

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INDIA'S LAND REFORMS AND ITS IMPACT ON RYOTWARI, ZAMINDADI AND MAHALWARI SYSTEM

Niraj

Designation - Assistant Professor

Department - History

University - North East Frontier Technical University (NEFTU)

Email - nirajSOROUT19@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

We have seen how the three central British land systems came into being in this study. The ryotwari and the malware were renamed as additional regions came under British control. Mahalwari also applied to a vast portion of central India under malguzari, significantly changed from malware. According to Awadh's administration, following their uprising in 1805, the Talqudar farmers were recognized to guarantee their support during any future uprisings. When it came to the assessment itself, it was a malware affair. Throughout our conversation, it has been evident that the British Government's policy was driven by a desire to collect a significant amount of money. There was a period when this led to a land market when people would sell or buy land. Other times, though, the demands of the state were so great that no buyers could be found. The Government's huge expenditures in India and its need to send! Via slims to Britain for its costs, there prompted the need to gather so much. The commercialization of the agriculture unit will cover some of these issues.

Keywords: *Diwani (revenue collection right), Mahal (estate), Potta (lease), Raiyat (peasant), Zamindar (landlord).*

INTRODUCTION

India's primary source of revenue is agriculture, which has been their most significant economic activity for many centuries. Of course, land revenue management and administration need special attention since it was the state's most significant source of revenue. Established as a colonial looting weapon, the East India Company monopolized commerce and collected land tax. The British Moneyocracy had transformed India into its landed estates to destroy the old Asian method of production, which hastened the pace of the commercial revolution in India. 1 Agrarian reform in India was radically altered to extract down the country's growth and increasing burdens on Indian farmers.

Because of this, the English East India Company adopted the Mughal agricultural system's institutional structure. Following British traditions and regulations related to land, they imposed a system over the existing land settlement pattern. This resulted in several

changes to land tenure, property relations, agricultural productivity and food supply in British-India due to government-sponsored cooperative movements. These developments changed Indian economic history from the mercantile phase to finance capitalism over decades [1].

To collect maximum land income, the Company changed the previous land settlement system from time to time after acquiring complete control of Bengal in 1765 (the year Diwani rights were acquired).

It was 1772 when the first auction-based agricultural system was introduced, replacing the previous contract-based land income collection system.

Land settlements such as Zamindari in Bengal, Raiyatwari in Madras and Bombay, and Mahalwari in the North-Western Provinces revealed the "colonial nature of British authority." They served as a platform to begin wealth accumulation. All three systems were characterized by a desire to integrate aspects of the previous agricultural system. Globalization has resulted in many diverse local outcomes and hybrid forms.

To begin with, the British had colonized India's economy based on two key factors: the method of production and, in particular, the system of surplus extraction. British imperialism was another factor that affected the Indian economy during the industrial revolution [2].

All settlements were compared based on their geographical boundaries, evaluation processes, and effect on society. No one could have predicted the immediate consequences of the Permanent Settlement's adoption. Zamindars' (Land Lords') lands became valuable commodities since they were perpetuated and had a fixed tax burden. It is also worth noting that British East India Company's tax collectors refused to adjust for times of drought, flood, or another calamity. At the time, the tax demand was more significant than in England. Due to this, many Zamindars went into debt quickly. As a result of the Company's strategy of auctioning off any Zamindari properties judged to be in arrears, a land market was established that did not exist before. Several Indian officials in the East India Company's administration bought this property. Those officials were in a perfect position to buy an under-assessed property and, therefore, lucrative for them. Among other historians, Bernhard Cohn argues that the Permanent Settlement contributed to the commercialization of land that did not previously exist in Bengali. It also shifted the governing class's socioeconomic basis from "lineages and local chiefs" to "civil servant descendants, businessmen, and bankers." 6 Many of the new landowners were "absentee landlords" who "controlled their property via managers and had no connection to the country [4]."

Aside from being a revenue-generating tool, the Company anticipated that the Zamindari elite would act as mediators for the political supremacy of their authority, maintaining local tradition and safeguarding rural life from the potentially greedy effects of its representatives.

Zamindars, on the other hand, formed a conservative interest group as a result of this.

According to the report, companies and Indian landlords tended to push their tenants into plantation-style cultivation of cash crops like indigo and cotton rather than rice and wheat. Many of the worst famines of the 19th century were caused by this. As a result, Zamindars ultimately became absentee landlords, with all the implications for neglecting investments on the land. Because of the replication of the Settlement in India, the political system was permanently changed. The Zamindars were able to amass money due to the lack of governmental demand, which they used to assist agriculture, industry, public and private organizations, and the needy in times of need. As a result of Zamindars' wealth, all classes of people benefited [5].

