

Research Paper

History



Consequences of the Mahalwari Settlement : Village Community

* Md. Hamid Hussain ** M. Parwez

* Guest Faculty in History, Zakir Hussain PG College, New Delhi

** Associate Professor in History, Department of History, AMU Aligarh - 202002 UP

ABSTRACT

The Mahalwari system implemented by colonial state, was a land settlement for estates of proprietary bodies which introduced in most areas of North Western Provinces, the Central Provinces, and the undivided British Punjab. It was a modified version of Zamindari Settlement. The settlement was directly made with the village or Mahal by the Settlement Officers, who fixed the rent with the consultation of Lambardar and the rent to be paid by the cultivating tenants. The system was known as Mauzawari in United Provinces, Malguzari in the Central Provinces, and village or Mahali settlement in pre-independent Punjab. In all Mahalwari operated regions, the land revenue tax was not fixed permanently but revised periodically. One of the worst results of the operation of Mahalwari system was the breakup of the institution of village community. It spread out a wave of fear, uncertainty and sense of insecurity among the agricultural communities because of no other alternative. Karl Marx believed that by breaking the institution of village community British annihilated the old economical basis of the village economy in India.

Keywords : Mahalwari settlement, Holt Mackenzie, Marx's perception, destruction of village community.

Consequences of the Mahalwari Settlement : Village Community

The English East India Company needed a fixed, maximum, and regular income from the land, they introduced various land settlements on the experiment basis in India. The Mahalwari system was one of them which introduced as the last land settlement by the British and expected to be an improvement over the previously existing Zamindari and Royatwari system.

The Mahalwari system was a land settlement for estates of proprietary bodies which introduced in most areas of North Western Provinces, the Central Provinces, and the undivided British Punjab. It was a modified version of Zamindari Settlement. The settlement was directly made with the village or Mahal by the Settlement Officers, who fixed the rent with the consultation of Lambardar and the rent to be paid by the cultivating tenants. The system was known as Mauzawari in United Provinces, Malguzari in the Central Provinces, and village or Mahali settlement in pre-independent Punjab. In all Mahalwari operated regions, the land revenue tax was not fixed permanently but revised periodically.

Initially, the Mahalwari system covered the most fertile tract of British India including Ganga-Jamuna Doab, major areas of Agra and Awadh Provinces, North Western Provinces, old Banares, the Ceded and Conquered districts and Later on it was extended to Central Provinces and the British Punjab. Till 1857, the operation of the Mahalwari system was more or less confined upto the regions of the North Western Provinces.

North Western Provinces with Oudh (added to the North Western Provinces administration after T. C Robertson's recommendation) under the Company administration was slightly more than the present day area of Uttar Pradesh. In terms of area, the present day Uttar Pradesh is the fourth largest state of independent India. This state is of boot shaped size divided into three natural tracts, i.e., (i) Himalayan, (ii) Central Indian plateau, and (iii) the Gangetic basin. During the entire course of Company administration, the whole region of the

state was categorized into six different parts, with divisional heads, viz., Benaras division, Ceded and Conquered districts, Oudh, Regions acquired after Nepal wars in 1816, and Princely States during the British rule. The tract of the provinces to the north includes some of the highest mountains of the world, and separated by a series of valleys from a lower range which bounds the alluvial plains.

It was the final outcome of the integration and consolidation process of different parts of the Himalayas foot-hills region under Company rule. The whole region of North Western Provinces & Oudh were enclosed with the districts of Jaunpur, Basti, Azamgarh under Gorakhpur division to the east and Shahjehanpur, Farrukhabad, Aligarh and Kanpur etc. to the west. This is a country of veritable garden for British India, with a soil of unrivalled fertility, most part protected from the dangers of famines by a magnificent series of irrigation works especially of canals, tanks and ponds.

The idea of Mahalwari system was first presented in the Minute of 1st July 1819 by Holt Mackenzie, then Secretary to the Territorial Department, Board of Revenue, who declared Permanent Zamindari Settlement a "Loose Bargain" for the British Empire. Mackenzie's recommendation incorporated in the Regulation VII of 1822 and settlement was made on the basis of almost 90 % of the rental value, payable by the Cultivators. The settlement attained maturity by the Regulation IX of 1833 under the supervision of R. Martineau and completed by James Thomason in 1844. The state demand was fixed at 66 % of the rental value and the system was made for 20 or 30 years. The 66% state demand was reduced to 50 % of the rental value under Saharanpur rules of 1855 by then Governor-General Lord Dalhousie.

