Chapter Six
RESPONSE OF THE STATE

The state's attitude towards peasants and its response, both to exploitation of peasants and resistance by them, as an area of research, has immense scope as well as significance. Students of the medieval history of Eastern Rajasthan are lucky to have, amongst their source, chithis, which are par-excellence, as far as the possibility of studying state response is concerned. We have discussed earlier the richness of 'chithis' in terms of the range of information provided. The instructions given to Amils, Amins, Faujdards etc., at the end of every 'chithi', shed invaluable light on the state's attitude towards important issues, the basics of its policy and its response to a wide range of situations.

Section I
Attitude of the State towards Peasants in Normal Conditions

By 'normal conditions' I mean the state of affairs when peasants and their traditional spokespersons, the Patels, appear quiet, law abiding, peacefully engaged in tillage and non-inclined to creating trouble. The paternal posture of the state is most dominant and its exercise of 'compensatory power' best evident, under such 'normal conditions'.

As defined by J.K. Galbraith in 'The Anatomy of Power'. This has been discussed in Chapter II.
Let us first consider the routine directions issued by the state to its officials. When new faujdars were appointed, they were instructed to ensure that there was no “चोरी-जोरी” in the pargana. They were entrusted with the “बंदोबस्त” of the entire pargana and were directed to take care and provide. Amins were exhorted to provide for raiyats and take care of them. Even taaluqdars were advised to ensure prosperity of raiyats. Zamindars were told to settle raiyats and ensure prosperity. Whenever permission was granted for construction of ‘kotri’, the state instructed that vasidars should be settled and ‘raiyats’ and ‘vasindas’ should be taken care of. आबादानी or prosperity of the raiyats was obviously dear to the state. Welfare of the peasantry was a basic norm of state policy.

2 Chithi to Shri Chela Khushyal, from Diwan Kantiram Nandlal, Asoj Vadi 4, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762. Arzdashta dated Mageshra Sudi 5, V. S. 1783.

3 To Sah Shri Jai Chand, from Diwan, Kati Sudi 4, V. S. 1819/ AD 1762 “काम रिचः मज़लुर को दुयान्त अबानत कीमती रक्षक व रकायती रखती की… स्यो भाली भाली सरकराह करीयो कीज्यो…”

4 Chithi to Sah Sahib Ram, Chait Sudi 5 V.S. 1819/ AD 1762 “काम भाली खान्ज्यामा स्यो करीयो कीज्यो अर तरसुदुद ई सो कीज्यो रक्षति आवादान होय यमा आधी बठे…”

5 Chithi, Bhadva Vadi 10 V.S. 1834/ AD 1777.

6 Chithi, Sawan Vadi 6 V.S. 1816/ AD 1759; Chithi, Asoj Vadi 10, V.S. 1812/ AD 1755.

7 Chithi to Madhav Singh Ji, Bhadva Sudi 3 V.S. 1816/ AD 1759 “खालिर य्मा से कोटडी बाबीन्यो वा बसईदार बसान्यो और उठा का राक्ष वा वासीदा की आवादानी राखीन्यो…”
Welfare of cultivators, as a norm of policy, went hand in hand with the state's inherent interest in ensuring optimum cultivation. The state's concern in this regard is best reflected in a chithi to the Amil of Fagi, where it is repeatedly mentioned that all land should be cultivated. We have discussed in Chapter V that non-cultivation constituted an offence in the eyes of the state. The state warned against obstruction of cultivation. So keen was the state's interest in bringing maximum land under the plough that people often sought favours by pledging their commitment to cultivation. The state's pre-occupation with maximization of the area under cultivation was coupled with its concern for good cultivation. Raiyats were exhorted to cultivate sincerely and earnestly. Officials were directed to put in their best effort in cultivation i.e. "बाह जोत की तरबूज असी कीज्यो". The phrase "ज्योत मली भोति करवायो कीज्यो" appears in several documents.

8 Chithi to Amil, pargana Fagui, Bhadva Vadi 1 V.S. 1802/ AD 1745. "धरती पड़त रहेवा पाबे नहीं, सारी जुलाज्यो... धरती पड़त न रहे सो कीज्यो..... धरती पड़त न रहे"

9 Chithi to Amil, pargana Tonk, Asoj Vadi 14, V.S. 1795/ AD 1738

10 Chithi to Amil, pargana Serpur, Pos Sudi 13, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762; Karsi Patel of Kasba Aalanpur, claimed that his kith and kin had settled in the village and made it prosperous, after Tarachand Patel abandoned it. He further said that if he given the Pateli, he would cultivate every bit of land i.e. "दाम दाम धरती जोती" and pay haasil.

11 Amber Records, Sawan Vadi 2 V.S. 1803/ AD 1746

12 Chithi to Purohit Raja Ram Sah Rekh Raj, Kati Sudi 15 V.S. 1784/ AD 1727. Chithi to Amil, pargana Malarna, Pos Sudi 2. V.S. 1819/ A.D 1762.
The state never failed to grant concessions for the extension of cultivation, digging of wells and re-settlement of abandoned villages. Peasants who had abandoned cultivation and returned to re-start, were given concessions and allowed to cultivate on the same terms as previously. They were given concessions in the payment of land revenue. Pahis were helped in the construction of their chhappars. Those who expressed the desire to get wells dug, were assisted in various ways right from revenue concessions to the grant of sanads. In one case the state even extended help in the purchase of wood. Paltis of village Sakkarpura were given riyayat for a period of 12 years to enable them construct a masonry well. In one document, it is explicitly stated that if the patta of 1/4th is not sufficient to get land irrigated, peasants should be induced with a patta of 1/5th. Clearly, the state used all kinds of incentives to induce peasants to put in their best efforts.

---

13 Chithi to Amil, Pargana Tonk, Vaisakh Sudi 11 V.S. 1819/ AD 1762.
14 We have discussed this in Chapter III.
15 Chithi to Amil, pargana Maujavadi, Mah Sudi 12, V.S. 1820/ AD 1763. Ramchand Khushyal Chand Luharia of Kasba Narayana, who was already exempted from malba was given a further concession of 4 aanas on 1 beegha.
16 Chithi to Amil, paragan Fagui, Mah Sudi 4, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762. Kishoredas Mansaram Bhavsa of Choru was given the sanad that he wanted to get a well dug on land.
17 Chithi to Amil pargana Bahatri, Vaisakh Vadi 6, V.S. 1793/ AD 1736 Nanhuram Musalman was helped in purchasing wood for चूना की भाटी so as to get a well dug.
18 Chithi to Amil, pargana Fagui, Chait Vadi 9, V.S. 1793/ AD 1736
19 Chithi to Amil, pargana Maujavadi, Asoj Sudi 4, V.S. 1799/ AD 1742. “अर कूच सारा चलाई छड़र रहवा न पावे और चीथा से भी न चाले तो पाँचवा ही करी दीज्यो”
20 J.K. Galbraith has defined 'incentive' as something that makes more efficient and compelling, the compensatory reward for socially desirable submission. “The Anatomy of a Power” p. 21.
effort in the task of cultivation.

Let us next take a look at the manner in which the state responded during times of natural calamities. We have innumerable accounts of the despair caused by failure of rains. Officials reported time and again that raiyats were disheartened. "रैयति बोहत बेदल छे" it was reported. Evocative language was used to describe the misery of peasants. "रैती लोग बहीत दुःखा व हल चालता छोड़ी बैठी रहया था"22, "केताएक दिन थे लोग जुदा लंग हल था"23 etc. Such descriptions of the rainfall conditions were inevitably followed by reports that raiyats had been consoled and assured. The terms "दिलासा तस्ललि" appear frequently.24 The state directed to console raiyats of every village e.g. "तस्ललि हर एक गांव की रैती की कीप्नो"25. Sometimes, riyayat was given. Tagai was advanced. Bohras were encouraged to provide for the raiyats. In one document, when failure of rain was reported, both the raiyats

---

21 Amber Records, Asoj Vadi 10 V.S. 1803/ AD 1746
22 Arzdashta, Sawan Sudi 7, V.S. 1762/ AD 1705
23 Arzdashta, Bhadva Vadi 5, V.S. 1762/ AD 1705
25 Arzdashta, Mah Vadi 2 V.S. 1761/ AD 1704
26 Chthi to Amil, pargana Maujavadi, Chait Vadi V.S. 1793/ AD 1736. The Patel and Pattis of village Ghamana were given riyayat, when they reported failure of irrigation.
27 Chthi to Amil, pargana Toda Bhim, Chait Vadi 10, VS 1784/AD1727; Chthi to Amil, pargana Tonk, Bhadva Sudi 9, VS 1779/AD1722.
28 Arzdashta, Sawan Sudi 3 V.S. 1762/ AD 1705
and the bohra of the raiyats were reportedly consoled together. When bohras were reluctant, the state took care and provided for raiyats. Credit requirements of the peasantry were thus well taken care of. Bohras and Mahajans were directed to provide. When they failed the state provided. Sometimes the state borrowed from Sahukars, in order to advance tagai to the peasants.

The destruction that came in wake of Maratha invasions evoked a sympathetic response from the state quarters. Riyayati patta was given to the paltis of kasba Pindayan and they were encouraged to cultivate. When villages of pargana Niwai were looted and crop destroyed, the Amil was empowered to extend concessions that were required.

Under what we have called ‘normal conditions’, the state

---

29 Arzdashta, Bhadva Vadi 2, V.S. 1762/ AD 1705. “रैया की व रैया का बोहरा की दिलासा तसली करी मोठा गैरह कोरा की बाह जीत भली भाली करवावें है जी”

30 Chithi to Amil, pargana Tunga Lal Garh, Asadh Vadi 13 V.S. 1820/ AD 1763. It was reported that the asamis of the pargana are poverty stricken and the bohra did not provide for them i.e. “बोहरा जुड़े नहीं”. The state advanced tagai; Chithi to Amil, pargana Malpura, Sawan Sudi 2, V.S. 1800/ AD 1743. “बोहरा बुदू हाल देवा में अड़वड़ रह कर है सो रपली तगाई सरकार सो मागे है, बीज बिना काम अटकी रहें है”. In this case, the state advanced Rs. 2000/- by way of tagai. Also see Arzdashta dated Bhadva Vadi 5, V.S. 1762/A.D. 1705.

