CONCLUSION

The first Hada principality Bundi had emerged in 14th century. Its establishment and expansion entailed a violent subjugation of the early Meena and Bheel tribal polities in the region. Ever since its establishment it had to cope against the claims of Guhils of Mewar. It had been incorporated in the Guhil polity as Hadavatim or the share of the Hadas in 15th century. Inspite of horizontal spread of Hadas, reflected in the multiplication of Hada Khamps settled around Bundi and at Kota, the area under effective Hada domination remained limited. Alliance with the Mughals strengthened the position of Hadas in the areas adjacent to the Bundi valley. The Mughals were able to use the Hadas successfully against the Khinchis, who remained zorta/ab through out. Rao Ratan occupied an important place in the Mughal nobility. It was in the middle of 17th century that Kota emerged as an independent Hada principality with Madho Singh, the eldest son of Rao Ratan, as its first chief. The Mughal policy was to give not only higher mansab but even the title of Rao to the Hada chief of Bundi, alone. The mansabs granted to Kota chiefs were always lower than the chiefs of Bundi. Thus, inspite of creation of a separate principality for Madho Singh and his successors, the primeval position of Bundi line of Hada chiefs was maintained within Hadauti and at Mughal court for quite some time. Nevertheless, creation of another Hada principality in the region helped the Hadas to expand and consolidate their position further in the region.

It was during Aurangzeb's period, that Kota chiefs managed to have a relatively better deal. There was a clear reversal of the policy towards Bundi, reflected in grant of zamindari of Mau-Maidana to Ram Singh by taking it away from Budh Singh. It created internal rivalries, which came to surface when Budh Singh of Bundi, obtained the farman from Bhadurshah to occupy Kota, which was resisted by Bheem Singh successfully. He also managed to gain support of Saiyyad
brothers in order to retain his claim on his ancestral domain. It shows that both
the Bundi and Kota line of Hadas were fully aware of the importance of
recognition extended by the imperial power. It was through Mughal support that
they had acquired a dominant position vis-à-vis other Rajput clans in the region.
It had proved to be crucial in the intra-clan rivalry as well. Survival of the Kota
chiefs inspite of problems created by their arch rivals like Raja Uttam Ram Gaud
in 1682-83, by Durjan Sal Hada of Bundi in 1687, by Bishan Singh and Hamath
Singh Hada of Kota, at the time of Ram Singh's accession amply demonstrated
this. Therefore, support of the leading faction at the Mughal court tilted the
balance in favour of Bheem Singh in the crisis created by growing factionalism
after Aurangzeb's death.

Hadas of Kota had acquired a dominant position in the *parganas* of Kota,
Palaitha, Mangrol, Itawa, Baran, Barod, Aton and Sangod by the end of 17th
century. In order to retain this position and to enhance it further, often the
remaining villages of the *parganas* in *jagir* of the Kota chief were secured in *ijara*
from other Mughal *jagirdars, khalsa* or *paibaqi*. Thus a large numbers of
*parganas* were held by the Kota chiefs in *ijara / mukata* towards the end of 17th
and beginning of 18th century. The *ijaras* provided the Kota chiefs with necessary
leverage against their kinsmen. They could favour or punish the *sardars* and
different Hada *khamps* in the process of redistributing these areas. The Kota
chiefs also held *faujdari* in some of the *parganas*, which strengthened their
position against the non-Hada Rajputs. Use of *ijara* and *faujdari* as a political
instrument helped the Hadas to dominate a much larger area in early 18th century
than assigned to them against their *mansab*. However, it also highlights the
dependence of Mughal ruling class upon the locally powerful groups for revenue
collection. It also demonstrates the local political pressures upon the imperial
system. It was for this reason that the Hada support in the region was crucial for
the Mughals.
Factionalism at the court and the trouble in Malwa prompted the Kota chiefs to consolidate their position in their ancestral domain. Receding Mughal control and entry of Marathas in Malwa had created a climate of political uncertainty. It also had an impact upon the attitude of Hada jagirdars towards the Kota chief. All these developments brought about significant changes in the Hada polity. The kinship ties and clan support once again became crucial factors in the process of state building. The system of sub-assignment known as ghoda bant jagirs was gradually replaced by patta jagirs. More and more jagirs were now assigned for chakri-desh. While the ghoda bant jagir was basically an arrangement to recruit kinsmen for fulfilling military obligations as Mughal mansabdars the patta jagir was a reinforcement of the claim of kinsmen within the Hada polity. These jagirs could be made sadamadi or permanent although, the system of transfer was never given up formally. In some cases patta jagir was granted even before fixing the military obligation. The patta jagirs entrenched the bhai bhatijas in their jagir villages. The jagirdars came to acquire a definite say in the process of assessment and collection. A patta gradually came to be interpreted as a document of right. There were also some changes in the position of different Hada khamps. For instance, Sawat Hadas lost their position enjoyed in the period of Bheem Singh while some other khamps like Hada Hammir, Ramlot, Baranwat and Mewawat managed to secure a higher number of jagirs. Similarly, the need to counter the position enjoyed by Sawai Jai Singh in the inter-state politics of Rajasthan led to assignment of jagirs to Kachwahas in a big way. At the same time inclusion of several new groups like Marathas and Pindaris reflected the new political compulsions of the Kota chiefs.