Destruction of the Village Community

One of the worst results of the operation of Mahalwari system was the breakup of the institution of village community. It spread out a wave of fear, uncertainty and sense of insecurity among the agricultural communities because of no other alternative. Karl Marx believed that by breaking the institution of village community British annihilated the old economical ba-

sis of the village economy in India.¹ He compared the Indian village communities to the municipal organizations of England and termed it as village communes². According to Marx, the historic pages of British rule in India hardly did anything for the development of their colonies, but destroyed and annihilated its most important basis of village economy carried out by the institution of village communities. Sir Charles Metcalfe, who succeeded William Bentinck as Governor- General, has opinion that the institution of village community was the heart and soul of the Indian village economy and so of land revenue administration³.

Marx highlights that the pace of destruction due to British rule was far greater in comparison to the regeneration process. In other sense, he points out that the development of India through the regenerative processes was nothing but a process to fulfill their target of exploitation and destruction. Marx asserts that the breaking up of the institution of village community broke the self-sufficiency of village economy and destroyed the whole inertia of village economical basis⁴. He asserts that the introduction of railways and improved system of communication played a prominent role in the destruction of the village community. The situation of the villages worsened because of their peculiar features; viz., (i) the dissolution of the society into stereotype and (ii), disconnected atoms had survived their vitality. He pointed out that the village isolation produced the absence of roads in India, and the absence of roads perpetuated the village isolation⁵. It affected the whole village as well as agrarian set-up of India and altered the inward-oriented peasant community into an outward-oriented community.⁶

In the early decades of the nineteenth century A.D., village communities especially in Mahalwari region consisted of several horizontal layers with very different rights and claims. These different social strata consisted persons belonging to different social castes, classes, communities and religions. Most of the times, their social status have been fixed on the basis of their occupation. It was a typical development of the early nineteenth century, having several parallel social strata and sort of hierarchy which was determined by the order in which various units of families got absorbed in the community⁷. These communities were the final form of family units which descended from the original founders of the village. These village communities were grouped into various divisions and sub-divisions and they were designated as co-parceners, sharers, pattidars, thokedars, and behriwars, etc⁸. These village communities had striking features of strength and stability, which was sustained over the centuries in spite of their constant dissolution and never ending changes of dynasty. This institution possesses a unique feature of self-sufficiency based on the integration of agriculture and handicraft industry.

The village community is a part of Indian social heritage. Its description is found in Rig Veda. The Buddhist Jataka stories as well as Kautilya in 'Arthashastra' had given detailed description of the village organization. Most of the sociologists considered it as the primary cell of social structure on which whole structure of society was based. It was an institution of the members of proprietary bodies who were ordinarily grouped in divisions and sub-divisions, each in possession of separate shares of the cultivable area, corresponding more or less with the shares determined by the rules of inheritance and partition under the joint family system, by the operation of which the shares were owned, not separately by individuals, but jointly by families⁹. The cultivable land of the whole area was divided with inhibited site but the waste and pasture remain undivided and constitute the joint property of the proprietary body as a whole.

The institution of village community was a key-stone of the arch of the British land revenue settlement which was formed by the "village republics"¹⁰ or 'village democracy'. The fiscal and legal apparatus of this institution prevailed in all Mahalwari region prompted and deprived a decisive structural alteration in the existing agrarian society. The condition and

rights of the village communities where holdings of the village or estate or mahal was vested with one or a few village zamindars, and where muqaddams appear as representatives of a distinct and sometimes of rival claims appear especially to call for investigation¹¹.

According to L.S.S. O'Malley, the institution of village community presented a conspicuous picture about the social, economic and cultural aspects of village life. He remarks about the village community in the following words¹²:

"The chief social institutions, as they existed in their integrity, were not individualist but collectivist. The unit was not the individual but the family which regulated the relations of its members inter se. the inter- relations of different families were governed by the village community and the caste, the former of which was a collection of families organized for the purposes of communal self- government, while the latter was an aggregation of families united by rules as to marriage, diet, occupation and intercourse with the rest of the community, but not localized like the village community. All three, the family, the caste, and the village community maintained ideological control over the individual who was bound to conform to their standards. The individual scarcely existed except as a member of a group. Self- determination was only possible within the limits which the latter imposed..... The village community was only partially a social institution. It was more an economic and administrative organization, over which the state had the right of control though this was sparingly exercised. The affairs of the caste and the family, however, were matters with which the state had no direct concern. The relations of their members were governed not by secular law but by Hindu law and customary regulations."

