7. THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT

The Zamindar, as has been shown, was a crucial intermediary between the state and the Peasant economy in Masulipatnam as elsewhere. He was, in fact, the most powerful rural element, enjoying various kinds of economic, military and social power. The advent of the Company into the district and the consequent attempts to restructure the revenue system had a profound impact on the Zamindari. This impact was rendered all the more significant with the introduction of the Permanent Settlement in the district. It is necessary to examine the Permanent Settlement at work in Masulipatnam, to understand not only the local implications of the settlement, but also to seek answers to larger questions regarding the impact of the Permanent Settlement on the agrarian economy.

In 1765, when the British acquired control of the region, they found the circars in the possession of powerful men who had been appointed by the pre colonial government to administer the revenues on their account, and as the country was already in the hands of powerful intermediaries the situation rendered it necessary for the Company to continue them in their offices. Though they were originally the revenue Collectors employed by the state with specific powers and functions, taking advantage of the political situation during the transition period between the Nizam's authority and that of the Company, they entrenched their
position politically, economically, and militarily. This increased power and position made the colonial administrators view Zamindaris as feudal districts and the Zamindars as Rajahs. Thus the actual situation made the Company align with the Zamindars. The desire to pacify them with minimum military force also reflected the Company's weak position in the initial stages. By 1795 the Court of Directors was able to order the disbandment of military followers of the Zamindars who were then left with only their traditional economic privileges.

The Company in the beginning thought that all the military men in the Circars should be under their immediate orders. But as some of the estates were located among hills and jungles the unhealthiness of the climate was a great obstacle to employing regular troops in repelling the depredations of the people in the neighbouring Zamindans. For this task, as the country peons were well equipped and were supported at much less expense than could be done by the Company, the Company thought of allowing a small contingent of armed force to each Zamindar.

The Regulation of 1802 which introduced Permanent Zamindari settlement in Masulipatnam district merely formalized and introduced in a more permanent form a revenue system which had been evolved from 1765, when the region came under the Company's
control. It confirmed proprietary right in the Zamindari estates on the existing Zamindars under a new contract. It also created proprietary estates in Haveli lands, the intended aim being the creation of a new group of Zamindars in these Haveli lands. The evidence clearly indicates that all the Zamindari estates were retained by the existing Zamindari families only. Map 7.1 shows the spatial distribution of Zamindari and Haveli estates in Masulipatnam district. For instance, under the Permanent Settlement, the estates of Devarakota, part of Charmahal, Chintalapudi, Zammulavayi, and Medurgutta were given to the original Zamindars only. The estates of Bezwada, Mylavaram, Munagala, Nuzividu and Zammulavayi estates were conferred on the sons of the existing Zamindars.

As the Permanent Zamindari system in the region was modeled on lines similar to that of the Bengal Settlement, it is necessary to briefly review the objectives of Permanent Settlement in Bengal. The Permanent Settlement was introduced in Bengal in 1795 with certain objectives. The Permanent Settlement which was essentially a whig notion introduced a rule of property for Bengal which led to the creation of landed estates. By creating absolute property in the soil, the Permanent Settlement had brought into existence a demand and market for land.
Notions of Private Property in Land:

According to Ainslee T. Embree, one strand of the western European way of thinking about property came from the practices and legal codes of the Roman Empire. The characteristic Roman idea about property that became rooted in the European mind was the concept of unqualified possession. While this was one influence, other factors also shaped both British thought about property as well as actual practice. One of these was the synthesis of social customs that emerged in England following the Norman conquest. The transfer of lands from the old owners to the followers of the conqueror made possible a legal theory that the land was the kings and that the people were not only his subjects but also his tenants.

In the case of India, the idea of the king granting lands to tenants who became both territorial powers and eventually the supporters of Royal power was one of the organizing concepts that the British used for understanding Indian political and social life. Political Philosophers like Voltaire considered inheritance as the best evidence of individual ownership. The inheritable quality of the lands proved that they were the property of the Zamindars, Talukdars and others to whom they had descended by a long course of inheritance. However a clear distinction was made between the Zamindari tenure and the feudal tenure.
What was the reason for the widespread acceptance of the belief that Indian rulers owned all the land and that private property was unknown in India? According to Irfan Habib, the European travellers had given a mistaken account, because the Mughal Jagirdars appeared to be the same as European landlords. Since the Jagirs were transferable at the Emperor's will, the Europeans concluded that there was no private property in India. Besides, all these European travellers as well as the Company officials were drawing upon an ancient and well-articulated view of the nature of Asian society. In the pre-colonial regimes in India with the Muslim conquest entirely new practices entered India. Islamic law and theory recognized private property and the rules governing it had been influenced by Roman Byzantine laws. Yet despite the long administration of Muslim rule, the Islamic concepts of property made very little difference to Indian society.

In introducing the Permanent Settlement in the region in 1802, the Company tried to create a system of ownership in land on the assumption that this was the basis of a prosperous state. More than the proprietary right in the soil the Zamindars were given the right to collect the revenue on the soil, and for these duties they were given certain fees in the form of Rusums and Saverams.

Under the Permanent Settlement the land holders who were holding the land as hereditary tax officials were given absolute
property rights over these lands. Since private property was considered a necessity for material progress, the makers of Permanent Settlement tried to convert the existing hereditary tax farmers who had certain proprietary rights into a full fledged propertied class.

Even the Physiocrats believed that an efficient, economical and just tax system should consist of a single direct tax on agricultural rent. Perhaps this was the reason why the Zamindars were given the right to collect only the land revenue. Previous to the Permanent Settlement the pre colonial tax systems were a conglomeration of numerous taxes without any definite pattern. Because the Zamindars not only collected land taxes but also levied many other taxes like Moturfa, Salt tax, Customs duties, and other petty taxes.

Both supporters and opponents of the Permanent Settlement agreed that the soil of right belonged to the natives. The question was who the natives were who owned the soil. The Company administrators were convinced that the hereditary tax Collectors were the land lords. They equated these landlords with the English lord of the manor. as they felt that it would not be viable to vest these rights in cultivators who were attached by custom to the authority of their masters; this task, the Company felt, should be left to the native masters.
The recognition of the right of the Zamindars to landed property was the main principle on which the entire principle of Permanent Settlement ran. They thought that no government could be assured of its revenue unless it was prepared to guarantee the rights of proprietorship. Elaborating the principle, Francis one of the authors of the Permanent Settlement wrote:

Without private property there can be no public revenue. I mean that regular and permanent revenue on which alone a wise government ought to place its dependence. Agency can never supply the place of proprietorship because many, of the principle duties of a proprietor are such as an agent has no personal interest in performing. It is not the mere name of proprietor that will engage any man to perform these duties if he has no real security that is if he does not know once and for all how much he is to pay to government and be not assured that the remainder will be his own.

Principles of the Permanent Settlement:

However there was one main difference in the Permanent Settlement in Bengal and that introduced in Northern Circars. In Bengal nearly the whole region was in the hands of the Zamindars and Havelli lands as such did not exist at all. In Masulipatnam district on the other hand, the Havelli lands were part of Company's possessions and were under the direct management of the ruling authority. They were situated mainly around the principal towns and military establishments. The principal Havelli lands in the district were clustered around the towns of Bandar, Eluru and Kondapalli. But these three Havelli lands were divided into many small mootahs under the Permanent Settlement.
Thus the existence of Haveli lands in the region made the system different from that of Bengal. For instance, the existence of Haveli raised questions about the mode and form of assessment which should come into effect in these parts. The system also contributed to the evolution of a distinct agrarian structure.

Despite the natural advantage of having the most fertile and populous lands in strategical places the Company decided to parcel the Haveli lands into small mootahs and grant a right of property in Haveli lands also. The Company probably evolved the system of proprietary estates to ensure the regular collection of revenue from the Haveli lands without investing much on the administrative machinery on its own. Another idea behind it was to create a new group of land owners. The Company did not intend to confer the proprietary rights for the Haveli lands on the members of the traditional Zamindari families. It hoped instead, as mentioned above, to sell their rights to persons of other categories.

The three principal Haveli lands of Bandar, Eluru, and Kondapalli were divided into many small mootahs. Bandar estate was sub divided into Kaldindi consisting of 8 villages, Tumidi, Pedanah - 17, Gudur - 52, Akulamannadu - 6, Inuguduru - 14. Six Islands - 6, and Divi. The pargana of Eluru was sub-divided into small mootahs of Eluru consisting of 8 villages, Kovali - 8, Pedapadu - 8, Vasantavada - 12, Malakacherla with 18 villages and Kondapalli consisted of 14 villages.
The Company wanted to confer the proprietary rights on as many new people as possible. May be they were afraid to lease large parganas to one Zamindar. But this policy of the Company led to many complications because these estates with such small jurisdictions were scattered throughout the region and thus increased administrative problems. Since the people who bought these lands were traditional regional Zamindars contrary to Company's expectations, there were constant Zamindari rivalries and the Zamindari estates no longer remained as compact blocks. Also with the sale of proprietary estates the Company brought for the first time land to the market. Table 7.1 shows the sale of proprietary estates and the Zamindars who bought them and the amount for which they bought.

