

# LAND USE POLICIES IN THE STATE OF MIZORAM

James L.T. Thanga\*

*The traditional practice of jhum cultivation is considered unsustainable as it leads to erosion of top fertile soil. Policy makers and academicians accepted that there is a need to control it so as to improve the ecological quality and to protect crop productivity. In their attempt to uplift the poor farmer by giving them sustainable form of cultivation, the state government of Mizoram has chalk out different land use policies from time to time. The central objective of any land use policy ever adopted in the state is to move the farmers out of Jhum cultivation and complete abolition of Jhumming in some future date. There were changes in the policy with the changes in the ministry. This paper attempted to study the various land use policies implemented in Mizoram after 1950s. The major policies were Garden Colony Project, New Land Use Policy (NLUP), Jhum Control Project (JCP), and Mizoram Intodelhna Project (MIP). All the schemes and programmes under these policies were found to have impact on the increasing areas of plantation crops, wet rice cultivation, forest; and reduction in the areas under shifting cultivation. However, complete abolition of jhum cultivation, which was the main objective of any policy, could not be achieved and the system is still in practice till date.*

**Keywords:** *Jhumming, NLUP, Garden Colony, MIP, Jhum Control, Land Use.*

## INTRODUCTION

*Jhumming* (or shifting cultivation) practice has become a subject of debate among foresters, ecologists, economists, and policy makers (Leblhuber, et. al, 2012). The main contention is that it is the leading cause of land degradation (Lianzela, 1997; Maithani, 2005) that has constantly declined the agricultural productivity and thus income of the farmers (Sati and Rinawma, 2014). On the other hand, some scholars believe that it is a major source of livelihood of the people and a way of life for them. *Jhumming* is more than an occupation in Mizoram; it is a lifestyle and is an integral part of the socio-cultural life (Garbyal, 1999). Despite its strong attachment to the socio-cultural life of the tribal population, farmers have started feeling the pressure of growing population and shortening of the shifting cultivation cycle (Maithani, 2005) and deterioration of soil fertility under the system over time. It is universally agreed that the *Jhumming* is a primitive and unproductive method of cultivation (Garbyal, 1999), and it has become imperative to control it, which would not only improve the ecological quality but also enhance crop productivity (Sati and Rinawma, 2014).

Till the mid-1950s, there was no realisation that the damage to the top soil formed by hundreds of years of slow natural process would create any problem to the people (Lawma, 1991). With the establishment of Mizo District Council in 1952 after independence and its subsequent upgradation to Union Territory status in 1972, the need to switch the *Jhumia* families to settled cultivation was seriously felt by the government. Thus, control of *Jhum* cultivation became the main objective of several land use policies implemented in the state of Mizoram. The State has seen plethora of land use policies introduced by several ministries under different political leadership especially after the 5<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan.

This paper attempts to study the different land use policies introduced by different ministries of the state of Mizoram using the data and information obtained from Government documents, published and unpublished research papers of individual, institutions and organisations. The rest of the paper

---

\* Department of Economics, Mizoram University, Email: [jametea@yahoo.com](mailto:jametea@yahoo.com)

is organised in different sections. Section two presents Garden Colony Project, and New Land Use Policy, Jhum Control Project and Mizoram Intodelhna Project are discussed in section three, four and five respectively; while section six present the way forward as takeaway of the discussion. Different ministries in the state conceived their own land use policies with the abolition of the age old practice of *jhum* cultivation as primary objective. Accordingly, this paper uses the concepts of policy, programmes and schemes interchangeably in the discussion as they are part and parcel of these land use policies.