The village autonomy was chiefly confined to the internal relations of the villagers. In most parts of the country, menials (such as the messenger, watchmen, barber, and sweeper) and artisans (blacksmiths, carpenters, and potter) were village servants and receive a share in crops for ordinary services¹³. Before the consolidation of the British Empire, the village organization of northern India was in the form of local government controlled fully by a landed aristocracy. In the villages, the lower castes managed their own social affairs by panchayat system, which was an important feature of the village community¹⁴. However, the higher castes had no panchayat but managed by the zamindars or chief tenant of the village.

By the implementation of the Mahalwari system, the British government of the East India Company decided to recognize, admit, and protect the property rights of the members of village communities, who had been excluded from the land revenue administration in the early settlements of permanent or Zamindari of Bengal Presidency¹⁵. This institution played a prominent part in the process of self-sufficiency of the village economy. The economical basis of the village community was at the lower stage of specialization and division of labor based on insufficient differentiation of agriculture and industry. For centuries, the mind of the over-whelming portion of the Indian people distributed in numerous and autarchic village centers, each village being a closed system with very little social, economic or intellectual exchange with the outside world, remained cramped, or did not grew. Their social and intellectual existence was narrow and stereotyped¹⁶. It was a caste- stratified social organization of the village population which was not conducive to any development of individual initiative, adventure or striking out of new paths.

Karl Marx has given a vivid and picturesque description of the process of simple reproduction that goes on in the Indian village community. How the institution of village community gone to disintegration could be clearly and easily understood by the following remarks of Marx. He writes,¹⁷

"Those small and extremely ancient Indian communities, some of which have continued down to this day, are based on possession in common of the land, on the blending of agriculture and handicrafts, and on an unalterable division of labour,

which serves, whenever a new community is started, as a plan and scheme ready cut and dried. Occupying areas of from 100 up to several thousand acres, each forms a compact whole production all it requires. The chief parts of the products are destined for direct use by the community itself, and do not take the form of a commodity. Hence, production here is independent of that division of labour brought about, in Indian society as a whole, by means of exchange of commodities. It is the surplus alone that becomes a commodity, and a portion of even that, not until it has reached the hands of the state, into whose hands from time immemorial a certain quantity of these products has found its way in the shape of rent in kind. The constitution of the communities varies in different parts of India. In those of the simplest form, the land is tilled in common, and the produce divided among the members. At the same time, spinning and weaving are carried on by each family as subsidiary industries. Side by side with the masses thus occupied with one and the same work, we find the 'chief inhabitant', who is the judge, police, and tax-gatherer in one; the book-keeper, who keeps the accounts of the tillage and registers everything relating thereto; another official, who guards the boundaries against neighbouring communities; the water-overseer, who distributes the water from the common tanks for irrigation; the Brahmin, who conducts the religious services; the schoolmaster, who on the sand teaches the children reading and writing; the calendar- Brahmin, or astrologer, who makes known the lucky or unlucky days for work; a smith and a carpenter, who make all the pottery of the village; the barber, the washer man, who washes clothes, the silversmith, here and there the poet, who in some communities replaces the silversmith, in others the schoolmaster. This dozen of individuals is maintained at the expenses of the whole community. If the population increases, a new community is founded, on the pattern of the old one, on occupied land. The whole mechanism discloses a systematic division of labor, but a division like that in manufacture is impossible, since the smith and carpenter find an unchanging market, and at the most there occur, according to the sizes of the villages, two of three of each, instead of one. The law that regulates the division of labor in the community acts with the irresistible authority of a law of nature, at the same time that each individual artificer, the smith, the carpenter, and so on, conducts in his workshop all the operations of his handicraft in the traditional way, but independently, and without recognizing any authority over him. The simplicity of the organization for production in these self-sufficing communities that constantly reproduce themselves in the same form, and when destroyed, spring up again on the spot and with the same name- this simplicity supplies the key to the secret of the unchangeableness of Asiatic societies, an unchangeableness in such striking contrast with the constant dissolution and re-founding of Asiatic states, and the never ceasing changes of dynasty. The structure of the economical elements of society remains untouched by the storm clouds of the political sky."

