

PN-AAU-6

RESEARCH REPORT SERIES

Number 2

July 1985

**LAND REFORM:
PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS IN NEPAL**

Ram Bahaour K.C.

**HMG-USAID-GTZ-WINROCK PROJECT
STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY IN THE
FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SECTOR IN NEPAL**

FOREWORD

This Research Report Series is funded through the project, "Strengthening Institutional Capacity in the Food and Agricultural Sector in Nepal," a cooperative effort by the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) of His Majesty's Government of Nepal and the Winrock International Institute for Agricultural Development. This project has been made possible by substantial financial support from the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ).

One of the most important activities of this project is funding for problem-oriented research by young professional staff of agricultural agencies of the MOA and related institutions. This research is carried out with the active professional assistance of the Winrock staff.

The purpose of this Research Report Series is to make the results of these research activities available to a larger audience and to acquaint younger staff and students with advanced methods of research and statistical analysis. It is also hoped that publication of the Series will stimulate discussion among policy-makers and thereby assist in the formulation of policies which are suitable to the development of Nepal's agriculture.

The views expressed in this Research Report Series are those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect the views of their respective parent institutions.

RESEARCH REPORT SERIES

Number 2

July 1986

LAND REFORM: PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS IN NEPAL

Ram Bahadur K.C.

Editor:

Michael B. Wallace

HMG-USAID-GTZ-WINROCK PROJECT
STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY IN THE
FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SECTOR IN NEPAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	1
LAND REFORM AND LAND RESETTLEMENT MEASURES	2
Background	2
Structure of Land Tenure	2
Land Reform Measures and Policy Instruments	3
Resettlement Programs	5
ASSESSMENT OF LAND REFORM AND RESETTLEMENT PROGRAMS	6
Impact on Land Redistribution	6
Land Distribution Under Resettlement Program	8
Impact on Tenancy Reform	8
Agricultural Development	10
Landless Peasants	10
Migration and Forest Encroachment	12
REVIEW AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS	13
Resettlement	13
Land Reform	13
Objectives of Land Reform in the Sixth Plan	14
Reconsideration of Land Ceiling	15
Tenancy Reform	16
Land Administration	18
Peasant Proprietorship	19
Resettlement Program	20
APPENDICES	22
Main Forms of Land Tenure in Nepal	22
Land Ceiling and Agricultural Rent	23
REFERENCES	24

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Area Under Various Forms of Land Tenure, 1952	2
Table 2. Land Under Different Tenure Systems	2
Table 3. Redistribution of Land Under 1964 Land Reform Program	7
Table 4. Distribution of Farm Households and Cultivated Area	7
Table 5. Size of Cultivated Holdings and Distribution of Sample Households and Area Cultivated After Land Reform	7
Table 6. Households by Holding Size, 1972	8
Table 7. Landless Households	11
Table 8. Landless Sample Households by Development Region	11

ABSTRACT

In many developing countries where agriculture is dominant and land distribution is skewed, agrarian reform may be a pre-condition of agricultural and economic development. From the early 1940s until the mid-1960s, the egalitarian and development aspects of agrarian reform appealed to many countries, including those emerging as newly independent and those desiring rapid economic development. The major objectives of such programs were to break down feudal holdings, redistribute land among the real farmers, and provide institutional facilities and services to help increase agricultural production and people's income.

Land reform in Nepal had the same spirit and objective. Land and its ownership are great sources of income and power in Nepal, and as a result there have always been conflicting interests with respect to land ownership. This has led to many structural and institutional defects hindering agricultural development. The uneven distribution of land also gave rise to a landed aristocracy and a poor peasantry.

Agriculture could have a vital and multiple role in the national economy in terms of income, employment, trade development, and meeting the basic needs of the people. The economic development of Nepal and the economic well-being of the vast majority of Nepalese farmers depends on agricultural development. However, the desired pace and level of agricultural development required suitable agrarian reforms, and thus the land reform program was initiated.

The national land reform program created high hopes and provided inspiration to the people, particularly to the peasant community. The program was launched with noble objectives: to increase agricultural production, improve the condition of the peasantry, and to divert capital and labor from agricultural to non-agricultural pursuits in order to accelerate economic development.

Noble and ambitious as the objectives were, they were not realized in implementation. The program had many achievements in the beginning, but these are gradually being eroded. The need now is for consolidation and further reform. This study attempts to analyze this program and suggest policy measures for future action.

Mr. Ram Bahadur K.C. was actively engaged in the land reform program from 1964 to 1974, specifically involved with planning, research, and evaluation. He worked in the capacity of Deputy Director and Director of the Land Administration and Land Reform Department. Mr. K.C. joined the National Planning Commission Secretariat in 1974, where he was Under-Secretary and Joint Secretary in charge of Research, Planning and Agriculture until 1983. Since 1983 he has been Acting Director General in the Department of Commerce. This paper was originally written in 1983 as one of a series of issues papers supported by the Winrock program in Nepal.

LAND REFORM AND RESETTLEMENT MEASURES

Background

Land and its ownership have been prestigious symbols of social status and the main sources of economic and political power in Nepal for many centuries. The government has used land to obtain military, administrative and political objectives, as well as for pleasing relatives and friends. A bewildering number of ownership and tenurial practices, skewed distribution of landed property, and the rise of a long line of exploiting intermediaries (rent and revenue collecting agents, merchants and money lenders) have occurred. Despite the many forms of land tenure systems, definite land use and development policy have been lacking.

Structure of Land Tenure

Land distribution has been skewed within varied land tenure systems (see Table 1). Raikar, taxable land, was 50 percent of the total, whereas Birta, Jagir, and Rakam constituted about 44 percent. As these were the privileged forms of land tenure bestowed on relatives and officers, they produced little income for the treasury. Between 1951 and 1964 Birta, Jagir, Rakam, and Jimidary were abolished. The present structure of the land tenure system is shown in Table 2.

Table 1. Area Under Various Forms of Land Tenure, 1952

Forms of tenure	Area (ha)	Percentage of total area
Raikar	963,500	50.0
Birta	700,000(a)	36.3
Guthi	40,000	2.0
Kipat	77,000	4.0
Jagir, Rakam	146,500	7.7
	-----	-----
	1,927,000	100.0

(a) Some of the 700,000 hectares of land under Birta tenure was used as Guthi by individuals, so the total area under Guthi tenure may have approximated 4 percent.

Source: Compiled from the papers presented in the National Seminar on Land Reform, Kathmandu, October 24-27, 1970.

Table 2. Land Under Different Tenure Systems

Tenure	Area (ha)	Percent of total
Raikar	2,067,744	94
Kipat	87,965	4
Guthi	52,360	2
	-----	---
	2,208,069	100

Source: M.A. Zaman, Draft Report of Land Reform and Land Administration in Nepal, Kathmandu, 1973.