## GARDEN COLONY PROJECT

Garden Colony Project was the first state sponsored major land use policy introduced by People Conference (PC) Party Ministry under the leadership of Brig. T. Sailo. It was implemented as one of the projects of the Annual Plan of 1977-78. The schemes introduced during this Annual Plan period include land reclamation, settlement of *Jhumias* on settled farming, soil amelioration, and improvement and terracing of hill slope lands (Thangchungnunga, 1997). The Garden Colony Scheme intended to colonise several families in a compact area of settlement so that they might confine themselves to horticultural cultivation. It was expected that this would ultimately lead them to abandon the primitive *Jhum* culture. A total of 1545 families from 41 villages could be assisted under the project and more than 8 lakhs seedlings were distributed to these beneficiaries. Total financial assistance to each beneficiary was Rs.14500 which was to be paid in phase manner in five years.

Though the scheme was actually implemented with concerted effort on the part of the government, it is difficult to examine its impact due to the unavailability of records on it. The available records showed that the programme had many weaknesses as follows: (1) no effort or mechanism was found in place for monitoring and evaluation, (2) as the flow of expenditure on the development of the scheme was distributed year wise in a pre-assigned order, the programme lacked fixation of target to be achieved within a stipulated time, (3) further, there was no clear basis for identification of the beneficiaries for this scheme, leaving it to the responsibility of the concerned government officials. Following the defeat of the ruling PC party in the Election of 1984, the Garden Colony scheme was discontinued by the new ministry.

**Table 1: Physical Achievement (No. of Beneficiaries) of New Land Use Policy (1984-1987)**

Sl. No	Department	No. of Families				Share (Percent)
		1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	Total	
1	Forest	1259	3224	--	4483	29.74
2	Animal Husbandry & Veterinary	226	796	1000	2022	13.41
3	Fisheries	--	112	--	112	0.74
4	Soil & Water Conservation	946	414	940	2300	15.26
5	Agriculture	1069	1788	1773	4630	30.71
6	Sericulture	769	94	666	1529	10.14
	Total	4269	6428	4379	15076	100

Source: Department of Rural Development, Mizoram, Aizawl

## NEW LAND USE POLICY (NLUP)

The New Land Use Policy (NLUP) was implemented three times (or three phases) in Mizoram by the Congress Ministry during 1984-87, 1991-97, and 2011-14. The main objective was abolition of shifting (*Jhum*) cultivation by providing the *Jhumia* families permanent and sustainable means of livelihoods, while also increasing the forest cover. It is a policy with an objective to put an end to the practice of *Jhumming* by providing alternative land based permanent occupations and stable income to the families practicing *Jhumming* in rural areas thereby raising their standard of living (Garbyal, 1999). The policy encompassed simultaneous attempts on progressive reduction of areas under *Jhum* cultivation and its complete abolition in some future date; allotment of suitable land to individual rural households for permanent cultivation and utilisation on the basis of working capacity of the family; promotion of wet rice cultivation (WRC) for self-sufficiency in food production; and preservation and protection of land areas other than those allotted for permanent cultivation so as to keep significantly large areas under forest cover. The different phases of NLUP may be discussed as follows:

### a) NLUP Phase-I (1984-87)

To control and replace the primitive agricultural practice of shifting cultivation (Lawma, 1991) and to protect the land from degradation and to promote productivity (Upadhyaya and Jha, 1997), a meeting of the Council of Ministers dated 24<sup>th</sup> November 1984 decided to introduce a new scheme called New Land Use Policy (Zoramchhana, 2000). It was initially expected to be implemented till 1989. However, when the Indian National Congress (INC) government was replaced by the Mizo National Front (MNF) in 1987, the programme suffered a serious setback. Consequently, the programme was implemented for three years only, from 1984-85 to 1986-87.

The scheme was implemented through several state government departments like Environment and Forest, Soil and Water Conservation, and Agriculture, coordinated through Rural Development Department. Different departments identified families to rehabilitate them on settled farming, plantation, etc. They had different orientation and approaches in each case and financial support of up to Rs.3000 per family was assured. It was implemented through a centrally sponsored scheme of Social Forestry and Plan Budget of the state government. The physical and financial achievements (no. of families assisted) are presented in Table 1 and Table 2 respectively.

