

George Saintsbury

East India Slavery

London: George Bell and Sons, 1907.

Printed in Great Britain.

George Saintsbury

East India Slavery



Irish University Press

Shannon Ireland



Library IAS, Shimla



00042774

First edition: London 1829
Second edition: London 1829

This IUP reprint is a photolithographic facsimile of the second edition and is unabridged, retaining the original imprints.

© 1972 Irish University Press Shannon Ireland

All forms of micropublishing

© Irish University Microforms Shannon Ireland

ISBN 0 7165 1816 3

301.452 2 0954
Sa 28 E

T. M. MacGlinchey Publisher
Irish University Press Shannon Ireland



Printed in the Republic of Ireland by
Robert Hogg Printer to Irish University Press

711

EAST INDIA SLAVERY.

BY

GEORGE SAINTSBURY.

“ IN INDIA, SLAVERY HAS EXISTED FROM TIME IMMEMORIAL: THERE
“ SHE HAS TAKEN UP HER ABODE, AND MADE UNTO HERSELF A
“ NEST.”

WILBERFORCE.

SECOND EDITION,

WITH AN APPENDIX.

LONDON :

CHARLES TILT, 86, FLEET STREET.

1829.

PRINTED BY A. J. VALPY,
RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

EAST INDIA SLAVERY.

THERE are at the present moment many persons to be met with who, actuated no doubt by an honest zeal in what they believe to be the cause of humanity, are exerting themselves throughout the sphere of their influence to discourage the use of West India sugar, *because it is made by Slaves*—and recommending as a substitute the sugar of the East Indies, “Because *that*,” as they allege, “is the produce of *free labour*.”

As this recommendation, simple and easy of adoption as it may appear to the individual, is no less than a direct proposition to annihilate property to the amount of at least one hundred and fifty millions; to cut off from the national revenue not less than ten millions of annual income; and consequently to create a necessity for additional taxes at home to supply that deficiency—it will be advisable, before we act on such a recommendation, to make ourselves so far acquainted with the subject in *all* its bearings, as to secure for what we do, not merely the approbation of our feelings, but the sanction of our judgment; to be assured that while we are anxious only to promote the cause of humanity, we are not directly in-

juring it, and practising injustice ; to be thoroughly satisfied that the case is one which calls for our interference ; and to ascertain, if we do interfere, that the remedy proposed is really preferable to the disorder.

Those who wisely condemn speculative philanthropy, where it leads to error ; and who value facts which may guide the judgment above flights of eloquence which captivate the feelings ; will not be unwilling to have laid before them the means of forming a correct opinion for themselves on this interesting subject. Without such means, we are too frequently led into wrong by our very eagerness to go right.

West India sugar is, undoubtedly, cultivated by slaves ; and we will presently consider what is the actual condition of those persons, and what they are to gain by emancipation.

A party hostile to the colonies *insist* on this emancipation, at whatever hazard.

But England and all Europe insist on being supplied with sugar ; and there is good reason to believe that present emancipation would at no very remote period put a stop to its cultivation in those colonies which now supply us.

“ Yes, but you can get it from the East, unstained by Slavery,” is the reply.

This, then, brings us to the point—it is the fact which we are to admit, or to disprove : Shall we, by encouraging the sugar culture of the East, discountenance, and as regards the supply of our own market, abolish, Slavery ?

West India Slavery, undoubtedly, we may ; for nothing is easier to abolish than an agricultural people : we have but to deny them a vent for their produce, as above recommended, and we promptly put an end to their system, and themselves along with it, by the simple process of starvation.

So if it be the colonial proprietors, and the negro labourers, and the unoffending offspring of both, that we seek to get rid of—if it be the thousands of our fellow-countrymen and

neighbours, hospitable families or dependent widows and orphans, deriving their subsistence from the colonies, but residing in every county and almost every parish throughout England—if it be these that we desire to destroy, doubtless the power is in our own hands. But, was it these, or was it slavery, we were adjured to annihilate? It was *professedly* the latter. Let us see if our patronage of East India sugar will do this. If it will *not*—if it will only crush the evil in one hemisphere to cherish it in the other—we may really just as well continue to deal at the old market, since we gain nothing whatever for humanity—and, if good housewives are not deceived, *lose not a little* out of our own pockets—by the exchange.*

* It is well known to housekeepers, that the sugar of the East Indies is weaker, and possesses less of the property of sweetening, than that of the West Indies, in the proportion of 2 to 3, and it is about 2*d.* per lb. higher in price. Thus if 2lbs. of West India sugar at 6*d.* will sweeten as much coffee as 3 lbs. of East India sugar at 8*d.*, the purchasers of the latter pay *two* shillings instead of *one*. Its eulogists, to be sure, will tell you, that you should not grudge this trifle, in the great cause of humanity; but let them at any rate first convince you, that humanity is one tittle promoted, or Slavery discouraged, by the sacrifice.

It is but fair, however, to admit, that if the one sugar surpasses in strength, the other excels in fineness and colour, or rather absence of colour. Though most persons may have remarked the fine, sandy, colourless appearance of East India sugar, some probably are not aware how it becomes so. It is

“ By frequent *treading in the sun*, they produce the fine sugar.”
—East India Sugar Report, p. 73.

This work *in the sun* must be very laborious—to be sure they do it under favourable circumstances:

“ The sugar is now laid on canvass in the sun, where it is trodden

The following is a strictly authentic picture of the actual condition of the sugar-cultivators in the East. Compare it impartially with the condition of those in the West, and say whether we can safely consume the productions of the one, if conscience commands us to renounce those of the other.

In Grant's "State of Society among the Asiatic Subjects of Great Britain," printed by order of the House of Commons, we are told that

"The lowest class or caste (those who are, and will always be, employed in making sugar,) are doomed to perpetual abasement, and unlimited subjection. They have no relief against the most insulting and oppressive tyranny—no hope of ever escaping from their sufferings; and lest through the medium of knowledge they should have a chance of emerging from their low and confined state, the Brahmins (the higher class) have forbidden them, on pain of death, to read the sacred books.

"If," says the Gentoo Code, "a Sudra read the Vedes to either of the other three castes, or if he listen to them when read, heated oil, wax, and melted tin, shall be poured into his ears, and the orifice stopped up!"

Again:—as to the relative value in which the law holds these human beings, and the brute creation:

"If any person, in time of war, steal a horse or an elephant, the magistrate shall *deprive him of life*. If he steal either of these

for a considerable time by men with their *naked* feet."—page 202.

Still it must be hot work "in the sun," and in a temperature like that of Bengal; for

"This climate is considerably hotter than the West Indies."—p. 7.

However, the "trampling the sugar with the feet *naked*" must be a great comfort—to the poor perspiring labourer.

animals in time of peace, the magistrate shall *cut off from him one hand and one foot*. If any person steal a man of the inferior caste (a Sudra—a sugar cultivator), he shall be—what? burnt alive?—no; FINED THIRTY-TWO SHILLINGS!”

Again:—

“If a Brahmin has purchased a Sudra, *or even if he has not purchased him*, he may cause him to perform service.”—Gentoo Code (Halhed’s Translation), Sect. iii.*

And this is the land whose sugar must be “*free sugar*,” its labourers being “*free labourers!*” This is the state of things we are bound to encourage; because, if we *do not* encourage all this, we shall be guilty of—tolerating Slavery!

But the subject is too important to be dismissed with even this decisive proof; and, fortunately, we are just furnished with additional evidence, rendered to His Majesty’s Government by the highest possible authority, the East India Company, to which incredulity itself must bow. Such ample testimony to the existence of Slavery throughout India, in its worst possible form and degree, is here afforded, that the only difficulty we shall have will be that of selection.

In the last session of Parliament, a volume of nine hundred and forty folio pages of Official Returns and Reports from all parts of India, exclusively on the subject of East

* It is curious, that in transmitting this translation of the Gentoo Code to the Court of Directors, the Governor-general of the period (the celebrated Warren Hastings), after vouching for Mr. Halhed’s great ability and *fidelity* in the execution of his task, observes: “I could have wished to have obtained an omission or amendment of some passages, to have rendered them more fit for the public eye; but the pundits, when desired to revise them, could not be prevailed upon to make any alterations, as they declared they had the sanction of their Shaster, and were therefore incapable of amendment.”—Slavery in India, p. 6.

India Slavery, was laid before the House of Commons;* and in every one of its nearly one thousand pages establishes the fact, on the authority of the Company's own most confidential servants, that

“ In India, hereditary slavery has from time immemorial been sanctioned by the laws and usages of the country.”—Orders of the Court of Nizamut Adawlut, 12th June, 1816.—Slavery in India, p. 346.

“ Slavery is not only tolerated by the Malay laws, but admitted in the fullest extent. It was as common to see slaves sold at auction as a lot of sheep.”—G. J. Siddons. Resident, Ft. Marlboro, 2nd Sept. 1813.—p. 203.

“ The sale of them is as common as that of a bond.”—p. 597.

“ There are *fifteen* different sorts of male and female slaves authorised by the Mahomedan or Hindoo laws respectively.”—pp. 303, 306.

“ There are,” says Judge Richardson, “ many thousand male and female slaves held in bondage in the Company's dominions, and subject to the grossest usage, prostitution, and every other depravity.”—p. 317.