Land Reform Measures and Policy Instruments

The various land tenure systems and sub-systems have had far reaching effects on land and agricultural development in Nepal. The agrarian system that existed at the end of the Rana Regime (1846-1951) encouraged social and economic differentiation in the agrarian community and a trend toward the concentration of land ownership and absentee land ownership. The problems of land systems included:

1. Feudalistic holdings, landed aristocracy, uneconomic holdings
2. Unequal distribution of farmland and farm income with heavy peasant indebtedness
3. Conflicting and harmful land tenure practices
4. Insecurity of occupancy and tenancy rights
5. Arbitrary, unrestricted rent and labor-exacting practices
6. Exploiting and unproductive intermediaries such as rent and revenue collectors, merchants and money lenders
7. Lack of effective development-oriented land administration
8. Lack of irrigation credit and marketing facilities and agricultural production services
9. Lack of land use and development policy

Pre-1960's Measures. Lively discussion on the need for adopting agrarian reform measures for production increase and economic development went on throughout the 1940s and 1950s, and various measures were attempted. These included:

1. Tenancy Rights Security Act, 1951
2. Royal Land Reform Commission, 1952
3. 13-Point Program, 1955
4. Land and Cultivators Records Compilation Act, 1956
5. Land Reform Act, 1957
6. Birta Abolition Act, 1959
7. Land Reorganization Act, 1962

The most drastic of these was the Birta Abolition Act, which did away with the feudal land tenure system. Despite some achievements, the absence of dependable implementation machinery, lack of firmness and clarity in government policies, and considerable influence of the feudal elements severely constrained these measures. The Land Reorganization Act of 1962 was the successful pioneer experiment that paved the way for launching the national land reform program in 1964.

Policy Objectives of Land Reform. Though some writers define land reform specifically to mean the redistribution of landed property for the benefit of small farmers and agricultural workers, agrarian reform for others has a different significance. The egalitarian aspect of agrarian reform is emphasized by Keith Griffin who says, "Land reform is an indispensable part of institutional reform generally to bring about a more egalitarian development of agriculture. Unless redistribution of land takes place, there is no way in which political situation will alter so as to bring about an egalitarian change" (Griffin 1974).*

Nepal was motivated with egalitarian spirit and objectives to launch the comprehensive Land Reform Program under the Land Act in 1964. The objectives of land reform are stated in the preamble of the Act:

1. Diversion of inactive capital and surplus labor from land to other sectors to accelerate economic development
2. Improving the living standard of the actual tillers through equitable distribution of land
3. Increasing agricultural production through the provision of production services and thus maintaining the economic interests of the general public

To achieve the above objectives, various policy instruments and programs were designed. Some of them are:

1. Imposition of ceilings on ownership and tenancy holdings
2. Abolition of jimidary and intermediary interest in land
3. Land acquisition and redistribution among tenants and landless
4. Fixation and regulation of rent
5. Debt-determination and interception of outstanding loans
6. Scheme of compulsory saving and institutional arrangements for credit facilities
7. Formation of village and town committees for lending and providing other services

*Though the terms "land reform" and "agrarian reform" are interchangeably used here, sometimes a distinction is made between the two. The term "land reform" is often used to denote mere distribution of land but agrarian reform is often used to mean redistribution of land, adjustment of tenancy conditions, regulation of rents, institution of a farm credit system, and cooperative organization. Nepal's land reform was an agrarian reform in spirit and content.

Resettlement Programs

The first resettlement program was started under the Rapti Valley Development Program in Chitwan District in 1956 with the objectives of relieving population pressures in neighboring areas, rehabilitating landless peasants, and partially solving the food problem of the Kathmandu Valley resulting from the flood of 1954. However, the program could resettle families only after the malaria eradication program was effective in Chitwan Valley in 1958. In fact, the planned resettlement program began in 1964 with Israeli aid, based on a survey in the Tarai which suggested possible resettlement areas as Nawalpur, Banke, Bardia, Kailali and Kanchanpur Districts. By the time the resettlement program was implemented in Chitwan Valley, the malaria eradication works were in effect. Also, land, basic infrastructure, and more social amenities were available in the Tarai, which subsequently worked as "pull" factors for migrants from the Hills.

The Resettlement Company. The Nepal Resettlement Company was established in 1964 under the Nepal Company Act with His Majesty's Government as the shareholder. In 1984 the company launched its first planned resettlement project at Nawalpur (Nawalparasi District) in Rapti Valley. The main objectives of the company's resettlement program were:

1. To bring fallow and uneconomic forest land under cultivation through resettlement
2. To reduce population pressure on land in the Hills
3. To remove forest encroachers from protected forest and resettle them in an organized way elsewhere
4. To conserve the natural vegetation of the catchment areas of irrigation, drinking water, hydroelectricity and other projects
5. To distribute excess land above the ceiling set by the Land Reform Program

Since then, the company has launched various resettlement projects in Nawalpur and Dhanewa (Nawalparasi District), Prithvinagar (Jhapa), Kajura (Banke), Jamuni (Bardia), Parsan (Kanchanpur), Jugeda (Kailali), and Nawalpur (Sarlahi).

Resettlement Department. Due to high population pressure without matching employment opportunities in the Hills and easy availability of land and job opportunities in the Tarai, migration from the Hills to the plains began. This compelled the government establish, over the Resettlement Company, the Resettlement Department with the objective of organizing land resettlement on a massive scale. Though the main task of the Department was to look after coordination and policy matters of the resettlement programs, it had also to be involved in implementation. Subsequently, the Department started its first resettlement programs in Sijuwa (Morang District), Murtia (Sarlahi), Sindhureghari (Rautahat), Nijgarh (Bara), and Dhanewa (Nawalparasi). Later as these settlements grew and forest encroachment began, the Department had to establish offices at Jhapa, Morang, Parsa, Rupandehi, Dang, Nepalgunj, Dhangadi and Mahendranagar.

The objectives of resettling the landless and controlling forest encroachment could, however, not be effectively realized. Hence the government opted for policy change in 1973. The government decided to have two types of resettlement programs: resettlement plan and program, and disorganized settlement control program. The objectives of the former were to resettle families displaced by natural calamities and landless families dependent on agriculture, and to increase agricultural production through improved agricultural practices. The objectives of the second program were to control the encroachment on government land and forests by regulated resettlement in specified areas.

Other Resettlement Agencies. In addition to these two major resettlement agencies, ad hoc commissions and agencies were created:

1. Resettlement by the Zonal Commission
2. Resettlement by Jhora Commission
3. One-Man Commission of Resettlement in Sarlahi District
4. Tikapur Development Committee
5. Resettlement by Forest Conservators
6. Resettlement by Military Ex-Servicemen
7. High-Powered Forest Conservation Committee

ASSESSMENT OF LAND REFORM AND RESETTLEMENT PROGRAMS

While many land reform measures have not been effective, the 1964 Land Reform Program made the most incisive intervention in systems of land ownership and tenancy in the history of Nepal, with profound social and psychological consequences (Regmi 1976, p.207). However, all efforts, particularly in the context of limited resources and complex problems, raised mass consciousness, helped mobilize Panchayat and class organizations, abolished various harmful tenures, identified tenants and created land records.

Some authorities are happy resettling a large number of migrants in the forests and adjoining areas, but some say the emergence of resettlement as a crash program without sufficient planning or basic mechanisms to settle landless people and to control forest encroachment, has aggravated the problem of landlessness and forest encroachment (Kansakar 1979, pp.18-19). Both programs should be assessed with respect to the factors discussed below.

