Chapter III : Review of Literature
Literature relating to output, employment and marketed surplus of agriculture has been fairly extensive; and alternative hypotheses have been put forward. However, while the conversion of jhum into settled cultivation has been strongly advocated by economists, sociologists and political thinkers of the North-Eastern Region, there has hardly been any scientific research investigation to find out if there is any reasonable ground based on economic factors for converting jhum into the settled cultivation. The steps that have been taken by the state governments of this region to transfer jhum holdings into the settled ones are, most of the times, simply the results of the beliefs and convictions of the thinkers. If there exist no economic factors that warrant this policy of transforming jhum lands into the settled holdings, a large sum of money spent for the purpose may simply be the wastage of the development funds. It is, therefore, high time to know if there are reasonable grounds for the conversion of jhum into the settled cultivation. As such, the present study aims at finding the relative advantages and disadvantages of the jhum and the settled cultivation with special reference to employment, output and the marketed surplus of foodgrains generated by the two modes of cultivation in order to determine whether investment required for the conversion is warranted by the economic factors. In order to do so, a
review of the literature and hypotheses that have been put forward regarding the output, employment and the marketed surplus may be of great help in putting our approach in a proper context. Though a particular study may have a narrow focus the review of different studies will enable the investigator to view the problem in a wider perspective. Such an attempt will also reveal the gaps in the understanding of the problem, and may help us to have an appreciation of the problem in a proper perspective. In fact, each and every new theoretical development is built upon the earlier research findings; and such published literature constitutes the major source of learning about what has already been found, and also serves as a medium for comparison of the new findings with the existing ones.

The present review, therefore, discusses other studies which would help us to have a proper perspective of the problem under investigation.

3.1 Key Concepts

The concepts of the marketed and marketable surplus have been well distinguished and differentiated though several studies blur these distinctions. Marketable surplus represents the surplus available for disposal to the farmer. It is the surplus over and above his genuine requirements of family consumption, payment of wages in kind, feed, seed and wastage, etc., which have to be met out of the produce. As
against this, the marketed surplus refers to the amount actually sold. Hence, it represents only that portion of the surplus which is actually brought to the market and placed at the disposal of the non-farming rural population and the urban consumers.  

The distinction between these two concepts is of a very high operational significance as the agricultural sector of the developing economies is dominated by the small and marginal farmers, who feel compelled to sell a larger proportion of their output than what they can afford immediately after harvesting of the crops at relatively low prices in order to meet their immediate cash requirements even though they purchase these goods at higher prices in the lean seasons to meet their consumption requirements. These distress sales tend to make their gross sales larger than the net marketed surplus and it also raises the marketed surplus above the level of the marketable surplus. For such farmers, marketable surplus may be less than the marketed surplus. On the other hand, the rich farmers may like to keep whole or part of their surplus in the form of stock. For such farmers, the marketable surplus would be more than the marketed surplus. Thus the marketed surplus in a given year may be less, equal to or more than the marketable surplus depending upon such factors operating in the market economy. The marketed surplus and the marketable surplus are equal
only under ideal conditions. According to Mathur and Ezekiel, which of the terms—marketed and marketable surplus—is more appropriate depends upon the nature of the economy. In the developed countries, marketed surplus may be equal to or may represent only a part of the marketable surplus; whereas in the developing countries, marketed surplus may be more than the marketable surplus. This is because of the fact that the producers of foodgrains in the developed countries refrain whatever is necessary for their own consumption and sell the surplus to the market. On the other hand, producers in the developing countries sell that amount of output which will provide them the necessary cash and retain the balance for their own consumption. Thus, it is consumption rather than the sales which constitutes the residual.

Nadkarni distinguishes between the two concepts of marketed surplus—gross and net. "Gross marketed surplus refers to the actually marketed quantities; and net marketed surplus is the gross marketed surplus minus repurchases of foodgrains." Thus, gross marketable surplus is the sum of positive marketable surplus net of the purchases of foodgrains. Though marketed (−able) surplus of all agricultural commodities is of significance as it indicates the degree of commercialisation, but the marketed (−able) surplus of foodgrains is of special significance because they are basic wage-goods. In view of this the present study has taken into account the marketed surplus of foodgrains only.
3.2 Marketed Surplus, Employment and Economic Development

In most of the developing countries where large numbers of people are engaged in agriculture as a means of livelihood and where industry and services are not adequately developed, a fundamental pre-condition for economic development is the achievement and maintenance of an adequate surplus of foodgrains or, at least, the reduction of its deficit by a magnitude which expanding manufactures for export might realistically be expected to cover in the near term. In fact, no country can be expected to go forward with continual economic growth until the cultivators are producing a surplus over and above their immediate needs.