Sir William Jones, as Judge of the Supreme Court at Calcutta, declares :

“ The condition of slaves within our jurisdiction is beyond imagination deplorable ; and cruelties are daily practised on them, chiefly on those of the tenderest age and the weaker sex, which,

* The title of this most important document is as follows :—“ Slavery in India :—Return to an Address of the Honourable House of Commons, dated 13th April, 1826, for Copies or Abstracts of all Correspondence between the Court of Directors of the East India Company and the Company's governments in India, touching the state of Slavery in the territories under the Company's rule, or respecting any Slave Trade therein, &c. &c. ; so far as the same were completed on the 21st May, 1827. (Presented 1st June, 1827. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 12th March, 1828 ; and issued in September last.)

if it would not give me pain to repeat, and you to hear, yet, for the honour of human nature, I should forbear to particularise. Hardly a man or a woman exists in a corner of this populous town who hath not at least one slave child,* either purchased at a trifling price, or saved perhaps from a death that might have been fortunate, for a life that seldom fails of being miserable." Address to the Grand Jury, 1785.—p. 10.

"The great slave population," says the Madras Board of Revenue, "consists of the Hindoo slaves, *all of whom*, with the exception of a very few, *are employed in agriculture*, and may be termed field slaves, though occasionally employed in domestic service."—p. 897.

"In Trichinopoly, (where the number of slaves is 10,000 in the wet district alone,) *agricultural Slavery* has existed from time immemorial, unchanged and undiminished."—p. 839.

The Madras Board of Revenue says :

"Throughout the Tamil country, as well as in Malabar and Canara, far the greater part of the labouring classes of the people have, from time immemorial, been in a state of acknowledged bondage, in which they continue to the present time."—p. 817.

And finally, Judge Richardson says :

"Slavery exists *throughout* our dominions in India."—p. 317.

This, though not a hundredth part of the proof with which the volume before us teems, is probably enough to prove the fact of the *existence* of Slavery in British India.

Let us now turn to the evidence of its *progress*, its *continuance*, and its *character*.

Progress.

"It is *increasing*," says Mr. Cotton,—p. 930; and this was in June, 1825.

"The practice of stealing children from their parents, and sell-

* This was *forty-four* years ago; but how far are things improved in our day? Why, *not four* years ago, another high officer of the Company declares, as above, that Slavery "is *increasing*."

ing them for slaves, has long prevailed in this country, and has *greatly increased* since the establishment of the English government in it."—Minute, Bengal Consultations, p. 3.

"It is very generally admitted, that the price of slaves has *risen* since the Company's government: this is attributed to the *increased demand for them*; and the demand again owes its rise to an *extended cultivation*."—p. 921.

So much for the extended consumption of *East India sugar*, which we are called on still further to promote.

Continuance.

No less an authority than the Marquess Cornwallis, when governor-general, states in one of his despatches to the Board of Directors—

"There are many obstacles in the way against abolishing Slavery in the Company's dominions, as the number of slaves is considerable, and the practice is sanctioned both by the Mahomedan and Hindoo laws."—p. 13.

"By the Hindoo laws, Pooliars, Porrears, Parmues, and others, are born slaves, the property of a superior, who is authorised by the laws of Malabar to dispose of his right in favour of another person, so that the sale of them is as common as that of a bond: the Pooliar, born in a state of bondage, must remain so, as well as his posterity; for I never heard of any example of manumission: neither do I believe that, agreeable to the Hindoo system, it is in the power of those to whom they belong in any way to alter their relative station in society."—p. 597.

"A large portion of our most industrious subjects, (says the Madras Revenue Board,) are at present totally deprived of a free market for their labour, restricted by inheritance to a mere subsistence, and sold and transferred with the land which they till—confined to a condition scarcely superior to that of the cattle which they follow at the plough."—p. 818.

"By the laws and customs of the country (Malabar, where the number of slaves is 100,000), it is as impracticable to reduce a free-born subject to a state of bondage, as *it is contrary to them*

to emancipate a slave ; and, ' once a slave, always a slave,' may be considered a motto to be prefixed to the subject of Slavery in Malabar, according to the ideas of the natives."—p. 845.

The East India Company, it will be found, have shown themselves by no means backward in humouring these "ideas of the natives;" for we find them thus adding the weight of their sovereign authority to preserve the system :

"No variation whatever is to be made in the existing laws regarding slaves."—Bengal Political Consultations, p. 339.

"With reference to the extent to which domestic Slavery exists in India, under the established laws and usages of the Hindoos and Mahomedans, and to the known habits and feelings of the people relative to that point, the Vice-president in Council is of opinion, that the greatest care should be observed to guard against the prevalence of an impression amongst the natives, that any general or direct interference in the existing relation of master and slave is contemplated by government."—Proceedings of the Right Honourable the Governor-general in Council, in the Political Department, under date 7th April, 1817, p. 333.

And accordingly, as proof that this injunction has been duly obeyed, Mr. Commissioner Elphinstone, under date November 10th, 1819, writes to the government—

"I have the honour to acquaint you, that my reason for permitting the sale of slaves, was the general principle of not interfering with the laws of the country, &c. &c."—p. 340.

What these "laws" and "usages" are, which are to be so religiously observed, we learn from every part of the volume. Some of them are as follows :

Extract from Major Walker's Report on the Tenures of Malabar :

Character.

"The Cheramers, although slaves of the soil, and the property of the owners of the land, are distinct from the jennu, and may be possessed or sold separately from it.

“The Chermars are absolute property; they are part of the live stock on an estate. In selling and buying land, it is not necessary that they should follow the soil; both kinds of property are equally disposable, and may fall into different hands. The Chermars may be sold, leased, and mortgaged, like the land itself, or like any cattle or thing.”—p. 866.

“The people who keep slaves (in Arcot, where the number is reported at 17,000) most likely find it cheaper to buy than to rear them; and the offspring, when left to their parents’ charge, who have barely sufficient to support themselves, die of absolute want.

“They have not any particular marks whereby they may be distinguished, except it is their wretched appearance; they are fed, and clothed, and subsisted, entirely by their masters: their food consists of raggy, the coarsest kind of grain, and their clothing is a common cumly.”—p. 874.

“The increase of cultivation, and abundance of grain, &c. makes no alteration in the miserable state of these unhappy wretches. If ever so much is gained by their labour, *they* reap no advantage. A rag of the coarsest texture, scarcely sufficient to cover their nakedness, and a scanty allowance of the most cheap and unpalatable food, is their uniform portion.”—p. 300.

“The master, *according to his means*, feeds and clothes his slaves—he *never pays them wages in money*.”—p. 844.

“In regard to the treatment of masters towards their slaves, it does not appear to be incumbent on them to afford a subsistence to their slaves, except when employed on their business; and then it is on the lowest scale of allowance, being generally no more than two measures of *paddy* a day: at other times their slaves are obliged to seek a livelihood at the hands of others, being bound only to return to their masters when the season of cultivation again commences.”—p. 841.

“It is hardly heard that any slave has been possessed of property, from which he could derive his means of subsistence; whatever little property they may be possessed of is the right of

their master, for whom they must, under all circumstances, work.”—p. 853.

“ I cannot discover, though I was very particular in my enquiries on the point, that they have any rights or privileges ; and they are not possessed of any property, neither can they inherit any.”—p. 874.

“ As the proprietor is the person who will inherit whatever property his cherman (slave) may be possessed of at his death, he (the proprietor) will not accept the amount his cherman may have cost him, and grant him his liberty.”—p. 848.

“ The right of sale was, and is still, the master’s exclusive privilege, either with or without the land : the price varies, and is settled amongst the purchasers and sellers. The usual rates are as follow : for a strong young man, from 12 to 26 rupees (1*l.* 4*s.* to 2*l.* 12*s.*) ; a woman, from 12 to 24 ditto ; a child, never under 4 rupees.”—p. 843.

“ A race called Chermars, Pooliars, Panians, &c. &c., born in slavery to the soil on which they receive their birth, are bought, sold, mortgaged, and transferred, sometimes with, or even without the soil, parents and children together, or separate, as the exigencies of the proprietors demand.”—Judge Wilson, p. 906.

“ The master can lend his slaves out on hire ; he can sell the husband to one person, and the wife to another. This is not often done, *because*—what ? because neither of the purchasers can be sure of keeping his purchase.”—p. 843.

“ The master can sell the children ; but this is seldom done, from the foregoing cause, the fear of desertion.”—Ibid.

“ As it is not the interest of the landlords in Malabar and Canara to sell the slaves who cultivate their lands, they *usually dispose of the increasing stock only*, for which they have no immediate use ; but their *power* to dispose of *all* their slaves ; independently of their lands, seems undisputed.”—p. 817.

From Dacca, the chief officer writes to government :

“ At this time many boats are between this and Calcutta, loaded with children of all ages. This morning, forty-two, from

two years and upwards as far as six years, were produced, with the people who had them for sale. The children are objects the most striking, and can barely be said to have life.”—p. 11.

“ Many lives of infants are destroyed, by the attempts to secrete them.”—Minute, Bengal Consultations, p. 3.

“ Female children and grown-up young women are bought by all ranks. Among the Rajpoot chiefs these slaves are *very numerous*. The usage, however, descends to the lowest ranks; and few merchants or cultivators with any property are without mistresses or servants of this description.”—p. 414. “ Female slaves, almost in every instance, *are sold to prostitution*.” Some chiefs, “ who have from 50 to 200 female slaves, after employing them in all the menial labours of the house during the day, send them at night to form such connexions as they please; but a large share of the profits of that promiscuous intercourse into which they fall is annually exacted by their master, who adds any children they happen to produce to his list of slaves! The female slaves in this condition, as well as those of the dancing sets, are not permitted to marry, and are often very harshly treated. There are many instances of owners *selling the children borne to themselves* by these slaves!”—p. 415.

“ We are informed,” says the Calcutta Journal of Nov. 1, 1823, “ that 150 eunuchs have been landed from the Arab ships this season, to be sold as slaves in the capital of British India! It is known, too, that these ships are in the habit of carrying away many of the natives of this country, principally females, and disposing of them in Arabia, in barter for African slaves for the Calcutta market!! One fact shall suffice to show the savage and murderous barbarity resorted to by the wretches engaged in a traffic so revolting to humanity—A gentleman has informed us, that of 200 African boys emasculated at Judda, only ten survived the cruel operation.”—p. 378.

