Chapter 3

ANNEXATIONS AND CONSOLIDATION OF BRITISH POWER IN
BUNDELKHAND, EARLY REVENUE SETTLEMENTS

The British embarked on a cautious but very determined policy towards Bundelkhand. Their imperialistic designs took root from the land, and the revenue called jama or Khiraj, which accrued from it, provided the basis of their grand designs of empire building. Where they thought it expedient & advantageous they annexed the territory speedily where the gain was not immediately profitable they left it to the local chiefs, till such time that deemed suitable. There was always an undercurrent of authority in all transactions conducted, that should the need arise, strings could be pulled to their advantage as will be subsequently seen. Their policies were thus framed and motivated to achieve this end.

Early Annexations, Consolidation and Formation of the District.

The British gained a foothold in Bundelkhand by the Treaty of Bassein concluded on 16th Dec., 1803. By this treaty the Peshwa had acquiesced to cede territory in Bundelkhand which yielded revenue of Rs. 36,16,000 annually to the British.(1) Out of this the Government retained under its own administration land yielding about Rs. 14,00,000.(2) The Peshwa also relinquished his rights and pretension in the remaining portion of the province of
the area which he conquered in 1803. (3) By a subsequent Treaty of 1804, some chiefs also surrendered their independence. Their states were absorbed in the British jurisdiction. (4)

The initial fundamental principle in the arrangements made by the British Government in Bundelkhand between 1805 and 1806, was to confirm those chiefs who held ancient territorial rights at the time of Ali Bahadur. (5) No tribute was extracted from them. Another category of chiefs left independent were those who held ancient rights of territory since the time of Ali Bahadur. But they soon experienced that leaving these chiefs independent was not suitable, hence the territories were also absorbed into the British administered area. The native chiefs became vassals and they forfeited any further plans of aggrandisement. (6) The British let some chiefs continue to retain their position because their territories acted as a buffer between the Holkar and the ruling power, as the former was hostile towards both the English and Marattas. (7) Pacts were made with leaders of plundering bands who lived on the loot for subsistence. The Government pacified them by settling them on land to earn their livelihood. (8) Treaties of friendship and alliance were also made with those chieftains in the most western portion of Bundelkhand. Further, part of the territory which came under British jurisdiction was also relinquished in the form of grants to several Bundela chiefs. (9)

Rath, Jalalpur, Kharka and other districts soon came under British occupation. Banda and Hamirpur were acquired in 1804. (10) The district of Banwari formed the N. W. frontier of
Bundelkhand province. Kori, Parsalla districts east of Banda and a few villages of Raipur on the banks of R. Jumna to the south of Kalpi completed the British possession in Bundelkhand upto 1805. (11) Amils were subsequently appointed to settle a collect land revenue in Mahoba, Kalpi and also other district with the exception of Augasi and portion of the Banda district. In March 1807, the entire territory came in possession of the British and the land west of the Jumna were formed into one district known for a long time as Zilla Bundelkhand.

Towards the close of 1804, a commission was appointed to manage the affairs of the acquired territory in Bundelkhand. John Baillie was appointed agent to the Governor General, answerable to the superintendent of the Board of Revenue at Calcutta. (12) Baillie was an officer of commendable reputation and ability and J. D. Erskine was appointed collector. (13)

The British felt that the mere extension of the military and civil administration over the ceded territory would not produce the desired results unless they held the reins of both civil and revenue administration. Consequently, once the general foundation of the British political relation with the Bundela chiefs had been established, Baillie sought to use his good offices and propitiate an expedient course of action and endeavoured to bring uniformity in the general system and thereby reduce the charge of the District Political Agent in Bundelkhand. (14)

In 1811, when the country was settled, an agent to the Governor General for Bundelkhand was appointed with
Headquarters at Banda. In 1818, it moved to Kalpi and thence to Hamirpur in 1824. In 1832 back to Banda and in 1835, the control passed to the newly appointed Lt. Governor of north west provinces with Headquarters at Agra. (15)

