

*The
Quarterly Review of Historical
Studies*

VOL. XII

1972-73

NO. 2



CL
V. 12, NO. 2
N72.12.2
1972-73

5/2/73 RR 978/73 P.
THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW OF
HISTORICAL STUDIES



VOLUME XII

(1972-73)

NUMBER 2

INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL STUDIES
CALCUTTA

INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL STUDIES

35, THEATRE ROAD, CALCUTTA-17

Director : DR. S. P. SEN

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (1972-75)

DR. R. C. MAJUMDAR (*Calcutta*).

MM. D. V. POTDAR (*Poona*).

DR. BISHESHWAR PRASAD (*Allahabad*).

DR. K. K. PILLAY (*Madras*).

DR. AMBA PRASAD (*Delhi*).

DR. FAUJA SINGH (*Patiala*).

DR. GANDA SINGH (*Patiala*).

DR. G. S. DIKSHIT (*Mysore*).

DR. V. G. HATALKAR (*Bombay*).

DR. A. L. SRIVASTAVA (*Agra*).

DR. H. L. GUPTA (*Saugar*).

DR. H. K. SHERWANI (*Hyderabad*).

DR. H. K. BARPUJARI (*Gauhati*).

DR. N. SUBRAMANIAM (*Madurai*).

DR. A. G. PAWAR (*Kolhapur*).

PROFESSOR V. N. DATTA (*Kurukshetra*).

PROFESSOR P. G. MAVLANKAR (*Ahmedabad*).

PROFESSOR T. C. SANKARA MENON (*Cochin*).

DR. D. C. SIRCAR (*Calcutta*).

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW OF
HISTORICAL STUDIES

2109

VOLUME XII

(1972-73)

NUMBER 2

EDITOR : S. P. SEN

INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL STUDIES
CALCUTTA

CONTENTS		PAGE
EDITORIAL	...	75
PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS (TENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE)	...	...
— <i>Dr. R. C. Majumdar</i>	...	79
LIST OF PAPERS (TENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE)	...	84
A NEW LIGHT ON THE LAHORE RESOLUTION	...	...
— <i>Amalendu De</i>	...	86
BUDDHISM AND OTHER RELIGIONS IN MALWA	...	...
— <i>S. M. Pahadiya</i>	...	99
MUHAMMAD ALI SHAH AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF OUDH	...	...
— <i>Dr. Anshuman Mukherjee</i>	...	104
DISPOSAL OF THE DEAD AMONG THE AHOMS	...	...
— <i>Sunil Kumar Das</i>	...	111
THE SEPOY MUTINY AND THE PORAHAT CHIEF OF SINGBHUM	...	...
— <i>Nikhil Sen</i>	...	117
HOW GANDHIJI VIEWED HISTORY	...	...
— <i>Dr. R. K. Dharaiya</i>	...	123
BOOK REVIEWS	...	126

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW OF HISTORICAL STUDIES

35, THEATRE ROAD, CALCUTTA-17.

Annual Subscription: India—Rs. 20.00; U.S.A. & Canada—\$7.50; Other Countries—£ 2. 25

Advertisement Rates :	(PER ISSUE)	(ANNUAL—4 ISSUES)
Back Cover—	Rs. 300	Rs. 1100
2nd or 3rd Cover—	Rs. 275	Rs. 1000
Full Page—	Rs. 200	Rs. 700
Half Page—	Rs. 125	Rs. 400

Cheques, Postal Orders and Money Orders are to be sent to

THE EDITOR,

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW OF HISTORICAL STUDIES

35, THEATRE ROAD, CALCUTTA-17.

Books for Review are to be sent in duplicate.

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW OF HISTORICAL STUDIES

Vol. XII

(1972-73)

No. 2

EDITORIAL

Annual Conference:

The Tenth Annual Conference of the Institute of Historical Studies was held at Kurukshetra from 28th to 31st October under the auspices of the Kurukshetra University. The Conference was well attended, with delegates from all the States and from most of the Universities in India. Dr. S. K. Datta, Vice-Chancellor of the Kurukshetra University and Chairman of the Reception Committee, welcomed the delegates and referred briefly to the antiquity and historical importance of Kurukshetra. The Director of the Institute gave a brief review of the activities of the organisation and also explained the two themes of discussion chosen for the Conference.

The Conference was to have been inaugurated by Shri B. N. Chakravarty, Governor of Haryana. But owing to his sudden illness he could not be present at the inauguration and his address was read out by Dr. S. N. Mukherjee of the Kurukshetra University. In his Inaugural Address Shri Chakravarty referred to the rich historical heritage of India and especially of the North-Western region. He also urged the historians to remain faithful to the muse of Clio without any regard for other considerations.

The Conference was presided over by the

Doyen of Indian historians, Dr. R. C. Majumdar. In his Presidential Address, which is reproduced in full in this number, Dr. Majumdar made appreciative references to the manifold activities of the Institute. He expressed his happiness at the completion of the Dictionary of National Biography Project and the publication of the first of its four volumes. As he remarked, "After considering the inherent difficulties mentioned above in preparing the volume, and particularly its undoubted claim as a pioneer work, the first impression on a fair-minded critic is likely to be highly favourable, and I for one would not hesitate to give the credit that is justly due to the Editor and the organisers". Dr. Majumdar next referred to the general state of historical studies in India. He expressed his unhappiness at the "unsatisfactory condition of historical study and research in independent India". He felt that "serious research in History, like all other material and cultural aspects of life in India, is passing through a great crisis.....". He particularly regretted that "History is now used more as a vehicle for supporting the ideas, prejudices and pre-possessions of political groups and social or religious communities", and cited some concrete illustrations. He called upon the historians "never to cease fighting against the evils threatening to lower the standard of

research which we have inherited from our predecessors"; and concluded: "this is a sacred trust imposed upon us and the Annual Conferences of historians could serve a very useful purpose by keeping it constantly before our mind".

The Conference Programme was divided into six academic sessions, from 28th to 30th October. On the 31st October excursions were arranged to places of historical importance. The principal theme of discussion for the Conference was—*Religious Reform Movements in India and their Social Contents*. The objective was not to put any emphasis on the theological aspect of any religious reform movement but to bring out its social significance, objectives and effects. Out of thirty-three papers covering all periods, twenty-five were actually read and discussed. The remaining papers were not taken up as the writers were absent. But all the papers will be included when the volume is published.

The second theme for the Conference was—*Sources of the History of Haryana*. On this theme six papers were presented and discussed. The lists of papers are given elsewhere in this number for the information of those who could not attend the Conference.

In keeping with the past tradition of the Institute's Annual Conferences, the standard of papers read was quite high and was appreciated by all present. There were lively and useful discussions on each paper, and it deserves to be noted that quite a large number among those present felt actively interested and took part in the discussions. Notes of the discussions were taken by three Rapporteurs.

The papers read at the Conference will be published in two separate volumes in the course of the year 1973.

We take this opportunity to offer our thanks to the Vice-Chancellor of the Kurukshetra University, to the Local Secretary, Professor V. N. Datta, to the members of the History

Department of the Kurukshetra University and to the most helpful band of student volunteers who did so much to make the stay of the delegates at Kurukshetra pleasant and comfortable. We also take this opportunity to thank Shri B. N. Chakravarty, Governor of Haryana, for his Presidential Address, Dr. R. C. Majumdar who kindly presided over the Conference, the Universities and Institutions which sent delegates, and the Contributors of Papers, Rapporteurs and all those who had participated in the discussions.

