

Working Paper No. 122

**Access to Land for the Scheduled Castes
and Scheduled Tribes in India**

by
M. Thangaraj

Madras Institute of Development Studies
79, Second Main Road, Gandhi Nagar
Adyar, Chennai 600 020

June 1994

Title of Paper : Access to land for the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes in India

Author's Name and Institutional Affiliation :

M. Thangaraj
Madras Institute of Development Studies,
79, Second Main Road,
Gandhinagar, Adyar,
Madras 600 020,
India.

Abstract of Paper

Land is an important source of livelihood for most of the rural population, particularly for the SCs and STs in India. Bulk of the SCs population work as wage labour in agriculture. In ancient India, today's SCs and STs were the original sons of the soil. The Aryan invasion alienated them from their traditional means of livelihood. The colonial government and the post independence Indian government extended several welfare programmes for the upliftment of the SCs and STs. On the economic front, redistribution of land also been emphasised. In this context, it is worthwhile to study the access to land by these communities.

The data on the distribution of landholdings were collected from the All India Report on Agricultural Censuses, 1980-81 and 1985-86. The data with regard to population by social groups were collected from the Population Census 1981 and the Population data for the year 1986 have been estimated from the 1981 and the 1991 Censuses.

The results of the study indicate that the access to land by SCs was low and those who had access to land, the size of such lands were relatively small as compared to STs and Others. The access to wholly owned and self operated holdings was low for SCs as compared to STs and Others. Access to irrigated land was also low for both the SCs and STs. The result of the study further shows that the distribution of land was not equal for all social groups. The main reason for the low access to land by SCs is their social and economic oppression. Hence there is a need for state intervention to achieve equality in the distribution of land holdings and to provide the land to tiller and the landless.

Acknowledgement

The author is grateful to Dr K Nagaraj, Prof. Nirmal Sengupta and Prof S Neelakantan for their helpful comments on the earlier version of the paper. All errors and omissions are wholly the author's responsibility.

ACCESS TO LAND FOR THE SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES IN INDIA

I. Introduction.

Ownership of land is closely associated with the social stratification in India. In the characteristic of the Indian social and economic milieu caste and class by and large overlap with each other, although sometimes they may not coincide. This has been true for the historical period too. Some fragmentary attempts have been made to study the access to land by the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and to compare their position with the rest of the population both at the all India and the state level. The present study purports to show some additional light, being on the data available in sources like Agricultural Census. Unfortunately the earliest period on which the data related to the social group are available is the 1980-81 Agricultural Census. But there too we do not have the break-up of data on holdings for Others which constitutes several communities, such as, Most Backward Class, Backward Class and Forward Castes.

In this analysis, we have to bear in mind that the quality of land may not be good in all parts of the country particularly in the Tribal areas. Most of the land operated by the Scheduled Tribes may be the barren and undulated land. The quality of these lands can not be equated with that of the land in the plain. Irrigation is the most crucial input that determines the yield, but most of the land operated by the Tribals are unirrigated. The land operated by types of irrigation and sources of irrigation has been dealt elsewhere in the paper. Hence, the result of the study pertaining to tribal land may not be applicable and comparable to that of the SCs and Others. The land owned by Tribals should not be transferred to non-Tribals due to protective laws enacted in almost all states in India, but in practice alienation of land is going on illegally because of loopholes in the law. In many cases, the land will be in the name of Tribes for the record sake, but the cultivators will be other than the Tribes. Kaul's¹ study indicates that the land operated by Tribals is being transferred to non Tribals in Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Maharashtra, Orissa, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal.

Despite these limitations, the study will be useful for the planners to chalk out the future plan for the Depressed section. The study also will be helpful for the government while implementing the land reform legislation, as almost the entire depressed class population is depending upon the land for their survival. Before going to the analysis of the study, an attempt is made to review the pattern of land ownership that were existing earlier, as it is hoped that this will serve as a background information to this study.

In the primitive society, the land was controlled by the community. Since there was no market in those days, the members of the community were allowed to collect whatever they wanted for their consumption from the land and the rest of the produce was left out. In the ancient India, the people of SCs and STs were the original sons of the soil and the land must have been cultivated by these people. The Aryan invasion alienated the sons of the soil from their traditional means of livelihood. Subsequently, 'when the country was ruled by the kings, the ownership of land was vested with the peasantry and the kings received a share of the produce'². When the society was under the hegemony of the Hindu religion, a section of the society was despised and tormented and subsequently they became the Untouchables. In those days the persons of depressed community were not permitted to acquire land when the caste system came into being. It was considered as an offence for a member of the untouchable community to acquire wealth, such as land or cattle in the Indian villages³. In some parts of India, laws were enacted prohibiting the Untouchables from purchasing the land. For instance, in the province of Punjab there was a law called the land alienation Act. This law specified the communities which could purchase land and the untouchables were not allowed to purchase the land⁴.

Prior to British rule, the whole of the Pariah, an Untouchable community, without exception, were the slaves of the superior castes. The British government freed them from the yoke of hereditary slavery⁵. The Harijans (SCs) and the low caste Sudra communities fell under the category of slaves. The Pallis or Vanniyas, a Sudra community, worked as serfs under Brahmin landlords while the Pariahs and Pallans (SCs) served the other superior non-Brahmin masters like Vellalas⁶. In this connection, Dharma Kumar's study also shows the existence of agricultural labourers who were slaves even before the British rule⁷. Her study further indicates that the agricultural labourers could not own land of their own due to socio or economic reasons⁸. Dharma Kumar's study also indicates that the British government had shown some interest in removing the slavery, but they were reluctant abolish it, as it might be dangerous to disturb the long established relations between the ryots and the slaves⁹. There is also an another view that the class of landless labourers was created during the British period. An untouchable leader, Gangadhara Siva, accused the British government which was responsible for the landlessness of the Untouchables in India and he made it clear in the Madras Legislative Council in 1928 that the Untouchables were the real owners of the land. According to him, "The real owners of cultivable land in India were the depressed classes. In those days there were no boundry stones or anything of this sort as now exist, after the settlement of the East India Company In 1751 the British people adopted a system of lords, tenants and sub-tenants for the purpose of collection of revenues in india. The British without enquiring into the grievances of the depressed classes, ascertained the opinion from caste Hindus who used to be in the centre of the village as to who is the owner of the cultivable lands whereas the depressed classes were shunted out of the villages on question. Caste Hindus said that the lands were their own and the British people made the pattas in their name and thus deprived the lands of the depressed classes"¹⁰. He also requested the British Government to provide atleast one acre of land for each depressed class family to lead an independent life without depending upon the caste Hindus¹¹. Walhouse also had shown that the deprived castes in South India once held far higher positions, and were the real masters of the land¹². However, the British government in India which was primarily intrested in generating Income from land did not yeild to the pressure. To cite an example, Tremenheera's study shows that the Untouchables had very little access to land in Chengleput district. During the early 1890s, in the whole district of Chengleput, the depressed class population was 25 per cent but they held only 2 per cent of the land¹³. The study further indicates that the Pariahs were cultivating the land for rent as "subtenants"¹⁴. The study also further shows that the land cultivated by pariahs were forcefully and illegally occupied by the caste Hindus¹⁵. The Pariahs' social status in the hierarchical caste society was low and this was the main reason for the forceful and illegal occupation of their land by the caste Hindus.

The British government, however, began to extend the welfare schemes to the depressed classes to ameliorate their economic conditions. As the first step, the British administration issued a government order in 1894 that the Untouchables should be freed from their serfdom by means of land grants and educational facilities¹⁶. In 1918, the British Government adopted special measures to assign lands to the depressed classes for cultivation and some lands for house-sites. The labour department was created in 1920 to assign the lands for the depressed classes. Total number of house-sites provided by acquisition of land since the inception of the department was 36,530. The extent assigned for cultivation was 3,42,611 acres in 1931 while the land assigned for cultivation was 19,251 acres in 1920-21¹⁷. When the freedom struggle movement gained importance in India, several leaders from the depressed classes not only joined in the freedom struggle but also fought against the social and economic oppression of the SCs. They demanded the British government to initiate several welfare measures to uplift the oppressed masses. The British government in India conceded their demands and started implementing several welfare measures such as: assignment of lands to the families of SCs and provision of educational facilities to the children of SCs.

After independance, Indian state government started various welfare schemes to ameliorate conditions of the SCs. Distribution of surplus land through land reform legislations and assignment of cultivable waste land were considered to be the crucial measures for their economic development, since most of them were working as landless agricultural labourers. Despite several welfare programmes, there is no marked change in their socio-economic conditions even after independance due to poor implementation and lack of will.

However, there were changes in the tenurial relationships. It is important to note that the Brahmins were interested in leasing-out their land to the Untouchables due to the submissive nature of the Untouchables. Beteille's¹⁸ study indicates that in the south Indian village, Brahmin mirasdars (landowners) were replacing non-Brahmins (caste Hindus) with Adi Dravidars (SCs) as their tenants. As tenants, the non Brahmins became more demanding and aggressive, with the shift of political power in their favour, the Brahmin mirasdars tended to show greater preference for Adi Dravida tenants who were on the whole less militant and more respectful.

