

INDICA - 34
The Heras Institute
St. Xavier's College
Mumbai 400 001

**THE POLICE SYSTEM IN SOUTH KANARA
1799 - 1862 ***

by
N. SHYAM BHAT

The nature and significance of the Police system in colonial India has not been fully appreciated by historians because very little research has been done in this area of modern Indian history. This paper attempts to present some significant details on the development of the Police system in India, with special reference to early colonial South Kanara,** based on archival sources, such as Administrative reports, Official correspondence and Judicial and Police reports.

According to J. C. Curry, "the history of the Police in British India for the century prior to 1860 was, as a part of the general administration, that of a long series of experiments".¹ This observation

* Vide the author's research project on 'Judiciary and Police in Early Colonial South Kanara: 1799-1862' funded by I.C.H.R., New Delhi.

** The present South Kanara District (of Karnataka State), during the period of this study was part of the Province of Kanara and Soonda, attached to the Madras Presidency. This Province was annexed by the British in 1799. Later it was divided into two: Southern Division and Northern Division (1801-05). The former consisted of Barkur, Bekal (Kasaragod), Buntwal and Mangalore taluks. The Amindivi group of islands formed a part of the Mangalore taluk. The phrase 'South Kanara' here refers to the Southern division of Kanara and Soonda. See, Proceedings of the Madras Board of Revenue (Hereafter, *PMBR*), 11.12.1800, Vol.268, p.366; *PMBR*, 27.12.1800, Vol.269, p.10681; *PMBR*, 30.4.1801, Vol.281, pp.5,124; H. A. Stuart, *Madras District Manuals, South Kanara*, Vol.II (Madras, 1895), pp.236-37.

1. J. C. Curry, *The Indian Police*, quoted in B. Shalini Devi, *The History of Crime and Punishment in the Presidency of Madras in 19th Century* (unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Madras, 1966), p.162.

holds good for the Police system that existed in early colonial South Kanara. The Police system was part of the general administration and it came under the authority of the Collector. From 1816, the Police system was mainly the creation of Sir Thomas Munro. After a series of experiments, a thoroughly reorganized Police system came to be established in 1859-60. It became a separate body, distinct from the Revenue and Magisterial departments, without any revenue duties and magisterial powers.

The Early Experiments and the Darogha System

It was through the Madras Regulation XXXV of 1802 that the Police system (actually the Bengal Police system) was introduced in the Madras Presidency. Each District was divided into small Police jurisdictions with an area of about twenty square miles. In each division, a Police officer, called Darogha, and a Thanadar were employed with about twenty to fifty armed policemen serving under them. The entire unit came under the authority of the Collector of the District.

A Police Committee, consisting of senior Public Servants, was formed in 1804 to "enquire into the present and former state of the Police in the several provinces under this Presidency" and to devise measures for keying up the pitch of its efficiency.² In 1806, T. M. Keate, Judge and Magistrate in Mangalore, while reporting on the Police system, suggested that both economy and efficiency should be taken into consideration. He got the Principal Collector to agree that duties, like maintaining peace in the interior regions and the detection of offenses, would be performed by the Village Sibbundy (officials) of the Collector.³

For the purpose of administration, South Kanara was divided into three Police divisions, each to be superintended by a Darogha, who had a regular force of Thanadars and peons subject to him. Each division was divided into as many Thanadar stations as was found necessary. In each Thanadar station, there was a Thanadar and a proper compliment of peons. The Daroghas, Thanadars and Peons were appointed and/or

2. *The History of Madras Police, Centenary Volume 1859-1959* (Madras, 1959), p.96.

