CHAPTER 11

LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Cooperative Joint Farming Society (CJFS) is an institutional mechanism to endow the weaker sections of the society with land assets so as to improve their socio-economic conditions. Since majority of the families of SCs and STs are poor landless labourer households depending solely on agriculture labour for their livelihood, placing land assets in their hands provides them an opportunity to own agricultural land and engage on it improving its productivity. Thus land assignment to these landless segments in the rural areas transform their socio-economic status by providing them land asset ownership, gainful agricultural employment and improvement in their family incomes. In what follows the review of literature is attempted to focus on two broad themes viz, land reform policies in section A, cooperativisation of agriculture as an institution to gain economies of scale and scope for the benefit of member beneficiaries in section B. Methodology of the study forms part of section C in which are included the objectives of the study, hypotheses, scope and sample design, data bases, limitations and organisation of the thesis.

SECTION A: LAND REFORM POLICY AND INSTITUTIONS

Grigory Kotovsky in his book 'Agrarian Reforms in India', studied land reforms along the dimensions viz., reform of the system of land holding and reform of the system of land cultivation. Under the reform of system of land holding, he reviewed the place for, or attempted at, imposition of ceiling on land
holding and opposition therefor since pre-independence days. All Indian Kissan Sabha, 1946, demanded 25 acre per land holder ceiling for self cultivation and redistribution of land among the peasants. Economic programme documents of 1947-48 of Indian National Congress pointed to the need of fixing maximum amount of land a private person could hold1.

First Five Year Plan recommended in principle the upper limit to the amount of land an individual may hold. Agra session of AICC in 1954 adopted a resolution that the state governments should take immediate steps to fix ceilings on land holdings so as to distribute the surplus land among landless workers. Ajmer session of AICC observed though in many states intermediaries had been eliminated, this had not resulted in tillers owning the land. Concentration of land ownership was shown by a Census of Land Holdings held in 1954-55 and also by the eighth round of the NSS 1953-54. Government commissions were set up to draw up recommendations for new land legislation in 1950s. Avadi (1954-55) and Amritsar (1956) AICC sessions underscored the need for carrying out agrarian reforms as early as possible2.

Agrarian programme of second Five Year Plan and Panel on Land Reforms gave a picture of implementation of legislations covering Zamindari abolition and tenency, and specific recommendations in regard to ceiling on land holdings and development of agricultural producers cooperatives3. Report of the

1 Grigory Kotovsky, Agrarian Reforms in India, Peoples publishing House, Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi, 1964, p.83.
2 Ibid, pp.84-85.
3 Ibid, p. 88.
Indian Delegation to China on Agricultural Planning and Technique (1956) and report of Indian Delegation to China on Agrarian Cooperatives (1957), recommended the ceiling on land holdings. Nagpur Session of AICC resolved fixing land ceilings on existing and future holdings and abolition of intermediaries in all states by the end of 1959. The legislation on land ceiling had been completed in all states by 1969. The land ceiling laws enacted by the states preserved small middle and rich land holders by setting ceilings on land holdings too high a level.

Planning Commission, (1958), recommended fixing the ceiling at three times size of family holding, the family holding being the plot of land yielding a net income of Rs. 1200 per year. Based on the above review the author observed that the agrarian policy would not solve the main problem which was to give away with concentration of land in the hands of landlord class and to transfer the land to the tillers of the soil. To him, Bhooman movement donation of land by rich farmers to be distributed among landless poor peasants, and Gramdan movement, donation of village where land belongs to everybody, initiate by Acharya Vinoba Bhave served as a break on the revolutionary struggle of the peasants for land. In his book the author also reviewed reform of the system of land cultivation. The main focus was on cultivated land under leases resulting in exploitation of peasantry.

4 ibid, p.88.
5 ibid, p. 94.
6 ibid, p. 102.
By NSS (1953-54), 20.34 per cent of the cultivated land was held under leases. The principle lessors were big land holders. The higher the size of the land holding, the greater the proportion of the families in that size group leasing out the land. This was also supported by census of land holdings and cultivation taken for different states during same years. Responding to the situation all states passed laws regulating tenancy relations with the purpose of securing the rights of occupancy tenancy to the tenants. The legislation also provided for the rights of tenants to acquire the ownership of land cultivated by them under certain conditions. One of the important limitations of early legislation was that crop sharing tenants were not recognised as tenants. In some states the tenants failed to get permanent and heritable rights permanently.

In some states permanent occupancy rights were granted only when the leased land was cultivated for long time. It was also observed, even after legislation, there was a large scale eviction of occupancy tenants. Moreover, the legislation prohibiting the eviction of present tenants, covered only a 9 per cent of the land area under tenant cultivation and by conferred the rights on land owners to evict tenants. A very low per cent of tenants could able to purchase land from landlords or from other land owners. Thus the goal of tenancy legislation to confer tenancy rights on large member of tenants had not been achieved. Another dimension of tenancy legislation was the regulation of rent payable under tenancy. Under the recommendations of the First Plan the maximum rates of rent should not exceed 20-25 per cent of the value of crop. It was observed in the Third Five Year Plan that in several states the rent was

\[\text{\cite{ibid, p.103.}}\]
about a one-third of the value of produce. The development in the positive direction in regulation of rent under tenancy regulation might reduce the rates of rent to one-sixth of the produce. But the empirical studies showed that the rent paid for land cultivated under tenancy was on the average higher than the rate fixed by law. It was further remarked that the tenants belonging to different size holdings took differential advantage, large tenants being in a better position. Other limitations noticed in this respect were the machinery to reduce rents had not been invoked; machinery for fixation of fair rents on leased land was also not functioning. Wherever tenure rights were insecure the rents were higher; and the tenants could not receive written receipts for the rents paid, defying the implementation of provisions of tenancy legislation.

Another aspect served by the author is consolidation of holdings. Though there were attempts in pre-independence India to consolidate peasant holdings by the exchange of plots between the individual holders, they were few and far between. After independence special legislation for compulsory consolidation of holdings was enacted for the most of the states. First and Second Five Year Plans also envisaged consolidation of holdings as one of the important measures for the reorganisation of Indian agriculture. The effect of this legislation was that consolidation benefited upper stratum of peasantry, since it was the larger peasant holdings that were scattered. The poorest peasantry became impoverished and transformed themselves into landless agricultural laborers.

\[\text{Ibid, p. 140.}\]

\[\text{Ibid, p. 148.}\]
S.C. Jha provided in his book 'A critical Analysis of Indian Land Reform Studies', measures of land distribution under ceiling measures and floor measures. He commented that the first two plans emphasised on ceilings with no clear cut indication as to what they were expected to achieve and in what manner. The author also presented the criterion or methodology for determining the appropriate ceiling level by referring to merits and limitations of each. The criteria suggested were economic holding evolved by Zamindari Abolition Committee. Economic holding was implicitly the family holding meeting the considerations such as affording reasonable standards of living, providing full employment to the family of normal size and at least a pair of good bullocks and bearing on other relevant factors. But this concept of economic holding suffered, for a limitation of inadequate use of economic principles in determining ceiling. Using this criteria Land Reform Panel appointed by the Planning Commission in its report said that the ceiling was to be placed at three times of family holding, yielding a gross income of Rs. 1600 or net income of Rs. 1200 per annum (1958). But this measure was criticised for the following reasons. There was no reference to standard of living desired for the farmers and level of income necessary for the desired standard of living.

Another criterion discussed was plough unit holding as an addition to economic holding. This criterion suggested that family holding should be equal to a plough unit that could be cultivated by the help of pair of bullocks. But the plough unit norm had to be worked out for irrigated and non-irrigated areas.

---

10 S.C. Jha, A Critical Analysis of Indian Land Reform Studies, India Institute of Asian Studies, Bombay, 1971, p. 8
within a region and also by division of an area by phiscial conditions. Yet another criterion suggested was work unit holding for determining family holding. The criterion stated that family holding should have covered an area sufficient enough to be cultivated by the family labour and occasionally hiring hired casual labour. But in determining the ceiling using this criterion earners in the family should be taken into account. Some suggested provision for full employment for family member could be made by adding units of land through leasing or by transferring labour to non-farm sector. This criterion to be effective necessitates estimation of labour requirements per acre in different regions with varying soil and crop mix and irrigation facilities. Then it could be easy to calculate the employment potential per an average size of farm family\textsuperscript{11}.

The study also focused on the issues of the availability of surplus land and image of new farm organisation. There were two problems. One problem was too small a surplus land available to meet land hunger of many and small fragments of land if surplus was to be distributed among landless laborers, accentuating the problem of small holdings. Another problem was the size of the land was to be adequate enough to provide the holder with subsistence. Then only a small number could be satisfied by redistribution of surplus land available over and above ceiling. In that case the reform would not be worth pursuing. There were two alternatives. One was to redistribute the land among those whose individual farm holdings were below the economic size so that they could have holdings of minimum economic size. But this leaves large member of landless laborers without benefit of redistribution of land. The alternative of distributing the

\textsuperscript{11} ibid, p.10.
surplus land among all the prospective cultivators might appease the land hunger, defeating the purpose of creating economic size holding.

