

AGRARIAN UNREST IN RAIBAREILY 'HISTORY FROM BELOW'

Dr. Munendra Singh*

Recently the peasant studies are being acknowledged among the scholars as the peasants and their struggles were the politically, socially, economically, and ideologically motivated against the colonial government. The peasant struggles expanded in the whole country against the British rule. Similarly, Raibareilly district, part of Oudh Province, had also crucial place in the history of peasant struggles. The unique feature of Raibareilly district was the Taluqdars system, which came into effect after the annexation of Oudh, 1856. This taluqdari system emerged from the traditional and dynastic landlordism and has no comparison in any other part of the country. In the last phase of 18th century the relation between peasants and taluqadars were changed rapidly and type of contradictions and internal conflicts were developed. The severity of these conflicts became more complex because of the British policy, which led to begin the resistance of the peasant's revolts in the various places in the districts. The central theme of this paper to examine the various questions regarding the peasant revolt in Raibareilly; such as nature of peasant revolt, socio-economic background of the revolt, point out the nature of local leadership; and lastly the distinct cases of sporadic resistance to convert into the mass movement. This paper also points out the varied information about the role of different caste, religion, and impact of First World War on the peasant revolt in Raibareilly.

Taluqdari framework

The East India Company annexed the Oudh province in 13 February 1856¹. The two questions were raised before the British East India Company. Firstly, the question of land revenue settlement and secondly, what should be the company's policy towards the taluqadars as they have been the influential class since the Mughal.² The person who was the head of the taluqa (group of villages) called the taluqadar.³ They have been customarily involved in the function of land revenue collection since the Mughal period.⁴ Under the Mughal government, they performed their work properly 'but as

* Assistant Professor, Department of History, Lovely Professional University, Phagwara, Punjab

the Mughal authority declined, they declared themselves as the head of that area.⁵ The taluqadars was the two types; one who was ancestral chief belong to the Rajput's clans; other who attained this status by the corruption and hypocritical methods.⁶ The Nawab Sadat Ali Khan ascended the throne in the last phase of 18th century and tried to make the direct contact to the villages' occupant for the revenue collection by ignoring the dominance of taluqadars in the administration.⁷ Nawab introduced this policy not for the betterment of Villages, but maintaining his position strong over the taluqadars as they achieved the huge amount of revenue than the Petty Zamindari.⁸ Until 1856, the Nawab lost nearly all control on him and the taluqadars, who engaged in the function of revenue collection, continuously obtained the prominence in Oudh society by the extreme revenue collection from the peasants.⁹ Moreland described the taluqdar's strength in the following words-

“In the time of anarchy when the distinction between raja and robber was little more than verbal, one of the easiest path to successful career was to secure the position of Zamindars.....a raja, or collector, or even a robber without other qualifications, might make himself forcibly the Zamindars of one or more villages by the simple means of harrying the cultivators till they submitted , in order to avoid the danger, should submit voluntarily to the control of any neighbor sufficiently powerful to protest them against the rest”.¹⁰

The East Indian Company determined to get the solution of the land revenue problem in Oudh with the help of two different views. The first settlement was a little supportive to the Villagers while the other, because of the Mutiny, was in favor of the taluqadars.¹¹ The Lord Canning, the governor general of India, accepted the failure of the previous settlement and gave suggestion in this word:

“We must work downwards. If we work upwards, elevating the village proprietors... we should succeed in nothing but in sowing dissension between the two classes of lords and cultivators of the soil, making discontented subjects of the first and getting little gratitude from the second.”¹²

Another British officer James Outram, the chief commissioner of Lucknow put his opinion about the land settlement before governor general in about the weakness of taluqdari settlement and gave his remarks about it-

“The system of settlement with the so called village proprietors will not answer at present in Oudh. These men have no influence and weight to aid us in restoring order. I see no prospect of restoring the old taluqdari system. The taluqadars have both the power and influence to exercise either for or against us. The village proprietors have neither”.¹³

The government therefore regarded them as the natural leaders of the people and left the villagers of Raibareily under their control and they came out as strong class of society.