Some areas of British India adopted the Raiyatwari system by 1820, which was one of two primary methods used to collect income from farmers directly. Land taxes and rentals were collected at the same time. Thus the total income was higher. The Raiytwari method of assessment was used when the land income was levied directly on the Raiyts - the individual farmers who cultivated the land. Zamindari was the method of assessment used when the land tax was enforced indirectly - via agreements signed with Zamindars. For example, the Zamindar does not mediate between the Government and farmers in Bombay, Madras, Assam, and Burma.

When describing the Raiyatwari land tenure system in 1857, John Stuart Mill described it as "the System where every registered owner of the land is acknowledged as its owner and pays rent directly to the Government." Subletting or selling his property is entirely up to him. While he pays the set assessment, he is protected by the Government and has the choice of expanding or decreasing his holding or even giving it up completely. Seasons that are adverse result in remissions of assessment. If a Raiyat pays an extra rent to the Government for water used to turn dry land into a wetland or two-crop land, the assessment is set in money and does not change from year to year. It is almost as if the peasants are proprietors, with a flawless and straightforward title. They have all the advantages of perpetual leases without the obligations, in that they may give up their property at any moment, but they cannot be evicted as long as they pay their dues.

Raiyatwari's annual settlements are frequently misunderstood. It is essential to clarify that they are required since the Raiyat can reduce or increase his crop from year to year. Instead of evaluating the property, they want to determine how much of the assessment due on his holding the Raiyat is responsible for paying "Return to House of Commons Order (June 1997), Showing under what tenures, and subject to what Land Tax, lands are held during the various Presidencies of India".

Raiyatwarisystemis, associated with Sir Thomas Munro, was appointed Governor of Madras in May 1820 "the present."

The Raiyatwari approach was, in essence, more pragmatic than theological. When the Raiyatwari system was implemented, the interaction between the administration and each farmer seemed to be more beneficial to the state's interests since the state could assess its cultivated area and the revenue of the taxpayer, as well as collect its taxes. Peasants would also benefit from this arrangement since they would be freed from the harsh control of a

large landowner. It should also be noted that, although though this system had adverse effects on the landowners, it seemed to have less of an impact on the customs and social balance in the countryside [6].

A scientific basis for the land tax system was at the heart of Ricardo's utilitarian political economics. When it came to establishing the new land tax system, James Mill played a key role. 1819-1830 he was directly responsible for writing the revenue dispatches to India for a liberal land revenue assessment system in the subcontinent. Stocks have argued that utilitarian philosophy's distaste for landlordism was a significant factor in the emergence of a comparative society based on individual rights in the soil.

Northern Indian' talukdars', whose authority over the revenue settlements of numerous villages was sometimes overthrown by Mahalwari arrangements Munro and Wingate, who were the driving forces behind the Madras and Bombay systems, were likely influenced by the political experience of regions where cultivating peasants controlled the land.¹⁵ Without a doubt, the ideas in vogue in Great Britain played a role in determining the pattern of settlement. The denationalization of rustic ideals that had currency in the home nation may also have been mirrored in European Romanticism.

As early as 1822, the estate or "mahals" system was introduced, wherein land collectively belonged to the local community (BCS). There is a communal liability for the payment of land revenue, but there is still individual responsibility. After adopting Regulation VII in 1822, which was the practical outcome of MacKenzie's Minute of 1819, this system was only created because of the overwhelming government demand and rigidity in its operation and collection of land revenue. When it comes to farming, co-sharers in Mahalwarivillages are the ones who are doing it. After all, the peasant landowners have made a deal with the state. Instead of dealing with the Government individually, the proprietors dealt with it via "villages [7]."

William Bentinck, who became India's administrator in 1822, conducted a comprehensive assessment of the Mahalwari system's 1822 implementation. This was a judgment reached by the Bentinck administration that the Regulation of 1822 had led to widespread suffering. His Regulation IX of 1833 was the result of a lengthy deliberation and debate. This legislation made the Mahalwari system's terms and conditions more flexible. Because the settlement officials, who were the carriers of the settlements, were corrupt and avoided the fundamental regulations, the system did not function as intended. As a consequence, the agricultural classes suffered under this system. This led to considerable dissatisfaction, and the Mahalwari System ultimately failed to have any lasting impact.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ZAMINDARI, RYOTWARI AND MAHALWARI LAND REVENUE SETTLEMENTS

For land tax collection, the British established the Land Revenue Settlements of Zamindari, Ryotwari, and Mahalwari in India. We compare these settlements based on their geographical distribution, execution and social effect.

