



# Free and Unfree Agrarian Relations in Colonial India

Dr. Vijaya Rajni

Associate Professor College of Vocational studies University of Delhi-110017.

**Abstract** - The Research Paper “Free and Unfree Agrarian relations in Colonial India” explores the existence of various types of free alongside Unfree labourers during the colonial India. According to the nationalist and many other economic historians, the various colonial land settlements, combined with high revenue demands, resulted in making small peasants subservient to moneylenders and bigger landowners. This led to the ‘gradual transference of land from the hands of the original cultivators to the moneylenders. As a result, instead of developing free labour forms, as was happening in many advanced capitalist countries in the West, empirical evidences pointed towards the existence of attached labourers (long duration labour) in various forms even in some of the most developed regions of British India.

**Index Terms** - Agricultural labour, Free Labour, Unfree Labour, Agrestic slavery, Beck and Call Relationship, Bonded Labour.

## I. Introduction

The growth of agricultural labour during the colonial period has been one of the most contentious issues among modern economic historians of India. S.J. Patel was one of the pioneers who espoused a nationalist point of view of the growth of agricultural labourers during the colonial period owing to the policies of the colonial government. His views were contested by many other economic historians, Dharma Kumar being one of the prominent among them, who argued that such a clear picture was not evident and the possibility of continuity appears more likely. This debate has been joined by many others on either side. Eric Stokes, Utsa Patnaik, Jan Breman, Jairus Banaji, K.P. Kannan, Gyan Prakash, Neeladri Bhattacharya, and Sugata Bose are some of the important scholars in this area.[1]

According to the nationalist and many other economic historians, the various colonial land settlements, combined with high revenue demands, resulted in making small peasants subservient to moneylenders and bigger landowners. Nationalist economic historians, such as Gadgil, argued that colonial policies were responsible for the ‘gradual transference of land from the hands of the original cultivators to – in most cases – the moneylenders.’[2] As a result, instead of developing free labour forms, as was happening in many advanced capitalist countries in the West, empirical evidences pointed towards the existence of attached labourers (long duration labour) in various forms even in some of the most developed regions of British India.

While some early interpretations posited a clear rise of affluent peasant classes and growing land inequality, subsequent scholarship paints a more complex picture. Structural patterns of landholding remained relatively stable, with increasing inequality largely a result of widespread impoverishment rather than concentrated wealth



accumulation. Yet beneath this surface continuity lay significant shifts—through debt burdening, changing caste land ownership, and intensified forms of exploitation—that led to the widespread pauperization of the peasantry.

It is with this background this paper discusses agrarian relation and analyse the nature and extent of Free and Unfree labour in British India.

## **II. Nature of Employment of Agricultural Labourers**

Agricultural labourers were employed under different types of contracts ranging from free labour to unfree labour. These contracts had a large variety emanating from different terms and conditions. Broadly two types of relationship existed between the employer and the employee: 1) Unfree or pre-capitalist type, where terms and conditions were decided by the employers and were more or less customary. Employees did not have much bargaining power and were generally forced to adopt the terms dictated by the employers; and 2) Relatively free or capitalist type, where terms and conditions were decided mutually and agreed upon by both employers and employees. Both these types of relationship have been recorded in the official and in the non-official reports during the 19th century and in the early 20th century, although some scholars claim that the process of casualization of labour in the 20th century led to the dominance of free labour. The period between 1850 and 1950 is marked with changes in the nature and form of relationship between landlords and labourers. In the beginning of the 19th century, most labour relationships were the unfree type but by the mid-19th century many changes became visible.

