CHAPTER 1: HISTORICAL GROWTH OF OUDH RENT ACT

The British introduced the rule of law into their colonies. This rule was an attempt to civilize their subjects, as if they lived without any rule before becoming the subjects of British empire. The British were teaching their subjects the significance of the rule of law by forcing them to live according to this rule. The Land Rent Act introduced into Awadh after her annexation is an expression of the British rule of law. This rule of law was responsible for all kinds of miseries imposed upon those who cultivated land with their own hands. These cultivators of the Awadh soil became acquainted with the Rent Act for the first time in 1868. This Rent Act was however withdrawn and in its place another Act was introduced, called the Second Oudh Rent Act of 1886. The Rent Act of 1886 had its own imperfections and was amended in 1921. However, the United Provinces Tenancy Act of 1939 made the Oudh Rent Act of 1886 and its amendment in 1921 null and void. Since 1939 the tenants of Awadh lost their special status, they are living under the same roof as the tenants of Agra Province. The history of peasant sufferings and peasant uprisings is deeply connected with the history of the Oudh Rent Act. In this chapter I have attempted to study the growth of the Oudh Rent Act, from its birth to its demise, with the hope that such a study may give me a picture of peasant protest that occurred during the British rule in Awadh.

This chapter is divided into five different sections, viz., Condition of Tenantry Prior to the Oudh Rent Act, First Oudh Rent Act of 1868, Second Oudh Rent Act of 1886, the Oudh Rent (Amendment) Act of 1921 and the United Provinces Tenancy Act of 1939.

Condition of Tenantry Prior to the Oudh Rent Act: Before the intervention
of the East India Company in the affairs of Awadh, i.e. before 1775, the tenants in Awadh enjoyed a paramount power. This power came to them not through any written contract with their landlords but through their art of agriculture. Agricultural art and skill was restricted to the people of the lower castes like Kurmis, Koeries, Lodhs and Ahirs. What is a weaver for the production of textile goods or an ironsmith for the production of iron tools, so is the position of an expert in agriculture for the production of food grains. Not everybody can be a weaver or an ironsmith so also not everybody can be an agriculturist. The agricultural art and skill was the only instrument through which the agricultural castes defended themselves against the enhancement of rent, etc. The fear that they will leave the land and go to some other lands kept the landlords restricted to the normal rent. While commenting on the earlier days Baden-Powell writes,

Land was once as abundant as it was fertile, and good cultivating classes were attracted to it as tenants. Such are the large classes of Kurmis and Muraos, who form a considerable part of the tenantry, and number about a million of souls. They are the backbone of the wealth of the country, and, though they will pay very high rents, the value in which they are held will deter a landlord from driving them off his estate by excessive extortion.  

History tells a little different story. The tenants who were attracted to Awadh were not charged high rents, they were charged lower rents than the tenants of other castes during those days to which Baden-Powell is referring. It is they who were responsible for the land-reclamation and for making soil worth cultivation. They were responsible for making soil fertile. Because of their technical proficiency in agriculture, the land was in need of them. The demand was for tenants, and not for land. Land was in abundance, not the tenants.

Tapan Raychaudhuri writes while referring to a report of the British officials. As late as 1772, British officials wrote in envious admiration of Oudh's flourishing agriculture under Shuja-ud-daula that his metropolis Faizabad 'eclipsed Delhi, after the anarchy of 1759-61, in prosperity and
It is the tenantry of Awadh which was responsible for the flourishing of agriculture. One of the possible reasons for the flourishing of agriculture was the reclamation of land. New areas of jungle were brought under the plough. The extension of cultivated land gave way to more production. Land was in abundance, but not the cultivated land. The cultivated land was created by the tenants of lower castes. In the beginning less amount of rent was charged from those who reclaimed land. As Bayly points out, 'Kurmi, Kacchi and Koeri... castes were given special rental rates for bringing areas of jungle under the plough. In the first five years, for instance, the rent might be only what was common for soil of the same type.' Bayly finds their settlements in the Eastern, Western and Northern Awadh. They came from the Delhi region where condition became very disturbed, no agriculture was possible in those conditions. According to Bayly Awadh 'gave protection to migrant families of the castes which specialised in agricultural production.' Awadh gave protection to them, and in return they gave agricultural products to Awadh. This is how agriculture came to a flourishing state during the days of Shuja-ud-daula.

The villages of Awadh were importing expert agriculturists, i.e. the cultivators of lower castes, from the disturbed North-Western Provinces. At the same time they were in the process of exporting non-agricultural hands to the urban centres of Awadh. So there was no pressure on the agricultural land or rural life. There were two major sources for the absorption of rural mass in the cities. First was the army and second the urban-based industries. Soldiers for the army were recruited from villages. And soldiers were recruited not only by the Nawabs of Awadh but also by the taluqdars and other kind of amirs. In 1849, according to Sleeman, 'taluqdars had 250 forts, 500 pieces of cannon and an average of 400 men in each fort.' And 'at the time of annexation there were 623
forts, 351 in good condition. Concerning the employment of the rural mass by the Nawabs, Bayly remarks, 'Peasants formed a reserved army of the early Nawabs'... 'Asif's great monuments in the city of Lucknow were said to have employed 40,000 people from the district during the horror of the 1783 famine.' What is wrong with Asif's employment of famine-stricken people? He found a way for the survival of people.

From seventeenth century Awadh had a reputation for the textile industry. But once the textile industry of the North-Western provinces collapsed because of the anarchic condition prevailing there, Awadh had a textile boom. Textile producing experts like weavers, spinners and dyers migrated to Awadh. Awadh welcomed these textile experts as it welcomed the people of the agricultural castes. Mirzapur (ceded in 1775) became the "Manchester of India." The eighteenth century textile boom in Awadh had its beginning in the Lucknow part of Awadh from the early part of the seventeenth century. As Naqvi points out 'In Oudh Lucknow was one of the principal centres of cotton fabric from the early 17th century and W. Finch had found great traffic in "linen" here.' Later Daryabad and Khairabad became great centres of textile production. In due course Nawgaon (Hardoi), Akbarpur, Tanda and Jalalpur (Pysabad) emerged as the textile centres. Benaras produced silk of fine quality. Awadh textile had both national and international markets. Referring to the export of Awadh textile, Naqvi points out 'Oudh stuffs used to be exported to Persia, Europe and South East Asia through the port of Calcutta, and presumably a smaller quantity of Central Asia by overland routes.' Awadh textile was popular with the western merchants who were operating in India. Referring to these merchants Bayly writes 'So strong was this demand from the "western merchants" indeed that the East India Company found it necessary to use its political power in the Lucknow court to secure a monopoly on the production of the Awadh weavers at Tanda and Aliabad.' Monopoly over the product of wea-
vers' allured the British to have monopoly over the whole of Awadh.

The textile industry of Awadh was spread out in its cities as well as villages. Village weavers were independent of the large-scale weaving which was operative in the Awadh towns and cities. Village contributed to the textile industry in three ways. First, they supplied their own share of finished textile goods. Secondly, they supplied labour force to the urban centres. And thirdly, they produced cotton for the urban textile industry. There is a fourth way, that of supplying food grains to the industrial workers of all kinds. Awadh was not only self-sufficient in producing food grains, it had the record of exporting food grains. Referring to the importance of textile Naqvi says, 'In the middle age, cotton fabrics dominated the economy in much the same manner, as steel works do today.' Many Awadh towns were formed, others later came to be known, for their cotton fabrics. The status of these towns was the same as the status of Jamshedpur in our own age. The picture of Jamshedpur in our mind brings out the picture of a town where nothing but steel is produced. Similar is the situation of mid-eighteenth century Awadh towns. They were Jamshedpurs of textile industry.

The British wished to extinguish the textile industry of Awadh in order to introduce their own Manchester textile. They succeeded in annexing Benaras in 1775 and Lower Doab and Rohilkhand in 1801. Finally, they annexed Awadh in 1856 on the pretext of ill-management of the State. The real reason was to crush the textile of Awadh. As Professor Bipan Chandra says, 'In reality, it was the immense potential of Awadh as a market for Manchester goods which excited Dalhousie's greed and aroused his "philanthropic feelings".' The process of annexing Awadh was started by Wellesley when he imposed the Subsidiary Alliance on Nawab Saadat Ali Khan in 1801. According to Rudrangshu Mukherjee this alliance was an interference, and 'such an interference would provide not "only supper of Oudh"
but also immense commercial and economic gains for British imperialism.\textsuperscript{13}

Awadh was not restricted only to the production of textile. It had a well established iron industry. Shuja started producing arms for his army. Barnett accepts 'Factories for producing muskets, and foundries for cannon, were soon producing war material which rivalled that of the Company in quality.'\textsuperscript{14} There was all-round industrial development.

Connected with the industrial development of Awadh is the fact of growing importance of Awadh towns as centres of trade and commerce. Awadh towns were well connected with roads and rivers. There were two highways passing through Awadh. The Jamuna and Gandak appear as two arms of Awadh, and its body being drenched by the water of the Ganges, Ghagra and Gomti. The rivers Son and Chambal help trade with the Central India. The Ganges functions as the sea of Awadh; it carries goods to Calcutta for the international markets. If eighteenth century saw Lucknow becoming a great trade centre at Gomti, Fyzabad became a great centre at Ghagra. Jaunpur was a junction for two highways. Other than Punjab there is no part of India which is so suitable for riverine traffic as Awadh. But Punjab was in turmoil. As Bayly points out '... the commerce... which had once existed along the route between Delhi and Mughal Bengal was replicated along the link between Lucknow and Calcutta.'\textsuperscript{15} Because of Maratha invasions of Bengal, Awadh was even safer than Bengal for trade and commerce. According to Chaudhuri 'during the period of Maratha invasions close to 4,00,000 people were killed in Bengal and Bihar and among them were many merchants, weavers, silk dealers, and other useful inhabitants.'\textsuperscript{16} In the whole of North, Awadh was the safest place for trade and commerce. To have trade of one's own industrial goods Nawabs imposed heavy duties "on imported goods".\textsuperscript{17} The basic economic truths were known to the Nawabs.

The causal conditions which led to the industrial development of Awadh, and swung the balance of trade in her favour, were also responsible
for the development of Awadh urban life and culture. According to Naqvi 'The influx of poets and intellectuals at Lucknow court from Delhi and surrounding areas in the last decades of the 18th and early 19th centuries is common knowledge.'¹⁸ The fall of Delhi coincides with the rise of Lucknow and Fyzabad. Hambly finds the prosperity of eighteenth century Awadh 'manifested especially in the flourishing conditions of urban life.'¹⁹ But it is impossible for the urban life to flourish without the agricultural base. As Naqvi points out 'The agricultural fertility acted as the base on which the superstructure of industrial prosperity could possibly be erected.'²⁰ Villages supplied not only the manpower for urbanisation but also food to the urban dwellers, both industrial and non-industrial.

The British did not like the prosperity of Awadh. They decided to annex it and convert it into an agricultural form of Britain. For the promotion of British industries, Indian industries must be stopped. India should remain only an agricultural country. As R.C. Dutt quotes a remark of a Director of the East India Company made in 1823, 'Henry St. George Tucker, himself a Director of the East India Company wrote in 1823: "India is thus reduced from the state of a manufacturing to that of an agricultural country."'²¹ The programme of converting India into an agricultural country was started by the British long before the annexation of Awadh. After annexation the British decided to send the urban population of Awadh back to villages. If the eighteenth century saw the rural population migrating to the urban centres of Awadh, with the coming of the British the table has turned, the urban population started migrating to villages. Agricultural activities are performed in villages, not in cities. The Subsidiary Alliance was the first calculated step. It led to the 'replacing of thousands of Saadat Ali's own officers and troops, making his regime suffer gross abuse from those who were dispossessed of their livelihood.'²² These troops had no other option but to migrate to villages from where they
were recruited. After annexation the situation worsened. Not the Nawab’s troops were thrown out, ‘the taluqdars’ forts were levelled, and their armed retainers permanently disbanded.” The total of disbanded soldiers of the Nawab and his taluqdars will be in lakhs, not in thousands. Where did these disbanded soldiers and retainers go? Could they afford the luxurious urban life without jobs? They had no other option but to migrate to villages. Except in the days of famines, villages allow people to survive, if not with two meals then with one meal.

The next step was the disbanding of textile workers. The process started with Wellesley’s intervention into Awadh affairs. Import of Manchester textiles replaced the export of Awadh textiles in the same fashion in which the British soldiers replaced the Awadh soldiers. The quality of export from Awadh was very different after 1801 from what it was prior to this date. Consider the following comparative study by Rudrangshu Mukherjee:

In 1795-6 Rs. 50 lakhs worth of goods were exported from Awadh; in the same year Awadh piece-goods exported from Calcutta were worth Rs. 30 lakhs... By 1803 exports from Awadh to Bengal were Rs. 76,18,193, but the proportion of cotton piece-goods within the total amount had fallen to only Rs. 9,95,630. Significantly, this gap was filled by the increasing export of raw cotton which was worth Rs. 55,42,927 within the total export to Bengal of Rs. 76,18,193 in 1803.

