A Comprehensive Evaluation of India's 2020 Agricultural Laws and Their Effects on Farming Policy

Shivaray Sindagi

Indian Council of Historical Research - Junior Research Fellow, Teaching Faculty, Department of History, Post Graduate Center, Bangalore University, Ramanagara.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22105228

ABSTRACT:

Both domestically and internationally, the three agricultural reform laws passed by the Indian government in 2020 are widely regarded as important and long-overdue initiatives. Nonetheless, several stakeholders have voiced significant criticism and called for its repeal, including farmers, state governments, and policy analysts. This essay examines the justification for these legislative modifications and situates them within the broader context of reforming agricultural policy. It describes the continuous attempts over the past two decades by various central governments to persuade states to implement market-oriented agriculture reforms. The study assesses the potential impacts of the three acts on Agricultural Produce Market Committees (APMCs), the Minimum Support Price (MSP) system, farmer livelihoods, and the rural economy as a whole, by closely examining their key provisions and objectives. It also addresses the objections and concerns expressed by agricultural associations and other groups. According to the report, these laws are the result of a reform effort that began in 1991, aiming to integrate and finalize the fragmented and inconsistent policy changes that had been attempted in many states in the past. The article also aims to clarify misconceptions about the law and provide guidance to help states effectively implement it. It concludes by emphasizing how these reforms could enhance Indian agriculture, promote modernization, and initiate a more comprehensive transformation in the country's rural economy.

KEYWORDS:

Farm Laws, APMC, MSP, Dissent, Contract Farming.

Introduction

Over half of India's workforce is employed in the agricultural sector. This sector has long been a vital part of the country's economy, significantly shaping the socioeconomic makeup of rural areas (Government of India 2021). Despite its significance, this industry has remained largely immune to the liberalization movements that have transformed other sectors of the Indian economy since 1991 (Gulati and Fan 2007). To modernize agricultural marketing, encourage private investment, and grant farmers greater autonomy, the Indian government enacted three agricultural laws in 2020, recognizing the need for structural reforms. These regulations, which were first proposed as ordinances in June 2020 and subsequently passed by Parliament in September of the same year, were presented as important steps to eliminate outdated regulatory frameworks and provide farmers with new options (Press Information Bureau 2020). With an emphasis on strengthening forward links between farmers and markets, they sought to rethink the trading, contracting, and storage of agricultural products (Chand 2020).

However, there was considerable debate surrounding the implementation of these measures. Concerned that the new legislation would undermine the Minimum Support Price (MSP) system, reduce the function of Agricultural Produce Market Committees (APMCs), and expose smallholders to corporate exploitation, farmers from Punjab, Haryana, and several other states began protracted protests (Ghosh 2021; Singh 2021). Kerala and other state governments formally rejected the bill, citing constitutional concerns and possible threats to federal sovereignty (Chatterjee and Mohanty 2021). The Supreme Court of India responded by halting the implementation of the laws and forming a committee to examine their effects (Supreme Court of India 2021).

This essay provides a critical examination of the history, content, and contentious reception of the 2020 agricultural acts. It addresses the concerns raised by critics and farmer unions, assesses the potential impact of the changes on key institutions and stakeholders, and situates them within the broader context of agricultural policy evolution in India. By doing this, it aims to offer a fair assessment of whether these laws represent a real breakthrough or a regression in India's agricultural development.

The Three Farm Laws

The Farmers' Produce Trade and Commerce (Promotion and Facilitation) Act, 2020:

To liberalize India's agricultural marketing system, the Farmers' Produce Trade and Commerce (Promotion and Facilitation) Act, 2020, was passed. It gives farmers more flexibility and access to a wider range of buyers by enabling them to sell their produce outside of the official Agricultural Produce Market Committee (APMC) mandis (Government of India 2020). The act encourages a more unified national agricultural market by removing obstacles to intra- and inter-state commerce. The development of electronic trading platforms, which are intended to streamline transactions, increase transparency, and reduce dependency on physical marketplaces, is a noteworthy component of this legislation (Gulati, Terway, and Hussain 2020). By allowing sales to take place at any location of production, gathering, or aggregation rather than only designated market yards, the act significantly broadens the scope of acceptable trading places.