Raibareily, the south-eastern District of the Lucknow Division, United Provinces, lying north-east of the Ganges, between 25,49' and 26,36' N. and 80, 41' and 81, 34' E., with an area of 1,748 square miles. In shape, it resembles a segment of a circle with the Ganges as the chord. Unao bound it on the north-west; on the north by Lucknow and BaraBanki; on the east by Sultanpur and Pratapgarh; and on the south-west by the Ganges, which divides it from Fatehpur. There are four tehsils—Raibareily, Dalmau, Maharajganj, and Salon.¹⁴ In thesecond summary settlement, taluqadars got the legal and unrestricted rights “Sanads’ on land and now their status become more consolidated in villages.¹⁵The Sanads were also granted full proprietary rightsto the taluqadars with obligation to promote agricultural prosperity.¹⁶With the help of sanads, the extent of the taluqadars area amplified and covered only little over three-fifth of the malguzari or revenue area in Oudh as whole.¹⁷In the Raibareily district, it was the 66 % of the total land.¹⁸As the conclusion of the settlement 1872 of the 1482 villages of the district, 1029 were held by the taluqadars and only 69 of these had sub settlement.¹⁹

The taluqadars tenure in the Raibareili in the respect of both extent and strength was perhaps the most entrenched and because of this, the status and wealth of the taluqadars varied enormously.²⁰ Now the hierarchy of the agrarian set up now comprised 1- taluqadar, proprietors 2- Zamindars, subs proprietors 3- Pukthidars, under proprietors 4- occupancy, tenants 5 tenants – at will.²¹The structures of tenants in these districts were not uniform in the all places. The majority among the

tenants were poor. Rent wise, 57.61% of the tenants paid the Re 1 and Rs. 24, 26.91% paid between Rs. 50 to 99, and 2.4% paid above Rs. 100. Only 3.63 of the total tenants came under the category of secured tenants.²² Out of the 80,894 agricultural laborers, 34,771 were male and 46,123 female. On the other hand, there were 62 taluqadars out of which 2 paid more than one lakh as land revenue, 2 between Rs. 50,000 to one lakh, 8 between Rs.25, 000 to 40,000 and 50 below Rs 25,000.²³

The land classification in was deciding by the caste, the 66.08 per cent land was held by Thakurs; 6.06 by Brahmans, 10.05 by Muslims; 3.59 by Sikhs and 3.05 by Kayasthas. What remains was held by other castes. As regards cultivation, Thakurs cultivate the largest area amounting to 18.0 per cent of the total; Ahirs come next with 16.1 per cent, closely followed by Brahmans at 15.6 per cent. Then come Pasis, Kurmis and Lodhis in that order. Murais and Kachhis together cultivate 5.8 Per cent and Muharnadans 5.1 Per cent.²⁴ Thakurs and Brahmans, both are privileged class and indifferent from the ordinary farmers, cultivate one-third of the district, in the matters of rent.²⁵

The taluqadars used the various oppressive methods for exploitation of the tenants, in which one method was instrument of ejection.²⁶ The primary motive of the ejection was to bring the tenants to terms rather than to eject them. Evictions followed mainly in those cases where the tenants refused to agree to the terms of their landlords. On enquiry, it was found in Raibareilly, out of the 3506 notices issued, 1153 tenants remained at enhanced rent ranging between 10 to 37 percentages.²⁷ If the tenants was good cultivator and frugal person, his rent was raised.²⁸

The practice of Nazarana and Beshi were other methods. The tenants had to pay some extra money as Nazarana, besides paying the normal rent for securing holdings and for retaining, them, and taluqadars pressurize the tenants for paying the higher Nazarana and abwabas. In cases these demands were not met, the tenants were ejected from the holdings.²⁹ In the Raibareilly districts ejection notices continuously increased from the 1918-19 to 1920-21.³⁰ The Beshi system was the absence of the rents receipts. This system was creation of taluqadars under which they charged twice or thrice of the annual rent.³¹ The Pandit Janardhan Joshi, Deputy Collector of Raibareilly wrote:-

“In one estate out of a rental of Rs.77, 000, Rs.9, 500 were concealed. In another estates Rs. 13,000 out of Rs.32, 000. If the Karinda has to collect Rs. 13000 without receipts, why should he not collect Rs. 18,000? If the tenants revolts against this rotten system, what wonder is there”.³²

