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Abstract
The subject of land is conceived as an important component of agricultural economy. For many factors, the Sistan landscape was not exploited favorably, and its residents lived a miserable life as many were forced to leave the country in order to meet their ends. Different kinds of ownerships, namely endowed, public, private and lordship in Sistan are as old as history goes in this region. The understanding of ownership and exploiting system on this land has been a need for researchers working on this field: this study can be viewed as a prominent issue in the history and society of this region. The reason is that most problems the Sistanian have arise from the matter of land. Indeed, is there any factor that contributed to the fate of this area more fundamental than land and its related issues? One can realize the fact that most social, economic, political and cultural issues of this area end up with land by looking into agricultural economy and land- related facts predominating this area! A topic has been made through centuries. This suggests that different kinds of ownership and lands namely endowed, public, private and lordship still matter in this area. This article is in quest of an answer that accounts for the questions of what impact the land has on the social life of Sistanian people. Moreover, what ownerships can be found in this town? In addition, what kind of history they hold in Sistan? And what changes the landholderships brought up in this territory?
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Introduction
Different kinds of ownerships and lands namely endowed, public, private and lordship in Sistan are as old as the history goes in the Sistanian’s homeland. Perhaps, the origin of the flourished agriculture and landing in this area can be traced through its Zoroastrian doctrine as well as appropriate natural and economic conditions. It is because Sistan was one of the key places where followers of Zoroastrianism lived. Its doctrines were built on the promotion of agriculture, and often had an admirable look on agriculture and land. The religion was keenly interested in farming (Mesgar & Mohammadi, 2011: 357). The significance of farming was to the extent that Achaemenid emperors had a great fondness for agriculture and usually admired farmers and farming (Joneidi, 1999, 22). Moreover, during 1959 to 1963, when discovering the Burnt city, Italian archeologists found the remains of a life dependent on farming among the Sistanian in third millennium B.C.: wheat, vinegar grains and hemp, which suggest that the residents had passed the basic procedures for farming and managed to exploit appropriately Hirmand river and its fertile delta by regulating an irrigational system (Sistani, 1989, 2c, 452).

People said a lot about the fertility of Sistan land (the Hirmand Delta). With a conceivable water shortage in this area, farmers and cultivators managed to create the best agricultural economy through their former experience. The agricultural economy involves cultivating lands during fall and harvesting it during summer. With such way of cultivating and basic farming, the lands under cultivation in Sistan were several times bigger in the last century than what it is today (Badei, 1980, 12). According to “the history of Sistan” as to the effect of farming and landing on the social and economic life of this territory, “it is a city where standing on its own, is independent from others; if a caravan comes along, anything from any benedictions with different colors and grandiose garments and what kings and friends deserve to have can be found in this city, so that they feel no need to go to another place as they have everything in abundance. There are fresh fruits in winter so as goats with breast replenished of milks every summer, and fresh fish every time in a year as Great Lord appreciated it in His Book... and it is well known among residents of this world that (there is no land better than that of Sistan).”(The History of Sistan, 2008; 57-58)

During the sixth up to the tenth century A.C., there were three forms of grand land ownership in Sistan and in eastern Iran as well: endowed, estate, and bureau. Among these three forms, state lands (governmental) were the dominant form of land ownership. Later in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, royal properties and families were split off from state properties, while dividing ownership, considered as crucial one (Petrochefsky, 2535, 434). From the thirteenth century onwards, grand personal property and endowed property grew significance. With respect to owner and farmer relationship in Iran and in Sistan, farming fashion and paying ownership interest were dominant throughout the centuries in this Islamic country. Although it was more predominant than other forms of settlement (in return to work or money), paying ownership interest in kind was not as elegant as it seemed (Petrochefsky, 2535, 650). In other words, ownership interests have been paid based on time and place conditions and sometimes in kind and in cash, and sometimes in both forms. People said a lot about the fertility of Sistan lands (Hirmand Delta). With a conceivable water shortage in this area, farmers and cultivators created the best agricultural economy in
this area by their former experiences. With such way of cultivating and basic farming, the lands under cultivation in Sistan were several times bigger in the last century than what it is today (Badi, 1980, 12).

