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CHAPTER - III

PATTOM PROCLAMATION OF 1040 M.E (1865 A.D)

There were two classes of lands held by cultivators in Travancore. They were Jenmivakai and Pattomvakai. The Jenmivakai lands belonged to private land-lords while the Government was considered the sole proprietor of the Pattomvakai lands. The Pattomvakai lands were of different kinds. They were Sanchaya Pattom, Durghasu Pattom, Pandaravagai Payattu Pattom, Vettazhivu Pattom, Adiyara Pattom, Karikkur Pattom, Pandaravagai Viruthi Pattom, Pandaravagai Putuval Pattom, Nadu Pattom, Viruthi Nerpati Pattom, Vilakka Pattom, Miteduppu Pattom, Toal Pattom, Kudippullittanatu Pattom, Nerotti-NerPattom and Verum Pattom.¹

The characteristic feature of the Pattom tenure was the liability of the holding to pay the full assessment. These lands were, till 1040 M.E (1865 A.D)., the absolute property of the Sirkar, and the holders had till then no proprietary rights or even transferable rights of occupancy.² The holders in such cases were

² Ibid.
mere tenants-at-will and also had no permanent interest in the properties concerned.³

The Durghasu Pattom comprised of nirthal lands leased out at a lower pattom for a specified or unspecified period. They were liable to higher assessment at the discretion of the Sirkar. These leases were generally for ten years or lesser periods after which they were renewed. If the old lessee was unwilling to take it up once again, the lands were auctioned and given on lease to the highest bidder.⁴ This, however, only applied to wet lands. In the case of garden lands they were given on Kanda Pattom if it was higher than the Ayacut Pattom or on the adjacent Ayal Pattom itself if it is more. Failing to get tenants on either of these conditions, the gardens were let out to the highest bidder.

The Pandaravagai Payattu Pattom included such lands as were Sirkar waste and unassessed lands with no taxable trees thereon which the ryots wished to bring under cultivation. They were then rendered liable to a pattom fixed by the Sirkar. This tenure was so called from the assessment being fixed according

⁴ Ibid, p.329.
to the capacity of the ground for sowing Payar or green-gram in it. When, however, the lands began to yield, the tenure was changed and brought under puthuval or Sirkar Pattom tenure bearing Vriksha Pattom or tree tax till the next settlement.5

The Vettazhivu Pattom appears common to Sirkar as well as to Jenmam lands, and the Sirkar in its demand made a deduction equal to the interest on the amount spent for bringing the waste under cultivation; while in the case of Jenmam lands, the Jenmi can redeem them on payment of the amount spent on improvements.6

The cultivation of Malancherikals or hilly tracts known as Cherikal in the taluks of Changanacheri, Tiruvalla, Minachil and Kottayam came under Adiyara Pattom. Once in twelve years the brush-wood was removed and the ground cleared and sown with paddy or other grains.7 This cultivation was called Ozhavu, the second and the third Kala and Kumpappu the first two cultivations were generally paddy while the third had sugarcane, tapioca or some other minor produce. For Sirkar lands the tax levied for years of cultivation

---

5 TLRM, vol.IV, p.408.
6 TAR, 1048-1049 M.E, p.140.
7 HCVR, Proclamation, dated 17th Karkadagam 1010 M.E.
was 2/10 of the produce and the Paranel and kottai for every Cherikal, while in the Jenmi tracts, the Sirkar was entitled to only \(\frac{1}{10}\). These assessments were levied on measurements of cultivated areas made by the subordinate revenue officials at 2 fanams for every parai of Sirkar land while it was just half in the case of Jennam lands.\(^8\) However, in the slightly different Adiyara Pattom tenures, the Jenmi having received an Adukuvathu or payment at the rate of 2 chuckrams per parai of land got only \(\frac{3}{20}\) of the produce as Varam in addition to Paranel in kottai. No Varam was then paid for Kumpappu cultivation.\(^9\)

The Karikkur Pattom included waste lands intercepted by channel beds and valleys overgrown with shrubs leased out for cultivation. In these cases, \(\frac{1}{4}\) of the assessment was deducted for the cultivator’s trouble and the remaining \(\frac{3}{4}\) alone forms the Government demand. The tenant in such cases acquired full rights over the land.\(^10\)

The Pandaravagai Viruthi Pattom was the same as Sirkar Pattom and differed only in that it was once a viruthi for

