



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

Vol XXIII
No. 1

ISSN 0019-5014

JANUARY-
MARCH
1968

INDIAN JOURNAL OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS



INDIAN SOCIETY OF
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
BOMBAY

CHANGES IN LAND HOLDINGS CONSEQUENT TO THE ABOLITION OF THE INTERMEDIARIES

P. T. George

After Independence a number of steps were taken to reorganize the agrarian structure in the country. The abolition of the intermediaries, regulation of tenancy and fixation of ceilings on agricultural holdings were some of the main steps in this direction. A number of surveys were conducted under the auspices of the Research Programmes Committee to study the impact of these measures in the various States. In this paper, we shall discuss the results of abolition of the intermediaries on landholdings in some States.

A direct comparison of the findings of the various surveys is beset with many difficulties. The differences in approach, coverage, tabulation and analysis and presentation are some such problems. However, we shall try to trace some salient features of the changes in landholdings on the basis of the reports we have in hand.

For the purpose of this paper we could take up only the following studies :—

- (1) Economic and Social Effects of Zamindari Abolition in Andhra, by B. Sarveswara Rao.
- (2) A Study of Land Reforms in Uttar Pradesh, by Baljit Singh and Sridhar Misra.
- (3) A Study of Land Reforms in Rajasthan by Dool Singh.
- (4) Effects of Land Reforms in Saurashtra by R. R. Mishra.
- (5) Economic and Social Effects of Jagirdari Abolition and Land Reforms in Hyderabad by A. M. Khusro.

All these five studies were based on the principle 'before' and 'after' and covered, broadly, the period 1946-1961.¹ The objectives of these studies were mainly to examine the socio-economic effects of land reforms and the changes in the structural distribution of land as a result. The economic impact of the abolition of the intermediaries could not be easily measured and therefore some of these studies refrained from such exercises.

II

Before we take up the findings of the Reports it would be useful to make a very brief survey of the legal provisions which are of direct significance. What we should look into are the provisions regarding the grant of ownership rights to tenants and the allotment of land for personal cultivation of the intermediaries.

1. The periods covered by the respective studies were :
Andhra 1946-47 to 1954-55.
Uttar Pradesh—period 'before' covered 1948-49, 1949-50 and 1950-51 and the period 'after' covered 1957-58, 1958-59 and 1959-60,
Rajasthan—1953-54 to 1960-61.
Saurashtra—1947-48 to 1954-55.
Hyderabad—1948-49 to 1953-54.

The allotment of *khudkasht*² or personally cultivated area is important because in most cases the vesting of the estates in the Government saved for the intermediaries such areas already in their possession. The provisions in this connection varied considerably from State to State.

The principle adopted in Andhra, under the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948, for conferring lands on the *zamindars*,³ was that "any land which is proved to have been in possession of the ryots at any time, even if it be for a single day, will remain with the ryot and not with the zamindar."⁴ In the process of verification and issue of *pattas* (title deeds held by ryots), it was inevitable that some of the lands in the possession of the intermediaries would go to the ryots who could present proper claims. This is evident because under the Act the intermediaries were entitled for ryotwari *pattas* only in respect of private lands which belonged to them before the notified date. Private lands meant home farm lands which were cultivated by them without interruption since 1896 and lands in which they had recorded rights as private lands. If such rights could not be proved and if no ryot came forward with valid claims the land would revert to the government. Though normally lands inherited, purchased or received as gift or exchange were allowed to the intermediaries the conditions attached on such lands were significant. For this purpose a distinction was made between the zamindars on the one hand and *inamdars*⁵ and pre-settlement under-tenure holders on the other. Zamindars could get *pattas* for land acquired by inheritance or succession under a will and lands abandoned by ryots or which were never occupied by ryots, only if they were in possession of such lands and personally cultivating them from 1st July, 1939.⁶ For the other types of intermediaries the date was shifted to 1st July, 1945.⁷ Zamindars could get *pattas* for ryoti lands purchased or received as gift or exchange only if such lands were in their continuous possession from 1st July, 1945, or the date of acquisition, whichever was later.

