural devolution and low yield of land.

CASE 35

The present head Harsha, is just 22 years in age and the eldest son of his blind and illiterate father who died at a relatively young age of 44 in 1976. Harsha is married but yet without a child. He is a matriculate coming from Jat (Hindu) caste which is in minority in the remote village located 21 kms. north east of Jind. At the time of the First Act, the number of members in the family was just 2. The former head who was blind and just 20 years of age, lived with his widowed mother. The number of family members rose to 6 in 1972 all of whom were illiterate. The number has remained the same but 2 young males and 1 female except Harsha have sought some elementary school education. The corresponding increase in the coparceners is from 1 in 1953 to 3 in 1972 and to 4 till date. All of the family members solely depend on agriculture for their livelihood. The family has hired 3 full-time farm workers since long before the First Act.

The family owned 60 acres of land at the time of the First Act. The land is divided into 3 farms of size 20 acres each. Out of the total, only 20 acres is irrigated and the rest is rainfed. The entire land is ancestral. The family has never leased-in or leased-out any land. The cropping pattern of the land is as usual, 2 crops in irrigated and 1 crop in unirrigated land.

In the Second Act, 18 acres of the total land that the family held was declared as surplus. For this, taking help from 'Advocates' a suit was filed in District Court, which is still pending there. Harsha says that nobody came to take possession because they were a very weak family.

The family finds the 'court-case' as a big loss in its meagre social prestige and economic status. The family has never tried to diversify its occupation or purchase some more land. The reason for this being the bad

The original family owned about 120 acres of land out of which 80 acres was irrigated and 40 acres unirrigated. This land was divided into 8 sub-farms of 2 to 24 acres in size but after consolidation the farms were re-united to one big farm. The entire land is inherited from Kewal Singh's father, who in turn inherited this land from his father-in-law. The family has never leased-in or leased-out any piece of land. The cropping pattern is as usual, 2 crops in irrigated land and one crop in unirrigated land.

The family has never given possession of its 9 acres of land which was declared as surplus in 1954. The family did not need to do much for the retention of its land as no claimant seriously came for the possession. The reason was that inferior quality of land was offered to allottees.

The family was not in a position to purchase any more land because surplus generated has been too less. There is no bearing of the Ceiling Act on the social prestige of the family as nobody else knows about it in the village.

The family owns the same 'pucca' house covering 800 sq.yds. as it owned in 1953. The number of cattle has increased from 6 in 1953 to 11 in 1972 and to 15 at present owing to the increase in domestic demand of milk. The family has purchased 3 second hand tractors in last 10 years.

As the family is not basically from that village, it does not have much political standing. The living standard of the family is also not adequate.

DISCUSSION: The family fell in the 'very big' category of farmers but now the land has been devolved and the new independent families are in the 'big' category.

Now, the families live in actual bankruptcy not because of land acquisition but because of natural devolution and low yield of land.

CASE 37

The present head of the family Dayanand, aged 54 years, is the eldest son of his father who died in 1982 at an age of 70 years. Dayanand is a law graduate practising at High Court, Chandigarh and is staying with his family in Chandigarh. His brothers stay with their families in their native village located 16 kms. south-east of Hansi (Tahsil) in Hisar district. The family comes from dominant Jat (Hindu) caste enjoying a majority status in the village. The number of members in the family increased from 10 in 1953 to 20 in 1972 and to 30 till date. Dayanand's parents were illiterate, all others in the family are literate. The number of coparceners increased from 3 in 1953 to 7 in 1972 and to 21 till date. The family hired one or two full-time agricultural labourers in 1972 but afterwards the family increased in size and contained enough manual labour within. Dayanand is an Advocate and his wife is a school teacher in a local village near Chandigarh, all others depend on agriculture.

The family owned 74 acres of irrigated land in 1953, adding 6 acres more to it in 1968, it now holds 80 acres of well irrigated land. The land was consolidated to two farms of 46 and 34 acres in size. Except the 6 acres mentioned above, rest of the land is ancestral. The family has never leased-in any land but was leasing-out all its land in 1953 and 32 acres of the total land in 1972, afterwards the entire land was self-cultivated. The tenancy on the land was because of scarce family labour. The tenants were usually low caste people. The land has been yielding 2 crops consistently. One crop of cotton and the other of wheat are the usual crops.

In the First Act, 30 acres of the land that the family held was declared as surplus. This land was soon recovered by the help of Court and known Officers. 4 more acres of land was declared as surplus in the Second Act of 1972 for which the litigation went on till recently when the family lost

the case. The land is not utilised and the possession is retained by the family. The family is quite influencing which made it easier to retain the land. There is no loss in social prestige as none in the village knows about it. The family has tried to diversify its occupation; besides Dayanand practising as an Advocate, family owns a 1 acre plot and a cotton mill in Hansi town. Dayanand's younger brother is Sarpanch of the village. The productivity of the land has increased but is neutralized by the increased investments and cost of living. Dayanand quotes in the context that until recently no soap was used to wash clothes, and instead buffalo's urene was used for the purpose, or the clothes were kept under ash and then rinsed in water.

In 1953, the family owned a 'pucca' house covering 800 sq.yds. and 10-12 cattle. The covered area of the house is doubled, the cattle remaining almost the same. A cotton mill was established in 1980 and 2 tractors were added in 1978 and 1985. The family also owns a 1 acre plot in Hansi worth Rs. 10 lakh.

Dayanand does not find any apparent change in their social, economic or political status.

DISCUSSION: The family protected its land and falls in the upper half of the 'big' category. This is an example of upward mobility. The living standard of the family in Chandigarh and also in the village is very high and is comparable to the urban middle class.

