Chapter Five

FORMS OF RESISTANCE

Integral to the phenomenon of power is the notion of resistance. Until some time back, resistance was understood majorly, if not solely, in terms of periodic outbursts (of those subjected to the exercise of power) which assumed the form of violent upheavals. Revolts, with their potential to send tremors down and out and up, were thought of as the classic embodiment of dissent. Two pictures of the oppressed predominated the literature. They were portrayed either as maimed, silenced, supine, oblivious of the exploitation being subjected to or as martyrs who raised the banner of rebellion, when pressed beyond certain limits.

The overriding emphasis on violent upheavals and open rebellions should not be unduly decried and condemned. The focus on agrarian revolts was in itself, "a necessary and long overdue corrective"\(^1\). Rebellions and revolts, since they are more flashy, are understandably more noticeable. Given the nature of historical sources, these are undoubtedly better documented than the everyday variety of resistance. For a period like the 17\(^{th}\) and 18\(^{th}\) centuries, everyday resistance is particularly difficult to speak of, because of dearth of appropriate sources. And besides,

\(^1\) Ramachandra Guha, “Presentation of Class in Everyday Life”, *EPW* Nov. 21, 1987, p. 2002.
rebellions and revolts seem so much more romantic than the mundane activities that we club together as everyday resistance.

From being centred on revolts and rebellions i.e. resistance that was confrontational and violent, the literature on resistance has evolved and matured over the years. The very concept of resistance has been loosened and made more assimilative. It has taken note of the richness, diversity, complexity and subtleties of the world of the oppressed. The behavioural pattern of the oppressed has been subjected to closer scrutiny. We have begun observing every moment of peasant history, instead of focusing only on those fixed points of time, when history was made by confrontation.

In this changed way of looking at resistance, the notion of everyday resistance has been vital. We have discussed this in details in the Introduction. 'Avoidance Protest'² or 'Weapons of the Weak'³ is that variety of resistance which is more ingrained in the everyday lives of its practitioners. It is more prosaic, constant, routine and diffused. It avoids direct confrontation with those in authority. It is more pervasive and yet, less likely to ever make headlines. It stops short of outright defiance, minimizes risks and

---

² Michael Adas 'From Footdragging to Flight: The Evasive History of Peasant Avoidance Protest in South and South East Asia' *JPS* Volume 13 No. 2, January 1986
is mostly aimed at immediate, tangible gains. It requires virtually no co-ordination, mobilisation and formal networking.

Activities hitherto not thought of as constituting resistance have now been understood in terms of expressions against perceived injustice. It has been conceded that resistance can assume the form of foot-dragging, non-compliance, passivity, complaints, slander, wisecrack, pilferage, proud posturing, theft etc. Thoughts about resistance have been researched. Resistance masked in conformity has been examined.

For a period like the 17\(^{th}\) and 18\(^{th}\) centuries, considering the nature of sources available, it is not easy to recover the ‘unwritten history of resistance’. We have the disadvantage of having to rely exclusively on archival sources, which are essentially official records. Any account of the everyday variety of resistance, based on such archival sources, cannot have the kind of depth and scope that is possible in a study based on field work. What the available sources render possible is a discussion of the ways in which peasants resist the exercise of power, prior to and apart from those occasions when they rise in rebellion. These less confrontational ways of protest have received little attention in medieval Indian history. The sources for Eastern Rajasthan, available in the Rajasthan State Archives, make it possible to recover bits and portions of the ‘unwritten history of resistance’.
Petitioning

To discuss petitioning as one of the several methods of protest, it is necessary to first make a distinction between different kinds of petitions. When peasants petitioned, they either pleaded for concessions or reported exploitation and urged the state to take remedial action. In the latter category, there were two sub-types – those whereby peasants expressed their inability to survive in the face of transgression of custom and those by which the privileged peasants defended their rights and entitlements.4 Both were in the nature of complaints and protests. Pleas for concessions can at times take the form of mild protests. Implied in the petition is a veiled threat of counter-action if demands are not met. A brief discussion of the pleas will help understand the pattern of peasant behaviour. Both categories of petitions presuppose the petitioners’ faith in the willingness as well as ability of the state to fulfil requests and redress grievances. Some amount of confidence, imagined or real, that the state will take note and do justice, is a basic necessity for petitioning to be a prolific method of protest.

Before we proceed to discuss the different kinds of petitions,

---

4 This distinction has been made only to facilitate an analysis of the behavioural pattern. There is considerable overlapping between these two categories. The categories are also not comprehensive.
it seems pertinent to point out that a distinction needs to be made between legal and illegal petitions on the basis of the channel through which they were forwarded. Those addressed directly to higher authorities, in violation of the established hierarchical chain of command were in a sense illegal. When peasants of the Kachhwaha principality of Amber went directly to the Mughal Emperor with their appeals, they violated the existing hierarchy of power and authority and the Amber Raja took offence. We come across some instances of peasants going to Delhi with their faryaad.⁵ Peasants who did so were warned i.e. "ताकीद की ज्ञानी" and officials were instructed to prevent petitioners from appealing directly to the Mughal Emperor. Dispensation of justice was a royal prerogative and direct appeals to the Mughal Emperor were naturally a diminution of that privilege. The right to mete justice to subjects was therefore, zealously guarded from being appropriated by the Mughal Emperor. ‘Illegal’ petitions were to be discouraged and the Raja was to project himself as a champion of justice. When the Maharaja’s ‘sawari’ returned, as we gather from documents called Syah Hazoor, he personally heard petitions. The

⁵ The raiyati of pargana Mundavar went to Delhi with their petition i.e. दिल्ली पुराण गई थी, Amber Records, to Shri Ganga Raj Ji, From Kheshodas, Vaisakh Vadi 13 VS 1722/ AD 1665; Raiyati of the jagir of Ali Ahmed went to Delhi, Chithi to Rao Shri Jagram Ji, Fagun Vadi 1 VS 1785/ AD 1728; Raiyati of Mewat went to the Emperor with their faryaad, Amber Records, To Shri Kalyan Das Ji, from Dalu Chand Ghanraj, Chait Sudi 3 VS 1722/ AD 1665; Also see Amber Record, to Diwan, from Kalyan Das and Hathi Ram, Chait Vadi 3 VS 1722/ AD 1665.
peasants possibly went over the head of the Jaipur State, perhaps not expecting or failing to get justice locally. The Jaipur State’s warning notwithstanding, the direct approach to Delhi does demonstrate the peasant’s determination to have their grievances redressed, without taking recourse to violence. Some power indeed rests in this determination.

Most petitions were attempts to bring injustice to the notice of the state. They were statements of disapproval of transgression of custom. They were intended for redressal. All such complaints were borne out of the petitioners’ assessment of the appropriateness of the demands made on them. Peasants petitioned against a wide variety of injustices. Most frequent were complaints about excessive demand of taxes and various other dues and services. The patel and paltis of Devati, pargana Bahatri, complained that due to excessive harassment over baith, begar etc. i.e. “खेचल ज्यादा रहे” they could not settle in the village. Telis of Nevata reported excessive demand of baith, begar, khat, gudada i.e. “अदाह ज्यादा”. Barbers of a village complained that the tapdar and sahna exploited day in and day out over baith and beggar i.e. “खेचल दिन राती हमेसा रहबे करे”. Raiyats of Manoharpur protested

---

6 Chithi to Faujdar and Amil, pargana Bahatri, Fagun Sudi 15 VS 1799/ AD 1742
7 To Sah Mansaram Ji and Sah Shri Mauji Ram Ji, Chait Vadi 10, VS 1799/ AD 1742
8 To Sah Mansaram Ji and Sah Shri Mauji Ram Ji, Sawan Vadi 2, VS 1800/ AD 1743
against excessive sehnagi taken by the ijaradar.\textsuperscript{9} Raiyats of Fagi reported that during times of poverty, the Amil had fixed their viraad at Rs. 4000/-.\textsuperscript{10} We have numerous examples of Telis, barbers, tailors etc. petitioning, when exploitation over baith, begar, vaach, viraad, kholdi, etc., crossed reasonable limits.\textsuperscript{11} We have discussed these in the previous chapter. Barbers of Deegarya, pargana Gaji Ka Thana petitioned, when they could not cope with the combined demands of the jagirdar, patel and tapdar.\textsuperscript{12} Particularly interesting is the case of village Pipalu in pargana Tonk. The patel, raiyati and Panch Mahajan of the village together lodged a complaint against the jagirdar, who was exploiting them literally over everything i.e. “हरेक त्रह की खेचल करे”.\textsuperscript{13}

Attempts to force upon peasants, dues they had been exempt from or were not customarily required to pay was met with resistance. Raiyats of Manoharpur insisted that they were never required to pay qanungoi.\textsuperscript{14} Individuals petitioned when harassed

\textsuperscript{9} Chithi to Amil, pargana Manoharpur, Asadh Sudi 8, VS 1800/ AD 1743
\textsuperscript{10} Chithi to Amil, pargana Fagui, Chait Sudi 13, VS 1809/ AD 1752
\textsuperscript{11} Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Asadh Vadi 55 , VS 1799/ AD 1742; Tailors of village Khoh complained about exploitation over Kholdi, baith and begar; Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Vaisakh Vadi 9, VS 1802/ AD 1745, Telis of Kasba Chatsu complained over baith and begar; Chithi to Amil pargana Lalsot, Asadh Sudi 1 VS 1819/ AD 1762, Telis of Kasba Lalsot complained of harassment over baith and begar.
\textsuperscript{12} Chithi to Amil, pargana Gaji Ka Thana, Asadh Vadi 13 VS 1799/ A 1742
\textsuperscript{13} Chithi to Amil, pargana Tonk, Mageshra Sudi 1 VS 1819/ AD 1762
\textsuperscript{14} Chithi to Sah Moji Ram Ji, Asadh Sudi 8, VS 1800/ AD 1743
to pay dues either not sanctioned by custom\textsuperscript{15}, or those they had been exempt from.\textsuperscript{16} The Patel, paltis and panch mahajan of Kasba Narnaul complained, when despite exemption from ‘athotra’, they were harassed over it.\textsuperscript{17} The patel and paltis of kasba Tunga Lalgarh, said in a petition that though they had already paid malba and kharch to the durbar, the Amil was forcing them to pay Kharch for the Tapdar and Sahna as well.\textsuperscript{18} What is important to note is that when peasants resisted such attempts by petitioning, more often than not they claimed that they possessed the required sanad or parwana by which they had been exempt. Sometimes, these were cited to bolster claims of exemption.\textsuperscript{19} When the barbers of kasba Chatsu petitioned against harassment over baith and begar, they cited the parwana dated Fagun Vadi 10, VS 1765/ AD 1708, obtained from the deceased Maharaja by which they had

\textsuperscript{15} Bharmal Har Kishan Gujar of village Pali, tappa Ramgarh petitioned that he was never required to pay tax on sheep and the Kotwal was exploiting over this. Chithi to Sah Shri Jai Chand Ji and Sah Shri Gulab Chand Ji, Kati Sudi 15 VS 1819/ Ad 1762; Roopchand Gandik compained about harassment by Amil over Kharch, he was never required to pay. Chithi to Amil, pargana Maujavadi, Vaisakh Vadi 9 VS 1802/ Ad 1745.

\textsuperscript{16} Bali Ram Dalpat Balahi’s son claimed that he had been exempt from baith and begar and was being harassed, Chithi to Faujdar and Amil, pargana Malpura, Asadh Sudi 3 VS 1800/ Ad 1743; Mishr Kanhi Ram complained about harassment over viraad despite exemption, Chithi to Amil, pargana Narayana, Pos Vadi 10 VS 1813/ AD 1756; A Nai of Jobneri, who had been exempt from baith, begar, vaach and viraad petitioned when the Amil exploited over these, Chithi to Amil, pargana Jobneri, Fagun Sudi 13, VS 1809/ Ad 1752.

\textsuperscript{17} Chithi to Amil, pargana Narnaul, Mah Sudi 3 VS 1823/ AD 1766.

\textsuperscript{18} Chithi to Amil, Tunga Lalgarh, Mah Vadi 10 VS 1819/ AD 1762.