3. T. M. Keate to the Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, 13.8.1806, Proceedings of the Madras Judicial Department (hereafter, *PMJD*), 29.8.1806, Sl.No.19, p.2774.

transferred by the Magistrate. Neither the Darogha, nor any other Police officer, was to inflict any punishment nor levy any fine on the culprits. They could only suggest the necessary punishment or fine to the Magistrate. As the work of the Collector increased considerably, his Police powers were transferred, in 1808, to the Zillah Judge. However, in 1812, there was only one Darogha in the Police Department attached to the Zillah Court of Kanara. A. Wilson, the then Judge and Magistrate, suggested the addition of three more Daroghas to increase the efficiency of the Police force in a Zillah as extensive and turbulent as Kanara. It was the opinion of Wilson that the Police system must be dependable for its vigour and its promptness. He advised the Daroghas to maintain a constant vigilance over the performance of their Junior Officers and to acquire the necessary knowledge of the locality in order to provide stability and vigour to the Police system in their area.⁴ Accordingly, in 1812, a number of Regulations were enacted for the suppression of violence and the preservation of due order.⁵

Evaluation of the Darogha System

In 1814, the Court of Directors criticized the Darogha system and expressed itself strongly in favour of the Village Police as a better system for the maintenance of local peace. It pointed out that no 'social order and tranquility' could adequately be preserved by a handful of Daroghas and Peons, who were usually lacking in local influence and had no connection with the common people. They were also often ill-remunerated and, being placed in a position of power, they were tempted to misuse their power for personal gains. What the Court wanted was to revive the Police to its original vigour at the village level and to combine, in the office of the Collector, the duties of Magistrate and the control of the Police at the district level.⁶

As stated earlier, the duties of Magistrate and superintendence of Police were vested with the Judge. Sir Thomas Munro observed (during 1814-16) that the Judge had no time to attend to these duties and he

-
4. A. Wilson's letter dated 3.3.1812 to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, in *PMJD*, 9.6.1812, Sl.No.73, pp.3034-35.
 5. *PMJD*, 9.6.1812, Sl.No.73, pp.3041-61.
 6. B. B. Mishra, *The Administrative History of India 1834-1947, General Administration* (Bombay, 1970), p.534.

could not discharge them without deranging the Municipal institutions of the country which were connected inseparably with the office of the Collector.⁷ Munro opined that, in order to facilitate the administration of justice and the superintendence of the Police, it was not necessary to overthrow the existing system. He suggested that the Judge should be confined entirely to his judicial functions and that the offices of Magistrate and Superintendent of Police should be re-united with that of the Collector. He stated that this was the regular practice under the British Government and also under the Native Princes. Further, Munro insisted that these changes would grant the Collector and the Heads of villages a limited jurisdiction in petty civil suits. This arrangement would also relieve the Judge from the duties of Magistrate which involved the hearing of a number of petty causes for the greater part of his time. It would also enable him to settle all the important suits that came before him. According to Munro, "The police would be infinitely better managed by the Collector than the Judge; and the potails and cumnams of villages would be relieved from serving two masters, the Collector in matters of revenue, and the Judge in those of Police, and would regain their usual authority, which has been too much weakened, and strengthen Government. The union of the powers of Magistrate and Collector may appear extraordinary in this country; but as the municipal institutions of India are calculated for those duties being vested in the same person, it is much better that they should remain united in him, by whom they can be adequately discharged, than that, by a separation, the important office of Magistrate should be rendered totally inefficient. We are not to consider English maxims as always applicable to India, but to follow those rules which are most applicable to that country, as it now is. India has no political freedom, no voice in framing laws or imposing taxes; and many regulations are now proper there which might be otherwise under a state of greater freedom".⁸

7. Sir Alexander J. Arbuthnot, *Major-General Sir Thomas Munro, Selections from his Minutes and other Official Writings*, in 2 volumes, Vol.II, *Judicial* (Madras, 1886), p.278.

8. *Ibid.*, p.279. John G. Ravenshaw, Madras Civil Servant, also agreed that these changes would give the Judges more time to discharge their duties. See Ravenshaw's letter of 15.1.1814, in *Selection of Papers from the Records of the East India House Relating to the Revenue, Police and Civil and Criminal Justice, under the Company's Governments in India*, in 2 volumes, Vol.II (London, 1820), p.136.

