

To the Right Honorable Hugh Elliot, Governor in Council, Fort St. George¹

Honorable Sir and Sirs,

Para 1 – We have the honor to submit a report of the proceedings of the committee appointed under your orders for investigating the truth or falsehood of sundry complaints preferred in three separate petitions against the head servants and others employed under the Commercial Resident of Vizagapatam, by certain persons styling themselves Company's Weavers², and directing such suggestions may be offered as shall appear best calculated to protect both the interests of the Honorable Company and their weavers from injury;³

2nd – The members originally named for this committee were Messieurs Savage and Dodwell; and Mr. Savage arrived at Vizagapatam on the 23rd of September firmly [fol. 295] expecting to commence business in a few days afterwards but Mr. Dodwell subsequent illness preventing that gentleman undertaking the duty assigned him, it was not till the 20th of the following month and after Mr. Savage had learnt Mr. Fraser's appointment as Mr. Dodwell's successor, that your committee began the investigation;

3rd – Under date the 25th of August last the Board of Trade transmitted to your committee the several petitions and vouchers connected therewith, without however furnishing any detailed instructions, we have consequently been guided by our own judgment in the mode of proceeding keeping in view the material points alluded to in Mr. Secretary's Hill's letter;

4th – Mr. Savage (then acting alone) at first proposed an examination of the whole number of weavers whose signatures were affixed to the petitions delivered at Madras, and accordingly required their attendance for such purpose through the channel of the Commercial Resident [fol. 296] of Vizagapatam; on more mature consideration and with the view to secure the regular delivery of the investment he thought it advisable that circulars should be substituted inviting the weavers of such Mocaums only as had been oppressed to depute five delegates from each with full power to represent to the committee all their grievances against whomsoever they might exist, and notwithstanding the acknowledged influence of Chinnum Juggiah at the Vizagapatam Factory, motives of delicacy toward Mr. Taylor prompted your committee to send these orders also through his office fully anticipating his ready cooperation and immediate execution of them, but they regret to add they were in this particular as in several others, greatly disappointed;

¹ Godavari District Records, vol. 832, fols. 294-340. This letter from the Commercial Resident at Ingeram and the Deputy Commercial Resident at Madepollam, Ingeram 18 January 1818, regards the problems these two found upon being called to respond to petitions submitted by weavers complaining of the cobdar system in Vizagapatam.

² The weavers themselves were careful to note that they were "Company Weavers."

³ Note also that the Company took care in designating certain weavers as under its care.

5th – From the 23rd of October, the date of these circulars, no less than 19 days elapsed ere a single summons was [fol. 297] obeyed tho' on the same day (23rd) four weavers of the Bonie Mocaum unsolicitedly sent by the Commercial Resident himself underwent examination and denied in toto the existence of any grievances or having assented to the Madras deputation in which by subsequent investigation however it pretty clearly appears they had originally acquiesced and were equally disposed to encourage with the most dissatisfied of the district thus strengthening the suspicions your committee earlier entertained of improper measures being in practice by the accused to refute the charges preferred against them in bribes—threats of and actually with holding advances from the weavers who refused their signatures to papers of the contests of which they were then wholly ignorant many of these extorted documents were received by your committee from the [fol. 298] Commercial Resident himself and prove to be nothing less than formal avowals of the weavers perfect dissatisfaction with the general management of their respective cobdars; --

6th – The several complaints set forth by the weavers in their petitions delivered at Madras are:

