**Patan Pragya** *(Volume: 8, Number: 1 2021)* *ISSN No. 2595-3278*

Received Date: Jan. 2021 Revised: April 2021 Accepted: June 2021

https://doi.org/10.3126/pragya.v8i01.42435

# Land Tenure and Its Relation on Food Security

**(A study of Dolakha District)**

Sunil Rawal*

## Abstract

*This writing discusses on Land Tenure and its relation on Food Sufficiency from a sociological perspective. Land Tenure and Food Security is an interdisciplinary concept that makes it easy to see from sociological lenses. The issues of food security concern with the management of food resources to combat the people from food deficit, shortage, starvation and diseases whereas land tenure is the system that refers to arrangement or right under which the holder holds or uses holding land. The food security and land tenure is one of the political-economic discourses, where livelihood, geographic exclusion, food production, distributions and accessibility largely discussed. I would like to examine relationship between land tenure and food security at Dolakha district. Which causes effects of food insecurity challenging it and risking to food security contingently? In this essay, I would like to explore the significance of food security from primary and secondary information from the different literatures to conceptualize the term food security.*

**Keywords:** land tenure, food security, ownership, availability, access, utilization

## Introduction

Land in Nepal still represents as the principal form of wealth, the principal symbol of social status, and the principal source of economic and political power. Ownership of land means control over a vital factor of production and therefore a position of prestige, affluence, and power (Regmi, 1976). Even though we are halfway through attaining the Millennium Development Goals, many areas in Nepal are food insecure, owing mostly to low agricultural productivity as a result of a lack of complementary infrastructure. This is exacerbated by insecure land tenure, which leads to a lack of investment in land and poor land management, trapping peasants in a vicious cycle of poverty. Existing land tenure structures have restricted rural people' access to productive resources as well as other survival measures. Internal and external migration has been identified as one of the coping methods for poverty and hunger. This is further hampered if land tenure is weak, prohibiting people from moving to other locations in search of work during periods of low output. Because of this, a fundamental human right, the right to eat, has been jeopardized.

*Mr. Rawal is a faculty member the department of sociology, Patan Multiple Campus, TU, Nepal

Land tenure refers to the connection between people, as individuals or groups, and land, whether legally or conventionally defined. (For the sake of simplicity, "land" is used here to encompass other natural resources such as water and trees.) Land tenure is an institution, or set of norms devised by civilizations to govern conduct. Tenure rules specify how property rights to land are to be distributed among society. They specify how rights to use, control, and transfer land are awarded, as well as the related obligations and constraints. In layman's words, land tenure regimes govern who has access to what resources for how long and under what circumstances (Bruce & Migot-Adholla, 1993).

Land tenure is derived from both statute and customary law, which governs not only property rights and ownership, but also marriage, authority and control, and inheritance. Customary and statutory tenure arrangements are rarely static. Two significant areas of land tenure studies are the evolution of customary tenure and the influence of land reform. Tenure research, particularly research relevant to food security, has tended to divide land into three categories: a household's agricultural holdings (including individually managed plots); common land or common property resources (usually grazing and forest land); and state-reserved land (usually gazetted reserves for preservation of forest or wildlife resources) (Feder&Feeny, 1991).

Land is a production component that influences agricultural productivity and revenue. However, in order to result in production and income growth, access to land must not only be secure, but also be accompanied by access to complementary inputs and take place in an environment conducive to productive land use. Other sorts of natural assets, such as water, working capital, and human capital, are empirically well-established complementing inputs. Without these complementing inputs in the agricultural production function, access to land is useless for development. Furthermore, the context in which land is issued influences its production. Access to land will achieve nothing in terms of productivity and revenue unless complementing inputs and a suitable setting for land usage are given.In the context of Nepal, Province-1 receives more rainfall per year than Far-west, Karnali, Lumbhini, and the other remaining provinces.

This has resulted in eastern region being better off due to good agricultural yield and with better standard of life compared to the other counterparts. This is accompanied by the fact that irrigation facilities are not well-developed in Nepal which is an essential complementary input for agricultural production.

For the agricultural households, land is more than just a factor of production. Its endowment leads to other sources of productive resources which help in generating income resulting in increased participation in social activities and government and nongovernment programs. This however cannot be determined by the area of land held or owned. It is often found that

households with smaller but productive and earn better than those with larger but unproductive land. In Nepal, where the majority of farmers are smallholders, the situation is completely different since, most of the time, smallholders possess land that is marginalized and less productive, making life tough and making them unable to break out from the cycle of poverty and endangering their survival (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Rome, 2015).