The major regions where the Ryotwari system was used were Madras, Bombay, and portions of Assam, Sind and Berar. The British Government collected taxes directly from the peasants, sometimes known as Raiyts, under this arrangement. Unlike the permanent settlement, the income may be reviewed every 20 to 30 years and increased. It was adopted in 51% of the British regions, according to the report. The main flaw in this scheme was the high tax rate. Between the Government and the peasant, there was typically no intermediary. His property may be leased, gifted, sold, and mortgaged. If he continues to pay the fixed assessment, he has the choice of expanding or decreasing his holdings, as well as leaving it altogether. It is a system where the peasant is effectively a Proprietor, with all the benefits of a perpetual lease, without the obligations, in that he has the freedom to give up his land whenever he pleases, but cannot be kicked out so long as his dues are paid, receives assistance under challenging seasons, and is irresponsible for the payment to others. [8] In other instances, the tax required was more than 50% of the gross income, even though it was not based on actual earnings from the land's production. As a result of Ricardo's utilitarian politics, the land revenue system was founded scientifically. When it came to the new land revenue system, James Mill was crucial. 1819-1830 he was directly responsible for writing the revenue dispatches to India for the liberal land revenue assessment that was to take place after that. A utilitarian society founded on individual rights in the soil relied as much on income assessment and land registration as it did on judicial codes and institutions. [9] Well-known research by Stocks argues that utilitarian philosophy's ideological dislike for landlordism was a key driving factor behind the creation of Ryotwari and Mahalwari communities, concluding that policy may have destroyed historically strong landlord groups in the process. The "Talukdars" of northern India, whose authority over the revenue settlements of numerous villages was sometimes overthrown by Mahalwari arrangements, are a possible example. Munton and Wingate, two of the most influential people in Madras and Bombay, were likely influenced by their political experiences in areas where peasants owned the land. [10]. Unquestionably, the prevailing ideologies in Great Britain at the time had a part in determining the settlement pattern. Their anti-landlord sentiment mirrored the rising intellectual impact of utilitarian philosophers like James Mill and Bentham and Stuart Mill, and others. Also, during the beginning of European Romanticism, the idealization of rural ideas that were popular in the native nation may have been mirrored in this work. [11]

As early as 1822, Holt Mackenzie and Robert Mertins Bird created the Mahalwari system, which included Punjab and central India and western Uttar Pradesh, which represented 30 percent of British India at the time. Zamindari and Ryotwari systems were combined to form the Mahalwarri system. After every 20 or 30 years, the revenue may be changed. It resembled the Permanent Settlement in specific ways and was also known as Temporary Zamindari Settlement. 'The peasant proprietors compound with the state for a definite time,' said J. S. Mill. As a group, they negotiated with the Government rather than individually. [12]

The Mahalwari system had been established in 1822 when William Bentinck became India's administrator. Benjamin's administration concluded that the Regulation of 1822 had resulted in a great deal of suffering for many people. The 1833 Regulation IX was the result of much debate and discussion. As a result of this legislation, the Mahalwari system's terms and conditions were made more flexible. Martins Bird was in charge of the new program. There was also a new method for assessing land value and a right to make internal changes. Because the settlement officials, who were the carriers of the settlements, were corrupt and avoided the existing regulations, the system did not function as intended. As a consequence, the agricultural classes suffered under this system. This led to considerable dissatisfaction, and the Mahalwari System ultimately failed to have a lasting impact.[13]

IMPACT

When it came to taxes, the British East India Company was rigid and refused to make adjustments during times of natural disaster. As a result, the land was seized from peasants, leaving them landless. In the marketplace, land became a commodity that could be purchased and sold with relative ease. There was a great deal of money coming in from the property.

According to historians Bernhard Cohn and others, the Permanent Settlement contributed to the commercialization of land in Bengal. It also shifted the governing elite from "lineages and local rulers" to "civil officials, their offspring, and merchants and bankers." This is known as Absentee Landlordism or Sub-infeudation [14].

