NMML
OCCASIONAL PAPER
HISTORY AND SOCIETY

New Series
2

Colonialism and its Nomads in South India

Bhangya Bhukya

Nehru Memorial Museum and Library
2012

Published by

Nehru Memorial Museum and Library
Teen Murti House
New Delhi-110011

e-mail : ddnehrumemorial@gmail.com

ISBN:81-87614-37-4

Price Rs. 100/-; US $ 10

Page setting & Printed by : A.D. Print Studio, 1749 B/6, Govind Puri Extn. Kalkaji, New Delhi - 110019. E-mail : studio.adprint@gmail.com

This paper attempts to discuss the Lambadas' encounter with the British colonial state and their historical transition under the rule of Nizams during the colonial period. Although Hyderabad was during this period a princely state under the rule of the Nizam, it is argued in this paper that it was compelled by the British colonial rulers to change its forms of government and administrative practice largely in line with colonial models and imperatives. The Lambadas originated as caravan trading community in medieval India. The colonial market economy, trade regulations, and the growth of modern transport fractured their long-established caravan trade. From the middle of the nineteenth century, they were compelled to depend on various other livelihoods, such as cattle-raising, agriculture and agricultural labour. The deployment of rules, regulations and laws based on the new colonial political rationality badly hampered their cattle-raising and agricultural practices. The state also discouraged the nomadic lifestyle of the Lambadas, inducing them by a number of means to become settled peasant subjects. But the revenue and agricultural policies introduced by the state involved heavy exploitation and gradually reduced the Lambadas into working as labourers in the dominant peasants' fields. During famines and the off-season, they resorted to dacoity. This led the state to brand them as a criminal community, and a range of methods were used to curb their dacoity. On the whole, the deployment of a colonial-style political rationality by the Hyderabad government reduced the Lambadas to subalternity. The Lambadas responded through a programme of self-reform that would allow the community to face the challenges posed by the new system.[1]

The larger significance of this history should not be missed. Despite work by economic or social historians or scholars of environmental change, it is notable how no one has examined the stories of itinerant groups in peninsular India expecially in Princely States.

As mentioned above, the history of the Lambadas begins with the caravan trade. Communities of nomadic caravaners were found all over

the subcontinent, each with its own distinctive historical, cultural and social background. They appear to have been fluid groups, assimilating members from others involved in such a trade or even from settled peoples. Being a flourishing trade, there were attractions in taking up such an occupation. In the course of time, each group thus developed a varied social and racial composition and past. The communities of nomadic caravaners have different names and social roots in every region, and they claim a variety of statuses within the Hindu caste-society.[2] Their complex pasts and the scanty record of their early history make it difficult to understand the social history of these groups.

Before the advent of the modern market and transport system in India, the Lambadas were known as major caravan traders and merchants. The caravan trade dates back to ancient times. From the eleventh century, as trade and commerce expanded, it began to flourish, peaking during the Mughal period, as the imperial army maintained and employed huge numbers of nomadic groups as baggage carriers and food grain transporters.[3] Several nomadic and pastoral communities were involved in this trade, the Lambadas being a principle one among them, particularly in South India. Their caravan trade networks were highly organised and played a crucial role in the growth of large-scale long-distance trade from the sixteenth century. Their role was particularly important during famines, as food grain was supplied from surplus to deficit areas through their caravan network. In addition, they also served as commissariat food grain and baggage transporters to armies during wars. They served the Sultanate, Mughal, French, British, and Nizam armies as independent transporters. They also acted as carriers for other merchants and dealers, and were often merchants in their own right as well, a fact that suggests that at least some had accumulated capital.[4]

They had particularly good relations with the Nizams, as they had served their armies from the times of Aurangzeb. The first Nizam employed them in large numbers during his early consolidation of the Deccan. The first time that the Lambadas were employed by the British was during the war with Tipu Sultan in 1791-92, when the British commissariat arrangement failed. It is said that about sixty thousand Lambada oxen had furnished the British army with grain from various parts, but chiefly from Coramandel.[5]