- 1st That cobdars pay them a less price for their cloth than is allowed by the Company at the same time inserting the full amount in their woojetties.
- 2dly That the cobdars take on their own account the rejected cloth paying for the same at a rate far below its value with or without the weavers consent.
- 3dly That the advances are not made to the weavers till a considerable time after the cash has been [fol. 299] received for such purpose from the commercial resident.
- 4thly That proportion of grain, cotton, and other articles of merchandise are substituted for advances which ought to have been made wholly in cash.
- 5thly That the weavers have not access to the commercial resident to state their grievances because C. Juggiah's influence with him is such as to induce his belief of every misstatement and their being eventually flogged without a hearing.
- 6thly That Cobdars M. Paupoodoo, Grundy Vencataramdoo and Maumedy Sooriah all of the Banyan Caste, purchase ready-made cloths with a proportion of the money they receive for [fol. 300] advances making it appear by charcoal endorsement on such supplies that every piece is the real manufacture of registered weavers of the Company.
- 7thly That these said cobdars exact sums of money from the weavers on all occasions of marriage ceremonies at their houses and on various other pretenses, and lastly, that the general tenor of their conduct, aided by their

powerful ally, Chinnum Juggiah is so oppressive that the weavers are unable to follow their occupations in support of their numerous families.

7th – So far as your committee have been enabled to judge, hardly any regard is paid in the Vizagapatam District to [fol. 301] the true principle of the cobdar system; the investment seems to be provided by a series of large contracts confined to a few wealthy individuals totally unconnected with and of a distinct caste from the weavers, instead of being divided into small cobdarees of from 100 to 250 looms each, and conferred on respectable Thanapatties or head weavers.

8th – Banyans are of all castes the least calculated for holding the situations of cobdars—they are perpetually engaged in trade and will naturally appropriate the company's money to such purpose they will also lend it at exorbitant interest to Zamindars and other and substitute their own various articles of merchandize viz. grain, cotton, tobacco, etc. for cash advances, and ultimately defraud the weavers in the exchange—in fact they will practice every maneuver to profit by the supineness and ignorance of this class of men.

9th – The bare possibility therefore of such acts of oppression must sufficiently evince the impolicy if not cruelty of employing cobdars of this description. Ever remarkable for their cunning as well for a most rigid and particular method of keeping accounts, will it be believed that M. Paupadoo of the Vizagapatam Factory, a cobdar, with upwards of 1,400 looms under his own and brother's superintendence, has positively denied (as appears on his examination) having kept any statement of his daily expenditure and consequently has no such document to produce to your committee?

10th – On reference however to the last part of Marapallasetty Coniah's examination it would appear that the very accounts in question with numerous [fol. 303] others were removed to Chadavaram by the cobdar's son in law Poesalla Tummanah only ten days before the arrival at Vizagapatam of the president of your committee this witness was for a long time in the cobdar's service a peon in the Demela Mocaum, where his (the cobdar's) brother Chellemiah conducts the business, and declares he was turned away only a very few days previous to his examination by the committee, because when tampered with on his way to Vizagapatam to give evidence (under the charge of a magistrate peon) he would not consent to speak in the cobdar's favour; the cobdar's own reason for his dismissal is his having had a quantity of grain of which he could not give an account stored in his house at Mellooopalee; --

11th – This witness appeared under considerable alarm on first coming [fol. 304] before the committee, where Paupiah was also present, but soon assumed courage, and explained so far as his knowledge enabled him the various illicit transactions of the cobdar and particularly his dealings in rejected cloth – he stated that when the quantity became large it was sent to private merchants at Bimalipatnam that the weavers were only paid 6 Rupees per piece for the rejected 18 punjum and 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ for 14 punjum, and that those weavers who grumbled at or refused such prices, had the money thrown at their heads – and might pick it up or not as they pleased; this cruel and insolent practice existed for 4 years to the witnesses (sic) own knowledge and only ceased about 16

months ago, since which time he observes not cloth of this Mocaum had been rejected; [fol. 305] on being asked what could so suddenly have reversed the order of the cobdar's proceedings, he declared it was owing to his dread of the weavers gaining access to the Commercial Resident, (who then at Annakapilly – about 8 miles distant from Melleorpaka) to state their grievances, this witness also speaks on the subject of money exacted from the weavers on the performance of ceremonies etc. at the cobdar's house and also on the particular occasion if (sic) this cobdar having made a purchase of a maunium for the Bramin of the church at Annakapilly.