In Uttar Pradesh the intermediaries were recognized as *Bhumidars*⁸ over *Sir*⁹ and *khudkasht* lands held by them before the abolition of zamindari. Besides, all groves held by them remained in their possession. These rights were given to the permanent lessees of Avadh also. Similarly, all lands held by a fixed rate tenant or a rent free grantee also were converted into *bhumidari*. There were no restrictions in respect of the maximum area that could be so converted. The original Act, however, laid down a maximum limit of 30 acres (later reduced to 12 1/2 acres by an amendment in 1958) in respect of future acquisitions as

2. Generally land other than *Sir* which is under the personal cultivation of the landlord, under-proprietor, etc. Also, home farm of the proprietor.

3. Landlords under the Zamindari system of land tenure.

4. B. Sarveswara Rao : Economic and Social Effects of Zamindari Abolition in Andhra, Research Programmes Committee, Planning Commission, Government of India, Manager of Publications, New Delhi, 1963, p. 33.

5. An *inamdar* is one who holds an estate or grant, wholly or partially exempt from land revenue, made, confirmed or recognized by the Government.

6. In this year the Prakasam Committee on Madras Estates Land Act recommended radical changes in the rights and privileges of Zamindars. The Committee did not make any reference to *inams*.

7. The object in prescribing these dates was chiefly to avoid recognizing collusive or *mala fide* transactions undertaken by the landholders in anticipation of legislation detrimental to their interests.

8. Peasant proprietors with rights of full transferability.

9. Lands in a village which are cultivated by the hereditary proprietors or zamindars themselves as their own especial share, either by their own labourers or at their own cost or by tenants-at-will.

bhumidar. Of course, this restriction does not apply to the old intermediaries who acquired *bhumidari* rights by conversion. Under the various provisions in the Act, the intermediaries could also retain possession of lands which were under tenants, under certain circumstances. The rest of the lands were held by cultivators with *sirdari*¹⁰ and *asami*¹¹ rights with varying degrees of permanency.

In Rajasthan intermediaries were of three types, *Jagirdars*,¹² *Zamindars* and *Biswedars*.¹³ The *jagirdari* system was abolished under the Rajasthan Land Reforms and Resumption of Jagirs Act, 1952. Under the Act all tenants with permanent and fully transferable rights were given *khatedari* rights.¹⁴ For the allotment of *khudkasht* to the intermediaries the provisions were peculiar. The maximum area that should be allotted to *khudkasht* was fixed in relation to the size of the estate, and not on the basis of the area already personally cultivated. The *jagirdars* who did not possess adequate lands under personal cultivation at the time of resumption of their estates could apply within a given time to the Collector or the *Khudkasht* Commissioner for allotment of lands. In terms of unirrigated lands the maximum extent of *khudkasht* was fixed at 500 acres, but those who already possessed more than this were not disturbed. It was also possible for the *jagirdars* to exchange their (dry) lands in the districts for lands commanded by irrigation projects. In the allotment of *khudkasht*, the *jagirdars* were thus treated with favour and the tenants' rights were only of secondary importance. Under the provisions of the Act, it was possible that many *jagirdars* who previously did not care to cultivate any land would come to own extensive areas of agricultural lands after the abolition of the intermediaries. But here it will be of great significance to note the provisions in the Rajasthan Tenancy Act, 1955.¹⁵ According to this Act, any person who at the commencement of the Act was a tenant of land, otherwise than as a sub-tenant or tenant of *khudkasht*, became a *khatedar* tenant. If any one was admitted as a tenant otherwise than as a sub-tenant, tenant of *khudkasht* or as an allottee of land given for temporary cultivation, he automatically became a *khatedar* tenant. Certain categories of tenants of *khudkasht* were given the right to apply for the acquisition of the *khatedari* rights and the rights in improvements, or payment of compensation to the landlords. Further, by a new amendment in 1959 every person who was entered in the annual register on the 15th day of October, 1955 as a tenant of *khudkasht* or sub-tenant of land other than grove lands, automatically became *khatedar* tenant, from the commencement of the amendment, *i.e.*, from 5th April, 1959. These provisions satisfactorily safeguarded the interests of the tenants against mischief by the intermediaries.

