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CONCLUSION & FINDINGS

This conclusion is an attempt to summarize the analyses and discussions in order to arrive at conclusions regarding status of implementation of Land Reforms in Uttar Pradesh. In the beginning of this study we have tried to understand the theoretical background of the Community Development, plus the theoretical study of Land Reforms and the evolutionary aspect of the Land Reforms, we have also analyzed the initiatives and programmes pertaining to Community Development and Land Reforms particularly after independence. It is also evident from the analysis of the profile of the study location for selected sample areas and villages and census survey of the households that socio-economic backwardness, poor infrastructure, lack of basic amenities (still waiting for safe drinking water) and resources are the basic feature of the households mainly depending on agriculture. Majority of them constitute marginal holdings and landless labourer category with pervasive gap in gender ratio. Canal and private tube wells remained major sources of irrigation. Mainly wheat, pulse and rice have been grown as staple food. Depressed wage added with significant gender differential turned to lower income. Many households' income could not cross the poverty line. Despite the facts that there has been obvious indifference in implementation of redistribution of land and limited implementation, land reforms measures could bring positive and visible results. To the extent of limited implementation, Land Redistribution could create space for economic security, reduced landlessness, and initiated income generation. Indications of liberation from bondage on account of ownership of residential land were found. Poor could erect house and enjoy relatively comfortable living elevating their social status. In case of beneficiary households of cultivable land, production of food grain increased which placed them relatively comfortable at food front. Land as collateral security provided
access to public institutional network and credit. These could reduce their
dependence on exploitative usury network of moneylenders. Allied activities
such as cattle rearing to supplement their income became possible. However
due to lack of comprehensive follow up package much is left to be desired.
Independent departments at federal and state government levels handle land
and agricultural administration. In one way, this helps to monitor land outside
agricultural use separately from agricultural land, but the lack of integration
creates uneasy administrative regimes. Moreover, there are several different
departments responsible for various aspects of land administration, land data,
and land legislation. Unfortunately, these do not work with perfect
coordination, which gives rise to various problems. The spread of
administrative regimes makes land-policy decision-making and implementation
difficult. The Department of Land Resources in the Central Ministry of Rural
Development has the primary central government responsibility for addressing
issues related to land administration, particularly of degraded land. This
department oversees a range of programmes that set the national framework.
The Department of Land Resources also works as an advisory and coordinating
body for the implementation of land reform, and helps in arriving at a
consensus among states on the changing emphasis in land reform. For example,
recently the Department of Land Resources convened a national workshop
focused on tenancy reform, which drew together a group of experts to review
the current situation in land policy. The question of opening of the leasing
market was debated and there was a general consensus that the leasing of land
should be liberalized. However, no firm decisions were made in the workshop.
Subsequently, however, the National Agricultural Policy focused for the first
time on the policy of leasing and suggested a liberalization of leasing
legislation, an increase in land ceilings, and allowing for contract farming.

The Department of Land Resources at the central level also issues guidelines
for strengthening land revenue administration and updating land records. It has
recently initiated a large-scale programme for computerizing land records. The department has also initiated various activities focused on wasteland (drought prone areas, desert development, integrated wasteland development, technology development, extension and training, investment promotion and support for NGOs/voluntary organizations for such activities). It is now accepted in India that the recording of land rights, and their periodic updating, is an essential prerequisite for an effective land policy. During the Seventh Plan Period (1997 - 98) a Centrally Sponsored Scheme on Computerization of Land Records (CLR) was introduced with 100 percent financial assistance from the Central Government for pilot projects in a few selected districts (Gulbarga in Karnataka, Rangareddy in Andhra Pradesh, Sonitpur in Assam, Singhbhum in Bihar, Gandhinagar in Gujarat, Morena in Madhya Pradesh, Wardha in Maharashtra, Mayurbhanj in Orissa, and Dungarpur in Rajasthan). These pilots were undertaken with a view to removing problems inherent in the manual maintenance and updating of land records, and to ensure the issue of timely and accurate copies of Records of Rights to landowners by the local land revenue officials. The main objectives of the scheme were to: (1) computerize ownership and plot-wise details for issue of timely and accurate copy of the Records of Rights to the landowners; (2) achieve low-cost, easily reproducible storage media for reliable and long-term preservation of land records; (3) provide fast and efficient retrieval of textual and graphical information; (4) create a Land Information System (LIS) and database for the agricultural census. By the end of the Eighth Plan (1997), 323 districts in the country were to be brought under the computerization of land records scheme. During the first year of the Ninth Plan (1997 - 98), 177 new project districts were covered. The available feedback from our fieldwork and other sources clearly indicate that the scheme has been slow to progress. Many bottlenecks are also emerging in the process, including: (1) delayed transfer of funds to the final implementing authority in the field by the state governments; (2) a delay in the development of appropriate software tailored for the specific requirements of
different states; (3) a lack of adequate training facilities to the revenue staff who handle computers in the field areas; and (4) unavailability of private vendors to enter data. In addition to these, an administrative system for the computerization has not been clearly set up. It is operated under the state-government revenue departments, sometimes with only partially trained staff. Therefore, a quantum change in this process is needed.