The usual practice when engaging the Lambadas for commissariat transportation was to give them an unsecured advance to purchase grain from any part of the country. A patent order was simultaneously issued stating that the said party was recruited by the army and should not be stopped from procuring grains in any territory and that no duty should be levied on the grain. Upon their return, they were bound to give an account of the quantity of grain purchased, and were not permitted to open a single bag until they had obtained the permission of the commander-in-chief. They had to sell their goods at the average rate of the camp-market. After the disposal of the entire stock, they had to repay the original sum advanced to them and could only then distribute the remaining amount among themselves for their labour.[6] Such an arrangement sought to satisfy the mutual interests of both parties.

The wars in particular provided opportunities to the Lambadas and others because they created a number of army camp markets. Army commanders extended protection to merchant communities from enemy forces during the war.[7] The situation was not, however, entirely advantageous to them. The Lambadas were relatively independent merchants and transporters and had their own trade practices. But once they entered into a contract with the British colonisers, their trade activities were strictly regulated and monitored by army commanders and they lost their independence and monopoly over their trade. They were not allowed to sell the procured grain to either enemy forces or civilians. Although precolonial rulers had also regulated and monitored their trade, the patents issued to them by the Mughals and the Nizams suggest that they were given a freer hand in many ways previously, as they were allowed to determine the source from which to procure grain, to ensure reasonable prices and given a right to obtain fodder for their cattle.

Market prices were generally higher than military camp prices, and this used to tempt the Lambadas who were carrying grain and other goods to the camps. The British set out a number of regulations to check such sales, and held a breach of them to be a serious crime. From the time of the last Mysore war in 1799 a native commissary of the East India Company always accompanied the caravans to ensure that there was no such breach of contract.[8] During this war, the allied forces employed huge caravans.

The British forces also resented the Lambadas' monopoly in food grain transportation and treated them harshly, especially after the last Mysore war. The Lambadas were also accused of looting war-stricken regions. Depredation of the enemy's country at the end of the war was a regular practice by armies at this time, and the Lambadas were certainly culpable of this.[9] After the capture of Seringapatam, a small horde of Lambada in the employment of the British army attempted to leave, and suspecting that they intended to loot the conquered region, the Subsidiary Forces intercepted them and hung seven of their principal naiks.[10] The armies of the British and the Nizams carried out many such brutal hangings, especially after the last Maratha War of 1817-18.[11] This led to them being stigmatised by the British as a predatory community—a stigma that haunted them throughout the colonial period.

After the Maratha wars, the British created its own commissariat force that hired its own pack animals and supplied food grains to their army. They also continued to hire many Lambadas as transporters.[12] These arrangements came to an end after the railway connected the major army stations later in the nineteenth century. Similarly, the Lambadas also lost their traditional commissariat transportation rights with the Nizam. With the loss of their chief livelihood, the Lambadas became financially vulnerable and in time fell into the clutches of big traders and merchant moneylenders.

The caravan traders were soon to be marginalized with the emergence of the regulated market and new economic relations enforced by the colonial rulers.[13] This, coupled with the introduction of the railways and the growth of infrastructure, ruined the Lambadas' caravan trade. In fact the Lambadas suffered harsh treatment at the hands of the colonial state. Their caravans had been used by the colonial powers when the latter were first establishing themselves and expanding their markets. Once they stabilised their position, the Lambadas fell out of favour. Now, their nomadism appeared to inhibit the formation of the new market economy and the modern state.[14]

The colonial state did not view the long-established trade and market practices of groups such as the Lambadas positively, considering them to be backward and irrational.[15] Fairs and jataras (pilgrimages), at which communities converged for trade and transaction, were discouraged and

suppressed by the colonial state through new regulations and custom and transit duties. These practices inhibited the local market and exchange relations. The colonial state, indeed, appropriated and refashioned long-established market places by erecting regulated markets in towns and urban centres or fixed market places.[16]

Thus, from the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Lambadas' longstanding caravan trade began to crumble away. The majority were forced to settle down as cattle raisers, agriculturists, and agriculture labour and a few resorted to dacoity during bad seasons. Their history as caravan traders had nonetheless given them their identity, weaving them into a coherent community.

