

CURRENT TRIBAL SITUATION

Strategies for Planning, Welfare and Sustainable Development

[https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Easwaran-Kanagaraj/publication/](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Easwaran-Kanagaraj/publication/303527767_LAND_ALIENATION_AND_TRIBAL_LIVELIHOOD_THE_CASE_OF_KALRAYAN_HILLS_IN_TAMIL_NADU/links/5746f25708aea45ee8582e5f/LAND-ALIENATION-AND-TRIBAL-LIVELIHOOD-THE-CASE-OF-KALRAYAN-HILLS-IN-TAMIL-NADU.pdf)

[303527767_LAND_ALIENATION_AND_TRIBAL_LIVELIHOOD_THE_CASE_OF_KALRAYAN_HILLS_IN_TAMIL_NADU/links/5746f25708aea45ee8582e5f/LAND-ALIENATION-AND-TRIBAL-LIVELIHOOD-THE-CASE-OF-KALRAYAN-HILLS-IN-TAMIL-NADU.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Easwaran-Kanagaraj/publication/303527767_LAND_ALIENATION_AND_TRIBAL_LIVELIHOOD_THE_CASE_OF_KALRAYAN_HILLS_IN_TAMIL_NADU/links/5746f25708aea45ee8582e5f/LAND-ALIENATION-AND-TRIBAL-LIVELIHOOD-THE-CASE-OF-KALRAYAN-HILLS-IN-TAMIL-NADU.pdf)

EDITED BY

DR. SOUBHAGYA RANJAN PADHI



MANGLAM PUBLICATIONS
DELHI-110053 (INDIA)

Published by :

MANGLAM PUBLICATIONS

K-129 Main Road 3-1/2 Pusta Near Shiv Om Jewellers

Gautam Vihar Delhi-110053

Ph. : 011-22945677 Mob. : 9868572512, 9968367559

Email : manglam.books2007@rediffmail.com

Web. : www.manglambooks.com

Current Tribal Situation: Strategies for Planning, Welfare and Sustainable Development

© Editor

First Edition 2013

ISBN 978-93-82983-15-6

All rights reserved no part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the Publisher.

PRINTED IN INDIA

Published by D.P. Yadav for Manglam Publications Delhi-110053,
Laser Typesetting at Shahabuddin Computers Delhi-53, Printed
at Sachin Printers, Delhi- 53

Acknowledgement

It gives me immense pleasure to express my sincere thanks to all those who directly or indirectly helped me in completing this book. I am extremely grateful to esteem Vice Chancellor, Rajiv Gandhi University, Arunachal Pradesh, Professor Tamo Mibang for writing the foreword for this edited volume. I cherish my deepest sense of gratitude and indebtedness to esteemed Professor E.Haribabu, Current Pro Vice-Chancellor, former Dean, School of Social Science and former HOD of Sociology, Central University of Hyderabad, my M.Phil supervisor Professor K. Laxminarayan, HOD of Sociology, Central University of Hyderabad, my Phd supervisor Dr. PK.Kar, Reader and HOD of Sociology, B.J.B Autonomous college, Odisha, Dr. M.C.Behera, Professor in Tribal Studies, Rajiv Gandhi Central University, Arunachal Pradesh and Prof. M.Hussain, HOD of Sociology, Rajiv Gandhi Central University for their enthusiastic insight, unfathomable motivation, valuable suggestions and illuminating guidance for the completion of this editorial volume.

I shall fail in duty if my indebtedness is not acknowledged to all the authors, who have contributed their valuable papers to bring out this book. Words of gratitude and thanks I definitely owe to my family members and friends who have rendered their love and support in the process of making this book a reality. Most importantly my thanks are due to Mr. D.PYadav of Manglam Publications, New-Delhi, for his keen interest in publishing this edited book for its wider circulation.

Foreword

It gives me immense pleasure to pen a few words about Dr. Soubhagya Ranjan Patra's book "Current Tribal Situation: Strategies for Planning, Welfare and Sustainable Development". This book encompasses a remarkable collection of research papers by distinguished academicians on different aspects of tribal issues across disciplines. This volume analyses the kaleidoscope of tribal situation and attempts to offer some valuable insights to indicate the problems of recent problems of tribal society. It is expected that the endeavor will provide intellectual sustenance to those who cherish interest in this field.

This work is a significant addition to the growing literature on tribal studies. I hope, the book will invite wider interests from scholars to generate concern and curiosity to carry on with further research.