The next cruelty of the taluqadars oppression is exposed in the practice of Murdafaroshi (selling of the corpses). After the death of the tenants, his holding was let out at enhanced rents to the higher bidder. That is why this is called as Murdafaroshi.³³ The worst part of this wicked transaction was an open bid for the holdings in the market to enable the landlords to maximize his gain. V.N.Metha wrote about this system:-

“People describe to me that a new kind of the Mahabrahman has come into being whose one object is to pray for an epidemic so that he may have a rich harvest of Murdafaroshi fees and this is the Zamindars. Before the ashes are cold on the pyre this Mahabrahman has to be satisfied”.³⁴

Eviction and Nazarana were not only weapons used to squeeze the tenantry. Various kinds of the cesses were imposed by the landlord. Gorawan was a cess imposed by the taluqadars for the purchase of estates horses. The amount was levied at the rate of 2 annas a rupee on the rent, 2 annas per bigha or in lump sums up to a maximum of Rs. 2. A common practice prevalent in some estates was to compel the tenants to purchase them whether or not they were willing.³⁵ The visit of the landlord to the village was also used to extort money from the tenants. Such practice in Oudh was known as Nazar Daura.³⁶ In olden days, such offerings were regarded as sign of honor. However, later it was charged without the taluqadars having toured the villages. When the taluqadars assumed the titles of Raja, the tenants had to offer him some money.³⁷ The tenants were supposed to provide one to three basket of the bhusa to the landlords in the Rabi seasons.³⁸ Those tenants who grew sugarcane were charged Re.1 and four annas per bigha rent to the landlords.³⁹ More ever, as the thorns, bushes, and woods were taken from the taluqadars to protect the crops or to light the fire to make gur, taluqadars claimed an extra premium.⁴⁰ Whenever that government’s official visited in the taluqadars estates, the tenants were made to look after their comforts and supply the bhusa, ghee, milk for their consumption.⁴¹ In the newspaper Prem, it was mentioned:-

“Official on the tour generally wastes their time in shooting and do not consider about the peasants. The peons accompanying the official take away the crops and other goods”.⁴²

The Sawak system, which was the concrete proof of people's indebtedness. Any person belonging to chamar, Kori, Kurmi and Lodhi caste who received an advance sum of money from a rich farmer, landlord, or a mahajans became a bond labour until he repaid the advances.⁴³ According to the W.C.Bennett,

“At present the only motive for entering into contract is want of food, and that this is increasing motive, is shown increasing numbers of Sawak”.⁴⁴

An increase in rents made the tenantry dependent more and more on the village banias or mahajans. According to the pioneer, “the wealth and power of the bania have been increasing since establishment of the British rule”. Most of the landlords lent the money to their tenants on interest and make them indebted tenantry”.⁴⁵ In Raibareilly district the in 1878 the 70 percentage tenants was indebted and number was same until 1882-83.⁴⁶

The price rise of essential commodities was another method that responsible for the tension in the Raibareilly. A general assumption is that a rise in the price of agricultural products is beneficial to the cultivator. However, the real benefit got by the Mahajans, landlords, and rich cultivator and majority of tenants were indebted to mahajans.⁴⁷ The cultivators were disappointed by these systems and tried to improve their situation by organizing themselves in the Kisan Sabha.

Organized Act “Kisan Sabha”

The two-peasant organizations were working in the Raibareilly district whose origin was distinct. One was from the below and other was from the above. The peasant organization from the above for drawing the government's attention to various forms of agrarian discontent then prevalent, and this was overtly political.⁴⁸ The other process through which Kisan sabha came into being was the results of the grassroots peasant activity and was formed under the local leadership.⁴⁹ The first sign of the organized peasant activity were noticed in Rure at Amargarh estates of Pratapgarh district.⁵⁰ The main responsible person was Jhinguri Singh and Sehdev Singh.⁵¹ The Kisan sabha soon became a centre of peasant activity and began to spread out into

the other districts as well. Towards the end of the October 1920, Kisan sabha were formed in Rasulpur and Arkha two village of the Raibareli districts.⁵²

The Kisan sabha movement in above was thus born at Allahabad.⁵³ The first meeting of the U.P. Kisan sabha was held on 11 February 1918 at the Triveni ghats Allahabad. Pt. Kedar Nath of Raibareily presided over the meetings.⁵⁴ Under the leadership of the Allahabad UP Kisan Sabha began to spread out into various districts. Within the, by June 1919, at least 450 branches sabhas had been formed in 173 tehsil.⁵⁵ These sabha, established at village and tehsil level, were different from the kind of sabha at Arkha, which had not been created from above level.⁵⁶ Now the Kisan from the above and below met together. However, in the year 1921 the new phase of peasant activities were began in the various places in Raibareli district.