Table : 7.1

Sale of Proprietary estates in Masulipatnam district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of Estates</th>
<th>Name of Purchasers</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kondapalli</td>
<td>Vasireddi Venkatadri Naidu</td>
<td>Rs. 8,600-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallursamut</td>
<td>Bommadevarah Naganna</td>
<td>Rs. 16,000-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gundur</td>
<td>Bommadevarah Naganna</td>
<td>Rs. 4,950-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akulamannadu</td>
<td>Vasireddi Venkatadri Naidu</td>
<td>Rs. 400-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inuguduru</td>
<td>Vasireddi Venkatadri Naidu</td>
<td>Rs. 950-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedanah</td>
<td>Erlagadda Nageswar Naidu</td>
<td>Rs. 425-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Islands</td>
<td>Vasireddi Venkatadri Naidu</td>
<td>Rs. 2,225-0-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source : Statement of the Zamindaris and Mootahs created under Permanent Settlement, Miscellaneous Records, v.15. p.58.

Many of these estates were bought by the Zamindars at a price much above the permanent jumma fixed on these estates. By the Permanent Settlement of 1802 the Company recognized the
existing Zamindars of the region and even the proprietors of 
Haveli estates were placed on par with the former Zamindars.

Though the alliance with the Zamindars to pacify them was a 
matter of necessity and political expediency for the Company the 
ideological factors shaped at the higher levels were also impor-
tant. However, it was mainly the economic realities which made 
the settlement necessary. Because of the experience prior to the 
Permanent Settlement the Company wanted stable revenue and by 
creating a proprietary right in the soil and confirming it on a 
single individual permanently it felt that the Company would be 
assured of unalterable revenue under any circumstances. The 
Company thought that the new settlement would improve the land 
revenue collections and also systematize the process.

The leading principles upon which the Permanent Settlement 
was based were the security of government with respect to its 
revenues and the security and protection of its subjects. First-
ly, under the Permanent Settlement, the land or the estate of 
the Zamindars would be the security to the government. Secondly, 
the tax which each individual had to pay was fixed and also the 
time of payment, and manner of payment. Another feature of the 
1802 settlement was that it prevented the enhancement of rent and 
assessment. This centered around the fundamental principle that 
the rate of rent and tenure should be fixed in perpetuity and 
should be made unalterable under any circumstances.
Before the 1802 settlement the Company thought that the Zamindars held their estates on very precarious tenure. It felt that as the revenue assessment was arbitrarily fixed the revenue to the state fluctuated considerably. The whole Zamindari was liable to sequestration in case of even a partial failure in the payment of Kist.

The permanent proprietary right was extended to Zamindars and other land holders and to their heirs and successors in order to end the practices of tax farming, revenue augmentation and dispossession which had been a source of uncertainty and disquietude. However, this proprietary right according to Nicholas Dirks was not to be absolute. It was dependent on the proper and punctual payment of peishkash. Default in revenue would give the Company a free hand to assume the estate. This right was not to infringe upon the established rights of under tenantry. The government reserved to itself many rights over sources of revenue.

So in order to rectify these faults the Board in its Regulation of 1802 fixed the jumma permanently and conferred proprietary rights in the individuals. In case of default, instead of the whole estate being sequestered only a part of the Zamindari amounting to that value would be sequestered. By this Regulation, the Company thought that it had left an option to the
Zamindars to encourage cultivation and add the revenue to their profit as the assessment was fixed. But what actually happened in the region, in fact in the other Circars also was contrary to the Company's expectations.

**Working of the Permanent Settlement:**

At the time of the Permanent Settlement, Devarakota Zamindari was assessed at Rs. 1,54,036-3-2. The Zamindar's share was Rs. 51,346 -3-2 and the government's share was Rs. 1,02,690. The Permanent Assessment on the estate was fixed with the Durbari Karchulu forming part of the assessment. In the Devarakota Zamindari Durbari karchulu formed a huge amount. This amount seemed to have varied from Rs. 15.000 in an ordinary year to Rs. 25,000 in a good agricultural year. This amount was collected from the ryots by the Zamindars and was demanded from the Zamindars by the government in all seasons alike.

The revenue of the Zamindari for the first twenty years after the Permanent Settlement that is from 1800-1821 was profitable as the Zamindar got a profit of Rs.. 37,046 on an average per year. The revenue decreased in the next twenty one years, that is from 1821 - 1842. On the whole, though the Zamindari was still getting a profit of Rs.5,387 per year, it was low when compared with figures of previous decades. But from 1830 onwards there was a deficit of Rs.10,716 to the Zamindari in its revenue collections. The Zamindari was under the management of the Court
of Wards from 1819 - 1831, as the Zamindar was a minor. In 1831
though the estate came under the management of the Zamindar the
estate was again attached to the government for arrears of reve-
nue in 1852. Between 1851-1841, the balance of peishkash
amounted to Rs. 2,77,886 - 6 - 4 and with the old debt the total
amounted to Rs. 3,17,688. For the liquidation of this, the
Zamindari was put up for sale.

The Board had asked the Zamindar to pay the revenue arrears
and take the proprietorship of the estate. The Board proposed to
make an enquiry for the purpose of ascertaining whether in con-
sequence of the fall in the prices of grains or any local causes it
was necessary to make any temporary or permanent reduction in the
peishkash payable by this estate or any other estate in Northern
Circars.

The Collector opined that, the Devarakota Zamindari had lost
its productiveness not by any sudden calamity but by the gradual
and regular deterioration. The prices of the produce had not
suffered greater diminutions in the Devarakota than in any other
Zamindaris of Northern Circars. But whatever be the cause of its
impoverishment, whether to be found in the negligence or incapaci-
ty of those who should have carefully watched over its inter-
est, the fact remained that the deterioration had taken place
while the estate was in the hands of the officers of
government.
This clearly shows the working of the Permanent Settlement in the region. The Zamindari passed from one hand to the other, thus making the settlement very inconsistent both in its working and the management. Of four decades of Permanent Settlement in the Zamindari of Devarakota, only for twenty years the estate was under the actual management of the Zamindar. The rest of the period for several reasons, the Company managed the estate, for some years under the Court of Wards and later under the attached estates for arrears of revenue. This shows the Zamindari system after two decades of its introduction was not as effective as the Company thought it would be.

Nicholas Dirks argued that, the authors of the Permanent Settlement thought that there would be a redirection of the interests and energies of the Zamindars whom he called the "little kings" from local warfare and intrigue to agrarian management and investment. In short, the Zamindars would become the rural gentry, sources of both local stability and a steady flow of revenue.

But in due course of time the same principles worked contrary to the expectations of the Company. For various reasons, and because of the principles of the Settlement itself, the Zamindaris were put up for sale in parts and this resulted in Zamindaris being subdivided into many parts and passing into different hands each time the estate was in arrears to the Compa-
ny. This generally weakened and furthered the already deteriorating conditions in the estates.

Under the Permanent Settlement the Zamindari of Jammulavayi and Medurgutta were granted to Vellanki Venkata Narasimha Rao. The Zamindari consisted of six villages, all managed by the Zamindar Vellanki Venkata Narasimha Rao. In 1806 when the Zamindar died, he left a will bequeathing the Zamindari to his two brothers Vellanki Tirumalarao and Vellanki Rama Rao jointly', with injunctions to give food and raiment to his widow.

In 1811 because of the family feuds the Zamindari was divided between the two brothers. One portion consisted of the villages of Mallavaram, Lingala, half of Kakarla and Ramanapalem village and 5/4 of Inagadapa village. Totally, the Zamindari consisted of 5-1/4 villages and was placed under the management of Tirumalarao. The other portion consisting of 1/4 of Inagadapa village, the villages of Anumulanka, Kottapalli and the other half of Kakarla and Ramanapalem, together consisting of 2-3/4 villages was placed under the management of Rama Rao.

The widow of Vellanki Venkata Narasimha Rao, Ramanamma sued the two brothers jointly for maintenance and obtained a decree for five pagodas per month payable by them jointly. But with the death of Vellanki Tirumal Rao, his portion of the Zamindari came under the management of the Collector.
Regulations of 1802 Settlement:

The Permanent Settlement which detailed so clearly the duties and ryots of the Zamindars failed to protect the interests of the cultivators against the Zamindars. The supporters of the Permanent Settlement believed that the settlement with the ryot was strictly the business of the Zamindars and not of the government. The government could not limit the Zamindar in his agreements with his tenants. For, that would amount to an invasion of the rights of property in the first instance. Secondly, to descend to the ryots was considered a business of detail which no way belonged to government which, the framers of the policy felt, carried a "vexatious scrutiny and an arbitrary exertion of power upon the face of it". Thus on grounds of principle as well as of administrative convenience Francis, one of the framers of Permanent Settlement recommended the adoption of what Firminger called a laissez faire attitude towards the Zamindar's relation with his ryots. The policy described land as the hereditary property of the Zamindar. He held it by the law of the country on the tenure of paying a certain contribution to government. When this condition was complied with, he was master of the land to relet it to whom he thinks proper.