Historically, food security and agricultural development programs have failed to achieve their anticipated outcomes. One of the primary causes for this failure is a failure to address land tenure concerns. Land tenure systems influence rural development through influencing land rights, production decisions, investment decisions, resource allocation decisions, and conservation and land management practices. This has resulted in a situation in which, despite the fact that overall food production looks to be ample, the aggregate food level is such that 42 districts out of a total of 77 districts are food insecure.

The World Food Summits led by FAO periodically upgrade the definition when the heads of the states and governments of its member countries meet and discuss. The recent upgraded definition of the food security is provided by the World Summit (2009a, 2009s):

Food security exists at the individual, household, national, regional and global levels when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. The four pillars of food security are availability, access, utilization and stability. The nutritional dimension is integral to the concept of food security' (FAO, 2009:1).

From the inception to the present, the idea and definition of food security have remained mostly unchanged. The Summit, like previous summits, defines food security as the availability, accessibility, usage, and distribution of food to all people in all seasons across all communities. Food security, according to Pinstrup-Anderson (2011), is the ability of an individual, household, or nation to procure sufficient food for nutrition and preference through legal, culturally acceptable means, and it incorporates the concept of risk; that is, a person who has enough food today but may not have enough tomorrow is not food secure (Rai, 2014).

Food security is frequently associated with food safety: the food to which a person has access should keep him or her healthy. Food insecurity, on the other hand, refers to the likelihood that a person will not have enough food throughout a specific time period. It is more common among the impoverished or the socially excluded, and in places far from food

markets. People living over the poverty level may be food insecure as well, depending on their availability to food (Pinstrup-Anderson, 2011).

Food security is directly and indirectly dependent on land tenure security; that is, those contributing to food security through their own food production require arable land tenure security, while those contributing to food security through other economic activity typically require secure tenure of the land on which that activity takes place—either for themselves or for those controlling the activity on which their livelihoods and food security rely.

### Research Question

The study's research goal aims to analyze the impact of land use practices on food sufficiency, which leads to food security. The study's research issue is whether food sufficiency is related to land use practices.

## Objectives

The study's research goal is to analyze the impact of land use practices on food sufficiency, which leads to food security. The study's research question aims to investigate/explain the link between land tenure and food security status.

## Methodology

Security of tenure has an impact on both what is produced and who consumes it. Clear and secure property rights for both owners and users reduce the chance of conflict. Removing the threat of eviction; providing incentives to maintain and safeguard the environment; increasing the value of these assets; stimulating land-related investments Allow for the transfer of more land to more individuals through land lease and sales markets. Credit costs are decreased by adopting land administration systems, which are used by users and productive uses; and, when paired with cost-effectiveness, credit costs are reduced. Making use of these assets as collateral (World Bank 2008).

This work is based on original data sources. It includes the findings of a household survey done with 106 families in the Dolakah region (Jiri Municipality). To begin analyzing the data, the findings were entered on the home questionnaire during the field survey at the time of the interview (2016). To enter quantitative data onto a computer, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences was employed. The qualitative data were first coded and translated into quantitative form so that they could be computed, and then the analysis was carried out. Data were quantified when available throughout the questionnaire creation phase.

## Result and Discussion

### *Relationship Between Level of Food Sufficiency and Land Size of Family*

The study shows the relationship between level of food sufficiency and land size of family in Table 1 The level of food sufficiency is up to 3–5 months for the family having (1-4) ropani. The level of food sufficiency is 6–8 months for 1.9 %, 3–5 months for 0.9 % family having (5-9) ropani. The level of food sufficiency is 6–8 months for 11.3 %, 3–5 months for 5.7 %, 9–12 months for 3.8 %, surplus for 9.4 % family having (10-19) ropani.

**Table 1**
**Relationship Between Level of Food Sufficiency and Land Size of Family**

| Land size of the Family | | Levels of food sufficiency of the households | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Surplus | 9–12 months | 6–8 months | 3–5 months | Less than 3 months | |
| (1–4) ropani | HHs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.9 | 0 | 0.9 |
| (5–9) ropani | HHs | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| | percent | 0 | 0 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 0 | 2.8 |
| (10–19) ropani | HHs | 10 | 4 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 32 |
| | percent | 9.4 | 3.8 | 11.3 | 5.7 | 0 | 30.2 |
| (20–39) ropani | HHs | 10 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 37 |
| | percent | 9.4 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 6.6 | 1.9 | 34.9 |
| (40–59) ropani | HHs | 12 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 26 |
| | percent | 11.3 | 3.8 | 6.6 | 2.8 | 0 | 24.5 |
| 60 and + Ropani | HHs | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 |
| | percent | 2.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 0 | 6.6 |
| Total | HHs | 35 | 18 | 31 | 20 | 2 | 106 |
| | percent | 33 | 17 | 29.2 | 18.9 | 1.9 | 100 |

**Source: Field Survey, 2016**

Thus the study shows the level of food sufficiency for the family having (20-39) ropani is 9.4 % surplus, 8.5 % for 9–12 months and 6–8 months, 6.8 % for 3–5 months and 1.9 % for less than 3 months. Level of food sufficiency for the family having (40-59) ropani is 11.3 % surplus, 3.8 % for 9–12 months, 6.6 % for 6–8 months, 2.8 % for 3–5 months. Level of food sufficiency for the family having (60 and above) ropani is 2.8 % surplus, 0.9 % for 9–12 months and 6–8 months, 1.9 % for 3–5 months. The above Table 1 explains the size of land has some association with nature of or level of food sufficiency.