Dictionary of National Biography:

The Second Volume of the Dictionary of National Biography covering names from 'E' to 'L' was sent to press in November. It was behind schedule by two months, mainly due to the preoccupations of the Annual Conference. Anyway, press work is going on as speedily as possible under conditions of chronic labour troubles, and it is hoped that the volume will be out by the end of February 1973. Editing work on the remaining two volumes has also been taken in hand so that there will be no delay in sending the volumes to the press as soon as Vol. II comes out. According to our present calculation, Vol. III will be out by the end of June 1973 and Vol. IV by the end of October 1973. It is regretted that faster progress could not be made as we had originally hoped for. But in view of the numerous difficulties facing the Project and also troubles in the press, it will be appreciated that the publication of four big volumes in the course of eighteen months is not very slow work.

We are happy to note that Vol. I of the Dictionary of National Biography was very well-received not only in academic circles but also among the general reading public. The demand for the DNB at pre-publication and special concessional rate has been much beyond our original expectations. It shows how eagerly the country was waiting for a publication of this kind. The references in newspapers have been on the whole highly appreciative, although

critical comments have been made in one or two papers. The critical comments, however, are not of a constructive type but reflect an unintelligent approach to the whole Project. Some of these comments have been made on the basis of individual bias and prejudices, as for example, in respect of the selection of names for the DNB, the choice of the period, the nature of arrangement etc. To these critics Dr. R. C. Majumdar in his Presidential Address at the Tenth Annual Conference has given the most effective reply. To quote from his address, "cheap criticism against it (selection of names in the DNB), which has already made its appearance, would be best met by making an open offer to the critic to prepare a new list which would be less open to criticism".

There are some funny people in India (who suffer from a pathetic complex of identifying themselves with the old British imperialists) to whom the inclusion of extremists, or 'terrorists' as they are called, is like a red rag before the bull. We only feel pity for these queer people and would just ignore their silly charges.

Then again there are people who are so much attached to their sectarian interests that they resent the slightest critical view, however just and appropriate it may be, of the life and work of one adored by their particular sect. Unfortunately, we cannot deviate from our path of true representation just to avoid wounding the susceptibilities of a bigoted few. In that way no history book can ever be written. We were no doubt quite prepared for adverse criticisms motivated by personal prejudices or sectarian loyalty. But we have the satisfaction that we firmly refused to be influenced by such pulls and pressures. We leave our work to the sober judgement of the reading public in general and we know that it will be decidedly in our favour.

Publications:

We are happy to announce that our latest publication, *Modern Bengal: A Socio-Economic Survey*, is just out. This little volume is a collec-

tion of six papers read at a Seminar at the Institute on September 12-13, 1971. The object of the Seminar was to go into the causes, the process and the extent of the modernisation of Bengal in the second half of the nineteenth century. In six papers dealing with different aspects of the subject, an attempt has been made to bring out the character of modernisation in the second half of the nineteenth century, either distinct from or as a continuation of the trends in the first half of the nineteenth century.

It is no doubt true that much of the progress made in Bengal in the second half of the nineteenth century was based on the foundation laid in the first half of the century. This is particularly true when we consider the psychological change in the people and the pattern of social behaviour. But at the same time in matters of transport and trade, industrialisation and urbanisation there is a perceptible 'divide' between the two halves of the century. The phenomenal growth of Calcutta, the introduction of railways, the development of iron, coal, jute and other industries and the expansion of the internal market—all testify to the remarkable process of change that was going on in the second half of the nineteenth century. By the end of the nineteenth century the change was quite noticeable not only from the picture a hundred years earlier but even from that in the forties of the nineteenth century. From the point reached by 1900 it was an easy process to travel further and faster during the next two decades.

The importance of the study of Bengal in the nineteenth century lies not only in the changes that came over in the limited region of later day Bengal as a linguistic province, but also in the developments that took place in the whole of North India. The study of Bengal in the nineteenth century is almost the study of North India; and in fact, many of the changes that had come about in other parts of India had originated in Bengal. To a historian of India,

therefore, Bengal in the nineteenth century offers a most fascinating study.

It is to be hoped that the six short papers

collected in this little volume will stimulate further interest in the subject and will lead to more detailed researches in the different aspects covered.

TENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE (1972)

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

DR. R. C. MAJUMDAR

After finishing my Presidential Address at the last Annual Conference at Tirupati I bade farewell to my Fellow Delegates as I did not expect to live long enough to meet them again. But God and the Director of the Institute willed otherwise. And so here am I to preside over this Conference for the second successive session. It is an arduous task for an old man who has completed eighty-four years of his life, but nevertheless I must say that I deem it a proud privilege, and thank you all for the great honour you have done me.

It may be a pure coincidence, but it seems to be very remarkable that the venues of two Annual Conferences of the Institute are holy places of pilgrimage known and revered all over India. Situated as they are almost at the two extremes of this great sub-continent, they indicate, in a way, to the students of history the nature of the great bond that united the people of India irrespective of the barriers of language and historical tradition.

But Kurukshetra, where we meet today, has a unique importance. It is not only a holy place but was once regarded as the holy of the holies and associated with a great historical event which was perhaps as great and epoch-making as the two Great World Wars of the present century. But in addition to all this, Kurukshetra has a great significance in Indian history which is not shared by any other holy place in India. It is the only *tirtha* or sacred place in India, belief in whose great sanctity was not confined to this country, but spread thousands of miles across the Bay of Bengal

to a region, north of Cambodia in Indo-China, known today as Laos—a vast inhospitable country full of hills and dense jungles, whose very name was unknown to most of us until very recent times when it has come into prominence in connection with the military campaigns of U.S.A. in Vietnam. A Sanskrit inscription of the fifth century A.D. recently discovered at Laos contains a long eulogy of Kurukshetra in twenty verses declaring it to be the best among the holy places, and adding that one who lives there lives in the paradise as it were. The inscription further records that in view of this the local ruler Maharajadhiraja Sri Devanika set up a New Kurukshetra in his domains which flourished as a place of pilgrimage fifteen hundred years ago.

It is again another coincidence that this holy place will be associated with the completion of the first great project undertaken by the Institute heralded by the publication of the First Volume of the Dictionary of National Biography, an ambitious undertaking commenced about nine years ago. It may be reasonably expected that by the time the next Annual Conference is held at least the remaining two if not all the three volumes will be before the public. Compared with other similar projects the Institute may well feel proud of this achievement, and I am sure I voice the opinions of many present here when I congratulate the Director and his colleagues and the contributors on the monumental literary work undertaken and successfully accomplished within such a short period. I take this opportunity to recall to your mind some of the salient features of the work though they are known to many present here.

It is the first attempt to place before the public a short but authentic account of the activities of individuals in various walks of life who have contributed to the growth and development of Modern India in one or more aspects which conspicuously mark the distinctive features of the New Age or Renaissance, as compared with the Medieval Age preceding it, in more or less the same sense in which the expression is used in the case of Europe. We need not enter into a hair-splitting discussion, like the logicians or *Naiyaikas* of Medieval India, as to whether the transformation in India is on all fours with that in Europe or whether the period chosen to indicate it namely 1800 to 1947, is accurate or not, either as starting or closing date. I think the period chosen is in accordance with the general view of historians and am sure that no other date would be less open to objection of one kind or other. Carping criticisms against it and others of a similar nature may be safely ignored, and we may fix our attention on the broad features of the work which may be briefly referred to as D.N.B. The individual persons whose biographies have been included number about 1400, and they represent activities in different walks of life such as political, industrial, social, religious, and economic development or contributing to the progress of art, science and literature, as well as those who have distinguished themselves in professions like law, medicine, business, etc. A proper selection of persons of such varied character, scattered over a vast country like India, is almost a super-human task, and though the list was compiled with great care and subjected to repeated scrutiny, no one could possibly claim that it is free from defects. Cheap criticism against it, which has already made its appearance, would be best met by making an open offer to the critic to prepare a new list which would be less open to criticism.