The provisions in the Rajasthan Zamindari and Biswedari Abolition Act, 1959 were also similar.

10. A tenure in which the right to transfer the land is limited.

11. Non-proprietary cultivator—a tenant.

12. A *Jagirdar* is the holder of *jagir*, *i.e.*, an assignment of the rights or interest in whole or in part, of land revenue or any other kind of revenue of an estate or village with or without any consideration of past or future services.

13. A category of permanent holders of interest in land.

14. Rights held by *khatedars*—a class of tenants having heritable and full transferable occupancy rights in their tenancy.

15. To protect the tenants from wholesale ejection the Government promulgated the Rajasthan Protection of Tenants Ordinance in 1949 (June). This Ordinance not only checked further evictions, but also provided a quick and simplified process for the re-instatement of evicted tenants. The Ordinance remained in force till 1955 when the Rajasthan Tenancy Act, 1955, was enacted.

The provisions in the Saurashtra Acts appear to be more interesting. The Saurashtra Land Reforms Act, 1951, divided *girasdars*¹⁶ into three classes on the basis of the size of their estates.¹⁷ Here also the area of *khudkasht* that should be allotted was not related to area already so held but to the extent of agricultural lands in the estates. The maximum extent of land to be allotted was as follows:—

Class A :—Enough area to make 3 economic holdings plus all lands held by them as *gharkhed*¹⁸ in their estates and *khalsa*¹⁹ lands, if any.

Class B :—This class was divided into three groups on the basis of the area of their estates:—

- (1) 120 acres to 320 acres. They were to be given one and a half economic holdings.
- (2) 320 to 500 acres. They were entitled for 2 economic holdings, and
- (3) 500 to 800 acres. They were to be given 2½ economic holdings.

In all these cases, as in respect of A class *girasdars*, the limit was fixed inclusive of all lands held by them.

Class C :—*Girasdars* were divided into two groups :

- (1) upto 80 acres. They were allowed one economic holding, and
- (2) 80 to 120 acres. They were given one and a half economic holdings (including all lands already held by them).

An important aspect of allotment of *khudkasht* lands to *girasdars* was that if lands otherwise available was not adequate, their tenants could be dispossessed to a given extent. For example, to allot lands to A and B class *girasdars* areas held by their tenants in excess of one economic holding could be claimed. If even this was inadequate the deficit could be made up by taking agricultural land from all tenants of the *girasdars* in proportion to the area held by them irrespective of the size of their holdings. Further, the area so allotted from the tenants' holdings was to have the same proportion of *bagayat* (irrigated land) and *jirayat* (non-irrigated or dry land) and also good, medium or poor lands as existed in the estate. What is more, the allotment was to be made as far as possible in contiguous blocks of 10 acres or more. The inroad into the tenants' holdings of C class *girasdars* for the purpose of allotment could be to the extent of half the total area held by each tenant.

Under the Saurashtra Barkhali Abolition Act, 1951, the *barkhalidars*²⁰ in whose estates the agricultural land was equal to two economic holdings or less

16. A class of landholders with quasi-proprietary rights.

17. A class—over 80 acres of agricultural lands.
B class—120 to 800 acres of agricultural lands.
C class—upto 120 acres of agricultural lands.

18. Land reserved for personal cultivation by intermediaries.

19. Land whose revenue is collected directly by the Government. So unalienated or Government land.

20. Ordinary landholders whose produce from the land is free from State demand. They have no proprietary rights in land but are entitled to the usufruct of their holdings.

and who was not a *Chakariyat*,²¹ *Dharmada* Institution²² or *Jivaidar*²³ for life, was to be allotted land in the following manner:—

- (1) Each of his tenants should first be given half an economic holding, including any other land in his possession.
- (2) If there remained any *barkhali* land the *barkhalidar* was to be given land to make up half an economic holding, including *gharkhed* and *khalsa* lands held by him.
- (3) If there still remained any *barkhali* land it should be divided equally between the *barkhalidar* and the tenants. The maximum area allotted to the *barkhalidar*, however, was not to exceed one economic holding. Furthermore, the Act provided for a mutual right of pre-emption for 10 years for lease or sale at a price determined by the *Mamlatdar*.²⁴

We may note here that in Saurashtra there were no laws to protect the interests of the tenants at the time of the intermediary abolition. This was a major difference between the situations in Rajasthan and Saurashtra.