\textsuperscript{19} Chithi to Faujdar and Amil, pargana Malpura, Asadh Sudi 3 VS 1800/ AD 1743; Chithi to Amil, pargana Jobneri, Fagun Sudi 13 VS 1809/ AD 1752.
been exempted.\(^{20}\) A Meena of village Nagal, pargana Sawai Jaipur, while reporting harassment over ‘garhi’, viraad and nyoto, furnished details of all the three sanads by which he had been exempt.\(^{21}\)

Attempts of dominant sections to transfer their burdens on peasants, did not go unreported. Raiyats of village Bagadi, pargana Tonk complained that the Patel was forcing them to pay ‘viraad’ for his peshkash.\(^{22}\) In another case, raiyats of kasba Tonk petitioned that the Patel was harassing them to pay for the ijara he had taken from the sarkar in VS 1796/ AD 1739.\(^{23}\) The burden of malba generated a lot of misgivings and these formed the matter of several complaints.\(^{24}\) The patel and paltis of Chaandseni, pargana Lalsot complained that though the Chaudhry, Qanungo etc cultivated most of the village land, the entire burden of malba was on them.\(^{25}\) The patel and raiyati of a village in pargana Dausa similarly complained against Dayaram and Lakshmiram Vakavat and others who did not pay malba even on the extra land they

\(^{20}\) Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Kati Vadi 12, VS 1819/ AD 1762
\(^{21}\) Chithi to Shri Gordhar Ji and Sah Shri Raja Rai Ji, Sawan Sudi 11, VS 1809/ Ad 1752. Three separate sanads, dated Fagun Vadi 13 VS 1785/ AD 1728, Kati Vadi 4 VS 1790/ AD 1733 and Jaith Sudi 2 VS 1794/ AD 1737, were quoted.
\(^{22}\) Chithi to Bhaiya Shyam Ram and Sah Syo Ram Das Ji, Fagun Vadi 3 VS 1784/ AD 1727
\(^{23}\) Chithi to Amil, pargana Tonk, Vaisakh Sudi 8 VS 1799/ AD 1742
\(^{24}\) Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Bhadva Sudi 14 VS 1819/ AD 1762; Chithi to Sri Gulaab Chand Ji, Kati Sudi 5 VS 1823/ AD 1766
\(^{25}\) Chithi to Amil, pargana Lalsot, Jaith Sudi 11 VS 1794/ AD 1737
cultivated. There were petitions against forcible occupation of land. Patels and raiyats of pargana Sawai Jaipur and Chatsu complained when their land was forcibly occupied. Attempts by jagirdars to build kotri were resisted. The Patel and paltis of Paladi, tappa Ramgarh, pargana Sawai Jaipur reported that Surajmal Hamirdeka had got the village in jagir and was trying to build kotri without a sanad. The reference here, to the sanad is important. It is a comment on the ability of peasants to question the legality and appropriateness of moves. The patel and paltis in one case and the patel and raiyatis in another expressed their unhappiness with harassment and demands of the old bohra. Various other unfair demands were complained about. In two separate petitions, patel and paltis of village Kachaha and kasba Pindayan, reported that the ijaradar took from them more hasil than what was specified in the patta. Insistence on terms and conditions was a common feature in these complaints.

26 They had been exempted from malba on 30 bighas of land. The patel and raiyats complained that they were not paying malba on the land over and above these 30 bighas. Chithi to Amil, pargana Dausa, Vaisakh Sudi 8 VS 1810/ AD 1753

27 Chithi to Sri Mansaram Ji and Sah Shri Raja Ram Ji, Asadh Vadi 14 VS 1799/ AD 1742. In this case Chaand Singh Pratap Singh Rajawat of another village had occupied the land which raiyats had been cultivating for 20 years.

28 Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Asadh Vadi 7, VS 1786/ AD 1729. The jagirdar, Ram Padam Singh was accused of forcibly occupying 500 bighas of raiyati land.

29 Chithi to Sah Shri Jai Chand Ji and Sah Shri Gulab Chand Ji, Mah Vadi 13 VS 1819/ Ad 1762.

30 Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Kati Sudi 5 VS 1793/ AD 1736

31 Chithi to Amil, pargana Fagi, Jaith Vadi 16 VS 1800/ AD 1743

32 Chithi to Amil, pargana Pindayan, Mah Sudi 2 VS 1819/ AD 1762

33 Chithi to Amil, pargana Pindayan, Mah Vadi 13 VS 1819/ A 1762
conditions of the patta is again important to note. The unreasonable demand of hasil from fallow land was reported by the patel and raiyats of village Vikolav, pargana Maujavadi.\textsuperscript{34} A Brahmin cultivator of Karoli, pargana Toda Bhiv accused the Amil of deviating from the written agreement.\textsuperscript{35} Clearly, petitions against excessive demands, transgression of custom, exploitation by bohras, establishment of kotri, forcible occupation of land etc. were in the nature of protests and were meant to get the state to hear and take action. Particularly interesting is a petition by the patel and paltis of pargana Tonk. After having obtained quite a few sanads from the Diwan of, when remedial action was not taken, they went to the Huzuri and petitioned against inaction.\textsuperscript{36}.

Regardless of the content of the petitions, the seriousness of the issue reported and the desperation of the petitioner, the tone of petitions was never loud, the posture never aggressive. Anger was always masked. Chithis don’t even vaguely hint at the possibility of peasants ever questioning the legitimacy of the entire structure of domination and subordination. What was opposed was specific, isolated moves of the dominant and powerful

\textsuperscript{34} Chithi to Amil, pargana Maujavadi, Fagun Sudi 15 VS 1798/ AD 1741
\textsuperscript{35} Chithi to Amil, pargana Toda Bhiv, Jaith Vadi 13 VS 1794 “अब आमिल लिख्या माफिक अमल करै नही” reported Jagram Brahman.
\textsuperscript{36} Chithi to Amil, pargana Tonk, Sawan Vadi 13 VS 1799/ AD 1742 “प्र. टोंक का पटेल पालत्या हजुरी मैं आय जाहरी करी जो केतेरक्व बावती की सनवी मे देस का दीवाना की ले गया था सो अमल मैं आई नही…”
sections. Infact the closest that petitions ever came to questioning the fairness of the system, was when there were complains about the disproportionate burden of malba. Even here the patel and paltis, after reporting the matter, said “ली करी निवाह न ही”. There is nothing to the effect that the patel and paltis expressed doubts about the unfairness of the system. By petitioning, peasants played up to the rhetoric of the traditional obligation of rulers to be fair and just in order to be legitimate. Indeed a major handicap is that the original petitions have not been preserved and we are entirely dependent on fragments of petitions contained in chithis.

The second category of petitions offer us a glimpse of the manner in which peasants defended their rights and safeguarded their privileged tenures. Those who paid at the riyayati dastoor became defensive when Amils, Jagirdars etc coerced them to pay more. Mayaram Joshi was a gharuhala cultivator of Khudala, pargana Maujavadi, and paid at the rate of 1/4th. He complained that the Amil was harassing him over share. Jagram Brahman of Chandavaas lodged a similar complaint. Tularam Khoob Ram Brahman of qasba Udehi petitioned to defend his privilege of paying at the rate of i.e. 1/3rd. Collectively too, privileged positions were guarded. Joravar Singh, Jodh Singh Hamirdeka

37 Chithi to Amil, pargana Lalsot, Jaith Sudi 11, VS 1794/AD1737.
38 Chithi to Amil, pargana Maujavadi, Vaisakh Sudi 4 VS 1798/ AD 1741
39 Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Jaith Vadi 5 VS 1802/ AD 1745
40 Chithi to Amil, pargana Udehi, Bhadva Vadi 2 VS 1816/ AD 1759
and Dayaram Mahajan of village Katli together petitioned against the jagirdar who was harassing them over their privilege to pay at the rate of 1/4th. Several Kachhwaha cultivators of pargana Chatsu appealed to the state of uphold their gharuhala tenure and prevent the Amil from harassing them over shares. The privilege of exemption from malba was similarly guarded. Pragdas Nathuram Brahman, who was exempted from malba, complained that the patel was exploiting him over it and the jagirdar was harassing over patta. Khemdas Vairagi made a similar petition. There are several other examples. Abhay Singh Naruka of village Saikhal, pargana Khohri, pressed for treatment like the other Thakurs in matters of payment of revenue and kharch. The undertone of dissent and disapproval is not hard to see in all such petitions. Individually as well as collectively, the privileged peasants listed down the terms and conditions of their tenures, cited these in petitions, kept sanads in safe custody, requested for new sanads in case they were lost, and insisted that their privileges be respected. The picture that emerges is of the privileged gharuhalas clinging on with determination to their

41 Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Chait Sudi 15 VS 1802/ AD 1745
42 Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Sawan Sudi 5 VS 1819/ AD 1762
43 Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Sawan Vadi 5 VS 1819/ AD 1762
44 Chithi to Amil, pargana Fagui, Vaisakh Vadi 6 VS 1798/ AD 1741
45 Chithi to Amil, pargana Khohri, Jaith Vadi 3 VS 1802/ AD 1745
46 Balchand Bhelidas, who cultivated land in village Karhada Bujarak and village Nagal Narhar, pargana Chatsu, paid at the rate of 1/4th and was exempted from malba. When he lost the sanad, he requested for another one. Also see Chithi to Amil, pargana Tonk, Mah Vadi 2, VS. 1811/AD1754. Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Bhadva Sudi 14, VS 1819/ AD 1762.
customary entitlements and zealously defending their privileged positions.

In the third category of petitions, we have appeals for various kinds of concessions. Peasants supplicated most humbly for leniency in assessment and collection. When assessment was excessive, when the assessed figures were not in tune with the actual produce, there were pleas for reduction. The Patel and raiyati of pargana Ajabgarh went to the Huzuri and pleaded for a revision of the ijara amount on the ground that their village had been arbitrarily assessed by the Amil. A Brahman cultivator expressed dissatisfaction with assessment. Sahib Ram Chhavra pleaded for leniency in the collection of arrears that he owed to the durbar. Those who colonized villages requested for riyayat. The Charan of Palasoli requested to be assessed at concessional rates. There were several requests to assess with due consideration to the declining yield of villages. The patel and raiyati of Chaahakavaas, pargana Bahatri requested to be allowed to pay peshkash and ikotra on upeja, rather than tan, since upeja

---

47 Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Pos Sudi 14, VS 1820/ AD 1763
48 Chithi to Amil, pargana Ajabgarh, Chait Sudi 2 VS 1785/ AD 1728
49 Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Pos Vadi 1 VS 1813/ AD 1756
50 Chithi to Daroga, Amin, Kachehri Huzuri Des Ka, Asoj Sudi 9 VS 1820/ AD 1763
51 Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Pos Vadi 14 VS 1796/ AD 1739
52 Arzdashta dated Jaith Sudi 15 VS 1784/ AD 1727
53 Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Pos Vadi 14 VS 1816/ AD 1759. It was stated that the 'tan' of mauza Teetarya was fixed at Rs. 22,000/- and the 'upeja' had declined because of which it was increasingly difficult to pay the peshkash which had been fixed on the 'tan'.
and fallen.\textsuperscript{54} We came across several petitions from individuals for concessions to enable them get wells dug. Nanhuram Musalman of pargana Bahatri sought help to purchase wood for a well.\textsuperscript{55} Kishoredas Manoaram Bhavsa of Choru, appealed for a sanad, so that he could get a well dug on waste land.\textsuperscript{56} Ram Chand Khushyal Chand Luharia was exempt from malba and paid at the rate of $1/4^{th}$ on the land he cultivated. When he appealed for concessions for a new well, he was given a further concession of 4 anas on 1 bigha.\textsuperscript{57} The patel and paltis of village Sakkarpura, requested for a riyayat in shares so that they could construct a masonry well.\textsuperscript{58} The patel and paltis of village Ghamana pleaded for riyayat when there was a failure of irrigation.\textsuperscript{59} Raiyats petitioned for tagai.\textsuperscript{60} In one case, the patel and raiyats of mauza Dausa Khurd petitioned that since they had always paid in kind, they should be allowed the same in future.\textsuperscript{61} There were several requests to reduce the number of sahnas. The patel and raiyati of village Margehda petitioned that when the area of their village was 3000 bighas, they maintained two sahnas. Now only 1163 bighas

\textsuperscript{54} Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Jaith Sudi 1 VS 1819/ AD 1762
\textsuperscript{55} Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Vaisakh Vadi 6 VS 1819/ AD 1762
\textsuperscript{56} Chithi to Amil, pargana Fagi, Mah Sudi 4 VS 1819/ AD 1762
\textsuperscript{57} Chithi to Amil, pargana Maujavadi, Mah Sudi 12 VS 1820/ AD 1763
\textsuperscript{58} Chithi to Amil, pargana Fagi, Chait Vadi 9 VS 1793/ AD 1736
\textsuperscript{59} Chithi to Amil, pargana Maujavadi, Chait Vadi 55 V.S. 1793/ AD 1736
\textsuperscript{60} Amber Records, To Shri Shambhu Ram Ji, from Piragdas, Sawan Vadi 12 VS 1805/ AD 1748; Chithi to Amil, pargana Toda Bhim, Chait Vadi 10, V.S.1784/AD1727.
\textsuperscript{61} Chithi to Amil pargana Dausa, Mah Vadi 4 VS 1822/ AD 1765
remain and therefore, they could not keep two sahnas.\textsuperscript{62} In another case, the patel and raiyati of Rampuravaas requested that since the upeja had fallen, they should be allowed to keep only one sahna.\textsuperscript{63} There were appeals to reduce the number of patwaris.\textsuperscript{64} Clearly, petitioning seems to be a well tried out method of wrestling concessions and obtaining favourable terms. A decided advantage accrued when peasants appealed for concessions. They were able to evoke a sympathetic response from the state.