---


\(^{9}\) *Ibid.*

\(^{10}\) *Ibid*, p.330.
some service which was no longer required and hence discontinued as such and brought under the pattom tenure.\textsuperscript{11} The Pandaravagai Puthuval Pattom included the nirthal and cultivation. Tree-tax alone was levied for portions of ground containing taxable trees while Payattu Pattom or ground rent alone was levied on the grounds containing no such trees.\textsuperscript{12}

The Nadu Pattom included such temporary leases to third persons of escheated properties pending inquiries into the rights of claimants if any.\textsuperscript{13} The Viruthi Nerpati Pattom was a tenure in which one-half the pattom was allowed for some service and the rest paid to Government.\textsuperscript{14}

\textit{Vilakku Pattom} includes such lands as were assessed to Sirkar as pattom lands, but were formerly given for lighting some temples which have now been assumed by the Sirkar. Similarly we had Kazhaka Pattom and Palpayasa Pattom.

\textsuperscript{11} TLRM, vol.II, pp.112-116.
\textsuperscript{12} HCVR, Circular No.3200, dated 9th Vrischigam 1036 M.E.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid, Circular No.7289, dated 14th Mithunam 1036 M.E.
\textsuperscript{14} V. Nagam Aiya., \textit{op.cit.}, vol.III, p.331.
for other services in temples which in later times had been assumed by the Sirkar.\textsuperscript{15} The Miteduppu Pattom was the tenure under which assessment was levied on the surplus of Viruthi lands.\textsuperscript{16}

The Toal Pattom was another tenure under which Sirkar forests were leased out for the supply of toal or leaf manure for paddy fields.\textsuperscript{17} The Kudippullitanatu Pattom was another tenure peculiar to the Shertallai taluk and was so called from the Settlement made on the assurance of the ryots themselves after the land was made over by the Cochin State in the absence of any accounts.

By the Nerotti-Ner Pattom the Jenmi received an amount from the Kudiyan that would secure to him an interest which would be equal to the pattom of the property transferred. This could be redeemed but it was seldom done as the money received, which would have to be returned, was the full value of the property.\textsuperscript{18}

The Verum Pattom was a lease without any debt or money consideration entering into the transaction. It may be oral or

\textsuperscript{15} V. Nagam Aiya., \textit{op.cit.}, vol.III, p.331.
\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Ibid.}
written, but the latter method was adopted when the term was for more than a year in which case it must be stamped and registered. Under this tenure the tenant took possession of the property and paid an annual rent to the land-lord as agreed upon. He was bound to quit the land on the expiry of his term.  

A few tenures of this kind in the frontier taluk of Shenkottai were known by various other names such as Japti-Ayan zufti and Ayan included in the Layan (frontier) from certain historical causes. The first was so called because those lands were once attached by the British as theirs, but were given back subsequently as the frontier disputes ended in favour of Travancore. The second class comprised of lands ceded by the British in lieu of Malayankulam Desam lands given up by Travancore, while the third comprised of accretions to Travancore from the outlying British District of Tinnevelly on a demarcation of the boundary line when disputes arose. As a consequence of such origin, these three classes of lands still retained their British character and were treated as such in the state accounts.

Similarly, there were some special tenures of this kind current in South Travancore. These were chiefly Sirkar Devaswam

---

19 V. Nagam Aiya, op.cit., p. 320.
The peculiarity of these tenures was that in none of these was the full assessment demanded on behalf of the Sirkar except in the first in which case the full assessment was taken by the Sirkar as the Devaswam expenses were defrayed by the State since the assumption of the institutions by the Sirkar. Under the other tenures a portion of the assessment was allowed for the purposes indicated by the names of the tenures and the rest went to the Sirkar. The names merely indicate the original source or tenure which became converted into pattom in later times.

Besides garden and Punja lands, wet lands alone held under pattom tenure, came to about 2,00,000 acres. The Sirkar was considered the sole Jenmi, Merassiholder or the land-lord of these lands. The ryots in possession of these lands hold them of the Sirkar, just as the tenants of an ordinary Jenmi or Merassidar hold lands of him.