Impact on Land Redistribution

The provision of a land ceiling (18.4 ha per family including homestead) was enforced to further land distribution. Implementation of the provision indicated there were 66,000 hectares of land above the ceiling of which about 34,000 have so far been redistributed. The present situation is shown in Table 3.

Though it was estimated that 600,000 ha of land would be available for redistribution, the combined area of all holdings exceeding ceiling levels and available for redistribution was less than 3 percent. Less than 1.5 percent has been legally appropriated or confiscated and only 1 percent has been distributed. Unequal distribution of land has remained intact (Tables 4 and 5), but average holdings of large landowners dropped to 39 ha from 114 ha after the ceiling was implemented.

 Table 3. Redistribution of Land under 1964 Land Reform Program (ha)

Region	Cultivated Area	Above Ceiling	Appropriated or Confiscated	Area Distributed
Tarai				
Eastern	167,247	9,153	4,676	3,380
Central	364,879	6,645	943	377
Western	194,717	11,651	3,124	495
Far Western	133,382	25,173	23,880	18,723
Inner	658,560	6,291	1,053	559
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Sub-total	1,518,785	58,913	33,676	23,534
Kathmandu Valley				
Kathmandu Valley	42,577	7,062	149	54
Other Hills	764,638	405	6	-
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	2,326,000	66,380	33,825	23,588

Source: Ministry of Land Reform.

 Table 4. Distribution of Farm Households and Cultivated Area, 1961

Size Group (ha)	Percent Households	Percent Cultivated Area
0.15 - 0.50	46	10
0.50 - 1.00	29	15
1.00 - 3.00	17	36
Above 3.00	8	39
	---	---
Total	100	100

Source: Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS), Agricultural Census, 1961.

 Table 5. Size of Cultivated Holdings and Distribution of Sample Households and Area Cultivated after Land Reform

Class group	Percent of Households	Percent of Cultivated Area	Area Cultivated
Landlords	3	27	17.67
Owner-Cultivators	65	49	1.63
Owner-Cum-Tenant	21	15	1.64
Tenant-Cultivator	11	9	1.74
	---	---	-----
	100	100	100.00

Source: CBS, 1961; M.A. Zaman, Evaluation of Land Reform in Nepal, 1973.

Table 4 shows that 8 percent of the households held 39 percent of the total cultivated area and 92 percent of the households had 61 percent of the land. Similarly, Table 6 indicates that land is still concentrated among a few landowners (3 percent of the households own 30 percent of the land). The fact that 88 percent of the households hold only 45 percent of the land, with an average holding of 0.72 ha, indicates that land concentration has been left intact.

 Table 6. Households by Holding Size, 1972

Size of Holding	No. of Household	Percent of Household	Land Area in ha	Percent Land	Average Size Holding (ha)
0 - 2.5	676,661	88.10	202,351.8	44.96	0.72
2.5 - 6.8	66,996	8.66	278,088.9	25.56	4.10
6.8 - 10.2	13,288	1.73	116,249.9	10.68	8.70
10.2 - 15.04	9,778	1.27	130,624.0	12.00	13.30
15.04 and above	1,878	0.24	73,982.4	6.80	39.30

Source: Department of Land Reform, Survey of 17 Tarai Districts, 1972.

Land Distribution Under Resettlement Program

Under the Rapti Development Project in Chitwan District, 29,000 hectares of land were distributed among 5000 families. The Resettlement Company under its planned settlement program has resettled 13,000 families on 23,000 hectares of land. The Department of Resettlement has resettled 46,000 families on 39,000 hectares of land. However, resettled areas may exceed official estimates.

Of the eight resettlement projects under the Resettlement Company, the largest number of settlers are in Kanchanpur--3044 families on 4261 hectares of land--followed by Nawalparasi with 2884 families on 3663 hectares of land, Bardia with 2838 families on 4169 hectares, and Banke with 1520 families on 3676 hectares. The smallest project is in Sarlahi, so far resettling 241 families on 310 hectares of land.

The Resettlement Department alone and on behalf of commissions and agencies, has piecemeal resettlement programs in 29 districts. The Kanchanpur office under the Resettlement Department has the largest number of settlers (9664 on 8541 hectares of land), followed by Morang (8691 families on 7914 ha), Jhapa (6343 families on 6178 ha), Kailali (5211 families on 4195 ha), Bardia (2814 families in 1641 ha), Nawalparasi (2630 families on 2356 ha), and Banke (1748 families on 1462 ha).

As most of the settlers under the Company or the Department programs were given either forest or cultivable wasteland, these programs have had no direct bearing on land redistribution. Some resettlers were genuine victims of natural disasters or landless, but undue and illegal advantage of resettlement programs has been taken in some cases.

Impact on Tenancy Reform

So far as the impact of resettlement programs on tenancy is concerned, there is a scarcity of data as to how tenants have benefitted.

Furthermore, resettlement programs were not exclusively designed for resettling tenants. The programs aimed to resettle natural disaster victims (both small owners and tenants), landless and agricultural laborers. The study, Effectiveness of Planned Resettlement Program, by Kansakar et al., shows that 87 percent of the migrants had agriculture as their main occupation, and the tenant-migrants might have also benefited from resettlement programs. This, however, needs further study.

The impact of land reform on tenancy reform is mixed. In fact, Land Reform Programs under the Lands Act 1964 are also called "tenancy reform," as reforms of tenurial conditions were the main focus of the programs. These did not attempt to abolish outright all absentee landlords and intermediary interests in land, but attempted to strengthen the status of tenants and gradually turn them into landowners. The Act stated that tenants may only be evicted after evidence has been produced in court that they have defaulted in payment of rent or mismanaged the farm. About 1.8 million tillers were identified by the administration during implementation and 1.5 million provisional certificates of tenancy rights were issued. Provisional certificates were gradually replaced by permanent ones though the former were equally valid.

Since security of tenancy means little unless a fair share of produce is made available, the Lands Act 1964 with subsequent amendments in 1968 made provision that the rent rate shall not exceed 50 percent of the main annual crop. Also there is provisions that the prevailing rate, if lower than 50 percent, shall be retained. In those districts where rents have been fixed absolutely, the peasants are reported to have been comparatively better off. The farmers of Kathmandu Valley are most benefitted, with rents estimated at one-third to one-fourth of the produce. Rents have been fixed in absolute amounts in 12 other districts where studies have shown the impact has increased production and improved the economic status of the farmers (APKOSC 1977).

For equity considerations and to relieve the peasantry from age-old indebtedness, the Lands Act of 1964 also had a debt determination provision. Under this measure, the amount of debt determined based on the loan particulars submitted by money-lenders and farmers involved nearly Rs. 187 million of which Rs. 30 million was reduced and 50,000 farmers were made debt free. This is a significant achievement of the program.

Tenurial reforms of whatever magnitude are counter-productive without simultaneous adequate credit facilities. Without credit and supporting services, farmers protected by law again fall into the traps of landowners and money-lenders and are deprived of cultivation rights. A Compulsory Saving Scheme was made an integrated part of the program to create the Agricultural Development Fund and help farmers be independent of traditional sources of finance that charged usurious interest rates.