In Hyderabad the regulation under which the *jagirdari* system was abolished provided that the home farm (*seri khudkasht*) of a *jagirdar* or *hissedar*²⁵ should not be disturbed. They could hold such lands subject to the laws in force from time to time. The extent and the boundaries of the home farm of a *jagirdar* or *hissedar* were to be determined by the *Jagir* Administrator. No forest or waste land was to be included in any home farm.

This brief survey of the legal provisions regarding allotment of *khudkasht* would bring out the vast differences in the approach to the problem in the various States.

III

In the Saurashtra study a special schedule was canvassed among 124 *girasdars* and 112 *barkhalidars* to study the economic conditions of the ex-intermediaries. This was over and above the general sample study, which also studied the different categories of landed interests. It would be better to start with the findings of this special probe. In 1947-48 the 124 *girasdars* held 11,870 acres of land of which only 4,455 acres (37.5 per cent) were self-cultivated. The average self-cultivated area in 1947-48 was 35.92 acres. In 1954-55 they owned 5,764 acres, the average holding being 46.48 acres, which was 29.3 per cent higher than that in 1947-48. Out of the 124 *girasdars*, 26 persons (21.0%) secured additional lands under *khudkasht* allotments. The area so allotted was 740 acres, constituting 12.8 per cent of the total holdings of all the *girasdars* and 17.6 per cent of the holdings of these 26 *girasdars*. It is again significant that 157.11 acres (or 21.2 per cent of the area) of the area allotted, over which tenants were inevitably dispossessed, went to *girasdars* holding above 120 acres, though normally the maximum limit for

21. Holder of a service grant.

22. Religious or charitable institution.

23. Holder of a maintenance grant.

24. Chief officer entrusted with the local revenue administration of a taluka (sub-division of a district).

25. A person who is entitled to a share in the income of a *jagir*.

TABLE I—CHANGES IN THE NUMBER OF HOLDINGS OF DIFFERENT CATEGORIES OF CULTIVATORS BETWEEN 1947-48 TO 1954-55 (SAURASHTRA)

Size of holding (acres)	All categories		Occupants		Girasdars		Barkhaidars		Girasdari tenants		Barkhaidari tenants							
	1947-48	1954-55	1947-48	1954-55	1947-48	1954-55	1947-48	1954-55	1947-48	1954-55	1947-48	1954-55						
	ge	ge	ge	ge	ge	ge	ge	ge	ge	ge	ge	ge						
Nil	129	98	-31	76	61	-15	43	4	-39	8	10	2	1	16	15	3	7	4
0-5	371	404	33	157	179	22	21	18	-3	87	99	12	43	46	3	61	62	1
5-15	994	1250	256	531	726	195	65	51	-14	181	172	-7	77	123	46	141	176	35
15-25	965	1147	182	552	666	114	87	84	-3	122	116	-6	102	148	46	102	133	31
25-40	1207	1215	8	683	658	-25	80	92	12	79	84	5	226	236	10	138	145	7
40-60	745	573	-172	372	271	-101	50	96	46	31	27	-4	178	112	-66	114	67	-47
60-80	291	175	-116	154	79	-75	19	25	6	11	11	0	59	29	-30	48	31	-17
80-100	123	51	-72	61	26	-35	12	13	1	5	4	-1	26	3	-23	19	5	-14
100-150	112	33	-79	94	19	-75	12	10	-12	4	3	-1	2	1	-1	-	-	-
150-200	8	6	-2	1	1	0	6	4	-2	-	-	-	1	1	0	-	-	-
200 and above	12	5	-7	5	-	5	5	3	-2	2	2	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	4828	4859	31	2610	2625	15	357	396	39	522	520	-2	714	714	0	623	619	-4

Notes : (1) The total excludes persons in the Nil acre group. (2) The change in total at the bottom is the net.

