



FROM SOIL CLASSIFICATION TO REVENUE DEMAND: THE PUCKLE'S RYOTWARI SETTLEMENT IN SALEM

B. Sanchay* & V. Manimuthu**

* Research Scholar, PG & Research Department of History, Jamal Mohamed College (Autonomous),
Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu, India

** Assistant Professor, PG & Research Department of History, Jamal Mohamed College (Autonomous),
Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu, India

Cite This Article: B. Sanchay & V. Manimuthu, "From Soil Classification to Revenue Demand: The Puckle's Ryotwari Settlement in Salem", *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Arts and Humanities*, Volume 11, Issue 2, July - December, Page Number 61-66, 2026.

Copy Right: © DV Publication, 2026 (All Rights Reserved). This is an Open Access Article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

Type of Review: Peer Reviewed as per [C|O|P|E] Guidance.

Disclaimer: The scholarly papers reviewed and published by DV Publication, India, reflect the views and opinions of their respective authors and do not necessarily represent the views or opinions of DV Publication. The publisher disclaims any responsibility for any harm, loss, or damage resulting from the use of the published content by any party.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22676523>

Abstract:

This article examines the Ryotwari settlement introduced in Salem under Puckle and analyses its principal administrative and fiscal mechanisms. It focuses on surveying, soil classification, taram formation, revenue assessment, patta issuance, and the maintenance of settlement records. Although the system was presented as a scientific arrangement based on direct relations between the State and the ryot, its operation often failed to reflect local agricultural conditions. Standardised assessments, inadequate deductions for unproductive land, and additional charges such as water tax increased the cultivator's burden. The Salem settlement thus reveals the tension between colonial claims of administrative rationality and the revenue demands imposed upon rural society. It functioned not only as a land-tenure arrangement but also as an instrument for strengthening state control over cultivation and agrarian resources.

Key Words: Ryotwari System; Salem; Puckle Settlement; Land Revenue; Soil Classification; Colonial Agrarian Administration.

Introduction:

The Ryotwari system introduced in the Madras Presidency was a major colonial attempt to restructure agrarian administration by establishing a direct fiscal relationship between the government and individual cultivators, thereby reducing the role of traditional intermediaries such as zamindars. While colonial officials presented the system as a rational, adaptable, and comparatively equitable method of land administration, its implementation frequently revealed a gap between official principles and the complex realities of rural society. The settlement undertaken under the direction of R. K. Puckle in Salem during the mid-nineteenth century illustrates this developed stage of the Ryotwari system, in which detailed surveys, systematic classification, and standardized procedures became central to the assessment of agricultural land. At the same time, the settlement reveals important weaknesses in colonial revenue policy, particularly the assumptions made by officials concerning soil quality, agricultural productivity, and the cultivators' ability to meet revenue obligations. This paper examines the Puckle settlement with particular attention to the methods adopted for land measurement and assessment, the classification of different soil types, and the estimation of net agricultural produce. It contends that, although the settlement demonstrated considerable administrative organization and methodological refinement, its standardized revenue practices often failed to accommodate variations in local ecological and agrarian conditions, thereby contributing to considerable pressure on cultivators. The study adopts a qualitative historical approach based primarily on archival records and administrative reports. Through a critical examination and cross-comparison of these sources, it reconstructs the procedures employed by colonial officials and evaluates the extent to which standardization shaped the assessment and administration of land revenue under Puckle's supervision.

Land Revenue Settlement under Puckle's Ryotwari System:

Under the Ryotwari system, all cultivable land, whether under active cultivation or left fallow, was surveyed and divided into separate plots or holdings. Each holding was assigned a specific revenue assessment for a fixed period, which determined the amount payable to the government. The demand was collected directly from the ryot, or individual cultivator, according to the extent of land in his possession. Since the area held by a cultivator could change over time, the system allowed him to relinquish certain plots and take up others, including uncultivated land or fields abandoned by previous occupants. This arrangement provided considerable flexibility in the composition of individual holdings.¹

The cultivator occupied the land under an annual lease issued directly by the government. Consequently, the ryot maintained a personal and immediate relationship with the State and was individually responsible for the payment of the revenue assessed on his holding. Unlike the zamindari arrangement, the system did not recognise landlords or other intermediaries between the cultivator and the government. Although the ryot was technically regarded as a tenant of the State, he possessed hereditary and transferable rights over the land. These rights could be sold, mortgaged, or otherwise transferred, giving them many characteristics of private property. Nevertheless, the continuance of the rights depended upon the regular payment of the government assessment, which functioned as the charge for occupying the land.²

¹Report of the Administration of Madras Presidency during 1921-22 (hereinafter referred to RAMP), p.87.