---

21 Ibid.
Many serious disadvantages attached to this tenure as a consequence of its character. The *Sirkar* was supposed to have the absolute dominion of a *land-lord* over these lands, limited only by its own considerations of self-interest. It seems that the *Sirkar* was not bound to respect possession. It was thought that the lands could, in some cases, be resumed at the *Sirkar*’s pleasure, though this was not often done in practice. *Sirkar Pattom* lands could not be legally sold by one ryot to another, for the reason, he was a simple tenant, and could not act as a proprietor.\(^{23}\)

If a sale was nevertheless effected, it was deemed invalid, and the *Sirkar* had the right to ignore the transaction altogether.\(^{24}\) When a sale was executed, it was done secretly and in a most circuitous manner, involving an infraction of the truth at almost every step.\(^{25}\) As *Sirkar Pattom* land could not be legally sold, such land was no security for the tax payable on it. When the tax on such land had to be levied by coercive process, the land could not, of course, be brought to sale, but the *Sirkar* had to seek out


\(^{24}\) Ibid.

\(^{25}\) Ibid.
other property of the defaulter, and on failure, the demand had to be remitted.\textsuperscript{26} As sales were illegal, mortgages were also equally so; and thus the tenant was unable to borrow capital on the security of his pattom lands, though such capital was required for the improvement of those very lands. It was only carrying out the pernicious principle, to refuse to accept pattom lands as security for public servants, for public contracts etc.\textsuperscript{27} Nor could pattom lands be sold by the Civil Courts of the country in execution of decrees. The judgement creditor was not therefore at liberty to regard the pattom lands in the possession of his debtor, as any assets available for the satisfaction of the just debt.\textsuperscript{28}

The \textit{Sirkar} steadily refused to assent to any action on the part of the tenant, such as was calculated to establish any pecuniary interest of his in the pattom lands forming his holding. This was carried so far that, if a ryot asked to be permitted to spend capital in improving his lands, the \textit{Sirkar} told him that he might do so if he liked, but that the \textit{Sirkar} would not recognise

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{26} \textit{TLRM}, vol.IV, pp.874-875.
  \item \textsuperscript{27} T. Madhava Rao, \textit{op.cit.}, pp.8-18.
  \item \textsuperscript{28} \textit{Ibid.}
\end{itemize}
the improvement, or respect any claim to consequent pecuniary interest in the property. Following out the system, no price or a mere nominal price was paid by the Sirkar for pattom lands resumed for public purposes, such as for roads, canals and public buildings.²⁹

The Sirkar in its capacity of Jenmi acted until a very late period as the private Jenmies, and the Sirkar lands otherwise called Pandaravagai were held by tenants under the same local arrangements as were made by private Jenmies. Both the theory and practice in respect to Sirkar lands are and have all along been, that the Sirkar is primarily the land-lord and that whatever rights in them vest in the ryots have been derived from the Sirkar. None of the arrangements with regard to the holding of land made by the Sirkar in olden times indicates the consciousness of the existence of occupancy rights in the ryots, except those expressly conceded to them by contract or grant, and it was not until 1040 M.E that the Sirkar by a Royal Proclamation conferred the rights of permanent occupancy upon the large body of Verum Pattom holders under the Sirkar, who until then held the lands - in theory at least - as tenants-at-will. The effect of the liberal policy adopted in 1040 M.E. (1865 A.D) has

²⁹ Ibid.
been to bring about a distribution or diffusion of landed property among all classes of His Highness' subjects, and the evils arising from land monopoly have thus been remedied to a considerable extent.\textsuperscript{30}

The holders of *Pandaravagai* lands, as a matter of fact, enjoyed for over a century, and that fixity of tenure should be guaranteed to them as in the case of *Pandaravagai* lands. Government concurred in this view and resolved to declare all *Devaswam* lands as *Pandaravagai* lands and to place the holders of the former in the same position as that of the latter.\textsuperscript{31} The decision involved a substantial loss of revenue to the *Devaswams*; but, in view of the lasting benefit which this measure would confer on a large section of His Highness' subjects, Government felt that this sacrifice of revenue must be faced by them and also that the *Devaswams* should not suffer on this account.\textsuperscript{32}

Prior to the Malabar year 1040 (1865 A.D), *pattom* lands in different parts of Travancore, but chiefly in the South, were known to be suffering from the effects of over-assessment. In many cases, they

\textsuperscript{30} *S F R*, pp.12 -21.

\textsuperscript{31} T.K.Velu Pillai., *op.cit.*, vol.1, p.569.

