



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

Vol XVII
No. 3

ISSN 0019-5014

JULY-
SEPTEMBER
1962

INDIAN JOURNAL OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS



INDIAN SOCIETY OF
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
BOMBAY

veys and collection of data care should be exercised not only in laying down its scope but also in the choice of aspects for scrutiny and of accuracy and relevance of information collected. Where results arise on account of more than one factor, they should be clearly pointed out to explain any possible conflicts that might be read from the analysis.

Again, based on the analysis of land transactions that took place after land reforms, the reader is given to understand that they are a by-product of land reforms and reflect favourably on the agrarian financial conditions. While on this analysis, the high land values were surprisingly attributed to land reforms as well as favourable prices of farm produce. Free transfer of resources including land within and between sectors would measure the relative remunerativeness of resources as between sectors. They would promote resource flows to points of maximum returns. Under Indian conditions, however, they precisely tend to do the opposite and cause distress. It is for these reasons that numerous restrictions on land transactions have been imposed in our country.

Going through the analysis on agricultural finance, it is difficult to resist the urge to put together such remarks as 'the money lender seems to be doing roaring business', 'co-operative finance is getting a foothold' and 'private finance in agriculture is gradually languishing' to underline the contradictions, unless of course, the comments relate to performances at different points of time or refers to different sectors of agricultural classes. Co-operative finance did not exist in Saurashtra. Concerted efforts to organise co-operative movement began after 1951. Unless co-operative credit has reference to mortgage finance to pay compensation, it is difficult to reconcile the achievements with the actual conditions which then prevailed. This is aside from the question of relevance of the analysis to the major theme of research. It is not possible to discern an attempt to relate the shifts in the quantum or pattern of agricultural finance to land reforms.

These comments are offered in a constructive vein and are in the nature of an academic exchange. They are certainly not made disparagingly towards the author who has attempted a difficult piece of evaluation under heavy odds. Most of our colleges have little of tradition, facilities and scope for economic research. To have done a major research study under such conditions speaks volumes for the author's capacity to do sustained and systematic work.

M. B. DESAI

Report on an Economic Study of Small Farming in Jamaica, David Edwards, Institute of Social and Economic Research, University College of the West Indies, Kingston, Jamaica, Robert Mac Lehosé and Co. Ltd., University Press, Glasgow, Great Britain, 1961. Pp. 370. 28s.

In the above publication the author reports on a field survey carried out in nine typical farm regions of Jamaica. He covered a sample of 87 farmers for extensive study in one round and 27 farmers for intensive study in 52 weekly rounds. The regions are purposively selected but farmers are selected by random sample. He makes no claim to statistically representative sample. The information was

collected in eight different schedules relating to farm history, employment, inventory, production, extension channels, improvement plans, and incomes and levels of living.

Jamaica, though a low income country, would rank fairly high among countries with low income, its annual income being £78 per capita. It shared with under-developed countries the surging tide of population increase—2.5 per cent per annum—which could not be absorbed in gainful occupation despite the fact that nearly half of additions to labour force emigrated abroad, with the result, it suffered from extensive unemployment—12 per cent of labour force being unemployed (under-employed ?).

The report leaves on us two major impressions : Firstly, problems of small farmers in Jamaica resemble in essence to those in other under-developed countries despite Jamaica's different economic background. These problems can be traced to relatively abundant labour and severe capital rationing. Secondly, problems of the small farmer are in a way an adjustment of the economy to the given circumstances, through the operation of market forces. Hence, the problems of the small farmer would need attention for an early solution but no partial solution will endure unless the entire economy is made to move forward.

The problems of the small farmers as depicted by the author with the help of detailed statistics can be summarised as under. We take up only the major ones.

In Jamaica small farmers constitute mainly the descendants of old 'slaves' ; slavery in Jamaica was abolished a century ago. They cultivate land with poor soil on hillside, 46 per cent of them were part tenants with their holdings fragmented. Investment on these farms is mostly their own, liabilities being only 3 per cent of the total assets (p. 124). Current loans are mostly borrowed for short term and for financing crop production (50 per cent) and for family living (1/7) (p. 137). Interest rate was above 10 per cent for 80 per cent of amount borrowed (p. 137). They use mostly hand tools (p. 140). Average annual employment of the family in 1954-55 was 3,884 hours (p. 141) mostly (60 per cent) for crop production. On farms, 84 per cent of the labour is supplied by the family. Out of the total output 23 per cent was consumed on farm. Average annual (profit ?) income per farm was £11 (p. 184) with 12 out of 27 farms incurring losses (p. 184). Average return on capital was 5 per cent (against 10 per cent interest rate) (p. 184) and average labour income of the family was £50 per annum. Non-farm income constituted 27 per cent of the total family income (p. 187). Level of nutrition was below the recommended standard in regard to protein as well as calories though health on the whole was not poor.

Small farmers, most of them, received minimum formal education for 8 years, yet their attitude was conservative. They would not borrow for long-term and would avoid registering title to land (which would enable them to borrow on long-term) to avoid the temptation of borrowing on long-term in future despite the fact that the price risk (through fluctuations in prices) was not heavy, and they had to combat only the natural calamity of 'polar air'. Their professional knowledge was mostly inherited from parents and somewhat from personal trials (p. 79). Their contact with the headman (the lowest extension agency) was low (17/45).

They did contact extension officers (32 out of 68 farmers) and consulted them but their contact was at the best casual (p. 83). They did not benefit from this contact. They employed women and children on farm but would withdraw their labour as soon as their income would rise (p. 78).

Most of the land they cultivated they owned, unowned being 7.5 per cent (p. 93) and more than half of the unowned land was of relatives and rent free. Rent per acre was £1 to 2 (p. 113) against average land value of £35 per acre and the lowest of £15 to £17 per acre. Despite low rent, soil being poor, many of them found difficult to meet this cash commitment.

Barring the history of slavery and tenure, the above picture would fit description of the small farmer in most of the low income countries. Even this little detail—per acre yield is higher on small farms—also fits well. Against 38 per cent of land under small holdings, their contribution amounted to 50 per cent of gross farm output. The author has concluded that the small farm in Jamaica is “technically bad, but economically it appears to represent a reasonable response to the conditions under which farming is practised.” It is worth noting that technical improvement would depend on entrepreneurship as much as on the type of technical research. The technical research in Jamaica till recently was geared to the needs of exports and large farms particularly and for mango and citrus tree crops, once again an experience common to most of the low income countries. And this proves a hard obstacle to overcome for finding an enduring solution in most of the under-developed countries.

We would welcome the study for what it contains rather than complain about the scientific representativeness of the sample.

C. H. SHAH

Food, Land and Manpower in Western Europe, Lamartine P. Yates, Macmillan & Co. Ltd., London, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1960. Pp. xiii + 294. 35s.

Western Europe is facing a new situation. There is a new desire for prosperity, a new dynamism in industry, and a new scarcity of labour. In the light of this new situation, what are the changes required in the organisation of food production? The purpose of this book is to provide an answer to this question. The problem is more sharply posed by relating the probable increase in food production with the probable demand for food.

A descriptive account of the levels of consumption and nutritional status in each country precedes an estimate of the increase in farm-gate demand for food production in 1970. Basic characteristics of farmers in each country, a review of farm organisation and efficiency, and of programmes undertaken to strengthen and to stabilise the family farm and to modernise agriculture precede an estimate of the increase in agricultural output in 1970. A statistical account of exports and imports of food in each country is given to complete the picture of demand for and supply of food output.