

**ANALYSIS OF THE INDIAN AND BRITISH GOVERNMENTS'
AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS EITHER BEFORE AND FOLLOWING
INDEPENDENCE**

Shaik Ajith, Research Scholar, Department of Sociology, Radha Govind University,
Ramgarh, Jharkhand.

Dr. Brijnandan Chaudhary, Assistant Professor, Supervisor, Department of Sociology,
Radha Govind University, Ramgarh, Jharkhand.

Abstract:

The word "commercial" is often used in business and marketing. Commercialization is the process of successfully launching new goods or services on the market. This is done to attract clients and so sharply increase sales. This feature reminds me of how the idea was popularised across British India as the commercial elite rose to prominence. This research thoroughly examines a number of choices that are directly related to commercialization in India. Even though "commercialization" is one of the phrases that is most often used, its principles and introduction are not new to the history of the Indian subcontinent. The first use of this term that has been documented in England seems to have originated during the Industrial Revolution. The statement is very important in light of British India's history. British understanding of India's northern plains' high level of productivity allowed for the idea of commercialising agriculture. Additionally, if commercialised, this might benefit the British people greatly. The process of gradually transforming subsistence farming into a "production of sales" for consumers is referred to as commercialising agriculture. The article also claimed that Indian farmers used to just grow food for their own use, but that Britishers made them boost output for the benefit of others. In order to increase their profit margins, the British created methods for cultivating crops using artificial processes and forced the majority of Indian farmers to adopt them. According to documents, commercial agriculture only got its start thanks to the British. As a consequence, there was a significant boom in the British people's national economy. They came to embrace capitalism in all of its forms as a result of their steady financial situation. A modest but steady improvement has also been made in the social,

economic, and technical spheres. The growth of capitalism gave the British a lot of power and made it possible for them to firmly impose authority over their many colonies. Additionally, progress has occurred everywhere, increasing the military's might.

1 Introduction

The farmers were driven to get loans from private money lenders at high interest rates. These loans were taken out to support agricultural operations and pay for land revenue that could only be received in cash. People who failed to pay the agricultural tax would have their land removed. Large loans were first obtained by farmers in response to this concern. They accrued more debt every day. The British government put a lot of pressure on the farmers. They decided to depose the government and its regulations. Farmers and capital lenders suffered losses. In order to resolve the issue, a committee was established under the supervision of Sir Fredrik Nickolsan. However, this did not really aid the farmers.

The British government's free market policy did not succeed in raising the market value of agricultural products. Businesspeople and finance providers deliberately drained the market of certain essential goods. The market worth of these commodities rose as a

result. Because they had to pay the land income in cash and within the given time, farmers were forced to sell their products at lower rates in order to meet the demands of local lenders or entrepreneurs. They were compelled to do this because they feared losing their lands to "land revenue." Ironically, producers of agricultural goods were forced to sell their products for cheap prices in order to pay for expensive expenditures that came after.

The fact that the farmers couldn't even eat two meals a day made their condition worse. The British utilised Jamindari, Rayatwari, and Mahalwari to extort large sums of money. According to D. A. Thorner, the new land regimes (Jamindari and Rayatwari) "made both land and the peasant mobile and opened the way for the growth in power of the money lender and the absentee land lord." The imperialist British way of thinking changed Indian agriculture, brought forth new economic land practises, advanced new theories about owner rights, altered customs, sought

maximal tax, etc., which changed rural economics and social structures. This change brought about an unwelcome modernization and prompted the agriculture business to undergo a profound upheaval.

With the intention of plundering the Indian economy, the company government made significant profits. They changed the revenue policy as a result. Different forms of land income existed across the nation. They used the Jamindari, Rayatwari, and Mahalwari methods to enforce and levy high agricultural levies that economically exploited the farmers. During the British era, farmers were disregarded. The British government heavily commercialised agriculture.

Farmers relied on agriculture as their primary source of income prior to British control. The farmer had not considered turning his farming into a business. He used to grow the crops he thought were essential to feed his town and himself. Regarding agricultural production, he was unrestricted. However, the British forced Indian farmers to grow the necessary products in sufficient quantities in order to ship

them to England. In India, business or cash crops were being harvested. Food grain was being preferred over cash crops including cotton, sugarcane, jute, groundnut, bluish, tobacco, tea, coffee, and rubber. In actuality, the commercialization of agriculture had hurt the Indian economy. The farmers had to grow cash crops or else. This resulted in a decrease in food grain output, which raised prices further and worsened farmer poverty. Indian farmers have sometimes begun to sell or mortgage their land. As farmers began to grow more and more cash crops with the intention of making a lot of money, the commercialization of agriculture grew.