With respect to mildness of treatment, it must suffice to mention, that at p. 907, Judge Baber reports, amongst other cases on his circuit, two, of slaves beaten to death by their

owners: one for absenting himself to visit his wife on a distant estate; and the other for eating a few handfuls of grain from a field which he had been set to watch. And again, at p. 927, occurs a case where the death of a slave is proved to have resulted from the cutting off his nose as a punishment, by his owner; on which trial, two other slaves appeared, each of them deprived of his nose by the same proprietor.

Two more extracts, and we have done: they are part of the *law of the land!*

“Whoever is born from the body of a female slave, and whoever hath been purchased for a price, and *whoever hath been found by chance anywhere,** and whoever is a slave by descent from his ancestors,—these four species of slaves, until they are freed by the voluntary consent of their master, cannot have their liberty.”—Gentoo Code, Sect. ii.—p. 7.

“If the slave of any person marries a woman, *that woman becomes the slave of the same master*, unless she be the slave of any other person.”—Ibid. Sect. iii. p. 8.

What feature is there in the whole West India system half so frightful as this? A slave absconds, passes himself as a free man, and obtains the hand of some unsuspecting female in marriage: the owner, ere long, discovers the refugee, seizes *both* “according to law;” and the ill-fated woman, whatever her rank, becomes a slave for life! her children slaves for ever!!

This, then, is East India freedom. This is the source

* It has been made a ground of incessant accusation and obloquy against the West Indians, that any vagrant negro, whom there is reason to suspect of being a slave, shall prove before a magistrate that he is a free man, or be committed to the workhouse; but here, in the East, any body is authorised by law, and sanctioned by “usage,” in making that man his property, whom he may *chance* [or CHOOSE] *to find anywhere!*

whence we may supply ourselves with sugar, unpolluted by the sins and sorrows of Slavery! *

The cunning fabricators of the fraud long trusted for its success to our ignorance of the real condition of internal India; and for a while they were successful. Hundreds believed, because a few had hardily asserted, that, in India, Slavery had no existence. Nevertheless, this fallacy has often been refuted, and at length so effectually, that its authors have been at last compelled to abandon it. But they forsook it, only to take refuge in *another* fiction: they boldly asserted next, that though perhaps Slavery might be found to exist somewhere in India, it was certainly unknown “*in the sugar*

* It must be acknowledged that Dr. Buchanan informs us of a description of labourers in India who are not *called* slaves; he tells us—

“In *Cherical* and *Cotay-hutty* there are slaves chiefly of the *Poliar* and *Pariar* castes; but the greater part of the cultivation is carried on by *Panicar*, or hired men. These *Panicars* are at liberty to change their service whenever they please, unless they be indebted to their master, and about *one half* of them are in that state. They work from morning to noon, when they are allowed an hour for breakfast; they then work until evening, and all night they watch crops. The master gives the servant a hut, a piece of cloth twice a year, from six to twelve silver fanams (2s. 3½d. to 4s. 7d.) annually for oil and salt, and a daily allowance of rice, which is larger than that given to the slaves. When the servant is in debt, stoppages from this allowance are made. The *Panicars* are frequently flogged; and, as their masters are not bound to provide for them in old age, or during famine, they seem to me to be in a worse condition than the slaves.”—Buchanan, vol. ii. p. 562. The “Free Sugar” ought surely to be *warranted not to have been produced by the labour of Panicar!*

districts!" This fraud has also prospered, for thousands at the present hour believe it; it must therefore also be refuted.

Without borrowing the courteous motto of a late anti-colonial publication—"Out of thine own mouth will I condemn thee"—we may yet remark, that it is highly favourable to the establishment of this case that it will be grounded wholly upon evidence furnished by the Court of East India Directors. While the means of accurate information, which that distinguished body so pre-eminently possess, will guarantee the authenticity of the following evidence, it is but natural to assume that the side to which their interest in the question leans will effectually preclude mis-statement or exaggeration.

The work on East India Slavery the Company compiled to lay before Parliament, in obedience to its order.—Another work, of almost equal importance to this enquiry, on East India Sugar, they prepared for the use of their own body of Proprietors.* We propose to place in corresponding columns such extracts from both, as will amply show that Slavery and the sugar-cane flourish *together*.

EAST INDIA SUGAR.

EAST INDIA SLAVERY.

Bengal.

"Sugar and indigo are common to the whole champaign of Bengal."—Papers, p. 79.

"Slaves may be found in Bengal *among the labourers in husbandry*."—Papers, p. 80.

"Sugar is a natural produc-

"Many estates in the country

* The title of this work is, "Papers respecting the Culture and Manufacture of Sugar in British India. Printed by order of the Court of Proprietors of the East India Company, 18th December, 1822." 554 pages, folio.

tion of Bengal, and has for ages been cultivated in very large quantities."—*Id. ib.* p. 82.

"From Benares to Rengpur, from the borders of Asam to those of Catac, there is scarcely a district in Bengal or its dependent provinces wherein the sugar-cane does not flourish."—*Id.* p. 79.

are cultivated by indigenous slaves."—Bengal Judicial Consultations, 4th Feb. 1817, Slavery in India, p. 345.

"In Bengal, throughout some districts, the labours of husbandry are executed chiefly by bond-servants. In certain provinces, the ploughmen are mostly slaves of the peasants for whom they labour."—*Id.* p. 80.

"There are very many natives of Africa in the provinces under the Bengal government, that have been imported by people now holding them as slaves."—Judge Leycester's Report, 9th Sept. 1815, p. 344.

The Calcutta Journal of Nov. 1, 1823, says :

"This great capital is at once the depôt of the commerce and riches of the East, and the mart in which the manacled African is sold like the beast of the field to the highest bidder."—p. 378.

Dacca.

"The number of begahs of sugar-cane in cultivation in the Dacca district is about 10,000 begahs of 50 yards square."—p. 166.

"The sugar from Dacca, we

"It is an established custom throughout the Dacca districts, to keep in bondage all the offspring and descendants of persons who have once become slaves."—Governor in Coun-

beg leave to point out for the particular notice of the Court of Directors."—Despatch Revenue Board, p. 236.

"The number of begahs of sugar-cane cultivated in Dacca Jelalpore is estimated at about 6000."—p. 139.

cil of Bengal to the Court of Directors, p. 2.

"Inveigling away and selling slaves has long been a prevailing offence, I believe, peculiar to this district."—Sir R. Dick, second Judge of Dacca, p. 242.

"Occasional instances appear to occur in Dacca Jelalpore, of the disposal of children as slaves; and the transfer of slaves is reported to be common."—Judges' Report, p. 245.

Moradabad.

"You will inform us," says the Court of Directors, "whether the advances for the cultivation of the sugar-cane in Moradabad and Etawah, amounting to 124,925 rupees, have been repaid, and whether the cultivation of the sugar-cane in these districts has received the expected extension."—p. 19. 2nd App.

"The magistrate of Moradabad sent to this office twenty-three children, who turned out to have been purchased by individuals from the slave-dealers. These children had all been purchased at the towns of Nudgeebabad, &c. which are established marts, where these children are collected in hundreds."—Bengal Polit. Cons. p. 115.

[On referring the above case to the Governor-general in Council, the children were ordered by him to be "*restored to the proprietors.*"—p. 118.]

"Since the promulgation of the regulation previously speci-

fied, the *traffic in slaves from foreign countries* is almost, if not entirely, suppressed in the districts of Moradabad and Etawah.”—Bengal Jud. Cons. p. 140.

[That is to say, the state of Slavery *within* the district *remains unchanged*; the practice of *importing* fresh slaves from without is suppressed: precisely as is the case with all our West India Colonies, where the *Slave Trade*, that is to say slave importation, has been suppressed and extinguished two-and-twenty years.]

Malabar.

“ In South Malabar, sugarcane has been lately introduced. In North Malabar the sugarcane seems to thrive, and does not want watering.”—p. 16. 3rd App.

“ The slaves of Malabar are *entirely* prædial or rustic, being engaged only in the cultivation of rice lands and *plantations*.”—p. 914.

“ In Malabar, as in the West Indies, a man’s wealth is as much appreciated by the number of his slaves, as by any other property he may possess.”—p. 895.

“ The *exportation* of slaves from Malabar is hereby *strictly prohibited*.”—Madras Regulations, Sec. xviii. 14. p. 553.

Whilst under this head of Malabar, it may be worth while to notice another branch of the Free-Labour Fiction, in the case of Coffee. A worthy trader in one of the great thoroughfares of the metropolis, who garnishes his shop-window with anti-

“ I am directed to acquaint

slavery pamphlets, and tea-cups and other utensils glittering with gilded blackamoors in every variety of interesting attitude; and above all, pre-eminent in the centre, a statue of a kneeling negro, displaying a high intellectual forehead and much brawn about his limbs, wearing (for they are egregious dandies) a very pretty tin chain from his ancles to his hands, which latter he appears to be ever and anon clapping, either to make himself laugh, or some fair admirer smile—This worthy personage, that is to say, the free-grocery shopkeeper, displays in another section of his window a most ostentatious mound of coffee, graced at its summit with a ticket whereon is inscribed

“ EAST INDIA COFFEE.”

“ MALABAR.”