CASE 38

The eldest male Khem Chand aged 36 years, is the eldest son of the former head who died in 1974 at an age of 75 years. Khem Chand who lives with his small family alongwith his brothers' families in a small village within the periphery of Hisar town. He is educated upto

primary level while his father was illiterate. The family belongs to Jat (Hindu) caste enjoying a majority status in the village. The number of family members in 1953 was 5 including the parents and his three sisters (Khem Chand was not born at that time). The literate member at that time was only the eldest sister. The total number went upto 7 in 1972, out of whom 3 males and 2 females were literate. At present, there are 10 members in the family, among whom 6 males and 3 females are literate. The number of coparceners increased from 1 in 1953 to 4 in 1972 and to 6 in 1993. Except the young and school going children all others work on farm. The family hired 2 full-time labourers for farm work in 1953 and 1 of them in 1972. Now, the family labour is sufficient for the farm work. None of the family members have any other occupation than agriculture.

The family owned 38 acres of land in 1953, of which 10 acres was irrigated. The family maintained the land upto 1976 when it sold 5 acres of land which was at some distance from their bigger farm. Rest of the land, i.e. 33 acres, is consolidated into one farm, half of which is irrigated. The entire land that the family owns is ancestral. The family has never leased-in any land but was leasing-out around 10 acres of irrigated or unirrigated land to some known people before 1976. The land which was leased-out was located at some more distance from the village.

In the Second Act, 6 acres of the land that the family owned was declared as surplus. This land was never given possession of and till today the litigation goes on. Khem Chand informs that the allottees to whom the land was allotted have died and now there is no claimant. He adds that it was mischief of the 'Patwari' who asked for bribe which the former owner could not give at the right time. Finally, he took Rs.10,000/- and got himself transferred without doing the task. He further adds that now the 'Tahsildar' asks for a bribe of Rs.1,00,000/- but the family is not in a position to give.

The family seeking the guidance from 'Munshi' and 'Patwaris' filed a suit in 1974 which is yet not decided. Khem Chand acknowledges a loss in social prestige and a recurring loss of money. The family has no access to politics or bureaucracy which adds to the problem. As the land did not produce much, it was difficult to diversify the occupation.

The family owned a 'kuchcha' house covering 400 sq.yds. in 1953 which was soon made 'pucca'. Now, the covered area of the house is doubled. Besides that, the family reared 20 cattle in 1953 which are now reduced to 4. The family purchased a tractor on a bank loan in 1970, which was sold in 1985 and a new one was purchased but again on a bank loan.

Khem Chand concludes that although the productivity of land has doubled (or even more) but it is not indicative of anything prestigious.

DISCUSSION:The family falls in the lower half of the 'big' category of farmers. The family has gone down struggling to retain its land. The sale of 5 acres shows that it was difficult for the family to cope with the new demands. This is an example of downward mobility, not due to the Ceiling Act alone but also due to other miscellaneous factors.

CASE 39

The owner Joginder, aged 70 years, was head of the family even at the time of the First Act in 1953. Joginder is illiterate and comes from Rajput (Hindu) caste enjoying a majority status in a village located 16 kms. east of Ambala. The number of members in this family did not increase drastically. The number was 9 in 1953, of which only 1 male was literate, again 9 in 1972 of which 2 males and 2 females got literate. The number is 13 at present of which 5 males and 3 females are literate. The number of

coparceners increased from 1 in 1953 to 4 in 1972 and 8 till date. As is well known, traditionally the 'Rajput' females do not work outside their house. In this context, Joginder remarks, "Ladoes (loved ones) do not work outside". While only one male was working on farm in 1953, 3 of the males worked in 1972 and now 5 adult males are working on farm excluding young and school going children who too share some work. The family had hired 8 full-time farm workers in 1953, reduced to 6 in 1972 and to only 2 workers at present.

One of the sons of Joginder is an Advocate at Ambala who owns a small house there and keeps his family with him. All other members are depending on agriculture for their livelihood. The family owned 70 acres of unirrigated land in 1953, all of which got irrigated by 1970. The land was divided into three farms of sizes 16, 24 and 30 acres. The smallest farm is located in a neighbouring village. The entire land was ancestral. The family has never leased-in or leased-out any land. In the First Act, 12 acres of the land that the family owned was declared as surplus following which 12 acres of land was sold and Joginder went to the court to prove that he does not have any surplus land. He lost this case but very smartly got the sold land allotted to the allottees. When the new owner, who purchased that land, asked for his money back, he was denied. Therefore, the family did not lose actually any land.

The cropping pattern on the land has been as usual, 2 crops in irrigated and 1 crop in unirrigated portion. The production from the land was only 10 tonnes in 1953 which increased to 30 tonnes by 1972 and is 65 tonnes of food-grains at present.

The family owned a 'kuchcha' house covering 500 sq.yds. in 1953 which was soon transformed to 'pucca' adding 200 sq.yds. more to the covered area. The family had 15-20 cattle at the time of the First Act which

are now reduced to 5. The other assets of the family are: a house (worth Rs.2 Lakh) at Ambala and a new tractor.

Joginder remarks that social life has decreased and thus, so there is no question of social prestige.

DISCUSSION: The family falls in upper half of the 'big' category and is in the same category even after the sale of 12 acres. As is evident, the family has not lost any land due to the Ceiling Acts. Practically, the family has only sold 12 acres of its land. This case can be treated as a circumventor who has comparatively improved its status overtime.