12th – To invalidate this witness's testimony the cobdars delivered in the 3 documents noted in the margin – but your committee have no hesitation [fol. 306] in pronouncing the witness's remarks thereon to be fully as worthy of credit, if not more so, for the cobdar obtained the documents from person strong in his own interests;

13th – The next witness, Allamoory Mullaparaue a Bramin and curnum of the village of Codoor, state that he was in the habit of writing the foul accounts of this cobdars daily transactions with the weaver of Codoor – but under the superintendancy of his son Motamurry Ramachendroodoo receiving a pay of 1 ½ Rupee per mensem for so doing – and adds that grain, cotton, and money were indiscriminantly (sic) advanced to weavers, but that the particulars of such were all kept distinct – these accounts Ramachendroodoo has at command but he could not say [fol. 307] when he had concealed them the witness also states that Ramachendroodoo receives large sums of money from his father the cobdar which are advanced in part to the weavers, tho' the greater proportion is generally appropriated towards the purchase of ready made cloth which he sends to the factory having previously indorsed on them in charcoal the names of such weavers of the Mocaum as may hold advances by this means he avoids outstanding balances and not only derives a profit by low prices but by lending out the Company's money – Immundy Commanah the weavers agent when a gomastah under the cobdar was the agent for making the ready made purchases and principally from the weavers of Vapada this witness further states that the cobdar benefits considerably by [fol. 308] keeping from the weavers all the rejected cloth;

14th – Your committee showed the witness a bundle of cadjams given in by M. Paupiah as his accounts of cloth received from the weavers for the year 1815 and asked him whether they were of his writing he replied in the affirmative and added that the accounts of cloth purchased ready made were kept separate – he knew this, because he himself was the person who wrote them for the cobdar and such accounts were in Ramachendroodoo's possession;

15th – A bundle of papers said to be the foul copies of the cobdars accounts of money advanced to the weavers during the year 1815 was also shown to the witness who was asked if they were his writing, or if he could say whether they were the fair or foul copies [fol. 309] this witness after inspection said they were not accounts of his writing but the fair accounts of such parts only of the foul or rough accounts as would show all to be correct, could however the rough accounts which he himself wrote be produced, they would clearly prove that 1 Rupee had been gained on every piece of purchased 14

punjum – this profit that witness declares the same accounts specify to have been carried to its proper head in some other private account;

16th – The cobdar after this curnums examination was directed to cross question him if he pleased but he declined the privilege observing that the witness had been perfected in his lesson by the weavers agent Simmundy Ammanah;

17th – A third witness Allamoory [fol. 310] Letchempetty also a curnum in Codoor states that he was accustomed to keep the revenue accounts of Motamurry Ramachendroodoo (the cobdar Paupiah's son) for the village of Codoor, Beemavaram, and Colapata. The actual renter of those villages witness says is Chinum Juggiah, Ramachendroodoo's brother in law, and that the rent of Codoor alone is Rupees 2700 per annum; the witness being a servant of the manager Ramachendroodoo it is fair to suppose him possessed of some knowledge of his master's proceedings and he has stated that the weavers were clamorous against short prices and the imposition of grain and other articles and in an emphatic way added 'I have repeatedly heard the weavers complain of being cheated in the prices of their cloths, by the cobdar.' The weavers [fol. 311] agent S. Ammanah by questioning this witness established that he himself the agent had formerly transacted business for the cobdar, during the absence of his son Ramachendroodoo.

18th – A fourth witness Streenadoola Veeranah a Banyan formerly a cobdar in Codoor and on such account presumed capable of speaking as to the conduct of the accused states that the weavers often mentioned to him being cheated in the prices of their punjum and in reply to a question from the weaver's agent proved that large quantities of grain had been frequently sent on bullocks from Chadavaram in the Rajam Mocaum to Codoor, but he could not positively say whether for the purpose of being imposed on the weavers in lieu of money he also added that the agent, when formerly in Paupiah's employ was [fol. 312] considered in the character of a writer and not in that only of a sorting gomastah; --

