IRRIGATION

Irrigation is the controlled supply of water for agricultural operations. It is of much significance to a dry tract like Pudukkottai. The state is served by a system of rain fed tanks. Some of these tanks are natural depressions. Others were formed or improved by human effort. Alfred Deakin viewed that India has not much to teach the outside world about its agricultural administration, but her method of construction, management of canals, conservation and distribution of water can teach a great deal.\(^1\) The varied activities connected with irrigation is the basic determinant of agriculture. Its protective role against the vagaries of rainfall and drought is fully recognised in Pudukkottai.

The most important water sources of Pudukkottai are dams, tanks, canals, embals and īrāṇīs. The redistribution of rain water which has poured into the above sources are an essential feature of irrigation. The dams and tanks store rain water from the intermittent floods for later use. The canals carry water from one source to another for immediate use. Embals are mostly with a natural fountain as source. Īrāṇīs are primarily drinking water sources.\(^2\) Irrigation works of the state are in three categories namely lift, storage and river. In lift irrigation water is raised from a lower level. Lifting is effected by manual labour, animal power like bullocks or by appliances erected for
that purpose. Storage works are reservoirs formed by the construction of dams across drainage lines. Tanks also come under this category. River works consist essentially of canals. Storage works are incomplete without a network of canals.

**HOLDSWORTH DAM**

Dams consist mainly of four parts. The height of the dam varies from fifteen to one hundred feet. It may be constructed of earth or concrete. Secondly, the submerged area would be thrown out of cultivation. Thirdly, the outlet and channel form a very expensive item of the whole system. Lastly, the dam must have a weir or an escape route through which flood waters may flow. Otherwise abnormal rainfall will imperil the safety of the work.

The Darbar of Pudukkottai State took efforts since 1893 for the improvement of the existing storage system of water by the construction of dams. In 1930 T.Raghaviah of the Madras Civil Service was appointed as the Superintendent of the state. An irrigation committee was constituted under his guidance to enlarge the existing storage facilities. Steps were taken for the construction of a masonry dam at Kadayakkudi. The main aim in the construction of this dam was to use the surplus water of the Vellar barrier. A supply channel along the side of the road was contemplated running from Vallanad Kanmoi to Onangudi.
village as part of the scheme. The initial expenses of the project was estimated to cost fifteen thousand rupees.\textsuperscript{5}

The river Kundaru after a course of nearly five miles from Kavinadu tank falls into the Vellar to the north-east of Kadayakudi. In 1931, the state administration was entrusted to B.G. Holdsworth of the Indian Civil Service. The Investigation Report of the Vellar system fully occupied his immediate attention. He studied the whole system of channels, courses, tank bunds and contours covering an area of fifteen square miles.\textsuperscript{6} Realising its importance and urgency Holdsworth constructed Valanad anicut, named after him as Holdsworth Dam. It took a lot of time for its construction, effective use and maintenance. The newly constructed anicut diverted the Vellar at Kadayakudi to the Valanad tank.\textsuperscript{7} A visit to the dam site on the Arimalam road clearly reveals the constructive skill and engineering marvels of the Thondaiman period.\textsuperscript{8} The reservoir was aimed at greening the drought hit areas of the state. Certainly the implementation of the scheme facilitated improved irrigation to the nearby ayacutdars.

THE TANK SYSTEM

The capacities of the tanks differed widely in terms of the command areas. Tanks situated at the foot of small hills and endowed with springs ensured water for raising more than one crop.\textsuperscript{9} In other places normally in a year one or two heavy
Rainfalls help in filling up these tanks. The tanks adjoining the rivers get a few more fillings from the anicuts constructed across the river. Digging wells inside the tank bed helped to augment water supply.  