Jhansi district was formed in 1839, when Raja Raghunath Rao died. (16) The British on the pretext of misrule prevailing in the state took over the direct administration till 1842 when the state was given to Gangadhar Rao who ruled till 1853, when he died issueless and state once more lapsed into British hands. (17) Military officials carried out ad hoc settlements with the people. In 1847, the control was handed to the commissioner for Sagar and Narvada territories. A political Assistant was stationed at Jhansi holding intermediate charge under his order. He was moved to Nowgong with Headquarters at Gwalior. Further, to gain a firmer hold of the territory annexed, it was advised to merge the Bundelkhand Agency into the Central India Agency including Jhansi with the political Assistant to reside at Rewa for administrative convenience. (18)

Early Settlements and Condition of the District:

There is not much information regarding the settlement for the period when Bundelkhand was under the Bundela and Maratta Governments. From information available, villages were largely given in reward or on condition that the grantees furnished troops. In villages which did not come under the purview of jagir or farmland, the principle of collection for the Government was to take the gross outturn, granting some allowance in cash or
land to the "mehteys" or headmen. (19) This was given in recognition of their status, as representative of the brotherhood, or for their services which they rendered in the management of the villages. They collected the rents and paid the cost of management either in cash or its equivalent in land. This was the universal custom which under the Maratta rule. (20) The lessee fixed the highest revenue he could extract and selected the headmen who would make the highest offer. If the government retained the management in its own hands, the whole collection minus expenses were remitted to the Government, or held in Kabz (custody) by the military leaders, in lieu of the pay for the troops under his command. (21) Under the Marattas, there was another system non as "Dekha-par-Kee" whereby the demand was fixed, after an appraisement either at the close of each season or at the end of the year. The headman was responsible for payment of the demand, who in turn obtained it from the cultivators. (22)

The British found that the jama of the territory granted away to the Bundela chiefs added to the jama of the territory retained by the British Government did not exceed the value of the lands which the Peshwa had ceded to the British and consequently, they staked their claim from the Peshwa's share of the province. (23) The British resident at Poona directed the Board of Revenue to prepare a statement of the Parganas of Bundelkhand actually in British possession to collect the jama of them. (24) But work was hindered due to paucity of records. Baillie was asked to furnish the statement of jama of the native
states under Bundela chiefs and list of lands granted to various Bundela chiefs. (25) The first settlement was to be for one year, to be followed by three triennial settlements before a permanent settlement.

As portions of the district came under British rule the system of making summary settlement was introduced and they were naturally made with the mehtey's of each village. They became responsible for collection and payment of Government demand. The collection of revenue between 1803 - 1805, was done on a summary basis. Very little mentioned in the official records. The demand for 1803 - 1804 was approximately 57 lakhs and for 1804 - 05 slightly less. (26) Early in 1805 steps were taken to introduce the second triennial settlement of the ceded provinces. As the produce of the land had not sufficiently increased, the settlement imposed was not a very harsh one. (27) But it was neither an amiable one. Captain Baillie who confronted a complex situation where the problems were of a political and economic nature, did best to compromise by uniting his own authority with that of the former Government realizing the just balances of revenue. He also endeavoured to ascertain the correct assets and pending balances in all the resumed parganas. He was able to check the conduct of the previous Government officials who sought to enrich themselves in the last opportunity.

It is essential to throw some light on the conditions which prevailed in the district. They were appaling in view of the settlements which were being imposed. The total failure of crops, the surplus rents, which had accrued from
preceding years had caused extensive ruin of villages and led to the impoverishment of the people. (28) With heavy Government demands and no cultivation, the people faced great hardships and there was no alleviation in sight from it. Many farmers did not have any money to till their land. (29) Though representations were made to the Government for the abatement of Government demand in context of the prevailing circumstances. The Government continued to be adamant on its decision and claimed justification on grounds that standing crops could yield revenue. (30) Officials who were appointed had no idea of the conditions prevailing in the district and they endeavoured to increase the demands of the Government before the zamindars. (31) The zamindars too had failed to take responsibility of collection from villages where farmers had already made arrangements with other zamindars not under purview of the Government. (32) The situation warranted rectification, but none was forthcoming. In these circumstances, the Board of Commissioners for the affairs of Bundelkhand was directed to correspond with the Board of Revenue at Calcutta. Orders were issued for a triennial settlement on the sample principles as that of the ceded provinces; but these orders were soon rescinded. Quinquennial settlements with land holders were also to be made. (33)