A very interesting fact about petitions is that after the complaint had been made, petitioners invariably mentioned that in face of the reported transgression, “we cannot survive” i.e. “\textit{ती करी निवाह नहीं}”. Raiyats, when they protested against exploitation over viraad, said “\textit{ती करी निवाह नहीं}”.\textsuperscript{65} Patels and paltis, when they complained of the disproportionate burden of malba, took care to mention “\textit{ती करी निवाह नहीं}”\textsuperscript{66} When Patels and raiyats together protested against the burden of sahnas, they said “\textit{ती करी निवाह नहीं}”\textsuperscript{67}. Telis, Barbers etc responded to exploitation over baith, begar

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{62} Chithi to Amil, pargana Tonk, Bhadva Sudi 3 VS 1793/ AD 1736
\item \textsuperscript{63} Chithi to Amil, pargana Fagi, Kati Sudi 7 VS 1816/ AD 1759
\item \textsuperscript{64} Chithi to Sah Shri Sahibram, Asadh Sudi 4 VS 1785/ AD 1728. The Patel and raiyati of village Nevata and Maivasa petitioned that they could not bear the burden of four patwaris.
\item \textsuperscript{65} Chithi to Amil, pargana Fagi, Chait Sudi 13 VS 1809/ Ad 1752
\item \textsuperscript{66} Chithi to Amil, pargana Labot, Jaith Sudi 11 VS 1794/ AD 1737
\item \textsuperscript{67} Chithi to Amil, pargana Tonk, Bhadva Sudi 3 VS 1793/ AD 1736; Chithi to Amil, pargana Fagi, Kati Sudi 7 VS 1816/ AD 1759; Chithi to Amil, pargana Dausa, Mah Vadi 4, VS 1822/ AD 1765
\end{itemize}
etc. by saying “ती करी निबाह नहीं”68 Other similar phrases which we frequently come across are “ती करी गाँव में तसी सका नहीं”,69 “ती करी गाँव में रहो जाय नहीं”,70 “ती करी गाँव में आबादान होय सके नहीं”71 “ती करी गाँव में तिकी सका नहीं”.72 The recurrence of these phrases in petitions is of immense significance and has parallels elsewhere.73 When peasants complained about exploitation and took care to follow it up with a mention of their inability to survive, or continue, or prosper, they must have been aware of the state’s interest in their continued existence as peasants. Why else would the exploited, whose exploitation was sanctioned by the state, repeatedly mention their inability to survive? By stressing that they could not survive, peasants let it be know to the state that if remedial action was not taken, they would be ruined. The urgency of their situation was thus communicated. Though it would be far-

68 Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Asadh Vadi 55 VS 1799/ AD 1742; Chithi to Amil, pargana Gazi Ka Thana, Asadh Vadi 13 VS 1799/ AD 1742.
69 Chithi to Faujdar and Amil, pargana Bahatri, Fagun Sudi 15 VS 1799/ AD 1742. Patel and paltis, in response to harassment over baith, begar etc; Chithi to Sah mansaram Ji and Sah Shri Mauji Ram Ji, Chait Vadi 10 VS 1799/ AD 1742, Telis, in response to harassment over baith, begar, khaat and gudada.
70 Chithi to Amil, pargana Maujvadi, Fagun Sudi 15 VS 1798/ AD1741. Patel and raiyats, in response to the Amil’s demand of hasil from fallow land.
71 Chithi to Sah Shri Mansaram Ji and Sah Shri Mauji Ram Ji, Sawan Vadi 2 VS 1800/ A 1743. Barbers, in response to exploitation by tapdar and sahna over baith and begar.
72 Chithi to Amil, pargana Malpura, Asadh Sudi 8 VS 1800/ Ad 1743. This was said in response to harassment by the bohra.
73 In a study of Tokugawa Japan (1600-1867 AD) it has been observed that villagers petitioned to the lord of the domain to exercise “benevolence” so that the petitioners could “continue as farmers” see Stephen Vlastos, Peasant Protests and Uprisings in Tokugawa Japan, 1990.
fetched to treat these phrases as threats, they were certainly to caution (in a very polite, masked and deferential manner) those in power of the consequences of ruination of the petitioners.

Petitions by gharuhalas far outnumber those by raiyats and paltis. The fact that gharuhalas petitioned more does not come as a surprise. Owing to their relatively greater affluence in rural society, petitioning must have certainly been easier for them in comparison to the less privileged. This also seems to suggest that defending one's gains made one more voluble than fighting absolute poverty. Petitions by raiyats and paltis, though comparatively fewer, are however not less in terms of their absolute numbers. Raiyats and paltis mostly got the patel to act as their spokesperson. Lobbying by the patel seems to have been important for raiyats to get their petitions through. They mostly went in for joint petitions with the patel. Instances of petitioning by raiyats or paltis alone are rare. Seldom did the gharuhalas petition jointly with the Patel. They were more inclined to petitioning individually. Patels never pooled in with barbers, Telis, Tailors etc to write joint petitions. Joint petitions were mostly by patels and raiyats or patels and paltis. Sometimes patwaris and the panch mahajan also joined in.

74 Out of a random sample of 80 petitions, only 22 were from raiyats and paltis.
Petitioning seems to have been a popular method of protest. It was probably also the first reaction of peasants to exploitation, their first line of defence.\textsuperscript{75} It entailed no risks. It was a sure way to get one's voice heard. The sheer number of petitions, the range of their contents, the wide spectrum of people who petitioned, proves that as a method of protest, petitioning was both popular as well as effective in some substantial measure. Petitioners seem to have possessed a very clear understanding of what was acceptable and what was not. Though we have no evidence whatsoever of organized political opinion being voiced in petitions and they were essentially very local in character, petitioners were able to judge very accurately when the limits sanctioned by custom were over-stepped. They seemed determined not to let acts of oppression go unquestioned and unchallenged. Peasants could of course, submit petitions for redressal of their grievances, only on the assumption that obtaining redressal was possible within the system. Yet, veiled in the silences, was also a quiet threat that if the system failed to deliver, resort to other means could also be an option.

\textsuperscript{75} R.P. Rana has observed that like in other medieval societies, the first act of medieval Indian peasants' protest was to go to the higher authorities for the redressal of their grievances. "Agrarian revolts in Northern India during the Late 17\textsuperscript{th} and Early 18\textsuperscript{th} Century", \textit{IESHR}, Vol. XVIII No. 3 and 4 p. 305.
The Threat of Petitioning

Not only did the peasants petition, they also threatened to petition when wronged. In an arzdashta written in V.S. 1740/AD1683, the raiyats are seen arguing persistently and vehemently, over jizya, bhom and serino. It is reported that raiyats don’t want to give jizya i.e. “रैती हल जोता जेजीयो दीयी चाहे नही”. Raiyats insist that they have been exempted and don’t agree to give i.e. “रैती माने नही”. They argue that they already pay double bhom, “रैती कही म्हान तो भोभी आगे ही दुहरा लागे छै” give majuri to the patwari and that it is unfair to now force them to pay serino “म्हे किसी भांति दे सक्रा” they say. What is extremely important in this document is that at various points in course of the argument, the raiyats threaten to leave for Ajmer. As reported in this Arzdashta, when harassed by the ‘sawar’, they seem to be leaving for Ajmer i.e., “अजमेर नै चाली”. A little later, they say that they will go to Ajmer and petition, “अजमेर जाई अरज करी ला”. Then, अजमेर तो म्हाने जेजीया के वास्ते जाणी सो जावा ही छै बैठे और जु अरज म्हाने करणी होसी सो करा ही ला”. This document is unique in that it shows how peasants used the threat of appealing to higher officials, in this case the Subedar, in their dealings with lower level officials. The threat of going to Ajmer with their faryad was successfully used in this case. The resentful officials, perceived this as an act of हरामजादगी.
Nonetheless, The aggrieved raiyats were consoled and brought back.\textsuperscript{76}

**Non Payment**

Non - payment of revenue has mostly been conceived of as overt refusal by peasants to pay, hence as outright defiance. It has been called “the classic act of defiance” on part of the peasants.\textsuperscript{77} Peasants who dared to refuse payments are called ‘zortalab’ in our documents. Such pockets were identified by the state and force was used to stamp our recalcitrance. Certain villages in pargana Bahatri were deemed zortalab in VS 1816/AD 1759.\textsuperscript{78} In pargana Khohri, nobody paid without use of force i.e. 

\begin{quote}
विना जोर पहुंचाए न तो कोई चुकावे न दाम एक भरे”, it was reported and to deal with such “बदःअमली”, it was requested that the army be sent.\textsuperscript{79}
\end{quote}

Arrears were due from village Virajpura, pargana Chatsu in VS 1799/AD 1742. The tankhwadars and officials sent to realize dues were openly defied and even physically assaulted.\textsuperscript{80} The extent of peasant participation in such acts of confrontation, varied regionally and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{76} Arzdashta, Jaith Sudi 12, VS 1740/AD 1683
\item \textsuperscript{78} Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Asoj Sudi 6 VS 1816/AD 1759. Halkaras were appointed and officials directed to ensure that they got their ‘tankhwah’ on time.
\item \textsuperscript{79} Amber Records, to Diwan Shri Murali Dhar Ji and Diwan Nand Lal Ji, from Purohit Jagdish Sangahi Anopchand, Mah Sudi 12 VS 1811/AD 1754
\item \textsuperscript{80} Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Chait Sudi 12 VS 1799/AD 1742
\end{itemize}
these were mostly spearheaded by Bhomias and other dominant sections. The interconnection has been competently analysed in a study of late 17th and early 18th centuries.81

These 'classic' acts of defiance have received sufficient attention of historians. What has been left by and large unexplored by scholars of medieval Indian history is the other side of the picture. Non payment need not always assume the form of open and violent confrontations. It need not necessarily be collective. Documentary evidence from Eastern Rajasthan shows that it invariably varied from outright refusal to what seems almost like a policy on the part of peasants to delay, evade, under-pay and not yield willingly. A variety of terms appear in documents — ऊजरवाई, कोताई, ढील सोखी, सुखण, हुजली, सीनाजोरी and even हरामज़ादगी. Richness of the terminology suggests all that happened between acquiescence and outright refusal to pay. 'ऊजरवाई' comes from the Persian 'uzr'. It means to avoid and make excuses. 'कोताई' comes from the Persian 'kotahi', meaning deficiency or falling short. 'नालीस/नालसी' means complaint. 'सुखण' would come closest to the term utterance. It is used in documents in the sense of 'सुख न करै' i.e. reluctance. 'हुजली' in Rajasthan means to argue or fight. I have consciously retained these terms in text and refrained from trying

81 R.P. Rana, "Agrarian Revolts in Northern India during the Late 17th and Early 18th Century", IESHR Vol. XVIII, No. 3 and 4.
to translate so that the exact sense in which they appear in documents can be understood.

Deepa, Maha Singh Parasya, Jagroop Patel and others of mauza Gambheera did उजरखाई with the official who had gone to collect hasil.82 Raiyats of Aaveri did उजरखाई in repayment of a loan taken from Nihal Chand Pemraj Brahman.83 Sabha Chand Lekhraj Mahajan complained of उजरखाई by asamis of pargana Pahari.84 Gujar Pasari also reported उजरखाई by asamis of kasba Aaveri in repayment of his loan.85

कोलाई in payment was reported. The Jagridar of a village in pargana Gaji ka Thana accused raiyats of कोलाई.86 Hetamparas Kesula Vatval of kasba Malarna did कोलाई in paying hasil to the banjara.87 The Patel of mauza Jhadoda, pargana Malarna was accused of कोलाई in the payment of perquisites to the sahna.88

Another term we come across in documents is नालीस/नालसी. The patel and paltis of mauza Shripur, pargana Malarna, were accused by the jagirdar, Bhup Singh Bharat Singh Rathor of नालसी.

---

82 Arhsatta, Malarna, VS 1747/ AD 1690
83 Arzdashta, Asoj Sudi 15 VS 1742/ AD 1685
84 Chithi to Faujdar, Amil, pargana Pahari, Pos Sudi 11 VS 1784/ AD 1727
85 Chithi to dated Kati Sudi 8, VS 1784/ AD 1727
86 Chithi to Amil, pargana Gaji ka Thana, Vaisakh Vadi 2, VS 1800/AD 1743.
87 Arhsatta, Malarna, VS 1774/ AD 1717
88 Arhsatta, Malarna, VS 1770/ AD 1713
in payment of hasil of VS 1809/AD 1752.\textsuperscript{89} The patel and patwari of a village in pargana Toda Bhiv, likewise, did नालसी in the payment of peshkash.\textsuperscript{90}

The term सुखण आर आर is repayment of loan.\textsuperscript{91} Lenders of credit often complained of सुखण by borrowers in repayment.\textsuperscript{92} Pahis of a village in pargana Malpura did सुखण in giving hasil to the jagirdar.\textsuperscript{93} Noisiness in parting with hasil is reported in a document. Jeeto Mahjan of Kasba Lalsot is accused of having made a noise in paying hasil to the musarraf of the chotra. The term used is 'सीर कियो'\textsuperscript{94}. The patel and paltis of mauza Talaav, pargana Bahatri did सोखी and बदआमली in paying haasil to the state.\textsuperscript{95} Moti Ram Mahajan was accused of not paying adequately i.e. "हासिल हाथ उजायो दे थे"\textsuperscript{96} Rao Mevada of mauza Sahjiapur, pargana Malarna, paid only half of the rahdari hasil (हासिल आधो चुकायो) and did not pay the entire ghaas charai (हासिल घाटी चुकायो)\textsuperscript{97}. Amra Mahajan of