²Henry Le Fanu, *A Manual of the Salem District in the Presidency of Madras*, Vol. I -The District, Madras Government Press, 1883, pp. 236-237.

John Stuart Mill's description of the Raiyatwari system in 1857 similarly emphasized, the cultivator's substantial control over his holding. According to Mill, each registered farmer cultivated a defined plot and paid the revenue directly to the State. Subject to meeting the government demand, the ryot could lease, sell, mortgage, or transfer the holding and could annually increase, reduce, or surrender the area under cultivation. In the event of crop failure, the assessment could be reduced in proportion to the loss, including complete remission where the harvest failed entirely. The revenue demand otherwise remained fixed in monetary terms. Where government irrigation transformed dry land into irrigated or multiple-crop land, an additional charge was imposed for the benefit of that facility; however, improvements financed by the cultivator himself did not result in an increased assessment. Mill therefore viewed the ryot as enjoying many of the benefits associated with permanent ownership. He could abandon the land at will, could not ordinarily be evicted while fulfilling his obligations, received relief during periods of agricultural distress, and was not held responsible for the revenue liabilities of other cultivators.³

Procedure for Making a Ryotwari Settlement:

In the Madras Presidency, the preparation of a Ryotwari settlement generally involved three connected activities: the creation of survey and cadastral records, the calculation of the land revenue demand, and the subsequent recovery of that demand from the cultivators. The first two activities were collectively understood as the actual process of settlement. Thus, settlement operations were not limited to fixing the amount of revenue payable. They also involved identifying fields, recording their occupants, determining the quality of the soil, defining the cultivator's obligations, and creating an official record for the future administration of land.⁴

Survey and Demarcation:

The initial task was to establish the boundaries of villages and individual fields. This work was carried out by the Survey Department, which marked the limits of each village and holding on the ground. Where disagreements arose over the position of a boundary, the matter was examined and decided by the responsible officer according to the rules laid down by the Madras Government.

Permanent boundary marks were placed at significant points, particularly at corners, bends, and other locations where the limits of a field or village changed direction. These markers commonly consisted of stones or masonry pillars. Their upkeep was not treated solely as a government responsibility; the ryots and other persons liable for land revenue were required to preserve, repair, and replace them when necessary. A reliable system of boundary demarcation was essential because the assessment of revenue, the recognition of holdings, and the settlement of disputes all depended on the accuracy of the survey.⁵

Nature of the Survey:

Surveying provided the technical basis for the Ryotwari system by connecting the physical measurement of land with the government's revenue policy. During the nineteenth century, surveys in India were generally divided into three broad forms: trigonometrical, topographical, and cadastral. In the Madras Presidency, the Survey Department was primarily responsible for topographical and cadastral work.

A topographical survey recorded the larger physical features of the region, including rivers, roads, hills, and other natural characteristics. A cadastral survey, on the other hand, dealt with individual fields. It measured the size and location of holdings and was particularly important for revenue administration. Since an accurate assessment could not be made without knowing the extent of each plot, cadastral surveying became a necessary preliminary to settlement. After the field measurements had been completed, village maps were prepared. Information from these maps was then used to compile registers showing the various holdings, their areas, and the revenue payable on them. The intention was to create uniform and reliable maps that could be used not only for the immediate settlement but also for later administrative and fiscal work. The maps were prepared according to standard scales, commonly eight or sixteen inches to the mile, which made it easier to compare records from different areas.