The evidence afforded, by the growers and importers of this coffee, in the parallel columns, must make it particularly agreeable to *tender* stomachs. Nine-tenths of it, you see, *must* be slave produce. Your plan must be, to ordain a rigorous search in your kitchens, in order to detect the guilty nine out of every ten coffee berries. Happily they may be readily known, by looking for “the indelible

you that the Collector of Malabar has no authority to interfere between the slaves and their masters. Although the exportation and importation of slaves as a traffic be prohibited, domestic Slavery is recognised by the usage of the country, and the Mahomedan and Hindoo laws, and has never been abolished by the British Government.”—Government Secretary, to the Board of Trade, p. 559.

“ The system prevails throughout Malabar: their numbers may be estimated at about 100,000.”—p. 845.

“ They are slaves of the soil, and are generally attached to the land on which they were born; but this is by no means considered an essential point, being frequently transferred by sale, mortgage, or hire.”—Ibid.

“ In South Malabar, nine-tenths of the cultivation is carried on entirely by Chermas (slaves).”—p. 846.

“ Chermas are employed in *all* the works connected with husbandry and agriculture.”—p. 850.

This is repeated not less than ten times in different parts of the volume.

impress of Slavery," which all slave-grown commodities bear. This envied tenth you will put on the fire, the nine into it. With regard to the trivial loss thus occasioned, the conscientious grocer will, as a perfect matter of course, bear that: you will find that he deducts 90 per cent, or 'nine-tenths' of the price, in his bill. There is only one real awkwardness. Suppose, after you have thus decimated 10lbs. of Malabar coffee to furnish forth a breakfast—suppose, for it is really a supposable case—that *one*—a treacherous one—of the forbidden berries eludes cook's vigilance! it mixes itself amongst the elected grains—you drink—and rise up from table an aider, an abetter, an encourager, a participator of the most atrocious, the most accursed, the most hellish system that ever—&c. &c. &c.

Canara.

"In South Canara, it is upon the sort of land called betta that sugar-cane is cultivated."—p. 16. 3rd App.

"In Northern Canara, sugar-cane is raised on mackey land. The kind of cane used here is called bily-cabo, which above the ghauts is called mara-cabo. Inland they cultivate the caribabo, which above the ghauts is called puttaputty."—p. 17.

"The quantity of sugar-cane annually raised in the Canara districts, below the ghauts, is estimated at 9,189,250 canes. Mr. Read, the collector, observes, 'As the land on which the sugar-cane is reared is all rice ground, its cultivation might

"By far the greatest part of the slaves employed in agriculture are the Daerds: the whole number of them, by the population statement, is 52,022. (At p. 843, they are said to be 60,000.) Exclusive of the Daerds, there were another sect of slaves in Canara: the number of this sort now is 722. There are also many slaves imported from Arabia."—Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, Madras: pp. 548-50.

"By the Daerds, and slaves of other sorts, nearly the whole cultivation of the country is carried on. An estate, indeed, without a property in some of these people, would be of little

be increased to a very considerable extent.'"—p. 18.

value, because day-labourers are not to be procured in this, as in other countries."—*Id. ibid.*

"In Canara the labourer is the personal slave of the proprietor, and is sold and mortgaged by him independently of his lands."—Madras Revenue Board, p. 817.

"The number of slaves of all descriptions in Canara has never been correctly ascertained: they may be estimated at 82,000."—p. 844.

Goruckpore.

"The sugar-cane in Goruckpore occupies about 4800 beghas."—3rd App. p. 38.

Of six runaway slaves brought before Chas. Dumbleton, Esq., magistrate of the Zillah Goruckpore,

"Nathee denied that he was the prosecutor's slave, alleging that he belonged to Shoobeer Suen Chouturya.

"Sobhaee confessed that he was a slave, and said that the prosecutor had purchased him, two of the slaves present, and three others, viz. his father, mother, and sister, for the sum of 140 rupees. [£14 sterling; £2. 6s. 8d. each.]

"Jeewee also acknowledged that he was a slave; he represented that if he should now return to the hills, the prosecutor

would cut off his ears as a punishment for his offence." &c. &c.—Bengal Judicial Cons. p. 119.

Ganjam.

“ Sugar may be justly esteemed the staple produce of the Ganjam province.”—p. 265.

“ Whereas there were a number of slaves intended for sale, who had been purchased at Ganjam.”—Government Proclamation, p. 469.

Randaterra.

“ In the district of Randaterra the sugar-cane seems to thrive, and does not require watering. The experiment has not yet been carried to a sufficient length to enable Mr. Brown, the superintendent of an experimental plantation, to speak decidedly on the subject; but if this valuable plant be found to answer in such situations, its introduction will be of immense benefit to the province.”—Buchanan's Journey (East India Papers), 3rd App. p. 16.

“ I sent (says Judge Baber) to Mr. Brown, owner of the plantation at Randaterra, advising him that I had received information that certain free-born children had been kidnapped by his agents, and were now amongst the slaves on his estate. The commissioners returned, bringing with them 76 men, women, and children, found on Mr. Brown's plantation, all of whom declared they had been stolen, or forcibly carried away. The total number of slaves was 350; but the rest were unable to prove that they had been kidnapped: indeed, many had been born on the property.”

At an earlier period, corresponding exactly with the date of Dr. Buchanan's visit, men-

tioned in the opposite column, Mr. Brown, in a letter here printed, says: "I have purchased 45 Pooliars, men, women, and children: if they could be procured, I should be able to employ 2000 men and 800 women." This was probably in order to realize the "immense benefit" from sugar, which he had just begun to cultivate, and which already "seemed to thrive."—pp. 560-96.

Ramghur.

"The cultivation of sugar in Ramghur amounts to 1200 begahs only; but the late increased demand for sugar will, I am of opinion, prove a sufficient incentive to the cultivation of it. Excepting the apprehension that government might make it a monopoly, I know not of any existing cause that tends to discourage the cultivation of sugar."—Papers on East India Sugar, p. 170.

"There are districts under the Company's dominions wherein, to my own knowledge (particularly Ramghur), the greatest part of the cultivators and labourers are slaves."—Report from Judge Richardson, p. 300.

This most considerate judge adds: "It is argued, that were Slavery abolished, many wretches would perish in times of extreme scarcity or famine. Admit that some would perish, those would be chiefly the infirm and superfluous in towns, not the industrious cultivators or the ploughmen."—*Id. ibid.*

Rungpore.

"There are numberless sugar-

"I take the present oppor-

works in this and the adjoining districts.—The cultivation is greatly increased throughout the country within these two years: in all the aurungs within the circle of my business on the part of the Company, I may safely state the cultivation to be now above double.”—Report of Mr. Mason, Resident at Rungpore; Papers, p. 159.

tunity of bringing to the notice of government, the expediency of making provision for the importation into our territories of slaves by visitors, or by emigrants coming to settle therein.”—Commissioner of Rungpore to Government, 3rd July, 1825, p. 381.

Patna.

“Extract of sugar-cane comes from Patna.”—Papers; Dr. Hamilton’s Statistical Survey, p. 34.

“Sugar, prepared like that which in Europe is called clayed, comes from Patna, &c.”—Id. *ibid.*

“Sugar comes from Patna.”—Id. p. 35.

“Besides the palms and the mahuya-tree, the only article of a saccharine property is the sugar-cane, which is cultivated to a great extent.”—Id. *ibid.*

“There are two kinds of slaves in this province, Mussulman and Hindoo. Slaves of either denomination are considered in the same light as any other property, and are transferrable by the owner, or descend at his demise to his heirs. The proprietor *cultivates his lands by the hands of these slaves.*”—The Provincial Council of Patna to the Governor in Council, p. 5.

Sylhet.

“The quantity of sugar-cane in the Sylhet district makes in the whole 2575 kears of sixty-four square cubits each.”—p. 177.

“In those districts where Slavery is in general usage, which we are informed is the case at Sylhet—.” Bengal Revenue Consultations, p. 4.

“ The odious practice of trafficking in slaves has long subsisted in that zillah.”—Sir R. Dick, Judge ; p. 244.

Tipperah.

“ The sugar-cane *throughout this district* (Tipperah) is of a very inferior quality, owing chiefly to the poorness of the soil.”—p. 167.

“ The inhabitants of the zillah of Tipperah appear to refrain from the practice of becoming *venders* of slaves ; although it is reported by the magistrate, that they *make such purchases* from people coming from the districts of Sylhet, Chittagong, and Backergunge.”—Judges’ Report, p. 245.

[Slavery must thrive here, since it seems they *get* as many as they can, and *keep* all they *get*.]

Surely this is enough to show that Slavery and East India Sugar come into pretty close companionship. It is here demonstrated, beyond a shadow of doubt or dispute, that Slavery *does* exist, and widely prevail, in the sugar-districts. And the fact which every where appears in the Papers on Sugar, that that particular article yields larger profits than almost any other, is a sufficient assurance that *no* farmer who has land and labourers will neglect to grow it. Supposing that only a portion of these farmers hold slaves, can it be for a moment imagined that that portion should disregard a species of cultivation which is pursued, and found the most advantageous, by all his neighbours? * It may, however, be objected, that

* “ The accounts from different quarters show, that sugar is

were slaves habitually employed in sugar cultivation, we should have found, amongst such a multiplicity of documents, some more *direct* proof of the fact.

If all that we have just seen is not sufficient for the most sceptical, the following may perhaps have better success :

“ The expenses of cultivation and manufacture (of sugar) are invariably estimated upon a supposition that the work is performed by *hired labourers*, whereas it is *mostly executed* by the ryott's own family and *dependents*, and consequently costs less than hired labour.”—p. 49. 3rd App.

What kind of *dependents*, over and above his family and his “hired labourers,” can any farmer have, that are not slaves?