Another special feature of the work that must be emphasized is that no less than 350 different persons selected from all the parts of India were engaged in writing the biographies. One

who, like me, has the experience of editing a cooperative literary work of this kind, even with less than one-tenth of the number of contributors, can appreciate the tremendous nature of difficulties in continuing a team work of this kind over a number of years and completing it within the stipulated time. I can easily cite the names of contributors who, whenever reminded, promised to send their writing next week, but never did so even in a decade. In view of this state of things in this country the completion of the writing and editing of four big volumes within a period of three years, after the necessary preliminary work which took about six years, is a highly creditable performance.

As regards the quality of the work, time has not yet come for making a proper assessment after a minute study and careful scrutiny. In forming a proper judgment we must make due allowance for the limitations of space imposed by the very nature of the work, which necessarily gave a great deal of latitude to the individual writers to pick and choose the important points out of too many which, specially in the case of eminent individuals, are bound to thrust themselves upon one's attention; and opinions are bound to differ regarding the relative importance of the points finally selected by the contributor. Further, in some cases it was not an easy task to gather sufficient and reliable materials to form a proper judgment. These obvious difficulties are enhanced by the fact that the volumes are intended to cater to the needs not only of scholars but also of the general public and there was hardly any opportunity to discuss different points of view or support one's own view by detailed arguments for lack of space. All these points must be borne in mind before making any cheap criticism against the volume already published and the others that would follow. I naturally hesitate to express any opinion on the quality of the published volume as it contains a contribution of mine. But as it is confined to a single entry, I hope I would not be accused of self-adulation when I say that after considering the inherent difficulties mentioned above in preparing the

volume and, particularly, its undoubted claim as a pioneer work, the first impression on a fair-minded critic is likely to be highly favourable, and I for one would not hesitate to give the credit that is justly due to the Editor and the organizers.

I am happy to find that in spite of the arduous work of publishing the first volume of the D.N.B. the Institute has carried out its normal activities as usual. This will be evident from the details given in the Annual Report (1971-72) which has already been circulated. Special attention may be drawn to the two-day Seminar on the "Modernisation of Bengal in the Second Half of the 19th century", four discussion meetings based on scholarly papers on a variety of interesting subjects, and the Annual Conference in which a large number of papers were read on the two following selected themes:

1. The North and the South in Indian History : Contact and Adjustment.
2. The Sources of the History of Andhra Pradesh.

The Quarterly Journal of the Institute, as usual, contained learned articles and a great deal of useful information on the progress of historical studies in India. It is highly gratifying to know that all the four volumes were published during the year—a rare and highly creditable achievement in this country. The Institute published a book, entitled *The Sino-Indian Border Question: A Historical Review*. Another interesting Volume, entitled *Historians and Historiography in Modern India*, is in the Press and is expected to be out in December next. Two more volumes are under preparation. It is a matter of regret that the publication programme of the Institute was considerably handicapped by financial difficulties.

In my two previous Addresses as the President of the Annual Conference of this Institute I dwelt at some length on the very unsatisfactory condition of historical study and research in Independent India. I am sorry to observe that,

in spite of some individual exceptions, the general trend continues to be as bad as before, and almost every word that I uttered may be repeated today without violating truth or propriety. The adage that history repeats itself seems to be illustrated by a study of the history of historical research itself in India. In my opinion serious research in history, like all other material and cultural aspects of life in India, is passing through a great crisis due to the steady deterioration in the political, economic, social and moral condition of the Indian people. Without stressing the broader issues of which it is merely a part or symptom, I would like to draw special attention to the lamentable condition of education in general and of the historical study and research in particular. Almost all the specific evils in historical study and research to which I had referred in my two previous addresses are not only rampant but even seem to grow worse day by day. The very first principle and the fundamental basis of the study of history, namely that it is an eternal quest for truth, irrespective of all other considerations, is gradually receding into the background. How many of us, with a clean conscience, are prepared to repeat, what a great historian said after concluding his book: "I have not knowingly and without earnest investigation written anything which is not true".

History is now used more as a vehicle for supporting ideas, prejudices and prepossessions of political groups and social or religious communities. Illustrations of this meet us at almost every step, and I have referred to several instances in my previous addresses. A recent example is furnished by the great commotion and controversy in Bengal in connection with the bicentenary celebrations of Raja Rammohan Roy in the month of May of this year. The subject of dispute concerns the proper assessment of the contribution of Rammohan to the re-awakening or renaissance in Bengal in the 19th century. A small group, mainly if not wholly consisting of the members of the religious community which looks upon Rammohan as its founder, and including several professional his-

torians, attribute to Rammohan alone the creation of the modern age, and even those who do not go so far give him the sole credit for introduction of English education, initiation of social reforms, creation of Bengali prose literature and bringing about political regeneration. Though there is clear and conclusive evidence to show that so far at least as the first three are concerned Rammohan has no claim to be the pioneer as he had many predecessors, and the last claim can, at best, be regarded as only partially true, even professional historians, not to speak of ordinary persons, repeated the claims in enthusiastic language in the numerous public meetings. Only a single illustration may be cited to show how far popular traditions defy historical facts. An eminent journalist of Calcutta observed that but for Rammohan the cruel rite of *Sati*, i.e. burning the widow along with her dead husband, would not have been stopped by legislation. I pointed out that the fact is that when Lord William Bentinck decided to stop the cruel practice he consulted, among others, Rammohan Roy who gave his definite opinion against the proposed legislation. It raised a great outcry and it was alleged that I was ignorant of even well-known facts of Indian history. Though I pointed out that Bentinck himself had recorded it in the preamble to the proposed ordinance, several writers have repeated the old claim of Rammohan in the recent controversy. It is clear from the whole controversy which is still going on, that even senior teachers of history pay scant regard to historical facts established by irrefutable evidence if these go counter to their cherished beliefs or traditions.

How deep-rooted this evil is may be illustrated by another instance. A reputed journal of Calcutta, *Science and Culture*, asked a historian to contribute an article on Rammohan Roy, but he declined on the ground that his views were very different from those of some of the leading members of the Editorial Board. He was assured that they would publish two articles on this subject, representing the two different views, as befits a scientific journal whose only

object is to seek truth. The article was, however, returned to the writer with the following remark: "The Editorial Board feels that, in view of the Journal's avowed liberal stand on all questions relating to social, cultural and religious matters; it might not be appropriate for it to publish the article whose publication is likely to generate controversies".

Thus even according to a body of scientists the expression "liberal stand" means or involves the acceptance of popular views irrespective of any consideration whether they were reasonable deductions from facts or merely inherited traditions or cherished sentiments. Further, the scientists, of all persons, practically declared that controversy must be avoided at any cost even for establishing truth. I cannot regard this as anything but a direct negation of the fundamental principles of search for truth both in science and history, properly so called. Fortunately the true scientific spirit is not yet dead, as is shown by the following observation in the Scientific Journal *Man in India* with reference to the adulations of Rammohan Roy during the Bicentenary Celebrations: "The cult of *Guruvada* is one to which as a people we are unfortunately addicted. It is indeed ironical that a man who set his face against idolatry in all its forms should have been made into an idol by some of his admirers".