The penetration of the British started showing its impact on the society and economy more intensely after the 1850s. Fast transport system, mainly led by the railways, enhanced communication levels which integrated society. At many places customary laws were strengthened or replaced by legal laws. Local elite needed the sanction of British authority to exercise their power over peasantry. New land settlements which started in late 18th century affected agrarian structure and agrarian relations. Early 19th century is characterized by overwhelming type of unfree labour relationships which took variety of forms, discussed below. Unfree labour also had their own characteristics in different regions and sometimes they varied even between villages. These differences were due to differences in the degree of unfree element and the rights and obligations towards their employers. Many scholars have discussed the existence of unfreedom even behind the façade of mutually agreed contractual relationships.[3]

By the 20th century much had changed and the process of change continued. There was a significant increase in the number of free casual labourers. There was also a change in the nature and form of existent unfree relationships. The speed of change was different in different areas and in some regions the change was so slow, that, it was almost non-existent. Sometimes the existing relationships were transformed not into free relationships but into newer form of unfree relationships.[4] Various types of unfree and free agrarian relationships are discussed below.

### **Unfree Relations**



Unfree labourers can be broadly put into three categories on the basis of the nature of relationships: 1) debt bondage, which was more common in the whole of north India, east India and west India; 2)beck and call relationship, which was commonly spread in west and north India; and 3) agrestic serfdom, which was mainly prevalent in southern part of India.

**Permanent/ attached / bonded labourers:** The bonded labourers were attached to the landlords through debt. This bondage had many variations and characteristics in different regions but widely existed in the early British period. Labourers were called with different names in different regions. Bondage was institutionalized through caste relationships and even where the land was abundantly available, a group of labourers were forbidden to freely hold it. During the later British period, this system of labour relatively declined, though it did not disappear, and gradually certain forms of free labour emerged as an important type of arrangement. The period of decline of unfree labourers was broadly from the late 19th century to the mid-20th century.

This trend depended on many factors which were sometimes local in nature. For example, by the 1920s, Bihar region still reported a large portion of labourers being *Kamiyas* [5] and only by the 1940s, it was reported to be dying out.[6] These labourers were attached to the employer for long periods. Period of attachment ranged from about a year to their lifetime and many a time the attachment would pass on to their children. In most regions particularly in the north the relationship began with a small loan for marriage or some other purposes and in return labourers accepted bondage till they repay. Uneducated labourers never got to repay this loan and continued to work for the employer for their life-time. R. K. Mukerjee says that even in the 1930s this system was most prevalent in Orissa, Bihar and Chotanagpur, although it was not spreading.[7] These people never received cash and their ‘condition vary from absolute to mitigated slavery’.[8] Similar was the situation with the contract of the *Halis* with their employers *Dhaniama* in western India particularly in south Gujarat. *Halis* came from tribal caste of *Dublas, Talavias, Naikas, Dhodias, Ghodras* and their bondage also began with the loan. Even as late as the 1930s, the total number of *Halis* has been estimated at 20% of the agricultural population of the district.[9] In fact, over the years illiterate *Halis* had internalized the relationship so much that they thought it was a sin to leave their employers. Even if that happened in some rare instance, another *Dhaniama* would never employ the *Halis* who deserted their earlier *Dhaniama*.[10]

In Oudh these bonded labourers were called *Sewaks*. People from castes such as *Chamar, Koeri, Kurmi, or Lodh* caste accepted serfdom for life against a loan from rich landlord and this serfdom was passed on from father to son: ‘It is quite common to meet men whose fathers entered into these obligations and who still labour in their discharge’.[11] These *Sewaks* formed a large proportion of the whole population of the Bahraich district. All these types of relationship have been described as debt bondage.

Many factors were responsible for the change in this system such as the change in cropping pattern from sugarcane and cotton to mango and other fruits in western India, increasing employment opportunities in urban areas and growth of agricultural labour class and thereby abundant supply of labourers which led to free the labourers from



bondage. Socio-political reasons were also responsible for the decline in this type of relationships. For example, in Baroda the *Hali* system was banned in 1923.[12]

**Beck and Call Relationship:** Apart from debt bondage there were other forms of attachment, where the employers did not give any loan but gave a small piece of land to the labourers to cultivate and also allowed the labourers to make a roof for himself and his family on allotted land. The labourers were allowed to retain the produce from this piece for his household consumption. In return the labourers had to plough the master's field and do other works if and when required for nominal wage (1-2 annas) or no wage. He may be given meals on the days he ploughs and sometimes even a small sum of money is advanced to the labourers. These labourers were called *Halwahas* in eastern U.P.[13] They continued to hold and stay on a piece of land of the landlord and were at their mercy. The fear of ejection made them most vulnerable to the exploitation by the landlord. Such system was said to be flourishing even by 1944 in eastern districts of U.P.