The first settlement was a summary one made for one year (1213 fasli) by Erskine in 1806 A.D. the amount was Rs. 1,72,517 in Koonch and Rs. 76,285 in Kalpi on the principles laid down for the whole of the ceded provinces. The general
result of the assessment for 1213 fasli (1805-06) was that out of a total revenue of about 13 and half lakhs, one lakh was remitted on account of losses, caused by the incursion of the bandits from the western provinces. (34) In addition the "Gurrebunds" or refractory farmers who held forts in that pargana refused to make payments of revenue and instead used it themselves. (35) Though they were subdued, their revolting attitude could not be suppressed. This is controversial as, though the British termed them rebels, they were in fact, rightful owner of land and who collected the revenue but now were being deposed of their rights and denied their source of income and branded as rebels and causing disturbance to the British administration. With no alternative they indulged in dacoity and other means to extract their source of livelihood.

During the rule of the local Rajas, amils were entrusted with the task of revenue collection but they took advantage of the situation and tried to enrich themselves by undue exaction. To curtail the power of the amils, tehsildars were appointed to look into and supervise for the remaining period of the current fasli year and also surveyors were appointed to several of the resumed paraganas to collect data on which to base the succeeding assessments. The following statement shows the revenue statistics of this portion of Bundelkhand known as resumed mahals for the years between 1806-07. (36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Pargana</th>
<th>Year / Net Realisation</th>
<th>Year/Net R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1804 A.D. (1213 fasli)</td>
<td>1806 A.D. (1214 fasli)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pailani  Rs. 2,23,618  Rs. 2,20,603
Maudha  Rs. 1,67,180  Rs. 1,77,744
Sumerpur & Hamirpur  Rs. 1,59,384  Rs. 1,70,411
Sihonda  Rs. 62,975  Rs. 6,71,643
Chandela  Rs. 15,000  Rs. 1,500
Koonch  Rs. 30,836  - - -

Erskine's Triennial Settlement - 1806 A.D.

J. D. Erskine was entrusted with the task of implementing the third triennial settlement in 1806. It commenced from 1214 to 1216 fasli (1806-07 A.D.) to (1808-09 A.D.) The fiscal officers were to supply all the information regarding the assets under the native government and also a statement of annual revenue of each paragna for the preceding ten years. (37)

The Patwari or the village accountant and tahsildars supplied the relevant information but it was sceptically treated in the absence of authentic documentation. The collector was obliged to accept whatever revenue was offered as there had not been a systematic survey and assessment had not been made on any standard value. Added to this were the various assignments of land and also of collection which made the task stupendous for the new masters. (38)

Land was a hereditary asset, acquired by right of succession in the form of a co-operative brotherhood. Each family shared in the revenue to be paid to the headman called the 'beriwar'. He was the over all incharge of the 'beris' that is
the sharers or the individual families who used to pay revenue. The beriwar collected the revenue from the subordinates and conducted all the business of the beri. Settlements were made with them and it was the responsibility of these sharers to meet the revenue demands. As the government assessed the entire village jointly the sharers were to allocate the ratio or proportion of payment amongst themselves. This allotment was made on the basis of the quantity of land which the sharers may have possessed, or in a state of cultivation. (39) The quality of land was not taken into computation of the assessment, for as each sharer was assigned land, which was considered uniform in soil productivity and quality. In pre-British era, the 'Bhaichara' (land tenure) system was in vogue. (Nature will be discussed in a later chapter) The cultivation of lands of each sharer was ascertained by actual measurement. This was done to a certain proportion called the bigha 'Bhaichara'. The motive was to elude the actual details from the government. The term of assessment upon each sharer remained vague. Settlement was made with the 'Mukhias' and with those who had paid the revenue since 1210 fasli. This settlement was concluded in 1807 A.D. After deducting the revenue of lands handed over to native chiefs the net revenue for four years was as follows.