\textsuperscript{32} *Ibid.*
were assessed at 18, 20 and 21 times the estimated quantity of seed required to sow them. Thus, one *kottai* of land was assessed at 18, 20 and 21 *kottas* of paddy and similarly, one *parai* of land at 18, 20 and 21 *paras*. In 1040 (1865 A.D), matters appeared to have reached a crisis. Some immediate relief was considered urgently called for, and as a rough and ready method, all rates of assessment exceeding 10 *kottas* were reduced to that rate and orders were accordingly, issued and given effect to. But apparently from a misapprehension of the instructions given, the benevolent intentions of the administration of the day, when Raja Sir. T. Madhava Rao was *Dewan*, had been marred in a certain class of cases. When lands assessed at less than 10 *kottas* — say at 5, 6 or 7 *kottas* or less — came to be abandoned (and by the rules in force they were allowed to be abandoned only when the holders was reduced to absolute destitution and had no more property of any kind from which to make good the *Sirkar* demand) and subsequently applied for or taken up by another, he was saddled not with the 5, 6 or 7 *kottas* of assessment which they bore at the time they were relinquished, but at 10 *kottas* — the rate to which all assessment above 10 *kottas* had been brought down. Obviously, the local officials must have thought that was the minimum rate of assessment allowable, and rigidly worked upto that point whenever the opportunity offered, believing all the time, no doubt,
that they were adding to the revenue and thus benefiting the Sirkar. The result could not prove otherwise then most disastrous. The mischievous action of the local officials had the most repressive effect on cultivation, and orders were issued during the year peremptorily forbidding the practice and requiring all assessment below 10 kottas to be maintained intact at the existing rates.33

The characteristic feature of the pattom tenure was the liability of the holding to pay the full assessment, or in the language of the accounts, ‘Kanda Pattom’. These lands were till 1040 M.E. (1865 A.D), the absolute property of the Sirkar, and the holders had till then no proprietary rights or even transferable rights of occupancy.34

In 1040 M.E. (1865 A.D) the restrictions which had made the holders of Sirkar Pattom lands, both wet and garden, mere tenants-at-will, were removed and full rights of ownership were conferred on them, but the properties thus enfranchised were made liable to the payment of a fee of 2 per cent for the consideration in every case of transfer by sale or mortgage.35

34 SFR, p.21.
35 Ibid.
When Sirkar lands were given out on pattom, certain fees known as adukuvathu, chittipanam, neettupanam were released. By Huzur Sadhanam No. 3813, dated 18th Kumbham 1054 M.E. (1879 A.D), addressed to the Division Peshkars, it was laid down that the practice, then obtaining in some places, of levying the pattom fee on redemption of mortgages was inconsistent with the provisions of the Rules dated 27th Karkadagam 1040 M.E. (1865 A.D), and should be put a stop to, for the benefit of the public.

This measure is referred to and explained as follows in the Travancore Administration Report. It may be observed that when Sirkar Pattom lands were enfranchised in 1865 A.D., a fee at the rate of two per cent payable by the transferee of a holding to the Government was introduced. This was done partly with a view to strengthen the title of the transferee and partly with the object of realising a fund to meet the additional expenses which the Sirkar had to incur in paying full compensation for lands assumed for public objects. In the practical working of the system, a fee was levied not only on deeds of transfer of pattom lands, but also on their redemption from (otti) mortgage.

---

36 Agasteeswaram Taluk Records, Account dated 19th Kartigai 921 M.E.
37 H C V R, dated 27th Karkadagam, 1040 M.E.
In the year under review, the levy of fee on the latter description of transactions was exempted to the advantage of the public.\textsuperscript{38} By Huzur Sadhanam No. 593, dated 1\textsuperscript{st} Kanni 1057 M.E. (1882 A.D), addressed to the Division Peishkars, it was ordered that \textit{pattom} fees need not be recovered in respect of lands granted on \textit{Pidipadus} or \textit{Sunnads} as a result of revenue auction sales, as such cases were outside the scope of the Rules dated 27\textsuperscript{th} Karkadagam 1040 M.E. (1865 A.D).\textsuperscript{39}

By the Royal Proclamation, dated 3\textsuperscript{rd} Medam 1057 M.E. (1882 A.D), some modifications were made in the provisions relating to the levy of \textit{pattom} fees on alienations of \textit{Sirkar Pattom} lands contained in the Proclamation dated 21\textsuperscript{st} Edavam 1040 M.E. (1865 A.D) and the Rules dated 27\textsuperscript{th} Karkadagam 1040 M.E. (1865 A.D). The \textit{pattom} fees had been made payable to the Sub-Registrars instead of to the \textit{Proverticars}. As a consequence of this arrangement, the time limit fixed for the payment of the \textit{pattom} fees and the penalties for default were cancelled. Some supplementary provisions were also introduced to ensure the proper recovery of the

\textsuperscript{38} TLRM, vol.IV, p.434.