National economic development should ideally bring about an enhancement in the quality of life for all citizens within a given nation. But the question remains, are these parameters met by the present model of development? It seems, instead, that “development has become a big business, preoccupied more with its own growth and imperatives than with the people it was originally created to serve” (Domer 1992, 72–75). The present economic model is premised on the centrality of markets. But the market forces themselves are a function of economic power and control. In cases in which economic resources and opportunities are widely distributed, economic activity may best be left to individual, private initiative, and market forces, but in societies with a skewed distribution of natural resources and opportunities, a free play of market forces could marginalize an increasing proportion of people, without state intervention through reforms. In these circumstances, land reform holds a key to the removal of current socioeconomic abuses and serves as a means to break the age-old bondages of exploitation and poverty, to foster greater equity and justice. Increasing people’s access to land and creating a more equitable redistribution of land assets are important for India, particularly in view of its high and ever-increasing person-to-land ratio. Increased emphasis on industrialization should not result in an abandonment of the rural sector. For an economy that has little capital but a surplus of labor, optimal land utilization is an important component of land sustainability, and should be based on a consideration of land’s labor-absorption capacity—to avoiding crowding and soil degradation—in a bid to achieve higher output per unit of land. Policies
aimed at liberalizing markets and privatizing natural resources fail to address the problem of land and labor in the rural sector of India.

Proper land records continue to be a major problem even after five decades of land policy interventions. Computerization alone may not solve the problem and land surveys involve heavy costs. The body appointed by the Planning Commission recommended the Torrens System for land records in order to provide clear title to land. The Government of Maharashtra has taken steps to introduce the Torrens System on a pilot basis. The scheme provides for the conversion of the present presumptive titles to land into conclusive titles, which requires the updating and publication of the Records of Rights. The scheme is being implemented in two districts and the pilot process may come out with a fool-proof scheme. As the basis of all economic activity, land can either serve as an essential asset for a country to achieve economic growth and social equity, or it can be used as a tool in the hands of a few to hijack a country’s economic independence and subvert its social processes. During the two centuries of British colonization, India experienced the latter reality. During colonialism, India’s traditional land-use and landownership patterns were changed to ease the acquisition of land at low prices by British entrepreneurs for mines, plantations, and other enterprises. The introduction of the institution of private property delegitimized the community ownership systems of tribal societies. Moreover, with the introduction of the land tax under the Permanent Settlement Act 1793, the British popularized the zamindari system1 at the cost of the jajmani relationship that the landless shared with the landowning class. By no means was a just system, the latter an example of what has been described by Scott (1976) as a moral economy, and at the least it ensured the material security of those without land. Owing to these developments in a changing social and economic landscape, India at independence inherited a semi feudal agrarian system. The ownership and control of land was highly concentrated in the hands of a small group of landlords and intermediaries,
whose main intention was to extract maximum rent, either in cash or in kind, from tenants. Under this arrangement, the sharecropper or the tenant farmer had little economic motivation to develop farmland for increased production; with no security of tenure and a high rent, a tenant farmer was naturally less likely to invest in land improvements, or use high-yielding crop varieties or other expensive investments that might yield higher returns. At the same time, the landlord was not particularly concerned about improving the economic condition of the cultivators. Consequently, agricultural productivity suffered, and the oppression of tenants resulted in a progressive deterioration of their well-being.