Increasing agricultural productivity leads to the release of labour force for industrial employment, raises agricultural incomes thereby increasing rural purchasing power needed to buy the industrial goods. It also enables agriculture to supply the major wage-goods (food) to industrial workers at reasonable prices. Thus, increasing agricultural productivity makes important contribution to the general economic development and that, within a considerable limit, at least, it is one of the pre-conditions which must be realised before the stage of take-off into 'self-sustain economic growth' becomes possible. It is equally important to note that the industrial urban development creates a favourable condition for increasing agricultural productivity.
and output. However, while an overall increase in agricultural productivity is, no doubt, essential, it may not, by itself, be sufficient to sustain the tempo of economic development. What is far more crucial to the process of economic development is the growth of the marketable and marketed surplus along with the increases in output.

In the underdeveloped countries with a dualistic economic structure and a large subsistence agricultural sector, this sector is supposed to serve as the primary basis for economic development. If we take development as a synonym for industrialisation and also ignore the factors on the demand side, the importance of resource transfer from agriculture is, no doubt, justified. The resource transfer from agriculture becomes crucial in case the industrial sector can neither produce its own food nor import it from abroad. In this case, the industrial sector is heavily dependent on resource transfers (marketed surplus) from agriculture. In general, transfer of resources from agriculture may be functional or dysfunctional depending upon the specific conditions under which development occurs. The obsession with the marketed (-able) surplus as an over-riding constraint has led quite a few economists, such as Nicholls to insist that agriculture must first be developed sufficiently to generate sizeable marketable surplus before any measures towards industrialisation are contemplated.
Some economists are of the opinion that the marketed surplus from agriculture determines directly the growth of non-agricultural sectors. However, these opinions leave many aspects of the development process unexplained, and the marketed surplus can be generated without any effect on the development of other sectors of the economy. Besides, a significant and sustained jump in the marketed surplus is not possible unless there is a chance for selling the surplus production. Again the marketed surplus may not often lead to economic development if the resources so generated go into unproductive lines of investment. Griffin points out how mobilisation of the marketed surplus go towards increasing the number of civil servants, armed forces, and urban consumption rather than towards the investment in industry (for detail see Keith Griffin, 1976, p. 119). Besides, lack of an expanding market hinders not only the development of industries but also agriculture. However, this does not mean that the marketed surplus is not necessary for industrial development. What it implies is that underdeveloped economy may be unable to deploy even the scarce marketed surplus for the purpose of industrial growth. Surely, marketed surplus is intimately related to the commercialisation of economic relations, which is inherent in the process of capitalist development. "Under commercialisation the small farmers are as much involved in the market as the big ones though differential advantage and disadvantage" accruing to them may still remain (Nadkarni, 1980, p. 11).
The importance of marketed (–able) surplus is not only relevant for industrialisation in a sectoral perspective, but it is also important for development of the concerned holdings and then agricultural development in general. According to Vimal Shah and C.H. Shah, "a small marketable surplus leading to lower cash incomes and smaller expenditure on such modern inputs as fertilizers, small investible resources with relatively greater need for investment in traditional items, have acted and likely to act as obstacles to the progress of small farmers. The inevitable result would be the widening of income gap between small and big farmers". It is, therefore, clear that an increase in marketed (–able) surplus leads to an increase in cash incomes, increasing use of modern inputs in agriculture and the release of larger investible resources, thereby promoting the progress of small farmers leading to the reduction of the gap between small and big farmers. Similarly, increasing investible resources and the use of modern inputs lead to the growth of marketable and marketed surplus of foodgrains and other agricultural products. They also lead to increasing labour productivity which have set in motion a self-sustaining process of decreasing costs and increasing output.