His remarks rightly explored out the disintegrating factors of the village community in India. His first argument that some of the ancient institutions of the village community in India have continued down to this day which means that the rest of all have been disintegrated¹⁸. Secondly, he claimed that land becomes a commodity for market which generates surplus for the state. Third notion of Marx's assumption refers to 'those of the simplest form' and the complex ones are not included; wherein a different state of production naturally prevailed. In fourth perception, Marx uses the phrase "unchangeableness of Asiatic Society" only in a relative sense. Fifthly, Marx deals with the question of property, which was considered as the most controversial question among the English writers on India, and asserts that "the broken hill-country south of Krishna region, property of land does seem to have existed"¹⁹.

When Marx explained about the destruction of the old existing Indian village communities as an impact of British rule in India, he is essentially referring to an exogenous or external factor and at no occasion has discussed the endogenous or internal factors responsible for the disintegration of these primitive organizations²⁰. So, we must have to discuss the other available

sources to trace out the endogenous factors which lead to the dissolution of the village community, ultimately ended the village-based economy resulted in the starvation and death due to immediate crisis of food grains.

When land became a commodity for market and transfer of land made easy by mortgage, purchase and buying, the British government introduced a full capitalistic conception of property in land²¹. The transfer of land took place mainly on two basic results of forced sales of land because of land revenue arrears, and the frauds of the subordinate revenue servants. The landholding structure dominated by the institution of the village communities was nonetheless subjected to severe change through sale laws, private transfers of land and commercialization of crops²². These all factors played a prominent role in the destruction of the institution of the village community.

It distorted the mechanism of the mutual economical basis of the village people. According to John Edward Colebrooke, a settlement officer, there was about 80 percent of land holding which was in the hands of joint-proprietorship. But, towards the last two decades of the nineteenth century it had diminished and declined to about 30 percent which we can say is a sharp decline in the joint ownership. The alarming change in the structure of landholding distribution during the crucial period of land revenue policy formation have been pointed out by some prominent revenue officer such as Holt Mackenzie, James Thomason and Charles Metcalfe and that could be a striking cause of village community dissolution.²³ These prominent revenue officers blamed British legislation as the prime cause for the breakup of the institution of the village community.

The conflicts among the agricultural communities were one of the reasons for the break-up of the institution of village community. The conflicts in the village community persist mainly on economic basis. The economic interdependence of agricultural population based on the principle of Karl Marx's "dialectical materialism" was the prime of source of conflicts in the village community which lead to the struggle between the superior and the inferior class of agricultural population²⁴. This too was an exogenous factor and force of change in Indian society. Inter and intra conflicts within the village community on the basis of community, and castes provided sufficient cause for endogenous changes. According to this notion, a traditional view has been developed that the village communities disintegrated because of the impact of British rule which was analogous to the dissolution of Greek slavery on account of roman invasion²⁵. By the notion we could analyze that how and to what extent British rule in India was responsible as the exogenous factor in the breaking up of the village community. The importance of the British rule as exogenous factor in the destruction of the institution of village community was undeniable, but the role played by certain internal factors in this destruction process was also of greater significance. Some of the important internal factors that contributed to the process of disintegration of village community are listed as follows²⁶:

1. First, the internal conflicts, i.e., factional squabbles amongst the superior agricultural classes e.g. the jagirdars and taluqdars, who were behaving like feudal lords²⁷. The faction is primarily a kinship unit, consisting of one or more extended families or kumbas (descendants of a single common ancestor). Membership in a faction is never on an individual basis, but only by family groups. These kumbas acted as cohesive units. However, this assertion of Oscar Lewis has been challenged because it lays exclusive stress on kinship. A village faction is a power group formed to serve the socio-economic interests of its members. This naturally proved to be a cause of change in the existing institution of village community throughout the Indian history, and the dissolution process taken alarming path during the period of final decay of Mughal Empire and the consolidation of British power²⁸.