Perhaps most importantly, the law forbids state governments from imposing market fees, cesses, or levies on international trading that takes place outside of the APMC framework. The goal of this program is to encourage private sector participation and reduce transaction costs (Narayanan 2020). By allowing farmers to communicate directly with private buyers, processors, exporters, and retailers, the law seeks to eliminate the monopoly of government-controlled mandis and improve price realization and market accessibility.

Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Act, 2020:

In order to formalize and regulate the agreements made between farmers and agribusiness companies, processors, wholesalers, or exporters, this act establishes a comprehensive national framework for contract farming. It creates a legal framework that permits farmers to enter into written pre-production contracts that specify the terms under which livestock or agricultural goods will be reared or cultivated for the contracting party. These agreements include detailed clauses pertaining to the amount, quality, grade, standards, delivery dates, and pricing policies of the agricultural goods or services in question (Government of India

2020a; Chand 2020). The act seeks to ensure market stability and price security in this way, especially for small and marginal farmers who often face volatility in open markets.

The act creates a three–tiered dispute resolution process to safeguard farmers' interests and ensure fair contract enforcement. This approach includes: A Conciliation Board for preliminary dialogue–based resolution. If conciliation fails, the Sub–Divisional Magistrate (SDM) will make a formal decision; if not, an Appellate Authority will review and appeal the decision further (Government of India 2020a). In conclusion, by reducing market risks, encouraging private investment, and fostering long–term partnerships, the legislation aims to empower farmers. It also includes measures to prevent exploitation and guarantee responsibility.

Essential Commodities (Amendment) Act, 2020:

This act provides a significant shift in India's agricultural trade and storage regulations. The act aims to deregulate the production, storage, transportation, and distribution of these important food items by removing grains, pulses, oilseeds, edible oils, onions, and potatoes from the list of essential commodities (Government of India 2020b). The goal of this program is to encourage private sector participation, reduce administrative obstacles, and encourage investment in agricultural infrastructure, such as warehouses and cold chains (Gulati, Terway, and Hussain 2020).

The amended laws state that, in normal circumstances, stockholding limits for these commodities will not be applicable. Only in extreme situations like a war, hunger, a major natural disaster, or a sharp price change—may such limitations be put into effect. In particular, regulatory action is permitted if the cost of non–perishable items (like grains, pulses, and edible oils) increases by more than 50% or if the yearly retail price of horticulture products (like potatoes and onions) increases by more than 100% (Narayanan 2020).

Additionally, the law provides exemptions for food processors and exporters, ensuring that operations continue even during emergencies. Furthermore, it mandates that any stock restriction implementation be closely linked to price developments to reduce capricious government intervention and enhance market predictability (Chand 2020). In conclusion, the legislation seeks to promote a more market–oriented atmosphere by permitting agribusinesses to freely stock and sell while also addressing the need for consumer protection in some dire circumstances. This is a major step in opening up India's agricultural supply chain and bringing it into line with global best practices.

Arguments

In Favour of the Farm Acts

With the potential for major alteration, the new agricultural regulations are viewed as a crucial shift for Indian agriculture. By empowering farmers, boosting industry participation, and enhancing consumer results, these changes seek to benefit the entire agricultural value chain (Chand 2020; Gulati, Terway, and Hussain 2020). Small and marginal farmers, who make up 86% of India's farming population and frequently fight for fair prices and investment, are the main beneficiaries of the changes (Government of India 2021). The laws aim to lessen dependency on middlemen and stabilize incomes by establishing new marketing avenues and enabling direct buyer connections. By increasing transparency, decreasing inefficiencies, and simplifying the marketing and distribution of agricultural products, the new policy framework is anticipated to promote a more competitive and integrated agricultural market. Modernizing agriculture and creating a more robust rural economy are the goals of these projects.