(1213 to 1216 fasli) (40)

1213 fasli  Rs. 11,57,890
1214 fasli  Rs. 11,72,071
1215 fasli  Rs. 12,02,357
1216 fasli  Rs. 12,22,264

This gave an aggregate increase of Rs. 1,23,623 on the revenue of
Erskine's aim was to introduce some element of uniformity but the prevailing economic conditions impeded in obtaining maximum results. Further, as mentioned earlier the new masters were not sympathetic to the cause of the revenue payers, nor were they inclined to extend assistance to enable in the improvement of agriculture so as to receive the return they expected. The territory in the preceding years of British occupation had undergone the ravages of war and devastation and therefore in the light of the existing circumstances the settlements were arbitrary. No thought or consideration was given to the consequences which would arise. (41) Erskine has remarked in his report that the proportion of land belonging to certain farmers was very large in several paraganas.

The third settlement of land revenue under the British administration was made for three years from 1217 to 1219 fasli. (1809-1810 A.D.) to (1811-1812 A.D.) by Wauchope who succeeded Erskine as colletor in December 1808. His settlements were very hard and severe and consequently the farmers paid under duress. Revenue intake increased by nearly 40%. Though the eastern paraganas paid under constraint, the British felt that the settlement was fair and reported this to the Board of Commissioners. The regulation of 1809 was enacted, which declared that the jama assessed in the previous area of the existing settlement, that is to say the 3rd settlement which was the last for four years would be fixed in perpetuity pending the approval.
of the Court of Directors. (42) Though the British government made endeavours to bring area cultivation under exigency, land holders sold their land and fled. Consequently, land changed hands several times, especially in places like Bhaissunda, Chibbun etc.

The fifth settlement was made by Waring, and it considerably enhanced the revenue, so that in the eastern paraganas there was a gross increase of 46% and in the western (including Hamirpur) it was 21% (43)

The constant shifts in the boundaries of the Bundelkhand territories and the destruction of the records during 1857 disturbances made it difficult to follow the details of fiscal history of Bundelkhand in the initial years of British occupation. The last summary settlement was made by Major Erskine.

It would be relevant to mention that there was an over assessment in Bundelkhand. Since there was no particular group of engagers with whom settlements could specifically be made, settlements were made haphazardly with zamindars, taluqdars, revenue farmers and headmen of villages. The immediate need of collecting revenue was the main reason for accepting engagements from a variety of individuals. Also, this prevented the collectors from determining who were the right persons with whom the settlements were to be made. In Bundelkhand as the predominant tenure was 'Bhaichara' a form joint tenure, the settlement was made with the representative of the community as stated earlier.
Division of Bundelkhand into two Districts

In 1817, the whole of the rights of the Peshwa over the Jhansi principality were transferred by the Treaty to the British government which decided to incorporate the state of Jhansi with the districts in Bundelkhand under the charge of the Erskine.(44)

In November, 1818, it was resolved to divide the district of Bundelkhand into two portions. Kalpi was selected as headquarters and in March 1819, the districts of northern Bundelkhand including Hamirpur and Kalpi were formed with Headquarters at Kalpi. The district of southern Bundelkhand with Headquarters at Banda was formed. In 1817 perganas Khandeh was ceded by the chief of Jaloun and added to the Banda districts.(45) Between 1807-1822, Bundelkhand was incorporated under the western Board of Commissioners and merged into the Board for western provinces at the close of 1822.(46) The supervision of Bundelkhand was transferred to the Central Board of Commissioners.(47)

Relationship of British with the States; Interchange of territory between the States and with the British.

The British relationship with the states and chieftains of Bundelkhand were of a mixed order.

a. Sanad States: There were twenty six sanad states in Bundelkhand, namely Panna, Ajaigarh, Bijawar, Lugasi, Chattarpur etc.(48) Sanads granted were of three kinds.