The second half of the nineteenth century was a crucial period in the history of the Lambada community. It was during this period that the colonial state forced the Lambadas to abandon their longstanding occupation as food grain traders and cattle-raisers, and to settle down as a subordinate peasantry. The process of settling the Lambadas as peasant subjects involved a range of tensions, as many continued with their nomadic lives as cattle raisers. The Lambadas possessed huge herds of cattle when they were thrown out of the caravan trade and so they turned to cattle-trading and milk-vending. Thus the Lambadas continued to move with their cattle down into the twentieth century for grazing and trading purposes. This led the state to associate their nomadism with their cattle. The Lambadas and their cattle soon became the main target of the state.

In fact, the policing of cattle and the nomadic people became a major concern of the colonial state, particularly from the early nineteenth century, as the colonial state had begun to map out and measure the Indian landscape, parcelling it out as either the landed property of landlords and peasants, or as state property to be exploited for its timber or other resources. The colonial state believed that all land had to serve a useful and productive purpose. As a result, both agricultural and forest land was effectively enclosed. The nomadic communities such as the Lambadas, who wandered with their herds on an off such land, were placed on par with 'vagabonds', who ought to be disciplined.

Indeed, the colonisers had a fear of nomadic people, the fear that they

acquired from their experience with vagabonds back in Britain. In Britain, the vagrants and vagabonds posed a serious threat to established order and property during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. There were many reasons for the emergence of vagabonds in Britain. One important reason was the creation of private property and the growth of a capitalist economy, which marginalised large sections of the population. The British state promulgated a series of Vagrancy Acts between the sixteen and the seventeenth century to confine the vagabonds and paupers in enclosures so as to create 'docile bodies'. The vagabonds were blamed for sowing sedition, robberies, decay of husbandry, horrible crimes and offences and burglary. Many communities and classes were brought under the Vagrancy Acts, such as pedlars, tinkers, gypsies, the Irish, soldiers, mariners, entertainers, students, unlicensed healers and fortune-tellers. One important aspect of the Vagrancy Acts was that the offenders were arrested not because of their actions, but because they were classed as vagrants or vagabonds. The British ruling class sought in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to enclose lands in Britain, and either eject people from the land, or demand that they work as paid farm labourers on landed property controlled either by the property-holding landlords or the yeoman farmers who rented land from them. In the process, the vagabonds and paupers were marginalised.[17]

The colonisers thus were suspicious of nomadic people and used similar methods to settle nomadic communities in India. As I have mentioned above, the caravan trade and imperial armies produced and nurtured a huge body of nomadic communities in India. From the early nineteenth century these communities were thrown into a desperate situation. On the one hand, they lost their employment with the army as the warfare had ended with the establishment of British power; and on the other, the new market forces began fracturing their caravan trade. At this point, these communities began resorting to predatory activities. Many adivasi communities were also engaged in such activities in response to the colonial intervention in the forest tracts. Particularly in Central and South India, the Lambadas, Bhils and Pindaris were marked out as the most turbulent communities.[18] A number of regulations and coercive methods were deployed by the colonial state to settle them in agriculture The wider process of settling these communities that evaded colonial control continued right into the twentieth century, and in some cases it was never fully carried

through, as in the case of the Pathans of the North Western Frontier Province. In the process the nomadic and adivasi communities were marginalised.[19]

The deployment of a colonial political rationality that aimed to systematise, stabilise and regularise power relations led ultimately to the loss of the Lambadas' cattle wealth and their confinement to settled agriculture The colonial state promulgated and deployed a number of Acts and regulations to check the movements of Lambadas and their cattle. The new policies of governance on forests, cattle fodder, cattle census, cattle breeding, the creation of a regulated cattle market and cattle trespassing laws made it difficult for the Lambadas to survive. These regulations were not only confined to British India but also extended to the princely states. The outcome was that cattle either died due to contagious diseases or were sold by their owners. Owing to the heavy taxation, many peasants and cattle breeders, including the Lambadas, sold their cattle for export to British India.