Source : R. R. Mishra : Effects of Land Reforms in Saurashtra, *op. cit.* This table is based upon the data in Tables 25 to 30 in the Report.

personally cultivated area allowed was 120 acres. The Report says "on the whole, however, it can be surmised that the process of dispossessing of the tenants of *girasdars* was not very extensive and could not have resulted in a great reduction in the size of the holdings of the latter."²⁶ But it is evident that there was substantial increase in the average size of holdings of the *girasdars* between 1947-48 and 1954-55 to which this dispossession must have contributed. From the data it is clear that if no additional land was allotted after dispossessing the tenants, the average holdings of *girasdars* would have been about 40.41 acres and not 46.48 acres. In other words, a substantial part of the increase in the average size of holding between the two years is attributable to the dispossession of *girasdari* tenants.

The average area of holdings of *barkhalidars* too increased (from 21.74 acres in 1947-48 to 23.88 acres in 1954-55), but by a much smaller margin. Only 6 out of 112 *barkhalidars* got fresh lands allotted for *khudkasht*. The area owned by the *barkhalidars* in 1954-55 was 9.3 per cent higher than the area personally cultivated in 1947-48.

According to the general sample, in 1947-48 only 357 out of 400 *girasdars* engaged in cultivation while the number was 396 in 1954-55. In 1947-48 there were 43 *girasdars* who did not cultivate any land. In 1954-55 there were only 4 such cases which means that 39 persons who previously did not care to cultivate any land have now become cultivators. This amounted to 9.75 per cent of the total sample *girasdars*. Among *barkhalidars*, there was a decline by 2 in the same group. There was considerable shift in the distribution of households in the different size-groups. The trend was an increasing concentration in the middle groups with a corresponding decline in the two extremes. This was notable in the case of *girasdars* as well as *barkhalidars*. To some extent, in their cases there was a reduction in the inequality in the distribution of holdings. This was partly at the expense of their respective tenants because we clearly see an increase in the number of holdings in the lower size-group with a corresponding decline in the higher size-groups in respect of both *girasdari* and *barkhalidari* tenants (see Table I). A similar reduction in the inequality in the distribution of land after the land reforms was seen among the ex-intermediaries in Rajasthan. But in Rajasthan the tenants did not seem to have suffered adversely mainly because of the extent of protection given to the tenants under the Rajasthan Tenancy Act, 1955.²⁷ There was a reduction in the number of holdings and area only in the size-group of 30-100 acres, in respect of sample tenants, while in the other groups there was slight gain.

The average operational holding of the intermediaries in Rajasthan declined from 30.17 acres in 1953-54 to 24.74 acres in 1960-61 (see Table II). The *khudkasht* area held in 1960-61 was 26.4 per cent less than the operational holding of the intermediaries in 1953-54. A close study of the data shows that there were some significant changes in the pattern of land holdings by the intermediaries.

26. R. R. Mishra : Effects of Land Reforms in Saurashtra, Report of a Survey sponsored by the Research Programmes Committee, Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi, Vora & Co., Publishers Private Ltd., Bombay, 1961, p. 139.

27. Dool Singh : A Study of Land Reforms in Rajasthan, Report of a Survey sponsored by the Research Programmes Committee, Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi, Students Agency, Birla Vidyavihar, Pilani, Rajasthan, 1964, pp. 63-64.

TABLE II—VARIATION IN OPERATIONAL HOLDINGS OF EX-INTERMEDIARIES AND TENANT CULTIVATORS BETWEEN 1953-54 AND 1960-61 (IN RAJASTHAN)

Region	Ex-Intermediaries			Tenant cultivators		
	Average size in		Per cent change	Average size in		Per cent change
	1953-54 (acres)	1960-61 (acres)		1953-54 (acres)	1960-61 (acres)	
1. Mainly <i>Jagir</i> Districts ..	25.41	22.53	—11.33	17.29	17.43	0.90
2. Districts with some <i>Za-</i> <i>mandaris</i>	29.11	29.12	0.03	22.46	21.78	—3.02
3. Mainly <i>Khalsa</i> Districts ..	48.81	22.22	—52.53	24.62	24.64	0.08
Total	30.17	24.74	—17.99	19.87	19.78	—0.04

Source : Dool Singh : A Study of Land Reforms in Rajasthan, *op. cit.*, based on Tables on pp. 319 and 236.