(Prof. Jyoti Mishra)
Vice-Chancellor
Rajiv Gandhi University

List of Contributors

A.K. Ravishankar	Senior Lecturer, Population Studies Wing, DDE, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar.
Alok Chantia	Lecturer, Dept. of Anthropology, Sri Jai Narain Post Graduate College, Lucknow.
Anup K. Mohanty	Lecturer in Economics, Semiliguda College, Orissa.
Anupam Hazra	Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work, Assam(Central) University, Silchar.
Debabrata Patra	Regional Manager, ActionAid India, Lucknow
Kalyani Sadangi	Reader in Philosophy, Utkal University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha
Kanagraj Easwaran	Associate Professor, Department of Social Work, Mizoram University, Mizoram
Malini Srivastava	Lecturer, Department of Anthropology, University Of Allahabad, Allahabad, U.P
Muktesh Joshi	Environment Activist
Muralidhar Majhi	Lecturer and Head, Department of Economics, Govt, Junior College, Jeypore Dist - Koraput, Odisha.
N.K.Das	Visiting Fellow, Anthropological Survey of India, Kolkata
Narayan Mohanty	Junior Research Fellow, Rajiv Gandhi Chair in Contemporary Studies, Barkatullah University, Bhopal.
PS.R.Murthy	Professor and Director, Department of Management studies, Adikavi Nannaya University, Government College, Rajahmundry, A.P

CHAPTER-17

Land Alienation and Tribal Livelihood: The Case of Kalrayan Hills in Tamilnadu

Kanagaraj Easwaran

Land alienation is a major challenge to tribal development policy in India. In fact, the Government of India (2001) has recognised it as one of the unresolved issues in tribal development planning in India¹. Today the threat has become more alarming than ever, as the process of modernization has begun to sweep over the tribal areas. The problem assumes enormous significance because it has the potential for generating violent conflict between tribals and non-tribals, which causes unrest in the tribal areas and threatens their integration. The tribal revolts and movements arisen over the land question remind the significance and intensity of this problem. The historical tribal revolts (Patel 1993; Desai 1979; Rangaswamy 1973) and contemporary tribal movements (see Arun Kumar 2006; Chathukulam and John 2006) as well as tribal and non-tribal conflicts (see Das Gupta 1985; Das Gupta 1984) in different tribal regions in the country were the attempts on the part of tribal masses to restore the land lost to the non-tribal outsiders

Land alienation is a process of transfer of land from the tribal households to the others, which results in deprivation of their livelihood and contributes to their impoverishment. The process of land alienation is both historical as well as contextual.

Historically, it is the legacy of colonialism as British policies and administrative practices reduced the tribal's access to land and forest resources. In the post independence context, land alienation can be construed as backlash of development process and failure of government's development programmes (Saravanan: 2006).

Land is not only an economic resource but also source of culture, in the tribal contexts. Land is only tangible asset of a tribal household, other possessions being meagre at the present stage of their economic development. Land also occupies a pivotal place in the tribal culture, and there are a number of religious rituals connected to land, which promote emotional ties with the same. Further, tribes are known for their territorial affinity and identity. Hence, loss of land not only means a loss of livelihood for the tribal households but also a loss of culture and identity (Dalvi and Bokil:2000).

The present paper attempts to assess the magnitude, causes, modes and consequences of land alienation among the Malayali tribal households in the Kalrayan hills in Tamil Nadu. It is presented in five major sections. First section presents an overview of the literature on land alienation and the research issues therein. In the second section, the methodological aspects of the present study are outlined. The third section depicts the setting i.e. the Kalrayan hills and its people. The results and discussion are presented in the fourth section while the final section presents the concluding observations.

I

Overview of Literature and Research Issues:

As the problem of tribal land alienation has bearing on tribal integration, development and policy, there is copious literature on its varied dimensions and ramifications all over the tribal regions in India viz., north and north-eastern zone (see Batra 1999; Sinha 1990; Shankar 1988; Das Gupta 1985), central zone (see Dalvi and Bokil 2000; Dubey and Murdia 1977), southern zone (for instance Reddy 1988; Rao 1987; Karuppaiyan

2000). There are a few works on the national scale too (see Misra 1995; Kaul, 1977; Roy Burman 1972:48).

These studies focused mainly on the magnitude, causes, modes, agencies and consequences of the problem of tribal land alienation. Apart from these aspects most of these studies have gauged the adequacy of administrative and legal arrangements for prevention of land alienation and restoration of the land to the tribal households. There were some studies, which have concentrated on the tribal and non-tribal conflicts over the land (Das Gupta 1984) and the tribal revolts arisen over this issue of land alienation (see Saravanan 2001; Patel 1993; Rao 1988; Parulaker 1975). In Tamil Nadu too, the problem has received the attention of a few scholars and they have focused on these dimensions (see Shanmugam 2004; Saravanan 2001; Karuppaiyan 2000; Roa and Baskaradoss 1989). A brief review of these studies that follows would be fruitful to identify the research gaps and issues.