19th – From the examination of M. Paupiah's gomastah of Demella Mocaum Caparapoo Lechannah it appears that Mr. Suter's agent as gomastah Poosala Tummanah of the Banyan Cast, was in the habit of making advances to the registered weavers of the Company for private cloth by the sufferance of Ramachendroodoo his relation – and under whom he serves also as a gomastah – this Ramachendroodoo is in reality the chief agent of the private merchants of the district for providing their merchandize and he alone receives their money for such purpose;

20th – The gomastah C. Luchannah could not or would not explain what [fol. 313] was meant by an entry (in his own hand writing too) in the cobdar's ledger of 1815 ... for the Demella Mocaum showing that (42) forty-two pieces of 18 punjum had been purchased at Muchapilly there are numerous other entries of a similar description fully demonstrating the hitherto established and injurious system if (sic) ready made purchases, detrimental to the industrious and tending by promoting the manufacture of an inferior and cheap fabric, to the ultimate debasement of the Company's investment;

21st – The examination of Caparapoo Soobiah another gomastah under the same cobdar but in the Paravada Mocaum shews that similar purchases were made in this Mocaum and what prices were paid – an alteration in [fol. 314] one of the entries of this cobdar's ledger was so very clumsily executed as to excite suspicion, and on closer inspection prove the fact altho' the gomastah pretended it was merely an error – what could induce a man to write an account embracing a long list of calculations unless some transaction of the kind had actually occurred – The name of the weaver in the account before it was erased was Vanapillee Sommanah and the particulars went on to state the sums that had been advanced for so many pieces of 14 punjum at 7 Rs. Per piece, whereas the subsequently corrected entry exhibits another weaver's name Vanapillee Chinniah and payment of the full prices or 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ Rupees per piece.

22nd – The evidence addressed in the [fol. 315] foregoing paras your committee have selected merely because it was obtained from persons who with only one exception (that of the peon Narallysetty Conniah) could have had no immediate interest in criminating the cobdar, we therefore think it the more entitled to credit – The weavers' depositions should of course be viewed with every degree of caution; yet where all are so unanimous and so clamorous for redress and the number of complaints against the three Banyan Cobdars and the head servant C. Juggiah about three thousand we are still more impressed with the conviction of the existence of many and flagrant abuses and such as demand an early and thorough reform⁴ –

23rd – [fol. 316] As in the preceding case of M. Paupadoo we shall again pass lightly over the depositions of the delegated weavers against G. Vencataramdoo Cobdar – depending chiefly on the various documents and evidence produced by their principal agent Immundy Aummanah, towards substantiating the allegations, as likewise upon his own replies to the questions severally put to him.

24th – The statement furnished by the Commercial Resident shews G. Vencataramdoo to have upwards of 1,000 looms under his management comprised in the three Mocaums of Bonie Nachapilly and Gooravampollam with a brother to assist him in the superintendence of this too extensive charge – During the past [fol. 317] year no advances were made in Gooravampollam, because as G. Vencataramdoo pretends, the weavers had neglected business and produced inferior cloth – The weavers themselves however, tell a very different story, and state the reason to have been their declining (having previously represented to the Commercial Resident the cobdar's shameful oppressions) to sign acquittance papers, and deny also having in any way encouraged delegates to proceed to Madras, and petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

25th – G. Vencataramdoo admits on his examination of the 20th November that he occasionally received presents from the weavers and that such consisted [fol. 318] of money ioyes (sic) and sundry other articles – it is not however probable that there were voluntary donations, tho' customary as he observes on the celebration of a marriage or other ceremony at his house – such contributions were obtained it is presumed under false

⁴ Note the figure of 3,000 weavers complaining about this cobdar. There was a huge number to seek redress through the aegis of the petition; more likely for such a large group was a protest at the factory itself.

promises, or by threats of the nature adverted to in para – in fact your committee are of the opinion that a regular organized system of taxation has been practiced by these cobdars, supported by their relative C. Juggapah, who no doubt participated in the plunder thus shamefully obtained – admitting however the weavers to be sometimes desirous of conferring such marks of approbation on their cobdar, they ought not to be countenanced, because it is [fol. 319] obvious this cannot be done, but at the expense of the Company's investment; in which for every sum, however trifling, thus appropriated, there must be proportionate deterioration – if otherwise, of the little profit accruing to the weaver from his labour, he would be wholly deprived;