Munro stressed that the duties of Magistrate and Judge were totally unconnected and advocated the transfer of all magisterial duties to the Collector. Munro emphasized that under the Hindu institutions, the functions of the Police and of the Revenue Department were closely interwoven. The village Watchmen, the Patels and even the Curnums or village Registrars were both Revenue and Police servants, and the Tahsildars and their establishments were employed alike in the performance of both duties. The system of Police functioning under the Collector, the Amildars, Patels and village Watchmen had a great advantage since they involved the employment of an active and zealous body of village personnel and were assured of the cordial assistance of the people.⁹ However, he cautioned that there should be a good supervision over the Collector whenever he was a concerned party for, in such cases, he could be biased.¹⁰

Thus Munro argued that the new system of Police, established under the Madras Judicial Regulations, had everything against it and nothing in its favour. It did not take into consideration the feelings and prejudices of the people and had therefore no moral force to uphold it. Its functioning depended almost exclusively on the services of a set of hired Daroghas and peons, who had no connection with the local people nor any common interest with the inhabitants.¹¹ In his memorandum on the Revision of the Judicial System (1813), Munro said: "The new system of Police was not half so efficient for the protection of the inhabitants and maintenance of the authority of Government as the ancient system was".¹²

The Munro System of Police

Sir Thomas Munro strongly advocated the continuation of the existing system (the rough-and-ready native system) of Police administration with maybe a few modifications. This was in keeping with his policies in the field of Land Revenue administration. As the first Collector of the Kanara Province, Munro had introduced the 'Ryotwari' system of Land Revenue administration for it suited the system of

9. Alexander J. Arbuthnot, *Op.cit.*, p.282.

10. *Ibid.*, p.279.

11. *Ibid.*, p.282.

12. *Selection of Papers from the Records of the East India House*, Vol.II, p.107.

landholdings in the region - the system of private ownership of land which was hereditary in nature.¹³

Appointed as Special Commissioner (1814-18) for the revision of the Madras Judicial System (or the Cornwallis System established under Wellesley in 1802), Sir Thomas Munro was at Fort St. George on 16th September 1814.¹⁴ Munro was instructed to carry out the reforms recommended in the Court of Directors' despatch of 29th April 1814. To implement this, he worked from September 1814 to September 1816. This long judicial letter was primarily concerned with the Civil Judicature of Madras and secondarily, with Police administration. The Directors insisted that their recommendations were based upon extant and old practices. They agreed with a point made earlier by Munro in his letter, of 15th August 1807, to the Madras Board of Revenue, when he had argued for the use of Indians and of Indian institutions as the sole means of penetrating that strange mixture of fraud and honesty in the natives of India. On the subject of native Police also, the Directors appreciatively noted Munro's views about the hereditary village Watchman constituting an adequate as well as an acceptable form of local policing.¹⁵

Among the reforms suggested by the Court of Directors, Munro opined that the most important one was the transfer of Police and Magisterial duties from the Zillah Judge to the Collector. The Judicial Commission, headed by Munro (a colleague of Commissioner George Stratton) held that the Zillah Judges had hardly any opportunity to acquire an intimate knowledge of the local people as they were confined to their headquarters. They reported that such knowledge could be had only by the Collectors because they frequently toured the Districts in pursuance of their revenue duties. This was not accepted by the Governor's Council.

13. For more details on the topic - see N. Shyam Bhat, "South Kanara 1799-1860: A Study in Colonial Administration and Regional Response" (unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Mangalore University, 1988), Chapter V; For details on the Police system during the pre-British times, see David H. Bayley, *The Police and Political Development in India* (Princeton, 1969), pp.36-42.
14. T. H. Beaglehole, *Thomas Munro and the Development of Administrative Policy in Madras 1792-1818 - The Origins of 'The Munro System'* (Cambridge, 1989), p.102; Burton Stein, *Thomas Munro - The Origins of the Colonial State and His Vision of Empire* (Oxford, 1989), p.178.
15. Burton Stein, *Op.cit.*, pp.180-82.

