

Effect of Agricultural Production and Prices on Incidence of Rural Poverty

A Tentative Analysis of Inter-State Variations

Sudipto Mundle

Three broad groups of factors determine the incidence of rural poverty. We have, first, factors like distribution of land which directly affect the income of cultivating households and, second, factors, like rural wage rates and wage employment which affect mainly the income of rural labour households. The following analysis deals with the third set of factors, agricultural prices and production, which affect the incomes of both segments of the rural poor directly.

The reference period is 1963-64 to 1973-74, beginning before the so-called Green Revolution and extending well into that phase, so that the results reflect the forces that have come into play during this period of agricultural growth.

THE original attempts to find some measure of the abysmal levels of poverty in British India, undertaken towards the end of the 19th century, were aimed at a critique of the colonial state.¹ In recent times, however, it is under the auspices of the state itself that attempts to measure the incidence of poverty in post-independence India have been revived. This new research of the sixties and seventies was initiated by the Planning Commission, ostensibly to aid a new kind of planning which would hopefully eradicate at least the most intense levels of poverty.² No one was surprised that, all the research notwithstanding, planning failed to make a dent on poverty; for nobody had really believed that all that stood in the way of eradicating poverty was the preparation of proper estimates of minimum levels of living, target groups of population and the like. The effort however was not entirely wasted for while the ostensible planning goals were not achieved, the research did contribute enormously to the construction of a fairly cautious statistical picture of poverty in India.³ Though it was essentially preoccupied with problems of measurement the work of this period also prepared the ground for research of the kind reported here which is more concerned with the effect of various economic factors on the incidence of poverty rather than the measurement of poverty itself.

FACTORS UNDERLYING RURAL POVERTY

For our present purpose it is useful to note at the very outset that the rural poor do not form a homogeneous category. They are differentiated not only in terms of the intensity of deprivation but also functionally in terms of their roles and positions in

the structure of agrarian relations. Accordingly the effect of different factors governing the incidence of poverty may also vary between different segments of the rural poor. Analytically they may be classified into two broad strata, i.e., the class of cultivators who earn their living primarily from the produce of their operated holdings (whether owned or leased in) and the class of agricultural labourers who earn their living primarily by hiring themselves out as wage labourers. For a cultivating household its income would depend not only on the general level of agricultural production but also on the household's command over land — the principal asset in agricultural production — which largely determines the share of its own claim out of total production. To the extent that a portion of the household's share of total produce is also marketed its real income would rise or fall with a rise or fall in the selling price of agricultural commodities relative to the price at which the household may buy inputs or items of consumption from the market. Finally, given a cultivating household's family income the actual level of living or income per capita of the family varies inversely with family size.

In the case of agricultural labourers, the number of persons offering themselves for wage labour may rise directly as a consequence of population growth and declining land:man ratio. The number could also rise, however, as a consequence of changes in the distribution of land which may be quite independent of population growth. This rise in the supply of agricultural labourers might be matched by growing demand. However if the growth of agricultural production is not proper-

tionate, or takes a form which is less labour intensive, such that the increased labour supply is only partially offset by the increased labour demand, then this would adversely affect either the wage rate or the average mand-days of employment available per labourer or both. Unionisation of agricultural labour may help to protect the wage rate but not the period of employment per worker. The effect of the above factors on the average income per labourer would be either reinforced or neutralised by changes in agricultural (especially foodgrain) prices, depending on the cash: kind composition of wages and the relationship of money wages to foodgrain prices. Finally, given an average annual real income per labourer, the level of living or per capita income for the agricultural labour household would vary directly with the number of earners per family and inversely with family size.

The factors determining the incidence of rural poverty may thus be classified into three broad groups. First we have factors like the distribution of land which directly affect the income of cultivating households and, second, factors like rural wage rates and wage employment which affect mainly the income of rural labour households. Both these sets of factors have been set aside in the present analysis. Only the third set of factors such as agricultural prices and production, which affect the incomes of both segments of the rural poor directly, have been taken up for analysis in this paper.

In a sense this is a re-examination of some of the conclusions reached in an earlier exercise where the effects of all the various factors identified above on the incidence of rural poverty were examined in the context of rural Bihar and Punjab-Haryana [Mundle 1982a

and 1982b]. These two regions were studied as representing polar cases in terms of agricultural performance. The inferences drawn on the basis of these two polar cases are re-examined here using data covering a set of fifteen states. However this re-examination is partial since it is confined to the effects of agricultural production and prices only. The effects of land distribution and trends in agricultural wages, wage employment or other factors related to the income of rural labour households have not been taken up here.