CASE 40

The present head, Kanwar Pal aged 80 years, is the only son of the previous head who died in 1973 attaining an age of 102 years. Kanwar Pal is illiterate and so was his father. He lives with his family in a remote village located 28 kms. north east of Jind (district headquarters). The family belongs to 'Rajput' (Hindu) caste which is in minority in the village. The number of members in the family was 15 in 1953, 24 in 1972 and is 34 till now. The literate members counted 6 (all males) in 1953, 15 in 1972 and 30 in the family at present. Only 4 members (Kanwar Pal and 3 of his daughter-in-laws) are illiterate. The number of coparceners was 4 in 1953, 12 in 1972 and is 17 till now. All of the males, except the young and school going offsprings, are engaged in farm work. The family hired 15 full-time agricultural labourers in 1953, 10 of them in 1972 and now only 5 workers are considered enough owing to the increasing mechanization and family labour within. All the members reside in the village solely depending upon agriculture for their livelihood.

The family owned 275 acres of land, only 20 acres of which was irrigated in 1953. This land was divided into 3 farms of 100 acres, 90 acres and

85 acres in size. The entire land is ancestral. Twenty percent of the total land was brought under irrigation by 1972 and at present about 60 percent of the land is adequately irrigated. The family has never leased-in or leased-out any land. The land was very less productive around 1950 but now half of it is giving 2 or 3 crops and the other half yields 1 or sometimes 2 crops. 195 acres of land with the family was declared as surplus due to the First Act, the possession for which was never given to anybody. The authorities allotted the land to the 'Chamar' tenants of the same village. Kanwar Pal narrates the story as follows: "The land was declared as surplus in 1954 due to the First Act. The amount of land declared as surplus was massive (i.e. 195 out of 275 acres; i.e. 71%). This loss was unbearable, thus, my father and I never got ready to surrender the land. On the other hand, our cousins (Ram Singh & family of Case-41) did not keep desired relations with us. With the help of an Advocate (their relative) they managed to get our land allotted to the local village tenants and furthermore, my land declared as surplus was 40 acres more than their's even when we had almost the same number of units. As the land was allotted to the local tenants, it increased the intensity of the struggle. For the first time, when the authorities came to take possession, one of the allottees was killed in the clashes. We were baffled at that, but we never gave up and launched an all out struggle. The second time when the possession was sought, another allottee was killed. This time my son and two more members of the family were arrested and imprisoned. The debacle was thus initiated. By this time, we were prepared to do anything. The government even tried to take possession by itself. Trees were planted on the declared surplus land, but I put them off. It took almost 40 years to finish this matter. Anything earned was spent on the six different litigations (Criminal and Civil). We have incurred a massive loss of carefully calculated 18 lakh rupees".

Kanwar Pal further adds in retrospect . "In 1953, a Tahsildar offered to save my land, if in exchange I gave him 11 acres. I was prepared to give that, but when the papers were made and I was required to put my thumb

impression, suddenly, I got afraid and I denied to do that as I was illiterate. It would have been a lot better if I had done that".

As is evident the generated surplus was all consumed in litigations till recently. Now, it is about 4200 quintals of foodgrains per year. Nevertheless, the family seems to have regained its standing overtime. The eldest son of Kanwar Pal is 'Sarpanch' of the village since 1991. But, there was little chance of any more purchase of land and increasing the assets. The family owned a 'pucca' house covering 1000 sq.yds. in 1953 and still except some repairs it is the same. Besides that, the family has purchased 2 tractors (one of them, 10 years back and the other 2 years back) and a car. The number of cattle remained 8 to 9 throughout.

DISCUSSION: Now, the family is relieved and back to its original status. Kanwar Pal's family falls in the 'very big' category of farmers and is still there.

In this village, none has surrendered his land, although 12 households possessed land above the permissible limit. 9 of the households were Pakistani refugees who were educated and smart enough to circumvent the legislation before-hand. Most of them have sold their lands (a few small farms are leased by two households) and have migrated out to urban centres. The whereabouts of these families were difficult to trace and thus these families are not included in the study. Moreover, as confirmed by other residents they are no more dependent on agriculture. Rest of the 3 households were 'Rajputs' and are taken as Cases-40 to 42.

CASE 41

The present head Jagat Singh, aged 72 years, is the eldest son of the previous head. Jagat Singh is illiterate and so was his father. He stays with his big joint family in a remote village located 28 kms. north east

of Jind (district headquarters). The village is same as that of Kanwar Pal of Case-40 . The family belongs to 'Rajput' (Hindu) caste, which is in minority in the village. The number of members in the family was 10 in 1953, 22 in 1972 and is 69 at present. While none of the members was literate in 1953, 3 sought elementary education in 1972 and 51 are literate at present. Out of the 18 illiterates, 13 are females. The number of coparceners was 5 in 1953; 20 in 1972 and is 43 at present. In 1953, 5 males were working on the farm the number increased to 19 males in 1972 and to 38 at present. The females as usual in Rajputs are not allowed to work outside their house. The family hired 3 full-time farm workers in 1953 and since then the farm work is shared by the males in the family. One male is employed as a 'constable' in Navy and another is an Advocate in Jind since 1971. Rest of the members are engaged in agriculture.

The family owned 275 acres of land in 1953, 250 acres of which was unirrigated. By 1972, half of the land got irrigated and now, the entire land is irrigated. This land was ancestral and was divided into two farms of 100 acres and 175 acres of size. The family has never leased-in or leased-out any land in the remembered past. The land yielded 1 to 2 crops depending upon the availability of water uptill 1975. Since then, 2 or 3 crops are harvested from the land. Taking guidance from the Advocates (one of whom was relative), a case was filed in 1954. This case was decided after 35 years in 1989. The family won the case and retained the possession of its land. Jagat Singh terms the legislation as a big trauma for the landowners. He adds that everything that was produced from the land was spent on the litigation. He cites lack of muscle power as the main cause of their ruin. Further, there was no scope of diversification or purchase of more land.

The family had very less political and bureaucratic influence. None of the members has resorted to active politics.

Jagat Singh tells that surplus generated was less in the past. It is lesser at present because of increase in the number of members.