The fall in the export of textile piece-goods and rise in the export of raw cotton shows the decline of Awadh textile industry after the imposition of Subsidiary Alliance. The textile industry of Awadh totally collapsed after the annexation. The ‘Manchester of India’, Mirzapur, became a cotton market long before the annexation. As Bayly points out ‘At its height after 1861, Mirzapur was primarily a forward cotton market for Calcutta.’ On the same page Bayly refers to Mirzapur as the Manchester of India.

Once the textile industry of Awadh declined, and simultaneously the
other industries were not allowed to develop, the people involved in textile work became unemployed. They had no chance to migrate to other textile centres of India. Just as they came to Awadh from the North-Western part of India in the mid-eighteenth century, they could have possibly migrated to other parts of India if the situation became difficult in Awadh. This option was unfortunately not open to them, for the British discouraged the production of textile throughout India. In order to introduce their Manchester goods in India, the Company, according to Dr. Tara Chand: 'oppressed the weavers and other artisans and perpetrated inhuman crimes to crush the rival producers: instances of thumbs of workmen being cut off to prevent them from winding raw silk or weaving cloth were not unknown.'

Under these circumstances the textile workers could not leave Awadh. The doors of Indian textile were closed to them. They had no option but to remain in Awadh. What they did was simply to migrate to the Awadh villages from the Awadh cities. The cotton weavers and spinners perhaps became cotton growers. Thus they increased the rural population. They too became a part of village economy, if there was any such thing, like the soldiers and retainers of Awadh Nawabs and taluqdars. The pressure on agricultural land increased beyond imagination.

Though the trade and commerce of Awadh did not decline in the nineteenth century, it was moulded to fulfil the needs of the British economy. We can see this from the following remark of Rudrangshu Mukherjee, 'China got raw cotton from Awadh, Britain got tea from China, and Awadh got British control.' Thus the Imperial Balance was maintained. And in maintaining the Imperial Balance Awadh got nothing but poverty, particularly the poverty of the rural masses.

Like trade, the agriculture of Awadh did not decline, but was moulded to satisfy the needs of the British economy. The production of those crops increased which were to be exported. Referring to the expansion of agri-
culture in the United Provinces during 1860-1900, Elizabeth Whitcombe writes, 'The expansion was most marked in "valuable" crops... especially indigo, sugar-cane and cotton.' To this list of the "valuable crops" was later added opium, which too had its market in China, particularly when the cotton export to China declined. The Chinese became addicted to opium, so export to China continued, earlier of cotton, later of opium. Referring to the cultivation of cotton in Awadh, Rudrangshu Mukherjee points out 'the whole purpose of gearing up cotton cultivation and export of raw cotton from Awadh to Calcutta was to supply the China market.' The China market was restricted to cotton and opium, for wheat, sugar-cane and indigo the British had the whole European market. As Rudrangshu Mukherjee further points out 'The expansion of the European market for indigo stimulated the cultivation and trade of indigo in Awadh.' Thus what the cultivators of Awadh produced was not for their own consumption, it was for the consumption of foreigners. Not only that the cultivators of Awadh did not eat indigo or opium, they were not in a position to eat even wheat and sugar. It is for the payment of high rents that they produced the so-called valuable crops. And then they had hardly any land left to produce the coarse crops which they could possibly eat. So they had hardly anything to eat, yet they survived, survived through indebtedness, through bondages.

The Imperial Gazetteer of India writes 'Oudh has probably the densest rural population if any equal area in the world.' This is the position of Awadh at the close of the nineteenth century. Within a span of hundred years an extremely thin rural population bursts into an extremely thick rural population. Who is responsible for the density of rural population? It is certainly not the high birth-rate in Awadh. The responsibility goes to the coming of the British to Awadh. Collapse of industries led the industrial workers to migrate to villages. The soldiers and retainers of
Nawabs and their taluqdars after disbanding migrated to villages. In the eighteenth century only the cultivators of agricultural castes came to Awadh from outside. But they increased the cultivated land of Awadh. They did not make land crowded, they decreased the crowd by extending the volume of land for cultivation. But there is a limit to which the volume can be extended. Perhaps they reached the maximum limit. Migration from cities to villages was more than the land could hold. The tenants were no more in demand, it was the land that was in demand.

While referring to the population of U.P. peasants during the nineteenth century, Crooke writes:

... the conditions vary enormously in different parts of the country. The Azamgarh peasant, with 1244 souls to a square mile of cultivation, has to subsist on about half an acre; in the Meerut division to the extreme west each person has about an acre and a half; in Oudh about three quarters of an acre.32

Meerut was the suburb of Shahjahanabad, and Azamgarh belongs to the Greater Awadh which was ceded in 1801. Meerut agriculturists and textile workers migrated to different parts of Awadh in the eighteenth century. They were not any kind of burden on Awadh; they improved its economy. The agriculturists brought about the green revolution and the textile workers the textile boom. However, in the nineteenth century a qualitatively different kind of migration to Awadh villages occurred. Those who had no knowledge of agricultural skills started migrating to Awadh villages. The weavers, dyers and spinners of cotton were trying to grow cotton. Those who were trained to thrash human heads were trying to thresh wheat and rice. Those who lived by saluting their maliks were forced to plough the soil. Agriculture was the last resort of all kinds of urban unemployed hands.

In this situation the worst sufferers were the tenants of the agricultural castes. In the changed situation they were charged more rent than the tenants of the higher castes. Caste-wise imposition of rent became a new convention. Those who reclaimed land, those who made Awadh soil fer-
tile, those who generated more land for occupation became the worst sufferers. They were now charged more rent because they belonged to lower castes. They had no written contract with their landlords, so suffered more.

The First Oudh Rent Act of 1868: It took considerable time for the British to introduce this Act, for Awadh was annexed in 1856. And one may be misled by the designation "Rent Act". One may think that this Act looked after the "rent-payers". But this Act looked after only the "revenue-payers" and other rich landholders. How this was done will be shown in this section. The Rent Act of 1868 was the consequence of the second Summary Settlement. The Governor General gave assent to this Act on July 22, 1868. There is a history behind the introduction of this Act. The history goes back to the first Summary Settlement. That Settlement was made in 1856 after the annexation of Awadh in February 1856. The first Summary Settlement incorporated the principles laid down by Lord Dalhousie. In his letter to the settlement officers he instructed them to bear in mind, as a leading principle that the desire and intention of the Government is to deal with the actual occupants of the soil, that is, with village zamindars, or with the proprietary coparcenaries, which are believed to exist in Oude, and not to suffer the interposition of middlemen, as Talookdars, Farmers of the revenue, and such like. The claims of these, if they have any tenable claims, may be more conveniently considered at a future period, or brought judicially before the courts competent to investigate and decide upon them.

It is the tone and the spirit behind the letter which is more important than the actual result of the Settlement. Dalhousie's letter clearly humiliates the taluqdars by calling them 'farmers of the revenue' and by giving priority to zamindars over them. The settlement was to be made with the zamindars, and if there was any left-over it could be settled with the taluqdars at 'a future period' after studying their claims. Taluqdars treated themselves as rajas and nawabs, having their forts with all kinds of soldiers and retainers. They were not just "the farmers of
revenue" as Dalhousie calls them. The relation between them and the cultivators of the soil was that which exists between a raja and his praja. Referring to the relation between the taluqdars and their cultivators before annexation, Metcalf points out that "Their states have been called "little kingdoms", and the taluqdars, as little "kings" or rajas, were not owners of land but rulers of men." Dalhousie wished the taluqdars to know that they were not 'the rulers of men'; they were not even the owners of land. All land belongs to the Company; the taluqdars were only the revenue collectors for the areas of land allotted to them. And as revenue collectors they were inferior to the zamindars in the eyes of the British. They had a secondary status.

Crooke gives expression to Dalhousie's view when he points out that the British 'were pledged to support the village community, which they regarded as the only element in the country which deserved to be maintained; they looked on the Taluqdar as a grasping interloper, a danger to the State, a curse to the people themselves.' Crooke has certainly exaggerated the situation. For the moral character of the taluqdars was certainly not the concern of the British. Their concern was only the might of the taluqdars; they were "a danger to the State". They had forts and armies with military equipments. They were treated by their subjects as rajas. The British at this stage only wished to convert these rajas into mere "landlords", and their subjects into "tenants". Raja and praja has to be converted into landlord and tenant; the later is purely an economic relationship. It is after annexation, and not prior to the annexation, that the taluqdars became mere 'farmers of the revenue'.

By having direct settlement with the zamindars, the British were killing two birds with one stone. The ego of zamindars was inflated, they were "mini-taluqdars", though without forts and retainers. The taluqdars on their own turn, in spite of their forts and retainers, were nothing but
Neither taluqdars nor zamindars were rulers of men, they were simply holders of land. 'Taluqdars' and 'zamindars' were mere titles for collecting rents from the tenants and paying revenue to the Company. Zamindars were not given any kingly powers of which the taluqdars were deprived.

Though the British were against the taluqdars, direct confrontation with them at this stage would not have been wise. So they decided to attack their financial resources. They snatched parts of their estates and settled them directly with the zamindars. In the first Settlement the taluqdars lost some 9,900 villages out of 23,500 villages which they held at the time of annexation. This was a very peculiar kind of arrangement. If all 23,500 villages had been directly settled with the zamindars, then this would have led the British to have direct confrontation with the taluqdars, for which they were not prepared at this stage. Without confronting the taluqdars their power was to be weakened. Though a large number of villages were left with the taluqdars, what they got was only a left-over, left-over after the settlement with the zamindars. A class of landholders was created which will not bow down before the taluqdars. Perhaps the British thought that this newly created class of landholders would side with them against the taluqdars. They created this class to use it at a proper time in the future. The question has been raised by Metcalf why the direct settlement with zamindars was restricted only to 9,900 villages? Why was it not extended to more number of villages? His response is: 'In view of the government's avowed hostility towards them it is perhaps surprising that the taluqdars retained so many villages as they did. Most likely, they were simply too firmly rooted, and the villagers' rights too indistinct, to permit everywhere their being ousted from power.' Perhaps the 'firm roots of the taluqdars' and not the 'indistinct rights of the villagers' was the reason for the limited number of villages which came in-
to direct settlement. Where there were no claims, fictitious claims could easily be manufactured. But this was not done. The real reason for the limited operation was the principle of consolidation by avoiding confrontation. Perhaps a limit was reached under which the taluqdars would not become totally hostile to the British power. However, the British miscalculated. The taluqdars disliked both, the withdrawal of their villages and the setting up of the new gentry (new landholders) within their boundaries.

Dalhousie's scheme misfired. The first Summary Settlement lasted only fifteen months, from the time of annexation to June 1857 when the War of Independence (Mutiny? Revolt?) started. Taluqdars, who had all the reasons to participate in the War against the British, took active part, carrying the zamindars (new gentry, new landholders, village proprietors) with them. The British had direct settlement with the zamindars, thinking that they would side with them against the taluqdars. But at the time of the War they sided with the taluqdars, which meant the same as rising for the Independence of the country against the foreign rule. Zamindars gave up their parochial interest. They decided to remove the firangees from Awadh. Perhaps the taluqdars, so also the zamindars, were convinced that what was happening in 1857 was the War of Independence against the foreign rule. Of course there were exceptions. But such exceptions have always existed, and will continue existing so long as human civilization exists. If the newly created landholders by the British would have supported the British, as many taluqdars did, the War would have failed from its very start. Of course the War ultimately failed but not without teaching a lesson to the British.

The 1857 War of Independence proved that it was a futile attempt on the part of the British either to abolish the old gentry (taluqdars) or to create a new gentry (zamindars). The British decided that it was not the
new gentry but the old established gentry that must be backed up. After recapturing of power the British made second Summary Settlement. They wished to avoid the mistakes committed by them in the first Summary Settlement. New principles of settlement were to be evolved. The zamindar proved himself as a wrong horse to back. The 1857 War taught the British the lesson that they cannot rule Awadh peacefully without taking taluqders in their favour. Sir James Outram, the Chief Commissioner of Awadh, writes on 5th January 1858 'I see no prospects of returning tranquillity except by having recourse for the next few years to the old taluqdari system ... Talukdars have both powers and influence to exercise for or against us. The village proprietors have neither.' Instead of proving their loyalty to the British, the village proprietors proved their loyalty to the taluqders. So the taluqders deserve favour and not the village proprietors. It is only with the loyalty of the taluqders that the British rule in Awadh was possible. Thus a new "Oudh Policy" had to be evolved, a policy that would endure the British rule in Awadh. The old "Oudh Policy" led to the revolt of 1857; therefore, it must be rejected. The second Settlement gives expression to the "New Oudh Policy", the Policy which was followed by the British till they ultimately left India in 1947. The settlement must be taluqdari settlement, and not the zamindari settlement. The zamindari settlement, the first Settlement, had already failed. The mistake should not be repeated. So the second Summary Settlement was carefully made. Baden-Powell speaks of it "as the taluqdari Settlement". The following remarks are made in the General Report on the Administration of the Province of Oudh: 'Talookdars, if they choose, could materially assist in the re-establishment of authority and the restoration of tranquillity, it was determined by the Right Honourable the Governor-General, that the settlement of the land revenue should be made with talookdars.' Thus, the 'New Oudh Policy' was made with the expectation that the taluq-
dars would assist the British in bringing about peace and tranquillity in Awadh. The events of 1857 should not recur.