The Council accepted the idea of transferring to the Collector only the superintendence and control of the Police. The Council was opposed to giving the Magistrate's power to the Collector. It did not want to unite executive and judicial powers which would be in opposition to the whole basis of the Cornwallis tradition.¹⁶ It was only on 13th September 1816, that the seven Regulations, implementing the 29th April Judicial letter, drawn up by Munro and Stratton, were finally promulgated as law by the Governor of the Madras Presidency. One of the Regulations transferred the superintendence of the Police and Magisterial duties from the Zillah Magistrate to the Collector. The Darogha establishment was abolished. The Police of the villages were placed under the immediate direction of the Patels, the Police of Districts under that of the Tahsildars, and the Police of Provinces under the Collector.¹⁷

As far as Munro was concerned, the work of the Judicial Commission (1814-18) was directed to one main end, that of employing Indians more extensively in the internal administration of the country. In every Department, whatever could best be done by Native servants should, he believed, be entrusted to them. In the discharge of all subordinate duties, especially judicial ones, Indians not only cost less, but being infinitely better qualified, were more efficient than Europeans.¹⁸ In framing the Regulations, Munro and Stratton endeavoured, "to adapt them as far as possible to the manners and institutions of the people for whose use they are (were) intended, and to that end they were made as simple as possible."¹⁹

16. T. H. Beaglehole, *Op.cit.*, p.103.

17. *PMJD*, 19.8.1815, Sl. No.108, pp.2913-3042; Burton Stein, *Op.cit.*, pp.182-83; T. H. Beaglehole, *Op.cit.*, pp.111-12; B. S. Baliga, *Tanjore District Hand Book*, p.493.

18. T. H. Beaglehole, *Op.cit.*, p.119;

For details on Munro's views on the native system of justice and police, the role played by the patels or heads of villages, the combination of revenue and police duties during the pre-British period and his strong conviction to transfer magisterial and police powers to the Collector, see Sir A. J. Arbuthnot, *Major General Sir Thomas Munro*, Vol.II, *Judicial*, (Madras, 1886), pp. 278-86.

19. T. H. Beaglehole, *Op.cit.*, p.109.

Munro's suggestions and arguments were favourably considered by the Madras Government and it enacted Regulation 9 of 1816 and reverted to the old Police system of village Watchmen, mostly hereditary. Thus the office of the Zillah Magistrate and the Police duties were transferred from the Zillah Judge to the Collector-Magistrate. The Collector, Sub-Collector, Tahsildar (Head of the District Police), Patel (Head of a village) and other Revenue officials were thus vested with Magistracy and the charge of the Police.²⁰ The Revenue, Police and Magisterial authorities centered in one and the same set of functionaries. In fact, it was in 1816, that a general system of Police was established throughout the territories subject to the Government of Fort St. George. The establishment of the Daroghas was abolished. The duties, previously performed by Police Daroghas and Thanadars were transferred to the Heads of villages, Tahsildars, Zamindars, Ameens of Police, Cutwalls, Magistrates and their Assistants. The Heads of villages were aided, in the discharge of their duties, by the village Accountants and village Watchmen, and the other Police officers by the Peons of their respective establishments. Rules were laid down for the guidance of the Native Heads of Police, who were required to aid the village authorities in the apprehension of offenders, and to investigate all complaints of offenses directed to the Criminal Court; certain powers were also vested in them for disposing off trivial offenses. Such powers were extended by subsequent enactments. They could inflict a punishment of ten day's imprisonment, with labour, in cases of petty theft, when the value of the property stolen did not exceed five rupees and could impose a fine, not exceeding three rupees, for other offenses of a trivial nature.²¹