As far as Yaghub Leith Safari’s justice and fondness for his subjects were concerned, the history of Sistan considered the agricultural and irrigational system as an indication of justice of its state and the welfare of its subjects in the society; as one said that “he was in a position that sent a man from Neishabor to Sistan, with a mission to gather information about the status of Sistan and then have him informed. The man came to Sistan and he gained access to all of the town’s attribution and features and then came back to him. He asked him: were you in trouble? “Yes, I was”, the man said, he asked; was anyone who complained about the administration of water control? “No”, he replied. “Thank God”, he said. Did you pass along the Ammar? “Yes, I did”, he replied. Did you see any kids there? He asked. “No”, he replied. “Thank God”, he said. Did you get to old torques? “Yes, I did”, he replied. Were there villagers? He asked. “No”, he replied. “Thank God”, he said. Then the man stood up and started talking to give an account of what happened along the way, Yaqub withheld him, and said, “I’m quite aware of them, you don’t need to say anything further”. Again, the man stood up and went toward Shahin Bato; he started telling the story of his journey. Shahin said; “Can you wait till we reach there?” Shahin arrived at the presence of Amir, and said, “This man came with news and he needs to have it unfolded”. Aftermath, the Amir said that “I heard what he told me”, the current affairs of Sistan wrapped up with three things: construction, compassion, and contract. “I asked them all”. As with the construction, it is the story of the commander of water. I asked him if there was anyone having objection to the commander of water control. “No”, he replied. I was also aware that there is no doubt in telling the story of its construction and its compassion; seems like a small stream in the first place. “Once the prejudice comes to pass among two sections, was the original small stream flown towards the kids living in Ammar?” I asked. “No, it wasn’t” he replied. I knew immediately that the compassion still stands, as the prejudice does not. The other three are contract, actions and subjects. In case your subjects were treated with injustice, they make their way toward the old minaret and congregate there. They pray for help as they are treated cruelly. If they fail to get what they were praying for, they set off to flee. When I was aware that they are not there any longer, it came to me that they are not in an agreeable state. What else do I ask about now?

As for landing and various ownerships, the area was dependent on and influenced by the unstable situation of this country. The latter acknowledges it to some extent. However, there is a difference between the ways of landing, the type of ownership and rules observed in the country and in Sistan; it is being considered in this article. Among the variety of ownerships available in Iran, the endowed estate is considered relatively safe. The despot ruler failed to manipulate them at his will. According to some researchers including Dr. Seif, the fact is that there is no real free and unlimited ownership, meaning that individual ownerships were usually threatened or at stake (Seif, 1999; 174). As for the Sistan territory, its all estates, lands became public, and the rest were ruined by the order of Naser-al-Din-Shah (Lemton, 1981: 435). In the past, there were different forms of ownerships in Sistan, which included:

**A) Domain (public) property or real bureau**

Domains are the lands legally belonging to the government. These lands are allowed to be sold or bought only by the permission and knowledge of the government (Badie, 1981: 29). Until the early days of the Constitutional Revolution, public lands, in effect, belonged to the Shah. Having the Constitutional System settled and the constitution passed, Shah’s powers were limited and domains were considered as public lands. So long as Mohammad Shah Qajar’s period came, the estates and lands were at local elite disposal and they were regarded as governors of Sistan, who were appointed by Shah, and owner of Sistan. In return for this, they sent the assessed tax to the Court. The rules of ownership in some areas of Sistan were conferred to governors and generals of Sistan by the Safavid, Afshari and Qajar Court (a sample of the document showed herein). In Safavid period, real property was considered as domains and real bureau because of the connection among different parts of the Court. After Nasser Din Shah’s ultimatum, many Sistan lands became public (Lemton, 1984: 435; Bazi & Akbari, 2001: 140).

