JETIR.ORG ISSN: 2349-5162 | ESTD Year : 2014 | Monthly Issue
JOURNAL OF EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND INNOVATIVE RESEARCH (JETIR)
An International Scholarly Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

THE LAND REVENUE SYSTEM DURING NARAYAN AND CHILARAI

Nurnehar Khatun
Asstt. Professor of Assamese
Alamganj Rangamati College, Alamganj,
Dhubri (Assam) 783339

ABSTRACT

The term "land revenue" refers to any sum of money that is paid to the government in lieu of the owner owning actual land. Paying taxes to the government is what it is. Land Settlement: This process involves valuing the parcel of land in order to calculate the amount of land revenue that will be paid to the government.

The land revenue may be payable in cash or in kind, depending on the policies of the government. A set share of the product is typically used as payment in kind. For instance, a tax known as Chauth, set at one-fourth of the produce, was levied by the Maratha Empire.

Land Revenue System in India During British Rule:

After British rule was established in India, the distribution of land ownership underwent a significant change. The British changed how land revenue was collected, which changed land ownership as well.

In the event that revenue was not paid in full, they implemented a policy of eviction and land sale. As a result, land became a commodity that could be moved, leaving many peasants without land and making zamindars wealthy.

Due to the revenue rate's unsustainable fixation at an extremely high level, there were widespread evictions, poverty, and suffering. This accounted for the majority of the unequal land allocation.

Three forms of land revenue policies were introduced by the British to India. These are:

I. Zamindari System (Permanent Settlement system)
II. Ryotwari System
III. Mahalwari System

I. Zamindari System (Permanent Settlement system:

The Mughal emperor and his representative, the Diwan, in Bengal, were represented by zamindars, who were previously officials in charge of collecting taxes in different states. The Diwan oversaw the zamindars to make sure they were neither overly accommodating nor excessively strict. Following the Battle of Buxar in 1764, the East India Company was granted Diwani, or overlordship, over Bengal by the empire; Landowners were either unmonitored or referred to dishonest and lazy officials due to the absence of experienced administrators, especially those well-versed in local customs and regulations. Revenues were thus taken out without consideration for the general health of the community or for potential future income.

The Mughal emperor and his representative, the Diwan, in Bengal, were represented by zamindars, who were previously officials in charge of collecting taxes in different states. The Diwan oversaw the zamindars to make sure they were neither overly accommodating nor excessively strict. Following the Battle of Buxar in 1764, the East India Company was granted Diwani, or overlordship, over Bengal by the empire; Landowners were either unmonitored or referred to dishonest and lazy officials due to the absence of experienced administrators, especially those well-versed in local customs and regulations. Revenues were thus taken out without consideration for the general health of the community or for potential future income.

The East India Company Board of Directors initially suggested a long-term solution for Bengal in 1786, altering Calcutta's then-current strategy of trying to tax zamindars more heavily. The incoming governor general, Lord Cornwallis, and the later governor general, Sir John Shore, engaged in a contentious dispute between 1786 and 1790 regarding whether or not to propose a long-term settlement with the zamindars. Shore contended that it would take time for the native zamindars to recognise the permanent settlement was real and that they would not trust it to be lasting.

Resolving the issue of the crisis of agriculture and suffering that had led to decreased agricultural productivity was the primary goal of the Permanent Settlement. British officials believed that agriculture could boost trade, agricultural investment, and state revenue streams. The method that became known as the "Permanent Settlement" was adopted in order to guarantee property rights and fix revenue indefinitely. The British assumed that there would be a consistent flow of tax revenue after the state's revenue demands were established in stone. Landowners would also invest in their agricultural land because producers are allowed to keep surpluses over and above the fixed tax.

This new class that was emerging will support the British. The policy was unable to find anyone who was prepared to enter into a contract for the eternal payment of a fixed revenue and to make investments in the advancement of agriculture. The absence of seasoned administrators—especially those versed in local laws and customs—meant that landowners went unmonitored or were directed to dishonest and incompetent officials. Therefore, zamindars were the state's agents in charge of collecting taxes rather than the landowners. Cornwallis thought they would take it right away and start making improvements to their land. The zamindars were granted a ten-year (decennial) settlement by the Court of Directors in 1790; this was extended to a permanent agreement in 1793.

The Company intended that the Zamindar class would not only be a source of income but also act as a middleman for the more political aspects of their control, safeguarding rural life from the potentially greedy impacts of its own representatives and conserving local customs. It did, however, benefit both parties, as zamindars developed into an inherently conservative interest group. The Company intended that the Zamindar class would not only be a source of income but also act as a middleman for the more political aspects of their control, safeguarding rural life from the potentially greedy impacts of its own representatives and conserving local customs. It did, however, benefit both parties, as zamindars developed into an inherently conservative interest group. The zamindars were outspoken in their resistance to British policies after it shifted towards reform and meddling in custom in the middle of the 19th century. A feature of the Permanent Settlement was that the rent was to be divided between the zamindar and the state, with the zamindar keeping 11% and the state demanding 89%. The 'sundown Law' got its name from the fact that the state demand could not be raised and that payment had to be made by sundown on the due date. The land was sold to the highest bidder after payments were not received.