Interlocking system is the important feature of tank system in this region in which the surplus of one tank formed the source for another tank. The progress of agriculture of the region hinged on the 3711 tanks. Of these, about 799 tanks were capable of irrigating more than fifty acres of land. They are called major tanks and the rest are minor tanks. It is reported that the number of tanks per square mile was 3.57. The major tanks were Kavilnadu tank, Valanadu tank and Nerunjikudi tank. There were supplementary tanks too in the ayacuts. As noted above the tanks were inter-connected so that the surplus of one tank formed the supply source of another tank as noted above. Any change in the existing tank system may cause submergence of the foreshore area. It may cause water scarcity in the tail end area crops. The whole area served by these tanks were called basins. Each basin was named after a river. For instance the Mirattunilal tank and Perumanad tank constitute the Vellar basin. It was the largest basin covering an area of 320 square miles. The Thirunallar basin was the smallest having an extent of ten square miles.
Every irrigation tank possesses its bund called karai. The tank bunds are popularly called Kulakkaraï. It has been formed over the years and hardened enough to check seepage of water. The tank bed, called kulapparappu, stands on an elevated land above the fields it intended to serve. The tank bed slopes towards one side and this slope helps to drain the upper part of the tank when the water level goes down. Every tank is provided with a vent otherwise called mađai. It is through the mađai that water is let out for irrigation. The tank is provided with a sluice called kumili to control and regulate the flow of water. The distribution channel which begins its course from the vent is called puramađai. The opening on the side of the tank is called kalīṅgu. The overflow of the water during floods is directed through the kalīṅgu. The channel that carries the surplus water away is known as marukāl. It is through the mađai that water in the tank is let out for irrigation by raising or lowering the shutters fixed to the sluice. There remained ayacut lands which were irrigated by water leaking through the shutters of the kalīṅgu. The presence of many tanks compelled the Thondaiman rulers to take an earnest interest in their administration. The state capital was situated near the Kavinad tank. It provided water to the nearby fields. Land revenue being the main source of income, the rulers could not ignore the tanks as they inherited the legacy of irrigation from their predecessors. An inscription of the eighteenth century on a
Calingula mentions that it was constructed by the Thondaiman rulers. Another inscription reveals that the rulers solved irrigation disputes. Early Thondaimans granted lands for cultivation. Their aim was to encourage the beneficiaries to reclaim the land and construct tanks.

**TANK IRRIGATION**

Land grants were given to local agents called mirāci. The umbalam (tax free land) was awarded to regulate the equitable distribution of water and the collection of taxes. To provide local irrigational facilities such as canals and sluices, uraṇi mānyam were given. Many uraṇi Mānyam holders too were Mirācis. Hence they were called mirāci umbalam. They determined the mode of sharing water available within the village. The extent of lands and the water requirements were the factors taken into account for water distribution. The mode of distribution of water otherwise called angisha mural was followed. According to Dirks the lands given to Brahmins were situated closer to the river Vellar. They possessed better water facilities and the better quality of the soil ensured higher production of grains.

In Pudukkottai state, ayacuts were reclaimed and tanks renovated to provide water supply to both īnām (tax free) and ayaṇ (fully assessed) lands. Some holders of land were burdened with ūliyam (a kind of obligation to perform a service) for the maintenance of tanks. As on 1853, fifty percent of the
Inām lands and thirty two percent of the ayan lands were irrigated. The interview of the Governor of Madras with the Thondaiman in 1826 reveals the concern of the state for the agrarian expansion through tank irrigation.

A statement in Tamil prepared in the year 1827 reveals that there were 12500 vēlis of wet lands, 14200 vēlis of uncultivated lands requiring irrigation facilities. A scheme to bring Kaveri water to the state was contemplated in 1838 but it never materialised. The importance of irrigation was felt after the enfranchisement of inam lands and the abolition of amani system. Adequate supply of water by an improvement in the system of irrigation was beneficial to the state as it enhanced land revenue.

So far, the general features of irrigation under Thondaiman rule is studied. Now the details regarding construction, maintenance, and distribution require a proper enquiry.