In the early Naseri era, the number of domains increased. However, most of them were sold due to excessive expenses and the need for money (Rahmani, 1971: 1410). In addition to this, selling net goods continued in the Mozafar-al-Din Shah era, by which public lands were reduced to some extent. Public lands were usually run through a lease. The lease system was of traditional systems operated in the agricultural society of Iran. By the lease administration, tenants leased the land for a fixed term and in return for fixed amount of money. The attempt that tenant made so as to harvest more crops was to his own benefit. Traditional farming was more inclined to this system rather than share-taking system. However, the major defect of this system could be attributed to the potential losses that might have been incurred by the tenant. The only issue that made the farmer concerned was that the tenant in this specified system could possess the land only for a short term; meanwhile the owner was allowed to get back his land at the end of an agricultural year.
It appears that Alam Khan, the Amir, who was appointed as a governor by Nasser Din Shah, played a pivotal role in making the Sistan lands public. During his rule, he assigned some clergies and notable persons of Sistan to offer the state some parts of the lands that could be conferred to them as lease. The interim government came to an agreement with such a proposal. He then forced some generals and local chieftains to pay taxes in kind. After a while, this state had been considered as leasehold and finally the Sistan lands became public by set of measures this person made (Lemton, 1981: 435). The writings of Abolhassan, the court physician as to Sistan, suggest that personal landholdership, particularly farm ownership, in Sistan did not exist at all. Furthermore, if there was any land around, it belonged to the state that governed them and was used by local feoffees. In return for this exploitation, they were expected to pay rental fees and tax. In some parts of this writings, it tells us that “in the city of Sistan, the tax law was built upon the following: the governor takes up one third of the crops the farmer harvested and forty one cows and sheep, and out of hunters, forty one feathers of predators; businessmen and unions and other shoppers are not liable to this” (Jamalzade, 1991: 220).

Before 1931, public lands in Sistan were rented to generals and notable local persons. In so far as, generals and tenants of public lands did not attempt to fertilize the mentioned lands and they were negligence about the rights of their subjects and refused to pay leasehold to the government. In 1931, the government made a decision on dividing the public lands as a share among farmers (Lemton, 1981, 437).

In November 1937, the law on selling net lands around Tehran was also passed by the national parliament. In a number of cases, the policy on selling net lands to individuals was intended for making profit as well as accommodating nomads (Bazi & Akbari, 2001: 132 - 133). In the Reza Shah period, the area of crown lands had reduced (Badei, 1981: 30). After August in 1941, when Reza Shah left the country and communist movements grew, publicizing the transference and vending arable public lands caused to spread the rumors of dividing lands among farmers, a discussion which had though never turned into practice. (Badei, 1981: 31)

In 1925, Milspo recognized that the amount of Iran’s public lands were increased and outnumbered, meaning that their annual crop yields was over 36000000000 kg; much of it was the crops of rich grain lands in Sistan. Based on an unofficial statistics collected in 1948, the aggregation of public estates and the countryside in Iran were roughly 1373 villages and towns. (Azkia, 1991, 31)

Therefore, Sistan was one of the important public areas in the country. The report, made by Mahmud Jam the head of Khorasan state during the reign of Pahlavi I, considered the state of public estates inappropriate: “Most Sistan lands belong to the government. There were 191 small public towns, which had been divided among some tenants(The center of presidential documents, 2004: 48). He presented the owners of these 191 villages as few persons who are 11 individuals as follows: 1) Amir Mohammad Reza Khan Samsamodole; 2) Amir Masom Khan Hesam-o-Dolleh; 3) Khodad Khan, the general; 4) Ali Khan, the general; 5) Mir Ali Kalantar; 6) Haj Sheikh Mohammad Reza; 7) Mohammad Sharif Khan; 8) Hossein Khan Sarabandi; 9) Haj Amir Khan Sanjariani; 10) Haj Amir Khan, and 11) Malek Mohammad Ali Khan Kiani.

In his report to Teymourtash, the minister of court of Pahlavi, he expressed the living state of the peasants in Sistan horrible: “The peasants of Sistan became poor and destitute to the degree that some of them feed only on fish and poultry of rivers a few months a year and on grain bread in other months... There is hardly a person who could afford to buy a pair of shoes. 70 out of 100 of these people were bare feet and maybe 30 out of 100 of them were naked. Perhaps, inhabitants living in 50 out of 100 small towns and farms in Sistan would not turn on a light in a month” (The center of presidential documents, 2004: 50). Aftermath, he began to remind us about the obligatory jobs(i.e. drudgery), namely shutting down a dam and building embankments and drainage, which put a heavy burden upon the back of this people. This left them desperate to take any steps to make their land and farms a better place to live, and to farm. In addition to the pathetic state of the peasants, he lamented, again, the state of public Sistan lands and their fertility of which one eight of tenth remained barren (The center of presidential documents,2004; 53 & 51).