Outram's remark quoted above, and so also the Governor-General's order, back the taluqdari system. Retention of the taluqdari system, however, does not mean the retention of the persons who occupy their positions in the system. Positions in the system are constant, persons who occupy those positions are variable. Removing a person from the system is not the same thing as rejecting the system. So far as the stability of the system is concerned, any person is as good as any other person, for persons are only the variables of the system. For stability of the system only constants are required. Following this mathematical principle Canning confiscated the proprietary rights of the taluqdars. There was no danger involved in the confiscation of such rights. Because, after the suppression of the Revolt, as Metcalf points out 'the taluqdars' forts were levelled, and their armed retainers permanently disbanded.' For the sake of consistency the proprietary rights of zamindars and other village proprietors were also confiscated. All of them participated in the War of Independence. All of them should know that the Land of India belongs to the Crown. They can be landholders on the will of the Crown. Thus, Canning started with a pure formal taluqdari system, for which he required only persons (values of the variables) of his choice to fill the positions which are constant.

Baden-Powell justifies Lord Canning's proclamation for the confiscation of proprietary rights of taluqdars. Referring to this proclamation he remarks 'I have never, for my own part, been able to discover what was wrong in Lord Canning's proclamation, or how it was possible to effect any real good in the necessary work of defining and placing land-tenures on a legal basis.' Thus, to provide a rational or legal basis Canning, according to Baden-Powell, begins with a 'tabula rasa as to enable a fresh
start to be made on a reasonable basis.' But unfortunately the British did not begin with a tabula rasa or a clean slate. They began with a highly unclean slate and an extremely unreasonable basis. For the property of those taluqdars who helped the British at the time of the War of Independence was not confiscated. Baden-Powell is aware of this inconsistency, this uncleanness. He himself writes, 'The Mutiny supervened, the work done perished. The war ended; all lands were confiscated by proclamation in 1858, with the exception of the estates of six (reduced to five) loyal taluqdars.' The mathematical formula for the loyal taluqdars was not applied, as if these taluqdars were constants of the system and not its variables. Loyalty is the rational and legal basis for the British rule of law. For the British the rule of law simply means the rule that helped the British to establish their empire. Whosoever helped the British at the time of Revolt deserved to be placed as a taluqdar in the Awadh taluqdar system. Even the loyal subjects of other States of India were given taluqdar estates in Awadh for their loyalty.

The second Summary Settlement, i.e. the taluqdar settlement, was completed in 1859, which settled only one issue, and that issue was not of rent but of revenue. Who should be the revenue-payers? What should be the percentage of revenue to be imposed on the revenue-payers? The taluqdars were considered as the most suitable agents for obtaining revenue. To give them formal recognition they were given Sanads at Lucknow Darbar presided over by Lord Canning on 26th October 1859. These Sanads were documents giving formal recognition to the taluqdars. Concerning these Sanads Metcalf writes that they confirmed the holders in the full proprietary possession of their estates provided only that they paid their revenue, remained loyal to the British government, encouraged agricultural prosperity, preserved the rights of those beneath them on the land. By this act all claims to land in taluqdar possession, no matter how that land had originally been acquired, were forever debarred.
The territorial disputes were solved in the sense that the law courts were not allowed to entertain any appeal concerning these disputes. There could have been two kinds of territorial disputes. A village or a group of villages was attached to a taluqdar of which he was never a landlord. And the territories of some estates were extended by decreasing the territories of the other estates. No sort of appeal against this was allowed. Whatever a taluqdar has got he has got it rightly. No questioning was permitted. Whatever the legal right a taluqdar got over his land, he has got it as a matter of favour. For this favour a taluqdar is expected to be loyal to the British Government. Loyalty to the British was no less an important condition than the payment of revenue. If any taluqdar ever plans to revolt his land right will be withdrawn and his property confiscated. Of course the British made the material condition of revolt impossible. For 'the taluqdars were required to disband their followers, surrender their cannon, and dismantle their forts.'46 They were expected to live like landholders and not like rajas and nawabs. There was no praja to be attracted towards them, there were only tenants from whom rent could be charged. A raja has been converted into a mere taluqdar who pays revenue to the government and collects rent from his tenants.

In their Sanads the taluqdars were required to "preserve the rights of those beneath them". Till the issue of Sanads no law was framed to protect the rights of those beneath the taluqdars. Who were beneath the taluqdars whose rights were to be preserved? There is no specification of those classes of people in the Sanads whose rights were to be preserved. There were so many classes of people who were beneath the taluqdars. Reference has certainly not been made to all of them. Reference has been made only to those classes of people about whom discussion went on for ten years after the award of the Sanads. The discussants were the Chief Commissioner of Awadh, the taluqdars and the British Government. Since there
was a kind of general amnesty given to taluqdars, some kind of amnesty must be given to those zamindars and other village proprietors with whom direct settlement was made in the first Summary Settlement. Some 9,900 villages at that time were snatched from the taluqdars and given to these zamindars. In the second Settlement only 906 villages were settled with the village zamindars. So the zamindars lost some 9,000 villages. These zamindars require sympathetic treatment. If not the proprietary rights, they should be given some kind of right which is superior to that of an ordinary tenant. Thus they were given, as a result of discussion, underproprietary rights, they were proprietors placed under the superior proprietors, the taluqdars.

The zamindars and other village proprietors were given subproprietary tenure or the right of subsettlement by the Act XXVI, called the Oudh Sub-Settlement Act of 1866. This Act was the result of "Oudh Compromise", a compromise reached with the taluqdars, Chief Commissioner and the Government of India. Thus those who were proprietors in the first Settlement became underproprietors in the second Settlement. They were placed beneath the taluqdars. This was a kind of victory of the taluqdars, for the zamindars were not allowed to have their independent status. Of course Canning was happy neither with the taluqdars nor with the village proprietors, the zamindars. Consider the note from the Imperial Gazetteer about Canning's views:

Lord Canning in April, 1858, described the majority of the taluqdars as men, distinguished neither by birth, good service, nor connexion with the soil... but at the same time he justified the new policy by declaring that the village proprietors had shown themselves unfit for the position in which they had been put. In October he was of opinion that the action of the latter had almost amounted to an admission that they did not value independent rights.

The fact that the village proprietors followed the taluqdars in the Revolt of 1857 shows that the former deserve no independent rights, their rights
should be subordinate to the rights of the taluqdars. Taluqdars are bad, but the zamindars are no good. Therefore, Lord Canning accommodated both of them. Such people can function as better instruments for governing a country. Those who distinguish themselves or have independent mind can be a danger to the government.

Concerning a tenant who 'could show that he was once proprietor—i.e. within thirty years before February 13, 1856 (date of annexation) he might be entitled to the occupancy-right.' Occupancy rights to those who were entitled were formally accepted at roughly the same time when the underproprietary rights to zamindars were accepted.

After a couple of years of passing of the Oudh Settlement Act, 1866, the First Oudh Rent Act was passed in 1868. This Act was passed to safeguard the interest of the 'rent-payers', i.e. the interest of those who are technically described as 'tenants'. Tenants are different from those who pay revenue to the government. A taluqdar pays revenue to the government and a tenant pays rent to the taluqdar. Revenue and rent explain the relationship between a taluqdar and a tenant, the latter is subordinate of the former. The First Oudh Rent Act of 1868 safeguarded the interest only of underproprietors and occupancy tenants who were 'beneath the taluqdars'. It did not at all touch the tenants-at-will who formed the majority of people 'beneath the taluqdars'. They were left undefended and unsafe. They had no legal instrument to fight against excesses committed by the taluqdars and underproprietors. The underproprietors were even more cruel to their tenants and subtenants than the taluqdars. It is said by the Government officers and the historians that the tenants suffered more in the underproprietary villages than in the proprietary villages. While writing about occupancy tenants, Baden-Powell remarks

... in Oudh, 'occupancy tenants' as representing the residuary class of persons, who have some right to consideration, and yet not definite enough to be sub-proprietors, & c, are a small class.
Under the Act of 1863 they were holding only 1 per cent of the whole cultivated area; 78 per cent was held by tenants-at-will. Thus those who cultivated 78 per cent of the soil were left at the mercy of proprietors and underproprietors; the Oudh Rent Act of 1868 was not meant to give them legal support. These tenants have been described in the Banking Enquiry Committee Report as those 'who enjoy no rights save that they are allowed to hold their land for one complete agricultural year. Generally they pay high rents for small holdings.'

If the definition of 'tenant' in the context of Oudh tenure system is accepted then the Oudh Rent Act of 1868 is restricted only to one per cent of landholders, those who were occupancy tenants. For Awadh Baden-Powell defines tenant 'When the cultivator of land is not in proprietary possession under the taluqdar, and is not the holder of any "Sir", or "birt", or other of the sub-proprietary holdings, he is a tenant.' This definition of tenant excludes not only the taluqdar, but also all kinds of underproprietors from the class of tenants. Only occupancy tenants and tenants-at-will are genuine tenants. But occupancy tenants occupy only one per cent of the land. So the Rent Act of 1868 takes care of only a small fraction of tenantry. Then how can the Oudh Rent Act of 1868 be even called a Rent Act? It gives no protection to a majority of rent-payers. It is so paradoxical that though it is called Rent Act, it protects only the proprietors and underproprietors with a side glance at the occupancy tenants.

Not only that the Oudh Rent Act of 1868 is no rent Act, it is an anti-tenant Act; for it provides no kind of right to the tenant on the land but provides all kinds of rights to the landlords for evicting the tenants just with one month's notice, and just with the expenses of eight annas. In order to evict the tenant a landlord is required to put only eight-anna stamp on his application. According to Mata Prasad Saksena 'No
limitation on the enhancement of rents was prescribed and the courts were even prohibited from enquiring into propriety of rate of rent payable by ordinary tenants. This is the British rule of law for the Awadh tenants.

The Second Oudh Rent Act of 1886: Not even two decades passed that the Rent Act of 1868 was withdrawn and in its place a new Act was introduced, called the Second Oudh Rent Act of 1886. The Rent Act of 1868 was not worth revising or amending; it was worth only for withdrawing. The British officials started feeling the necessity of withdrawing it. It served its purpose, its continuity is harmful to the cause of the British. What was its purpose? With what intention was it introduced? It had no other purpose but to punish the tenantry with those very hands which led it to participate in the Revolt of 1857. There was a general amnesty granted to the taluqdars and zamindars, but no amnesty to the tenantry which plunged into the revolt with all its crude weapons. The situation of revolt in Awadh was very different from the situation in the rest of the United Provinces and other parts of the country. According to Rudrangshu Mukherjee "The people of Awadh had fought the British". And by "people" he means the rural mass, the tenantry. Concerning the weapons of the 'peasant army' Mukherjee has collected evidence that 'by the beginning of February 1859 there had been collected 29,941 spears, 427,932 swords and 129,414 firearms. Bows and arrows were counted at 6,418. Firearms could be recovered even from the house of an ordinary peasant.' An ordinary peasant had firearms for the reason that the taluqdars' sowars, foot-soldiers and retainers came from the ordinary peasant houses. Even the Nawab's army was rural as has already been pointed out in the preceding section. Raja Jailal, the son of Darshan Singh, was an important figure in the Revolt of 1857. "In the new government of Begum Hazratmahal, Raja Jailal Singh
was made the Minister of War and the Collector of Revenue. He was given the *chukladari* of Dariabad and Azamgarh.⁵⁷ According to Rudrangshu Mukherjee 'Raja Jailal Singh seems to have been the most important and powerful figure on both bodies. He also acted as the link between these bodies and the Begum.'⁵⁸ The bodies in question are 'military cell' and 'court officials'. All the members of his family, his brothers, Beni Madho, the Raja of Atraulia, Raghubar Dayal and his son-in-law Jai Ram Singh participated and perished in revolt. Raja Jailal Singh was executed by the British on October 1, 1859 at Lucknow.⁵⁹ Tenantry in general and Kurmis in particular participated in the freedom struggle of Awadh. For Jailal Singh was a Kurmi, his grandfather, the father of Darshan Singh, was an ordinary Kurmi Cultivator. Kurmi cultivators, who according to Baden-Powell, formed "a considerable part of tenantry", jumped into the fire of revolt because the man of their caste held the highest position of honour in the government of Begum Hazrat Mahal. Tenants of Awadh had hardly any love and respect for the alien rule.