Roa and Baskaradoss (1989) assessed the magnitude, causes, agencies, mode and consequences of land alienation in Tamil Nadu. Out of 986 households surveyed, 38 per cent of the households have alienated their lands. The alienated land constitutes 31 per cent of the total land owned by the tribal households. The study showed the proletarianisation consequence of land alienation on the marginal and small farmers. The marginal and small farmers were the worst hit in the process of land alienation and 16 per cent of the tribal households become landless. Sale was the major form and the non-tribes were the predominant agents. Enactment of legislation to prevent the land alienation in the state to restore those alienated was suggested.

Karuppaiyan (1990) in his study in Aladipatti village in Salem district, observed that an upward trend in the magnitude of land alienation which was a peculiar problem of the Malayali tribal households. He found that out of 346 households surveyed, 55 households have alienated their lands to the tune of around 180 acres worth Rs. 1110.37 per acre for sale and Rs. 1100.65 for acre for leased out. The sale was the predominant mode of land alienation prevailing in the village and the family expenses

and the marriage were the major reasons. He also observed proletarianisation consequence of land alienation. Eighteen families had alienated their lands completely and became landless. As regards agencies, he found certain shifts in the patterns of agencies responsible for land alienation. In the initial stage (before 1918), the lands were transferred to non-tribes, in the second stage (1918-1990) the agents were moneylenders and in the final stage (after 1998), the lands were alienated among themselves. He suggested enhanced access to credit and the enactment of legislation for prevention of land transfer.

Karuppaiyan (1990) in his study observed four major modes of alienation viz., sale, usufructuary mortgage, leasing out and encroachment. According to him the major causes for land alienation were domestic consumption, debt redemption, expenditure on social and religious functions, medical expenses and alcoholism. He held that the dependence of these communities on private moneylenders for loan has considerably contributed to land alienation.

Ramachandran (1992) in his evaluation study on ITDP among the Malayali tribals of Kalrayan Hills at South Arcot district observed that the tribal households in the hamlets located adjacent to plain villages though acquired more benefits of tribal development programmes, but alienated major portions of their lands to the non tribals due to their greater level of interaction with the non-tribals. He observed that the magnitude of alienation was comparatively higher in the top of the hill and hamlets located than that of the hamlets located in the remote area. He also found proletarianisation consequence of land alienation and about one fourth of the households in the former group alienated their entire lands and become landless. He suggested enactment of proper legislation to prevention of land alienation and restoration of land to the tribal households. He also suggested for conduct of fresh survey to identify the individual households, who had lost their land throughout the tribal areas.

Saravanan (2001) attempted to identify the basic internal and external forces responsible for alienation of tribal lands in Salem and Baramahal regions of Madras Presidency during the

colonial period (1972-74). According to him the external factors introduction of reserve forests, coffee plantations and influx of non-tribal areas and the internal factor indebtedness.

Another notable study was the one by Ragava Roa and Baskaradoss (1989), which focused on the extent, mode, causes and consequences of land alienation tribal lands in Tamil Nadu. They found that in the state 20 per cent of the tribal households alienated their lands and become landless. According to them the most common mode of alienation was sale and cause was domestic consumption.

Karuppaiyan (2000) provided a comparative picture of the problem in 1989 and 1998. He found an increased magnitude of land alienation among the tribal households in the state. According to him the incidence was high in the tribal concentrated Salem district. The domestic consumption was the prominent cause and sale was the main mode while the major agents were non tribals in both the. Thus the study observed similar patterns of causes, agency and mode of land alienation in the eighties and nineties.

In a recent a recent study, Velayutham Saravanan (2006) has argued that land alienation as a major factor responsible for economic decline of tribals in Tamil Nadu during the post independence period (1947-2000). According to him along with land alienation, the restrictions on access to forest resources, expansion of the land for cultivation, and extension of reserve forests were responsible for economic decline of tribals in Tamil Nadu. He contended that using the infrastructural facilities established by government programmes the non tribal outsiders entered into the tribal areas occupied the tribal land and made the tribals landless labourers.

The studies on land alienation in Tamil Nadu clearly demonstrate its consequences on tribal life especially proletarianisation and economic decline in the state. Though they report the major dimensions of the problem such as magnitude, agency, mode, and consequences, they have not probed the impact of it on the living conditions of the tribal masses (except Shanmugam 2004). In the light of the earlier

studies, the present paper attempts to probe into the problem of tribal land alienation among the Malayali tribal households in the Kalrayan hills of Vilupuram district in Tamil Nadu. The purpose of the present study is to assess the magnitude, mode, agency, and causes of land alienation. In addition, it tries to assess the impact of land alienation on the livelihood and living conditions of tribal households. In other words, the present study also tries to look in to the proletarianisation and pauperisation consequences of land alienation.