Thus, the capitalist development is based on the development of both industry and agriculture; and the development of agriculture involves the release of labour from agricultural sector for employment in the industrial sector,
and release of the marketable surplus of foodgrains and other agricultural products for such labour. Hence, the commercialisation of marketable surplus is a pre-condition for the capitalist development involving the growth of product, land and labour markets.19

In the developing countries, the population is usually increasing very rapidly thereby leading to increasing pressures on land. Consequently, disguised and under-employment have become a permanent feature in most of the developing countries. This has led to the fragmentation of holdings and decreasing productivity per worker. In such countries, agricultural development is not a question of increasing productivity per unit of cultivated land alone, what is far more important is the increasing labour productivity. Mechanisation without any release of the labour so displaced from agriculture may not increase per capita production. In fact, the marketable surplus of all classes of farmers diminishes as population pressure increases.23 If the import of foodgrains does not increase significantly, small farmers, who depend, to a considerable extent, on the market for their own requirements for foodgrains will be faced with the reduced availability of foodgrains as the marketable surplus of large farmers decline.24 Hence absorption of displaced labour in non-agricultural sectors not only increases the marketed (able) surplus but it also leads to increasing capacity for using it.
This further results in the expansion of the home market, thereby, leading to economic development.

Thus adopting the special case of Lewis model where the industrial work force is dependent on the marketed surplus of foodgrains from the domestic agriculture for its subsistence, Chakravarty has pointed out that with the increasing excess demand for foodgrains, the terms of trade started shifting in favour of agriculture from the mid-sixties onwards, thus, forcing up the industrial wages. However, even within its own framework, Chakravarty's explanation raises a number of questions which it does not answer. Bagchi has argued that for the post-colonial period, the pace of industrialisation, in particular the deceleration of industrial expansion from about the mid-sixties, is to be explained by the demand conditions. Whatever be the case, the marketed surplus of agriculture has an important contribution to the development of agriculture itself and industrialisation, thereby transforming the nature of employment leading to the reduction in disguised and under-employment. In short, it is a necessary and pre-condition for capitalist development of agriculture.

3.3 **Agrarian Structure, Employment, Output and Marketed Surplus**

Marketed surplus, output and employment are influenced, to a large extent, by the agrarian structure as
reflected by differences in the size of holdings. As such, a study of the behaviour of output and the marketed surplus across size classes and employment helps us to identify the viability of holdings in different regions which may facilitate evaluation of the agrarian structure. It can also indicate the possible effects of any redistribution of land following land reforms on the size of output and marketed (-able) surplus. Some of the studies on the distribution of output and marketed (-able) surplus by size groups of farmers are based on indirect estimation covering aggregate data while some other studies are based on direct estimation from micro-level data.

Dharma Narain has undertaken the pioneering study based on indirect estimation for the year 1950-51. He found that the marketed (-able) surplus as a proportion of output has declined as the size of holding increased up to the size group of 10-15 acres, and rose steadily thereafter along with the size of holding. He found that the holdings below 15 acres accounted for 54.4 per cent of the marketed (-able) surplus and those below 10 acres accounted for 46.5 per cent, which is interpreted as indicative of distress sales which presumably had perverse relationship with output and which contributed more than half of the overall marketed surplus. Only a part of the marketed surplus could then be said to constitute a commercial surplus which would have a normal positive slope character.
A study by Utsa Patnaik for the year 1960-61, based on indirect estimation, however, found that the small farmers accounted for a smaller proportion of total sales to the market. Farmers having up to 10 acres of land accounted for 33.2 per cent while the farmers with holdings of up to 15 acres accounted for 44.4 per cent of the total marketed surplus. She found that there is a positive relationship between output and the size of holdings. She did not find any perversity as she found that the proportion of the marketed surplus increased steadily from 20% in the lowest size-class of 1 hectare and below to 63% in the highest size-class of 20 hectares and above without any dip in between.

Sharma, however, found that the size-class up to 5 acres was having a negative marketable surplus at both national and all the states except Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Tamil Nadu. The size-class at 5-10 acres was found to be deficit in Gujarat and Maharashtra, while it shows positive surplus in other states and at the national level (see pp. 327-335). He also studied marketable surplus across size class based on indirect estimation for the year 1960-61 both at national and state level. His conclusion is that the marketable surplus of foodgrains increases consistently with an increase in the size of holdings. However, the size of holdings is only a proxy to output and/or income.
Shri Prakash and Sushma examined the nature and extent of influence exercised by the holding size on employment in Haryana and found that farm employment is a positive function of the holding size. Another study by Shri Prakash and others in Punjab reveals that size is not a decisive determinant of the marketed surplus but it might be exercising its influence on the marketed surplus via income and output.