The scheme was a novelty and had fair success. Under the scheme both landowners and tenants were required to deposit a fraction of their produce either in cash or kind to the Fund. The cumulative amount collected under the Scheme was Rs. 146 million and loans distributed totalled Rs. 328 million. According to the findings of the Evaluation Report, 95 percent of the households participated in the Scheme. According to the Survey Report of the Rastra Bank in 1972, out of 21 percent of the institutional loans, 14 percent came from the Scheme. The Rastra Bank

reports that of the 14 percent, medium and large farmers used 5 percent, and small and marginal farmers, 8 percent.

However, the status of tenancy is still not satisfactorily improved, nor exclusively secured. The total number of real tenants is still not confirmed. The owners of tenant land are strongly prejudiced that tenancy right is the most cumbersome in landed property, and they do not hesitate to seek loopholes. Evictions are common; voluntary surrenders, sometimes under threat, are often reported.

Rents fixed under the Lands Act have not been practiced exclusively in all districts. Though the Act forbids exacting rent in more than the one crop, taking rent in all crops is still practiced. Even with the lapse of one and a half decades since the land reform program was implemented, and despite reports that rent fixation provides an incentive to invest and produce more, rent fixation in absolute amounts in districts other than those fifteen are still pending.

Even for the Compulsory Saving Scheme collective efforts to constitute a credit fund have largely benefitted the owners of medium and large size holdings. Also, the Scheme, which accumulated a handsome fund to be utilized as institutional agricultural credit, has been suspended.

Agricultural Development

One major objective of both Land Reform and Resettlement Programs was to add incentive to agricultural development by diversification, modernization and increase in production. Sufficient systematic study has not so far been made with respect to the impact of land reform on agricultural development. One study shows land reform has not helped increase agricultural production (Shrestha 1978). However, some studies show the opposite. In Bhudware, where successful experimentation of Land Reform was done, total agricultural production increased from 4315 mt in 1963 to 6321 mt in 1972 and the cropping intensity increased from 101 in 1963 to 125 in 1972 (Dhital 1973). The example of Bhaktapur is encouraging, as it was one of the best districts in Nepal with regard to the availability of agricultural extension facilities, improved inputs, and supporting services from cooperatives. The tenants were secured and rent was fixed in absolute amounts at about one-fourth of the primary crop. The total production of food grains in Bhaktapur was 21,457 mt in 1963. This rose to 35618 mt in 1972--an annual increase of 5.8 percent in total cereal production compared to the national average of 1.6 percent in the same period (Dhital 1973).

Despite input and infrastructures facilities, agricultural development in the company projects is not better than the surrounding areas. Several factors (lack of irrigation, poor quality of land, inaccessibility of the projects) have been responsible (Kansakar 1979, p.273).

Landless Peasants

One direct result of land concentration is the marginalization of the peasantry and their landless condition. Data showing the magnitude of landlessness are still lacking. Even though it is true that in Nepal the vast majority of people live mainly by agriculture, the condition of landlessness exists. According to one estimate, 7.8 percent of the

farming households are landless, though this phenomenon lacks statistical evidence. As estimated by the Agricultural Census of 1972, the percentage of households with no land are indicated in Table 7.

As land concentration has remained mostly intact, and marginal and sub-marginal holdings are increasing rather than decreasing, these estimates seem unconvincing. The recent findings of the National Planning Commission's Survey on Employment, Income Distribution and Consumption Patterns are shown in Table 8.

Table 7. Landless Households

Development Region	Total Households	Landless Households	Percentage of Landless
Eastern	415,961	4242	1.02
Central	562,137	4385	0.78
Western	363,812	2009	0.55
Far Western	353,508	3220	0.91
Total	1,695,418	13856	0.82

Table 8. Landless Sample Households by Development Region

	Eastern	Central	Western	Far Western	Total
Mountains	3	1	2	10	16
Hills including Valley	5	14	14	4	37(2)
Tarai including Inner Tarai	155	141	50	19	365(19)
Total	163(17)	156(11)	66(7)	33(5)	418(10)

Percentages of respective sub-samples in parentheses.

Of the total 4037 sample households, 418 are landless (10 percent). The landless percentage in the Tarai is six to eight times greater than in the Hills and Mountains. By Development Region, the highest percentage is in the Eastern Region and the lowest in the Far Western Region.

One study undertaken by the Land Reform Department, covering four Tarai Districts (Jhapa, Dhanusha, Kapilbastu and Banke) representing the Eastern, Central, Western and Far Western Development Regions, indicates the same fragmentation problems. The average holding has 3.6 fragments which resembles the findings of the cadastral survey records (3.8 fragments per holding). Besides economic factors, gift and inheritance laws, registration practices irrespective of land size, revenue arrears, and land auctions have been responsible for the problem.

How far the resettlement programs have reduced landlessness is not precisely known. According to one sample survey of 537 settlers in Kanchanpur, Bardia, Banke, Nawalpur, Jhapa, Dhanuwa, Nijgarh, Murtia and Siguwa under resettlement programs, landless were 56 percent.

Migration and Forest Encroachment

Traditional emigration (going abroad for career service and employment) changed recently and the scale of rural to rural internal migration (hill migration to the southern plains) has increased, demanding immediate measures such as systematizing encroachment and forced settlement, opening resettlement programs, and distributing food for work.

According to the last three Censuses of Nepal (1952/54, 1961 and 1971) the Eastern Hills rank first in having the largest number of out-migrants (52 percent in 1952/54, 42 percent each in 1961 and 1971). The Western Hills account for 30 and 21 percent in the 1952/54 and 1961 censuses respectively, but in the 1971 the Central Hills had 28 percent out-migrants as against 15 percent in the Western Hills. The recipient areas are not uniform in the three censuses. Kathmandu Valley was the greatest recipient with 7678 migrants followed by the Eastern Tarai with 3497 and the Western Tarai with 1425 migrants in 1952/54. The regions receiving the greatest number of migrants in 1961 were the Eastern Tarai (72,030) and Central Inner Tarai (27,560). In 1971, it was the Eastern Tarai that absorbed 185,799 in-migrants (37 percent), followed by the Central Inner Tarai which had 161,751 or 32 percent of the migration.

The causes of migration are economic as well as social. Natural factors (flood and soil erosion, earthquakes) and political factors (forest encroachment, forced settlement) have been equally important.

Up-to-date records of forest encroachment due to migration are not available, but of the total 638,300 acres of forest land in 1928, only 205,000 acres are left in the Eastern Tarai. The rate of depletion is increasing: 28 percent during 1928-54, 30 percent during 1954-64 and 36 percent in 1964-72 (Gurung 1974, p.31). This deforestation activity is not simply due to the natural growth rate of population, but also to hill migration on a large scale. The fact that the total forest area of the nation decreased from 600,000 hectares in 1964 to 394,000 hectares in 1980, (from 41.3 to 27.1 percent of the land area) is an indication that most forest had either been encroached or used for resettlement, and the key factor for this is the growing migration from the hills.

The recent trend is moderate, but it is expected that even at current rates, about 75,000 families or 500,000 persons will migrate from the Hills to the Tarai in search of food and employment during the next five years (ADB/Manila 1982, p.51).