**Table 2: Expenditure under New Land Use Policy (1984-1987)**

Sl. No	Department	Total Expenditure (Rs. In lakhs)				Share (Percent)
		1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	Total	
1	Forest	16.44	96.72	--	113.16	32.88
2	Animal Husbandry & Veterinary	5.65	5.65	30	41.3	12
3	Fisheries	--	3.36	--	3.36	0.98
4	Soil & Water Conservation	29.39	15.05	25.33	69.77	20.27
5	Agriculture	32.1	4.68	53.19	89.97	26.14
6	Sericulture	3.84	2.82	19.98	26.64	7.74
	Total	87.42	128.28	128.5	344.2	100

Source: Department of Rural Development, Mizoram, Aizawl

### b) NLUP Phase-II (1991-97)

With the return of the INC Party in the Ministry led by Lal Thanhawla in 1989, the NLUP programme was revived with major improvements over the first attempt (Singh, 2007). The government decided to reorganise and enlarge the Rural Development Department to full fledge Commissionerate by inducting officers from different departments. Selection of beneficiaries and their activities were coordinated through Rural Development Block. The government introduced 53 main trades and 5 subsidiary trades. Subsidiary trade was introduced to overcome the problem of the beneficiaries who undertake activities with long gestation period.

Although the original target of the programme was to cover the entire 20 RD blocks by the end of the 8<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan (i.e. 1997), only 12 were covered within the stipulated time frame. The number of beneficiaries under the scheme was still below expected even in the covered RD blocks. Inadequate funding from the centre was attributable to the slow progress of the programme (Zoramchhana, 2000). Though the Programme had positive impacts on increasing the forest areas, area under WRC, and areas under plantation crops; its main objective of abolishing *Jhum* cultivation could not be achieve (Thanga, 2016). The programme underwent a serious setback due to change in ministry in 1998 Election.

**Table 3: Year Wise Coverage of RD Blocks under NLUP**

Year	RD Block Covered	Expenditure (Rs. in lakhs)	No. of Beneficiaries
1990-91	Thingsulthliah, West Phaileng, Reiek, and Lungsen	1200	12907
1991-92	Thingdawl, and Zawlnuam	2070	10494
1992-93	-----	2220	-----
1993-94	Serchhip, and East Lungdar	2770	9452
1994-95	Khawzawl, and Lunglei	2479	11776
1995-96	Tlangnuam	2500	1867
1996-97	Ngopa	2300	2529
	TOTAL	15539	49025

Source: Abstract of NLUP Beneficiaries, Government of Mizoram, 1998.

Note: Annual Expenditure also includes the successive instalments given to the beneficiaries in the RD Blocks covered in the preceding years

### c) NLUP Phase-III (2011-14)

After a gap of 10 years and immediately after winning in the Election in 2008, the INC revived its endeavour to implement NLUP in a more comprehensive way. Several commentators attributed the landslide victory of INC in the 2008 Election to its propaganda of implementing the policy in an improved form, in terms of coverage and amount of assistances. Further modifications and better frameworks were made to the previously implemented policy following the suggestions of Government of India that envisaged a five year period for the project to be completed with a cost of staggering Rs.2800 crores. Although the groundwork was initiated in 2009, the NLUP was officially launched on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2011. This particular day was celebrated as 'Farmers' Day' (*Kuthnathawktute Ni*, in Mizo). The programme encompasses a wide range of activities with a

maximum assistance amount of Rs.1 lakh per family and a total of 1.2 lakhs families were targeted to be covered by 2014-15.

**Table 4: Abstract of Funding Pattern for NLUP as approved by CCEA**

Component	CSS/Central Share	ACA (State Share through the ACA and outright ACA)	Additional Subsidy through ACA for beneficiary	Total ACA/SP (3+4)	Rs. in Crores	
					Beneficiary Contribution	Total Cost
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Management	---	72.20	---	72.20	---	72.20
Development	110.34	---	1171.66	1171.66	338.15	1620.15
Infrastructure	890.50	282.28	282.28	282.28	8.00	1180.78
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1000.84</b>	<b>354.48</b>	<b>1453.94</b>	<b>1526.14</b>	<b>346.15</b>	<b>2873.13</b>