In Punjab, the studies suggest the existence of permanent farm servants who were called *Siris*. In the 19th century, *Siris* were secured by giving advance but by 20th century, the contracts were more legal and written out and signed by both the parties and the witnesses.[14] The *Siris* of the Punjab were free labourers and the contract was mutual in the 20th century. The change was much faster in Punjab than in other parts of the country.

**Agrestic slavery:** On the other extreme, there were *panneyals* or *padiyals* in Madras Presidency, who were agrestic slaves. They were referred by their caste names *Palli*, *Pallam*, and *Pariah*. They were sold along with the land and were attached to the land.[15] The modes of dependence in the Tamil districts during the early 19th century spanned a wide range, from near freedom to near slavery.[16] In south Canara Dr. R.G Kakade observed in 1949 on the basis of personal survey that *Mulada Holeyas* (their caste name) were still hereditary serfs attached to the *Muli Wargs* (estates) and were owned (not legally) by the *Wargadars* or landholders. They received no wages and were given only three meals a day.[17] In Malabar, these labourers were called *cheruman* and were treated like private property of the masters who could be bought, sold or leased out, independent of land as the master thought fit.[18] The 'serfs of *janmi*' were leased to certain farmers who wanted cheap labour to cultivate their farms in return of money or paddy to *janmi*. [19] In fact, it was reported that 'there are certain areas, especially in chirakkal taluq, where some of the rajas and landlords have got a number of serfs under them... As lands are leased on Kanam, these people are also sometimes leased'. [20] Early 20th century records show that the right of the landlord over the *Panneys* of Mayavaram were also transferred in the document which transfers the ownership of the land.[21] Market for slaves was quite developed. Even among agricultural labourers, caste was important. Castes of slaves determined their price.[22]

**Unpaid labour / Begaar:** Particularly in north India, there was a system of *begaar* or unpaid labour. Economically and politically powerful landlords belonging to upper caste could force certain days of labour on the poor lower caste tenants, agricultural labourers or on any other residing in the area. It is being described by A.M. Lorenzo as



the 'customary right of the landlord to exact for a certain number of days, free labour from their raiyats'.[23] The payment in such cases may be nil to very low, much lower than the market price. In the Palamau district of Bihar, tenants were forced to perform *begaar* on the landlord's fields and there was little difference between *Kamia* and these tenants who had to perform *begaar*. [24] N. Bhattacharya also talks about small tenants being indebted so largely to landlords, that their independence was completely lost, and to retain their plots they would perform *begaar* on landlords' fields. In fact, it is reported that in the second half of 19th century landlords in Punjab secured labour through loans and advances, but by 20th century these landlords signed the contracts with *Siris*, *Sanjjihis* or *Sajjhis*. *Sagri* system of Rajasthan also shows that debtor labourers performed labour only for food and a share in crop without any wages on the creditors' field.[25] In Orissa, labourers who took loan from landlords, worked only in return for food. The system was called *Gothi*. [26]

In the Chittagong hill tracts in earlier eastern India, there existed a type of intra-tribal bondage where some hill tribes had to perform four days of unpaid service for the tribal chief.[27] In Oudh, there was a system of *begaar* (unpaid labour), *hari* (forced service) and *rasad* (supplies). Tenants were forced to perform *begaar* for 40 days in a year for taluqdars. Wages were nil or very low. In Pratapgarh district, market wage was 8 annas and taluqdars paid 6 paise to 3 annas or, if they were kind enough, provided *chabena* (roasted grain).[28] Anybody was picked up for the purpose. In *Hari*, the tenant had to provide his plough and oxen 12 times a year without any payment, most of the time at the cost of his own fields. *Rasad* meant providing *bhusa*, *ghee*, milk and other commodities to the British agents whenever they visited their village. Nothing was paid to the tenantry for these commodities. In fact, a government report in 1887 said that phenomena of forced labour for landlords prevailed all over the country and was a recognized form of tenancy.[29]