Even if one hesitates in calling the revolt of 1857 as the first War of Indian Independence, it was certainly the first War of Oudh Independence. Rudrangshu Mukherjee quotes Canning admitting that "the rising against our authority in Oude has been general, almost universal".⁶⁰ It is the participation of tenantry in the revolt that has given it its universal character. As a matter of fact only the peasants were fighting throughout the territories of Awadh, for "the sepoys were really peasants in uniform".⁶¹ The strength of the revolt came from the non-uniformed sepoys and the uniformed peasants. This situation was lacking in the other parts of the country. Peasant-participation was missing in those parts; therefore, it was easy to suppress the revolt in those parts. Peasants of Awadh were not fighting for any material gains; they were fighting
for the honour of their king. Perhaps the taluqdars were fighting for their material gains.

In converting a raja to a landlord the British were converting a patron of tenants to their enemy. Those who were leaders of the tenants in 1857 revolt should become their oppressors. This is the best way of punishing the tenantry for its participation in the revolt. This also prohibits the possibility of a future revolt in Awadh; the tenantry has lost its leaders. Rudrangshu Mukherjee writes about the situation

The British destroyed the talukdar-peasant interdependence by conquering Awadh militarily and then buying over the talukdars with rewards of land. It was only then that talukdars became subordinate allies of the Raj, representing the politics of order and collaboration. Defeat led to subordination and loyalty. The peasantry now faced a landlord without the former frills of patronalism and 'rajadom'.

The relation of raja-praja was that of interdependence, but that of taluqdar-tenant is not of interdependence. The tenant is made totally dependent on the taluqdar. If the military defeat made the taluqdars subordinate and loyal to the British, the Rent Act of 1868 made tenants subordinate to the taluqdars without being loyal to them. The British saw to it that the tenants never become collaborators of taluqdars, that they never become loyal to them. If the tenants become allies of the taluqdars then the possibility of revolt occurring again cannot be ruled out. This would endanger the rule of the British in Awadh. Therefore, the Rent Act of 1868 gives no powers to the tenants but gives all powers to the taluqdars. This was the best way of producing a rift between taluqdars and tenants, that they should consider each other as their enemies.

The Sanads made the taluqdars dismantle their forts and remove the military outfit. Instead of the military outfit they were required to establish 'revenue outfit', an outfit which will look after their rent collection from tenants and deposits of revenue to the government. They had to appoint zeladars, karindas, sepoys, etc. The financial aspect of the
State was looked after by this 'revenue outfit'. The efficiency of this outfit depended purely on the quantum of rent collected. Means used for collecting the rent was not so much important. Because the taluqdar is now looking at his cultivator of the soil only as the rent-payer. He is not looking at him as his praja. The events such as deaths, births, marriages, crop failure, indebtedness, etc. of the cultivator are not his concern. He has transcended these concerns when he was converted into a landlord. His revenue outfit too transcended the mixed state of being an army outfit. Its function was only to realise rent, and as much rent as possible from the tenants. The Rent Act of 1868 did not impose any restriction on the realisation of rent.

Sometimes, though not always, the heavy extortion of rent was the only way to meet the revenue demand of the government. "The Oudh assessments were made on the usual plan of 'half assets'". To this 50 per cent were added the cesses of Road, Postal, School, Patwari, etc. coming to nearly 5 per cent. This revenue demand was very heavy. In his Open Letter to Lord Curzon, O'Donnell makes fun of the British who knew what percentage of tax they pay in their own country:

What a gay and contended and abounding loyalty subject the Briton would be if the tax rose, not to 10 but to 50 per cent. And yet it is a fact that in "prosperous India" the annual taxation of land over nearly all its provinces is equivalent to at least a 55 per cent.

The revenue demand on Awadh was high, but then it was not higher than the other provinces of India. However, there is a sense in which it was higher than the other provinces of India. For Taluqdars were given Sanads which distinguished them from the rest of the Awadh people. Even if they were no more rajas, they were given all the external appearances of rajas; they should look like rajas. Though they were not rulers of men, they had to appear before men as if they were rulers. Though they lost their raj, they had to maintain the semblance of raj. And for maintaining the sem-
balance of raj sometimes they had to spend more money than an actual raja would have spent. They had to maintain paid admirers (courtiers) and a bureaucratic set-up. Some States like Balrampur had even the Prime Minister. Metcalf has given a list of senior officials of the Balrampur estate in 1881–82 which includes the name of the Prime Minister. From where will the money for maintaining the semblance of raj come? There were only two sources. One was the extortion of rent from the tenants. And the other was borrowing money from the Mahajan. And the taluqdars used both the sources. The result is obvious. In spite of rent extortion most of the estates of Awadh became heavily indebted. Heavy revenue demand from the government plus the maintenance of the semblance of raj made the taluqdars indebted to Mahajans and other kind of banking resources. Taluqdar-tenant system for Awadh proved as a system of indebtedness. Taluqdars imposed indebtedness on the tenant, and the British Government converted the taluqdar into an indebted being. By supplying Sanads to taluqdars the taluqdars were converted into dummy rajas. It is quite expensive to act as a dummy raja. If the British wished to retain the semblance of raj in Awadh then the revenue demand on the taluqdars should have been lowered. Instead of lowering the revenue demand they allowed the taluqdars to extort from their tenants as much rent as they like. This will serve two purposes. This will lead to the punishment of tenantry for its participation in the revolt of Awadh’s freedom. And this will also introduce a permanent rift between the taluqdars and their peasants, thus ensuring the British Raj in Awadh. The tenant should not become an ally of the taluqdars. The taluqdars should not be collaborators with the tenants.

The revolt of 1857 occurred in both the provinces of the North, the North-Western Provinces and the province of Oudh. But the widespread peasant uprising occurred only in the Oudh part of the North. Therefore, the Rent Act which was introduced in Oudh after suppression of the Revolt was
very different from the one which was introduced in the North-Western Provinces. In the latter province the Rent Act X was introduced in 1859, a couple of years after the Revolt. As a result there was only 38.5 per cent cultivated land that was occupied by the tenants-at-will. Occupancy-tenants occupied 36.5 per cent of the cultivated land. The position of tenants-at-will was not so bad. There were cases when the tenants-at-will refused 'hereditary rights' on their land, because they wanted to retain their freedom "to give up and go". But the Oudh Rent Act of 1868 produced very bad results. Occupancy-tenants had only one per cent of the cultivated land, and the tenants-at-will occupied 78 per cent of the cultivated land. Why in Awadh the occupancy-tenants were restricted to only one per cent of the cultivated land? Why in the North-Western Provinces the figure reached to 36.5 per cent? In Awadh the condition for occupancy was thirty years continuous possession of the land before annexation, whereas in the North-Western Provinces it was only twelve years possession. Why was this discrimination made after having an absolute control over the two provinces, and complete suppression of the Revolt? Why was the tenantry of Awadh allowed to suffer? Why was such a special Act as the Act of 1868 introduced which gives protection to only one per cent of the tenantry and gives all protection to the landlords? The responsibility is shifted to the taluqdars, the dummy kings, who were a party to the "Oudh Compromise". So far as the tenantry of Awadh is concerned, so far as the realisation of their rent is concerned, these dummy kings were treated as real kings. All the responsibility for peasant suffering goes to them. They, and not the British, were responsible for framing of the anti-tenant act. The British only carried out the wishes of the dummy kings when they passed the Act in 1868. Within a decade's time after the revolt the taluqdars became allies of the British. They became their collaborators. They forgot about the rural mass of Awadh of which they were once leaders. Now
they were the rulers of that mass. At the matured stage of the Act of 1868 it was found

that out of the total cultivated area in Avadh only $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent was cultivated by proprietors, $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent by sub-proprietors or tenants having occupancy rights and 88 per cent was cultivated by the 'tenants-at-will', as against 38 per cent of the cultivated area occupied by 'tenants-at-will' in the province of Agra.70

The position of occupancy-tenants has improved; from 1 per cent he has reached $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. But then the tenant-at-will has also not remained where he was earlier. Instead of 78 per cent he has started cultivating 88 per cent of the land. The cultivator of Avadh is so very different from the cultivator of Agra province. Avadh became the miserable land of the cultivators-at-will.

No sooner than the Rent Act of 1868 was passed that the taluqdars, zamindars and other kinds of village proprietors started using it against their tenantry. The British officials in their Settlement Reports, Famine Reports, etc. have narrated the tales of peasant suffering resulting from the Act of 1868. The twentieth century Avadh historians of our times have also retold those tales through their own historical jargon. It is pointless to repeat those tales. However, in the present context I would like to refer to the report of Pratapgarh Settlement given by J. Sanders. Referring to the consequences of Oudh Rent Act of 1868 Sanders quotes from the Pioneer of February 26, 1892 which says

the majority held their lands at the beck and call of the taluqdar, who might turn them out or double their rents at his own sweet will without a voice or hand being raised to oppose him. A carefully written notice, a petition with an eight anna stamp on it, and, because he had by some trivial word or deed offended his landlord, many a hitherto prosperous husbandman had his means of subsistence taken from him, and was ejected for ever from fields that had been cultivated by his ancestors as far back as the memory of man could go.71

Sanders perhaps did not realise the full implications of these remarks.

What was the condition of tenantry before the annexation, and what is its position after the annexation and introduction of the Rent Act of 1868?
This Act displaced the tenant who occupied the fields that 'had been cultivated by his ancestors as far back as the memory of man could go.' Who will accept that the condition of tenantry became better after annexation than prior to the annexation? But one of the main reasons for annexing Awadh was to liberate tenantry from its horrible state, from the clutches of taluqdars:

The Governor General had made up his mind to annex Avadh and the ostensible excuse was that the cultivators had been reduced to such a condition that the British Government in fulfilment of their ultimate responsibility could not overlook the state of affairs. 72

In what way does the Act of 1868 fulfil the responsibility towards the tenantry of Awadh? The real reason of annexation was the possibility of huge revenue to be obtained from the landlords, the revenue which did not reach the King of Awadh. Thus the revenue from the taluqdars was secured, and what happened to the tenantry was not their concern. Rather the tenantry was allowed to be punished for its anti-State activities in 1857.

The Rent Act of 1868 allowed the tenant to stay in his field only for one year. Suppose his one crop fails, then he can compensate for the loss in the second crop. Therefore, the long duration of one year is allowed. If the landlord wishes he can eject the tenant after one year. What is required for ejection is just one month's notice and a revenue stamp of eight annas. It is generally for the enhancement of rent that the ejection notice is given. But the landlord is not required to give any reason in his notice. His wish and will is the only reason. And he is free to enhance the rent to any limit he likes. No limit on the enhancement of rent was prescribed in the Act of 1868. "The courts were even prohibited from enquiring into propriety of rate of rent payable by ordinary tenants." 73 This shows that the doors of law courts were open for the landlords to get their tenants evicted and to enhance their rents to any extent they like. But the doors of law courts were closed to the tenant for
fighting his case against eviction and enhancement of rent. This was the British rule of law for the rural mass of Awadh. Of course the law courts allowed the tenant to give the relinquishment notice. He was given a legal right to relinquish his land and become landless. Thus there was no law to help him in retaining his land, but there was a law to help him in giving up his land. The choice is given to the tenant, whether he wishes to quit his land through eviction or through relinquishment. By giving land to the landlords the British converted the landlords into their allies and collaborators. By further giving them the Rent Act of 1868 they converted the landlords in their slaves, they were revenue-paying slaves. The taluqadars brought political stability to the British rule in Awadh.

The British, however, were interested not only in harvesting revenue, they were also interested in harvesting cotton, indigo, opium, sugar-cane and wheat for the foreign markets. And the harvesting of agricultural products is possible not through the hands of the revenue farmers but through the hands of the agricultural farmers. Therefore, after obtaining political stability in Awadh with the help of taluqadars, the British diverted their attention to the possible agricultural products from Awadh. According to Rudrangshu Mukherjee 'in 1856... it was estimated that Awadh was capable of producing half the amount of indigo that was produced in Bengal.' Soon the idea of producing indigo in Awadh was implemented. Pratapgarh Settlement Report of 1896 gives a list of 30 indigo factories in the district of Pratapgarh alone. The Report further mentions that 'Captain Chapman and Raja Rampal Singh have large factories for its manufacture.' Similar to indigo, the British thought of intensifying the production of cotton. Rudrangshu Mukherjee quotes the remarks of the Commercial Superintendent of Lucknow made in 1860: 'No country in the world affords a finer investment for capital than India and no part of India better than Oudh.' The Superintendent's further remark refers to a pos-
sible state of tenantry, 'If seeds and advances are given the landowner would cultivate cotton to any extent required.'

It is not only that advances for the cotton crop were contemplated, advances were given for all the valuable or exportable agricultural products in Awadh. Because of these advances the cultivator became bonded. All kinds of people came forward to give advances, merchants, money-lenders, landlords and the government itself. The cultivator was no more in a position to grow anything else. He lost all his resources to grow food for his own consumption. He was drowning in the ocean of indebtedness.