COMPARISON OF THE LAND REVENUE SYSTEMS

Zamindari System	Ryotwari System	Mahalwari System
Lord Cornwallis introduced the Zamindari System in 1793.	Thomas Munro introduced the Ryotwari System in 1820.	The Mahalwari System was devised by Holt Mackenzie in 1822 and introduced in India by Lord William Bentinck in 1833.
The land revenue was collected by the intermediaries known as Zamindars from the peasants.	The land revenue was paid directly by the peasants.	The village headman collected the land revenue from all the peasants in that village.
Zamindars were made the owners of the land.	Peasants had ownership over the land.	Peasants had ownership over the land.
The revenue to be collected was fixed permanently.	The revenue to be collected was revised periodically.	The revenue to be collected was revised periodically.
This system was prevalent in the provinces of Bengal, Orissa, Bihar and Varanasi.	This system was prevalent in Madras, Bombay and some parts of Assam and Coorg.	This system was prevalent in the Northwest frontier province, Punjab, Gangetic valley and central province.

TERRITORIAL ACQUISITION UNDER THREE SETTLEMENTS

In Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, and the Banares region of Uttar Pradesh, permanent Zamindari villages have been established. North-Western and Northern Carnatic Provinces were added to this settlement in 1800. (Eastern U.P.). It encompassed approximately 19 percent of British India's entire land area. There is a Mahalwari tenure in Uttar Pradesh, Punjab (with variations), and the central provinces.

In contrast, villages in Oudh have been put under taluqdars or intermediaries with whom the Government has direct contact. This system covered nearly 30 percent of the British controlling area. Mumbai, Madras, and Sindh provinces were significant Raiyatwari settlement areas. A similar system exists in Assam and Burma. Temporarily inhabited areas include a few hilly regions in Bengal and the coastal strip of Orissa. This system covered approximately 51% of British Indian land. v Approximately 5/6 of Bengal and Bihar, 1/8 of Assam and 1/10 of Uttar Pradesh are permanently inhabited, as is 14 of Madras in British India. Land income accounts for 53 percent of the total, with 47 percent from Raiyatwaritracts v [15].

In order to effectively manage land assessment, all of these central regions were split into numerous parcels.

As part of the Land Revenue System, the three settlements area has been divided among British authorities and native landlords. Bengal, for example, was initially divided into twelve prominent and numerous smaller Zamindars who had an insignificant part in the land assessment process and local Government. 21 Territories in Madras were subdivided into Nellore, Trichinopoly, Coimbatore, Tanjore, Arcot, and several smaller areas as well. Like Central Province, the Mahalwari settlement area is divided into many divisions, including Meerut, Agra, Rohilkhand, Allahabad, Bundelkhand, Varanasi, Gorakhpur, Lucknow, Faizabad, Kumaun, etc. (a) Under Permanent Settlement, Zamindars are recognized as landowners with rights of inheritance, sale, and mortgage, but are vulnerable to losing their property if they fail to pay their taxes by a specific date. Settlements that permanently restricted state demand to a set amount of income and specified taxes or services. A ZAMINDAR was required to protect the rights of its tenants by issuing pattas, which are papers indicating the area and rent of the individual properties. To preserve the rights and privileges of the tenants in their various tenures, the Zamindars were made "subject to such regulations as may be established by the government." There was complete abolition of all abwabs or cesses imposed by Zamindars in addition to the rent. The Government took over the transit taxes, road tolls, and ferry tolls, but the market tools and earnings from fisheries, forests, and unused land were given to the Zamindars. When the talukdars of Bengal were promoted to Zamindars, they were given the right to pay a certain amount of money to the Government. Many minor tributary chieftains have been stripped of their governing rights and demoted to the status of Zamindars, who must pay a set amount of tax. Private property was supposedly created by the Zamindari system [16].

One of the foremost experts on British India's land tax system, Baden Powell, outlined the many interests in property under various tenure systems. During state landlordism, the

Government and the Raiyats had a single stake inland. Government, Zamindars, and actual cultivators were involved in Zamindari. Land ownership is divided into four categories: Government, landlord, tenant holder and actual cultivator. These three systems have seen many changes throughout the years, resulting in a mixture of features that leans towards the Zamindari system. As a result of the evils of the Zamindari system and absentee landlordism, the whole Indian land system was affected. It became popular to sublet and rent racks in Raiyatwari. It is based on the Zamindari system in Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh, where the Government emphasizes local accountability for land tax assessment [17].