Several micro level studies have probed the question whether there was any upward mobility in the distribution of land holdings by those who have been detached from acquiring the landed assets and whether the land ownership tended to get concentrated more on the middle or dominant castes. For instance, a study¹⁹ conducted in a village in Andhra Pradesh based on data pertaining to four points in time viz. 1930, 1948, 1965 and 1982. The study shows that the share of land owned by non-Brahmins increased while the share of Brahmins decreased over time. The quantum of land owned by the Scheduled Castes remained more or less the same. Another study²⁰ in a Maharashtra village compares the position of the households in 1958-59 with those in 1942-43 and 1945. The study shows that the area of land owned by higher castes decreased and the land held by middle castes increased over time. The land occupied by Buddhists (Scheduled Castes) remained constant. A village study²¹ in Tamil Nadu shows that the land ownership is heavily concentrated among caste Hindus. The SCs who constitute about 30 per cent of population altogether own less than 18 acres in total or less than 3 per cent of the land under ownership. The largest holding among the 40 SCs who own some land is less than 2 acres. A study (resurvey) conducted in a village by Athreya²² examines data on land holdings in 1984 with those in 1916, 1934, 1958-60, and 1984. This shows that the land is being transferred from Brahmins to Backward Castes (mainly Thevars) and SCs (Pallars) in Gangaikondan village in Tamil Nadu. Yet another resurvey conducted by Athreya²³ in Vadamalapuram village in Tamil Nadu. The study was conducted in 1983 and compares the situations with those in 1916, 1936, and 1958. The study shows that the share of Scheduled Castes population to total was 17 per cent but the share of land held by them was about 3 per cent in 1983. Cohn²⁴ conducted a study in 1952 shows that the Camars (SCs) of Madhopur in Uttar Pradesh cultivated land as tenants. The average cultivated area was only a little over one acre of land. On the contrary, the average area cultivated by the Thakurs (non SC) was six times as much. Kripa Shankar²⁵ conducted a study in 19 Nyaya Panchayats in Uttar Pradesh. The study was confined to the post zamindari abolition period till 1982-83 i.e for thirty years. The study shows that the higher caste Hindus and Muslims were the net losers and Backward castes, SCs and Sikhs were the net gainers in the operation of land market. Another study²⁶ conducted in Tamil Nadu at the village level shows that persons belonging to SCs and Backward Castes who have been detached from the land for centuries, are in the process of acquiring land from higher castes. Thus, these studies, by and large, show that the people belonging to oppressed sections are in the process of acquiring landed assets. In this context, it is worthwhile to probe into the distribution of land holdings by social groups at macro level.

Population

Indian society is socially and culturally diversified, as the persons of higher castes enjoy the benefit of higher economic and social status and the lower castes, lower economic and social status. The census of India divide the Indian society into three distinct groups. viz., Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Others. Each group consists of numerous castes and sub castes each of which is a separate entity in the society. The Others constitutes the persons of middle and higher castes i.e. those who do not belong to SCs and STs. It could be seen from the Table 1 that there was a slight increase in the percentage of SCs and STs in 1986 over 1981. The percentage of Scheduled Castes population to total population was highest in Punjab followed by Himachal Pradesh. The percentage of Scheduled Tribes population to the total population was highest in Madhya Pradesh followed by Orissa.

TABLE 1**Distribution of population by social groups in 1981**

States/India	Scheduled Castes		Scheduled Tribes		Other population	
	Population	%	Population	%	Population	%
Andhra Pradesh	7961730	14.87	3176001	5.93	42411942	79.20
Bihar	10142368	14.51	5810867	8.31	53961499	77.20
Gujarat	2438297	7.15	4848586	14.22	28798916	78.62
Haryana	2464012	19.07	Nil	Nil	10458608	80.03
Himachal Pradesh	1053958	24.82	197263	4.61	3029597	70.67
Jammu & Kashmir	497363	8.31	Nil	Nil	5490026	91.69
Karnataka	5595353	15.07	1825203	4.91	29715158	80.02
Kerala	2549382	10.02	261475	1.03	22642823	88.95
Madhya Pradesh	7358533	14.10	11987031	22.97	32833280	62.93
Maharashtra	4479763	7.14	5772033	9.19	52532370	83.67
Orissa	3865543	14.66	5915067	22.43	16589661	62.91
Punjab	4511703	26.87	Nil	Nil	12277212	73.13
Rajasthan	5838879	17.04	4183124	12.21	24239859	70.75
Tamil Nadu	8881295	18.35	520226	1.07	39006558	80.58
Uttar Pradesh	23453339	21.16	232705	0.21	87175969	78.63
West Bengal	12000768	21.99	3070672	5.63	39509207	72.38
All India	104754623	15.75	51628638	7.76	508904588	76.49

Sources : 1. Census of India, 1981, Primary census abstract, General population, Series-1, Part II-8 (i) 1983.
2. Census of India, 1981, Primary census abstract Scheduled Castes, Series-1, Part II-B (ii) 1983.
3. Census of India, 1981, Primary census abstract Scheduled Tribes, Series-1, part II-B (iii) 1983.

TABLE 1 (Contd.)

Distribution of population by social groups in 1986

States/India	Scheduled Castes		Scheduled Tribes		Other population	
	Population	%	Population	%	Population	%
Andhra Pradesh	9183200	15.39	3652062	6.12	46833701	78.49
Bihar	11291891	14.53	6200807	7.98	60211703	77.49
Gujarat	2731677	7.28	5465885	14.57	29324202	78.15
Haryana	2830254	19.40	Nil	Nil	11755279	80.60
Himachal Pradesh	1175158	24.98	207538	4.41	3321821	70.61
Jammu & Kashmir
Karnataka	6421349	15.72	1869900	4.58	32566859	79.71
Kerala	2712720	9.97	289698	1.06	24212517	88.97
Madhya Pradesh	8416545	14.32	13586342	23.12	36759606	62.56
Maharashtra	6263630	8.92	6499338	9.25	57465126	81.83
Orissa	4452818	15.41	6449497	22.33	17985235	62.26
Punjab	5090047	27.59	Nil	Nil	13360531	72.41
Rajasthan	6664919	17.16	4785614	12.32	27378389	70.51
Tamil Nadu	9753912	18.76	546544	1.05	41698753	80.19
Uttar Pradesh	26203638	21.10	258836	0.21	97723830	78.69
West Bengal	13891713	22.79	3419862	5.61	43633624	71.59
All India	119608422	16.23	57878056	7.86	559316347	75.91

Source : Computed

Note : Data for the year 1986 have been estimated from the 1981 and 1991 Censuses by geometric growth rate for comparison purpose with the data on land holdings of 1985-86.

A brief note on access index

The magnitude of access to land for SCs and STs has been examined in terms of simple index of access which is defined as follows :

$$1) \quad a_i = \frac{l_i}{p_i} \quad \text{where} \quad \begin{array}{l} a_i = \text{access index} \\ l_i = \text{percentage of land owned} \\ \text{by community } i \text{ to total land} \\ p_i = \text{percentage of community } i \\ \text{to total population.} \end{array}$$

$$2) \quad l_i = \frac{L_i}{L} \quad \text{where} \quad \begin{array}{l} L_i = \text{amount of land owned by community } i \\ L = \sum L_i = \text{total amount of land owned} \\ \text{by all communities.} \end{array}$$

$$3) \quad p_i = \frac{P_i}{P} \quad \text{where} \quad \begin{array}{l} P_i = \text{population of community } i \\ P = \sum P_i = \text{total population} \end{array}$$

$$4) \quad a_i = \frac{L_i/L}{P_i/P}$$

The access index is equal to 1 then it indicates that there is perfect equality between the proportion of the community i to the total population and proportion of land operated by the community i to the total land operated. If the access index is less than 1 then it shows that the proportion of land operated by the community i was less than the proportion of population of the community i to the total population. If the index is more than 1, then it indicates the high access to land i.e. the proportion of land operated by the community i to the total land operated was more than the proportion of population of the community i to the total population. By studying the magnitude and variation of a_i for SCs, STs and Others for different types of land and across States etc., certain broad generalisations may be derived regarding the extent and nature of access to land by these communities.

II. Access to land for SCs, STs and Others : All India

1. Land holdings by social groups

Distribution of area of operational holdings by social groups as shown in Table 2, at all India level, clearly indicates that the percentage of area operated by SCs and STs have increased marginally in 1985-86 as compared to 1980-81. Increase in the land operated by SCs may be partly due to the distribution of land through land ceiling Acts. The land operated by the Others has come down slightly.

Access to land for SCs, STs and Others at All India level as given in the Table 2 clearly shows the per capita land availability and average size of the holdings was low for SCs than the Others and STs. The access to land operated was much low for the SCs.

TABLE 2

Distribution of number and area of operational holdings by social groups

Social Groups	Area operated ('000 ha.)	
	1980-81	1985-86
Scheduled Castes	11522 (7.0)	12839 (7.7)
PLA	0.11	0.11
Access Index	0.44	0.47
AAPH	1.15	1.05
Scheduled Tribes	16704 (10.2)	17234 (10.5)
PLA	0.32	0.30
Access Index	1.31	1.34
AAPH	2.44	2.25
Others	135571 (82.8)	134689 (81.8)
PLA	0.27	0.24
Access Index	1.082	1.078
AAPH	1.88	1.74
TOTAL	163797 (100.0)	164562 (100.0)

NOTE : 1. Figures in brackets represent percentage to the total of respective columns.

2. PLA= Per capita land availability.

3. AAPH= Average area per holding.

Sources : 1. All India report on Agricultural Census, 1980-81, Ministry of agriculture, Government of India, New Delhi, 1987.

2. All India report on Agricultural Census, 1985-86, Ministry of agriculture, Government of India, New Delhi, 1990.

2. Land holdings and area operated

The distribution of number of operational holdings and area by social groups and size of holdings as given in Table 3 shows that the marginal and small holdings constitute 74.5 per cent of the total holdings and accounted for only 26.2 per cent of the area in 1980-81, but the percentage of operator and area operated had increased to 78.2 per cent and 29 per cent respectively in 1985-88. Similarly the number and area operated in the small and marginal holdings by SCs, STs and Others also increased in 1985-88 as compared to 1980-81 and the percentage of number and area was the highest in the case of SCs as compared to STs and Others. The number and area in the highest size class declined in 1985-88 for all social groups, SCs, STs and Others. The data further show that the proportion of land under the large size holdings to the total holdings was minimum in the case of SCs. The concentration ratio (CR)²⁷ had declined in 1985-88 as compared

to 1980-81, but the decline was more in the case of STs than that of SCs and Others. The concentration ratio continued to be higher even in 1985-86. Thus the data clearly indicate that the persons belonging to SCs, by and large, operate relatively smaller size and the magnitude of land operated by them was also lower than that of the rest of the social groups. The marginal increase in the access to land by SCs is well illustrated in this table that the SCs have more access to only small size holdings.

Table 3

**Distribution of holdings and area operated
by Social Groups according to size classes**

(Number in '000 and area in '000 ha.)