Agriculture's poor state has only become worse as a result of commercialization. Production was no longer intended to meet the demand. Instead, it was benefit-driven. Ironically, the British government received this advantage while the Indians did not. Therefore, the farmers received no advantage from commercialization. Commercialization turned out to be profitable only for Britain, not for Indian farmers. Farmers who were before autonomous and self-sufficient became greatly reliant as a result of

commercialization. One strategy the British used to abuse the Indian farmers was commercialization. In India, British influence on the agriculture sector was nonexistent. There were certain exclusions made for their own gain. They unfairly treated Indian farmers by using a variety of techniques to impose revenue on Indian agriculture.

It was a heinous economic scam. Farmers in the British era were weak and in poverty. He borrowed money from moneylenders and zamindars to pay for their everyday requirements as well as agricultural supplies, chemicals, fertilisers, and seeds. Even amid natural calamities, British people have made a lot of money. Land used to be seized if the farmer failed to pay taxes. In order to survive, the farmer used to get large loans from moneylenders and zamindar. Money lenders used to mortgage the land of the farmers in order to make loans. It was almost hard for the farmers to escape the grip of compound interest after the loan was obtained. Due to the farmer's incapacity to pay back the loan with the high compound interest, the land would be readily seized by sly, egotistical, and bloodthirsty moneylenders. However, six uneducated,

impoverished farmers were forced to go on with their farming under the weight of an impossible debt with interest. He could have never been freed from the grasp of the lender. He would accept another loan of similar kind to repay the first one, becoming overburdened and reluctantly saying farewell to the world.

The bare reality about an Indian farmer is that he is born into poverty, lives in poverty, and dies in poverty. Due to the English industrial revolution, the British forced Indian farmers to only produce the essential raw materials. They paid a pittance for the raw materials for the raw and demanded excessive amounts for the final product. Indians become impoverished as a result of this. This mostly benefited the British while the Indians were ignored. Indian farmers were oppressed by the British in many ways with the sole purpose of making money.

2 Literature Survey

The landlord class was more numerous, strong, and of a governing class. They had their own army. While the larger landowners resided in the citadel and castle, the majority of the smaller landlords were dispersed across rural regions. "The rights of zamindars were

governed by hereditary law. In fact, these rights were bought and sold. 12 The Mughal rulers consistently made an effort to repair, stabilise, and incorporate landowners in regencies. Their percentage, known as Malikana, was 10% of the entire money received. The tax-free lands or a net payment were used to pay for this.¹³ It was challenging to stop landowners from using their power to dominate serfs and launder their own money. The primary responsibility of landlords during the Mughal era was to collect money from the farmers, which gave them great prestige. The government would set a fixed income from these "Malgujars," and he was required to collect the money from the farmers and deposit it in the national treasury. He was also supposed to assist the administrative official in keeping the region law and order. On occasion, the higher-ups in the government might order the landlord to do his own military duty.

The Mughal era's "landlords, the mediators, were the backbone of land revenue administration." 14 These landlords were forced to take active steps to boost local farm output. He used to get revenue-free land, a portion of the

money collected, and the ability to levy various sub-taxes on the farmers in return for his government service. In this fashion, Jamindars were present throughout the Mughal era. Different tasks were given to them. The Mughals used these jamindars as intermediaries to collect taxes.

Thus, the Mughal emperors made this class, who was earlier seen to be the adversary of the central government, a major element of the tax administration and a representation of the rural areas. The empire's primary source of wealth was land revenue. Other sources of revenue for the government were import and export taxes on international commerce, mining, forests, industries, mint, gifts, fines, unclaimed property, salt, and the estate of the late Mansubdar. One of the major ways people made money was by looting. In addition, the Muslims paid Jakat as tax while the Hindus paid Jiziya and pilgrimage tax.¹⁵ "The elements influencing tax fixation were the fertility of the land and its capacity for production. The ratio was nominally 1/2, 1/6, or 1/8, but in reality it was variable. 16 The farmers also had to pay other taxes apart from that.

In the villages, the head of the Gramme (village) was in charge of collecting the money. He would get milk, wood logs, and food grain in return for these services. In Gujarat, some residents in rural areas used to collect money on their own and deposit it in the government's coffers. Then, they would be referred to as "Grampattak Pradhan." The "Grampattak"'s revenue consisted of excess tax above and beyond what the government established.