Source: Draft Annual Plan - New Land Use Policy 2013-14, Government of Mizoram

There is a high power committee at the State level called NLUP Apex Board headed by the Chief Minister and the Council of Ministers, Commissioners/Secretaries of concerned Line Departments and Expert/Prominent Citizens as its members. Next to the Apex Board is the NLUP Implementing Board (NIB) with the Vice Chairman of the Apex Board as its Chairman. Members of the NIB are the heads of concerned line departments, experts, prominent citizens, and representatives of NGOs. The NIB is the executive body of the programme. The third tier of the project management is the District Level NLUP Implementing Committee under the Chairmanship of Deputy Commissioners (DC) with district officers of the concerned departments, farmers, and NGOs as its members. The fourth tier is the Village Level NLUP Implementing Committee headed by President of the Village Council (VC) and all members of the Village Council, and prominent citizens appointed by NIB as members.

An abstract of the funding pattern for NLUP as approved by Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs (CCEA), Government of India, is presented in Table 4. It is broadly divided into three components: *management component* for administration and direction of the project, *development component* for beneficiary assistance in cash or kind, and *infrastructure component* for creation of supporting infrastructure to facilitate the success and sustainability of the programme.

The Sector Wise physical achievement of NLUP is presented in Table 5. A total of 1,32,044 families could be covered during the five years of its implementation. This is much higher than the targeted number of beneficiaries as given in the original DPR basically due to the permission granted by the Planning Commission to cover an additional number of 35000 families beyond the original target of 1.2 lakh families.

Given the magnitude of expenditure incurred and the number of beneficiaries under it, the programme is expected to have significant impact on the economy of the state. According to the report of Economic Survey, *Jhum* area decreased consistently from 44947 hectares in 2007-08 to 20064 hectares in 2014-15, which amounted to 55.36 percent decline during this period. As this stage

coincides with the NLUP, one may conclude that *Jhumming* had decreased after the implementation of NLUP. Though *Jhumming* is not yet abandoned in the state as desired by the policy statement, its scale of operation has reduced drastically after the implementation of NLUP. This may be one important case indicating the success of the programme in achieving its objective. Secondly, the NLUP has positive impact in the expansion of area and production of many agriculture and allied crops cultivated on settled mode.

**Table 5: Physical Achievement of NLUP among the different Line Departments (Sectors)**

Sl. No	Department/ Sector	1st Phase (2010-11)	2nd Phase (2012-13)	3rd Phase (2013-14)	No. of Beneficiaries		
					4th Phase (2014-15)	Total No	Percent
1	Agriculture	6052	7576	4383	1900	19911	15.08
2	Horticulture	9327	8592	4049	1845	23813	18.03
3	Soil & Water Conservation	5389	3545	2022	898	11854	8.98
4	Sericulture	826	1058	233	89	2206	1.67
5	Fisheries	1447	1131	717	359	3654	2.77
6	Environment & Forest	1409	1191	474	208	3282	2.49
7	Animal Husbandry & Veterinary	9923	12886	9536	4709	37054	28.06
8	Industries	10730	7632	5936	2879	27177	20.58
9	UD&PA	--	1416	1244	433	3093	2.34
	Total	45103	45027	28594	13320	132044	100

Source: NLUP Implementing Board, Govt. of Mizoram, dated 29.05.2014

However, there are several weaknesses in the implementation of NLUP after 2011, and some of them may be noted here. *First*, inefficient delivery of material assistances are found to have demoralised the beneficiaries which directly ramified their performance. Take one example, as much as 73.17 percent of the beneficiaries who adopted orange as their NLUP trade in Sihfa village had shown great enthusiasm by undertaking jungle clearance and land preparation, were reported to receive the seedlings towards the end of the planting season. *Second*, the performance of the beneficiaries under Industries Department was found to be very poor in urban areas. The study conducted by Department of Economics, Mizoram University in 2015 observed mass failure of the scheme in urban areas as more than 50 percent of urban beneficiaries undertaking industrial trades did not take any initiative in their trades (i.e. non-performing).