Relating to the image of new farm organisation, there are two schools of thought: one school argues fixing land ceiling at a low level and to distribute surplus among large section of agriculture population creating of millions of small holdings. This is justified not only an equity and social justice considerations but also efficiency of farm production. The other school is convinced about the superiority of the large holdings and it is opposed to any land ceiling. But interestingly the advocates of large scale farming are proponents of land ceiling with idea of land distributed in small parcels among large agricultural population should be consolidated either through inducement or coercion through joint farming cooperatives or collectives. They argue that without cooperatives, collectives or state farms economic reorganisation for operation of the existing numerous small land units is impossible. They further argue without being members of the cooperatives, the small farmer can never avail technical financial or other external aid. The author concludes the major defect lies not with the size of holding but with the supply and credit policy of the Government which are not conducive to the small holders.¹²

Coming to floor measure Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee stated that lands below the basic holding should not be allowed to be cultivated independently and they should be pooled into some type of cooperative productive organisation. But the problem was what was the basic land holding

¹² ibid, 06.15-16.
was not at all defined. The land redistribution approach needs to be justified from the point view of productive organisation. The abolition of the independent existence of smaller land units can only be subsequent to land redistribution and consolidation.

P.S. Appu in his book, "Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings", traced out evolution of national policy on land reforms. He reviewed, in brief, the official policy during plan periods. The First Plan, while placing accent on increased production, considered small and economic holdings were the root cause of many difficulties in the way of agricultural development. Hence he did not visualise any large scale redistribution of land as result of imposition of ceilings on land holdings. A committee setup by Panel on Land Reforms, which was set up by the Planning Commission 1955, was in favour of fixing an absolute ceiling on land holdings to fulfil the objectives of meeting the widespread desire to possess land, reducing inequalities in ownership and operation of the land, inequalities in agriculture incomes, and enlarging the sphere of self employment. The committee favoured fixing of ceiling at three times the family holding. The Second Plan with ambitious programmes of industrialisation, had main goal of meeting increasing requirements of raw materials and food as agrarian policy. Hence imposition of land ceiling on the requirements of social justice and redistribution of land and organisation on cooperative basis were given a back seat. The plan recommended redistribution of surplus land among tenants displaced by resumption of land by landlords, farmers with uneconomic holding and landless labourers without setting priorities among these categories. It was silent on upper limit to the area of land to be allotted to each family. However, it indicated
that settlements should be on cooperative lines. The Third Plan pronounced no
new guideline on question of the ceiling on agriculture holdings. The Fourth
Plan had a very brief reference to the question of ceiling except starting that the
state laws on ceiling were far from being perfect and even the existing
legislation had not been pursued and implemented effectively.\textsuperscript{13}

A.M. Khusro in his book, "The Economics of Land Reform and Farm Size
in India", presented many aspects relating to the economics of land reform, the
minimum feasible size of holding and the optimum size of holding. He suggested
an integrated strategy for a new agrarian structure. He suggested
coopervationisation on small land holdings of the recipients of the surplus land
under ceiling laws, the landless, the marginal farmers and dispossessed tenants.
He suggested land as a lever or incentive for cooperative farming among those
small holders. These groups should be demonstrated that individual allotments
of 1 and 2 acres was wasteful of indivisibilities, hence cooperation. Cooperatives
would only be of small people, un-inhabited by large and unequal elements. To
him, the credit organisation, financial institutions and various service
organisations could move in and provide facilities to cooperativised land.\textsuperscript{14}

He explained the concept of minimum feasible holding, which represents
the concepts of minimum income unit of land, the plough unit of land and the
work unit of land. The minimum size represents the concept of minimum land
holding below which the farm becomes too small to absorb effectively the

\textsuperscript{13} P.S. Apppu, Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings, Ministry of Agriculture, New Delhi, 1972, p.6.

\textsuperscript{14} A.M. Khusro, Economics of Land Reform and Farm Size in India, Macmillan, India, 1973, p.25.
services of a pair of bullocks and the family man power. He observed that neat reconciliation of income unit, plough unit and work unit is not always achieved and some inefficiency inevitably results. Analysing the study of farm management surveys he concluded as a conservative limit of 7.5 acres was accepted as minimum plough unit for the whole of India. Similarly 7.5 acre size represents a unit of land that provides adequate farm employment for the family unit. As per as the income unit is concerned it is 15 acres that would provide Rs. 1,200 per annum.

He dealt at length an integrated analysis of uneconomic holdings. He classified agricultural land holdings and acreage into four meaningful categories: (i) holdings and acreage free from both size and tenure difficulties; (ii) holdings and acreage subject only to size disabilities; (iii) holdings and acreage subject only to tenurial disincentives; and (iv) holdings and acreage subject both to size disabilities and tenurial disincentives.\(^{15}\)

When the households are found to be subject to difficulties of size, they could admit of some structural changes such as an enlargement of their size through reclamation and consolidation of holdings through cooperative farming and other devices. The question here is to give wait not only to intensification of inputs and establishment of service organisation but also the need for structural changes of size. Cooperative farming and land reform as devices to bring transformation in agrarian structure have to be intensified, if size-tenure reform were needed.

\(^{15}\) ibid, p.94.
P.C. Joshi in his book, "Land Reforms in India: Trends and Perspectives", dealt with agrarian studies in India before and after independence. The following pre-independent agrarian studies were referred having political genesis. Most of the studies were initiated by those concerned directly with formulation of land and revenue policies or the critique of these policies, not by professional social scientists. Major changes initiated during pre-mutiny phase of British rule in the traditional agrarian system led to land problems in modern India and its socio-economic impact. The mutiny marked the beginning of new era of maintenance of status quo in the institutional structure, specially the property structure. Hence no changes in the existing system of land ownership and tenancy. This ultimately resulted in what is called colonial theory of poverty and economic backwardness by Gunnar Myrdal. This theory explains away India's poverty and backwardness without reference to economic and social framework created under British rule. Ranade emphasised on the link between agriculture degeneration and industrialization. Another critique of colonial theory was R.C. Dutt who attributed agriculture backwardness to the British-created institutional framework of agriculture production. In concrete terms he also showed how lack of industrialization accentuated basic evils of the agrarian structure including preponderance of tenancy under small sized holdings. The marxist viewpoint was the conflict of interest in Indian rural society between different classes specially landlords, money lenders and traders on one hand, and peasants and landless masses on the other. The radical nationalists and Marxists advocated drastic changes in the land and revenue systems in favour of the peasants and landless labour. A few of social scientists imparted professionalism. Radha Kamal Mukherjee developed the concept of rural communalism as an institutional form
of economic activity as well as an integrative normative principle of social life in the east. This concept was oriented to more social mobility than economic growth, which required modification to suit the requirements of modern economic growth. He favoured peasant-agriculture supported by a cooperative institutional framework for credit, marketing inputs and irrigation, etc. So he observed that the rural community movements on the cooperative organisation were thus in the forefront of social programmes to arrest the disintegrative effects of urbanism.\(^{16}\)

P.T George in his book, "Ceiling on Land Holdings in India: A Review", presented evolution of the policy by referring to its origin, AICC election manifesto, 1946, which declared that reform of the land system involved removal of intermediaries between peasants and state. He also referred to Agrarian Reforms Committee, 1949, which expressed not to put a ceiling on individual holding was irrational and unjust. Since supply of land in relation to the people seeking it was so limited, the First Plan Document also said there should be upper limit to the extent of land that individual may hold. This plan also commented on the concept of family holding as suggested by Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee for fixing maximum limit. There was also reference to panel on land reforms set up by the planning commission 1955 to review the progress in implementation of land reform policy proposed in the First Five Year Plan and examine the steps needed to be taken in the Second Five Year Plan. The panel appointed a committee to go into the problem of size of holdings. The

committee felt that the ceiling should apply to the owned land for personal cultivation. The committee employed the concept of income unit, plough unit and work unit in defining family holding. It also examined three alternatives for the distribution of surplus land. These were: (i) state to acquire the surplus land and distribute to the landless according to some prescribed norms; (ii) to requisition and settle the tenants on the lands and (iii) to ask landholders to lease out surplus land to tenants.

The committee was in favour of the second alternative as it could not involve payment of compensation for acquired land. Regarding distribution, the committee could not agree on priority to be given to different categories of persons. The committee also favoured fixing the floor below which no farm should be allowed to fall to avoid the problems of inadequate or disproportionate equipment, backward techniques and inefficiency of unemployment and wasted labour, poverty and exploitation. During the Second Plan period many of the states enacted ceiling legislation, though there was no uniformity in many of the basic aspects. The Third Plan suggested that the ceiling should be applied invariably to the aggregate area held by a family rather than individual members. In brief, the ceiling policy in the first three plans had the objective of reducing the disparities in landholding and providing some land to the landless in the rural areas, without disturbing on going production programmes. The Fourth Plan Document said that there was potentially an important link between land reform and amelioration of the living conditions of landless agricultural workers. The plan wanted to concentrate on systematic

redistribution and resettlement of surplus as well as government waste land and extend credit and other facilities to the allotees. In a nutshell, it assigned an important role to land reforms to ensure greater access to land for the landless. The working group set up prior to formulation of the Fourth Plan considered land reforms and felt that the new technology based on irrigation, seed and fertiliser, made it imperative to quickly distribute all surplus land, since small holdings had also become economical under new technology. The chief Ministers’ Conference 1990 examined certain prepositions relating to land reforms which included the proposition that allotees and other beneficiaries of agrarian reform should get higher priority in the supply of credit, fertilisers, seeds and other inputs. The recommendations of AICC and Congress Land Reforms Committee, the Chief Ministers Conference, evolved certain national guidelines. Among other things these guidelines stipulated while distributing the surplus land, priority was to be given to the landless agricultural labour particularly those belonging to SCs and STs.\footnote{Ibid, pp.8-9.}

