



Cover Page



FROM REVENUE EXTRACTION TO PUBLIC WELFARE: THE INSTITUTIONAL EVOLUTION OF THE SALT COMMISSION OF INDIA

Dr. B. Roja

Guest Faculty, Department of History and Archaeology, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh.

Abstract

This paper traces the institutional evolution of the Salt Commission of India from its origins as a colonial revenue-extractive apparatus, which by the late nineteenth century, had become most important source of colonial income and the third-largest source of revenue for the British Raj, to its contemporary role as a developmental and regulatory agency. Utilizing primary archival documents, legislative acts, and colonial commission reports such as the pivotal 1856, Plowden Report, the research examines how control over salt transitioned across three distinct phases. Initially managed as fractured provincial monopolies under the British East India Company, which enforced its monopoly through the aggressive physical barrier of the Inland Customs Line, the administration was eventually consolidated into a centralized statutory entity under the Government of India Act of 1935 and the Central Excises and Salt Act of 1944. The study highlights the profound paradigm shift that occurred immediately prior to independence, heavily catalyzed by the targeted dismantling of salt infrastructure during the 1930 Salt Satyagraha. Following the historic abolition of the salt duty by the Interim Government on 1 April 1947, the Salt Department abandoned its century-old taxation mandate. Repurposed by the Salt Cess Act of 1953, the institution shifted its focus toward the welfare of marginalized salt manufacturers, technological modernization, and industrial cooperative development. Today, functioning as the Salt Commissioner's Organization is indeed an attached office of the Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade under Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India. The agency serves critical public health and administrative functions, most notably driving the universal iodization of salt under the National Iodine Deficiency Disorders Control Programme and managing over 60,000 acres of government-owned salt lands.

Keywords: Salt Commission of India, Regional Salt Departments, Inland Customs Line, Salt Satyagraha, Institutional Evolution, Dharasana, Sambhar Lake, Agariyas, Upparas, Luniyas, Mallar Mukkuvars, Kharwals, Malangis, Nuniyas, satyagrahis, lathis.

Introduction:

India has a long tradition of salt production, sustained by a number of communities whose livelihoods have historically been closely tied to this industry. Among them, the *Agariyas* of Gujarat are perhaps the most well-known. Living in the Little Rann of Kutch, they produce a substantial portion of India's inland salt and seasonally migrate into the Rann to work in the salt pans. In South India, the *Upparas* of Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Karnataka, and Tamil Nadu have traditionally been engaged in salt manufacture and trade, while also undertaking activities such as tank excavation and earthwork. The *Luniyas* of Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, and Madhya Pradesh have long been associated with salt extraction and commerce. In Tamil Nadu, particularly around the important salt-producing centre of Tuticorin, the *Mallar* community has historically participated in salt production. The *Mukkuvars*, a coastal community primarily found in Tamil Nadu and Kerala, have combined fishing with salt production and trade. Similarly, the *Kharwals* of Rajasthan have traditionally been involved in extracting and transporting salt from the region surrounding the famous Sambhar Lake. Beyond these communities, salt production along the coasts of Andhra Pradesh, Odisha, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, and West Bengal has relied on a wide range of local salt-pan labourers drawn from fishing, farming, and other working communities, many of whom supplemented their livelihoods through a combination of salt-making, fishing, and agriculture.



Cover Page



2 2 7 7 - 7 8 8 1



Salt and Colonial Political Economy

Salt has historically served as a critical economic resource and a powerful instrument of state control. While the extraction of transit duties on salt was practiced by various native rulers prior to British arrival, the organized, uniform institutionalization of this process began under the British East India Company. In 1765, Lord Robert Clive established the Society of Trade, enforcing a lucrative, exclusive monopoly over salt, betel nut, and tobacco in Bengal.ⁱ This monopoly laid the groundwork for a massive administrative apparatus. By the late 19th century, salt had become the third largest contributor to the Imperial treasury, trailing only land revenue and opium.ⁱⁱ The economic imperative to protect this revenue stream profoundly shaped British domestic policy in the subcontinent for over a century.ⁱⁱⁱ The modern Salt Commissioner's Organization is the direct descendant of this colonial machinery, though its philosophical mandate has been entirely inverted from extraction to public welfare.