Entry of Marathas in Hadauti and their repeated demands for money combined with an increased expenditure on military due to inter-state rivalries enhanced the
burden on state resources. As a result the occasional borrowings of the Kota chiefs started acquiring features of perpetual indebtedness. Revenue from villages had to be assigned in tankhwa and ijara to the merchant-money-lenders for repayment of the state debts. The Kota chiefs had been giving mukatas to resourceful persons like Rajputs, patels and local sahas and bohras, even earlier for various reasons. In 18th century it acquired a new dimension, as it had become a mode of repayment of accumulated debt. It changed the nature of mukata and the position of the mukati and made mukata a source of profit. Pandit Sankara ji had 75 villages in eight parganas in mukata against his patra of rupees 11,50,000. Similarly Chiranj Lunkaran Mehta Manik Ram had 34 out of 44 villages in mukata in pargana Baran against his patras. Pandit Ram Chander had 13 villages of pargana Suket in his mukata, which were assigned back to him in his tankhwah. Pandit Narhar Rao had villages of various parganas in his gharu mukata. It can be gathered from these developments that many of the old institutions and practices acquired a new relevance during the period.

The only way to clear up the financial mess was to increase agricultural production and expand the trade network. It was in this context that there was an increasing realisation that the peasant form of production alone can not come up to this task and the state policy has to be geared to attract greater investment from those sections who had accumulated resources at their command. The study shows that a major section of the village society till early 18th century was the peasant proprietors. The population data available for pargana Nandgaon (Kota) suggests that most of the villages were original agrarian caste settlements. The peasant population in most of the villages was overwhelmingly of the same caste, often of the same lineage group. A section within the karsa enjoyed 'bapoti', which was a hereditary claim on the land under their ploughs. They considered land to be their most important resource. Their claim on village land and other resources got reinforced, by holding the karsa collectively
responsible for cultivation of the village land. If the karsa was unable to cultivate the entire village land on its own, they sought approval from the state to call pahi (non-resident) cultivators, as well as the rate of jama to be charged from them. It was the responsibility of the village karsa to pay the revenue on the land cultivated by the pahis. At the same time, if any one wished to cultivate more than already under his plough, he had the obligation to cultivate beed and parat land within his own village, instead of undertaking cultivation as a pahi in another village. From some of the references it appears that the state generally disapproved of the karsa taking up pahi cultivation in the adjacent villages. Thus, the traditional claim of the karsa on the village land and other resources was recognised and reinforced by the state although, it had been linked to the obligation of maintaining the production cycle. Sometimes, the state for its own reasons encouraged migration of peasants from populous pargana to ujad (disserted) villages. A powerful section of the village society was the himayatis. They were the bhomias, Rawats, dohli land holders and some state officials etc. Their halas were termed as himayati and gharu halas. The land under their halas enjoyed concession in revenue rates and various other exemptions. A part of the resources accumulated by the himayatis went into creation, improvement and maintenance of irrigation facilities like building a bawri (stepped well) etc. at the village level. Another important section of the village population was the kholad or thalad assamis. It included some of the Brahmins, bohras, sahas and most of the artisans and menials living in a village. Since, they practised their profession or rendered service by virtue of living in that village, they paid the cess kholdi.