31 Chithi to Amil, pargana Udehi, Fagun Sudi 11, V.S. 1809/ AD 1752. It is reported in this document that Rs. 10,000 was borrowed from the sahukar to advance tagai in pargana Udehi. Dilbagh Singh has also stressed on this point see “The Role of the Mahajans in the Rural Economy in Eastern Rajasthan During the 18th Century” p. 21, Social Scientist, No. 22, 1974.

32 Chithi to Amil, pargana Pindayan, Mah Vadi 13, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762

33 Chithi to Amil, pargana Niwai, Fagun Vadi 12, V.S. 1810/ AD 1753
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appeared quite responsive to the needs of the raiyats. It displayed enormous patience in the realization of arrears and other dues. Individuals who petitioned for leniency, were granted permission to pay arrears in easy instalments.\(^{34}\) We know that arrears were written off.\(^{35}\) The ta'alluqdar of several villages in pargana Aaveri was asked not to harass the patel and raiyats over arrears i.e. "खेचल वा तलब कोई तरह की करो मलि"\(^{36}\). Raiyatis of Pavta had taken several villages in ijara and the ijara money was due from them in Syaalu. Since the Syaalu yield was less than the Unhalu yield in the pargana, they expressed inability to pay money in Syaalu. The state complied with their request and the Amil was instructed to take care of the raiyats i.e. "राजी परेशान न होय"\(^{37}\) With regard to the fixation and realization of peshkash of Patels and Patwaris, the state adopted a paternal posture. Complaints about arbitrary increase of the amount due by way of peshkash was disposed favourably.\(^{38}\) When the Patels of Veerda and Majhewal, pargana

\(^{34}\) Chithi to Daroga, Amin, Kachehri, Hazuri Desh Ka, Asoj Sudi 9, V.S. 1820/ AD 1763 Officials were directed not to harass over baki.

\(^{35}\) Dilbagh Singh "The State...." p. 117

\(^{36}\) Chithi to Amil, pargana Aaveri, Asadh Vadi 11, V.S. 1785/ AD 1728

\(^{37}\) Chithi to Amil, pargana Pavta, Mageshra Sudi 14, V.S. 1785/ AD 1728

\(^{38}\) Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Pos Sudi 15, V.S. 1816/ AD 1759. The Patel and Patwari, in this case, were being forced to pay peshkash on तन, while previously, they paid on जमा वैठी. The state directed the Amil to fix peshkash correctly and do what is वाजिब or what is reasonable. Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Pos Vadi 14, V.S. 1816/ AD 1759. The Patel and Patwari of Teetarya complained that even though the upeja of their village had fallow, the Amil had fixed peshkash on तन. The state, in this case also, asked the Amil to take peshkash on upeja.
Chatsu, abandoned the villages due to high demand of peshkash, the Amil was directed to send a parwana, console them, call them back and realize peshkash in easy instalments, according to the patels' convenience.\footnote{Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Bhadva Vadi 10, V.S. 1785/ AD 1728. "पेसखास सहूलती सो वसूल कीज्ञो"} When the Patel and Raiyats of mauza Chaaha ka Vaas, pargana Bahatri, reported that the upeja of their village had fallen and they were being harassed to pay ikotra etc on tan, the state again responded favourably. The Amil was told to take dues on upeja and realize arrears in the next season.\footnote{Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Jaith Sudi 1, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762} We come across several instances of requests to reduce assessment and fix dues in accordance with the declining yield. These were invariably disposed in favour of the petitioners.\footnote{Chithi to Amil, pargana Malpura, Mageshra Sudi 11, VS 1823/AD 1766; Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Jaith Sudi 15, VS 1819/AD 1762.} Allowance was thus made during times of poverty and the inability of raiyats to pay dues was considered by the state. Every time raiyats petitioned to decrease the number of sahnas, their wish was granted.\footnote{Chithi to Amil, pargana Dausa, Mah Vadi 4, V.S. 1822/ AD 1765; Chithi to Amil, pargana Tonk, Bhadva Sudi 3, V.S. 1793/ AD 1736; We have discussed these documents in Chapter V.} The Amil of Tonk was directed to appoint sahnas, with the upeja of the village in mind.\footnote{Chithi to Amil, pargana Tonk, Bhadva Sudi 3, V.S. 1793/ AD 1736. "मा. उपेजा साहणा एक ही राखीज्ञो"} We come across requests to reduce the amount of fine levied.\footnote{Chithi to Sah Shri Harnarayan Ji, Chait Sudi 12, V.S. 1810; Roznama, Baswa, V.S. 1741/ AD 1684} Dissatisfaction expressed with
assessment was followed by instructions to do what was reasonable or वाजबी.45 Plea by the Patel and raiyatis of pargana Ajabgarh to revise the ijara amount was entertained favourably. Amil was directed to take in accordance with the ‘dastoor’46. In one case, the assessed income of a village in pargana Chatsu was reduced by half.47

Our documents therefore show that despite the “basic contradiction”48, the “permanent antagonism”49 in the state-peasant relationship, the story of their mutual enmity cannot be over-emphasised. James C. Scott’s assumption that the state is always the enemy of peasants50, is not borne out by our evidence. Oppression was restrained. Fulfillment of the responsibility towards peasants was necessary for sustenance of the state. So long as the needs and desires of peasants did not clash with the state’s primary interest (which was land revenue) the state harmonized the two. It posed as a paternal figure and exhorted the welfare of peasants.

45 Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Pos Vadi 1, V.S. 1813/ AD 1756
46 Chithi to Amil, pargana Ajabgarh, Chait Sudi 2, V.S. 1785/ AD 1728
47 Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Pos Sudi 14, V.S. 1820/ AD 1763
48 Irfan Habib, “Forms of Class Struggle in Mughal India” in “Essays...” p. 239.
50 “Weapons of the Weak”.
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Two aspects of the state’s paternalism however, merit consideration. First, that it is very discriminatory in the treatment of peasants. A chosen few are accorded a favourable treatment. Existence of the gharuhala tenure testifies to this. We have discussed in chapter III, the privileges and material advantages that accrued to gharuhalas. Those assessed at the riyayati dastoor, paid substantially less than what ordinary raiyats had to part with. This policy of the state was blatantly discriminatory in that it burdened those who were already most burdened.

The second is that the paternalism of the state seems to have been born out of very material considerations. Peasants seem to have been valued for the haasil that was obtained from them, a haasil, which ensured the very existence of the state. The metaphor of peasants “giving birth” to haasil is used in documents. Instructions to ensure prosperity of peasants was often followed by directions to officials to ensure that hasil was given brith to i.e. हासिल पैदा करावे51 and हासिल पैदा करावो कीज्यो.52 Such documents are striking for the frank and honest acceptance on part of the state vis-a-vis its motive and interest in ensuring prosperity of peasants. In another chithi, the Taalluqdar is exhorted to take care of raiyats and provide for them and ensure

51 Chithi to Raval Ji Shri Sher Singh Ji & Bakhshi Ram Ji, Sawan Sudi 10, V.S. 1811/ AD 1754
52 Chithi to Shri Gulaab Chang, Kati Vadi ___, V.S. 18—Date Unclear
their prosperity, so that “ज्ञा आढ़ी बैठे”. The state is also very business-like, when it’s interest is at stake. There are several documents wherein officials are directed to ensure that the state’s interest is not harmed. Every time tagai was advanced, officials were instructed to see that there were no dues and the amount advanced was to be realized with interest after the harvest. The state seems adamant about timely realization of the amount advanced by way of tagai. “बर बढ़त तहसील करी लीज्यो” was the instruction given to the Amil and Amin of pargana Toda Bhim.

53 Chithi to Sah Sahib Ram, Chait Sudi 5, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762 “काम भली भाली खातिर ज्ञा स्थो करवो कीज्यो... अर तरदुद सो कीज्यो... रयति आवादन होय... ज्ञा आढ़ी बैठे”

54 Chithi to Sah Shri Saligram Ji, Jaith Vadi 4, V.S. 1810/ AD 1753. It was reported that in village Jhijha etc., pargana Sawai Jaipur, the same person is both vadhdar and patel. “ई बात मैं हासिल सरकार मैं कसर पड़े है” The state directed that vadh be resumed in Khalsa; Chithi to ___ (unclear) and Sah Bakht Ram, Pos Vadi 1, V.S. 1785/ AD 1728. Mutual differences between Amil and Amin were reported in this case. The state responded by saying “आपस की खेती खाची करी काम सरकार को विगाड़ी मतीई ई बात की लाकीद जाणिीयो”. - Chithi to Sah Shri Saheb Ram Ji, Bhadva Sudi SS V.S. 1785/ AD 1728. In this document, it is stated that land of the Chaakars of the Sarkar was been resumed in Khalisa and this is a loss for the state, since chaakars pay at concessional rates.

55 Chithi to Bhaya Syaam Ram and Sah Syo Ram Das, pargana Tonk, Asadh Vadi 12 V.S. 1784/ AD 1727 This Chithi reports the difficulty in sale of जबुन (bad) grain. The state’s resopnse is सरकार को तो नुकसान न होय और नाज सिलाब बिकी जाय सो कीज्यो- Chithi to Sahib Ram Ji, Jaith Sudi 15 V.S. 1786/ AD 1729 Here it is reported that the Sarkar’s maal is rotting in village Chitana, pargana Manoharpur “सरकार को नुकसान न होय” is the response. Chithi to Amil, pargana Tonk, Vaisakh Vadi 13 V.S. 1799/ AD 1742. This also relates to difficulty in Sale of grain. The Sarkar should not suffer losses, the Amil is told.