The only proof that could be given of a nature *more direct* than this, would be the explicit declaration, that “The sugar of Bengal is cultivated by the slaves of Bengal.” This avowal nowhere appears; but surely it cannot be very difficult to assign a cause for the omission. The enemies of the West India Colonies (hopeless of bringing those colonies to ruin, unless they can offer the public an alternative of markets,) are so strenuous in asserting the absolute integrity of East India sugar, that independent of the disadvantage to the sale of the article itself, by putting such a fact upon printed record, it would be quite too ungrateful in the Honourable Company so to give the lie direct to champions thus zealous in their favour. From the pointed manner in which many of the officers in India, when called on by the Court at home to describe the state of Slavery in their respective districts, exert themselves to draw a distinction between it and

in Bengal more profitable than any other produce, except mulberry.”—p. 99. “The profits to the cultivator, even at the low price the article has hitherto borne, are said to be very considerable, more than on any other article of cultivation.”—p. 94.

the Slavery of the West Indies, by name,* it is *quite evident* that the discussions in England, and the odium affixed to the system of the West, had led to that investigation in the East of which these volumes are the fruit. No wonder, therefore, that as little resemblance as possible between the two has been permitted to appear; and above all, that the article of sugar is most studiously kept out of sight, and not even mentioned. Is it possible, under any other view of the case, that when the one work tells us “Sugar is a necessary of life, and cultivated by *all descriptions* of ryotts and cultivators of lands,†” and the other work declares that “Slavery *exists throughout* our dominions in India;”‡ is it possible, without a miracle, that the two should not *somewhere* come together? The thousand pages filled with East India Slavery mention incidentally every other article of Indian production: the article of sugar is never once named: does not such a marked omission, in the case of sugar, all but *prove* the case?

Having thus brought home the employment of slave-labour to the growth of East India sugar, let us in conclusion see where the largest quantum of suffering is sustained, in the production of any given quantity of sugar; whether in the East, or the West Indies; in a word, which is the most innocent, or, if you please, the least guilty, sugar of the two?

“In Hindostan, slaves are kept for show, or employed in the meanest and most laborious offices of servitude.”—Judge Richardson, p. 299.

“Slaves in India are to be viewed rather as useful and laborious instruments of agriculture.”—Board of Revenue, p. 897.

“Female slaves, almost in every instance, are sold to prostitution.”—p. 415.

* See pp. 837, 846, 862, &c.

† Gov.-Gen. in Council, to Board of Trade, p. 182.

‡ Judge Richardson's Report, p. 317.

What *can* Slavery be more than this? The slaves of the East it seems, from these three passages, are either appendages of ostentation, or they are menial drudges, or they are implements of agriculture, or they are instruments of vice. How many degrees of ingenuity beyond the utmost that has been as yet developed, would it take to devise a *more* abject condition for the slaves of the West, supposing their masters willing and anxious to inflict it on them?

But this point may be carried a little further. The party who stand arrayed against the Colonies; and recommend East India produce as the only grocery that can be eaten without sin, have laid it to the charge of the West India planters, as among their chief enormities, that the negroes during harvest had to work at night; that they were allowed but twenty-six week days during the year for themselves; and that they sometimes worked (in their own gardens) on a Sunday. Let us see how the Free-sugar slaves stand, with regard to this matter:

“During the crop-season they continue to work night and day.”
—East India Sugar Papers, p. 23. 3rd App.

“They are required to watch the fields and granary during the night.”—East India Slavery, p. 865.

“They have *no* day which they can call their own.”—Ibid. p. 844.

“*Every body works at Calcutta upon Sundays!*” *—Ibid. p. 271.

* This last fact is comprehensive, and curious. It comes out on a slave's cross-examination before a tribunal, and appears unquestionably true. This slave has been forcibly removed by his master from Bengal to New South Wales: he at length complains of ill usage, and that he is compelled to work all and every Sunday. His master may be supposed to ask (for, as is usual in our own reports, the questions in a cross-examination are not given, but

But it may be said, that this system in India is of *native* origin, and utterly abhorrent to *British* feeling throughout that empire. In the very first of the thousand pages of *Slavery in India*, the Company's government in Bengal, composed of course entirely of Englishmen, announce, in their official despatches to the Court of Directors, that they have just passed a law, ordaining that the families and children of a certain class of thieves called *Decoits*, shall, upon apprehension, be sold into perpetual slavery, "deprived of their liberty, and separated for ever from each other," for their fathers' offences. To be sure, the judicial body acknowledge that "this, in some respect, involves the innocent with the guilty;" but anon they quiet their conscientious qualm, and stoutly pronounce that, because "their families subsist by the spoils which they bring home to them, they are all therefore alike criminal."

This precious *law* runs thus :

"Whereas the peace of this country hath for some years been greatly disturbed by bands of *Decoits*, &c. Be it therefore resolved, That every such criminal, on conviction, shall be carried to the village to which he belongs, and be there executed for a terror and example to others; and for the further prevention of such abominable practices, that the village of which he is an inhabitant shall be fined according to the enormity of the crime, and each inhabitant according to his substance; and that the family of the criminal shall become the slaves of the states, and be disposed of for the general benefit and convenience of the people, according to the discretion of the government."—*Slavery in India*, pp. 1, 2.

only the answers)—the master may be supposed to say, "Work on Sundays! Why, does not every body work on Sundays in Bengal, whence you came?" The slave's recorded answer is, "*Every body at Calcutta works on Sundays.*"

Beyond these facts, it is needless to pursue the question. Throughout India, Slavery prevails: India is therefore a slave territory, as Jamaica is a slave colony. What odium attaches to the productions of the one, from which the productions of the other can honestly be pronounced free?

It only remains to add a word or two on the Slavery of the West. To assert that East India sugar is "Free Sugar," is not a greater error (great as we have proved it to be) than it is to assert or to believe that the sugar of the British West India Colonies is produced by a set of beings, whose existence is one unvaried round of ill usage and of misery. Yet this has been said with equal confidence, and received with equal credulity.

Let us examine this matter *fairly*—we owe as much to ourselves, and surely not less to those whom, if we *should* be in error, our mistake deeply *injures*.

Our West India labourers are called slaves, it is true; but we must not form our idea of *their* estimate of such a condition by a reference to *our own* feelings: * to a Briton

* Those who have not seen the voluminous work, "Slavery in India," and who may possibly have been brought to disbelieve the fact which the mere title of that work establishes, will pardon one more extract from it, since it pursues the very same line of reasoning, in an apology for East India Slavery. Every syllable is as strictly applicable to that of the West.

"The Slavery of Malabar may be considered of a mild description. The individuals are born in it, and it is a second nature to them. The habits of their lives from childhood are formed in subserviency and accommodation to it; and they feel no impatient irksomeness arising from the cherished memory of rights and comforts once enjoyed, which they have recently lost, or from a spirit of proud independence conscious of a title to higher privileges, and

—to any man who has been *bred up* in the enjoyment of rational freedom—the exchange to a state of Slavery would prove the greatest of all calamities : but not so to the wretched sons of Africa—to them the change has been the very opposite. West India servitude has actually raised them—and would assuredly raise the prostrated race of Hindostan, such as we have just beheld them—* in the scale of being. The negro has been rescued from the barbarism and the darkness of Paganism in his native Africa, to participate in the pure light and the inseparable blessings of Christianity. He has been raised from a condition, of which the common features were murder, rapine, and every abomination, into a state of society holding out to him every incitement to meritorious conduct and to habits of civilization. He is placed in a condition where his welfare is not only sure of being promoted by his own good conduct, but where its promotion has become the direct object, because the interest, of another : it is thus guaranteed him by perhaps the strongest of human securities, that of reciprocal advantage : it is the master's interest to treat his slaves well, that he may thereby have labourers both able and inclined to work for him ; while it is the slave's interest to be a meritorious servant, and in

indignant at an unjust exclusion from them. Their habitual dependence upon superiors would, for a time, even make them uneasy upon being thrown adrift upon their own resources.”—Slavery in India, p. 921.

* Dr. Claudius Buchanan says, “ In districts of Malabar, by far the greater part of the labour in the field is performed by slaves. They are very severely treated ; and their diminutive stature and squalid appearance show evidently a want of adequate nourishment. *There can be no comparison between their condition and that of the slaves in the West India Colonies.*”—Buchanan, vol. ii. p. 495.

consequence a good member of society, that he may continue to benefit by his master's favour.

What then do policy, and justice, demand? Policy, that by duly appreciating what he has done already, the master may be encouraged still to advance in the work of amelioration, and thus the negro's welfare will be *most effectually* promoted; and justice, that this acknowledgment of the master's efforts should procure for him such a space of time for completing them, as that no injury shall accrue to either when the final change takes place—that amelioration shall not have obliterated slavery, until the negro shall have been gradually so familiarised with the comforts and the requirements of civilised life, as that there shall be no fear of his relapsing into barbarism and indolence when left to his own control; and that thus the master may have a reasonable assurance that his property will not be rendered valueless to him, from the mere want of labourers to conduct its cultivation; but that, when he shall have ceased to command the labour of the negroes as his slaves, he may have no difficulty in obtaining it from them, as his voluntary labourers for hire.*

This, in the negroes' present condition, it would be folly to expect. The following passage from a writer uniformly inimical to the West India colonists, shows pretty clearly what dependence is to be placed on the alleged disposition of the negroes to *free labour*, supposing them emancipated:

“The high price of labour enables them to gain sufficient,

* “It can be hardly necessary to enter into long arguments to show the difficulty of abolishing Slavery (in the East Indies), since the most able and strenuous advocates for the abolition of the Slave Trade in the British House of Commons always deprecated the danger and impolicy of thinking to emancipate slaves before their moral condition was so far improved as to render them capable of enjoying freedom.”—*Slavery in India*, p. 454.

by slight and discontinuous exertion, to pass nearly a third of their time in sleep or gambling. A free man of colour, who is a tolerable artificer, will make from *twelve reals* (6s. 9d.) to *three dollars* (13s. 6d.) per day; and this he earns rather by a sort of hysterical effort, than by *labour*. He will work half this day, a third of next, abandon his work the day after, and return as he feels the necessity. Perhaps in the middle of the work to be completed, he will leave his employer for another situated nearer his gaming haunts; no dependence is to be placed on him."—*Letters from Havana, 1820, p. 37.*

So much for the blessed results of *freedom*, inflicted on a negro unprepared for it by the previous formation of habits of industry. Is such a man a useful member of society, or is he a nuisance?