In the years immediately following India’s independence, a conscious process of nation building considered the problems of land with a pressing urgency. In fact, the national objective of poverty abolition envisaged simultaneous progress on two fronts: high productivity and equitable distribution. Accordingly, land reforms were visualized as an important pillar of a strong and prosperous country. India’s first several five-year plans allocated substantial budgetary amounts for the implementation of land reforms. A degree of success was even registered in certain regions and states, especially with regard to issues such as the abolition of intermediaries, protection to tenants, rationalization of different tenure systems, and the imposition of ceilings on landholdings. Fifty-four years down the line, however, a number of problems remain far from resolved. Most studies indicate that inequalities have increased, rather than decreased. The number of landless laborers has risen, while the wealthiest 10 percent of the population monopolizes more land now than in 1951. Moreover, the discussion of land reforms since World War II and up through the most recent decade either faded from the public mind or was deliberately glossed over by both the national government of India and a majority of international development agencies. Vested interests of the landed elite and their powerful connection with the political-bureaucratic system have
blocked meaningful land reforms and/or their earnest implementation. The oppressed have either been co-opted with some benefits, or further subjugated as the new focus on liberalization, privatization, and globalization (LPG) has altered government priorities and public perceptions. As a result, we are today at a juncture where land—mostly for the urban, educated elite, who are also the powerful decision makers—has become more a matter of housing, investment, and infrastructure building; land as a basis of livelihood—for subsistence, survival, social justice, and human dignity—has largely been lost. In recent years, the government's land policy interventions have focused on the correction and computerization of land records, improving the land survey process, and improving land quality through the reclamation of degraded wasteland and forests. Land reform implementation is almost thinning out as a priority. In fact, the important policy discussions now centre on whether certain land-reform interventions should be reversed; particularly whether the land ceilings should be increased and whether tenancy restrictions should be liberalized. Marginalization of land holdings and land administration are also of major concern. Policy discussions concerning rolling back land ceiling laws have assumed prominence. It is argued that the current ceiling limits hinder investment in agriculture and diversification to high-tech agriculture. It is questioned that there are no limits on investment in other sectors, yet agriculturalists face a restriction on increasing the size of holding. Added to this the average size of holding is sliding down in successive censuses because of nationalization of the smaller holdings. Putting a bottom ceiling on the smallest size is worth considering given the present political and administrative climate in the country; rolling back the land ceiling limits seems to be a difficult political option. It is argued that economies of scale could be achieved by allowing larger holdings and that large farms would also attract greater investment in the agriculture sector. This is necessary before it is possible to generate an exportable surplus and to participate effectively in the world market. Pooling small farms together to form formal or informal groups of
producers for purposes of marketing may be a way to achieve this goal. This was successfully attempted in Karnataka, growing rose onions and gherkins for export. The second policy option being actively discussed in a countrywide debate is the desirability of liberalizing the current restrictions (sometimes prohibitions) on agricultural tenancy. The argument that liberalizing tenancy restrictions will have a pro-poor impact has gained ground. It is felt that a majority of the beneficiaries from tenancy liberalization will be small and marginal farmers. Presently, most concealed tenancies give no protection for the tenant or the landlord. Moreover, informal (or concealed) tenants cannot gain access to capital from banks and financial institutions. A recent study of a spate of farmers' suicides in Karnataka found that many of them were informal tenants who borrowed from moneylenders and could not pay back because of high interest rates (Deshpande, 2002). Legalizing tenancy will also help to bring the small and marginal tenants within the ambit of institutional credit. If legal status is conferred on the tenant, this may not leave room for imperfections in the tenancy market usually caused by concealed tenancy and unilateral fixation of land rent. It is also expected that opening the lease market will attract much-needed private investment in agriculture. It may be possible to prevent possible imperfections by restricting the upper limit and allowing leasing of land up to that limit. The limit should also serve as a threshold to allow only those who have ownership of land below such a limit. Similarly, the tenant as well as the owner should have a guarantee of protection of their interests. Interestingly, the National Commission on Agriculture referred in 1976 to the need for new amendments in tenancy reform to overcome the problems of concealed tenancy as well as reverse tenancy (NCA, 1976, pp. 159 - 60). Leasing in land belonging to the disempowered people should be


regulated, with a proper intervening authority to help to protect them from unscrupulous dealings. Land policy in post-Independence India has evolved through different phases. These include: two phases of land reform; attention to issues pertaining to quality of land through the Drought-Prone Area and Desert Development Programmes, Wasteland Development and Watershed Development Programmes designed to reclaim environmentally degraded land. These policy interventions have had varying impacts on poverty and the overall development process. It is difficult empirically to segregate the influence of the changes in land policy on poverty, environmental management, sustainability and production, but available studies indicate that land-reform measures have had a significant impact on equity and poverty. The measures dealing with the quality of land have a partial to significant impact on environmental parameters. In addition to these, other land-policy instruments were used for the purpose of transforming development policy effectively. In the previous section we have indicated the key areas for the purpose of action and major policy interventions required. The key areas for future land policy action include legalizing the tenancy market, contract farming, and watershed and wasteland development to assume greater significance. Such interventions involve important implementation issues relating to the political economic aspects of the reform measures and reform of the institutions. Future research should be directed towards establishing the institutional framework to fit these issues into a broader policy-making process.