Pattah Regulation of 1802 specified that the proprietors should enter into agreements with the inhabitants and cultivators of land on the terms on which they respectively occupied such
lands and should exchange their engagements called the Pattahs and Muchalikas respectively. These Pattahs included four kinds of engagements:

1. for the rent of village in gross sums of money specifying the rent, the payment rate;
2. for a division of the produce of the lands specifying the rate of cultivator's share;
3. for land on which the money rent is assessed showing the rate of assessment according to the land measure in use;
4. for lands charged with grain rent stating the specific quantity of grain to be rendered.

The Regulation which so clearly defined the powers and rights of Zamindars, no where specified the position of the cultivators and under tenants in the actual production process of agriculture. This left the various groups of cultivators at the mercy of the Zamindars. However, while guaranteeing the Zamindari rights the government resolved that all the Talukdars and the under tenantry would be preserved in the enjoyment of all their just rights which no Zamindar would be permitted to infringe. According to the new settlement, the cultivating ryots though had no property rights in the soil, did have a right of occupancy in the lands they occupied and cultivated as long as they paid their share of revenue regularly. This seems to indicate that the position of the different groups of cultivators remained as they were before the Permanent Settlement.
Generally by distraint, the Zamindars enforced the payment of rent from the ryots. Zamindars always had recourse to distraint of the property of the ryots without any reference to the Collector. For the Collector was not authorized by the regulations to interfere with the Zamindars. By this the ryots were left at the mercy of the Zamindars, since there was no official or legal action against the Zamindars in case of oppression on the ryots.

The Zamindars usually disposed of the property of the ryots so distrained, by selling it to the merchants either by private or public sale. The ryots were left with very little produce after the Zamindar’s share and various customary deductions were made. Even supposing that it did leave little to the ryot the Zamindar’s imposed new taxes whenever they required money. Under the Permanent Settlement the Company made a provision that cultivators could get redress from Courts of Law. But in practice, it was often out of reach of the cultivators.

In the estates where the proprietors were the traditional and old Zamindars the fear of personal violence deterred the ryots from complaining. If they were new Zamindars, even then ryots submitted quietly to the loss, not from fear of personal injury but from the well grounded fear of losing their cause in the court. They knew that the influence of the Zamindar would easily procure witnesses to swear falsely and also would be
supported by the fabricated accounts of the Karanams, who were entirely under the authority of the Zamindars. Even if they gained their cause it would be of no advantage to them as the Zamindar without transgressing any law would be able to harass them in many ways and make their situation uncomfortable.

However the plan of 1776 did not rule out official intervention altogether. It was not for the administration to come between the Zamindar and ryot in such a manner as to influence the terms of their contract. But once this was decided to their mutual satisfaction the government had to undertake to enforce it. This was to be done by the issue of a uniform pattah containing the terms of the agreement which must be respected by both the parties.

The Permanent Settlement has often been criticized for its failure to safeguard the interests of ryots. But the failure was easily explained. The word permanency was to extend to the jumma only and not to the details of the settlement. The security of the ryots the framers of the policy thought was a problem requiring no immediate solution and any measures that might be necessary could be introduced occasionally as abuses occurred.

The exaction of revenue was felt as a far greater hardship by the land holders than the personal confinements or coercion to which they were subjected under the pre colonial governments when they failed to pay any part of the public dues.
In the district where the land revenue was permanently settled and where the collections from the ryots were made by the Zamindars the cultivator was protected from enhanced demands by an appeal to the Collector under the provisions of Regulation 30 of 1802 and Regulation 5 of 1822. However, on the Collectors decision also, the Zamindars could further appeal by formal process to the Courts of Law.

Perhaps this long process also deterred the ryots from complaining and also the lengthy procedures involved were out of reach and the cultivators could not afford most of the times to attend the courts leaving their work.

The Zamindars, ignoring the traditional custom, tried to introduce new rules to suit their need. For instance, the Zamindar of Devarakota, Ankenaidu stopped the cultivators from cultivating their shares. The Zamindar introduced new duties or rents on Pumpkin gardens (gummadi thotalu), Brinjal gardens (vanga thotalu), goguputtalu, uncultivated lands. Bullocks and water channels. The Zamindar in collaboration with the Aumeen Tadekonda Seshaiyah who was a Brahmin, made the cultivators suffer. The cultivators unable to bear the violence deserted the villages and took refuge in neighbouring taluks.

In examining the Permanent Settlement in Masulipatnam district it is essential to know what was the sort of permanency
that was established in the mode of assessment? and where was it established?

Under the Permanent Settlement all lands in a Zamindari both waste and arable were assessed in perpetuity with a fixed land revenue payable in all seasons. For fixing the state demand on the land permanently, the government's share out of the total produce of the land was first fixed. Revenue was assessed not on each village but on all the villages of a Zamindari collectively. The amount payable by the Zamindar to the government was unalterably determined and on the condition of payment of this defined sum each Zamindar was vested with the proprietary right of the soil in his Zamindari area. The amount to be paid by each Zamindar was calculated at two thirds of the half of the gross produce of lands. The other half being supposed to be the share paid to them by the cultivators.

Though the division of rights between the ryots and Zamindars remained undefined, the Zamindars were given power to get the defaulters arrested through the agency of courts, to attach and manage the defaulters' holdings. When the arrears were not recovered within the current revenue year by those means, then further powers were given to the Zamindars to proceed either to sell the tenure of the defaulters if saleable, or to eject the lease holders or tenants whose right of occupancy depended on payment of certain rents.
But the Regulation did not contain any remedy for the ryots against the misuse of these powers by the Zamindars except the order that the Zamindars were liable to prosecution for any undue exactions practiced on the ryots. In case of any dispute on the rates Muchalikas were the only specific statements with regard to the protection of ryots. But these Muchalikas were quite meaningless, because at the level of the locality the power of Zamindars was combined with the services of the Karanams who in most cases supported the Zamindars. Thus the cultivators always had to depend on the Karanams and go according to their wishes since they were a more powerful and immediate authority to the cultivators at the village level than even the Zamindar.

The Regulation of 1802 however strengthened the power of the local administrative machinery in the village. Abolishing the offices of other revenue servants like Deshmukhs, Deshpandes, and Mazumdars it greatly strengthened the Karanam’s position. He looked after the registration of gross produce of all lands shared between the proprietors and cultivators, recorded the quantity of grain so divided, fixed the rates of division, and also recorded the extent of land cultivated, and the amount of money collected, and the amount of rent due. As he was the sole revenue authority at the village level the cultivators came to depend on him heavily and also were at his mercy in discharging their economic transactions.
With all these provisions the settlement of 1802 transformed the customary relations that were existing between the Zamindars and different groups of cultivations till then into contractual terms. The regulating act while granting proprietary rights in the soil to the Zamindars successfully restricted most of the powers of the Zamindars and clearly specified their position and powers. Even in the economic sphere the assessment was fixed exclusive and independent of all duties, taxes and other collections which were generally known under the denomination of Sayer. In return for his services the Zamindar received certain specified amount of emoluments in the name of Rusums and Saverams. Thus through the settlement of 1802 the Company was able to curtail the power of the Zamindars successfully over a period of time while working with them.

Impact of the Permanent Settlement:

However, though the permanent Zamindari settlement was introduced with many hopes and guarantees the system did not last long and ironically many Zamindaris were put up for sale for various reasons. Though the first lapse occurred in 1813, within a decade of the introduction of the Permanent Settlement, many other estates continued to pay the peishkash regularly. Table 7.2 shows number of the Zamindari estates, which paid their peishkash regularly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Zamindaris</th>
<th>Permanent Jumma MPs.</th>
<th>How many years the jumma was regularly paid.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nandigama</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>16 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Devarakota</td>
<td>29,340</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bezwada</td>
<td>10,338</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mylavaram</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Charmahal</td>
<td>34,820</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Part of Zammulavayi and Medurgutta</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. - do -</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. - do -</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. - do -</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Part of Zammulavayi and Medurgutta</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. - do -</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. - do -</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. - do -</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Part of Zammulavayi</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Part of Medurgutta</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Munagala</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lingageri</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Chintalapudi</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Nidadavolu</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Nuzividu</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Statement of the Zamindaris and Mootahs created under Permanent Settlement. *Miscellaneous Records, v.15, p.22.*
The permanent jumma sometimes was fixed very high on some estates and some were under assessed. For instance, under the 1802 settlement the peishkash on the Charmahal estate was fixed at Rs.1,21,870. As the peishkash was too high, the Zamindar, Sobanadri Rao refused to take it up and then the government leased the estate on account of the Zamindari. This was the estate which for arrears of revenue was put for sale in 181? and ultimately bought by the government for Rs.93,000. But the other estates continued to pay their revenues regularly for approximately sixteen years in the Zamindari estates. Graphs 7.1 and 7.2 illustrates the land revenue demand and collections of the Company in Masulipatnam district. Many of these estates though under the Zamindari System for many years, came under the management of the Company for several reasons like lack of heirs and some of the Zamindars being minors they were under the Court of Wards.