The average operational holding declined. The *khudkasht* in 1960-61 compared with the net holding in 1953-54 was smaller. But as far as these intermediaries were concerned a healthy trend was a more equitable distribution of holdings and area in the different size-groups after the land reforms (Table III).

TABLE III—PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE OPERATIONAL HOLDINGS OF THE EX-INTERMEDIARIES IN THE SELECTED DISTRICTS IN RAJASTHAN, BEFORE AND AFTER LAND REFORMS

Size-group (acres)	Before		After	
	No. of house- holds	Area	No. of house- holds	Area
Below 10	47.22	7.54	47.68	9.52
10—30	32.87	19.69	32.41	24.21
30—100	14.82	25.67	15.21	34.62
Over 100	5.09	47.10	3.70	31.61

Source : Dool Singh : *op. cit.*

In Uttar Pradesh, just before the enforcement of the Act there were attempts to bring more land under *sir* and *khudkasht*. In the sample villages, the area under *khudkasht* increased from 11,325 acres in 1948-49 to 12,309 acres in 1951-52, the last pre-abolition year. In that year in the sample villages, 66.94 per cent of the zamindars (2,905 out of 4,340) had *khudkasht* lands accounting for 16.33 per cent of the total area held by them. But the distribution was very lop-sided in that 81.55 per cent of them held 5 acres or less, which accounted for 21.04 per cent of the area; and 97.04 per cent held below 25 acres covering 59.63 per cent of the total *khudkasht* area.²⁸ The average *khudkasht* area was 4.24 acres.

28. Baljit Singh and Sridhar Misra : A Study of Land Reforms in Uttar Pradesh, Research Programmes Committee, Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi, Oxford Book Company, Calcutta, 1964, p. 34.

In the household sample there were 145 ex-zamindars. Unfortunately, this group is not adequately analysed to show the *khudkasht* area held by them before 1952 or the changed state of their holdings after the land reforms. They are mixed up with the *bhumidars* who would also include other persons who acquired *bhumidari* rights. While the average ownership holding of all the zamindars in the sample villages was 17.37 acres in 1951-52, that of the sample zamindars (145) was 53.64 acres.

To study the changes after land reforms in Uttar Pradesh, we have to look into the holdings of *bhumidars*. The average size of cultivated holdings in the sample villages changed noticeably. For *bhumidars* it declined from 12.57 acres to 10.48 acres (by 15.28 per cent), for *sirdars* from 6.49 acres to 6.13 acres (by 5.54 per cent), for *asamis* from 5.80 acres to 5.39 acres (by 7.07 per cent) and for non-tenure holders from 3.53 acres to 3.45 acres (by 2.27 per cent). If we look into the size-groupwise distribution it appears that *bhumidars* in the size-groups 5 to 15 acres gained considerable area and there was a substantial decline in the size-groups above 30 acres. We witness shifts of a similar type among the holdings of *sirdars* as well as *asamis* and they may be indicative of the changes that have taken place after the Zamindari abolition. It is evident that there is considerable inequality in the distribution of holdings both before and after land reforms though the inequality seems to have been slightly reduced after the Zamindari abolition (see Table IV). If we take the overall position, *i.e.*, all the sample households, there was a decline in the number of holdings and area held by persons in the higher size-groups and an increase in the middle and lower size-groups. For *sirdars* in the lowest two ranges the increase was clear, while in the middle ranges the changes were erratic and in the highest ranges the decline was definite. For *asamis* in the size-groups 3-10 acres the increase was marked, with decline in both the ends of the ranges. For the non-tenure holders there was considerable gain in 1—3 acre groups and decline in all other groups. These changes are significant and can be attributed to the fact that as larger estates were broken up, the smaller cultivators gained though differently. This effect was, however, very limited since large scale cultivation by zamindars was rare and redistribution of their cultivated holdings has not taken place under the operation of the Act.²⁹ However, the differential declines in the average holdings and the inter-tenurial variation in distribution can be attributed to the impact of Zamindari abolition.