\textsuperscript{89} Chithi to Amil, pargana Malarna, Jaith Vadi 12 VS 1810/AD 1753
\textsuperscript{90} Chithi to Amil, pargana Toda Bhim.
\textsuperscript{91} Chithi to Amil, pargana Serpura, Pos Vadi 7 VS 1819/AD 1762
\textsuperscript{92} Chithi to Daroga, Amin, Pastofi, Kachehri, Chait Sudi 15 VS 1819/AD 1762; Chithi to Shri Gulab Singh, Asadh Vadi 2 VS 1799/AD 1742; Chithi Vaisakh Vadi 14, VS 1818/AD 1761.
\textsuperscript{93} Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1775/AD 1718.
\textsuperscript{94} Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Jaith Vadi 14, VS 1809/AD 1752
\textsuperscript{95} Chithi to Jesht Sudi 11, VS 1772/AD 1665, pargana Malpura
\textsuperscript{96} Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Mah Sudi 4 VS 1820/AD 1763
\textsuperscript{97} Arhsatta, Malarna, VS 1774/AD 1717
mauza Malarna Khurd, underpaid i.e. हासिल कमी चुकायो.98 Jotas of pargana Maujavadi did सुखण 99 and सीनाजोरी100 in paying nalbant. In one document, the patel and raiyats were accused of “हरामजादगी” by the jagirdar, when they did not pay.101 We have several instances of individuals not paying hasil. चुकायो नहीं,102 भरया नहीं,103 हरजाई न कीयो.104

Clearly, there were many nuances, as the wide variety of terms used in documents, suggest. Non payment by peasants assumed various forms apart from open refusal to pay up. These acts of delaying, evading, under paying and not paying willingly have to be taken note of. Though incomparable to the ‘classic act’ of collective refusal to pay, these are not insignificant. They are considerable in numbers and show how widespread and ingrained resistance to payment was. If we confine attention to just those violent, open outbursts and non-payment of just land revenue, we will be reducing peasant resistance to just those moments of confrontation when raiyats refuse to pay, rise in rebellion (mostly

98 Arhsatta, Malarna, VS 1774/ Ad 1717
99 Chithi to Amil, pargana Maujavadi, Fagun Sudi 13, VS 1815/ AD 1758
100 Chithi to Amil, pargana Maujavadi, Asadh Sudi 7, VS 1823/ AD 1766
101 Chithi dated Vaisakh Vadi 7 VS 1800/ AD 1743
102 Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1771/ AD 1714; Arhsatta, Malarna, VS 1774/ AD 1717
103 Arhsatta, Malarna, VS 1747/ AD 1690; Arhsatta, Malarna, VS 1778/ AD 1721.
104 Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1700/ AD 1643
in collusion with dominant sections) are termed zortalab and are crushed forcefully and ruthlessly. The covert methods, if one were to compare with the 'classic act' of defiance, are far more suited to the peasantry. They help get away, without incurring the wrath of the state. They are low profile, more constant in nature and defensive rather than offensive.

Overt refusal to pay land revenue was mostly not dared by peasants individually. It has been observed that the Rajput cultivators were especially inclined to collective resistance to the payment of land revenue.\(^{105}\) This brings us to the debate on militancy and deprivation.\(^{106}\) Amongst gharuhalas, or even amongst the raiyats in general, the Rajputs were by and large, better placed, both materially\(^{107}\) as well as politically.\(^{108}\) The fact that it was the Rajput cultivators who took an openly confrontational posture vis-a-vis payment of revenue and other dues, raises doubts about feasibility of the notion that the more deprived sections are more militant.

\(^{105}\) Madhavi Bajekal has drawn attention to the fact that Rajput defaulters, instead of being mentioned by their individual names are referred to by their generic caste or clan name. Gharuhalas, apart from Rajputs, did not individually or collectively defy the authority of the state, by refusing to pay revenue dues, she says: “Rural Disputes in Eastern Rajasthan in the 18\(^{th}\) Century”, pp. 75-76.


\(^{107}\) This has been discussed in Chapter III

\(^{108}\) Due to their caste and clan ties with the ruling Kachhwhahas.
The state was increasingly unable to realize from cultivators the assessed amount. Apart from inability of peasants to pay due to the rising burden of taxes, and embezzlement by bhomias, non payment by peasants, both covert as well as overt also contributed to this. Jagirdars frequently reported delays in realization and requested the state to warn raiyats to pay up. Udikis complained that jotas did not pay i.e. हासिल जेता खाय जाय. Patel and paltis together refused to part with hasil. The state repeatedly directed officials to realize timely i.e. “बर बरबूत रुपया तहसील कीज्यो.” There were villages whose raiyati was accused of delaying and postponing every year. Raiyats of several villages of pargana Wazirpur were accused by the ijaradar of non-payment. The covert varieties of non-payment often also included excuse making and feigning one’s inability to pay. From the Kaagad Bahi of Bikaner, comes this extremely interesting case wherein an official expresses surprise at the excuse offered by a raiyat for his inability to pay hasil. The raiyat reportedly said to the official that he could not pay since

109 Dilbagh Singh, The State...., p. 117
110 Ibid., Also see, R.p. Rana, “Agrarian Revolts...” pp. 316-317
111 Dilbagh Singh, The State...., p. 117
112 R.p. Rana “Agrarian Revolts...” p. 316
113 Chithi, Jesht Vadi 10 VS 1800/ AD 1743, pargana Sawai Jaipur.
114 Chithi, Jesht Suidi 3 VS 1813/ AD 1756, pargana Hindaun.
115 Chithi to Amil, pargana Gaji Ka Thana, Vaisakh Sudi 12 VS 1802/ AD 1745. Than Singh Chauhan, the Jagirdar of village Kisori, said “गाँव में हासिल भाग को बाकी हर साल…” And the Amil was directed to warn raiyats to pay.
116 Chithi to Amil, pargana Wazirpur, Asadh Sudi 12 VS 1802/ AD 1745
rats had eaten 20 mans of bajra while it was in the store-house i.e. "काली उंदरा खाय गया."\textsuperscript{117} The peasants clearly had the ability to drive the State agents hopping mad with their highly inventive excuses.

**Non Cultivation and Preferential Cultivation**

Land remained uncultivated due to several reasons. We have to consider first, the inability of some raiyats in some regions, at some points of time to continue cultivation due to resourcelessness and poverty.\textsuperscript{118} We also have to take note of abandonment of cultivation due to famines\textsuperscript{119} and Maratha invasions.\textsuperscript{120} That raiyats often withdrew from cultivation in response to excessive exploitation is also well documented.\textsuperscript{121} It has been observed that sometimes land was left uncultivated due to local agricultural limitations to the extension of cultivation.\textsuperscript{122} In one case, the Jagirdar of village Norangpura, pargana Tonk, accused the Patel of forcibly keeping land uncultivated to graze

\textsuperscript{117} Kagad Bahi Bikaner, No. 28, VS 1871/ AD1814.
\textsuperscript{118} In several documents it is reported that land lies uncultivated due to सबब नावारी, Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Asadh Sudi 11 VS 1802/ AD 1745.
\textsuperscript{119} ‘सबब कहलसाली’ often forced peasants to abandon cultivation and migrate. Chithi to Amil, pargana Lalsot, Asadh Sudi 2 V.S. 1809/AD1752.
\textsuperscript{120} Chithi to Amil, pargana Malpura, Asadh Vadi 2 VS 1820/ AD 1763.
\textsuperscript{121} Arzdashta, VS 1819 / AD 1762
\textsuperscript{122} Chithi to Amil, pargana Pindayan Mah Sudi 2 VS 1819/ AD 1762. It is reported that land of the village Kachaha remained uncultivated due to excessive exploitation by ijaradar; Chithi to Amil, pargana Tonk, Mah Sudi 8, VS. 1798/AD 1741.

Madhavi Bajekal, *Rural Disputes in Eastern Rajasthan in the 18th Century*, p. 86. The patels, writes Madhavi Bajekal, were responsible for overall agricultural production and they may have sometimes kept some land uncultivated as encroachments would have ultimately affected overall production.
cattle i.e. गाँव की ढाड़ा चराया नै जोरावरी पड़त राखे, while he himself cultivated another's land. Here, the patel's action seems to have been the result of tension between him and the jagirdar. In another case the Patel apparently kept land uncultivated and sold off the grass.

While certainly resourcelessness must have forced many peasants to abandon cultivation, as also excessive harassment, famines and the Maratha menace, it is possible in most cases, to distinguish between land that remained untilled due to reasons cited above and land that was deliberately left uncultivated. As far deliberate non-cultivation, apart from the cases of Patels being accused of intentionally leaving land uncultivated, (discussed on the previous page) I would like to draw attention to three other documents, which establish that raiyats also often deliberately left land uncultivated. In the first, the patel of Roopvaas, pargana Chatsu, accused the jagirdar Surat Ram Kachhwaha of forcibly cultivating paltis' land. The state directed the Amil to stop the jagirdar from doing so. The state however, also took care to assert that if raiyats do not cultivate land, the jagirdar should be allowed to cultivate and raiyats should not be allowed to keep land

123 Chithi to Amil, pargana Tonk, Pos Vadi 9 VS 1796/ AD 1739. In this case, the jagirdar also accused the Patel of 'eating' hasil, harassing the pahis (who cultivate his land) over malba and not giving him a share of the malba. This document has also been quoted by Madhavi Bajekal, “Rural Disputes...” p. 85.
124 See Madhavi Bajekal, p. 85.
uncultivated without any reason. i.e. "नाहक रैत्य धरती पड़त राखिवा न पावे."

In the second document, the Amil of Fagi is directed to ensure that all land is cultivated. He is directed to do whatever it takes to get all land under the plough. Further, the state says that land should not be forcibly kept uncultivated i.e. "जबरी करी धरती पड़त न रहे".

In the third, the jagridar of Hiranothi, pargana Bahatri, complains that despite the fact that he made for the raiyats the concession of paying bhomi and baqaya on the upeja, the raiyats do कोलाई in cultivation and do not pay heed, despite warnings.

The words "नाहक", "जबरी" and "कोलाई" in these three documents are revealing. They hint at the possibility that peasants sometimes deliberately left land uncultivated. That these three are not cases of raiyats being unable to cultivate, is further confirmed by the nature of the State's response, which, in all these cases, is in the form of reprimands i.e. "ताफ़ीद कीज्यो", and directions to take 'muchalka' so that such activities are not repeated. When poverty or exploitation forced peasants to abandon cultivation, the state invariably directed officials to console i.e. "दिलासा कीज्यो" and provide i.e. "खातिरजमा कीज्यो".

The state's pre-occupation with cultivation is well known.

125 Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Asoj Vadi 1 VS 1793/ AD 1736
126 Chithi to Amil, pargana Fagui, Bhadva Vadi 1 VS 1802/ AD 1745
127 Chithi to Purohit Rajram Sah Rekh Raj, Kati Sudi 15 VS 1784/ AD 1727.
Several arzdashtas testify to the state's keen-ness in ensuring that maximum land was under the plough. In VS 1783/AD 1726, Amils and Amins of several Parganas, were ordered by way of a Parwana, dated Bhadva Vadi 10, VS 1783/AD 1726, to prepare yad-dashtis of all such land that remained uncultivated and submit it to Hemraj's Bakshi. That the order had been executed well is reported and in case of pargana Toda Bhiv, the Chaudhry, Qanungo and Raiyati were even warned about land left uncultivated. 128 Diwan Vidyadhar is also known to have issued direction to ensure good cultivation. 129 Officials often reported to the state that they had done the needful and all land was under cultivation. 130 The state's concern is best articulated in a Chithi, where it is explicitly stated that non-cultivation constituted an offence i.e. "न बाहा तो सरकार का गुल्लियार" 131. One can therefore extend a hypothesis. We know that peasants sometimes deliberately left land uncultivated, apparently without any 'justifiable' reason and displayed reluctance in cultivation. We

128 Arzdashta, Asoj Vadi 7 VS 1783/Ad 1726. This pertains to pargana Aaveri; Arzdashta, VS 1783/AD 1726, pertaining to pargana Toda Bhiv
129 Amber Record, Sawan Vadi 2, VS 1803/AD 1746, Dalpatram Mansaram acknowledged having received the कागद which said "बाह जोल की तरबुद असी कीजो".
130 Arzdashta, Sawan Vadi 4 VS 1724/AD 1667 "धरती घण्टी बहावां ला जी" Arzdashta, Asoj Vadi 9, VS 1706/AD 1649 "जिमी गाँव की सगली जुलाई"  
131 Chithi to Sah Mansaram and Sangahi Ajab Ram, Bhadva Sudi 8 VS 1784/AD 1727. The Patel of Village Saligrampura reported that land in village Mahasinghpura remained under uncultivated.
know also, that the state saw all such activities as an offence, a
crime, or at least as a gross neglect of one’s obligation to till. And
therefore deliberate non-cultivation may have been one of the
several ways by which peasants let it be known to the state that all
was not well.

Land was not scarce. Labour was. The state was extremely
eager to bring virgin soil under the plough and extend cultivation.
It was keen not just to increase the area under cultivation but also
to ensure optimum cultivation of all land under plough. Those who
hired out their labour for agricultural purposes (no matter how
depressed their position was) were assets. We have discussed in
Chapter III, how these sections were lured with concessions.
Against this backdrop, let us discuss the innumerable cases of
individuals as well as groups, choosing to cultivate the land of
vadhdars, inamis, udikis etc. at the expense of either their own
village land or the khalsa land. Most of this evidence comes from
Arhsattas, where people are variously fined for doing so.
Sometimes Roznamas and Chithis also provide information.