During the transition from a nomadic to a settled peasant life in the second half of the nineteenth century, a considerable number of Lambadas began resorting to dacoity. This became more widespread in the last quarter of the nineteenth and first quarter of the twentieth centuries. It was during this period that the Lambadas lost their caravan trade and cattle-raising occupations completely. This was compounded by the succession of severe famines that hit the state in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In desperation some Lambadas, along with members of other subaltern communities, took to dacoity.

Dacoity was defined under British Indian law as a group robbery by five or more persons.[20] When dacoity was seen to be a threat to civil society and the state, the authorities deployed a variety of methods to put down, control, punish and reform the dacoits, many of who were considered to belong to 'criminal tribes/communities.' Important in this respect was the creation of a body of anthropological knowledge about the 'criminal' communities, as it helped the state to separate supposedly 'delinquent' from 'honest' subjects. In turn, it conferred a specific social identity upon such groups, and thereby socially stigmatised them.[21] The creation of a surveillance society served colonial ends. The Criminal Tribes

Act (CTA) of 1871 provided for those designated as such to be registered with local police stations, confined to specific villages, fined and punished, and put in reformatories. Groups that suffered such a fate found it hard thereafter to earn an honest livelihood, so that they were even more likely to commit dacoity. Itinerant Lambadas who were so confined were particularly hard hit. Although the CTA was framed with the intention of transforming the delinquents into honest subjects, its actual deployment led to the creation of a huge body of criminals in colonial India. Attaching a criminal stigma to a community, draconian legal practices and strict surveillance were basically colonial inventions. The deployment of these practices created a vicious circle from which a criminal could not escape once he was caught in it. As we shortly see the Lambadas' dacoities began largely during famines, and they were perpetuated because of the state's cruel practices of detention and surveillance.

From the 1850s, the British Indian government forced the Nizam's government to implement the colonial methods of classification, surveillance and policing of criminal communities. Hyderabad State was seen as particularly dacoit-prone because of its geographical setting and the complexity of the state's political practices. It was a land of forests and hills, and the British considered it an ideal cover for criminals. The Lambadas of Warangal, Nalgonda, Medak and Karimnagar, who were considered the most notorious dacoits in the state, inhabited the forests of these areas, and it was said that after committing the robberies they would hide in the forests. They would not appear until it was time for the next offence. It became very difficult for the police to track them down.[22]

The colonial state understood dacoity in terms of the caste system, being supposedly a hereditary occupation of particular castes passed on for generations or centuries.[23] Added to this mix were various European notions that linked a nomadic life with criminality. It has been pointed out in some recent studies how the ideology of the colonial state on dacoity was an echo of the European concept of the 'dangerous class'. Important in this respect was Lombroso's theory of the 'born criminal,' that rested on a belief in criminality as an innate biological and heritable trait.

During the course of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the colonial state became increasingly fixated on delineating and identifying

India's various racial and ethnic groups. These ethnological studies, often deploying anthropometric methods and practices, largely focused on the physical and cultural peculiarities that were entrenched in India's diverse demography. This project was largely sponsored by the state. It was an established practice that whenever any gang committed a theft or dacoity, the colonial state would immediately call for a study of that gang. If it were found that the gang had no specific occupation or fixed residence, it would be notified as a criminal tribe or caste under the CTA. The colonial state went on to publish details about the group and circulate the material among all the provincial governments and princely states. The colonial state thus created a body of knowledge regarding the criminal communities throughout the subcontinent.

