

Slavery in Colonial Bihar during the Nineteenth Century

Mukesh Kumar

From the very beginning slavery has been practiced in virtually all parts of the world. It was a universal element in the social and economic structure of all ancient civilizations—in those of Greece, Rome, The Middle East, China, Japan, the Malayan Archipelago and India. Slavery is an ancient institution whose origin is impossible to date.

With the advance of time and crystallisation of social institutions, slavery became more and more institutionalised, and its legally recognized forms and practices increased. It is no accident that the name for the opponents of the Aryan invaders of India, '*dasas*', is later used in classical Sanskrit for slaves or bondsmen. They constituted the lowest strata of the society. A slave is a person whose moral power to claim anything as due to him is not recognized. Despite the static use of the unfree labour in the Mauryan period, the law was notably mild in its prescription for the treatment of slaves, and Megasthenes failed to notice slaves in Indian society. Agrarian and domestic slavery continued throughout the ancient period.¹ With the arrival of the Muslim invaders, slavery in war obtained a fresh and strengthened lease of life. Slavery during the medieval period acquired connotations and a magnitude which was bound to affect the ruled. The new rulers were a product of a very different historical experience—one in which slavery played a major and unconventional role. This period saw a tremendous growth in the incidence of domestic slavery.²

When the English first came to India in pursuit of trade and commerce, they found slavery established in the land as a commonly accepted social institution duly sanctioned by the laws of the land. This evil was an inherited one, well adjusted in the Hindu and the Muslim states to which the English company had succeeded. The company largely followed the policy of non-interference in the Indian affairs and concentrated mainly on its trading activities as well as on

ways to establish British hegemony in the region.³ The rise of the East India company as a predominant political force in the country did not lead to any change in the position of slaves; rather, it encouraged the practice.

The period between 1756 and 1765 was one characterized by chaos, conflict and confrontation which saw four enthronements of Nawabs in Bengal with several shocking military campaigns. Such frequent change of the head of the province after a half century of raids by the Marathas seriously weakened the administration. The receipt of Diwani of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa by the Company in 1765 and the separation of power from responsibility further aggravated the situation. The life of a common person had become very difficult under the exorbitantly higher demand in land revenue and its rigorous collection along with the systematic destruction of Indian industries. The situation became even more precarious during the famines of 1769-71 and 1785 because no relief measure was undertaken by the British officials. The Company's administrative policies further reduced the poverty stricken peasants and the landless labourers to slavery. In practice, the Permanent Settlement placed the ryots at the mercy of the zamindars who encroached upon the rights of the ryots to the waste or pasture lands attached to every village in the absence of any definite demarcation of revenue-paying and waste lands. The Permanent Settlement rendered the acceptance of *pattas* obligatory on the part of the cultivators as per the terms specified by the *zamindars* who were authorized under the Regulation IV of 1794 to issue their own rate of rent to be collected from the cultivators. To enable the landlords, farmers and even dependent *talukdars* and farmers to realize the arrears of their demand, the Regulation XVII of 1793 vested them with the powers of restraint and sale of the personal property of the cultivation. The Company had also tightened its grip on the zamindars, who were threatened by the loss of their estate in case of failing to observe the *sunset law*. To reduce the expense on agriculture the zamindars preferred their lands to be cultivated by the slaves, who would cost less in comparison to the free tillers. In the absence of any rights except those found in *pattas*, the resident cultivators found themselves utterly helpless and were cornered in the society as a frustrated and forlorn group.⁴ They had to give up their own agriculture under severe socio-economic pressure and faced a situation which has always been considered a state of great distress for an Indian, as is evident from a local proverb:

*Chhore kheti howe faqir
Sada rahe oh bepir*

(A man who gives up cultivation becomes a pauper and remains forever without a spiritual guide)

In a Minute of 21 September 1815, Governor-General Moira himself admitted the inequities of the system. The rights of the ryots were annihilated by the *pattas* being forced on them for payment in money by the *zamindars* who fixed no limits on their demand. (Loans advanced to labourers by landlords invoked the supply and demand theory to account for the debt-slavery).⁵

Lord Hastings also confessed in a Minute in 1819 that due to the Company's pledge the oppression of the lower classes was confirmed throughout the region and the Company's officials were unable to relieve the sufferers.⁶

The famines, its aftermath of continuing agricultural stress and the economic hardship pressed upon the people by the revenue demands led great numbers of starving people to sell themselves into slavery, as the only way to preserve their lives and support their families.