The study in Hyderabad did not analyse the changes in the landholdings of the different categories of cultivators. The Report says that the abolition of *jagirs* by itself did not confer any new lands on the cultivators.³⁰ It was only in respect of small areas of lands called *seri*³¹ that the *jagirdars* were real owners. The *pat-tedars* either cultivated the lands themselves or leased them out. This arrangement was not affected by *jagirdari* abolition. The *seri* lands remained with the *jagirdars* and only where they had attempted to augment the extent of *seri* lands by forcefully nullifying the *patta* rights of some persons, the lands were given back to the people. Thus we may expect the total ownership holdings to remain largely unchanged as a result of *jagir* abolition, apart from any new lands, which was

29. *ibid.*, p. 153.

30. A. M. Khusro : Economic and Social Effects of Jagirdari Abolition and Land Reforms in Hyderabad, Research Programmes Committee, Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi, Osmania University Press, Hyderabad, 1958, p. 63.

31. Arable land originally excluded from the village assessment.

TABLE IV.—PERCENTAGE CHANGES IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF CULTIVATING HOLDINGS AND AREA IN THE SAMPLE VILLAGES IN UTTAR PRADESH AFTER ZAMINDARI ABOLITION OVER THAT BEFORE ZAMINDARI ABOLITION

Size-group (acres)	Bhumidars		Sirdars		Asamis		Non-tenure holders		All categories	
	House- holds	Area	House- holds	Area	House- holds	Area	House- holds	Area	House- holds	Area
Less than 1	+2.25	+0.11	+0.91	+0.13	+0.76	-0.05	-14.30	-2.84	+2.08	+0.12
1—3	-1.79	+0.06	+0.16	+0.62	-7.46	-1.71	+19.50	+10.30	-0.99	+0.60
3—5	+0.22	+0.82	-0.44	+0.18	+5.48	+4.77	-1.00	-2.95	-0.73	+0.58
5—10	+1.14	+3.30	+0.65	-2.32	+7.79	+12.08	-5.50	-11.58	+1.13	+2.46
10—15	-0.10	+2.58	-0.46	+0.06	-4.53	-14.78	—	—	-1.01	+0.92
15—20	-0.16	+0.72	-0.32	-0.29	+2.61	+8.79	—	—	-0.33	+0.19
20—30	+1.05	+5.09	-0.06	+0.37	-0.20	-0.35	-1.00	-0.18	+0.65	+1.84
30—40	-1.27	-2.77	-0.28	-1.15	—	—	—	—	-0.72	-1.67
Over 40	-1.04	-9.91	-0.26	-1.60	—	—	—	—	-0.08	-5.04

Source : Baljit Singh and Sridhar Misra : A Study of Land Reforms in Uttar Pradesh : *op. cit.*, on the basis of Tables 12 and 21, pp. 225 and 236.

previously unowned, which the State may have given on *patta* after the abolition of *jagirs*. However, the data collected do not contain any information on these matters. The changes in cultivation holdings and ownership holdings, according to the Report, are more closely associated with the tenancy legislation. Hence we are not in a position to identify the changes resulting from abolition of *jagirdari* system, if any. The failure to include a sample of ex-intermediaries makes it impossible to examine the changes in their ownership or cultivation holdings during the period.

In Andhra the average size of holding before the land reforms was 5.23 acres (1946-47) which declined to 5.06 acres in 1954-55. The decrease was only by 3.25 per cent which could very well be explained by the secular trend in the growth of households. Even if we examine the changes in the distribution of holdings in the different size-groups, we cannot see much change between the two years, except perhaps in the size-group above 25 acres. Holdings below 5 acres accounted for 74.2 per cent of the holdings and 27.7 per cent of the area in 1946-47, compared with 74.8 per cent and 28.1 per cent respectively in 1954-55. Further, the survey did not include an analysis, separately, of a sample of ex-intermediaries and in the absence of such an analysis it is not possible to attribute the small changes to the effects of abolition of the intermediaries.