According to Sadhu and Singh the scope and objectives of land reform would include the following: (i) abolition of intermediaries; (ii) tenancy reform, which include a. regulation of rent b. security of tenure for tenants c. conferment of ownership on them, (iii) selling on land holdings; (iv) agrarian reorganisation including consolidation of holdings, prevention of sub-division and fragmentation; and (v) organisation of cooperative farms.\footnote{Sadhu and Singh, Fundamentals of Agricultural Economies, Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay 1983, p. 163.}
Ashok Rudra and Pranab Bardhan in their book, 'Agrarian Relations in West Bengal' which was the result to two surveys conducted by them, studied three important aspects like agricultural labourer, tenancy and money lending. Coming to agricultural labourers the study presented patterns of labour relations in agriculture depending upon different combinations of certain number of attributes: duration of contract, basis of payment, frequency of payment, medium of payment, degree to which work obligations were specified or otherwise, inter linkage with other contracts with employer and freedom to work for different employers. In the survey they classified labourers into following categories: (i) totally unattached or casual labourers or daily labourers; (ii) totally attached labourers or farm servants; (iii) semi-attached labourers. Type 1, who work exclusively for single employer for part of the year and for major part of the year they have freedom to work for other employers; (iv) semi-attached labourers type 2, who are obliged to work for employer whenever called for a stipulated number of days in a stipulated period; and (v) semi-attached labourer type 3 who are obliged to work for the employer whenever called for an unstipulated number of days over on indefinite period.

It was reported in the study that the casual labour families, attached labour families, and semi-attached labour families constitute 84, 10, and 6 percent respectively of the total agricultural families i.e., cultivation plus agriculture labour families in the sample villages surveyed. It was found that the degree of casual labour families was highest in highly advanced villages and reverse was

---

true with attached and semi-attached labourers. Some characteristics of landed agricultural labourers reported in the survey were that the hired labourers, on occasions, had foregone wage earning opportunity for giving priority to own farm work. They found getting consumption loan more difficult. They spent during lean season the excess time on won farms. During lean season, they sought outside work.  

Jeffrey P. Bonner in his book, "Land Consolidation and Economic Development in India", a study of two Haryana villages, analysed the impact of land consolidation on the agricultural system of study villages which were in turn related to other changes in village economy and society. The advantages of consolidation over the scattered and irregularly scattered fields characteristic of fragmented holdings are the following as revealed by the study. The two main long-term effects on consolidation of holdings are: (i) consolidation changes patterns of land utilisation; and (ii) consolidation creates conditions that encourage rapid expansion of irrigation agriculture. Relating to the first advantage consolidation increases the cultivated acreage i.e., horizontal expansion of agriculture that rises overall potential of the production base of the economy. It also leads to the rapid expansion of irrigation agriculture at the expense of rain-fed agriculture which changes agriculture system in four ways. As irrigation spreads across the village lands, it leads to local micro environmental variations resulting in increased specialisation of cropping. The second change is the rise in intensity of cropping. The third consequence is the

21 Ibid, p 7.

shift from subsistence cropping to market-oriented cropping. The fourth is
adoption of high yielding varieties. The modernisation of agriculture techniques
is also one of the noticed changes. These changes ultimately lead to a rising
economic status of villagers, a shift in the economic basis of the village life from
exchange-in kind to cash transactions and changes in nature and extent of
Jajmani relationship. The study considered number of criteria which included
cropped area per person, cropping pattern, extent and intensity of cultivation,
extent of irrigation, etc. The study had the following conclusions to offer.
Consolidation had a influence on land utilisation. It was found the rapid increase
in the cultivated areas was at the expense of common grazing land and other
portions of village lands not used for agriculture purposes. Cropping intensity,
the total matured cropped area by net area sown, which is also an index of
multiple cropping, was also noticed very high. It was in the excess of 170 per
cent. As cropping intensity increased there was a corresponding decrease in the
area under follow in the study villages. The changed intensity of irrigation,
computed by dividing a net area irrigated, by the net area sown, had climbed
fairly and steadily from the time of consolidation. No change was noticed in the
cropping pattern as measured by the index of cropping diversification by dividing
the total harvested area under ‘n’ crops, where ‘n’ equals the member of crops
which individually occupied 5 per cent or more of the harvested area.\textsuperscript{23}

presented achievements of land distribution to landless tribes. He identified
three sources of land for the purposes of settling landless agricultural workers,
which were as follows: (i) cultivable waste and other land of the state

\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Ibid}, p.3.
government; (ii) surplus land declared after execution of legislation on ceiling of the holdings; and (iii) Bhoodan and Gramdan lands. The author present a potential under these three sources for the distribution of land. Plan wise data was presented revealing extent of land distributed to SCs and STs state-wise.\footnote{M.L. Patel, Changing Land Problems of Tribal India, Progress Publishers, Bhopal 1989, p.28.}

K.C. Mishra in his book, "Land systems and Land Reforms" dealt among other things, with land reforms in Orissa since sixties under the themes and sub-themes such as peasant proprietorship, ceiling on land, land ceiling and socio-economic justice in the context of farm productivity, mechanization, unemployment, consolidation of holdings and issue of rent.\footnote{K.C. Misra, Land Systems and Land Reforms, Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay, 1990 p. 501.} Harikishan Singh surject, in his book, 'Land Reforms in India', presented, among other things, the declared surplus land under land ceiling laws state-wise, and surplus land taken over and surplus land distributed with reference to 1985-86. He concluded only 1.26 per cent of the land was distributed. The distributed land constituted one-fourteenth of land which was originally plan to be distributed. He also presented state-wise figures with respect to number of beneficiaries who got benefitted under surplus land distribution. He also provided the state-wise figures relating to a number of scheduled cast beneficiaries of surplus distributed land along with extent of area, with reference to the year 1985-86. In his book was also presented the distribution of wasteland state-wise. Out of 124.61 lakh acres of government waste land distributed, Andhra Pradesh topped the list with 30.4 lakh acres, followed by U.P. with 22.28 lakh acres, Gujarat 13.73 lakh acres, Karnataka 13.22 acres, Maharashtra 10.23 lakh acres, Bihar 9.75 lakh acres Orissa 6.64 lakhs acres. He also presented state-wise figures of land received as gift under
Bhoodan Movement, land distributed out of it and surplus land yet to be distributed. The total land for entire country received as gift was 45.9 lakh acres out of which 23.23 lakh acres were distributed leaving 22.67 lakh acres undistributed²⁶.

"Land Reforms in India Volume 1: Bihar-Institutional constraints", edited by B.N. Yugandhar and Gopal Iyer, dealt with four major themes in first volume. The first theme is related to perspectives which studied land reforms under broad perspectives like growth with social justice, and land to the tillers of the soil, simultaneously focussing light on issues like productivity, land consolidation and sustained agricultural development. The second theme related to empirical studies on land ceiling, reported the weak implementation of land ceilings, stressed the imperative need of redefining 'personal cultivation' and also pointed out the success in implementation land ceiling laws wherever they had been mobilisation of people. The third set of papers relate to the status of tenancy reform in Bihar state highlighting wide spread of share cropping and informal tenancies, the frequent changes of plot and eviction of share croppers from land and exploitative rate of rent for leased land. The fourth theme dealt with is related to allotment of Government land to weaker sections. A few of the conclusions relating to the underprivileged are worth mentioning here²⁷. There was a considerable gap the extent of government land under use for cultivation and extent of land allotted. The state of Bihar this gap of as much as 76.43 percent.


The norms of allotment were generally adhered since overwhelming proportion of beneficiaries and major extent of land allotted was to weaker sections consisting of SCs and STs. Most of the allottees continued to have physical possession of the lands allotted to them. Allotment made considerable differences in the social and psychological status of allottees, though the impact on their economical status was marginal, because the average extent of the allotted land was less than one acre and its quality was poor. Hence the allotted lands need to be reclaimed and developed, and the allottees should be linked with nonland inputs like irrigation, fertilizers, etc and there was little assistance from the government agencies, which was one of the weakest links in the chain. Most of the government land was encroached from the dominant class.

"Land Reforms in India. Vol.3: Andhra Pradesh Peoples Pressure and Administrative Innovations" edited by B.N. Yugandhar, presented focus on government land and its distribution. In Andhra Pradesh the distribution of land at the disposal of the government, commonly known as banjar land, constituted an important component of land reform programme. It was estimated, by the end of 1992, about 37.29 lakh acres had been assigned to landless poor, numbering to 19.13 lakh beneficiaries. Of the total land allotted 11.24 lakh acres were allotted to scheduled castes and 6.06 lakh acres to scheduled Tribes. The land allotted to the poor in A.P. including ceiling surplus land, while constituting 1.5 per cent of the area, amounted to 12.5 per cent of the operated area. A few more facts with respect to land reform were also presented in this book. By 1992, out of the estimated surplus land of 8 lakh acres, 5.72 lakh acres of land was taken surplus and 5.11 lakh acres had so far been distributed. Much of this land was dry land.

\[\textit{Ibid, p.318.}\]
On the whole, re-assignment of the rural economy as a result of surplus land distribution can be only minimal. Hence the focus has shifted from distribution of surplus to government waste land. Out of 32 lakh acres distributed, four-fifths of it was wasteland. Relating to socio-economic impact of land allotment on beneficiaries, the following were reported. Though the income of the assignee was doubled when compared to that of pre-assignment period, the assignees were still below the official poverty line. The assignees were not provided with monetary assistance to purchase basic inputs. No specialised body was created at the state level with linkages with district unit to channelise necessary funds and services to assignees. Most of the assignees of land were casual or daily wage labourers. One of the limitations pointed out in this study was developmental agencies like DRDA, Scheduled Caste Finance Corporation, etc., make virtually no attempt to integrate allottees into their schemes. Of the total 4.42 lakh beneficiaries of allotted land 64 per cent were from SCs and STs and 31 per cent from BCs. Land allotted to many beneficiaries is of the poor quality, that too in small, greatly fragmented plots.

