FIRST CHAPTER

PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN UTTAR PRADESH UNDER BRITISH COLONIAL EMPIRE

A GENERAL STUDY
India has a particularly intriguing agrarian history; so in the various stages of historical developments; land systems and social arrangements on lands in different parts of India had changed. At the same time the place of peasant in the Indian Social Structure, its agrarian economy the role of various classes of peasantry in social, economic and political transformation and then major attempts to resist oppression and injustice had always been focus of discussions for the contemporary intelligentia recent academic research as well.

So, the revenue bureaucracy had always been an integral part of every government in Indian history and was superimposed by the central authorities. Land revenue formed the backbone of finance since ancient time and which later played a vital role in the economy of medieval finance. The ruler derived the largest income from this source and it was on the success of their policy in this field that their popularity largely depended; that is why all the great rulers tried to keep their land revenue policy on a sound footing.

Among the temurids it was Mughal who first paid special attention to this question and the arrangements made by him continued to influence state policy even until the British rule.

During Akbar’s long reign three revenue systems could be seen in its early day Bairam Khan was incharge. Some local chief and rulers used to collect revenue on emperor’s behalf. Such chiefs or rulers were recognized as zamindars or mansabdars, who had a privilege either land tax free or share in the revenue they collected. Second system, came under the control
of *quanungoes* who used to assess the production of his area and one third revenue of the total production was sent to center.\textsuperscript{02}

This revenue system was continued between 15\textsuperscript{th} year to 24\textsuperscript{th} year of Akbar’s regime.\textsuperscript{03} And the third system was introduced “Ten Year Revenue System”. The Mughal period, ranges over 600 years from the 13\textsuperscript{th} to the 18\textsuperscript{th} centuries. It was Akbar’s administration that pioneered a land revenue system and set up a bureaucracy to run it; though it goes without saying that Sher Shah Suri was the fore runner of Akbar in the field of land revenue system. Sher Shah Shuri laid down the principles which were followed later in the time of Akbar.

Sher Shah’s system was adopted by Akbar with the necessary alterations, as Sher Shah regime was too short to stabilize the system. Akbar’s long regime gave him ample opportunity to plan out, develop and perfect the new land revenue system. And during the Muslim period, Indian polity had three constituents; the ruling sovereign, the army that supported the throne and a peasantry that paid for both.

So troops and peasants were the arms of the kingdom and state was heavily depended on the revenue paid by the peasantry. Intially Khwaja Abdul Majid Khan and Mazaffar Turbate made efforts to reform the revenue system. *Quanungoes* were appointed who made certain recommendation but could not be adopted on account of the Uzbek Rebellion.

In 1575 A.D. *jagirs* were abolished. Local chief rulers who acknowledged the supremacy of the Mughal emperor were given rights to collect revenue as long as they were loyal to the throne paid tribute collected
revenue on behalf of emperor and also fulfilled the feudal military obligations they owed to the central power. Such chiefs and rulers were recognized as zamindars or mansabdars and were given either land tax free or a share in the revenues they collected.

And their prestige and political importance used to determine their extension of right to collect revenue. Sometimes heads of tribes, certain caste, classes and ethnic goups were also conferred with petty zamindari rights. However, wherever necessary a full revenue collecting apparatus, from zamindari down to Mukaddams and village level revenue personnel, was created.

Entitlement to a share in the revenue was a common form of salary; for revenue officials it was an attractive one because they were authorized to use coercion at their discretion. All that paved way to the different social categories the rise of intermediaries who combined traditional authority with the new role of revenue administrator in the newly emerging power structure could be considered the most important development in agrarian relations in rural society under Mughal rulers with which possibilities of oppression, corruption and fraud were emerged at almost all levels of Mughal administration.

These zamindars had no long term interests in their territories, as they were held at the pleasure of the emperor and the instability of their position and privilege often drove them to fleece the peasantry. Despite the central authority’s efforts to enforce standard revenue regulations and to check the
possibilities of oppression and fraud; the poor peasants were still under the reign of under privilege.

Nevertheless, the land belonged to those peasants who enjoyed hereditary occupancy rights and the land was not sold or snatched so long as they paid rent or revenue (in case or a part of the production). In the year 1582 A.D. Raja Todarmal became the Diwan-i-chief and changed the whole revenue system. He made an aggregate of the rates collection to ten years. The survey of paimaish of the whole land was undertaken. Land was divided into four classes. Polaj land was the land which was regularly cultivated and yielded revenue from year to year. Parauti was the land occasionally left cultivated. Chachhar land was left uncultivated for three or four years; whereas Banjar land was left uncultivated for five years. Revenue was taken in coins but it was certainly the average of last ten years.⁰⁴

Hence the collection of revenue was different in above land categories, different in the case of banjar and chachhar lands. Money collectors had to write officially about the work character and integrity of their subordinates; receipts of payments and records of all the holdings and liabilities of every cultivator were to be maintained. And this above mentioned was known as Zabti system.

Despite all these areas there were certain areas which were under the direct control of central authorities and a special tax collectors was appointed in those areas. But collection of revenue from central authorities was not possible and despite of a very good land revenue system Mughal
Empire could not remain aloof from oppressions, corruptions held on farmers at all levels. All the Jagirdars and feudal chiefs had to maintain an army to collect revenue from farmers because there were conflicts between the farmers and the collectors of revenue.

Nevertheless, the land belonged to the peasants who enjoyed hereditary occupancy right under the Mughal rulers and production of the land, increased by giving proper help to the peasants and were prepared to till the land. Though peasants occupancy rights were always respected, yet there were some zamindari oppressions of the peasantry but since the rights of the landed aristocracy were not absolute, it was limited to extortion of revenue. And the peasants had to face the oppressions of feudal chiefs at the time of political instability; economic and authority crisis. Whereas in some attempts peasants revolts were in the form of co-operation and support to their zamindars that were against the emperor and asserted their own political independence owing to the signs of decay of the imperial powers.