The ideas of these people, in fact, require to be more elevated, and their habits more civilised, before they can be stimulated by those artificial wants, nothing short of a desire to gratify which can reconcile man to steady labour.

When these habits are formed, and the wants which they create are felt, then the negro, like the English labourer, will feel that he *must* work, to realise his desires. He will then find it as necessary to give a week's work for a week's maintenance and enjoyment, as the peasant does in England.

This is all that the proprietor of the soil can wish to secure. As to the term Slavery, it is idle to suppose him in love with *it*—what should make him so? Service is all that he requires—service in return for support: and what landholder in England would be content with less? what labouring population in any part of the globe gets more?*

* An apologist for East India Slavery in the work so frequently quoted in these pages, may be again employed to speak to the point in question: Mr. C. M. Lushington, Receiver for Trichino-

Let us for a moment institute another parallel, and see how far it will hold. What, let us enquire, is the real amount of difference between servitude in Jamaica, and apprenticeship in Britain? Let it not be objected, that the one state applies to men, the other only to boys. Mr. Canning truly pronounced of the negro race generally, that it was "in strength a giant, but in intellect a child." The cases, therefore, are in this respect sufficiently alike. Being then similar in principle, how do they assimilate in detail? In both cases, the master requires work, the servant maintenance: in both, the servant being found unfit to be trusted with his own guidance, the master has to take the management of him into his own hands: in both, as a consequence of this system of manage-

poly, in his Report to the India Government on the Slavery of that province, says—"There is something so revolting and abhorrent to an Englishman in the idea of Slavery, that the advocates for its continuance *in any shape*, must ever labour under the disadvantage of pre-judgment. Notwithstanding this, I shall endeavour to show that the abolition of the system would be attended (as regards the revenue) with the most serious and ruinous consequences. It has been the custom to describe the pullers [or substitute negroes] as involved in wretchedness and misery, and reduced to a condition scarcely superior to that of the cattle, &c. This theme holds out a fine subject of declamation: but divesting the discussion of national feeling, the most obvious inconvenience and evil which attends the system is, that a man, for the sake of food, and the other necessaries of life, is condemned to perpetual labour; I exclude all unreasonable rigour on the part of the master, because I have already shown that the ruling principle of human conduct, self-interest, is conducive, in the present instance, to soften severity. But whether this obligation to perpetual labour on the part of the puller [or the negro] is not fully requited by a perpetual certainty of maintenance, for which those who work for hire are often at a loss, may, I think, be fairly doubted."—pp. 839, 40.

ment, instead of paying the servant's earnings in money, with which he may buy for himself the necessaries of subsistence, the master provides those necessaries for him: in both, neglect of duty is punished by personal correction—the reason of this is obvious; if the slave or the apprentice were paid in money, the master could at any time indemnify himself for misconduct, or neglect, by withholding an equivalent amount of wages; but where he is paid, as both are, in the shape of lodging, clothes, and food, payment cannot be so withheld: the master can have no remedy for injury done; and his sole resource is to apply personal correction, both to warn others, and to deter the actual offender from a repetition of his fault.*

Now does not this view of the case, which surely is a fair one, qualify the "horrors of the cart-whip," "the exaction of service without wages," and some other of the long catalogue of accusations which a party of enthusiasts have so profusely heaped upon the heads of our colonial proprietors?

Let us glance at one further parallel, and with it we will conclude. What does the British labourer work for? Is it not for a subsistence? And does he, by his utmost efforts,

* With regard to corporal punishment, its infliction is sufficiently authorised by the general usage of England, where flogging has not only never been abolished, but, as may be seen by the police reports in all the London prints, has of late come into increased popularity, and been pronounced by all parties (patients alone excepted) as the most salutary corrective that can possibly be exhibited: so much for the *principle*—as for the *practice*, the Commander-in-chief of the British army, with consent of the nation, considers from 100 to 1000 lashes as a reasonable allowance for the back of a free man—for a slave, the universal colonial law prohibits, under a heavy penalty, a single stripe beyond 39.

always compass this? Does every labourer in England obtain the ordinary necessaries of life for himself, his wife, and his children, in return for his and their labour? It is to be feared that it would be easier to find thousands who do not, than equal numbers who do. Yet the West India labourer obtains this: he enjoys in return for his labour, ample food, adequate clothing, a comfortable home, proper medicines, and the promptest medical aid in sickness; and in the decline of life, the enjoyment of all that is requisite to smooth his passage to the grave.

These are his enjoyments—and what are his cares? Has he, besides the burden of his own domestic wants, to sustain a double struggle with poverty, in order to find a maintenance for aged and helpless parents? No; his parents are effectually cared for by their master. Has he to forego the dearest wish of his heart, that of a union with the woman of his choice, because prudence, that is to say poverty, forbids? No; he is on the contrary encouraged to this union, the moment inclination prompts it. Is his joy as a parent damped by the bitter reflection, that he has brought into existence beings for whose future welfare and even present wants he is unable to make provision? No; for he well knows that, whilst all the joys which spring from parental feelings are secured to him by a tie which no human power can sever, the cares and the cost of bringing up his offspring are all borne for him by another. And as to the future—that point to which so few can look without anxiety—is the negro's present comfort marred by the sad reflection, that old age is approaching, with all its wants, whilst not one of them is as yet provided for; nay, what is worse, that from the scantiness of means and the largeness of present demands, it is, and will continue, utterly out of his power to make provision for them? Is this—a source of care which clouds the brow of the great mass throughout England—is

this one of the negro's cares? No; *he* knows well that he has nought to care for, as regards his earthly comforts, beyond the present hour. Helpless parents, orphan children, sickness, old age, lose all their terrors for him: parents and children are never thought of but with pleasure—sickness and old age are unthought of altogether.

An able writer, in treating of this subject, observes—
 “ We have heard much of the misery of the slaves in our West India Colonies, and it is not my purpose to refute all the calumnies which have, with great industry, been circulated on the subject.

“ But it may not be amiss to compare with the picture we have presented you of the Eastern labourers, a contrast drawn not by a West India planter, or proprietor of slaves, but by a *Wesleyan missionary*, Mr. Robert Young, who, in a sermon addressed to an assemblage of negroes in Jamaica, on the 19th September, 1824, observes—

“ It ought to be remembered, that the situation of life in which Providence has placed you is not without its comforts; for when you have performed your appointed work, you are happily delivered from all anxiety and tormenting care; and, in the evening of each day can return to your humble cabins with confidence, being assured that no creditor will be found there claiming the little property of which you may be possessed: no sick wife or sick child will be there, without the aid of medicine, and, if required, the assistance of a nurse; neither will your children meet you at your doors with looks expressive of starvation, and pierce your hearts with cries of hunger. No! such scenes of misery are not found in your dwellings; for your bread is given you, and your waters are sure! Such, however, are the trials of many of the labouring poor in England; and I feel no reluctance in stating that many of them have much harder labour, and enjoy fewer comforts, than the generality of slaves in Jamaica.’

“ Let it be remembered, that Mr. Young did not set this picture before an inexperienced audience, ignorant of the

real situation of the negro slave; but before those whose confidence it was the great object of his mission to gain, and who must have treated his admonitions with scorn, had they not *known and felt* that the description he gave to them of their own condition and treatment was *faithful and true.*"

Thus, then, stands the case: the British labourer, though a free man, is too frequently the slave of want and of care; the negro, though a slave, is wholly free from *both*. Let us beware how we meddle with his condition, unless we can ensure him a better. His master is at the present moment sparing no expense to impart to him the best of knowledge, religious instruction, through which he may learn to appreciate the blessings of freedom. When he does appreciate them, then let us think of making him the offer. At present, it would be as absurd to tender him the hungry freedom of the Briton—to him, literally, an *empty* sound—as it is injudicious to revolutionise a population of 800,000 souls from the visionary hope of doing them a service; or as it is insane, to think of repressing Slavery, by extending the cultivation of India.

A P P E N D I X.

THE following strictures on the first edition of this pamphlet, and the correspondence with one of the public journals to which those strictures gave rise, are here reprinted, that the reader may see how far it has been possible to impeach the evidence which this publication contains, even by a writer who shows himself bent on refuting it, and who proves himself unshackled by any of the restraints of veracity in the prosecution of his task.

The *Times* paper, of the 8th August, devoted its leading article to a very favourable notice of the present publication. The same journal, of the 4th September, with that observance of fair dealing for which *The Times* is conspicuous, extracted the following strictures in reply, from a periodical tract called the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*.