In pargana Lalsot, in the course of two years (VS 1794/ AD
1737 and VS 1795/ AD 1738) individuals who were fined for
cultivating the vadhdar’s land were mostly of the middle and low
castes – Anada Nai of mauza Goval, Ghasi Nai of mauza
Ramsinghpura, Ratno Khati of mauza Nehadi, Gana Balahi of
mauza Jagneri and Chaina Mali of mauza Sarima. We hear of just one Brahman, one Rajput and a Patwari being accused of cultivating the vadhdar's land. Collectively too, it was mostly the middle and low castes who were fined – A Meena, a Khati and a Gujar in mauza Goval in VS 1794/ AD 1737; two Meenas a Nai and a Balahi in mauza Kalyavaas in VS 1794/ AD 1737. Sometimes the names or castes of the individuals are not specified – Harkishan and other asamis of mauza Ranoh, Harchand and other asamis of mauza Nalhavaas, Hari Ram and others of mauza Ratanpur, Mayala and others of mauza Sumalkha. In one case, in pargana Dausa in VS 1742/ AD 1685, paltis of Kalyan Patni were fined for cultivating the vadhdar's land. In the same year, in mauza Jotalay of pargana Bahatri, two Meenas and a Mahajan are jointly fined.

While in these cases, it is only mentioned that individuals and groups have been fined for cultivating the vadhdar's land, in

---

132 Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1794/ AD 1737 and VS 1795/ AD 1738
133 Deva Brahman of mauza Mudo (VS 1795/ AD 1738), Khem Singh Chauhan of mauza Nizampur and Sadaram patwari of mauza Goval (both in VS 1794/ AD 1737). See Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1794/ AD 1737, VS1795/ AD 1738
134 Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1794/ AD 1737
135 Ibid
136 Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1795/ AD 1738
137 Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1794/ AD 1737
138 Ibid
139 Ibid
140 Roznama, Dausa, VS 1742/ AD 1685
141 Roznama, Bahatri, VS 1742/ Ad 1685
several others, it is explicitly stated that land of vadhdars, udikis, inamis etc. has been cultivated at the expense of the village or khalsa land. The jagirdar of village Abhaipur and Mohana, pargana Sawai Jaipur accused paltis of cultivating the Vadhdar’s land at the expense of village land. Sadaram and others of mauza Veechhyo, pargana Lalsot, cultivated the Vadhdar’s land and left the Khalsa land uncultivated. Balu Khati and others of mauza Nagaryavaas, pargana Lalsot also cultivated Vadhdar’s land at the expense of Khalsa land. A Mali of kasba Lalsot was accused of cultivating the inami’s land before the Khalsa land. Goval and Mathura Meena of mauza Karehda, pargana Toda Bhiv were fined for cultivating Qazi Milki’s land without permission. What is also fairly well established is that cultivators often took to cultivation of Vadhdars’ land, not in their own villages, but in other neighbouring villages as well. Thus we hear of Ratan Meena of mauza Ranoh cultivating land of the Vadhdar of mauza Goval. Jaskaran and others of mauza Gopalpur went to mauza

142 Chithi to Sah Shri Nanigram Ji and Amil, Asadh Sudi 4 VS 1794 / AD 1737 “पालती बाढ़ की धरती वाहे, गाव की धरती वाहे नहीं…” complained the jagirdar, Daulat Singh
143 Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1795 / Ad 1738 “… बाढ़ में खेती वाही छी अर खालसा की पड़ी राखी…”
144 Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1773 / Ad 1716 “… खालसा की धरती पहली जोती नहीं”
145 Arhsatta, Toda Bhiv, VS 1770 / AD 1713
146 Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1794 / AD 1737
Paldi and cultivated the Vadhdar’s land.148 A group of five (three Meenas and two others, whose caste is not specified) in village Rampur Chhoto was fined for cultivating land of the vadhdar in village Babuvaas.149 A group of three, similarly, of village Vidoli, cultivated the vadhdar’s land in mauza Davari Vadi.150 We also have the instance of Mayaram Patel of mauza Davari Chhoti being fined for cultivating Vadhdar’s land in Davari Badi.151

The preference shown for cultivation of land of vadhdars, udikis, inamis etc. may have been to a great extent, due to the policy of exempting jotas of such land from malba and various other dues. Cultivators often found in the person of Udikis, Bhogis etc., patrons who could offer them some protection from exploitation.152 The terms of cultivation must certainly have been more advantageous and conditions more propitious. By showing their preference for the land of vadhdars, udikis, inamis etc. and

148 Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1788/ AD 1731
149 Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1794/ AD 1737
150 Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1794/ AD 1737
151 Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1794/ AD 1737
152 We frequently hear of Udikis and Bhogis objecting to the exploitation of their jotas and paltis. Chithi to Amil, pargana Gaji ka Thana, Mah Sudi 3 V.S. 1809/ AD 1752. The Udiki complained that the Jagirdar and Patel were forcefully extracting malba from the jotas; Chithi to Faujdar, pargana Bahatri, Asadh Vadi 3 VS 1800/ AD 1743. The Udiki accused the Patel of harassing paltis of his udik, without reason; Chithi to Sah Shri Jai Chand and Sah Shri Gulab Chand, Kati Sudi 13 VS 1819/ AD 1762 The Udiki here, objected to the exploitation of jotas over ghughari, vaach, viraad, malba etc.; Chithi to Amil pargana Gaji ka Thana, Sawan Vadi 3 VS 1819/ AD 1762. The Udiki in this, complained that his 'jotas' were being severely exploited by the Chaudhry, Qanungo, Faujdar and Kotwal; Chithi to Faujdar, Amil kasba Sanganeri, Chait Sudi 13 VS 1816/ AD 1759. The Bhogi, in this case, advocated the cause of the raiyats.
by cultivating it, at the expense of the Khalsa and village land, cultivators were exercising a choice, howsoever inabsolute or relative it may be. What is also important to note is that the preferred course of action, (in this case, the decision to cultivate the land of vadhdars, udikis etc at the expense of the village and khalsa land) violated the existing norms. The state disapproved of the preferred course of action and fined the violators. And yet, cultivators indulged in it. They transferred their labour either to more favourable terms of production, or to better liked patrons. The state was denied the fruits of their labour. Michael Adas has discussed this in terms of "the protest of denial" (through) exit..."\(^{153}\) Adas has discussed at length the problem and difficulty in determining whether such activities were expressions of protest or whether they were purely opportunities being made the most of.\(^{154}\) The evidence we have analysed, suggests that both could have been intertwined. The matter is complicated because our documents never recount events from the point of view of those who transferred their labour dues. We are totally dependent on the events, as recorded by the state and as perceived by those, from whose land, labour had been withdrawn. As discussed earlier, the clinching evidence in our case is that the state disapproved of

\(^{153}\) "From Footdragging to Flight: The Evasive History of Peasant Avoidance Protest in South and South-East Asia" in *JPS*, V. 13, N. 2, January 1986, pp. 72-78.

\(^{154}\) Ibid.
such activities and cultivators indulged in them, despite warnings, despite fines.

Migration and the Threat of Abandonment

Historians of medieval India have mostly discussed migration of peasants either in the context of famines and invasions, when resourcelessness and destruction forced peasants to abandon their land and villages, or in the context of excessive exploitation, when peasants migrated in order to survive. For Eastern Rajasthan in the 17th and 18th Centuries, both processes are well documented. We know for certain that peasants deserted their villages during famine years,155 when face to face with the Maratha menace156 and also when they were unable to cope with exploitation.157 Although it is significant that the possibility that peasants sometimes threatened to migrate has been conceded,158 the picture by and large, is of helpless peasants abandoning their


156 Chithi to Amil, pargana Pindayan, Mah Vadi 13 V.S. 1819/AD 1762, “कसबी सबब दीखण्या कै निपट विरान हुवे है” ; Chithi to Amil, pargana Fagui, Kagi Sudi 7 V.S. 1816/AD 1759. Here, it is said that due to सबब दीखण्या and केहतनसाली the village has been deserted.

157 We have several documents where it is explicitly stated that exploitation has caused desertion of villages. Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Fagun Sudi & V.S. 1809/AD 1752; Arzdashta, Asadh Vadi 2 V.S. 1762/AD 1705; Chithi to Amil, pargana Bahatri, Chait Sudi 11 V.S. 1800/AD 1743; Chithi to Amil, pargana Narayana, Chait Vadi 13, VS 1796/AD 1739.

villages, when left with little or no options. From Eastern Rajasthan, we have some extremely important evidence, which shows that some cases of desertion of villages, must be interpreted more as a line of defence rather than as a measure of desperation. We are also fortunate to have some sources that throw light on how peasants used the threat to migrate, to their advantage.

Let us first consider the case of village Palasoli, pargana Narayana. In V.S. 1796/ AD 1739, the Patel and raiyats of Palasoli complained that due to excessive exploitation by the faujdar, several asamis have run away i.e. "केताएक आसामी याँच म्हा भाजी गई" and if the exploitation does not stop, we will also not stay i.e. "और म्हा को भी टीक्याची नही". This document is unique in that the Patel and Raiyats actually threaten desertion in response to exploitation. The fact that the threat of desertion actually has a precedence in the actual desertion of some asamis of the village, adds to the probability that the threat will be carried out. The state responded to the threat by instructing the Amil to restrain the faujdar. If the faujdar did not pay heed to the warnings, the Amil was directed to warn the faujdar's men who came to the village on his behalf.

---

159 Irfan Habib "Forms of Class Struggle in Mughal India", p. 240 in Essays in Indian History... Also see The Agrarian.... by I.Habib, p. 371, 372.

160 Chithi to Amil, pargana Narayana, Chait Vadi 13, V.S. 1796/ AD 1739.
In a study of the concept of threat and power, it has been pointed out that the credibility of a threat depends on the perceived probability that the threat will be carried out and one of the factors on which perceived probability depends is the threatener’s history of fulfilled promises to harm.\(^{161}\) As for credibility of the threat by the Patel and Raiyats of Palasoli, we know that some asamis had already deserted the village and the remaining threatened to follow. That peasants elsewhere in the Amber principality could and did abandon villages when faced with similar situations of excessive exploitation, is well known. The state had dealt with abandonment of villages at various points of time. The state was also keen to prevent abandonment. That the state perceived the probability of the threat by the Patel and Raiyats of Palasoli, is also confirmed by the nature of its reaction to the threat, which was essentially to comply with the threateners’ demand and thus “disarm” them.\(^{162}\)

We therefore have to concede to the possibility that peasants, sometimes at least, did threaten desertion. It has been said that the protest of denial through exit i.e. actual


\(^{162}\) For the other options before the threatened party, see Kenneth E. Boulding, “Three Faces of Power”, 1989, pp. 25-27.
abandonment and desertion, cannot be undertaken lightly.\textsuperscript{163} For peasants in Eastern Rajasthan, migration in response to famines, was more difficult than for peasants in the Western half.\textsuperscript{164} While actual migration must have certainly been a difficult proposition, the threat of migration, could have been slightly more lightly used as a weapon to bargain. Besides the case of Palasoli, some other documents merit consideration. We have several instances of peasants being consoled and brought back, when they deserted their villages. When the paltis of Rampur Sadi deserted the village with their seven ploughs, the sarkar's men were immediately sent to console and bring them back.\textsuperscript{165} We know also of searches being conducted to find raiyats who had abandoned villages. In one case, it is mentioned that the raiyats who have abandoned the village should be thoroughly searched for and they should be called back from wherever they are. "जो गया था सो जैटे जैटे छेड़ तड़ा थे त्यावा को तलास कीज्यो".\textsuperscript{166} In another case, three asamis of Chatur Singh Faujdar of pargana Bahatri abandoned him. Men were sent to find them. They were found in Lalsot and the Amil of Lalsot was

\textsuperscript{163} Michael Adas, "From Footdragging...." p. 77; David Hardiman makes a similar observation in a study of Bhils and Sahukars of Eastern Rajasthan. He says that although migration was a potential weapon against excessive exploitation, it was not a weapon which could be lightly used. See "The Bhils and Sahukars of Eastern Gujarat" in Subaltern Studies V, ed. Ranajit Guha, 1987, p. 14.

\textsuperscript{164} Alka Rehani, "Famine and Rural Society...." p. 57.

\textsuperscript{165} Arzdashta, Jaith Sudi 1, V.S 1762/ Ad 1705.

\textsuperscript{166} Amber Records, Chait Vadi 13, V.S. 1722/ AD 1665.
Besides, we have from chithis, the spectacle of peasants rounding up their petitions with phrases like “तू करी गाँव में रहो जाय नहीं.” and “तू करी गाँव में टिकी सका नहीं.” When these are seen in light of the fact that peasants did desert villages in face of excessive exploitation, we can interpret the evidence as some kind of a threat to migrate, howsoever implicit and masked.

We have therefore, the fact that desertion in response to excessive exploitation was not infrequent. We also have the fact that everytime peasants actually migrated, they were searched for, called back, consoled, assured and pacified. Keeping these in mind and considering the land man ratio and the State's interest in uninterrupted cultivation and settlement of villages, it would be unfair to completely rule out the possibility of some peasants, sometimes at least, expressed resentment, threatened desertion and had to be pacified with assurances as well as concrete concessions to get them to return.

