

Background of travencore-cohin minor dispute survey: An analysis

■ J. Suresh

Article Chronicle :

Received :
03.03.2018;
Accepted :
30.11.2018

Key Words :

Swaroopam,
Desoms,
Encroachments,
Modus operandi,
Arbitration,
Khandoms

ABSTRACT : The name of Travancore is an anglicized form of *Sri-Vazhum-kodu*¹, which developed to *Thrivithankodu* and later to Travancore which means ‘the abode of prosperity’ or a ‘place where the Goddess of prosperity dwells’. Travancore was renowned in other parts of the world as *Dharma Rajya*. Erstwhile Cochin state, known in Malayalam *Kochi*, situated on the western coast of Kerala State. The state was originally known as Perumpadappu *Swaroopam*. With the emergence of the Cochin port, the rulers of Perumpadappu *Swaroopam* shifted their headquarters from Mahodayapuram to Cochin. The state is singularly diversified in its physical aspects as in its configuration.² The significant features of Geography like rivers, lakes, climate, hills and forests, seacoast etc., are the vital factors in shaping the History of both the states. Erstwhile Travancore, ‘the garden of India lies in the extreme south-west of Indian sub-continent. The dispute between Travancore-Cochin states was also related to encroachments and the right of establishing their power. The important disputes in this regards were related to Anthakaranazhi, Keezhcheri *Desam*, Thiruvamkulam *Muri* and Canal, Kaniannoor *Desom* etc. These disputes had existed only for a Decade. The minor disputes were emerged after the settlement of J.C.Hannington Commission, appointed by British as mediator. Both Travancore and Cochin had taken special interest in settling these minor disputes cordially without changing them into major issues. All these problems were settled with sustaining their rights and authorities.

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE : Suresh, J. (2018). Background of travencore-cohin minor dispute survey: An analysis. *Asian J. Environ. Sci.*, 13(1&2): 33-38, DOI: 10.15740/HAS/AJES/13.1and2/33-38.

Travancore and Cochin had experienced certain Minor Disputes along with major disputes. Most of which were related with the boundaries of both Travancore and Cochin. These disputes were mainly concerned with border, encroachments of rivers, canals, cultivated land, changing of border stones, and alteration of survey maps and illegal collection of taxes from boundary places. Though certain problems were amicably solve to some extent through discussion, consultation, agreements and arbitrations, some problems were continued for a protracted period.

The boundary line of Cochin goes along the border of the *Proverthies* of Aykaranad, Trikakara, Manjapra and Perumpavur in the Kunnathunad taluk in order to prevent future disputes and references in regard to the boundary of the two States; it is sought-after to commence survey operations in the Kunnathunadu Taluk with the survey of the adjoining Taluk of Cochin³. The Cochin Survey Agency began their operations in certain portions adjoining to the common boundary between the two states. At the same time, Travancore commenced survey operations in villages adjacent to the above said portions of

Author for correspondence :

J. Suresh
Department of History,
University College,
Thiruvananthapuram,
(Kerala) India
Email : Sureshrosegarden@gmail.com

the Cochin state.

An arrangement has been already sanctioned for the deputation of a Cochin official to represent Cochin during the progress of Travancore survey operation on the boundary line. It is desirable to lay down certain definite instructions of the guidance of the survey Departments of both the states to enable them to act in recital, in the demarcation and survey of the lands on the border⁴. The Survey Superintendent suggests a modus operandi it may be adopted.

The state boundary between Travancore and Cochin to the boundary stones planted at that time, were found to be incorrect during the proceeds survey of 1890⁵. It has to be verified and corrections to be made in the Field books conjointly by the two survey Departments of the two states. It creates some indirect difference on boundaries.

By the corrections had to be made in the field books of the state boundary preserved in the office of the Arbitrator by the British Resident. Thomlinson, the Survey Officer forwarded a copy of the table of corrections to be made in the field books, signed by him and the Superintendent of Cochin Survey. He requested that the same may be forwarded to the British Resident and his office conjointly by two Draftsman one from each state. The Cochin Superintendent has similarly applied to the Cochin Government, forwarding a copy of the table of corrections.

Inspected with the surveyors, and marked out with pegs, the encroachments made by ryots on the bed of the canal were to be subsequently shown to the Tahsildar for disposal according to the orders of Government. The encroachments were extension of paddy cultivation in the bed of the canal and must be removed as the breadth of the canal was limited.