### Free labourers

Free labourers' work depended on the availability and they performed any type of task. A survey by S. C. Chaturvedi recorded that very often 'all agricultural occupations such as ploughing, sowing, weeding, transplanting, irrigation, hoeing, reaping, thrashing are done by the same group of workers'. [30] In fact, even certain non-agricultural works were taken up by these labourers. It has been noted that in eastern Uttar Pradesh, carpentry, preparation of mud walls etc. were also performed by *Lohars* besides their main occupation, smithy. In hill districts, variety of works such as, smithy, masonry, carpentry and even ploughing was taken up by *Shilpkars*. Most of these labourers were employed on a daily basis but sometimes period of employment varied. Payment was made either on daily basis or piece basis. Because of the small size of holdings, even small peasants and tenants engaged in casual jobs.[31] These workers predominantly came from various lower-caste or tribal groups. In some parts of eastern India, these labourers were called *Majur* [32] or *Krishans*. [33]

The category of these free labourers in modern India was quite mobile. They migrated from place to place in search of work. The significance of these labourers was a 20th-century phenomenon. Expansion of railways, new employment opportunities in urban industries attracted the labourers from rural areas and thereby increased their mobility. The number and proportion of such labour was the highest in south India. In the



Birbhum area free labourers called *Krishans* migrated from one place to another for work either on farms or in the industries.[34] Similar type of labourers has been found in Punjab as noted by Bhattacharya.

In Punjab whole families of workers moved together for work specially during the harvest season. A settlement officer of Sirsa noted that the 'wandering bands of labourers, such as *Thoris*, *Ods*, or *Mens*, go about from village to village while the harvest lasts.' [35] The movement was from the 'south region where harvest was early to the north where it was late, from barani tracts where labour demand was marginal to the tracts where demand for labour was high due to higher intensity of cultivation because of irrigation'. [36] Poor harvest or monsoon failure in Punjab and nearby Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan increased the supply of these labourers, who returned to their homes after the harvests. These workers took employment in government-sponsored public works during the lean season and moved to the urban areas to take up jobs in the industrial sector during the winter months, particularly for cotton ginning. This was the pattern of employment. It has been estimated that '42 percent of all industrial workers were employed in seasonal factories'. [37]

Around the mid-nineteenth century, many villagers and tribals were displaced due to land settlements and declaration of common land as private property and forests as reserved government preserves. These villagers and tribals became migratory labourers. These migrant labourers in Narmada valley area came from the areas of reserved forests of Jarkahu Gokakhal and Lokhartalai in Hoshanagabad, and the districts of Soeni, Chindwara, Mandla and Betul. This group of labourers were called *Chaittharas* who formed roughly about 20 percent of total work force in the Narmada valley in the 1920s. [38]

These labourers also worked for the construction of railways during the 1850s and 1860s. From the central provinces, large groups of displaced labourers also travelled to far off areas such as Khandesh and Gujarat cotton tracts. [39] Estimate by Sumit Guha shows that Cotton growing areas and the canal zones of Bombay Deccan created demand for about ten lakh labourers, almost 10 percent of the total population of the region. [40] Growing mining industry in Bihar also attracted labour who sometimes came from distant regions. [41] In South Gujarat *Halis* (Tribals) became casual labourers and worked in railways and emerging modern industries in Bombay particularly during the 1940s and after. They also worked in salt pans and brickyards during the off-peak period but came back to their villages during peak season to work as agricultural labourers. [42]

### Summing up

There is a lot of evidence that the nature of labour in the nineteenth century was distinctly different from the nature and form which replaced it in the twentieth century. The change in the nature and form of labour itself represent the transformation which took place in the Indian agriculture during this period. [43] One perspective on the casualization of agricultural labourers is that the growth of commercialization and penetration of capitalist relations changed the landlord- labour relations. [44]





Another perspective considers that the growth in population was the main reason for growing casualization of labour. Landlords in the early period secured labour through debt bondage but when the population increased and the opportunities of work expanded with growing industrialization, labour moved and migrated to other areas in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Moreover, growing social awareness against bondage and related laws in certain cases, such as the one in Baroda in 1923, loosened the grip of landlords on the labouring classes.[45]

### **III Mode and Medium of Payment to Agricultural Labourers- Cash, Kind, Combined or Share**

The transition from kind to cash was intricately related to the casualization of labour and the nature of contract. Where the casualization was faster, cash component of wages increased faster as compared to other regions. There were a variety of systems of payment to agricultural labourers in different regions. These systems varied according to the nature of contract, or according to the agricultural operation.