CONSTRUCTION

When the Thondaimans established their sway in the eighteenth century, the region had already been dotted with many irrigation tanks. So there was less need to create new irrigation sources. The anxiety of the state and the peasants for the creation of new irrigation sources, resulted in the appointment of an experienced engineer to study the issues. The engineer
reported that there was no scope for the creation of any new irrigation sources and that the urgent need was the proper maintenance of the existing tanks. He also suggested the continued and devoted attention to the restoration and the renovation of the existing tanks. \(^{26}\) Reports on the administration of the Pudukkottai state refers to the steps taken to improve the existing sources. To augment the available water resources in the Vellar, the state constructed a dam at Kadayakudi, the details of which have already been noticed.

There were numerous references to the construction of Calingulas by the state. The Vellar Calingula of the Kavinadu tank was newly constructed after dismantling the old one. The newly designed surplus escape was of fifteen feet length with bridge span and roadway. The discharge of water calculated through the weir was 1349.25 cubic feet per second against the old discharge of 901.50 cubic feet per second. Its estimated cost was Rupees five hundred. The Puttuavanchi calingula was improved with five surplus sluices and water way of 7.5 feet. To strengthen the tank bunds, trees and coconut palms were planted. \(^{27}\) The masonry calingulas were constructed with an aim to have maximum storage of water in the tank. Care was taken so that the bunds were not affected with the provision of shutters for the calingula. The ayacutdars could operate them whenever it was necessary to save the bunds from breaching. \(^{28}\) There are
references to the construction of sluices and formation of supply channels. Tower head sluices were constructed and stones were fixed on the calingula. Mortar type of sluice was replaced by reinforced concrete sluice. The state gave permission to private individuals to reconstruct damaged sluices.

The Darbar acquired lands for the formation of supply channels and surplus drainage. Deep pits were dug near the sluices so that the water collected in such pits could be used to save the standing crops just before harvest. For the construction of tanks local labourers were used. Protective measures were worked out so that water could be diverted according to their need and importance. With the introduction of electricity, supply from irrigation tanks and their construction became a continuous process.

MAINTENANCE

Maintenance of tanks and other irrigation facilities assumed greater importance under the Thondaiman rulers. During the pre-Thondaiman period the local assemblies which represented the interest of land holders maintained the tanks of the locality.

Land grants of umbalam (tax free land) like mirācl umbalam and vēṭṭi umbalam for the maintenance of the tanks were made. The state often intervened inspite of the land grants for the maintenance of tanks. The compulsion was the unsatisfactory
conditions of the maintenance of existing tanks. Seshiah Sastri renovated 227 tanks at a cost of Rupees 25000. He spent all the available funds on works of irrigation which constituted one half of the state's revenue. The administration report of 1893-94 reveals the inability of the state to provide all resources to close the breaches caused by unexpected floods. Yet a total outlay of Rupees 17433 was sanctioned to close the breaches of 100 tanks in Thirumayam taluk. Besides, an amount of Rupees 10,000/- more had been advanced to be distributed through Tahsildars for the ordinary repairs of the tanks. In 1894-95 there was an increased allotment of Rs.18034 for irrigation. For the maintenance of Irumbanadu tank the state spent six thousand rupees.

A memorandum by the Dewan on Kolathur taluk mentions the various irrigation works done in 1895. The earth works on tanks were made at Kolathur under the supervision of a Special Tahsildar. Directions were issued by the marāmath Superintendents to place certain maistries at the disposal of the Special Tahsildar who was relieved from magisterial duties to pay undivided attention on tank repairs and to issue loans.

For improving the sources of irrigation the ryots were given loans ranging from rupees ten to rupees two hundred and fifty. For all the amounts up to rupees fifty the loan could be repaid in five instalments. For loans above rupees fifty the
Instalment was raised to ten and the interest to be paid was six percent per annum. Application for such loans were scrutinised by the Manager, Tahsildar, Diwan Peishkar and finally by the Diwan. The Diwan was given discretionary powers in sanctioning loan. The administration report of the year 1903-1904 reveals the intention of the Darbar to help the proper maintenance of 1798 tanks with an ayacut less than ten acres.