In Bihar slavery existed on a wide scale. The slave force was mainly derived from the internal traffic which was generally maintained in three ways:

- a. Under pressure of need, i.e., in the time of famines and other hardship parents sold their children, husbands, wives or the adults themselves entered voluntarily into slavery. The sale of children by their parents or relations as a result of poverty, and the inability to maintain them in times of famine or of other general calamities, was the most prolific source of slavery and the origin of almost the entire slave-population. In the year 1833, owing to the disastrous inundation experienced in the southern parts of Bengal, hundreds of half-starved, helpless wretches thronged the suburbs and streets of Calcutta and the adjoining districts, offering themselves and their children for sale for a few measures of rice only.⁷
- b. As a result of violence, i.e., by the kidnapping of men, women and children, which was the second most prolific source of slavery in Bihar. The practice of kidnapping children from their parents in the interiors of the region and selling them as slaves in Calcutta was widely prevalent and is corroborated by the Minutes issued by the Governor-in-Council of Bengal to the Hon'ble Court of Directors dated 18 October 1774 and from R.K. Dick, Judge at Dacca to H.H. Turnbull.⁸ Young girls and female children were kidnapped or forced by enticing their parents into selling themselves as prostitutes in big cities.⁹ On 24 August 1839, the *Calcutta Christian Advocate* reported that "the practice of enticing away young native

widows, and of kidnapping and purchasing young destitute native children for the vilest bazaar purposes, is daily carried on to a considerable extent in Calcutta.”¹⁰

- c. By natural growth: (i) the children of slaves were normally themselves of servile status, and (ii) women marrying or cohabiting with slaves became slave. Another source of slavery in Bihar was slavery by birth. Slaves were the personal property of their masters, and as such the offsprings of the slaves were always the slaves of their masters or their successors. During the first two decades of the Company’s rule, as has been seen, many people were sold into slavery due to famine and other natural disasters. Their offsprings were also regarded as the slaves of their masters.

Sometimes, punitive measures also contributed in the growth of the slave population during the Company’s rule. In 1772, the Governor of Bengal was faced with the challenge to establish law and order in the region where, due to forceful realisation of revenue by the Company after the famine, a large number of people were forced to become plunderers for their own survival.¹¹ The Company did not do anything to relieve them of the revenue demand or to pacify them. It decided to execute the dacoits and enslave their family members”...they are all, therefore, alike criminals; wretches who have placed themselves in a state of declared war with Government, and are, therefore, wholly excluded from every benefit of its laws.”¹² The Company formally sanctioned the institution of slavery as a penal measure “...every such criminal on conviction shall be carried to the village to which he belongs, and be executed to excite same as an terror and example to others...that the family of the criminal shall become the slaves of the state, and be disposed of for the general benefit and convenience of the people”.¹³

In the early years the Company was more concerned towards consolidate her position in India than to think about Indian social stratification, and so it did not pay any heed towards such social evils as slavery. The Conservative government in England had also suggested that the Company govern India only according to the Indian traditions. James Cumming, who had served the judicial and revenue department at the Board of Control, London, warned the Company to leave matters of social reforms, including slavery, to the Indian people who were at all events good enough to judge themselves in India.¹⁴

The English in India, in general, considered the existing state of slavery very mild in nature and advocated for its continuance. They were of the opinion that its abolition would be a great evil, the

consequences of which were beyond comprehension,¹⁵ because after the abolition the government would have to make provision for maintaining the starving poor in times of scarcity, and also to compensate the slave-owners who would lose a valuable category of private property.¹⁶ H.T. Colebrooke also supported the form of slavery prevalent in India and did not find it fit for the Company to abolish slavery or prevent enslavement or prohibit the sale of slaves within British India.¹⁷