It must also be emphasised that the conclusions presented here are tentative. We are only reporting here the results of the first stage of a larger programme of work currently in progress. As any researcher in this area is well aware, each of the three main sets of data used here, i.e., the state level agricultural production data, the state level NSS consumer expenditure data and the state level index of agricultural and foodgrain prices present formidable problems for statistical analysis and interpretation. We hope to eventually present a better set of results based on more rigorous treatment of the data problems. At the same time we feel that it is important to report the present set of results, even if these are crude and tentative. This is because the issues involved here are quite crucial — both politically and economically — and the positions adopted on these questions are usually based on casual impressions, some prejudice and very little by way of real information.

INTERPRETING THE DATA

The reference period is 1963-64 to 1973-74 which begins just before the so-called Green Revolution and extends well into that phase. Hence the results reported below reflect the forces that have come into play during this period of agricultural growth. In this context we must distinguish carefully the question of poverty incidence from that of income distribution. In particular it must be noted that inferences drawn regarding the effect of certain economic factors on income distribution do not necessarily apply to the incidence of poverty as such.

Thus, it is generally believed that agricultural growth has been accompanied by increasing income inequality in the Green Revolution. Even if true it does not follow automatically that the incidence of poverty too should have increased. In principle we can have increasing inequality along with declining incidence of poverty. Similarly it

is quite plausible that among cultivating households inequality may increase with rising agricultural prices since the bigger farmers have larger surpluses and are also able to realise better prices — such that their gains are proportionately larger — compared to the peasants. Indeed there is evidence to confirm that this is the case. But it does not follow that the small peasant is worse off in an absolute sense. On the contrary it is conceivable that his income too may have increased. Unfortunately even these elementary distinctions are often lost sight of in the relevant literature. It has to be emphasised therefore that the present paper is concerned exclusively with the effect of agricultural prices and production on the incidence of rural poverty and that alone. The question of rural inequality has not been addressed.

Regarding the analysis of data the standard procedure now employed to test hypotheses regarding the incidence of rural poverty is to regress the relevant independent variables on some measure of poverty such as the proportion below a given poverty line or Sen's index of poverty.⁴ This was also the method adopted by this author in the earlier exercises on Bihar and Punjab-Haryana cited above. However there is some doubt as to the statistical validity of employing this method when we have no clear *a priori* expectation as to the form of the functional relationship between our measure of poverty and the independent variables. None of the usual functional forms employed in regression analysis may reflect the real form. It is not clear therefore precisely how the estimated coefficients are to be interpreted.

Analytically our real concern is to test whether the variables in question are positively or inversely related and whether the strength of the relationship is statistically significant. For this purpose the simple correlation coefficient, along with a test of statistical significance, seems to be quite adequate. Accordingly we have tested for the relationships in question using this measure and used the Z-transformation of the correlation coefficient, $Z = \frac{1}{2} \log_e \frac{(1+r)}{(1-r)}$, to test for statistical significance where r is the correlation coefficient and the expression $\sqrt{n-3}$ ($Z-0$) approximately follows the standard normal distribution, n being the number of observations.

The index of poverty used in the analysis is the proportion of population falling below the estimated poverty line corresponding to a daily intake of 2,435

calories per capita for each state in each year. A detailed note on the construction of poverty lines is given in the appendix. It is sufficient to point out here that a poverty line is important to our analysis only insofar as it gives us benchmark at which to observe whether the population is shifting upwards or downwards on the consumption scale. As such the choice of one or another poverty line is not really crucial to our analysis, unless of course the direction of change itself turns out to be sensitive to the choice of a poverty line. Sensitivity tests applied in the earlier exercises on Bihar and Punjab-Haryana using multiple poverty lines showed that while the actual values of the response elasticities did vary, the sign of the relationship between poverty incidence and the independent variables remained unchanged, and the statistical significance of estimated coefficients were similar, across different poverty lines. These tests have not been repeated in this exercise.