The results of the present study will be useful for the policy makers, civil society organisations, as well social workers committed to tribal development and integration in India at multilevel. The policy makers would find necessary information for tribal development planning especially to device suitable strategies to arrest land alienation. The civil society organisations and social workers will be able to design appropriate intervention strategies as well as to advocate suitable policy measures for promoting tribal livelihood and living conditions.

II

The Context: the Malayali Tribe of the Kalrayan Hills

The Kalrayan hills of Vilupuram are on the western extremity of the Kallacuruchi Taluk, where it intersects with Thiruvannamalai, Dharmapuri and Salem Districts. The hill tract sprawls over some 600 square kms and rises from 500 to 1250 meters above the sea level. Rainfall varies between 1200 mms to 1675 mms (Ramachandran 1994). Though the range looks levels from below, it contains no true plateaus, for the valleys are eroded into basin-shaped depressions. Its general slope is towards the Eastern, or South Arcot, side in this direction flow the chief streams, which drain it; namely, the Manimuktanadi, Gomukhanadi and Mayuranadi (Francis 1906:3). It is an area rich in forest produce especially sandal, jack, lemon, tamarind and gallnut while in fauna spotted deer, bear, and wild boar.

The Malayalis (literally, hill-men) are the inhabitants of the Kalrayan hills. They are also found in the Shervaroys, Pachaimalais, and Kollimalais in Salem and on the Javadis. They speak Tamil

and worship the ordinary deities of the lower country. All the different branches of the community believe that they are Vellalans who migrated from Kancheepuram to these hills, bringing with them their god Kariya Raman, who has a temple on the Periya Kalrayan section of this range in Salem district. The tradition in this district is that Vedans inhabited the hills at the time and that the Malayalis killed the men and wedded the women; and at marriages a gun is still fired in the air to represent the death of the Vedan husband. The copper sasanams show that the migration occurred at least as early as the beginning of the sixteenth century (Farancis 1906:106).

The Malaiyalis have no endogamous or exogamous divisions among them to serve as bars to marriage, and there is no theoretical objection to unions between the Malaiyalis of the various hill ranges. Formerly, marriage among them had to be sanctioned by the Palayagar of the locality. Widows may remarry and in their case the ceremony is simpler and shorter. The dead are buried, the reason given being that it is not good to pollute the air below dwelling of the deity of the famous temple at Chinna Tirupathi situated on the south-east corner of the Kalrayans (Baliga 1962:154).

As regards religion, the Malaiyalis subscribe to the Hindu religion and they believe that their progenitors wore the sacred thread. They worship both Lord Siva and Lord Vishnu as well as to a number of minor deities. The minor deities include Mariamma, Draupadi, and many other Goddesses. In their temples, there are prehistoric cells and other stone implements, are also placed. Though the people do not understand what these are, they reverence them. Pongal is the most important festival celebrated by the Malaiyalis. They also celebrate Mahashivaratri sacred to Lord Siva, and Sri Ramanavami and Gokulastami sacred to Lord Vishnu (Thurston 1987:411-12).

III

Methodology

The present study is based on the primary data collected from the tribal households in the Kalrayan hills of Tamil Nadu

with a structured interview schedule. A multistage stratified random sampling procedure was adopted to select taluk, villages and households. Sankarapuram taluk has been selected in view of the fact that there is concentration of population in this taluk. In this taluk, one hilly village and one plains village were purposively chosen as many studies have shown the greater susceptibility of the former to land alienation as compared to the latter (see Ramachandran 1992). A list of households in each of the villages with details of land possession and land alienation in the last four decades was prepared. All the households who alienated their land in last five decades were identified and surveyed. The data was processed and analysed with the help of SPSS package. For analysis, simple averages and percentages were used.

IV

Land Alienation, Livelihood and Living Conditions

In this section, the results of the present study are discussed in terms of the profile of the sample households, magnitude, causes, and modes of land alienation, and its impact on livelihood and living conditions.

4.1. Profile of Sample Households:

The characteristics of respondents such as gender, age group, and education status are discussed as under (see table - 1).

As regards gender almost all the respondents were male. All the respondents in the plains village and most of the respondents in the top hill village (91%) are male. It is mainly due to the fact that the survey was conducted with the heads of the households and very few households were female headed.

Age of the respondents was classified into three groups viz., young (Below 35), middle age (35-60), and old (60 and above). Most of the respondents in both the villages were middle aged. More than one half of them in the plains village (59%) and more than two thirds of the top hill village (70%) belonged to middle age group.

Education of the respondents was classified into five levels viz., illiterate, primary (1-5), secondary (6-10), higher secondary and above (above 12). The results indicate that most of the respondents had primary education and very few have completed secondary schooling in both the villages. Further, it was observed that the education status of the respondents in the plains was better as compared to the top hill village. One half of the respondents in the plains village (59%) and nearly one half of them in the top hills village (48%) had primary level of education.