(1980-81)

Size Groups	Scheduled Castes		Scheduled Tribes		Others		All Social Groups	
	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area
Marginal (Below 1ha.)	6923 (68.9)	2510 (21.8)	2728 (39.8)	1309 (7.8)	40471 (56.2)	15916 (11.7)	50122 (56.4)	19735 (12.1)
Small (1-2 ha)	1644 (16.3)	2324 (20.2)	1551 (22.6)	2220 (13.3)	12877 (17.9)	18625 (13.8)	16072 (18.1)	23169 (14.1)
Semi-Medium (2-4 ha)	952 (9.5)	2576 (22.4)	1405 (20.5)	3850 (23.1)	10098 (14.0)	28219 (20.8)	12455 (14.0)	34645 (21.2)
Medium (4-10 ha)	438 (4.4)	2554 (22.2)	936 (13.7)	5596 (33.5)	6694 (9.3)	40393 (29.8)	8068 (9.1)	48543 (29.6)
Large (10 ha and above)	95 (0.9)	1557 (13.4)	234 (3.4)	3729 (22.3)	1837 (2.6)	32419 (23.8)	2166 (2.4)	37705 (23.0)
Total	10052 (100.0)	11521 (100.0)	6854 (100.0)	16704 (100.0)	71977 (100.0)	135572 (100.0)	88893 (100.0)	163797 (100.0)
Concentration Ratio (CR)		0.5615		0.5624		0.6075		0.6037

Access to land by the size class of operational holdings by social groups as presented in Table 4 shows that the access to land operated had declined in the case of SCs, as the size class increases. On the other hand, the access to land operated had increased as the increase in the size classes for Others. There was a marginal increase in the access of land in 1985-86 over 1980-81 for SCs and STs. In the case of SCs, the access to land was very low for all size classes and particularly in the higher size classes.

$CR = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n P_{(i-1)} Q_i - \sum_{i=1}^n P_i Q_{(i-1)} \right\}$ Where P_i refers to the cumulative percentage of households of the i^{th} group and Q_i to the cumulative percentage of area owned by the i^{th} group.

Table 3 (Contd.,)

(1985-86)

Size Groups	Scheduled Castes		Scheduled Tribes		Others		All Social Groups	
	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area
	8508 (70.7)	3000 (23.7)	3161 (41.3)	1512 (8.8)	44478 (57.4)	17530 (13.0)	56147 (57.8)	22042 (13.4)
	1923 (16.0)	2713 (21.5)	1795 (23.4)	2563 (14.9)	14204 (18.3)	20432 (15.2)	17922 (18.4)	25708 (15.6)
	1067 (8.9)	2878 (22.8)	1545 (20.2)	4225 (24.5)	10640 (13.7)	29563 (21.9)	13252 (13.6)	36666 (22.3)
	456 (3.8)	2636 (20.9)	936 (12.2)	5570 (32.3)	6524 (8.4)	38938 (28.9)	7916 (8.1)	47144 (28.6)
	87 (0.7)	1413 (11.2)	212 (2.8)	3365 (19.5)	1619 (2.1)	28224 (21.0)	1918 (2.0)	33002 (20.1)
	12041 (100)	12369 (100)	7648 (100)	17234 (100)	77466 (100)	134689 (100)	97155 (100)	1645 (100)
Concentration Ratio		0.5505		0.5330		0.5949		0.5913

- NOTE : 1. Figures in brackets are percentages
2. Totals may not tally due to rounding off in 1985-86

- Sources : 1. All India report on agricultural census, 1980-81.
2. All India report on agricultural census, 1985-86.

Table 4
Access to land by size classes

Size Groups		Scheduled Castes		Scheduled Tribes		Others	
		No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area
Marginal	1980-81	0.88	0.81	0.70	0.85	1.06	1.05
	1985-86	0.94	0.84	0.71	0.88	1.04	1.05
Small	1980-81	0.65	0.64	1.25	1.24	1.05	1.05
	1985-86	0.66	0.65	1.27	1.27	1.04	1.05
Semi-Medium	1980-81	0.48	0.47	1.46	1.43	1.06	1.07
	1985-86	0.50	0.48	1.49	1.46	1.06	1.06
Medium	1980-81	0.34	0.34	1.49	1.48	1.09	1.09
	1985-86	0.36	0.35	1.50	1.50	1.09	1.09
Large	1980-81	0.28	0.26	1.39	1.28	1.11	1.12
	1985-86	0.28	0.26	1.41	1.30	1.11	1.13

Sources : Computed

3. Operational holdings by residential status

The distribution of operational holdings by dispersal of operated area as given in the Table 5 shows that the access to land operated entirely in the village of residence was higher for STs than the SCs and Others. The access to land operated in 'partly in the village of residence and partly in other villages', and 'land operated entirely outside the village of residence but within the same same tehsil' was minimum for SCs than the STs and Others. The access to both area and holdings was less than 1 in the case of SCs in all types of land. In the case of Others, the access to land was more than 1 for all types of land. Thus the table clearly shows that the access to land by SCs was low both in the village of residence and in the other villages. In the case of Scheduled Tribes, the land operated in the outside of the tehsil was low.

Table 5

**Estimated number and area of operational holdings
by dispersal of operated area (1985-86)**

Number in '000 units and area in '000 hectares

Social Groups	Total holdings		1		2		3		4	
	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area
1. Scheduled Castes	10903 (12.6)	11449 (8.0)	10004 (12.8)	10132 (8.1)	532 (10.5)	867 (7.2)	314 (10.5)	389 (8.4)	53 (9.2)	61 (5.7)
Access Index	0.78	0.49	0.79	0.50	0.65	0.44	0.65	0.52	0.57	0.35
2. Scheduled Tribes	7017 (8.1)	15778 (11.0)	6559 (8.4)	14603 (11.6)	313 (6.2)	892 (7.4)	129 (4.3)	257 (5.6)	16 (2.8)	27 (2.5)
Access Index	1.03	1.40	1.07	1.48	0.79	0.94	0.55	0.71	0.36	0.32
3. Others	68954 (79.4)	115950 (81.0)	61658 (78.8)	100662 (80.3)	4240 (83.4)	10331 (85.5)	2549 (85.2)	3969 (86.0)	507 (88.0)	988 (91.8)
Access Index	1.05	1.07	1.04	1.06	1.10	1.13	1.12	1.13	1.16	1.21
4. Total	86874 (100.0)	143178 (100.0)	78220 (100.0)	125397 (100.0)	5085 (100.0)	12090 (100.0)	2991 (100.0)	4615 (100.0)	576 (100.0)	1076 (100.0)

Sources : 1. All India report of Agricultural Census, 1985-86.

NOTE : Figures in brackets indicate percentages to respective columns
Totals may not tally due to rounding off.

1. Entirely in the village of residence.
2. Partly in the village of residence and partly in other village within the same tehsil.
3. Entirely outside of the village of residence but within the same tehsil.
4. Operational holdings whose operators reside outside the tehsil.

4. Irrigational Status

Irrigation is the most crucial input in any agricultural production. It is a scarce resource and hence its use has a tremendous impact on the users for their economic development. It has been hypothesised that the less privileged section of the society viz. SCs and STs have a limited access to irrigation facilities. Distribution of land by irrigational status as shown in Table 6 clearly shows that the area irrigated to the net area sown has increased from 27 per cent in 1980-81 to 29 per cent in 1985-86 for all social groups. The share of area irrigated to the net area sown has increased marginally for SCs and STs and decreased for Others in 1985-86 as compared to 1980-81. It is significant to note that 3.3 per cent of the irrigated area to the total irrigated area was controlled by STs; 7 per cent by SCs and the rest 89.7 per cent by Others in 1985-86. The table further shows that the access index was less than 1 in the case of SCs and STs while for Others, the access index was more than 1. It is also clear from the table that the access indices have marginally increased for SCs and STs and decreased for Others in 1985-86 as compared to 1980-81. Thus the table clearly indicates that the access to both net area sown and net area irrigated was very low for SCs; and the access to area irrigated was very low for STs.

Table 6

Distribution of area of land by irrigation status

('000 ha.)

Social Groups	Net area sown		Net area irrigated	
	1980-81	1985-86	1980-81	1985-86
Scheduled Castes	9631 (7.0)	10639 (7.7)	2201 (6.0)	2830 (7.0)
PLA	0.09	0.09	0.02	0.02
Access Index	0.44	0.47	0.38	0.43
Scheduled Tribes	12942 (9.5)	13606 (9.9)	1109 (3.0)	1333 (3.3)
PLA	0.25	0.24	0.02	0.02
Access Index	1.22	1.26	0.39	0.42
Others	114068 (83.5)	113183 (82.4)	33488 (91.0)	36298 (89.7)
PLA	0.22	0.20	0.07	0.06
Access Index	1.09	1.09	1.19	1.18
Total	136641 (100.0)	137428 (100.0)	36803 (100.0)	40461 (100.0)

Sources : 1. All India report of Agricultural Census, 1980-81.
2. All India report of Agricultural Census, 1985-86.

NOTE : Figures in brackets indicate percentages to the respective columns.

5. AREA IRRIGATED BY DIFFERENT SOURCES

Irrigation is one of the important natural resources which influences the agricultural production. Theoretically, the access to surface irrigation viz. canals and tanks is equal to all social groups. The sub-surface or ground water irrigation viz. wells and tube wells involves heavy investment and hence its access may not be equal to all social groups. The distribution of area irrigated by different sources as presented in the Table 7 shows that there was a decline in terms of absolute number in the irrigated land by tanks and wells for the Others; there was also a marginal decline in the irrigated area by tanks for SCs; and there was an increase in the irrigated land by all sources of irrigation for SCs, STs and Others in 1985-86 over 1980-81.

Table 7
Distribution of area irrigated by sources
(in '000 ha.)

Source of Irrigation	Scheduled Castes		Scheduled Tribes		Others		All Social Groups	
	1980-81	1985-86	1980-81	1985-86	1980-81	1985-86	1980-81	1985-86
Canals	920	1212	388	456	13065	13439	14373	15107
Tanks	253	252	124	128	2955	2404	3332	2784
Wells	380	433	320	367	6305	5943	7005	6743
Tube wells	514	757	22	76	9111	12368	9647	13201
Other sources	139	176	255	306	2052	2144	2446	2626
Total	2206	2830	1109	1333	33488	36298	36803	40461

Sources : 1. All India report of agricultural Censuses, 1980-81.
2. All India report of agricultural Censuses, 1985-86.