The index used for price is the state specific foodgrains price index in the ACPI series. A composite weighted producers price index of agricultural commodities would have been more appropriate but such an index is not available. The food price index, which is mainly a composite index of foodgrain prices, is therefore the most appropriate index available since foodgrains do account for the bulk of agricultural production in most states. For the same reason foodgrain production has been used as a proxy for agricultural production in the absence of a composite official measure of agricultural production or agricultural incomes at the state level. We have taken foodgrain production per head of rural population to capture the effect of rural population growth on rural per capita real income growth.

EFFECT OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

Our earlier reasoning on the factors underlying the incidence of rural poverty suggests that unless there are sufficiently strong offsetting forces at work an increase in agricultural production would tend to increase real incomes of both poor cultivating households as well as rural labour households. We may therefore expect an overall decline in the incidence of rural poverty with a rise in agricultural production per capita.

Table 1 gives the coefficient of correlation between these two variables for each of fifteen states. In six out of the fifteen states there is a statistically

TABLE 1: COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN INCIDENCE OF RURAL POVERTY AND PER CAPITA FOODGRAIN PRODUCTION

Positive Correlation		Negative Correlation	
Gujarat	0.263	Uttar Pradesh	- 0.824***
Andhra Pradesh	0.226	Tamil Nadu	- 0.815**
Assam	0.215	Bihar	- 0.718**
Rajasthan	0.146	Punjab and Haryana	- 0.609**
Maharashtra	0.093	West Bengal	- 0.528*
		Karnataka	- 0.396*
		Jammu and Kashmir	- 0.337
		Orissa	- 0.337
		Madhya Pradesh	- 0.175
		Kerala	- 0.032

Note: The asterisks indicate statistical significance at 1 per cent (***), 5 per cent (**) and 10 per cent (*) levels respectively.

TABLE 2: COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN INCIDENCE OF RURAL POVERTY AND TIME

Positive Correlation		Negative Correlation	
Assam	0.795***	Punjab and Haryana	- 0.752***
Rajasthan	0.432	Tamil Nadu	- 0.726*
Orissa	0.328	Karnataka	- 0.422
Madhya Pradesh	0.257	Uttar Pradesh	- 0.320
		West Bengal	- 0.316
		Andhra Pradesh	- 0.312
		Gujarat	- 0.251
		Jammu and Kashmir	- 0.226
		Maharashtra	- 0.198
		Kerala	- 0.097
		Bihar	- 0.038

Note: The asterisks indicate statistical significance at 1 per cent (***), 5 per cent (**) and 10 per cent (*) levels respectively.

significant negative correlation between poverty incidence and agricultural production (per capita foodgrain production being the proxy variable.) In Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Bihar and Punjab-Haryana the correlation is quite high (significant at 1 per cent or 5 per cent levels) while in West Bengal and Karnataka the correlation is moderate (significant at 10 per cent level). In another four states, i.e. Jammu and Kashmir, Orissa, Madhya Pradesh and Kerala the sign of the correlation coefficient is negative but it is not statistically significant. As against this we have five states where the sign of the correlation coefficient is positive, i.e. Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Rajasthan and Maharashtra. However the coefficient is not statistically significant in a single one of these cases.

This statistical picture is consistent with the hypothesis that increasing agricultural production tends to reduce the incidence of rural poverty. At any rate there is no evidence that it increases the incidence of rural poverty. At the same time our maintained hypothesis is only tentative since the data does not allow us to test any *ceteris paribus* propositions which require controlling for the other factors at work. Moreover it must be noted that in as many as nine out of the fifteen states

there is no statistically significant correlation between the two variables. This suggests that the production performance of agriculture is not a decisive factor underlying the incidence of rural poverty though improved performance does help to ameliorate poverty. This view is consistent with our earlier more detailed analysis of the Bihar and Punjab-Haryana region [Mundle 1982a and 1982b]. It is also consistent with the results derived by Ahluwalia (1978) using different methods and a somewhat different set of data. By the same token it differs from the views of Griffin and Ghosh (1979) and Saith (1981).

It has sometimes been suggested that correlation or regression exercises which basically capture the association between year-to-year variations in poverty incidence and agricultural production are not appropriate to capture the adverse effects of Green Revolution type agricultural growth on the rural poor since by their very nature these effects only work themselves out over the long run. If true this should show up as a distinct trend increase in rural poverty at least in a large number of states since these adverse effects of growth would be reinforced by other known adverse long term processes such as the steady decline in land:

man ratios.