4.2. Magnitude, Causes and Mode of Land Alienation:

The problem of land alienation has been analysed in terms of magnitude, type of land alienated, year, causes, agency and mode (refer table - 2).

As regards magnitude of land alienation, it is slightly greater in the hill village as compared to the plains village. During the last four decades in the plains village, 198 acres were reportedly alienated while in the top hill village it was worked out to be 148 acres. In the former village, 7 acres of land was alienated on an average per household while in the latter only of 6 acres were alienated on an average. Distribution of land alienation has been analysed with a four fold classification viz., less than 2 Acres, 2 - 5 acres, 5 - 10 acres, and above 10 Acres. It could be observed that most of the households alienated 2 - 5 acres of land in both plains as well as top hill villages. Over 50 per cent of the sample households in the plains village and 48 per cent of them in the top hill village have alienated lands in the range of 2 - 5 acres.

Most of lands alienated were reportedly irrigated in both plains as well as top hill village. Alienated lands of 93 per cent of the respondent households in the plains village and 74 per cent of them in the top hills were reportedly irrigated. Earlier studies too have reported the alienation of irrigated and productive lands (see Rao 1987).

Year of land alienation indicates that most of the respondent households alienated land during the 1980s. More than one third of the respondent households in the plains and more than one

half of them in the top hill village have reportedly alienated land in during 1980s. Interestingly, in the post 1990s, the scenario was changed and the process of land alienation had been slowed down. This slow down was attributed to the active role of communist workers who started spreading awareness about land among the tribal masses in the post 1990s by the knowledgeable persons during the fieldwork.

Land alienation is caused by a number of socio economic and political factors. In the perception of the tribals, the reasons reported for land alienation were repayments of old debts, social function, lack of entry into land, and others. Of these reasons, repayment of old debt was the major reason reported in both the plains and top hill villages. More than one half of the respondents in the plains village and more two thirds of them in the top hill village reported repayment of old debt as the main cause of their land alienation. Similar result was reported in the earlier studies too (Govt of Tamil Nadu 1989). But this was contrary to the findings reported by Karuppaiyan (1990), who reported financing social functions as the major reason.

Interestingly, though financing social functions was not a prominent reason for land alienation it was a significant cause. Over a fourth of the respondents in the plains and a tenth of them in the top hill village reported financing social function as a reason for land alienation.

As regards agency, earlier studies report that the non-tribals, NGOs, Government and private organisations grabbed the tribal lands (see Ramachandran 1992; Karuppaiyan 1990; Roa and Baskaradoss 1989). In the present study it was observed that the non tribals were responsible for land alienation. Hence, non tribals were classified as locals and outsiders. Most of the households reportedly alienated lands to the non-tribals from outside the villages. 78 per cent of the respondents in plains village and 52 per cent of them in the top hill village have reportedly alienated land to the non-tribals from out side their village.

In the literature on land alienation, a number of modes of land alienation were reported. The most prominent were sale,

mortgage, leasing out, encroachment and acquisition. In the study area, all the households disposed of land in the form of sale. Similar findings were reported in earlier study too (see Ramachandran 1992; Karuppaiyan 1990; Roa and Baskaradoss 1989).

4.3. Land Alienation and Livelihood:

Land alienation has been observed in the literature as a major process responsible for economic decline (see Saravanan 2006), proletarianisation and further pauperisation (impoverishment) of the tribal households in India. By proletarianisation or depeasantisation it is meant that the landed become landless. A number of studies have indicated such a consequence of land alienation (see Mander 2002; Ramachandran 1992; Karuppaiyan 1990; Roa and Baskaradoss 1989; Dubey and Murdia 1977). The results of the present study too provide ample support to this thesis. Both indicators of livelihood occupation and size of land holding reveal that the process of proletarianisation had set in due to land alienation. But a greater extent of it was observed in the case of the plains village as compared to the top hill village (see table 2).

More than one half of the households who lost their lands have reportedly become landless agricultural labourers in the plains village while only more than one third of them in the top hill village have become land less. The size of land holding too shows a similar impact. Most of the sample households in the plains village as well as top hill village have become either landless or marginal farmers. One half of the sample households in the plains village were reportedly landless (56%) and over one fifth of them were marginal farmers (22%). On the other hand, in the top hill village more than one third of the households were landless (35%) and over one fourth of them were marginal farmers.

4.4. Land Alienation, and Living Conditions:

Impoverishment of the tribal households due to land alienation has been observed as a consequence of proletarianisation due to land alienation (See Shanmugam

2004). This thesis has been supported by the results of the present study. The patterns of household income, expenditure, and assets in terms of their composition reveal the process of pauperisation of tribal households as a consequence of land alienation (see table 3).