Enough has been said to indicate the extent of the malady that may prove fatal to the critical spirit, vital to all kinds of historical research. This makes it an imperative necessity to launch a combined, strenuous, fight against the growing evil, particularly as there are other factors contributing to it, such as the partisan or communal approach and distortion or suppression of facts on political grounds or under direct or indirect pressure of the Government to which I referred in my previous address.

These are rampant evils and I stress them again and again as I feel it to be the bounden duty of all of us never to cease fighting against

the evils threatening to lower the standard of research which we have inherited from our predecessors. This is a sacred trust imposed upon us and the Annual Conferences of histo-

rians would serve a very useful purpose by keeping it constantly before our mind. With these words I take leave of you and thank you all for the patient hearing.

TENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE (1972)

LISTS OF PAPERS

Theme : Religious Reform Movements and their Social Contents*(Ancient Period)*

BUDDHISM—Dr. G. C. Pandey (University of Rajasthan, Jaipur).

—Dr. B. N. Mukherjee (Calcutta).

JAINISM—Shri D. L. Sheth (L. D. Arts College, Ahmedabad).

SHANKARACHARYA AND THE VEDANTIST MOVEMENT—Dr. N. Subrahmanian (Madurai University).

TANTRICISM—Dr. N. N. Bhattacharyya (University of Calcutta).

(Medieval Period)

CHAITANYA AND THE GAUDIYA VAISHNAVA MOVEMENT—Dr. K. K. Das Gupta (University of Calcutta).

KABIR PANTH—Dr. R. C. Khandelwal (Kurukshetra University).

SHANKARDEV AND THE VAISHNAVA MOVEMENT IN ASSAM—Dr. M. Neog (University of Gauhati).

GURU NANAK AND SIKHISM—Dr. Ganda, Singh (Patiala).

SUFISM—Dr. Abdus Subhan (University of Calcutta).

RELIGIOUS REFORM MOVEMENT IN RAJASTHAN—Dr. G. N. Sharma (University of Rajasthan, Jaipur).

RELIGIOUS REFORM MOVEMENT IN MAHARASHTRA—Shri N. H. Kulkarnee (National Archives, New Delhi).

PRANAMI MOVEMENT IN BUNDELKHAND—Dr. Bhagwan Das Gupta (Bundelkhand Post-Graduate College, Jhansi).

RAMANUJA AND THE BHAKTI MOVEMENT IN THE SOUTH—Dr. H. V. Sreenivasa Murthy (Bangalore University).

RAMANUJA AND THE BHAKTI MOVEMENT IN ANDHRA DESA—Dr. V. Yashoda Devi (S. V. University, Tirupati).

BASAVESWARA AND VEERASAIVISM IN KARNATAKA—Dr. M. Chidananda Murthy (Bangalore University).

—Dr. K. R. Basavaraja (Karnatak University, Dharwar).

—Dr. P. Jash (Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan).

(Modern Period)

BRAHMO SAMAJ—Dr. Amitabha Mukherjee (Jadavpur University).

PRE-PRARTHANA SAMAJ RELIGIOUS REFORM MOVEMENT IN MAHARASHTRA—Dr. H. A. Phadke (Kurukshetra University).

—Dr. P. V. Ranade (Marathawada University).

PRARTHANA SAMAJ—Shri J. V. Naik (Ismail Yusuf College, Bombay).

ARYA SAMAJ—Dr. Shri Ram Sharma (Una, Himachal Pradesh).

ARYA SAMAJ MOVEMENT IN RAJASTHAN—Dr. V. K. Vashishtha (University of Rajasthan, Jaipur).

—Dr. R. K. Saxena (Kurukshetra University).

SWAMI DAYANAND AND SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN EASTERN INDIA—Dr. Sharda Devi Vedalankar (Bhagalpur University).

RAMAKRISHNA-VIVEKANANDA MOVEMENT—Dr. Pranab Ghosh (Calcutta University).

THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY—Mrs. M. P. Kamerkar (Principal, Nootan Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Bombay).

NON-BRAHMIN MOVEMENT IN SOUTH INDIA—Professor C. E. Ramachandran (University of Madras).

SRI NARAYANA DHARMA PARIPALANA YOGAM (KERALA)—Professor P. S. Velayudhan (University of Kerala).

SHRIMAN NRISINHACHARYA AND SHRI SHREYA SADHAK ADHIKARI VARGA (IN GUJARAT)—Dr. V. K. Chavda (M. S. University, Baroda).

WAHABI MOVEMENT—Dr. Qeyamuddin Ahmad (Patna University).

IMPACT OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS IN INDIA—Dr. S. Krishnaswamy (Madras Christian College).

Theme : Sources of the History of Haryana*(Ancient Period)*

—Dr. U. V. Singh (Kurukshetra University).

—Shri Suraj Bhan (Kurukshetra University).

—Dr. D. K. Ganguly (Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan).

(Medieval Period)

—Dr. S. B. P. Nigam (Kurukshetra University).

—Shri M. S. Ahluwalia (Panjabi University, Patiala).

(Modern Period)

—Dr. K. C. Yadav (Kurukshetra University).

—Dr. D. Awasthi (Kurukshetra University).

RAPORTEURS :Shri J. V. Naik
Shri N. H. Kulkarnee
Sm. S. R. Shirgaonkar

A NEW LIGHT ON THE LAHORE RESOLUTION

AMALENDU DE

(Jadavpur University)

The All India Muslim League adopted an important resolution at Lahore on 24 March 1940 on the Indian Constitutional problem. It opened a new chapter in Indian politics. Since then Congress-League rivalry gradually intensified and communal outlook vitiated the Indian political atmosphere. In the beginning M. A. Jinnah and all other Muslim League leaders referred to it as the Lahore Resolution. They did not use the word 'Pakistan'. It was clearly mentioned as Lahore Resolution in the Proceedings of the Muslim League. There is a short history of christening it with the words 'Pakistan Resolution'. The news of the adoption of the Resolution was flashed in all the Hindu and Nationalist papers under the headlines of 'Pakistan Resolution'. The Muslim League leaders stated that the Hindu Press sarcastically called the resolution as 'Pakistan Resolution' and they did it with an ulterior object. The Hindus started condemning it on the ground that it was Pakistan or the demand for a separate state. Chowdhury Khaliquzzaman wrote that "the Hindu Press had thus supplied to the Muslim masses a slogan which immediately conveyed to them the idea of a state"¹. Thus the expression became popular. Only on 25 December 1940 for the first time Jinnah mentioned it as Pakistan Resolution. He said that some sections of the Hindu Press and the British Press gave us this word and he thanked them for it. At the Delhi Session of the Muslim League, Jinnah observed thus: "Now one more thing I wish to say about Pakistan is this. There is a new propaganda. The latest argument, I think, is really very wicked, the most wicked of all. The arrangement is this: Mr. Jinnah is working for the territories in the North-West and East Zones

as 'Pak', the other being 'Na-Pak'. I have heard this from several quarters and I was thunder-struck. You know what false propaganda can do. I think you will bear me out that when we passed the Lahore Resolution we had not used the word Pakistan'. Who gave us this word? (Cries of 'Hindus'). Let me tell you, it is their fault. They started damning the resolution on the ground that it was Pakistan. They are really ignorant of the Muslim movement. They fathered this word upon us. 'Give the dog a bad name and then hang him'. You know perfectly well that Pakistan is a word which is really foisted upon us and fathered on us by some sections of the Hindu Press and also British Press. Now our resolution was known for a long time as the Lahore Resolution, popularly known as Pakistan. But how long are we to have this long phrase? Now I say to my Hindu and British friends: we thank you for giving us one word".² In this way the Lahore Resolution was transformed into Pakistan Resolution, and centering round this resolution the demand for a separate state for the Indian Muslims became loud and louder.