Regional Salt Administrations (1765–1850s)

The administrative complexity of the early Salt Department was dictated by the Indian subcontinent's immense geographical and topographical diversity. To monopolize salt, the British could not rely on a single method of extraction or a centralized bureaucracy. Instead, they established decentralized regional administrative bodies, each tailored to a specific topography and method of extraction, extensively documented in early economic surveys.^{iv}

1. **Marine Salt (Coastal Solar Evaporation):** The vast majority of India's salt was produced along its extensive coastline. This was managed by two primary bodies:
 - **The Madras Salt Department:** Managing the Coromandel and Malabar coasts, this department oversaw solar evaporation in shallow earthen pans. It regulated a system of "excise salt" where private manufacturers produced salt under strict government supervision and sold it at fixed rates.^v
 - **The Bombay Salt Department:** Controlling the massive evaporation works in the Rann of Kutch, Kathiawar, and the Konkan coast, this administration operated several massive works directly including the infamous Dharasana pans utilizing a mix of government production and tightly taxed private enterprise.^{vi}
2. **Estuarine Boiling (Bengal Delta):** The estuarine geography of the Bengal delta, the Sundarbans and Midnapore lacked dry heat, necessitating the boiling of saline seawater. The Bengal Salt Agencies tightly controlled these tracts, utilizing indentured style labour from the local *Malangis*.^{vii}
3. **Inland Lakes and Mountainous Mines:** Headquartered originally in Agra, the Northern India Salt Revenue Department controlled the arid inland hyper saline lakes Sambhar, Didwana, and Pachpadra of Rajasthan. The British coerced native rulers into treaties between 1869 and 1870, leasing Sambhar Lake exclusively to the Imperial Customs Department.^{viii} This powerful department also managed the massive solid rock salt seams of the Punjab Salt Range, Khewra and Mandi.^{ix}
4. **Saline Earth (Sub-soil Extraction):** In the alluvial plains of northern India, salt was traditionally extracted from *kallar* or *reh* by a specialized caste known as the *Nuniyas*. To prevent the smuggling of untaxed Rajasthan and rock salt, and to suppress decentralized earth-salt manufacture, the Northern India department administered the Inland Customs Line the "Great Hedge of India," a 2,500 mile physical barrier guarded by 12,000 customs officers.^x

Institutionalizing the Salt Monopoly: Commissions and Consolidation (1835–1882)

As the colonial government sought to maximize revenue across these diverse geographical departments, it commissioned a series of formal investigations to streamline administration. The Salt Commission of 1835-1836 highlight the early regulatory mindset. The Commission explicitly recommended a framework that heavily taxed Indian salt to artificially inflate prices, thereby facilitating the profitable sale of imported English marine salt arriving as ballast from Liverpool.^{xi} By



Cover Page



2 2 7 7 - 7 8 8 1



the 1850s, the fractured nature of provincial revenue systems required an administrative overhaul. In 1856, the government appointed William Chichele Plowden, Secretary of the Board of Revenue of the North West Provinces, to report on the establishment of a uniform system of revenue realization from salt within the British Provinces. At the time, salt production, taxation, and revenue collection varied considerably across different regions of the country, creating administrative difficulties for the colonial government. Plowden's investigation sought to establish a more uniform and efficient system that would enhance state control and increase revenue from one of the most essential commodities consumed by the Indian population.^{xii} Among the key recommendations of the Commission were the standardization of salt duties across British India, tighter government supervision over the manufacture and distribution of salt, and the introduction of licensing arrangements to regulate production. The Commission also advocated stricter measures to curb smuggling and improve the efficiency of revenue collection. Furthermore, it proposed the reorganization of the salt administration through a more structured Salt Department headed by regional Salt Commissioners. Plowden's recommendations led to the extension of the excise system and the strengthening of the dedicated provincial salt departments. Two decades later, the Madras Salt Commission of 1876 evaluated the specific challenges of the coastal salt pans, leading to the appointment of formal "Salt Commissioners" at the level of each British Province and Presidency.^{xiii}