The Court of Wards intended to introduce a proposal of granting to Collectors a remuneration for their trouble and responsibility in managing the estates of disqualified proprietors. But granting this commission to the Collectors out of the surplus funds of minor estates the Board thought would be liable to objection. The Board opined that the equitable mode of remunerating Collectors for their trouble in managing the estates of disqualified proprietors would be to allow them to draw a commission of 1 1/2 on the jumma payable to government.
Apart from these factors of excessive burden of revenue on the Zamindars and the inefficient management of the estates by the Zamindars the efficient and systematic manner of its collection was also responsible for the fall of the estates. Another common feature and factor responsible for the revenue arrears was the lavish spending and extravagance made by the Zamindars. The Zamindars vied with each other to outdo the other. For example, the Vasireddi Zamindar who was a dominant and leading Zamindar of the region when he went on pilgrimage had to be accompanied with a large contingent of men and material which cost the Zamindari a few lakhs of rupees. The family expenditures of the Zamindars, expenses incurred during their marriages and on other occasions reveal the nature and working of the Zamindari which are discussed in chapter 3. Another factor was family feuds which were taken advantage of by others and thus slowly reduced the Zamindars to paupers. The longest of such feuds was the one involving the Zamindar Vasireddi's two adopted sons which continued for three decades at the end of which the Zamindari was reduced to a state of deterioration and came under the management of the Company. The Zamindars showed little interest in the management of the Zamindari affairs often indulging in extravagance. The Zamindars under the new policy of the Company were happy to be mere beneficiaries of the estates and allowed the Company officials to manage them on their behalf. This was the case with the Zamindar of Charmahal. As his arrears increased, he expressed his inability to pay the revenue in a
letter to the Collector and requested the Company to take over the management of the estate till the conditions improved.

When compared with the Zamindari estates the conditions in the proprietary estates were worse and these estates before finally coming under the management of the government passed through several hands. As the land was regarded as the symbol of wealth the traditional Zamindars of the region vied with one another to possess the proprietary estates. This greatly enhanced the prices of the mootahs and the estates were bought above the jumma rates fixed on them. But in due course of time because of the heaviness of revenue burden and also due to the efficient manner of its collection, many of the estates were voluntarily surrendered, and some were sold to private individuals. For example, the Kaldindi mootah unable to pay the peish-kash was voluntarily surrendered to the government. The estate of Tumidi after the Permanent Settlement passed into the hands of two individuals before it was finally divided into two and bought on account of the government. The same was the case with the estates of Malakacherla and Pedanah.

The Company's revenue management policies in the first decade of the nineteenth century therefore began to erode the traditional structures of power and status and many of the Zamindari and proprietary estates unable to meet the revenue demands, collapsed into economic disarray and were there upon put
on sale to recover the arrears, thus leading to the emergence of a land market in the region. The new system of the Company of selling estates or parts of estates for recovery of dues had occasioned a vast permutation of property and many ancient and opulent families had been thus reduced to a state of depression and indigence.

In 1836 when more and more estates were put up for sale the Company contemplated the principle when the estates were placed temporarily under attachment whether to allow the Zamindar or one of his relatives to manage the estate as Ameens.54

The Board decided that in cases where it was essential, a member of the Zamindar family would be selected for the temporary charge of the management. This would mainly to render attachments of estates nominal than real. The Chief advantage in such a measure would be that the estate would be in the hands of one acquainted with and one having an interest in the improvement of the resources of the estate than a stranger who would have to acquire the knowledge of the estate.55

Ancient Zamindaris: Company’s Attitudes And Aspirations

Many of the Zamindaris in Masulipatnam region failed to live up to the expectations and aspirations of the Company in introducing the Permanent Settlement. When the Permanent Settlement
was concluded with the Zamindars in the region the Company thought that since the Peishkash payable by the Zamindars to the Company was fixed permanently, it would be an incentive for the Zamindars to improve the cultivation and increase the revenues of their estates and efficiently handle them in order to make a huge profit for themselves.

Contrary to the expectations of the Company the very assessment became a financial burden to many of the Zamindaris and this, coupled with factors like the extravagance of the Zamindars, family disputes, inefficient handling of the estates and other external factors, finally sounded a death knell to the Permanent Settlement in the region. Over a period of time the Zamindars had accumulated huge amounts of arrears and thus became indebted to the Company. Even those who paid their Kists regularly became slowly and heavily indebted to the Sahukars or creditors. In the first case, the Company had the right to sequester that part of the estate which would satisfy the arrears amount due to the Company and put up for sale. But in the second case, the Zamindar's estates slowly passed into the hands of the creditors.

With the failure of the Permanent Settlement, the Government began to think of introducing a different land revenue settlement in the region. So it decided slowly to acquire the estates for itself through sale. But as pointed out, some of the Zamindars became largely indebted to the creditors and these Zamindar-
ris were passing into the hands of the creditors. This, the Company thought, would defeat its purpose. So in order to acquire the estates and also to keep its hold on the Zamindars the Company passed a Regulation in 1821. The Regulation specified the government's decision and intention of maintaining the ancient families of distinction in these territories in their former dignity and affluence, by securing to them and their families the permanent possession of their Zamindaris and their territorial rights. This Regulation covered four major aspects concerning the Zamindars and their estates and were related to -

1. succession in ancient families.
2. mode of recovering the arrears of revenue and private debts from the Ancient Zamindaris.
3. relations between the creditors and the Zamindars.
4. the management of Police in such Zamindaris.

Francis believed that such moderate estates as require economy and confine the proprietors to live at home were better calculated for duration. The preserving the little Zamindaris entire would certainly be attended with many conveniences. He believed that for this a new law of inheritance would be required and the rule of primogeniture customarily held valid for the larger estates and not the smaller ones must be applied in reverse so that the great Zamindariss should be divided equally among all the sons and the small ones descend to the eldest on condition of supporting the younger children.
In the families of all Rajahs, Zamindars, Jagirdars, Poligars and Native Chiefs it had been usual not to divide the family property on the death of the head of the family. Generally the eldest son otherwise the next heir would succeed to the rank and possessions of the family except in cases where a contrary usage might have prevailed or where the head of the family with the consent of the government had made any other lawful arrangement for its disposal. The Company did recognize the law of succession in the Zamindaris and followed the existing custom as long as it suited the interests of the government.

But the Company did make certain exceptions and had reserved the right to choose as the Zamindaris were given under a contract. For instance, women were generally considered disqualified except in particular cases to succeed to a Zamindari. Because the government considered them weak and believed that as they had lived in seclusion, women of that rank were in general incapable of managing the estates efficiently. It was for this reason, that in the case of Divi, after the death of the Zamindar his son being a minor the Company appointed the father of the mother of the minor Zamindar as the guardian and manager of the estate, of course with the consent of the widow of the Zamindar.

The family disputes became a common feature in most of the Zamindaris over property issues. So the Company also recognized
the law that the Zamindar should give a reasonable share for the other members of the family in order to prevent disputes. Perhaps the Company did approve this measure as it would prevent law suits which continued for years and finally led to the impoverishment of the Zamindars. Besides these, all the state equipages, elephants, houses, furniture, arms and all family utensils, idols, books and jewels which were considered as essential articles to maintain the respectability of the Samsthan were provided. Though these involved an extravagant expenditure, the Company did allow the practice as they were necessary for the maintenance of the status of the Zamindars.

It was the intention of the government not to allow in future the sale of ancient Zamindaris for arrears of revenue. Where the Zamindar in such ancient Zamindaris might fail to pay the Permanent Peishkash the Collector should sequester the Zamindari or such part of it as might be necessary, with reference to the amount of the balance and take it under Circar management until the arrears were paid off. In such cases Zamindar would be considered as the nominal manager of the estate and the government would manage the estate on his behalf. Besides, the government would allow a suitable allowance for the maintenance of the family chargeable to the Zamindari.

Though it was the intention of the government to maintain the ancient families intact in their Zamindaris, when an individual holding the Zamindari failed in his engagements or in his
duties he would be considered to have forfeited his right to the Zamindari. In such cases his restoration or that of one of the members of the family to the Zamindari or the amount for their maintenance would entirely depend on the favour of the government and the government also had the right in such cases to alter the permanent Peishkash.

To prevent the Zamindaris or any part of the Zamindaris from passing into others hands the Company declared that all ancient Zamindaris for which no Permanent Sanads had been given, all Jagirs, service Inam lands and generally all territorial possessions attached to offices should not be saleable or transferable or in any way answerable for private debts of the Zamindars.