As pointed out by Thomlinson, any interference with the original Theodolite work would necessitate the modification of several records connected with the boundary survey⁶. A certain unsettle state of things arrived after the boundary was laid down by Hannyngton the arbitrator.

EXPERIMENTAL METHODOLOGY

The Materials used for analyzing the topic is mainly primary sources. Most of the primary sources are related to multi-dimensional matters with special reference to Political especially, boundary, temple and Water Disputes

between the two states. The methodology relied in this perusal, primarily indicates descriptive, analytical and argumentative. The descriptive method is used to trace out the historical antecedence of the states of Travancore and Cochin minor disputes

EXPERIMENTAL FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the present study as well as relevant discussion have been presented under following heads :

Observations of earlier survey:

The Superintendent of Cochin Survey stated that he did not contemplate revision of demarcation and survey of state boundary, but believed that lands along boundary had already been correctly marked and that he had become alive to the fact that slight alterations may in parts be necessary.

The Cochin *Dewan* apparently passed over the subsequent perception of necessity for revised demarcation of state boundary by Superintendent, Cochin Survey and holds up, for adoption by the Travancore Governments as a correct principle of action, the impression that all lands along the boundary have already been marked to meet cadastral requirements⁷.

To the re-conjoint mapping of the Travancore-Cochin state boundary, he had the honor to state that the mapping had been finished except for the isolated portions of each State within the other and that encroachment sketches had been prepared for the portion from Anthakarazhi to Munambam adjoining the Taluk of Cherthala, Vaikom, Muvattupuzha, Kunnathunadu and Parur⁸.

The mapping involved the plotting together of the old "Arbitration Survey" of the Boundary completed in 1885 A. D. and the "Co-operation Survey" of the same boundary, are primed. It was found from the map and the difference in measurement in the Field Books that there had been deviations on the Boundary line⁹. Those deviations were shown by the differences seen in the plotting of the two surveys and they were marked as encroachments.

It was also observed that among these apparent encroachments, there were the differences between the measurements of the co-operation survey and those of the old Arbitrations survey were only a few links in chain line or offsets. These differences were only such as always happen in practical work, when the same measurement taken a number of times over uneven

ground, gave each time a slightly differing value. These differences were so trifling that they were not visible on the village maps, scale 16"=1 mile¹⁰. The Superintendent of Cochin Survey is of the opinion that those trifling differences of measurements could not be regarded as real encroachments.

As regards other class of encroachments marked T/55-57, C/61-63 in specimen copy of sketch above referred to, they had to be inspected on the spot by responsible Revenue officers and surveyors of both the States in conjunction and arrangements had to be made for their rectification according to the circumstances of each case and orders of Government thereon¹¹.

The time to begin in the above work of conjoint inspection by Revenue officers and surveyors of the two States would be about next Survey, when there would be low water in the *Kayals*, Rivers and canals on the State boundary area. Thomlinson, therefore, requested that in consultation with the Cochin Government earlier orders may be assessed on the subject and also arrangements may be made for the deputation of Revenue officers.

He met the Travancore and Cochin Survey Superintendents at Edappalli and inspected with them a few cases of encroachments on the State boundary line. A consultation was also held at Ernakulam on the instant between the Travancore and Cochin survey Superintendents, the southern Division *Peshkar* and Thomlinson at which the matter was fully discussed¹². Subject to the approval and sanction of the two Governments an agreement was arrived at as to the general principles to be adopted in dealing with the various cases of encroachments and as to the Revenue Officer to be entrusted with the work of inspecting and dealing with the encroachments and rectifying the boundary line. A copy of the notes of consultation signed by the Cochin *Peshkar* and Thomlinson is enclosed for the orders of Government.

It would be seen that for the reasons, the conclusions were, first the *Peshkar* were not in a position to attend the work. Secondly the special officers need not be appointed for the purpose. Finally the respective Tahsildar of the Taluk along which the boundary line passes was the proper officers to do the work¹³. From the enclosed statements of the encroachments on the section of the boundary from Anthakaranazhi to Munambam proposed to be taken up the season, it would be seen that there was encroachments in Chertala, Muvattupuzha and in

Parur. It would more time, to the respective Tahsildar to inspect these encroachments and the enquiry in connection with their removal may also be conveniently attended to by them. By considering the things, there view reveals that thirty four encroachments covering a distance of 15 1/4 mile of boundary had to be inspected and dealt with in Vaikom. Under the arrangements made by the Survey Superintendent of both the states and referred to in the notes of consultation it may not take more than three or four days for the Tahsildar to inspect and take notes of the encroachments. The enquiry in connection with them was also not likely to throw much additional work on him. In the case of the Kunnathunadu Taluk, the line of boundary to be inspected was much longer and the encroachments to be dealt with were more numerous. The discussions and meetings noticed the rights and duties of Tahsildar¹⁴.