Evaluation of the Munro System of Police

The Police system, introduced in 1816, continued to exist in the region till the middle of the nineteenth century. However, the system suffered from defects like corruption, torture and oppression of the natives as it was in the fields of Revenue and Judiciary. In September 1854, the Madras Government appointed a Commission, consisting of E. F. Elliot, H. Stokes and John Bruce Norton, to investigate the whole subject of torture and oppression of the natives by the officers of the

20. Minutes of Evidence, XX B-151-2, p.534. B. B. Mishra, *Op.cit.*, p.535.

21. A. J. Arbuthnot, *Select Records of Criminal Cases determined in the Court of Foujdaree Udalt of Madras, 1826-1850* (Madras, 1851), p.xi.

Revenue Department and also by the Magisterial and Police officers. The Commission submitted its report on 16th April 1855. The Commissioners stated that "torture was more prevalent in revenue cases than in police cases. However, it was widely used in the police cases as well. They stated that torture was prevalent in the districts where European supervision was less frequent, strict and effective..... Also its prevalence was due to the fact that the revenue and police functions were combined in the same set of officials."²²

On the issue of torture, F. N. Maltby, the Collector and Magistrate of Kanara in 1854, said: "With regard to Police, I regret to express my full conviction that scarcely a case of robbery occurs in which illegal means are not used for obtaining concessions and discovering proof; confinement without food is the most common but others of a most cruel nature used to be resorted to and I fear that, although diminished in number and atrocity, they are by no means obsolete. Horrible torture applied to females and varieties of cruelties applied to men are, within my recollection, constantly charged against the Police and I believe them charged truly ... I have known a prisoner to be put into a nest of red ants as an effectual means of getting a confession from him".²³ Maltby also stated that threats, intimidation, false promises of pardon and sometimes hunger and worse cruelties were doubtless resorted to in the detection of crimes.²⁴

Offering pardon was one of the methods used for criminal detection. By Section XX, Regulation VIII of 1802, it was laid down that the accessories in crimes of a heinous nature such as murder, gang robbery, arson and the like, could be offered pardon if they made a full disclosure of the crime and all the persons involved in it and thereby helped the apprehension and conviction of the principal offender or offenders. In the early half of the nineteenth century this method was resorted to frequently.²⁵ Torture was another important and most frequently used method of criminal detection by the Police till 1856. The Government

22. *Report of the Commissioners for the Investigation of Alleged Cases of Torture in the Madras Presidency* (Madras, 1855), (Henceforth, *Report of Commissioners*), Vol.I, pp.55-71.

23. *Ibid.*, Vol.I, Appendix-C, No. 10, *Canara*, p.cvii.

24. *Ibid.*, p.cxiii.

25. B. Shalini Devi, *Op.cit.*, pp.166-67.

took half-hearted measures to check the practice of torture and between 1806 and 1855 as many as 10 circular orders were issued by the Foujdari Adalat on the subject of the practice of extorting confessions with the object of abolishing that barbaric method.²⁶ W. Fisher, the Sub-Collector of Kanara, even in 1855, commenting on the Police System said that there was no case on record, but he remembered one instance of ill-treatment of a prisoner by a Tahsildar in 1839, of which he did not hear for two years; and he had no reason to believe that the superior Police officers of the district resorted to improper means to elicit confessions.²⁷ Fisher continued and said: "... that it is certainly probable that prisoners are sometimes ill-treated by the lower grade of Police in order to discover where stolen property has been concealed".²⁸ Regarding torture, in 1854, Rev. H. Moegling, a Missionary in Coorg said: "In the Police Department, violence and cruelty of a minor degree, is a daily practice. I lived formerly in the neighbourhood of a Police office and saw daily that prisoners were beaten, flogged and ill-treated. I know also for certain that for the purpose of extorting confession from women, a disgusting application of red pepper is sometimes employed. Most of the police officials do not know better and it is remarkable that several of the ablest officers are most forward in the use of violent means."²⁹

The whole Police was underpaid, notoriously corrupt and without any of the moral restraint and self-respect which education ordinarily engendered. Commenting on the Police system, Salfelt said: "The Police Establishment has become the bane and pest of society, the terror of the community, and the origin of half the misery and discontent that exist among the subjects of Government. Corruption and bribery reign paramount throughout the whole establishment; violence, torture, cruelty are their chief instruments for detecting crime, implicating innocence, or extorting money."³⁰

Reforms of the 1850s

The existing system of Police required either a thorough replacement

26. *Report of Commissioners*, pp.167-68.