Agricultural labour constituted the major source of income for the tribal households both in the plains village as well as the top hill village. Agricultural labour constituted more than four fifth of the income of the respondent households in the plains village (84%) and more than two thirds of household income in the top hill village (69%). Agricultural income formed about one tenth of the household income the respondents of the plains village (10%) and one fourth of the same of the sample households in the top hill village (26%).

The household income in both the villages was very low. Yet the mean household income of the plains village was far below that of the top hill village. The annual average household income of the plains village was worked out to Rs 15718 while that of the top hill village was computed out to Rs 23555.

A similar picture could be observed in the case of household expenditure too. It was greater in case of the sample households of the top hill village as compared to the plains village. The annual average household expenditure of the plains village was worked out to Rs 232407 while that of the top hill village was computed out to Rs 375225. It is heartening to note that the household expenditure exceeds the household income in both the villages. It implies the inadequacy of income in meeting the day-to-day requirements of the tribal households, which again contributes to indebtedness with the moneylenders.

In spite of proletarianisation, land constitutes still the major form of asset of the tribal households surveyed. Over four fifths of the value of household assets is constituted by land in both the plains (82%) and top hill (83%) villages. This is mainly due to the fact that the other forms of assets such as house, livestock, consumer durables etc. are qualitatively poor and quantitatively insignificant.

Further, the average household assets too indicate the impoverishment situation of the sample households, which could again be attributed to have been caused by land alienation led proletarianisation. The average household assets of the plains village was worked out to Rs 54205 while that of the top hill village was computed to Rs 70134.

V

Conclusion and Implication

The study demonstrates proletarianisation and pauperisation consequences of land alienation on the livelihood and living conditions of the tribal households. In fact, both market failure and government failure in promoting development among the tribes have played significant role in land alienation. Tribal households were unable to adjust with market forces and they have neither access to credit market or agricultural market. Increased demand for consumer good results in heightened household non-food consumption, which is incommensurate with their income. Hence, the tribal households rely on borrowing from the non-institutional sources. To repay the debt they sell their lands to the non-tribals, which deprive them of their livelihood and further impoverishes them.

As land alienation is a major threat to tribal development and integration there is an urgent need for comprehensive legislation in the state of Tamil Nadu to preventing it and restoring the alienated land to the tribal households. This pending demand of the social activists as well social scientists need to be fulfilled by the state government. All efforts shall be made to revamp the credit structure and promoting commercial banks, cooperatives and self help groups to fulfil the productive and consumption credit needs of the tribal masses. Development of agricultural markets and infrastructure in the tribal areas too need the attention of the government. The voluntary sector which is almost invisible in the tribal areas needs to promote the tribal livelihoods, living conditions by mobilising, organising, facilitating and supporting them. They also generate awareness about the rights among the tribal masses.

References:

- Arun Kumar (2006) "From Landlessness to Ownership: The Tribal Struggle for Property Rights". In Govinda Chandra Rath (Ed.) *Tribal Development in India: The Contemporary Debate*, New Delhi, Sage Publications.
- Batra, S.L., 1999, *Final Report on Survey of Alienation of Tribal Land in Dumka and Ranchi Districts of Bihar*, New Delhi, Council for Social Development.
- Chathukulam, Jos and M.S. John (2006) "Issues in Tribal Development: Recent Experience in Kerala". In Govinda Chandra Rath (Ed.) *Tribal Development in India: The Contemporary Debate*, New Delhi, Sage Publications.
- Dalvi, Surekha and Milind Bokil, 2000, "In Search of Justice, Tribal Communities and Land Rights in Maharashtra", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.35, No.32, 2843-50.
- Das Gupta, Malabika, 1985, "Tribal Unrest in Tripura: An Alternative View," *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.20, No.1, 38-40.
- Das Gupta, Manas, 1984, "Tribal Unrest in Tripura", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.91(11): 449-451.
- Desai, A.R., 1979, *Peasant Struggles in India*, Bombay, Oxford University Press.
- Dubey, S.N. and Ratna Murdia, 1977, "Land Alienation Maharashtra," In S. N. Dubey and Ratna Murdia (eds.) *Land Alienation and Restoration in Tribal Communities in India*, Bombay, Himalaya Publishing House, 32-57.
- Fancis, W., 1906, *South Arcot District Gazetteer*, Madras, Lawrence Asylum Press.
- Garstin, M.C.S., 1878, "Manual of the South Arcot District", Madras, Lawrence Asylum Press.
- GOI, 2001, "Tenth Five Year Plan", New Delhi, Planning Commission, Government of India.
- GOT, 1989, "Alienation of Tribal Lands in Tripura," Agartala, Department of Revenue, Government of Tripura.
- Karuppaiyan, E., 1990, "Alienation of Tribal Lands in Tamil Nadu," *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.35, No.37, 3343-3350.
- Karuppaiyan, E., 1990, "Development of a Tribal Village in Tamil Nadu 1961-1988." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Annamalai Nagar: Department of Economics, Annamalai University.
- Karuppaiyan, E., 2000, "Alienation of Tribal Lands in Tamil Nadu: Panel Data Analysis". *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.35, No. 37, 3343-50.
- Misra, S.N., 1995, "Where is Tribal Land Alienation", *Kurukshetra*, Vol.154, No. 1, 47-51.
- Parullker, Godavari, 1975, "Adivasis Revolt: The Study of Worli Peasants in Struggle," Calcutta, National Book Agency Pvt. Ltd.
- Patel, M.L., 1973, *Changing Land Problems of Tribal India*. Bhopal: Progress Publishers.
- Ramachandran, S., 1992, "Integrated Tribal Development Programmes: An