*Third*, the study by Consultative Committee for NLUP in 2015 noted that the limited role played by the village level committee in the monitoring of the performance of the beneficiaries. Practically, there is no effective mechanism in place at the village level to monitor the beneficiary selection and their performances in the trades they adopted. It was reported that field level monitoring could not be effective as expected because of the frequent interferences and overruling of the decision made by the field staff from higher authority. Beneficiaries found not working were reported to the higher

authority by the field staff to stop their further assistances. On knowing that, the beneficiaries sought help from their political boss so that their assistance can be continued, on which the latter took immediate action in their support. In such situation, it is not possible to ensure strict monitoring by the line department on the performance of the beneficiaries.

*Fourth*, the project set out a clear approach to land use planning in view of the need for environment protection, market accessibility of the project area, and to enhance further public intervention schemes. However, it is unfortunate that approaches such as *one crop – one village*, *cluster approach*, and *compact area approach*, could not be implemented even at the beginning of the project. Implementation of such a massive land use policy without sticking to proper set of strategies in its allocation and management at the village level is a risky initiative, which could result in cultivation of diverse crops in isolated locations. This can complicate the challenge of making further public intervention schemes on crop maintenance, marketing, and sustainable land resource management practices in the future.

### **JHUM CONTROL PROJECT (JCP)**

In 1987, the MNF party took over the ministry from the Congress and replaced the NLUP with a centre-sponsored *Jhum* Control Project (JCP). The JCP was implemented on pilot basis in Aibawk RD Block during 1987-88, and the scheme was extended to Tuipang RD Block the next year. However, the scale was curtailed as the National Development Council discontinued the Special Area Development Programme in eight states, including the JCP in Mizoram (Singh, 2007). Thus, the project was not able to make much headway and was discontinued immediately without significant impact.

The aim of the project was to progressively reduce and replace *Jhumming* till its complete abandonment by 1993. Horticulture was the most favoured option. Where topography permitted, WRC, bench terracing, contour bunding, and minor irrigation were to be introduced. Improved piggery, poultry and duck rearing, cattle development and upgradation of local cows were also planned. Crafts, such as carpentry, tailoring, and knitting were to be promoted. Departmental works were proposed for soil and water conservation, social forestry, roads, and other support infrastructure. A total of 1936 beneficiaries from 16 villages in Aibawk RD Block were covered. Assistance in cash and in kind was to the extent of Rs.30,000 per family. The total project cost was estimated to be 5.30 crores and was aiming at complete abolition of *Jhumming* in the state by 1993 (Menon, 1988). However, the total financial achievements and actual amount of assistance provided to the beneficiaries could not be ascertained clearly from the available sources.

### **MIZORAM INTODELHNA PROJECT (MIP)**

The MNF Ministry which was elected in the 1998 Election initiated a new line of thinking for *Jhum* control policy at the backdrop of the failure of previously implemented land use policies like Garden Colony, NLUP, and JCP. The new project so evolved was called the Mizoram Intodelhna Project (MIP) - *Project for Self-Sufficiency in Mizoram*, to be funded through the central plan schemes of Additional Central Assistance (ACA) and Normal Central Assistance (NCA). The main aim of MIP was the upliftment of the rural poor especially the shifting cultivators (Sinha, 2012). Its main concern was attainment of self-sufficiency, food security, and better livelihood for the cultivator as a whole. The concept of watershed management was utilised, giving importance to *Jhumias* (Ralte, 2015).