Ratna Murdia in the article, "Land Allotment and Alienation: Policies and Programmes for Scheduled castes and scheduled Tribes", presented the following facts. Though these castes derive livelihood by working on land, they are the most disadvantaged in respect to land as the incidence of landlessness is high. According to 1961 census there were 3.16 crore agricultural labourers in India, out of whom 33 per cent belonged SCs and 10 per cent STs. Regarding to land holdings 74 per cent of SC cultivators and 54.71 per cent of ST cultivators had holdings below 5 acres of land. Further productivity of land owned by them is

low, due to low fertility, primitive methods of agriculture, and poor irrigation facilities. In Andhra Pradesh 24.09 per cent of SCs held less than one acre of land. A problem relating to land is more serious in the case of Schedule Tribes than Schedule caste due to alienation of land to nontribals.

The measures adopted by the state governments to ameliorate the economic conditions of these groups can be put under two categories. Promotional measure undertaken to these groups on priority basis; and protective measures undertaken for controlling alienation of land especially from tribals to non-tribals. Allotment of land to landless labourers is one of the major programmes for improving the economic status for SCs and STs.

Priorities in the laws governing the allotment of land to SCs and STs were also reported. These priorities were recommended by the Commissioner, Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, 1968-69. SCs and STs having small holdings should be given first priority in allotment so as to make their holdings economically viable. The second priority should be given to landless labourers among SCs and STs allotting them lands whose sizes are of minimum economic size as recommended by the committee on untouchability. Fifty per cent of the total surplus land available should be reserved for SCs and STs, because they constitute 50 per cent of total landless agriculture labour. It should be also be ensured that required land be allotted without recovering the costs from the allottees, because most of the land allotted to them is of inferior quality. Immediately after allotment, the committees felt sufficient assistance should be given to the allottees for purchase of agriculture implements, bullocks, fertilisers,
seeds, etc. Harpal Singh in the article, 'Structural Changes in the Size Distribution of Holding: A Macro View', studied this phenomenon from 1953-54 to 1970-71 to identify the pace and direction of change using Lorenz ratio and Gini coefficient. The Gini coefficient concentration of land among ownership holdings had slightly increased over the period. In contrast, the Gini coefficient for operational holdings gave a significantly lower value in 1970-71 over 1953-54 and 1959-60. The Gini coefficient of concentration of the operational holdings excluded the impact of swelling number of landless households. Finally it was reported that distribution of land holdings was in the direction of equal distribution, which was exemplified by declining share of large farms, 15 acres and above, in number as well as total area and increasing number of small and very small farms, in the total number of operational holdings as well as total area operated.

A.S. Sirohi, G.S. Ram and C.B. Singh in their article "Inter-State Disparities in the Structural Distribution of Land Holdings in Rural India" concluded for the country as a whole the number of holdings as well as area increased over the period in all size groups except large holdings. The largest increase was noticed in the case of marginal holdings followed by small farmers in terms of both number and area. As to leasing of land the net area leased-in increased in the marginal and small groups. It was interesting to note that the largest increase was noticed in the case of marginal farmers who leased-in an area almost equal to half of their owned area. Quite interestingly the overall net leased-in area was


zero in the size group of 2-4 hectares of land. So this suggested a minimum size of 2-4 hectares is necessary, proving the practice of leasing in by small and marginal farmers.

In the Rapporteur’s Report on Changes in the Structural Distribution of Land Ownership and Use Since Independence, C.H.Hanumantha Rao presented the following summary. Inequality in the distribution of land owned in rural India had shown a decline, particularly in the sixties. The inequality in the distribution of area operated had also declined, but the decline was less marked than in the case of owned land. At any point of time the distribution of operated area was less unequal than owned area due to the fact the small and marginal farmers leased-in area, bulk of which was leased-out by large farmers. But one disturbing trend was significant increase in number of landless and marginal farmers. The land ceiling reform, the former contributing to more equality and the latter to more inequality due to resumption of land by lessors. While posing the issues for discussion, among other things, the question of economics of scale and cooperative farming, the physical and institutional infrastructure i.e., irrigation and credit institutions for supporting the small and marginal farmers, were raised.

D Bandhyapadhya, in his article ‘Land Reforms in India: An Analysis’ made a reference to Sixth Five Year Plan and stated that progress of land reform had been less than satisfactory, not due to policy abuse but due to poor implementation, particularly in the matter of ceiling laws, consolidation of

---

holdings and lack of vigorous pursuing of concealed tenancies and vesting the tenants with tenancy and occupancy rights. The plan indicated a frame for the completion of different tasks under land reforms. It was reported since the inception of land ceiling programme a total of 2.97 million hectares had been declared surplus under the pre-revised and revised ceiling laws. 79.35 per cent of the area declared surplus had been taken possession of. 61.29 per cent of area declared surplus had been distributed under pre-revision and revised laws. 43.61 per cent of the area distributed had been given to members of scheduled castes and scheduled tribes who account for 54.63 per cent of the total number of beneficiaries. The declared surplus land was less than 2 per cent of the cultivated area. There was also a reference to Seventh Plan stating that the core of the antipoverty programme lies in the endowment of income generating assets on those who have little or none of those. Hence redistribution of land under land reforms and security of tenure to the informal tenants have to be directly integrated with antipoverty package of programmes. It further reiterates land reforms has been a vital element in the antipoverty strategy as well as for modernisation and increase in productivity in agriculture. More over redistribution of land could provide a permanent asset base for large number of rural landless poor for taking up land based and other supplementary activities. Similarly, among other things, consolidation of holdings would widen the access of small and marginal holders to improved technology and inputs and thereby directly leading to increase in agricultural production\textsuperscript{33}.

T. Haque, in his article "Temporal and Regional Variations in the Agrarian Structure in India" using NSS data and employing Gini coefficient, presented an analysis of revised land ceiling laws which came into effect from 1965 on agrarian structure in India. Distribution of land state-wise remained skewed between 1971 and 1981. The article also focused attention on the growth of landless and semi-landless households. For the country as a whole the proportion of landless households to total rural households increased from 9.6 per cent in 1961 to 11.3 per cent in 1981, including semi-land households (with an average land size of 0.2 hectares to 0.5 hectare) along with landless. Their combined share increased from 37.4 per cent in 1971 to 39.9 per cent in 1981. Since the rising proportions of landless, semi-landless and marginal households in majority of the states was matter of serious concern. This problem had to be tackled in an integrated manner thorough far more radical redistribution of land and planned industrialisation and diversification of rural economy.

M.L. Dantwala in his article "Rural Asset Distribution and Composition of Labour Force", dealt with the following. Land is the single largest component constituting 60 per cent of total rural asset, so it is a major determinant in socio-economic and political life and relations in rural community. The article also addressed to diversification of rural economic bringing into focus non-land assets in the rural area and changing composition of rural employment. Between 1970-71 and 1980-81 due to high increase of number of operation holdings and not proportionate increase of the area operated, the average size of operation holding declined from 2.30 to 1.82 hectare. During this period no significant change in
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the composition of assets had taken place, except rather sharp increase in the share of durable household assets. Surprisingly in all the sixteen states there was a decline in livestock. Further the ratio of average value of all assets to cultivator household to that of non-cultivator household had declined in favour of the latter from 5.59 to 4.96. The fact that six types of rural assets excepting land and buildings had been widely distributed among different size classes of operational holdings was corroborated with lower C.V.value of 0.68, which was distinctly lower than the C.V. of distribution of the operation holdings, area-wise (1.39). Regarding to composition of quality of labour force the author employed the criterion of income accruing from particular type of employment, the other criterion would be the degree of dependence and attached conditions involved in the type of employment. Classifying employment under three types of self, regular salary-wage work and casual wage labour-distribution of rural work force was presented at three points of time 1972-73, 1977-78 and 198335, using N.S.S. data. The following are startling features of data. There was a persistent increase in the casual wage labour, more so with males and corresponding decline in self-employment36. Coming to sectoral distribution of work force a percentage engaged in agriculture decline sharply from 83.23 to 76.80 for males and slightly from 89.67 to 85.73 for females37.