The methods of the Madras Survey Department gradually became more precise. Earlier operations often depended on approximate measurements, whereas later surveys adopted more systematic and scientific procedures. In some cases, cadastral and topographical work was combined so that the administration could record both the legal limits of fields and the physical conditions affecting their agricultural value. The Madras Survey Department functioned separately from the Great Trigonometrical Survey, which was based at Calcutta and was concerned with establishing extensive survey networks and permanent trigonometrical stations throughout India. The legal framework for boundary demarcation in the Madras Presidency was provided by Act XXVIII of 1860. This legislation prescribed the manner in which boundaries were to be marked and also defined the obligations of ryots regarding the preservation of boundary indicators.⁶

Inspection and Soil Classification:

Once the survey had been completed, the settlement authorities proceeded to inspect the land and determine its relative value. The Settlement Officer visited the fields and examined the conditions that influenced agricultural productivity. These investigations included the nature of the soil, the availability of irrigation, the types of crops grown, the fertility of the land, and other local circumstances affecting cultivation. The fields were then placed into different classes or grades according to their productive capacity. More fertile or better-irrigated land was distinguished from poorer or less productive soil. This classification was intended to make the revenue demand more proportionate to the actual value of each holding. In principle, therefore, the assessment was to be based not simply on the size of a field but also on its agricultural potential.⁷

³Dutt, R. C., Letter to Lord Curzon on the Subject of Land Revenue Settlements in Madras, 20 Feb. 1900, Proceedings No. 20, Serial No. 2, p. 2.

⁴C.R. Ray, Land Revenue Administration in India, Calcutta University, 1915, p. 3.

⁵C.D. Meclean, Manual of Administration of Madras Presidency, Vol. III, op. cit., pp. 415 - 417.

⁶The Boundary Marks (Madras) Act, 1860 (Act XXVIII of 1860), Government of Madras, Legislative Department, pp. 1-2.

⁷C.D. Meclean, op. cit., pp. 421-423.

Record of Rights:

The final stage involved preparing the Record of Rights. This document brought together the information required to establish the cultivator's interest in the land and the revenue payable to the government. It normally consisted of two principal components: the field map and the field register. The field map showed the location, shape, boundaries, and identifying number of each plot. The field register provided the corresponding written details. These included the area of the holding, the quality or classification of its soil, its irrigation facilities, the amount of assessment imposed, and the name of the person recorded as its occupant.

Questions relating to possession, occupancy, or competing claims were investigated by the Settlement Officer. The officer could examine local evidence and verify the relevant facts before entering the final particulars in the record. Because the Ryotwari system established a direct fiscal relationship between the State and each cultivator, the field register was also useful as a revenue account. It could be revised whenever the person in possession changed or when the extent or condition of a holding was altered. The Record of Rights consequently served a dual purpose. It provided official evidence concerning the cultivator's tenure and supplied the revenue administration with the information needed to calculate and collect the government demand. The Ryotwari settlement was therefore simultaneously a survey operation, a system of land classification, a method of recognising occupancy, and a mechanism for organising the collection of land revenue.⁸

Structure and Responsibilities of the Settlement Department:

The Settlement Department was placed under the control of a Director who also served as the Director of Agriculture. This combined arrangement brought the administration of land revenue and agricultural development under a common authority. The department operated through five settlement parties: four permanent parties that worked in the plains and a separate party created to undertake special or exceptional assignments.

Each regular party had a Deputy Director, an Assistant Director, an un-covenanted assistant, a clerical establishment, and a field staff under the supervision of a settlement supervisor. The monthly cost of the office establishment was approximately Rs.575, while the field establishment required about Rs.1,245. The senior officers were arranged in two grades. A First-Class Deputy Director received Rs.1,100 per month, whereas a Second-Class Deputy Director was paid Rs.750. Assistant Directors were similarly divided into two grades, with salaries of Rs.550 and Rs.425 respectively.⁹ The permanent staff could be supplemented by temporary personnel whenever the volume of settlement work increased. This arrangement enabled the department to respond to large or urgent assignments without permanently expanding its ordinary establishment. The graded hierarchy, clearly defined responsibilities, and separate provision for office and field expenditure indicate the highly structured character of the settlement administration. The functions of the Survey and Settlement Departments were separate but closely connected. The Survey Department measured the land and determined the area for which each ryot would be held responsible. The Settlement Department used these measurements, together with information regarding soil quality and agricultural conditions, to fix the revenue rate applicable to each holding. In this way, the Survey Department established the physical basis of the assessment, while the Settlement Department converted that information into a specific financial demand. Their cooperation formed an important part of the revenue machinery of the Madras Presidency.