By this the Company aimed at two objects, one of not hurting the feelings of the Zamindars and also the people generally. Because sale of a Zamindari was a question of status to the Zamindar. By this measure many of the Zamindars for example the Zamindar of Charmahal as he ran into huge debts voluntarily petitioned to the Company to take up this Zamindari under the government management till such time that government dues were realized. The Zamindars it would seem were more interested in their titles and their status and position than of the far reaching consequences it would have once the Zamindari passed into the government hands. The other objective of gaining control of estates, in this way was achieved through a smooth process.
However this facility was not extended to all the Zamindars. The government made a distinction between the ancient Zamindaris and those Zamindars who had acquired the status under the Permanent Settlement. But what was not however very clear was who were the ancient Zamindars? What was the criteria of the government in distinguishing modern Zamindars from the ancient ones. Because there were several opinions in the official records, itself as to whether Masulipatnam Zamindars could be grouped under ancient Zamindars or not? But even if one makes a simple distinction between the two that is, the ancient Zamindars were those who held the Zamindaris from pre colonial times and the modern Zamindars were those created by the British under the Permanent Settlement certain questions are bound to arise. In Masulipatnam region even under the Permanent Settlement the Zamindaris were mostly retained within the family with one or two exceptions. The Haveli lands which were parcelled into proprietary estates were also bought by the same traditional local Zamindars. Thus there was little change in the composition of the Zamindari group even under the Company. In that case how were the modern Zamindars distinguished from the ancient ones?

The Company made it clear that the law of entail applied only to the ancient Zamindari families in which the office and the territorial rights had been hereditary. The mootahdars who had newly purchased the estates or the other landed rights were not covered by the law.
However one thing which comes out clearly was that in all these cases, the Company had the sole right to decide as to who would benefit from these privileges, and to whom to extend them. Service Inamdars and those holding other offices to which lands were attached, or heads of old families and other Zamindars would not enjoy any of these privileges. But even their service lands would not be liable to be sold for private debts. Whereas the lands of the ordinary Zamindars could come up for sale even for private debts.

The entail Zamindars were not liable to be arrested for any private debts or for any judgments in any civil units. But the amounts which may be put against any such Zamindars by the Collector should be recovered again by the collection in the same manner as arrears of revenue.

However the sale of any personal property of the Zamindars to recover such dues could be done. But the Zamindari itself should not be considered in any way answerable for the amount of such awards. The government declared that the sources of the public revenue could not be held answerable to an unlimited extent and for an unlimited time for private debts.

The Sahukars who might have lent money to Zamindars during the period their Zamindaris were held under the terms of the Permanent Sanads and were alienable for private debts were partly
encouraged to advance their money by means of recovery held out by the present regulations, by the eventual sale of such Zamindaris to satisfy decrees of courts.

It was true that Sahukars were perhaps equally ready to lend their money before the establishment of the courts. The creditors might have chiefly depended on the honour of the Zamindars or were tempted to risk their money by the exorbitant interest and bonus which they usually insisted upon.

But under this Regulation the Company specified that the Zamindaris were in some measure answerable for the private debts. But only for the debts which the Zamindars made during the period they held their Zamindars on the terms of the Permanent Settlement were to be recoverable in the same manner from the Collector. The Collector shall take the Zamindari under their management and pay the creditors the surplus collections from the Zamindari which might remain after realizing the public revenue and paying the Zamindars an amount for the maintenance of his family which would be fixed by the Collector.

Moreover the Company felt that the Collectors should assist the Sahukars in realizing their debts from the Zamindars. The Collector should try to settle the disputes between the two parties smoothly and in a private settlement avoiding the law suits which would take a long time and involve much expense and trouble to both the parties when there was any difficulty in the settle-
ment of the accounts in the process of the settlement between the two parties the Collector should refer the matter to the Panchayat. The amount of usurious interest and the bonus which the Zamindars in many cases paid on obtaining loans must be rejected by the government on the grounds of usury or at least reduce the amount due for interest to the lawful rate.

Keeping in view the high social status they enjoyed in the locality the Zamindars were exempted from attending the court in person. On their behalf the Company allowed the Zamindars to institute Vakils. These Vakils would represent the Zamindar in the courts from time to time whenever their presence was necessary in the court.

Another important field in which the ancient Zamindars were given freedom in the management of their internal affairs by the Company was the management of the police in such estates. The Company felt that the establishment of the police officers of the magistrate in the management of the ancient estates resulted in dissensions. The Company felt that the internal management of the estate should be left to the Zamindars themselves who they thought administered efficiently with the aid of their own people. By this measure the Company did try to please the Zamindars. Moreover on the part of the Company it was saved from the additional establishment of police which would incur a lot of expenditure. Section 58 of Regulation 11 of 1816 was intended in
this way to restrain the interference of the magistrate in the police of the ancient Zamindars. However the Board of Revenue felt that there should be certain simple rules to check the powers of the Rajahs and any abuse of authority by them, but without lowering their position. The Rajahs should afford all the aid and information to the magistrate in preserving peace and that they apprehend and send all offenders to the magistrate for action.

This Regulation had left a lot of authority in the hands of Zamindars. The cultivators position which was not clearly specified in the Permanent Settlement left that to be decided between the Zamindar and the cultivator thus leaving lot of authority in the hands of Zamindar. Having placed police and law and order in the Zamindari hands the Company left the cultivators virtually at the mercy of the Zamindars. The cultivator lost all hopes of law and was subdued. In the event of any oppression by the Zamindars they did not have any other channel to complain as police and internal management of the estates were in the hands of ancient families.

Thus the evidence clearly suggests that the Permanent Settlement which introduced for the first time a regular and systematic process in the revenue administration had a deep negative impact on the rural social structures. For example, the very principles which were introduced to guard the smooth running of the system ironically contributed to the failure of the system.
Another important consequence was the rise of a land market. However the argument that the settlement introduced a social transformation in the region was virtually untenable as can be seen especially in the consideration of the land market which emerged during this period.

LAND MARKET AND THE LAND LORDS

The process of change in rural India under British rule was many folded. Land was one of the most important and deeply affected variables of the agrarian world. British policies, especially those relating to land revenue impinged most dramatically on rural attitudes to land thus affecting its value and consequently creating a demand for it. Before the British took possession of the Circars a land market did not exist at all. The new revenue policy of the Company for the first time gave land a commodity status. The creation and sale of proprietary estates under the Permanent Settlement in the district of Masulipatnam brought land to the market on a commercial scale. This in course of time led to the development of land market with the distress sale of defaulting Zamindari estates.

Firstly, it is necessary to examine the emerging land market which was, however, in incipient stages of development in the district of Masulipatnam under the Company's rule. Secondly it is useful to debate the view that the colonial policies had
brought about revolutionary changes in the locality and through them the Company was able to transform the structure and economic base of the rural societies with reference to the social composition of the land owning groups in the region.

In the pre-colonial regimes there was little demand for land and consequently there was no real 'land market'. The limited evidence of land sales and transfers that we have under the pre-colonial regimes indicates that these were for a different purpose. For example, many inscriptions record several cases of sale and purchase of lands. The old tradition of kings purchasing lands from private individuals continued through the centuries. Kali Vishnuvardhana, the Eastern Chalukya king, purchased some land from a Brahmin for gold to grant it to a temple in a village situated in Nandigama taluk in Krishna District. There are many other such land sales by private individuals recorded in the inscriptions during the pre-colonial regimes.

There was plenty of arable land available and in fact it was labour and not land that was scarce during that period. For instance, one form of protest of cultivators against the Zamindars and their oppressions in Masulipatnam as in other parts of India, was to quit their lands. The cultivators usually migrated to neighbouring Zamindaris as they were assured of land for cultivation. This form of protest could only be effective in a land surplus situation. Again, the scarcity of labour was illustrated by the practice of carrying away the agricultural workers
of a rival Zamindar. Similarly, the status of the Zamindar was reflected not so much in the extent of his lands as in the number of the ryots whom he controlled.

Thus, while labour was perceived as being valuable, land itself had little value in the pre-colonial period. Even during the early phase of the Company rule, land did not acquire any value. There were many reasons for this. Firstly, the Company adopted the existing systems of revenue without many changes. As explained in the previous chapter this was partly because of the necessity of quickly creating a class of loyal supporters of the new political structure, and partly because of the need for caution in restructuring a strange and complex society. The preservation of the existing revenue and social structures meant, in turn, that there was no large disturbance in the social map of the region. Even when the Company was forced by political exigencies to quell some troublesome Zamindars, this was not necessarily followed by any radical rupture with previous socio-economic configurations. That is, land rarely, if ever, was put on `sale'.

However, it is necessary to know briefly the origins of the development of land market and also the revenue defaulter cases in the pre-colonial regimes. Till the introduction of the Permanent Settlement the primary means of the government for the realization of arrears of revenue were traditional coercive
measures such as imprisonment and torture. The Company also disapproved of the sale of estates for arrears of revenue in the early stages of its rule out of political considerations, since indiscriminate sales of Zamindaris in disregard of their antiquity and their place in the rural society were always attended with some degree of opposition. Besides, in the pre Permanent Settlement period the powers of Zamindars being many and militarily also as they were more powerful the Company for several reasons allowed the Zamindars to continue in their position.