Such rebellions increased after Akbar, as the Mughal emperors grew oppressive and persecuting. Aurangzeb’s rule was the peak point for the uprisings and revolts of this nature. To cite only one example, a series of famous Jat revolts occurred with varying intensity and spread between 1669 and 1722 in the Agra and Dholpur region near Delhi.⁶ The relations between the ruling aristocracy, entrusted by the central authority with the task of revenue collection and the peasantry that paid taxes for cultivating land gradually became antagonistic. The formers could impose greater demands on the peasantry using the army, whenever political conditions were favourable. But we must not conclude that there were no peasant
uprisings and rebellions in Mughal period. There were many revolts and uprisings in Mughal Empire in which mainly the poor peasants, tax payers, raised their hands against the tyranny of land lords – the tax receivers – or their police.

The discontent of the peasants resembled with the peasant was of medieval Europe. The Mughal Empire could not satisfy the minimum needs of people. The condition of the Indian Peasants gradually worsened during the 17th and 18th centuries.

The burden of land revenue went on increasing from time of Akbar; heavy demands were made on peasants and cruelly pressed them. After the death of Aurangzeb there was stagnation and deterioration in agriculture and improvishment of the peasants. Peasant discontent increased and came to the surface. Agrarian conflicts were becoming visible gradually during the Mughal Empire. Many peasants formed roring bands of robbers and adventures and thereby undermined law and order and efficiency of the government. After securing the rights of Bengal the Britishers primarily worked for enlargement of the country’s revenue which reflected in their land policy and settlements. A series of experiments or assessments etc continued which redefined the rights of certain classes on the land, inaugurated a series of structural changes in control over land and in the relations among classes associated with land-cultivation.

As land reveue was the main source of income, the company tried to make the maximum out of it. In the year 1762 they had introduced a novel experiment in the districts of Burdwan and Midnapur. In order to get the
maximum revenue from those territories they sold the estates by the public auction. Lands were sold for short period of three years. Though the system was profitable to the state, it harmed the interests of the peasants. As a result CHAUR UPRISINGS took place due to the enhanced land revenue demands and economic distress made the tribesmen of Midnapur districts to take up arms. These uprisings lasted from 1766 to 1772 A.D. and again surfaced between 1795 to 1816 A.D.

In 1765 A.D. the East India Company obtained the Diwani of Bengal, Bihar and Orrisa from Mughal Empire. It was superintendency of all the lands and the collection of all the revenue of the provinces of Bengal, Bihar, Orrisa. In 1769 supervisors were appointed to study the method of collecting the revenue. In 1772 A.D. the company stoodforth as to Diwan and took upon itself the management of the revenue. In October 1772 a revenue board consisting a governor and council was constituted at Calcutta. Assessment was made for a period of five years, lands being formed out to highest bidders by public auction but caused great losses to the company. Ultimately in 1777 A.D. the five year settlement was abolished. The company adopted the method of annual settlement preferably with the zamindars which continued upto 1789 A.D. ⁶⁶

In 1781 the provincial councils were abolished. Land revenue was the main prop of the government finance and government’s claim to the share of it was universally accepted. Under Akbar it was fixed at one third while in Deccan it was as high as one half. The British now set themselves to evolve a system which was likely to secure maximum stable revenue.
The experiment of Warren Hasting’s quinquennial and annual settlements proved to be costly. After the acquisition of the Diwani, the first object of the company was extract more and more sum from the country and during the years of Diwani, the Rangpur district was over burdened with very large demands. As the demands and exactions of the farmer increased, the zamindars passed on their burden to the ryots; as a result the ryots were ruined; their grain, cattle were sold.

On January 18, 1783 A.D. the uprising took place. The Rangpur uprising 1783 was the revolt of the entire people. All the people irrespective of their caste and community participated in the revolt. The rebels formed a government of their own and issued proclamation for bidding all payments of revenue to the existing government. The peasants uprising of 1783 exposed the weakness of the farming system and paved way to the permanent settlement.

The authorities in London and India decided that a moderate assessment and a hereditary ownership for the zamindar in return for a strictly punctual payment alone could bring the much needed revenue to the company. And it was left to Cornwallis, ably assisted by Sir John Sore to initiate the system of permanent settlement in 1793 A.D. Lord Cornwallis’s permanent settlement of 1793 A.D. was the wisest and most successful measure which the British Nation had adopted in India, but no account was taken of the fertility of the soil and the area of the land.

The rights of the ryots were sacrificed and the zamindars were left to make their settlement with them on such terms as they might choose to
require. So the legislation of 1793 left the ryots rights outstanding and undefined and by solving them it tended to obscure them in many cases to destroy them. So the permanent settlement embittered the relations between the land lord and the ryot; because the British government regarded the zamindars as the main props in their imperial structure and upheld their authority at the expense of the people’s interests.

The zamindars were the Key link between the central authority and the vast numbers of peasants who occupied and cultivated land. Actually the civil servants of the East India Company wanted to search for an Indian Counter part of the English land lord to bring about a commercial revolution in Indian Agriculture. To some extent the permanent settlement was devised to create a class of Loyal Callaborators for building the British Empire safe and sound; and to recognizing the zamindars as lords of the soil was certainly a great injustice to the peasants. It totally reduced them to the position of mere tenants-at-will their own fields. Actually permanent settlement was an experiment in transplanting the enterprise and dynamism of the English land lords on to Indian soil.07

The Company’s initial revenue demands were so high that zamindars had to impose high on the tenants too. Defaulting zamindars were dispossessed their land rights were again re-sold and auctioned to the highest bidders and new zamindars came into being. As a result the old zamindars made their own terms with tenants and oppressed the peasantry and imposed a different illegal levies and taxes to maintain their semi-political image. So far the question of land rights and land ownership under British rule was concerned; the zamindars or land lords were never given absolute ownership
right. The Britishers did not create any private property. But undeniably early British policy accelerated the process of the peasant’s deterioration and helped to turn zamindars into despots.

The permanent settlement was extended to Orrisa, Benaras and to other northern regions in 1802-05 but by then its manifest evils had started coming out and was also felt by the administrators as well. The utilitarian like James will, J.S. Mill opposed the extension of the engal system to other parts of India.