Access to irrigated land by different sources as given in the Table 8 shows that there was an increase in the irrigated land by all sources of irrigation for SCs and STs. In the case of Others, there was a marginal decline in the irrigated land by all sources in 1985-86 over 1980-81. The access to irrigated land was more than 1 by all sources of irrigation for Others; while the access was less than 1 for SCs and STs. In the case of SCs and STs, their access to irrigated land by all sources of irrigation taken together was, by and large, the same in both 1980-81 and 1985-86. It is important to note that the access to irrigation by wells and tube wells was low in comparison with canals and tanks for SCs. This clearly indicates that a majority of the farmers belonging to SCs were largely depending upon the surface irrigation which is a free natural resource. While the Others had more access to both surface and sub-surface irrigation.

Table 8**Access to irrigated land by sources**

Source of irrigation	Scheduled Castes		Scheduled Tribes		Others	
	1980-81	1985-86	1980-81	1985-86	1980-81	1985-86
Canals	0.41	0.49	0.35	0.38	1.19	1.19
Tanks	0.48	0.56	0.48	0.59	1.18	1.14
Wells	0.34	0.40	0.59	0.69	1.18	1.16
Tube wells	0.34	0.35	0.03	0.07	1.23	1.23
Other sources	0.36	0.41	1.34	1.48	1.10	1.08
Total	0.38	0.43	0.39	0.42	1.19	1.18

Sources : Computed

6. Land use pattern

Land is an important scarce natural wealth and its use is a matter of concern to its people. Its improper use leads to wastage of such a scarce resource. Land use pattern is an index of agricultural development. In the recent past, the per capita availability of land is coming down, as there is mounting pressure of population on land. The area under different land use pattern by social groups as given in the Table 9 shows that the percentage of net sown area has marginally increased for SCs and STs and declined for Others. The percentage of area under current fallows and other fallows has declined for STs and gone up for SCs and others. The percentage of area of other uncultivated land has declined for SCs and STs and increased for Others. The percentage of land not available for cultivation has declined for SCs and Others and increased for STs. The data also clearly indicate that the percentage of net sown area was slightly higher for SCs than that of STs and Others.

Access to land by types of land use as given in the Table 10 shows that the access indices were less than 1 for SCs in both 1980-81 and 1985-86. The access indices were more than 1 in the case of STs in both 1980-81 and 1985-88, but the access indices have declined in the land under current fallow, other uncultivated land excluding the fallow land and fallow land other than current fallow for STs during this period. This is a positive development that STs are able to reduce the uncultivated land. In the case of Others, the access indices were more than 1 in all types of land use except the land under fallow land other than current fallow. Although the access to cultivable waste land and land not available for cultivation by Others had declined, but there was an increase in the access to current fallow, other uncultivated land excluding the fallow land and fallow land other than current fallow by the Others. It can be inferred from the data that the Others were not efficiently using the land.

Table 9

Area under different land uses by social groups

	Total area		Net area shown		Current fallow		Other uncultivated land excluding fallow land		Fallow land other than current fallow		cultivable waste land		Land not available for cultivation	
	1980-81 (1)	1985-86 (2)	1980-81 (3)	1985-86 (4)	1980-81 (5)	1985-86 (6)	1980-81 (7)	1985-86 (8)	1980-81 (9)	1985-86 (10)	1980-81 (11)	1985-86 (12)	1980-81 (13)	1985-86 (14)
Scheduled castes	11521 (7.0) (100.0)	12632 (7.7) (100.0)	9631 (7.0) (83.6)	10639 (7.7) (84.2)	888 (7.8) (7.7)	998 (7.9) (7.9)	177 (5.8) (1.5)	183 (5.6) (1.4)	337 (6.9) (2.9)	310 (7.1) (2.5)	203 (6.2) (1.8)	269 (7.6) (2.1)	285 (6.4) (2.5)	233 (7.0) (1.8)
Scheduled Tribes	16704 (10.2) (100.0)	17233 (10.5) (100.0)	12942 (9.5) (77.5)	13606 (9.9) (79.0)	1384 (12.1) (8.3)	1319 (10.5) (7.7)	498 (16.2) (3.0)	494 (15.2) (2.9)	1038 (21.2) (6.2)	811 (18.6) (4.7)	414 (12.7) (2.5)	603 (17.0) (3.5)	428 (9.6) (2.6)	400 (12.0) (2.3)
Others	135567 (82.8) (100.0)	134664 (81.8) (100.0)	114068 (83.5) (84.1)	113183 (82.4) (84.0)	9174 (80.2) (6.8)	10277 (81.6) (7.6)	2399 (78.0) (1.8)	2572 (79.2) (1.9)	3531 (72.0) (2.6)	3242 (74.3) (2.4)	2648 (81.1) (2.0)	2682 (75.5) (2.0)	3747 (84.0) (2.8)	2708 (81.0) (2.0)
All social groups	163792 (100.0) (100.0)	164529 (100.0) (100.0)	136641 (100.0) (83.4)	137428 (100.0) (83.5)	11446 (100.0) (7.0)	12594 (100.0) (7.7)	3074 (100.0) (1.9)	3249 (100.0) (2.0)	4906 (100.0) (3.0)	4363 (100.0) (2.7)	3265 (100.0) (2.0)	3554 (100.0) (2.2)	4460 (100.0) (2.7)	3341 (100.0) (2.0)

Note : Figures in brackets indicate row and column percentages.

Sources : 1. All India Report of Agricultural Census, 1980-81
2. All India Report of agricultural Census, 1985-86

Table 10

Access to land by land use pattern

Social Group	Total area	Net area sown	Current fallow	Other cultivated land excluding fallow land	Fallow land other than current fallow	Cultivable waste	Land not available for cultivation
Scheduled Castes							
1980-81	0.44	0.44	0.50	0.37	0.44	0.39	0.40
1985-86	0.47	0.47	0.49	0.35	0.44	0.47	0.43
Scheduled Tribes							
1980-81	1.31	1.22	1.56	2.09	2.73	1.64	1.24
1985-86	1.33	1.26	1.34	1.93	2.36	2.16	1.53
Others							
1980-81	1.08	1.09	1.05	1.02	0.94	1.06	1.10
1985-86	1.08	1.09	1.07	1.04	0.98	0.99	1.07

Source : Computed

7. Area under principal crops

Cropping pattern depends on the choice of the farmers to cultivate a particular type of crop. The decision making of the farmers about the cropping pattern varies from place to place and one social group to another. It also varies among farmers by size class of operational holdings. The rational farmer will try to minimize the risk and uncertainty in agricultural production. The area under principal crops by social groups as presented in Table 11 makes it clear that the percentage of area under all food crops to the gross cropped area has increased for SCs and STs; while the percentage has come down for Others in 1985-86 as compared to 1980-81. The percentage of area under non food crops to the gross cropped area has increased for Others; while the percentage has declined for SCs and STs. The cropping intensity was highest in the case of Others in both 1980-81 and 1985-86. Thus the data clearly indicate that the share of the land under food crops to the gross cropped area was more in the case of STs while the share of the land under non food crops to the total gross cropped area was higher in the case of Others among all social groups.

Table 11

Area under principal crops by social groups

(Area in '000 ha.)

Category	All Social Groups		Scheduled Castes		Scheduled Tribes		Others	
	1980-81	1985-86	1980-81	1985-86	1980-81	1985-86	1980-81	1985-86
1. All food crops	134221 (80.3)	137098 (79.9)	9668 (81.8)	10950 (83.2)	12268 (83.8)	13199 (86.4)	112285 (79.9)	112948 (78.9)
2. All non food crops	32834 (19.7)	34533 (20.1)	2145 (18.2)	2204 (16.8)	2370 (16.2)	2075 (13.6)	28319 (20.1)	30254 (21.1)
3. Gross cropped area	187055	171631	11813	13155	14638	15274	140604	143202
4. Net area sown	136641	137428	9631	10639	12942	13606	114068	113183
5. Cropping intensity (3/4)	1.223	1.249	1.227	1.236	1.131	1.123	1.233	1.265

NOTE : Figures in brackets indicate percentages to the gross cropped area
Totals may not tally in 1985-86 due to rounding off.

Sources : 1. All India report of Agricultural Census, 1980-81. 2. All India report of agricultural Census, 1985-86.

Access to land under principal crops by social groups as given in the Table 12 shows that the access was less than 1 for all food crops, non food crops, gross cropped area and net area sown and the access had marginally declined for all non-food crops in 1985-86 over 1980-81 in the case of SCs. The access was more than 1 but increased in 1985-86 over 1980-81 except in all non food crops in the case of STs. In the case of Others, the access was more than 1 for all categories in both 1980-81 and 1985-86 and the access had marginally increased in all food crops in 1985-86 over 1980-81. It is clear from the table that the access to food crops had increased in the case of SCs and STs, while the access had increased in the case Others for all non food crops.

Table 12

Access to land under Principal Crops

Category	Scheduled Castes	Scheduled Tribes	Others
1. All food crops			
1980-81	0.46	1.18	1.09
1985-86	0.49	1.23	1.09
2. All non food crops			
1980-81	0.41	0.93	1.13
1985-86	0.39	0.76	1.15
3. Gross Cropped area			
1980-81	0.44	1.13	1.10
1985-86	0.47	1.13	1.10
4. Net area sown			
1980-81	0.44	1.22	1.09
1985-86	0.47	1.26	1.08

Source : Computed.

8. Tenure of Tenancy Status

Tenurial status is an important factor indicating the involvement of the farmers in the production process. Land owned and self operated provide the nature of personal involvement in the production which ensures higher productivity. It is an established fact that the productivity of the land cultivated by the owner is more than the tenants. In order to achieve social justice and to reduce inequality in the distribution of landholdings, some of the state governments abolished the tenancy system and the tenants were made owners of the land. Distribution of the number of operational holdings by tenure and tenancy status as represented in Table 13 indicates that there was not much difference between the social groups with regard to the percentage of number and area of land under different tenurial status to the total holdings and area. The percentage of owned and self-operated holdings and area has increased and the percentage of area and holdings has declined under the land wholly leased-in in 1985-86 as compared to 1980-81 among all social groups. The percentage of number of holdings and area of land operated under wholly-leased-in was highest for the SCs and lowest for the Others.

Table 13

Distribution of number and area of operational holdings by tenurial status by social groups in 1980-81 and 1985-86

(Number in '000 and area in '000 ha.)