However, J. Richardson, the Judge and Magistrate of Bundelkhand was one of the most outspoken critics of Indian slavery. He said that slavery was against the law of nature and thus it was one of the greatest evils present in the society. He firmly believed that with the abolition of slavery the population would increase faster and its use in production would work as a powerful preventive of famines.¹⁸ He protested against slavery and submitted his Draft Regulation on the Abolition of Slavery to the Judges of Sadar Dewani and Nizamat Adalat in 1809.¹⁹ But his Draft was put aside for quite some time and it was only in 1816 that the Draft was submitted to the Governor General.²⁰ Richardson was so disappointed with the treatment meted out to his efforts to end an evil that he made a very bold statement that the spirit of the British rule in India was to follow the usage of the country and the customs of the people, for the profit of the rulers and not for the benefit of the ruled.²¹

When W. Leycester, the Second Judge of the Bareilly court of Circuit, proposed the complete abolition of the East Indian Slavery,²² the court of Nizamat Adalat rejected this move on account of the better condition of the slaves in India in comparison to the same in other countries.²³

These measures reflect the real nature of the Company's understanding of slavery. It was very careful in its dealing with this issue and conformed to the paternalistic ideas of Munro, Malcom and Elphinston. It had no hope of sudden and miraculous changes in the progress of human society and the division of society into the rulers and ruled was for them, a natural order. For the paternalists, politics was experimental in nature, necessarily near-sighted, and essentially limited in its achievement. Hence they were not to be pursued dogmatically along a path of violent change.²⁴

The British largely followed the policy of non-interference, leading to apathy towards the vast population of the slaves. Barring some differences in the Hindu and Muslim religious interpretation of slavery, both these laws were almost parallel in terms of the content and form. In theory and practice we find that:

- i. A slave's right to emancipation was virtually non-existent.
- ii. Liberation from servitude was absolutely impossible under the legal system which was clearly biased favour of the slave-owners.
- iii. Slave women suffered as a class and where they were not directly under the control of the master, by sheer virtue of their conjugal ties with a slave, were subjected to being treated as a possession of the slave-owner.²⁵

The children born of slave women were also the property of the master. Drawing the interpretation based on the authorities of Shurhi, Heday and others, W.H. Macnaghten had remarked in his book on the Principles and Precedents of Muslim law that, "*the embryo follows the mother both in slavery and emancipation.*"²⁶ Hindu Law also supported this theme.

Slavery existed everywhere and exhibited the owner's absolute and unconditional control over the slaves who were present in a great number. As per the Law Commission in 1839, in the districts of Bihar the total number of slaves in domestic works, agricultural activities and in both was 79,888.²⁷ But this record provides only the figure of the able-bodied men-slaves engaged in agriculture and domestic services. The number of female slaves was not given nor was there any comprehensive record of child-slaves, including the girls who were sold to prostitutes in various *bazaars*.

John Richardson, the District Judge and Magistrate of Bundelkhand had noted in 1808 that "In Bihar there are districts under the company's dominion wherein to my knowledge the greatest part of the cultivators and labourers are slaves."²⁸ But this made little difference to the Company's overall understanding of this inhuman practice. According to a rough estimate by H. Russel presented before the Law Commission in 1839, in Bihar, Patna, Shahabad, Ramghar and Tirhut Districts, almost five per cent of the population were slaves.²⁹ Another witness, Pandit Vaidya Nath Mishra informed the Law Commission that in Tirhut and the adjoining district one to two sixteenth of the population were slaves.³⁰ In order to maintain the old Laws and institutions, the laws of slavery which suited the peculiar nature of the British rule in India were legalized, perpetuated and administered.