It is argued that both Land Reform and Resettlement have directly or indirectly created the problem of migration and forest encroachment. Land Reform programs failed in their original expectations to acquire more land under ceiling provisions, many people began to migrate internally, especially from the Hills to the Tarai. Similarly, as resettlement projects were opened, migration became almost uncontrolled.

REVIEW AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Resettlement

One of the major objectives of the Fifth Plan (1975-80) was to increase agricultural production by bringing new lands under cultivation. This objective was partially to be fulfilled through planned resettlement programs on cultivable lands with necessary agricultural inputs and irrigation facilities. Priority was given to allot such lands among the victims of natural disasters, landless farmers and those displaced from protected forests. Each of the settlers would be given 2 ha of land, 0.67 ha in the first year, and 1.33 ha in the second year of resettlement. It was planned to resettle 22,500 families on 50,000 ha of land chiefly in Jhapa, Nawalpur, Bardia, Kailali and Kanchanpur.

Though it was said that resettlement would be carried out in a planned way, actual implementation took the form of both planned and disorganized settlement control. Also some procedural changes were adopted. The company adopted a policy to resettle applicants who were duly certified and recommended by the concerned Chief District Officer. This policy was again changed and for the last few years, both Company and Department projects stopped entertaining applications recommended by the CDO. Since 1977, the Central Natural Disaster Victim Relief Committee under the Home Ministry scrutinizes and approves recommended applications from the District Administration. Besides resettling old applicants, both the Company and the Department are now engaged in regulating the resettlement of forest encroachments. For this purpose, the Forest Encroachment Investigation Sub-Committee has been reconstituted under the chairmanship of the District Panchayat Chairman. The Committee scrutinizes and selects encroachers on the basis of age, family members, cultivated land, personal belongings and physical stature.

Despite these new approaches, only 8000 families have been resettled on 13,000 ha of land. Under disorganized resettlement programs the target was to resettle 25,000 ha of land. It is not known how many disorganized resettlements have been reorganized.

Land Reform

The Fifth Plan emphasized consolidation and strengthening of the Land Reform Programs in line with redistributing land above ceilings, new identification and security of tenants, rent fixation, and revival of compulsory savings. The Plan set targets to issue permanent certificates in 41 districts (where cadastral surveys have been completed), to fix rent in 26 districts, and to establish land administration offices in 17 districts. The Plan also aimed to provide institutional loans for transfer of ownership rights to tenants and make necessary arrangements to gradually abolish dual ownership and restore peasant land ownership.

Noble and ambitious as the objectives were, they did not fully materialize. Permanent certificates could be distributed only in 39 districts. Identification of new tenants and guarantee of security of those already identified could not effectively be done. Throughout the plan period only 310 ha of land could be appropriated. Rent fixation programs were not carried out in a single additional district.

Objectives of Land Reform in the Sixth Plan

It was realized that the major objective of land reform could not be achieved during the Fifth Plan due to many administrative, technical and legislative difficulties. Hence the Sixth Plan (1980-85) has come forward with new prescriptives for consolidating and strengthening the programs. The objectives and policies of the program during the current plan are related to security of tenancy rights, experimentation to gradually eliminate dual ownership of land, rent fixation for production incentives, and provision of farming requisites (inputs, credit, irrigation facilities) in a package deal. Necessary amendments in the Lands Act particularly with respect to tenants security, are included.

So far as implementation is concerned, legislation has already been passed and is waiting for implementation. Proposals of rent fixation are underway. Strengthening cooperatives for making them capable to cater the needs of the farmers is under consideration.

The Sixth Plan has given emphasis to strengthen resettlement programs and explore possibilities of starting resettlement programs in the Hills in addition to the Tarai. Hence the objectives of the Plan are to bring additional arable land under cultivation for boosting agricultural growth, resettle landless and illegal occupants, and start organized settlements in feasible areas of the Hills. Resettlement programs will be made consistent with forest plans, land will be allotted to landless peasants only, legal provisions will be instituted, and criteria, rules and procedures will be refined.

Three types of programs have been designed under the current plan: Planned Resettlement--the Company and its District Offices will carry out planned resettlement for 9280 families on 12,220 ha of land; Organized Settlement--the Department and the Regional Offices will systematize forced settlements, mainly forest encroachers, and thus resettle 16,350 families on 17,985 ha of land; hill resettlement--the Hill Resettlement Program will be implemented to the extent feasible.

Future Directions for Policy Research. The statement of King Mahendra that "Land Reform has come as the demand of social justice, political expediency and economic rationale" is increasingly relevant in the present context of Nepal. Lively discussion on the need for appropriate agrarian reform reflects the fact that agriculture is the mainstay of the economy. The economic development of Nepal and the economic well-being of the vast majority of Nepalese farmers depends on agricultural development. Agriculture has a vital and multiple role in the national economy, in terms of income, employment, trade and meeting basic needs of the people. Agriculture and allied sectors have been accorded due priority in all periodic plans from 1956 onwards, and given top priority in the Fifth and Sixth Plans.

However, the speedy and egalitarian development of agriculture needs suitable agrarian reform measures for institutional support. Land reform helps break down market imperfections and introduce appropriate technologies in agricultural development under conditions of unequal distribution of land and insecurity of tenancy, highly imperfect factor markets and inefficient allocation of resources. Since large owners and absentee landlords are more influential, the vast majority of farmers

are often not profitably served by institutional agricultural services.

In recent years, planning and development exercises are gradually using new strategies such as people's participation, integrated rural development, basic needs approach, and decentralization of planning and development. Nepal is currently implementing seven Integrated Rural Development Programs, many of them having assistance from international agencies and friendly countries. But, whatever the number and categories of rural development, one basic ingredient and indispensable element of the rural development strategy is a suitable land tenure system.

The objectives of meeting basic needs and creating more employment opportunities for a majority of the people can be fulfilled only when agricultural development activities based on a suitable land tenure system can be implemented. Given the large holdings and feudal tenure practices, fulfillment of basic needs and creation of employment opportunities cannot be made. The present land reform program is said to be in a state of stupor for the last 13 or 14 years (ADB/Manila 1982).

Reconsideration of Land Ceiling

The ceiling imposed under the Lands Act 1964 has virtually remained intact. The existing ceiling (permitting one family unit to hold as much as 18.4 ha of land) seems quite high. As explained earlier, little surplus land could be appropriated for redistribution under the existing ceiling provisions. The countries that have implemented land reform programs successfully have set lower ceilings: Japan and Taiwan fixed 3 hectares for owner-operators, and the Philippines fixed 7 hectares per family. India is trying to fix 10-15 acres, while in Korea it is only 3 hectares. For Nepal, the present ceiling is very liberal.

Estimates for revised ceilings on land holdings at 2.5, 6.8 and 10.2 hectares per family show the surplus land available to be redistributed would respectively be 350,232; 251,169; and 85,635 hectares. This however requires the family unit to be redefined, with every son above 16 and every unmarried daughter above 35 identified as a separate unit of family and entitled to hold the same amount of land (18.4 ha). The aspects discussed below are worth considering.