The family owned a 'kuchcha' house covering 500 sq.yds. in 1953, which is increased to 2000, sq.yds. owing primarily to the increase in the members. Besides that, the family reared 40-50 cattle in 1953, reduced to 30-35 by 1972 and 2 tractors are added to the same number of cattle till now.

DISCUSSION:Jagat Singh's family has maintained its status of 'very big' farming unit as the family is still united. This case is from the same village as in Case-40 and shares a common descent with it. This household had some more influence than Kanwar Pal of Case-40 by dint of which it managed to get allottees from other villages. This family now maintains no relation with Kanwar Pal's family. There is no doubt that the family has gone down in all dimensions but it is mainly due to the phenomenal increase in the family size.

CASE 42

Gopal Singh, aged 71 years, is the eldest son of the previous head who died in 1976 at an age of 70 years. Gopal Singh is illiterate like his father. He stays with his family alongwith his brothers' families in a remote village (same as Case-40 & 41) located 28 kms. north-east of Jind (district headquarters). The family belongs to a socially dominant 'Rajput' (Hindu) caste which is in minority in the village. The number of members in the family was 6 in 1953, 16 in 1972 and is 34 at present. None of the members was literate in 1953, 4 of the males sought elementary school education by 1972 and 28 are literate in the family at present. Among the 6 illiterates, 4 are females and 2 are elderly males. The number of coparceners was 2 in 1953, 8 in 1972 and is 22 at present. Only the males work on the farm. 2 of them worked on the farm

in 1953 with the help of 6 full-time agricultural labourers. 5 of the males worked on the farm in 1972 seeking help of 3 full-time paid workers. Now, 19 males are taking-up the farmwork without any full-time worker. Except one male member who is working as a school master in a neighbouring village rest of the members depend on agriculture. All the members of the family reside in the village (including the school master).

The family owned 185 acres of land in 1953. Except 6 acres, rest of the land was unirrigated at that time. One half of the family's land was brought under irrigation by 1972 and now almost whole of the land is irrigated by canal and tubewells. The land is divided into 3 farms of 30, 60 and 95 acres in size. The entire land has been self-cultivated. 130 acres of the total land was declared as surplus in 1953. The possession for this land was never given to the allottees. Instead, the allottees were afraid to claim the land as this village was notorious in this context (referring to Kanwar Pal of Case-40). The allottees were from other neighbouring villages. Taking note of other landlords in the village, a suit was filed in 1954. This case remained pending in High Court till 1982, when the family won it. Gopal Singh adds that the litigation has dragged them down economically. Much of their surplus produce upto 1982 was spent on the litigation and after that land was devolved into 6 households (the family got disintegrated).

The family has had negligible political and bureaucratic influence. The members of the family are not interested in politics but are keeping desirable relations with fellow villagers. The family is perceived as simple and honest.

The family owned a 'pucca' house covering 400 sq.yds. in 1953 which was doubled in 1987. Besides that, the family reared 20-30 cattle in 1953, which is more or less the same till now. A tractor was purchased in 1986 and a two-wheeler was added two years back. The family has dug 6 tubewells for irrigation which is more than any family has dug in the village.

DISCUSSION: The family was in the 'very big' category of farmers till 1980. Now the independent families fall in 'big' category. The family has certainly gone down in all dimensions partly due to the cost of litigation and partly due to the population pressure on land and natural devolution.

Next chapter concludes the study taking up the analysis of the sample in all aspects. Policy implications will also be discussed.

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY
&
CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER - VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The principal objective of the present study was to attempt to examine questions having social implications of the Land Ceiling legislations in the state of Haryana. Broadly, the study has attempted to answer that how the ceilings on agricultural land have affected the status and prestige (alongwith economic and political aspects) of the one time rich landowning class in Haryana. It has also explored- how this class attempted to evade the 'Acts', or to what extent it has lost the land. And that, did the class diversify its occupations to maintain or improve its status or have some of them sold their land and moved to urban centres in search of higher status and better life. Several other related questions ran parallel to the above mentioned ones which were also examined.

The field of the study extended to 32 villages in 8 districts of the state of Haryana.

'Social mobility' in the present study referred to the same broad concept as defined by Sorokin (1959). The sub-types which were frequently used in the study were 'upward' and 'downward' mobility and were treated as congruent with 'social sinking and climbing' or 'ascending and descending mobility'.

The concept of 'Surplus' or 'Acquired Land' exclusively meant the land which was acquired due to the two Ceiling Acts for agricultural holdings.

Despite the difficulties faced in eliciting the information from the respondents, the data was more or less successfully gathered.

It was found useful to make three categories of the targetted landowners, viz., total submitters, partial protectors and total protectors.

Chapter-IV, i.e. 'Total submission and Social mobility' was an attempt to appraise the landowners who were not able to save any part of their land which was declared or should have been declared as surplus.

The loss of land for the 'total submitters' came out to be 614.5 acres with an average of 43.9 acres per family. The range of loss of land was from 4 acres (Case-7) to 100 acres (Case-3). The general reasons/factors found to be responsible for the landloss in this chapter were: illiteracy and ignorance; lack of muscle power; and covert jealousy of other villagers.

While 'illiteracy and ignorance' was assigned as the major reason in the 14 cases, jealousy and factionalism was also considered important in two cases (Case-1 and Case-11). Case-7 assigned weak leadership of his mother-in-law as the main factor who was a widow and headed the family at the time of the First Act. Case-8 termed his prolonged illness as the main factor of landloss and the subsequent social sinking.

The list of strategies employed to circumvent the Acts, although unsuccessfully, included- Land transfer; court cases; bribe to government officials and use of muscle power. Land transfer was tried in Cases-1,2,5 and 10. Cases-11 and 12 knocked the doors of court and Case-3 and 13 resorted to the relatively uncommon methods of offering bribe to the officials and use of muscle power respectively. While the remaining 6 families claimed to have employed none of the strategies.