The Tahsildar as the responsible officer of the Taluk must be in touch with the work of removing the encroachments and of rectifying the boundary line that passes along his Taluk. He will be in a position to command greater influence with the ryots than an officer specially deputed for the purpose and this will facilitate the removal of petty encroachments then and there also the enquiries in disputed cases. In cases in which the encroachments have to be registered the Tahsildar is the proper officer to make the necessary enquiries and register them¹⁵. As each Tahsildar will have only to deal with the encroachments on a portion of the line he will be able to begin the enquiry and proceed with it as soon as he finishes the inspection within his portion: whereas an officer specially deputed for the purpose can start the enquiry only after the inspection of the whole line is over and they noticed two important factors.

No additional expenditure will have to incur by government if the work is entrusted to the Tahsildar¹⁶. Moreover, a special officer, if appointed may still require the assistance of Tahsildar and the village officers to carry on the work in a satisfactory manner. The survey Superintendents have agreed that the Tahsildar need not attend on the Surveyors on all those days and that it will be enough to do so on two days in a week to inspect the encroachments already pegged out by the Surveyors during the interval. The days of the week on which the inspection is to be held can also be fixed beforehand¹⁷.

Methods and principle of marking encroachments:

The following are the principles to be adopted in

dealing with the several kinds of encroachments. In the case of the land boundary or single line boundary the encroachments will be either by the Cochin ryots in Travancore territory or by the Travancore ryots into Cochin territory. In these cases as a general rule the existing possessions will have to be confirmed and the respective portions lying on either side of the arbitration line registered in the names of the existing holders by the States concerned if the states see no reason to the country. If however, the encroached portion is already registered by either state that state will have to abandon the registry and leave the other state to deal with it as it things best¹⁸. In cases in which the middle of a line or road is the boundary all encroachments on either side of the arbitration line must be removed and the line or road restored to its former condition. This will necessitate a re-survey if the fields concerned and a re-adjustment of the area and assessment in the Revenue records in the settled Taluk.

In case of canals, rivers and back-waters form the boundary. When they do not exceed 100 links in width or 50 links on either side of the arbitration line all artificial encroachments including grounds must be removed. In cases in which a complete diversion of any portion of the canal etc., has resulted by natural or artificial causes the old arbitration line and not the canal, river, etc., in their altered condition shall be the boundary between the two States and the land or accretion on either side upto that line may be registered by either state¹⁹. When they exceed 100 links in width all encroachments on either side within 50 links from the midline must be removed and those beyond 50 links may be left to be dealt with by each State as it thinks fit.

Pending the receipt of orders from the Government in regard to the proposed deputation of Tahsildar for the work the Survey party may go on with the work in the Edappalli Section and the Tahsildar concerned will be asked to depute a sub-ordinate to move with the party, take notes of the encroachments pegged out by the surveyors and otherwise render them all assistance²⁰.

Although the boundary between Travancore and Cochin states has been defined, demarcated and surveyed under the arbitration of the late British Resident. J.C. Hannington, interpolations on the line will be necessary to mark junctions of village, Khandom and field boundaries on Travancore side, for the obvious reason that the survey of the state point of view of the

state Boundary under the authority the arbitrator was made merely from a delimitation point of view of the state Boundary, without reference to the requirements of a Cadastral Survey of Travancore Taluk.

It is also possible that the arbitration survey may require correction, as its accuracy has not been tested either by traverse proof or by connection with trigonometrically stations. As for these reasons, the Travancore Survey Officers may have to interfere with the Travancore-Cochin boundary, to avoid misapprehension on the part of the Cochin State of the nature of the proceedings of this Department, it is desirable that a Cochin official of status to represent that Government should attend the resurvey of the line as above indicated²¹.

The Cochin official to be deputed for this work should be instructed to sign the revised field books showing interpolations and corrections in original survey.