**Ryotwari Settlement**

In the Madras presidency a different system of settlement – the ryotwari system was adopted; which made directly with the cultivators for a period of years. By this system a direct relationship was established between the government and the cultivator. The raiyat was in theory, a tenant of the state responsible for paying revenue directly to the state treasury. But he could not be ejected so long as he paid his revenue. ⁰⁸

The assessment of revenue in the raiyatwari settlement was fixed, and the raiyat in the Madras System held his land in perpetuity without any increase in assessments, atleast initially. However in the Bombay Presidency, when the raiyatwari system was introduced actual assessments were fixed for a thirty year period. The share of the government was usually fixed at half the estimated net value of the crop with remissions in times of drought and famine. This whole system led the cultivator to remain at the mercy of heavy demands of government officers.
In Bombay the revenue system associated with the name of Mountsturt Elphinstone followed more or less the ryotwari system. Again in this system the cultivator had no voice had to simply pay the taxes and quit the land; as a result remain resourceless and poor. The raiyats turned rent farmers and below them a chain of sub-tenants and share-croppers came into existence. In the raiyatwari areas various categories tenants such as “Protected”, “Occupancy”, “Oridinary” and “Sharecropper” tenants were emerged.09

**Mahalwari or Village System**

In the great area of the north-west comprising Oudh, the territories between Ganga and Jamuna, Delhi and Punjab during 1833 to 1853; R.M. Bird and James Thomson, carried a survey a thirty year assessment was fixed. This was known as Mahalwari system or Villagewise system. In Mahalwari system cultivation of land was done on a co-sharing basis because Mahalwari areas were inhabited by members of a single caste, Kinship, lineage or tribe. It was a task of communal management.

But the spirit of land lord was still dominant in this system. Either a single individual land lord or a body of descendants (sons or grand sons of land lord) were enjoying the rights of a co-sharers.10 The village as a whole was responsible for payment of revenue the village headman was known as lambardar. And later on undue privileges were given to lambardars.
Early Revolts

After the acquisition of the Diwani, the East India Company did the level best to extract the sum from the country; and during the years of Diwani, when the five years settlement was introduced in 1772. The burden of revenue was beyond the capacity of the farmers. Initially practically all agrarian classes were distressed by the government’s high revenue demands although the economic burden was greater for the lower strata of peasantry.

The resulting discontent was manifested in manifold ways. Either the peasants (those who were actual cultivators) revolted against their oppressors – the land lords under whom they held land or some times all the agrarian classes joined together. Consequently on January 18, 1783 the uprising took place in five districts of Rangpur. It was a mass movement of the people irrespective to their caste and community participated in the revolt.

The rebel government issued proclamations for bidding all payments of revenue to the existing governments. In the same way the discontent of the peasants led to the series of revolts in Chhota Nagpur in Nineteenth century against their Thikadars; who had deprived the tribals of their ancestral estates.

**The Santhal Rebellion (1855):** The permanent settlement of 1793 and the pressing demands for increased rents forced the Santhals to leave their home lands and settled themselves in the plains of Raj Mahal hills and succeeded in making the land fertile and producing crops of various kinds.
Actually the Santhal uprising was a tribal rebellion. The ethnic identity and peasant economy were strongly offended by the imposition of an alien land revenue administration and of stranger zamindars. A wholesale appropriation of land for recovery of revenue dues and land transfers to urban money lenders had deeply hurt the tribal sentiment.

Some money lenders migrated to these new lands of Santhals and introduced high rates of interests and zamindars imposed heavy taxes on them. As a result an antigovernment feeling was raised against the government and the Santhal peasants broke out in open rebellion. The government moved with ruthlessness to suppress the rebellion. Several landlords, mahajans and darogas (police) were murdered.

British forces suppressed the insurrection ruthlessly and several thousand Santhal insurgents were massacred in the operation. A strong tribal identity provided the peasant uprisings with the necessary impetus, which differed from the rebellions of the Mughal era. Agrarian discontent was however only the common element. The Santhal insurrection though put down with utmost brutality, but the struggles of the Santhals had not gone in vain; their echo was to be heard at the time of the Indigo Movement of 1860, the Pabna and Bogra uprisings of 1872, the Deccan uprisings of 1875.

The circumstances in which the great Indian Revolt of 1857 occurred and its consequences are relevant in this context. It is true that liquidation of the landed aristocracy in Oudh (U.P.) under the principal of British paramountcy was one of the most important and immediate causes of the revolt. Peasant masses participated in the revolt either at the behest of their
caste superiors or due to ethnic or religious loyalties of their chiefs, rajas or the over lords under whom many of them held lands. All the districts which were violent particularly in rural areas had been disturbed by the British land revenue policy and administration. In fact the revolt was pushed further only by the agrarian masses at grass root level.

Improverishment of Peasantry

So the British policy of extracting the maximum land revenue had impoverished the country so much that even Cornwallis had once complained that one third of Bengal had been transformed into a Jungle inhabited only by wild beasts. The permanent settlement theoretically guaranteed the peasant about his holding, but in reality the land lord could erect the tenants on any ground. In the same way the condition of peasants in the Ryotwari and Mahalwari areas were no better.

After the 1857 revolt had been crushed, the British firmly established their authority and restored law and order. However, one of the immediate effects of the revolt was that the crown took over colonial administration from the East India Company. The upper stratum of Indian Society who helped the British government in rehabilitating the British raj in the post mutiny years, in turn derived rich dividends for their loyalty. The post revolt period was thus the “land lord’s paradise”, because agriculture was shifting from food crops to cash crops required credit facilities. The needy peasants naturally turned to the money lender who exploited him by charging high rates on loans and thus pocketed the vast economic surplus generated in the countryside. Peasants who were unable to repay loans with interest had to
surrender their land to their creditors sometimes auctioned land was purchased by rich owners too. The new legal and judicial institution established by British government helped, the money lenders.\textsuperscript{13}

Here the government took the place of the zamindars and levied excessive land revenue. And this way heavy assessment led to the growth to poverty and the deterioration of agriculture in the nineteenth century. Half of the gross produced of the soil was demanded by government and due to the rigid manner of its collection forced the peasantry to sell his hand or to borrow money from money lenders at exorbitant rate of interest.