1. Absentee Holding. One of the objectives of Land Reform is to replace absentee landlordism by peasant proprietorship, because the former system is neither advantageous to landowners nor gives incentives to tillers. It is a great obstruction to proper land use and development of agriculture. A rough calculation for 20 Tarai districts shows surplus land above 2.5 hectares per family of such absentee landlords comes to nearly 100,000 hectares. This is worth considering in the context of abolishing absentee ownership and intermediary interest on land.

2. Homestead. The existing ceiling on homesteads seems too generous. There is no economic, rational or social justice in permitting a landowner to hold 16.4 hectares as agricultural holding and 2.0 hectare for homestead purposes. The fact that tenants are not entitled to additional areas for residential purposes, whereas the landlord, absentee or residential, is entitled to have that much is discriminatory.

3. Ceiling exemption. The provision of the Land Act is that land

used for industrial and other specified purposes could be exempted from the ceiling. But not all lands supposed to have been utilized for such purposes have been. Genuine use of land can be verified and land given gratis and ceiling exempt could be stopped. The land ceiling is not only high, but also fixed irrespective of site, fertility, and land use.

4. Land tax. Redistribution of land may occur in various ways. One option is heavy progressive taxation depending on the size and quality of holding. Big owners may then be inclined to dispose of excess land. Some experiments may also be done transferring ownership of rights to real tenants through the provision of institutional credit. This, however, needs precaution so that actual tillers benefit from the scheme.

5. Declaration of low ceiling. Another effective way to induce a peaceful and orderly redistribution of land may be to announce a lower ceiling on land well ahead of time to enable the landowners having larger holdings to sell excess land and bring their holdings down. This has the additional advantage of making some land available to those who wish to migrate from the Hills to the Tarai (ADB/Manila 1982, p.141).

6. Right of pre-emption. Right of pre-emption in favor of tenants (whenever the owner wants to dispose of land) would be another alternative for gradually ensuring equitable distribution of land.

Tenancy Reform

Another research area is tenancy security. Many tenants have still to be identified and protected, and those already identified need to be effectively protected against the imminent threat of eviction. In countries where political, administrative and economic systems prevent more radical land reform programs, tenancy reform may be a viable substitute which can gradually strengthen the position of a tenant, improve income distribution, and have a positive impact on agricultural development.

Although Nepal's Land Reform was virtually a tenancy reform, it has not been effective in guaranteeing the rights and interests of tenants. Tenants are still being evicted on many grounds and pretexts. Policy research may be directed toward the topics listed below.

1. Tenancy lands. Weak clauses related to tenants' rights need to be amended. These include the owner's right to resume land on nominal compensation, right to resume tenanted land after retirement from military service, or after a minor becomes an adult, invalidity of tenancy right on residential land, and conditional transfer of tenancy right to the family member after death. Tenancy rights on all types of Guthi land should, without exception, be given to the real tillers.

2. Tenancy protection measures. All legal provisions of tenancy security should be strictly implemented, and the administration should guarantee against eviction, arbitrary rent practices, and forced surrenders. Agriculture extension and production services should adequately be provided and voluntary surrenders should be discouraged. Fresh identification of new tenants and issue of certificates for those qualified (such as those tilling land for one main crop) should be done promptly and regularly. The sole responsibility for tenants' security should be with the land office, and no cases should be referred to the courts.

3. Transferability of tenancy rights. As a measure of strengthening tenants' position, the Nepal Agriculture Sector Strategy Study recommends amending laws and permitting transfer of tenancy by sale (now prohibited under the Lands Act, 1964) on the grounds that it will give tenants partial ownership of land, enable tenants to get credit by pledging tenancy rights, add to tenants' assets, and help them to enjoy agricultural extension services and other input facilities. There are also contrary views that this will perpetuate dual ownership of land, complicate land record and transaction systems, further increase land value, develop selling tendency among tenants, and make them gradually landless and share-croppers. Instead, it is suggested that tenants' rights be made hereditary, tenants be given the right of pre-emption to ownership right, and there should be institutional credit to buy land.

4. Regulation of rent. Whatever the technologies and additional service facilities, agricultural development cannot materialize unless tenants are given incentives through a fair amount of produce. This requires rent fixation at a reasonable level. Wolf Ladejinsky wrote frequently while he was with the Ford Foundation (1961-64) about tenurial conditions and agrarian reform in Nepal. In one of his letters to His Majesty King Mahendra, dated March 16, 1963 he wrote: "... cultivators in Nepal are not in a position now to invest one extra rupee in order to increase their yield. Their actual share in the crop is much too little to provide them with the incentive to invest and produce more. Only a significant reduction in rent which would give the farmers the extra Rs. 100 to 200, can make the difference between investment and no investment, larger production or customary stagnation. For this reason alone a reduction in rent and its enforcement are the only conditions that would provide the cultivator with modest funds and incentive to improve the land and produce more. To ignore this, and for reasons of questionable validity, is to attempt the perpetuation of a situation which has not helped the country's economic development in the past and which is bound to do greater harm in the future" (Louis 1977).

Reducing rent to a reasonable level has also been suggested in the Agriculture Sector Strategy Study. The conducive effect of low rent has already been felt in Kathmandu Valley where rent is about one-fourth of the main crop produced in a year. Rent fixation in 12 other districts (though less favorable) has similar impacts. But rent fixation has not been done in other districts for administrative and political reasons.

5. Debt redemption and credit. Farmers need adequate credit facilities not only for investment in agricultural development, but also for heavy indebtedness to be settled. During the past years of implementation, 40 percent of household debts have been scaled down under the debt-determination program. Of the total amount of debt (Rs.199 million) involved in debt-determination, nearly Rs.40 million was scaled down and 8000 hectares of land on mortgage were redeemed to the insolvent farmers. Legal provisions are there, but enforcement has been slow.

The gap between the traditional private loan and the institutional source (cooperatives and village committees) is wide and could get wider unless some suitable arrangement is made. The Compulsory Saving Scheme was exclusively designed to meet the gap and give relief and independence to the peasantry. The Scheme which helped collection of Rs.146 million, and cumulative investment of Rs.328 million, and capital

formation in the construction of warehouses, has been suspended for an uncertain period and uncertain reasons. Given effective administration in collection and loan realization, proper management (proper accounting and auditing) and better utilization (lending to small and marginal farmers on a priority basis and supervising productive and specific uses of the fund), the Scheme should still be a blessing especially in meeting credit needs and increasing agricultural production.

Suggestions have been made regarding collection, account-keeping and use of funds for this scheme and the Panchayat Development and Land Tax (PDLT), but not been implemented. Research and appropriate policies are needed for capital formation and institutional credit provision.

Land Administration

Where land records have been well maintained, land reform programs can be effectively implemented. One of the main reasons that planning and implementation of land redistribution, tenurial security, abolition of Birta and Jimirdars systems and their subsequent conversion into taxable Raikar land, could not be effective, is lack of proper records of land, landowners and tenants. Any new land reform measure without an effective land administration system, will have the same problems.

Hence development-oriented land administration is a necessity and in many cases a precondition for planning and implementation of the Land Reform Program. Land administration broadly implies land alienation and settlement, land transactions and dealings, preservation of rights and interests of the parties concerned, regulating land tax or rent collection, and preservation of government or public lands. Land administration and its jurisdiction varies from country to country, but in the context of Nepalese agrarian problems and traditional line of land administration functioning, it may be designed to implement the present and future land reform programs, maintain up-to-date land records for land dealings and transactions, reorganize land tax and land classification system, carry on settlement and resettlement programs and provide a statistical base for future land use and development policy.