27. *Ibid.*, Vol.I, Appendix-C, No.10, *Canara*, p.cxi.

28. *Ibid.*, p.cxii.

29. *Ibid.*, p.cxiii.

30. *Report of Commissioners*, p.62.

or reorganization. In fact, the Commissioners, E. F. Elliot, H. Stokes and J. B. Norton, in their report of 1855, suggested measures to overcome the problems in the administration. They suggested: (a) the separation of Revenue and Police functions; (b) the reorganization of Police under the direct supervision of a Superintendent of Police, who would be an European Officer; (c) the simplification of the legal procedure so that prisoners could be produced before the Magistrate at a very early date and those, who resorted to torture, could be brought to book very soon.

The Madras Government accepted these recommendations of the Commission. The Police were made a distinct body and separated from revenue powers.³¹ "The atrocities committed by revenue servants, acting as police officers, and attracting a bad name to both the branches, the lackadaisical attitude of Collectors to police work and consequent growth of indiscipline and corruption in the ranks of revenue servants and the apparent ineffectiveness of the check exercised by the Zillah Judges over the police led to the reorganization of the Police in 1859".³²

Thus, in the late 1850's, the Government introduced some measures to place the Police administration under an independent European authority - separating the duties of Police and Revenue. They thought of creating a better paid, better organized, Police force, separated altogether from ordinary revenue duties, placed under European officers, and commanded by an intelligent Superintendent, immediately responsible to Government for the peace of the whole region. In 1859, the whole Police force of the Madras Presidency was placed under the direction of the Inspector General of Police for the Presidency of Madras, whose powers were prescribed in Act XXIV of 1859 - an Act for the better regulation of the Police within the territories subject to the Presidency of Fort St. George. The offices of Inspector General, Deputy Inspector General, Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent and so on were created. The Inspector General was in charge of the general administration of the Police.³³ The Deputy Inspector General was in overall charge

31. *Ibid.*, pp.34-71; B. Shalini Devi, *Op.cit.*, p.171; B. B. Mishra, *Op.cit.*, p.536.

32. *The History of the Madras Police - Centenary Volume*, p.261; B. Shalini Devi, *Op.cit.*, p.172.

33. *Orders of the Madras Police (Corrected upto 20th February 1897)*, Vol.I (Madras, 1897), pp.3-9; B. B. Mishra, *Op.cit.*, p.536.

of the Police at the District level. He had to ensure a harmonious working and co-operation between the Magistracy and the Police in each District within his range. The Superintendent of Police was the head of the District Police force. The duties of the Assistant Superintendents were similar to those of Superintendents of Police and consisted of such portions of details of police management of the District as were assigned to their special care. The subordinate Police staff included Division Inspectors, Head-quarter Inspector, Audit-Inspector, Security for Office Inspectors, Reserve and Store Inspector, Court Inspector, Prosecuting Inspector, Head Constables and Constables.³⁴

The Indian Penal Code

With the introduction of the new Police in 1860, there was some improvement and progress in the field of criminal detection. However, throughout the nineteenth century, faith in the efficacy of harsh punishments for the prevention of crime continued. The Indian Penal Code was passed in 1860. Until that time, quite a number of barbaric punishments such as mutilation (abolished in 1802), branding (abolished in 1818), torture and so on were prevalent. The Indian Penal Code recognized only five punishments. They were capital punishment, transportation beyond the seas, imprisonment - simple and rigorous, forfeiture and fines. The Indian Penal Code came into operation from 1st January 1862.³⁵

