

Most of those households, especially the ones in the lower end of this category, could not have benefited from the increase in the price of agricultural products for lack of any marketable surplus beyond their subsistence needs. It was peasants from this category who provided a major proportion of the substantial labor supply during WWII. There was no other main source of labor except from these peasants who underwent increased pauperization under the intertwined impact of debt, taxation, and intensified market relations during the Mandate.

Whether peasants became solely dependent on labor, agricultural or otherwise, was determined by their ability to hold on to their land by paying off their debts, to the extent it existed. This, in turn, was determined by: first, the extent to which a household benefited from the increase in agricultural prices (i.e., the extent of a marketable surplus); second, and inversely, the detrimental impact of the increase in agricultural and other prices to the extent of how much of their subsistence goods had to be purchased; and, third, the amount of income derived from wage labor.

Finally, there were the agricultural laborers who, more or less, correspond to Patnaik's "full-time laborers." In our case, this is qualified by the fact that most of the agricultural wage labor was casual and seasonal, although with time the number of full-time laborers increased. The crucial point here was the dependence on wage labor regardless if it was casual, seasonal, or permanent. It is important to reiterate that some full-time laborers "may [have] owned a small strip of land which they lease[d] out; however, the labour [sic] equivalent of the rent received