(*From the Anti-Slavery Reporter.*)

“ We are anxious, before we close this number, to advert to another topic, on which the colonial pamphleteers and journalists have laboured hard during the last month to work on the public mind:—we allude to the culture of sugar by free labour. A writer of the name of Saintsbury has stepped forward among the rest, and repeated the exploded fallacies of the late Mr. Marryat, as well as those of Mr. Macqueen, on the subject of the sugar imported hither from the East Indies, which they hardily affirm to be the produce of slave labour, and not the produce of free labour. Our readers of the present day are, perhaps, not aware that this controversy was conclusively settled in 1823. The late Mr. Marryat then employed his able pen in endeavouring to establish this point; and the present race of writers have, in fact, done little more than, with far less of talent and acuteness, to produce again

his refuted arguments, and to fortify them with his disproved statements.* The refutation and disproof may both be found in a pamphlet published by Hatchard, entitled *A Letter to W. W. Whitmore, Esq., M. P.* This pamphlet was deemed decisive at the time. The facts of the case are precisely the same now as they were then, and the letter to Mr. Whitmore is just as complete a reply to Mr. Saintsbury's positions as it was to those of Mr. Marryat. A sheet, extracted from this pamphlet, has been published by the Anti-Slavery Society, and to that we must refer our readers. It will there be seen, that not only is there no instance in which the husbandry of the Bengal provinces, from which alone we derive our sugar, is conducted by slaves; but we have it pointed out to us clearly, and in every instance, by whom the labour is performed,—namely, by the family of the ryot or farmer, and by labourers hired by him as they are wanted, and whose rates of wages are distinctly given in the official documents on the subject.†

“ The whole effect on the public mind produced by Mr. Saintsbury and others, proceeds from their wilful and deliberate misrepresentation of the documents to which they refer. They quote, as applicable to Bengal, passages which have a reference only to the Malabar coast. The existence of slavery, for instance, in some recently ceded district, on the Malabar side of India, is made to prove that sugar is cultivated by slaves in Bengal. The voluminous collection of documents, printed by the East India Company in 1823, furnishes the most decisive and irrefragable proofs (every page is full of them) that the whole of the agriculture of the Bengal provinces is conducted by free labour. On this fact there can be no controversy with any honest reader of these documents.

* What the Anti-Slavery Reporter assures his readers are nothing more than statements made by the late Mr. Marryat, who died in 1824, and which statements could not therefore have been made less than five years ago, are, as the reader of this tract has seen, almost exclusively *portions of a Parliamentary Document which had no existence until September 1828.* It is probably easier to deter a man from reading that which you wish him not to read, by telling him he will find nothing but fallacies exploded and statements disproved five years ago—than it is to show how they could be exploded and disproved five years at least before they came into existence.

† See p. 28, l. 4, *et seqq.* of the present work.

But in order to overthrow this mass of testimony, what do such writers as Mr. Saintsbury do? They resort to statements which refer to quite another part of the world, and apply them to Bengal; and they hope to evade detection, because Malabar and Bengal are both in Asia or in India. They might with equal conclusiveness prove that corn is grown in Great Britain by slave labour, because there happen to be slaves in Russia. The only sugar, however, which we receive from India comes from Bengal.* Malabar imports sugar from abroad for its own consumption. The proof of all this may be seen in the pamphlet to which we have referred, and which points in every case to the page of the authentic work which it cites.

“ There is also another pamphlet, published in 1824, which is equally conclusive on this point as the letter to Mr. Whitmore. It is entitled, *East India Sugar; or an Inquiry respecting the means of improving the Quality and reducing the Cost of Sugar raised by Free Labour in the East Indies.*

“ But if there were no such pamphlets in existence, the statements of Sir Edward Hyde East and Mr. Hume in the House of Commons, on the 1st of March 1826, would of themselves be sufficient to refute every syllable published by Mr. Saintsbury or a thousand such writers. Sir E. H. East is a large Jamaica proprietor, who had filled for years the situation of Chief Justice in Bengal. He denied, in the most explicit terms, that slavery was recognised by law as a condition of society in Bengal; and Mr. Hume added, that he had been much in Bengal, and from what he knew of society there, he could undertake confidently to say that there were no agricultural slaves there.—(See Vol. I. No. 10, p. 105.)

“ Let a single extract more on this subject suffice for the present. It is taken from the letter to Mr. Whitmore already referred to. The letter writer quotes the testimony of the Bengal Board of Trade, of the 7th of August 1792, to the following effect, as contained in the first Appendix to the East India Company's great volume, printed in 1823, pp. 51 to 60. ‘ In this country (Bengal) the cultivator is either the immediate proprietor of the ground, or he hires it, as in Europe, of

* This is untrue. Consult any one of the diurnal mercantile publications called a *Price Current*, where it will be seen that under the general denomination of East India Sugar, there are daily sales of sugar the produce of Manilla, Java, Siam, and other slave countries.

the proprietor, and uses his discretion in cultivating what he thinks best adapted to the nature of the soil or the demand of the market. One field produces sugar, the next wheat, rice, or cotton. The husbandman is nourished and clothed from his own ground, or, if he thinks it more his interest to sell the whole of his own produce, supplies himself and family with the necessaries of life from his neighbours on the next public market.' Contrasting their state with that of slaves in the West Indies, it is added, 'the Bengal peasantry are freemen.' 'The Bengal peasant is actuated by the ordinary wants and desires of mankind. His family assist his labour and soothe his toil, and the sharp eye of personal interest guides his judgment.' This statement is followed by a great variety of reports from the presidents and collectors in the different provinces of Bengal, and extending through more than 200 closely printed folio pages. The existence of slavery as a condition of society in Bengal is not once alluded to in any one of these reports, although they give us a variety of minute and detailed calculations of the cost of raising sugar. In short, there is no more allusion to slave labour, as forming a constituent part of the charge of cultivating sugar, than there would be to slave labour in an estimate of the cost of growing corn in the county of York. Slaves are never mentioned; and the only substitute for hired labour ever hinted at is the labour of the farmer's household.*

"But we may spare ourselves the trouble of confuting the elaborate mis-statements of our adversaries on this question. The controversy is fast tending to its termination. The march of events will scarcely leave room much longer, either for misrepresentation or misapprehension. The facilities already given in Bengal by Lord W. Bentinck to the investment of British capital and the development of British skill in the

* Having hazarded one sturdy falsehood (viz. that I prove no slavery in Bengal), in the hope that but few were likely to satisfy themselves to the contrary by a reference to the present little work, the Reporter now ventures a second, in the well-grounded confidence that still fewer would be able to detect him by referring to the East India Company's "great volume." Of the first falsehood the reader may satisfy himself by turning back to p. 17 of this tract; of the second, by turning forward to p. 48, where I quote the Reporter's own authority, this identical "great volume," to contradict what he here asserts of it.

cultivation of the soil; the almost certainty that those fiscal regulations which have hitherto depressed the growth of sugar in Bengal, and prevented the large increase of its imports into this country, will soon be repealed; the prospect of an early removal of the other restrictions which still fetter the commerce of our Eastern possessions; the rapidly increasing population and prosperity of Hayti;* the official statements of Mr. Ward as to the profitable culture of sugar by free labour in Mexico; and the rapid extension of the manufacture of beet-root sugar in France,—a prelude, as we conceive, to its introduction into this country, and especially into Ireland;—all these circumstances combined afford a promise which can scarcely fail of seeing a death-blow inflicted on the culture of sugar by slave labour, which all the misrepresentations of all the slave-holders in the world, with all their clamorous partisans in this country, cannot avert, or even long retard. We mean, however, shortly to recur to the subject.”

To this the following reply was inserted in *The Times* of the 9th October:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR,—The article which you copied from the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* on the 4th of September, but which, having been out of London, I have only now seen, is one elaborate untruth. *The Times* can have no room, nor have I inclination, for a mere literary controversy; but the claims of truth are imperative; and, fortunately, the following facts can involve no controversy, for they are beyond the reach of denial or dispute.

* This case of Hayti is one to which the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* clings, in defiance of facts which would annihilate any but an anonymous partisan. Mr. Mackenzie, our Consul-General, has furnished, and Parliament has printed, an official Report, which shows that, so far from the fact being as here stated, Hayti is sunk into the lowest abyss of poverty and disorder, from the universal antipathy of the negroes to voluntary labour. For proof of this, look no further than to the manner in which they discharge their pecuniary debt to France. Hayti, the anti-colonists' *cheval de bataille*, is in fact *hors de combat*.

The article in question, which would probably be insignificant had it not made *The Times* journal the vehicle of its most erroneous statements upon a great public question, arose out of a publication of mine, which you were pleased to notice in *The Times* of the 8th of August, entitled "East India Slavery." I have there shown that slavery prevails in such a degree throughout British India, that those who renounce West India sugar because cultivated by slaves, and substitute for it East India sugar under the persuasion that it is the produce of free labour, are grossly imposed upon. This fact—to use your own words, "The existence of slavery in [and throughout] the East—its intensity, its progress and increase—are stated and proved by documents."

Such an allegation it of course behoves the eulogists of East India sugar to contest with their best ability; for, unless rebutted, it annihilates their whole case. Their monthly oracle, the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*, has addressed itself to this task; and were its statements based on truth, has succeeded. I propose to show you—not to assert, but to show by unimpeachable evidence—that those statements are wholly and wilfully false.

That slavery exists, and has existed, in India, from time immemorial, all parties now admit; but to indemnify themselves for this concession, or rather to evade its consequences, the champions of East India sugar ingeniously contend, that though there is perhaps some small slavery somewhere in India, there is none in that part of it which is comprehended in the presidency of Bengal; that all the East India sugar which reaches England is grown in Bengal (which is a mistake); and that consequently such sugar must be the produce of free labour.

Upon this ground I meet them, and distinctly show that slavery—agricultural slavery—prevails in Bengal, and pervades the sugar districts. I quote from parliamentary and other documents, all emanating direct from the best possible authority on such a subject, the growers of the sugar,—that is to say, the East India Company,—I quote reiterated and distinct proofs of the fact, each applying to Bengal exclusively, and by name. These proofs the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* had before him when writing the "reply" which, with even-handed justice, you copied; and his comment upon them is, "There is no instance in which the husbandry of the Bengal provinces is conducted by slaves."—(See *Times*, 4th Sept.) This he deliberately wrote, having at the moment before him

the following, amongst other quoted facts:—"In Bengal, throughout some districts, the labours of husbandry are executed chiefly by bond-servants. In certain provinces the ploughmen are mostly slaves of the peasants for whom they labour."—(See *East India Slavery*, p. 18.)