Social Groups	Wholly owned and self operated		Partly owned and partly leased in		Wholly leased in		Wholly otherwise operated		Partly owned and partly otherwise operated		Partly leased in and partly otherwise operated		Partly owned & partly leased in partly otherwise operated		Total	
	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area
1980-81																
Scheduled castes	9317	10677	302	352	143	134	92	83	119	243	5	5	24	27	10002	11522
	(93.2)	(92.7)	(3.0)	(3.1)	(1.4)	(1.2)	(0.9)	(0.7)	(1.2)	(2.1)	(0.1)	Neg	(0.2)	(0.2)	(100.0)	(100.0)
Scheduled Tribes	6258	15340	131	299	73	120	147	184	222	680	7	29	13	52	6850	16704
	(91.4)	(91.8)	(1.9)	(1.8)	(1.1)	(0.7)	(2.1)	(1.1)	(3.2)	(4.1)	(0.1)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.3)	(100.0)	(100.0)
Others	67760	127924	1540	3096	574	683	384	436	965	2870	83	77	385	481	71672	135566
	(94.5)	(94.4)	(2.1)	(2.3)	(0.8)	(0.5)	(0.5)	(0.3)	(1.3)	(2.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.5)	(0.4)	(100.0)	(100.0)
All social groups	83335	153941	1973	3747	790	937	603	703	1306	3793	95	111	422	560	88524	163792
	(94.1)	(94.0)	(2.2)	(2.3)	(0.9)	(0.6)	(0.7)	(0.4)	(1.5)	(2.3)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.5)	(0.3)	(100.0)	(100.0)
1985-86																
Scheduled castes	11008	12005			101	92	103	75					289	460	11536	12632
	(95.4)	(95.0)			(0.9)	(0.7)	(0.9)	(0.6)					(2.1)	(3.6)	(100.0)	(100.0)
Scheduled Tribes	6971	15975			52	72	175	201					366	985	7564	17233
	(92.2)	(92.7)			(0.7)	(0.4)	(2.3)	(1.2)					(4.8)	(5.7)	(100.0)	(100.0)
Others	73369	129780			373	490	416	402					1684	3992	75807	134664
	(96.8)	(96.4)			(0.5)	(0.4)	(0.5)	(0.3)					(2.2)	(3.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)
All social groups	91348	157760			526	654	694	678					2339	5437	94907	164529
	(96.3)	(95.9)			(0.6)	(0.4)	(0.7)	(0.4)					(2.5)	(3.3)	(100.0)	(100.0)

NOTE : Figures within brackets are percentages

Sources : 1. All India report of Agricultural Census, 1980-81.

2. All India report of Agricultural Census, 1985-86.

Table 14

Access to land by tenurial status

Social Groups	Wholly owned and self operated		Partly owned and partly leased in		Wholly leased in		Wholly otherwise operated		Partly owned and partly otherwise operated		Partly leased in and partly otherwise operated		Partly owned & partly leased in partly otherwise operated		Total	
	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area
1) Scheduled Castes																
1980-81	0.71	0.44	0.97	0.60	1.15	0.91	0.97	0.75	0.58	0.41	0.33	0.29	0.36	0.31	0.72	0.45
1985-86	0.74	0.47	-	-	1.18	0.87	0.91	0.68	-	-	-	-	0.76	0.52	0.75	0.47
2) Scheduled Tribes																
1980-81	0.97	1.28	0.86	1.02	1.19	1.65	3.14	3.37	2.19	2.31	0.95	3.37	0.40	1.20	1.00	1.31
1985-86	0.97	1.29	-	-	1.26	1.40	3.21	3.77	-	-	-	-	1.99	2.31	1.01	1.33
3) Others																
1980-81	1.06	1.09	1.02	1.08	0.95	0.95	0.79	0.81	0.97	0.96	1.14	0.91	1.19	1.12	1.06	1.08
1985-86	1.06	1.08	-	-	0.93	0.99	0.79	0.78	-	-	-	-	0.95	0.97	1.05	1.08

Source : Computed.

Access to land-owned and self-operated was less than 1 for both in terms of number and area for SCs and the access had increased marginally in 1985-86 over 1980-81; the access to area was more than 1 and had increased for STs. In the case of Others the access to both number and area had marginally declined in 1985-86 over 1980-81 and the access was more than 1 for both 1980-81 and 1985-86 (Table 14). In the case of access to land wholly leased in was less than 1 for both SCs and Others, but the access had declined marginally for SCs and increased marginally for Others; the access was more than 1 but had declined for STs. It is clear from the table that the access to wholly owned and self operated and wholly leased was low but the access was high in terms of land under wholly leased-in for SCs.

9. Terms of Leasing

The leased in area by terms of leasing is also an important factor deciding productivity in agriculture. The area under the 'fixed money' and 'fixed produce' is expected to encourage the farmers to produce more. The fixity of rent encourages the tenants to produce more and more so that the excess over and above the rent fixed will be taken away by the tenants. The implementation of land reform legislation is not uniform in India. Some states have abolished the tenancy system and some other states have regulated the rate of rent and also protected the tenants from eviction. The lease under the 'share of produce' will not be beneficial to the tenants as the rate of rent is proportionate to the production. The land under the 'share of produce' will not encourage the tenants to go for higher production. The break-up area of land leased in by terms of leasing by social groups as given in Table 15 clearly shows that the share of the leased area by 'fixed money', 'fixed produce' and 'share of produce' in terms of absolute number has declined for all social groups in 1985-86 as compared to 1980-81. The land under 'usufructuary mortgage' has not declined but remained same for SCs. It is also clear from the data that 'share of produce' was the major leasing pattern which accounted for about 42 per cent of the total area leased-in and percentage of land under 'share of produce' to the total area leased-in was more for SCs and the percentage of land under 'fixed money', 'fixed produce', 'usufructuary mortgage' and 'other terms' was higher for Others.

Table 15

Distribution of leased in area by terms of leasing by social groups

('000 ha.)

Social Groups	Area leased in for											
	Fixed Money		Fixed Produce		Share of produce		Usufructuary mortgage		Other terms		Total	
	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86
Scheduled Castes	35 (11.8)	23 (11.9)	19 (6.4)	14 (7.2)	163 (55.1)	110 (51.5)	3 (1.0)	3 (1.5)	76 (25.7)	44 (22.7)	296 (100.0)	194 (100.0)
Scheduled Tribes	38 (15.8)	37 (25.7)	21 (8.8)	13 (9.0)	72 (30.0)	58 (40.3)	6 (2.5)	3 (2.1)	103 (42.9)	33 (22.9)	240 (100.0)	144 (100.0)
Others	401 (23.4)	302 (28.8)	154 (9.0)	114 (10.9)	614 (35.9)	409 (39.1)	35 (2.0)	28 (2.7)	507 (29.6)	194 (18.5)	1711 (100.0)	1047 (100.0)
All social groups	474 (21.1)	362 (26.1)	194 (8.8)	141 (10.2)	849 (37.8)	577 (41.7)	44 (2.0)	34 (2.5)	688 (30.6)	271 (19.8)	2247 (100.0)	1385 (100.0)

NOTE : Figures in brackets represent row percentages.

Sources : 1. All India report of agricultural Census, 1980-81. 2. All India report of agricultural Census, 1985-86.

It is clear from the Table 16 that the access had declined in terms of 'fixed money', 'share of produce' and increased in 'fixed produce' and 'usufructuary mortgage' and 'other terms' for SCs In 1985-86 over 1980-81 and the access was more than 1 in terms of 'share of produce' in both 1980-81 and 1985-86. In the case of STs, the access had declined in terms of 'fixed produce' and 'usufructuary mortgage' in 1985-86 over 1980-81 but the access was more than 1 in all items both in 1980-81 and 1985-86. In the case of Others, the access had increased in terms of 'fixed produce' and 'usufructuary mortgage' in 1985-86 over 1980-81, but the access was more than 1 in all items except in the 'share of produce' and 'other terms' both in 1980-81 and 1985-86.

Table 16
Access to land by terms of leasing

Social Groups	Fixed Money	Fixed Produce	Share of produce	Usufructuary mortgage	Other terms	Total
<i>Scheduled Castes</i>						
1980-81	0.47	0.62	1.22	0.43	0.70	0.84
1985-86	0.39	0.61	1.17	0.54	1.00	0.86
<i>Scheduled Tribes</i>						
1980-81	1.03	1.39	1.09	1.75	1.93	1.38
1985-86	1.30	1.17	1.28	1.12	1.55	1.32
<i>Others</i>						
1980-81	1.11	1.04	0.95	1.04	0.96	1.00
1985-86	1.10	1.07	0.93	1.08	0.94	1.00

Source : Computed.

It is evident from the Table that the access to land in terms of leasing-in by 'fixed money' was very low for SCs than that of STs and Others in comparison with the 'fixed produce' and 'share of produce'.

10. Institutional holdings

In India land is not only owned and cultivated by individuals but also temples, mutts and charitable institutions. These institutions are exempted from the ceiling on land holdings. Most of the land under the institutional holdings are leased out. The land under the institutional holding may not be beneficial to both tenants and institutions, if the land is leased out to the tenants. The tenants may not pay sufficient attention to the long term developmental activities over the land. Distribution of number and area of institutional holdings by social groups as indicated in Table 17 shows that the number and area operated by SCs, has declined and the area operated by STs and others has increased in 1985-86 as compared to 1980-81. It is significant to note that about 97 per cent of institutional holdings and area operated was controlled by others in both 1980-81 and 1985-86. The data also show that about 3 per cent of the land was occupied by SCs and STs taken together but their percentage population to the total population was about 24 per cent. The size-wise data further show that there was an increase in the area of institutional holdings in the large sized holdings. The main reason for holding land under institutional holdings was attributed to evade the land reform legislations. A comprehensive study has to be undertaken to probe into the genuineness of the institutional holdings.