In addition to the anthropological studies, census reports and gazetteers were another cherished achievement of the Indian colonial state. Together, these provided for the bureaucracy knowledge of the racial and morphological character of each community. These studies were produced and reproduced throughout the colonial period in various forms. In this process, many lower caste Hindus and adivasi communities were marked as "criminal", as they were considered the oldest races and with no specific occupations and/or a permanent shelter. Every province and state police department was equipped with a huge stack of such ethnographic notes.[24] Interestingly, many police officers also began to carry out their own ethnographic studies of criminal communities.

In 1851, the British Indian Government directed the Resident at Hyderabad to find out whether any specific caste or community was committing dacoity. After seeking information from the Nizam's government, the Resident replied that people of all castes and religions committed dacoities and that, as there were no scientific studies on the subject, it was difficult to attribute a caste or religious basis. He added, however, that those who did not earn an honest livelihood mostly committed dacoities and he was unsure as to whether they did it on an occasional or regular basis. Unable to attribute any particular caste name, he settled for merely calling them professional dacoits.[25] At that time, therefore, the colonial mode of classifying criminality by caste did not prevail in Hyderabad state.

This situation was not to last. The Lambadas were scattered throughout

India and some, as was the case with many such communities, were known to commit petty thefts and occasional robberies. A handful of studies were done on the Lambadas of British India and they were then brought under the provisions of the CTA. In all these studies, their cultural traits were marked as martial and muscular; they were seen to descend from the oldest race and possess a nomadic, predatory past, worshiping predatory personalities and symbols; all these characteristics were enumerated in the CTA of 1871. These traits were enough for the colonial state to brand them as a notorious criminal community. Although only a few Lambada gangs in fact committed dacoities, mainly during times of famine and drought, the whole community was stigmatised.

The colonial state and colonial anthropologist thus systematically constructed a criminal identity for the Lambadas, in the process twisting observations of their cultural practices to signify a cultural basis for their dacoity. It is not suggest that the Lambadas were by standers, for some did take part in dacoity. Colonial observers stigmatised an entire community, however; and this had severe implications for both the guilty and innocent. Dacoity was neither an inborn trait nor a hereditary practice in Lambada society. Rather, some Lambadas took to dacoity when colonial interventions destroyed their longstanding livelihood practices and threw them into perpetual impoverishment.

In colonial India, 'criminal' communities were policed through various methods: legal, coercive, and reformatory. More importantly, unlike in modern western states, the colonial state deployed these methods not only through the regular police force but also through village authorities, the dominant castes and landlords.[26] These practices were more apparent in Hyderabad state where a considerable amount of state power continued to rest in the hands of such local groups up until the end of the Nizam's rule. These local power holders had limitless opportunity to exploit the CTA to their own advantage. This in turn encouraged criminal activity further.

The colonial state was constantly modifying and perfecting its methods of surveillance of the criminal communities. Another initiative in this respect was the relocation of whole 'criminal' communities to settlements where they could be kept under close observation and, ideally, reformed. We

can link this programme to a much a wider colonial agenda, which embraced a number of institutions — educational, medical, military and punitive - that were designed to create disciplined and docile bodies.[27] The practice of dealing with criminals separately in reformatory barracks was informed by a discourse of criminality in nineteenth century Europe that stated that a criminal steals not because he is poor - for not all poor people steal - but because there is some thing wrong with his character, his psyche, his upbringing, his consciousness, and his desires. So he must be handed over either to the penal technology of the prison or the asylum, or at least be kept under special supervision.[28]

The creation of criminal settlements was also a response to the fact that the criminal communities were seen to be living in conditions of extreme poverty. An increasing number of colonial officials began to argue in the early twentieth century that such criminality had been caused by the destruction of traditional livelihoods. Taking into account such considerations, the British Indian government incorporated a new principle into its revised CTA of 1911 that one aim of this legislation should be to reform criminal communities. In this way, they could be brought back into the so-called civilised or mainstream society.