The Tank Restoration party constituted by the princely state to furnish useful information for maintenance, surveyed the Vellar, Agniyar and Tiruullar basins in 1904. Their suggestion with regard to the investigation on twenty five minor tanks and five major tanks was not accepted by the Darbar. It was admitted that there were differences of opinion and confusion in the engineers' office. The Darbar announced in 1907 that the Tank Restoration Party would be abolished and that its role will be administered by the ordinary establishment for maintenance.

Generally the revenue derived from the ayacutdars was taken into consideration to decide the repair work on tank maintenance. Forest, Public Works and Revenue Departments were incorporated in repair operations. Sometimes the revenue department failed to utilise the full estimated amount in time. The workers who found profitable work in Chetti villages were reluctant to report for tank repair works. Occasionally repair works were threatened by persons who were inimical to the princely administration. Andrew, the political agent of Pudukkottai, has stated in his
report to the Chief Secretary that the explanation of the state on its inability to procure coolies was not a clear estimate of existing facts.  

A special staff was appointed to look after the Railway line which had affected tanks. An amount of nearly five lakhs of rupees was spent in the first decade of the twentieth century on repairs to irrigation sources.  

A minor irrigation system was introduced and the small tanks and embals were transferred to the Revenue Department for speedy execution of repairs. The state tried to centralise the works related to irrigation by the Public Works Department.

Legislative Council debates reveal the active participation of its members on matters of irrigation. Financial stringency of the Darbar was often cited as the reason for the delay in the execution of repairs. The government member in 1938 admitted that allotment for irrigation was low because extra amount was spent on famine from the state's surplus fund. Poverty of the people was lamented and the inability of the Government to meet fifty percent of the costs on Kudimaramath was pited in the legislature. Customary rights were cited when tank maintenance was pressed. But the state agencies issued order for the closure of unauthorised sluices and it denied permission to dig pits to store rain water.
The Darbar office records refer to the resistance of the ryots to the unnecessary merger of two tanks. Culverts were provided when a supply channel crossed another one. The state was willing to help the ayacutdars to remove prickly pear by reimbursing the cost. The government always sought the co-operation of the ayacutdars for the maintenance of the irrigation tanks. Improvement of the calingula and the completion of needy earth works were aimed to seek their co-operation. The moniagar of the village was given power to operate the sluice of the tank. Babul trees of the tank bunds were trimmed, to serve as a deterrent against floods and wave action.

Members of the Legislative Council were critical of tank administration and raised the cry that small tanks were not cared. They complained about the irregularity in earth work and other relief works carried out in areas where influential members resided. They wanted the restoration of the lapsed amount intended for irrigation to all the tanks that required repairs. In the legislative council a bill was introduced to authorise the irrigation officer to carry out urgent repairs and collect the labour cost subsequently from the ayacutdars. It was opposed on the ground that work was costly and that the government could not bear it.
KUDIMARĀMATH

Kudimaramath involves the voluntary presence of the peasants to do the repair and maintenance of tanks. According to the Kudimaramath regulation of 1903 unpaid customary labour could be employed to repair the tank bund and to remove the weeds. It envisaged that labourers could be called to clear silt deposits from sluices, channels and rivers. During rainy seasons it provided personnel to watch the rise of water flow and to uncover the sluices during official inspection.