Table 17

Number and area of Institutional holdings by social groups

Size of holdings	Number of holdings ('000)								Area operated ('000)							
	SCs		STs		Others		All Social Groups		SCs		STs		Others		All Social Groups	
	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86
Below 1 ha.	1	1	1	1	76	86	78	88	1	neg	neg	neg	28	29	29	29
1.0 - 2.0 ha.	neg	neg	1	neg	23	24	24	24	1	neg	1	1	33	34	35	35
2.0 - 4.0 ha.	1	neg	neg	neg	20	20	21	20	1	1	1	1	56	55	58	57
4.0 - 10.0 ha.	neg	neg	neg	neg	18	17	18	17	1	1	1	1	109	103	111	105
10.0 and above	1	neg	neg	neg	15	16	16	16	17	16	14	23	1097	1139	1128	1178
All categories	3	2	2	3	152	160	157	165	21	19	17	26	1323	1359	1361	1404

Note : **Neg = Negligible**

Total may not tally due to rounding off (in 1985-86)

Sources : 1. All India report of Agricultural Census, 1980-81.

2. All India report of Agricultural Census, 1985-86.

To sum up, the access to land operated has declined with the increase in the size of holdings, irrigated land, irrigated area by all sources, particularly superior type of irrigated area by wells and tube wells, land under all crops as well as non food crops, land by terms of leasing in respect of fixed money and fixed produce, other uncultivated land, wholly owned land were low for SCs; in the case of STs, the access to irrigated; irrigated land by sources, particularly tube wells are very low. It is a matter of significance to examine how far land distribution through land ceiling Acts had helped in establishing an egalitarian society. The land redistributed (Table 18) to the SCs through Ceiling on Land Holdings Act was 824551 acres (333691 ha.) benefitting 703690 persons. This constitutes only 2.84 per cent of the land operated and 5.84 per cent of the operators of the SCs in 1985-86. Though Land Ceiling Acts had positively contributed, but this is not sufficient to meet the needs of the land hunger of SCs.

Table 18

Distribution of surplus land by social groups - all India

	Scheduled Castes	Scheduled Tribes	Others	Total
1. Area distributed in acres	824551	325887	1110977	2261415
2. Percentage to total area	36.46	14.41	49.13	100.00
3. Number of beneficiaries	703690	223055	776308	1703053
4. Percentage to total beneficiaries	41.32	13.10	45.58	100.00

Source : Report of the commission for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (April 1983-March 1984), Sixth report, 1984, p44-45.

III. Access to land for SCs and STs: State level analysis.

1. Land holdings by social groups.

The break up of the number and area of operational holdings by states and by social groups as provided in the Table 19 shows that the percentage of holdings and area among states was highest (22.7 and 19.3) in West Bengal in 1985-86 for SCs with 21.99 per cent of population (Table 1). The percentage of Scheduled Castes population to the total population was highest in Punjab with 26.87 per cent of the total population (Table 1) but the land operated was only 2 per cent. As far as STs are concerned, the holdings, and the area operated was highest in Orissa with 26.9 per cent and 29.4 per cent respectively in 1985-86. The percentage of number of holdings and the area operated was highest in Haryana for Others while the percentage of population to the total population was highest in Jammu and Kashmir for Others (Table 1). The data also show that average size of holding was highest for STs in Assam, Bihar, Orissa, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh. The data further show that the percentage of area and holdings controlled by SCs was less than the percentage of Scheduled Castes population for all states. The percentage of area of land operated by STs was less than the percentage of population in 6 states viz., Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu. Thus the above data clearly show that there was an inter-state and inter-social group differences in the distribution of holdings and in the area operated and average size of holdings by states.

Table 19

**Statewise distribution of number and area of operational holdings
by social groups in 1980-81 and 1985-86**

(Number in '000 and area in '000 ha)

1980-81

State / India	All Social Groups			Scheduled Castes			Scheduled Tribes			Others		
	Number	Area	Average size	Number	Area	Average size	Number	Area	Average size	Number	Area	Average size
Andhra Pradesh	7370	14333	1.94	930 (12.6)	984 (6.9)	1.06	473 (6.4)	902 (6.3)	1.91	5967 (81.0)	12447 (86.8)	2.09
Assam	2298	3121	1.36	108 (4.7)	128 (4.1)	1.19	289 (12.6)	432 (13.8)	1.49	1901 (82.7)	2561 (82.1)	1.35
Bihar	11030	11068	1.00	900 (8.2)	499 (4.5)	0.55	832 (7.5)	1798 (16.2)	2.16	9298 (84.3)	8771 (79.3)	0.94
Gujarat	2930	10104	3.45	119 (4.1)	311 (3.1)	2.60	320 (10.9)	813 (8.0)	2.54	2491 (85.0)	8980 (88.9)	3.60
Haryana	1012	3562	3.52	22 (2.2)	46 (1.3)	2.10	990 (97.8)	3516 (98.7)	3.55
Himachal Pradesh	638	980	1.54	156 (24.5)	114 (11.6)	0.73	27 (4.2)	32 (3.3)	1.18	455 (71.3)	834 (85.1)	1.83
Jammu & Kashmir	1035	1030	0.99	72 (7.0)	76 (7.4)	1.05	963 (93.0)	954 (92.6)	0.99
Karnataka	4309	11746	2.73	366 (8.5)	703 (6.0)	1.92	160 (3.7)	407 (3.5)	2.54	3783 (87.8)	10636 (90.5)	2.81
Madhya Pradesh	6411	21931	3.42	824 (12.9)	1729 (7.9)	2.10	1610 (25.1)	5448 (24.9)	3.38	3977	14754 (62.0)	3.71 (67.2)
Maharashtra	6862	21362	3.11	467 (6.8)	956 (4.5)	2.05	413 (6.0)	1299 (6.1)	3.14	5982 (87.2)	19107 (89.4)	3.19
Punjab	1020	3892	3.82	51 (5.0)	99 (2.5)	1.95	969 (95.0)	3793 (97.5)	3.91
Rajasthan	4487	19932	4.44	640 (14.3)	2255 (11.3)	3.52	689 (15.4)	1665 (8.4)	2.42	3158 (70.3)	16012 (80.3)	5.07
Tamil Nadu	7191	7708	1.07	564 (7.8)	379 (4.9)	0.67	48 (0.7)	78 (1.0)	1.62	6579 (91.5)	7251 (94.1)	1.10
Uttar Pradesh	17817	17971	1.01	2631 (14.8)	1661 (9.2)	0.63	29 (0.2)	50 (0.3)	1.75	15157 (85.0)	16260 (90.5)	1.07
Remaining States & Union Territories	14473	15057	1.04	2202 (15.2)	1581 (10.5)	0.72	1964 (13.6)	3780 (25.1)	1.92	10307 (71.2)	9696 (64.4)	0.94
All India	88883	163797	1.84	10052 (11.3)	11521 (7.0)	1.15	6854 (7.7)	16704 (10.2)	2.44	71977 (80.1)	135572 (82.8)	1.88

NOTE : Figures in brackets are percentages to the total of respective rows.

Table 19 (Contd.,)

**Statewise distribution of number and area of operational holdings
by social groups in 1980-81 and 1985-86**

(Number in '000 and area in '000 ha)

1985-86

State / India	For all Social Groups			Scheduled Castes			Scheduled Tribes			Others		
	Number	Area	Average size	Number	Area	Average size	Number	Area	Average size	Number	Area	Average size
Andhra Pradesh	8231	14158	1.72	1005 (12.2)	958 (6.8)	0.95	525 (6.4)	945 (6.7)	1.80	6701 (81.4)	12255 (86.6)	1.83
Assam	2419	3161	1.31	115 (4.8)	129 (4.1)	1.12	315 (13.0)	443 (14.0)	1.41	1989 (82.2)	2589 (81.9)	1.30
Bihar	11711	10898	0.93	1359 (11.6)	566 (5.2)	0.42	916 (7.8)	1752 (16.1)	1.91	9436 (80.6)	8580 (78.7)	0.91
Gujarat	3145	9954	3.17	152 (4.8)	356 (3.6)	2.34	355 (11.3)	852 (8.6)	2.40	2638 (83.9)	8746 (87.9)	3.32
Haryana	1347	3714	2.76	40 (3.0)	75 (2.0)	1.88	1307 (97.0)	3639 (98.0)	2.78
Himachal Pradesh	753	980	1.30	180 (23.9)	134 (13.7)	0.74	32 (4.2)	38 (3.9)	1.19	541 (71.8)	808 (82.4)	1.49
Jammu & Kashmir	1185	1025	0.86	97 (8.2)	99 (9.7)	1.02	1088 (91.8)	926 (90.3)	0.85
Karnataka	4919	11879	2.41	500 (10.2)	856 (7.2)	1.71	181 (3.7)	405 (3.4)	2.24	4238 (86.2)	10618 (89.4)	2.51
Madhya Pradesh	7603	22155	2.91	969 (12.7)	1774 (8.0)	1.83	1883 (24.8)	5577 (25.2)	2.96	4751 (62.5)	14804 (66.8)	3.12
Maharashtra	8101	21352	2.64	645 (8.0)	1183 (5.5)	1.83	549 (6.8)	1455 (6.8)	2.65	6907 (85.3)	18714 (87.6)	2.71
Punjab	1088	4104	3.77	49 (4.5)	83 (2.0)	1.69	1039 (95.5)	4021 (98.0)	3.87
Rajasthan	4743	20589	4.34	707 (14.9)	2413 (11.7)	3.41	722 (15.2)	1734 (8.4)	2.40	3314 (69.9)	16442 (79.9)	4.96
Tamil Nadu	7707	7796	1.01	876 (11.4)	557 (7.1)	0.64	58 (0.8)	87 (1.1)	1.50	6773 (87.8)	7152 (91.8)	1.06
Uttar Pradesh	18985	17648	0.93	3026 (15.9)	1821 (10.3)	0.60	31 (0.2)	54 (0.3)	1.74	15928 (83.9)	15773 (89.4)	0.99
Kerala	4408	1767	0.40	392 (8.9)	48 (2.7)	0.12	44 (1.0)	29 (1.6)	0.66	3972 (90.1)	1690 (95.6)	0.43
Orissa	3586	5261	1.47	484 (13.5)	451 (8.6)	0.93	965 (26.9)	1547 (29.4)	1.60	2137 (59.6)	3263 (62.0)	1.53
West Bengal	6130	5643	0.92	1389 (22.7)	1091 (19.3)	0.79	437 (7.1)	387 (6.9)	0.89	4304 (70.2)	4165 (83.8)	0.97
Remaining States & Union Territories	1094	2479	2.27	54 (4.9)	44 (1.8)	0.81	634 (58.0)	1929 (77.8)	3.04	406 (37.1)	506 (20.4)	1.25

Note : Figures in brackets are percentages to the total respective rows.