An extreme case of the behaviour of the marketed surplus of paddy was found in Punjab by Singh and George. According to their study for Amritsar and Karnal Districts, 91% of production of paddy was sold on the whole, the proportion ranging from 88% among small farmers with 1 hectare and to 92% among farmers with 4-5 hectares of land. Their finding shows that even small farmers grow paddy mainly as a cash crop and depend on other crops for consumption. Their finding was also confirmed by the Farm Management Survey for Ferozpur District, Punjab. But Rice is not the staple diet of Punjab. Adoption of paddy-wheat-paddy-wheat mono-rotating culture in the wake of Green Revolution has enabled paddy to emerge as a cash crop and as a substitute of the conventional cash crops that had been grown in the region in the past.

Asoke Hati's study based on data from Hoogly district, West Bengal (1971-72 and 1972-73) has shown a
somewhat different picture. It was found that the marketable surplus was negative for the size-class of 0.66 hectares and below; for holdings upto 1.98 hectares, an increase in farm size has practically no effect on the marketable surplus, and the proportion of marketable surplus increases for farm size above 1.98 hectares at an increasing rate as farm size increases.

A study of paddy in Burdwan District of West Bengal (for 1967-69) conducted by Bhargava and Rastogi reveal a different result from that of Hati's in that none of the size class, not even the lowest size class of 1 hectare and below, had a negative marketable surplus.

A study of Canal irrigated areas in the Bellary district of Karnataka by Mishra and Vivekanand showed that even under perennial irrigation, the share of small holdings upto 2 hectares in the total marketed surplus of crops was only 4%.

Vyas and Maharaja provided a contrast between two regions in their study of Himatnagar (Gujarat) and Desuri (Rajasthan) blocks for the year 1963-64. Their study showed that the small farmers also produce commercial crops though to a smaller extent than the large farmers. But the proportion of the area used for the cultivation of superior cereals, which may be treated as cash crops by small farmers, was
greater than that of the big farmers. In both the areas, the proportion of the marketed surplus has increased progressively with production though the variation was less in Himatnagar. The presence of commercial crops also seems to reduce the marketed surplus of foodgrains as a proportion of output since income from commercial crops can be used to increase the consumption of foodgrains. This type of behaviour pushes up the marketable surplus of even small farmers.

A study of the Vidharba region by Mathur for 1956-57\(^2\) showed that the farmers in small size of holdings have less marketable surplus and they marketed a small portion of their output. Hence, the total receipts of the small farmers will increase less in comparison to the receipts of the big holders. This view is supported by Mandal and Ghosh\(^2\) in that the marketed surplus would increase with an increase in farm size.

According to Mathur and Ezekiel\(^2\) small farmers in developing countries sell only that much amount of output which is necessary to satisfy their cash requirements. However, these farmers have fixed cash requirements. This tends to make short-run supply curve of foodgrains backward bending. Thus, the residual is the amount of output which is retained for consumption and not the amount which is sold.
A study by Mathur and Prakash\textsuperscript{30} show the validity of this hypothesis both empirically and algebraically.

However, Dandekar\textsuperscript{12} pointed out that Mathur-Ezekiel proposition is valid only for a small and a very special class of farmers, who have very little other sources of cash income. He argued that for a large class of small farmers, their own production is not sufficient to meet their needs. As such, they sell little of it and derive their cash income from other sources to meet their cash requirements. According to him, prices of foodgrains affect the farmers, they affect them more as consumers and less as producers. But Dandekar's proposition has been shown to be at variance with the empirical evidence by Indu Bala Tripathi\textsuperscript{61} and Sushma.

Ravi Varma and Shankar\textsuperscript{62} have calculated the marketed and marketable surplus as a percentage of total output of paddy and wheat for the year 1961-62 for different asset groups. They found that the richer the farmers the higher the marketed surplus. This support the view of Prakash and others that large farmers contribute relatively more to the marketed surplus, and that the size influences the marketed surplus via income and output.

According to a report of National Sample Survey,\textsuperscript{40} the peasants make relatively greater contribution as the supplier of the marketed surplus. It showed that expenditure
elasticity for cereals for rural families were .74 in the fourth round, .65 in the fifth round and .54 in the sixth round. This supports the view that, if the demonstration effect is in operation, increments in income of cultivators are likely to be spent, at least partially, on commodities other than foodgrains. This will result in increasing marketed surplus of foodgrains.