But there were other voices also in the environment. Claudius Buchanan, a spokesman of the missionary concept of the evolution of history in terms of progress in Christianity, was horrified with the Indian religious practices and social institutions based on inequality and especially with the tolerance with which the British Government in India viewed the existence of slavery.³¹ At times, in the early years, the

Company tried to control the level of slavery by issuing a regulation forbidding the stealing of children or/and their sale as slaves which involved legal procedures for the immoral trade without the execution of a deed.³² However, there was no question of emancipation which would have inflicted great financial loss upon the proprietors.³³ Patna Council advised that the rights of the masters over their slaves should not extend beyond the first generation³⁴ while MacPherson, the Governor-General in 1785 directed the officials to be very vigilant to prevent the sale of the children as slaves.³⁵ The Supreme Court in Calcutta also highlighted this evil with a clear note disapproving of the trade of children.³⁶ In 1789, Lord Cornwallis prohibited the export of natives of British India as slaves,³⁷ but could not challenge the proprietary rights of the masters. Nevertheless, the attack on this inhuman practice came from the rank of the Company's officials and the Liberals from England. A British officer Baber charged the colonial rule of perpetuating the evil with the addition of the export of slaves from India.³⁸ But it was James Mill and his followers who began an agitation against certain defective institutions and social practices to transform India according to the Utilitarian notions. Mill was one of the first coherent spokesmen of the liberal movement in England and had presented a solid historical argument for the liberal and the utilitarian policies to be applied to India.³⁹ Charles Metcalfe, the British Resident at Delhi prohibited the sale and purchase of slaves in the territory of Delhi in 1812.⁴⁰ He did so even when the British Government had advised him to go slow and asked him to rescind the steps already taken in this regard.⁴¹ It was a great step towards checking the slave trade in the north but it had little impact on the state of slavery in Bihar. This enactment primarily dealt with one aspect of the problem, i.e., the slave-trade and so it had hardly touched the core of the institution of slavery. In Bihar, life was very tough due to heavy economic pressure on agriculture in the absence of any substantial industrial sector. No concrete legislative step was ever taken by the Government to ameliorate the conditions of the slaves even during famines. The British Government turned towards the problem in 1830 when the Select Committee of the House of Lords heard the evidence of Baber, Campbell and Warden, the British officials who had served in India.⁴² This paved the way for the issue to be discussed effectively at the time of the Charter Act of 1833 which provided for the preparation of drafts of laws and regulations to mitigate the state of slavery.⁴³ Next, a dispatch from the Hon'ble Court of Directors, dated December 10, 1834 gave instructions regarding the manner in which the intentions of the Legislative, as expressed in the Charter Act, should be carried into

effect in order to enact a strict law to safeguard the interests of the slaves.⁴⁴ On June 15, 1835 the Indian Law Commission was formed with Macaulay as its head. Though the Commission was to prepare a criminal code for all parts of the British Indian Empire and for all classes of subjects irrespective of caste and creed, it entered upon a study of slavery administration in India as early as August 1835. The Commission prepared the Criminal Code of 1837 and then the Anti-Slavery Report of 1841.

The Law Commission moved with a certain pace and setting aside the interference of the Government of India in the matter of inquiry into the state of slavery, it drew up in 1839, the draft act for which the Court of Directors had persistently asked the Commission and the Government of India to act fast.⁴⁵ The commission came out with the following recommendations "No act falling under the definition of an offence should be exempted from punishment because it was committed by a master against his slave."⁴⁶ But some of the members of the commission and the Governor-General's Council questioned the merit of the draft act which would leave the master helpless and encourage the slaves to be recklessly lazy. Thus, an attempt should be made to examine the laws of slavery as well as to protect the rights of the masters.⁴⁷ However, the draft act touched only the periphery of the question of slavery, i.e. putting the slaves on an equal footing with a free person only in the matter of judging the criminality of an act. It did not provide for the release of the slaves from the clutches of their masters.⁴⁸

The draft act was also discussed by the Governments of Bombay and Madras who found it unsatisfactory and for quite some time the work of the Law Commission came to a standstill. This made the Court of Directors anxious and they reminded the Government of India in July 1840 that the "Parliament and the public are becoming impatient at the delay." The Governor-General then asked the Law Commission to expedite the matter and the Anti-Slavery Report was made ready in 1841. Investigating the various aspects of slavery, the Report consisted of thirty three recommendations of which the first ten referred to free persons in relation to slavery, next seventeen directly to the slaves, and then four to bonded labour.⁴⁹