Contractor income collection was used in southern India. In certain areas, a person was awarded a contract based on a set percentage of tax revenue. "In other words, some individuals were willing to give the government a particular sum in exchange for the contract. These contractors would bring in more tax revenue than was set. They would retain the surplus revenue to themselves while depositing the predetermined sum into the Treasury. "Pakka Adhikar" is the name of this practise in the official Indian language.¹⁷ There was a lot of this going on in southern India. Akbar sought to use pratyaksha (direct) as an optional tax collecting technique during the Mughal era. However, it is evident

that "Theka" System was expanding quickly. However, the Indians chose the terms "Kacha" or "Kam Adhikar" (inferior right) for pratyakshaas. The individual hired for this position was paid a certain salary, and he was responsible for depositing the money earned in the senior official's treasury. While the emperors who followed Akbar favoured the payment in the form of Jahagir, which is not in the form of payment and allowances but rather the right to collect the income in a certain region, Akbar was in support of the net payment from the treasury like present day practise. The designated official used to attempt to collect the income in the form of money from the particular region as if he owned it. He might sometimes get more money than the predetermined ratio. During the Mughal era, the government or the landowners were assigned the business of the vast regions. Up until he deposited the predetermined revenue in the government's treasury, he was the ruling power.¹⁸ Although landlords had the same status as farmers, their leases were sufficiently lengthy.

3 Research Analysis

India attained independence on August 15, 1947, ending a protracted chain of 200 years of servitude. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru presided over the swearing-in ceremony of India's first legislature on August 15, 1947. In his moving address, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said with absolute conviction, "Many years ago we struck an arrangement with our destiny. Now is the moment to carry out our promise. When the buzzer sounds at twelve o'clock and everyone is asleep, a new and independent India will be born. Rarely in history do such moments occur when we leave the old world behind, when a decade is over, or when the spirit of a country that has been in mourning for a long period is set free.¹ Indian territory was governed by the British for around 200 years. India achieved independence on August 15, 1947, putting an end to this cruel and tyrannical empire.

India gained independence on August 15, 1947, but other issues soon surfaced, including casteism and division, the issue of resettling refugees, the issue of combining minor states, economic issues, agricultural issues, a food crisis, etc. Such issues were present during the

Nehru administration. The agricultural issue was the most significant of these issues since Indian agriculture served as the backbone of the Indian economy. "The Indian economy and culture had numerous flaws during British rule, including uneducated and underprivileged farmers who devastated the agricultural industry and colonisation. As a result, achieving self-motivated growth became challenging. The lack of connection across various economic sectors has a negative impact on people's lifestyles.² Indian farmers have been cultivating land since ancient times. He was, nevertheless, seen as being archaic by current standards.

Indian agriculture remains outdated as a consequence. Due to economic exploitation throughout the British era, Indians suffered and experienced severe droughts. However, slavery was not the only factor at play. Indian agriculture is referred to be "A 3 gamble in the monsoon" since it relies on rain.³ The farmer engaged in this form of farming and was ignorant, superstitious, and resistant to modern technologies. He was always enmeshed in debt and destitution. He was farming with his outdated equipment in such poor shape.

Small agricultural plots, land ownership, a lack of modern equipment and pesticides, among other factors, were the main causes of Indian agriculture's backwardness. During the British East India Company's existence, several tax kinds were being collected as income. Different techniques, including Kayamdhara, the Rayatwari system, the Mahalvari system, and Jamindari, were used to collect taxes in different sections of the nation. Indian farmers were thus very underprivileged, uneducated, and insolvent before to Independence. The British government made some remarkable efforts to increase agricultural output.

1) The first five-year plan significantly improved agricultural productivity, much to the delight of the planning commission and the leaders. The following graphic helps us to comprehend it.

Products	Part	Actual Production 1950-51	Objective 1955-56	Actual Production 1955-56
Edibles	10 lakh tons	52.02	61.06	65.0
Sesame	10 lakh tons	5.1	5.5	5.0
Sugarcane	10 lakh tons	5.6	6.3	4.0
Cotton	10 lakh tons	2.9	4.2	4.0
Jute	10 lakh tons	3.3	5.4	4.0

Table no.3.1 Agricultural production 1950-51 and 1955-56

The figures of agricultural productivity during the plan are as follows:

Products	Part	Production	Aim/ Objective	Actual Production
Edible foods	Million ton	82.0	100.0	72.3
Sesame	Million ton	7.0	9.8	6.1
Sugarcane	Million ton	11.2	10	12.7
Cotton	Million ton bundle	5.6	7.0	4.6
Jute	Million ton	6.1	6.0	4.5

Table 3.2 : Agricultural productions during third plan

We may infer from the preceding chart²³ that, other from sugarcane, no other crops had an increase.