Peasant's Activities in Raibareily

The first incident in the massive agrarian upsurge took place in 2 January 1921, when the crops belonging to the Sardar Nihal Singh were destroyed by the large crowd at Aundu, Village under police Station Jagatpur.⁵⁷ On the 3 January, crops belonging to taluqadars Ram Pratap Singh of Chichandi were destroyed.⁵⁸ On the 5 January 1921 village Chandanian, or Chandanian. It was located in the pargana of Dalmau and Rae Bareilly.⁵⁹ The Thakurain Sheoraj Kunwar was the owner of the estates and the village Chandanian, a part of the estates was administered by the by Thakur Tribhuvan Bahadur Singh.⁶⁰ Near about the 3000 men assembled at the house of the Thakur Tribhuvan Bahadur on 5 January 1921.⁶¹ The main component of this crowd was peasants and the procession was led by the Baba Janki Das, Baba Badri Narayan Singh and Amol, a Brahman.⁶² The two contradictory questions rose here about the gatherings of peasants. In the pioneer newspaper it was given that the Kisan were invited by the taluqadars self to listen their problem."⁶³ According to the official version, "the house of the taluqadar Tribhuvan Singh was taken into custody by the crowd of peasants and, things would have been different if the police had not been reaching on time".⁶⁴ It is difficult to say anything about this event and what was the exact reason behind this gathering but the demands of the gathered peasants were not altogether simple. They demanded exemption from ejection, money and "the turning out of a prostitute in the Taluqdar's keeping named Achhijan".⁶⁵ Baba Janaki Das was charged for extorting the five guineas and some gold rings from the taluqdar's house and were transferred to the Lucknow jail.⁶⁶

At Salon, on 8 January, eight men, mostly panches and sarpanches of the local panchayats were arrested for defying the authorities and creating conditions that were not altogether favorable for a peaceful administration.⁶⁷ Among these men was one Shah Naim Ata, who, it was reported, had styled himself the king of Salon. A report from Rae Bareli dated 11 January stated,

“Shah Naim Ata, King-designate of Salon, arrived by ekka this evening and apologized to the deputy commissioner, stating that he had acted under compulsion and will in future assist Government with his disciples”.⁶⁸ This episode showed that how the Kisan leader challenged the British raj by setting up his kingdom. British officer Sleeman described this event in his word

“At Salon resides a holy mahommedan, Shah Puna Ata, who is looked up to, with great reverence, by both mahommedan and Hindus, for the sanctity of his character and that of his ancestors, who sat upon the some religious throne. He gets from the King of Oude twelve villages, rent free, in perpetuity; and they are said to yield him twenty five thousand rupees a year, with which he provides for his family and for needy travellers and pilgrims”.⁶⁹

It is evident; therefore, that Shah Naim Ata was a descendant of a former muafidar, or revenue-free tenure holder. By the beginning of the 20th century, this land had slowly inched out of the hands of the trustees of the dargah. Shah Naim Ata was the Sajjadah Nashin of this dargah. In Kisan memory, the benevolence of Shah Naim Ata's ancestors was very much alive. What appeared, therefore, to be the claim of a village idiot, was in fact the swansong of a traditional charitable institution that could not survive the ravages of a contract society”.⁷⁰

THE RIOT AT FURSATGANJ BAZAAR

Fursatganj was a small bazaar in Ilaqa Nasirabad of tehsil Salon. On 6 January, rumors reached the deputy commissioner at Rae Bareli, that some "miscreants" intended to loot the bazaar. The deputy commissioner directed the sub divisional officer to take precautions, and dispatched a force of armed police, "consisting of one sub-inspector, one head constable, and ten armed constables to the bazaar."⁷¹ From about two in the afternoon crowds began to swell, and in spite of the persuasion of the officer on duty, refused to return to their homes. Armed with lathis, axes,

spears and bricks, the crowd stubbornly resisted the threats of the administration with cries of "Jai." The story can best be told in the words of the sub divisional officer himself.⁷²