In 9 of the 14 cases the families were on with their traditional occupation, i.e. farming and cattle rearing. Case-6 had recently allowed his son to go in for business. A part of families in Case-11 and 13 had gone in for tertiary services alongwith their traditional occupations.

Cases-9 and 12 had gone for as much diversification as was possible. On the whole, the landowning families were struggling to earn their livelihood through their traditional occupations, though a desire to go for tertiary services was perceived in most of the cases.

The classification of the landowning households was too broad for generalizations. Yet six cases (Cases-1,2,3,5,11 and 14) were found sinking down from the 'very big' category to the 'big' category with respect to landownership. The other 8 cases remained in the 'big' category even when they lost the entire land that was declared as surplus (or should have been ~~deceased~~ as surplus).

It was perceived that in 9 cases (Cases-1,2,3,4,5,7,8,11 and 13), a clear downward mobility was experienced in all three aspects (social, economic and political). While Case-6 found only a social degrading and that too more because of lost 'Jaildar status' than because of the loss of 21 acres of land. Case-9 found that a major part of his family (which was engaged in business and tertiary services) has improved its status, while the part of the family which is engaged in agriculture is experiencing the social and economic sinking. Case-10 considered the loss as more of emotional than anything else which is evident in the death of his predecessor. Case-14 too considered the loss as more of emotional and social than economic or political as the increased production has neutralized much of the loss.

As far as the place of residence was concerned, except for the families in Case-9 and Case-12 in which some part of the family had moved out, all others were staying in their native villages. There was also an instance of a Pakistani refugee (as quoted by Case-7) who had submitted the declared surplus land, disposed-off the permissible area and migrated permanently to some urban centre which was not known to the villagers.

It was also ascertained from the sample in this chapter that there was almost no caste bias in taking over the surplus land. Out of the total

sample of 42 cases, 21 belonged to Jat (Hindu) caste and 12 belonged to Rajput (Hindu) caste besides other less prevalent castes in the area. The total submitters comprised exactly the same proportions of these two castes as did the total sample.

Furthermore, for our sample in this chapter, it can also be said that the data in the revenue records more or less matched the ground reality.

Chapter-V dealt with the cases which were able to save a part of their land that was declared as surplus (or should have been declared as surplus).

The total landloss for the sample of partial protectors was 589 acres averaging 49.08 acres per family. The range of landloss was from 8 acres (Case-19) to 190 acres (Case-23). The general reasons/factors given for the landloss (though partial) in this chapter were: illiteracy and ignorance; lack of muscle power; wrong calculations; and lack of acquaintance with bureaucrats and politicians. While 'illiteracy and ignorance' was the most predominant reason; lack of muscle power (Case-22), wrong calculations (Case-18) and lack of acquaintance with bureaucrats and politicians (Case-15) were also quite significant.

The list of strategies employed (whether successfully or unsuccessfully) to circumvent the legislation in order to avoid the possible landloss included- repurchase; court cases; gifting or donation of land; land transfer; sale of land and use of muscle power. Repurchase of the allotted land was employed as strategy by Cases-15 and 16. Suits were filed in court by cases- 17,20,21 and 26. Multiple strategies like donation or gifting of land; land transfer and sale of land were employed by Cases- 18 and 22. Muscle power was also used as a strategy by Case-24. The remaining two families (Cases-19 and 23) did not seem to have employed any strategy.

Four of the twelve families did not diversify their traditional occupation. The other five families (Cases-15,16,17,21 and 23) had gone for tertiary services as a subsidiary occupation. Case- 20 had practising professionals in his family. Case-26 had resorted to politics to enhance his prestige. A great deal of diversification was observed in Case-18. Yet, it can be said that except Cases -18,26 and 20 the others did not show signs of upward mobility though most of them aspired for tertiary services (Government services for their offsprings). Most of the families (Cases-16,17,22,23,24,25 and 26) felt that their loss was more of social and economic than political while Cases- 15,19 and 18 termed their loss as only 'social'. Case-21 did not find any loss or downgrading in his status due to the loss of land.

When the changes in the category of landownership were analysed, it was found that Cases-18,20,25 and 26 had come down from the 'very big' category to the 'big' category. Case-17 had come down from the 'very big' category to 'small' category. Case- 16 had come down from 'big' to 'small' category. In Cases-16,17 and 18, natural devolution due to disintegration of the family had a more severe effect than the land acquisition. The remaining families remained in their categories even after the landloss.

Case-18 had previously migrated from Pakistan in 1947. The family did not stay for long in the village where it was allotted land and is now living at various urban centres, though the the present head himself was running his business at the village where the land was allotted to him. The entire family had migrated in Case-20, while only a part of the family had migrated in Cases-16 and 23.

The social categories of the partial submitters included Jat, Rajput, Brahmin, Khatri, Baniya and Jat (Sikh). Six cases were from Jat, two from Rajput and one each from Brahmin, Khatri, Baniya and Jat (Sikh) castes.

For the cases in this chapter, except the Cases-25 and 26, the data in revenue and tahsil records did not match the ground reality.

Lastly, Chapter- VI, i.e. Total protection and Social mobility, took up the cases who by dint of one 'strategy' (or trick) or the other have saved their land. The Chapter also included the cases who had litigations going on for a part (or whole) of their land but retained the possession of that land.