The administrative consolidation of these provincial efforts and their aggressive enforcement lines culminated in the Indian Salt Act of 1882.^{xiv} This legislation brought together earlier regulations into a comprehensive legal framework and firmly established the government's monopoly over the manufacture, possession, transport, and sale of salt. This act codified the strict penalties for illicit salt manufacturing across the empire, granting unprecedented policing powers to salt revenue officers.^{xv} Under the Act, salt could be produced only with official authorization, and its movement and storage were closely regulated to prevent the evasion of duties. The Act also empowered salt officials to inspect premises, seize illegally produced salt, and prosecute offenders. Stringent penalties were imposed on those engaged in unauthorized production, possession, or transportation of salt. While these measures significantly increased colonial revenue, they also placed heavy burdens on traditional salt-producing communities and ordinary consumers, making the salt laws one of the most unpopular features of British rule in India. Here are some key statistical and revenue figures that vividly illustrate the sheer scale and economic impact of the British salt monopoly. Here is chronological key revenue figures of the salt revenue growth from the 18th to the 20th century stated in the table below:

| Years | Revenue/tax imposed | Historical context |
|---------|---------------------|--|
| 1780 | 80,000 Rupees | Revenue collapsed due to rampant corruption and mismanagement of leases before Warren Hastings reformed the system. |
| 1781-82 | 2,960,130 Rupees | Revenue rebounded sharply after Hastings brought the trade back under strict government agency control. |
| 1784-85 | 6,257,750 Rupees | Continued exponential growth under the reformed East India Company monopoly. |
| 1888 | £7 Million | Direct income for the British Crown from the salt tax alone, following the stabilization of the Inland Customs Line. |
| 1929-30 | 67 Million Rupees | Annual tax revenue on the eve of Gandhi's Salt Satyagraha, even after the aggressive doubling of the tax rate in 1923. |

Source: *Statistical Abstract Relating to British India from 1896-97 to 1905-06*, Forty-first Number, (1907) London, Wyman and Sons, Ltd.

The history of salt revenue in British India demonstrates how the colonial state transformed a basic necessity into a major source of income. Following Warren Hastings' reforms, salt revenue rose dramatically from 80,000 rupees in 1780 to over



Cover Page



2 2 7 7 - 7 8 8 1



6.2 million rupees by 1784–85, reflecting the success of the East India Company's monopoly and tighter administrative control. Throughout the nineteenth century, the British strengthened their grip over salt production and distribution through regulations, customs barriers, and taxation. From the era of the East India Company through the direct rule of the British Crown, the colonial government utilized the salt tax as a major revenue instrument to build one of the most profitable imperial enterprises in history. By 1858, the salt tax already accounted for roughly 10 % of total revenues in British India. This financial reliance only deepened over time; by 1888, the monopoly was generating about £7 million annually, and despite decades of fierce public opposition, it yielded a staggering 67 million rupees by the 1929–30 fiscal years. Ultimately, the relentless taxation of a biological necessity transformed salt into the defining symbol of colonial economic exploitation, directly sparking the nationalist resistance that culminated in Gandhi's historic Salt Satyagraha of 1930.

Socio- Economic Impact on the Indian Populace

To understand why the salt tax triggered a mass nationalist movement, it is essential to quantify the severe economic burden it placed on the poorest citizens. The burden of the salt tax fell most heavily on ordinary Indians, particularly the rural poor. In 1788, the East India Company increased the salt duty to 3.25 rupees per maund, approximately 37 kilograms, causing the wholesale price of salt to rise sharply from about 1.25 rupees to nearly 4 rupees per maund. This increase was not the result of scarcity or higher production costs but rather of the Company's monopoly and revenue-driven policies. Since salt was an essential item required by every individual regardless of age, occupation, or income, the tax had a deeply regressive impact. Historical evidence suggests that between the late eighteenth century and 1836, the salt tax absorbed nearly one-sixth of a rural labourer's annual income. At its peak in the early nineteenth century, particularly around 1823, a labouring family could spend the equivalent of two to six months' wages simply to obtain an adequate yearly supply of salt. Such conditions reveal how the colonial state extracted revenue from even the most basic necessities of life, turning a universally consumed commodity into a powerful instrument of economic exploitation and social hardship.^{xvi}