56 Chithi to Amil, pargana Gaji Ka Thana, Jaith Sudi 8 V.S. 1810/ AD 1753; Chithi to Amil, pargana Dausa, Vaisakh Vadi 13 V.S. 1785/ AD 1728; लगाई में बाकी करी मती.... बाकी न रहेः

57 Arzdashta, Sawan Sudi 2, V.S. 1783/ AD 1726
It has been said that those in positions of power develop certain “indulgency” patterns in their relationships with subordinates. This is best evident in the manner and occasions on which सिरोपवर, पाष and पहरावणी were given to Patels. When Mohvali Patel of mauza Bharja, abandoned the village, the state instructed that he should be consoled, given a सिरोपवर and called back. In a chithi to the Amil of Narnaul, the Diwan wrote that since the pargana had been abandoned, the raiyats will feel consoled if their Patel is given a पाष. When villages of pargana Wazirpur were resumed in Khalsa, the Amil was instructed to console the Patels and Patwaris and give them पहरावणी. Such was the extent to which Patels were indulged, under ‘normal conditions’ that in one case they reminded the state that they had not been given पाष.

To suggest that peasants’ consent or रजामण्डी counted in the prevailing power structure would be too quixotic and attempt to

---

58 J.A.A. Van Doorn, “Conflict in Formal Organisations” in Conflict in Society edited by Anthony de Reuck and Julie Knight, 1966, p. 129. Doorn argues that lower, dependent participants are never altogether powerless, even in strongly coercive organisations. They always have their means of influencing those in higher positions and the latter develop, what A.W. Gouldner terms “indulgency” patterns in their relationships with subordinates.
59 Amber Records, Chait Vadi 11, V.S. 1722/ AD 1665
60 Chithi to Amil, pargana Naranaul, Asadh Vadi 10, V.S. 1820/ AD 1763 “प्रगानी वेरान छ अर हाल असाही को बख्त से प्रगाना का पटेला ने पाष बने. बढ़ाए तो रेल्प की दीलासा होय अर खाऱी जमा सो जीत बाहा करै”
61 Chithi to Amil, pargana Wazirpur, Asadh Vadi 2, V.S. 1809/ AD 1752
62 Amber Record, Sawan Vadi 12, V.S. 1805/ AD 1748
establish the case that they did have some power. A set of three documents, however, need to be discussed. The first is a chithi written to the Amil of Bahatri, wherein, it is stated that the patwari should be appointed with “रजामंदी” of raiyats.\(^{63}\) In the second, it is stated that if the privileged and favoured lot i.e., “हिमायती लोग”, cultivate land in excess, they should do so with “रजामंदी” of raiyats.\(^{64}\) The third relates to the difficulty encountered in the sale of wet and bad grain of pargana Tonk. To dispose off this grain, the state directed that raiyats should be given the grain at market prices, but his should be done with their रजामंदी.\(^{65}\) There are two possible ways of interpreting these documents with their emphasis on रजामंदी of raiyats. The first is to assume that the state was sincere with regard to what it said about रजामंदी of raiyats. If this be the case, it may be safe to conclude that raiyats, sometimes atleast did matter. Their रजामंदी did count and the state did give some weightage to the consent of raiyats. If, on the other hand, we treat these documents as aberrations and doubt the sincerity of the state’s intent, we can treat these cases as attempts by the state to indulge peasants with trivials, so as to keep them pacified.

---

63 Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Asoj Vadi 4, V.S. 1820/ AD 1763. “पटेल की या समस्त रैल्य की रजामंदी को पटवारी, पटेल रैल राखे”
64 Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Bhadva Sudi 14, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762. “रैल्य की रजामंदी माफिक बाहवी करे”
65 Chithi to Bhaya Syaam Ram and Sah Syoram Das, Fagun Vadi 7, V.S. 1783/ AD 1726 “नाज रैल्य की रजामंदी स्यो दीव्यो...”
Attitude of the State towards Exploitation of Peasants

We have delineated in Chapter IV, some of the major forms of exploitation of peasants. The basic contradiction has been identified and we have discussed the nature of the demands made on them. In this section, we will try and analyze the nature of the state’s response to specific forms of exploitation.

Let us first consider the state’s reaction to excesses in the collection of haasil, malba and other dues. When the Patel and raiyati of kasba Harsana, pargana Pindayan, were co-erced into paying more haasil, than what was sanctioned, the Amil-Ijaradar was ordered to return the extra amount he had collected. This was accompanied by directions not to harass raiyats and not to force them to pay ‘tankhwah’. The ijaradar of pargana Manoharpur, when he collected excessive sehnagi from raiyats, was also asked to return the amount thus collected and take only according to dastoor. Another ijaradar, who had disregarded the dastoor and over assessed the village, was similarly asked to return the amount to the raiyats. In all these cases the state asserted that

---

66 Chithi to Amil, pargana Pindayan, Asadh Sudi 1 V.S. 1820/ AD 1763 Haasil to the tune of Rs. 269 and 50 paisa was collected in excess from raiyats. The term फागािल was used to denote the amount collected in contravention of custom.
67 Chithi to Amil, pargana Manoharpur, Asadh Sudi 8, V.S. 1800/ AD 1743. “फेर दीन्यू, अर आगा ये मा. दस्तूर लीजो, सिसो खेचल करो मती”
68 Chithi to Amil, pargana Tonk, Jaith. Vadi 4, V.S. 1796/ AD 1739. This relates to village Vas Chaturbhujpuro, which had been colonized by Chaudhry Chhajuram in V.S. 1794/ AD 1737. The Chaudhary here reported that residents of the village were परेशान because the Amil gave the village in ijarada in V.S. 1795/ AD 1738 and the ijaradar, instead of assessing the village at 1/3rd vato according to नवाबास का दस्तूर, had assessed them at ½. The state ordered the ijaradar to return the amount thus collected i.e. “फिराय दीन्यू”.
collections be made in accordance with the prevailing dastoor. Not only were the erring ijaradars told to refrain from harassing raiyats, the raiyats were also recompensed. Fauj Singh Hari Singh Naruka, the jagirdar of village Palikala, pargana Bahatri, was more severely dealt with. When the patel and raiyats went to the Huzuri and reported that he had forcibly collected an excess of Rs. 1300/- in vaav etc. his jagir was confiscated and a likhtang taken from him. Excessive collection of vaach by the Patel and Patwari of mauza Bajhadi, pargana Toda Bhim, made them liable to a fine of Rs. 22/-. Elaborate instructions were issued to the Amil and Amin of pargana Aaveri, when the Huzuri received reports that Sahnas were collecting excessively in the name of ghughri. The state responded variously to excesses in the collection of malba. The Patel and Patwari of mauza Pachali were fined Rs. 4/- for taking excessively from paltis. The excess amount collected from the paltis of mauza Ajmeri was returned to them, the Patel and Patwari were caught and fined 101/-. The Patel of mauza Muhikala, on the other hand, was removed from office when he collected an extra Rs. 100/- in the name of malba. Unreasonable

69 Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Vaisakh Sudi 9, V.S. 1800/ AD 1743
70 Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1787/ AD 1730
71 Chithi dated Bhadva Vadi 14, V.S. 1783/ AD 1726
72 Roznama, Fagui, V.S. 1759/ AD 1702
73 Amber Records, Vaisakh Sudi 2, V.S. 1803/ AD 1746. The paltis, in this case, had sought audience i.e. "पुकार आया छा" and the Patel and Patwari had allegedly collected Rs. 150/- in excess, in the name of the bohra i.e. "बोहरा को नाव करि वगाहि लीया छा".
74 Arzdashta, Mah Sudi 15, V.S. 1739/ AD 1682
demands from raiyats led the state to appeal to reason. The Amil of pargana Maujavadi, when he demanded haasil from ‘parat’land, was instructed not to do so.\textsuperscript{75} The Amil of Tunga Lalgarh was directed to take a reasonable amount of kharch or “वाजबी खरच”\textsuperscript{76} from paltis. The state asserted that farohi should be legitimate and there should not be undue strictness over it.\textsuperscript{77} There were repeated injunctions to take from raiyats, only what was right and legitimate.\textsuperscript{78}

We have discussed in Chapter IV, the different ways by which land of ordinary raiyats passed into the possession of the well to do gharuhalas. The state was opposed to this, in principle.\textsuperscript{79} We have the case of Patel of Sitarampur, pargana Malarna, who was directed to refrain from allotting village land to gharuhalas.\textsuperscript{80} Several similar instructions to officials are known of.\textsuperscript{81} It was reported to the state that the Sarkar’s ‘chaakar’ had

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{75} Chithi to Amil, pargana Mauzavadi, Fagun Sudi 15, V.S. 1798/ AD 1741. The Patel and raiyats of village Vikolav had complained to this effect and the state directed the Amil to take haasil only from land under cultivation “वाही बरती को हासिल लेनो”
\item \textsuperscript{76} Chithi to Amil, Tunga Lalgarh, Mah Vadi 10, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762. The Patel and Paltis had alleged that the Amil was forcing them to pay Kharch for topdar and sahna, besides the kharch and malba that they had paid to the durbar.
\item \textsuperscript{77} Chithi to Rai Syo Das, Chait Vadi 14, V.S. 1785/ AD 1728 जो फरोई करने सो वाजबी किज्जो… नाहक सकती न हेम “Chithi to Faujdar, pargana Tonk, Jaith Vadi V.S. 1800/ A.d. 1743
\item \textsuperscript{78} “हासिल रयति सु मा. पट वाजबी लेनो… गाँव आबादान रखणी…” Several Egs. of this in Mawajana Kala, B.N. 121.
\item \textsuperscript{79} Dilbagh Singh “The State….” pp 19-20.
\item \textsuperscript{80} Cited by Dilbagh Singh, “The State…” p. 19.
\item \textsuperscript{81} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
settled in a village in pargana Aaveri. He had the pateli of the village and had mortgaged the land and wells of several raiyats. The state, ordered by way of a parwana that the land and wells should be resumed under khalisa and handed over to the raiyats. Despite the state's injunctions to check the expansion of gharuhala holdings at the cost of raiyati land the tendency did assert itself. The state was unable to implement this policy fully. While the state was helpless in face of such conversions of land from the raiyati to the riyayati category and probably also apathetic towards this tendency, its response to forcible occupation of land of raiyatis was not one of indifference. Land of the raiyatis of village Kudeh, tappa Ramgarh, pargana Sawai Jaipur, had been forcibly occupied by Chand Singh Pratap Singh Rajawat. The raiyatis claimed that they had cultivated this land for 20 years. The state ordered that if this was the case, all such land should be returned and raiyats should not be harassed on this account. The Patel and patis of village Labota, pargana Malpura alleged that the jagirdar, Chhatarsal Rajawat had forcibly occupied