The relationship of the agriculturist and non-agriculturist section of the village society was governed by the customary practices. Inspite of plenty of beed available in every village most of the artisans and menials cultivated only small strips of land. Since, the customary share of these sections in village produce was hardly one percent, they were unable to mobilise enough resources to
cultivate a sizeable piece of land. The power structure in the village society had also got related to land and to the means of acquiring land. A change in the relationships of various section of the village society was imperative in order to expand the area under cultivation.

So far the peasant family form of labour organisation had dominated agricultural production in Hadauti. The peasant plough units in a village were denoted as karsa halas in contrast to the himayati halas. Participation of ordinary peasants in superior variety of food grains and cash crop production in early 18th century was almost on par with the himayatis and the patels. However, growing link of agriculture with market and credit exposed the peasant production to market forces, many a times resulting in heavy losses. Usurious credit often compelled the smaller peasants to revert back to subsistence and extensive agriculture. The difference in the number of plough units cultivated by the peasant households, belonging to the same cast, enjoying a similar claim on the land under their plough, underlined sharp inequalities, which had emerged amongst the peasant households. As compared to the patels and sahas, resources of an ordinary peasant household were quite limited. The himayatis who were the privileged section of the village society could no longer remain complacent, about their claim in the village surplus, as it could hardly be maintained without agricultural expansion. Although, growth of a rich peasant sector in the village society was not always a smooth and steady process but in 18th century there was a noticeable increase in the participation of the himayatis in agricultural production.

The need to bring about quantitative and qualitative change in agricultural production prompted the state to make adequate provisions of credit and state patronage for peasants as well as to allow the expansion of non-peasant agriculture. Participation of non-peasant section of society in agriculture was in the form of Gharu and karsa dav halas, resources support for jammet (sad) and
revenue farming. The state itself began organising agriculture as *sarkari halas*. It led to expansion of non-peasant sector of agriculture and an increase in the number of *hali cultivators*. While in the peasant form of production, the labour and capital resources were of a peasant family which constituted the basic unit of production, in the non-peasant sector, capital inputs were provided by the party organising production and the form of labour organisation was primarily the *halis* and *rojgarden*.

In some of the *jagir* villages share of the *himayatis* in agriculture production had become much larger than the average of 20 percent, earlier. In the *khalsa* villages *himayati* plough units were only 13 percent while the big merchant moneylenders plough units had risen to 14 percent of the cultivated area. Besides, in many of the *khalsa* villages local *sahas* and *bohras* were involved with the peasant agriculture by way of providing inputs for *jameet* as well as through the system of giving ‘sad’. It suggests that because a large number of peasants needed resource support the state tried to involved *bohras*, *sahas* and other resourceful individuals. The incentive which *bohras* and *sahas* were given to provide such resource support to the peasants is not clear. Generally, the rate of revenue for the *karsa dav halas* of even the big merchant moneylenders was according to the local *ramreet* (prevailing revenue practice). As a result of such incentives to resourceful individuals several new villages were settled by taking out surplus land from long standing villages. Some of the villages were entrusted to the merchants or state officials as *taluka*. At times a *jagir* was given for shouldering this responsibility. Some of them were extended the privilege of having *gharu halas* in the *taluka* villages.