2. This continuous state of warfare and the feudal lord's luxurious mode of living required an increasing amount of revenue,

which in turn brought in enhanced exactions from the peasantry²⁹ and other skilled workers. According to this view, local legends and magnets had abandoned the cultivation and left the hamlet villages in search of a secure place like forest or a river belt. This definitely affected the settled living pattern of society and so disrupted the institution of village community.

3. Thirdly, the agrarian economy failed to provide food for an increasing population. This brought famines, which destroyed the fabrics of village economy. Nazir Akbar Abadi (1736-1830) in his *shahar-i-Ashob* with a verse describes the impact of famine in the city of Agra. He writes that "poverty and starvation has entered every house, as water enters after the bund is broken, and consequently all the thirty-six occupations are unemployed³⁰. The tradition of the thirty-six occupations or guilds is strong throughout the region of northern India" carried out by the institution of village community.

4. Fourthly, in such conditions, rack-renting and usury grew, which naturally contributed in the dissolution process of the village institution and economy. Land transfers to non-agriculturalists like the urban traders, usurers, merchants and moneylenders proved an important factor which helped in the dissolution of village community³¹. It compelled the rural people to abandon their cultivation and migrate to prosperous regions or cities to live on relief work. The occurrence of famine was a powerful instrument in breaking the internal rigidity of the rural communities and facilitated migration.

The liberal elements and private property in the land revenue policy could be discerned the creation of broad conditions for the emergence of valuable and individual property rights in land. The creation of a new class of landed proprietors also contributed to the dissolution of the institution of village community. The new proprietors enjoyed full rights of private property in land including right to extract maximum rent from tenants and evict them and secured exclusive rights of private property in wastelands, pastures, forests and fisheries, etc. which were formerly the joint property of the village communities as a whole. In all Mahalwari regions, millions of people were deprived the rights that they and their ancestors had enjoyed for centuries under the operation of summary settlement. The rights of the village zamindars and resident ryots were dissolved over extensive areas and the new rights were conferred on the newly created landed proprietors by means of which all the substantial rights of the former were transferred to the latter³². In small mahals, extensive taluqs were created by tehsildars and Qanungos by usurping the rights of a large number of Pattidari and Bhaichara village communities. The institution of village community also broke down because petty holders and cultivators were lost their rights to the single village zamindars who were admitted to the revenue settlements as individual representatives³³. When British launched new land revenue system with the Lumbardar or village chief who assumed the character of a single proprietor in a short span of time naturally destroyed the original Pattidari and Bhaichara villages based on mutual co-operation of village organization.

Now, all the benefits that were so far enjoyed by the village zamindars in the form of malikanah, zamindari rasoom or nankar were transferred to the new proprietors by law. There were various types of concession previously given to the different classes of the village communities in the form of different rates of revenue assessment on their lands could now be withdrawn from them by the emergence of new proprietors.³⁴ The emergences of new class of proprietors' belonged to urban merchants lessen the importance of the institution of village community

The security of occupancy rights that khudkasht ryots enjoyed in the past before the coming of the British had disappeared now and fixity of rent which was a corollary of the security of occupancy could no longer be maintained in view of the nature of the rights property conferred by the British regulations³⁵. Purchasers of land at public auction or through private sale also acquired rights over the entire village community.

The new land legislations contributed greatly in the way of the dissolution of village community because it broke the integrity and unity of village economy. In big mahals, the former intermediaries and the revenue farmers grabbed the rights of the village communities which had been paying their state revenue to the former governments through them. In this way, the organization of village community sharply lost their hold on the village economic affairs and activities.

The creation of private property in wasteland also contributed greatly in the destruction of the institution of village community. The wasteland property under the possession ship of the village communities now made available for the new proprietor. The new group of proprietors usurped the benefits of the village communities which enjoyed previously over the wastelands by them. The availability of wasteland would be check on the economic pressure that could be exercised by the new proprietors based on the implicit assumption that, under the former governments, the cultivators derived only a bare minimum subsistence from the land and that the former revenue collecting classes appropriated all the economic surplus beyond the minimum necessary for the subsistence of the cultivators.³⁶ The property of individuals including wastelands no longer remained the joint property of village community and extension of cultivation on the wastelands could be possible only after the payment of the rent demanded by the new proprietors.