26th – The accounts required from this cobdar were not produced to your committee till they had been so mutilated by interpolation as to leave not a doubt in our minds of their former incorrectness – the most essential document too was not at all forthcoming; but withheld under the state[d] pretext of having been destroyed by fire; it is possible, but surely very improbably, that the whole of the daily account for the three Mocaums [fol. 320] for the years 1815 and 1816 should have been burnt at two distinct places, and at two different periods – it should be here explained, that this description of accounts is the only one which exhibits a true state of the cobdars transactions with the weavers and it is therefore manifest what motive indeed the cobdar to trump up such a tale – by reference to the proceedings, it will be observed how frequently and how strenuously he repeated his original assertion; but how feebly such has been proved your committee leave to your judgment, when stating that one set of the very accounts said to have been burnt, is actually in their possession and can be forwarded to Madras if required;

27th – [fol. 321] The cobdar of course denies the authenticity of the preceding set of accounts, because they contain such damning proof of his irregular and unwarrantable acts – but when your committee avow that they tried them by the only test which in such cases can be resorted to, viz. a strict comparison with other accounts, and cadjans also, written by the hand of the very gomastah who compiled the greater part, and found not the least perceptible difference between them, and when this trial was supported by the evidence given by one of the cobdar's former gomastahs who most unequivocally stated, when asked, whether the handwriting which ran thro' the greater part of them was familiar to his eye “that it was [fol. 322] familiar to his eye,” and the hand writing of the cobdar's gomastah Moova Caumiah, and (he added) “that,” he also knew from the hand “who had written the interpolation” there are strong grounds for pronouncing them authentic, the cobdar himself after prevaricating and denying their writing to be of his gomastah said he could speak after scrutinizing the several entries; he then denied the possibility of their being his, from their exhibiting numerous items which could not have crept into his accounts; his gomastah admitted them to be his and even pointed out five or six cadjans as actually written by himself but he also, after a closer inspection and a hint it is presumed from his [fol. 323] employer stoutly denied their authenticity – that one man could in a fabricated set of accounts containing 159 cadjans so perfectly imitate another writing as wholly to deceive such person himself is incredible – and should it even be possible to accomplish this, does it follow unless preternaturally endowed that he could also be equally well acquainted with the particulars therein detailed – your committee under such view of the subject are strongly impressed with the originality of

this set of accounts produced in judgment against the cobdar as well on the several other documents numbered ... margin and presented by the agent for the weavers –

28th – The abovementioned accounts exhibit in their abstract the following practices viz.:

1st [fol. 324] That the cobdar purchase ready made punjums from the weavers by which his gain amounted during the year 1815 to Rs. 1448 as. 10 beside the commission obtained on the same –

2nd That the sum of Rs. 249 as. 4 was collected by him for Chinnum Juggiah at the rate of ¼ Rupee per loom on 997 looms –

3rd That 150 Rupees were paid to Namalla Veerasha –

4th That 25 Rupees were paid to Wooremy Durmazzy –

5th That 50 Rupees were paid for freight –

6th That 19 ½ Rupees were paid as wages these five [fol. 325] last sums the accounts specify were taken from the weavers under the pretence of defraying the expenses of the Resident –

7th That the cobdar places at interest the money he receives from the Resident in lieu of advancing it to the weavers –

8th That he purchases grain at a low and imposes it on the weavers at a high rate;

9th That the profit gained by paying the weavers only a short price for the punjums they deliver is credited in a separate set of accounts;

10th That he took the rejected cloths himself paying the weaves a very trifling price for the same

29th – [fol. 326] The agent Immundy Aumanah justly remarked that when this one set of account proved that practices of the above description existed in the Bonie Mocaum, it was but fair to give credit to the weavers complaints in the other two Mocaums under the same cobdar – in fact a similar practice he declares had obtained during the last 10 years by which means the greater part of the Company's weavers have been nearly ruined;