Although the CTA appeared to offer a legal framework against dacoity, the way in which it was deployed was largely coercive. Indeed the implementation of the CTA reminds us of Britain's Black Act of 1723, which was passed by the parliament without any discussion and under which hunters and paupers were hanged publicly and legally.[29] Of course, the Indian dacoits were not hung, but many were killed in encounters, or died prematurely in colonial labour colonies and plantations, in prisons and in reformatory settlements.

The Lambadas were pushed towards peasantisation by the state and became agriculturists from the middle of the nineteenth century, settling down in more significant numbers during the last quarter of the century. Those who were involved in food grain transportation and trade, cattle raising and dacoity settled as agriculturist in both the forest and the plains areas. For many, agricultural labour became their main source of livelihood.[30] It was during this period that the colonial-style ryotwari system was introduced in Hyderabad State.

Initially, the ryotwari system was beneficial to the Lambadas, helping them to occupy land in the forest and grazing areas. They were unable, however, to retain their control of this land for very long. The British Indian land tax system created a notion of land as alienable property that could be confiscated and sold for failure to pay taxes or repay debt.[31] Long-established rights of customary access to land were replaced with a notion of land as an alienable individual property that could be acquired by anyone with the resources to do so. Coupled with colonial promotion of a market-based economy, the introduction of the ryotwari system created a great demand for land. This encouraged many non-cultivating dominant communities to grab vast acres of land through money lending, their influence over officials, or through force. This led to land ownership being concentrated in the hands fewer and fewer landlords, moneylenders and rich peasants. In this process, subaltern peasants such as the Lambadas were expelled from their land and reduced to mere tenants at will or agricultural labourers.[32] Towards the end of the Nizam's rule, they waged a violent revolt against eviction and exploitation which is known as Telangana armed struggle, in which the Lambadas played a crucial role.

With their nomadic way of life under threat from the 1820s onwards, and their gradual realignment within different social spaces, the Lambadas had to negotiate new social roles and identities for themselves. In particular, they sought to carve out a new position for themselves within the Hindu caste hierarchy. Two powerful cultural movements were launched to meet the new needs. The first, which began in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, was initiated by a religious saint, Seva Bhaya; and the second, in the first quarter of the twentieth century, by Lambadas who had been educated in modern schools. Seva Bhaya's movement, which preached new values such as vegetarianism, cleanliness, and abstention from liquor, had a particularly profound impact on the community. His movement not only for the first time united the community into a single force, but also created a new consciousness and paved the way for a new cultural assertion. In both movements, the spiritual culture of the Lambadas was articulated and rearticulated in order to unite and mobilise the community.[33]

This phenomenon was seen on a wide scale among the subaltern communities of colonial India from the middle of the nineteenth century onwards. Indeed, colonial rule created a stage for innumerable alternative

articulations and histories, in which castes/communities adopted certain alternative cultural values either to challenge colonial power or the domination of Brahmanism, or to become a part of the colonial establishment or the caste-Hindu society. What was forged as a result was a synthesis of old and new, with some older cultural markers finding a place alongside the articulation of new community values and ambitions.[34] To some extent, the newly adopted values were those of Brahmanical Hinduism, and to this extent the process may be seen to conform to Srinivas' model of Sanskritisation.[35] And yet, the process also represented an act of assertion that challenged the caste hierarchy as it was then constituted. The process was thus full of tension.