**Reprisal**

Peasant anger in medieval Indian history has been

167 Roznama, pargana Bahatri, V.S. 1742/ AD 1685.
168 Chithi to Amil, pargana Maujavadi, Fagun Sudi 15 V.S. 1798/ AD 1741.
169 Chithi to Amil, pargana Malpura, Asadh Sudi 8 v.S. 1800/ Ad 1743.
discussed mostly in the context of violent upheavals, when an inflamed peasantry takes to rebellion and makes history. For a period like the 17th and 18th centuries, because of dearth of evidence, which in turn is due to the nature of our sources, it is difficult to talk of the wrath of peasants in any other context anyway. Studies of the peasantry since the 1980s have suggested time and again that peasant wrath can express itself in forms less confrontational but highly retributive. Sources from Eastern Rajasthan, quite understandably, have little to say about peasant anger. They are all official records and recount issues and events from the perspective of the state. Despite the difficulty of finding in such sources, any considerable body of information on the less confrontational ways in which peasants vented their anger, we have some evidence which merits consideration.

Crop destruction has been considered one of the forms of the protest of retribution. We have before us the example of peasants of the Agra region, rooting up plants, when Shah Jahan granted the monopoly of indigo trade to Manohardas Danda in A.D. 1633. Evidence of crop destruction in our region comes from Arhsattas. We frequently hear of fines being levied for destruction of crop. It is difficult to ascertain whether the cases of

170 Michael Adas, “From Footdragging...” pp. 78-82.
171 Quoted by Irfan Habib in “Forms of Class Struggle...” in Essays., p. 240.
crop destruction cited in Arhsattas were accidents or due to carelessness of those accused or whether they were acts of reprisal. We have to consider first, the language used in documents to describe these actions. The terms used are “उजाड़ किया”, “उजाड़ कराया”, “उजाड़ दिया” or simply “उजाड़िया”. Grammatically, these suggest an element of deliberate intent. We have to keep in mind the fact that crop destruction was a way of settling scores.\(^{172}\) We also have to consider the fact that the state was likely to view accidents or carelessness more leniently. The fact that it was fining people for crop destruction, and the fine was sometimes as high as Rs. 33/-\(^{173}\) is important to note. While most documents merely state that the moth or chana crop, the sarkar’s baag, or pasture or the jarayati has been destroyed,\(^{174}\) some others are more explicit and leave little doubt about the motivation of those accused. The Patel and paltis of mauza Ramsinghpura are known to have destroyed the jinsi i.e. “जीनसी में उजाड़ कराया”. A big fine of Rs. 125/- was levied on them.\(^{175}\) Pahis of mauza Vadkopado, who cultivated land in mauza Devali are known to have destroyed the crop and rooted moth.\(^{176}\) This unit of eight

\(^{172}\) Chithi to Amil, pargana Chatsu, Vaisakh Vadi 10 V.S. 1820 / AD 1763. Also see Arhsatta, Toda Bhiv, VS 1772; Arhsatta Lalsot, V.S 1775/ AD 1718.

\(^{173}\) Dalu Gujar was fined Rs. 33/- for destruction of crop. Arhsatta, Malarna, VS 1773/ AD 1716.

\(^{174}\) See Arhsattas, Lalsot VS. 1794/ AD 1737, VS 1795/ AD 1738; Malarna VS 1773, 1772/ AD 1715. Also see Roznama, Bahatri VS 1741/ AD 1684.

\(^{175}\) Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS. 1794/ AD 1737.

\(^{176}\) Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1794/ AD 1737. “उजाड़ कराये वा मोठ खोदि…”
pahis, comprising five Meenas, one Jat, one Brahman and one by
the name of Tulchho, whose caste is not specified, was fined Rs.
28/-. Kashi and Ram Singh Meena of mauza Veerpur destroyed
the sylu crop of the kasba i.e. “उज्जाह्री दियो”. Tanya Nai of mauza
Nijharna got crop destroyed. Bikho Brahman of mauza Teersul
got the sarkar’s pasture destroyed. Another fact about the
retributive intent in cases of crop destruction is that people were
often fined collectively in groups, which suggests that they may
have sometimes collaborated to destroy crop. In pargana Bahatri,
four Meenas, a Patel and a Brahman were collectively fined for
crop destruction. In Malarma, Hasana Sulaiman and Udo
Kumhar were fined together, in one case and two Muslims and a
Mali in another.

Anger was expressed by destroying crop. The intention was
to injure those perceived as oppressors by destroying something
precious and valuable. Destructive behaviour is also manifest in
some other activities like destroying the चाक and burning
something valuable. Acts of cruelty against animals have been a

177 Arhsatta, Toda Bhiv, V.S. 1788/ AD 1731.
178 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1769/ AD 1712.
179 Arhsatta, Toda Bhiv, VS. 1772/ AD 1715.
180 Roznama, Bahatri, V.S. 1742/ AD 1685.
181 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1771/ AD 1714.
182 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1771/ AD 1714.
183 Teek Mali of Kasba Lalsot was accused of destroying चाक Arhsatta,
Lalsot, VS 1795/ AD 1738.
184 Bamle Balahi was fined Rs. 41/- Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1772/ AD 1715.
means of expressing hatred against owners in several societies.  

We have from mauza Ralhavaas, pargana Lalsot, the case of Tiloka Meena, who cut off the tail of the jagirdar's horse and killed his oxen. This is a classic example of attacking the symbol of the oppressor's power.

**Non Compliance**

Non-compliance was pervasive in our region. Crop was frequently cut off without the state’s permission. The prohibition on the sale of fresh grain was flouted. Bhil Singh Rajput and others of mauza Laharvaada removed crop from the field before it was ready. Gagga Meena of mauza Rajoli sold land without state permission. The Patels of several villages in pargana Malarna sold 'gur' to the vyapari of Kishangarh without

---


186 *Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1788/ AD 1731.* “जागीरदार का चोड़ा की पुछ काटी वा बलच मारो”

187 *The Patel and others of mauza Joli cut off the bajra crop without seeking the sarkar's permission, Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, VS 1787/ AD 1730; Kushya and Rupa Gordhan of mauza Khidrapura cut off the crop without permission, Arhsatta, Toda Bhim V.S. 1787/ AD 1730; The Patel and others of mauza Veerdodha cut off bajra without permission, Arhsatta, Toda Bhim V.S. 1787/ AD 1730; A Meena and others of mauza Pada were fined for doing लावणी without permission, Roznama, Bahatri, V.S. 1742/ AD 1685; Udo binjar was similarly fined, Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1769/ AD 1712.*

188 *Revadyo Meena and other of mauza Ajabpura fined, Arhsatta Lalsot, V.S. 1769/ AD 1712; Three asamis, including a Mahajan sold the fresh grain of unhalu without permission, Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1770/ AD 1713.*

189 *Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1769/ AD 1712.* देहन्या को मुद्र्रे आयो.

190 *Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1773/ AD 1716.*
seeking permission. Mahajans of Lalsot sold grain and tobacco on days when it was prohibited. The Patel and raiyati of mauza Ugarpura cut off the crop in the sahna's absence. Grain was purchased without the state's permission. Than Patel of mauza Naroli, pargana Malarna and Chitra Patwari of mauza Mudawari, pargana Malarna were fined for disagreeing with the sarkar. The phrase used in documents was “सरकार थे रजु न रखो छो” and “सरकार थे रजु हुआ नहीं”. People flouted rules. Patels did not always comply. Such “spontaneous, stubborn and silent non-fulfillment” could make a mockery of the whole system.

**Working the System to One's Maximum Advantage**

From the concept of a supine, inert, silenced and maimed peasantry to the notion that they are capable of working the system in which they operate to their minimum disadvantage or maximum advantage, has been a long journey historiographically. We are lucky to have sources that give us an insight into how peasants in Eastern Rajasthan in the 17th and

---

191 Patels of mauza Ladota, Malarna Chhota and Vanupur were fined, Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1789/ AD 1732.
192 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1773/ AD 1716 & V.S. 1775/ AD 1718.
193 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713.
194 Arhsatta, T. Bhim V.S. 1787/ AD 1730.
195 Arhsatta, Malarna, VS 1772/AD 1715.
196 Arhsatta, Malarna, VS 1776/AD 1719.
18th centuries, maneuvered, evaded, cheated and connived in an effort to corner for themselves as large a share as possible. We have a wide range of activities to consider.

Concealment of land and crop was very common. The Patel and paltis of mauza Jhafda, pargana Chatsu, managed to conceal a field from measurement. Asamis and pahis of mauza Samatpura, pargana Lalsot did not get a field measured by the tapdar. Jotas of mauza Udaipurya, pargana Lalsot, secretly kept pasture unmeasured. On investigation, 13 bighas of unmeasured land was found. A group of cultivators including the Patel of mauza Ajippur, pargana Toda Bhim kept the unhalu land unmeasured. Another group was fined for concealment of one bigha of land under vegetables. A Meena of pargana Dausa concealed land under mustard from assessment. Bhiva Mali did not get a portion of the garden of Maluk Sah Khauldar measured. Lal Khan Gadik of mauza Bharijahusag, pargana, Malarna, secretly grew maize on two biswas of land and

199 Roznama, Chatsu, V.S. 1771/ AD 1714. पटेल पालत्या खेत १ जवती को बिना मपाया रखायोः
200 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713.
201 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1769. / AD 1712
202 Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1777/ AD 1720. “जिमी उन्हालु की बिना मपी रखी”
203 Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1769./ AD 1712
204 Roznama, Dausa, V.S. 1769./ AD 1712
205 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1747/ AD 1690
concealed it at the time of measurement. Patels of various villages frequently concealed land and crop from measurement. The Patels of mauza Mirzapur, Mehed Vade and Kushalpur in pargana Toda Bhim, Nijharna, Sahaspura and Paasalvaas in Lalsot, Kadloda, Teeghri and Karel in pargana Malarna were fined.

Chheli and jhunpari were often not disclosed at the time of counting. Bhil Singh Rajput and others of mauza Loharvado were fined for not disclosing 15 chhelis to the tapdar. Godhuram Vakavat of Mauza Samatpura is known to have concealed jhunpari during counting. Dala Gujar of mauza Davara Badi was fined for not getting chheli counted, whereas Ram Chand Gujar of Mauza Dagoh is known to have walked out during the counting of chheli. Netyo Gujar of mauza Palodha sold his chehli to another

---
206 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1771/ AD 1714.
207 Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1778/ AD 1721.
208 Ibid.
209 Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1779/ AD 1772.
210 Arhsatta, Labot, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713.
211 Ibid.
212 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1771/ AD 1714.
213 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1771/ AD 1714.
214 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1778/ AD 1721.
215 Roznama, Malarna, V.S. 1770./ AD 1713
216 Arhsatla, lalsot, V.S. 1770./ AD 1713
217 Ibid.
218 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1795/ AD 1738. "छेली की गणती कराई नहीं"
219 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1795/ AD 1738. गणती की वार छेली ले उठी गया
Gujar of another pargana at the time of counting.\textsuperscript{220} Hatheela Gujar of mauza Ram Singhpura hid three chhelis from the tapdar.\textsuperscript{221} Patels of mauza Dholavaas\textsuperscript{222} and Beedarkha,\textsuperscript{223} pargana Labot were accused of under-counting of chheli. We have evidence of people cheating in collaboration at the time of counting. Kishordas Mansaram, Godhuram Vakavat and others of mauza Samatpura together concealed jhunari from the sarkar's tapdar.\textsuperscript{224} Rajputs and Gujars or mauza Dobh colluded to get chheli under counted.\textsuperscript{225}

We have evidence of people grazing cattle in the sarkar's pasture Lala Gujar\textsuperscript{226} and Khan Muhammad Musalman\textsuperscript{227} of kasba Malarna were fined for grazing cattle in the sarkar's pasture Ram Das Chamar of mauza Nehadi, pargana Lalsot fed his cattle a handful of moth.\textsuperscript{228} Jassa Mochi of kasba Lalsot sneaked his cattle inside the sarkar's haveli, taking full advantage of its ruined fence.\textsuperscript{229} Three asamis of mauza Jeevad, pargana Malarna cut off

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{220} Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1772/ AD 1715. छेली गौती के लाख पैला प्रागना का गुजर नै छेली बेची
\item \textsuperscript{221} Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1772/ AD 1715
\item \textsuperscript{222} Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1795/ AD 1738
\item \textsuperscript{223} Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1769/ AD 1712
\item \textsuperscript{224} Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713
\item \textsuperscript{225} Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1773/ AD 1716
\item \textsuperscript{226} Arhsatta, Malarna, VS 1771/ AD 1714
\item \textsuperscript{227} Arhsatta, Malarna, VS. 1774/ AD 1717 “सरकार की बीड़ में ढ़ा चराया”.
\item \textsuperscript{228} Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1769/ AD 1712
\item \textsuperscript{229} Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713
\end{itemize}
the grass from the pasture.  