Production and Enforcement Statistics

The protection of salt revenue necessitated the development of a complex administrative and enforcement system. To safeguard this important fiscal resource, the colonial government invested considerable administrative resources in supervising production, regulating distribution, and preventing the evasion of salt duties throughout British India.

A Captive, Massive Market: Even with crushing taxes, humans literally cannot survive without salt. The sheer size of the subcontinent's population guaranteed constant demand, turning British India into one of the largest salt producers on the planet. By 1900, the empire was churning out 1,021,426 metric tons of salt, a figure that climbed to 1,212,600 metric tons by 1905. The tax was inescapable simply because the product was biologically indispensable.

The "Great Hedge" of India, the Inland Customs Line

The lengths the government went to prevent smuggling highlight their absolute obsession with this revenue. To stop untaxed salt from the Rajasthan lakes and Punjab mines from bleeding into British controlled territory, they built the Inland Customs Line. This wasn't just a border drawn on a map, it evolved into the "Great Hedge of India," around 2,500-mile long physical wall of impenetrable thorny bushes, brambles, and deep trenches cutting right through the heart of the country. By 1869–1870, this bizarre living fortress required a standing army of 12,000 to 14,000 customs officers just to patrol it. It remains one of the most extreme, labor intensive pieces of tax enforcement in human history, proving just how much administrative overhead the British were willing to shoulder to protect a single revenue stream.



Cover Page



The Freedom Struggle: Dismantling the Salt Machinery (1930–1947)

The fragmented provincial control of salt faced its ultimate existential threat from the Indian nationalist movement. The salt tax was viewed as the most regressive colonial policy, directly taxing a biological necessity. The government itself recognized the precarity of the industry, commissioning the Salt Survey Committee of 1930 to evaluate domestic production capacities amidst rising unrest.^{xvii} The Indian National Congress, under the leadership of Gandhi, weaponized this grievance, targeting the physical infrastructure of the regional Salt Departments. Archival intelligence reports from 1930 detail how the Salt Satyagraha was a coordinated assault across multiple geographies. Gandhi understood that to mobilize a fractured nation, he needed a symbol that reached into every single household, regardless of class or caste. He found it in salt. What began as a single march soon triggered a highly coordinated, pan-Indian assault on the colonial monopoly, adapting to the unique geographies of the subcontinent:

The Dandi March (Gujarat): Gandhi's exhausting 241-mile march from Sabarmati Ashram to the Arabian Sea was a highly effective political strategy. As he walked, a small band of followers swelled into a massive, moving column of defiance. When Gandhi finally waded into the surf at the coastal village of Dandi on April 6, 1930, and boiled a handful of saline mud, he was doing more than illegally manufacturing a few worthless grains of salt, he directly violating the Bombay Salt Department's monopoly and sparking nationwide civil disobedience.^{xviii} This highly publicized act of law breaking shattered the psychological hold of the monopoly and triggered widespread civil disobedience across India.