This passage, I presume, may be received as proof of the fact for which I contend,—that slavery pervades Bengal. It further answers the purpose of showing, that the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* made his assertion to the contrary, in the face of proof against him.

Again, to insure implicit credence, by referring to his authority, the *Reporter* says, "The voluminous collection of documents printed by the East India Company in 1823, furnishes the most decisive and irrefragable proofs (every page is full of them) that the whole of the agriculture of the Bengal provinces is conducted by free labour."—(See *Times*, Sept. 4.)

Yet, Sir, this very collection of documents, printed by the East India Company in 1823, states the fact, in addition to that I have already quoted, that "Slavery is not unknown in Bengal; slavery may be found in Bengal among the labourers in husbandry. In some places (in Bengal) the landholders have a claim to the servitude of thousands among the inhabitants of their estates."—(See *Papers on the Culture of Sugar in British India*, printed by the Hon. Company in 1823; third Appendix, p. 80, line 41.)

Here, then, is the fact of Bengal slavery again established; and the *Reporter* thrice contradicted in one page of the very authority, to "every page" of which he refers for corroboration.

But the most inconceivable of the *Reporter's* offences against truth, to subserve to the purpose of a party, is the assertion, not merely that there is no instance of slavery in Bengal, but that the publication to which he is replying contains not a single proof of slavery in India which at all applies to Bengal. Trusting, probably, in the hope that his readers would never see the statements which that publication does contain, he says, with an effrontery almost enviable, "The whole effect on the public mind produced by Mr. Saintsbury, and others, proceeds from their wilful and deliberate misrepresentation of the documents to which they refer. They quote, as applicable to Bengal, passages which have a reference only to the Malabar coast. The existence of slavery, for instance, in some recently ceded district on the Malabar

side of India, is made to prove that sugar is cultivated by slaves in Bengal. They resort to statements which refer to quite another part of the world, and apply them to Bengal; and they hope to evade detection, because Malabar and Bengal are both in Asia or India."—(See *Times*, Sept. 4.)

Suffer me, Sir, to quote here the statements which the *Reporter* says do not refer to Bengal, but refer to Malabar. They are—

1. "Slaves may be found in Bengal among the labourers in husbandry," *supra*.

2. "Many estates in the country (*Bengal Judicial Consultations*) are cultivated by indigenous slaves."—(*Parl. Pap.* 125, p. 345.)

3. "In Bengal, throughout some districts, the labours of husbandry are executed chiefly by bond-servants. In certain provinces the ploughmen are mostly slaves," *supra*.

4. "There are very many natives of Africa, in the provinces under the Bengal government (says Judge *Leycester*), that have been imported by people holding them as slaves."—(See *Parl. Paper*, 125, p. 344.)

5. "This great capital," (says the *Calcutta Journal* of Nov. 1, 1823,—and Calcutta, let me hint to the *Reporter's* exclusive ear, is the capital of Bengal)—"This great capital is at once the depôt of the commerce and riches of the East, and the mart in which the manacled African is sold like the beast of the field to the highest bidder."—(See same *Parl. Pap.* p. 378.)

These are the proofs I produced of slavery in Bengal—the *Reporter* cannot but have seen them, for they are conspicuously printed, and, in fact, head the list;—having seen them, he deliberately takes up his pen and asserts that they refer not to Bengal, but to Malabar. Let me ask the readers of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* how far that publication, after this, deserves their confidence,—how far they will be safe in giving credit to one of its statements for the future, unless backed by evidence, and that evidence known to be authentic?

There is but one other point worth notice in this article of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*, and that is an untruth, like the rest. Though by no means new, it has never, I believe, been publicly contradicted; having found shelter, probably, in the contempt of the distinguished individual whom it misrepresents. The *Reporter* says—"Sir Edward Hyde East, who had filled for years the situation of Chief Justice in Bengal,

denied in the House of Commons, on the 1st of March, 1826, in the most explicit terms, that slavery was recognised by law as a condition of society in Bengal.”—(See *The Times*, Sept 4.) This is untrue. I am enabled, on the best possible authority, to state, that Sir Edward Hyde East never made, or could have made, such a declaration, either then or at any other time. On the occasion referred to, when there was some debate in the house on Indian affairs, a member suddenly appealed to Sir Edward East, who had taken no part in the discussion, and inquired whether slavery existed in India. Sir Edward’s answer was to this effect:—“That he could not speak from judicial knowledge of that matter in the provinces, nor beyond the Supreme Court in Calcutta; nor had he any other means of acquiring information as to its existence in the provinces and other parts of India than such as were open to every other person. But within the local limits of Calcutta, which was governed by the general law of England, excepting only the Hindu and Mussulman laws of contract and inheritance, which were saved to those respective classes, he had no legal experience or belief of the actual existence of slavery.”

What, then, does this reply of Sir Edward Hyde East in reality amount to? Why, that he had no legal cognizance of slavery within the local limits of Calcutta; but, that so far from having “explicitly denied the existence of slavery in Bengal,” he explicitly disclaimed all official knowledge of Bengal (with regard to slavery) beyond the jurisdiction of the capital. So far from denying its existence, the hon. baronet knows well that it has always existed, and does still exist, and that the Hindu as well as the Mussulman codes recognise its existence.

To this I will only add, that should any of your readers who have never heard of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* desire a more specific account of that respectable production, you can inform them that it is the work of which a member of Parliament, in his place in the house last session, pronounced that “A more false, libellous, scandalous, and disgraceful publication never issued from the British press.”—(See *Debates*, June 3, 1829.)

I have the honour, &c.,

London, Oct. 6.

GEO. SAINTSBURY.

In *The Times* of the next day, the 10th October, appeared the following ingenious substitute for a vindication of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* :—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—I have seen in your paper of to-day the letter of a Mr. Saintsbury, in reply to some observations which you had lately inserted from the last number of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*. I will not now ask you to occupy your pages with a detailed exposure of the disingenuity or the ignorance of such a writer as this upon a question already settled. But let Mr. Saintsbury do this :—let him name one man in Great Britain who owns, or has ever owned, an agricultural slave in Bengal. Let him name a single decision of any Indo-British Court which makes a British subject in India the subject of sale as a field slave. Let him name one respectable man in Great Britain who will come forward and state that, having lived in Bengal, at any time during the last forty years, he ever saw a gang of slaves in Bengal driven by the whip. There are now in England thousands of men who have been indigo-planters in India : let him produce one who has ever grown a hundred weight of indigo by slave labour. Compare this with the West Indies,—compare one week's *Jamaica Royal Gazette* with twenty years of *Bengal Gazette* : let Mr. Saintsbury, or any other man, do this, and it will make short work of the question. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

London, Oct. 9.

VINDEX.

In *The Times* of the 14th October appeared the following reply :—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—To the questions proposed to me in *The Times* of the 10th, I can owe no answer—first, because they are put by an anonymous querist ; and next, because they demand of me

what it is not essential to my case to prove. Knowing, however, the effect of an unanswered challenge upon mere lookers-on, I notice those questions; and to reply to the first of them will be to answer all.

“Let Mr. Saintsbury,” says your correspondent, “name one man in Great Britain who owns, or has ever owned, an agricultural slave in Bengal.” Your correspondent well knew that this was impossible, for the simple reason that the Bengal slaves are slaves of the soil: the soil is the property not of any European adventurer now “in Great Britain,” but of the Hindu landlord, holding under the sovereignty of the East India Company. Of this, and of the general fact of agricultural slavery in Bengal, let the following proof suffice:—“Slavery may be found in Bengal among the labourers in husbandry. In some places the landholders have a claim to the servitude of thousands among the inhabitants of their estates. Slaves of this description must be considered as villeins attached to the glebe.”—(See *Papers on the Culture of Sugar in British India*, printed by the East India Company, 3d App., p. 80.)

This is decisive of the fact. Yet who could name an owner of such slaves in Great Britain—unless, indeed, he named the Honourable Company, who are lords of the soil?

Your correspondent says, “Let him name a man who has seen them driven by the whip.” Have I said they were so driven—have I alluded to a whip?

He says again, “Let him name an indigo planter who ever owned a slave.” Have I said any thing about indigo? I speak of sugar, and he refers me to indigo.

Such are the questions. And what kind of argument do they contain? Unless a private individual in London can name the owner of a certain property in Bengal, there is no such property! Unless “Vindex” can name the Editor of *The Times*, there is no such journal!

I will only add, Sir, that anonymous assertion, and personal abuse, can never settle this important question. “Vindex” says, “It is a question already settled;” and the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* says, “This controversy was conclusively settled in 1823.” If so, these gentlemen must have settled it between themselves, and kept that circumstance a secret. In 1828, it was thought to be still open; for then only it was, that the evidence on which I rest my case was laid on the table of Parliament. Until the authenticity of that evidence

is impugned, or the fidelity impeached with which I have cited it, the continuance of this discussion must be utterly unprofitable; whilst the position I have maintained—the fact of agricultural slavery in Bengal—remains unshaken.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

London, Oct. 13.

GEO. SAINTSBURY.

With this letter, published one month ago, but as yet unanswered, the discussion has apparently terminated. The world has been favoured with two new numbers of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* during that interval, but in neither is this particular topic noticed. This delay is prudent; for it must greatly lighten the labour of refuting statements, if your refutation be but deferred until the statements themselves are forgotten.

9th Nov. 1829.