4 EVALUTION

On August 15, 1947, India gained independence from the British government, ending more than 200 years of enslavement. Indians were subjected to brutal treatment by the British authorities. They had done the Indians a great deal of wrong. In the realm of the British administration, Indian agriculture had reached its end. They used to levy high taxes on agricultural activity. They took advantage of the farmers by imposing the various levies. The farmers were insolvent and lived in poverty. The agriculture policies have drastically changed since India's independence. When we examine the Indian government's agricultural policies, we

learn that the country devoted attention to agricultural issues and encouraged advancements. Agrarian India is a nation. People were mostly reliant on agriculture. These people's conditions were appalling under British control. To improve their quality of life, the Indian government thus prepared for and paid attention to the growth of the agricultural sector. The Indian government implemented a number of five-year plans in an effort to improve the nation. Agriculture was given priority in the first five-year plan, and a lot of effort was done to enhance the sector. The Indian government made an effort to revive the agricultural sector, which had failed during British control. The middleman who stood between the government and farmers was eliminated once the landlord system was destroyed. They attempted to promote agriculture by enacting new legislation. All land revenue schemes were abolished, and a single revenue system was implemented for everyone. They protected the clans after independence by establishing clan law. They attempted to enhance productivity by imposing a maximum land consumption rule, distributing surplus land to small-scale farmers and

farmworkers, and centralising all agricultural grounds. The post-independence administration made all the aforementioned steps to improve farmers' conditions. The government also promoted the use of new technologies, seeds, fertilisers, and equipment in addition to supporting the use of other crops. The government tried to provide irrigation systems and water for agricultural by building ponds, dams and other structures. The government built rural banks, cooperative trusts, and offered low-interest loans to support people financially. As a result, the farmers were released from their debt.

We can observe that the Indian government has made earnest efforts to boost agriculture and farmers by creating facilities and enacting legislation. The farmer seems to be in the same state, however. Most small farmers still live in appalling conditions today. The Indian government attempted to advance agriculture by enacting several regulations and offering facilities. Due to several flaws, however, these regulations weren't very successful. It did not completely remove landlords. The issue of clan protection went unaddressed. The maximum land

consumption law's restrictions vary from state to state and were retained at a high level. The centralization of agricultural land could not be done successfully. Farming cooperatives failed. All Indian farmers did not really profit from the irrigation system. Despite the establishment of cooperative banks, farmers still borrow money from commercial money lenders. Banks failed to provide the requested loan amount. Even if the Indian government had some success with its laws, programmes, and development, it utterly failed. We may conclude from all of these research that farmers and farming are still in the dark ages today. Farming is still reliant on the natural world today, and the majority of small farmers are in dire financial straits. Farmers are now also killing themselves as a result of hopelessness and inflation. Their standards need to be elevated, and this has to stop. Their way of life and means of subsistence should be improved.

5 SUMMARY

This chapter examines the change in agricultural marketing in the state of Karnataka while taking into account the introduction of commodities in certain

marketplaces in particular districts. Additionally, the marketing shift is predicted by accounting for four key factors: area, production, arrivals, and the value of the various commodity kinds under consideration. It was possible to comprehend the relevance of these characteristics in absolute terms by the examination of four parameters for three separate years, namely 1978–1979, 1989–1990, and 1999–2000. This demonstrated that the main market-influencing commodity kinds include food grains, oil seeds, and others. The market share of each commodity type in its production was revealed by the examination of percentage arrivals to production over the course of three years. According to the research, compared to other commodity kinds, spices, fruits, and vegetables were sold in greater quantities throughout production. In the years under consideration, the markets were impacted by spices, vegetables, other products, and oilseeds with higher prices, according to the analysis of arrivals, value, and price. Understanding the significance of various commodity groupings in terms of four factors was made easier thanks to the ratio analysis. Food grains, for instance, do not rank

equally in output, arrivals, or value while having the largest acreage ratio. Vegetables, plantations, and others have an influence on marketing when it comes to arrivals. Based on ratio analysis and analysis of percentage changes, a comparison of the four parameter changes throughout the two research periods was conducted.