The Dharasana Satyagraha: The momentum from Dandi immediately shifted to a much more dangerous confrontation at the government-owned Dharasana Salt Works. With Gandhi pre-emptively arrested, leadership fell to Abbas Tyabji and, later, the poet Sarojini Naidu. The archival accounts of what followed remain chilling. Thousands of unarmed *satyagrahis* marched in peaceful, disciplined columns toward the heavily guarded salt pans. In response, colonial police unleashed a violent repression, systematically beating the unresisting protesters with steel-tipped *lathis*. The protesters refused to even raise their hands in self-defense, falling in bloody rows. Eyewitness reports of this state sanctioned brutality flashed around the globe, attracting widespread international criticism of the British colonial governance and permanently crippling the moral authority of the Raj.^{xix}

The Wadala Salt Pans (Bombay): While Dharasana became the global symbol of non-violent suffering; an equally relentless siege was unfolding just miles from the urban heart of Bombay. Over the course of several weeks, the Wadala salt depots became the site of repeated, daring raids. Thousands of ordinary citizens ranging from mill workers to middle-class housewives, mobilized by leaders like Kamaladevi Chattopadhyay broke through heavy police cordons to physically scrape together and steal the heavily taxed salt. They effectively transformed a strictly controlled government revenue facility into an uncontrollable zone of mass urban resistance.

The Southern Marches (Vedaranyam and Payyanur): The rebellion resonated just as deeply in the south. Veteran leader C. Rajagopalachari orchestrated a grueling 150-mile parallel march from Trichy to the Agastampalli salt pans on the Coromandel Coast. Archival records from the Madras Salt Department during this march expose the sheer paranoia of the colonial state. Officials didn't just arrest the marchers; they weaponized the law against the local populace, aggressively prosecuting ordinary villagers who dared to offer a cup of water, a meal, or a place to sleep to the passing protesters. Further down the western coastline into present-day Kerala, K. Kelappan revered as the "Kerala Gandhi" led a similarly determined march from Calicut to Payyanur. By openly defying regulations across both the Malabar and Coromandel coasts, these marches proved that the British enforcement machinery was being stretched to its absolute breaking point.^{xx}

The Eastern Seaboard (Inchudi and the Bengal Delta): On the eastern coast, the movement took on its own powerful character. The coastal villages of Inchudi in Odisha's Balasore district saw such massive participation that historians often refer to it as the "second Dandi." What makes the Inchudi archives so remarkable is the unprecedented mobilization of rural women. Led by figures like Rama Devi and Malati Choudhury, thousands of women stepped out of their conservative



Cover Page



domestic spheres and marched to the sea. The local revenue officers were completely overwhelmed; the state simply did not have the jail capacity to arrest the thousands of women openly mocking the monopoly every single day.

Further north, in the Bengal Delta (Contai and Tamluk), the protests carried a profound, almost poetic justice. This was the exact estuarine geography where the East India Company had established its ruthless monopoly a century earlier, systematically destroying the livelihoods of the indigenous *Malangis*. In 1930, the descendants of those ruined communities rose up. Across the coastal subdivisions of Midnapore, massive crowds defied the Bengal Salt Agencies by boiling seawater in earthen pots. Archival police records from Contai detail how entire villages formed human shields around the boiling pans, enduring severe beatings and mass arrests rather than surrender their illegally manufactured salt.

The immediate institutional consequence of these protests was the Gandhi-Irwin Pact also known as the Delhi Pact of March 5, 1931. Clause 20 of the treaty explicitly forced the colonial government to concede the right of local coastal residents to collect and make salt for domestic consumption without paying duties.^{xxi} This marked the first legal fracture in the absolute monopoly of the Salt Department. Following this unrest, the colonial government sought legislative centralization to consolidate its waning grip. Under the Government of India Act 1935, salt was formally transferred from provincial jurisdictions to the Federal Legislative List.^{xxii} This central authority was legally codified by the Central Excises and Salt Act of 1944, which unified and standardized all preceding colonial laws dealing with salt duties.^{xxiii}