A long time was spent under the permanent settlement, neglecting to safeguard the rights of farmers that the Government had specified with the Zamindars in 1793. Renters and cultivating village owners in Bengal and Bihar now hold the position of European peasant-proprietors and are susceptible to the magic of property ownership. They enjoy the total rewards of their labor and capital, as well as, in reality, the entire unearned increase. As a result, they have a strong desire to see agriculture thrive on their land. However, if the Zamindars continue to levy illegal cesses, it is due to police corruption or incompetence rather than the Permanent Settlement. However, despite being pro-Zamindar, the settlement was unable to overcome a variety of obstacles. According to Daniel Thorner, since imperial power maintained complete control of land, "private property" was a misnomer.

Similarly, the Magistrates' vigilance is reducing the frequency of illegal extortion, as well as dacoities. When art is vacant, he cannot spend his money on upgrades, and industry is discouraged due to this. In theory, the Zamindari system encourages agricultural development at the expense of the Zamindar since he is the permanent owner and may recoup his expenditure from the land's value. Furthermore, due to the size of the Zamindari estate, farmers may reap the benefits of production on a big scale, which is not feasible in the tiny plots of the Mahalwari and Raiyatwari regions of the state.

Because of the permanent presence of Zamindars, who serve as a mediator between the state and farmers, large enterprises may be feasible in eastern India [18].

The state is a landowner with all the privileges of a monopolist under the Mahalwari and Ryotwari settlement. Ricardo's rent theory assumes that landlords compete for renters, but there is no competition here since there is just one landlord, the Government. Since the Raiyat was a monopoly, the rent must theoretically be a factor in the pricing of agricultural products. 33 Agricultural production on a wide scale is complex since the Government only leases land on tiny parcels of land, averaging 5 acres apiece. The Raiyat's capital is discouraged from investing in industry and land because of the possibility of increasing income at each periodic settlement. There is no incentive for the Raiyat, who does not own his land, to become a more advanced farmer. Because the Raiyats are responsible for the necessities of life, and the excess land production is "washed into the coffers of the state," capital cannot be accumulated via agriculture. The Raiyats are likely to be destroyed by the

rigorous enforcement of the state dues in the years of famine if the head of Government does not immediately declare a remission of income.

Before we get into the specifics of each kind of settlement, let us look at some of the commonalities among them all.

Performing a thorough survey of the property, including the preliminary delineation of the required boundary lines, is crucial. Taxpayers and their holdings must be correctly listed and every piece of property in each town. In the end, the land must be valued, revenue rates must be calculated, and the amount due by the estate or holding must be determined.

When it came time to try out a new system, only the permanent settlement had borders that were well defined. In Bengal and Madras, the settlements with large landlords fall under the first category, while those with Oudh Talukdars fall under the second. All settlements in Agra, Punjab, Central Province, etc., and the Raiyatwari settlement system, are considered temporary and have demarcation, surveys and rights record carried out [19].

It is common to discover references to "middleman" owners inland settlement documents. In the Permanent and Mahalwari settlements, there was a middleman between the actual farmer and the Government; this intermediary is more or less entirely the owners and keeps these settlements in trust for him. Usually, under the Raiyatwari system, there was no such thing as a pension. Instead, the person was paid directly by the state, and his income was based on the fields he owned. MUNRO STRONGLY RECOMMENDS the Raiyatwari technique without an intermediary.

As part of the Zamindari settlement, the landowner possesses a formal proprietary claim, as well as a specified duty that he must fulfill. Because of his contractual obligations, he cannot surrender his estate at any time. There is a contract between him and the state. In the Raiyatwari system, the tenant is not bound by a lease and disagrees with the landlord. His income rate cannot be increased during settlement. However, he may surrender his holding at any time before the following cultivating season starts and be free from obligation anytime he wants.

However, it was only for a limited length of time in a permanent settlement area. There would have been a "sub-settlement," which would have established what each town was to pay the landowner, but at a more significant amount to allow for the overlord's profit. Where there was evidence of talukdari or double tenure, the settlement was retained by the villages directly. However, the talukdari allowance was shown by making the assessment so much higher as to include the amount. They were to be paid via the riches, and the overlord did not collect it. 38 It would be seen from the section on Village Tenures that Mahalwari settlement was a joint and severally responsible unit. For each village or Patti or section, a sharer of standing and respectability assumed primary responsibility and signed the Someone like this was known as a "Iambardar." Co-sharers share the weight of the income based on the principles of sharing and the estate's constitution. This procedure is referred to as thebachh in Hebrew. For example, unlike permanent settlement, the assessment for the mahal settlement is based more or less directly on the accurate rental value of the lands in the community [20] [21].