There was another important factor which played significant role in the dissolution and disintegration process of village community was the chain of working within the organization itself.³⁷ The village community had originated with a distant ancestor, and had the same religion and caste. According to the custom of the community each member had the right to transfer his share wholly or partially by sale or in any other way, to persons belonging to any religion or caste³⁸. The exercise of these rights to a considerable extent led to the sub-division or fragmentation of the actual joint holding into smaller ones called thokes or behris. The religion and caste of the joint owners of the thokes and behris differed far from the original community where transfer laid positive effects. This type of development naturally weakens the hold of joint ownership of village community.³⁹

Though the British statesmen in favour of maintaining the institution of village community and cautious to retain the institution but on practical scale British agrarian and land revenue policies still favour the big zamindars and taluqdars who yet have firm hold on the existing local condition and situation. However, with the introduction of Mahalwari system the company government tried to prevent the power of big zamindars that were control all the affairs of villages remotely. They were not exterminated at greater level. They still concentrated all the benefits of peasants that come from cultivation. The new group of proprietors (zamindars, taluqdars, urban merchants and moneylenders) could exercise all economic pressure on the cultivating class and forced them to live with the bare subsistence. The new class of exploiter enjoyed all the surplus of agricultural productivity which was the property of peasants in real sense.

In 1830s, the combination of commercial depression and continued harsh assessments drove the cultivating communities into debt and arrears on their land revenue payment.⁴⁰ The new pattern of land settlement brought a more precise definition of landed rights. The result was a dramatic and altogether unforeseen increase in the enforced transfer of property through the agency of the civil courts. Ultimately, the beneficiaries from the operation of new settlement proved to be its victims too. The load of revenue debt, which had accumulated over the years, was the product of consistent heavy assessment. For example, E.J Thornton, settlement officer of Aligarh district found that the village communities already mired in debt. He reported that 'Jama' was considerably high and malguzars lost all hope of improving their condition because of too much burden imposed on them. The peasants were now in deep debt and utterly not capable of making any arrange-

ments for defraying their arrears.⁴¹ These mounting debt and arrears obviously contributed in the process of disintegration of village communities.

The centralized form of land revenue administration, the establishment of police and law courts and the extension of modern means of communication broke the isolation of villages. The isolation of villages broke the mutual based barter economy which was the basis of Indian economy from the very beginning of ancient civilization. The new means of communication connected the villages to the other parts of the country in easy way and ended the hegemony of village organization.⁴² It brought commercialization in agriculture and now local based market shifted to country wide market because export and import became easy.

High rents and increasing amount of agricultural rural indebtedness pushed the village top- guns to seek employment in urban areas. The above two causes together given rise to rural migration. Rural migration got pace by the destruction of village handicrafts which left no option of work in villages. The British government created a situation from where peasants were no longer in a position to raise their crops and lived on them. The villages were never be completely independent but entered into a condition where changes in the set- up seems compulsory and brought to an end of village organization⁴³. The new situation created by the British administration ended the self- sufficiency of village community which was nothing more than a traditional form of ancient agency of social control, social security and a bulwark against social change. The self- sufficiency of the villages had broken down when the village economy got connected with the world market due to the innovation of advanced means of communication.

The introduction of landlordism in agrarian set-up by the British with a semi- feudal and semi- colonial land tenure nature created a new pattern of relationship between the hierarchy of tenants and the landlords⁴⁴ (most often absentee). The British

administration of the Company government selected the zamindars and taluqdars as the social base of their rule instead of the institution of the village community. The old set- up of village economy based on moral and ethical values have been replaced by the new social order shaped on materialistic approaches and relation. Marx said that the loss of old set - up had not been replaced with the establishment of a good alternate in accordance with the demand of Indian history.⁴⁵

However, the institution of village community sustained, with some basic changes in its rigidity, and could be witnessed even in the thirties of the twentieth century. According to the Report on the Moral and Material Progress of India, 1930-31, 'throughout the greater part of the country the typical self- contained Indian village community, which has been maintained without any modification for centuries, still exists as an interesting and surprisingly intricate social organism'.⁴⁶ The rigidity of village community swept away by the occurrence of a world-wide Great Depression in 1929-33. Further, the outbreak of the Second World War changed the whole set-up with the introduction of intensified commodity production which intensifies the existing money economy. After independence, Indian government tried to re-establish the institution of village co- operative societies with the establishment of three-tier Panchayati Raj system.⁴⁷ The British government of East India Company replaced the community feeling by materialism and individualism which harmed the village societies at greater scale in the long run. They destroyed the self- sufficient village economy and turned India into a single economic unit with the introduction of capitalist forms of private property.⁴⁸ This transformation was not progressive for their subjects but subjected to the economic requirements of British trading and industrial concerns. These land settlement impeded the economic development of Indian society. Thus the impact of British land settlement proved more destructive than the regenerative. And the process of regeneration took place only on the cost of destruction in the form of maximum exploitation and exhaustion of India's agriculture resource and wealth.