Post-Independence Transformation: From Taxation to Welfare

The most significant institutional rupture in the history of the Salt Commission occurred on the eve of independence. Recognizing the deep symbolic and economic injustice of the colonial tax, a topic heavily debated in the Constituent Assembly.^{xxiv} The Interim Government officially abolished the salt duty on April 1, 1947.^{xxv} Overnight, the fundamental purpose of the Salt Department shifted from revenue extraction to industry development and labor welfare. To strategize this new era, the government formed the Salt Experts Committee in 1950, which recommended sweeping modernizations.^{xxvi} To fund this developmental mandate, the independent government introduced a nominal cess on large-scale manufacturers, codified in the Salt Cess Act, 1953.^{xxvii} Section 4 of the Act legally bound the Salt Commission to utilize proceeds exclusively for the development of the salt industry, the promotion of cooperative societies, and the welfare of the salt pan laborers.^{xxviii} To effectively execute its new welfare and developmental mandate, the Salt Department underwent a comprehensive administrative restructuring throughout the 1950s. This transformation systematically dismantled the colonial era revenue framework across three major phases:

Re-designation of Authority in 1952

The first major administrative shift occurred in 1952, focusing on the nomenclature and fundamental purpose of the department's leadership. The colonial era titles of "Salt Controller" and "Deputy Salt Controller" which were inherently tied to revenue extraction, quota enforcement, and monopoly control were officially redesignated as "Salt Commissioner" and "Deputy Salt Commissioner." This change was not merely semantic; it formally reflected the organization's new developmental mandate and signaled an ideological shift away from punitive taxation toward industry support.

Creation of the Indian Salt Service in 1954

Recognizing the need for specialized expertise to modernize the industry, the government established the Indian Salt Service in 1954. Constituted as a Central Engineering Service operating under the purview of the Union Public Service Commission, this new branch was designed to elevate the scientific and operational standards of salt production. The creation of this service provided the dedicated personnel required to actively manage and improve the complex technical, chemical, and developmental demands of a rapidly modernizing national salt industry.^{xxix}



Cover Page



Reallocation of Ministry in 1957

The final, definitive structural change took place in 1957, permanently severing the department's historical ties to the state's treasury apparatus. For over a century, salt administration had been deeply anchored to imperial revenue collection. By officially transferring the Salt Department from the Central Board of Revenue under the Ministry of Finance to the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, the government formalized the institution's complete departure from taxation.^{xxx} This reallocation firmly repositioned the Salt Commission as an engine for industrial growth, public health, and commercial development.

Today, operating under Item 58 of the Union List in the Seventh Schedule of the Indian Constitution, the Salt Commissioner's Organization focuses entirely on regulation, health, and industry promotion. Headquartered in Jaipur, it maintains major regional administrative offices in Ahmedabad, Mumbai, Chennai, and Kolkata, mirroring the colonial era provincial departments but with a radically different purpose. It manages over 60,000 acres of government-owned salt lands and plays a foundational role in India's public health infrastructure by serving as the nodal agency for monitoring salt quality and iodization under the National Iodine Deficiency Disorders Control Programme.^{xxxi} Over the next few decades, the government continuously tweaked the system to make it fairer and more efficient. In 1961, the Act was amended to level the playing field, ensuring public sector salt works paid the same levy as private ones. A few years later, the Salt Cess Rules of 1964 were introduced to manage data collection and offer concessions to different types of salt manufacturers.

To ensure the industry was heading in the right direction, the government frequently brought in experts to review the department's operations. A series of committees including the Salt Expert Committee (1948), Estimates Committee (1950), Departmental Committee (1951), and the Manu Bhai Shah Committee (1958) helped shape the organization. They recommended establishing "Advisory Boards" to guide how the cess money was spent. Later, the High-Level Salt Enquiry Committee of 1980 helped further streamline the department's day-to-day operations.

Liberalization and the Modern Era

By the 1990s, India was liberalizing its economy, and the salt industry followed suit. In 1996, the government officially delicensed salt manufacturing to encourage growth. In 2001, they cut the bureaucratic red tape even further by amending the Salt Cess Rules and instead of requiring producers to get a permit for every single consignment, they introduced a much simpler "Self Removal" procedure for tax payments.