It is sad part of implementation that land reforms measures, which have enormous potential of community development, have become victim of neglect of ruling class and its natural allies. Even political power with this given superstructure remains ineffective. Despite ruling of effective implementation with a declared deadline by the state government, land reforms remained on the same ground with a marginal difference, as the superstructure did not correspond because of their anti dalit and anti poor allegiance. This suggests
that unless superstructure is radically transformed mere usurpation of political power does not empower in real sense to implement the agenda of poor, for instance, land reforms. Vicious nexus of land owning social groups and class embedded with this bureaucratic connivance because of their common interest, all sorts of manipulations of record have been done to foil the efforts of implementation of land reforms. Majority of functionaries from villages to secretariats are represented and controlled by the landowning class and its natural allies in politics. Indifferent attitude towards implementation of Land Reforms and to ensure possession has been quite obvious. Now the land reforms have been pushed to back seat. There is urgent need of reorienting policies through effective mobilization of poor so that the policy makers and implementing functionary do not have any option but to work in favour of deprived masses.

Indian agriculture has made great strides in the course of the last half a century of planned development. From chronic hunger and abject dependence on the import of food grains, the country has achieved not only self sufficiency in the availability of food grains but has become a net exporter of food grains consecutively for the last six years, despite the trebling of the country’s population since independence. There has been a major transformation of farming from the traditional to the modern with millions of farmers, including the small and marginal, who have become increasingly science and technology conscious, fully participating in the Green Revolution. With these achievements, the country has entered the new era of globalization with confidence even as the expectations of farmers have been aroused. The country is now well poised to cope with the new challenges of achieving effective food security by raising the employment and purchasing power of the poor through the diversification of agriculture as well as facilitating shift of labour force from agriculture to the rural non farm sector, and making our agriculture products internationally competitive through the adoption of new cost reducing
technologies. The influence of industrialization on national and international economic systems has reshaped the manner in which agriculture is conducted and for what purpose. From a family, or, at the most, a community affair, agriculture has been "professionalized" into an industry in which a farmer produces for the global market. Indeed, modern farming methods and techniques have transformed agriculture into a science of food production and a system of commodity distribution. This shift in agricultural production goals has been promoted most fervently since the 1980s, by policy makers and politicians, who conceptualize agriculture more as an industry that must be conducted to maximize profits, and less as a way of life with social and ecological ramifications. The trend has been justified by the substantial increases in agricultural output, which, it is argued, has substantially eased India's national food-security concerns. Undoubtedly, Indian granaries are overflowing. And yet, the individual in the Typical Indian village is starving to death, and a "failed" farmer resorts to suicide. Surely, the disparity between these two realities calls for a closer examination of the issues involved.

Commercialization of agriculture first gained a foothold in India in the 1960s, with the green revolution in Punjab, when the World Bank, along with the US Agency for International Development (USAID), promoted agricultural productivity through importation of fertilizers, seeds, pesticides, and farm machinery. The Bank provided the credit necessary to replace the low-cost, low input agriculture in existence with an agricultural system that was both capital- and chemical-intensive.