Dr. Taqi Bahrami, who came to Sistan to study the agricultural affairs, prepared a detailed report on the situation of land and agriculture in Sistan and handed it down to the Ministry of Economy in the early years of Reza Shah's monarchy. In the same year, this ministry was in charge of public lands. He announced, “We have no longer lordship land and presented chieftains and generals as tenants of net lands. He claimed that there are one hundred and twenty of them (The center of presidential documents, 2004; 371). He also announced the state of net lands inappropriate. Despite the fact that none of these people had a registered deed of ownership, they soon began to sell and buy these lands as some of them divided among heirs because of the death of their owners and then became smaller. Consequently, two classes, great owners and small owners emerged. Because of seeking power, it was the supremacy and pressure of the owners in the first place that operated on the water shortage at time of low flow water; this made small owners sustain losses. In the second place, land weathering and a fall in crop yields appeared. The lack of registered deed of ownership at the hands of farmers
was another barrier in the agricultural development of Sistan. Due to a failure on trust issue, new owners were hardly inclined to invest substantially on making the land's situation better and improving irrigation networks. Their agricultural activity rather sounded traditional. Until this time, dividing crops among owners and farmers was the current procedure in this town. Endowed properties involve persons who make these lands immovable and take all their benefits based on charity or personal intention (Bazi & Akbari, 2003: 134). The endowment is of two kinds: 1) Special endowment through which the interests of the property are flown into a special person, and 2) General endowment through which the interests of the property belong to the common people (Lemton, 1991: 413). The endowment existed in the time of Yaqub Leith, so it was said that Yaqub Leith had built one of these malls and bequeathed it to Adine mosque, one thousand Derhams (money unit in Safavid era) had been made out of the hospital, Mecca and the mall (Estakhri, 1988: 194). Among general endowed properties was Qale Fath for which the endowed estate of Hamze Kiani doomed appropriate (Tit, 1985: 145).

The endowed estate was contingent upon the presence of clergies and Saadat, because they had strong influence on the development of the endowment custom as well as on their religious role. Concerning this, there are crucial proofs and evidence that reveal the endowment practiced due to Ta'zieh (Iranian Passion Play) for Imam Hossein and supply of expenses for mourning ceremony. This suggests that Shiite had such a crucial position in this area. In addition to this, there was a letter of endowment written in 1893 by Seyed Abdollah, the clergy. According to the letter, the Dolat Abad lands had been conferred to for Ta'zieh of Imam Hossein (Sadr, 2009: 20). Moreover, Haj Molla Ali Akbar, the leader of Friday prayers in Sistan in the Naseri era, endowed many estates to be used in Ta'zieh holders of Seyyed-o-Shohada and needed materials of students of religious science in Bonjar in 1893.

In one of the letters of endowment written in 1897, Molla Mohammad Hossein endowed plenty of lands, Marki and Ghorghory, Neyzar, Zaghon southern hill, Kanz eastern hill, eastern Gore palaki, Gore Kamalak, along with water and landscape to Ta'zieh for Imam Hossein. Surprisingly enough, these lands were big enough that some of them remained in the territory of today Afghanistan. Agha Seyyed Abdolla also bequeathed an estate in Khaje Ahmad small town under surveillance of the interim government around 1892 in order to have any crop yields and property used for religious practice. (Refer to the appendices; the original letter of endowment available in the office of Zabol Charity department).

C) Private property

Personal ownerships are divided into two parts: A) yeomen, and B) Great owner.

A) Yeomen; was another example of landing in Sistan. As for designating yeomen, there is no special criterion. In actuality, all individuals who were considered lower than great owners of lands were called yeomen (Bazi and Akbari, 2004: 135). This sort of estates had increased in number after land reforms in Sistan.