As the villages of Turavur and Arur, Chertala Taluk, abutting on Cochin are to be taken up for survey almost immediately, he request that arrangements may be made, through the British Resident, for a Cochin official meeting the Assistant Surveyor Quinless will take steps on the arrival of that official, to make arrangements for revision of survey of the boundary of the above two villages to meet the requirements of a Cadastral survey²². As the points of contact of Travancore Taluk in Kottayam Division with Cochin state boundary are numerous and this Department will have consequently in future to deal with such boundary off and on, it is desirable that arrangements should be made once by Cochin official whenever required by this Department, on a requisition being previously made to that effect by his Assistant Quinless to an officer of the Cochin state whom that Government may nominate for the purpose, instead of the circumlocutory method of procuring the attendance of Cochin official through the British Resident each time of its attendance is required. Regarding the extension of survey to Taluk bordering the Cochin state and to request you will be good enough to arrange with that Government for its being duly represented at the demarcation of the state boundary²³. No interference with the line, as fixed by the arbitrator, will of course, be made subject to this condition, the Taluk boundaries connected and identical with state boundaries will be demarcated for purpose of cadastral survey in the presence and with the full knowledge of Cochin officials who may be deputed for

the purpose.

Demarcation and survey:

On Travancore Survey Department commencing survey of any portion of the State adjoining the common boundary line (and *vice versa*) a requisition will be made by the officer in charge of field work to the officer in charge of Cochin field operations to depute a competent survey for co-operating with the Travancore survey for revision of demarcation of the common boundary line in question. The duties of the two surveyors²⁴ will be as follow:

- Amendment of demarcation and survey of the common boundary to meet requirements of Cadastral survey of adjoining land in the two states.

- Sketches (drawn to 8"=1mile) and field books should be kept by the two surveyors and signed by both on conclusion of operations.

- Care should be taken to interpolate only such boundary stations or marks as are absolutely necessary for starting Khandoms or marking boundaries of fields branching off on either side.

- In order that these field books and sketches may take the place of original field's books and sketches, copies should be made and exchanged between the two States, through the British Resident, who should also be supplied with copy of the Revised Survey of Boundary, in supervision of original.

- Surveyors on both sides should be accompanied by respective village officials, with accounts and ryots to points out all fields converging on the common boundary marks on State Boundary line.

- On approval of the details of arrangements, in the essence of which the Cochin State has already acquired, and from papers forwarded to issue necessary instructions to officer in charge of field operations²⁵.

While the mode of operation laid down, by improvement upon the Cochin Dewan's suggestion to report and obtain previous sanction of the two Governments whenever an additional boundary mark has to be interpolated it still necessitates for a preliminary joint reconnaissance of ground for preparation of lists of interpolations for obtaining sanction and a subsequent retroversion of ground on receipt of sanction for fixing such marks and taking measurements together. The procedure entails double work on the Travancore and Cochin survey, the Revenue Departments and ryots.

The Government, notwithstanding, consider that preponderating reasons exist for the double operation, which necessarily means increased cost of this particular work and diminution of out-turn, in a much as the additional labour involved in the double operation can be profitably utilized for processing of original survey work, the prolix procedure to prescribed to be, adopted.

Even in such cases where back-waters and rivers intervene between the two States the boundary runs through the middle of such backwaters and rivers, the Cochin Dewan argue that no fresh mark should be fixed on the survey lines of Backwater and River side's, without previous and formal sanction of the two States, not with remarks, as a professional, that any revision of demarcation of Cochin side of back-waters will not affect the Travancore State and *vice versa*. He also recognizes the necessity for mutual co-operation of Travancore State and Cochin Survey departments for interpolation of additional boundary marks on common boundary line between the two States. His fear, however, that this operation will make a large demand on his establishment is groundless, as the services of not more than single surveyor will be required at a time.

The interpolation of additional boundary marks for marking junctions of fields is really so unimportant that the two States may safely be left free to fix them without reference to each other²⁶. By the Go No. 176/118 dated 27th March, 1896, it was merely to avoid misapprehension of the nature of the work. He demanded the execution of the proceeding with the cognizance of a responsible Cochin official.

It will be observed that the rectification of the boundary line is necessary to meet cadastral requirements, while there is nothing to justify the apprehension that the original Theodolite survey will be materially revised. With regard to the procedure to be adopted, Tomlinson is of opinion that the necessary boundary marks should be interpolated in the course of the survey, such interpolations being subsequently communicated to the two Governments for information, sanction and adoption²⁷. The process suggested by the Cochin *Dewan* seems to be oblique involving much time and labour, whereas Tomlinson's proposals is better suited for the speedy progress of work.