Table 2 shows the state wise coefficients of correlation between incidence of rural poverty and the time variable. Barring the exceptional cases of Assam with high positive correlation, Punjab-Haryana with high negative correlation and Tamil Nadu with moderate negative correlation, we see no statistically significant correlation between rural poverty incidence and time. Regression enthusiasts can easily verify for themselves using the same data set that except in these three cases the time coefficient is statistically insignificant.

In other words except in the three cases cited there has neither been a trend increase or trend decrease in poverty incidence. These statistics could be interpreted to mean that agricultural growth is simply irrelevant to the incidence of poverty. Alternatively it could also be interpreted to mean that agricultural growth has helped offset the adverse effects of some long term processes which are known to be at work. This view would be consistent with our interpretation of Table 1. It would be further reiterated if the NSS survey for 1977-78 which is yet to be released to the public, were to show that there has been a sharp decline in poverty in 1977-78 compared to the early seventies in a number of states.

EFFECT OF AGRICULTURAL PRICES

The coefficient of correlation between the incidence of rural poverty and agricultural prices (the proxy variable used being foodgrain prices) is presented here in Table 3. We find a positive correlation between poverty incidence and agricultural price in eight out of the fifteen states. However barring the case of Assam, where the correlation is very high, the correlation coefficients are all statistically insignificant. Similarly we have seven other states where the sign of the correlation coefficient is negative. However except in the case of Punjab-Haryana, where it is moderately high (significant at 10 per cent level) the coefficients are statistically insignificant in all other cases.

In other words, in thirteen out of fifteen states, which between them account for the bulk of India's population and the rural poor, agricultural prices seem to have no significant effect on the incidence of rural poverty. Once again this is consistent with our earlier more detailed analysis of Bihar and Punjab-Haryana which showed that the observed price-poverty relationship was quite weak. The important question is how do we interpret these results?

TABLE 3: COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN INCIDENCE OF RURAL POVERTY AND FOODGRAIN PRICES

Positive Correlation		Negative Correlation	
Assam	0.937***	Tamil Nadu	— 0.655
Rajasthan	0.461	Punjab and Haryana	— 0.593*
Uttar Pradesh	0.416	Karnataka	— 0.293
Jammu and Kashmir	0.397	Andhra Pradesh	— 0.280
Bihar	0.329	Gujarat	— 0.263
Orissa	0.301	Maharashtra	— 0.093
West Bengal	0.110	Kerala	— 0.039
Madhya Pradesh	0.069		

Note: The asterisks indicate statistical significance at 1 per cent (***) and 10 per cent (*) respectively. The coefficient for Tamil Nadu is insignificant though it is higher than Punjab and Haryana because there are only seven observations for Tamil Nadu.

For one thing we see that there is no evidence at the state level, barring Assam, to support the view that an increase in agricultural prices has a general adverse influence on the incidence of rural poverty. At the same time it is difficult to believe that agricultural prices leave the rural poor unaffected. In terms of the *a priori* reasoning presented earlier it would appear that a rise or fall in agricultural prices has opposite effects on the two major strata of the rural poor which tend to offset each other thus leaving a minimal net effect on the overall incidence of rural poverty. In the case of agricultural labourers the kind component of wages only partially protects them from rising foodgrain prices. To the extent that they buy grain from the market rising prices erode their incomes and increase the incidence of poverty in this strata. On the other hand a large portion of the rural poor is made up of cultivating households who may be selling grain and also buying it at different points of the agricultural cycle or they may sell other crops and buy grain. The effect of rising agricultural prices on their real income depends therefore on whether they are net buyers or not sellers. The fact that the adverse effect of rising prices on wage-dependent households does not show up as an increase in the incidence of rural poverty suggests that in general these poor cultivating households are net sellers who enjoy real income gains which tend to offset the real income loss suffered by labour households when agricultural prices rise.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The main conclusions emerging out of our analysis of the effect of agricultural production and prices on the incidence of rural poverty in the states may now be briefly summarised as follows:

(i) Neither agricultural production nor agricultural prices seem to have a strong or decisive effect on the incidence of rural poverty. Other factors which have not been taken up here, but were examined in some detail in an earlier study of the Bihar and Punjab-Haryana regions, such as land distribution, wage rates and employment would appear to be more important.

(ii) Agricultural production is not significantly positively correlated with rural poverty in a single state whereas these variables have significant negative correlation in six out of fifteen states.