I. Those who held hereditary rights since Ali Bahadur's time and were included in the assignment of 36 lakhs
of revenue ceded by the Peshwa. They were confirmed of their chieftainship and territorial rights and bound by 'Ikramnama'. The chieftains advocated loyalty and total submission to the British Government. In addition they were to relinquished territory that had been acquired after Ali Bahadur's death. (49)

II. Those who declared themselves during the troubled period before and after the Maratta invasion as independent. (50)

III. Those whom it was necessary to pacify. In such cases the government did not want to impose itself on them and hence brought them under the purview of the Regulation XXII of 1812, by which they were exempted from the operation of the general Regulation and from the jurisdiction of the civil and criminal courts. A statement of lands not inserted in the Sanad, but for which chiefs paid a fixed revenue though the Governor General's agent were also drawn, to determine whether or not those particular lands were to be exempted from the British courts. The exemption was to provide for two points viz a) to enter the Bundela chiefs who who should concern themselves in the Malguzari tenures or amenable to the jurisdiction of British Courts in all matters concerning such tenures or transactions and to exclude from the operation of British laws of
Regulations from these categories and fixed a revenue of 5 lakhs. (51)

b. Treaty States;

The relations between the British Government and the Treaty States of Rewa, Orchha, Datia and Sampthar were based on friendship and protection against the Marattas. (52) When the rights of the Peshwa over the Jhansi principality were transferred to the British Government the cases of Orchha and Datia were slightly different, because they were neither granted by the British Government nor the Peshwa. They were independent states before the Marattas entered Bundelkhand and on this ground, the government recognised the adoption of sons by Rajas of these states. (53)

Sampthar State: Sampthar state received villages from paragana Koonch in Jalaun district. Two villages from paragana Moti in Jhansi district was also given to Sampthar state. (52)

Jhansi State: A treaty of friendship and alliance was concluded between the British Government and the Peshhwa and Sheo Rao Bhao, the Subedar of Jhansi, so that he would not be a source of trouble for either friends of the British and harbour the enemies of the British. For this, he was allowed to retain his position. (55) In 1843, a new political engagement with Raja Gangadhar Rao was concluded by which the state was returned to him except the lands (estimated annual revenue of Rs. 2,27,458) which were to be assigned to the British government for the payment of half the cost of the Bundelkhand legion. (58)
Which was disbanded in 1848. Gangadhar Rao ceded most of the land in the tahsils of Moth and Garautha in 1843, and it was put under the control of the superintendent of Jalaun. The land revenue of the autumn crops went to the Governor General's treasury and the spring was left to the Raja. He assented to all the above conditions. (57) In 1853 Gangadhar Rao died without any heir and his estates lapsed to British. The area comprised of 696 villages scattered over the paraganas of Pachor, Karahra, Mau, Bijaigarh and Pandwaha. (58) Seizing this opportunity, Gwalior which was waiting for a propitious moment put forth the following suggestion to the British Government. (59) The Gwalior durbar had wanted to exchange some villages of Jhansi state, situated on the right bank of river Scinde, bordering Narwar and Ranode as far as village Karwi. (60) This was to enable a direct route to Esagurh, which otherwise was a very circuitous one. The point they tried to prove was that it would be advantageous for the British to approach territory in the Deccan and quell any disturbance expeditiously. However, the British administration did not immediately acquiesce to this proposal and scrutinized it to see whether Gwalior was not in fact trying to consolidate its position and intended to get rid of rebellious states. (61) It was ironical that Jhansi which played a vibrant role in the upsurge of 1857, was subjected to the maximum penalty for its participation against the British. This was the watershed of British policies in Bundelkhand. Ever since this region was subdued and suppressed with utmost cruelty, rigorous punishments were inflicted on the people in the form of heavy settlements and no let up in case of defaultment and no compassion for genuine sufferers. Further, it
was suggested to re-adjust the boundary between the Gwalior state and Jhansi, and that to transfer the Jhansi fort to the Maharaja Gwalior for the services rendered to the British during the 1857 uprising.

Further exchange of territory took place, when in 1856, Jhansi city was acquired from Scindia in exchange for Gwalior fort in Morar. In 1871, Jhansi villages were transferred to Scindia. These were the productive areas of the Jhansi state and since their transfer, Jhansi was devoid of cultivable land to a great extent. The question was soon going to arise, as to where would the revenue come from to pay the government.