Sources : 1. All India report of Agricultural Census, 1980-81. 2. All India report of Agricultural Census, 1985-86.

In the case of SCs, their access to land operated was very low in Punjab with 0.07 and Haryana with 0.10 which are agriculturally prosperous states. The access had declined in Punjab and has remarkably increased in Jammu and Kashmir and Tamil Nadu in 1985-86 over 1980-81 (Table 20). Access to land was highest in Jammu and Kashmir for SCs in 1985-86. In the left front ruled/ruling states such as Kerala and West Bengal, the access varied greatly i.e. th 0.27 in Kerala and 0.85 in West Bengal for SCs. In the case of STs, their access was low in Gujarat with 0.60, Kamataka, Maharashtra and Rajasthan with 0.69 each respectively. There was a marked increase in the access in Himachal Pradesh and decrease in Karnataka and Bihar in 1985-86 over 1980-81. In the case of Others, the access had increased marginally in Punjab, decreased in all other states and no change in Rajasthan in 1985-86 over 1980-81. It is also clear from the table that a small reduction in the access of land in the Others made a remarkable progress in the SCs and STs. .mt8.mb9

Table 20

Access to number and area of operational holdings by social groups

States	Scheduled Castes				Scheduled Tribes				Others			
	Number		Area		Number		Area		Number		Area	
	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86
1. Andhra Pradesh	0.85	0.79	0.46	0.44	1.08	1.05	1.06	1.09	1.02	1.04	1.10	1.10
2. Bihar	0.53	0.80	0.29	0.36	0.90	0.98	1.95	2.02	1.08	1.04	1.03	1.02
3. Gujarat	0.57	0.66	0.43	0.49	0.77	0.78	0.56	0.59	1.10	1.07	1.15	1.12
4. Haryana	0.12	0.15	0.07	0.10	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	1.22	1.20	1.23	1.22
5. Himachal Pradesh	1.00	0.96	0.47	0.55	0.94	0.95	0.72	0.88	1.01	1.02	1.20	1.17
6. Jammu and Kashmir	0.84	..	0.89	..	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	1.01	..	1.01	..
7. Karnataka	0.56	0.65	0.40	0.46	0.75	0.81	0.71	0.74	1.10	1.08	1.16	1.12
8. Madhya Pradesh	0.91	0.89	0.56	0.56	1.09	1.07	1.08	1.19	0.99	1.00	1.07	1.07
9. Maharashtra	0.95	0.90	0.63	0.62	0.61	0.74	0.62	0.74	1.04	1.04	1.07	1.07
10. Punjab	0.19	0.16	0.09	0.07	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	1.30	1.32	1.33	1.35
11. Rajasthan	0.83	0.87	0.66	0.68	1.26	1.23	0.69	0.68	0.99	0.99	1.13	1.13
12. Tamil Nadu	0.43	0.61	0.27	0.38	0.65	0.76	0.93	1.05	1.14	1.09	1.17	1.14
13. Uttar Pradesh	0.70	0.75	0.43	0.49	0.95	0.95	1.43	1.43	1.08	1.07	1.15	1.14
14. Kerala	-	0.89	-	0.27	-	0.94	-	1.51	-	1.01	-	1.07
15. Orissa	-	0.88	-	0.55	-	1.20	-	1.32	-	0.96	-	1.00
16. West Bengal	-	1.00	-	0.85	-	1.27	-	1.23	-	0.98	-	1.17

Source : Computed.

2. Irrigational status

The statewide break up of net irrigated area and net area sown by social groups as given in Table 21 clearly shows that 2.3 per cent of the net irrigated area and 2.5 per cent of the net sown area was controlled by SCs in 1980-81 in Punjab but the percentage of Scheduled Castes population to the total population was 26.87 per cent in Punjab (Table 1); 13.8 per cent of the net irrigated area and 13.5 per cent of the net sown area was controlled by SCs in Himachal Pradesh but the percentage of SCs population to the total population was 24.63 per cent in 1980-81 (Table 1); the percentage of net irrigated and net area sown was 8.2 per cent and 24.0 per cent respectively for STs in Madhya Pradesh but the percentage of STs population to the total population was about 23 per cent in 1980-81 (Table 1); 98.8 per cent of net irrigated area and 98.7 of the net area sown was controlled by the Others but the percentage of population to the total population of Others was about 80 per cent in Haryana in 1980-81. The percentage of population to total population was about 63 per cent for the Others in Madhya Pradesh but the net irrigated area and net area sown were 82.4 per cent and 67.7 per cent respectively in 1980-81.

Table 21

Distribution of net irrigated and net area sown by Social Groups
(Area in '000 ha.)

States	All Social Groups				Scheduled Castes				Scheduled Tribes				Others			
	Net irrigated area		Net sown area		Net irrigated area		Net sown area		Net irrigated area		Net sown area		Net irrigated area		Net sown area	
	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86
Andhra Pradesh	3435	3517	10753	10152	150	191	725	753	99	106	744	762	3192	3220	9284	8637
					(4.4)	(5.4)	(6.7)	(7.4)	(2.7)	(3.0)	(6.9)	(7.5)	(92.9)	(91.6)	(86.3)	(85.1)
Assam	176	169	2712	2753	2	2	112	114	25	26	402	412	149	141	2198	2227
					(1.1)	(1.2)	(4.1)	(4.1)	(14.2)	(15.4)	(14.8)	(15.0)	(84.7)	(83.4)	(81.1)	(80.9)
Bihar	2766	3087	7730	7517	108	150	350	393	53	97	986	958	2605	2840	6394	6166
					(3.9)	(4.9)	(4.5)	(5.2)	(1.9)	(3.1)	(12.8)	(12.7)	(94.2)	(92.0)	(82.7)	(82.0)
Gujarat	1434	1614	9602	9426	30	49	287	323	32	5	768	814	1372	1512	8547	8289
					(2.1)	(3.0)	(3.0)	(3.4)	(2.2)	(3.3)	(8.0)	(8.6)	(95.7)	(93.7)	(89.0)	(87.9)
Haryana	2110	2449	3476	3504	25	48	44	58	2085	2401	3432	3446
					(1.2)	(2.0)	(1.3)	(1.7)	(98.8)	(98.0)	(98.7)	(98.3)
Himachal Pradesh	94	97	579	584	13	15	78	91	9	9	22	25	72	73	479	468
					(13.8)	(15.5)	(13.5)	(15.6)	(9.6)	(9.3)	(3.8)	(4.3)	(76.6)	(75.3)	(82.7)	(80.1)
Jammu & Kashmir	306	314	715	723	17	40	52	78	289	274	663	64
					(5.6)	(12.7)	(7.3)	(10.8)	(94.4)	(87.3)	(92.7)	(89.2)
Karnataka	1212	1457	10269	10524	54	71	614	764	34	36	351	346	1124	1350	9304	9414
					(4.5)	(4.9)	(6.0)	(7.3)	(2.8)	(2.5)	(3.4)	(3.3)	(92.7)	(92.7)	(90.6)	(89.5)
Madhya Pradesh	2330	2900	18671	19228	218	264	1543	1552	191	202	4473	4696	1921	2434	12655	12980
					(9.4)	(9.1)	(8.3)	(8.1)	(8.2)	(7.0)	(24.0)	(24.4)	(82.4)	(83.9)	(67.7)	(67.5)
Maharashtra	1436	1412	17706	18289	52	64	794	1019	34	42	1058	1250	1350	1306	15854	16020
					(3.6)	(4.5)	(4.5)	(5.6)	(2.4)	(3.0)	(6.0)	(6.8)	(94.0)	(92.5)	(89.5)	(87.6)
Punjab	3378	3702	3797	4027	78	70	96	81	3300	3632	3701	3946
					(2.3)	(1.9)	(2.5)	(2.0)	(97.7)	(98.1)	(97.5)	(98.0)
Rajasthan	2772	3065	14943	15134	249	290	1685	1784	277	343	1232	1330	2246	2432	12206	12020
					(9.0)	(9.5)	(11.3)	(11.8)	(10.0)	(11.2)	(8.2)	(8.8)	(81.0)	(79.3)	(80.5)	(79.4)

Table 21 (Contd.,)

States	All Social Groups				Scheduled Castes				Scheduled Tribes				Others			
	Net irrigated area		Net sown area		Net irrigated area		Net sown area		Net irrigated area		Net sown area		Net irrigated area		Net sown area	
	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86
Tamil Nadu	2942	2346	6020	5574	161	189	293	410	8	5	59	68	2773	2152	5668	5096
					(5.5)	(8.1)	(4.9)	(7.4)	(0.3)	(0.2)	(1.0)	(1.2)	(94.2)	(91.7)	(94.1)	(91.4)
Uttar Pradesh	9608	10922	16430	16466	802	1037	1499	1675	17	30	47	52	8789	9855	14884	14739
					(8.3)	(9.5)	(9.1)	(10.2)	(0.2)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(91.5)	(90.2)	(90.6)	(89.5)
Kerala		252		1543		5		38		1		25		246		1480
						(2.0)		(2.5)		(0.4)		(1.6)		(97.6)		(95.9)
Orissa		885		5245		78		450		88		542		719		3253
						(1.5)		(8.8)		(9.9)		(10.3)		(81.2)		(62.0)
West Bengal		1897		5329		258		1019		86		365		1553		3945
						(13.6)		(19.1)		(4.5)		(10.8)		(81.9)		(74.0)
Remaining States & Union Territories	2804	375	13229	1412	247	8	1459	37	336	210	2799	960	2221	157	8971	415
					(8.8)	(2.1)	(11.0)	(2.6)	(12.0)	(56.0)	(21.2)	(68.0)	(79.2)	(41.9)	(67.8)	(29.4)
Total	36803	40461	136641	137428	2206	2830	9631	10639	11.09	1333	12942	13606	33488	36298	114068	113218
					(6.0)	(7.0)	(7.0)	(7.7)	(3.0)	(3.3)	(9.5)	(9.9)	(91.0)	(89.7)	(83.5)	(82.4)

Note : Figures in brackets indicate percentages.

Sources : 1. All India report of Agricultural Census, 1980-81.
2. All India report of Agricultural Census, 1985-86.