**Table 6: Number of Families Assisted and Amount Disbursed under MIP in Mizoram**

District	Phase-I (2002-03)			Phase-II (2002-03)			Phase-I& II Total	
	No. of Families	Amount (Rs. In Lakhs)	Amount per Family (Rs)	No. of Families	Amount (Rs. In Lakhs)	Amount per Family (Rs)	No. of Families	Amount (Rs. In Lakhs)
Aizawl	7943	595.725	7500	4571	182.84	4000	12514	778.56
Lunglei	4509	338.175	7500	2076	83.04	4000	6585	421.22
Saiha	1564	117.3	7500	440	17.6	4000	2004	134.9
Kolasib	3025	226.875	7500	4254	170.16	4000	7279	397.04
Champhai	5664	424.8	7500	4028	161.12	4000	9692	585.92
Lawngtlai	727	54.525	7500	623	24.92	4000	1350	79.44
Mamit	3112	233.4	7500	1329	53.16	4000	4441	286.56
Serchhip	3849	288.675	7500	1993	79.72	4000	5842	368.40
Total	30393	2279.475	7500	19314	772.56	4000	49707	3052.04

Source: Lianzela (2008)

The actual implementation of the scheme saw the formation of the State Level Apex Committee under the chairmanship of the Chief Minister. The Apex Committee comprised of Agriculture Minister, Chief Secretary, Secretary of Agriculture Department, and other members appointed by the government. The Committee was responsible for consideration and approval of the programme activities formulated for MIP. Under the Apex Committee were two sub-committees, viz. Marketing Committee, and Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Committee. Meanwhile, the MIP establishment functioned as a separate Cell within the Directorate of Agriculture, Government of Mizoram. The Cell was entrusted with the roles of administration and supervision of the programme.

The core beneficiaries of the programme activities were the small and marginal farmers either organised through self-help groups (SHG) or through crop grower associations. The groups were encouraged to voluntarily organise themselves into interest groups. As per the policy guidelines, fund for the whole village (cluster) would be given (in each phase) to the farmers' association of that village. The association would deposit the fund in the nearby bank which would then be released at the right time. This was done so as to attain grassroots participation in the programme. One of the important aspects of the programme was prioritisation of crops and selection of the size of beneficiaries based on the available resources. The underlying idea of crop prioritisation was import substitution for crops that could be easily grown in the state. These crops were given priority in the MIP for immediate production. They include potato, onion, garlic, pulses, edible oil (mustard oil), soyabean, and maize, while passion fruits, red oil palm, grapes, papaya, and some medicinal plants were also included in the revised guidelines. Instead of cultivating them by everyone and everywhere, cluster approach was taken into consideration. To facilitate this initiative, a memorandum of understanding (MoU) was signed with some firms and organisations for selected products like Oil Palm.



Although evolved in 2001, the actual work of MIP started in 2002 under the supervision of the MIP Task Force. Each beneficiary, before getting the assistance, was required to prepare a project with the help of an expert in the field. Originally, the quantum of assistance proposed to the beneficiary was Rs.50,000 and any amount above this would be met by the beneficiary himself (Lianzela, 2008). The fund was to be released in a phase manner. An amount of Rs.7500 per beneficiary would be released in the first year, and Rs.15000 and Rs.12500 were to be released in the second and third year respectively. Table 6 presents the year wise number of families assisted and expenditures under MIP.

The MIP was evolved as an improved one with more or less similar objectives taking into account the lacunae of the previous programmes, thereby, having better chance of success. The emphasis on group approach in MIP, rather than beneficiary followed under NLUP (1991-97), was quite attractive and invited better participation in its implementation and monitoring. It is understood that a participatory project is likely to be a success. Further, the underlying principle on the nature and roles of the MIP Task Force to be a *'think-thank'* for gap analysis and channelising of available funds for projects with higher scope of success was also a welcomed initiative. One of the positive signals implicating the success of MIP can be found in the emergence of contract farming for Oil Palm cultivation which continues even today.

However, the actual implementation of MIP showed significant deviation from its objectives and principles, as set out in the Policy Guidelines, in many respects. *Firstly*, the entire fund allocation was less than Rs.50 crores which was considered too small an amount to make much headway. Also, involvement of line departments was minimal and frequent changes of programmes and guidelines created confusion (JICA Study, 2014). In respect to the beneficiary assistance, out of the total target of Rs.50000 per beneficiary, only Rs.11500 could be delivered in two installments, a shortfall of 77 percent from the target amount, which clearly denotes the failure of the programme.