A. K. Fazlul Huq, Chief Minister of undivided Bengal, moved this Lahore Resolution. Many persons were amazed to see that it was moved by a non-communal and generous person like Fazlul Huq. But the question is: Do we really find any similarity in outlook between the liberal-minded genuine Bengalee Fazlul Huq and the orthodox 'protagonists of Pakistan demand? Why did Fazlul Huq raise his powerful voice against the separatist policy of the Muslim League? Even now all these questions have not been discussed in detail. We must not forget

the fact that Fazlul Huq was the first person who vigorously worked for weakening the foundation of Pakistan State which was based on religion, and he galvanized the minds of the East Bengal people by the ideal of Bengali Nationalism. Naturally without studying the role of Fazlul Huq during the period 1940-1954 it would be difficult to understand the background of later-day freedom struggle in Bangladesh.

The twenty-seventh session of the All-India Muslim League commenced at Lahore on 22 March 1940. Jinnah was in the chair. In his presidential address he had elaborately discussed the two-nation theory³. He said that the conception of one Indian nation was the cause of most of the troubles and would lead India to destruction unless it was revised in time. The history of the last twelve hundred years would show that this conception of unity of India and one nation was never achieved. Rather during these ages India was "divided into Hindu India and Moslem India". After the conquest of India, the British preserved the present artificial unity by their bayonets. But the termination of the British regime will throw the Muslims into a terrible disaster. Jinnah observed: "Surely that is not the legacy which the British would bequeath to India after 150 years of rule, nor would Hindu and Moslem India risk such a sure catastrophe". The Muslims cannot accept such a constitution in which the Hindus would enjoy the dominant position. That would be pure and simple Hindu Raj. The democratic system as enunciated by the Congress High Command would destroy the precious objects in Islam. The Muslim India had gathered enough experience from the working of provincial constitutions during the last two and a half years. So, any repetition of such a government would lead the Hindus and Muslims to a civil war⁴.

Jinnah believed that the Hindus and Muslims belonged to two different and distinct social orders and they never evolved a common nationality. He clearly stated in his address:

"The Hindus and Moslems belong to two different religious philosophies, social customs, literatures. They neither intermarry nor inter-dine together and, indeed, they belong to two different civilisations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. Their outlooks on life and of life are different. It is quite clear that Hindus and Mussalmans derive their inspiration from different sources of history. They have different epics, different heroes, and different episodes. Very often the hero of one is a foe of the other and, likewise, their victories and defeats overlap. To yoke together two such nations under a single state, one as a numerical minority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be so built up for the government of such a state."⁵

Just one month before this Presidential Address Jinnah wrote an article entitled 'Western Democracy unsuited for India' for a journal of New Delhi. This article became famous as "Jinnah's Thesis".⁶ He stated in this article that the British Parliamentary form of Government was totally unsuited to India and its imposition on India was the main cause of constitutional maladies. Jinnah wrote: "Democratic systems based on the concept of a homogeneous nation such as England are very definitely not applicable to heterogeneous countries such as India, and this simple fact is the root cause of all India's constitutional ills". Therefore, the British Government should realise that "Hinduism and Islam represent two distinct and separate civilisations and, moreover, are as distinct from one another in origin, tradition and manner of life as are the nations of Europe". He also pointed out that the Muslim League was irrevocably opposed to the scheme of Federation, because under the guise of democracy and parliamentary system of Government it would impose the rule of the majority community. So, he demanded that the British Government should review and revise the entire problem of India's future constitution and evolve such a constitution which "recognises that there are in India two nations who both

must share the governance of their common motherland". In this 'Thesis' Jinnah attacked Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress leaders and raised the cry of India-wide attack on Muslims.⁷

Thus from the long address of Jinnah at Lahore and his 'Thesis' we know that Jinnah firmly believed that the idea of one united India does not actually exist, the Hindus and Muslims constitute two separate nations and the Indian Constitutional problem cannot be solved within the scheme of a Federation. Analysing the viewpoint of the Muslim League, he said that the League had put a fivefold demand before the Viceroy. These were: (i) The Act of 1935 should be totally repealed. (ii) The Government should not frame any constitution without the consent and approval of the League. (iii) The Government should not use the Indian, particularly Muslim, troops against any Muslim country. (iv) The British Government should settle the Arab question to the satisfaction of the Arabs. (v) Adequate arrangement should be made to remove the grievances of the Muslims in Congress-governed provinces.⁸ Jinnah always asserted that the Congress was the organisation of the Hindus and the Muslim League had the sole authority to speak on behalf of the Indian Muslims. In this way Jinnah developed the two-nation theory and the Pakistan Resolution for the first time gave a concrete shape to this idea.

The Second Open Session of the League at Lahore commenced at 3 P.M. on 23 March 1940 under the presidency of Jinnah. When Fazlul Huq entered the pandal at 3-45 P.M. the entire area resounded with cheers of 'Sher-e-Bangla Zindabad' and the whole gathering stood up to welcome him⁹. Then Fazlul Huq moved the following resolution: "While approving and endorsing the action taken by the Council and the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, as indicated in their resolutions dated the 27th of August, 17th and 18th of September and 22nd of October 1939, and 3rd of February 1940 on the constitutional issue, this session of the All-India Muslim League emphatically

reiterates that the scheme of Federation embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935 totally unsuited to and unworkable in the peculiar conditions of this country and altogether unacceptable to Muslim India.

"2. It further records its emphatic view that while the declaration dated the 18th of October 1939, made by the Viceroy on behalf of His Majesty's Government, is reassuring in so far as it declares that the policy and plan on which the Government of India Act 1935 is based will be reconsidered in consultation with the various parties, interests and communities in India, Muslim India will not be satisfied unless the whole constitutional plan is reconsidered de novo, and that no revised plan would be acceptable to the Muslims unless it is framed with their approval and consent.

"3. Resolved that it is the considered view of this Session of the All-India Muslim League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to the Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic principle, viz., that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority, as in the North-Western and Eastern Zones of India, should be grouped to constitute 'Independent States' in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign: that adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards should be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in the units and in the regions for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them and in other parts of India where the Mussalmans are in a minority adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specifically provided in the constitution for them and other minorities for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them.