Dilip S. Swamy, in his article, Agricultural Tenancy in the 1970s', presented assumption if land reforms were ruled out under the prevailing socio-

36 Ibid, p.279.
37 Ibid, p.280.
political conditions reallocation of land from large land owners to the landless and marginal farmers through the lease market would likely to lead to greater utilisation of both land and labour. Agriculture tenancy, the percentage of leased in area to operated area, remained stable in 1960s’ and declined during 1970s’. The direction of leasing i.e., the extent of leasing-in area as against leasing-out area varied according to the crops grown in a region and as well as the size of the ownership holding. In rice growing regions, leased-in area remained grater than leased-out area for holdings upto 5 acres. The cut-off sizes were higher for wheat growing regions. Relating to vertical tenancy it was reported that in lower size classes the leased in area was generally greater than leased-out area with opposite tendency prevailing in the higher size class. The percentage of area leased-out for sharc cropping to the total area leased out was 56.50 per cent in 1971-72, which declined to 45.92 per cent in 1982. Moreover the decline in external tenancy i.e., leasing by urban household institutions was more than the internal tenancy by the rural households.\footnote{Dilip Swamy, Agricultural Tenancy in the 1970's Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol XXXIII, No.4, Oct-Dec 1989, p.557.}

SECTION B : COOPERATIVE FARMING IN INDIA

A.M. Khursro and A.N. Agarwalas’ book ‘The Problems of Cooperative Farming in India’ presented patterns of agricultural organisation and criterion for choice in Chapter II and agrarian reform and cooperative farming in India in Chapter III and case against cooperative farming in Chapter IV.

Providing reference to five patterns of agricultural organisations viz., small peasant farming, estate or capitalist farming, state farming, collective...
farming and cooperative farming, essentials of these categories were provided. With reference to the essentials of cooperative farming, the following were presented. Though cooperation had long history, cooperative farming was a recent innovation experimented in Eastern Europe, Mexico and China. It has high elasticity of meaning. To some it is the joint use of some essential services without pooling and joint management of land, which borders on peasant farming. Others identify it with collective farming in which there is joint ownership and joint cultivation. Not withstanding its divergent connotations, this form of organisation refers to the system wherein cultivators of an area voluntarily associate together and pool their individual holdings for the purpose of cultivation and manage the whole farm as one unit under an elected management. However, the individual ownership of land is retained, ownership dividend is paid in proportion to the land and some times other assets contributed by the member. Each member working on the farm receives wages at stipulated rate from work done. Its main objective is to combine the incentive of private ownership with size economies possible in agriculture. In its loose connotation this form of organisation is not extended for non-farm operations like marketing, processing, obtaining services like seeds, fertilisers and tools. The criterion considered for selecting for one form of organisation or another includes making agriculture economically efficient. To make it efficient agriculture must be incentive oriented for mass of producers, majority of whom are small peasants. A like this criterion is the criterion of increase in marketed agricultural surplus. Yet another criterion is creation of more employment. These are the social values widely accepted by the community. The economic benefits claimed for present farming—maximum soil fertility, high yields, some surpluses for the market—are true of farming on holdings of economic size, which does not
farm optimum size. Its limitations are: adverse land man ratio and inability to
tackle intricate problems of underdeveloped agriculture on individual basis. In
a political democracy like India organising agriculture on lines of capitalist mode,
collective or state farming is ruled out. Then the only alternative left with is
cooperative farming. This is recommended on the basis of two propositions. This
farm ensures to the members all those things which large farm can do and a
small one cannot undertake. It leads to increased production thereby
increased consumption and marketed surplus. Other farms of cooperatives like
cred cooperatives or service cooperatives can only support and supplement
cooperative farming, but not supplement it, because they do nothing to utilise the
more abundant resources of under-utilised labour for constructing capital.

The third chapter dealt at length with agrarian reform and cooperative
farming. The development of agriculture, the authors said, requires two sets of
measures, one set relates to provision of technical facilities essential for scientific
agriculture and second set relates to the creation and maintenance of
institutional framework. The scientific agriculture should follow and not precede
the required institutional and structural change. The authors built a strong case
for a genuine cooperative farming by marshaling the support this form of
organisation has been receiving since long past. The Policy Committee on
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (1945) recommended the undertakings of
pilot schemes on different types of farm organisation so that the comparative
advantages of different organisations might be determined and suitable one
evolved for wider application. A similar suggestion was made in the year 1946
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by the committee on Cooperative Planning when it said that experimental ventures on types of cooperative farming should be undertaken in two selected villages in each district. This proposition was endorsed by the first Indian cooperative congress in 1952 by adopting a resolution to the effect that state and cooperative movement should take vigorous steps to organising cooperative farming societies whenever this formation is feasible and desirable. Indian delegation to China on agrarian cooperatives emphasised the view that cooperative farming is both desirable and necessary for the successful reorganisation of Indian agriculture.

Indian Planning Commission also expressed a similar view when it regarded cooperative farming as essential for bringing into existence sizeable farm units, facilitating application of scientific knowledge on wider scale, increasing capital investment and rising the productivity of land. This view also reflected in the five year plans. During the First Plan a sum of Rs 40 lakh was provided for promoting planned experiments in cooperative farming. State Governments were later requested to draft phased programmes for cooperative farming. The Second Plan felt that over a period of ten years substantial portion of agriculture land was cultivated on cooperative line, and cooperative farming societies were to be given special concessions and subsidies. Conference of State Minister of Cooperation (1956) decided to bring about one cooperative farming Society in every national extension block during the Second Plan Period. Standing committee of the NDC (1967) recommended the conduct of 3,000 cooperative farming experiments during the remaining period of the Second Plan beginning with 600 in 1958-59. The sub-Committee of AICC (1968) which went
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40 Ibid, p.33.
into question of agriculture production, made certain recommendations farming the basis of well known Nagpur resolution of INC supporting cooperatives as the spear head of development.

The book reviewed the progress of cooperative farms state-wise and type-wise. The authors also pointed out some glaring weaknesses of the societies: management in the hands of bigger partner, higher proportion of relatives in total membership, vast disparities in the lands held by the largest and smallest partners. Thus the cooperative would not stand for criteria for genuine cooperation. Ministry of Community Development and Cooperation appointed a Committee of Direction for the assessment of progress and evaluation of the pilot project under the chairmanship of D.R.Gadgil in 1963. While reviewing the progress in chapter II of the report, the committee dwelt at length cooperative farming on Government lands. The committee suggested allotment of waste land which also reflected the policy of government of India in this regard. The following suggestions were made.

i. Compact blocks of land should be settled with cooperative farming societies with minimum number of members and area to be allotted depending upon local conditions.

ii. Surplus lands available under land ceiling laws should also be settled under cooperative farming society as far as possible.

iii. For the available land, cooperative farming societies need not be insisted upon. Instead the allotees should be persuaded to join a service cooperative wherever it exists.
iv. Land should be allotted to cooperative farming societies unreclaimed, except where state reclamation is necessary. When unreclaimed lands are allotted the societies may be provided with the necessary finances for reclamation.

v. Necessary financial assistance may be given to other purpose for various schemes.

vi. To effect permanent improvement on the land security of tenure or occupancy rights, land should be conferred on the society.\(^{41}\)

There was varied response to this policy among the states, Only states like Maharashtra, M.P., Mysore, and Gujarat pursued vigorous action. With the result, 376, 104, 97 and 53 societies were organised in that order in the above states. The total societies organised were 797. This could be possible in the states due to coordinated efforts of revenue and cooperative departments. At the request of the central government, the state governments later formulated a scheme for rehabilitation of landless labourers on cooperative farming lines. Earlier the government framed the proposals for rehabilitation of landless labourer on individual basis. Subsequently the Ministry of Food and Agriculture requested the state governments to associate the state cooperative departments at the time of preparing proposals for the allotment of government waste lands. The committee also presented salient features for cooperative farming society. In cooperative farming society the land can be pooled in two ways.

1. The ownership may be retained by the individuals (joint farming).

\(^{41}\) Ibid, p.p. 34-35.
2. The ownership may belong or be transfer to the society (collective farming)\textsuperscript{42}

S.K. Goyal in his book 'Cooperative Farming in India', reviewed literature relating on cooperative farming in India in chapter IV. The review was made for two period, the first covering 1946-56 and the second 1956 and after. Then the author made some observations on cooperative farming and presented progress. The first period covered the following aspects, Cooperative Planning Committee, on the recommendations of the fourteenth Registrars' Conference, suggested cooperative farming as a measure to enlarge the unit of cultivation for more economic use of land. It suggested four types of cooperative farming societies viz., cooperative better farming societies, cooperative joint farming societies, cooperative tenant farming societies and cooperative collective farming societies. 

The cooperative farming societies were recommended by the committee for two purposes:

(i) to secure more output by introducing better methods of cultivation and by increasing the size of cultivation holdings and

(ii) to rehabilitate ex-soldiers (1946).

In 1947 Mohites Report on Cooperative Farming in Bombay state was submitted. The committee came to the conclusion that cooperative farming should be started on government waste, forest lands and acquired leased sites and the expenditure should be borne by the government and recovered later from

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid, p.10
cooperative farms. Reserve Bank of India Publication, 1949, observed that cooperative farming enabled small farmers to increase production, while reducing working expenses. The Ministry of Agriculture publication, 1949, presented the case for cooperative farming on these grounds: better economic security to the farmers, better adjustment of production to the market needs, and bringing erstwhile individualistic elements in the common fraternity. The Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee, 1947, recommended compulsory cooperative joint farming for cultivators whose holdings were below basic size and who formed 40 to 50 per cent of the total Indian cultivators and some form of compulsory cooperative better farming for the rest. The committee rejected two types of cooperative farming societies viz., cooperative tenant farming society and cooperative collective farming society.

Review of literature after 1956 included the following. The Second Five Year Plan made the important statements with regard to cooperative farming, restricting the concept only to such societies pooling the land and jointly managing it. The entire literature of this period can be grouped under three heads:

1. Advocating cooperation as a national policy;
2. Opposing the idea; and
3. Examining the benefits of cooperative farming, keeping in view the present problems of Indian agriculture.