*Secondly*, the policy guidelines of MIP did not clearly establish the mechanism for identification of clusters, selection of beneficiaries, and the methodology for selecting particular crops. It rather looked like a simple selection of families and giving cash assistance without much care about the purpose and activities to be undertaken.

*Thirdly*, absence of strict monitoring and evaluation was another area of concern. A Sub-Committee for Monitoring and Evaluation was constituted by the Government in 2004; however, there was no concrete and tangible initiative for its materialisation. *Lastly*, poor delivery of the assistance whether in cash or kind was a serious setback of the programme. Take one example; out of the 1239 piglets distributed by the RD Department in Lunglei and Hnahthial RD blocks, it was found that only 8 survived. These piglets were purchased by the Government at the rate of Rs.2500 per piglet. The death rate was 94.46 percent which means that the Government incurred a loss of Rs.30 lakhs. Moreover, triple the price of each piglet was spent for transporting them from Shillong to the distribution points. These piglets were said to be of superior breed and were professed to have been examined by veterinarians before distribution. With such types of implementation of the programmes meant for the development of the farmers, the very notion of development was very difficult to achieve (Ralte, 2015).

## THE WAY FORWARD

Mizoram has implemented several land use policies specifically meant for abolition of *Jhum* cultivation and uplift the poor families by providing sustainable means of livelihood. The commitment of various political parties to evolve better and sustainable land use practices is commendable, and

there are a number of areas where such policies were found effective and have positive impacts. At the same time, there are also a number of areas where such policies could be strongly criticized, and the successes or failure of the land use policies implemented by the main political parties have been the continuing debate today. The following points may be raised as takeaway of the preceding discussion.

*Firstly*, any land use projects should not be initiated in the state without having clear set of strategies and approaches for sustainable land use practices as it could disturb the existing system of cultivation rather than improve it. The inability of the government to ensure land use practice like *cluster approach*, *one crop-one village*, and *compact area approach* as mentioned in the policy documents from time to time amounted to the failure of land use policies in the past.

Secondly, it is necessary to change the perception of the academicians as well as the government towards *Jhum* cultivation. *Jhumming* should not simply be considered as the worst form of cultivation, but be accepted as a part of tribal culture and living to which the people have strong attachment.

*Thirdly*, the existence of proper marketing policy is one of the keys to the success of any project that strives to push production of agriculture and allied crops. Although NLUP has envisaged a set of marketing policy, the only visible efforts shown were building of physical infrastructures at different places without proper basis for the identification of strategic market location.

*Lastly*, as the state had implemented different schemes for the development of agriculture sector mostly by following *beneficiary approach* (i.e. giving assistance to farmers), we have also seen many drawbacks in their implementation. It may be more effective to evolve government policy towards infrastructure development in agriculture sector, which aims at self-sufficiency in input supply, link road, productivity improvement, marketing and storage infrastructures, quality control, etc.

## References

- Consultative Committee for NLUP (2015), *A Study on the Success and Impact of NLUP under Horticulture Sector in Mizoram: Mandarin Orange*, NLUP Implementing Board, Govt. of Mizoram.
- Garbyal, S.S (1999). '*Jhumming* (Shifting Cultivation) in Mizoram (India) and New Land Use Policy – How far it has succeeded in containing this primitive agriculture practice,' *Indian Forester*, Vol.125, Issue No.2 (Feb), pp.137-148.
- Government of Mizoram, *Basic Statistics (Various Issues)*, Directorate of Economics and Statistics.
- Government of Mizoram, *Draft Annual Plan for New Land Use Policy 2013-14*.
- Government of Mizoram, *Economic Survey of Mizoram (Various Issues)*, Department of Planning and Programme Implementation.
- Government of Mizoram, *Revised Guidelines on Mizoram Intodelhna Program (MIP)*, Notifications No.G.28014/11/2004-AGR, the 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2006.
- Government of Mizoram (2009), *Comprehensive Project under New Land Use Policy for Sustained Economic Development and the Uplift of the Poor in Mizoram*. Detailed Project Report submitted to the Planning Commission, NLUP Implementing Board.
- Government of Mizoram (2009), *New Land Use Policy Manual*, NLUP Implementing Board.
- JICA (2014), *The Study on Development and Management of Land and Land and Water Resources for Sustainable Agriculture in Mizoram*, Nippon Koei Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan.