Before we conclude, we may turn our attention to the analysis in the Saurashtra Report which throws light on the effect of abolition of intermediaries on the changes in the holdings of different categories of persons. We do not have comparable data in the other Reports. Out of the total 4,947 holdings, 1,849 were affected one way or the other. It was found that 35 per cent of the holdings of occupants, 48 per cent of that of *girasdars*, 26.8 per cent of the holdings of *barkhalidars*, 49.8 per cent of the holdings of *girasdari* tenants and 34.8 per cent of the holdings of *barkhalidari* tenants were affected. These figures are illustrative of the effect of abolition of intermediaries, to a large extent. If we take the *girasdars* and their tenants, we find that 125 out of 192 cases of changes in the holdings of the former were due to allotment of new lands, while 263 out of 356 cases of changes in the holdings of the latter were due to losses on account of *khudkasht* allotment. The effect of *khudkasht* allotment to *barkhalidars* was not so marked, but all the same noticeable (22 out of 142 cases of changes of *barkhalidars*' holdings and 17 out of 218 cases of changes of *barkhalidari* tenants' holdings). Altogether 157 holdings (out of 1,849 affected holdings) increased as a result of *khudkasht* allotments and 295 holdings decreased for the same reason. However, partitions, sales and purchases (836, 151, 175 respectively) accounted for a majority of the cases of changes during the period (see Table V).

The Andhra Report shows that while 1,926 holdings increased in size, 1,060 decreased in size between 1946-47 and 1954-55. From an analysis of the source of change we see that commercial transactions accounted for most of the changes with partition and inheritance following distantly. The changes in holdings either by sale or by purchase in the other surveys also do not indicate that such transactions were due to the impact of abolition of intermediaries.

TABLE V—REASONS FOR CHANGE IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF HOLDINGS OF DIFFERENT CATEGORIES OF CULTIVATORS IN SAURASHTRA (1947-48 TO 1954-55)

Reason for change	Category of cultivators					Total
	Occu- pants	Giras- dars	Barkha- lidars	Girasdari tenants	Barkhalidari tenants	
1. Got in <i>Gharkhed</i> ..	—	125	22	6	4	157
2. Lost in <i>Gharkhed</i> ..	3	2	10	263	17	295
3. Purchase	145	4	5	4	19	177
4. Sale	117	5	11	12	13	158
5. Partition	585	45	35	65	106	836
6. Acquisition by State	20	5	5	—	3	33
7. Resignation	5	—	—	1	—	6
8. Survey	25	—	41	3	22	91
9. Mortgage	23	4	12	1	32	72
10. Exchange	2	1	1	1	2	7
11. Gift	13	1	—	—	—	14
12. Got from Govern- ment	2	—	—	—	—	2
Total No. of holdings affected	940	192	142	356	218	1848
Total No. of holdings not affected	1746	208	388	359	408	3109
Total No. of holdings ..	2686	400	530	715	626	4957

Source : R. R. Mishra : *op cit.*, p. 67.

IV

It is easy to see that the provisions regarding the retention or the allotment of land for personal cultivation under the various Acts were not uniform. The examination of the findings of the Reports would show that where the provisions were liberal and biased in favour of the intermediaries and where there was no adequate protection to the tenants, the tenant cultivators were adversely affected, for example, in Saurashtra. On the other hand, where abolition of intermediaries was associated with tenancy legislation of a progressive nature the effects of abolition of intermediaries was not so adverse : this is clear from the Rajasthan Report. Where the provisions for *khudkasht* were strict we find, as in Andhra and Hyderabad, that the intermediaries' disappearance did not affect the landholdings of the cultivators. Thus, in Saurashtra though an upper limit was prescribed for the allotment of *khudkasht*, there was some redistribution of lands in favour of the intermediaries. In Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan and Saurashtra, the distribution of land among the intermediaries after the land reforms was more equitable than that before the land reforms. It may be correct to assume that as far as self-cultivated areas were concerned the intermediaries did not suffer adversely as a result of abolition of the feudal system.