(iii) A statistically significant trend increase in rural poverty is noted only in Assam as against a significant trend decrease in rural poverty in Punjab-Haryana and also possibly Tamil Nadu. It could be argued that the absence of a trend increase in poverty in all other states, in spite of certain known adverse processes at work such as a declining land:man ratio, is attributable to the positive effects of agricultural growth.

(iv) There is no evidence, once again except in the case of Assam, of any significant positive correlation between rising agricultural prices and increased incidence of rural poverty.

(v) Since wage dependent rural labour households are clearly adversely affected by a rise in foodgrain prices, (iv) suggests that the real income loss of this strata tends to be offset by real income gains of the other major segment of the rural poor, i.e., cultivating households, who are therefore generally likely to be net sellers rather than net buyers of agricultural commodities.

Appendix

CONSTRUCTION OF POVERTY LINES FOR INDIVIDUAL STATES: 1963-64 TO 1973-74

The problems associated with the measurement of poverty lines and

poverty incidence are dealt with briefly as they have been discussed extensively in the relevant literature. In the original official attempt to estimate a poverty line the Planning Commission specified Rs 20.00 per capita per month at 1960-61 prices as the minimum norm of required expenditure for all India, including rural and urban areas (Planning Commission 1962). Allowing for rural-urban price differentials corresponding to this norm, Bardhan (1974) adopted the all India rural norm of Rs 15 per head per capita at 1960-61 prices. The same line was also adopted by Dandekar and Rath (1971) as meeting a minimum calorie intake requirement of 2250 calories per head per day. More recently the same norm has been adopted by Ahluwalia (1978) and Nayyar (1977) who made adjustments for inter-state price differentials in order to apply the norm to Bihar state.

However, the difficulty with an all India norm is not only that it fails to take account of inter-state price variations but also that it ignores variations across states in food habits and consumption preferences. Accordingly in some exercises pertaining to individual states such as Kerala [Panikar 1972], Punjab [Rajaraman 1977], etc, the procedure adopted was to find a state-specific least cost diet subject to a set of minimum nutrition constraints and taste preference constraints as a standard linear programming solution. The difficulty with this approach is that a great deal of arbitrariness and personal judgment gets built into the model in the specification of the taste-preference constraints such that it is not very clear what the solution actually represents.

The preferred procedure, therefore, is to examine consumer expenditure patterns state-wise to identify separately for each state which consumer expenditure level satisfies a given nutritional intake norm. This is possible using the NSS 26th round consumer expenditure survey for 1971-72 which gives state-wise data on the daily calorie and protein intake per consumer unit in each per capita expenditure class separately for rural and urban areas. In the present exercise we have followed this procedure, adopting as the intake norm 2435 calories per head per day. This is the norm recently recommended by the Nutrition Experts group set up by the Planning Commission [Planning Commission 1979]. The exact minimum expenditure level was computed by linear interpolation between the average per capita expendi-

TABLE A1: ESTIMATED POVERTY LINES FOR INDIVIDUAL STATES: 1963-64 TO 1973-74

(Rupees)

State	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74
Andhra Pradesh	22	27	29	33	34	36	37	36	39	44	52
Assam	25	29	32	42	49	46	41	45	47	48	58
Bihar	20	25	30	39	42	32	34	35	35	41	57
Gujarat	25	31	32	36	38	38	40	41	43	53	58
Jammu and Kashmir	—	23	26	31	29	26	28	29	29	35	45
Karnataka	21	28	33	34	38	37	36	38	39	44	56
Kerala	35	43	48	52	55	63	65	69	68	71	89
Madhya Pradesh	14	16	18	23	25	22	24	23	24	28	36
Maharashtra	28	38	40	44	46	44	46	48	52	61	69
Orissa	23	25	28	33	37	38	37	37	39	43	49
Punjab (including Haryana)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rajasthan	17	22	23	28	29	30	32	29	29	38	47
Tamil Nadu	—	—	—	—	40	42	45	41	41	45	57
Uttar Pradesh	—	26	26	33	37	28	31	29	30	37	47
West Bengal	31	32	40	46	56	47	46	48	49	51	64

Sources: (i) The National Sample Survey, 26th Round, July 1971-June 1972.

(ii) Agricultural Labourers Consumer Price Index from various issues of Agricultural Prices in India.

ture of the two classes with average per capita calorie intakes just above and below the specified norm.