- Evaluation at Kalrayan Hills of South Arcot District," Unpublished Ph.D Thesis. Annamalai Nagar: Department of Economics, Annamalai University.
- Ramachandran, S., 2007, "Tribal Poverty in Tamil Nadu: The Case of Kalrayan Hills". Chennai: Dr. Ambedkar Centre for Economic Studies, University of Madras.
- Rangaswamy, Amrita., 1973, "And there were none." *Economic and Political Weekly*, 8: (46):.
- Rao, Ragava and K. Baskaradoss, 1989, *Alienation of Tribal Lands in Tamil Nadu*. Udhgamandalam, Tribal Research Centre.
- Reddy, Subba N., 1988, "Depriving Tribals of Land: Andhra Move to Amend Land Transfer Laws", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.23, No.29, 1458-61.
- Roa, Janardhan B. 1988, "Tribal Land Rights, Government and Socio Political Movements", In *Problems in Tribal Society: Some Aspects*. RGICS Paper No. 47. 1-24.
- Roa, Jaswantha P, 1987, "Tribals' Struggle Against Land Alienation", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.33, No. 3, 81-83.
- Roa, Ragava and Baskaradoss, 1989, "Alienation of Tribal Lands in Tamil Nadu". Udhagamandalam, Tribal Research Centre.
- Saravanan, Velayutham, 2001, "Tribal Land Alienation in Madras Presidency During the Colonial Period: 1792-1947", *Review of Development and Change*, Vol. 6, No. 1, 73-104.
- Saravanan, Velayutham, 2006, "Economic Decline of Tribals in Tamil Nadu: 1947-2000". In Govinda Chandra Rath (Ed.) *Tribal Development in India: The Contemporary Debate*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Shankar, Kripa (1988) "Land Transfers in Uttar Pradesh", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.23, No. 30, 1514-17.
- Shanmugam, P., 2004, *Alienation of Tribal Lands in Tamil Nadu*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Annamalai Nagar, Department of Economics, Annamalai University.
- Sinha, S.P., 1990, *Final Survey Report on Problem Extent and Remedies of Land Alienation of Tribals in Chota Nagpur and Santal Parganas (Bihar)*, Ranchi, Bihar Tribal Welfare and Research Institute.
- Thurston, Edgar and K. Rangachari, 1935, "The Malaiyalis". In *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*. Vol. IV: K-M., New Delhi, Asian Educational Services.

Notes

- i. According to the tenth plan document the unresolved issues are displacement of tribals, tribal land alienation, indebtedness, shifting cultivation and deprivation of forest rights while the persisting problems include low literacy and high drop out rates, inadequate and inaccessible health services, nutritional deficiencies and diseases, lack of adequate irrigation facilities, extreme / abject poverty, endangering of intellectual

rights crimes/atrocities against STs, neglect of forest villages, extinction of primitive tribal groups, ineffective implementation of PESA, 1996 and routinised mechanism of TSP (Government of India 2001).

- ii. According to A.R Desai the Kol insurrections of 1883 were caused by encroachment on the tribal land. The Tamar Rebellions, which repeated seven times between 1789 and 1832, were primarily due to the illegal deprivation of their rights in land, which the Hos, Mundas and Oraons had suffered and the best land available in tribal areas had been passed into the hands of outsiders (Desai 1979:17) and this is the basic problem of underdevelopment.
- iii. There are number of studies which document the contemporary tribal movements for restoration of land alienated and on the question of land rights. Jos Chathukulam and M.S.John (2006) discussed the Advasies of Kerala non-violent movement for their land rights under the leadership of C.K. Janu in their recent study. Arun Kumar (2006) has documented the tribal struggle for restoration of land alienated and the role played by a civil society organisation called *Shakthi* in the movement, in West Godavari district of Andhra Pradesh. Manas Das Gupta (1984) has discussed the conflict between tribals and non tribals as the latter have grabbed the formers land in the north eastern state of Tiripura.