In the early British period, payment to agricultural labourers was according to the customary rules. In north India, mostly *jajmani* system was prevalent, where in the village each caste had its own pre-decided share in the crop. Cash transactions were generally less. Peasants were mostly self-sufficient and a very small number entered the market to sell their produce. During this period, payment in kind widely prevailed in India and this was so till 1920s, vast tracts of eastern India showed payment in kind which were nearly constant for a very long time.[46] Various districts Gazetteer in the 1920s tried to provide reason for the payment in kind. Generally non-availability of cash and the difficulty in marketing of the crop were the main reasons for the payment in kind.[47]

Wherever commercial crops were grown, payment to labourers was mainly in cash. In eastern and northern Bengal districts wages were widely received in cash, as these were the areas where jute was cultivated on large tracts.[48] The Imperial Gazetteer of India for the period 1873-5 to 1901-3, observed that 'as regards agricultural labourers, the system of payment in kind is still widely prevalent, but speaking generally, cash wages are still commonly paid only in the vicinity of towns or industrial villages and by large employers of industrial labour'.[49] The only cash system was almost non-existent. Mostly payments were made in various combination of kind, cash and perquisites. While at work, food, drinks (*sherbet* etc.), tobacco (*bidis*), light meals to full meals etc. were more common along with some cash or a share of produce.

In the late 19th and early 20th century, there was a gradual increase in the payment in cash in almost all regions due to growth of agricultural labourers, change in their nature and form, dis-entanglement of their ties with landlords, rigidity about the payment of revenue in cash, increasing commercialization and the emergence of capitalists tendencies.[50] In the short run, however, form of payment varied according to the prices in the market. The pace of transition differed in different regions. In Punjab, for example, early 20th century reports suggest a fast movement towards cash wages replacing wages in kind, although the onset of depression slowed down this pace of



transition from kind to cash.[51] In the post-depression period, we again find a fast change towards cash payment. Punjab Wage Survey in 1943 reported that 60 percent of the villages showed pure cash wages whereas 30 percent showed cash with supplements.[52]

But even within a village, system of payment differed operation-wise. For sowing, manuring, transplanting, irrigation or thatching etc., payment was usually in cash, whereas in reaping, thrashing, and winnowing, the payment of wages was in kind.[53] Even where such cash was given, it was combined with kind payment. In western Punjab, a day labourer was paid a monthly wage of Rs. 5 plus a pair of shoes and a blanket at the end of the year in 1943.[54] In the canal colonies wages were higher (almost twice) but still they were combined with food and clothing.[55]

Attached labourer or bonded labourer usually received the payment in kind and an advance of some cash. *Halis* in south Gujarat received '*Bhata*' which was a portion of food grain which varied from place to place. Payment was not made by weight but by a certain local measure. These measures varied from 2 to 2.5 seers of jowar and 4 seers of paddy or 4 annas if paid in cash. Before the World War II the *Dhaniama* preferred to pay in kind, but after the War when the prices of agricultural produce increased, there was more and more of a tendency towards payment in cash. Cash wages increased from 4 annas to 8 annas but the increase in prices was even sharper and wages often lagged behind.[56]

A study conducted in 1944 [57] reports that in U. P.'s 6981 surveyed villages, 70% and more of the villages reported payment in cash for many operations. Only for reaping around 70% of the villages reported kind payment.[58] N. Bhattacharya observed a similar pattern in Punjab. Further, in U.P also there was a wide variation in different regions. Cash wages were reported by a much larger proportion of villages in hill tract and north-west region for almost all the operations and the least in eastern region.[59] Hill and north-west region showed a fast transition towards casualization of labour whereas eastern and central regions reported a large proportion of attached labour till very late.