The present economic trends in India are negatively affecting land use and distribution in a variety of ways, some of which have been described above. Attempts to either reverse these trends or propose alternative approaches to development present a significant challenge to the landless in India. As the neo liberalization of the Indian state decreases the opportunity to resist the top down World Bank models, there is an increased awareness of the problem
with land use and distribution both within the Bank itself and among international nongovernmental organizations more generally (see introduction to Part I of this volume). However, the need to sensitize people to these realities cannot be underestimated. Increasing the prominence of land reform challenges through public discourse and Indian politics is particularly important since more comprehensive agrarian reform has virtually disappeared from the popular, political, and elite radar screen throughout the country. The growing size of the urban-based population in India presents another challenge to establishing a national, comprehensive land reform policy. Most urban dwellers perceive land in a compartmentalized and detached way, and are unable to identify with the problems of the small or marginal farmers or Fathom the larger linkages of land use to the functioning of the macro economy. For instance, the urban middle-class market demand for cheaper products pushes farmers toward agricultural systems that have a low-unit cost of production. This is only possible if the yield per acre is increased through the use of artificial fertilizers, pesticides that reduce crop losses, and, more recently, through genetically modified crops that claim to be more resistant to pests. All of these require access to and maintenance of capital for cash poor farmers. Higher capital costs on the part of farmers drive the demand for borrowing from individual or credit institutions. As farmers’ debts rise, along with the frequency of bankruptcy, they are forced to sell land to richer farmers or corporate houses and move into cities in search of other jobs. Equipped with few skills, these now landless people live in the slums. The environmental and social costs of cheap agricultural produce are huge; but this scenario is largely invisible to urbanites. Few acknowledge or appreciate the link between huge entertainment complexes or wildlife sanctuaries and the fate of the displaced, or between rising urban crime and increasing rural dislocation as a result of commercialized agriculture, bankrupted farmers, and environmental degradation. Vinoba Bhave said, “People used to criticize Bhoodan as tending to break up the land into very small fragment. I replied that my work is
not to break up the land, but to join together divided parts. This union of hearts is the chief aim of *Bhoodan*, once we achieve it every thing". The land reforms measures have affected the village life drastically and promoted Urbanization and Industrialization, the new environment equipped with modern means and instruments. The Green Revolution has motivated the peasantry to produce more, to earn more; thereby economic competition has become a working norm. The exchanges of labour, farm implements, monetary help etc. have become things of the past. Economic relations are being rebuilt on the axis of what may be more appropriately called market orientation of the transaction.

Rapid agricultural growth continues to be the key to poverty alleviation and overall economic development. Agriculture accounts for about one fourth of the Gross Domestic Product and is the source of livelihood for nearly two thirds of the population. The agriculture sector in India has been successful in keeping pace with the rising food demand of a growing population which has crossed the one billion mark. Food grain production more than quadrupled since the early 1950’s from 51 million tones to over 212 million tones in 2002, while population nearly tripled from 350 million to one billion during the same period. The present study is an attempt to understand the impact of land reforms on structure of agricultural holdings, agricultural production, employment and income distribution. It is expected that those who receive the surplus land would be able to use the same as a base for improving their economic and social status, and that land would be intensively cultivated with family labour which would reduce the unemployment and underemployment faced by these sections in rural areas. It is therefore, necessary to study in depth the structural changes in agricultural holdings, utilization of surplus land by the allottees, their production, employment generated and income distribution.

The main purpose of this work is to look upon the social and economic consequences of land reforms which have had implications for structural
changes, mainly in the agrarian society at the level of family, kinship, marriage, *Jajmani* system, share cropping and labour system. The land reform measures aimed at abolition of institution of intermediaries, rent receivers, security of tenure to tenants, ceiling on land acquisition, distribution of surplus land among the landless, regulation of wages and supply of modern agricultural inputs.

It has been observed that agriculture had become a problem of relationship between man and man than between man and land. As such the term “**Land Reform**” symbolizes by itself a certain degree of maladjustment in the distribution of land both owned land and cultivated land, that necessitated some ameliorative measures to bring about a more just and/or egalitarian redistribution of land among the cultivating class. The present study has examined the social and economic consequences of land reforms in District *Aligarh* of Uttar Pradesh. While examining the social and economic consequences, emphasis has been laid upon in the following indicators of social and economic development, **Literacy, Life expectancy, Health, Drinking water, Happiness, Employment etc.** Once again there is much hue and cry against the ongoing land reforms programme, in the wake of liberalization, decontrol and globalization of our trade and the integration of our economy with the global economy. It is argued that land reforms have no relevance in the liberalized, free market economy. This view is however, strongly opposed and the relevance of the land reforms has in fact increased more than ever before. There is need for a responsive administration for the effective implementation of land reforms, and also the need for the empowerment of the poor, the depressed and the downtrodden to bring in radical implementation of land reforms.

The experience of countries like *Japan and Korea* shows there is no contradiction between land reforms and the dynamics of all-round comprehensive development. The radical land reforms carried out by the
administration in Japan and Korea released initiatives for development of both agriculture and industry through development of the market and democratization of the rural society which was essential for the growth of capitalism. There is no evidence that there were economies of scale in agriculture in the East Asia forty years ago, in India also there are no significant economies of scale today, as there are constant returns to scale. There is no reason to believe that small farms, and for that matter, reforms, will act as a constraint on development and that there is no case for land ceilings, and hence the corporate sector should be allowed to take up farming. There is strong economic case for land reforms for raising farm productivity, income and employment as well as for creating a better socio-economic order and environment which results in to the overall development of the community. Besides, in view of the slow growth of employment in the non-agricultural sector, there is need for greater absorption within agriculture through land reforms and appropriate changes in cropping pattern as well as occupations of the farming population.