These poverty lines at 1971-72 prices were then extrapolated to all years covering the period 1963-64 to 1973-74 using the state specific Agricultural Labourers Consumer Price Index (ACPI). This was available only from 1964-65 onwards for Uttar Pradesh and Jammu and Kashmir and 1967-68 onwards for Tamil Nadu. The time series of poverty lines constructed for each state are given here in Table A1. The use of ACPI as a general deflator for consumer expenditure can lead to serious errors since the prices of different items, accounting for different proportions of the consumption basket at different levels of consumer expenditure, have changed at different rates. However it will be evident that the problem arises mainly in the context of measuring changes in inequality of consumption expenditure over time. The ACPI is probably not a bad deflator for computing the current money value in different years of a fixed basket of 'poverty line' consumption.

The time series of poverty line consumption expenditure constructed for each state was then applied to the NSS state-wise rural tables of household distribution by consumer expenditure classes in order to estimate the percentage of rural population below the poverty line for all years in the period 1963-64 to 1973-74. The precise percentages were computed by linear interpolation within the expenditure class enclosing the poverty line on the assumption of even distribution of the population within the expenditure class.

The proportions so computed were taken as measures of the incidence of rural poverty over time for correlating variations in poverty incidence with variations in per capita foodgrain production and foodgrain prices in each state.

One difficulty with this 'head count' measure of poverty incidence is that it counts the proportion of population below a poverty line without taking any account of the distribution of that population below poverty line expenditure. Sen's Index [Sen 1973] does take account of this aspect and has been used by Bhatti (1974), Ahluwalia (1978) and others in India. However, it is an extremely complex index, not easily amenable to intuitive interpretation, especially when applied to grouped data. A less elegant but intuitively more appealing approach is to employ the conventional head count method but use multiple poverty lines to see whether the over time pattern is sensitive to the choice of a particular poverty line.

The use of multiple poverty lines also takes care of a second problem, namely, the specification of an appropriate minimum calorie intake norm. The current debate on this question among statisticians and nutrition experts in India suggests that the problem is almost intractable because there appear to be variations in calorie requirements not only between different persons but also for the same person on different days, and this is quite apart from the effect of variations in the nature of work or the environment. The problem can be circumvented by adopting multiple poverty lines, corresponding to different calorie intake norms, and

checking to see whether the patterns of poverty incidence are sensitive to the choice of a particular line.

In the present exercise such sensitivity tests have not been applied. However in an earlier exercise dealing with Bihar and Punjab (including Haryana), in some sense polar cases with regard to agricultural performance, the sensitivity tests using multiple poverty lines were applied [Mundle 1982a and 1982b]. It turned out that the numerical value of the response elasticities of poverty incidence with respect to agricultural production and prices were different at different poverty lines. However the broad qualitative relationship between these variables, or the lack of it, was invariant with respect to the choice of a particular poverty line.

Notes

[This is a slightly revised version of a paper prepared for the seminar on Development and Inter-regional Disparities in India at Giri Institute of Development Studies, Lucknow, March 1983. I am grateful to J Muraleedharan Nair and Sujana Bai for their help with the computations. I have also benefitted from useful discussions with Rajaram Dasgupta, Chandan Mukherjee, Ashok Nag and K N Raj.]

- 1 See William Digby, "Prosperous British India", London, 1901.
- 2 See "Perspective of Development: 1961-1976. Implications of Planning for a Minimum Level of Living", Perspective Planning Division, Planning Commission, 1962.
- 3 Most of the important work of this period has been put together in the volume edited by Bardhan and Srinivasan (1974).
- 4 See for instance Ahluwalia (1978),

Griffin and Ghosh (1979), Saith (1981) or the last uncompleted work of the late Dharan Narain.