As both the professional men the Superintendents of the Travancore and Cochin Surveys agree on the point that interpolations wherever necessary, of boundary

marks in the course of the Survey may be made conjointly, to be subsequently communicated to both the Governments for information, sanction and adoption and that as alterations of this nature will be made only in unavoidable cases and will be extremely rare, both government has no objection to the course proposed.

REFERENCES

¹Emily Gilchrist Hatch, *Travancore a Guide Book for the Visitor*, Oxford University Press London, 1933, p.1.

² Ravi VarmaTampuran (ed.), *Cochin*, Ernakulam, 1944, p.9.

³ Document No.4567S/ 343, K.Krishnawamy Rao,Travancore Dewan, dated 6th November 1898, to Superintendent Travancore Survey, State Archives Thiruvananthapuram.

⁴G.O.No699/ Dept.No.459,J.J.Thomson,Superintendent, Travancore Survey dated 28th November 1898,to the Dewan of Travancore,

⁵*Ibid*

⁶G.No.176/Dept.No.118,J.J.Thomilson,Superintendent Travancore Survey dated 27th March 1896 to Dewan of Travancore.

⁷ G. No.S/76 Shungra Soobyer, Dewan dated 2nd April 1896 to the Resident of Travancore and Cochin.

⁸ Letter No.3562 dated 14th March 1899, from the *Dewan* of Cochin to the Superintendent Travancore Survey.

⁹ G.No.540, Dept No.171,G.N. Krishna Row,Superintendent Travancore Survey dated 7th November 1905, to the Chief Secretary.

¹⁰ Letter No.10782/L R Dewan Peshkar of Kottayam dated 31st March 1906 to the Chief Secretary of Travancore.

¹¹ Document No.4567, Boundary, Travancore –Cochin Con Joint Mapping, 1896-1906,Kerala State Archives , Thiruvananthapuram, p. 3.

¹² Go No.4700/P.210 V.P. Madhava Rao,*Dewan* dated 21st March 1906 to the Resident.

¹³ Document No.4567, Boundary ,Travancore –Cochin Con

Joint Mapping, 1896-1906, Kerala State Archives , Thiruvananthapuram, p.5.

¹⁴ Ge No.S/ 380 K.Krishna Swamy Rao, Dewan, Travancore dated 6th December 1898, to the Superintendent of Travancore Survey.

¹⁵ Document No.4567, Notes of Consultation held at Erunakulam on the 28th March 1906 between the Peishkar of Kottayam and Survey Superintendent of Travancore and Cochin.

¹⁶ Document No .4567, Memorandum on the Mapping of the Encroachments of the Travancore - Cochin Boundary. p.5.

¹⁷ Ref. on.C.no.453/Pol, K. Krishnaswamy Row, Dewan dated 1st May 1903 to the Resident.

¹⁸Go. No.1691/ P. 99 ,Dewan V.P. Madhava Rao dated 1st February 1906 To the Resident.

¹⁹G.No.540/Dept No.171, The Superintendent, Travancore Survey dated 2march 1897 to Chief Secretary of Cochin.

²⁰ Telegram 24th march1906, Meeting of Survey Superintendent, *Dewan Peshkar*,Kottayam to Chief Secretary.

²¹ G.No .271 Dept No.93 G.N. Krishana Row , Superintendent of Travancore Survey date 29th April.1906 to Chief Secretary of Travancore.

²² G.N. 699/Department No.457, J.J. Thomilson, Superintendent of Travancore dated 28th November1898 to the Dewan of Travancore.

²³G.No. 280/Dept No.90 , G.N. KrishnaRao, Superintendent Travancore datd24 April 1907Survey to the Chief Secretray.

²⁴Ref.On.C.No.383 of 83/ L.R. N.Subramanyalyer, Dewan Peishkar,Kottayam, dated 22nd 1907 to the Chief secretary.

²⁵*Ibid*.

²⁶Document No.4567, Boundary, Travancore –Cochin Con Joint Mapping,1896-1906, Kerala State Archives, Thiruvananthapuram (Kerala) India.

²⁷ Go. No.10793, P. Rajagopalachari Dewan Travancore dated 18th December 1907 to the Resident of Travancore and Cochin.

13th
Year
★★★★★ of Excellence ★★★★★