In the recommendations concerning the contract labour we find measures to mitigate the state of slavery. Framed as measures to check slavery and its gradual extinction, these recommendations however, perpetuated the system of control over both the labour and person by legally sanctioning contracts for life or for a number of years. Also, people were allowed to apprentice or sell their children, but the

impersonators were liable to be penalised. The recommendations relating to the slaves just provide for the general guidelines to be adopted to check the abuse. At the same time these allow the Hindus and Muslims to own slaves who should be cared and treated according to the law, and if things permitted, they may be emancipated by paying the slave-price. But there was hardly any definite frame to analyse and decide that the slaves were treated properly and to make arrangement for their emancipation. Toeing the same line the next four recommendations for the bonded labour only provide for the general considerations to regularize debt bondage.⁵⁰

These recommendations attracted comments from various quarters, the most important of them were by Lord Auckland, the Governor-General, W.W. Bird and H.T. Prinsep, members of the Council. Lord Auckland was in favour of passing an act which would put an end to the dissimilar treatment between a free man and a slave.⁵¹ Bird was of the opinion that a law should be passed to the effect of refusing to recognize slavery as a status in any form. He also suggested that no compensation should be paid to the owner.⁵² H.T. Prinsep, another member of the Council, expressed surprise that no proposition had been suggested to make changes in the law of property and of inheritance. He considered the law severe because all that belonged to the slave was his master's property.⁵³

A draft act based on the anti-slavery report of 1841 was drawn up but due to the conflicting views of the members of the Governor-General's Council, all papers relating to the draft act were sent to the Home Authorities. On January 24 1843, a Draft Act was published in the Government Gazette and on February 11, 1843, Lord Ellenborough, the Governor-General of India, gave his assent to the proposed act.

After the publication of the Draft Act, the zamindars protested against it and expressed their fear that the proposed act would adversely affect the socio-economic structure and jeopardize the existing social system in India being sanctioned by the laws of the land. But their petitions were not entertained and on April 7, 1843, Act V was passed by the President of the Council of India with the assent of the Governor-General of India.

Regarding the enactment of the law we must remember that there could be no sovereign whose orders are generally obeyed unless there are certain general customs actually prevailing,⁵⁴ and here although the English denounced slave-trade, they did not move an inch regarding the institution of slavery which they found and recognized as an important, widely accepted custom which was quite profitable for them. Again the sharpest issue on the question of legal methods or the nature of the legal system is to view:

- (a) The law as a natural phenomenon or
- (b) The law as an eternal ideal to which external human conduct ought to conform.⁵⁵

The law tells us not what empirically exists but what is categorically imperative to the society.⁵⁶ But this basic principle for enacting any law was not taken into account in the face of the larger British imperialist interest.

As a system a law is developed through logical and technical methods of interpretation and analysis, whereby recurrent and relevant elements are recognised in the cases before the body, and the decision is made to fit as far as possible the reasonable expectations of those who have considered the law and the given case.⁵⁷ Furthermore, where inequality or privilege exists, natural law demands its abolition because equality is meaningless under unequal conditions.⁵⁸ Under the Company's rule there was no question of equality. The Company wanted to control and regulate the labour force and enacted the law accordingly. Bihar, one of the worst hit areas during the period, fell an easy prey to the vicious regulations of the Company.