43 S.K. Goyal, Cooperative Farming in India, Asia Publishing House, Bombay 1966, p.70.
44 Ibid, pp. 72-73.
The first group included the following. Panel of Land Reforms, 1956, suggested bringing substantial portion of the area under cooperation with in 10 years. Indian Delegation of China on agrarian cooperatives which submitted its report to Planning Commission in 1957 felt that cooperative farming was the only alternative if India was to achieve speedy progress in economic development. In 1957 the NDC recommended the cooperative farming should be organised in all the states. Nagpur session of AICC resolved that the future agrarian pattern should be that of cooperative farming, in which the land would pooled for joint cultivation while farmers retaining the individual rights in the land and getting share from the net produce in proportion to their land. In another resolution it suggested service cooperatives should be organised throughout the country, Nijalingappa Working Group studied the working of cooperative farming societies in some states of the country and recommended the programme of setting up of 20,000 cooperative farming societies by the end of the Third Plan. The group was confident that after this programme the condition would be created, paving the way for cooperative farming to emerge as a pattern of agriculture in the country. The Third Plan reiterated faith of the government in cooperative farming when it observed that contribution of cooperative farming to rural progress would be significant, if it was developed as a voluntary mass movement under genuine local leadership, and as a logical growth of community development and cooperation at village level\(^{46}\).

Some studies were against cooperation, of which the following deserved special mention. The Cooperative UNION brochure put forth a case against cooperative farming on the grounds that the large scale farming was likely to be

\(^{46}\) Ibid, p.79.
uneconomical and had a tendency towards mechanisation creating problems of unemployment and foreign exchange. It was also argued that the form of organisation would change the owner cultivator into a mere worker. Chanan Singh in his book 'Whither Cooperative Farming' found no difference between cooperatives and collectives of Russian type and opposed cooperative farming on two grounds viz. unemployment arising from mechanisation of land and reduced productivity of land due to lack of interest of the farmer in this farm. Range and Parachuri, comparing economies of cooperative and individual farming, felt cooperative farming could not be justified. The arguments advanced were, unlike in industry, economies of scale could not be achieved in agriculture and it would lead to loss of many imponderables like loss of independence, etc.\(^7\)

Among the empirical studies on the already working cooperative societies in the country, some were conducted by the government agencies. They included studies of Programme Evaluation Organisation, Board of Enquiry in Punjab, Indian society of Agriculture, Economics, Agarwal Working Group on Cooperative Farming Societies, and seminar of the Indian Society of Agriculture Economics at Nagpur. Otto Schillers book on 'Individual Farming on Cooperative Lines' studied the subject of cooperative farming dispassionately. He felt the benefits of this farm could be reaped by small farmers by pooling their land for certain agricultural operations, while keeping the individual rights with them. He suggested that the members should pay for common costs according to respective areas and reap their own harvest on their individual fields. This farms would ensure economies of scale available to small farmers without marring individual incentives. Samiuddin, in his book 'cooperative Farming and Its

\(^7\) Ibid p.80.
Impact on Rural Industries', reviewed historical growth of cooperative movement in India. So many of associations like chit funds and Nichis to satisfy the financial needs of the members existed before the official inauguration of cooperative movement in India. First cooperatives societies act was passed in 1904 which gave rise to number of societies, but act was found inadequate to cover non-credit activities. The cooperative societies Act of 1912, while removing the deficiencies of the old act, had an objective of formation of cooperative societies for promoting thrift and self help among agriculturalists, artisans and persons of limited means. Under the government of India Act of 1919 cooperation was transferred to the provisional governments. During 1935-39 development of long term credit through cooperative land development bank was stressed and also the concept of primary societies as multipurpose cooperatives. During 1939-45 the movement began to give greater attention to production and distribution. Number of cooperative stores, milk suppliers, can growers, fruit and vegetable growers, weavers and other industries were developed during this period. In 1945 Cooperative Planning Committee submitted its report recommending the introduction of cooperative farm.

R.B.Tyagi in his book 'Recent Trends in Cooperative Movement in India' dealt in eleventh chapter cooperative farming. This chapter had reference to the working Group on Cooperative Farming headed by Nijalingappa. The committee studied the problem and made certain recommendations falling under 18 broad groups. The committee felt the growth of farming societies should be spontaneous and voluntary. The cooperative farm need not necessarily cover entire village. More than one farming society may be organised in one village, Every society should formulate a programme of production and employment.
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including works of permanent improvement. It also recommended maintenance of accounts of farming societies, with 8 books and registers. Number of recommendations were made to strengthen the finances of the societies and its sources of borrowing. It also recommended better farming and tenant farming society should not be classified as farming societies, since they did not really confirm to the principles of cooperative farming societies. In the allotment of government and surplus land preference should be given to cooperative farming societies. Coming to technical guidance, all the concerned agencies and officers of the development departments in the states at the district level are expected to provide necessary technical guidance.

C.B. Memoria and R.D. Saksena, in their book 'Cooperation in India', assessed the performance of cooperative farming. They felt unless service cooperatives should create a ground by working efficiently, cooperative farming would not help situation. Their review of assessment had the following references, The Planning Commission Report published during second five year plan, covering 22 societies, made a dismal reading. Most of the societies were formed to evade land ceiling laws and most of the members were absentee land holders, did not participate work on the farm. A review of the programme of cooperative farming by the Cooperative Farming Advisory Board showed that the programme had not made any significant headway in many states. It felt successful service cooperatives as a prerequisite for cooperative farming. The Programme Evaluation Organisation of the Planning Commission noticed malpractices both in large and small societies and domination by money lenders.

The Gadgil Committee found success of the societies linked to active interest of non-official leadership. The committee also found the societies had proved the worth and usefulness by providing irrigation facilities, reclamation of land and improved techniques of agriculture production. The committee observed the societies were unable to get adequate finances and technical guidance from the government. Among other recommendations the committee made the following important ones. Small holders be encouraged to form societies, drawing special concessions under the special schemes formulated to help them. The federation be set up at district or regional level, when there are 250 or more societies working in the state. The members should pool their whole land in the society. It also recommended providing money and more land development loans to societies.50

A.C. Ray in his book, Cooperative Farming in India, explained rationales for cooperative farming. Cooperative farming was seen as an attempt towards solution of the problem in India agriculture arising out the archaic tenancy conditions and low productivity of agricultural farms, and cooperative farming was also considered as the most suitable organisation that brings the small farmers together to share the benefits of green revolution.51. It is also eminently suitable organisation in extending agriculture to cultivable waste lands. It also ensures social status and higher standard of living to landless labour and marginal and sub-marginal owner cultivators. It would also provided the scope of much needed consolidation of fragmented land holdings. The author


reported the proceedings of F.A.O. Regional Seminar on Cooperative Farming for Asia and the Far East held in New Delhi in 1966. The seminar suggested criteria for assessing the economic success of cooperative farming. The criteria are:

(1) ability to pay all inputs;
(2) ability to pay wages to workers including labour put in by the members;
(3) ability to pay nominal return on capital employed including land;
(4) ability to generate adequate residue;
(5) facilitating continuing investment for the development of society; and
(6) contributing to increasing production and productivity in terms of yields and labour output helping the rising standard of living of members. The book also dealt with aspects like organisation, financial assistance, technical guidance, training and education.\textsuperscript{52}

R.D.Bedi in chapter XXVIII of his book, 'Theory, History and Practice of Cooperation' focused on cooperative farming establishing need for cooperative farming in India. Some important features of it, the working, progress and policy changes during the first five year plan were presented in it.\textsuperscript{53}

V.Sharada in her book, 'The Theory of Cooperation' also categorised cooperative farms into four groups by listing out benefits of cooperative farming

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid. p.63.

and practical difficulties in it. It also reviewed the origin and growth of cooperative farming in India and also presented the scope for cooperative farming in India. The scope was explained on the following grounds. Land holdings in this country are very small and uneconomic. The method of cultivation is still primitive in greater part of the country. Heavy dependence is on external agency for finance, ultimately leading to lower agriculture production due to inability go get credit, low yields per acre, exploitation by middle men. There is love for land. With the result that even uneconomic holding are owned and operated. For the above problems the solution is cooperative joint farming. The author concluded finally listing out the problems of cooperative farming.  

Sudahmoy Bhatta Charye, in his article ‘Agrarian Reforms and Farming Cooperation. A Growth profile’, brought a new focus on the subject, stating the small and marginal farmers including tenants might increase total agriculture output to a greater extent by contributing the share of increased output per unit of land facilitated by credit and service support. To achieve this and also egalitarian dispersion of growth, land ceiling and tenancy laws had been galvanised in all the states in the country to create stake in agrarian development at micro level. Moreover, constraints to secure optimal output per acre in small and marginal holdings are not technological, but they are institutional as seen by lack of supply adequate and timely credit and of organisational structure. Hence institution of farm organisation by bringing the

weaker farmers is essential to bring timely credit\textsuperscript{55}. In the wake of increasing member of landless agricultural households, there is a lot of scope to distribute surplus land, 14 million acres of surplus land as in 1961. Were to be distributed among these families by creating 5.6 million new land holdings, each having a size of 2.5 acres. As in 1971 it was estimated that 12 million landless agricultural households were there, 46.6 per cent of land owning households were marginal holdings. This necessitates consolidation of holdings as one alternative, statutory collectivisation is another alternative. Joint farming with cooperative character on wider basis of small and marginal farmers is another alternative\textsuperscript{56}. The author states, considering socio economic condition in the country, cooperative farming maybe adopted in either of the two farms viz. better farming society and joint farming society. As the two farms have a large measure of affinity with ownership rights of small and marginal peasants. Cooperative farming operated largely with the help of family labour, appear to be accepted. Service cooperatives offering integrated services may be of help to collective efforts of the members. Pooling of lands including some other resources would be undertaken on the basis of homogeneity of members. It would be better policy if joint farming societies organised with ownership of land allowed to be retained by individual members. Relating to size, the author says, it may vary with according to the intensity of cropping per unit of land. The author also suggests farming unions at the district levels with government assistance for coordinating activities of small joint farming societies with the view to rising the


\textsuperscript{56} Ibid, p.254.
level of productivity through adequate extension work. Coming to credit, he says, broad based specialised institutionalisation of credit constitutes building block of institution of farming. The author also suggests with formation of societies with nascent marginal farmers allotted with government land and surplus land which are of poor quality from the point of view of situation and productivity and production and investment loans for various developments of land operated by the society should be available from institutional agencies.