Land reforms provided a necessary condition in itself for quick alleviation of rural poverty and social injustice. However, they will have to be supplemented by measures like removal of illiteracy, and various other infrastructural and institutional constraints to development. Also, they should be integrated with other anti poverty programmes like IRDP, and NREP for yielding better results.

The planners, administrators and the leaders of the people at the national and state levels, as well as at the village levels, have to put “their shoulders to the wheel” if we have to see results in the near future. Old landlordism has to be abolished, and for that reforms have to be carried out. But the importance of administrator cannot be overemphasized in the whole scheme. The political leaders at different levels together with the active participation of people are an integral art of the entire scheme.
Thus the principal components of an effective land reforms strategy seem to be-

(1)- Political commitment at the top.

(2)- Administrative preparedness, including the improvement of the technical design of enactments, the provision of financial resources and the streamlining of the organizational machinery of implementation.

(3)- Creation of necessary support services for the beneficiaries.

(4)- The organization of beneficiaries themselves as land reforms cannot be properly enforced without popular cooperation and support at all levels.

(5)- Finally, it is also important that potential beneficiaries are made aware of the land reforms programme.

The framework of analysis provided above describes the increasing importance of land reform to the national and global agenda from national food security, economic, ecological and social perspectives. The direction of land politics and land reform in India will continue to be one of struggle and hope. It will be important to widen the scope of land reforms beyond the mere activity of redistribution of land or revisions of ceiling limits. In order to be effective, land Reform must be seen as part of a wider agenda of systemic restructuring that undertakes simultaneous reforms in the sectors of energy and water. Deeper structural reforms will ensure that the exercise of land redistribution actually becomes meaningful, enabling small farmers to turn their plots into productive assets. The existing socio-economic order in which power base lies with the rural rich needs to be radically changed to a new order in which power balance with favour the rural poor. In the ultimate analysis, land reforms would improve the future prospects in relation to raising farm productivity, income
and employment through the creation of new incentives and opportunities for increased work and investment.

Findings & Recommendations:

Based on the discussion and analysis of this study following findings are thrown up for consideration of the implementing agencies and functionaries in order to achieve effective targets of land reforms:-

1. A poor peasant Land Management Committee (LMC) at village level should be formed to verify the implementation status.

2. Poor peasants cooperative should be formed and follow up packages, access to credit, etc. should be rooted through cooperative.

3. Undistributed scattered land parcels should be consolidated and redistributed through cooperative ownership.

4. Poor peasant committee should be provided legal support to identify *benami* transfer of land. The *benami* land should be declared surplus and those surplus lands should be redistributed among poor households on the recommendation of poor peasant land management committee.

5. Wasteland should be acquired and transferred to landless through their cooperative ownership and follow up assistance should be rooted through cooperative in reference.

6. Ban on individual purchase of redistributed land should be executed effectively.

7. Assured irrigation cooperatives of landless peasants should be formed to provide irrigation on distributed and other lands.
8. Effective insurance cover on crops should be extended through micro finance cooperative of land beneficiaries.

9. A provision for direct institutional loan on land should be extended to the beneficiary of land directly on producing *kisan* passbook.

10. Subsidized inputs should be provided to the beneficiaries of land.

11. Indifference and negligence in implementation of land redistribution and possession by functionaries should be treated as *cognizable non-bailable offence*.

12. Administration and policy implementing agencies should be made accountable directly for non possession and should be punished in terms of career of service.

13. Best implementing functionaries should be given incentives.

14. Minimum wages should be implemented effectively.

15. Poor households should be organized and proper support should be extended to safeguard the interest of the beneficiary of land.

16. Participation of poor in cooperatives, PRI and land management committee should be ensured.

17. Illegal possession of redistributed land by influential persons should be liberated on priority basis.

18. Effective flood control measures should be initiated.

19. Rural industrialization should be promoted.
20. Functional education should be encouraged and women participation should be promoted.

21. PRI should be empowered to form women cooperatives and functional education Groups. Technical support should be ensured to promote women participation.

22. Land records should be computerized, updated and easy access to the records should be ensured for information.

23. Pro-poor social activists should be involved in organizing poor.