The Settlement was introduced to fight against the worst of the tax-farming excesses, but it made no mention of land use. Several of the deadliest famines of the nineteenth century had this as a contributing factor. After the key components of the Permanent Settlement were replicated throughout India,

II. Ryotwari System:

The Ryotwari plan of land pay was presented by Sir Thomas Munro during the eighteenth hundred years. Thomas Munro spread out the ryotwari structure in English India, which allowed the public position to deal with the cultivator (or "ryot") to assemble land pay.

This system ran for almost five years and included many aspects of the Mughal revenue system. It was used in certain regions of India as one of the three primary methods for collecting fees from landowners. Simultaneously collected land revenue and rents were included in these taxes without distinction. The technique of assessment known as ryotwari was used in cases when the land revenue was levied directly on the (ryots)or the individual cultivators who actually worked the land. The technique of assessment known as zamindari was used in cases where the land revenue was imposed indirectly through agreements made with (Zamindars).

The Zamindar's job as a delegate between the public authority and ranchers was ordinarily non-existent in Bombay, Madras, Assam, and Burma. Every registered landowner is acknowledged as the land's proprietor under the Ryotwari System, and they all make direct payments to the government. He is free to give, sell, or mortgage his property, as well as sublease it. As long as he pays the fixed assessment, the government cannot evict him. He also has the annual choice to increase, decrease, or give up his holding completely. Every registered landowner is acknowledged as the land's proprietor under the Ryotwari System, and they all make direct payments to the government. He is free to give, sell, or mortgage his property, as well as sublease it. As long as he pays the fixed assessment, the government cannot evict him. He also has the annual choice to increase, decrease, or give up his holding completely.

Thomas Munro, the one who was chosen Representative of Madras in May of 1820, is related with the Ryotwari framework. Munro gradually reduced the tax from half to one third of the gross production, even at that high rate.

In arrange to empower the individuals of Northern India to store up riches and way better their claim circumstances, Edward Colebrooke and succeeding Governors-General had importuned the East India Company's Court of Executives in unsuccessful to recover the guarantee made by the British government and to for all time settle the land-tax. With interests, it is possible to rent out the arrival for covert assertions, preventing the person from having to pay the fees that have been imposed upon them.

III. Mahalwari System:

Early in the 19th century, it was introduced in regions governed by the East India Company. The village community, also known as the "Mahal," was the unit of income assessment under this system.

William Bentinck, the ruler, introduced the Mahalwari system of collecting income in 1833. The village chief's responsibility under this unique revenue arrangement was to gather fees from the villagers and then turn them over to the fitting professional.

Features of Mahalwari System:

The Mahalwari System promoted self-governance by attempting to create a direct line of communication between the rural community and the government. The villages' lands were split into mahals under the Mahalwari system of land taxation, and each mahal comprised a portion of one or more villages. After determining the tax and assessing the agricultural output, the officials collected the money from the peasants and gave it to the head.

The British government received the tax money, which was regularly amended according to the revenue of a certain mahal. But there were drawbacks as well. For example, the entire society had to shoulder the load, which resulted in inequity and exploitation. A variety of land settlement schemes in various regions of India eventually supplanted the Mahalwari System.

Conclusion

In spite of the advantages these systems offer landowners, there are drawbacks to each of them. In the instance of the Ryotwari land revenue system, farmers were required to pay taxes regardless of whether their yield that year was fair. Additionally, because the British government insisted on cash income, planting cash crops rather than food crops puts farmers at risk because it necessitates taking out additional loans for the inputs they must purchase.

On the other side, the Mahalwari System dealt with the challenge of intergenerational land ownership fragmentation. Peasants were forced to take out loans in the event of crop failures in order for the British government to collect taxes from them. The state acquired the majority of the village's land as a result of loan default.

References:

1. Jump up to:[a b c] *"Cornwallis Code". Encyclopedia Britannica. 4 February 2009. Retrieved 24 February 2017.*
2. *"Colonialism and the Countryside". Themes in Indian History III (PDF). National Council of Educational Research & Training. 2017 [First published 2007]. pp. 258–259. ISBN 978-81-7450-770-9.*
3. *Minutes of evidence taken before the select committee on the affairs of the East India Company: and also, an appendix and index: III. Revenue. 1832. pp. 208–209.*
4. *Keith, Arthur Berriedale (1922). Speeches & documents on Indian policy, 1750-1921. Kelly - University of Toronto. London Oxford University Press. p. 215.*
5. *Cohn, Bernard S. (August 1960). "The Initial British Impact on India: A case study of the Benares region". The Journal of Asian Studies.* ***19*** *(4). Association for Asian Studies: 418–431. doi:10.2307/2943581. JSTOR 2943581. S2CID 154726821.*