T.N.Rajaratnam and Kulandia Swamy, in their article 'Farming Cooperatives: Economic Gains and Social Constraints', were in support of cooperative farming societies and found them as possible mode of approach to alleviate the evils of Indian agriculture such as uneconomic holdings, low capital formation and productivity, underemployment, ineffective application of technology and inadequate irrigation potentials. The author presented this form of organisation would lead to some economic gains such as rational utilisation of resources by pooling small farms and employing fully underemployed men and materials, economies of large scale operation by bringing shift in unit of cultivation from small farming to large scale farming and reduction in cost of production by undertaking common services. Further they claim this farm leads to more production and income by undertaking developmental activities and modernising production techniques. Organisation and management would also be improved with units of cultivation of a few but large. Finally it leads of economic equality. The author also enumerated peculiar social conditions prevalent in India which are not conducive to cooperative farming. There are; in-

\[57 \text{ Ibid. p.256.}\]
built divisive social structure based on caste, the conservative attitudes and values like fatalism, ignorance, resistance to large and lack of inspiration, psychological factor that stand in the way of pooling of land and human factor. Where lack of integrity, honesty and selfishness and corruption eroded the cooperative farming to make this form successful. They made certain recommendations which include the following: making existing societies viable as demonstration of effective methods of extension, organising cooperative better farming societies; priority with cooperatives while allotting lands, when they are composed of landless person; adequate financial support to make existing societies viable from the government in the form of loans; subsidies and share capital contribution; and sufficient motivation to cooperative joint farming societies by offering proper incentives and education to cooperatives.58

P.A.Koli in his article ‘Cooperative Farming: Problem and Its Solution’, suggested pursuing cooperative farming as one of the solutions to the problem of food and unemployment in India. He presented different types of cooperative farming and their features and their scope in India. He tried to present cooperative farming as a tool of rural development in the light of most inequitable operational holding and small average size of holding. After narrating the benefits of cooperative farming societies like large sized joint management and individual proprietorship, progress made during first five year plan was narrated. He also focused on problems of cooperative farming by erasing their negative features, domination of societies with big farmers,

registering societies for getting rebates and other concessions. The author concluded offering suggestions which included the following: bringing small cultivators within the fold of cooperative farming; educating members properly about pros and cons of the organisation; and making available requisitioning amount of managerial skill and technical skill.\textsuperscript{58}

M.A. Deshmukh, in his article ‘The Case for Cooperative Farming in India’, presented the concept of cooperative farming and defined it by referring to Otto Schiller’s pooling of land, and joint cultivation and management. Second Five Year Plan document referring to different modes of pooling of land, and to Professor Dantwala’s concept of transferring of decision making authority in regard to all important matters from individual to collective body of all cultivators. He developed a case for cooperative farming in India by presenting all Indian picture of distribution of ownership holdings, using the data from the reports of various rounds of N.S.S. After presenting the progress of cooperative farming societies in terms of membership, paidup capital, borrowings, land utilisation, value of input, production and sale, number of societies in profit and loss, and amount of profit and loss, he brought forth causes of unpopularity of societies like individual cultivation of land after joining the society.\textsuperscript{60}

R.S. Deshpande, in his article ‘A case for Cooperative Farming for Upliftment of Harijans’, presented a case study of Sri Vithal Samyukta Sahakari


\textsuperscript{60} M.A. Deshmukh, A Case for Cooperative Farming in India, Cooperative Perspective, Vol XV, No.5, Jan-March 1981, pp.43-46.
Sethi society limited, Mainseal (Maharashtra). The case study was presented covering aspects like membership, land development, joint cultivation, production and earnings of members, government assistance and investment, etc.\textsuperscript{61}

H.Laxminarayana, in his article 'The Review of Growth of Cooperative Farming Societies in India, presented three studies carried out in Punjab, Haryana and Western U.P. during 1957-67 by the Agricultural Economics Research Centre, University of Delhi. He identified the common features of the working societies during the period. The large number of societies were non-genuine societies, were not functioning and dormant, were formed by one or two families with most of the members belonging to the same caste and with no attempt in bringing landless labourers and small peasants within the cooperative fold. He also reported another study conducted by Vegise and Gupta in a pilot project areas in U.P. in 1964. Out of 13 pilot joint farming societies 7 were genuine. Many of the societies were formed for evading zamindari abolition legislation and for continuing share-cropping tenancies.

Laxminarayana and Kunungo study revealed that the societies were formed to avail benefits of financial assistance from the government and the majority of the members were family members. The author, using the statistics published R.B.I., reviewed the progress of cooperative farming societies during the period 1964-77 focusing attention on growth of cooperative farming societies (number of Joint, farming societies and collective farming societies and their dormancy) changing type of membership (land holding members and agriculture

labour membership) land utilisation (net area sown and gross cropped area), working capital per acre, input, output, sales per hectare, financial position paid-up capital, asset and liabilities, reserves and other funds, land and borrowings, profit and loss position, subsidies, management cost. Based on the above analysis the author concluded that cropping intensity was low in the cooperatives. There was an increase in number of agriculture labour members in the society and decline in land-holding members. Dependence of societies on the government for financial help had increased. While the subsidies from the government increased, the number of profit making societies had declined and also the loss making societies increased. The redeeming features of the societies were increase in the reserve fund position and considerable capital formation in the form of land improvement and accumulation of machinery.

S.L. Tripathi, in his article 'Cooperative Farming Prospect and Retrospect, presented land distribution in India, need for cooperative farming and progress of collective farming during the five year plans. He studied the progress of cooperative farming society in terms of number of societies (dormand and functioning), location of the societies (Gramadana and Bhoojan Land, Waste land, other areas), membership (land holders, agriculture labour and others), number of working members (full-time, part-time and others), area covered (irrigated area, unirrigated), working capital and paid-up capital (from government and central financing agency), reserves and other funds (borrowings from government and central financing agencies), other liabilities, fixed assets

(land and buildings, land improvement, machinery and others), loans, land utilisation (net-area sown, gross area cropped), value of inputs (seed, manures, fertilisers, pesticides, labour) value of products, value of sales, government aid (loan and subsidy), cost management, profit and loss. The author appreciated the revival of cooperative farming in many states during the sixth plan by designing strategies for distribution of surplus land and government waste land, to many landless agriculture labourers and weaker section of the society.

Dilip Shah, in his article 'Factors Failing Cooperatives Farming: A Diagnostic Analysis of Rasulabad Cooperative Farming' which was studied and admired in 1960s. This was the case study of cooperative farming society in Baroda district of Gujarat. The study focused changes in the membership size of the society, caste-wise classification of members in two reference years, cultivated land of the society and irrigation land as a proportion of it over a period time, land ownership distribution pattern of the society, other resources of the society, performance of the society in terms per acre yield of principle crops, per acre value of crop proceeds realisation and annual income and expenditure of the society.

S.K.Dube, in his article "Role of Cooperative farming in Rural Development", reviewed the progress of cooperative farming societies in M.P. and also presented the main findings of two surveys conducted. He presented

---


important considerations for cooperative farming in relation to rural
development. The following are some considerations.

(1) Through cooperative farming the farmers borrowed substantial amount
from various agencies quite easily and at cheaper rates which facilitated
mechanisations of various operations.

(2) The societies were to be organised for improving a lot of small and
marginal farmers, making available the economies of scale, reducing
inequalities in their incomes and increasing employment opportunities.
For them that task of transforming peasant to cooperation farming should
not be underestimated. The possibility of getting easy credit and other
facilities under small farmers development and the agency for
development of marginal farmers and landless labourers would adversely
effect cooperative farming, since new agriculture strategy which is size-
neutral may discourage promotion of cooperative farming society. But
silver lining in dark clouds is the voluntary organisations like cooperative
farming have greater role to play in the future in the light of new thrust
of the government in the field of rural development and renewal of
democratic process\textsuperscript{65}.

R.S. Mishra, in his article ‘Cooperative Farming Problems and Prospects’,
summarised the results of the various studies conducted in many places in the
country. The following are deficiencies presented in the article.

\textsuperscript{65} S.K.Dube, Role of Cooperative Farming in Rural Development, Cooperative Perspective, Vol.XV,
1. Officials are target-oriented and members are interested in easy and cheap credit;

2. Lack of understanding among members and experience in handling ancillary undertakings on cooperative basis, absence of technical know, long term and phased development of land and common interest of the members;

3. No satisfactory formula for determining returns for the pooled land; and

4. Absence of consolidation of holdings, poor production for want of large machines and low crop yields in the absence of irrigation and dependence on rain-fed crops.