The third valuable crop was poppy from which opium is extracted. An extraordinary attention was paid to poppy in the later years of the century because when trade to China in cotton declined opium took up its place. See Appendix II on poppy production at the end of the chapter. In 1864-65 it occupied only 1,061 acres, but in 1890-91 it was cultivated in 14,721 acres: 'Poppy especially is favourite... The system of advances sufficiently explains its popularity.'

Encouragement to sugar-cane was as much as to poppy. So many sugar factories were established in the Pratapgarh district alone. A list of sugar factories is given in Appendix III at the end of the chapter. Referring to the Patti subdivision it is remarked 'The chief manufacturers of sugar are Kalwars, who have amassed large profits by their business from which they have advanced money.'

Thus be it cotton, indigo, poppy or sugar-cane, the cultivator has been bonded through advances to produce it. He has hardly any land left to produce food for his own subsistence.

The above references might have shown that Awadh had the potentiality to become a good agricultural form of Britain. For its Chinese and European markets the British Government could have cotton, indigo, opium, sugar and wheat in abundance. But the Rent Act of 1868 was a real obstruction in the production of agricultural goods. If a tenant is ejected
every year why should he think in terms of improving his land? Why should he dig wells or think in terms of permanent channels for carrying water to different parts of his field? The cultivator is as good with his sickle and plough as with his spears which he used in the Revolt of 1857. As a matter of fact it is his knowledge of sickle that helped him in using swords and spears. He is not only expert in using plough, he also knows how to subsist with minimum amount of food intake. His poverty-line is made up of a hard stuff. It is unlike the poverty-line of an English cultivator. If an English cultivator is deprived of a good breakfast he goes below the poverty-line. But the Awadh cultivators do not touch the poverty-line if 'they have one square meal a day and a handful of "chabena" or parched grain once or twice at other times.' This is his normal "standard of living". Of course sometimes during the seasons he saves his meal and chabena too. 'When the mango crop is a good one many live on it, and in 1894 the ample mahua crop was the main diet of many for several weeks.' So the cultivator can survive without touching the crops produced with the help of his plough. The property of the tenant can be judged by the fact that 'All classes of tenants and even labourers have brass and iron-cooking pots and lotas. Herds of sheep and goats are to be found in every villages.' This implies that they have transcended the stone-age. They have entered into the age of iron and bronze. Sheep and goat are a proof that they have started domesticating animals. Sanders seems to have forgotten to mention the name of "dog". Dog is the earliest domesticated animal of man.

The British realised the importance of Awadh land and also the importance of its cultivators. For his "one square meal and a handful of chabena" the cultivator requires a small piece of land for growing coarse crops like jowar, bajra, etc. which do not require either much ploughing or watering. The cultivator can keep intact all his resources for the
production of valuable crops. The valuable crops have to be protected and promoted. But then the protection of valuable crops requires the protection of cultivators. Rent Act of 1868 gives no protection to the tenant. Therefore, this Act must be rejected. The practice of yearly eviction of the tenant must be stopped. The tenant must improve his land, must introduce irrigation facilities, etc. This he can do only if he is allowed to retain his land for a longer time. And who is profiting from the enhancements of rents? Landlords and money-lenders are the only profiteers. Landlords hide the rents realised; therefore, do not pay the right percentage of revenue to the government. The enhancement of rent must be legalised and regularised, otherwise the government will never get its proper share of revenue. So also the agricultural productivity must be improved. It is for obtaining the proper share of revenue from the landlords and good produce of exportable crops that the Second Rent Act of 1886 was passed by the government.

The Second Rent Act XII was passed in 1886 but came into effect from January 1, 1887. Section 36, part B of Chapter IV (on Enhancement and Fixing Rates of Rent) considers the cases of those tenants who do not possess occupancy-rights and are not subtenants. Such a tenant 'shall be entitled to retain possession of the holding occupied by him at the commencement of the Oudh Rent Act at the rent then payable by him, for seven years from the date of the last change in his rent...' These tenants have later been described as "statutory tenants" because they have been given statutory rights which are different from the rights given to the occupancy-tenants. Thus for the first time since the British rule in Awadh a legal protection was given to the tenant. He was allowed to retain land for seven continuous years rather than one year as was the case with the Rent Act of 1868. Perhaps the seven years period was considered sufficient to ensure agricultural productivity. A tenant could not only
dig well on his land but he could also enjoy the fruits of his labour for seven years in succession. Digging of the well, which ensures productivity, was one of the important issues of the Act of 1886. All the valuable crops require heavy watering. In the absence of canals and nearness to natural channels of water, wells were the only alternative. Therefore, the Section 23 (2), Chapter II is inserted 'Every statutory tenant shall be entitled to construct, maintain and repair a well for the irrigation of his holding.' However, 'if the landlord desires to construct the well himself, he shall have a prior right to do so.' On the construction of wells depends the production of indigo, poppy, sugar-cane, etc. Therefore, wells must be constructed either by the tenant or by the landlord.

The enhancement of rent must be regularised so that the government may obtain the real proportion of revenue. Rack-renting leads government to suffer a loss of revenue. The Chapter IV of the Act deals with the enhancement of rents which is possible only after the statutory period of seven years. Though statutory right is not heritable, the heir of the deceased tenant is allowed to stay on the land till the completion of the statutory period. Section 38 (1) of Chapter IV says 'A landlord may enhance the rent of a statutory tenant or of a person who succeeds as an heir of a statutory tenant under section 48.' And the section 48 reads 'When a statutory tenant dies, his heir shall be entitled to retain occupation of the holding at the rent payable by the deceased for a period of five years from the date of the tenant's death... So the heir of a deceased tenant is as good as a new tenant.

Enhancement of rents and the ejectment of tenants was controlled by the Act. The enhancement was "limited to one anna in a rupee or 6\% p.c." For ejectment of the tenant earlier the landlord was required to spend only eight annas on the revenue stamp. But now there was imposition of a court-fee equivalent to half year's rent of the holding, subject
to a maximum of Rs. 25/-, which in no case could be recovered from the tenant." An attempt was made to stop rack-renting by prescribing the limit of enhancement. And by increasing the court-fee ejectment notice was made difficult. It would seem that the Rent Act of 1886 has given considerable protection to the tenant.

The proposal for life-tenancy was rejected because this would convert the landlords into mere "revenue farmers", they would not look like lords of the land. Even the statutory period for longer duration was rejected, because a tenant who had absolutely no right on the land, seven years right is more than what he expects. With seven years time in his hands he has all the reasons to develop his land. Perhaps the period of seven years was taken as the Golden Mean. The tenants were given right on their lands without disturbing the allies of the British, the taluqdars.

The Oudh Rent (Amendment) Act of 1921: This Act was only an amended form of the Rent Act of 1886. Its only purpose was to give more rights to the statutory tenants. The immediate cause for amendment is said to be the violent form which the tenant agitation took in 1920-21, led by Baba Ram Chandra and Jhinguri Singh. The real cause is, however, more deep-rooted. It is rooted in the British policy to rule Awadh by introducing a class conflict between the tenants and landlords. The tenants should never become the allies of the taluqdars. Their alliance would lead to the recurrence of such revolts as the one that occurred in 1857. The so-called "Oudh Policy", the Policy that was created by Canning, nursed by Benett and strongly defended by Butler, was the Policy of creating enmity between landlords and tenants. The landlords who were the natural leaders of the tenantry when they were its raja, should become the enemies of tenantry. In converting a raja into a landlord an attempt was made to convert a god into a devil (rakshas). The Rent Act of 1868 converted the landlords into
rakshas as who evicted the tenants from those fields which were cultivated by them "as far back as the memory of man could go". These rakshasas forgot that the tenants were their praja and to look after their praja was their paramount duty. Now they have only one duty—how to realise rent from their tenants. They forgot that they were their gods.

Consider the remarks of Sanders which have been quoted by the Awadh historians in order to justify their interpretations. About the taluqdars and their relation with tenantry Sanders remarks

It is contrary to the Indian or the Oudh idea that the landlord should interest himself actively in the welfare of his tenantry. The Indian idea of a good landlord is of one who lets his tenants alone. Enhancing rents... does not in the tenant's eyes make him a bad landlord.

Welfare of tenantry is a Western idea, and according to Sanders 'In Oudh, annexed 40 years ago, it is not to be expected that landed proprietors should at once assimilate this purely Western idea.' All this means that what the British did for 40 years after annexation was nothing but allowing the landlords to develop their Indian or Awadhian identity. They had no intention to disturb the Indianness of the taluqdar's identity; therefore, the taluqdar was allowed rack-renting. The conversion from a raja to a landlord was not an attack on the Indian identity of a taluqdar, for he was given the Rent Act of 1868 in compensation for any amount of loss in the process. It is not only in the case of rent that the Western ideas were not introduced to the Indians, the position of revenue is no better. 55 per cent revenue would be beyond the imagination of an English Landlord yet it was imposed on the landlords of India. And the landlord must pay his revenue either through rack-renting or with the help of money-lenders. It is not only the tenants who had to depend on the money-lenders, it would be a surprise if a landlord is free from the debt of money-lenders.

The Rent Act of 1886 was the first attack of the British on the
Indian identity of the taluqdar as Sanders understands by Indian Identity. The tenant was protected from the enhancement of rent for seven continuous years. How much protection was given to the tenant is a matter to be investigated. So also it is a matter of investigation whether the tenant developed good feelings towards his landlord as a result of the Rent Act of 1886. The Rent Act of 1868 certainly did not allow any good feelings between taluqdaras and tenants. Only Sanders can imagine that a tenant will not have bad feelings towards his taluqdar in spite of the fact that he is evicted from that land which was cultivated by him 'as far back as the memory of man could go.' For seeing the consequences of the Rent Act of 1886 attention may be drawn to the remarks of S.H. Fremantle, the settlement officer of Rae Bareli who was contemporary of Sanders:

In many cases in which the enhancement exceeds one anna in the rupee, I have had petitions from the tenants for reinstatement, pititiously stating that their forefathers had always held the land and how should they be treated in the same way as tenants whose holdings were of recent date. There is little doubt that provisions of section 48 fall very hard in individual cases, and I think it is a pity that a full court-fee is not payable on ejection under this section.94

Everybody is equal before the law. Therefore, the tenants who cultivated the same land which their forefathers cultivated were equalised with the tenants who started cultivating the land from 1886. This means that the landlords of Rent Act of 1868 were less cruel than the landlords having powers of the Rent Act of 1886. The tenants who were not evicted by the former Act were evicted by the latter Act. In what way is then the latter Act superior to the former Act? In what way has the latter Act protected the tenantry? Protection to tenantry is only an illusion created by the latter Act. A section of the Act introduces the court-fee of Rs. 25/- for eviction of the tenant, at the same time introducing another section for eviction which does not require any court-fee. The Rent Act of 1886 is as much a bundle of contradictions as is the colonial rule. There is a move
to protect the tenantry and at the same time a move to withdraw that pro-
tection.

Further remarks of Fremantle highlight the tenant-landlord tension
created by the land-rent Act of 1886. He had attempted to show how Irwin's
"good tenant" is heading towards a total extinction. According to Irwin a
"good tenant" is

one who is ready to live on one meal a day, and, in native phrase,
to sell his wife and children rather than fail to pay the highest
possible rent for his holding; who submits unquestioningly to any
cesses it may please his landlord's demand; and who is always will-
ing to work for him without payment; to give for him evidence in
court, and, speaking generally, to do any conceivable thing he is
told.95

This good tenant is dying out. For tenants, according to Fremantle, 'are
learning to assert such rights as they have. During the 40 years of
British occupation there has been very much litigation between landlord
and tenant. A dispute arises, and is taken to the courts, everyone in the
village becomes a partisan. Of course after the production of a large
amount of false evidence, the matter is settled, but the relations between
the parties and many others have been permanently embittered, and confi-
dence has been destroyed. Each case diminishes the members of "good" te-
nants and the importance of the taluqdar.96 "Litigation" exhibits the
form of "peasant protest". And the protest is not just subjective, it is
organised. Of course the protest is organised only at the village level,
for "everyone in the village becomes a partisan". The fact that a taluq-
dar has to go to the court itself decreases his importance; he is not the
ruler of men, he is only one man among others. How can such a taluqdar
attract Irwin's "good tenant"? A tenant would like to be ruled by a man
of honour. And a taluqdar has lost his honour. The Rent Act of 1868 it-
self exhibits the signs of peasant protest. Each eviction notice given in
the court exhibits peasant resistance. The tenant knows that he cannot
stay on the land if the landlord so wishes. The courts are in favour of
the landlord, yet the tenant resists. He vacates the land only after the
court notice. The number of notices for eviction given in the court exhi-
bits the number of tenants who protested against the landlords. Of course
the protest or resistance is not organised. Perhaps the organisational
character emerges only after the Rent Act of 1886 when 'everyone in the
village becomes a partisan.'