---

82 Chithi dated Bhadwa Sudi 10, V.S. 1783/ AD 1726
84 Madhavi Bajekal “Rural Disputes...” p. 95
85 Madhavi Bajekal has commented that the state displayed “considerable apathy towards the resolution of these disputes” p. 95. “Rural Disputes...”
86 Chithi to Sah Shri Mansaram Ji and Sah Shri Raja Ram Ji, Asadh Vadi 14 V.S. 1799/ AD 1742 “या की घरती वा खोसी होय सो सब दीवाय दीज्यो... अर या स्यी खेचल होया दीजो मली”
their land. The state instructed the Amil to let the patel and paltis cultivate land that they have always cultivated and a ensure that there was no ‘excess’ जाजती. The Jagirdar of village Kadra, pargana Chatsu had similarly occupied 500 bighas of the raiyati land. When the Patel and raiyatis reported the matter, the Amil was directed to ensure that the land was returned and the jagirdar was warned. Attempts to establish kotri without permission, were thwarted. Prahlad Singh Rathor was not allowed to construct kotri in village Bhakhrota, since this was a raiyati village. The attempt by the jagirdar of Kesar Kisri to build kotri was also frustrated and he was instructed not to harass. The Patel and paltis of village Paladi, pargana Sawai Jaipur petitioned when Surajmal Hamirdeka, the jagirdar tried to build kotri. The state warned the jagirdar and instructed not to build ‘kotri’, without permission.

---

87 Chithi to Amil, pargana Malarna, Kati Vadi 5 V.S. 1816/ AD 1759
88 Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Asadh Vadi 7, V.S. 1786/ AD 1729. “जागीरदार सो ताकीद करी जमी या की जोरवरी खोस ली होय सो फिराप दीज्यो”.
89 Construction of kotris implied the creation of new bhom rights. This would have added to the tax burden on villages. Besides, construction of ‘Kotris’ could have also posed a threat to the Jaipur durbar.
90 Chithi to Sah Shri Sahib Ram Ji, Kati Vadi 6, V.S. 1784/ AD 1727
91 Chithi to Amil, pargana Pavata, Asadh Sudi 3, V.S. 1800/ AD 1743
92 Chithi to Sah Shri Jai Chand Ji and Sah Shri Gulaab Chand Ji, Mah Vadi 13 V.S. 1819/ AD 1762 “बिना दरबार की हुकम कोट्टड़ी करावा द्यो मती... ई बात की ताकीद कीज्यो”
With regard to the tensions generated over malba, the state’s response to three situations will be considered. We will try and analyse the nature of its response to harassment of raiyats and paltis over excessive demand of malba. We will then take up the state’s response to complaints about the disproportionate burden of malba. We will also discuss its reaction to complaints by gharuhalas about harassment over malba.

We have already discussed how the state reacted to reports of excesses by patels and patwaris in the collection of malba. Those accused were either fined or removed from office or the amount collected in contravention of custom, was returned. Sometimes the patels or patwaris who had collected excessively were both fined and also asked to recompensate raiyats.

When the disproportionate burden of malba was grudged about, the state invariably directed that the malba kharch should be reasonable or बाजबी and it should be levied on all land under cultivation. The Patel and paltis of village Chaandseni, pargana Lalsot, complained that Chaudhris, Qanungos etc. cultivate most of the village land and don’t give malba, as a result of which the entire burden of malba falls on them. The state directed the Amil to ensure that the demand of malba was बाजबी and it was to be
levied on the entire cultivated land. When the raiyatis of pargana Fagi petitioned that several asamis don’t pay malba on the extra land they cultivate i.e. “सिवाय की मलबो दे नहीं”, the state again instructed that all those who cultivate land should pay malba. The Patel and Patwari of village Mohana, tappa Pavaalya made a similar complaint against asamis. The state stipulated that those who cultivate land should be warned to pay malba. We know that gharuhalas were partially or completely exempt from malba. We have also discussed how the burden of malba or raiyats became extremely disproportionate with the acquisition of their land by gharuhalas. The case of kasba Fagi is a classic example. To circumvent this problem, the state asserted time and again that the privilege of exemption from malba applied only to the stipulated amount of land and it was not to be extended on extra land acquired. The Patel and raiyati of mauza Ugravaas, pargana

---

93 Chithi to Amil, pargana Lalsot, Jaith Sudi 11 V.S. 1794/ AD 1737. The patel and paltis complained that “माहा का गाँव की धरती चोळेरी कानुगोह वगैरह ज्यादा वाढ़े तो मलबो खरच देनी अर माहा की धरती परी मलबा को सगले खरच वाढ़े, ती सो निवाह नहीं”. The State's response was “मलबा की खरच होय बाजबी सो सारी जोती परी वाढ़े कराय देवो कीज्यो अर हमें धरती वाहे है ती ही बहाया दीज्यो”.

94 Chithi to Amil, pargana Fagui, Chait Sudi 15, V.S. 1783/ AD 1726. The raiyats petitioned that “केतीयक आसामी सीवाय की मलबो दे नहीं अर जमी वाहे”. The state directed “जो जमी वाहे त्या कना स्थो मलबो दीवाजी अर हजूरिर ने हकीकती लिखीजी”.

95 Chithi to Shri Gulab Chand Ji, Kati Sudi 5 V.S. 1823/ AD 1766

96 Raiyats of kasba Fagi petitioned that the burden of malba, which was earlier borne by 700 ploughs owned by raiyatis, had now to be borne by just 28. Document cited by Dilbagh Singh, “The state…….” p. 24. The document is dated Jeth Sudi 2, V.S. 1821/ AD 1764.
Dausa, complained that Dayaram Lakshmiram Vakavat cultivated land and did not pay malba. The state clarified that he had been exempt only on 30 bighas of land and on all such land that was cultivated besides these 30 bighas, he was liable to pay malba.97 In the case of Sariram Brahman, the udiki of kasba Maujavadi, the state again clarified that he was exempt from malba only on 12 bighas of land and that if he cultivated more land than this, he should pay malba according to dastoor.98

When gharuhalas reported harassment over malba, the state always came to their rescue and upheld their customary privilege of exemption. Mauji Ram Mahajan, since he was a gharuhala and paid at the rate of 1/4th, was not to be harassed over malba, the state asserted.99 Praagdas Daas Nathuram Brahman, since he was never required to pay malba and had the required sanad, was not to be forced to pay malba.100 Sitaram Jaikisan Brahman, since he had been cultivating land since long, was not to be exploited over

97 Chithi to Amil, pargana Dausa, Vaisakh Sudi 8, V.S. 1810/ AD 1753
98 Chithi to Amil, pargana Maujavadi, Mageshra Vadi 8, V.S. 1809/ AD 1752. In this case, the Udiki had complained that he was being harassed over malba, by the Patel. The state's response was. “जामी बीणा बारा मैं यो खेती करे छ हमेसा सो तो ई जामी का मलबा की खेचल करीवा दो मती, बीणा बारा सीवाय वाहेन हो सिंही मलबा मा. दस्तूर दीयाजो”
99 Chithi to Amil, pargana Malpura, Kati Sudi 15, V.S. 1809/ AD 1752
100 Chithi to Amil, Pargana Bhatri, Sawan Vadi 5, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762 “खरच मलबा न लागो होय तो स. २२५ ताई अब नवासीर थे खेचल करवा दोह मती”
malba. The state directed the Amil of Maujavadi to not to harass Roopchand, over malba and to take as always. Malba, ghughri and parna collected from a group of cultivators of kasba Ajabgarh, who were never required to pay these, was returned. The Amil was directed not to harass. Even when the sanad of exemption was lost, as in the case of Balchand Bheli Das of pargana Chatsu, the state upheld claims of exemption and instructed not to exploit.

Harassment of gharuhalas over shares seems to have been very common. The state invariably invoked custom and exhorted Amils to take as always. Mayaram Joshi of village Khudala, pargana Maujavadi, did gharuhalal Kheti and reported harassment by Amil over shares. The state instructed the Amil to take as always and not to harass Mayaram Joshi. Kusalo Chainu Devo Brahman of village Paldi, pargana Fagui, when he reported harassment over patta, was similarly assured protection. The Amil was directed to take only 1/4th, since he was a gharuhala. Khemdas Vairagi did gharuhalal kheti, paid 1/4th and was exempt

101 Chithi to Amil, pargana Narayana, Asoj Sudi 3, V.S. 1809/ AD 1752
102 Chithi to Amil, pargana Maujavadi, Vaisakh Vadi 9, V.S. 1802/ AD 1745
103 Chithi to Amil, pargana Gaji Ka Thana, Sawan Suid 7, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762
104 Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Bhadva Sudi 14, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762
105 Chithi to Amil, pargana Maujavadi, Vaisakh Sudi 4, V.S. 1778/ AD 1721 “इ न न मद्दी वाटे चोथे माओ होय अर स. १७६७ ताई चोथे ही लेकी कीया है तो अब भी मु. मद्दी वाटो लैज्जो, नवासीर थे खेचल करो मली”
106 Chithi to Amil, pargana Fagui, Mageshra Vadi V.S. 1809/ AD 1752
from malba. The state asserted that since he was a gharubala, vato and malba should be taken as per established practices.\textsuperscript{107} The Jagirdar of a village in pargana Chatsu was warned not to exploit Joravar Singh, Jodh Singh Hamirdeka and Dayaram Mahajan over shares. Their privilege of paying at the rate of 1/4\textsuperscript{th} was upheld.\textsuperscript{108} In all these, and several other cases\textsuperscript{109} of harassment, the privilege of paying at the riyayati dastoor was defended by the state. In one document, the state clarified that if Jagram Brahman, cultivates land with ghar ka hal, he should not be harassed over shares.\textsuperscript{110} Groups of gharuhalas sometimes petitioned collectively against exploitation, sixteen asamis of village Bhor, pargana Tonk, in one case complained that the Amil had the parwana, specifying details of their gharuhala tenure and yet they were being harassed over shares and malba. The state warned the