Current Role of the Salt Organization

Today, the organization has shifted away from heavy-handed regulation, acting instead as a facilitator, monitor, and developmental body. Its primary responsibilities include:

- **Land Management:** Leasing out Central Government land for salt manufacturing, managing departmental properties, and collecting ground rent and assignment fees.
- **Production & Distribution:** Setting production targets, ensuring equitable distribution across the country, and monitoring market prices.
- **Quality Control:** Maintaining high standards for salt quality and acting as the central Nodal Agency for monitoring the production and distribution of iodized salt.
- **Modernization:** Promoting technological advancements, training personnel, and boosting salt exports (including pre-shipment inspections).
- **Welfare & Crisis Support:** Planning and running labor welfare schemes, and stepping in to rehabilitate salt works damaged by natural calamities.



Cover Page



Conclusion

The institutional trajectory of the Salt Commission of India presents a remarkable case study in administrative adaptation and statecraft. Archival records vividly demonstrate how a decentralized department originally engineered by the British East India Company to commodify and extract wealth from a biological necessity was systematically dismantled and restructured over the course of two centuries. For over a hundred years, this administration was characterized by aggressive surveillance, the geographical fracturing of the subcontinent, and the criminalization of indigenous livelihoods to protect imperial revenues. However, this colossal apparatus proved unsustainable against the dual forces of administrative overreach and relentless nationalist resistance. The mass civil disobedience of the 1930 Salt Satyagraha marked by pivotal, coordinated actions at Dandi, Dharasana, and Vedaranyam exposed the moral bankruptcy of the salt tax and struck a fatal blow to the colonial monopoly's legitimacy. Driven by these geographic and political realities, the institution was gradually forced to shed its punitive taxing authority. The definitive rupture occurred on the eve of independence. The abolition of the salt duty in 1947, followed by the enactment of the Salt Cess Act of 1953, was not merely a fiscal adjustment; it was a profound ideological pivot. The newly independent republic systematically reimagined the institution, reallocating it from the Ministry of Finance to the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. In doing so, the state redirected the agency's vast geographical footprint and bureaucratic expertise toward the welfare of marginalized salt pan laborers, technological modernization, and cooperative development. Ultimately, the evolution of the Salt Commissioner's Organization from erecting the oppressive "Great Hedge of India" to spearheading the universal iodization of salt under the National Iodine Deficiency Disorders Control Programme illustrates a complete inversion of institutional purpose. Guided by decades of expert committees, the government gradually loosened its administrative grip, ultimately de-licensing the industry in 1996 and slashing bureaucratic red tape for producers by 2001. Today, rather than heavily regulating the market, the Salt Organization acts as a modern facilitator. Its core focus has shifted to leasing out government lands for manufacturing, acting as the national watchdog for iodized salt standards, ensuring a stable domestic supply, and stepping in to support workers through ongoing welfare schemes and natural disaster relief. Salt Commissioner's Organization stands as a powerful historical testament to how the bureaucratic machinery of a colonial monopoly was successfully reclaimed and transformed into a vital engine of public health, industrial growth, and democratic welfare.

References

- ⁱ East India Company Factory Records, *Minutes of the Select Committee on the Society of Trade*, British Library, India Office Records, London, 1765, Folios 12-15.
- ⁱⁱ *Statistical Abstract Relating to British India from 1890-91 to 1899-1900*, Thirty-fifth Number, His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1901, pp. 214-217.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Roy, Tirthankar, *The Economic History of India 1857-1947*. Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2000, pp. 145-148.
- ^{iv} Watt, George, *A Dictionary of the Economic Products of India*, Vol- VI, Superintendent of Government Printing, Calcutta, 1893, pp. 394-401.
- ^v Madras Presidency Revenue Department, *Manual of the Administration of the Madras Presidency*, Government Press, Madras, 1890, pp. 88-93.
- ^{vi} Bombay Presidency Revenue Department, *Annual Report on the Administration of the Bombay Salt Department*, Maharashtra State Archives, Mumbai, 1895, pp. 45-49.
- ^{vii} Board of Customs, Salt and Opium Records (1819-1850) *Correspondence regarding the Malangis of the Bengal Salt Agencies*, Bengal State Archives, Kolkata, File 4A, pp. 22-27.
- ^{viii} Aitchison, C. U, *A Collection of Treaties, Engagements, and Sunnuds Relating to India and Neighbouring Countries*, Vol- III (Rajputana Agency). Calcutta, 1892, pp. 115-121.