"This session further authorizes the Working Committee to frame a scheme of constitution in accordance with these basic principles, providing for the assumption finally by the respective regions of all powers such as defence, external affairs, communications, customs and such other matters as may be necessary".¹⁰

Moving this resolution Fazlul Huq expressed his own opinion on the constitutional problems. He observed: "We have stated definitely and unequivocally that what we want is not merely a tinkering with the idea of federation but its thorough overhauling so that the federation may ultimately go. This idea of federation must not only be postponed but abandoned altogether. On many an occasion on the platform of the Muslim League and the other day on the floor of the House in the Bengal Legislative Assembly, I made an emphatic and definite assertion that the Mussalmans of India will not consent to any such scheme which is framed without our approval. We will make such a constitution absolutely unworkable. I hope those who may have in their power to shape the future constitution of India will take the Muslim feelings into consideration and not take any step which may be regretted. We have made our position absolutely clear. The problem is very simple. At present the Muslims constitute 80 millions scattered all over India. It may sound a big number but as a matter of fact, the Muslims are in a weak position numerically in almost every province of India. In the Punjab and Bengal we are not in an effective majority and are hopelessly in a minority elsewhere. The position is such that whatever may be the constitution, Muslim interests are bound to suffer just as they have suffered during the last three years of the working of the provincial autonomy."¹¹

In the course of his speech Fazlul Huq referred to the Presidential Address delivered by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad at the All-India Session of the Indian National Congress held at Ramgarh in Bihar on 19-20 March, 1940.¹² For various reasons Azad's address was important. It pointed out an alternative course to

Muslim India. So, before dealing with the observations of Fazlul Huq on Azad's views, it would be proper for us to deal with this address. In that address Maulana Azad examined the issues connected with the Indian Muslims. He said that British Imperialism had pursued the policy of divide and rule. The seeds of disunity were sown by them and they always used communal problem as a weapon against India's national freedom.¹³ Drawing the attention of the Muslims to this important fact Maulana Azad asserted that the Muslims do not "occupy the position of a political minority" and considering the size of the Muslim population they should not be considered as "a small minority". Similarly, it would be wrong on their part to think that their rights and interests would be violated in a free and democratic India. Maulana Azad was mortified to note that the Muslims were not conscious of their true position. The situation was not studied in right perspective. So they were confused.¹⁴ Maulana Azad observed: "Politically speaking, the word minority does not mean just a group that is numerically smaller and therefore entitled to special protection. It means a group that is so small in number and so lacking in other qualities that give strength, that it has no confidence in its own capacity to protect itself from the much larger group that surrounds it. It is not enough that the group should be relatively the smaller, but that it should be absolutely so small as to be incapable of protecting its interests. Thus this is not merely a question of numbers; other factors count also. If a country has two major groups numbering a million and two millions respectively, it does not necessarily follow that because one is half the other, therefore it must call itself politically a minority and consider itself weak.

"If this is the right test, let us apply it to the position of the Muslims in India. You will see at a glance a vast concourse, spreading out all over the country; they stand erect, and to imagine that they exist helplessly as a 'minority' is to delude oneself.

"The Muslims in India number between eighty and ninety millions. The same type of social or racial divisions, which affect other communities, do not divide them. The powerful bonds of Islamic brotherhood and equality have protected them to a large extent from the weakness that flows from social divisions. It is true that they number only one-fourth of the total population; but the question is not one of population ratio, but of the large numbers and the strength behind them. Can such a vast mass of humanity have any legitimate reason for apprehension that in a free and democratic India, it might be unable to protect its rights and interests?

"These numbers are not confined to any particular area but spread out unevenly over different parts of the country. In four provinces out of eleven in India there is a Muslim majority, the other religious groups being minorities. If British Baluchistan is added, there are five provinces with Muslim majorities. Even if we are compelled at present to consider this question on a basis of religious groupings, the position of the Muslims is not that of a minority only. If they are in a minority in seven provinces, they are in a majority in five. This being so, there is absolutely no reason why they should be oppressed by the feeling of being a minority.

"Whatever may be the details of the future constitution of India, we know that it will be an all-India federation which is, in the fullest sense, democratic, and every unit of which will have autonomy in regard to internal affairs. The federal centre will be concerned only with all-India matters of common concern, such as, foreign relations, defence, customs, etc. Under these circumstances, can any one who has any conception of the actual working of a democratic constitution allow himself to be led astray by this false issue of majority and minority? I cannot believe for an instant that there can be any room whatever for these misgivings in the picture of India's future. These apprehensions are arising because, in the words of a British statesman regarding Ireland, we are yet

standing on the banks of the river and, though wishing to swim, are unwilling to enter the water. There is only one remedy; we should take the plunge fearlessly. No sooner is this done, we shall realise that all our apprehensions were without foundation."¹⁵

Thereafter, Maulana Azad called upon the Muslims to give up fear and doubt and to view the free India of the future with courage and confidence. He appealed to them not to isolate themselves from the main stream of Indian nationalism and also reminded them of the heritage of common nationalism. He also emphasised the necessity of marching side by side with the Hindus to remould India's future destiny. Maulana Azad concluded the address with the following observation: "I am a Muslim and am proud of that fact. Islam's splendid traditions of thirteen hundred years are my inheritance. I am unwilling to lose even the smallest part of this inheritance. The teaching and history of Islam, its arts and letters and civilization are my wealth and my fortune. It is my duty to protect them. As a Muslim I have a special interest in Islamic religion and culture and I cannot tolerate any interference with them. But in addition to these sentiments, I have others also which the realities and conditions of my life have forced upon me. The spirit of Islam does not come in the way of these sentiments; it guides and helps me forward. I am proud of being an Indian. I am a part of the indivisible unity that is Indian nationality. I am indispensable to this noble edifice and without me this splendid structure of India is incomplete. I am an essential element which has gone to build India. I can never surrender this claim.

"It was India's historic destiny that many human races and cultures should flow to her, finding a home in her hospitable soil, and that many a caravan should find rest here. Even before the dawn of history, these caravans trekked into India and wave after wave of newcomers followed. This vast and fertile land gave welcome to all and took them to her bosom.

One of the last of these caravans, following the footsteps of its predecessors, was that of the followers of Islam. This came here and settled here for good. This led to a meeting of the culture-currents of two different races. Like the Ganga and Jumna, they followed for a while through separate courses but nature's immutable law brought them together and joined them in a sangam. This fusion was a notable event in history. Since then, destiny, in her own hidden way, began to fashion a new India in place of the old. We brought our treasures with us, and India too was full of the riches of her own precious heritage. We gave our wealth to her and she unlocked the doors of her own treasure to us. We gave her, what she needed most, the most precious gifts from Islam's treasury, the message of democracy and human equality.

"Full eleven centuries have passed by since then. Islam has now as great a claim on the soil of India as Hinduism. If Hinduism has been the religion of the people here for several thousands of years, Islam also has been their religion for a thousand years. Just as a Hindu, we can say with equal pride that we are Indians and follow Islam. I shall enlarge this orbit still further. The Indian Christian is equally entitled to say with pride that he is an Indian and is following a religion of India, namely, Christianity.

"Eleven hundred years of common history have enriched India with our common achievements. Our languages, our poetry, our literature, our culture, our art, our dress, our manners, and customs, the innumerable happenings of our daily life, everything bears the stamp of our joint endeavour. There is indeed no aspect of our own life which has escaped this stamp. Our languages were different, but we grew to use a common language; our manners and customs were dissimilar, but they acted and reacted on each other and thus produced a new synthesis. Our old dress may be seen only in ancient pictures of by-gone days; no one wears it today. This joint wealth is the heritage of

our common nationality and we do not want to leave it and go back to the times when joint life had not begun. If there are any Hindus amongst us who desire to bring back the Hindu life of a thousand years ago and more, they dream, and such dreams are vain fantasies. So also if there are any Muslims who wish to revive their past civilisation and culture, which they brought a thousand years ago from Iran and Central Asia, they dream also and sooner they wake up the better. These are unnatural fancies which cannot take root in the soil of reality. I am one of those who believe that revival may be a necessity in a religion but in social matters it is a denial of progress.