The cirkar assumed greater powers to enforce tank maintenance works. It demanded eight annas per acre from the ayacutdars. But the council members pleaded for four annas per acre. Collection of cess in lieu of Kudimaramath was resented. But the government stressed customary labour in the repair of small tanks. The Darbar office records reveal the non-performance of Kudimaramath work in the Viralur vattam. At the same time in Irungkulam they objected to the right of private individuals to repair an abandoned tank. Whenever kudimaramath was done by the ayacutdars, the fishery rentals were appropriated by them. For big tanks like Kavinadu tank, Valanadu tank and Palayyur tank the cirkar employed coolies and appropriated fishery rentals for themselves. The remaining balance of the cost of repairs was collected from the ayacutdars.
In addition to kuḍiμarāṁath, a system of watching the condition of tank bunds and supply channels was envisaged by the appointment of a watchman. The watchman was responsible to inform the threat of floods to the maistry who in turn will report the matter to the overseer and state engineer. His duty includes oiling and cleaning the sluice screw rod and keeping the head sluice opened if needed. The members of the Legislative Council pointed out that tanks needed systematic repair once in five years and revenue from the ayacut must be set apart for that purpose.

Regarding the repair work of the ināṁ tanks the government's stand was against any concession to them. It expressed that all ināmdars were liable to contribute to the repairs of the tanks. One member in the Legislative Council reported that any resolution on the collection of contribution from the ināmdars for repairs of tanks degrades their status as many among them rendered military service to the state.

**DISTRIBUTION**

Next to construction and maintenance of irrigation works, distribution of water assumes significance. Baker has pointed out that in the local system all the leading cultivators had specific right over the supply of water. The amount of water distributed was measured in terms of cubic feet. The problems of distribution involved fragile human relations. It can be viewed under three heads, namely the problems among the cultivators,
the problems between the Darbar and the cultivators and the problems that involved the adjoining British subjects.

The problems among the cultivators involved disputes that ended in costly litigations. In the Legislative Council debates were held and resolutions were passed. The discussions centered on the failure of monsoon, poor maintenance of tanks and the unequal distribution of water from them and stressed that the ills of the Pudukkottai irrigation system can be cured. As Cauvery water was still a dream, they demanded that not even a drop of Vellar water should be wasted. Water from Vellar after filling the Kavinad tank should be carried to Valanadu tank and other adjoining tanks subsequently. The members of the Legislative Council stressed timely instruction on water disputes to avoid chain reaction of further disputes. They pointed out the internecine feuds among the Mysore ryots who were entitled to use Cauvery water. Some members warned against the claim of the local people to the riparian rights of the Vellar basin. They warned that Marungapuri Zamin could impound all the water if such a claim was allowed, as Vellar originates from the Marungapuri Zamin area. The members requested the government to regulate the water supply to agriculture as per timely need as otherwise it may lead to crop failure. The Darbar was not in favour of passing a general order to please a few users. The permission to draw water for those who had cultivated ninety days of crop was prejudicial to those who cultivated summer
crop. The stand of the Darbar was that members need not entertain any doubt regarding the water rights of the land owners. Equitable distribution of water for agriculture was stressed.

IRRIGATION DISPUTES

The failure on the part of the Darbar may aggravate problems on irrigational disputes. Past practices provided the basis for the settlement of irrigation disputes. Kārāl Ambalam, Ūr Ambalam and Nāṭambalam were the authorities who played a decisive role in solving irrigation disputes. As early as 1705 A.D. there was an irrigation dispute regarding the ownership of a channel between the residents of Maravanendal and Turūma. The dispute was heard by Villvanam Pillai, the Kāryakartha (Agent) of Vijaya Regunatha Thondaiman. But he could not settle it. So the disputants were sent to the temple of Pulvanayaki Amman temple at Paganeri near Sivaganga. They underwent fire ordeal. Nagappan of Maravanendal came out successful in the fire ordeal and the channel was allowed to be enjoyed by him.

Some of the irrigation disputes centered upon the levy of water rate consequent on excess storage. Disputes may occur because of the extension of irrigation facilities at the expense of the existing riparian right holders. The obstruction caused to the British Kolathur ērī (tank) by the ryots by raising the
bund of Pappakurichi Kanmoi was resented by the Darbar and the obstructions were removed. On the question of tapping the surplus water from the British territory, the Darbar viewed that it will be happy if the Ayacutdars themselves made such arrangements. At the same time any agreement by private persons with the British government on matters of irrigation was construed as derogatory to the sovereignty of the state.