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{107} Chithi to Amil, pargana Fagui, Vaisakh Vadi 6, V.S. 1798/ AD 1741 “जो यो घरस्त्ताला खेती बाहे हे ती को वाटो चौथ्या वा मलबा खरच माफ भेट दे तो अब भी ई कना वाटो वा मलबो खरच माफीक सदामदी लीजयो नवासीर थे खेचल करो मती”
  \item \textsuperscript{108} Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Chait Sudi 15, V.S. 1802/ AD 1745 “जो या के खेती होय छ ती को वाटो जो सदामदी सो अब ताई चौथो लागी आयो छ तो अब भी जासीरदार सो तकीद करी मा. सदामदी क लेखो करी नवासीर सो खेचल करो मती”
  \item \textsuperscript{109} Chithi to Amil, pargana Maujamadi, Jaith Vadi 1, V.S. 1810/ AD 1753; Chithi to Shri Hare Har Ji & Sah Shri Gulaab Chand, Mageshra Sudi 13, V.S. 1816/ AD 1759; Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Sawan Vadi 5 V.S. 1819/ AD 1762; Chithi to Amil, pargana Udehi, Bhadva Vadi 2, V.S. 1816/ AD 1759; Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Sawan Sudi 5, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762.
  \item \textsuperscript{110} Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Jaith Vadi 5, V.S. 1802 / AD 1745 “यो धरती धर का हला सो बाहे, ती को वाटो स्थालु उन्हालु को यो थे नीखरचो लेखो कीन्यो सिवाय खेचल करो मती”
\end{itemize}
Amil and Patel to take in accordance with the parwana.111 In another case, Pema, Syama and Bihari Meena of mauza Bhagotsar, pargana chatsu alleged harassment by the Jagirdar over terms of their patta. The state again warned the jagirdar to abide by the terms of patta and not to exploit without reason.112 Exploitation of Abhay Singh Naruka of village Saikhal, pargana Khohri over shares led the state to direct the Amil to take from him according to the dastoor of Thakurs.113 In all cases we have discussed, privileges of gharuhalas were upheld by the state and they were accorded protection from exploitation. Interestingly, sometimes the state took care to clarify the exact terms and conditions of the gharuhala tenure. Thus, when Keshoram Surtanvat, a gharuhala of village Karahdi and Karahda, pargana Tonk, reported harassment by Amil over shares, the state specified the terms.114

---

111 Chithi to Ami, pargana Tonk, Jaith Sudi 15, V.S. 1800/ AD 1743
112 Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Pos Sudi 12, V.S. 1816/ AD 1759. The Meenas, in this case paid 1/4th in batai jinsi and were given a concession of a 2 aanas in zabti and 1 aana in chhoti zabti.
113 Chithi to Amil, pargana Khohri, Jaith Vadi 3, V.S. 1802/ AD 1745. “जो और ठाकुर लोग की दस्तूर होय ती ही माफिक या स्यो भी बाटो बीह लीज्यो”
114 Chithi to Bhaiya Syaam Ram and Sah Syo Ram Das Ji, Vaisakh Vadi 4, V.S.1784/ AD 1727. “बाटो या की सदामदी पालीज्यो… हल 9 पाछे बदुक 9 राखणी ठाकरी है साख की साख हाजरी लेबो कीज्यो, अर काम के बख्त बुलाय कसबा का कोट तालिक राखीज्यो अर दस दीन तो दीना चुन चाकरी कराज्यो अर दस दीन सीवाई राखो तो खाबा ने चुन दीवाज्यो अर सिवाई… अर जंमी या के सदामदी बहे आई होय सो ही बाहे, और रैंती की जंमी दवाई ती होय सो फिराय दीज्यो और रैंती कने बहाज्यो और जो मे घरहला सीवाई जंमी बाहे ती होय ती को बाटो प्राप्ता बरबसत रैंती माफिक पालीज्यो और घरहला को मु. सदामदी पालीज्यो”
The exploitation of Nais, Telis, Darjis, Malis, Chamars etc. assumed two forms. There were attempts to force them to render baith, begar etc and pay dues, which they were not required by custom to render or had been exempt from. And there was the tendency to coerce them to pay more and render more than what was sanctioned by custom. In all such cases where Nais reported harassment over baith, begar, vaachh, viraad etc., despite the fact that they had been exempt, the state upheld their claims of exemption and directed Amils to ensure that they were not harassed. The Nais of Malpura, since they had been exempt from baith, begar etc by way of a sanad, were not to be harassed, the state asserted.115 Nais of Jobneri were not to be harassed over baith, begar, vaachh and viraad, since they had been exempt by way of a sanad dated Chait Vadi 9, V.S. 1802/ AD 1745.116 Nais of Narayana had been exempt from baith and begari through a sanad dated Pos Sudi 2, V.S. 1785/ AD 1728. In V.S. 1811/ AD 1754, when they reported harassment, the state instructed the Amil to refrain from harassing them.117 In the case of Nais of Chatsu the state again upheld their claim of exemption from baith and begar

---

115 Chithi to Amil, pargana Malpura, Asoj Sudi 9, V.S. 1809/ AD 1752. “वा ने बेटी बेगारि वा पातली वगैं. हमेसा सो माफ़ है तो अब भी खेचल करो मति हमेसा सो जो रीत होय आई होय सो कीन्यो, नवास्तरे थे कही बढ़ की आवाह करो मति”

116 Chithi to Amil, pargana Jobneri, Fagun Sudi 13, V.S. 1809/ AD 1752

117 Chithi to Faujdar and Amil, pargana Narayana, Kati Sudi 13 V.S. 1811/ AD 1754. “बेटी बेगारी की खेचल नाया सु होया दूधो मति”
by way of a parwana dated Fagun Vadi 10, V.S. 1765/ AD 1708. Individual claims of exemption of Nais, were likewise upheld and the state warned those concerned to refrain from harassing them. The state also responded favourably when Nais, Telis etc. were excessively exploited over baith, begar etc. When the Nais of a village were reportedly harassed over baith and begar day in and day out i.e. "खेचल दीन राती हमेशा रहवो करें" the state warned the tapdar and sahna to refrain in the future and not to make them work for free. When Telis of Kasba Nevata complained about excessive demand of baith, begar, khaat, gudada etc., because of which they could not settle in the village, the state instructed that these were not to be demanded from the Telis. The phrases "खेचल करो मती", "खेचल होवा दो मती", "कही बात की खेचल होवा दोह"
recur in documents. In the case of Raigars and Chamars of kasba Malpura, the state directed the Amil to take only what was customary. In case of Malis of kasba Malpura, the Amil was instructed to ensure they were paid wages or ‘मजूंस’. What may be more than just a coincidence is that every time Telis complained about harassment over बलच, खाट, गुदझा etc they took care to mention that apart from extracting oil, they cultivated as well. The state’s response invariably, was not to harass.

What is important to note is that though the state directed that Nais, Telis, etc were not to be unduly exploited every time harassment was reported, officials were never instructed to provide for them and take care, the way in which they were told to take care of raiyats. The Patel and paltis of village Devati, pargana Bahatari, reported that they could not continue in the

124 Chithi to Amil, pargana Malpura, Bhadva Sudi 9, V.S. 1809/ AD 1752. “ज्यो हमेसा सु ले संकल ९०२ का साल ताई जो ये बैठ बेगर कर आया होय तो ही माफिक अब भी बैठ बेगर या सु करायं, सीवाय खेचल नवासीर थे या सो भी करो मती”

125 Chithi to Amil, pargana Malpura, Bhadva Sudi 9, V.S. 1809/ AD 1752 “सीवाय खेचल करो मती…. और ईमारती वगि. को काम याह कना करायं। ती की मजूंस देयो कीज्यो”

126 Chithi to Amil, pargana Lalsot, Asadh Sudi 1, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762; Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Vaisakh Vadi 9, V.S. 1821/ AD 1764; Chithi to Amil, pargana Fagui, Kati Vadi 4, V.S. 1809/ AD 1752.

We have discussed how the state frequently issued directions that raiyats were to be consoled, settled, made prosperous and provided for. The terms used were ‘दिलासा कीज्यो’, ‘तसल्ली कीज्यो’, ‘आबादानी कीज्यो’ ‘बसाज्यो’ and ‘व्यातिरित्ना राख्यो’ These terms never appear in context of Nais, Telis, Malis etc.
village due to excessive harassment over baith, begar etc. The state directed the Amil and Faujdar not to harass and keep the instructions in mind and settle the village.  

Khatis and Nais of village Khedali, on the other hand, deserted the village due to famine and those who came from neighbouring villages to do the work of village Khedali, were exploited excessively over baith and begar, both by the Faujdar as well as the Amil. When this was reported to the State, the response was pretty lukewarm. The state merely instructed that Kamins of Khedali were exempt and should not be harassed.

The contrast is even more striking if the state's response to exploitation of gharuhalas is compared with its response to exploitation of menials. Kanhi Ram Mishra's exploitation over 'viraad' led the state not only to instruct the Amil not to harass in the future, but also to reprimand. "या काम आछो न कीजो" 

In none of the cases of exploitation of menials did the state's response come anywhere close to such a tone of reprimand.

The state's reaction to attempts by Patels to transfer their burden of peshkash etc on raiyats, was rather inconsistent. In most cases, the state directed that peshkash should be taken from

---

128 Chithi to Faujdar and Amil, pargana Bahatri, Fagun Sudi 15, V.S. 1799/ AD 1742. वेट बेगार पुराताली वगो, खेचल करो मती अर या की गोर राख आँबादानी कीजो"

129 Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Bhadva Vadi 6, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762.