The immediate effect of this Act was the end of the slave trade. It did not show that it wished to abolish slavery altogether rather it aimed at the general improvement in the condition of slaves. It only covered the issues related to the slaves and did not touch the condition of contract and bonded labour which was necessarily in demand in the other parts of the empire. A humanitarian stroke was, of course, not behind this Act. It was the result of the economic and political exigency that attracted the attention of the home authority and the system of ownership of slaves was cautiously done away with in order to facilitate the free mobility of labour needed to save the British sugar colonies in far off places such as the Caribbean and the Pacific regions, and to support the tea plantation in Assam. This had already started with the passing of the Government of India Acts and Codes of Colonies Act of 1837. Calcutta was the one place for the recruitment of emigrants under the indenture system. This was a period of great hardship in Bihar and it was but natural that we find the early indentured labourers to be from Bihar itself. At first the hill coolies, the tribes of Chhotanagpur division were sent on the sea voyage to the West Indies and to the Pacific areas. But due to the high mortality rate, the recruiters turned towards the plains and people from all parts of Bihar were encouraged, allured and coerced to migrate as indentured labourers under severe living conditions.⁵⁹

Under this contract labour system or indentureship, the needy,

indigent and hapless were treated as the slaves in the plantations under the old slave masters who, after abolition of slavery, had lost the labour force to work on the sugar plantations in the Caribbean. The English by the Act V, 1843 declared slave trade an illegal act but they themselves started this inhuman activity under a legal framework and made various rules and regulations to shield it.⁶⁰

In this way they replaced the native zamindars of India; the only difference lay in maintaining the slaves at a distant place. On Indian soil the Act V provided no safeguards to the slaves and their condition was as deplorable as before. Besides, the Workmen's Breach of Contract (13 of 1859) Act was enacted to enforce and ensure performance of labour in lieu of an advance which brought them in virtual bondage under the threat of imprisonment.⁶¹ Another Act, the Civil Procedure Code was also passed in 1859 whose section 200 provided for the execution of a decree by attachment of property, or by imprisonment of the person against whom the decree was made. This provision was used by the landlords and the money-lenders to hold labourers in bondage.⁶²

The Workmen's Breach Contract stopped possible labour movement out of frustration due to partial or irregular payment of wages, harsh and inhuman treatment, i.e., the conditions of virtual slavery. The number of slaves went on increasing. It is corroborated by the fact that in Bihar the population of the slaves was more than six lakhs in 1862.⁶³ In 1863 an Act was passed to allow the planters to arrest runaway coolies, i.e., the contract labour (indentured labour), which further tightened the grip over the labourers. The colonial Government then in 1865, fixed the wages of the labourers as Rs. 5/-, Rs. 4/- and Rs. 3/- respectively, for men, women and children for nine hours of work per day. However, payment was not brought under the legal seal and no provision was made to ensure payment on proper basis.⁶⁴ A great famine visited India during 1876-78, but the Government organised a grand Royal Durbar at Calcutta in January 1877 in the honour of Queen Victoria. The Government took full advantage of the pathetic condition of the people and in 1882 by a regulation allowed uncontrolled recruitment without any licence to meet the persistent labour demand of the European planters.⁶⁵

Slavery during the colonial period thus turned into contract labour, bonded labour and debt-slavery which was obviously the outcome of the distinct feature of the workings of the East India Company to serve her capitalist needs. Though the English prided themselves on their liberal opinion, they were mostly hostile to the reforms. They thought, "Slavery in India is different from slavery elsewhere." Buchanan

emphasized the relative harmlessness of slavery in India (Bihar) and concluded that it was an integral part of the Indian society. Their political instincts were traditional and conservative in nature, and they distrusted the chilly dogmatics of the reforming spirit.⁶⁶ The whole gamut of economic changes growing out of colonialism—new land settlement, commercialisation of agriculture, de-industrialisation and lop-sided dependent industrial advancement led to the development of a huge sector of agricultural proletariat.