We hear frequently of Patels cheating in measurement and assessment. The Patel and Patwari of mauza Naroli, pargana Malarna tampered with the weighing scale during the weighing of bajra. The Patel of mauza Hadeva, pargana Lalsot was accused of not doing kankut properly. In Mauza Anadpur, pargana Toda Bhim, the Patel was accused for deception over malba. The Patel of mauza Thaloj, pargana Lalsot was accused of discrepancy in the.udik’s haasil for a period of eight years. Ram Das Patel of mauza Dholavaas manipulated the prescribed share i.e. “बट बटा छटाव में और भौंति लिखाया.” Mahajans often cheated over market prices. In one case the Panch Mahajan tampered the price. Mahajans of kasba Malarna, colluded to manipulate prices. Telis of kasba

---

230 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1794/ AD 1737
231 Khemu and Potahad Patel of mauza Ajipur, were fined for discrepancy in the measurement of Hargovind Kavisur’s land, Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713; The Patel of mauza Sujanpur was fined for discrepancy in assessment. Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1772/ AD 1715; The Patel of mauza Soneda was accused of manipulating the measurement of one field of maize. Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713; The Patel of mauza Vadi was fined for manipulation in assessment of till, moth etc, Arhsatta Malarna, V.S. 1779/ AD 1722.
232 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713.
233 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713.
234 Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1787/ AD 1730.
235 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1794/ AD 1737.
236 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1771/ AD 1714.
237 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1772/ AD 1715; V.S.1774/ AD 1717. “नीरख बजार का को तफावत लिखी”.
238 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1772/ AD 1715. “पंच महाजन नीरख भी तफावत लीखी”.
239 Roznama, Malarna, V.S. 1769/ AD 1712
year.\textsuperscript{240} Jai Chand Savda of kasba Fagui manipulated the khasra.\textsuperscript{241} Dhola Patwari of kasba Fagui also cheated in the addition of khasra.\textsuperscript{242}

Peasants often collaborated to under-pay. Sukhalyo Meena of mauza Palodho was fined when caught paying at the rate of $2/5$ths.\textsuperscript{243} Hiramani Mahajan colluded with the Bhomia’s men to pay dues.\textsuperscript{244} A Meena of pargana Toda Bhim\textsuperscript{245} and two malis of pargana Bhusavad\textsuperscript{246} were caught paying at the rate of $1/4$th.

Pilferage seems to have been very common. Arhsattas provide a lot of evidence. Meenas of several mauzas of pargana Lalsot were caught over “बाजरा का सीरा का मुद्रा”, “मोठ का मुद्रा” and “नब नाज का मुद्रा”.\textsuperscript{247} Meenas of Malarna and Bahatri were similarly fined.\textsuperscript{248} One Meena of Bahatri was caught stealing a

\textsuperscript{240} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{241} Roznama, Fagui, V.S. 1804/AD 1747 “चकबाड़ा की जीनसी स्थालु १५०४ को खसरा जोड़ो न है सो जोड़ मै तफाकत कीयो”.
\textsuperscript{242} Roznama, Fagni, V.S. 1804/AD 1747
\textsuperscript{243} Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1771/AD 1714
\textsuperscript{244} Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1770/AD 1713 “भोमी का आदमी थे मिली कीड़ी चुकावी थी, सो दरबार में जाहर हुई”.
\textsuperscript{245} Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, VS 1775/AD 1718.
\textsuperscript{246} Arhsatta, Bhusavad, VS. 1788/AD 1731.
\textsuperscript{247} Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1770/AD 1713; VS1771/AD 1714, VS1794/AD 1737.
\textsuperscript{248} Arhsatta Malarna, V.S. 1793/AD 1736; Arhsatta Bahatri, V.S. 1755/AD 1698.
handful of moth.\textsuperscript{249} Gujars of Lalsot and Bahatri were fined for بنا ीका सेवा का मुदा.\textsuperscript{250} A Gujar of Fagui was caught over pilferage.\textsuperscript{251} Balahis frequently engaged in petty thieving.\textsuperscript{252} From Lalsot, we hear of a Chhipi, a Thori, a Chamar and several Malis being fined for pilferage.\textsuperscript{253} Brahmans and Rajputs, it appears from Arhsattas, took to petty thieving relatively rarely.\textsuperscript{254} Patels of several villages of Malarna were accused of pilferage of bajra.\textsuperscript{255} While most reported cases of pilferage in arhsattas and roznamas merely mention who stole, what was stolen and how much the accused was fined, sometimes a little extra detail is provided as to whom the stuff was stolen from. Tulchhyo Meena of mauza Nangal Mandan, Toda Bhim stole the milki’s grain.\textsuperscript{256} Kalya Meena of mauza Daulatipur stole Rs. 5/- from the sarkar’s men.\textsuperscript{257} Teja Kumhar of kasba Lalsot stole from the ijaradar’s house.\textsuperscript{258} Pilferage of small quantities of grain from the storage is frequently

\textsuperscript{249} Arhsatta, Bahatri, V.S. 1755/ AD 1698
\textsuperscript{250} Arhsatta, Bahatri, V.S.1755/ AD 1698; Arhsatta Lalsot, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713
\textsuperscript{251} Roznama, Fagui, V.S. 1804/ AD 1747
\textsuperscript{252} Arhsatta, Bahatri, V.S. 1775/ AD 1718; Roznama, Dausa, V.S, 1769/ AD 1712
\textsuperscript{253} Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713
\textsuperscript{254} Arhsatta Lalsot V.S. 1770/ AD 1713, V.S. 1771/ AD 1714; V.S. 1769/ AD 1712, Arhsatta Bahatri, V.S. 1755/ AD 1698
\textsuperscript{255} Roznama, Malarna 1770/ AD 1713; Arhsatta, Malarna, 1771/ AD 1714
\textsuperscript{256} Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1769/ AD 1712
\textsuperscript{257} Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713
\textsuperscript{258} Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1779/ AD 1722
reported.²⁵⁹ Ram Das Chamar stole a कड़ी of moth,²⁶⁰ Ram Chand Bhopa’s son stole one ser of cotton from the sack,²⁶¹ Amoram Dayaram Meema stole a sack full of cotton.²⁶² Deepa and Gangalya of kasba Lalsot stole one ser of cotton.²⁶³ While Rajputs are known to have forcibly captured cattle,²⁶⁴ Meenas mostly stole cattle, as and when feasible.²⁶⁵ Interestingly, women frequently took to thieving and pilferage. A woman in Kasba Fagui was caught by the sahna with Jowar.²⁶⁶ A Kumhar’s wife was caught with one ser of fresh grain.²⁶⁷ Two Meena women were fined for stealing bajra.²⁶⁸ A group of asamis of mauza Nijharna who were caught over pilferage included a Pandit, a Meena, a Khati and a Meena woman.²⁶⁹ Parsa Brahman’s bahu stole and ran away.²⁷⁰ Balahi²⁷¹

²⁵⁹ Rupasi Chamar of Kanpur stole from the storage, Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1776/ AD 1719; Rupasi Mali of Rajoli was similarly fined, Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1770/ AD 1713
²⁶⁰ Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1769/ AD 1712
²⁶¹ Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713
²⁶² Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1747/ AD 1690
²⁶³ Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1771/ AD 1714 “सरकार को तकीयों स्थैर भरवा ने दीयी ख़ी, तीढ़ मा ई स्थैर सेर १ एक चोरी राखी”.
²⁶⁴ We have several examples in arhsattas as well as chithis Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1767/ AD 1710; VS. 1769/ AD 1712; V.S. 1771/ AD 1714
²⁶⁵ Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1795/ AD 1738
²⁶⁶ Roznama, Fagui, V.S. 1759/ AD 1702 “अमर झाड़ ती को बहु रामा स्थैर हरिजुवारी गाँव मैं लीया आवे थी सो तैहणा फलसे पकड़ी”.
²⁶⁷ Roznama, Fagui, V.S. 1804/ AD 1747
²⁶⁸ Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1775/ AD 1718
²⁶⁹ Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1794/ AD 1737
²⁷⁰ Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1773/ AD 1716 परसा वामण को बहु चोरी करी भाजी
²⁷¹ Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1773/ AD 1716
and Chamar\textsuperscript{272} women also engaged in pilferage.

The reported cases of theft and pilferage provide invaluable insight into the nature of collaborations, collusions and connivances within the peasant world. The Patel and paltis of Malarna Chhota colluded to steal grain from the storage.\textsuperscript{273} Halis of Purohit Kojuram in mauza Jeevad were collectively fined for stealing from his store-house.\textsuperscript{274} The Patel and several raiyats of two villages in Bahatiri stole from the sarkar’s share and were fined several thousand rupees.\textsuperscript{275} Three jotas of mauza Peelvadha, pargana Malarna, stole fresh grain in collaboration with the Patel.\textsuperscript{276} Several asamis of Malarna Chhota stole grain collectively.\textsuperscript{277} Two Meenas and a Chamar of mauza Kahad, pargana Malarna, collaborated and stole barley.\textsuperscript{278} Asamis of Sacholi, pargana Malarna were collectively fined for stealing fresh grain. This group of eight included five Meenas, a Chamar and two of unspecified caste.\textsuperscript{279} The Patel, Rajputs and raiyats of mauza Vanhedi stole fresh grain in collusion.\textsuperscript{280} The Patel and paltis of

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{272} Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1793/ AD 1736 \\
\textsuperscript{273} Chithi to Amil, pargana Malarna, Jaith Sudi 15, V.S. 1794/ AD 1737 \\
\textsuperscript{274} Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1794/ AD 1737 \\
\textsuperscript{275} Chithi to Purohit Raja Ram and Sah Hathi Ram, Vaisakh Sudi 13, V.S. 1785/ AD 1728 \\
\textsuperscript{276} Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1800/ AD 1743 \\
\textsuperscript{277} Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1800/ AD 1743 \\
\textsuperscript{278} Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1771/ AD 1714 \\
\textsuperscript{279} Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1793/ AD 1736 \\
\textsuperscript{280} Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1794/ AD 1737
\end{flushleft}
mauza Biharipur collaborated to steal grain. Balahis were collectively fined in two separate cases in Bahatri. The evidence shows that caste and even status did not come in way of collective and yet secretive attempts to corner gains and take advantage of loopholes. Peasants seem to collaborate with whoever seems helpful.

There seems to be no dearth of tactics. A sheaf of grain was found concealed under the heap of fodder of Bhagirath Meena, mauza Dholavaos. Peasants were caught cutting crop before it was ready. Neta Mali and others of mauza Muhi were caught with barley. A Brahman of mauza Dhapaband was similarly caught. Grain was stolen before assessment could be done. Sugar cane was stolen from the field. Mano Brahman is known to have deliberately scattered moth. Extremely interesting are cases of peasants caught chewing देहगी, बाजरा etc Bhikha, Saif and Khadu Musalman of Kasba Toda Bhim were caught chewing देहगी.

---

281 Arhsatta, Lalsot, VS 1794/ AD 1737
282 Arhsatta, Bahatri, V.S. 1755/ AD 1698
283 Arhastta, Lalsot, V.S. 1779/ AD 1722
284 Roznama, Dausa, V.S. 1769/ AD 1712; Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713
285 Roznama, Bahatri, V.S. 1758/ AD 1701
286 Ibid.
287 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1778/ AD 1721
288 Roznama, Malarna, V.S. 1769/ AD 1712
289 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1773/ AD 1716 "भोट बख़ेरी नाखी".
A woman in Malarna, was caught chewing bajra in the field. A Balahi in mauza Ugaryavaas was accused similarly of chewing सीरा. Jado Teli of mauza Khadeli was caught by the sipahi. Mukund Teli of kasba Toda Bhim was fined. In one case, the Patel and paltis of mauza Nijharna were collectively fined for chewing away the yield of the rabi crop. Even bribing is heard of Shyaama and Jodha Meena of mauza Surahyo tried to bribe the sarkar's harkara.

Misbehaviour

With widening of the term 'resistance', the behavioural pattern and language of the subalterns has come under scrutiny. One’s power or powerlessness, control or lack of control of the situation one is in, is manifest in one’s behaviour. The behavioural pattern of the subalterns, provides an insight into the entire culture of resistance to the exercise of power. Gestures assume significance. We have the case of a peasant of the Ionian Islands, slinging before the bailiff a basket full of ram’s horns, which

---

290 Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1769/ AD 1712
291 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1771/ AD 1714 “खेत में बाजरा चाबता पकड़ी”
292 Arhashta, Lalsot, V.S. 1771/ AD 1714
293 Arhashta, Lalsot, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713
294 Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1769/ AD 1712
295 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713
296 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713
signified cuckolding of the landlords. A Bhil woman is known to have greeted the new landlord with the remark “You can keep maize reserved for your respectable guests and eat Hal Malicha (animal fodder) yourself”. Every society has its own definition of what constitutes proper behaviour. Let us here examine how far the state and its apparatus was able to control the behaviour of peasants.

Arhsattas and Roznamas provide a lot of information on defiant behaviour. There is reference to सोखी and बेअदबी with state officials. We hear frequently of बदजुबानी and बदजुबानी. Peasants are known to have abused officials i.e. “कुजवा बोला”. They fought with officials i.e. “लड़यो”. They cursed “सापहदवती की” and tried to get equal i.e. “बराबरी बोल्यो”.