“In my opinion, the mob swelled to about eight or ten thousand and rushed into some houses and shops. They broke open the locks and began to plunder and riot. To prevent them, I with the guard reached at once near the shops. However, the mob rushed in upon us shouting 'Jai', 'Jai' and crying 'kill them, burn them and take away their guns. Scores of brickbats and lathis were thrown at us all. For the safety of our arms and us and for terrifying the mob, I ordered the guard to fix their bayonets and to open their cartridge bundles. This had no effect on the crowd; on the contrary, they began to make fun of us. Eventually I ordered the guard to fire in the air in order that the mob might disperse. However, the mob raised a cry, 'take away their guns, they are but few and can do nothing'. Forty-seven buckshot cartridges and five revolver bullets brought the rioters to disperse, all except the three wounded and four killed”.⁷³

According to the official as they described the events in these words, “the indiscriminate looting of village bazaars I would ascribe to badmashi pure and simple.’. Describing all such instances he observed: "It has been confined almost entirely to Salon and Nasirabad, which have always had more than their fair share of unruly Pasis”.⁷⁴ However, if we look at some of the names of the leaders of the crowd at Fursatganj, we get another picture. When the sub divisional officer was coaxing the crowd to return, he would direct his appeal to the leaders of the gathered peasants whom he mentions by name: "Ram Avtar, Ram Narain of village Potni, Kedar Brahman of village Katwar Mau, Kali Gujar of village Pura Kalu, and Ausan Brahman of village Potni”.⁷⁵ Just as it was not simply the “criminal tribe," it was not a one caste or low caste protest. The demands of the crowd at Fursatganj suggest that here, unlike at Chandanian or at Salon, the anger of the crowd was directed largely at the banias. "Sometimes they said that the banias have made heavy profits, we should avenge ourselves upon them. Sometimes they complained about the dearness of grain and cloth and said that all the shopkeepers should at once be ordered to sell cloth at four annas per yard and flour at eight seers per rupee”.⁷⁶

THE RIOT AT MUNSHIGANJ

The most prominent among the various instances of violence was Munshiganj on 7 January, less because of the "destructive nature of these riots and more because of the fact that the local political leaders of Rae Bareilly and Allahabad were also, however marginally, involved. In the same way as at Fursatganj, crowds began to collect at the Munshiganj Bridge, three miles from the heart of Rae Bareilly town, and by about two in the afternoon, numbered 10,000. They were all kisans who were under the impression that Ram Chandra had been arrested at Chandanian, and as they had been able to secure his release from the Pratapgarh jail in September 1920, they were adamant to try again.⁷⁷ Motivated by this idea, and swept along in the tide of resentment against taluqdari highhandedness, the kisans refused to budge from the bridge. They tried once or twice to rush the bridge but were pushed back by the mounted police.⁷⁸ Finally by late afternoon it was possible to push the crowds back by half a mile or so.⁷⁹ Then, suddenly, a few shots were fired and when the crowds began to throw kankas (stones) at the police, firing was continued for about five minutes.⁸⁰ Fifty-six, buckshot cartridges later, the crowds finally dispersed.⁸¹ Over 600 men were rounded up and put in jail.⁸² About ten to fourteen kisans died and many more were wounded.⁸³

The principal leader of the crowds at Munshiganj was a fakir named -Rahmat Ali Shah, who . . . pretended to make himself useful in helping the crowd to move back, but really was doing his best to detain them".⁸⁴ Another leader of the crowds was a sadhu, who had "a spear in his hand and was exciting the crowd".⁸⁵ He was later found to be a "registered criminal Pasi named Ram Ghulam".⁸⁶ Similarly, many of the leaders "appeared to be marked by distinguishing colours in their turbans".⁸⁷

The crowds had assembled to free their leader, and again, as at Fursatganj, there were either many Pasis or fakirs and sadhus among them.⁸⁸ It is small wonder that fakirs, sadhus and babas should have figured so prominently in the Kisan agitation.