For this chapter the strategies employed for saving the declared surplus land were: filing a suit in the court; use of muscle power; mutual adjustments; and offering inferior land for allotment. Most of the cases {i.e. 12 cases (Cases- 27,30,31,32,33,34,35,37,38,39,41 and 42)}, filed a suit in the court to save their land. While Case-27 also had an out-of court settlement (or mutual adjustment) with the allottee. Case-39 had sold-off the land exceeding the permissible limit and got the same land declared as surplus. This was followed by a suit in the court which he won. Case-29 resorted to mutual adjustment with the allottees. Case-30 used muscle power followed by a litigation as a strategy for saving the land. But in this case the litigation went on till year and a half back which resulted into a big financial loss forcing the owner to sell 120 acres of his land to save 46 acres of land which was declared as surplus. Case-28 used only muscle power as the strategy. Case-31 offered inferior land for allotment, of which the allottees did not take possession. This was followed by a litigation which was won. Case-36 did not need to do much except that he offered inferior land which the allottees did not claim at all.

Kanwar Pal of Case-40 who was living in his native village in Jind district could be appraised as the most noteworthy case in the study. Kanwar Pal's family used muscle power to the extent that two allottees got killed in a series of clashes. The family had to fight six civil and criminal cases but it did not yield any land and was finally back almost to its previous socio- political standing.

Seven of the sixteen families (Cases-28,30,31,35,36,38 and 39) were engaged in their traditional occupation (farming and cattle- rearing) without any apparent diversification. Whereas, Cases- 27 and 33 had gone in

for business and tertiary services in addition to their traditional occupation. Case-37 had closed down his existing business but a part of his family had gone in for professional practice and tertiary service. A part of family in Case-41 had gone in for professional practice and tertiary services. One member each from families in Cases-29 and 39 had gone in for professional practice at nearby urban centres. Five members of the family in Case-32 had gone in for tertiary services. Somewhat differently, Case-34 was rearing about one hundred cattle (though the number was reduced since 1953) and was thus satisfied with his traditional occupation.

Surprisingly, a downgrading was felt by a notable proportion of the total protectors too. The element of honour and prestige attached with the land was the major social factor for such a feeling, while the cost of litigation, increased cost of living and the increased population pressure were major economic factors for the feeling of downgrading. Cases-28,32,34,38 and 39 termed their loss as more profound in social sense. Cases-30 and 35 indicated that their loss was more of economic than social. Cost of litigation and population pressure were the major causes of downward mobility for Cases-41 and 42. The increased population pressure alone was a matter of concern for Cases-31 and 36. Case-40 went down in all dimensions due to the criminal and civil cases, factionalism in village and political rivalry, but since his son got elected as Sarpanch of the village and the cases were decided in his favour, the family was comfortably placed. Six of the sixteen total protectors did not feel any downgrading at all. Case-27 was also a victim of political rivalry and his son was murdered as a consequence. Most of the families in this section remained in their category. Nevertheless, Case-30 had come down from the 'very big' category to 'big' category as he had to sell 120 acres of his land to meet the cost of litigation and secondly because of natural devolution within the family. Case-41 has also come down from 'very big' to 'big' category as a consequence of natural devolution. Cases-32 and 37 had increased their holdings overtime but even then they remained in the same 'big' category.

Case-39 disposed-off 12 acres of his land which exceeded the permissible limit but yet remained in the 'big' category of farmers. Case-38 too had to sell 5 acres of his land but due to other reasons. He too remained in the 'big' category.

Seven of the sixteen families (Cases-28,29,31,35 38,40 and 41) were residing at their native villages. In seven other families (Cases-27,32,33,34,37,39 and 42), some of the members had settled down at some other places than their native village. While in Case-30 one of the brothers had settled down at his in laws' place where he had inherited his father-in-law's property. In a similar vein, the living owner's father (Case-36) had settled down at the family's present place of residence.

Of these total 'protectors', seven belonged to 'Jat' caste, another seven to 'Rajput' caste and one each to 'Meo' and 'Ahir' castes.

For the cases in this chapter it can be said with considerable authenticity that the data in the revenue records (i.e. the records with the Naib tahsildar for surplus lands) did not match the ground reality.

It is quite evident that the politically active families are relatively more mobile and aware about the government policies than the others in rural society. Four political positions were taken to analyse the political activity of the families in the context of this study. It was found that 23 cases (54.76%) have not attained any political position (Member of Panchayat was not taken into consideration; refer Table-3.12). In 'Total submitters' 10 of the 14 cases (71.42%) had not attained any political position and of the remaining 4 cases, 3 were sarpanch (or ex-sarpanch) but that too only recently and not at the time of the Acts. Only Case-6 held a position that could make any difference. Hence it can be said that most of the total submitters were not politically very active at the time of landloss. In Partial protectors category the families were politically more active. 6 of the 12 cases had attained one political position or the other. While quite evidently, 'Total protectors' were the most active ones.

per family being 79.36; also see Table-3.5). Two of the cases were forced to sell 825 acres and 500 acres respectively at a very low rate (see Cases-18 and 22). Hence, the government has partly succeeded in reducing (rather than taking over) the land of the targetted landowners. A fairly large number of landowners in the sample were able to partly or totally protect their land by dint of one strategy or the other but they too had to lose much in the process.

The major strategies employed by total submitters were: land transfer, litigation, bribe to the officials and use of muscle power. Most of the strategies were the same in all categories except repurchase, gifting or donation of land and sale of land for the 'partial protectors'. The exclusive strategies for the total protectors other than the general ones employed by others were: mutual adjustments and offering inferior land for allotment. As is clear, the total submitters employed a smaller range of strategies which too were employed in smaller proportion. The strategy of changing the 'class' of the land though frequently mentioned by the experts was not observed in the sample taken for this study.

At the initial stages of the study it was expected that the landowners might have acquired more land after the Acts but the landowners generally did not acquire more land. The general reasons given for this were less money and a fear of losing the land again. Besides that, a great deal of diversification was also speculated but on going to the field it was found that only a few families have diversified their occupation in the total submitters and a little more in the other two categories. On the whole a little diversification was noted and much of it was- going in for small services. Only six cases went for self-employment.