130 Chithi to Amil, pargana Narayana, Chait Vadi 55, V.S. 1814/ AD 1757
Patels and the raiyats should not be exploited over it. This is evident from the case of village Bagadi, pargana Tonk\textsuperscript{131}, village Kishorepur, pargana Dausa\textsuperscript{132} & village Sahivaad tappa Chandwa\textsuperscript{133}. In the case of Bagadi, the state even instructed that it should be known in the entire pargana that raiyats are not to be harassed to pay peshkash.\textsuperscript{134} In a parwana dated Bhadva Sudi 10, V.S. 1783/ AD 1786, however, Amils and Amins of several Parganas were directed to take the Patel’s peshkash from raiyats, if they thought it appropriate.\textsuperscript{135} This attitude of the state is difficult to reconcile with the evidence of pargana Tonk, Dausa and tappa Chandwa. If this was not an account of regional variations in the policy, it was double talk by the state. Apart from peshkash, attempts by Patels to force raiyats to pay the fine, that Patels were

\textsuperscript{131} Chithi to Bhaiya Shyaam Ram and Sah Syo Ram Ji, Fagun Vadi 3, V.S. 1784/ AD 1727. The raiyatis of Bagadi complained that the Patel took ‘viraad’ from them to pay his peshkash. The state’s response was "पेसकस पटेला परी ठारी हे सो पटेला ही सो पेसकस लीजी रैती स्यो कोई जह की खेचल न होय".

\textsuperscript{132} Chithi to Amil, pargana Dausa, Vaisakh Vadi 9, V.S. 1785/ AD 1728. Khushyal Singh Kumbhani, the jagirdar, in this case, reported that the Patel took viraad from raiyati to pay his peshkash. The state directed "पटेला सो ताकीद कीज्ञो पेसकस में रैती सो मुजाहीमन होय अर जो पटेली की दीसोद खाय सो ही देसी".

\textsuperscript{133} Chithi to Sah Shri Sahib Ram Ji, Vaisakh Vadi 4, V.S. 1785/ AD 1728. The Mahajan complained that the Patel took viraad from him and the raiyats to pay peshkash. The state wrote "पटेला सु ताकीद कीज्ञो म्हाजना वा रेयती स्यो पेसकस वावी मुजाहीमन होय अर पेसकस पटेला परी ठारी हे पटेला सु लीज्यो...".

\textsuperscript{134} "या सोरबरारी सारी प्रणा ही मे रारवीज्यो"

\textsuperscript{135} "मनासीब जाणी सो पेसकसी पटेली की रयत सु लीज्यो..."
liable to pay\textsuperscript{136}, or pay for the ijara they had contracted for\textsuperscript{137}, were also thwarted by the state.

Exploitation by bohras was sought to be contained. The patel and paltis of Ramsinghpura, pargana Bahatri complained that Jagram, the old bohra, was exploiting them. The state directed the Amil to ensure that he did not harass.\textsuperscript{138} In another case of harassment by old bohra, the state directed the Amil not to let the old bohra harass for one year. Thereafter, he was to be paid back in instalments fixed according to the paying capacity of the raiyats.\textsuperscript{139} When the patel and raiyati of Vabhoripur, pargana Fagui complained of harassment by the old bohra, the state instructed that the old bohra should not be allowed to exploit and after the new bohra has been paid back the old bohra was to be paid back in fixed instalments.\textsuperscript{140} Interestingly, we came across a large number of documents wherein bohras complained of reluctance by raiyats to repay loans. The state invariably sided with bohras and directed those who owed money to repay.\textsuperscript{141} The

\textsuperscript{136} Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Poṣ Sudi 6, V.S. 1785/ AD 1728. The Patel of Jatvaada was fined Rs. 51/-.
\textsuperscript{137} He collected Rs. 400/- from the raiyats to pay this. The state asked the Patel to return.
\textsuperscript{138} Chithi to Amil, pargana Tonk, Vaisakh Sudi 8, V.S. 1799/ AD 1742. The Patel of Kasba Tonk is known to have harassed raiyats to pay the ijara money, which was due from him. The state wrote that bagi should be taken from the person in whose name the ijara has been entered and raiyats should not be harassed.
\textsuperscript{139} Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Kati Sudi 5, V.S. 1793/ AD 1736
\textsuperscript{140} Chithi to Amil, pargana Malpura, Asadh Sudi 8, V.S. 1800/ AD 1743
\textsuperscript{141} Chithi to Amil, pargana Malpura, Asadh Sudi 8, V.S. 1800/ AD 1743
\textsuperscript{142} Chithi to Amil, pargana Malpura, Asadh Sudi 8, V.S. 1800/ AD 1743
\textsuperscript{143} Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Chait Sudi 7 VS 1816/ AD 1759; Chithi dated Chait Sudi 13 VS 1818/ AD 1761
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Patel and raiyati of a village in pargana Pindayan were warned to return every paisa they owed to the zamin, Anopchand Indraj.142

Let us next consider the state's response to exploitation of raiyats, paltis, jotas etc. who cultivated such land which given to Udikis, Bhogis, Jagirdars etc. Indra Bhan Naruka, the jagirdar of Syo Singhpura, pargana Narayana, complained that residents of his jagir village were being subjected to unreasonable exploitation. The state instructed the Faujdar not to harass the village in any way.143 Thakur Shri Gopi Nath Ji reported harassment of his village. The state instructed that there should be no exploitation of any kind.144 When Arjun Singh Chauhan, the jagirdar of village Jaholi, parganan Bahatri reported that the raiyats were being exploited by the patel over malba, the state asserted that only “बाजिब मलबा” should be taken from the jagirdar's region.145 The Punya Udiki of pargana Malpura reported that his raiyats i.e. “म्हा की रैयती” were being exploited over baith and begar. The state’s response was that the Punya Udiki’s raiyatis should not be harassed in any way over baith and begar.146 Various other

142 Chithi to Amil pargana Pindayan, Jaith Sudi 6, VS 1785/ AD 1728
143 Chithi to Faujdar, pargana Narayana, Fagun Sudi 7, V.S. 1794/ AD 1737. “या की जागीर का गाव सो थे कही त्रह की खेचल करी मती”.
144 Chithi to Amil, pargana Khadela, Fagun Sudi 15, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762. “ठाकुर का गावा भोग व उदिक का सो खेचल कोई त्रह मती कीजिये जो गैरवाजबी हो”.
145 Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Kati Sudi 13, V.S. 1799/ AD 1742
146 Chithi to Amil, pargana Malpura, Pos Sudi 3, V.S. 1799/ AD 1742- “पुन्य उदिक की रैयती सो बेठी बेगारी की खेचल कही त्रह की होवा दूयो मती”
complaints by Udikis were similarly followed by instructions to Amils and Faujdars, not to harass Udiki villages.147

We have discussed previously how gharuhalas, when they acquired raiyati land were liable to pay malba on all such land which was not their gharu. The gharuhala privilege of exemption from malba was not applicable to all such land that they cultivated. In the case of Bhogis, Udikis and some Jagirdars however, the state sometimes extended the privilege of exemption from malba, baith, beggar, sehnagi etc. to all raiyats and jotas who resided on their land. When Gujar Mal Kilanot’s jagir village, Rasoolpur in pargana Pindayan was reportedly exploited over baith and beggar, the state asserted that since he was exempt, his village should not be harassed.148 An Udiki of kasba Tonk similarly complained that jotas of his udik village were not required to pay malba, sehnagi, bisondh and ghughri etc. since V.S. 1818. The Amil was directed not to exploit unreasonably.149 A Bhogi of pargana Sawai Jaipur complained that the jotas of his bhog land

---

147 Chithi to Amil, pargana Gaji Ka Thana, Sawan Vadi 3 V.S. 1819/ AD 1762; The Udiki complained that jotas of his villae were being harassed by Chaudhry Qanungo, Faujdar and kotwal. The state wrote “उदीक के गाँव भोमि वगैं; सुधा छै सौ उदीक का गांव मजबूर स्यों खेचल होवा दूयों मती”. Chithi to Faujdar, pargana Bahatri, Asadh Vadi 3 V.S. 1800/ AD 1743. The udiki, in this case reported that the Patel was exploiting the paltis. “उदीक का गाँव छै सो वेठी वेगारी वगैं. की खेचल गाँव सो करो मती, उदीक का गाँव सो”.

148 Chithi dated Vaisakh Vadi 10, V.S. 1791/ AD 1734. Unclear as to whom it is addressed to.

149 Chithi to Amil, pargana Tonk, Mah Vadi 3, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762
were being harassed over malba by the Patel and Patwari. The state instructed that since they were never required to pay malba, they should not be harassed. Such blanket exemptions granted and upheld by the state probably also explains why peasants showed a preference for the cultivation of land of Udikis, Bhogis etc. We have discussed this in chapter V. Regional variations in this policy of exemption have been commented upon in chapter IV.

The phenomenon of Jagirdars, Udikis, Bhogis and Inamis, advocating the cause of their raiyats and jotas seems to have been widespread. In all the cases we have just discussed, the complaints about harassment of raiyats and jotas emanated from udikis, jagirdars, bhogis etc. The state’s response was favourable in all cases but one. Advocacy by Udiki, Bhegis etc. must have provided to peasants some degree of respite from harassment. The state’s emphasis that such and such village, because it was an Udiki village or Bhogi village, or a village granted as jagir ghar baithan ki, should not be unduly exploited, suggests that it took such cases of exploitation comparatively more seriously.

---

150 Chithi to Sah Shri Jai Chand Ji and Sah Shri Gulab Chand Ji, Kati Vadi 13, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762.