The act addresses the shortcomings of APMC regulations by enabling higher price realization for farmers and fostering a unified national agricultural market.

Laws like the APMC Act, which governed India's agricultural markets, created a centralized system that limited farmer participation and hindered competition. The industry experienced inefficiency and exploitation as a result of excessive commissions, market fees, and the dominating influence of trading groups. In order to address these issues, new law aims to dismantle the state-run mandis' monopoly, enabling farmers to communicate with private buyers directly and avoid APMCs (Narayanan 2020; Ghosh 2021). Farmers now have more liberty and independence when it comes to marketing their produce, thanks to these improvements.

By increasing their market options for selling agricultural products, the law aims to empower farmers and improve their capacity to fetch higher prices (Gulati et al. 2020). It permits private businesses to purchase straight from the farm gates, reducing transportation costs, and it gives small and marginal farmers access to competitive markets. As a result, farmers are expected to receive a greater share of consumer pricing, which is currently projected to be around 15% (Chand 2020; Ghosh 2021). This might increase rural incomes and promote wider economic development by increasing demand in rural areas.

By encouraging smooth trade between and among states with the aid of computerized trading platforms, the program seeks to create a single national agricultural market (Government of India 2020). It is anticipated that this strategy will rectify the current regional disparities in agricultural demand and supply. As a result, customers in areas experiencing shortages will profit from cheaper pricing, while farmers in areas with excess supply will be able to achieve better prices for their goods. This dual benefit is intended to improve the agricultural market's overall effectiveness and guarantee more equitable financial circumstances for everyone concerned.

Risk Mitigation, Improved Price Discovery, and Enhanced Farm Productivity Through Contract Farming

Small and marginal farmers can greatly benefit from contract farming since it transfers market-related risks from the farmer to the sponsoring business (Singh 2002). By reducing pricing and marketing uncertainty, this arrangement shields farmers from potential financial losses. Farmers can cut out middlemen and improve price realization and marketing expenses by entering into direct contracts with purchasers (Barrett et al. 2012). The benefit of these arrangements is usually assured purchase at set prices, which guarantees farmers a steady income. Contract farming also gives you access to top-notch inputs, cutting-edge agricultural technologies, and knowledgeable advice. Farmers can lower input costs and increase productivity thanks to this support (Birthal et al. 2005).

Boost to Private Sector Participation and Legal Safeguards for Farmers

By increasing the private sector's involvement in agricultural procurement, the law aims to reduce the burden on the government (Gulati, Terway, and Hussain 2020). Contract farming shields private organizations from changes in market prices while offering a consistent and reliable supply of raw materials. Importantly, the Act's legal framework ensures that farmers can enter into agreements with buyers on reasonable terms, removing the possibility of exploitation. The goal of the provision for a fair, profitable, and mutually agreed-upon price is to protect and empower farmers (Government of India 2020). Notably, the Act protects farmers' land ownership and rights by expressly prohibiting the sale, lease, or mortgage of their land under any contract farming agreement. Additionally, farmers are shielded from any land-related recovery measures (Singh 2021). A robust dispute resolution process with well-defined deadlines has been incorporated to further improve farmer protection by guaranteeing the timely and efficient handling of grievances.

Addressing existing gaps, the reforms aim to attract private investment and enhance forward linkage infrastructure.

A thorough analysis of the Essential Commodities Act (ECA) is given in the Economic Survey 2019-20, which shows that government actions taken under the ECA of 1955 have often affected agricultural commerce without effectively controlling inflation (Ministry of Finance 2020). Farmers suffer significant losses as a result of the provision allowing for sudden stock restrictions, which deters traders from purchasing big quantities, especially during times of surplus, especially for perishable goods (Gulati, Terway, and Hussain 2020). Furthermore, a major deterrent to private investment in vital infrastructure like cold storage, warehousing, food processing, and exports is the continuous possibility of governmental restrictions. Because of the uncertainty surrounding the Act's enforcement, entrepreneurs are hesitant to make investments. These restrictions also make it more difficult for India to use exports to profit from rising agricultural prices worldwide. Increased private and international direct investment in the agriculture industry is expected as a result of the ECA's revision and deregulation. A robust supply chain infrastructure may be established with the help of this investment boom, enhancing the domestic and international distribution of Indian agricultural products (Gulati et al. 2020).