For the purpose of revenue assessment, the soils of the Madras Presidency were grouped into five broad categories according to their texture, composition, mineral content, and productive capacity. These categories included regar or regadi, commonly called black cotton soil; red ferruginous soil; sandy or arenaceous soil; alluvial and permanently improved soil; and calcareous soil. Black cotton soil was valued for its capacity to retain moisture and its suitability for crops such as cotton. Red ferruginous soil contained a considerable amount of iron and was generally well drained. Arenaceous soil was predominantly sandy, contained little humus, and held water poorly. Alluvial and permanently improved soils consisted largely of fine deposits accumulated through river action or enhanced through irrigation and the application of manure. Calcareous soils contained appreciable quantities of calcium carbonate, which affected their chemical properties and agricultural usefulness.¹⁰

The examination of soil was carried out through samples taken from a depth of approximately six to eight inches. Where the nature of the soil was difficult to determine by ordinary inspection, its composition was tested by separating the sand and clay particles in water. The five principal soil groups were further divided into smaller categories known as "sorts." These subdivisions were based on the same general considerations of texture, composition, and quality that governed the broader classification. The classification assigned to each field was entered in the settlement register. In addition, adjoining groups of fields were shown diagrammatically in an eye-sketch attached to the register. The process was subject to several stages of verification. The initial classification made by the classifier was examined by the head classifier, reviewed again by the supervisor, and finally checked by the head of the settlement party. This system of examination was intended to maintain uniformity in the classification of land throughout the district.

Classes, Sorts, and Tarams:

The settlement authorities required a system that could simplify the wide variation in Salem's soils and convert it into a consistent basis for revenue assessment. For this purpose, the soils were organised at three levels: class, sort, and taram.

A class represented the broad physical character of the soil. Examples included permanently improved or garden lands, regar or black clay, red clay, loamy soil, and sandy soil. A sort indicated the relative quality of the soil within a particular class. The usual distinctions were good, ordinary, and inferior. A taram was formed by bringing together different combinations of classes and sorts that were considered broadly equal in productive capacity. It therefore served as the practical unit for fixing the revenue assessment.

⁸The Manual of the Salem District, Vol. I (Madras: Government Press, 1883), pp. 242-244.

⁹C. D. Maclean, Manual of the Administration of the Madras Presidency, Vol. I, Government Press, Madras, 1885, p.106.

¹⁰RAMP1881-82, pp. 91-92.

In Salem, the Settlement Officer arranged the soils into three principal groups:¹¹

- Permanently improved soils, including garden lands.
- Black and red clay soils, together with loamy and sandy varieties.
- Red clay and black sandy soils.

Each principal group was further divided into three grades according to quality. These classifications were expressed through numerical symbols. The first figure represented the class, while the second indicated the sort. Thus, a classification written as “2-1” meant Class 2, Sort 1.

The numerical system also reflected the arrangement adopted in the settlement records. The figure 1 was used in the reports to indicate a soil type that was not present in the district. Permanently improved soils, which were treated as comparatively inferior for the purposes of this classification, were placed under Class 2. Within that class, the two relevant grades were identified as Sort 1 and Sort 2. Accordingly, Class 2, Sort 1 was written as “2-1,” while Class 2, Sort 2 appeared as “2-2.” These numerical combinations were then used in preparing the *tarams* and in establishing the relative assessment of the various lands in Salem.

Description of Soil	Class	Sorts	Taram
Islands, &c.	1	Good	Taram 1
Permanently improved	2	Ordinary	Taram 2
Regar clay	3	Good	Taram 3
Loamy	4	Ordinary	Taram 4
Sandy	5	Ordinary	Taram 5
Sandy	6	Good	Taram 6
Rod clay	7	Good	Taram 7
Loem	8	Ordinary	Taram 8
Sandy	9	Good	Taram 9

Table: Showing Discription of soil, its Class, sort and respective *Tarams*.¹²

The table illustrates how different combinations of soil class and quality, or “sort,” were brought together under particular *tarams*. The classification applied separately to irrigated and dry lands. In the case of irrigated fields, varieties of black, red, loamy, and sandy soils were distributed among *tarams* numbered from 1 to 8. Permanently improved land was placed in *Taram 2*. Dry lands followed a comparable arrangement, although their *tarams* extended from 1 to 9.