151 Chithi to Chakravarti Shri Hare Har Ji and Sah Shri Gulaab Chand, Asoj Sudi 2, V.S. 1816/ AD 1759, In this chithi, Sardar Singh Naruka, the inaami of village Jai Singh puraavaas Bhakrota, pargana Sawai Jaipur, complained that raiyates of his village were being exploited over सतीत्रा. The state reacted by instructing that if सतीत्रा had been collected from the raiyati of khalsa villages, it should be taken accordingly from the Naruska’s village as well.
The state’s response to any and every kind of exploitation was clearly one of disapproval. “खेचल करो मति” “खेचल होता दूयो मती” “खेचल न होय” was the standard response to all kinds of situations. The degree of disapproval of exploitation however, varied from case to case and depended on who was being subjected to it. The case of paltis of Devati has been contrasted with the case of Khati’s and Nais of Khedali. Likewise, when Kanhi Ram Mishra reported exploitation over viraad, even though he had submitted the required sanad, the state’s response was “या काम आछो नहीं कियो”152 To a similar complaint by raiyatis of pargana Fagui over viraad, the state merely directed not to harass raiyats and to console them i.e. “खेचल करो मति... दिलासा करी आबादान कीज्यो”153 ... दिलासा करी आबादान कीज्यो Contrast this with the case of a Meena of Nagai, who reported harassment over garhi, viraad and nyoto and submitted details of all three sanadis by which he had been exempt. The state’s response was just an instruction not to harass and to take bhomi as always “अब भी नवासीर थे खेचल करो मति... या ने भोमि लगी आई होय सो तो लीज्यो”.154 Clearly the state’s disapproval was not uniform in all cases. It’s inclination to restrain harassment and exploitation wavered from halfhearted, lukewarm instructions to

---

152 Chithi to Amil, pargana Narayana, Chait Vadi 5, V.S. 1814/ AD 1757
153 Chithi to Amil, pargana Fagui, Chait Sudi 13, V.S. 1809/ AD 1752
154 Chithi to Shri Gordhar Ji and Sah Shri Raja Ram Ji, Sawan Sudi 11, V.S. 1809/ AD 1752.
serious reproach.

In all cases we have discussed in this section, the state's reaction to exploitation was in favour of those exploited. "Don't harass", "Don't exploit" seems to have been the maxim. How then, was the state a sconce of exploitation? On what basis have we commented that the state sanctioned and even enabled exploitation? We have said in Chapter IV that exploitation of a basic and permanent kind was sanctioned by the state, as its very survival depended on its ability to demand and obtain from peasants, a substantial portion of their produce. Regardless of whether this act of appropriation of surplus was recognized by peasants as being exploitative or unquestionably accepted by them as being customary, regardless of the argument that this appropriation of surplus was a kind of payment for the protection and patronage that peasants got from the state, the collection from peasants of nearly half of their produce, in one form or another, was exploitation per se. The entire state apparatus was geared, not just to the collection of land revenue, but also to the maximization of the amount obtained from peasants. The burden of payments on the agricultural community was anything but equitable. The state policy of burdening raiyats and letting off superior right holders with all kinds of concessions in the payment of land revenue and other dues was again exploitative and discriminatory.
So was the sanction it gave to the custom of forcing menials to render begar and various other free services. By endorsing such customary practices and several others, the state legitimized exploitation in the garb of custom and tradition. Irretrievable exploitation of peasants and menials, on the other hand, was detrimental to the state's long term interest in preserving its tax base. The golden goose could not be killed. Exploitation had thus to be contained within reasonable limits. The state's attitude towards exploitation was torn between the need to allow some degree of it to continue and the sheer necessity to disallow it from going over-board. The notion of “गैरवाजबी खेचल” “सिवाय खेचल” “नाहक खेचल” and “बेहिसाब खेचल” explains this best. These phrases appear in documents.\textsuperscript{155} The closest equivalent in English to the term खेचल is 'harassment'. When the state instructed officials not to indulge in “गैरवाजबी खेचल” “बेहिसाब खेचल” etc it was asserting that illegitimate or unreasonable harrassment was to be restrained from. By extension therefore, while harassment or खेचल could

\textsuperscript{155} Chiti to Amil, pargana Toda Bhim, Pos Vadi 9, V.S. 1816/ AD 1759. “गैरवाजबी खेचल करो मति”. Chiti to Amil, pargana Lalsot, Vaisakh Sudi 8, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762. “गैरवाजबी खेचल रैती स्यो न होया पाये”. Chiti to Amil, pargana Tonk, Mageshra Sudi 1, V.S. 1819/ AD 1762. “सिवाय खेचल नवासीर थे कोई त्यह की करवा दूयो मति”. Chiti to Amil, pargana Malpura, Bhadva Sudi 9, V.S. 1809/ AD 1752. “सिवाय खेचल नवासीर थे करो मति”. Chiti to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Asadh Vadi 14, V.S. 1785/ AD 1728. “नाहक खेचल न होय”. Chiti to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Asadh Vadi 7, V.S. 1786/ AD 1729. “नाहक खेचल जागैरदार की मति होया दीज्यो”. Chiti to Amil, pargana Narayana, Vaisakh Vadi 6, V.S. 1814/ AD 1757. बेहिसाब खेचल करो मति.
sometimes be condoned in the name of custom and tradition, unreasonable harassment which transgressed customary sanction or "गौरवाजबी खेलन" could not be endorsed.

**Attitude of the State towards Resistance and Protest**

That peasants resist and protest in myriad ways has already been established. The state's attitude towards resistance is best understood if disaggregated. We will therefore discuss separately the state's response to petitioning; its attitude to all varieties of non-payment, delayed payment and under-payment; its reaction to non-cultivation and preferential cultivation; migration and the threat of migration. We will discuss the response that misbehaviour and disrespect evoked. We will try and assess the state's attitude to non-compliance and non-fulfilment. We will see how the state coped with peasant's attempts to work the system to their minimum disadvantage. How the state rated the different forms of protest, the different kinds of dissident activities and the different degrees of insubordination, which forms were let off lightly and which were deemed serious violations, will be discussed.

As far as petitioning is concerned, there is no doubt about the fact that the state entertained petitions and allowed it. The very logic of submitting petition was that redressal was wanted and possible within the system. The numerosity of petitions and
the wide range of issues over which peasants petitioned, have been
discussed in chapter V. All petitions which were in the nature of
complaints about excessive exploitation and contravention of
custom were favourably dispensed.\textsuperscript{156} Though the degree of
disapprobation of exploitation varied, as we have discussed in the
previous section, the state's response was invariably in the form of
corrective instructions and warnings to refrain from violation of
long established customs. Parwanas and sanads of exemption
were always upheld. All petitions through which gharuhalas
reported that their customary privileges and exemptions were at
stake, were given a favourable and patient hearing.\textsuperscript{157} The state
expressed disapproval and ordered remedial action. It sometimes
reiterated the terms and conditions in an attempt to clarify. Pattas
and dastoors, the state asserted, were not to be violated. All
petitions for concessions evoked a sympathetic response.
Everytime peasants supplicated humbly and pleaded, their
requests for specific concessions were conceded.\textsuperscript{158} The favourable
response of the state to petitions of every kind, does not come as a
surprise, considering that as a method of protest or even as a
method of wrestling concessions, petitioning, at one level, is an

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{156} We have analysed all such petitions in Chapter V in the section on
petitioning and again in Chapter VI, in the section of the state's response
to exploitation.
\item \textsuperscript{157} We have discussed these in Chapter V.
\item \textsuperscript{158} See Chapters V and VI.
\end{itemize}
endorsement of power. Petitioners appealed to the benevolence of the state, without questioning its legitimacy, without ever becoming loud and the state obliged.

Petitions which violated the established chain of command however, were treated with alarm and skepticism. When peasants went directly to the Mughal Emperor with their ‘faryad’, alarmed officials hurriedly reported the matter to the state. The state warned petitioners to refrain from going to Delhi and officials were instructed to prevent them from going to the Mughal Emperor.\textsuperscript{159} Similarly, when peasants went personally to the Huzuri or threatened to seek audience, lower level officials resented. Wise men were sent to dissuade them and they were placated with concessions.\textsuperscript{160}

The state was intolerant of overt refusal of payment. Force was used on zortalab regions. Virajpur, in pargana Chatsu was resumed in Khalisa in VS 1799/ AD 1742, when tankhwadars, who were sent for realization, were misbehaved with and physical assaulted. The Amil was directed to oust recalcitrant elements.\textsuperscript{161} Certain villages in pargana Bahatri were deemed zortalab in VS 1816/ AD 1759. The Amil was directed to realize dues.\textsuperscript{162}

\textsuperscript{159} These have also been discussed in Chapter V.
\textsuperscript{160} See the section on ‘Threat of Petitioning’ in Chapter V.
\textsuperscript{161} Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Chait Sudi 12, V.S. 1800/ AD 1743
\textsuperscript{162} Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Asoj Sudi 6, V.S. 1816/ AD 1759
Jagdish Sangahi Anopchand reported to the Diwan in V.S. 1811/AD 1754, that nobody in pargana Khohri paid without the use of force and realization was possible only if an army was sent. The Amil of Khohri was instructed to send 150 ‘sawars’\textsuperscript{163} Nawab Mukhtair Khan, in pargana Nagar, had similarly to seek help.\textsuperscript{164} Pyadas were often deputed to help in the task of realization.\textsuperscript{165} We come across no instance of sale or enslavement of defaulters.\textsuperscript{166} Interestingly, one response of the state when hasil was not forthcoming from villages, was to grant the village to tankhwadars. Thus, when arrears were outstanding from Virajpur, it was granted to tankhwadars.\textsuperscript{167}

Insubordination of the kind displayed in acts of overt refusal to pay could not be overlooked by the state. By taking coercive action against zortalab raiyats, the state rooted out the challenge to its authority. The state was not alarmed however, when attempts to delay, evade, cheat, under pay etc were reported. It was more tolerant and lenient towards such covert activities. It