Few studies put forth a few advantages: income of the member farmers significantly increased, not possible under individual cultivation; better employment and better economic returns; and new economic life to small farmers and agricultural labourers by giving cultivation opportunities by reclamation of new and barren lands. The author suggests proper coordination among societies and external agencies to overcome the deficiencies observed.66

V. Malyadri, in his article ‘Research in Cooperative Farming: A Review’, while reviewing the research on cooperative farming, classified literature on research under three main heads:

1. Literature that advocates cooperative farming as a national policy and the literature that opposes any idea of pooling of land and joint management.

---

2. Publications that make an attempt in presenting actual data recording the experience of those already working in several parts of the country; and

3. the literature that examines the validity of cooperative farming in the present state of Indian agriculture\(^{67}\).

The report of the Panel on Land reforms, 1956, resolution of AICC at Nagpur (1959), AICC Seminar in Ooty, Report of the Working Group on Cooperative Farming under the chairmanship of S.Nijalingappa appointed by Ministry of Community Development and Cooperation (1959), the draft of the Third Five Year Plan reforming the faith of the government in cooperative farming, come under first category. The brochure of the Indian Cooperative Farming, Charan Sing's opposition to cooperative farming in his book, Wither Cooperative Farming (1959), Ranga and Parachuri's discussion of unfavourable aspects of cooperative farming as compared with individual farming\(^{68}\) also form part of the first group\(^{69}\).

Empirical studies under the second group include the following: this empirical studies were conducted government appointed committees, individual researchers and private bodies, Working Group on Cooperative Farming under the Chairmanship of Nijalingappa (1958), the Committee of Directions, study on cooperative farming in Gujarat, S.P.Mohites report (1946) farming the basis for governments sanction for organising four different types of cooperative farming


\(^{68}\) ibid, pp 78-80.
societies in Bombay State, Committee of Directors on Cooperative Farming (1965) which assessed progress and evaluation of pilot projects, the study of Programme Evaluation Organisation (1966) with respect to resettlement of agricultural labourers, are the studies that come under second category.

In the third group are included the following. Otto Schillers book on 'Individual Farming on Cooperative Lines' and balanced view on cooperative farming by the Fourth Five Year Plan.

The author suggested the following points for further research.

(1) Problem-oriented studies may be undertaken to identify the difficulties faced by the existing and dormant societies and to set right things by assisting the societies having potential for growth and by weeding out non-genuine societies.

(2) In the light of surplus land available for distribution under ceiling laws, feasibility studies in various parts of the country be conducted to locate areas to form such type of societies.

(3) A study of financial requirements of the societies to be formed newly may be undertaken, suggesting the sources from which the funds may be drawn.

\[80\] ibid, p.81.
(4) A possibility of settling educated unemployed youth on this farms may be studied with reference to their capacity to undertake some ancillary activities.

(5) The studies may be undertaken to study the possibility of detailing the cooperative farming programme with that of MPAL\textsuperscript{70}.

G.S.Kamat, in his article 'Revival of Cooperative Farming in India', presented the foreign experience in the field of cooperative farming, narrating how cooperative farming succeeded in most distress condition and the fact that farmers reverted to individual farming with limited cooperation after improvement of their conditions. The author referred the experience in England where income of small farmers were raised through provision of cooperative services without pooling land. He also referred to unsuccessful collective farming experience in Yugoslavia and Hungary. Commenting on dormant farming cooperatives, the author felt, the economies of pooling would be offset by diseconomies of inertia and strife, management by bureaucracy. He opined unfavourable land labour ratio responsible for low income of the farmers is not likely to be corrected by joint farming. The return to labour on this farms would continue to be low unless the surplus is diverted to other economic activities. Finally he expressed his views identical to those of Otto schiller who advocated combining cooperative methods with individual use of land\textsuperscript{71}.

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid, p.85

P. Narasimha Reddy, in his article 'Functional Analysis of Land Reforms and Cooperative Farming Societies', observed the implementation of land ceiling legislation and consequent surplus land available for distribution to landless poor resulted in phenomenal grounds of cooperative farming societies in Anantpur district of A.P., but most of the beneficiaries of land allotment and area distributed remained outside the fold of cooperative farming. Hence the author suggested cooperative farming societies would take up quantitative and qualitative measures to ensure better income to the beneficiaries under the land reforms.

Study of cooperative joint farming societies (CJFS) in Nellore District is undertaken for multiple reasons. The district has considerable SCs and STs population who mostly belong to landless agricultural labourer households, to whom the government waste lands and surplus lands are distributed as target groups. The assignees of these lands were first brought into the fold of CJFSs as their members in late 1970s but the performance of the CJFSs in their first bout was dismal. Preceding the revival programme of these CJFSs, DRDA-conducted investigation into causes of failures, revealed structural and functional deficiencies of the institutional arrangements at the district and the sub-district levels impinging on their bad performance. Revival efforts were initiated to put the CJFSs, on right track improving the structural and process aspects of the agencies involved in promotion and development of the CJFS. It is but appropriate to study the performance of the CJFSs in the post-revival phase to
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draw useful lessons as they have high potential to ameliorate the socio-economic conditions of rural poor. The focus of the study is on two levels-CJFS as such and the beneficiary household members of CJFSs.

SECTION C: METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Empirical data analysis is done at two levels namely CJFSs and their household members. Since most of the beneficiaries have large chunk of their household incomes derived from the assigned land cultivated under CJFSs, the two-level analysis is more meaningful in understanding their economic status a lot. Having gone through the theoretical and empirical studies related to agrarian relations in India and institution of cooperative farming and also ground level facts about functioning CJFSs in the Nellore district, the objectives and hypotheses of the study are set which are detailed in what follows.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The following are the objectives of the study:

1. To analyses the agrarian structure and reforms in India;

2. To study the cooperative joint farming societies in retrospective and prospective frame-work;

3. To study the origin and growth of cooperative joint farming societies in Nellore District;

4. To assess the operational and financial performances of cooperative joint farming societies in Nellore District; and
5. To measure the employment and income effect of cooperative joint farming societies on beneficiary households.

HYPOTHESES

1. There is no significant growth in number of cooperative joint farming societies, beneficiaries, extent of land brought under cultivation, since reorganization programme 1989.

2. There is no substantial growth in investment on land development projects under cooperative joint farming societies and no substantial differences between average investment on land and beneficiary.

3. There are no significant differences of cooperative joint farming societies among divisions with respect to cropping intensity, value of produce per acre and member, surplus per member.

4. There are no significant variations as to the status of working family members after joining cooperative joint farming societies when compared to before situations and also across caste categories.

5. No significant variations can be noticed among beneficiaries caste-wise as to net income derived from assigned lands.

6. After joining cooperative joint farming society no substantial differences can be found as to source of income from agriculture and allied activities and wage incomes.
SAMPLE DESIGN

Two-stage sampling procedure was adopted to choose the member households which are the ultimate units of analysis. There are 286 cooperative joint farming societies, co-terminus with land development projects, in operation at the end of 1995-96. In the first stage of sampling five cooperative joint farming societies from each of three revenue divisions were chosen randomly. There are 967 household members in this 15 sample cooperative joint farming societies. Hence 967 household members constitute the universe of the study. Keeping in view time and resources of the individual researcher, in the second stage of sampling 10 per cent of 967 households i.e., 97 were chosen as sample for detailed study. Statistical tools such as measures of central tendency, correlation, coefficient of variation, tests of significance, multiple regression, are employed. Techniques of financial analysis such as payback period method and average rate of return method are used to measure the financial performance of cooperative joint farming societies.

DATA BASES

The study is based on both primary and secondary data. Secondary data are culled out from reports of District Rural Development Agency (DRDA), Nellore and Chief Planning Office, Collectorate, Nellore. Primary data is collected using two sets of structured and proterted questionnaires, one set for cooperative joint farming societies and other for household member beneficiaries. In addition to the above tools of data collection, secondary data are also collected from reports of official committees appointed to study subjects like land reforms, agrarian reforms, cooperative farming societies and so forth. Studies on the subject by the individual researchers are extensively used.
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study is a district level study on CJFSs in the Nellore District. Performance evaluation of CJFSs in pre-and post revival phases in general is attempted at aggregate levels i.e., district and revenue divisions. For in-depth study a sample of 15 CJFSs five each from three revenue divisions is chosen. Since there are no proper maintenance of records by CJFSs, the only instrument the researcher relies upon to collect data is structured questionnaire. Both the questionnaires canvassed among CJFSs and their household members sought memory-based responses, which is one of the limitations of the study. No attempt is made to collect data from the individual persons working in the DRDA and other agencies which is invaluable source of information. This is yet another limitation of the study.

CHAPTER SCHEME

The study is presented in seven chapters. First Chapter deals with agrarian structure and reforms in India and the second chapter literature review and research methodology. In the third chapter is presented cooperative joint farming in India in retrospective and prospective frame work. Chapter four presents the origin and growth of cooperative joint farming societies in Nellore District. Chapter five is devoted to operational and financial performance of sample cooperative joint farming societies. Chapter six focuses on socio-economic impact of cooperative joint farming societies on beneficiary households. In the last chapter the conclusions and findings of the study and suggestions are incorporated.