### *Relationship between Landownership of Family with Level of Food Sufficiency*

In Nepal, the economy is dominated by agriculture. In the late 1980s, it was the livelihood for more than 90 % of the population, although only approximately 20 % of the total land area was cultivable, it accounted for, on average, about 60 % of the Gross Domestic Product and approximately 75 % of exports. The formulation of the Fifth Five-Year Plan (1975–80), agriculture has been the highest priority because economic growth was dependent on both increasing the productivity of existing crops and diversifying the agricultural base for use as industrial inputs (Savada, 1991).

**Table 2**
**Type of Land of the Family with Level of Food Sufficiency**

| **Type of land** | | **Levels of food sufficiency of the households** | | | | | **Total** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Surplus** | **9–12 months** | **6–8 months** | **3–5 months** | **Less than 3 months** | |
| Doyam | HHs | 30 | 13 | 23 | 16 | 1 | 83 |
| | percent | 28.3 | 12.3 | 21.7 | 15.1 | 0.9 | 78.3 |
| Sim | HHs | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 16 |
| | percent | 3.8 | 4.7 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 0.9 | 15.1 |
| Char | HHs | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 7 |
| | percent | 0.9 | 0.0 | 4.7 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 6.6 |
| Total | HHs | 35 | 18 | 31 | 20 | 2 | 106 |
| | percent | 33.0 | 17.0 | 29.2 | 18.9 | 1.9 | 100.0 |

**Source: Field Survey, 2016**

### *Relationship between Types of Productivity and Levels of Food Sufficiency of the Households*

In the study area the farmer has different kind of access on land and they grow and cash. Considering the notion of Sen (1981) food self-sufficiency is mainly related to production-based entitlement. Besides production-based entitlement, one can also acquire food through trade, trade-based entitlement. Borrowing and purchasing is the common form of trade-based entitlement in Nepal. Food self-sufficiency, a production based entitlement to acquire food is regarded as a principal indicator of food security in developing countries like Nepal where access of rural households to the food is limited due to inadequately developed marketing channel (Osmani, 1998; Thomson&Metz, 1998) (Osmani, 1998).The table 3explains about the level of food sufficiency of the household with type of productivity. The family having arable land have less than one-eighth of sufficiency Surplus food. The food

sufficiency of the households is more than half in both arable and unarable land because they have more land. The food sufficiency of household is 0 months having unarable and both arable and unarable land. The study shows the food sufficiency last depending on labor irrigation system and favorable condition given to land.

**Table 3**

**Types of Productivity and Levels of Food Sufficiency of the Households**

| Type of productivity | | Levels of food sufficiency of the households | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Surplus | 9–12 months | 6–8 months | 3–5 months | Less than 3 months | |
| Arable land | HHs | 6 | 4 | 19 | 15 | 2 | 46 |
| | percent | 13.0 | 8.7 | 41.3 | 32.6 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| Unarable land | HHs | 5 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 19 |
| | percent | 26.3 | 42.1 | 15.8 | 15.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Both arable and Un-arable | HHs | 24 | 6 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 41 |
| | percent | 58.5 | 14.6 | 22.0 | 4.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | HHs | 35 | 18 | 31 | 20 | 2 | 106 |

**Source: Field Survey, 2016**

The great majority of farmers in Nepal's rural middle hills are smallholders who frequently rely on family labor and adhere to traditional agricultural and water management techniques. However, the vast majority of the impoverished do not have enough access to good land, and when they do, their rights to it are limited. For example, they may be able to cultivate land, but the size of the land, the type of land, and whether or not the land is irrigated are all factors.

## Conclusion

In reality, food security and land tenure are not a single source of income; they frequently concern production, consumption, distribution, accessibility, animal husbandry, and the green revolution. The study's research question is to investigate and explain the relationship between land tenure and food security status. I would suggest that food security is related with unequal social relations in terms of access and allocation of resources. Because of the state's carelessness, food insecurity and land tenure have become widely prevalent in developing countries. The country is in transition, and we have a tendency to have everything right, right now, and right here. The issue of land reform and agrarian reform is

related with paving a long path toward the country's economic well-being, andthe issue of land reform and agricultural reform is linked to clearing the path for the country's economic well-being and the stability of democracy. Furthermore, the brief contends that realizing the right to food necessitates responsible land tenure governance. States must ensure compliance with human rights commitments via the development of strategies, policies, and legal frameworks that may be enforced through judicial and administrative recourse procedures. development of plans, policies, and legal frameworks that may be enforced through judicial and administrative recourse procedures.