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{163} Amber Records, Mah Sudi 12, V.S. 1811/ AD 1754
\textsuperscript{164} This case, pertaining to Arzdashta, Asadh Sudi 14, V.S. 1760/ AD 1703, has been quoted by R.P. Rana “Agrarian Revolts...” p. 306
\textsuperscript{165} Arzdashta, Man Vadi 2, V.S. 1761/ AD 1704
\textsuperscript{166} The comments of Pelsaert, Manrique etc are not borne out by the evidence from Eastern Rajasthan. See I. Habib, “The Agrarian...” pg 370.
\textsuperscript{167} Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Chait Sudi 12, V.S. 1800/ AD 1743. “गाँव विराजपुर प्र. मजाकुर का में सरकार का रूपया बाकी छा ती परी तनखाहदार की तनखा करी छी”
\end{flushright}
either fined those accused or warned them to pay. For उर्जरवाई with the sarkar's aadmi who had gone to collect haasil, Deepa, Maha Singh Parasya, Jagroop Patel and others were fined. The standard response to उर्जरवाई in the repayment of 'karz' taken from Mahajans and Bohras was to warn those who owed money to pay. The state fined for कोलाई in payment of haasil. Arhsattas are full of evidence of fines levied on individuals as well as groups for irregularities in the payment of haasil, under-payment etc. Bhup Singh Bharat Singh Rathor, the jagirdar of Shripur, pargana Malarna, reported that the Patel and paltis did not give haasil. The state warned them to pay up and the Amil was instructed not to let the patel and paltis do नालसी. The Patel and paltis of Talaav, pargana Bahatri, were similarly warned for बदअमली in the payment of haasil. When Than Singh Chauhan, the jagirdar of Kisori, pargana Gaji Ka Thana complained that raiyats did not pay and the haasil remained unobtained every year, the raiyats were warned and the Amil was instructed to help the jagirdar realize haasil. We repeatedly come across instructions to Amils to

168 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1747/ AD 1690
169 Chithi to Faujdar & Amil, pargana Pahari, Pos Sudi 11, V.S. 1784/ AD 1727
170 Arhsatta Malarna, V.S. 1774/ AD 1717
171 Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1779/ AD 1722
172 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1774/ AD 1717.
173 Chithi to Amil, pargana Malpura, Jaith Vadi 12, V.S. 1810/ AD 1753
174 Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Jaith Vadi 14, V.S. 1809/ AD 1752
175 Chithi to Amil, pargana Gaji Ka Thana, Vaisakh Sudi 12, V.S. 1802/ AD 1745
realize and to realize on time i.e. ”तहसील कीज्यों और बर बख्त तहसील
कीज्यों”. The state’s attitude towards non-payment that was non-
confrontational in nature was one of patient endurance. It hoped
to tide over with fines and warnings.

The state’s interest in smooth and uninterrupted cultivation,
extension of cultivation and optimum cultivation has been
discussed in Chapter V. The phrases “वरसी पड़त न रहे” “सारी
जुताज्यों” “बाह जोत भली भाली कराज्यो” “बाह जोत की तरबुदुर असी कीज्यो”
recur in documents. In all the three cases of deliberate non
cultivation, we have discussed in Chapter V, the state’s response
was in the form of warnings i.e. “ताकीद कीज्यो” and instructions to
take muchalka. The case of village Mahasinghpura merits a
discussion.176 The Patel of Saligrampura reported to the state in
V.S. 1784/ AD 1727 that land of Mahasinghpura remained
uncultivated and if this was attached to his village, he would pay a
peshkash of Rs. 250/- and cultivate the land. The Patel of
Mahasinghpura went to the Huzuri and defended himself. He
insisted that not even one bigha of his village land had been left
uncultivated. He further said that if, as alleged by the Patel of
Saligrampura, it was found that land had been left uncultivated in
his village, he was a गुल्लेगार and would give an undertaking to pay

176 Chithi to Sah Mansaram and Sangahi Ajab Ram, Bhadva Sudi 8, V.S.
1784/ AD 1727
haasil for the entire land. The state asked for a wise man to be sent to ensure that all land was under cultivation. If raiyats of Mahasinghpura did not cultivate the entire land of the village, the state directed that raiyats of Saligrampura should be made to cultivate such land. Further a muchalka was to be taken from the Sahukar and the Sahukar was to be made liable to pay, if land was left uncultivated. The importance of this document lies in the fact that it is unequivocally stated, not by the state but by the Patel that keeping land uncultivated was an offence i.e. “न बाहा लो सरकार का गुलाम”. It is not clear however, whether the land that allegedly remained uncultivated in Mahasinghpura, was due to inability of raiyats to cultivate, or due to lack of the Patel’s effort or whether it had been deliberately left uncultivated. Whatever the case may be, the state did not resort to the use of force. It sent a wise man with directions to ensure cultivation and took a muchalka from the Sahukaar. The fact that overt non payment invited coercive action of the sate but deliberate non-cultivation (as in the three cases discussed earlier) did not, is because non-cultivation, though it was deemed an offence, did not constitute an affront to the state’s authority. It was dereliction of one’s duty and obligation to till and till well.

When new vadhdars were appointed, clear instructions were given to Amils not to let raiyats cultivate vadhdars’ land i.e. “रैत्य ने
वाघदार की धरती वाहवा दो मती, ई बात की ताक्कीद राखीज्यो” These routine instructions also included directions that if vadhdars kept land uncultivated, they were to be made liable to pay hasil. Such routine instructions are particularly numerous and frequent in the case of pargana Tonk.177 When paltis of Abhaipurya and Mohana, pargana Sawai Jaipur cultivated the vadhdar’s land, they were warned not to do so.178 Mostly however peasants were fined.179 Sometimes likhtang was also taken.180 When it was reported that vadhdars’ land had been cultivated at the expense of khalisa land, those accused were again fined.181 The numerosity of instances of fines levied for cultivation of vadhdars’ land, suggest that the state was keen to check this trend and it expected peasant to fulfil their obligation to till the village and khalsa land as a matter of priority.

The state’s reaction to desertion of villages was to send men to console and bring back the peasants who had left. The case of

177 I was able to lay my hands on 14 chithis, addressed to the Amil of pargana Tonk in V.S. 1792 / AD 1735 and V.S. 1793/AD 1736. These were dated Dutik Jaith Vadi – V.S. 1792/AD 1735. Dutik Jaith Vadi – V.S. 1792/AD 1735; Jaith Sudi 4 V.S. 1792/AD 1735; Jaith Sudi 14, V.S. 1792/AD 1735; Jaith Vadi SS V.S. 1793/AD 1736; Jaith Vadi 2, V.S. 1793/AD 1796; Jaith Vadi 3, V.S. 1793/AD 1736; Jaith Vadi 3, V.S. 1793/AD 1736; Jaith Vadi 4, V.S. 1793/AD 1736; Jaith Vadi 14, V.S. 1793/AD 1736; Jaith Sudi 15, V.S. 1793/AD 1736; Jaith Sudi 15, V.S. 1793/AD 1736; Jaith Sudi 15, V.S. 1793/AD 1736; Jaith Sudi 15, V.S. 1793/AD 1736. Each of these relate to the appointment of new vadhdars and contain the instruction that raiyats were not to be allowed to cultivate vadhdars’ land.

178 Chithi to Sah Shri Narigam Ji and Amil, Asadh Sui 4, V.S. 1794/AD 1737

179 Arhsattas, discussed in Chapter V

180 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1794/AD 1737

181 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1795/AD 1738
paltis of Rampur Sadi has been discussed in Chapter V. They had deserted the village due to the Bohra’s बेदची with the Patel. Officials were immediately sent, paltis were consoled and re-settled in the village, reportedly within two days. The state warned the Bohra “असी ताकीद कीजे जु फेरी अैसा काम न करे” and directed officials to re-settle the paltis.\(^{182}\) Besides, we know of concessions granted to re-habilitate deserted villages. We know also that those who deserted villages were searched for and called back. In one document it was clearly stated that raiyats who had abandoned the village should be searched for and called back from wherever they are i.e. “जो गया छा सो जैठे जैठे होई तन्ता थे ल्याया की तलास कीन्यो”.\(^{183}\) In another document, permission was sought from the Amil of Lalsot to get back the asamis, who had abandoned Chatur Singh, Faujdar of Bahatri.\(^{184}\) There is hardly any evidence of force being used to call back such raiyats and paltis.

The state’s response to the threat of desertion by the Patel and raiyats of Palasoli has been discussed in Chapter V. The Amil was asked to ensure that the faujdar did not harass. The faujdar’s men who came to the village were to be warned, incase the faujdar did not listen. Clearly, the state did not take offence. It tried

\(^{182}\) Arzdashta, Jaith Sudi 1, V.S. 1762/ AD 1705
\(^{183}\) Amber Records, Chait Vadi 13, V.S. 1722/ AD 1665
\(^{184}\) Roznama, Bahatri, V.S. 1742/ AD 1685
instead, to placate the agitated raiyats by ordering remedial action. Similarly, when peasants rounded up their complaints about excessive harassment and contravention of custom with phrases like “ती करी गाँव में रहो जाय नहीं” ती करी गाँव में टिकी सका नहीं”, the state invariably complied and issued instructions to officials to redress grievances and be reasonable.

The punishment meted out for non-compliance of any and every kind was in the form of fines. When peasants flouted rules and sold or purchased grain of the current harvest, removed crop before it was ready, cut off the crop in the sahna’s absence, purchased grain without permission or sold/purchased land without the state’s knowledge, they were fined and a likhtang was sometimes taken. The state could do little about these pervasive acts of stubborn-ness, except try and contain them by levying fines. The philosophy must have been to fine in order to deter. The reaction to all kinds of concealment, non-disclosure, cheating, collaborations, collusions, pilferage etc was similar. All attempts to manoeuvre loopholes had to be made sufficiently unpleasant or painful.\(^{185}\) The exercise of condign power by the state is in fact, best evident in its reaction to all such activities.

\(^{185}\) J.K. Galbraith, while discussing Condign Power, wrote of the ability to win submission by imposing an alternative to individual preferences, sufficiently unpleasant or painful, so that individuals abandon those preferences. “The Anatomy of Power” p. 4.
Disrespect shown in conduct was not considered outrageous. सोखी बेअदबी, बदजुबानी, कुजबा were all let off with fines-big or small. We have no evidence of those accused of insulting officials, ever being physically punished. We have no evidence of coercion being used to cow down discourteous behaviour. Display of anger, so long as it was non-confrontational, was also endured patiently by the state. We only know of fines being levied. The fact that सोखी, बेअदबी etc., which are pretty offensive per se, did not evoke anger of the state is important to note. The fact that the state handled these with mere fines, probably suggests that the state did not chase the utopic dream of complete, total and comprehensive submission.