Nanjantha Rao argued that the increasing concentration of foodgrains output in the developed region and large farmers is responsible, to a large extent, for the emergence of the marketed surplus. This line of reasoning, however, provides only partial explanation because it considers only the increasing surpluses from rapidly growing region.

Criticising the view that an increase in agricultural production does not lead to an increase in the marketed surplus of agriculture due to fixed cash requirements, Dubey argued that the existence of backward and advanced sectors and their inter-relation should be given attention. In such a situation, an increase in per capita income in the backward sector increases consumption of all commodities produced by industries in the advanced sectors. So the farmers may be interested in selling the surplus production in order to secure the cash necessary to buy commodities produced by the developed
sectors. However, I.B. Tripathi has found that even when agricultural sector has grown quite rapidly in Punjab, cash requirements have shown negative growth. Consumption curves of the farmers are positively sloped, sales curves are negatively sloped. So these slopes of the curves are independent of the fixity or otherwise of cash requirements.

Krishna also derived results to show that Mathur-Ezekiel hypothesis is valid even if the fixity of cash requirements is relaxed. Mathur-Prakash demonstrated the validity of the hypothesis both empirically and mathematically independently of the fixity of cash requirements. Prakash-Tripathi studies have also furnished empirical evidence to support it by Haryana, Punjab and national data.

A study conducted by Khan and Chawdhury for West Pakistan showed positive elasticity of marketed surplus with respect to output and its value is more than one. Another study by Shah based on cross section data from Gujarat also showed a significantly high positive relationship between output and the marketed surplus. In regression analysis the "Shifters" of market supply function, Shah included the distance from the market centre as a variable, which was found to have a negative and statistically significant impact on market supply (see Shah, C.H., 1965, pp. 181-196).

Thomarajakshi derives direct estimates of marketable surplus for 1952-66 and studied them in relation to net barter
terms of trade of the agricultural sector. In both the linear and log-linear equations, the coefficient with respect to output were positive and significant. Similar estimates by Venkataramanan and Fradhachar for 1964-65 to 1973-74 showed that agricultural sector’s purchases from non-agricultural sectors have increased vastly during this period. Purchases include fertilizers, pesticides, drugs, electricity, diesel oil and repair services. However, total sales of agricultural produce to non-agricultural sectors are greater than the purchases made by the farmers from the latter in recent years. This shows that the increasing use of modern inputs which leads to more output results in greater marketed surplus.

Collin Clark and Turner have found a highly significant negative relationship between agricultural productivity and the share of farm supply retained for self-consumption. Their study is based on cross-section data, the results of which also showed that when agricultural productivity increases, self-supply decreases accordingly. What holds back the generation of marketable surplus is not under-commercialisation but low productivity.

3.4 Jhum vrs. Settled Cultivation

In India in general, and in the North-Eastern Hill Areas in particular, it has been fashionable in academic and
policy discussions to suggest the transfer of jhum land to the settled cultivation. The basic points of arguments, in general are: (a) the destruction of forest resources associated with the jhumming, and (b) that terracing will facilitate the application of modern inputs like fertilizers, water, etc., which are likely to raise per person and per hectare/acre productivities.

As a result of the pre-dominance of the jhum cultivation, a large number of the people in the North-Eastern Hill areas are dependent on jhum cultivation; and the major portion of the cultivable land is used for jhum cultivation.

The percentage of population dependent on jhum in Meghalaya in 1974-75 was 85, which came down to 20% in 1981. According to Borthakur,8 about 41 per cent of the net area sown in Meghalaya is under shifting cultivation, while, according to the 33rd round of National Sample Survey32, 32.88 per cent of the total area cultivated was under jhum/shifting cultivation, 27.31% under settled cultivation and 39.78% under mixed farming.