THE SEHGAON PACHHIGNAON FEUD

In the village of Sehgaon Pachhimgaon in the Rae Bareilly district, there was a small taluqadar, Chaudhri Gauri Shankar. He was a Kurmi and he held three villages and one Patti in pargana Kumhrawan. This small estate had in fact emerged as the result of a former bhaiachara holding of Kurmi co-sharers being transformed into a single zamindari of which Gauri Shankar Kurmi

was the owner.⁸⁹ In Sehgaon Pachhingaon particularly, the co-sharers who lost their ownership rights became mere tenants-at-will, and were not recognized as fixed rate or ex-proprietary tenants.⁹⁰ From around 22 January, there had been disturbances in the village when "the villagers had turned loose the Zamindar's cattle in his sugarcane".⁹¹ The peasantry was agitated, having heard the: news of the riots in the preceding three weeks, and this was made use of by Ram Avtar and Salik, "the Nose less," who, on a bazaar day, incited the peasants against the landholder.⁹² When the police intervened, "the crowd attacked the police with lathis and spears. One constable was killed by a lathi blow, which smashed the back of his skull. The others retired two or three hundred yards using their guns, but apparently without much effect".⁹³ The "ringleaders" were finally arrested. In this riot at Sehgaon, therefore, an essentially tenant agitation was enmeshed in the web of personal enmities arising from a property dispute and thus the spark was lit.⁹⁴

THE SIEGE AT KARHAIYA BAZAAR

Not all the incidents involving violence were directed against landlords. At Karhaiya, a small bazaar on the border of Rae Bareli and Pratapgarh districts, a riot occurred that might not have developed as it did, had it not been for the intervention of the police, after which the agitation became more anti-police than anti-landlord. The first spurt of riots that had lit the prairie fire had been crushed, four "agitators" had been delivering, "objectionable 'speeches" to gatherings at a village, Ratason, in police circle Salon, and at Karhaiya.⁹⁵ Three of them, Brijpal Singh, Surajpal Singh, and Gangadin Brahman belonged to a village, Mandiwan, in Pratapgarh, while the fourth, Jhankoo Singh to a village, Jodha, in Salon. They were to address a meeting at Karhaiya when the administration issued orders "prohibiting speeches at the meeting" scheduled for 20 March, and for the arrest of the "four itinerant agitators".⁹⁶ When the police attempted to arrest Brijpal Singh and Jhankoo Singh on the 20th afternoon, they were rescued by the crowd after a pitched battle with the police, in whom brickbats and buckshot were exchanged".⁹⁷ The police constables took refuge in a widowed taluqdarin's house, by, which time the "mob" had "swelled to large numbers and were threatening to kill the police".⁹⁸ By nightfall

The house was surrounded by a yelling mob of several thousand people. On arrival, we attempted to reason with the leaders but were forced to give up arguments as hopeless. The crowd was ordered to disperse by the Deputy Commissioner, whereupon the leaders promptly commanded the men to remain under penalty of incurring the sin of eating 10 cows

or 10 pigs. During the night, we were regaled with a flood of eloquence on the part of the leaders. Brijpal Singh who was under the influence of bhang was continually exciting the passions of the crowd and telling them not to be afraid of machine guns. Apparently two men had been killed in the firing and their bodies were kept in a prominent position in the crowd and as each detachment of villagers arrived upon the scene they were forced to gaze upon the unfortunate victims of the riot and were told that 15 other corpses of their brethren had been thrown clown a well in the village. The night passed in this manner and at daybreak, the entrance to the courtyard of the house was barricaded by the mob who said that the motors should not be allowed to pass out.⁹⁹

By 25 March, twenty men had been arrested and proceedings ordered against them. Of these six were Thakurs, five Brahmans, five Kurmis, one Muslim fakir, one Chamar and two Hajjams (nais or barbers)¹⁰⁰. One such soldier was Brijpal Singh who claimed to be an ex-sepoy of the ninth Bhopal Infantry, and "obviously had great control over the crowd which was not lacking in a certain degree of military discipline".¹⁰¹ Thus, the total period of his imprisonment was four years with the three-month's solidarity confinement. Further, on the completion of the term of his imprisonment, Brijpal Singh was asked to execute the bond of Rs.100 with the security of Rs.100 for keeping the peace for one year after expiry of the last sentence.¹⁰²