Gwalior: In 1844, the Maharaja Scindia, assigned to the British Government a large extent of territory which included the paraganas and taluqas of Bhandere, Garhman, Chanderi and eighty villages. The estimated revenue from Bhandere was Rs. 1,80,000. Indurki yielded about Rs. 37,000, Gurhew Rs. 2,400 and Moti were transferred in 1860. These tracts were given to the military subordinate to the Agent to the Governor General in Bundelkhand who made summary settlements with the land holders. This was in adjustment of accounts connected with the expenses of the Gwalior contingent. Scindia received in return all territory he had ceded in 1844 - the whole of the paraganas Pachor, Karahra and sixty one villages in Jhansi. All villages west of river Pahuj were given to Scindia and those east of the river 180 villages that had been assigned for the support of the Gwalior contingent were ceded to the British in full sovereignty.
Jalaun:

The state of Jalaun belonged to a Maratta family who emigrated from the Deccan in 1806. The British made a treaty with the chief of Jalaun, Nana Govind Rao, treating him as an independent ruler, without referring to the Peshwa, and guaranteed to him his crown and state,(70) by virtue of his ancestral hereditary. They acquired from him any territory without intimating or seeking permission from the Peshwa. The state was incorporated into the British administration zone after the death of Govind Rao in 1838.(71) The taluqa of Chirgban comprising of 28 village which formed the Hashtbhaiya Jagir, was given to then district of Jalaun. (72)

Kalpi:

All the villages and Mahals ceded by the British to Nana Govind Rao as an equivalent for the portion of the district and certain villages of Raipur in exchange for lands in paragans kotra and Mohammadpur. Twenty eight villages were restored to Nana Govind Rao.

Banda and Hamirpur:

The districts of Banda and Hamirpur were regulation districts and part of the Allahabad division. This arrangement was faulty. The district of Alipura lay between paraganas Mahoba and Jaitpur, both of which were administered from Orai.(74) The villages of Jaitpur were administered with those of paragana Punwarri in the Hamirpur district. Orai lay between Koonch and the station of Hamirpur and the long strip of land on the bank of
the Jumna was much nearer to Orai than to Hamirpur. Koonch suffered because it was cut off from the rest of the district. Thus the interest of this part of the territory was neglected, prosperity was on the decline. Therefore it was suggested to transfer Mahoba and Jaitpur to Hamirpur and Koonch and Kalpi to Orai. This would make them nearly equal and compact.

District | Area in sq. miles.
Banda     | 2878
Hamirpur  | 2379
Orai      | 2773

Hamirpur was restored to the Allahabad division. The non regulation paraganas of Mahoba and Jaitpur were at the same time brought under the operation of the general laws by the Act XII of 1863. Jalaun, Jhansi and Lalitpur on the other hand were never brought under the Regulation system. (77) In 1852, the Sagar and Narvada territories were transferred to the NWP Government from 1853 to 1858, a certain amount of system was introduced with the administration.

In the readjustment of boundaries which followed the 1857 disturbances, the Raja of Banpur’s estates were confiscated for rebellion and added to Chanderi. (78) In 1844, Chanderi territory (paragana Madhogarh, Indurki, Duboh came under British rule as a guarantee for payment of the Gwalior contingent. (79) The estates of the Raja of Shahgarh were in incorporated in the newly formed district of Lalitpur in 1860. (80) Thirty six villages formed part of the Sagar district and had been under the
British since 1819 were given to Lalitpur. (81) In 1812, a sanad had been granted to Kesri Singh of Jaitpur and his was reinstated in his tenure. (82) In 1849, it lapsed to the British government and was included in the paragana of Hamirpur district in 1853. (83) Amrit Rao was granted a pension of seven lakh rupees as his estate was seized because he did not side with the British.