The Revenue Offices were doing many land administration functions, such as land transactions, land alienation, revenue collection, tax collection, depositories along with other non-land administrative but obligatory functions. But their functions were mostly revenue-oriented land transactions (such as registration of deeds) which were cumbersome and sometimes fictitious, and land records were scattered and missing. Hence, great difficulties were faced in implementing ceiling and tenancy reform provisions under the Land Act, 1964. Streamlining the functions of land administration to match the spirit of land reform and the requirements of future land use and development policy was necessary. Consequently 18 Land Administration Offices were created between 1967-1970 entrusted with the functions of implementing Land Reform Programs, doing land transactions, maintaining and updating various land records (relating to land, landowners and tenants) and land alienations (registration and distribution of cultivable waste lands). During three to four years' implementation many land records (based on Cadastral Survey) were compiled, classified and up-dated, revenue collections were increased, land transactions through the introduction of various specified formats were made comparatively more convenient and prompt.

However, the central Lands Department and Lands Offices (other than Land Reform Offices) in the districts were dissolved and amalgamated into Land Reform Department and Offices. The necessity of development-oriented land administration once realized and materialized was again forgotten. Development-oriented land administration is more than a function of revenue collection and registration for fee and stamp duty, as also does land registration of refined types, land tax administration, land acquisition, land alienation, land use classification, land consolidation, and is an effective instrument for land reform.

In view of the present state of implementation of ceiling and tenancy reform, lack of up-to-date land records, growing absoluteness of the records available from cadastral survey, cumbersome procedures of land transactions and multiple agencies working in land acquisition and distribution, there is still valid reason for reviving, strengthening and effecting land administration which alone could be a good computer of land records, a good conductor of land ceiling and rent, a regulator of land taxation, a consolidator of land reform achievements and an indicator to future land development measures. Hence, a study is necessary as to why new land administration offices were established, how they performed, how present revenue offices are functioning and what the new institutional set-up should be.

Peasant Proprietorship

One of the principles and objectives of the land reform program in Nepal is to do away with the dual ownership of land and restore peasant proprietorship. It has many advantages over the present tenancy system. The tenancy system does not fully ensure equitable distribution of farmland and farm income. This is neither eviction-proof nor a guarantee against landless state, under which a tenant faces constant challenge from landowner, threat from money-lenders and intermediaries, and has low priority leasing from lending institutions. Furthermore, tenancy system and security laws have hardly been sufficient to contract the effect of monopoly ownership and its challenging threats. Tenancy security on a permanent basis is administratively difficult, legally complex, and economically costly. It is therefore desirable to think whether abolition of tenancy system by providing compensation to the dispossessed owner may prove economically, socially and politically more beneficial than the present tenancy arrangement (Chalise 1970).

It is said land reform has been motivated by two main considerations: the demand for greater social and economic equality and the need for higher productivity. Land-to-the-tiller has been the expression of this greater equality (Myrdal 1966, p.63). One author says that unless the super-landlord style of rent is given up and the gap between the right of holding and right of cultivation is closed, land legislation and propaganda do nothing (Thorner 1956).

In Nepal, the owner cultivator system is not new, and nobody would be taken by surprise to enforce the system. The start has already been made: Birta Abolition Act, 1959, Ukhada Tenure Act 1964, Abolition of Princely Estates 1961, reform in Kipat system, Resettlement and Rehabilitation Scheme, and financial support to acquire ownership rights. It is estimated that owner cultivator households already account for most of the total farm households. As such, gradual transformation of tenants

into owner cultivators will not be a difficult task.

Resettlement Program

For various reasons, resettlement programs of modest nature and noble objectives in the past have grown complex and more problematic, demanding policy research and appropriate measures for controlling the situation and making present and future programs more productive and complementary to agricultural and economic development.

Despite growing resettlement programs (both planned and disorganized), the flow of migration is not fully checked and forest encroachments have increased so much that national forest area has decreased from 34 to 29 percent. As the hill economy is still critical and other employment opportunities are lacking, there is still pressure of migration flow and the need for resettlement programs.

The other side of the picture is that the forest areas both in the Hills and Tarai have decreased far more than necessary for preventing natural hazards and maintaining ecological balance. There is limited scope for bringing more forest land under resettlement and cultivation programs. Consequently HMG has recently declared that there would be no resettlement programs in the forest area, and also constituted a High Powered Committee in various zones for protecting forests by controlling and even by evacuating the illegal encroachers on forest lands.

According to one estimate not even a single hectare is now available for resettlement purposes, yet another estimate states that about 500,000 ha under forest are suitable for agriculture (ADB/Manila, Vol.I, p.51). A strategy that may both help forest conservation and development as well as carry on resettlement programs seems necessary.

Impact Study of Resettlement Program. It has been almost two decades since the Resettlement Program (both planned and unorganized) began. However, it has neither resolved the problem of landless nor helped agricultural production. Hindrances to the Scheme are said to be starting resettlement programs in an unplanned way, encouraging disorganized and ad hoc settlement, lack of forest plan and protection measures in the beginning, formation of one commission after another without assessment of past performance, lack of clear demarcation between the functions of the Company and the Department, independent atmosphere of working for the agencies, integrated approach in providing necessary services to resettlement and settlement programs, ineffective technical machinery in implementation, and lack of a multi-sectoral approach.

For the successful implementation of the resettlement programs, it is suggested that a site and network of transport, land development programs, market and other service facilities developing a sense of security among the resettlers, retaining landownership rights with the Government or Company, and creation of non-farming activities for the second generation, along with proper evaluation, are needed.

Hill Settlement Program. The provisions of the Hill Resettlement Program in the current plan period have remained unimplemented, though some preliminary attempts were made. In view of the critical economy in the Hills and rising trend of inter-regional migration and the declared

policy of the government not to allow any forest land for settlement and resettlement purposes hill resettlement or group settlement program seem to be necessary. Some advocate Hill resettlement based on non-farming activities (teaching crafts and skills to the villagers), some for fringe-type of settlement, based on the availability of land and still others argue for group settlements based on all types of activities.

Institutional Arrangements. For the successful implementation of any program, some suitable institution is necessary. Such an institution should be a full-fledged authority and should be made effective and independent in functioning. Sometimes, duplicating institutions spoil the smooth functioning and the basic objectives of the program itself. This has happened in the case of the resettlement and settlement programs. Apart from the two central-level organizations--the Department of Resettlement and the Resettlement Company--many regional and district offices work under these. Besides, there have been created many commissions and committees for settlement and resettlement programs which often duplicate in the functioning and intervene in the jurisdictions of others. So far as land acquisition and distribution are concerned, the Forest Offices, the Chief District Offices, the Land Reform Offices, the Revenue Offices, and the Zonal Commissioners Offices seem to be working side by side. This duplication and confusion have to be checked if resettlement or any other land distribution functions is to be done efficiently. There is a need for one authoritative institution, well placed in the hierarchy of His Majesty's Government.