Disputes may arise because of different reasons. The water may be wasted by neglecting to close the sluice. Sometimes openings may be made in the bund to take water by collusion with lower ayacutdars. The Darbar expressed its anxiety over damage to public utilities. The generally held view was that the ayacutdars of the Kavindadu tank alone were eligible for the riparian rights of Vellar. So a strong plea was made by other ayacutdars to allow them to take water from Vellar at convenient places. On settling irrigation disputes the Darbar was guided by certain practises. Failure to do kudimaramath forced the state to press the same. The cost involved was collected from the ryots. According to the Pudukkottai Irrigation Bill of 1932 the Government and the inamdar should share the irrigation cost. The irrigation officer was empowered to bring any one to the nearest police station if he had caused damage to public utilities. On the question of taking water from tanks just
before harvest, the Darbar maintained that each case would be decided on merits.¹⁰²

WELL IRRIGATION

Wells and Ṛṇi constituted another source of irrigation in Pudukkottai. Ṛṇi was a drinking water source.¹⁰³ Repair and maintenance of the Ṛṇi was the duty of the villagers.¹⁰⁴ The Darbar advised the people to prefer well water for drinking purposes.¹⁰⁵ The wells were dug and held by private individuals. Nattambudī Udaiyāns, the cultivators par excellence, cultivated paddy with well water. The wells received the attention of Diwan Seshiah Sastri.¹⁰⁶ As a result the number of wells increased to 14372 in the state.¹⁰⁷

The report of administration of Pudukkottai for the years 1905-1906 mentions that there were 18036 wells in good condition.¹⁰⁸ Loans were granted to sink wells and it was collected with annual assessment rates.¹⁰⁹ The interest free period could be extended on loans for wells by the disbursing officer up to eighteen months. The Darbar decided to depute one Overseer to Madras for receiving training in well-boring.¹¹⁰ Agricultural relief regulation lessened the interest on loans, contracted before 1921, to three percent.¹¹¹ The collection of the instalments of agricultural loans was postponed in bad years.¹¹²
LEGACY OF THE PAST

With regard to irrigation, it should be noted that the Thondaimans inherited the legacy of their predecessors. They regulated the irrigation so that the existing riparian rights were not jeopardized. They tried to co-ordinate and regulate the interlocking irrigational system of Pudukkottai. Indiscriminate extension of water from one tank to another and raising the storage capacity of the tank which may cause damage to the crops of the foreshore area were not relished. The correspondence of the Darbar, related to irrigation works, increased enormously. The introduction of railways provided drought relief work to the people. The construction of rail roads dislocated the tank system in some places and the Darbar reconciled the claims of the railway and the ryots.

In British India the importance of irrigation was recognised as seen from the Irrigation Report of 1858, Famine Commission of 1880 and the Irrigation Commission Proceedings. But the Government's legal right over 'irrigation water' was not adequately protected. In the Pudukkottai state, the issue on irrigation was about the contribution of the ēnamdars to tank maintenance. On irrigation, Baker pointed out that the British were reluctant to invest in irrigation because the Privy Council upheld the riparian rights of the zamindar's on tank. In
Pudukkottai by custom the riparian rights of the ayacutdars were maintained and kudimarāmath was made obligatory.

Irrigation as a social factor, assumed full recognition in the princely state. There was less scope for fresh and further irrigation sources. The only solution was to improve and utilise the existing water resources through state aid and kudimarāmath system. Absence of perennial rivers and erratic rainfall depleted its water sources. It was a challenge posed to the peasants. Apart from physical environment, external factors like the world wars and economic depression depleted the resources of the state. When Pudukkottai merged with the Indian union, the irrigational landscape was not enviable. Since independence, mechanised well irrigation with electricity and deep borewell became the dominant feature of irrigation throughout the Pudukkottai region in addition to the existing interlocking tank system.
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