B) Great owners; was an important example of landing in Sistan. However, there was no actual bailiff for this land ownership. It was because the land ownership in every area has a diverse situation. In some areas, those who are the owners of several villages or own the entire village are called great owners in some regions (Lemton, 1981:458). To be a great owner in Sistan, one must become a multifaceted owner of a village. Most of the estates belonged to the great owners who were generals in local terms. The individuals owned the estates as inherited from their ancestors or in return for public service, they offered.

The group of great owners was divided into a few classifications: 1) The owners who inherited the estates from their forebears or owned them for a period of offering public services and the like;2) Chieftains and generals of tribes and nomads who had large estates at their disposal either by governmental feoffor or as family heritage, and3) clergies who either inherited great areas of land from their ancestors who were of major owner class at the time of Safavid, or had obtained great a deal of wealth and properties by being the custodian of endowed lands (Lemton, 1983 :462). According to a document in the Naseri era, the area of Hermake (Hermak), Shahi Darre, Dozdah, and their subterranean water canals were transferred to Mohammad Reza Khan, the general, in 1848, in exchange for his public services (Appendix 4). Depending on his public services, everyone had an area with great population. In as much as they incurred great deal of expenses with the custom and social state, they undermined savings. Extra expenses, magnanimity, maintenance, and general hospitality were among the customs that landholders held. Sometimes, the discrepancy between the owners of two contiguous areas had their money and power swallowed.

Among major owners in Sistan, we can name Miran Kalantar Khandan whose evidence indicates that their landing records date back to the Safavid, Afshar and Qajar era. For instance, Shah Tahmasb transferred Bishe and Kasang from Sistan estates to Badie-oal-Zaman Mirza and Agha Mohammad khan by an order made in 966 AH. (Kalantar, 2005: 79)

The decree of Safavid Shah made in 1038 AH is a proof for Uzbekian revolt in Sistan and how Sistani peasant farmers split off; it ordered Jalaledin Mohammad Khan, the owner, to gather peasants and farmers from other States and drive them to Sistan and other states not to intervene in this issue (Kalantar, 2005:94). Reviewing their ownership decree in
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Afshar era reveals that there would not be any significant change in the ownership state of estates in Sistan in spite of the changes in the government.

Nader Shah Afshar ordered Amir Mohammad Ja’far Bik Kalantar Alka’ to collect land taxes and spend them for the court’s money orders and headmen’s, the village elders’ and the subjects who obey him in this issue. Moreover, he can avail of some of them for his sustenance and corps. (Kalantar, 2005:104)

The trend continued even in the Qajar era, and the extended family (known as Khandan) of Kalantary kept their administration going in their own states namely Bonjar, Naser Abad, Fatholah, Jazinak, Kemak, Shih Ab, Eskel, and Ghasem Abad.

In addition to the villages mentioned above, the seized and inherited estates in the Pahlavi era in the other parts of Sistan after the plan for transferring lands implemented are as follows: Esmaeel Ali village, Ali Abad, Zahedan, Gol Mohammad Beyk, Asghar village, Mohammad Dadi Kod, Jabar village, Rende, Kang Molla Abdollah, Ali Namrodi village, Masti Khun, Mohammad Ghasem, Ali Akbar village, Molla Hossein, Ghasem Abad, Jangi Khun village, Tape Daz, Hassan Rahman, Eskel, and Banjar (kalantar, 2005: 132).

Among other major owners in Sistan, it was the extended family of Kiani who were the oldest ruling family in the area. The estate of Jalaledin Kiani, the last ruler of this extended family, lasted in Sistan until Mohammad Shah Qajar’s period. Some property records of this extended family had been sent to the court of Nasser-al-din Shah at the time of Goldsmith arbitration by an Iranian delegation (Zolfaghare Kermani) accompanied by Azim Khan Kiani, the ruler. “On Saturday of November 17, 1951, I woke up early in the morning, performed prayers,… and met Heshmat-al-Molk, He asked us to take him to the court” (Kermani, 1995 :190). Concerning this, it is said, in one of the resources, that “Today, I took this respected servant, who came to us with special agent, of Azim Khan Kiani, the ruler, to be received in audience of Grand Navab. Navab, my holiness, required us to tell the recent story of Sistan in detail and said to write down the materials of the booklet” (Kargozar, 2004: 95). The extended family’s record is one of the Iranian governmental documents by which it can prove its sovereignty in Sistan.