## References

Agarwal, B.(1994). A field of one's own: Gender and land rights in South Asia. https://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb.09210. Cambridge University Press.

Bardhan, P.(1984). Land, labor, and rural poverty: Essays in development economics. Columbia University Press.

Bhawan, K.(1997). Policy relating to sharecropping and leasing. [S.1: s.n.] p 13. https://entwicklungspolitik.uni-hohenheim.de/uploads/media/Land_Tenancy_in_Asia_Africa_and_Africa_02.pdf

Bruce, J., &Migot-Adholla, S.(Eds.). (1993). Searching for land tenure security in Africa. https://jsd-africa.com/Jsda/Vol15No5-Fall2013A/PDF/Land%20Tenure%20Security%20and%20Farm%20Investment.Lighton%20Dube.pdf. Kendall Hunt Publishing Company.

Feder, G., &Feeny, D.(1991). Land tenure and property rights: Theory and implications for development policy. *World Bank Economic Review*, *5*(1), 135–153. https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/5.1.135

Food and Agriculture Organization. (November 1996).Rome declaration on food security and world food summit plan of Action. https://www.fao.org/3/w3613e/w3613e00. Accessed: 23/10/2014, *43*, 56.

Food and Agriculture Organization. (2009). Declaration of the world summit on food security; world food Summit 2009. https://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/economy/fishery/wsfs0911-2.pdf. Food and Agriculture Organization.

Food and Agriculture Organization, (2015). The Economic Lives of Smallholder Farmers. *An Analysis Based on Household Data From Nine Countries,* Rome, FAO and London, Earthscan.https://www.fao.org/3/i5251e/i5251e.pdf

Gillam, C.(2012). *U.S. Denmark top ranking of world's most food-secure countries*. Reuters.

Mishra, C.(2009). Making research sociological. *Dhaulagiri Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, *3*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.3126/dsaj.v3i0.2779

Osmani, S. R. (1998).*Food security, poverty and women: Lessons from rural Asia, Part I*. International Fund for Agriculture Development/TAD

Pinstrup-Anderson, P. a. (2011). *Food policy for developing countries*. Cornell University Press.

Platteau, J.-P.(1992). *Land reform and structural adjustment in sub-Saharan Africa Rome*. Food and Agriculture Organization.

Rahmato, D.(1993). Agrarian change and Agrarian Crisis: State and Peasantry in Post- Revolution Ethiopia. *Africa*, *63*(1), 36–55. https://doi.org/10.2307/1161297

Rahmatoo, D.(1991). *Famine and Survival: A case study from North-East Ethiopia Uppsala*. Scandinavian Institute of Africa Studies.

Rai, P. U.(2014).Food security and exclusion among the Chepangs: A case study from central Nepal.*A[dissertation] submitted to the Office of the Dean Faculty of the Humanities and Social Sciences for the Fulfillment of the Requirements of DoctorofPhilosophy in Anthropology*. Tribhuvan University.

Regmi, M. C.(1976). *Land ownership in Nepal*. University of California Press.

Savada, A. M. (1991). Nepal: A country study: Agriculture. *Washington GPO for the Library of Congress*. *Retrieved September 4, 2008, Vo-3*. Pp20-25

Sawant, S.D.(1991). Comparative analysis of tenancy statistics: Implications for concealed tenancy. *ArthaVijnana*, *33*(1 (March)), 12–23. https://doi.org/10.21648/arthavij/1991/v33/i1/116242

Sen, A.(1981). Poverty and famines. *An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*. Clarendon Press.

Sen, A. (1981). *Poverty and famines: An essay on entitlement and deprivation*. Oxford University Press.

Sen, A.(1985).Poverty and hunger. Research memorandum No.102. *Williamstown, MA: Williams collage, center for development economics*.

Shipton, P.(1990). African Famines and Food Security: Anthropological perspectives.*Annual Review of Anthropology*, *19*(1), 353–394. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.19.100190.002033

Shipton, P.(1994). Land and Culture in Tropical Africa: Soils, Symbols, and the Metaphysics of the Mundane. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *23*(1), 347–377. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.23.100194.002023

Shrestha, B.(Ed.). (2008). Land and tenure systems in Nepal: Issues on access, use and reforms. *MODE Nepal and international land coalition. August 2008*.

World Bank. 2008. Agriculture for Development. World Development Report. Washington, D.C. :IBRD/World Bank, 2008.