The targetted landowners were also not all that active in politics, as most of them remained busy with the litigations on their land and other related problems. Less than 50% had ever attained any political position.

In the sample taken for this study a little geographical mobility was noticed especially so in case of the total submitters. Only two out of 14 cases had partially or fully changed their place of residence. On the whole, precisely 36 of the heads lived with their families at their native villages and the remaining 6 had migrated out in search of better living. 7 other cases had some part of their families living at some other place but the heads staying in their native villages.

There is almost a negligible evidence of caste bias in the acquisition of land although Case-18 complained of such partiality. The most prevalent agricultural castes in the state i.e. Jat and Rajput, were also found most preponderant in the targetted landowners. Six of the nine castes in the sample were found in the total submitters and likewise in the other chapters.

If at all any category that can be marked out as 'frequent loser', was that of the 'liliputians'. By 'liliputians' we mean those individual families which were weak in some manner like weak leadership, less male members, widows, physically handicapped, financially or politically weak, illiterates etc. Therefore, the study supports the view of Sharma and Puniya (1989).

Lastly, it is a right place to remark the major problem that was encountered in this study. The revenue records were not updated as it was observed that most of the times the records gave the same amount of land that was declared as surplus in the first instance as the amount of land acquired and distributed (or utilized). But, in many cases the previous landowners were also found to be practically the present owners and were working on it. In some other cases, a litigation was going on. There were also some instances where the land was in the name of state government but the possession remained with the original landowner.

In the context of this study, comments of knowledgeable persons were also noted. The following are the contents of some of the conversations with them.

Ch.Rajinder Singh of Hodal (Faridabad) found that the population pressure and the Ceiling legislations jointly dragged the rural society. He added that now the rural population is engaged in nothing, as in general the ownership holdings are reduced to less than a plough unit holding. Therefore, the efforts of mechanization and expensive technology according to him were not quite fruitful as very less farmers were in a position to avail that.

Ch.Lehna Singh a senior Block Development Officer remarked that the legislation was nothing but a vote catching policy of the then ruling political party. The policy according to him lacked rigorous implementation.

In a discussion with Mr.P.N.Pimpley and Mr.Sagar Preet Hooda it came out that even if there was no land ceiling, natural devolution would have done its part and the holdings were bound to reduce with time.

Some other veteran villagers questioned that why was the government so serious about the inequality in rural society and why not in urban society. They further probed about the effectiveness of Urban Land Ceiling Act of 1976.

Social mobility has long been a central topic of sociological speculation and over the last fifty years, the object of many empirical enquiries. The same interest was one of the main factors of the initiation of this study. For the sample of this study it can be safely concluded that there are only a few examples of upward social mobility (e.g., Case-12) and in most other cases there is a downward social mobility or social sinking or descending mobility, if at all there is any. But, it is evident that the land acquisition alone was not a sufficient causal factor. Land acquisition, cost of litigations and population pressure can collectively be considered as sufficient antecedent.

Despite the fact that the sample size was small and not quite representative, several hypotheses can be generated from the study, viz., Any further land ceiling would yield negligible results and may encounter a stiff

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aggarwala, C.D. 1956: The Punjab Security of Land Tenures Act (Punjab Act-X of 1953 as amended by Punjab Act-XI of 1955), Jullundhar City, Jain General House.
- Bergmann, T. 1984: Agrarian Relations in India; with special reference to Kerala, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh and West Bengal; New Delhi. Agricole Publications.
- Beteille. A. 1969: Caste, Class & Power; changing patterns of social stratification in a Tanjore village, Bombay, Oxford University Press.
- _____ 1974: Studies in Agrarian Social Structure, New Delhi, Oxford University Press.
- _____ 1983: (ed.) Equality & Inequality, Theory and practice, New Delhi, Oxford University Press.
- Bhalla, G.S. 1974: Changing Agrarian Structure in India, a study of impact of green revolution in Haryana Meerut, Meenakshi Prakashan.
- Calvert, H. 1922,30: Wealth & Welfare of Punjab, some studies in Punjab Rural Economics, Lahore, Govt. Press.
- Chadha, G.K. 1986: State & Rural Economic Transformation: The case of Punjab 1950-85, New Delhi, Sage Publications.
- Dantwala, M.L. 1949: Indian Agriculture; An introduction to the problem, Bombay, National Information and Publications.
- Denzin, N.K. 1989: The Research Act; A theoretical introduction to sociological methods, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Dharam Narain, 1986: Agricultural change and Poverty, variations on a theme, New Delhi, Oxford University Press.
- Durkheim, E. 1950: The Rules of Sociological Method, ed. by George. E.G. Catlin, tr. by Sarah A. Solovay & John H. Muller, 8th ed., Illinois', Free Press.
- Goode, W.J.; Hatt, P.K. 1952: Methods in Social Research, Tokyo, McGraw Hill Book Co.
- Gough, K. 1989: Rural Change in south east India: 1950 to 1980's, Delhi, Oxford University Press.
- Haque, T. & Sirohi, A.S. 1986: Agrarian reforms and institutional changes in India, New Delhi, Concept Publishing Co.