The Rent Act of 1886 has "permanently embittered" the relations bet-
ween landlords and tenants. This is what Canning wanted, and this was
achieved by the 40 years of the British rule in Awadh. Within 40 years'
time those who led the Revolt of 1857 the taluqdars, ultimately lost their
importance in the eyes of the tenants. Taluqdars became enemies of the
tenants, yet Butler in 1907 thinks that the taluqdars have the same rela-
tion with their tenants which they had before the annexation of Awadh.

Butler writes

The Raja is over-bearing, often cruel, but his people live at his
gate, where his horses and cattle and elephants are stalled, and
there is a strong bond of common humanity between them. It is the
old idea 'You shall be my people and I will be your God."

Is not Butler deluding himself and his superiors? The two rent Acts have
succeeded in converting the God into a rakshasa. Of course the rakshasas
are quite dangerous. The common bond of humanity between the taluqdar and
tenant disappeared with the introduction of the Rent Act of 1868, and by
the time the Rent Act of 1886 was introduced they became each other's ene-
mies. The British law courts were established to introduce enmity and
rift between them and to deprive the tenants of all his rights. As

Fremantle further remarks

We have opened the courts to disputes between landlords and te-
nants, and so inevitably created ill-feeling between them, but in
the last resort one of the parties, the tenant, is found to have
practically no rights.

Whatever rights the Act gave to the tenant, the courts took away those
rights. What is the use of opening the doors of courts to the tenants?
The Rent Act of 1886 was like a locked house with all its windows open for entry. The privilege of seven years tenure was not extended to many different classes of tenants. Two classes of such tenants are very important. One class consists of those tenants who have been described as shikmi, i.e. tenants of tenants. They become subtenants, therefore, they are deprived of statutory protection. The other class consists of those tenants who cultivate sir land of the landholder. Sir is the private or personal land of the landlord. Thus once a land is converted into a shikmi or a Sir land, the tenant on this land is deprived of the statutory right. Therefore, as soon as the Act was passed the landholders started converting their land into shikmi and sir. For obtaining shikmi right a patta (written deed) is required. The patta is given in the name of a relative or a friend or any other person who is reliable. According to this patta the person in whose favour the patta has been given has become the tenant of the landholder. Therefore, any tenant who occupies the shikmi land has become a subtenant, and hence he cannot have advantage of the statutory right. He is a tenant-at-will who can be charged any rent the landholder wishes. Similar is the case of the cultivator of the sir land of a landholder. Since sir land is landholder's private land, he can charge from the tenant any rent he wishes. The cultivator of sir land too is a tenant-at-will. Since the Rent Act of 1886 allows the tenants on both kinds of lands, the shikmi land and sir land, and gives them no protection, shows that the Act is just not interested in the extinction of tenants-at-will. The Act is interested only in the restricted existence of this species.

Why did the Act of 1886 keep its windows open for inviting subtenants? Why did it not convert all tenants into statutory tenants? The clue to answer such questions lies in the revenue demand from the taluqdaras. Corresponding to rack-renting there was rack-revenuing (to coin a new expres-
sion). If the taluqdars were involved in the former racket, the govern-
ment was involved in the latter racket. And both these rackets led only
the tenant to suffer. In order to satisfy the revenue demand of the
government, which was stretched to its maximum limit, the taluqdars used
their tenants to meet the demand. High demand of revenue can only be met
by high demand of rent. F.W. Brownrigg, the Settlement Officer of
Sultanpur District, finds both "demand for revenue" and "rent realised"
increased. He gives causes for rack-renting but no causes for rack-reve-
nuing. The causes for the former are given because he wishes to show that
the rack-revenuing has nothing to do with rack-renting. Speaking in a ge-
neral sense it may be postulated that one of the first effects of an en-
hancement in the revenue demand is an increase in rent.¹⁰⁰ He contra-
dicts that the increase in rent is the consequence of revenue enhancement.
The former, according to him, is the consequence of two factors *(1) the
increase in population, insofar as it has created a demand for land...
and (2) the enhanced value of crop produce.*¹⁰¹ By giving all these ex-
planations, has Brownrigg falsified that both revenue and rents have in-
creased? Can he deny that the Landlord will meet the enhanced demand of
revenue from the enhanced demand of rents? Is there any other way in
which the enhanced revenue can be met? The Settlement Officer of Rae
Bareli accepts clearly that the enhancement of revenue can only be met by
enhancement of rent. He says, 'It is very difficult to say to what ex-
tent rents are economically open to enhancement. Though it is practically
certain that many strong landowners will be able to transfer a considera-
ble portion of the increased burden to their tenants.'¹⁰² But in what way
can these strong landholders transfer their burden to tenants? Is there
any other way except through rack-renting? Then how can rack-renting be
stopped? For rack-renting tenant-at-will is the best target. So the
British law did not stop the generation and propagation of tenants-at-will.
For the British had no wish to stop their own practice of rack-revenuing.

Though the nineteenth century Awadh did not observe an organised protest of a wider range on rack-renting, it did observe an organised protest against the rack-revenuing. The taluqdar of Patti, Pratapgarh District protested against the second Settlement conducted by Sanders. The Settlement led to very heavy revenue demand. The taluqdar represented their case through BIA, an association which they established to fight for their demands. The Lieutenant Governor Sir Charles Crosthwaite came to Pratapgarh in January 1894, and later J.R. Reid, a Senior Member of Board of Revenue, visited Patti. Reid reduced the total revenue demand by Rs. 20,400 and then Rs. 12,300 more. Later Sanders himself reduced the demand by Rs. 13,000. Lieutenant Governor finally reduced the demand by Rs. 10,000. "The ultimate enhancement" for Patti pargana, according to Metcalf, was brought down to 38 per cent over the previous settlement. Sanders gives the comparative figures. In the previous settlement the incidence of revenue per acre of cultivated land was Rs. 2, a.3 & p.5. But in the second settlement it was increased to Rs. 2, a.6 and p.6. Similarly the incidence of revenue per acre of assessable area in the previous settlement was Rs. 1, a.8 and p.7. In the second settlement it was enhanced to Rs. 2, a.1 and p.2. The previous settlement was done in 1871.

The protest of Patti taluqdar succeeded in curtailing rack-revenuing, but not to the extent it should have been curtailed. Enhancement of 38 per cent revenue over the previous settlement has another dimension. The Revenue imposition of 1871 settlement was based on the rents realised those years. Rack-renting was legally sanctioned by the Rent Act of 1868. As has already been pointed out earlier, no limit was imposed on the imposition of rent. But if the revenue demand was based on the rents realised, then the demand was already high because the rents were high. Enhancing 38 per cent revenue means rents have enhanced. So the Rent Act of 1886
has not stopped enhancing rents, it has not stopped rack-renting. This is possible only if it has not stopped propagation of tenants-at-will. They were propagated through shikmi and sir.

Attacking the conversion of an ordinary tenant to a tenant-at-will the Pioneer writes

A quasi-fictitious patta is executed in the name of one of the taluqdar's servants, or more generally relatives, by whom again the land is with all due form sub-let very often to the original cultivator himself. The zilladar collects the rent as before, and the actual tiller of the soil never sees from one year's end to another the pseudo-tenant whose shikmi he nominally is.\textsuperscript{106}

How could Pioneer call the pattaholder as a pseudo-tenant? He is a genuine tenant accepted by the law. So also the law does not prohibit pattas to be written in favour of one's servants and relatives. Instead of blaming the law it is blaming a law-abiding landholder. It is the law that has permitted him to have shikmi-tenants. If Pioneer wishes to blame then it should blame the framers of the law. But being an organ of the law-framers it cannot blame them, and blames those who obey the law. The concluding remarks on the issue are quite interesting: 'The real tenant is again in his old bad plight, liable to ejection, liable to enhancement, and there is no remedy.'\textsuperscript{107} Why is there no remedy? Because the British do not want to have any remedy. Why were the statutory rights not extended to all classes of tenants? Why was the category of subtenants allowed in the Act of 1886? The reason is very simple. The high revenue demand of the government can only be met by landlords through imposing high rents on their tenants. The high rents cannot be imposed on the statutory tenants; therefore, subtenants are required.

It is certainly not the love for the Indian tenantry that Pioneer was moved to attack the landlords and their shikmi-tenants. Government suffers "loss through this practice". 'Returns supplied to Government only deal with tenancy rents, and thus Settlement Officers before whom they are
laid may often be led to believe that a landlord derives a much smaller profit from a village than he actually does.\textsuperscript{108} This is certainly not true about all the Settlement Officers. Sanders, for example, has been careful to see the actual rents realised. The worry, however, remains that the 'revenue is under-assessed and the Government suffers in proportion.'\textsuperscript{109} So it is not the tenantry, but the loot of the tenantry in which the government fails to have a share. Government does not get its reasonable share from rack-renting for which a provision in the Act of 1836 was made.

Not only that the landlords earned more money through their shikmi and sir tenants, they started the practice of nazrana, meaning a gift or a present. This nazrana in due course became a kind of concealed rent. Once a tenant is evicted he is required to pay nazrana to be reinstated. Nazrana became a custom of the time, and it was charged like rent. Landlords were not satisfied with the 6\% per cent rent enhancement. Perhaps they felt that it was too low. This might have led to the enhancement of nazrana. There is clear mention of nazrana at the time of second Regular Settlement. The practice started with the British land-tenure system. A tenant is required to pay not only rent but also nazrana so his burden increased. Land-competition made nazrana possible. Since nazrana is not a declared rent, the landlord is free from the share of revenue on it.

The government was not ignorant about the practice of nazrana and rack-renting, and yet it made no effort to revise the Act of 1886, or to make nazrana illegal. Though the government suffered huge losses because of the corrupt practices, it was not given any share in the loot, it allowed those corrupt practices. Perhaps the government wished to convert taluqdars into totally corrupt persons. In this fashion it was easier for the government to convert taluqdars into their allies and collaborators. The ushering of twentieth century saw the rise of Indian Nationa-
The nation started listening to the voices of Tilak, Pal and Lajpat Rai. Congress started losing its moderate character; it was preparing for a showdown. The Indian militants had started their separate war against the British. The British were in search of their allies and collaborators. Who could be the collaborators of the British in Awadh? Tenants were ruled out. For they can be moved only by black leaders. The choice fell on the taluqdars. After the Revolt of 1857 the taluqdars were used to crush the tenantry. They were given the Rent Act of 1868 to do so. Now they are required again. Now they are required to perform a bigger task. They have to stop the tide of nationalism and freedom. They have to see that the flame of nationalism and freedom is extinguished in Awadh. And they require bigger sums to perform this task. The money obtained through shikmi and sir lands given by the Act of 1886 was too small. Either the government should pass another Act to allow more legal money to them or it should allow them to have money through illegal exactions. Thus the taluqdars were allowed to have nazrana and so many other kinds of illegal cesses. The government simply took an attitude of overlooking those cesses. It was not the concern of the government what the taluqdars do to their tenants, government's only concern was that the taluqdars side with them against the rise of nationalism. They should become the residential agents of the British.

Both Dalhousie and Butler were misled about the taluqdars of Awadh in their own ways. Dalhousie thought that the taluqdars had no hold over their tenantry, and Butler thought that they had considerable hold over their tenantry. Perhaps the situation would have been very different if Dalhousie would have thought like Butler and Butler like Dalhousie. But this was not to happen. Both Dalhousie and Butler involved tenants to revolt. Dalhousie made them to revolt in favour of their taluqdars, and
Butler made them to revolt against their taluqdars. Awadh taluqdars were allowed by Butler to charge "whichever rent they please" from their tenants. How could the taluqdars imagine that there would be a better government than that of the British? It is only the British who have given law into the hands of the landlords to realise as much rent from the tenantry as they wish. They must collaborate with the British and not with any kind of anti-British movement. According to Metcalf, Butler's government thought that the tenants were inert and, therefore, "could be ignored". But this was not only how Butler thought. This was also how Dalhousie thought. And Dalhousie's views about the Awadh tenantry were shaped by Sleeman's report. Dalhousie gave no land rights to the tenants, the settlement was made with the village proprietors and taluqdars. The tenants were considered as inert and hence they were ignored. But these very inert tenants took up arms and fought against the well-trained army of the British. Again in 1920-21 these very inert tenants brought a revolution in Awadh by rising against the corrupt practices of nazrana, evictions and rack-renting. These tenants knew that the British were supporting the taluqdars, that the British army and police were with the taluqdars, yet they revolted. The tenants of Awadh once again, after 1857, have shaken the roots of the British administration in Awadh. The British were forced to amend the Rent Act of 1886. The Oudh Rent (amendment) Act, 1921, was passed by the Local Legislature, assented by the Governor on 28th November 1921, and the Governor General on 18th January 1922. It became a Government of India Act on 11th February 1922.

