

Prepared by

Dr. Md.Haider Ali, Assistant Professor

Dept.of History, R.B.G. R. College

Maharajganj, JPU, Chapra

Que: Discuss the features of Mahalwari land revenue settlement

The company could not draw any advantage from incremented engenderment in agriculture in the system introduced in Bengal .i.e., the sempiternal settlement. The system was opposed by members of the village communities. The adhesion of the zamindars to the company could additionally be taken for granted. The company lost its monopoly of trade with India in 1813 and therefore, India was opened to all British traders. The company so far had been fascinated with exporting Indian goods broad. But now the British manufacturers, because of the industrial Revolution in England desired to engender an astronomically immense market in India for their culminated goods and additionally to convert India in to a field for raw material. A modified version of the zamindari settlement, introduced in the Gangetic valley, the North West Provinces, components of Central India, and the Punjab, was kened as the Mahalwari system. The revenue settlement was to be made village by village or state (mahal) by estate with landlords or heads of families who collectively claimed to be the landlords of the village or the estate. In the Punjab, a modified Mahalwari system kened as the village system was introduced. In Mahalwari areas additionally, the land revenue was periodically revised. Under this system, the revenue was settled only for a fine-tuned period with either the local zamindars of a village and its hereditary collectors of the revenue or with the zamindars or hereditary collectors of a Mahal (estate which included many villages). The zamindars were not accepted as hereditary owners of the land. It was held that they had only the right to accumulate revenues which the regime

may perpetuate or withdraw. The Mahalwari system brought no benefit to the cultivators. It was a modified version of the zamindari system and benefited the upper class in villages. The regime demand was additionally very high. Initially the state share was fine-tuned at two-thirds of the gross engender. Bentinck, therefore, reduced it to sixty six percent and, afterwards, in some areas, it was reduced to fifty percent. The encumbrance of all this cumbersomely hefty taxation determinately fell on the cultivators. Both the zamindari and the ryotwari systems departed fundamentally from the traditional land systems of the country. The British engendered an incipient form of private property in land in such a way that the benefit of the innovation did not go to the cultivators. All over the country land was now made salable, mortgagable, and alienable. This was done primarily to bulwark the Regimes revenue. Another reason for introducing private ownership in land was provided by the credence that only right of ownership would make the land lord or the ryot exert him in making ameliorations. The British by making land a commodity which could be liberatingly brought and sold introduced a fundamental transmutation in the subsisting land systems of the country. The stability and continuity of the Indian villages were shaken. In fact, the entire structure of rural society commenced to break up.