The purpose of the table was to show that soils with different physical characteristics could nevertheless be assigned the same revenue value when their productive capacity was considered broadly equivalent. For example, irrigated *Taram 4* included the following combinations:¹³

- 3-1: black pure clay, good sort.
- 5-1: black sandy soil, good sort.
- 7-2: red loamy soil, ordinary sort.
- 8-1: red sandy clay, good sort.

Although these soils differed in colour, texture, and composition, the settlement authorities treated them as approximately equal in agricultural productivity for administrative and assessment purposes.¹⁴

The classification was organised through a numerical cipher that placed land into separate classes and sorts. The class indicated the general physical nature of the soil, while the sort reflected its relative quality. A modification to this numerical system was introduced toward the end of the settlement process, but the change was not considered to have produced any substantial practical advantage. The Director of Revenue Settlement recognised that cultivators already understood the basic distinctions between clay, loam, sand, and gravel. These familiar categories were therefore adopted as the main foundation of the official classification. Local conditions were also taken into account when assigning a field to a particular group. However, the authorities did not attempt to create an excessively detailed system based on every minor variation in soil or environment.

In practice, the formal scheme was not always applied mechanically. An experienced Settlement Officer later observed that, once fieldwork began, the classification was modified according to practical judgment and local experience, a method he described as a “rule-of-thumb” approach. The numbering of the *tarams* also required internal consistency. Since the second cipher value represented the best soil in the district, the officer argued that the highest *taram* should be numbered 2 rather than 1. This arrangement would ensure that the numerical order corresponded more logically with the structure of the underlying classification system.¹⁵

¹¹Arunagiri, Role of Modern Ryotwari System, Shanlax International Journal of Arts, Science and Humanities, Vol. 5, no. 1, 2017, pp. 73-74.

¹²Ibid., p. 453.

¹³H. Le Fanu, A Manual of The Salem District in the Madras Presidency, Vol. I, Government Press, Madras, 1883, p. 452.

¹⁴Ibid.,p.453.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 453 - 454.

Assessment Based on Agricultural Output:

H. S. A. Goodrich described the assessment of land revenue as a process that began with estimating the productive capacity of different kinds of land. Officials first calculated the quantity of grain that could ordinarily be obtained from irrigated and dry fields. These estimates were then expressed in money and reduced by the expenses required for cultivation. The balance, known as the net produce, provided the principal basis for determining the government demand. The administration used experimental plots to obtain an approximate measure of agricultural output. Selected fields were harvested, threshed, and weighed, and the results were compared with the performance of other fields possessing similar soil and environmental conditions. These experiments were not regarded as exact representations of every holding. Rather, they supplied a practical average that could be used in fixing the assessment for a particular locality and soil category.¹⁶

Different standards were applied to irrigated and dry lands. Irrigated fields were generally valued according to their yield of white paddy. For dry cultivation, officials relied on crops commonly grown in the region, such as cholam, cambu, varagu, and ragi. The average yield per acre was converted into the recognised Madras heap measure. This measure held roughly 100 cubic inches and was calculated to weigh about one and a half seers, or approximately 3.085 pounds, when filled with medium-quality rice.¹⁷ The government also placed a limit on the amount that could be claimed as land revenue. In ordinary circumstances, the demand was not to exceed one-half of the estimated net produce. The rule was intended to prevent the assessment from becoming so heavy that it undermined the cultivator's ability to continue farming. At the same time, it provided the State with a regular share of the agricultural surplus. Field experiments, standard units of measurement, price calculations, and restrictions on the government's share together gave the assessment procedure a relatively uniform administrative framework.