\textsuperscript{39} TGG, dated 6\textsuperscript{th} Kanni 1057, p.1020.
fees due under this head and for the prevention of frauds to evade payment of the fee.\textsuperscript{40}

On the 21\textsuperscript{st} Edavam 1040 M.E. (1865 A.D), the famous \textit{Pattom} Proclamation which has ever since been recognised as the Magna carta of the Travancore ryot was issued.\textsuperscript{41}

It is easy to see how adverse such a state of things must have been to the permanent improvement of this important class of lands. A remedy was much needed, and it was applied by His Highness by issuing the \textit{Pattom} Proclamation of 1040 M.E.1865 A.D.

According to the Proclamation the \textit{pattom} lands were declared fully as private, heritable, saleable, and otherwise transferable. The sales, mortgages, of these lands were valid and effected on stamped cadjans and were duly registered. The lands were sold for arrears of tax, in execution of decrees of Courts and such other legitimate purposes and be accepted as security by the \textit{Sirkar} as well as by private individuals. The holders of these lands were next assured to enjoy them undisturbed so long as the appointed assessment was paid. They had full liberty to lay out labour and capital on their lands.

\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Ibid}, dated 14th Medam 1057 M.E, p.332.
\textsuperscript{41} \textit{TLRM}, vol.IV, p.874.
Further, these lands would be resumable by the *Sirkar* like *Jenmam* and other private lands only for purely public purposes, as for instance, for making roads, canals, public buildings, etc. and when resumed for such purposes, compensation would be paid by the *Sirkar* not for improvements only, but equal to the full market value of such lands. These concessions were not, however, to be understood to effect in any way the rights of the *Sirkar* to regulate the land tax, to resume escheats, to confiscate the property of criminals, and generally such rights were exercised upon all property in general.

Thus the proclamation had effectively removed the uncertainties of the *pattom* tenure. The ryot in possession of *pattom* lands felt that he was the *land-lord*. He could regard the lands as his own property; and the whole some feeling of ownership thus generated was obviously of inestimable value. It is noted in the Travancore Administration Report for 1041 M.E that "The notification issued by His Highness dated the 2\textsuperscript{nd} June, 1865 and noticed in para 120 of the last Administration Report, enfranchising all lands held on what is called *Sirkar Pattom* tenure and placing them on the same secure footing as Ryotwari lands in the Madras Presidency, has, in the short time it has been in force, been
already attended with much benefit. This description of lands has directly risen in the estimation of the people from the sense of perfect security that that has been erected. Sales are now freely effected between ryot and ryot".42

The lands falling under the head of 'Verum Pattom' were formerly unalienable by the occupant ryots, the proprietary right being theoretically vested in the State. But after 1040 M.E. (1865 A.D), i.e., after the Pattom Proclamation, rights of full property were conferred on them without payment for the same, but subject to a fine or fee of 2 per cent on the money consideration indicated in the conveyances.43

The Pattom Proclamation enfranchised the Sirkar Pattom lands and converted a large body of the agricultural ryots from the position of tenant-at-will to that of full proprietors.44 A great extent of Sirkar Pattom property had been enfranchised and put on the same footing as Ryotwari lands in the Madras Presidency.45

42 TAR, for 1041 M.E, p.140.
45 Ibid.
This proclamation removed the restrictions which had made the holders of all Sirkar Pattom lands mere tenants-at-will and conferred on them full rights of ownership. By a Royal Proclamation, dated 22nd Karkadagam 1040 M.E. (1865 A.D) several minor taxes (110 in number) were abolished at an annual sacrifice of about rupees 8,500 as they were to be taxation to the ryots.

By another Royal Proclamation, dated 27th Karkadagam 1040 M.E. (1865 A.D), a measure of relief for the benefit of the Nanchilnad ryots was introduced by fixing 10 kottas per kottai as the maximum assessment for wet lands. All excess over this rate was written off. This is referred to and explained in the Administration Report that "while the land tax is generally very moderate in Travancore, it was extremely heavy in exceptional cases in the Nanchilnad. A corrective was long required in these cases. In the

---

46 Refer Kunchiraman Nairs Memo on Land Tenures, p.102.


48 H C V R, Refer also T A R, 1040 M.E.

49 Ibid.
year under review, His Highness was pleased to publish a notification, prescribing a certain maximum rate of tax, and ordering that all existing taxation in the Nanchilnad in excess of that maximum rate should be reduced at once to that standard. This relief cost the State about 15,000 rupees a year; but there is reason to hope that it has improved the prospects of many ryots, and will ultimately, secure a commensurate return to the state arising from extended or more regular cultivation".50