30th – Besides this set of accounts there are sundry other vouchers the contents of which your committee are of opinion render this cobdar utterly unworthy of being continued in the Company's employ;

31st – Of the third arraigned Banyan Cobdar Maumedy Sooriah your [fol. 327] committee have formed almost as unfavourable in opinion as of M. Paupiah and G. Vencataramdoo and against whom similar charges are preferred; but chiefly that of purchasing cloth with

the money that should be advanced in his own Mocaums, and altho' he was repeatedly called upon to produce his accounts, he withheld them until the 17th of December last, the day on which the junior member of your committee relinquished business, as explained in his letter to Mr. Lee Hill of that date; their presentment then became unnecessary; whilst the previous delay evinced their incorrectness – had fair charges only been inserted it is to be supposed he would have been early in producing [fol. 328] them – but time seems to have been required to correct certain items likely to expose his nefarious transactions. This man has more than 700 looms under his management in three Mocaums with an assistant cobdar, but as it is probable that some arrangement for a more extended enquiry may be in contemplation – we shall leave his case for future discussion – his caste however being Banyan is in the opinion of your committee a sufficient disqualification for office⁵;

32nd – In regard to placing Mocaum under aumany it appears to your committee that such practice has been adopted chiefly with the view of extending the influence and interests [fol. 329] of the favoured Banyan Cobdars who already sharing, in the number of their looms, a greater degree of responsibility than is consistent with the spirit of cobdaree system, could not without attracting the notice of the Board of Trade have a further increase – In two or three instances our proceedings shew that money was distributed by Cobdar Grusidy Vencataramdoo in Aumany Mocaums – and this practice is further aggravated by the provision of what is termed Private instead of Company's standard cloth, with every precaution however on the part of the cobdar to secure full dimensions, yet as such cloth is always of an inferior fabric, and the price paid proportionately less, an increased profit [fol. 330] accrues to the cobdar by the eventual delivery of the same as standard at the factory, and his having credit accordingly;

33rd – In now remains for your committee to notice the suspended head servant Chinnam Juggiah, who it is understood continued to the day of his leaving Vizagapatam to possess his accustomed influence and to be in daily attendance at the factory – this in itself was sufficient, without recourse to other means, to deter the weavers (were they to be so easily intimidated) from appearing against him – but with the view of still further impressing them with his independence he industriously circulated a report [fol. 331] (which also came to the ears of your committee) that having already exculpated himself, the summons to Madras was revoked, and his restoration to office certain and immediate – his subsequent departure however for the Presidency whilst preventing his personal examination by your committee satisfied the weavers that all was an empty boast; and tended to establish their confidence of complete redress of all their grievances

34 – As the proceedings throughout exhibit the unbounded influence that C. Juggiah was generally believed to possess at the Vizagapatam Factory your committee will only remark on the following evidence of a displaced [fol. 332] cobdar in point;

35 – Dummalloory Tummiah an inhabitant of Kintada and called by the weavers agent, (I. Aummanah) as an evidence states that he was formerly a cobdar and provided a very considerable quantity of cloth, but dismissed during Mr. Corbett's time at the instigation

⁵ The use of Banyan in this way identifies this easy British characterization of character along caste lines.

of Chinnum Juggiah, who, the witness states was then a dubash of the Company and his business to make advances and to sort the cloth, the witness further states that after his dismissal for refusing to bear with Juggiah's exactions Magetty Chinniah was appointed; he however shewing an unwillingness to bestow bribes was in a short time likewise [fol. 333] discharged and a third person named Dausary Caumiah (a Banyan of the town of Vizagapatam,) nominated cobdar; he also very soon lost his place thro' the same influence, and a fourth person, the present accused Motamurray Paupiah is now cobdar; Chinnum Juggiah recommended him for the situation from his being a relation by marriage and from other interested motives – the witness adds that Chinnum Juggiah (sic) suggestions are never for a moment questioned by the Commercial Resident, and that the accused cobdars divide with the former all their nefarious gains;