Cover Page



- ix · *Report on the Administration of the Northern India Salt Revenue Department for the year 1890-1891*, Government Press, Agra, 1891, pp. 34-37.
- x · *Report on the Administration of the Inland Customs Department for the Official Year 1869-70*. (1870) Government Press, North-Western Provinces, Allahabad, 1870, pp. 12-16.
- xi · *Report from the Select Committee on Salt, British India; together with the Minutes of Evidence and Appendix*, Parliamentary Papers, House of Commons Archives, UK, 1836, pp. 4-9.
- xii · Plowden, W. C, *Report on the Manufacture and Sale of, and Tax upon Salt in British India*, Revenue Department Records, National Archives of India, New Delhi, 1856, pp. 56-61.
- xiii · Madras Presidency, *Report of the Madras Salt Commission*, Lawrence Asylum Press, Madras, 1876, pp. 102-105.
- xiv · Moxham, Roy, *The Great Hedge of India*, Constable & Robinson Ltd Publishers, 2001, London, pp. 89-94.
- xv · *The Indian Salt Act*, (Act No. XII of 1882) Legislative Department, Government of India Calcutta, 1882, pp. 1-4.
- xvi · House of Commons, *Report from the Select Committee on Salt, British India*, London, 1836, pp. 39-42.
- xvii · Government of India, *Report of the Salt Survey Committee*, Government of India Press, New Delhi, 1930, pp. 21-25.
- xviii · Gandhi, M. K, *Letters to Lord Irwin regarding the Salt Laws*, Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, Vol-43, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1930, pp. 8-11.
- xix · Home Political Department, *Confidential Reports on the Dharasana Salt Works Protests and Police Action*, File No. 24/1930, National Archives of India, New Delhi, 1930, pp. 41-46.
- xx · Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras, *Reports on the Vedaranyam Salt March led by C. Rajagopalachari*, Public Department (Confidential) Records, Tamil Nadu State Archives, Chennai, 1930, pp. 17-20.
- xxi · Government of India, *Gandhi-Irwin Pact (Delhi Pact), March 5, 1931*, File No. 119/1931, Home Political, NAI, New Delhi, 1931, p. 2.
- xxii · Parliamentary Archives, *Government of India Act, 1935*, Records on the transfer of provincial salt revenue to central government control, Section 14, His Majesty's Stationary Office, London, 1935, pp. 55-57.
- xxiii · *The Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944* (Act No. 1 of 1944) Gazette of India, Legislative Department Archives, government of India Press, New Delhi, 1945, pp. 12-15.
- xxiv · Lok Sabha Secretariat, *Constituent Assembly Debates (Proceedings)*, Volume III. Parliamentary Archives, New Delhi, pp. 423-428.
- xxv · Government of India, Finance Department Notification- March 1947, *Abolition of the Salt Tax effective April 1, 1947*, NAI, New Delhi, 1947, p. 1.
- xxvi · Government of India, *Report of the Salt Experts Committee*, Ministry of Industry and Supply, Government of India Press, 1950, pp. 67-72.
- xxvii · *The Salt Cess Act, 1953* (Act No. 49 of 1953), Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India, pp. 3-5.
- xxviii · Ministry of Commerce and Industry, *Annual Report-2022-23: Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade (DPIIT)*. Government of India, New Delhi, 2023, pp. 112-114.
- xxix · Central Secretariat Library, *Notifications regarding the constitution of the Indian Salt Service*, File VII, New Delhi, 1954, pp. 8-9.
- xxx · Lok Sabha Secretariat, *Estimates Committee- 1961-62, Hundred and Thirtieth Report: Ministry of Commerce and Industry - Salt Organization*. Government of India, pp. 24-28.
- xxxi · Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, *National Iodine Deficiency Disorders Control Programme (NIDDCP) Guidelines*, Government of India, pp. 15-18.