A "Report on Socio-Economic Review (1979-80) Mizoram",4 has shown that 85 per cent of the workers in rural areas of Mizoram are engaged in agricultural activities, and the Mizoram Agricultural Diary 1987-8832 shows that 60 per cent of the area used for foodgrains production is under
jhum cultivation and only 12 per cent is under settled cultivation. 59

These figures in the two North-Eastern States show that the relative importance of jhum as an employment generator and share in area cultivated is much greater in Mizoram than that of Meghalaya. In Mizoram jhum cultivation has been offering employment to 85% of the working population of the rural areas. But the Agricultural Diary has shown that the settled cultivation is much more productive than the jhum cultivation. The productivity per hectare of land in jhum cultivation is 0.75 M.T., while the productivity per hectare of the settled land is 1.45 M.T. 32

The village grouping which took place in Mizoram as a result of the outbreak of the disturbances in 1966 has adversely affected the productivity of agriculture, because a large area of cultivable land has become beyond the reach of the farmers. This has led to the shortening of the jhum cycle from 8-10 years to 2-4 years, the resultant effect of which is low productivity per unit of land and labour. Besides, a large number of the young men had gone underground resulting in the reduction of the workers. Above all, frequent curfews imposed by the Security Forces had resulted in loss of a number of working days during the period 1966-70,
the resultant effect of which was low productivity of agriculture and then the poverty of the farmers. In short, the village grouping accompanied by frequent curfews had led to a considerable reduction in the level of output; and it has been rightly called by Brig. T. Sailo as a "Misguided Concept".

Brig. T. Sailo in his speech at the National Development Council in New Delhi stated that the vast majority of the cultivators in Mizoram still practised jhuming "which is not only unproductive but destructive to our Forest Wealth ...". He further suggested the reclamation of all the flat lands for W.R.C. and gentle slopes for terrace cultivation. In his speech at the N.E.C. special meeting at New Delhi, Brig. T. Sailo, once again, said that conversion of the jhum lands into settled holdings involves enormous efforts of land reclamation into W.R.C. and hill-side terracing, and this is possible only through an active help from the Central Government.

Dr. B.D. Sharma has authored an interesting article on "Shifting Cultivation and their Development", and stated that jhum cultivation is a relatively labour-intensive form of cultivation and it is feasible only when land-man ratio is highly favourable. He also pointed out that the jhum becomes inappropriate if the population pressures emerge in the economy.
He has, therefore, suggested certain measures to make jhumias leave the jhum cultivation and practise permanent cultivation.

Mayashree Borah has found that the jhum cultivation in Meghalaya is more labour-intensive than the settled cultivation, and the incidence of disguised-unemployment was found to be higher in jhum than in the settled cultivation. Besides, the productivity of land and labour has been found to be higher in settled cultivation than that of the jhum. The study also revealed that output per unit of land is higher in settled cultivation than in the jhum. In short, the results of her study suggested the conversion of jhum into settled cultivation.

One of the problems involved in converting jhum lands into settled plots is that the jhuming has been practised by the people for a long time, and they have a very limited knowledge of the other modes of cultivation. Besides, the problems and the expenditure involved is beyond the capacity of the jhumias who are usually very poor. A study of Meghalaya by D.N. Majumdar has revealed that the planners have not been able to make the jhumias take up permanent cultivation because there is a big communication gap between the planners and the cultivators. This finding has supported the view that the jhumias are too ignorant about other modes of cultivation to use settled cultivation as an alternative to jhuming.
According to P.C. Bora, nearly 60% of the people of the North-Eastern region are cultivators, 9.28% are agricultural labourers and 8 per cent depends on allied occupations of agriculture. According to this study, the decline in the jhum cycles from 15-20 to 2-3 years has led to a decline in the production per unit of jhum lands, and it has become an acute problem for the hill people of the North-Eastern Region even for their subsistence. He further pointed out that the recent experiences indicate that the people are not adamant to persist with the shifting cultivation; and he suggested that suitable alternatives must be provided to them to earn their livelihood.

M.P. Jagirdar has pointed out that shifting cultivation is accepted as a destructive practice, it cannot go unabated because of the in-built mechanism of the practice which are decreased productivity, resource degradation, deforestation, etc. He has suggested the rehabilitation of the shifting cultivators to the plains or to the lower levels of the hills and providing them facilities for terrace cultivation, horticulture and commercial crops, etc.

Thus, in the light of the past studies discussed above, we find that the size of holding, employment, output and the marketed surplus are intimately related. Besides, the main suggestion for the development of the North-Eastern
Hill Region is the conversion of jhum lands into settled holdings. So far as the area selected for the present study is concerned, official records are the only available data to support this suggestion that no scientific research investigation has been undertaken to find out the feasibility of this conversion. The present study, is therefore, an attempt to examine the relative advantages and disadvantages of jhum and settled cultivation in order to reveal the facts about the feasibility of this suggestion and to find out if there are economic factors that warrant the conversion of jhum lands into settled holdings.