NOTES

1. Chanana, D.R. (1960), *Slavery in Ancient India*, Delhi: People's Publishing House.
2. Kidwai, Salim (1985), 'Sultans, Eunuchs and Domesticity: New Forms of Bondage in Medieval India', in Patanaik, Utsa and Dingwaney, Manjari, (eds), *Chains of Servitude: Bondage & Slavery in India*, Madras: Sangam Books.
3. Bearce, George D. (1961), *British Attitudes Towards India (1784-1858)*, London: Oxford University Press.
4. Mishra, B.B. (1959), *The Central Administration of the East India Company*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
5. *Ibid.*
6. Parliamentary Papers (hereafter as PP), (1832), Vol. VIII, pp. 743-63.
7. Extracts of Notes and Observations on Slavery, as existing in Bengal, Bihar and Benaras and the Cede and Conquered Provinces by M.G. Myres, Principal, Sudder Ammin, Appendix II to the Indian Law Commission Report, 1814, Para, 3, p. 101.
8. Register to the Nizamut Adalat at Fort William dated March 12, 1813. (P.P. 1828, Judicial, pp. 3-56; 243-44)
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 246-48.
10. *Calcutta Christian Advocate*, August 24, 1839.
11. Hunter, W.W. (1897), *The Annals of Rural Bengal*, London, pp. 95-96.
12. Proceedings of the Committee of Circuit at Kashimbazar, dated June 28, 1772, Vol. I to III, pp. 22-23.
13. PP 1828, Vol. 24, pp. 3-4.
14. Bearce, George D. (1961), *British Attitudes towards India (1784-1858)*, London: Oxford University Press, pp. 31-32.
15. Banaji, D.R. (1933), *Slavery in British India*, Bombay, pp. 15-16.
16. Appendix VI NO. 5, Report from Law Commissioners relative to Slavery in the East Indies (R.I.L.C.) Parliamentary Papers Vol. 28, 1841, D. Scott to the Chief Secretary, Oct. 10, 1830.
17. Colebrooke's Paper on Slavery, O.C. No. 13, December 29, 1826, Judicial Department, Bengal Records Department.
18. J. Richardson, Judge and Magistrate of Boundelkhand to the Judges of the Sudar Dewany and Nizamut Adalat, dated March 23, 1808; Bengal Criminal and Judicial Proceedings, (B.C.J.C.) No. 47 of March 18, 1816, Judicial Criminal Proceedings, Bengal Record Department.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Ibid.*
21. *Ibid.*
22. Report from W. Leycester, the Second Judge of the Bareilly Court of Circuit, dated

- September 9, 1815, extract para 95, Bengal Judicial Consultations, Febraury 14, 1817; PP. 1828, Judicial, p. 342.
23. PP 1828, Judicial, p. 346.
24. Stokes, E (1959), *The English Utilitarians and India*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 16-23.
25. Dingwaney, Manjari, 'Unredeemed Promises: The Law and Servitude', in Patnaik, Utsa and Dingwaney, M. (eds.) (1985), *Chains of Servitude*, Madras: Sangam Books, pp. 283-347.
26. Macnaghten (1825), *Principles and Precedents of Muslim Laws*, Calcutta, p. 324-325; Macnaghten, (1828), *Principles and Precedents of Hindu Law*, Calcutta.
27. 'Notes on Slavery' by H. Torrens, Acting Registrar of Sadar Dewany and Nizamat Adalat, 1839, Appendix 1. Report of the Law Commission and Evidence on Slavery in the East Indies (R.L.C) Vol. I. pp. 33-34.

Districts only in domestic	Slaves engaged only in works	Slaves engaged in agriculture agricultural activities	Slaves engaged men-slaves as well as in domestic works	Total no. of
Bihar & Patna	5,055	32,820	18,495	56,370
Bhagalpur	574	4,434	2,560	7,568
Purnea	790	3,650	1,700	6,140
Shahabad	720	5,335	3,765	9,810
Total	7,139	46,239	26,520	79,888