A direct result of expansion of the non-peasant economy was an increasing number of *halis* in every village. The growing demand for agricultural labour in the non-peasant *halas* forced many to work as *halis*. As a result a large number
of poor peasants who had been reduced to cultivating less than one plough unit by the 1720's got reduced to the status of halis.

Expansion of non-peasant agriculture had deep implications for rural economy and society. The practice of entrusting villages in taluka for better management, mobilising resources support for jameet, sad etc. and the need of labour input for the hawalas implied an increasing interaction between peasant and resource rich section of the society. It also implied greater production for market. The, himayatis and merchants owned huge food grain stocks sold at high profit during scarcity years. These profits fuelled the expansion of non-peasant sector further and tied agriculture firmly to the market. The attitude of the karsa towards sarkari halas was far more positive than the merchant halas perhaps because of the peasants being used to the authority and claims of the state.

A scrutiny of the tensions and conflicts pervading the 18th century village society shows that many of these emanated from the very process of consolidation of state power. For instance, the disputes about the village boundaries or resentment against revenue rates or method of assessment and collection or the disputes between the jagirdars and dohli holders etc. Some of the disputes were of a different nature as these were within the village society, such as the dispute about pateli biswas or bapoti right on land or high handedness of the patel and patwari. The nature of state intervention in various disputes differed according to the issue involved. Number of disputes in which the state was also involved appears to be fewer than the disputes between individuals or with in a section or between two sections of the village society. On many occasions when a dispute could not be resolved at the village level, the matter was reported to the state. As a result intervention in village affairs had become a routine for the state.
Inspite of the caste network and genealogical ties amongst the patels as well as between a Patel and *karsa* which helped the state to maintain production and revenue flow, individual egos and interests could lead to serious rivalries. The disputes about pateli *biswas* due to the law of inheritance governing pateli rights had assumed serious proportions and often required state intervention. At times, there were serious disputes about the pateli *biswas* held by the patels belonging to different castes and the land in their respective pateli *patti*. The disputes between the Meenas about the pateli *patti biswas* in M.Pachail could only be settled through state intervention in favour of the *Brahmin* patels. It shows that the disputes and tensions about pateli *biswas* and the caste based rivalries to acquire pateli right, undermined the inner cohesion of the village society and marred the possibility of settling disputes at the local level. As a result, efforts to resolve disputes at the local level, often witnessed resistance and state intervention was sought by contending parties in their favour.

The dispute between peasants and the Patel patwari combine of *mauza* Babli revolved around the issues of corruption and high handedness of these officials. Since, the Patel and patwari and the *himayatis* were acting in collusion, the state found it difficult to punish the Patel and patwari alone and adopted a conciliatory approach and closed the matter by taking undertakings from both the sides. Perhaps the state did not want to alienate the *himayati* patel patwari combine as they were its mainstay in the village society or the state understood the real reason behind the complaint to be mutual jealousies and rivalries rather than resentment against village level corruption.

The growing state intervention in the rural society is also visible in the manner in which the disputes between the different sections of the village were resolved. The disputes about *dohli* land were between the different sections of rural society. The peasants as well as the *jagirdars* resisted their effort to extend the
area sanctioned as *dohli*. The attitude of the state towards the *dohli* holders was generally of patronage but at times it had leave such disputes to the discretion of the *jagirdar*. The disputes between *kholads* and the agriculturist section of the village society were also of various types. In some cases the peasants reported their disputes with the village *kholads* for arbitration. It appears from some of the cases that, even when an artisan or menial acquired some land the attitude of the peasants towards him did not change.

There was also a tendency particularly amongst the *himayatis* to encroach upon each other's customary share in the revenue resources of the village. There were repeated orders to the *tahalwas* of *jagirdars* to maintain the *dastur* and *patti* of *chaudhary* and *kanungo* in the *jagir* villages. Some of the patels also complained against the attitude of the *himayatis* towards pateli *hasil*. One of the patels described it graphically, "*hath ucaya de che*". More often than not the state succeeded in checking such encroachments on each other's share and in maintaining the balance.