- Lawma, T (1991). *Perspective Plan for Conservation, Management and Development of Land Resources in North-Eastern Region of India*, unpublished project report, North Eastern Hill University, Shillong.
- Leblhuber, Shahnaz Kimi and Vanlalhruaia, H (2012). 'Jhum Cultivation versus the New Land Use Policy: Agrarian Change and Transformation in Mizoram.' In *Fields and Forests: Ethnographic Perspectives on Environmental Globalization*, Daniel Munster (Ed), Rachel Carson Center Perspectives, No.5, pp.83-89.
- Lianzela (1997). 'Effect of Shifting Cultivation on the Environment with Special Reference to Mizoram', *International Journal of Social Economics*, Vol. 24.
- Lianzela (2008). 'Political Economy of Mizoram: A Study of MIP', *Mizoram Dimensions and Perspective*, Jagadish K. Patnaik (Edited), Concept Publishing Company Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi, pp.140-152.
- Maithani, B.P (2005). *Shifting Cultivation in North-East India: Policy Issues and Options*, Mittal Publication, New Delhi.
- Majumdar, D.N. (1990). *Shifting Cultivation in North East India*, (Edited) OMSONS Publication, Guwahati.
- Menon, Ramesh (1988). 'Mizoram Makes Official Plan to Stop Shifting Cultivation', *India Today*, January 15, 1988.
- Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (2013), *Household Ownerships and Operational Holdings in India*, Report of the NSS 70<sup>th</sup> Round, Government of India
- Mishra, V.K and Saha, R (2007). 'Characterisation of soil health under different land use pattern in hilly eco-system of Meghalaya', *Envis Bulletin* 15 (1&2).
- Mizoram University (2015). *Survey and Impact Analysis of NLUP Beneficiaries under Industries Sector in Mizoram*, Department of Economics.
- NABARD Consultancy services (2013), *Mid Term Assessment Report on New Land Use Policy of Government of Mizoram*, NABCONS Ltd., Mumbai.
- Ralte, Laltanpuui (2015). 'Sustainable Agriculture Development in Mizoram,' *International Journal in Management and Social Science*, Vol.3, No.8 (August), pp.10-27.
- Sati, V.P. and Rinawma, P (2014). 'Practices of Shifting Cultivation and Its Implication in Mizoram, North East India: A Review of Existing Research,' *Nature and Environment*, Vol.19 (2), pp.179-187.
- Singh, Daman (1996). *The Last Frontier People and Forest in Mizoram*, Tata Energy Institute, New Delhi.
- Singh, Daman (2007). 'The New Land Use Policy: People and Forest in Mizoram,' *Environmental Issues in India: A Reader*, Mahesh Rangarajan (Ed), Pearson Education (Kindle Book).
- Thanga, JLT (2016). *Sustainable Land Use Initiatives in Mizoram: A Case Study of NLUP*, Shipra Publication, New Delhi.
- Thangchungnunga (1993). *The Problem of Land Utilisation and The Place of Land Resources in the Economic Life of the Mizo Society*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Gauhati University.
- Upadhyaya, K.K and Jha, L.K (1997). 'Role of Tenancy in Deforestation and Some Measures for its Control,' *Natural Resource Management in Mizoram Vol.1*, L.K. Jha (Ed), APH Publication, New Delhi.
- Zoramchhana, R (2000). *New Land Use Policy and Rural Development in Mizoram*, Unpublished Mphil Dissertation, Department of Geography, North Eastern Hill University, Shillong.