In the Salem settlement, the officials proceeded by calculating the average yield associated with each soil category and then assigning that produce a monetary value. The conversion, or commutation, rate was particularly important. If grain was converted at an excessively high price, the resulting revenue demand could become oppressive. If the rate was fixed too low, the government would receive less than the value of the produce on which the assessment was based.

The settlement authorities therefore considered it necessary to use price records covering both favourable and difficult agricultural years. Since no satisfactory series was available for the period before Fasli 1231, corresponding to 1821-1822 A.D., Puckle prepared a price list for the earlier period himself. For the Talagath region, he used the Madras measure at ten annas from Fasli 1231 to Fasli 1274, or approximately 1824-1867 A.D. For the Baramahal and Balaghat areas, he applied a rate of twenty-four annas to the Harris kallam.

After converting the estimated gross produce into money, Puckle deducted the costs of cultivation. The deduction was fixed at 15 per cent for dry land in the Talagath and 20 per cent for dry land in the Baramahal. The remaining amount was treated as the net produce. This balance was divided into two equal portions: one portion was assigned to the ryot and the other constituted the government's share. Before finalising the demand, a further reduction of 10 per cent was made to account for portions of the holding that could not be cultivated, such as field embankments, rocky patches, hedges, and drainage channels. The final assessment also varied according to the quality of the land and the availability of irrigation. In the Talagath, dry lands were placed into three broad groups. The first group, associated with Taram 1 and considered the most productive, was assessed at the full rate appropriate to that category. The second group was charged at the next lower rate, reflecting its comparatively weaker productive capacity. The third group, regarded as the least favourable, received the lowest assessment.¹⁸

This graduated structure prevented all dry lands from being taxed uniformly. Instead, the revenue demand was adjusted to differences in soil quality and agricultural potential. The method therefore attempted to reconcile the government's demand for revenue with the cultivator's capacity to produce from the land under his control.

Settlement Registers and Revenue Records:

The conclusions reached during the settlement process were formally entered in revenue registers. These records specified the value of the produce adopted for each field and holding within a village, as well as the extent of the land, the assessment imposed, the name of the recorded occupant, and other relevant particulars concerning the holding. To ensure that the information was accessible and preserved for administrative purposes, thirty copies of each register were printed. One set, comprising ten copies, was made available for purchase by the ryots. A second set of ten copies was allotted for official use, while the remaining ten copies were retained in government custody for future reference. After the settlement had been completed, the final particulars were compiled in village-wise field settlement registers. These registers were printed in diglot form, containing the information in two languages, and were subsequently handed over to the ordinary revenue authorities. The transfer marked the conclusion of the specialized settlement operation and enabled the regular revenue administration to use the newly prepared records for assessment, collection, and future reference.¹⁹

Issuing Pattas and Recognising Tenure Rights:

The introduction of a new settlement was completed through the issue of pattas to the persons recognised as responsible holders of the land. These documents recorded the individual's holding and the revenue obligation attached to it, thereby giving administrative effect to the settlement.

In districts where settlement operations had first been introduced, the authorities generally relied on the names already entered in the government revenue accounts. Pattas were consequently prepared in favour of the persons shown in those records. In later settlements, however, officials undertook a more careful verification of possession. Where investigations revealed that the recorded ryot had died or had transferred the holding, and where no civil litigation prevented alteration, the patta could be changed to the name of the person actually occupying the land. Settlement operations also enabled the administration to address several

¹⁶H. S. A. Goodrich, "Land Revenue in Madras", *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 54, no. 4 (1891): 567-589.

¹⁷C. D. Maclean, op. cit., p. 108.

¹⁸Selections from the Records of Madras Governments, Vol. LXV, p. 279.