In the Goldsmith arbitration, Iran’s government cited these proofs (Ahmadi, 1999: 270 & 261). Some parts of the records of this family can be related to Safavid, Afshar and Qajar era, which represent their ownership on Sistan lands. The records include selling deed of Bashqaq village and Chang Morqan village dating back to 1627(Raees Alzakerin, 2007: 14), the deed which divides the lands into forty parts including Qarie Bashqanqand Qarieh Chang Morqan dating back to 1697 (Raees Alzakerin, 2007). The selling of deeds of Mahmoud Abad Sefli village located at the back of Kondorak city in 1817 (Raees-ol-Alzakerin, 2007: 19) indicates that this extended family had many estates in Sistan.

However, since the reign of Nasser-al-din Shah, the provisions of rules mentioned above had changed and landing affairs pertinent to Sistan transferred to other generals as supervisory or tenancy with respect to the lands had become public in Sistan. Therefore, former property owners and landholders became tenants and leaseholder of the government. In one case, the state of headman and tenancy in Khamak hill and Dolat Abad bequeathed to Ali Jangi, the headman, and in return for this he was asked to pay governmental taxes based on a contract stipulate provisions made in the booklet revolving about equally sharing the said places in an agreeable fashion whether it be in cash or in kind to those having money order. Moreover, it required him to treat subjects and inhabitants with good conduct to the degree that their prosperity was ensured. Just farmers and previously mentioned peasants recognize the previously mentioned man as headman and tenant who is independent of written rules. This was written on Ramadan 1949. (Raees-ol-Alzakerin, 2007:120)

One reason for this can be attributed to a change in politics and government of the region. In general, the Sistan state was separated from the Kiani extended family in the reign of Mohammad Shah Qajar, and was handed down to the Alam extended family after a term of ruling by different families, and chaos. The history of Sistan can be divided into two sections:

1. The ruling span led by the Kiani extended family and accompanied by visscissitudes that managed to maintain its power in Sistan until the assault of Mohammad Shah Qajar occurred in 1878 in Herat. The last ruler of this extended family was the king Jalaledin Kiani. After Nader the death of Nader Shah Afshar up to Mohammad Shah Qajar era, a solid relationship was held between Kianians and the commanders of Afghans, in a sense that this territory was under the ageist of the commanders and Herat's and sometimes Qandahar’s (Hedayat, 1984:87), to the extent that a family kinship established among them (Raeesol Zakerin, 1991: 178), so that King Suleiman Kiani let her daughter marry Ahmad Shah Ebdali, the first pretender to the Afghanistan monarchy, and Kamran Mirza, the ruler of Herat, married the daughter of King Bahram (Mahmoud, 1985: C 3, 550 and Raees-al-Zakerin, 1991: 174). This caused a political and family relationship to be formed between them. Consequently, the representative of Afghanistan argued at the arbitration of Goldsmith “Sistan is considered as part of Herat and the estate of Afghan from Ahmad Shah Ebdali onward and on behalf of
Afghan the ruler was in charge and collected taxes". (Tabatabaei Majd, 1994: 436)

2. Ruling the estates by the head of extended family in Sistan started from 1838. The era was started with the union of Sistan's tribes, which include Sarabandi, Shahraki, and Sanjarani all of which stood against Jalaledin Kiani the king and ended up with the egress of Kianian off the region. After a while, Mohammad Reza Khan Sarabandi became the ruler of Sistan that lasted until 1865. Within these years, there was a good relationship between the federal government of Iran and Sistan generals, but the era was accompanied with chaos, which ended up with the dominance of Alavi, the extended family in the region.

The span of Alam state, which began in 1865 and continued until 1937 in face of its all difficulties. Reviewing this era reveals that the position of ownership and landing in this landscape is dependent on political and governmental changes, so that there were trails of Kiani's estates in ownership records until Fath Ali Shah era. However, there was hardly a trail of them in governmental and local records from that time on. One of their last ownership records is related to the one made in 1888. The issue is related to the political and casual association of Sistan generals with Afghan commanders. The daughter of Mohammad Reza Khan Sarabandi had married Seyyed Mohammad Khan the son of Yar Mohammad Khan, the minister of Herat (Raeesol Zakerin, 1991:302 & Sistani, 1989: 4, 4).