During the Second World War, as the prices increased, the transition towards cash payment became faster because the employers tried to reduce their cost of payment. This was highlighted by the 1944 report on quinquennial enquiry conducted in U.P., which concludes that compared to earlier quinquennial surveys of 1934 and 1939, cash payment was fast replacing payment in kind and this process has been faster in the last quinquennial of 1939-44. In the hill tracts, this transition towards cash wages has been the fastest. In 1934 the ratio of cash to kind was 100:80, in 1939 it became 100:74 and in 1944 it was 100:12.[60]

The All-India Labour Enquiry, conducted in 1950-51, noted that out of the total wage employment in agriculture, around 58%-man days were paid in cash with or without perquisites and 32% in kind (with or without perquisites) and the balance 10.1%-man days were remunerated partly in cash and partly in kind (table 1). Although cash payment predominated in almost all the regions, its proportion was much higher in north-west and west, and south India. In central, east and north India payment in kind





was quite common which lay between 35-40%. Payment in cash + kind was paid for around 6% to 12% of labour households in all the regions.

Table 1. Percentage Man-Days of Men, Women and Child Workers Paid under Different Modes, 1950-51

Zones	Cash	Kind	Cash+Kind	Total	With perquisites	Without perquisites	Total
North	56.1	35.5	8.4	100	62.2	37.8	100
East	50.1	42.5	7.4	100	50.9	49.1	100
South	65.9	21.4	12.7	100	30.5	69.5	100
West	75.8	18.2	6.0	100	21.1	78.9	100
Central	46.2	42.6	11.2	100	1.7	98.3	100
Northwest	78.8	13.1	8.1	100	21.6	78.4	100
All India	57.7	32.2	10.1	100	33.4	66.6	100

Source: Report on intensive survey of agricultural labour, vol.-I, ALE, 1950-51, p. 48.

Summing up, Payment in cash or kind was related to many factors, such as the cropping pattern, traditional practice etc. or the nature of contract.

The region where cash / commercial crops were grown, payment was made mostly in cash. Secondly, the casualization of labour is also responsible for the mode of payment. Areas where casual labour was prevalent, were also the areas where cash payment dominated. Thirdly, the overall development of the region and the availability of cash also affected the mode of payment. Fourthly, the prices of various commodities in the market also determined mode of payment. Higher prices of superior grains tempted employers to pay in cash or switch over to inferior grains if possible.[61] And finally, the nature of operation for which the labourers were employed also affected the mode of payment. For most pre- harvest crop operations like ploughing, irrigation, sowing, weeding etc., large proportion was paid in cash whereas for most post- harvest crop operations like harvesting, thrashing, etc., large proportion of payment was made in kind.

#### IV. Conclusion

The colonial India witnessed a transformation in the agrarian relations including mode and medium of payment to agricultural labour. During the 19th century, labour relations were deeply rooted in unfree forms-debt bondage, “beck-and-call” attachments, serfdom, and unpaid obligations like *begaar*-where workers had little autonomy and were typically compensated through advances or in-kind payments. However, by the 20th century, a gradual shift emerged. Free casual labour became increasingly prevalent, especially in regions undergoing commercialization and payment of land revenue in cash. With this transition, cash payments gained strength in some regions but the still, entrenched traditional forms persisted-many laborers continued to receive



wages partially or wholly in kind specifically for operations like harvesting or threshing. Also, Cash component of wages was relatively less to unfree labourers. Kind and perquisites as part payment were much more common. Monetization gradually increased during the British period, with the increase in casual or free labourers, payment of revenue in cash and commercialization of crops. All evidence suggests that even though cash component was growing, it had not entirely replaced customary in-kind practices and dual (Cash + kind) component which continued to be significant especially in regions less integrated into cash markets.