The term sokhi appears very frequently. Chaino Meena of mauza Ladipur, Bhodi Meen of mauza Nijharna and Kesra Meena of mauza Achalpur mibehaved with the sahnas of their

---


299 The closest English translation would probably be ‘a show of disrespect’.

300 Misbehaviour.

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

302 Ibid.

303 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1793/ AD 1736 The term used in all the three arhsattas is “सोखी करी”.
respective villages. Harchand Meena of Kasba Toda Bhim did ‘सोखी’ with the sarkar’s servant,\textsuperscript{304} while Ghatam Meena of mauza Kudlikaji did sokhi with the sarkar’s men.\textsuperscript{305} Gujars and Balahis were defiant in their dealings with sahnas, Sarkar’s men and sarkar’s sipahi.\textsuperscript{306} A Musalman of Kasba Toda Bhim was fined for defying the sarkar’s aadmi.\textsuperscript{307} Most frequently accused of सोखी were Patels. They mostly resorted to सोखी with sahnas.\textsuperscript{308} Patels defied the sarkar’s sipahis.\textsuperscript{309} They did सोखी with, patwaris,\textsuperscript{310} tapdars,\textsuperscript{311} sarkar’s aadmi\textsuperscript{312} and sarkar’s ugaahas.\textsuperscript{313} The faujdar’s man was defied by Ganga Ram Mani of mauza Galad.\textsuperscript{314}

\textsuperscript{304} Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1750/ AD 1693
\textsuperscript{305} Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1747/ AD 1690
\textsuperscript{306} Thanu Gujar of Jakhal Vas Sadhari did sokhi with the sahna Arhsatta, Malarna V.S. 1789/ AD 1732; Vada Balahi of mauza Jaitpur did sokhi with the sarkar’s aadmi, Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1747/ AD 1690; Baksa Balahi was fined for सोखी with the sarkar’s soldier, Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1772/ AD 1715
\textsuperscript{307} Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1788/ AD 1731
\textsuperscript{309} Ram Mohan Patel of mauza Sawai Jai Singh Pur, Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1795/ AD 1738; Rupa Sachaja Patel of mauza Anadpur, Arhsatta, T. Bhim, V.S.1788/ AD 1731; The Patel of mauza Khohari, Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1776/ AD 1719;
\textsuperscript{310} Patel of mauza Sacholi, Arhsatta, Malarna, VS 1774/ AD 1717
\textsuperscript{311} Patel of mauza Kripapur, Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1788/ AD 1731;
\textsuperscript{312} Patel of mauza Jeevad, Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1774/ AD 1717;
\textsuperscript{313} Ibid. Patel of mauza Ladota, Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1776/ AD 1719
\textsuperscript{314} Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1793/ AD 1736 “फोजदार की तलब गई थी, सो आदम्य सू लोखी करी”.
evidence of सोखी done in collaboration. Sukha Patel and others of mauza Bhadkoli were accused of ‘sokhi’ with the sahna.315 The sarkar’s ugaha was defied by the Patel and Patwari of mauza Sacholi.316 Bhopat and Harkishan Brahman of mauza Vilano were together fined for defying the sarkar’s sipahi.317 A Meena and a Balahi of mauza Shri Kishanpur were accused of ‘sokhi’ with the sahna.318 We have several other instances of groups of people being fined collectively for sokhi.319 Documents sometimes provide some information about when sokhi was resorted to or the manner in which it was encountered by the state’s agents. Hatho and others of Fagui were fined for ‘sokhi’ with the sipahi who caught them stealing fresh grain.320 The Patel of mauza Galad was accused of ‘sokhi’ with the Jagirdar’s man and for breaking open the storage.321 The Patel of mauza Kahad did ‘sokhi’ with the sarkar’s sipahi, who had gone to collect haasil.322 An interesting case is that of the Baloch sahna of pargana Tonk. It was reported

315 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1774/ AD 1717.
316 Ibid.
317 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1794/ AD 1737
318 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1787/ AD 1730
320 Roznama, Fagui, V.S. 1804/ AD 1747 “मुझे नवा नाज की सीपाही लाया ता रूप सोखी करी”.
321 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1774/ AD 1717 “जागीरदार का आदभु मु सोखी करी वा खाली फोड़े”.
322 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1776/ AD 1719 “पटेला परी सीरकार का सीपाही रवी का हसिल का तलब भेजी छी त्या सोखी कर”.
to the Diwan, that Rahim Khan Baloach spoke against the durbar to Kripa
param Amil, took out his sword and defied excessively.\footnote{Chithi to Anil, pargana Tonk, Jaith Sudi 5, V.S. 1797/ AD 1740 “दरबार बेजुबालोल्यो... तराली काड़की... सोखी ज्यादा करी...”}

Another dimension of defiant behaviour was बेअदबी, which was essen-
tially a show of disrespect. बेअदबी by Meenas,\footnote{Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1772/ AD 1715. Kesla Meena with patwari, Chhitra Meena with Salma, Leela Meena with sahna, Khemdas Meena with patwari, Bholo Meena with sarkar's men, Hatheela Meena with sahna; Arhsatta Malarna, V.S. 1773/ AD 1716; Jagram Meena with sahna, Sukhla Meena with sarkar's men, Parso Meena with sarkar's sipahi, Kehri Meena with sahna; Roznama, Bahatri, V.S. 1758/ AD 1701, Jodhya Meena of mauza Vadoli with sarkar's men.} Gujars,\footnote{Roznama, Fagui, V.S. 1759/ AD 1702; Manohar Mali with sarkar's sipahi; Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1769/ AD 1712; Sundarya Mali with sarkar's men.} Malis,\footnote{Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1777/ AD 1717; Arhsatta Malarna, V.S. 1776/ AD 1719; Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1779/ AD 1722; Roznama, Fagui, V.S. 1759/ AD 1702.} Balahis,\footnote{Roznama, Bahatri, V.S. 1758/ AD 1701, Jodhya Meena of mauza Vadoli with sarkar's men.} and Nais\footnote{Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1771/ AD 1714, Ram Chand Kadera is accused of बेअदबी.} is adequately documented. Those at the receiving end of disrespect were mostly sahnas, but also tapdars, patwaris, sipahis, sarkar's men and sarkar's ugaha. बेअदबी with bohras\footnote{Roznama, Bahatri, V.S. 1741/ AD 1684; Harpo Nai with sahna.} and mahajans\footnote{Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1771/ AD 1714, Kesulo Vatvaal accused of बेअदबी.} over repayment of ‘karz’ is heard of. Patels of various mauzas resorted to बेअदबी with sarkar's sipahis, sarkar's aadmi, sarkar's ugaha, tapdars and sahnas.\footnote{Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713; Arhsatta Malarna, V.S. 1774/ AD 1717; Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1776/ AD 1719; Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1779/ AD 1722; Roznama, Fagui, V.S. 1759/ AD 1702.} A woman was fined for disrespectful
behaviour towards the sarkar's aadmi. Brahmans were frequently accused of बेअदबी. 332 Ghasi and Maharam Gujar of Kasba toda Bhim did बेअदबी with Purohit Mayaram and absconded. 334 Tulchhya Meena and others of Dholavaas were collectively accused. 335 A group of fourteen in Kasba Baswa were fined 50 paisa each for बेअदबी with the sahna. 336 Several asamis of mauza Govindpur are known to have resorted to बेअदबी with the sarkar's pyaada. 337

'बदजुबानी' is reported in documents. Bakasyo Meena of mauza Malarna Khurd was accused of speaking बेजुबा with a pyaada. 338 Kalyan Gujar of mauza Bhavad 339 and Govinda Gujar of mauza Rajpurya 340 were similarly accused of बदजुबानी. Pema Sarraf apparently spoke badly of the durbar. 341 The Patel of mauza kareli

332 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1773/AD 1716 "रामजी सुन्या की बेटी वा. सरकार का आदमी थे मु. अलेह की बहु बेअदबी करी".
333 Roznama, Fagui, V.S. 1759/AD 1702, Nathu Brahman did बेअदबी with sarkar's men; Roznama, Bhatri, V.S. 1742/AD 1685, Lala Brahman did बेअदबी with sarkar's sipahi; Roznama, Chatsu, V.S. 1771/AD 1714, Man Singh Brahman with sarkar's ugaha.
334 Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1771/AD 1714 "बेअदबी दे नाराजजरी होय गया".
335 Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1769/AD 1712
336 Roznama, Bahatri, V.S. 1742/AD 1685
337 Arhsatta, T. Bhim, V.S. 1779/AD 1722
338 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1771/AD 1714 "पयादा थे बेजुबा बोल्यो".
339 Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1771/AD 1714
340 Roznama, Bahatri, V.S. 1758/AD 1701
341 Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1771/AD 1714 "दरबारी बदजुबा बोली". The fine for this (which was Rs. 25/-) was much bigger than for other cases of बदजुबानी.
did बदजुबानी with the sarkar's men.\textsuperscript{342}

कुजबा बोलना is documented\textsuperscript{343} The Patel of mauza Kudali Nandi spoke कुजबा with the tapdar, who had gone for zabti.\textsuperscript{344} Gangaram Patel of mauza Karel was fined for 'कुजबा' with the sarkar's men.\textsuperscript{345} Rama Mahajan was also accused of कुजबा.\textsuperscript{346}

बदअमल्ली or misbehaviour was common. Meenas,\textsuperscript{347} Gujars\textsuperscript{348} and Balahis\textsuperscript{349} were accused of बदअमल्ली with sarkar's sipahi, aadmi and sahnas. बदअमल्ली in collaboration is documented. Mohan Singh Ajab Singh, Kanak Singh Chauhan and Sambhuram of mauza Sikray Khurd were accused of बदअमल्ली with the sarkar's sipahi.\textsuperscript{350} The Patel and several others of mauza Khedisaatal, it was reported, did बदअमल्ली with the sarkar's men.\textsuperscript{351}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{342} Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1771/ AD 1714
\item \textsuperscript{343} This term may have originated from the Rajasthani word कुजबा which means अपशब्द. The closest English word would be 'abuse'.
\item \textsuperscript{344} Roznarno, Malarna, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713
\item \textsuperscript{345} Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1771/ AD 1714
\item \textsuperscript{346} Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1770/ AD 1713
\item \textsuperscript{347} Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1772/ AD 1715, Jasodhar Meena was accused of बदअमल्ली; Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1769/ AD 1712, Harkaran Meena was accused;
\item \textsuperscript{348} Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1774/ AD 1717, Kushalo Gujar did बदअमल्ली with sahna.
\item \textsuperscript{349} Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1774/ AD 1717, Karmala Balahi did बदअमल्ली with sahna.
\item \textsuperscript{350} Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1769/ AD 1712
\item \textsuperscript{351} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Fighting and arguing with sahnas, patels, patwaris and sarkar's men is heard of. We frequently hear of Meenas fighting with Patwaris.\(^{352}\) The term used in document is ‘लड़यो’ or ‘लड़ाई करी’.\(^{353}\) Bhelo Meena is known to have fought with the sarkar's men.\(^{354}\) Brahmans fought with sahnas, patels and the sarkar's men.\(^{355}\) In one case, the jagirdar's man was fought with.\(^{356}\) In Lalsot, a Meena woman is known to have fought with the sarkar's pyaada.\(^{357}\)

Extremely revealing are cases of people talking back and trying to get equal. The term used was बराबरी बोल्यो. Hetam Turk of kasba Fagi talked back to the sahna.\(^{358}\) Chhitra Meena of mauza Sesa was similarly accused.\(^{359}\) A Meena is even know have rebuked the sarkar's men. सरकार का आदमी सु सापहबती की.\(^{360}\)

\(^{352}\) Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1772/ AD 1715, Khemdas Meena of Mauza Gambhira, Keslo Meena of mauza Savoli, Kesa Meena, Ghasi Meena of Bhavad.

\(^{353}\) Though literally, the term ‘लड़यो’ means to fight, it may have been used in documents in the sense of an argument.

\(^{354}\) Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1772/ AD 1715

\(^{355}\) Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. Kishano Bhrahman fought with sahna; Roznama, Dausa, V.S. 1769/ AD 1712, A Brahman fought with the Patel; Arhsatta, Toda Bhim, V.S. 1778/ AD 1721, Manko Brahman fought with the sarkar's men.

\(^{356}\) Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1774/ AD 1717; Dayaram Tara of mauza Hamirpur was fined for fighting with the Jagirdar's man.

\(^{357}\) Arhsatta, Lalsot, V.S. 1773/ AD 1716. Ramji Meena's brother's babu was accused. “सरकार का प्यादा सु लड़ी”.

\(^{358}\) Roznama, Fagi, V.S. 1759/ AD 1702

\(^{359}\) Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1772/ AD 1715. “सरकार का सहना से बराबरी करी”.

\(^{360}\) Arhsatta, Malarna, V.S. 1772/ AD 1715.
S媳ी, बेदबी, बदजुबानी, कुजवा etc. are all indicative of varying degrees of disobedience and misdemeanor encountered by officials of the state in their dealings with peasants. Though each of these had a specific nuance, together they constituted a set of behaviour that was disrespectful, insulting and improper. If the behaviour of subjects, is to be the index of the nature and degree of power exercised by rulers, a behaviour so ridden with सोखी, बेदबी, बदजुबानी etc suggests that though authority and legitimacy of the state was accepted, its dictates were never totally internalized. The state did manage to impose its will, in the sense that it managed to extract revenue. Extraction of revenue was never however an absolutely smooth process. It was ridden with tension. The state had to deal with frequent display of temper. Submission to authority was never total. Obedience was never comprehensive.

Clearly, it would be a great injustice to talk of peasant resistance only in terms of revolts and confrontations. There is much more to it. Peasants of Eastern Rajasthan petitioned to the state, reported injustice and appealed to its legitimacy to undo wrongs. They threatened to go to the Huzuri, when wronged by officials. They delayed and evaded payments. They tried to get away with underpayment. They sometimes deliberately left land uncultivated. They cultivated the land of grantees at the expense of khalisa land. They migrated when exploitation went over board.
and used the threat of migration to get the state into action. They
resorted to defiance and rebuked officials and showed disrespect.
They flouted rules and refused to comply. They expressed anger.
They made the most of situations and enlarged their gains. They
worked the system to 'their minimum disadvantage'.