¹⁹C. D. Maclean, op. cit., p.110.

wider land-management issues. Common lands could be divided where necessary, suitable areas could be reserved for grazing, and fields that had been incorrectly classified as wet or dry could be reassigned to the appropriate category. These adjustments helped align the official record with the actual use and condition of the land. The settlement did not deal only with land already under cultivation. It also fixed the revenue liability attached to each acre of waste land that was considered capable of being brought under cultivation in the future. Thus, the patta and the settlement register together established both the current assessment of a ryot's holding and the prospective charge applicable when cultivable waste was taken up.²⁰

A Ryotwari settlement in the Madras Presidency ordinarily remained in force for thirty years from the date on which settlement operations were completed in a particular locality. At the end of this period, the authorities could reconsider not only the money rates used for converting produce into cash but also the grain values assigned to different categories of land.²¹

Although the basic assessment was fixed for this period, the annual revenue demand could change when a ryot expanded or reduced the extent of his holding, received a remission, or became liable for an additional charge. These adjustments were reviewed through the *jamabandi*, an annual verification of village revenue accounts conducted after the principal harvests. Presided over by revenue officials and supported by the *Adangal*, irrigation accounts, and cultivation statements, the *jamabandi* connected the long-term settlement with changing local conditions.²²

The system also imposed a water charge when dry land was irrigated with government water, while uncultivated land could receive remission under the category "Waste Remitted." Assessment was generally based on the estimated net produce after deducting cultivation expenses, with approximately half of the balance claimed as the government's share. A further deduction was allowed for unproductive portions of holdings. This adjustment was particularly significant in Salem, where channels, embankments, paths, rocks, hedges, and saline patches could occupy a substantial part of the measured area without yielding any crop. The deduction therefore represented an attempt, though not always an adequate one, to reconcile the surveyed extent of land with its actual productive capacity.²³

Conclusion:

The Ryotwari settlement introduced in Salem under Puckle represented an important attempt to organise land revenue administration through surveys, soil classification, standardised assessment, and a direct fiscal relationship between the State and the cultivator. Its procedures gave the system an appearance of precision and impartiality. However, the practical operation of the settlement exposed significant limitations. Uniform methods could not always reflect the varied conditions of local agriculture, while inadequate deductions for unproductive land and additional charges such as water tax increased the financial burden on ryots.

The Salem experience therefore reveals the tension between the administrative logic of colonial revenue policy and the economic realities of cultivation. Although the settlement was presented as a rational and equitable arrangement, its primary effectiveness lay in securing a predictable income for the State. By giving insufficient weight to variations in productivity, agricultural risk, and the cultivator's ability to pay, the system often converted administrative efficiency into increased pressure on the rural population.²⁴

References:

1. Arunagiri, "Role of Modern Ryotwari System," Shanlax International Journal of Arts, Science and Humanities, Vol. 5, No. 1, 2017, ISSN: 2321-788X.
2. B. H. Baden-Powell, Land Systems of British India, Vol. III, Oxford University Press, 1892.
3. C. D. Maclean, Manual of the Administration of the Madras Presidency, Vol. I, Government Press, Madras, 1885.
4. C. D. Maclean, Manual of Administration of Madras Presidency, Vol. III, Government Press, Madras, 1893.
5. C. R. Ray, Land Revenue Administration in India, Calcutta University, 1915.
6. Dutt, R. C., "Letter to Lord Curzon on the Subject of Land Revenue Settlements in Madras," 20 February 1900, Proceedings No. 20, Serial No. 2.
7. H. Le Fanu, A Manual of the Salem District in the Madras Presidency, Vol. I, Government Press, Madras, 1883.
8. H. S. A. Goodrich, "Land Revenue in Madras," The Economic Journal, Vol. 1, No. 3, 1891, ISSN: 0013-0133.
9. Letter from R. K. Puckle, Esq., Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement, to R. E. Master, Esq., Officiating Director of Revenue Settlement, dated Sooramungalam, 26 October 1865 (No. 90).
10. Report of the Administration of Madras Presidency during 1881-82.
11. Report of the Administration of Madras Presidency during 1921-22.
12. Selections from the Records of Madras Governments, Vol. LXV.
13. The Boundary Marks (Madras) Act, 1860 (Act XXVIII of 1860), Government of Madras, Legislative Department.

²⁰B.H. Baden-Powell, Land Systems of British India, Vol. III, Oxford, 1892, pp. 129 - 130.

²¹RAMP 1921-22, p. 87.

²²C. D. Maclean, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

²³*Ibid.*, p. 110.

²⁴Letter from R. K. Puckle, Esq., Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement, to R. E. Master, Esq., Officiating Director of Revenue Settlement, dated Sooramungalam, 26 October 1865 (No. 90).