REFERENCES

- K. Marx, *The Future Results of the British rule in India*, New York daily Tribune, in Marx Engels (ed.) *The First Indian War of Independence 1857- 1859*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1959 p.84 | *Ibid.*, p.86 | I. Hussain, *Land revenue Policy in North India: The Ceded and Conquered provinces, 1801- 1833*, Calcutta, 1967, p.194 | Marx, *The Future Results*, op. cit., p.86 | Marx, op. cit., p. 86 | John S. Migdal, *Peasants, Politics and Revolution*, Princeton University Press, Guildford & Surrey, 1974, p. 84 | S. C. Gupta, *Agrarian Relation and Early British Rule in India: A Case Study of Ceded and Conquered Provinces, (Uttar Pradesh), 1801-1833*, Asia Publishing House, New Delhi, 1963, p. 38 | *Ibid.*, p. 39 | *Ibid.*, p. 26 | Dharma Kumar, *The Cambridge Economic History of India, Vol. II*, Cambridge University Press, 1982, p. 36 | Minute of 1st July 1819, Holt Mackenzie, Para-453, p. 97; in Revenue Selection, North Western Provinces, 1818-1820, Calcutta, 1866 Para- 91& 92 | A. R. Desai, *Social Background of Indian Nationalism*, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1948, p.13 | H. R. Nevil, *Imperial Gazetteer of India, Provincial Series, Uttar Pradesh*, Government Press, Vol -1, p. 101 | *Ibid.* | John W. Kaye, *Selections from the Papers of Lord Metcalfe*, London, 1855, p. 253 | H. S. Maine, *Village community in the East and West.*, B. R Publishing Corporation, New Delhi, First Published 1913, Reprinted 1985, pp. 108-121 | K. Marx's view on the destruction of Indian village community, in *Capital*, Vol-1, Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1949, pp. 350-352, cf., Radha K. Mukherjee, *The Rise and Fall of the East India Company*, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1955, pp. 143-144 | R. P Singh, 'Re-assessing the Writings on the Rebellion', in S. Bhattacharya | (ed.), *Rethinking 1857*, Orient Longman, Hyderabad, 2007., p.92 | Marx and Engels; in *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1956, p.104 | *Ibid.*, p.92 | Hussain, op. cit., p. 255 | *Ibid.* | *Ibid.*, | Singh, p. 92 | *Ibid.*, p. 93 | *Ibid.* | H. R. Nevil, *District Gazetteers of Uttar Pradesh, Faizabad, Vol- XLIII*, 1907, p.160 | Singh, op. cit., p. 93-94 | Nevil, *District Gazetteers of Uttar Pradesh, Barabanki*, p. 167 | Nazir Akbar Abadi 's view in his work, *Shahar- i- Ashob*; Cf., Singh, op. cit., p. 94 | Singh, p.95 | Minute of 12th July 1820, Minute of J. E Colbrooke, dated 12th July 1820, Paras.4-9, in Revenue Selection, 1818-1820, Calcutta, 1866, p.208 | *Ibid.*, p. 208 | Gupta, *Agrarian Relation*, op. cit., p. 119 | *Ibid.*, p. 118 | Gupta, *Agrarian Relation*, op. cit., p.120 | Minute of 27th July 1831, Alexandar Ross; in Revenue Selection, 1832-33, p. 36 | Hussain, op. cit., p.256 | *Ibid.* | T. Metcalfe, *Land, Landlords, and the British Raj*, p.106 | Metcalf, op. cit., p.107 | Marx, op. cit, p.86 | Singh, op. cit., p.95 | Singh, p.96 | *Ibid.* | Report on the Moral and Material Progress of India during the Year 1931- 32, Published 1932, p. 135 | Singh, p.97 | Desai, op. cit., pp. 1-2 |