One of the reasons for the lack of demand for land may be due to the fact that capital was kept away from land because trade with Europe on government loans was a more profitable investment, and that the land revenue still weighed too heavily upon the landlords and that the legal provisions against the defaulters were so dissuasive that the profits of agriculture remained too low.

It has been suggested that another reason for the lack of a land market was the heavy burden of land revenue and other taxes imposed by the pre-colonial regimes. This is debatable, because if it was the heaviness of the land revenue assessment that affected the land market, this situation was more true of the Company government. Under the Company government, especially after the Permanent Settlement of 1802, the land revenue collections were more systematized and more ruthlessly collected.
This, as we shall see, did not hinder the emergence of a land market. On the contrary, it stimulated the growth of a land market. The Permanent Settlement if it did no more, it was argued, did much by rendering land in the process of time a valuable property and a security for the realization of the revenue.

The formation of a land market resulted from several factors. The policy of the Company of putting the estates on public sale in the case of default was the main reason. Besides the inability of many Zamindars and more so of proprietors to cope with the increased revenue demand, the eagerness of the purchasers to acquire more land as land was a symbol of rural status and power. The revenue demand and the vigour of revenue collections of the Company under the Permanent Settlement was also the reason. However it was the famine of 1853 that quickened the process though the first lapse had occurred as early as 1813.

What critically affected the structures and patterns of land holding in the region, was the introduction of the Permanent Settlement of 1802, which marked a significant new departure. In the region the lands under the Company's rule consisted of both Zamindari and Haveli. Here too, in the Zamindari tracts, the existing Zamindars were confirmed in their previous positions and they were made the owners of the estates.

In Bengal and other provinces the land market slowly emerged with the defaulting estates coming for sale because of Company's
new revenue policy. In the Northern Circars the land market was in its incipient stages of growth by 1802 and 1803 itself when the Company had decided to create proprietary estates even in the Haveli lands. Thus with the proprietary estates coming on to sale in the Masulipatnam district for the first time, land had come to market in commercial terms.

While in early Nineteenth Century Bengal, land control remained in essence what it had been at all times, that is power over a stretch of land and its inhabitants, legitimized by such considerations as consequent antiquity of settlement, length of occupation and so on, the man who purchased land at a public sale after its legitimate owner had been forced to part with it was not unnaturally viewed as an intended and an usurper unless he managed to compel recognition by force, which possibly brought every body back to the more familiar situation of a conflict for power. Cases when defaulting Zamindars violently opposed their property being sold by order of the court were numerous after the passing of the Permanent Settlement.

The authors of the Permanent Settlement believed that the principle of natural selection was implicit in the law of the market: only the fittest must survive. Thomas Law had hoped that in this process the ignorant, extravagant or indigent would sell to the able, prudent or wealthy who would improve the lands. They hoped that the land market would produce a new pattern of
proprietorship based on enterprise rather than ancestry. In Masulipatnam also, no doubt the inefficient land lords were weeded out. But unfortunately as in the case of Bengal the land market did not produce a new set of enterprising proprietors. The estates as would be shown were bought by the same Zamindars and after a time most of them passed into the hands of the government.

The Zamindari and proprietary estates were often subdivided and were put up for sale. The Malakacherla estate was broken up and sold in six portions. Some of the portions were partly sold because of owner's private debts and some partly because of the government revenue demands. Of these one portion was bought by the government and the other two portions were bought by two individuals. These increasing subdivisions led to personal rivalries among the Zamindars. Due to the litigations and family feuds in the Zamindari families most of the estates were divided between or among the sons. For instance, Pedanah was divided into Pedanah and Pedapatnam between the two sons of the original Zamindar. Tumidi was divided into Tumidi and China Pundreka. These subdivisions were more in the Haveli lands when compared to the Zamindaris. The Haveli mootahs which were originally small were thus further subdivided.

Thus in the Haveli lands, the lands belonging to the Company Circa, proprietary estates were created parcelling out the land
into small mootahs. In Masulipatnam district the whole of the
Haveli land was parcelled out into 14 mootahs, their size varying
depending on the number of villages in each mootah. When com-
pared to the Zamindari estates these proprietary estates were
small, the smallest mootah being that of Kovali with four vil-
lages and the largest being Guduru with fifty two villages. This
disproportion in their size must have been due to the scattered
spatial distribution of Haveli lands in and around the towns
under the pre-colonial regimes. Table 7.5 shows list of Haveli
lands and the number of villages each estate consisted of which
gives us an idea of the position of proprietary estates in Masu-
lipatnam district.
In these estates the Company sought to create a new class of proprietors loyal to the British. As the amount of the revenue demand was fixed forever, the government expected a rapid rise in the value of the new estates, since any surplus income accruing from cultivation would now revert entirely to the land lords themselves instead of the state.

In the initial stages when the Haveli lands were put up for sale the regional Zamindars bought several of the proprietary estates at more than their original assessment. As possession of land was one of the rural status symbols the regional Zamindars vied with one another in purchasing these estates. Table 7.4 shows the sale price of the estates and the profit margin to the purchaser.
The proprietary estates as mentioned above were sold at such high rates because the Zamindars anticipated that they would make a profit. But in reality for many small estates the peishkash amount was fixed too high that is beyond the estimated figures of the Circuit Committee. For instance, for the mootahs of Vallur samut, Akulamannadu, Inuguduru and Six Islands the rates were too high.
Table: 7.5
Proposed Peishkash and actual Jumma on the Haveli Estates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mootahs</th>
<th>CC Estimate</th>
<th>Actual peishkash Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPs.</td>
<td>MPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallur Samut</td>
<td>1,795- 0- 0</td>
<td>21,897-12-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akulamannadu</td>
<td>2,455- 8- 0</td>
<td>2,712-10-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inuguduru</td>
<td>4,933- 0- 0</td>
<td>6,546-10-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Islands</td>
<td>9,166- 8- 0</td>
<td>9,208- 5-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statement of the Zamindaris and Mootahs created under Permanent Settlement, Miscellaneous Records, v.15, p.52.

For certain other mootahs the peishkash amount was less than the circuit committee estimates. For example, it was reported that the best and the lightest assessed Zamindari in Masulipatnam was Gundagolanu. Table 7.6 shows the circuit committee estimated jumma on the estates and the actual peishkash amount and also the amount of profit to the purchasers.

Table: 7.6
Sale of Some of the Haveli Estates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mootahs</th>
<th>CC Estimate</th>
<th>Peishkash Amount</th>
<th>Profit to Purchaser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eluru</td>
<td>27,722- 7- 6</td>
<td>23,042- 4- 0</td>
<td>4,679- 3- 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kovali</td>
<td>23,574-11- 0</td>
<td>18,906- 0-11</td>
<td>4,666-10- 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedapadu</td>
<td>20,189- 1- 3</td>
<td>16,379-14- 1</td>
<td>3,809- 3- 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: F.W. Morris, Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement Krishna district to H. Newill Director Revenue Settlement, Madras 25.2.1861, Report on the Assessment of the Masulipatnam portion of the Kistna district, 1861. pp.3-6.
When compared to the Haveli estates the profit to the purchaser in Zamindari estates was less. As the Zamindari estates were retained mostly in the family itself and perhaps as there was not much competition in these estates the value of existing Zamindari lands must have been less. Table 7.7 suggests that this was indeed the case.

Table 7.7
Profit margin to the purchaser in Zamindari Estates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Zamindaris</th>
<th>Peishkash</th>
<th>Net profit to Purchaser</th>
<th>Amount sale</th>
<th>How many folds the profit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Part of Charmahal</td>
<td>18252-2-1</td>
<td>24937-8-0</td>
<td>24957-8-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Part of Charmahal</td>
<td>12506-2-8</td>
<td>12377-8-0</td>
<td>12577-8-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Tumidi</td>
<td>12696-4-5</td>
<td>559-5-5</td>
<td>16099-12-5</td>
<td>44-15-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Chatrayi</td>
<td>104-4-0</td>
<td>1981-0-5</td>
<td>11200-0-0</td>
<td>5-10-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Vinukota</td>
<td>49-14-0</td>
<td>551-15-10</td>
<td>1450-0-0</td>
<td>4-5-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Gudivada</td>
<td>20-10-5</td>
<td>98-5-6</td>
<td>500-0-0</td>
<td>5-1-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The policy makers believed that when the quit rent was fixed, there could be no dearth of purchasers. Some of the Zamindars would lose their estates either for reasons of poverty and incapacity or from sheer distrust of the government and the
reluctance to come to a settlement. In all such cases, a transfer of landed property to moneyed people who were able to make improvements would be in some degree advantageous to government. The development of a land market was thus an important condition for the progress of their plan and the success of the improvements visualized by it.