28. J. Richardson *op. cit.*
29. The depositions of H. Russul, Vakil of Sadar Dewany and Nizamat Adalat, 1839, Appendix. I. R.L.C. Vol. II. p. 9.
30. The deposition of Vaidya Nath Mishra, Pandit of the Sadar Dewany Adalat, 1839, Appendix I. R.L.C. Vol. II. P. 7.
31. Bearce, George D. *op.cit.*, pp. 80-81.
32. Bengal Revenue Consultations (B.R.C). L.S. No. 213 dated 17 May, 1774.
33. Provincial Council of Revenue at Dacca to Hastings, June 20, 1774, Bengal Revenue Consultations Legislative Report No. 442, dated August 16, 1774.
34. *Ibid.*
35. R.L.C. Vol.I., p.309.
36. PP 1828, Vol. 24, pp. 9-10.
37. *Calcutta Gazette*, Extraordinary, Monday July 27, 1789.
38. Baber's Report of 1832, On the affairs of the East India Company Appendix K-549. I-Public, British P.P. Vol. VI, 1831-32.
39. Bearce, George D. *op.cit.*, pp. 65-78.
40. Metcalfe to Bengal Govt. September 4, 1812, Bengal Criminal Judicial Consultations (B.C.J.C.), December 19, 1812.
41. Bengal Government to Metcalfe, November 13, 1812, B.C.J.C. December 19, 1812. Enclosure- In reply to the Letter of Metcalfe, October 24, 1812.
42. British PP Appendix K. 1832 pp. 549-580.
43. Banaji, D.R. *op.cit.*, p. 334.
44. *Ibid.*
45. Communication from the Officiating Secretary to the Government of India dated December 18, 1838, in the Report of the Indian Law Commission, February 1, 1839, G.O.I.

- Legislative Proceedings, February, 1839, Imperial Records Department. Report of the Law Commission, 1839-41.
46. From the Hon'ble the Court of Directors to the Governor-General of India in Council, dated August 29, 1838, Home Department, Legislative Despatch form Court, 1837-38, para 5, No. 14 of 1838. Imperial Records, Department.
47. Minute by A. Amos dated April 1, 1839, Legislative Proceedings, April 1 to May 27, 1839, Imperial Records Department.
48. Minute by W.W. Bird and by Lord Auckland, *Ibid.*
49. Indian Law Commission Report, 1839-41.
50. Banaji, D.R. (1933), *op.cit.*
51. Minute by Lord Auckland dated May 6, 1841, Legislative Proceedings, August 2 to September 20, 1841. Imperial Records Department.
52. Minute by W.W. Bird dated June 18, 1841, Consultation No. 11, Law Proceedings, August 2 to September 20, 1841. Imperial Records Department.
53. Minute by H.T. Prinsep, dated July 31, 1841, Consultation No. 12, Law Proceedings, *Ibid.*
54. Cohen, Morris Raphael (1961), *Reason and Law*, New York: Collier Books, p. 76.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 87.
56. *Ibid.*
57. *Ibid.*, p. 89.
58. *Ibid.*, pp. 96-101.
59. Tinker, Hugh, (1974), a *New System of Slavery: The Export of Indian Labour Overseas (1830-1920)*, London: Oxford University Press, Kondapi, c. (1951), *Indian Overseas (1838-1949)*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, Saha, P., (1970), *Emigration of Indian Labour (1838-1900)* Delhi: PP, 1970 etc.
60. Tinker, Hugh(1974); *A New System of Slavery, Ibid.*
61. Dinghwaney, M., *Unredeemed Promises: The Law and Servitude, op.cit.*, p. 312.
62. *Ibid.*
63. Montgomery Martin in his book, *India- Its Recent progress and Present State*, has presented the following figure of slaves in the districts of Bihar in 1862:
- | | |
|-----------------|----------|
| Bihar and Patna | 1,31,280 |
| Bhagalpur | 40,861 |
| Purnea | 24,560 |
| Shahabad | 21,340 |
| Tirhut | 2,12,210 |
| Saran | 1,80,509 |
| Total | 6,10,760 |
- Banaji, D.R. (1933), *op.cit.*, p. 199.
64. Dingwaney, Manjari (1985), *Unredeemed Promises: The Law and Servitude*, in Patnaik, Utsa and Dingwaney, Manjari, eds., *Chains of Servitude, op.cit.* pp. 314-324.
65. Vidyasagar, R (1985), *Debt Bondage in South Arcot District: A Case Study of Agricultural Labourers and Handloom Weavers*, in Patnaik, Utsa and Dingwaney, Manjari, eds., *Chains of Servitude, Op.cit.* p. 116.
66. Stokes, Eric (1959), *The English Utilitarians and India. op.cit.* p. 14.