Table 1: Profile of Respondents

Sl.No	Characteristic	Type of Village		Total n = 50
		Plains n = 27	Top Hill n = 23	
I	Gender			
	Male	27 (100)	21 (91.30)	48 (96.00)
	Female	0 (0.00)	2 (8.70)	2 (4.00)
II	Age Group			
	Young (Below 35 Years)	8 (29.63)	3 (13.04)	11 (22.00)
	Middle (35 -60 Years)	16 (59.26)	16 (69.57)	32 (64.00)
	Old (Above 60 Years)	3 (11.11)	4 (17.39)	7 (14.00)
III	Education			
	Illiterate	7 (25.93)	8 (34.78)	15 (30.00)
	Primary	16 (59.26)	11 (47.83)	27 (54.00)
	Secondary and Above	4 (14.81)	4 (17.40)	8 (16.00)

Source: Computed Figures in parentheses are percentages

Table 2: Land Alienation: Magnitude Year Causes Agency and Mode

Sl.No		Type of Village		Total N = 50
		Plains n = 27	Top Hill n = 23	
I	Magnitude of Land Alienated			
	Less than 2 Acres	2 (7.41)	6 (26.09)	8 (16.00)
	2 - 5 Acres	14 (51.85)	11 (47.83)	25 (50.00)
	5 - 10 Acres	5 (18.52)	3 (13.04)	8 (16.00)
	Above 10 Acres	6 (22.22)	3 (13.04)	9 (18.00)
	Total Acres of Land Alienated	197.5	148	345.5
	Average Acres Alienated	7.31	6.43	6.91
II	Type of Land Alienated			
	Irrigated	25 (92.59)	17 (73.91)	42 (84.00)
	Unirrigated	2 (7.41)	6 (26.09)	8 (16.00)
III	Year			
	Before 1980	8 (29.63)	5 (21.74)	13 (26.00)
	1980 -1990	12 (44.44)	13 (56.52)	25 (50.00)
	After 1990	7 (25.93)	5 (21.74)	12 (24.00)
IV	Causes			
	Repayment of Old Debt	14 (51.85)	17 (73.91)	31 (62.00)
	Marriage and social ceremonies	7 (25.93)	3 (13.04)	10 (20.00)
	Lack of Entry to Land	2 (7.41)	2 (8.70)	4 (8.00)
	Others	4 (14.81)	1 (4.35)	5 (10.00)
V	Agency			
	Non tribals Outside Village	21 (77.78)	12 (52.17)	33 (66.00)
	Non tribals within Village	6 (22.22)	11 (47.83)	17 (34.00)
VI	Mode			
	Sale	27 (100)	23 (100)	50 (100)

Source: Computed Figures in parentheses are percentages

Table 3: Patterns of Livelihood

Sl.No	Livelihood Base	Type of Village		Total N = 50
		Plains n = 27	Top Hill n = 23	
I	Occupation			
	Agricultural Labour	15 (55.56)	8 (34.78)	23 (46.00)
	Cultivator	12 (44.44)	15 (65.22)	27 (54.00)
II	Size of Landholding			
	Land Less	15 (55.56)	8 (34.78)	23 (46.00)
	Marginal (1 - 2.5 Acres)	6 (22.22)	6 (26.09)	12 (24.00)
	Small (2.5 - 5 Acres)	4 (14.81)	5 (21.74)	9 (18.00)
	Medium (Above 5 Acres)	2 (7.41)	4 (17.39)	6 (12.00)

Source: Computed Figures in parentheses are percentages

Table 4: Patterns of Living Conditions: Composition of Household Income, Expenditure and Assets

Sl.No	Particulars	Type of Village		Total N = 50
		Plains n = 27	Top Hill n = 23	
I	Source of Income			
	Agricultural Wage	13248 (84.28)	16239 (68.94)	14624 (75.68)
	Agriculture	1556 (9.90)	6065 (25.75)	3630 (18.79)
	Livestock	674 (4.29)	764 (3.24)	715 (3.70)
	Others	241 (1.53)	487 (2.07)	354 (1.83)
	Annual Average Household Income	15718 (100)	23555 (100)	19323 (100)

Source: Computed Figures in parentheses are percentages

II	Expenditure			
	Food	7167 (0.04)	10407 (0.03)	8657 (0.02)
	Non-Food	225240 (96.92)	364818 (97.23)	590058 (98.55)
	Annual Average Household Expenditure	232407 (100)	375225 (100)	598715 (100)
III	Assets			
	Land	44437 (81.98)	58223 (83.02)	50779 (82.52)
	House	7870 (14.52)	7565 (10.79)	7730 (12.56)
	Livestock	1200 (2.21)	2495 (3.56)	1796 (2.92)
	Consumer Durables	673 (1.24)	1824 (2.60)	1202 (1.95)
	Others	25 (0.05)	26 (0.04)	25 (0.04)
	Average Household Assets	54205 (100)	70134 (100)	61532 (100)

Source: Computed Figures in parentheses are percentages