Therefore, the relationship of Kianian with Iran's government had cut and most of them as great owners of the lands immigrated from Sistan. Rival tribes and families namely Sarabandi, Shahraki, Sanjarani, Sarani and Narouei seized their properties. Because of this chaos and insecurity, the establishment of family kings occurred in the area. In the same period, the situation in the area was worsening by the dominance of England over India and their presence in the region. With exploiting policies, the geopolitics state of the region changed.

From this time on, Iran’s rules, which were received in audience of generals and chieftains who had been emerged as major owners, were passed. This showed that Iranian government encountered a lack of political power in the region. There had been many orders made Nasser-al-din Shah, Neiraldole, the ruler of Khorasan and Sistan, Mozafar-al-din Shah in audience of generals and lords of the lands such as Mohammad Ali Khan Shahraki, Darvish Khan Narroei and Seyyed Abdullah (Kalantar, 2005:4). In these rules, Iran’s government called upon them to abide by him and be optimistic about Shah’s favors. In return for this, some estates were handed down to them. In one of the rules, it has stipulated “one supervisor and bailiff having the entirety of the village, in which the tribe lives, should be bequeathed to the majesty… Abbass Khan, the son of deceased Ali Darvish Khan to perform farming, and collect, as stipulated in the laws, imbursements of the new skyscraper, the whole output of what people created, total financial aid, and a total of thirteen bull riders”. (Raeesol Zakerin, 2007: 92)

It seemed that Iran’s government noticed the importance of the position of Sistan territory with respect to the absence of local rulers and how Kianians became homeless and moved to India and Afghanistan. In order to dominate Sistan completely, they sought to fortify their presence in the region by making chieftains and generals subservient and transferring lands to them. Therefore, he decided to make Sistan estates public after a while to avail him of making decisions with as much power as he needed, and at the same time, he would have been able to flatter other rulers and to show himself off. Moreover, he intended to manipulate generals and chieftains of states in the region anytime by his will. At the time of Nasser-al-din Shah, it was needed to build up some sorts of flexibility and compromise concerning taxes and services with respect to critical and threatening circumstances of boundary measurements in Sistan and the so-called story of arbitration. Therefore, King Heshmat returned to compromise and diplomacy as he pointed out in an interview with Zolfaza Kermani that "Insofar as the estate is located on border, its subjects are all savages, and I intend to rule with diplomacy and serve the Blochies who live around us. I want to hand over the entire villages to chieftains, clergies, descendants of the Holy Prophet and local people (known as Saadat) as their duty and pension (Kermani, 1994, 139- 138). Furthermore, Zolfaza Kermani referred to the diplomacy King Heshmat entertain “we will notplacetaxes on their cow, sheep and donkey, since King Heshmat is intent on diplomacy and what he has in his mind is to attract Blochies tribe and people off Afghanistan's attention, and he wants to favor them boundlessly ... For instance, Sharif Khan e Baloch, the general, and his sons and brothers received money from King Heshmat ... and he appointed them as the grand general of Sistan state. (Kermani, 1993: 188- 89)

At this time, generals and chieftains were no longer the owner of the lands; rather they were considered as tenants. In addition to obeying the Iranian government, they were required to ensure that they pay taxes. This measure happened after the establishment of King Heshmat’s state in Sistan. (Lemton, 1981: 138)

The trend applied to one of social influential strata in the territory, namely decedents of the Holy Prophet and reputed clergies. In the same period, Mohammad Mehdi, the great clergy in Sistan, had many estates in the villages: Ale Sofi, Piran, Taqi, Dehkol, Podine and Balakhan and..., as well as religious influence (Raeesol Zakerin, 1991:205). The previously mentioned man was totally against England’s politics...
in the region, and participated in 1906 uprising against the England Consul (Chari, 2011: 384). Saadat Tabatabaei and Hosseini also owned numerous estates and villages in Sistan.