- Rajapurohit. (ed.) 1984: *Land Reforms in India*, New Delhi, Ashish Publishing House.
- Rao, Hanumantha C.H., 1975: *Technological change and distribution of gains in Indian Agriculture*, New Delhi, McMillan Publishers.
- Rastyannikov, V.G., 1981: *Agrarian evolution in a multiform structure society, Experience of India*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Rudra, A., 1982: *Indian Agriculture Economics, Myths and Realities*, New Delhi, Allied Publishers.
- Selltiz, C., et.al., 1959: *Research Methods in Social Relations*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Shanin, T., 1976: *Peasants and Peasant Societies: Selected readings*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.
- Sharma, M.L. & Puniya, R.K., 1989: *Land Reforms in India: Achievements, Problems & Prospects*, New Delhi, Ajanta Publishers.
- Singh, B. & Mishra, S., 1964: *A study of land relations in U.P.*, Calcutta, Oxford University Press.
- Singh, C., 1981: *Economic Nightmare in India; its causes and cures*, New Delhi, National Publishing House.
- Thorner, D., 1956: *'Ceilings' The Agrarian prospect in India*, Delhi, Delhi University Press.
- Willer, D., 1967: *Scientific Sociology; theory and method*, New Jersey, Prentice-hall, Inc.

Krishna, Raj, April, 1959: Agrarian Reforms in India; The debate on Ceilings, Volume-7, Economic Development and Cultural Change.

Minhas, B.S., 1970: Rural poverty, land distribution and development, New Delhi, Indian Economic Review.

Pradhan, H. Prasad, May, 1973: Production relations, Achilles' Heel of Indian Planning. Vol.VIII, No.19, Economic and Political Weekly.

Rothermund, D. Dec, 1960: Government, Landlord and Tenant in India; 1975-1900. The Indian Economic and Social History Review, VI, No.4.

Rao, Hanumantha, C.H. 1972: Ceiling on Agricultural holdings; Its economic rationale, June-24, Economic and Political Weekly.

Shah, C.H., October to December, 1976: Growth and inequality in Agriculture, Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol XXXI(4).

Subramoniam, T.P., April-June, 1959: "Ceiling on landholdings in India," Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics.

Thapar Romesh, May, 1992: A Ceiling on Celings Vol.VII, No.21, Economic and Political Weekly.

REPORTS AND GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Agro-Economic Research Centre, 1980: *Utilisation of vested land in West Bengal, Orissa and Bihar*, Viswa Bharti.

Bhalla, S., 1992: *Development, Poverty and Policy. The Haryana experience; Workshop on state level studies on Management of Poverty Alleviation programmes*, August. 3-7, revised October, Institute of Development Studies.

Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee, 1951: *A report*; All India Congress Committee, New Delhi

Dantwala, M.L., July, 1960: "Land Reforms in India", *Problems of Eco. growth*, M.K. Haldor and R. Ghosh (eds.) Compress for Cultural freedom, New Delhi.

Govt. of Haryana, 28th Sept. 1972: *Haryana Government Gazette (Extraordinary)*.

_____ 7th March-1973: *Haryana Government Gazette (Extraordinary)*.

Govt. of Haryana, 1973: *The Haryana Ceiling on Land Holdings Act, 1972 (Haryana Act No.26 of 1972 as amended upto 31st July 1973)*.

Govt. of Haryana, 1976: *The Urban Land Ceiling and Regulation Act, 1976 (Act No.33 of 1976)*.

Govt. of India, 1950-51: *First Agricultural Labour Inquiry*, New Delhi.

Govt. of India, 1970-71: *All India Agricultural Census*, New Delhi.

_____ 1976-77: *All India Agricultural Census*, New Delhi.

Govt. of India, (1961-66): *Third five year plan*, Planning Commission.

Govt. of India, 1986: *Ministry of Agriculture, Meeting of the consultative committee of the Ministry of Agriculture held on 4th July. Parliament House, New Delhi*.

Govt. of Punjab, 22 Nov. 1952: *Punjab Gazette Extraordinary*.

An ICSSR Working Group Report, 1980: *Alternatives in Agricultural Development*.

Indian Express, 01, Feb., 1982: *New 20 point plan to meet changing needs*.

ANNEXURE

ANNEXURE

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

**TITLE: SURPLUS LAND ACQUISITION AND SOCIAL
MOBILITY IN RURAL HARYANA.**

VILLAGE:

TAHSIL:

DISTRICT

1. Age of the head of the family/household w.r.t.:

1953 1972 1993

2. Sex of the head of the family/household:

1953 1972 1993

3. Marital status of the head:

1953 1972 1993

4. Strategic location of the village:

5. Education qualification/s of the head:

1953 1972 1993

6. Caste/Religion of the family:

7. Minority/majority status of the Caste/Religion:

8. The total no. of family members:

1953	1972	1993
------	------	------

9. Proportion of educated members:

1953	1972	1993
M/F	M/F	M/F

10. The no. of coparceners (practical):

1953	1972	1993
------	------	------

11. The no. of family members working on farms:

1953	1972	1993
------	------	------

12. The no. of hired workers for farm/domestic work:

1953	1972	1993
F/D	F/D	F/D

13. If some members changed the place of residence and why?:

1953	1972	1993
------	------	------

14. The occupational structure of the family:

1953	1972	1993
------	------	------

30. Land actually declared as surplus:

1953 1972

31. Land that should have been declared as surplus:

1953 1972

32. What happened to the acquired land:

1953 1972

33. Reasons for the land lost/saved:

1953 1972

34. Strategies employed to save the land:

1953 1972

35. To fulfill the loss, did the family purchase more land? If yes, how much?:

after 1953 after 1972

36. Who guided for the Ceiling Acts:

1953 1972

37. Any loss in prestige due to landloss:

1953 1972

38. Did the family diversify its occupation to maintain the prestige?

after 1953 after 1972

39. Did some members resort to politics? If yes, what position the hold/held?:

after 1953 after 1972

40. Average surplus generated:

1953 1972 1993

41. Political/Bureaucratic influence of family:

1953 1972 1993

42. Approx. covered area of the house (Kuchcha/Pucca):

1953 1972 1993
K/P K/P K/P

43. Other Assets:

1953 1972 1993

44. Any litigation:

1953 1972 1993

45. Social standing:

1953 1972 1993