The fact that the Rent Act of 1886 was only amended in 1921, and not withdrawn, shows that very few changes in the former Act were introduced. The important changes in favour of tenants were the following: Section 36 of the Rent Act of 1886 was amended which allowed only seven years statutory right to tenants. Now they were given ten years statutory right, as
if all the problems of tenants would be solved by extending their rights for three years more. The next important amendment was that of the Section 48 of the Act of 1886. The new Section 29 says 'When a statutory tenant dies, his heir shall be entitled to retain occupation of the holding at the rent payable by the deceased for a period of five years from the date of the tenant's death.'\textsuperscript{114} This is a new right given to the heir of a deceased tenant. Amendment to Section 13 is also important. Landlords were not providing rent-receipts to their tenants. The law was introduced to provide receipts of rents realised. The last important step was the withdrawal of Section 51 of 1886 and in its place the introduction of Sections 51A, 51B, 51C, 51D, 51E, 51F and 51G. All these Sections refer to the introduction of "roster year" and appointment of officers for controlling enhancement of rents.

The Rent Act of 1921 was only a symbol of tenants' victory. They could talk about it and could hang it on their walls as do our graduates with their degrees. These degrees do not bring jobs for them. Similarly the Rent Act of 1921 failed to solve any of the problems of tenantry. Neither sir lands were abolished nor shikmi tenants were withdrawn. Since the taluqadors and zamindars had majority in the Local Legislature they gave as many rights to themselves as to the tenantry, so neutralised whatever rights were given to the tenantry.

The United Provinces Tenancy Act of 1939: This Act was passed by the Provincial Legislature on October 3 and 4, 1939, assented by the Governor on December 6, 1939 and was Gazetted on December 16, 1939. Not only the Oudh Rent Act of 1886 was repealed, so was the Agra Tenancy Act of 1926 repealed. The whole province was given one and the same rent law. The tenants of Awadh for the first time were brought under the same law as the tenants of Agra province. The British policy of dividing landlords and tenants in-
to two different provincial entities, having two different sets of laws was given up. This was the first major step taken against the British policy by the Congress Ministry which came into existence by the Government of India Act of 1935. The Ministry was formed in July 1937, and it took the step of looking at the horrible state of Awadh tenantry. It had to fulfil the promises made to the Awadh tenantry. The enthusiasm of Awadh tenantry, and its expectations from the Congress Ministry, can be judged by the scene on the election day in Pratapgarh District. Visalakshi Menon writes 'a very large number of voters had brought with them pieces of dried cow dung to the various polling stations where these were lighted and... "bedakhli", i.e. ejectment notices, were burnt once for all.'

One of the resolutions passed in the Faizpur session of the Congress, 1936, was "Fixity of tenure with heritable rights..." Most of the resolutions were in favour of the tenantry. Therefore, the Congress Ministry of 1937 was bound to withdraw the anti-tenant Act of 1886 with all its anti-tenant amendments. The Rent Act of 1921 hardly gave any relief to the tenantry.

The Act of 1921 has inserted a new Section 30A in the Oudh Rent Act of 1886 which made the acquisition of land by landlords possible without facing any difficulties. Under this Section so many grounds have been provided to the landlord to evict his tenants. Some of them are quite flimsy grounds such as "(a) agricultural development (c) own cultivation (f) for groves and (g) for planting trees." After eviction a few plants would justify the eviction. And any stage of agricultural development is a backward stage. Eviction is obtained by applying to the Deputy Commissioner. The Deputy Commissioner of Rae Bareli writes to the Commissioner of Lucknow about the working of Section 30A 'The landlord is almost invariably the better off and is often at an advantage over the defendant in that he employs while the defendant cannot afford to pay the cost of employing a pleader.' Similarly the Deputy Commissioner of Lakhimpur Kheri
writes 'that landlords enhance the rent without reference to the Special Officer's rate; and in the case of big landlords it is very difficult for the tenant to resist.' This means that the sections on "roster" have hardly any value. Not the government officers but the landlords decide the enhancement of rent. And if the enhanced rent is not paid the tenant is evicted.

The Deputy Commissioners and even the Commissioner of Fyzabad division have expressed unhappiness over the Section 67 (l)(b) of the Rent Act which does not allow statutory rights to those tenants who have underproprietary rights over a small piece of land or a grove in a village. The Deputy Commissioner of Rae Bareli writes 'it is very hard on such persons that they cannot enjoy statutory right and in consequence can be ejected at any time. It gives frequently an opportunity to landlords to exact Nazrana.' The Commissioner of Fyzabad division writes that this section 'makes it impossible for an underproprietor or proprietor, however minute his proprietary or underproprietary share may be, to acquire statutory right... I found a Non-commissioned Officer of the Indian army, who had a distinguished Military record ejected by the taluqdar from his cultivation on the ground of his possession of a share of a small bagh.'

There are some sections in the amended Act of 1921 which specially hit the high caste tenants. Since these tenants pay their ploughmen in the form of subletting a piece of land, they cannot obtain statutory rights on their lands. According to the Deputy Commissioner, Rae Bareli, 'Section 62 (l)(b)... are oppressive, because tenants of high caste generally have to sublet some land to their ploughmen; thus they are in consequence liable to ejectment. This is another handle to the landlord for the exaction of Nazrana.' The Commissioner of Fyzabad division finds the Section 68A oppressive to the high caste tenants who cannot survive without helping hands: 'It is ordinary custom for persons employing permanent servants on
the work of cultivation, instead of giving them cash wages, to give them a small portion of land to cultivate.\footnote{122} It is not only a high caste tenant, any tenant can be in a position that he can survive only by subletting his land: 'If for instance a statutory tenant becomes insane or blind or otherwise physically incapacitated from cultivation, why should he not be allowed to sublet?'\footnote{123} Any tenant, and not only a high caste tenant, can become insane or blind. And when one is sick, and is unable to work in his field, then he requires his field more. But he cannot retain the land because he cannot sublet it. The Commissioner also finds the Section 62A (e) concerning pahikasht as an excuse for evicting tenants: 'I have come across several cases under this section when the tenant actually lives within the sight of the fields from which he is evicted.'\footnote{124} The landlords wish to keep only those tenants on their land whom they can monopolise.

It is not only the Section 30A that was devised to evict tenants, so many other sections in the amended Act of 1921 help the tenant's eviction. The Act was so amended that the landlords should not suffer any loss in terms of evicting tenants. And the Deputy Commissioners were made responsible for giving eviction orders. They gave these orders, because they were legally bound to do so. But they felt morally guilty in passing eviction orders. Reactions of a few Deputy Commissioners and one Commissioner have been cited here. One can imagine the reactions of other Deputy Commissioners of other districts of Awadh, so also of the other Commissioner of the other division. Their reactions could not be different. The whole Awadh had taluqdar-tenant system. Bedakhli, i.e. eviction, and nazrana were two curses of this system. The British knew about these curses, and yet made no attempt to remove them. Did they not wish to let the tenantry remain cursed?

Consider now the issue of enhancement of rent. 6\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent enhancement-
ment of rent after the expiry of tenure was sanctioned by the Act of 1886. This limit was withdrawn by the amended Act of 1921. A new Section 21 (1) was introduced which reads 'A landlord may enhance the rent of a statutory tenant or of a person who succeeds as an heir of a statutory tenant under Section 48, either by written agreement or by notice.' Instead of '6½ per cent of rent' the Act has introduced 'written agreement about rent'.

All kinds of unwritten dealings are possible only behind the written agreement about rent. A landlord would agree to the written enhancement only when the nazrana (unwritten rent) is paid to him. If the tenant is not willing to pay the unwritten rent, then he has no alternative but to face the notice of eviction. Therefore, if the tenant wishes to retain his land he has no other alternative but to accept the unwritten conditions given by the landlord.

One would feel that the difficulties which the tenant faced after seven years, he is now facing after ten years. His tenure has been extended by three years. But this favour too is an illusion. For at any time during the tenure of his statutory period, the landlord can evict the tenant under 62A (1). This Section, like the Section 30A, is a newly inserted section. The section reads 'A statutory tenant shall be liable to ejectment from his holding by suit during the currency of his tenancy.'

The grounds for ejectment are that the tenant is (a) unfit for the purpose of his tenancy (b) the whole or a part of his holding has been sublet (c) the rent payable in kind has diminished (d) lease has expired and (e) holding is situated in a village in which he does not reside. A landlord can easily prove through the help of his pleaders that the tenant is unfit for his tenancy.

The newly inserted Sections 30A and 62A of the amended Act of 1921 have brought the tenantry to the stage of the Rent Act of 1868, where he
had no guarantee of tenure. His eviction is as easy as the eviction of a tenant of the later Act. Rack-renting has not stopped, it has increased. Perhaps the only difference is that the government could obtain its share of revenue in the earlier days, now it is not obtaining its own share from the loot of the tenants. Now the higher rents are paid in the form of nazrana; therefore, the government is a loser. Taluqdars of the twentieth century developed the same relationship with the British Government which they had with the Nawab of Awadh before annexation. The Nawab never got his proper share from the taluqdars. Taluqdars realised more rent from their tenants, but they kept the rent hidden, and allowed the Nawab to suffer. Now, after the annexation also, the Awadh taluqdars were not giving proper share of revenue to the British Government. The British knew about this fact but did nothing; they found themselves helpless. Perhaps the Nawab also knew what his taluqdars were doing, yet he was helpless. His enemies, including the British, did not allow Nawab to oppose taluqdars. The British Government too found itself in a similar situation. Throughout India anti-British feelings were taking their roots. Gandhi took up the leadership of Congress, and Nehru and his group was trying to take up the cause of tenantry. The British, like the Nawab of Awadh, were frightened (though they never lost their composure). The taluqdars appeared to them as the last straw to hang on, as if the taluqdars would save the sinking British empire in India. So the taluqdars were allowed to evict their tenants, take as much rent as they wish. What was required in return was simply their faithfulness to the British masters.

Not only that the new laws for evicting tenants were introduced in the Rent Act of 1921, provisions were also made to increase the volume of khudkasht and sir lands. The new Subsection 17 was added to the Section 3 of the Rent Act of 1886 to provide more scope for sir and khudkasht. To the land "which was recorded as sir at the last settlement,"128 was added
land which for the seven years immediately preceding the passing of this Act had been continuously dealt with as sir. In each village a landlord was allowed to have his sir land up to "one tenth" of the total cultivated area of his proprietorship. Sir is very important, because a tenant on such a land can never obtain statutory rights because he is not a tenant in the eyes of law, he is a subtenant. An attempt to increase sir land simply means an attempt to increase the number of tenants-at-will.

The Section 55 of the Rent Act of 1886 was amended, and its Subsections (3), (4), (5) and (6) were withdrawn because of the peasant agitation of 1920-21. This Section refers to notices of eviction. If the tenant wishes to defend himself he should 'institute a suit for that purpose within thirty days from the date of the service of the notice.' Not only that the time was too short, the tenant was made into a defendant party. He was not in a position to employ pleaders, so he generally used to lose. But in the amended Act too the tenant has been made into the defendant party. The insertion of new Section 30A of the amended Act says, 'A deputy Commissioner shall, unless there are reasonable grounds to the contrary, on the application of a proprietor or under-proprietor who is the landlord of a holding, authorise the acquisition of the holding or part thereof.' Who will prove that 'there are reasonable grounds to the contrary?' Does not such a proof depend on the defendant? The tenant has to provide the contrary ground. Making the tenant a defendant is a subtle way of deciding the case against him, because he cannot afford to fight his case through the machinery of law-brokers. It is the landlord who should be the defendant party, it is he who should provide defence for his eviction notice. Instead, the tenant has been converted into a defendant party. The agitation of 1920-21 was launched against the conversion of a tenant into a defendant. Though the Section 55 of the Act of 1886 was
withdrawn, its harmful consequences were retained, and were transferred to
the Section 30A. The Deputy Commissioner of Rae Bareli writes 'Section 30A
throws all the onus of proof upon the tenant; under it the Deputy Commiss-
sioner is compelled to order ejectment, unless the tenant establishes rea-
sonable grounds to the contrary. The expression "Reasonable grounds to the
contrary" is vague, and needs in my opinion to be altered, so as to show
that likely hardship to a tenant if ejected as is to be regarded as a rea-
sonable ground. It seems also desirable to amend the wording of the sec-
tion, so as to shift the onus of proof from the tenant to the landlord.'

The Deputy Commissioner is clearly expressing the views of the 1920-21 agi-
tators. "Likely hardship of a tenant" itself "is a reasonable ground"
against his eviction. And the "onus of proof" must be shifted "from the
tenant to the landlord". Not the tenant but the landlord should be a de-
fendant party. The Section 30A should be so amended that it converts land-
lords into the defendant party. And the "poverty of the tenant" should be
a "reasonable ground" against his eviction.