Arguments Against the Farm Acts

Concerns have been raised that the new restrictions could endanger the welfare of the farming community after a number of agricultural organizations and other interested parties denounced the Acts for favoring corporations over farmers. Numerous political groups have strongly opposed this policy, which has led to widespread protests, particularly among Punjabi farmers.

Contrary to the Principles of Federalism: Concerns Regarding the MSP System:

Many people believe that the new Acts are an overreach by the Center, infringing on the authority of State governments and violating the cooperative federalism principle outlined in the Constitution, because agriculture and markets are listed in the State List (Entries 14 and 28 of List II) (Kumar 2020; Ghosh 2021). However, the Central Government maintains that it has constitutional authority and asserts that the Concurrent List regulates trade and commerce in food items (Government of India 2020).

Concerns have been expressed by farmers that the new approach may eventually weaken the existing Minimum Support Price (MSP) structure. They fear that promoting tax-free private commerce outside of the APMC mandis may render these controlled marketplaces unprofitable, which could result in fewer government purchases (Narayanan 2020). Because it may divert trade away from government-run APMCs and intermediaries, the emergence of private mandis is seen as a threat to the traditional agricultural marketing system. These markets run the risk of losing their importance and revenue as more and more transactions take place outside of the APMC network. There is concern that big corporations may take over the market and purchase agricultural goods at deeply discounted prices. Critics argue that removing the APMCs' monopoly could signal the end of guaranteed procurement at MSP, which would reduce farmers' bargaining leverage and expose them to changes in the market (Ghosh 2021). The absence of legal support for MSP in the most recent legislation is a significant problem, particularly for farmers in Punjab and Haryana, where the Food Corporation of India and state agencies purchase a significant proportion of wheat (65% in 2019) at MSP (Singh 2020; Kumar 2020). The reforms' detractors contend that rather than marginalizing APMCs, the focus should be on strengthening them and expanding MSP coverage to help more farmers, preserving crucial state–supported agricultural marketing institutions in the process.

Key challenges faced by farmers is the absence of a clear price fixation mechanism.

Due to their limited understanding of contract terms and their lack of negotiation power when dealing with major firms, small and marginal farmers may be vulnerable to abuse. Given the fragmented nature of the agricultural industry and their limited capacity to take legal action against wealthy private companies, critics worry that formal contract arrangements may disadvantage farmers. The Price Assurance Act does not offer a clear process for setting prices, despite its intention to shield farmers against price exploitation. Concerns over the potential exploitation of farmers have increased as a result of this circumstance and the broad latitude granted to corporations.

Concerns Over Food Insecurity, Price Volatility, and Unclear Guidelines.

Easing restrictions on food commodities, according to critics, might incite merchants, processors, and exporters to hoard agricultural products during harvest season, when supply is plentiful and prices are low, and then release them when prices rise. By creating artificial scarcity, this behaviour has the potential to seriously jeopardize food security in addition to upsetting market dynamics (Gulati, Terway, and Hussain 2020; Narayanan 2020). Additionally, there are concerns that this kind of deregulation would lead to more price instability and encourage the illegal market for necessities.

Critics contend that the criteria for triggering regulation are too general and imprecise, even though the Act creates a price trigger mechanism for activating the Essential Commodities Act (ECA). Important elements are left unclear and open to interpretation because the method does not explicitly define price thresholds based on local or regional market conditions. This ambiguity raises questions regarding the mechanism's ability to adequately protect farmers and consumers from market manipulation (Economic Survey 2019–20), as well as the consistency and equity of enforcement (Gulati et al. 2020).