Conclusion—

Peasant Revolt in the Raibareily was practiced in colonial set up by the taluqadars, with the overt and covert support of an Imperial Government. The taluqadars came to be recognized by the British Government as an important means of upholding the economic and political structure of imperial rule. The peasant revolt rose at the time when the oppression and exploitation of hapless peasantry were at their maximum. The Kisan began the movement against these illegal practices of the taluqadars and formed the Kisan Sabha at Pratapgarh. The another Kisan sabha was working at Raibareily, supported by the leaders of national politics. The incidents during the peasant upsurge come in the category of popular rising rather than being dubbed as riots. There were no law to check these oppressive method and peasant exploitation. The peasant thus acted on their own, the looting of cloth and grain merchants on their refusal to lower the prices, the bania and mahajans being accused of making heavy profits at cost of peasantry, the looting taluqadars stores, cutting of crops and the beating them were modes of the peasant protest. Thus

the movement was directed against all the oppressive social forces and completely independent from the Kisan Sabha from the above and from below, and this without any help from the leaders of the non-cooperation movement as was the case in some other instances.

Bibliography

- 1 – Moreland .W.H, “The Revenue Administration of United Province “, Allahabad , 1911, p.5
- 2 - Ibid
- 3 - Gubbins. M.R., “The Mutinies in Oudh, New Delhi,1978,p.61
- 4 - Moreland ,op.cit., p.25
- 5 - Imperial Gazetteer of India ,Oxford ,1907,vol-IV, p.206
- 6 - Garden. H.C, “The Garden of India, 1880, Lucknow ,1973, Vol.-I, P.7
- 7 - Gubbins ,op.cit, p.62
- 8 - Irwin , op.cit , Vol.2 , p.160
- 9 - Imperial Gazetteer of India ,Oxford ,1907,vol-XIX , p.288
- 10- Moreland ,op.cit, p.25
- 11- Metcalf. Thomos.E. , “ Laissez Faire and tenants’ rights in mid –nineteenth century”, The Indian Economic and Social History Review , Vol .1, July-September, 1963, pp-74-75
- 12- Cited in Report of the United Province Zamindari Abolition Committee , Vol.1, Allahabad ,1948, pp-111-112
- 13- Foreign Political Consultations ,12th November ,1858, Nos.8/11, National Archive of India, New Delhi
- 14- Imperial Gazetteer of India ,Oxford ,1907,vol-IV, p.21
- 15 –Irwin , ibid ,pp.178-190
- 16- Jafri .S.N.A, “History of Status of Landlords and Tenants in the United Province , Allahabad ,1931, p.163
- 17- Powell .Baden .B.H , “Land systems of British India, Vol.II , Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1972, p.204
- 18- Ibid, p.220
- 19 – Raibareilly Settlement Report ,Allahabad , 1872, Statement No-IV
- 20 - Ibid , 1898, p.35
- 21 - R.A.D, Rev, A, Prog.No.16, April 1884 , National Archive of India, p.786
- 22- Census of India , Vol.XVI ,1911(U.P), Part L, p.386
- 23- Raibareilly Gazetteer , Appendix, pp. XXXVI- XXXVIII
- 24 - Ibid
- 25- Ibid
- 26- R.A.D., Rev, A, Prog. No.16 ,April 1884, National Archive of India , P.786
- 27- Ibid, p.786h
- 28- Erskine Report in F.No.394/1882-83, U.P.S.A, p.8
- 29- Mukherjee Radhakamal, “Land Problems in India”, Calcutta, 1933, p. 174.
- 30- F.No. 45/1921, Revenue, U.P.S.A, Lucknow.
- 31- Faunthrope Report on Eka Movement , United Province Gazette, May 13,1922,Part VIII, p.276
- 32- Ibid
- 33- Abhudya, 10.07.1920
- 34- Exhibit ‘S’, Mehta Report, F.No. 753/1920, Rev.A. U.P.S.A , p.9
- 35- Ibid, MR.pp.73-74
- 36- Stewart Report on enquiry regarding Cesses in Oudh, F.No.271/1922, Rev, A , U.P.S.A. , p-76
- 37- Ibid, MR, pp.70
- 38- Ibid ,MR, pp. 56
- 39- SR, op.cit, p-35
- 40- Ibid, p.37
- 41- Hailey to T. Salon, 27.4.1921, F.No, 694/1920, Gen, U.P.S.A.
- 42- Prem, 1.5.1918, Native Newspaper Reports of U.P.
- 43- Oudh Gazetteer , Vol.1, 1877, p.145
- 44- Ibid, pp.146-147
- 45- Pioneer, 12.4.1872
- 46- Oudh Administration Report ,1880-81, p.115
- 47- Royal Commission of Agriculture in India,VolXII, Calcutta, 1927, p.739
- 48- Intelligence Bureau, UP, on Kisan Sabha or Peasant Associations, F.No. 49/1920, Home Political Deposit
- 49- F.No. 50/1920, General Administration Department, U.P.S.A ,Lucknow
- 50- Mehta, op.cit, p.2
- 51- Baba Ram Chandra Paper,SW,F,Nos.2A and 2C, p-7