The above discussion might have shown that the amended Act of 1921
stands only as a symbol of tenant victory. The British were not in a posi-
tion to give anything substantial to the tenants. The British required ta-
uqdars' favour to crush the national awakening. They were not in a posi-
tion to disfavour taluqdars. It did not occur to their mind that tenants
were a part of the national awakening, that the tenant uprising of 1920-21
was the result of national awakening. They continued to have the same pic-
ture of tenants which was painted by Sleeman, McMinn, Irwin and Sanders, to
name a few important officials. Butler continued thinking that there was a
'common bond of humanity between the raja and his people.' The raja must be
given wholehearted support. He will manage the tide of his people against
the national awakening in Awadh. Therefore, the Act of 1921 did not make
any attempt to disturb the raja.
Though there was stagnancy in the thought of the British about tenants, the Congress was rapidly moving towards the tenantry. The ideal of *Purna Swaraj* could be achieved only with the help of tenants. Urban centres can give birth to politicians, leaders, intellectuals, i.e. the businessmen of all kind, but not to those who can use their plough and sickle to fight against the mighty arms of the British. In Faizpur Congress Session the Congress took a historical step by converting itself into the party of tenants. And this step paid them dividends. They won the election of 1937 with thumping majority. They had to care for the feelings of their voters. The U.P. Tenancy Act was passed without any obstruction by Hailey, the then Governor of U.P. If the Governor had attempted to obstruct the bill it would have led the British to leave Awadh sooner than the time they left. For Awadh masses, its tenant class was with the Congress and not with the taluqdars. The election of 1937 showed to the British that they were backing the wrong horse. But then there was no other horse left for them to back.

The U.P. Tenancy Act of 1939 abolished the category of statutory tenants, and in its place it introduced the category of hereditary tenants who were little inferior to occupancy tenants. Congress restored to the tenants the rights which were denied to them by the British in their Acts of 1868, 1886 and 1921. It is not the British rule of law but the Congress rule of law which gave hereditary rights to the tenants. Even the tenants on *sir* lands could obtain hereditary rights under restricted circumstances. The Section 16(1) of the Act considers these restricted circumstances. A tenant of *sir* would become a hereditary tenant of his holding if at such commencement such *sir* holder possesses fifty acres or more than fifty acres of *sir*. Even the tenants of those *sir* holders who had less than fifty acres of land were given 5 years' tenure: 'Every person who is a tenant of *sir* at the commencement of this Act and who does not become a hereditary tenant would become a hereditary tenant of the holding if at such commencement the holder possesses fifty acres or more than fifty acres of *sir*. 

---

135 Even the tenants of those *sir* holders who had less than fifty acres of land were given 5 years' tenure: 'Every person who is a tenant of *sir* at the commencement of this Act and who does not become a hereditary tenant would become a hereditary tenant of the holding if at such commencement the holder possesses fifty acres or more than fifty acres of *sir*. 

---

Though there was stagnancy in the thought of the British about tenants, the Congress was rapidly moving towards the tenantry. The ideal of *Purna Swaraj* could be achieved only with the help of tenants. Urban centres can give birth to politicians, leaders, intellectuals, i.e. the businessmen of all kind, but not to those who can use their plough and sickle to fight against the mighty arms of the British. In Faizpur Congress Session the Congress took a historical step by converting itself into the party of tenants. And this step paid them dividends. They won the election of 1937 with thumping majority. They had to care for the feelings of their voters. The U.P. Tenancy Act was passed without any obstruction by Hailey, the then Governor of U.P. If the Governor had attempted to obstruct the bill it would have led the British to leave Awadh sooner than the time they left. For Awadh masses, its tenant class was with the Congress and not with the taluqdars. The election of 1937 showed to the British that they were backing the wrong horse. But then there was no other horse left for them to back.

The U.P. Tenancy Act of 1939 abolished the category of statutory tenants, and in its place it introduced the category of hereditary tenants who were little inferior to occupancy tenants. Congress restored to the tenants the rights which were denied to them by the British in their Acts of 1868, 1886 and 1921. It is not the British rule of law but the Congress rule of law which gave hereditary rights to the tenants. Even the tenants on *sir* lands could obtain hereditary rights under restricted circumstances. The Section 16(1) of the Act considers these restricted circumstances. A tenant of *sir* would become a hereditary tenant of his holding if at such commencement such *sir* holder possesses fifty acres or more than fifty acres of *sir*. 

---

135 Even the tenants of those *sir* holders who had less than fifty acres of land were given 5 years' tenure: 'Every person who is a tenant of *sir* at the commencement of this Act and who does not become a hereditary tenant would become a hereditary tenant of the holding if at such commencement the holder possesses fifty acres or more than fifty acres of *sir*. 

---
tenant... shall be entitled to retain possession of his holding for a period of five years from the date of the commencement of this Act' (Section 20). Though the sir lands were not abolished, grounds for their extension were taken away. It is pointless to extend the sir holding beyond fifty acres.

Section 90 was specially inserted to stop nazrana and begar. 'No landholder shall take a premium for the admission of a tenant to holding and it shall not be a condition of any tenancy that the tenant shall render any service to or do any work for the landholder, whether for wages or not.' This was an attack on the two evils of nazrana and begar which were specially attacked by the agitators of 1920-21.

We have already seen the reports of the Deputy Commissioner of Rae Bareli and the Commissioner of Fyzabad division, how they were disturbed with the Act of 1921 which did not allow the statutory tenants to sublet their lands. The Act of 1939 allows tenants to sublet their lands. Section 39 says 'A tenant other than a tenant of sir, or a sub-tenant, may sublet the whole or any portion of his holding under such restrictions as are imposed by this Act.' Section 40 (2) imposes the restriction that the subletting cannot be done "exceeding one year." However, the Section 41 (1) removes this restriction 'when the lessor is a female, a minor, a lunatic, an idiot, or a person incapable of cultivating by reason of blindness or physical infirmity or because he is in the military, naval or air service of the Government.' The Commissioner of Fyzabad division wanted that the tenant should be allowed to sublet his land if he is physically and mentally handicapped. The Act of 1939 takes care of his wish. It takes care even of those tenants about whom the Commissioner never thought. Even the physically fit high caste tenants could sublet their land to their servants and ploughmen. Only binding is that they could do it only for one year.
There were so many other rights which were given to the tenants, such as the right to improve land (Section 65), the right to plant trees (Section 80), etc. The Act took care of the tenant in many other ways. The most important way was to make nazrana as an illegal exaction. The whole Chapter XIII of the Act deals with the issue of illegal exactions. The tenant was given right to have "compensation for illegal exactions". The Act has been introduced within the framework of taluqdar-tenant system. The powers of taluqdars were to be curtailed, not abolished. So also the rights of tenants were to be defended, but not by abolishing the taluqdar system. Congress did not think it politically expedient to attack the taluqdar system before obtaining freedom from the British rule. Whether or not the U.P. Tenancy Act of 1939 brought any revolutionary changes is to be looked at from the point of total political perspective. It will certainly not be an exaggeration to say that for the first time the Awadh tenantry got certain rights on their land. The earlier Acts gave them rights which in the same breath were taken away from them. What is the use of giving life tenancy to a tenant when the law permits the landholder to evict his tenant at any time during his tenure? What is the use of fixing the enhancement of rent to the limit of 6½ per cent when the landholder can charge any amount of nazrana? Why not the nazrana was made an illegal exaction? When one looks into the three Acts given by the British to the Awadh tenantry, the Acts of 1868, 1886 and 1921, one would find that one and all of them were anti-tenant acts. Growth of Oudh Rent Act from its birth in 1868 to its demise in 1939, is the growth of tenants' misery. The Oudh tenantry was punished through these Acts. For what offence? There seems to be no other reason than its participation in the revolt of 1857. The tenantry was made to be punished through its own leaders. The Oudh Rent Act converted these leaders into rakshasas. General amnesty was given to these leaders so that they could be used to deal with the revolting te-
A postindependence official of Awadh, echoing the voice of his British predecessors writes,

For the first time the rights of the landlords and the tenants were codified under the Oudh Rent Act of 1868. Till then the relations between the landlord and the tenant were more or less governed by custom or usage and the good conscience of the landlord.143

For what purpose the codification done? Was it for any other purpose except to realise 55 per cent revenue from the landholders, the heaviest revenue realised in any part of the world? Has the codification helped the tenants? In what way was the result of codification better than the result of 'custom', 'usage' and 'good conscience'? The official in question himself writes referring to the Act of 1868 that the tenants 'had no security of tenure at all, nor did the Act of 1868 give them this much needed security.'144 Reacting on the second rent Act he writes 'The Act of 1886 for the first time gave the tenants security from ejectment, at least for seven years... limits were also placed on the enhancement of rent which the taluqdar could make.'145 But he himself writes that 'the provisions designed to afford a degree of protection to the cultivators could very easily be circumvented.'146 Then how was the tenant protected by the Act of 1886? And referring to the final stage of the development of the Oudh Rent Act, the stage of the amendment Rent Act of 1921, he writes 'At best, this amendment was a kind of compromise to answer the exclusive situation which obtained in 1920 and 1921. It did not really solve the problem of the cultivators whose economic condition deteriorated further by the worldwide slump in prices... The fall in prices... increased the real burden of rural indebtedness.'147 Yet the officer in question concludes his remarks on the Act of 1921 that it 'marked an important stage in the evolutionary process of tenancy legislation in Awadh. From a complete absence of laws
in 1856 a stage has now reached where the tenants had been recognised as an important part in Avadh. What sort of importance has been given to the Awadh tenant? Has he been given any other importance than the importance of rent-milking animal? All milking animals are looked after, so the rent-milking animal is also looked after. And once this animal stops giving milk or gives less milk he is thrown out (ejected). Has the condition of tenantry improved by giving laws to it than when there were no laws imposed on it? Does not the evolutionary process of tenancy legislation coincide with the evolutionary process of the tenants' misery? Has the economic condition of the tenants of Butler, Irwin and Sanders become better than the economic condition of the tenants of Sleeman? Majority of Sanders' tenants were in a position to afford 'one meal and one chabena' a day. Were Sleeman's tenants getting even less than this? Then how were they surviving?
## Appendix VII (v)—List of Indigo Factories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Tahsil</th>
<th>Pargana</th>
<th>Ground Register number</th>
<th>Circle number</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>No. of Factories</th>
<th>Tahsil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>III-D</td>
<td>Biranti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mufiad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>III-D</td>
<td>Blanipur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Parhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
<td>III-D</td>
<td>Raipur Bichhor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Raipur Bichhor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
<td>216</td>
<td>III-D</td>
<td>Pandri Zahar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Madipur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
<td>314</td>
<td>III-D</td>
<td>Jamtali</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Urain Dih.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
<td>323</td>
<td>III-D</td>
<td>Jugalspar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hissa II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
<td>290</td>
<td>III-J</td>
<td>Dohri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Madipur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
<td>561</td>
<td>III-J</td>
<td>Sisfalonl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hissa II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
<td>594</td>
<td>III-J</td>
<td>Kampa Madipur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Madipur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
<td>623</td>
<td>III-J</td>
<td>Kupa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hissa II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
<td>720</td>
<td>III-J</td>
<td>Majhanl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Raipur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
<td>777</td>
<td>III-J</td>
<td>Narayanpur Kalan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mufiad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
<td>810</td>
<td>III-J</td>
<td>Harpur Sound</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ajzara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Talud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asapur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Talud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barahi Bhangpur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Talud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rajgarh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Talud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sendapur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Talud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kulipur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Talud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L-kangpur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Targon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Barwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shamli Kundurji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dooker Patti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Murid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deori Haroi Patti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kundurji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mahrajpur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shekpur Chauras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bazar Kundurji</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rampur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pungun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rampur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dharupur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sital Mau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. E. CRAWFORD,
Settlement Officer.


### Appendix VII (b)—List of Sugarcane factories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial number</th>
<th>Tahsil</th>
<th>Tangle</th>
<th>General Register number</th>
<th>Circle Register number</th>
<th>Name of village</th>
<th>Number of factories</th>
<th>Name of Tahsil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goona</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mafraid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chetpulgarhi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nurpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Utraa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mafraid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anrain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hisa 9 and 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uska</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Madpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Barchauli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hisa 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bharokhati</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rasipur Bichun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bhamipur</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parlat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bahota</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hisa 9 and 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Raspur Kahan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rasipur Bichun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pachchilaya Kahan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bhalaj Kuar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Panwara</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hisa 11, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pura Kichungar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dippur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dhanapur Adharganj</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dhnasar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hisa 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tal Dih</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sultan Kuar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Raspur Beba</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hisa 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hanvaj</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hisa 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ramapur (Pirthigaun Dakhil)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dhalipur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Karsaput Khunji (Satloganj)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kanjua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hisa 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kasi Patti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Keora Khered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bhalaj Kuar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kanera Pura Khudali</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dhalipur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gondal Patti</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hisa 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Midhani Jagdipur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unani Dih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mahbaha</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hisa 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kandehi Madipur</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Madpur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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