## References

1. See, Patel, 1952; Kumar, 1965, Patnaik, 1985; Bose, 1993, and Bhattacharya, 2001.
2. Gadgil, 1972: 30.
3. Jairus Banaji, 2003; Banaji, 1933; Gyan Prakash, 2000; Breman, 1974; Mundle, 1979; Anand A. Yang, 2003; Anderson, 2004; Hjejle, 1967; Sarkar, 1985; Mohapatra, 2007.
4. Breman, 1974.
5. Chaudhury, 1982. In Bihar bonded labourers were called Kamiyas.
6. Chaudhury, 1982, p. 166.
7. Mukerjee, 1933.
8. Mukerjee, 1933.
9. Report of the Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee, (RCARC hence forth) 1949, p. 128.
10. RCARC, p.128.
11. Kumar, 1984, p. 22.
12. Fukazawa, 1982, p. 204.
13. Chaturvedi, 1947.
14. Agricultural wages in India, ALE, 1952, pp. 151-152.
15. Thorner and Thorner, 1962, p. 28.
16. Kumar, Dharma, 1992, p. 88.
17. There was also a custom of renting out the services of the Mulad Holeyas. The rental for a couple was fixed at 15 paras, a para is a dry measure equal to about half a bushel of paddy and that for a man alone 10 paras were fixed for a year and during the rental year he was paid wages by his new master.
18. Kumar, Dharma, 1992, p. 82.
19. RCACR, p. 131.
20. Shri Kelappan Committee, Quoted in RCACR, p. 131.
21. Tanjore Gazette, Quoted in RCACR, p. 132.
22. Kumar, Dharma, 1992, p. 83.
23. Thorner and Thorner, 1962, p. 36.
24. Sarkar, Tanika, 1985, p. 112.
25. Sarkar, Tanika, 1985, p. 112.
26. Nagesh, H.V., 1981.
27. Sarkar, 1985, p. 112.
28. Kumar, 1984, p. 44.
29. quoted by Tanika Sarkar, 1985.
30. Chaturvedi, 1947, p. 15.



31. Chaudhuri, 1982, p. 167.
32. Chaudhuri, 1982, p. 163.
33. In Birbhum area of west Bengal these labourers were called Krishans. also Chaudhuri, 1982, p. 165.
34. Patel, 1992, p. 69.
35. Bhattacharya, 1992, p. 177.
36. Bhattacharya, 1992, p. 177.
37. Bhattacharya, 1992, p. 178.
38. Bates, Crispin and Marina Carter, 1992, p. 221.
39. Bates, Crispin and Marina Carter, 1992, p. 221.
40. Guha, p. 141.
41. Bates and Carter, 1992, p. 222.
42. Breman, 1979, p. 78.
43. Patel, 1992, p. 50.
44. It is generally the position of Marxist and Nationalists historians.
45. Fukazawa, 1982, p. 204.
46. Fukazawa, 1982, p. 171.
47. Fukazawa, 1982, p. 171.
48. Fukazawa, 1982, p. 171.
49. Imperial gazetteer of India, p. 467, quoted in Report on Intensive Survey of Agriculture, p. 49.
50. Chaturvedi, 1947, p. 18; and Bhattacharya, 1992, p. 191.
51. Bhattacharya, 1992, p. 191.
52. Bhattacharya, 1992, p. 192.
53. Bhattacharya, 1992, and Chaturvedi, 1947, p. 18.
54. CACR, p. 116.
55. CACR, p. 116.
56. CACR, p. 130.
57. Chaturvedi, 1947, p. 31.
58. Chaturvedi, 1947, p. 31.
59. Chaturvedi, 1947, p. 31.
60. Chaturvedi, 1947, p. 33.
61. Chaudhuri, 1982, p. 172.

## **Bibliography**

### **Government Records and Publications**

- Agricultural wages in India, ALE, 1952.
- Imperial gazetteer of India, vol. iii (new edition), p. 467, quoted in Report on Intensive Survey of Agriculture, vol. I, Agriculture labour Enquiry (ALE).
- Report of the Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee, (RCARC hence forth) 1949, chairman, J. C Kumarappa, p. 128.
- Shri Kelappa Committee, Quoted in RCACR.
- Tanjore Gazette, Quoted in RCACR.