Thus the cultivators in Ryotwari and Mahalwari areas sank deeper and deeper into debt and more and more lands passed into the hands of money lenders; zamindars and merchants. This process of transfer of land from cultivators was frequent during famines scarcity. By the end of the nineteenth century the money lender had become a major force in rural society. In 1911 the total rural debt was about 300 crores which increased to Rs. 1800 crores in 1937.\textsuperscript{14} And the pressure of taxation and growing taxation made the peasants restive and led them sometimes to take up arms against the money lenders and exploiters.

The growing commercialization of agriculture also placed the cultivators at the mercy of the grain merchants who purchased the produce at reduced rate then the market price. Thus the peasantry was crushed under the burden of the governments, the zamindars and the money lenders. So the poverty of the peasants brought about the degeneration of agriculture. The
permanent settlement of Lord Cornwallis had not properly safeguarded the rights of ryots of cultivators.

**Peasants Mobilization**

It was not until the Ghandian era that the congress embarked on peasants mobilization. In a country where the peasants comprised 90% of the population, the congress could not ignore the agrarian problem and regularly passed resolutions in favour of reduction of the land tax; extension of the permanent settlement in different provinces and modified fixity of tenure for the tenants. In 1888 a congress resolution drew attention to the hardships of the raiyots caused by the periodical revision of revenue assessments and in 1892. Indian famines and the widespread poverty in rural areas kept the congress interest in the key agrarian issues alive. Dada Bhai Naoroji, Romesh Chandra Dutt, C. Sankaran Nair, R.M. Sayani and several other founding members of the congress sessions echoed the agrarian unrest in their presidential address.

The congress opposed the measures adopted by the government in 1893-94 to give great security to the tenants on the ground that these were reactionary attack on the permanent settlement. In the year 1899 session presided over by R.C. Dutt adopted a resolution against the labour laws of Assam. The congress session of 1901 A.D. proposed the establishment of agricultural banks as well. In the early congress Tilak was the only leader who tried to organize a no revenue movement in the Deccan Maharashtra in 1896-97 when famine broke out in the area, anticipating the Gandhian technique adopted in later years.
The Poona Sarvanajanik Sabha, captured by Tilak sent members in the villages that held meetings and asked uneducated land holders to withhold payments of revenue due by them to the state; even students of Poona College provoked the peasants in their villages not to pay taxes. As a result Tilak was arrested and sentenced to eighteen month imprisonment. Unfortunately the deep political implications of Tilak’s campaign were not grasped by other leaders at that stage; thus an opportunity to bring the peasant masses within the fold of the National Movement and to make the congress broad-based was completely lost.

The ambivalence of Indian National Congress in the early years to the basic social-economic issues affecting the masses and its inaction on the agrarian front can be explained in two different ways. Firstly, the elite leadership of the Indian National Movement was concerned with the problems of economic development of the country as a whole rather than the economic betterment of isolated segments. The leaders had to give priority to ending that exploitation (draining India of her rich resources); rather than to taking up “class demands”; the later would have weakened the national movement.

The political necessity of national liberation was more expedient than class war. Secondly, the Indian National Bourgaosise was pre-dominant in the Indian National Congress that is why agrarian issues and problems were inherent in the class character of Indian Politics. The fact is that congress consistently struck to no revenue movements; only in eastern U.P. did the congress and a rent strike was approved by J.L. Nehru and Baba Ram Chandra in the year 1931. And Tilak advocated non-payment of revenue
from the land holders when the government was adopting coercive measures in collecting revenue. In the agrarian disturbances which broke out in Punjab in 1906-07, the nationalist took the side of affluent peasants that benefited from the extension of irrigation.

So in Punjab the scene of disturbances was the Chenab Canal Colony where vast tracts of desert land had been brought under the cultivation with the help of canals. The Punjab government imposed a new condition on the ryots of this colony that they would have to maintain certain conditions concerning sanitation, treeplanting and construction of houses, otherwise fines would be collected. Consequently rich peasants launched a movement; Lajpat Rai was drawn into this movement along with Ajit Singh, the revolutionary leader, who called upon the peasants to launch a non-revenue movement with which later on raised a cry of non-payment of the new water rate also.

In Malabar region the nature of peasant unrest was different and much more complex than other peasant movements. In the region Jenmis were the dominant section; which concentrated the land where as Verumpattamdares were at the bottom of the social pyramid who were agricultural labourers. And the Kanamdar was another category to whom the Janmi leased his land. A large proportion of the Moplahs came from the non occupancy tenants. Between 1855 and 1896 several Moplah outbreaks were reported in the official documents; there were severe repression and Moplah became increasingly anti British. In 1916 Malabar tenants association was formed.18
It was Gandhi who embarked on peasant mobilization and at least the congress became linked with peasant masses. Meetings, processions, signature campaigns, Satyagrah were the techniques of struggle evolved by Gandhi ji which helped to generate among the peasant a spirit of defiance against the British. Gandhi ji emphasized to maintain unity among all categories of the rural people, so that these could develop a broad platform of the national movement.

The Kisan Sabha Movement

After the 1857 revolt the Awadh Talukdars had got back their lands. This strengthened the hold of the taluqdars or big land lords over the agrarian society of the province. The majority of the cultivators were subjected to high rents, summary evictions (bedakhali), illegal levies, renewal fees or nazrana. The First World War had hiked the prices of food and other necessities. This worsened the condition of U.P. peasants.

Mainly due to the efforts of the home rule activities Kisan Sabhas were organized in U.P. as well. Abhiudya, the paper from Prayag in an article on the history of Kisan Sabha in U.P.; 1945 asserted that first Kisan Sabha was formed in the year 1918 and Purshotam Das Tondon was the president. Its second annual meeting was held at Gangaghat on 30-31 January 1919; under the leadership of Ramnath Tripathi.

Madan Mohan Malviya supported their efforts; by June 1919 the U.P. Kisan Sabha had 450 branches. Other prominent leaders include Jhinguri Singh, Durga Pal Singh and Baba Ram Chandra. This movement splits
within two year on the council boycott issue, when Dwivedi tried to rally kisan votes for liberal candidates and his colleague Gauri Shankar Mishra joining non-cooperative and establishing links with the grass roots peasants’ movement; which had emerged by them in the Rae-Bareli-Pratapgarh region.\(^{19}\)

In June 1920, Baba Ram Chandra urged Nehru to visit these villages. During these visits; Nehru developed close contacts with the villagers. In October 1920, the Awadh Kisan Sabha came into existence because of differences in nationalist ranks. The Awadh Kisan Sabha asked the kisans to refuse to till Bedakhali land, not to offer *hari and beggar* (forms of unpaid labour) to boycott those who did not accept these conditions and to solves their disputes through panchayats.