36 – With the view therefore of affording satisfaction and encouragement to the weavers in general it [fol. 334] is advisable that heads of their own caste should alone be selected for cobdars, nor should they ever be nominated without the previous assent of the weavers of the Mocaum to which it is proposed to appoint them – It is true, few, if any of this description of persons are wealthy, but where eligible security is previously obtained, this becomes a secondary consideration; general respectability of character amongst the caste and reputation for industry is of much greater importance – besides the advantage derivable from the perfect knowledge it is presumed such persons must possess of the manufacturing process and their consequent ability to check [fol. 335] every attempt at imposition on the part of the subordinate weavers⁶ –

37 – The consistency throughout the several depositions of the interrogated parties fully justify your committee's conclusion that the alleged acts of oppression have been too generally practiced, and they beg to suggest the propriety of the removal from the Company's service of all the Banyan cobdars with their Banyan confederate Chinnum Juggiah – a measure known to be particularly desired by the weavers, and alone likely to restore complete tranquility amongst that manufacturing class;

38 – The custom of occasionally flogging weavers at the factory of Vizagapatam which seems to have [fol. 336] been countenanced by the Commercial Resident is in the opinion of your committee by no means calculated to promote the Company's interest, and tends only to gratify the revenge of interested persons, upon such individuals of the class, as are disposed to resist oppression⁷ – The regulations provide the method to be pursued with weavers who shall fail in their engagements and ought to be strictly observed;

39 – Your committee have not taken under consideration the several representations (noted in the margin) of the Cuttakum family, because such not only came to hand long after the general petitions of the weavers, but as not appearing at all connected [fol. 337] with the oppressions immediately affecting and complained of by the manufactures (sic) – that the former have experienced severity and injustice it is natural to infer from the prayer of their petitions, and no doubt at the instigation of Chinnum Juggiah whose aim from the commencement of his reign and at any expense seems to have been the

⁶ Again the juxtaposition of caste with character is imposed by these writers

⁷ Use of flogging is not mentioned elsewhere in these or similar accounts.

aggrandisement of his relations with his own conjoint benefit – The case of the Cuttakums in the opinion of your committee requires a distinct and thorough investigation by an impartial resident on the spot; upon the result of which should depend their eventual restoration to office as [fol. 338] cobdars, whilst for the recovery of their alleged demand against Chinnum Juggiah if clearly established, they should be directed to pursue a legal process – The Commercial Resident of Vizagapatam admits that no balance is due by them to the Company but themselves claim a considerable sum from individual weavers, which amount it is to be apprehended will prove wholly irrecoverable particularly the proportion outstanding in the Mocaum of Boditah, some time since transferred to the Ganjam Residency – and now from the abolition of that factory unless again annexed to the Vizagapatam range, no longer to be [fol. 339] considered a Company's Mocaum;

40 – Your committee are aware of almost the impossibility of any proportion of the cobdars various exactions from the weavers being ever forth-coming, notwithstanding the facility with which every individual's payments could be discovered by reference to the cobdar's private accounts – but these they will too carefully guard against examination – Of the sums in which weavers have been annually defrauded they could not themselves keep any memorandum – but admitting the capacity of a few to do so, their previous tacit submission to the cobdar's protracted system of imposition is their merited [fol. 340] punishment – The petitions it is true convey a partial desire for reimbursement – but the really aggrieved dwell on the dismissal of their oppressor, and such measure, it may consequently be presumed, will fully satisfy them.⁸

We have the honor to be
Honorable Sir and Sirs,
Your most obedient servants

Ingeram
18th January 1818

Signed, Savage
Commercial Resident at Ingeram

Signed, Fraser
Deputy Commercial Resident
At Madepollam

⁸ Godavari Records Vol. 832, fols. 374-377, an extract from minutes of consultation, note that the two residents at Vizagapatam (Taylor and Mongomerie) were moved to Madepollam, and Fraser was put in their place. Furthermore, the privilege of private trade was "recalled" from residents at Vizagapatam, Ingeram, Madepollam, Tinnevally, and Cuddapah.