Formerly some of the rice lands in Thovalai and Agasteeswaram were subject to taxes above 10 kottas per kottai. These excessive rates were remitted and the maximum tax was fixed at 10 kottas. This remission entailed on Government a sacrifice of revenue to the amount of Rs. 15,828/- annually.51 The maximum tax on a kottai of rice land in Nanchilnad which in some cases exceeded 10 kottas was fixed in 1040 M.E. at 10 kottas by a Government Notification issued for the purpose.52

By a notification dated 27th Karkadagam 1040 M.E. (1865 A.D), definite rules were laid down for the levy of the fee of

50 TAR, 1040 M.E.
51 Session Appeal, p.4.
52 SFR, p.12.
2 per cent on alienations of lands under \textit{pattom} tenure, referred to in para 9\textsuperscript{th} of the Proclamation of 21\textsuperscript{st} \textit{Vaikasi} 1040 M.E.\textsuperscript{53} The only restriction imposed by the Proclamation was that on every transfer of the lands in question for a money consideration, a fee of 2 per cent, should be paid to the \textit{Sirkar}. This fee which has been given up from the commencement of the current year 1059 M.E. (1884 A.D) averaged about 50,000 rupees a year, which implies that 25 lakhs of rupees worth of property which had before been unable and of no marketable value to the holders, now annually changes hands.\textsuperscript{54}

The coconut plantations of the country were for a long time subject to a demand for leaves for feeding the \textit{Sirkar} elephants which were largely employed for State and public works, as well as in the forests. The demand was of an uncertain and oppressive character; the rich contrived to evade it, and it fell with great severity upon the poor. The required leaves could be cut from any garden on payment of a nominal price, even which scarcely reached the owner. A notification dated 28\textsuperscript{th} \textit{Karkadagam} 1040 M.E., was issued declaring that elephant fodder should thereafter be purchased in the

\textsuperscript{53} \textit{TGG}, dated 8th \textit{Avani} 1011 M.E, p.14.

\textsuperscript{54} \textit{TLRM}, vol.IV, p.382.
open market at the ruling prices of the day. Owners of garden property must feel this as a considerable relief, the extent of which might to some decree, be measured by the fact that under the new arrangement, the fodder of a first class elephant cost 540 rupees a year, while under the old, it cost only 144 rupees but the relief was really more valuable than represented by the difference of cost. Many oppressions and exactions, for which the old system gave scope, had been swept away.

By a circular dated 31st Karkadagam 1040 M.E. (1865 A.D) it was laid down that no Oozhiam service should be exacted from the tenants of Sirkar Pattom lands as the lands had been enfranchised. By a Royal Proclamation dated 13th Karkadagam 1040 M.E. all arrears of tax up to 1030 M.E. (1855 A.D) were written off for the benefit of the ryots. This is referred in the Administration Report that “It used to be a considerable evil to perpetuate in the Sirkar accounts long standing arrears of land tax. A heavy demand kept hanging over the ryot, in some cases for more than one generation, often paralyzed his energies and afforded scope for oppression on the part of petty officials of the taluk. The public demand therefore up to the

---

55 TGG, 8th Avani 1041, M.E, p.304.
56 TGG, dated 5th September 1965, p.326.
57 HCVR, dated 13th Karkadagam 1040 M.E.
year 1030M.E inclusive was liberally and totally remitted by His Highness in a notification dated 27th July 1865 A.D 13th Adi 1040, at a sacrifice of about 71,900 rupees".58

The period covered by this chapter constitutes an important epoch in the Land Revenue Reforms of the State. With very few exceptions there was no item of public taxation of any importance which could not stand roughly, at least, the test of the science of political economy. The public revenue was drawn from a few large sources, so as to secure the great advantage of simplicity. Much of the revenue was derived from indirect taxation which, as a rule, was much more suitable to the people of Travancore than direct contribution to the State. The receipts too, in most cases, flowed into the public coffers in large volume (so to speak) instead of percolating tediously so as to lead to unnecessary wastage. Another satisfactory feature of the system was that the income must increase generally with the growth of the country's population and prosperity, without the necessity of imposing new taxes distasteful to the people, unless under very extraordinary circumstances. The land revenue could hardly be said to be a tax on that labour, as it was only a small part of the yield of the soil over and above the fair returns of labour and capital.

58 TAR, 1040 M.E.