The peasants upsurge in South and South-East Awadh associated with Baba Ram Chandra culminated in widespread agrarian riots in Rae-Bareli, Pratapgarh, Fyzabad and Sultanpur between January and March 1921. Houses and crops of talukdars were destroyed. Bazars and merchant property was destroyed and distructed. Shopkeepers were forced to sell their products very cheap. These riotings plunder and attacks on land lords were advocated by the extremist and local leaders. The most important among them was Baba Ram Chandra; who claimed some religions inspiration he often gave discourses on Tulsi Ramayan, the Hindi epic which was very popular in U.P. and particularly in Oudh.\(^{20}\) In this way he build up his followings. So these local leaders preached a form of class war which led tenants in Raibarelli and Pratpgarh districts into agitation.
So the pattern activity was completely changed in 1921. Several disciples of Baba Ram Chandra preached the people about non-payment of rent and land to the landless all in the name of Gandhi, whereas Gandhi condemned the nature of the agitation and J.L. Nehru persuaded the peasants not to indulge in violence. Even when Baba Ram Chandra was arrested on 10, February, they did not try to release him. These small agitations led to mass scale only because during the first two decades of twentieth century evictions in U.P. had increased by 100%, naturally embittering land lord tenant relations. Although the U.P. government was alarmed by the outbreaks of 1921, amended the Oudh Rent Act and protected the tenants from illegal exactions (by making nazrana illegal) the agrarian structure remained unaltered during the 1920s.

By summer 1921, the kisan movement came under the influence of non-cooperation and merged with it. As a result U.P. government persuaded taluqdars to agree a few concessions. So the non-cooperation movement and peasant’s mobilization went hand in hand. The non-cooperation was reaching the remotest villages and the Idea of “Swaraj” was an allembracing word to cover everthing. The two movements–non cooperations and agrarian were quite separate though they overlapped and influenced each other greatly.

**Eka Movement**

Towards the end of 1921, peasants discontent resurfaced in some northern districts of Uttar Pradesh. The issues involved in Hardoi, Bahraich and Sitapur were –
1. High rents 50% higher than the recorded rates.

2. Oppression of *Thikadars* in change of revenue collection.

3. Practice of share rents.

The meetings of the Eka or the unity movement involved in symbolic religious rituals in which the assembled peasants vowed that they would pay only the recorded rent but in time. These peasants denied leaving when evicted from land. And refused to do forced labour when asked by land lords; at the same time they refused to give any help to criminals. The grass root leader of the Eka movement was Madari Pasi who was assisted by some low caste leaders and many small zamindars also.

Again at the time of great depression, 1930-32, when prices slumped, peasants could not pay rents to land lords, nor land lords revenue to the state. The Indian Naitional Congress launched a non-rent, no revenue campaign of middle and rich peasants, supported by the rural poor. It may be noticed that to make the national movement i.e. (at that was civil disobedience movement) a mass movement rural masses were organized and no rent campaign was launched. Even the zamindars were motivated for no-revenue campaign. At the same time it was the only step which could hamper the generating class struggle of the rural society.

If we compare the congress relationship with agrarian disturbances in Oudh in 1920-22 and the no-rent campaign in 1930-32, we may conclude that class composition and leadership of these two major agrarian movements in U.P. were quite different; even their origins were different.
The Eka agitation in Oudh was synchronized with the non-cooperations and khilafat movement. In 1921, it was local and religious leadership which had mobilized poor peasants at the lower level; the urban elite, who operated through the kisan sabha network, had no firm roots in the countryside and therefore could not keep the peasant masses in check. The agrarian movements were led or encouraged by the congress, so long as they did not hamper its anti-imperialist national struggle or arouse political consciousness. The congress wanted to mobilize the peasantry for political reasons.

Even the economic and political circumstances of the above mentioned movements (agitations in 1920 and no-rent campaign of 1930-32) differed. In 1920 prices were at a record peak and rents were steadily rising. Substantial or poor tenants they shared the same anxiety, since their rents were equally liable to enhancement. In 1930-32, circumstances had changed. The agrarian distress during the depression was felt more by the rich and middle strata of peasantry. And congress primarily raised the cause of these rich and middle peasants, although it hired some poor tenants and landless labour to participate in the 1930-32 campaign.

Peasants emerged as the main force in agrarian movements, fighting directly for their own demands. And all these demands were centered almost wholly on economic issues. The movements were directed against the immediate enemies of the peasant-foreign planters and zamindars and money lenders. Colonialism was not the target of these movements; it was a struggle against particular economic grievances, besides the territorial reach of these movements was limited. There was a lack of continuity in the
struggles led by the peasants a long term organization could not be found for adequate leadership.

These peasant movements were lacking ideology because they did not possess any vision about new economic, social and political programme and were lacking a positive conception of an alternative society. The kisan movement of U.P. led to the new spirit of unity among all the kisan bodies of India. As a result All India Kisan Congress/Sabha was founded in Lucknow in April 1936 with Swami Sahajanand Saraswati as the president and N.G. Ranga as the general secretary.

The A.I.K.S. focused mainly on the grievances of peasants. The kisan manifesto of August 1936 demanded abolition of zamindari, cancellation of debts, 50% cut in revenue and rent, full occupancy rights to all tenants, abolition of begar. 1st September 1936 was celebrated as All India Kisan Day. The A.I.K.S. and the Congress held their sessions in Faizpur in 1936.