### **Books and Articles**



- Anderson, M. R. (2004). India 1858–1950: The illusion of free labour. In D. Hay & P. Craven (Eds.), *Masters, servants and magistrates in Britain and the empire*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Banaji, D. R. (1933). *Slavery in British India* (2nd rev. ed.). Bombay: Oxford University Press.
- Banaji, J. (2003). The fiction of free labour: Contract, coercion and the so-called free labour. *Historical Materialism*, 11(3), 69–95.
- Bates, C. (2000). Coerced and migrant labourers in India: The colonial experience. *Edinburgh Papers in South Asian Studies*, 13. Centre for South Asian Studies, University of Edinburgh.
- Bates, C., & Carter, M. (1992). Tribal migration in India and beyond. In G. Prakash (Ed.), *The world of rural labourer in colonial India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Bhattacharya, N. (1992). Agricultural labour and production: Central and South-East Punjab 1870–1940. In G. Prakash (Ed.), *The world of rural labourer in colonial India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Bhattacharya, N. (2001). *Labouring histories: Agrarian labour and colonialism*. Noida: VV Giri National Labour Institute.
- Bose, S. (1993). *Peasant labour and colonial capital: Rural Bengal since 1770*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Breman, J. (2021). *Patronage and Exploitation: Changing Agrarian Relations in South Gujarat, India*. Berkeley: University of California Press. (Original work published 1974)
- Chaturvedi, S. C. (1947). Rural wages in the United Provinces: a study of the material collected during the seventh quinquennial inquiry into rural wages, conducted in December, 1944.
- Chaudhury, B. (1982), 'Eastern India', in Dharma Kumar (ed.), *The Cambridge Economic History of India -Vol. II*, Orient Longman, Cambridge University Press, Delhi.
- Gadgil, D.R. (1972), *The Industrial Evolution of India in Recent Times, 1860-1939*, Delhi: Oxford University Press (originally published in 1924).
- Guha, S. (1985). *Agrarian economy of Bombay Deccan*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Fukazawa, (1982). 'Western India', in Dharma Kumar (ed.), *Cambridge Economic History of India-Vol. II*, Orient Longman, Cambridge University Press, Delhi.
- Hjejle, B. (1967). Slavery and agricultural bondage in South India in the nineteenth century. *Scandinavian Economic History Review*, 15(1–2), 71–126.
- Kumar, D. (1965). *Land and caste in South India: Agricultural labour in Madras Presidency during the nineteenth century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kumar, K. (1984). *Peasants in revolt: Tenants, landlords, Congress and the Raj in Oudh, 1886–1922*. Delhi: Manohar.
- Mundle, S. (1979). *Backwardness and bondage: Agrarian relations in a South Bihar district*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Mukerjee, R. K. (1933). *The land problems*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Nagesh, H. V. (1981, September). Forms of unfree labour in Indian agriculture. *Economic and Political Weekly*.



- Patel, S. J. (1952). *Agricultural labourers in modern India and Pakistan*. Bombay: Oxford University Press.
- Patel, S. J., 'Agricultural Labourers in Modern India and Pakistan', in Gyan Prakash(ed.), *The World of Rural Labourer in Colonial India*, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1992.
- Patnaik, U., & Dingwaney, M. (Eds.). (1985). *Chains of servitude: Bondage and slavery in India*. Madras: Sangam Books.
- Prabhu Mohapatra. (2007). Eurocentrism, forced labour and global migration: A critical assessment. *International Review of Social History*, 52(S15), 59–91.
- Prakash, G. (1990). *Bonded Histories: Genealogies of labor servitude in colonial India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Reissue 2003)
- Sarkar, T. (1985). Bondage in the colonial context. In U. Patnaik & M. Dingwaney (Eds.), *Chains of servitude: Bondage and slavery in India*. Madras: Sangam Books.
- Thorner, D., & Thorner, A. (1962). *Land and labour in India*. Bombay: Asia Publishing House.
- Yang, A. A. (2003). Indian convict workers in Southeast Asia in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. *Journal of World History*, 14(2), 179–208.