The Company thought that the new settlement would improve the land revenue collections and also systematize the process. But the actual results were contrary to the expectations, and quite rapidly, several Zamindaris were put up for sale. The primary reason for this was the heavy revenue burden the Company regime imposed on the Zamindars, having calculated the permanent assessment on the basis of the land revenue figures of the previous thirteen years, without consideration of the real resources of the estates.

Thus, many of the estates were over assessed. In 1802, at the Permanent Settlement Rs. 1,21,870 was fixed on the estate of charmahal. The Zamindar Sobhanadri Rao refused to take up the Zamindari as the peishkash amount was too high. Therefore, the government leased out the Zamindari on account of the Zamindar. But some Zamindars, like Vasireddi of Chintapalli, who could exert some influence with the Company, could escape with a lighter assessment.
This excessive burden was rendered even more oppressive and detrimental because of the systematic and efficient manner of its collection. For instance, the peishkash on the Zamindari for Bezwada was fixed at Rs. 36,885. As the Zamindar died without any heirs, and as the Zamindar's widow was still a minor the Zamindari had passed under the management of the Court of Wards in 1831. By 1835, the wife of the Zamindar having attained majority assumed the charge of the estate. But arrears of revenue had accumulated though the estate was under the management of the Company to Rs. 1,49,769. Besides a considerable amount was due as debts to private individuals. So the estate was put up for sale in 1836. But the sale of the estate was postponed as the Zamindar of Nuzvidu, a relative to the widow agreed to pay the debts due to individuals and to the Company in installments.

However as the arrears continued to accumulate the estate was put up for sale again in 1846. As there were no competitors the estate was purchased by the government for Rs. 3000 and the Zamindar's widow was allowed to receive a monthly pension of Rs. 106 150. The Company's revenue management policies in the first decade of the nineteenth century, therefore, began to erode the traditional structures of power and status, demands, collapsed into economic disarray, and were thereupon put on sale to recover the arrears, thus leading to the development of a land market in the region.
This process was further accelerated by the new system the Company introduced, of putting parts of the estates for sale for recovery of dues. This was considered to be an improvement over the older system of sequestering the entire estate of a defaulting Zamindar. Under the new system, only a part of the estate of value equivalent to the amount due to the Company was required to be put on sale, the expectation being that the Zamindars would thereby be induced to improve the estates and pay the revenue regularly, for fear of losing the entire estate otherwise.

Where proprietors of land fell into arrears they would be liable to pay interest at the rate of 17% per month from the date when such arrears should have become due. The kists had to be paid on the fifteenth of the month. If discharges on or before the first ensuing month no interest would be charged. From the fifteenth day when the kist fell due and if it had appeared that the public revenue was wilfully withheld by the defaulter or that the arrears were ascribable to the neglect, misconduct or mismanagement of the Zamindars then the Board was competent to impose a penalty of 1% per month on the arrears in addition to the prescribed interest to be paid from the time when the arrears might have become due until they be charged or until the estates or farms of the defaulters might have become due until they be discharged or until the estates or farms of the defaulters might have attached in which case the additional penalty was to cease.
But one of the difficulties and inconvenience experienced under the Permanent Settlement, was experienced in dividing the estates, portions of which were exposed to sale either voluntarily by the proprietors or compulsorily by the government for the realization of arrears of revenue.

In dividing the estate put up for sale voluntarily the separation of the smallest share was often attended with as much trouble and expense as a new assessment of the whole village and from the clashing interests of the different parties concerned, many obstacles were interposed that sometimes a delay of years took place before a division could be finally accomplished.

In the second case it was always a matter of great difficulty to guard against disproportionate allotments of the jumma and thus sacrificing the public interests on the one hand or doing injustice to the defaulter on the other.

However, the sale of small portions of estates made it possible for a land market to emerge in this region, although it needs to be noted that for various reasons, the market did not grow as rapidly here, as it did in the Godavari district.

In the Southern district of Guntur, which had been brought under the Zamindari system at the beginning of the nineteenth century the Collector still noted as late as 1820 that no lands
of whatever description were usually bought and sold either publicly or by private contract. This was true of Masulipatnam district also. Pouchepadass was right in pointing out that such a case had become exceptional by that date. Even in the Northern Circars mainly in Godavari district the Zamindari estates were put up for auction as early as 1812. It was only in Guntur and Masulipatnam we have Collectors reporting that revenue was regularly paid for long years. The land had come to the market considerably only after 1830s. It would be interesting to study why only in Masulipatnam the case was different and what were the reasons.

As the estates and the portions of estates came on sale, they found ready buyers, who either saw in these new opportunities for maximizing their wealth and incomes, or were impelled by the traditional associations between land and rural power to acquire more land. Two important consequences of this were an increase in the size of some estates, and the creation of estates which were scattered across the region. For instance, Vasireddy, the Zamindar of Chintapalli, acquired possessions as far away as Masulipatnam also.

For example, the first lapse in Masulipatnam region occurred in 1812. The parganas of Korukollu and Bhittarzalli which were part of the Charmahal estate were sold by auction in liquidation of the balances. The two parganas were bought by the government.
for Rs. 93,000. It is interesting to note that the Company which paid such a huge amount for two parganas in 1812 took possession of the entire estate of Bezwada only for Rs. 3,000 in 1846. Perhaps in the beginning as the land was put up for sale for the first time there was much competition.

The sales of estates and the prices they fetched at the sales were related in a fairly complex fashion, perhaps because they were affected by several factors. It might be logical to assume that when there was a great demand for estates, prices would be high. Indeed the prices these estates fetched were quite high. In a fully developed open market prices are self regulated and vary according to supply and demand. But in the case of nineteenth century land market in Company possessions the prices were fixed depending on the arrears amount and sometimes it was either too low or too high because then land wa3 not generally recognized as a commodity.

What was the price situation in Masulipatnam district which was characterized by the existence of numerous other description of lands in addition to the Zamindari estates?

Apart from the sale of Zamindari and Haveli estates there was a great demand for different kinds of Inam lands. These lands which were grants by kings and other officials to private individuals were also sold to private individuals in Masulipatnam district. During the first half of the Nineteenth Century sixty
three such sales were recorded in the Zilla Court of Masulipatnam. However unlike the Zamindari estates they were not big and sometimes consisted of one or only two cutties of land. It is interesting to note that in the sale of different kinds of Inam lands both the Hindus and Muslims were involved. In some cases the Muslim Inam lands were purchased by the Hindus and the Inam lands of the Hindus were purchased by Muslims.

In the district of Masulipatnam the value that different descriptions of lands fetched to its original assessment ranged from 7 3/4 to 61,600 fold. The Charmahal Zamindari which was in two divisions was disposed of by public auction in Collector's Cutcherry on account of arrears and it was sold 17 folds its revenue which was considered a low rate. Generally the sale of Jagir and Mokasa villages which were rent free fetched considerably a superior rate. However sometimes even the Jagir, Mokasa or Inam lands fetched less prices. For example, kattubadi Inam lands were sold at only four folds and Lakhiraj lands were sold at six folds.

In the Masulipatnam district the value of land was chiefly to be ascribed to the authority both actual and nominal with which purchasers thereby became invested which no other activity gives. The actual authority was that which they as land holders possess in common with all Zamindars and the nominal authority was that assumed by every land holder in taking the title of
Rajah. The later consideration seemed to be the principal inducement to possess landed property.

However, among them prices varied depending on the fertility of the soil and their nearness to the irrigation sources. Besides these, the Zamindar’s name and his administration also counted. For instance, it was the lands of Vasireddi which had higher value than the other zamindari lands.

While the increasing prices of the estates put on sale indicated the growth of the land market, another crucial denominator of the new structures that were emerging as a result of these land transactions were the social composition of the buyers. The question of who the buyers were assumes critical importance in any discussion of the social consequences of the Permanent Settlement, especially because of the traditional assumption that the Settlement initiated a revolutionary transformation of rural society. Who then, was the buyer in Masulipatnam region?

Sometimes parts of the zamindari estates and proprietary ones were sold to private individuals for many reasons. Some of the estates changed hands twice or thrice before they were finally bought by the government. For instance, Vasantavada was originally bought by Toleti Ramarazu for Rs. 49,087. Soon after
wards it was privately sold to Kocherlakota Venkata Rayudu. For arrears of revenue when the estate came up for sale again it was bought by Bommadevara Naganna Naidu. Another example was that of Pedapatnam which formed a part of Pedanah. In 1824 it sold privately for Rs. 17,000. Sometimes the estates were bought for a high price. The Pedapatnam mootah was one such case. The excessive personal rivalries between the Zamindars was one of the factors for the high prices of the estates.

In 1821 the Company clearly specified its policy regarding the purchasing of the estates. Having specified its policy of acquiring the estates and introducing a uniform new revenue system throughout its territories, the Board placed discretionary authority in Collectors in buying the estates to defeat the artifices which would be resorted to for raising the price if it were known that all mootahs were to be bought on account of government.