The congress manifesto (especially the agrarian policy) for the 1937 provincial election was strongly influenced by the A.I.K.S. agenda. Agrarian mobilization can also be of different types and address itself to different agrarian classes and their problems. Historically many patterns can be traced in the case of India reflecting the changing forms of agrarian demand, politics and the issues involved over time. During the colonial period in the erstwhile united provinces and other parts of India land lords were able to forum associations to defend their infronts against attempt by the colonial state to help tenants and to block demands by the poor peasants and landless labourers.
And according to Haig, the governor of the province, the result of the 1937 elections had left them in varying degrees, bewildered, frightened and angry and blamed their defeat to the British connections. Haig also noted that amongst them, there were some who were of the view that their best of saving anything of the wreck is (was) to hasten to tender their submission to the congress.²⁵ At the same time Haig also assessed that “the congress after using them and reducing them to practical impotence, would then finish them off.”²⁶ All the land lords organized themselves the United province zamindars conference was held at Lucknow on 29th, 30th and 31st October, 1937.

When congress ministry was quite alive to the pressing problem of the tenantry, the land lords had filed thousands of cases for ejectment of tenants and hundreds had been ejected. This association of the land lords condemned the activities of the congress party and passed a series of resolution from time to time and showed their power. On 30th October 1937 they even passed a resolution in which they urged the government to respect the terms of the contracts in permanently settled districts of U.P.²⁷ When the tenancy bill was introduced in the legislature on 20th April, 1938 and which be studied later, the land lords of Agra held a conference at Agra on 3rd July, 1938 reiterating their grouse that …. grave injustice was being inflicted on the zamindars of the province.

Yet another conference of the zamindars of Agra was held at Allahabad on 10th July, 1938 which condemned the socialistic approach of the congress and blamed an alien rule for the exploitation and miseries of the tenants.²⁸ When the congress ministry took two ameliorative steps in the direction of
easing pressure of land lords on the long suffering peasantry, the land lord community became more and more emphatic in their protests against the action taken by the ministry in suspending further proceedings in suits for arrears for rent. When the United Provinces Tenancy Bill was introduced in the U.P. Legislative Assembly on 20\textsuperscript{th} April, 1938, the British Indian Association in a petition to the governor, resisted and stated that they should be protected against the attacks of the government and reminded that the rights of the taluqdars had always been secured by crown for eighty years. At the same time the association advised the governor to be alarmed by that attitude of the ministry of congress; since the Bill was introduced without any previous sanction of the governor.

The British Indian Association of Oudh and other taluqdars sent a memorial claiming that the proposals in the Tenancy Bill were in conflict with their \textit{sanads} asked the governor for protection land lords devoted their energies to secure modifications on certain important points. Some tentative generalizations about the peasant organizations that developed and declined in U.P. and other parts of the country, between 1925 and 1947 can be made in the following few paragraphs. The way peasant organizations emerged in different parts of India strongly showed their agitational character. Basically they were agrarian agitations rather than ‘party’ or ‘organizations’ in the strict structural functional sense. Their activities gathered or lost momentum as the pressure of genuine peasant grievances increased or decreased. Therefore the peasant parties were transitory in character.

Secondly there peasant organizations always suffered from an identity crisis. They always tried to recognize themselves or affiliated themselves
with national political parties. Whether the congress, socialist or communist parties. They could not sustain themselves as independent parties and could not identify themselves as genuinely peasant political organizations. As a result these peasant organizations were fully exploited by the All India Political parties. These parties set up their own Satellite Kisan Sabhas or captured the existing ones in order to utilize them for their own political ends. Caste identity and solidarity also play some part in the peasant organizations particularly in their “take off” stage, but it was not very significant either in the formulation of the policy/programme of demands, or in their agitations which tended to represent specific agrarian class interests.

Despite the fact that the peasant parties make a genuine effort to organize a class oriented-peasant movement, their success was only a regional rather than an All India Phenomenon, but none could succeeded in building up a strong disciplined revolutionary organization. The leadership of the peasant organization came from either well-to-do-middle peasants, or the urban middle class including professionals, the intelligentia and politicians. The actual peasant, the cultivator seldom demonstrated any potential for leadership.

As regards the class base of peasant parties it could be said that from 1925 till 1938 or so it was predominantly the middle peasants, rich and well-to-do farmers, and substantial tenants, who took the leading part in organizing the parties. It was only after 1940 when the most influential peasant body of that period, the A.I.K.S. turned to the problems of poor peasants and landless labourers, that it was not called are exclusively rich
and middle peasant party. Thereafter the response from poor peasants was overwhelming.

The ideologies of peasant organizations were also of peculiar type and vacillated between Gandhism on the one hand and Marxism Leninism on the other. And the curious mixture of the two combined with Fabian socialism often characterized their concepts, demands, and overall agrarian policies; but ultimately the peasant parties moved away from the Gandhian approach and came nearer marxism and communism.30 Before we go into the deep study of other features of peasant organizations, let we should also discuss some of the other colonial aspects of exploitation in the countryside which led the peasants to raise and revolt.

Although the history the development of India agriculture has been inextricably linked with effective water management practices that have either been taken up by the state or by local village communities. Water management had necessitated a certain degree of cooperation and collective spirit in the Indian countryside and until the composition of colonial rule; it precluded any widespread development of private poverty in India. The imposition of colonial rule in India led to the drastic break with the past, in that not only did the scale and intensity of the exploitation of the village communities greatly increase, it also led to the introduction of new, and almost entirely parasitic intermediaries between the state and the tax paying masses-intermediaries who were typically induced (or pressurized) to abandon traditional restraint and discard the old formulate that helped mediate the burden of the typical village peasant or artiśn. Not only were these intermediaries under no pressure to build or maintain traditional water
management structures. The manner in which they were chosen by the British to collect the taxes actually discouraged any diversion of the taxes towards any capital upkeep.

In this way the British policy accelerated the process of the peasant deterioration and helped to turn land lords into despots. More fundamental questions have been raised regarding the nature of the land rights and land ownership under the British. Doniel Thorner for example has argued that in fact the British did not create any private property in land as it is generally assumed, and that the zamindars or land holders were never given “absolute ownership right” which the imperial power retained with itself.  

As a result, not only was the typical Indian peasant reduced to a state of utter degradation social relations within the village also became highly distorted. The traditional solidarity that had existed between villagers was now subject to the divisive and ruinous tactics of the intermediaries who had the protection and support of colonial state. As the colonial rule progressed, the typical Indian peasant and village artisan faced a dual burden. Not only did the traditional feudal form of exploitation greatly intensify (in comparison to traditional Indian practices) the typical Indian villager was now also subject to the merciless forces of merchantile capitalism, who attempted to extract every ounce of savings or assets that any villager might still posses.