A comparison of data related to 1980-81 with that of 1985-86 shows that the percentage of net area sown has decreased in Madhya Pradesh and Punjab in the case of SCs; decreased in Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, and Tamil Nadu in the case of STs; and increased in Madhya Pradesh and Punjab in the case of Others. The percentage of net sown area has decreased only in Madhya Pradesh and Punjab in the case of SCs and Bihar and Karnataka in the case of STs; and increased in Punjab in the case of Others. Thus the data clearly show that there was an inter-state difference in the net area sown and net area irrigated. The table also shows that the net irrigated area and net area sown was distributed disproportionately to the proportion of population.

In the case of SCs, access to net irrigated land and net sown area had declined in Madhya Pradesh and Punjab in 1985-86 over 1980-81 (Table 22); the access was very low in Punjab, Haryana and Kerala; and the access was more than 1 only in Jammu and Kashmir. In the case of STs, as far as the net irrigated area was concerned, the access was very low in Bihar, Gujarat, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu; the access had declined in Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu; and the access was more than 1 only in Himachal Pradesh. As far as net sown area is concerned, the access was less than 1 in Gujarat and Himachal Pradesh; the access had declined in Bihar, Karnataka and no change in Uttar Pradesh, and the access was very low in Orissa. In the case of Others, the access to irrigated land had increased only in Madhya Pradesh and remained the same in Karnataka and Punjab in 1985-86 over 1980-81. As far as the net sown area is concerned, the access had increased only in Punjab and remained unchanged in Haryana in 1985-86 over 1980-81. The access indices were generally more than 1 for all states except in Jammu and Kashmir where the access had declined to less than 1.

Table 22

Access to net irrigated and net area sown

States	Scheduled Castes				Scheduled Tribes				Others			
	Net irrigated area		Net sown area		Net irrigated area		Net sown area		Net irrigated area		Net sown area	
	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86	80-81	85-86
Andhra Pradesh	0.30	0.35	0.45	0.48	0.46	0.49	1.16	1.23	1.17	1.17	1.08	1.07
Bihar	0.27	0.34	0.31	0.36	0.23	0.39	1.54	1.59	1.22	1.19	1.07	1.06
Gujarat	0.29	0.41	0.42	0.47	0.15	0.23	0.56	0.59	1.23	1.20	1.12	1.13
Haryana	0.08	0.10	0.07	0.09	—	—	—	—	1.23	1.22	1.23	1.22
Himachal Pradesh	0.56	0.62	0.55	0.62	2.08	2.11	0.82	0.98	1.08	1.07	1.17	1.13
Jammu & Kashmir	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Karnataka	0.30	0.31	0.40	0.46	0.57	0.55	0.69	0.72	1.16	1.16	1.13	1.12
Madhya Pradesh	0.67	0.64	0.59	0.57	0.36	0.30	1.04	1.06	1.31	1.34	1.08	1.08
Maharashtra	0.50	0.50	0.63	0.63	0.26	0.32	0.65	0.74	1.12	1.13	1.07	1.07
Punjab	0.09	0.07	0.09	0.07	—	—	—	—	1.34	1.35	1.33	1.35
Rajasthan	0.53	0.55	0.66	0.69	0.82	0.91	0.67	0.71	1.14	1.12	1.14	1.13
Tamil Nadu	0.30	0.43	0.27	0.39	0.28	0.19	0.93	1.14	1.17	1.14	1.17	1.14
Uttar Pradesh	0.39	0.45	0.43	0.48	0.95	1.43	1.43	1.43	1.16	1.15	1.15	1.14
Kerala	—	0.20	—	0.25	—	0.38	—	1.51	—	1.10	—	1.08
Orissa	—	0.10	—	0.57	—	0.44	—	0.46	—	1.30	—	.00
West Bengal	—	0.60	—	0.84	—	0.80	—	1.93	—	1.14	—	1.03

Source : Computed.

Summary and Conclusion

To sum up, the access to land operated by SCs was relatively smaller in size of land as compared to STs and others, while the land operated by the Others was more than that of the SCs and STs. About 97 per cent of the area and holdings under institutional holdings was controlled by Others both in 1980-81 and 1985-86. The average size of land operated by STs was highest as compared to Others. The land cultivated by STs may not be fertile and uncultivable land as that of the land cultivated by SCs and Others, since persons of the Scheduled Tribes live in a hilly terrain. The access to wholly owned and self operated land was low for SCs as compared to STs and others. As far as leasing pattern is concerned, the share of produce was the major leasing pattern. The access to irrigated land, non food crops and cropping intensity was more in the case of others while the access to food crops was more for STs. The access to net sown area was higher for SCs than that of the STs and Others. Access to land operated entirely in the village of residence was higher for STs than that of SCs and others. It is important to note that a small decline in the distribution of land in the Others will make a remarkable progress in the SCs and STs. An attempt has been made to compare the access to land with literacy rates. The data as given in the Table 23 clearly indicates that literacy rate has nothing to do with the access to land by SCs and STs.

Table 23
Literacy rates in 1981

States / India	Scheduled Castes	Scheduled Tribes	Others
1. Andhra pradesh	17.65	7.82	33.91
2. Bihar10.40	16.99	30.17	
3. Gujarat	39.79	21.14	48.14
4. Hariyana	20.15	Nil	39.90
5. Himachal pradesh	31.50	25.93	47.37
6. Jammu and Kashmir	22.44	Nil	27.05
7. Karnataka	20.59	20.14	42.95
8. Kerala55.96	31.79	72.50	
9. Madhya pradesh	18.97	10.68	36.15
10. Maharashtra	35.55	22.29	50.90
11. Orissa22.41	13.96	44.22	
12. Punjab	23.86	Nil	47.11
13. Rajasthan	14.04	10.27	29.31
14. Tamil Nadu	29.67	20.46	51.00
15. Uttar pradesh	14.96	20.45	30.45
16. West bengal	24.37	13.21	48.12
All India	21.38	16.35	41.30

Source : Census of India, Part II B (i), II B (ii) and II B (iii), 1981.

The foregoing discussion clearly shows that the distribution of land was not equal. The bulk of the members of the SCs work as agricultural labourers. The main reason for the low access to land by SCs is mainly due to social and economic oppression. The main reason for the inequality in the distribution of land by size class of operational holdings is that all those who depend on agriculture were not having access to land in an equitable manner. Thus the present study unmistakably shows that there was an inequitable distribution of land holdings favouring more access to the higher and middle castes. Hence, there is a need for state intervention to achieve equality in the distribution of land holdings and to provide the land to the tiller and the landless. It is unrealistic that the inequality can be removed without change in the agrarian structure. Therefore it is suggested that Government should properly amend the land reform legislations to reduce the limit of the ceiling on land holdings and implement it more effectively so that the surplus land should be assigned to the socially and economically vulnerable section of the society, particularly to the SCs as they form a major chunk of the landless agricultural labourers. Ceiling on land holdings should also be applied to the land under institutional holdings on par with the individual holdings. It is now here to be remembered that the Karnataka government fixed the ceiling limit even to the all religious institutions, whereas in Tamil Nadu, the religious and charitable institutions are allowed to own land without any limit. Above all, those who do not work on the land should not be allowed to own land. It is also necessary that the government should enact laws to protect the lands owned or cultivated by SCs from being transferred to non-SCs.

NOTES

1. Kaur S.K, "A national picture", in Dubey S. N, and Ratna Murdla, (Ed.) "*Land alienation and restoration in Tribal communities in India*", Himalaya publishing house, 1977, p.p. 185-86.
2. Vermani, R.C, "*British Colonialism in India*", Authors Guild Publications, Delhi, 1983, p. 58.
3. *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar writings and speeches, vol. 5*, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, 1989, p.21.
4. Ibid. p. 23.
5. Tremenheere, H. "Note on the pariahs of Chengleput", (year of the publication is not known) p. 1
6. Manickam, S., "*Slavery in the Tamil Nadu: A historical over-view*", The Christian literature society, Madras, 1982, p. 6.
7. Kumar Dharma, "*Land and caste in south India*", Cambridge university pres, 1965, p. 190.
8. Ibid. p. 191.
9. Ibid. p. 69.
10. Proceedings of Madras Legislative Council, Vol. XL, P. 212.
11. Ibid. p. 213.
12. Walhouse, M.J., "Archaeological notes: Privileges of servile Castes", *Indian Antiquary*, III (Bombay, July, 1874) as quoted in Manickam, S., *Op. cit.* p. 17.
13. Tremenheere, *Op. cit.* p. 8.

14. *Ibid.* p. 10.
 15. *Ibid.* pp. 54-56.
 16. Indu Rajagopal, "*The tyranny of caste: The non Brahman movement and political development in south India*", Vikas Publishing house pvt limited, 1985, p. 121.
 17. Boag, G. T. "*The Madras Presidency: 1881-1931*", Government Press, Madras, 1933, pp.131-132.
 18. Beteille Andre, "*Caste, class and power: Changing pattern of stratification in a Thanjore village*", University of California press, 1971, pp. 195-96.
 19. Nancharaiah, "*Caste and land: A Study of Shift in land ownership in South India*", unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Andhra University, Waltair, 1985.
 20. Kamble N.D. *Poverty within poverty : A Study of weaker sections in a Deccan village* Sterling publishers, New Delhi, 1979.
 21. Guhan S and Joan P.Mencher, *Iruvelpattu : Revisited*, Working Paper No.28, Madras Institute of Development Studies, Madras 1982.
 22. Athreya V.B. Gangaikondan 1916-1984 : Change and Stability, Working Paper No.56, Madras Institute of Development Studies, Madras, 1985.
 23. Athreya V.B., Vadamalaipuram : A resurvey, Working Paper No.50, Madras Institute of Development Studies, Madras 1984.
 24. Cohn, S Bernard, "The changing status of a Depressed caste", in Mckim Marriot, (Ed) "*Village India: Studies in the little community*", University of Chicago press, 1955, p. 63.
 25. Shankar Kripa, "*Land Sales and land prices in Punjab 1952-53 to 1978-89*", Economic and Political Weekly, Vol.XXII, No.30, July 23, 1988.
 26. Thangaraj M, "*Agricultural land transfers in TamilNadu*", unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Mysore University, 1988.
 27. See: C.T. Kurien, "*Dynamics of rural transformation : A study of Tamil Nadu 1950-1975*, Orient Longman Limited, New Delhi, 1981, p.10.
-