The village society failed to evolve any effective mechanism to check the corruption, high handedness and transgression of authority at the village level. Role of the *panchas* also remained limited to imposing norms of social behaviour in the village. Even when the *panchas* who were considered to be the community and village representatives intervened in the disputes about land or administrative matters, they could not afford to ignore the interests of state. Success of state in upholding an unequal distribution of economic resources and social discrimination had been greatly facilitated by the institution of *panchas*, enjoying customary authority for imposing fines and penalties in cases of violation of social norms. Usurpation of this autochthonous institution by the state paved the way for perpetuation of an essentially discriminatory social system. The state found itself increasingly answerable for safeguarding the interests and
monitoring the activities of the various sections of the village society. State intervention in village affairs had thus increased considerably during this period.

A study of the forms of resistance adopted by the ordinary peasants, artisans and menials shows that their primary objective was to create better conditions to live within the Hada State. Sending petitions to state collectively or individually always remained to be the first choice. Most of the petitions were sent through the recognised leaders like the village patel and patwari, but some times the state could be approached even directly, when the issue concerned only a particular section and not the village or kasba in general. Although the overall attitude of various sections was of compliance but in some cases the peasants resisted by adopting evasive and time gaining tactics. It can be inferred from some cases that even the lowest section of the village society could adopt open and direct forms of resistance such as gatya against violation of customary norms by the village hierarchy. The complaints of the villagers were not only against the village hierarchy but also at time against the state policy, but the forms of resistance in these situations were never direct. The reasons for not resisting openly also emanated from the general perception of nature of state and authority. Although, the peasants held the state in high esteem but the kasht ka patters issued from time to time refer to the request made by the karsa to spell out or clarify the revenue rates or reclassifying the village land. It shows that the peasants had not lost their bargaining power with the state completely. Therefore, migration or flight always remained to be the last resort.

There are many instances of individual methods of cheating the system by a cross section of the village society. Concealment of crops, stealing from the state share of grains, misbehaving with the sehna or trying to manipulate the process of lata and selling the village trees etc. were the easier way outs. The state tried to deal with such methods of cheating the system for making life easier by
imposing heavy penalties. In the case of cheating the state the penalty could be much higher for a patel as compared to an ordinary peasants or menial.

Economic growth in the region was nowhere more clearly visible than in the emergence of a composite and powerful merchant class. Besides the different Vaishya caste, the Brahmins had also entered trade and money lending. The three main groups of merchants who had developed regular dealings with the state from 17th century onwards were the Nandwana, Sinwadi and Gujrati Nagar Brahmins. The Nandwana and Sindwadi merchants originally operating in Mewar had been encouraged by the Kota chiefs to spread their network towards Hadauti. In 18th century many Maratha Brahmins and Gosains had also developed big business establishment in Kota. Besides, these big traders, there were a number of local merchants living in the kasbas. As many as 14 and 16 different mahajan castes lived in kasba Kota and Rampura respectively. There are also some references to Turki bohras and Khatri traders operating in the region. A section of the merchants had emerged as sahukars. They acted as market leaders and could easily raise money from the smaller merchant in the same trade. At times, to meet an urgent financial need of the state the whole market associated with a particular trade pooled in money to be given as loan.

The links between the merchants and the state turned particularly advantageous to the former with the growth of trade network. It was the changed the pattern of grain trade which earned substantial profits for the merchant class of Hadauti. Reduction in padna sales and growing involvement of merchants in the marketing of grains reduced the state control on grain trade. Many big and small traders lifted state share of grains from the villages in such sales. References of grain traders coming from adjacent principalities suggest that the market for grain was not strictly local, inspite of the difficulties involved in transporting. With the expansion of the grain market it became increasingly unnecessary for the state to
carry on with the *padna* sales as before. Growing control of the merchants over grain trade lead to spread of commerce and widening of markets.