Critical Analysis

According to Article 246 of the Constitution, state governments have jurisdiction over "agriculture" (designated to Entry 14) and "markets and fairs" (designated to Entry 28) of the State List. On the other hand, the Central Government is authorized to regulate interstate trade and commerce by Entry 42 of the Union List (Kaushal 2021; Singh 2020). Although "within the state" trade and commerce are regulated by Entry 26 of the State List, Entry 33 of the Concurrent List also has an impact. This specific entry gives the Center the authority to enact laws pertaining to the trade and commerce of necessities like food, cotton, jute, fodder, edible oilseeds, and oils (Bhatia and Verma 2021).

As a result, Entry 33 of the Concurrent List gives the Center the authority to enact laws that remove barriers to agricultural goods trade within and between states. These laws supersede any conflicting state laws, including APMC Acts (Kaushal 2021). In order to promote free trade in agricultural products across state borders, the Farmers' Produce Trade and Commerce (FPTC) Act essentially supersedes current state laws, drawing its power from this constitutional provision (Chand 2020).

Some experts make a distinction between "marketing" and "trade" in agriculture. Agriculture encompasses all of the work that a farmer does, from clearing land and growing crops to marketing their goods. Just as the producing process itself is considered to be a part of "agriculture," so is the farmer's initial sale of food at a mandi (Narayanan 2020). On the other hand, "trade" doesn't start until the farmer has completed selling their produce. Given this distinction, the Center has the authority to enact legislation that facilitates the free flow of agricultural products between states, including removing limits on exports and stockholding, but only after the farmer has made their first sale (Bhatia and Verma 2021). The state is still in charge of monitoring the initial sale of agricultural products under the heading of marketing. The judiciary will ultimately be responsible for determining whether the 2020 farm legislation is constitutional.

Conclusion

Even though the new agricultural legislation aimed to give farmers more flexibility and access to markets, there was a lot of misinformation that led to resistance, particularly over the continued use of the Minimum Support Price (MSP) system and concerns about land loss from contract farming. However, neither contract farming nor the MSP framework was eliminated by the laws; land ownership was still protected by the law. Structural reforms in agriculture were long overdue and crucial given the significant strain on India's farming sector, especially small and marginal farmers. The proposed reforms had received backing from institutions like the IMF and were consistent with worldwide trends that encourage private sector involvement to modernize the industry.

However, long-lasting protests were caused by problems with implementation, ignorance, and a lack of trust. Important issues like guaranteeing fair prices, preserving current safety nets like MSP, giving farmers more negotiating leverage, and creating infrastructure to support them all remained crucial. Amidst persistent resistance, the government announced in November 2021 that all three farm laws would be repealed, promising to present a new bill before Parliament to formally withdraw them. All organizations created in accordance with the Acts were dissolved, and their rulings were deemed void. Going forward, any reform efforts must be transparent, inclusive, and founded on agreement with all parties involved, particularly the farming community.

References:

1. Barrett, Christopher B., Michael E. Carter, and C. Peter Timmer. "Contract Farming and Inclusive Growth: What Do We Know and Where Do We Go?" World Development 40, no. 5 (2012): 715–725.
2. Bhatia, Rishi, and Anjali Verma. "Constitutional Jurisdiction and Agricultural Trade in India: An Analysis of the 2020 Farm Laws." Indian Journal of Constitutional Law 9 (1) (2021): 45–61.
3. Birthal, Pratap S., P.K. Joshi, and Ashok Gulati. Vertical Coordination in High-Value Food Commodities: Implications for Smallholders. New Delhi: IFPRI and NCAP. (2005).
4. Chand, Ramesh. Agricultural Marketing Reforms in India: Background, Context, and Potential Impact. New Delhi: NITI Aayog, (2020).
5. Chatterjee, Patralekha, and Suchitra Mohanty. "India's Farm Laws and the Federal Faultline." The Diplomat, January 25, (2021).
6. Economic Survey 2019–20. Volume I. Ministry of Finance, Government of India,

(2020).