Baden Powell observes that even in the Mahalwari tenurial system (where many villages were inhabited by the members of a single caste, kinship, or tribe) the land lord spirit was dominant. Either a single individual
land lord or a body of descendants (sons or grandsons of a land lord) dominated villages in Mahalwari system which was tried in united province as well. Conquered ethnic goups-lineages, tribes or caste were made to work on the lands of co-sharing land holders.\textsuperscript{32} It is especially important to note that whereas a share of the village surplus went to a few Indian intermediaries who served as a buffer between the British colonial over lords and the Indian masses, and generally acted to quash the class struggle, it was the British who expropriated the bulk of the peasant’s assets and annaul agro-produce and transferred the wealth to the British homeland where it was turned into industrial capital and urban development. In Mahalwari system of Oudh even a co-sharer good social standing had to take responsibility of paying the assessed tax for the entire village.\textsuperscript{33}

Another significant but distressing development was the growth of communal passions in the wake of these agitations. In Allahabad district, where the no-rent campaign had made a significant impact, Muslim land lords, working under the guidance of the district collector, forced their tenants, specially the Muslim tenants, to pay rents. Hindu tenants who were congress supporters, began intimidating their Muslim co-tenants in an attempt to prevent them from paying rents and as a consequence, there were violent clashes between Hindu and Muslim tenants.\textsuperscript{34}

In Barabanki and Lucknow districts, most of the Muslim taluqdars supported Muslim league and the government, complicated matter further and evictions of tenants from their lands were carried out ruthlessly. Thus the communal tension in these regions arose out of class tensions as well.\textsuperscript{35}
After 1938, the peasant movements in U.P. were also accelerated by the influence of Swami Sahajanand Saraswati who is also considered the foremost of the leaders of the peasantry in Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and finally, all over India. Swami Sahajanand; in order to get to the peasant question however, went through political schooling in congress under Gandhi. Swami Sahajanand started off in congress as a devoted Gandhian, admiring Gandhi’s fusion of tradition, religion, and politics by 1920 threw himself into the nationalist movements as dissected by Gandhi. However, he first became disgusted with the petty, comfort-seeking hypocrisy of the self-proclaimed “Gandhians” especially in jail and within 15 years, he was disillusioned with Gandhi’s own ambiguity and devious pro-propertied attitudes.

The final break came in 1934, when in Bihar, after a great earthquake, during relief operations in which Sahajanand Ji was involved deeply, he saw the cruelty of the land lords in rent collection when Sahajanand found no way of tackling advised him to meet congressmen. In inspite of this, the oppression of the peasantry by the zamindari machinery including congressmen managers continued. It all disgusted Sahajanand and he broke off his 14 years association with the Mahatma. After his break with Gandhi, Sahajanand kept out of party politics of the congress (though he continued to be a member of the congress) and turned his energies into mobilizing the peasants. By the end of the decade, he emerged as the foremost kisan leader in India. In this task of organizing the peasants, at different times his political impetuosity took him close to different individuals, parties and groups. He first joined hands with the congress socialist for the formation of the All India Kisan Sabha; then with Subash Chandra Bose organized the
anti-compromise conference against the British and the congress; then worked with the C.P.I. during the Second World War and finally broke from them, too, to form an independent Kisan Sabha. Inspite of these political forays, however Sahajanand remained essentially a non party man and his loyalty was only to the peasants for whom he was the most articulate spokes man and a reliable leader too.

As a peasant leader, by standards of speech and action, he was unsurpassed. He achieved that status by a remarkable ability to speak and for the peasants of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh; he could communicate with them and articulate their feelings in terms, who’s meaning neither peasant nor politicians could mistake. He was relentlessly determined to improve the peasant’s condition and pursued that objective with such force and energy that he was almost universally loved by the peasants, and almost equally both respect and feared by the land lords, congressmen and officials. Swami Sahajanand was a militant agitator; he sought to expose the condition of agrarian society and to organize the peasantry to achieve change. Through countless meetings he managed his leadership. He did this with organizing rallies in which he used to address in his own inimitable manner. He was a powerful speaker speaking the language of the peasants.

Sahajanand was a Dandi Sanyasi and always carried a long bamboo staff (danda). In the course of his movement, this staff became the symbol of peasant resistence. The inevitable response by the masses of peasants was “Swamiji ki jai” (victory to Swamiji), “kaise logey malguzari, lath hamara zindabad” (How will you collect rent as long as our sticks are powerful) became the battle cry of the peasants.36
This was the manner in which a common communication was achieved, and it was vastly enhanced by the fact that Sahajanand was a Swami, which gave him a tremendous charisma. Such was Swami Sahajanand Saraswati, the charismatic sanyasi rebel, who laid the foundation of kisan organization in Bihar and U.P., built it up to a massive movement spread it to other parts of India and radicalized it to such an extent that what had started off as a move to bring about reform in the zamindari system, ended up by destroying the system itself.

Swami Sahajanand ji also recognised and emphasized the need for organization of peasants in Uttar Pradesh with the formation of the All India Kisan Sabha at Lucknow in April 1936. The Bihar Kisan Sabha became of the provincial units of that national body and Swami ji became the leader of the entire country. Swami Sahajanand Saraswati visited Uttar Pradesh in the year 1938 under the aegis of A.I.K.S. (All India Kisan Sabha). Swami during his visits in numerous places of Uttar Pradesh organized the peasants massively and addressed them for a change.

He addressed ten thousand peasants in Banaras, and in countless meeting and rallies in eastern Uttar Pradesh. From Banaras he went to Gazipur and addressed a meeting in Muhammadabad town hall. On 26th October 1938 he went to Balia and addressed 6000 peasants at a place named Maniyar; where peasants welcomed him with red flags. But owing to his illness the meetings were cancelled and Swami ji decided to visit Fatehpur, Agra, Mathura, Kanpujr, Itawa, Shahjahanpur, Moradabad and Mirjapur districts after 10th of October 1938. Again in October 1938,
peasants from all over Uttar Pradesh and demanded amendment in land legislation; they also demanded concessions for the peasantry.