In the extreme west Garha Kota was exchanged with Shahgarh and the Chanderi Rajas remained independent at Banpur. Chitauli were granted to Nasir-ud-daula. To Jugal Prasad surrounding villages were given. (84) Koonch was taken in 1809. In 1858, the Tahahwan Jagir was added to Banda while Kuchwahaga, Mahoba which upto 1837 formed portion of of Jalaun was then transferred to Hamirpur. (86) The latter was added to the Jhansi division and whole was formed with one commissionership in 1858. (87) Some villages in Panna were given to Bundelkhand. (88) This constant shift in the boundaries of the states and exchange of territory caused administrative and subsequently revenue problems arose as there was no consistency in the frontier of the states. This caused not only administrative, but revenue problems as the border areas could not be attached to a particular district and assessed properly. We have seen how post 1857 era witnessed the constant changes in the boundaries, as the British were fastidious as to whom to reward or penalise.

Settlements of Waring, Valpy and Reade 1815 A.D. - 1826 A.D.

The revenue administration of the district began with the arrival of Captain John Baillie in 1804, later by Erskine
1805-06, followed by Wauchope in 1808 who assessed the paragana for Rs. 89,416.

The fourth regular settlement was made in 1815 by Scott Waring. It was during his tenure that the troubles in Bundelkhand commenced. The annual average jama of this settlement exceeded the average of the preceding three years settlement by over Rs. 800,000. (88) There is no proper information on his assessment which he depended on vague assertions on expanded cultivation. His method of forming the settlement was highly questionable, as he encouraged zamindars to open auction assessment in which numerous estates were leased on to the revenue farmers. Thus the jama to a large extent was determined by speculation. The superficial prosperity bloated and people became optimistic of the continued prosperity but it soon burst and was short lived. The high assessment of Waring, the fall in prices combined with peculiarities of tenure and uncertainty of weather all combined to exert a tremendous hardship among the people and a severe strain on agriculture ensued. This resulted in unrealizable revenue and a decline in jama. (89) Transfers of property were the order of the day.

Valpy did not permit any remissions in the settlements of his predecessors, rather imposed it with utmost severity. He was of the view that the zamindars were always anxious to retrieve their lost patrimonial landed property, showed that they were capable of paying as they very anxiously desired the ability to do so. (90) Though eventually he reduced the demand in Kalpi to Rs. 1,12,514 and further to Rs. 1,05,349 in 1826. (91)
Khandeh was assessed by Valpy. The revenue was fixed at Rs. 1,83,490. Collection difficulties enhanced, and estates defaulted in payment and were put up for auction but there were no buyers. (92) The settlement had been for a quinquennial one and in 1820, the landowners took advantage of the permission given under Regulation IX of 1818 and expressing their inability and intentions to pay on the old terms. (93)

A fifth regular settlement was started by Campbell and completed by the Reade. In view of the deteriorating situation the demands were reduced from 85% to 80%. (94) But the benefit did not extend to the entire paragana. Bad seasons followed and added to the difficulties in management and collection accumulated. There was a temporary prosperity between 1823-24 but the situation before its recovery, fell back. The period of settlement expired and an attempt was made to settle the district under Regulation VII of 1822. (95)