"This thousand years of our joint life has moulded us into a common nationality. This cannot be done artificially. Nature does her fashioning through her hidden processes in the course of centuries. The cast has now been moulded and destiny has set her seal upon it. Whether we like it or not, we have now become an Indian nation, united and indivisible. No fantasy or artificial scheming to separate and divide can break this unity. We must accept the logic of fact and history and engage ourselves in the fashioning of our destiny".¹⁶

From the passages quoted here it is clear to us that the views of Maulana Azad were opposed to the views of Jinnah. Naturally, it became the target of attack by all speakers who defended the Lahore Resolution on 23-24 March 1940. Fazlul Huq as mover of this Resolution did not attack the main theme of Azad's address, i.e. the question of 'common nationality'. He only characterised that portion of Azad's address as 'Un-Islamic' where Azad said "Muslims should not feel nervous; eighty millions was not a small number", and that Fazlul Huq did only to point out the precarious constitutional position of the Muslims as a minority. Fazlul Huq observed, "Eighty millions was not a small number and they need not be afraid. Even if a sufficient portion of 80 millions had been congregated in one province we would have nothing to fear. Situated as we are, our political enemy can

take advantage of the situation. Our friends will remember that even in the Punjab and Bengal our position is not very safe. In the legislatures we are not in such a large majority; we have to seek the help of other interests and minorities to form coalition governments which are the weakest form of governments known to constitutionalists. As regards the other provinces we are in a very weak position and are at the mercy of the majority. Until a satisfactory solution is found of this unequal distribution of Muslim population it is useless to talk of constitutional advance or of safeguards.

"I earnestly appeal to my Muslim friends throughout India to remain united and exercise calm and sober judgement and remember that we have to stand on our own feet and cannot rely on anybody. It is a case of everyone for himself and no one for the Muslims of India". Finally, he "appealed to the audience to accept his motion and hoped the result would be good".¹⁷

Being advised by Jinnah, Choudhury Khaliquzzaman seconded the Lahore Resolution. Thereafter, Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, M.L.A. (Central), Sardar Aurangzeb Khan, leader of the opposition in the Frontier Assembly, and Sir Abdulla Haroon, M.L.A. (Central), spoke in support of it. Khaliquzzaman said that the circumstances had forced the Muslims to demand separation. For this, he accused the British Government, the Congress and the majority community. The Muslims gathered bitter experience from the actual working of the provincial part of the Act of 1935 in Congress provinces during the last three years. The treatment of the minority at the hands of the majority in these provinces helped the Muslims to realise the fact that their existence was in danger and for the maintenance of their identity they would have to struggle hard. He criticised Maulana Azad for advising the Muslims not to demand separation and Khaliquzzaman considered it as a betrayal to the Muslim cause in India. At the end of his speech Khaliquzzaman commented: "The responsibility of those Mus-

lims who had damaged Muslim rights in 'India was great, for they were not only betraying the present generation, but the future generations also. If the Congress continued to act on the advice of Muslim Congressmen there was sure to be a civil war in India'.¹⁸

Maulana Zafar said that Congress wanted to suppress the minorities. Sardar Aurangzeb Khan demanded a separate home for the Muslim nation and opposed the imposition of British democracy. Sir Abdulla Haroon referred to the fact that the Muslims entered India through Sind and the Muslims of this province were the first to raise the question of a separate state for the Muslims in 1938. Referring to that event Sir Abdulla Haroon "warned the Hindus that if the Muslims in Hindu provinces were not justly treated, the Hindus in the Muslim provinces would be treated in the same way in which Herr Hitler had treated the Sudetens".¹⁹

On 24 March 1940 several speakers also addressed the gathering in support of the Resolution. K. B. Nawab Mohd. Ismail Khan (Bihar) said that in his province the Mussalmans were deprived of the freedom of speech and he was happy to note that this session was being held in a 'free land'. He congratulated the Muslims of majority provinces for supporting the cause of the Muslims of minority provinces. He told the Congress that "Maulana Azad's voice was not the voice of the Muslims but that Mr. Jinnah truly reflected Muslim opinion in India". Similar statements were made by Mohd. Isa Khan (Baluchistan), Abdul Hamid Khan (Madras), Ismail Chundrigar (Bombay), Syed Abdul Rouf Shah (C.P.), Dr. Mohd. Alam, M.L.A. (Punjab), Syed Zakir Ali and Begum Muhammad Ali. The resolution moved by Fazlul Huq was passed by a show of hands on 24 March.²⁰

If we analyse the views expressed by different Muslim League leaders we shall find that the thought and approach of Fazlul Huq to the basic problems were quite different from that of Jinnah and his followers. There was, however,

a similarity among them in one point, i.e. all of them demanded a separate land for the Muslims. According to Fazlul Huq, the position of the Muslims in India was very weak. Even in the majority provinces their condition was not good, because there they had no effective majority. So there they could not assert their rights. If a sufficient portion of 80 million Muslims could live together in one province they would have nothing to fear. But the Muslims were distributed in an uneven manner in different parts of the country. Under the circumstances a satisfactory solution of this problem was urgently felt. Before that it was useless to talk of constitutional advance or of safeguards. In the light of this he had examined the views of Maulana Azad. It is clear from the speech of Fazlul Huq that like Jinnah he did not preach the two-nation theory. He did not attach importance to the separate identity of the Hindus and the Muslims. Nor did he explain the historical events from the communal standpoint. In fact he did not accept Jinnah's interpretation of Indian history. Moreover, the views of Jinnah on western democracy were not acceptable to him. Fazlul Huq felt the necessity of establishing a separate state only for the development of the Muslim Community without, of course, violating the rights and interests of the minorities. At the same time he was aware of the fact that too much centralisation of powers at the centre would deprive the constituent units of their natural rights. So, he put stress on 'autonomy' and 'sovereignty' of the units. There was no doubt that at that time Fazlul Huq could not realize the pernicious effect of this Resolution.

Jinnah and other Muslim League leaders were quite unaware of the defects of the Lahore Resolution when they finally adopted it on 24 March 1940. In this Resolution the words 'independent states', 'sovereignty' and 'autonomy' were used in such a manner that it would be difficult for a person to get the actual meaning of these words. It was mentioned in Section 3 of the Lahore Resolution that "the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a major-

ity, as in the north-western and eastern zones of India, should be grouped to constitute 'independent states' in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign". But it was not clearly defined whether these states would remain separately as independent sovereign states or would remain under one Federal or Unitary form of State. On the whole, we do not get any idea about the formation of a Federation or a Confederation with these states. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar thoroughly studied this problem and expressed opinion on it in his famous work 'Pakistan or the Partition of India', which was published immediately after the adoption of the Lahore Resolution, from Bombay in 1940. Jinnah expressed satisfaction after reading this book and certified it as authentic. Naturally we can attach importance to this book. Dr. Ambedkar wrote: "what does this Resolution contemplate? A reference to para 3 of the Resolution will show that the Resolution contemplates that the areas in which Muslims predominate shall be incorporated into independent states. In concrete terms, it means that the Punjab, the North-Western Frontier Province, Baluchistan and Sind in the North-West and Bengal in the East instead of remaining as the provinces of British India shall be incorporated as independent states outside of British India. This is the sum and substance of the Resolution of the Muslim League.