In this way Swami Sahajanand ji gave a formal organizational structure to the kisan sabha and all the peasants. Again during his second vision he reached the remote areas of Fatehpur, Kanpur, Mirzapur, Moradabad and stated that there should not be any delay in land legislation; and added that government could not fulfil the demands of the peasants. He condemned the ejectement of the peasants. He also added that if tenancy law is not amended it might create trouble between zamindars and tenants. Swami Sahajanand ji appreciated the work of the Acharya Narendra Dev done among the peasants. He also urged the peasants to be strong like zamindars and capitalist and asked them to hold regular meetings so as to show their unity.

Peasants had united themselves and were demanding to stop zamindari system as soon as possible. On 13 December, 1938 at Zhansi there were 5000 peasants where Swami ji urged the peasantry to fight for their rights and told the peasant leaders to arouse consciousness among the other peasants of the state. In this way Swami Sahajanand ji paved way to the agitational character of the peasant movement in Uttar Pradesh. He made the peasants organization a mass organization full of action rather than formalities. Swami Ji’s dramatic entry in the Uttar Pradsh caused considerable embarrassment among the zamindars and government. Sahajanand had co-ordinated the work of the peasants at different levels.
The peasant movement was non-violent in nature but owing to its inner promptness it sometime became violent. The entire peasant movement had experienced violence at many places. The peasantry attacked the zamindars and their family members. The peasants even resisted against the government officials. At Fatehpur a tehsildar was murdered when the peasants were resisting for their rights. When the prices of grains were falling rapidly, all the news papers stated that the politicians and officers should thing to give relief to the peasants. Otherwise it would be very difficult to maintain piece. The media further added that government officers should show sympathy with the peasants when they take rents of the lands.38

In this way, we see that congress had given a no rent programme after which the peasant movement moved ahead in different parts of the Uttar Pradesh with some violent cases in some areas. The nature of this movement was very local and some time the demands were different too; except the no-rent campaign which was the caused due to the fall in prices of the grains, consequently led the peasant not to pay taxes and rent.

The government and the police were assisting the zamindars in revenue collection. But Gandhiji programme of Swaraj had reached into the remote places of the country side and the congress had hampered the work of government by no-rent campaign. If we consider the state policy with regard to agriculture, forest, irrigation, co-operation and industries, though slow has been very constructive and successful. State in India had performed some functions, besides land legislation. There were reasons for the increased state interference and activity in India land problems. The increased pressure of population on land has resulted in rack-renting. The state to check this has
passed land laws. Agriculturists in every country are indebted. The Indian Cultivator’s condition was worse as a large portion of his debt was unproductive. Moreover, on account of his illiteracy he was an easy prey to the malpractices of the Mahajans. The land Alienation Acts and the debt legislation provision were attempted to protect the interests of the peasantry from exploitation by the mahajans.

The fall is prices besides increasing the pressure revenue and rentals, also increased the real burden of rural indebtedness. The agriculturists found it extremely difficult to repay their debts and forced sales of lands because the order of the day. This acute economic distress reslting from the transfer of land led the provincial government to devise measures for affording immediate relief to check this unhealthy situation.

In this regard debt legislation policy was adopted by the government between 1930 A.D. to 1940 A.D. to improve the condition of the indebted peasantry. The congress ministry during the short stay of their office (1937-1939) did additional efforts to solve the problem of rural indebtedness. The entire man of debt relief legislation may be grouped into two heads, according to the nature of the objective which the legislation had in view.

They are (i) short term legislation and (ii) long term legislation. The main short term measures to afford immediate relief were:-

1. The United Provinces Temporary Regulation of Execution Act (XXIV) of 1934.
2. The United Provinces Agriculturists Relief Act (1934) was introduced to reduce the liabilities of the debtors in respect of the part arrears of interest.

3. The United Provinces Regulation of Sales Act of 1934 was passed to provide relief in respect of the payment of the principal of the loan.

Among the long term measures we may mention the various Money-Lenders Acts for regulating the business of money lenders and providing safeguards for the protection of the person and property of the debtors against undue exploitation by the creditors. In 1939 the United Provinces Money Lenders Bills 1939 was passed with objectives aiming the registration and licensing of money lenders and the regulation of accounts and the regulator of interest. Besides Agriculturist Relief Act was passed in 1934 in order to give relief to the debtor of what he could not pay. This act had provided provision for a legal process by which an agriculturist debtor could apply to a civil court to get his account settled and to fix installation for the payment. Besides every agriculturist debtor was entitled to demand from his creditor a full and correct statement of the amount outstanding against him. Now the creditors were maintaining their accounts. The creditor was also bound to deliver to the debtor a receipt for any payment made by him and failure to do so was a penal offence.

This Act had been more extensively used than any other Deb Relief measure. Among the long term measures of the United Provinces Government. The United Provinces Agriculturists Debt Redemption Bill, 1939 proposed to effectively reduce the debts of small agriculturists. The
Bill provided for the investigation of agriculturist debts and lay down that the creditor should not be entitled to receive a sum higher than twice the amount of the principal of the loan minus all payments that he might have received. The main object of the U.P. Regulation of Agricultural Credit Bill, 1939 was to limit the capacity of the debtor of an average status to borrow indefinitely from the money-lenders by putting restrictions upon the transferability of the only security he can offer, viz; the standing crops or his land.

Finally, the United Provinces Money-Lender’s Bill 1939 attempted to control the money lending operations in the united provinces. The distinguishing feature of this bill was that it embodies all the various regulations which had been adopted by other provincial governments for the control and regulation of the money-lending operations.

In conclusion it may be said that the debt legislation 1930-37 of the united provinces government was a timely measure to relieve hardships and proved to be of considerable help to cultivators and landed classes. There measures had been criticized on the ground that they restricted the volume of rural credit and made borrowing difficult for the cultivators.

Thus, we find that peasants were so exploited that, violent incidents were frequent after resistance between zamindars and tenants. Many times the peasants were too unsophisticated and pre-occupied with bread and butter issues that they could not organize themselves with the principal intellectuals of the congress. But the final fusion of non-cooperation with peasant revolution was able to persuade a significant segment of the
congress to address the agrarian question and made the peasantry conscious and forthcoming.
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