These findings show that since the reform era began, fruits, vegetables, and plantation crops progressively took the position of conventional products such food grains, oilseeds, spices, and others in the markets. The Fisher's index number, which showed that spices and food grains, followed by plantations, vegetables, and fruits, have greatly grown their involvement in the market throughout the post-reform period, is a better way to analyse the changes in marketing. However, the acreage and output characteristics are not taken into account in this Fisher's index-based approach. Therefore, it is necessary to combine all of the aforementioned studies in order to fully comprehend the change in marketing. In this respect, the research shows that, despite their significant market effect, traditional crops such food grains, oilseeds, and

spices are rapidly losing ground, particularly during the post-reform era. The post-reform era markets are being influenced by fruits, vegetables, and plantation products. However, some commodity types are going straight to the wholesale or retail markets and processing facilities instead of using the conventional route via regulated markets. The analysis concludes by showing that the regulated markets have neither grown or changed in accordance with increases in output and shifting agricultural production patterns over the last 20 years, or that they have been steadily declining in size. The analysis in this chapter has the following policy implications: (a) Foodgrain and oilseed acreage and production have decreased over the past two decades, warning policymakers that if necessary action is not taken right away, the nation may soon experience a shortage of these crops. (c) Market regulation has not made things better. Over two decade periods, the proportion of arrivals in production has not changed considerably, showing the need for establishing infrastructure outside of the controlled markets.

6 Reference

- 1) Dr. Acharya D. Aadhunik Bharat (1750-1950). Nagpur: Shri Sainath publication; 2006.
- 2) Acharya S. State the Indian Farmer, a Millennium Study. Vol-27, New Delhi: Co-operation Ministry of Agriculture govt. of India; 2007.
- 3) Bipinchandra (Ed. Mukhrji M.) India after Independence. Pune: K. Sagar publication; 1996
- 4) Bhattacharya S. Aadhunik Bharat ka Itihas (1850-1947). New Delhi: Rajkamal publication; 1998
- 5) Bombay Legislative Council Debates. Vol-X, part-II, oct-1947.
- 6) Bhave V. Peshave Kalin Maharashtra. Nagpur: Mangesh publication; 2003
- 7) Chaturvedi V. Gramin Vikas. Jaipur: Prijm Books (India) publication; 2011.
- 8) Commission Report of Maharashtra Water and sprinkler. Vol- 1, Analytical Interpretation State of Maharashtra.
- 9) Chaudhari K. (Ed.). Maharashtra; Bhumi v Lok. Mumbai: Darshnika department Maharashtra Government; 1996.
- 10) Commission Report of Maharashtra water and sprinkler. Vol-1, Analytical interpretation govt. of Maharashtra.
- 11) Chavan R. Chatrapati Shahuche Jaldhoran. (Ed. Dr. Jige S.) Rayat Jagar. 2006/Oct/ Nov/ Dec.
- 12) Datt R. (Ed. Devadhar Y.). India Today. Pune: Diamond publication; 2006.
- 13) Dubhashi P. Jagtikikaran, Udharikaran, Aani Arthakaran. Pune: Shri Vidya publication; 2006.
- 14) Deshpande M. Bharatcha Aarthik Aani Waneejya Bhugol. 2nd edition. Pune: Vanes publication; 1970.
- 15) Dandekar V., Rath N. Bharatatil Daridrya. 2nd edition. Pune: Nadkarni Anand, Samaj Probhodan Institution publishers; 1979.
- 16) Deshmukh P. Bharatchi Arthavyavastha. Nagpur: pimpalapure and company publishers; 1987.
- 17) Dr. Satbhai S. Adhunik Bharatacha Itihas (1762-1950). Aurangabad: VidyaBook publication; 2008.
- 18) Desarda H. Sheti, Udhog Aani Shikshan. Aurangabad: Sahitya Seva publication; 1986.
- 19) Desai A. Agrarian struggle in India after Independence. New Delhi: Oxford university press; 1986.
- 20) E.P. W. Agricultural database for Maharashtra (1960-98). Economical and

political weekly research foundation;
2004.

21) Grover B. Aadhunik Bharatacha
Itihas. New Delhi: S. Chandra and
company limited; 2003.

22) Ghosh P. Mount Stuart Elphinston.
Poona affairs.

23) Gandhi R. Prospects for a National
level Farmer Movement, (Ed.
SahastrabudheS.). New Delhi: Ashish
publishing House; 1986.

24) Gupta M. Adhunik Bharat Ka Itihas
(1740-1950). Kanpur: Sahitya
Ratnalaya;2007.