State of Prisons

In the early days of British administration, the prisons were not constructed on any regular plan. The Government passed Regulations regarding the prison administration. Section XXI, Regulation VI, 1802 governed the place, security and other details of prisons. However, the implementation was not satisfactory.³⁶ Often, some old tents, a few hired houses, a disused Pagoda or a dilapidated wing of the Court-house itself constituted the Zillah prisons. Obviously, in such places there was an absence of security and discipline.

34. *Orders of the Madras Police*, pp.11-18.

35. David H. Bayley, *Op.cit.*, pp.41-45;

B. Shalini Devi, *Op.cit.*, pp.225-36.

36. *PMJD*, 8.1.1811, Sl. No.58, pp.59-60.

In South Kanara, the prison was in Mangalore. In 1805, it was located at four different places which required separate guards and attendants. There was a hospital and an Assistant Surgeon for the prisoners. Official records state that cleanliness and health of the prisoners were both unobjectionable.³⁷ However, in 1805, Alexander Read, the Principal Collector in Kanara, reported that there was a necessity for enlarging the jails in Mangalore for purposes of greater security and health of the prisoners.³⁸ Similarly, Bulby Hoodgson, the Judge on circuit in Kundapura, wrote to the Madras Government that the criminal prisoners in Kundapura were kept in a dark and confined room erected upon a ruinous Bastion of Fort - equally prejudicial to their health and discreditable to the Government.³⁹ The prisoners were supervised by guards and sentenced to hard labour.⁴⁰ Hoodgson suggested that a regular jail be set up in Kundapura.

In prisons, a whole ward or one or more cells were allotted to the different classes of prisoners such as debtors, criminals, females and juvenile culprits. Every prison had a hospital, lunatic cell, store room, kitchen, well and latrine. In 1836, the Prison Committee suggested the construction of Central Jails. Though the Government accepted this suggestion, nothing much was done for its immediate implementation. In 1857, the Madras Government decided to set up First Class Central Jails and Second Class Central Jails. South Kanara came under the Second Class Central Jail set up in Cannanore.⁴¹

Conclusion

The early six decades of the nineteenth century saw the growth of an organized system of Police in South Kanara and in the Madras Presidency. In the beginning, Police duties and the Darogha establishment were under the Collector. These were later transferred to the Judge. In 1816, on the recommendation of Sir Thomas Munro, the administration of Police was once again transferred to the Collector-Magistrate. Obviously, there was a combination of magisterial, police and revenue

37. *PMJD*, 15.4.1805, Sl. No.10, pp.730-32.

38. *PMJD*, 24.9.1805, Sl. No.12, pp.1923-25.

39. *PMJD*, 15.11.1805, Sl.No.13, pp.2149-50.

40. *PMJD*, 25.5.1810, Sl.No.52, p.2113.

41. B. Shalini Devi, *Op.cit.*, pp.362-63.

duties - all managed by the Collector. The traditional village Watchmen and Revenue officials were employed in this system which continued for about four decades. But it did not prove benevolent to the people. Its negative consequences like torture, bribery, corruption, etc. compelled the Madras authorities to reorganize it. Thus the new Police system was introduced in 1859-60.

The Government promulgated measures to place the Police administration under an independent European authority by separating the duties of Police and Revenue. They created a better paid, better organized, Police force, commanded by an intelligent Superintendent, immediately responsible to Government for the peace of the whole region. In 1859, the whole Police force of the Madras Presidency was placed under the direction and control of the Inspector General of Police for the Presidency of Madras, whose powers were prescribed in Act XXIV of 1859. The establishment of a Central Jail in Cannanore for South Kanara and the Indian Penal Code, which came into operation from 1st January 1862, ushered in a new era of security and progress in British administration in South Kanara.

* * * * *