Caste and community thus were transformed fundamentally under colonial rule. The Lambadas who formed guild-like groups that were involved in the caravan trade in precolonial times became defined as an endogamous caste. Although the colonial anthropological and census classifications delineated them as a 'community of caravaners' or 'Banjaras,' they no longer were necessarily involved in such an occupation, but could be cattle graziers, peasant farmers, agricultural labourers or, indeed, practice any occupation while still retaining their caste identity. Community coherence no longer revolved around a particular occupation. The caste was also seen to occupy a particular niche within the caste hierarchy as a whole. The caste did, however, share for the most part an experience of subalternity, and this created a distinct consciousness among them. In other words, the new political rationality that was imposed by the colonial state established a new order of civilisation, forcing the Lambadas to abandon their traditional occupation. In that process, the Lambadas 'reformed' their own cultural practices incorporating the 'ruling values', which were different from the precolonial ones. However the new articulations were based on the old values. One can call it 'counter-aesthetics of modernity' or 'counterculture of modernity' or 'double consciousness'.[36] Whatever the definition, it was very much a part of modernity. The redefined culture enabled the Lambadas to reinforce the community itself and relate with the larger caste-Hindu society. These new articulations helped them to face the challenges posed by the colonial establishment. In short, as the process of subalternisation became stronger, the community bonds and consciousness also grew stronger.

In this sense, community identity is not merely a morphological typology of a social group, but also an ideology by which a social group unites and reinforces itself. However, this is not to suggest that the community and its identity were undisputed, for there were many social and economic differences and conflicts between Lambada groups and thandas, which sometimes led to violent conflict. These differences were mediated through a shared past preserved in the stories and songs and a common spiritual order. These provided a unifying force to counter internal dissent. Their common experience of suffering at the hands of unscrupulous moneylenders and landlords, venal custom chowkidars, and police, forest and revenue officials also helped to strengthen their community bonds.

References

[1] For a detailed discussion on the subordination of the Lambadas see Bhangya Bhukya, *Subjugated Nomads: The Lambadas under the Rule of the Nizams* (New Delhi: Orient BlackSwan, 2010). This paper draws on this material but has incorporated new insights especially after the Seminar, at NMML on 15 February 2012.

[2] R. E. Enthoven (ed.), *The Tribes and Castes of Bombay* (2 vols, Bombay, 1920), II, pp. 331-35.

[3] C. A. Bayly, *Rulers, Townsmen, and Bazaars: North Indian Society in the age of British Expansion* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983), pp. 28-29.

[4] Edward Balfour, *On the Ethnology of Hyderabad in the Dekhan* (Madras, 1871), pp. 12-13.

[5] Mark, Wilks, *Historical Sketches of the South of India* (repr. Mysore: The Government Branch press, 1932, of orig. edn, 1800), p. 517.

[6] John Briggs, *'Account of the Origin, History, and Manners of Men Called Bunjaras', Transactions of the Literary Society of Bombay,* printed for Longman, Hurts, Rees Orme, and Brown, vol. I (London, 1819), pp. 186-187.

[7] Asiya Siddiqi, (ed.), *Trade and Finance in Colonial India 1750-1860* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 40-41.

[8] NAI, *HRR* (misc.), Vol. 225, 1 January 1800 - 2 December 1801, f. 357.

[9] M. D Francis Buchanan, *Journey from Madras through the Countries of Mysore, Canara, and Malabar,* (London: printed by Fort Cadell and W. Davies, and Black parry and Kingsbury, 1807), II, pp. 143-4,150,165,175,186,190, III, p. 432,435.

[10] Briggs, *'Account of the Origin'*, I, p. 186.

[11] Reginald George Burton, *History of the Hyderabad Contingent* (Calcutta, 1905), p. 75.

[12] NAI, *HRR*, Vol. 64, 1782-1888, p. 279.

[13] Siddiqi (ed.), *Trade and Finance*, Introduction, p. 43.

[14] NAI, *HRR*, vol. 568, part. II, 1782 - 1888, f. 378.

[15] K. N. Chaudhuri, *Trade and Civilisation in the Indian Ocean: An Economic History from the Rise of Islam to 1750* (Cambridge, 1985), p. 222.

[16] Sudipta Sen has brought out how colonial establishment considered traditional fairs and jataras in Bengal as obstacle to its business and destroyed them ruthlessly through various regulations. See his *Empire of Free Trade: The East India Company and Making of the Colonial Market Places* (Philadelphia, 1998), pp. 1-18.