7. Ghosh, Jayati. "India's Farm Laws: A Case of Corporate-Led Reform?" Development and Change 52(5) (2021): 1125–1136.
8. Government of India. The Farmers' Produce Trade and Commerce (Promotion and Facilitation) Act, 2020. Ministry of Law and Justice, New Delhi, September 24, (2020).
9. Government of India. 2020a. The Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Act, Ministry of Law and Justice, (2020).
10. Government of India. 2020b. The Essential Commodities (Amendment) Act, 2020. Ministry of Law and Justice, (2020).
11. Government of India. Agricultural Census 2015-16 (All-India Report). Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare, (2021).
12. Chatterjee Government of India. Annual Report 2020-21. Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare, (2021).
13. Ghosh, Jayati. "India's Farm Laws: A Case of Corporate-Led Reform?" Development and Change 52 (5) (2021): 1125–1136.
14. Gulati, Ashok, and Shenggen Fan. The Dragon and the Elephant: Agricultural and Rural Reforms in China and India. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, (2007).
15. Gulati, Ashok, Partha Pratim Saha, and Sanchit Terway. Three Farm Bills: Removing the Shackles. New Delhi: Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER), (2020).
16. Gulati, Ashok, Sanchit Terway, and Siraj Hussain. Three Farm Bills: Removing the Shackles. Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER), (2020).
17. Birthal Kaushal, Ankit. "Farm Laws and Federalism: Navigating Constitutional Jurisdiction." Journal of Indian Political Science 82 (2) (2021): 123–137.
18. Kumar, Sanjay. "Federalism and Farm Bills: Centre's Overreach into State Jurisdiction." The India Forum, October 2, (2020).
19. Ministry of Finance. Economic Survey 2019-20, Volume I. Department of Economic Affairs, Government of India, (2020).
20. Narayanan, Sudha. 2020. "Distinguishing Marketing and Trade in Agricultural Law." Economic and Political Weekly 55 (44) (2020): 13–17.
21. Narayanan, Sudha. "Essential Commodities Act Amendment: A Step Towards Market Liberalisation?" Economic and Political Weekly 55 (47) (2020): 18-21.
22. Narayanan, Sudha. "The Contract Farming Act, 2020: A Critical Appraisal." Economic and Political Weekly 55 (49) (2020): 20-23.

23. Narayanan, Sudha. "The Farmers' Produce Trade and Commerce Act, 2020: A Critical Assessment." Economic & Political Weekly 55 (44) (2020): 13–17.
24. Press Information Bureau. "Cabinet Approves Historic Reforms in the Agricultural Sector." Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare, June 3, (2020).
25. Singh, Harish Damodaran. "Explained: Why Are Farmers Protesting Against the New Farm Laws?" The Indian Express, January 3, (2021).
26. Singh, Sukhpal. Contracting Out Solutions: Political Economy of Contract Farming in the Indian Punjab. New Delhi: Institute for Development Studies, (2002).
27. Singh, Sukhpal. "Constitutional Challenges to India's Farm Laws." Law and Policy Review 18 (3) (2020): 299–312.
28. Singh, Sukhpal. "Understanding India's Agricultural Market Reforms: A View from the Ground." EPW Engage, October 15, (2020).
29. Singh, Sukhpal. "Reforming the APMCs Without Undermining Them." Economic and Political Weekly 56 (2) (2021): 10–13.
30. Singh, Sukhpal. "Understanding India's Contract Farming Act." Economic and Political Weekly 56 (2) (2021): 10–13.
31. Supreme Court of India. 2021. Order in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1179 of 2020. January 12, (2021).

Funding:

This study was not funded by any grant.

Conflict of interest:

The Authors have no conflict of interest to declare that they are relevant to the content of this article.