As the estates both Zamindari and Proprietary were in heavy debts there were no immediate buyers. So the Company bought most of the estates at throw away prices. Table 7.8 shows the number of estates bought by the government and the prices it fetched.
Table: 7.8

Estates bought by the Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estates</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Price in Rs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedanah and Pedapatnam</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>11,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedapadu</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valavadam</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nidadavolu</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamidi</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Pundreka</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaldindi</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akulamannadu</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inuguduru</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Islands</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gudur</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Company made its objective clear in saying that their main objective was to recover possession of the mootahs and only a secondary object to obtain payment of arrears of revenue out of the price at which they might be sold. However, it did place certain restrictions. The Collectors were ordered not to purchase any mootah at more than its value and they ought not to be imposed upon by the schemes of fraudulent bidders, but with these...
exceptions all mootahs put up for sale should be purchased on account of government.

The estates especially the proprietary ones which were in large arrears of revenue to the government as mentioned above were bought by the government. As the Company's object was mainly to recover the estates from individuals, the government as soon as it took possession of the mootahs the balances due to the government were struck off. For instance, the balances due to government from Tumidi and China Pundreka mootahs amounted to Rs. 1,51,209. The entire amount was written off by the Company. Same was the case with Pedanah and Pedapatnam. The arrears amounting to Rs. 41,259 were written off in 1857. Others were Guduru (Rs. 19,594) and Pedapadu (Rs. 50,580). Perhaps this must have acted as an incentive in the worst cases to the zamindars to surrender their estates to the government.

But later on many of the estates reverted back to the government due to lack of purchasers. The estates which were attached to the government for arrears of revenue and put up for sale did not attract any buyers and remained in the hands of government. For instance, the estates of Vasireddi Ramanadha Babu, four taluks in Nandigama, Six Islands, Inuguduru, Akulamannadu, Kalindi, China Pundreka in the Tumedi estate of Suraneni Venkata Pathi Rao, Korukollu division in the Charmahal estates and three taluks in the Bezwada estate were put up for sale.
There were many conditions and regulations for buying the estates. Transfer or gifts of land was allowed and was recognized by the courts. A Zamindar or a proprietor of an estate had the liberty to transfer without the previous consent of the government to whomever he liked either by sale, gift or otherwise his proprietary right in the whole or in any part of his Zamindari. Where proprietors of land fell into arrears they would be liable to pay interest at the rate of $\frac{1}{2}$X per month when such arrears shall have become due. Always persons desirous of becom-
ing purchasers of land may not participate in the proceedings. They can depute authorized agents or Vakeels on their behalf. In the event of any purchase being made under a fictitious name the deposit made on account of such purchase will be liable to be forfeited to the government and the estate was to be resold.

Even in the purchase money 15% of it was required to be paid immediately after the sale and payment of the remaining amount could be done in one month's time. If any one failed to do it such estates were resold at the risk of the first purchaser. Purchasers of land were not to be held responsible for any arrears of revenue due to the government from the lands sold to them prior to the date of purchase unless it was otherwise stipulated in writing.

Europeans were not allowed directly or indirectly to participate in the purchase of land and in the event of any estate being purchased in participation with an European or a descendant of a European it would be liable to forfeiture to the government together with the deposit money.

The evidence of the records indicates very clearly that most of the Zamindari estates put on sale were purchased either by the same Zamindar or members of the families of the erstwhile Zamindars. For instance, in Masulipatnam district, the Zamindari estates of Devarakota, Part of Charmahal, Chintalapudi and Zammu- lavayi and Medurgutta estates were purchased by the original
Zamindars only. The Devarakota Zamindari was retained by its original Zamindar Erlagadda Ankenaidu and Charmahal by Kamadana Sobanadri Rao. Again in the district, we have many cases of estates being bought by sons or brothers of the previous Zamindars. For example the estates of Bezwada, Mylavaram, Munagala, Nuzividu and Zammulavayi estates were purchased by sons. In Masulipatnam district we find that there were no non familial buyers at all.

However there is some change in the owners of the Zamindari estates later on when they were put up for sale for recovery of arrears. For example, the Charmahal estate which consisted of two divisions and was under the possession of Sobanadri Rao purchased by Zamindars of Mylavaram and Bezwada, that is Sooraneni Lutchmarow and Venkata Narsanna Rao respectively. But in this case also it went out of the family possession but purchased by the other regional Zamindars.

From this, we may quite safely conclude that the sale of estates in the early years at any rate, did not precipitate any radical change in the social composition of the rural elites. What is particularly striking is that even when the purchaser was an outsider, that is, one not directly related by kinship ties to the erstwhile Zamindars, he was invariably another Zamindar of the region.
What was the situation in the so called proprietary estates? These estates which were fourteen in number were created out of the Haveli lands. These proprietary estates were purchased by the Zamindars of Guntur. For instance, the Haveli lands of Kondapalli, Akulamannadu, Inuguduru, six Islands and Nizampatnam were purchased by the Guntur Zamindar Vasireddi Venkatadri Naidu. Pedanah was purchased by Erlagadda Nageswara Naidu and Vallur Samut and Gundur parganas were bought by Bommadevaram Naganna who alone was an outsider out of 14 estates put on sale in Masulipatnam seven were purchased by Vasireddi the Zamindar of Chintapalli.

These estates were purchased by Vasireddi Zamindar very cheaply except the Kondapalli mootah. Till 1816 the estate's management seemed to be remunerative. But with the death of the original Zamindar, Vasireddi Venkatadri Naidu litigations commenced between his two adopted sons leading to unsettled management. As the arrears accumulated the estates were bought in by the government in 1849. The government bought the mootah of Akulamannadu for Rs.500 and Inuguduru and six islands were bought for Rs. 1,000 each whereas the purchaser of Vallur Samut paid three times the peishkash amount. The annual peishkash amount on the estate was MPs.5454-22-73 and estate was sold for MPs 16000-0-0. As in the case of other estates the prices of these estates were merely nominal and there was no one to bid against the government when the estates were burdened with heavy debts.
Table: 7.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estates</th>
<th>Annual Peishkash</th>
<th>Purchased for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MP-F-C</td>
<td>MP-F-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kondapalli</td>
<td>4,090-38-15</td>
<td>8,600-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akulamannadu</td>
<td>672-50-44</td>
<td>400-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inuguduru</td>
<td>1,636-15-22</td>
<td>950-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Islands</td>
<td>2,272-50-44</td>
<td>2,225-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizampatnam</td>
<td>16,000-0-0</td>
<td>11,500-0-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: R.J.Porter, Collector Masulipatnam district to W.H.Bayley Secretary to BOR, 16.7.1850, PBOR, p.10901.

The purchase of the proprietary estates by the regional Zamindars themselves raises certain questions? Why was it that there were not many outsiders?

One major reason which perhaps dissuaded ‘the outside’ bidders from attending the public auctions was that it was often difficult for a purchaser to take possession of the land he had bought unless he had rural power and was as powerful as the Zamindars. But in case of the Havell estates as they were not geographically well situated this must have dissuaded many outsiders.
One major reason which dissuaded bidders from attending the public auctions was that it was often difficult for a purchaser to take possession of the land he had bought. Perhaps this was one of the reasons why there were not many outside purchasers and only regional Zamindars bought the estates. Even then unless the purchaser was a big one powerful Zamindar it was difficult to assert his new right in the estate that too as the estates were sold in parts it was difficult even to maintain their distinction with overlapping.

From the statistics mentioned above, it is clear that there was some redistribution of rural power, in the sense that there was a blurring of the traditional boundaries, with Zamindars outside the Masulipatnam region seizing the new opportunities to acquire estates there. Again, however, what is significant here is not so much the spatial redistribution of rural wealth important as it was but the fact that the new purchasers were old Zamindars.

Thus the Permanent Settlement introduced in Masulipatnam region in 1802 was not entirely new. It formalized various existing arrangements. But What the Permanent Settlement failed to do, however, was to regulate the relations between the peasant and the Zamindar, and this was to have long term consequences.

The Permanent Settlement did not fulfill all the expectations of the Company. One expectation that was indeed satisfied
was the emergence of a land market in the region. Though the formation of a land market was the result of many factors, the Company's policy of putting revenue defaulting estates on sale was the single most important factor. Indeed, the Company itself had strongly believed that because of the Permanent Settlement, inefficient landlords would be weeded out and that a new land owning class would emerge based on enterprise rather than ancestry.

But the evidence from the Masulipatnam region suggests that most of the Zamindari estates put on sale were purchased either by the same Zamindar or by members of the families of erstwhile Zamindars. With the exception of one or two cases, there were no non familial buyers in Masulipatnam region at all. What is particularly striking is that even when the purchaser was an outsider, that is one not related by kinship ties to the erstwhile Zamindar, he was invariably another traditional Zamindar. Thus, it can be argued that the sale of estates in the early years of the Company's rule did not precipitate any radical change in the social composition of the rural estates. Obviously, the Company quickly recognized the vital necessity of supporting the Zamindari system so that it could act as a prop for the new state.
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