[17] A. L. Beier, *Masterless Men: The Vagrancy Problem in England, 1560-1640* (London, 1985), pp. xxi, xxii, 9-10.

[18] George Reginald, *A History of the Hyderabad Contingent* (Calcutta: The Superintend of Government Printing, 1905), pp. 74-75.

[19] Crispin Bates, 'Lost Innocents and the Loss of Innocence: Interpreting Adivasi Movements in South Asia', in *R.H, Bornes, A. Gray and B. Kingsbury* (ed.), *Indigenous People in Asia* (Michigan, 1995), 103-119; David Arnold, 'Rebellious Hillmen: the Gudem-Rampa Risings, 1839-1924' in R. Guha (eds.) *Subaltern Studies I* (Delhi, 1982), pp. 88-142; Nandini Sundar, *Subalterns and Sovereigns: An Anthropological History of Bastar 1854-1996* (Delhi, 1997); Caldwell Lipsett, *Lord Curzon in India 1898-1903* (London, 1903), see chapter 3 'The Independent Tribes', pp. 29-44; also see Shail Mayaram, *Against History, Against State. Counterperspectives from the Margins* (Delhi: Permanent Black, 2003), pp. 152-188.

[20] David Arnold, 'Dacoity and Rural Crime in Madras, 1860-1940', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 6:2 (January, 1979), p. 143.

[21] Criminal Tribes were enumerated as a separate social group from the 1911 census. See Y. C. Simhadri, *The Ex-criminal Tribes of India* (New Delhi, 1979), p. 8.

[22] *Nizam Police Administration Report 1338F* (1928-29), p. 32.

[23] Radhika Singha, has shown that a move towards criminalisation of communities was started in 1772 by Warren Hastings-that is to say well before William Sleeman who prepared a detailed list of criminal tribes in India in 1830s. See her 'Providential Circumstances: The Thuggee Campaign of the 1830s and Legal Innovation', *Modern Asian Studies*, 27:1 (February 1993), p. 85.

[24] Nicholas B. Dirks, *Caste of Mind. Colonialism and the Making of Modern India* (Delhi: Permanent Black, 2002), pp. 43-60; Ajay Skaria, *Hybrid Histories. Forests, Frontiers and Wildness in Western India* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 197-99.

[25] INA, *HRR*, Vol. 491, 1782-1888, ff. 230-32.

[26] Arnold, *Police Power,* pp. 102-103.

[27] On this, see Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1980), p. 40.

[28] Ibid., p. 44.

[29] E. P. Thompson, *Whigs and Hunters: The Origin of the Black Act* (London, 1975), pp. 21-22.

[30] Furdoonji Jamshedji, 'Notes on the Agriculturists of the District of Aurangabad' (Bombay: Times of India Office, 1881), pp. 3-5; *Imperial Gazetteer,* Hyderabad, Aurangabad Division (Calcutta, 1907), p. 5.

[31] D. Kumar, 'Caste and Landlessness in South India', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 4:3 (April 1962) p. 237.

[32] S. Kesava Iyengar, *Economic Investigation in the Hyderabad State 1929-1930*, 5 vols (Hyderabad-Dn: Government Central Press, 1931-32), I, pp. 1-6.

[33] APSA, *NHD*, Confidential, Inst. 47, List 10, S. no. 777, File no. 620/1939, ff. 1-13; Bilgrami, *Historical and Descriptive Sketch*, I, pp. 337-347.

[34] Mayaram, *Against History*, p. 235; David Hardiman, *The Coming of the Devi: Adivasi Assertion in Western India* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 164.

[35] M. N. Srinivas, *Social Change in Modern India* (repr. New Delhi: Oriental Longman, 2001, of orig. edn, 1966), p. 7.

[36] Skaria, describes a similar process as 'counter-aesthetic of modernity', and also discusses how similar process has been termed in academic literature. See his *Hybrid Histories*, p. 21.