References

- Ahluwalia M S (1978): "Rural Poverty and Agricultural Growth in India", *Journal of Development Studies*, April, 1978.
- Bardhan P K [1974]: "On the Incidence of Poverty in Rural India in the Sixties", in Bardhan P K and Srinivasan T N (ed), (1974).
- Bardhan P K and T N Srinivasan (ed), [1974]: "Poverty and Income Distribution in India", Statistical Publishing Society, Calcutta, 1974.
- Bhatty I Z [1974]: "Inequality and Poverty in Rural India", in Bardhan P K and Srinivasan T N (ed), (1974).
- Griffin K and A K Ghosh [1979]: "Growth and Impoverishment in the Rural Areas of Asia", *World Development*, Volume 7, No 4 and 5.
- Mundle S [1982a]: "Land, Labour and the Level of Living in Rural Bihar" (mimeo), ILO, (ARTEP) 1982.
- Mundle S [1982b]: "Land, Labour and the Level of Living in Rural Punjab" (mimeo), ILO (ARTEP) 1982.
- Nayyar S [1977]: "Poverty and Inequality in Rural Bihar", in "Poverty and Landlessness in Rural Asia", ILO, Geneva, 1977.
- Panikar P G K [1972]: "Economics of Nutrition", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Annual Number, February 1972.
- Planning Commission [1962]: "Perspective of Development: 1961-1976 Implications of Planning for a Minimum Level of Living", reprinted in Bardhan P K and Srinivasan T N (ed), (1974).
- Planning Commission [1979]: "Report of the Task Force on Projection of Minimum Needs and Effective Consumption Demand", Perspective Planning Division, Planning Commission, 1974.
- Rajaraman I [1977]: "Growth and Poverty in the Rural Areas of the Indian State of Punjab", in "Poverty and Landlessness in Rural Asia", ILO, Geneva, 1977.
- Saith A [1981]: "Production, Prices and Poverty in Rural India", *Journal of Development Studies*, January 1981.
- Sen A [1973]: "Poverty, Inequality and Unemployment", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Special Number, August 1973.

Movement Restrictions, Procurement, and Market Price

A Case Study of Tamil Nadu

T Prabha

Under conditions of short supply of foodgrains, government intervention in India has taken the form of price control, acquisition of foodgrains through compulsory levies on producers/traders/millers at prices fixed by government, and ancillary measures such as zoning and movement restrictions, imports to augment domestic supplies, and controlled distribution of rice and wheat through rationing.

This paper presents a critical assessment of the movements restriction policy of the government of Tamil Nadu. It focuses mainly on the following issues:

- (a) *The influence of zonal arrangements (i.e., inter-district movement restrictions) on the volume of procurement.*
- (b) *The impact of movement restrictions on market price.*

It arrives at certain conclusions about the relation between procurement levels and method or source of procurement, nature of movement restrictions, differential between open market price and procurement price and between prices in surplus and deficit regions, and non-price factors.

I

Background of Food Policy

UNDER conditions of short supply of foodgrains, government intervention in India has taken the form of price control, acquisition of foodgrains through compulsory levies on producers/traders/millers at prices fixed by government, and ancillary measures such as zoning and movement restrictions, imports to augment domestic supplies, and controlled distribution of rice and wheat through rationing.

This paper presents a critical assessment of the movements restriction policy of the government of Tamil Nadu. It focuses mainly on the following issues:

- (a) The influence of zonal arrangements (i.e., inter-district movement restrictions) on the volume of procurement.
- (b) The impact of movement restrictions on market price.

The procurement policy imposed certain movement restriction from one

zone to another. Under the zonal arrangements¹ made in India in 1964, the country was divided as foodgrains surplus and foodgrains deficit zones (or States) and private trade movement of foodgrains from one State to another was prohibited, with government taking the responsibility of procuring foodgrains from surplus States and distributing them under the public distribution system in the deficit States. The defence of the system is best summarised in the Foodgrains Policy Committee Report of 1966, in the following words:

There is more than one reason why government should be in charge of the inter-State trade in foodgrains. First, this is necessary for ensuring equitable distribution to different States; trade, if untrammelled, would tend to move the surpluses of one State to points of highest purchasing power in another and not to those of greatest need. Second it would enable government to keep prices at levels which are reasonable for both consumer and producer; private

trade by catering for the well-to-do consumer, would be in a position to push up prices if allowed to compete with government. Third, if the trade is allowed to purchase within the State and sell outside it on its own account, it would not be possible to ensure maximum procurement by government and government agencies.²

Before discussing the point, as to whether or not movement restriction has attained its proclaimed objectives, it is necessary to indicate the movement restriction policy of the government of Tamil Nadu from 1964. Madras State was part of the southern zone from 1957 onwards. Madras State faced its worst food crisis in 1964. As a consequence, Madras State was made a separate zone. In order to meet the situation of crisis, the State government organised a system of procurement and distribution. To facilitate procurement operations, movement outside the State was banned. The launching of massive procurement