The state also followed an active policy of promoting trade. It resulted in granting many new facilities to the merchants and growth of many new *kasbas*. In the later half of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century a number of *kasbas* like Umed Ganj, Shahbad and Ganesh Ganj emerged at state's initiative. It strengthened the trading network which tied the villages to each other and to the near by *kasba* inhabited by the big traders. With the changed pattern of grain trade, regular dealings with the *kasba* merchants became necessary. As a result several *kasbas* had acquired a substantial *mahajan* and *Brahamin* population who had their roots in the village but interests in joining the expanding trade network operating through the *kasbas*. The state also introduced a new system of *kaurda-lagati* (levy) on trade transactions in the upcoming *kasbas* such as *kasba* Ganeshaganj in c. 1783. It ensured a profit margin for both the big traders as well as the petty traders and *banjaras*. In this system two different rates of *lagati* were to be charged from *kaurda-sauda* traders and the *banjaras*. It had made the mediation of *kasba* trader necessary for both the *banjaras* and petty traders. The tying up of the *banjaras* and *kaurda-sauda* traders to the *kasba mahajans* expanded the trade network internally and strengthened the links between the local market and the wider market network. All these developments show the impact of state intervention in promotion of trade network.

Many of the *kasbas* functioned not only as a market but also as production centres. *Kasbas* Kota, Kethun and Barod had a large population of weavers living there. Market and production had attracted a variety of castes and communities to the *kasbas*. As compared to the villages where the artisans and menials were about 20 percent of the population, they were almost 50 percent in the *kasbas*. The *Brahamins* and *mahajans* were 30 to 45 percent of the *kasba* population. A
related development was that some of the old kasbas had acquired new market centres. Rampura was the new market township added to kasba Kota in this manner. Within a kasba also the markets were fairly specialised catering to different types of needs and demands. The demand for the goods manufactured in the kasbas was created by sociological as well as political factors. The money borrowed from the bohras for the various small expenditures by the Kota chief in 17th century brings out the importance attached to such customary obligations of the chief. In 18th century there are references to purchase of luxury items as well. The demand, created by customary obligations, was fulfilled largely by local production and small traders, whereas, the luxury items were brought from far off places by the big traders operating in the region. For instance, while the chundri ka lapettas and pagh-phentas were bought from the Khatris of Baran, the pashminas and silks were bought from the Gosain traders.

It is true that non-agricultural production was not confined to the kasbas to the exclusion of villages, but its size was larger in kasbas than in villages. It seems that, in a kasba size of non-agricultural production was much bigger than agricultural production. Non-agricultural production in Hadauti consisted of mainly a group of products based upon agriculture like oil, liquor distillation, dye stuffs, sugar, cotton yarn and calicoes. Construction works were also a significant part of the non-agricultural production. Some of the artisans who were involved in weaving, dying printing, distilling and oil pressing were able to accumulate some capital and expand production. Sale and purchase of property in Kota shows that many of the artisans could afford to buy houses in the township. It suggests that there was a section amongst the artisans who were relatively better off.

The practice of begar associated with the life of artisans had not disappeared but some sections of the kasba artisans were able to gain some relief from baithi begar in 18th century. The orders issued by Bheem Singh specified the jobs for
which different artisans and menial castes could be engaged and the rate of payment. In the later half of 18th century several orders were issued from time to time on the complaints of artisans and menials living in kasbas. Protection extended to these sections in the kasbas promoted production for market and discouraged begar without formally putting an end to all types of customary exchange and services. This shift in the policy of state towards the artisans and menials and their protests against harassment indicates that the position of the kasba artisans was better than their rural counterparts.

Thus, while the early years of 18th century witnessed the tremors of the political crisis rocking the Mughal empire but the situation stabilised in the later half of the 18th century. Although the entry of Marathas in the region created new financial pressures upon the meagre state resources but the political effort for expansion and intensification of agriculture increased the resources at the command of state. The himayatis and the merchants played a significant role in this process and reaped the benefits in return. Thus, the period witnessed economic growth and expansion of the trade network inspite of temporary dislocations unlike many other Rajput principalities of Rajasthan.