- 52- Farnon Report to deputy commissioner, Raibareily, F.No.50/1920. U.P.S.A, Lucknow
- 53- CID note ,F.No.49/1920, Home Political Deposit, National Archive of India, New Delhi
- 54- F.No. 49/1920, Home Political Deposit, 1920, New Delhi
- 55- Ibid
- 56- Ibid
- 57- F.No.195-216A/February 1921-B, Home Political ,National Archive of India , p.11
- 58- Sherreff to Faunthrope, 5.1.1921, F.No. 50/1921, General ,U.P.S.A, Lucknow
- 59- Raibareily District Gazetteer, p.76
- 60- Leader, 14.1.1921
- 61- Ibid
- 62- Final report on the agrarian disturbances in Raibareily in January 1921, F.No. 50/1921, General Administration Department U.P.S.A, Lucknow
- 63- Leader, 19.1.1921
- 64- F.No.50/1921, op.cit
- 65- Leader ,14.1.1921
- 66- Pioneer, 12.1.1921
- 67- Leader, 12.1.1921
- 68- Ibid ,15.1.1921
- 69- Siddqui Majid, "Agrarian unrest in North India", Vikas Publishing house, 1984, New Delhi, p.155
- 70- Ibid, p-156
- 71- Report SDM, F.No. 50/1921, op.cit,
- 72- Ibid
- 73- Final Report, F.No. 50/1921, op.cit
- 74- Farnon report, op.cit
- 75- Report of SDM , F.No. 50/1921, op.cit
- 76- Ibid
- 77- Statement by the deputy commissioner of Raibareily , F.No.50/1921, General Administration file , U.P.S.A, Lucknow
- 78- F.No. 50/1921, op.cit , Statement DC
- 79- Final Report, F.No. 50/1921, op.cit
- 80- Ibid, Statement DC
- 81- Final Report, Statement DC, F.No.50/1921, op.cit
- 82- Leader, 12.1.1921
- 83- Independent , 23.1.1921
- 84- Ibid, Statement DC
- 85- Final Report, F.No. 50/1921, op.cit
- 86- Ibid, Statement DC
- 87- Ibid
- 88- Siddqui Majid, op.cit, p.159
- 89- Raibareily District Gazetteer , p.95
- 90- F.No. 50/1921,GAD, dated ,24.1.1921
- 91- Siddqui Majid, op.cit, p.161
- 92- Ibid
- 93- Ibid
- 94- Ibid, p.161
- 95- Superintendent of Police ,Raibareily to Inspector General , police, UP, 22.3.1921, F.No. 50/1921, GAD, UP, op.cit
- 96- Leader, 24.3.1921
- 97- Independent, 27.3.1921
- 98- Superintendent of Police, Raibareily to Inspector General , police, UP, 22.3.1921, F.No. 50/1921, GAD, UP, op.cit
- 99- Ibid
- 100- Deputy Commissioner ,Raibareily, to the secretary , UP government , 26.3.1921, F.No. 50-2/1921, GAD, op.cit.
- 101- SP ,Raibareily to IGP, UP, op.cit
- 102- Independent, 15.3.1921