Appendix I. Main Forms of Land Tenure in Nepal

Birta. This is the most privileged ownership of land; land previously alienated is granted to individuals as a favor and for specific jobs done. The Birta-owner was entitled to possess, occupy, transfer, mortgage, subdivide and bequeath occupancy rights. Insecurity of tenancy, rack renting, exacting unpaid labor services and other extra levies were the marked evils of the system. It was finally abolished in 1959, bringing all Birta lands to the status of taxable Raikar land.

Guthi. This is trust land assigned to religious and philanthropic institutions. Protection from arbitrary government action was generally guaranteed only through the Guthi system. This tenure, under present amendment, has given tenancy rights and permitted prescribed rents in most cases.

Jagir. Under this tenure, the beneficiaries in the capacity of government employees and functionaries, were given land instead of cash emoluments. It was finally abolished in 1957.

Kipat. This is a customary form of tenure, assigned to an ethnic group called Limbu of Pallo-Kirat (found in six districts--Ilam, Terathum, Dhankuta, Sankhuwasabha, Taplejung and Panchthar--in the Eastern Hills). Heavy indebtedness of the Limbu members, unsecured position of the non-Limbu mortgagers and tenants, and regressive tax systems were the inherent drawbacks of the system. It has recently been amended, permitting transactions of Kipat land outside their community, guaranteeing ownership and tenancy rights even among non-Limbus.

Raikar. Also known as state landlordism, this is a taxable land tenure. The registered owner (landlord), who enjoys quasi-ownership rights on condition of paying fixed land tax (revenue) to the state, is free to manage and transcribe land as long as the occupancy rights remain intact. With various tenurial reforms and subsequent transfer of other land tenures into Raikar, it is now the most important tenure covering about 93 percent of all cultivated land.

Rajya. This was the princely estate given to royal family members and relatives subject to payment of nominal taxes as a token of allegiance to the state. It is now abolished.

Rakam. It is the assignment of land as remuneration for some specific function like those of carpenters, brick layers and mail-carriers. It was regressive and exploiting in nature, exacting compulsory and unpaid labor services. It was abolished in 1957.

Appendix II. Land Ceilings and Agricultural Rent

Table 1. Ceilings on Land Holdings (in hectares)

Region	Landowners		Tenants	
	Agri. land	Homestead	Agri. land	Homestead
Tarai	16.4	2.0	2.5	-
Kathmandu Valley	2.7	0.4	0.5	-
Hills other than Kathmandu Valley	4.1	0.8	1.0	-

Table 2. Agricultural Rent

	Kathmandu Valley (in pathi per ropani)		Some Tarai Districts (in maunds per bigha)	
	Irrigated Rice Land	Unirrigated Maize Land	Irrigated Rice Land	Unirrigated Maize Land
	Abal (Grade I)	23.00	10.12	15.0
Doyam (Grade II)	18.75	7.25	11.5	6.5
Sim (Grade III)	13.00	4.37	8.5	4.5
Chahar (Grade IV)	8.62	2.87	5.5	-

Note: Amendments to the Land Act, which were enacted in 1968, stipulate that the landlord may not collect a rent higher than 50 percent of the main annual crop.

- 1 Pathi = 2.43 kg paddy; 3.4 kg. maize; 3.28 kg millet
 - 1 Ropani = 0.05 hectare
 - 1 Maund = 37 kg
 - 1 Bigha = 0.67 hectare
-

REFERENCES

- ADB/Manila, Nepal Agriculture Sector Strategy Study, December 1982.
- ARTEP, The Challenge for Nepal: Growth with Employment, ARTEP Report, Bangkok, 1974 and 1978.
- APROSC, Impact Study of Rent Fixation in Morang, Sunsari, Dhanusha and Rautahat District, Kathmandu, 1977.
- Central Bureau of Statistics, Agricultural Census of Nepal, 1961, 1972.
- Chalise, N.R., Land Tenure and Tenancy in Nepal, paper presented at the National Seminar on Land Reform, October 23-27, 1970.
- Dhital, B.P., Impact of Agrarian Reform on Employment and Productivity in Nepal, paper prepared for Expert Consultation on Land Reform organized by F.A.O., 1973.
- Diebold, P.B., "How the Planner Should View Land Reform in Land Reform Planning as an Integrated Part of Agricultural Development Planning," paper presented at the F.A.O. World Land Reform Conference, Rome, 20 June-2 July 1966.
- Dorner, Peter, Land Reform and Economic Development, Penguin Books, 1972.
- Griffin, Keith, The Political Economy of Agrarian Change, McMillan, 1974.
- Gurung, Harka, "The Population ASpect of Development," in Population and Development in Nepal, CEDA, 1974, p.31.
- K.C., Ram Bahadur, "Implementation of Land Reform," paper presented for the workshop on Development Support for Small Farmers, 1973.
- K.C., Ram Bahadur, "The Quest for Agrarian Reform in Nepal," paper presented at the National Seminar on Planning for Basic Needs and Mobilization of Resources, ILO and CEDA, November 12-24, 1979.
- Kansakar, Vidya Vir Singh, "Land Resettlement Program in Nepal: Its Efficiency and Effectiveness," mimeo.
- Kansakar, Vidya Vir Singh, Effectiveness of Planned Resettlement Program in Nepal. Vols.I and II, CEDA, 1979.
- Louis, W.J., ed. The Selected Papers of Wolf Ladejinsky: Agrarian Reform as Unfinished Business, New York, Oxford 1977.
- Ministry of Land Reform and F.A.O., Report of the National Seminar on Land Reform, Kathmandu, October 23-27, 1970.
- Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy and Programs, Kathmandu, 1974.
- Myrdal, G., quoted in World Land Reform Conference Report, 1966, p.63.

- National Planning Commission, A Survey of Employment, Income Distribution and Consumption Patterns, Kathmandu, 1977.
- National Planning Commission, The Fifth Plan, 1975-80.
- National Planning Commission, The Sixth Plan, 1980-85.
- Nepal Resettlement Company, Nepal Resettlement Company: An Introduction, 1979.
- Raup, Philip M., Land Reform and Agriculture Development, 1976.
- Regmi, M.R. Landownership in Nepal, University of California Press, 1976.
- Sairju, M.M. et al., Revisit to Budhabare, CEDA, 1973.
- Shrestha, B.N., Evaluation of Land Reform in Nepal: A Case Study of Padsari, Mainia Barrandi and Madan Pokhara Panchayat of Western Development Region, CEDA, 1980.
- Thorner, Daniel, The Agrarian Prospect in India, Delhi School of Economics, 1956.
- Warriner, D. Land Reform and Economic Development, National Bank of Egypt, 1955.
- World Bank, Land Reform Sector Policy Paper, Washington, D.C., May 1975.
- Zevering, K.H., Agricultural Development and Agrarian Structure in Nepal, ARTEP Working Paper, Bangkok, 1979.
- Zaman, M.A., Evaluation of Land Reform in Nepal, Ministry of Land Reform, Kathmandu, 1973.

Papers in this Series:

1. Pradeep M. Tulachan, "Socio-Economic Characteristics of Livestock Raising in Nepal," December 1985.
2. Ram Bahadur K.C., "Land Reform: Progress and Prospects in Nepal," July 1986.