The gravity of the situation warranted the attention of the Bengal Government and of the Governor General who was touring the western provinces, as the region had been presenting a grave problem of revenue collection. During 1820-21, the region had a jama of Rs. 1,581,608 (96) on 657 estates which were resigned estates. A pertinent question arose regarding the crisis in Bundelkhand whether it was a result of over assessment or whether behind the face of over assessment, there were deep rooted factors - economic and others, which made the pressure of assessment upon the people an intolerable one. (97) In 1829, the provinces of Regulation of 1821 were extended to Bundelkhand.
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which unsettled the minds of auction purchasers, because they felt the question of the legality of their title would be investigated on complaints made by the former zamindars. Added to this the British administrators felt that zamindars in general had a tendency to encourage the decline of cultivation towards the end of a settlement in order to obtain a reduction of the jama in a new settlement. (98) But to corroborate this statement there is no supporting evidence or convincing arguments. If a decline in cultivation was a way to obtain a reduction in the jama the question is why did innumerable zamindars resign their estates, being managed 'Khas' or handed over to the revenue farmers. (99) In fact it was the Board of revenue which did not wish to accept the factors of bad weather, peculiarity of tenure and other economic reasons as being the basis of the causes of the crises in Bundelkhand. (100) The fall in agricultural prices and an increase in the value of the currency made even a reasonable assessment intolerable. S. Waring's settlement of 1815 - 16 to 1819-20 had considerably increased the revenue whose pressure on land was aggravated by factors mentioned earlier. (100a) The result of Waring's assessment was to destroy the key to revenue collection - the village mahajan. Where the village community was in a prosperous state, the mahajan was established. Eventually it was he who turned to profit from the surplus produce and from that profit he aided the raiyats in cash and grain. (101) The mahajan commenced controlling the credit of the village economy and enabled the cultivators to pay revenue even in a bad season. (102) The mahajan was destroyed because the pressure of assessment prevented recovery of his advances. (103) The re-
organisation of the revenue administration took place in 1829, while the problems of revenue collection had been worsening since 1820-21. The extension of Regulation I of 1821, in Bundelkhand and its effect on revenue collection did not make any sense at all, as the Regulation was enacted to investigated fraudulent cases in land dealings, and in Bundelkhand there were very few of such cases.

To conclude briefly the five years settlements during the period under study did not meet with much success. The Regulation in question, however, remains a landmark in land revenue policy. The defects in the formulation of the 1822 policy and its impracticability led to the rethinking policy of 1833.

Formation of Jhansi Division and its Abolition.

In 1854, the superintendency of Jhansi was formed. (104) It consisted of nine lapsed paraganas - Jhansi, Pachor, Karahra, Mau, Pandwaha, Bijaigarh paragana - Moth including the taluqa of Chirgaon, Bhandar and Garautha (Including the 61 villages of Gurserai, ubari estates making a total of 1220 villages).(105) Bijaigarh paragana was divided between Pandwaha and Garautha in 1861. Pachor and Karahra were transferred to Scindia.(106) Six paraganas consisting of Jhansi, Moth, Bhandar, Garautha, Pandwaha and Mau were left out and were divided into five tahsils. Paragana Bhandar was incorporated in Jhansi.(107) On their transfer to Jhansi in 1854, Captain Gordon, the superintendent of the district was entrusted with the charge of the settlement in the same year.(108)
In 1868 the three districts of Jhansi, Jalaun and Chanderi were detached from the Sagar and Narvada territories and were formed with Hamirpur. This was removed in 1863 with a division under a separate commissioner. (109) In 1868, Pandwaha tahsil was abolished and its component villages were distributed over Mau and Garautha. In Lalitpur, the paraganas were recognised as fiscal divisions. By the Treaty of 1861, the Chanderi part of the district was formed into a tahsil the Headquarters of which were at Lalitpur. A new tahsil at Mahroni was created. It consisted of paraganas, Banpur, Mahroni and Madaora. (111)

In 1868, two questions arose regarding:

a: The separation of the judicial and executive functions of the officers of the Jhansi commissionership.
b: Re-organisation of the districts, subordinate to the commissionership and extension of his jurisdiction. The commission in the light of the existing situation made the following suggestion:- (112)

1. To abolish the commissionership and create the position of the judge.
2. To abolish the district of Lalitpur as a separate entity and to assimilate it in a sub-division of the district of Jhansi.
3. It was suggested to incorporate the two districts in the Allahabad division. By this Jhansi ceased to be a scheduled district and all the enactments in force in the Allahabad division were extended to Jhansi, Jalaun and Lalitpur from April 1st 1891. Revenue officers were released from their civil and judicial duties. (113)
Lalitpur was attached to the Jhansi district on Dec. 1st 1891. The district of Jhansi became one of the regulation districts of N.W. provinces and was placed under the general control of the superintendent of Jalaun and administration merged with it. By this the British tried to bring a general uniformity of arrangement in two tracts immediately adjoining to each other. Jhansi and Jalaun were under the authority of the commissionership in the Sagar and Naravada territories and Captain Skene was assigned the task of concluding the settlement both of Jalaun and Jhansi. (114)

Such was the political arrangement which ensued till the close of the 1800s.
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