CONCLUSION

As a result, land revenue is the primary source of funding for Indian business administration. The essential element of the Company's administration was, of course, the collection of land income. They used a variety of techniques across India. As a result of this arrangement, renters' land rights were strengthened. They had a direct line of communication with the Government, and there was no intermediary involved. At the same time, the Government enjoyed a steady source of income. According to reports, the revenue department's expenditures have risen as a result of this method. Zamindars who lost the Company's favor were also unhappy with the system's implementations. However, this method is also unpopular with certain business employees. Rashtriya and Muslims, too, disliked the system since it did not allow them to receive grants or many. A third of the output was assessed under Munro's method, but it was criticized since revenue officials rigorously collected the tax amid natural disasters like floods and drought. The renters grew impoverished due to the problems. So, in summary, he found that it was acceptable for both Government and the people and not unsatisfactory for either.

REFERENCES

Primary:

- [1]. From the private secretary to his Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General in India, Dated 14th May 1900, Transfer for Disposal, A Memorial from Mr. R. C., Dutt Regarding Land Settlement, in Bengal Proceedings No. 22, Serial No. 4.
- [2]. R. C. Dutt" s Letter to Lord Curzon on the subject of Land Revenue Settlements in Madras, dated 20th February 1900, Proceedings No. 20, Serial No. 2
- [3]. Amelia (Shipley) Heber, Life of Reginald Heber, D.D., The Lord Bishop of Calcutta by his Widow with Selections, Correspondence, Unpublished Poems, and Private Papers, 1830, Vol -II
- [4]. R. C Dutt" s Letters to Lord Curzon; Dated the 12th May 1900, Remarks on the Land Settlements in Northern-India, Proceeding No. 23, Serial No. 5
- [5]. From the private secretary to his Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General in India, Dated 14th May 1900, transfer for disposal a memorial from Mr. R. C., Dutt regarding land settlement in Bengal, Prof. No. 22, Serial No. 4, p. 21
- [6]. Dutt "s letter to Curzon, Dated 20th February 1900, op. cit., Proceeding No. 20, Serial No. 2
- [7]. From the private secretary to his Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General in India, Dated 14th May 1900, transfer for disposal a memorial from Mr. R. C., Dutt regarding land settlement in Bengal. Prof. No. 22 and Serial No. 4, .
- [8]. Regulation IX of 1833, R. M. Bird, in Revenue Law Report, North-Western Provinces, 1867

Secondary:

- [9]. Karl Marx, The Future Result of British in India, New York Daily Tribune, June 1853. No.3840, in Marx and Angles; On Colonialism, Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, 1960
- [10]. R Desai, Social Background of Indian Nationalism, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1948
- [11]. Sekhar Bandyopadhyay; From Plassey to Partition: A History of Modern India, Orient Longman, New Delhi, 2004

- [12]. Romesh C. Dutt, The Economic History of India: In the Victorian Age, Vol -II, Ministry of information and Broadcasting, govt. of India, New Delhi, 1963
- [13]. Irfan Habib; Essays in Indian History, Tulika Books, New Delhi, 1995
- [14]. Henry Cotton; India in Transition, B. R. Publishing Corporation, Delhi, 1885
- [15]. Dutt, R. C., The Economic History of India: Under Early British Rule, Vol. II, Routledge & Kegan Ltd., London, 1882, First Indian Edition 1960, Publication Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India Press, New Delhi, Reprinted 1963
- [16]. "Munro and the Ryotwari Settlement in Madras, 1820-27", in R. C. Dutt, The Economic History of India Under Early British Rule.
- [17]. Claude Markovits (ed.), A History of modern India 1480 -1950, First published 2002, (Wimbledon Publishing Company), Anthem Press, London, 2006,
- [18]. Eric Stokes, The English Utilitarians and India, Oxford at Clarendon Press, London, 1959
- [19]. Neil Charlesworth, British Rule and the Indian Economy, 1800-1914, Macmillan Press Ltd., London, 1982
- [20]. Got, Rohit Kumar, Social and Economic History of Modern India, Murari Lal & Son Publication, Meerut, 2007.
- [21]. Jadu Nath Sarkar, Economics of British India, Kuntaline Press, M.C Sarkar and Sons, Calcutta, 1909
- [22]. Islam, S., The Permanent Settlement in Bengal: A Study of Its Operation 1790-1819, Bangla Academy, Dacca (Dhaka), 1979.