In addition to running the lands of Dolat Abad and Qale Kohne, Qale Nou, Khaleghdad village and Sokhte village, Sadr Hosseini, an extended family, had the possession of most parts of Shib Abi, Shahraki, Narouei (Sadr, 2009: 30). They were even exempt from paying dues and taxes based on governmental rules. Concerning this, there were orders by Khorasan’s state and Amir Kabir, Asef-al-Dole and King Heshmat, dating back to 1871. The trend continued in Pahlavi era. This was certainly because of the intimate relationship they forged with Alam, the extended family, and Pahlavi. (Sadr, 2009: 31-760)

The extension of their lands and being exempt from paying tax gave rise to discontent and complaint among chieftains and generals in the region including Pordel Khan, the general, Khodadad Khan to the federal government.

The disagreement on arable lands such as Borj Kohne and Ali Abad was stronger and led to a wrestling match and competition in Tehran. In a personal report by Mirza Ali, which dates back to 1909, the disagreements on lands set forth in a few parts. This report went as far as identifying the origin of these land conflicts and disagreements traced to a foreign stimulus and Afghan government:

“Today, the government with mass presence calls on generals and state rules written on Borj Kohne and Ali Abad were used to evacuate the mentioned village. They openly replied that Borj Kohnehad been developed by Khodadad khan ancestors and as long as you would not expel us by law, we will not leave here and as it is clearly evident, the evacuation of estate is not possible unless by force. However, implementing this decision is quite against the Iranian policies on this crucial border. It is obviously suspicious that there is a foreign stimulus at play. The brother of Sardar Khan, Jan Khan, had gone to Kabul at this time, and he saw great hospitality from the aforesaid man, and Khodadad khan said that he was assigned to set off to Afghan estate and if he left hopeless from the members of government, we would depart along with the whole family... and people in Borj Kohne claimed if they give back the mentioned villages to Haji Seyyed Ali once again, they would escape right away with the general”.(Sadr, 2009:9)

In return for this, Khodadad Khan, the general, and Abbas Khan, the general, and Pour Del Khan contacted thepeople in charge in Khorasan and Sistan State by telegraph, reminding them about the services they offered, and making it public that they will set off for Afghanistan as a threat. After you implement this, the servants with their own tribe would be left desperate and have to cut interest regarding Sistan and sadly leave Iran...they would not make themselves satisfied making us homeless and that we leave our homelands. However, his majesty could remember quite well that he needs servants and tribes to serve the government and nation (the signature), Khodadad Abbas, Por Del. (Sadr, 2009:94) Khodadad khan, the general, reported on another telegraph to Khorasan ruler and expressed his complaint as follows: “My father and I who had served in this country and still do, do not deserve to be sold in exchange for a Seyyed who receives pension (Sadr, 2009: 94). With the disagreement of mentioned generals, the federal and state government recognized the rights ofAgha Mir Seyyed Ali indicating that their crucial stance at the center of power. Among major owners of Sistan lands was Khandan Alam. This extended family divided into two classes the one concentrating in Birjand, and the other who were settled in Sistan. They seemed to have intimate relationship, but in actuality, they were enemies and rivals. The way they engage in landing was different from each other. The first class (Birjand) was much into utilizing its political power in landing; political power was their priority. The second class (Sistan) sought to gain benefit from landing more and extending their range of influence. The first group believed that applying political power is preferred to the interest coming out of landing; meanwhile the method the second group employed was the same common and traditional one owner used in a sense that owning estates is a means to gain political power (Lemton, 1981; 470).

C- Joint lands of people of sheep farming and villagers

There was a community in Sistan who engaged in sheep rearing and are called cattle owners. The cattle graze in canebrake (Lemton, 1981:609). In the present century, the extent to which nomads and cattle owners immigrate is limited in comparison with the past. It is because these lands are growingly benefiting from local private ownerships. Cattle owners as jointly owned used the canebrake lands and pastures around Hamoon and the only tax they paid to the government was animal tax for animals grazing grass. However, some generals gradually seized pastures and the right of grazing for their animals as Kalantar Eskel who was a grand landholder and collected fee for grazing from the entire eastern canebrake.
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