"Does the Resolution contemplate that these Muslim provinces, after being incorporated into states, will remain each an independent sovereign state or will they be joined together into one constitution as members of a single state, federal or unitary? On this point, the Resolution is rather ambiguous, if not self-contradictory. It speaks of grouping the zones into 'Independent states in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign'. The use of the terms 'Constituent units' indicates that what is contemplated is a Federation. If that is so, then, the use of the word 'Sovereign' as an attribute of the units is out of place. Federation of units and sovereignty of units are

contradictions. It may be that what is contemplated is a confederation. It is, however, not very material for the moment whether these Independent states are to form into a federation or confederation. What is important is the basic demand, namely, that these areas are to be separated from India and formed into independent states."²¹

It may be mentioned here that even after the publication of Dr. Ambedkar's book Jinnah took no initiative to remove the defects of the Resolution. In fact nobody raised any question. Referring to that section of the Resolution Professor R. Coupland observed: "It was not clear exactly what this paragraph of the Resolution meant. It could scarcely mean that the constituent units of the independent states were really to be 'Sovereign', but that it did mean that the States were to be really 'independent' was shown by a subsequent paragraph."²² The expression 'States' (in plural) was for the first time subjected to analysis and critical discussions only at the Delhi Convention of the Muslim League held in April 1946. Khaliqzaman wrote that Mr. Abul Hashim, Secretary, Bengal Provincial Muslim League, demanded clarification of the word 'States'.²³ Jinnah replied that for printing mistake the word 'States' was included in the Resolution. Actually it would be 'State' in place of 'States'. In a resolution adopted at the Delhi Convention it was stated that "Pakistan will be a sovereign independent state". So, for the first time in April 1946 this Resolution replaced the word 'States' from the original Lahore Resolution of March 1940. M. A. H. Ispahani discussed this particular event in his book. He wrote: "Those who are alive today and were members of the Subjects Committee which was entrusted with the responsibility of drafting the main Resolution (9th and 10th April, 1946) and Mr. K. H. Khurshid, who was Secretary to the Qaid-e-Azam at the time, well remember that someone pointed out that the word 'State' would be inconsistent with the Lahore Resolution of 1940 which clearly mentioned the word 'States'. The Qaid-e-Azam said that the word 'States'

was a mistake and had cropped up probably as a result of a typographical error. It was then stated that even the published records of the central office of the All-India Muslim League carried the word in plural. The Qaid-e-Azam replied what really mattered was the intention and not the word. In fact, he directed that the records be rectified. Thus, this minor controversy on the words 'State' and 'States' was put to rest by him".²⁴ Ispahani hoped that this clarification would silence the voices of those who were supporting the demand for separate states and a loose confederation.²⁵

Can we accept this clarification of Jinnah as authentic? No. From the Proceedings of the Muslim League we get no clue in support of Jinnah's statement. Even at the annual session of the All-India Muslim League at Madras in April 1941, the Lahore Resolution was accepted as the main creed of the League and the word 'States' was kept intact in a Resolution adopted there. The Madras Resolution declared: "The North-Western and Eastern Zones of India shall be grouped together to constitute independent states as Muslim Free National Homelands in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign."²⁶ Here we find the word 'together' was added after the word 'grouped'. In the original Lahore Resolution the word 'together' was absent. But the authors of the Madras Resolution did not replace the word 'States'. Should we consider it a printing mistake? Ispahani and other supporters of Jinnah forgot to mention it. Again, in September 1944, Mahatma Gandhi raised this question and requested Jinnah to clarify the words 'independent states'. But Jinnah did not explain it and also he did not point out the fact that these words were included in the Lahore Resolution due to a printing mistake.²⁷

Perhaps only in 1946 Jinnah realized the importance of the word 'States', when a prominent leader of the Bengal Muslim League raised this question and an authoritative interpretation of the word 'States' was demanded by several members. It is significant to note that the

question was raised by a Bengalee. Jinnah could sense danger in it. He thought that in future taking the thread from the word 'States' any unit might go out of the orbit of Pakistan and declare its independence. Only to arrest the progress of this tendency Jinnah said that because of a printing mistake the word 'States' was included and by a resolution at the Delhi Convention in that year he corrected it by placing the word 'State'. Nevertheless, this change could not solve the problem. A section of Bengal's Muslim League considered the original Lahore Resolution acceptable to them. But in Bengal the followers of Jinnah were more powerful and they remained faithful to the amendment of the original resolution adopted at the Delhi Convention in 1946. Thus centering round the Lahore resolution a new trend developed in Muslim League politics of Bengal. But on the eve of the partition of India and Bengal this controversy could not disrupt the organisational pattern of the League. Because all sections of the League were, on the whole, moving in the same direction. Their sole aim was to realize a separate homeland for the Muslims. It should be noted that the Governor General of India issued Ten Orders on 15 August, 1947. In one of which he referred to the Pakistan state as a 'Federation'.²⁸

Anyway, after the establishment of Pakistan state controversy on the original Lahore Resolution and its amendment at Delhi in 1946 started. Referring to the original Lahore Resolution, several political parties of Pakistan demanded full autonomy for different national groups of Pakistan. The recent six point programme and the manifesto of the Awami League demanded it. It was declared in the Manifesto of the Awami League that "Pakistan shall be a Federation granting full autonomy on the basis of six-point formula to each of the federating units".²⁹ Sheikh Mujibar Rahman analysed in detail the six-point programme of the Awami League in a pamphlet entitled 'Awami League Chai Dafa Karma Suchi O Tar Byakhya' and demanded that on the basis of the historic Lahore Resolution a new consti-

tution with all the features of a real federation should be framed for Pakistan.³⁰ Similarly, National Awami Party leader Maulana Abdul Hamid Khan Bhasani demanded on the basis of the Lahore Resolution full autonomy for East Pakistan. He defended this policy in two pamphlets published in 1962 and 1964 respectively.³¹ The Communist Party of East Pakistan and other left parties also organized movement in support of this demand. Lieutenant Commander Moazzem Hussain, no. 2 convict of the Agartala Conspiracy case, founded a new party in East Pakistan known as 'Lahore Prastab Bastabayan Committee' in 1969. The object of this committee was to achieve political rights for the people of East Pakistan on the basis of the original Lahore Resolution.³²

Now the main question before us is : Was Fazlul Huq the author of this Resolution? A. S. M. Abdul Rab in his work 'A. K. Fazlul Huq (Life and Achievements)' observed that Fazlul Huq was the author of it.³³ In defence of this statement he reproduced a letter in his book written by Fazlul Huq on 13 October 1945 to Muhammad Shahjehan, an Honours student of the Aligarh Muslim University, in which he claimed that he himself had composed the Resolution.³⁴ He wrote : "As regards Pakistan, I stand by the Resolution whose wording I drafted and which I moved in the Lahore Session of the Muslim League and which is now the basis of the Pakistan demand".³⁵ This claim would certainly confuse those persons who are familiar with the Family Papers of Fazlul Huq and the available official and non-official papers. It is found that from March 1940 to September 1945 he never claimed that he was the author of the Resolution. Even he did not mention this fact to his close associates. Excepting this letter we have no other documents to justify it. It may be mentioned here that at the last phase of Huq-Jinnah rivalry many persons requested Fazlul Huq to rejoin the Muslim League. Several persons put pressure on him. Muhammad Shahjehan of the Aligarh Muslim University also wrote a letter to Fazlul Huq with this request. Fazlul Huq gave a reply

to that on 13 October 1945. In this letter he discussed in detail his attitude towards Jinnah and the Muslim League and his services to the Muslim community. Thus Fazlul Huq had to explain his position when he received requests from different quarters for rejoining the League. He said that the doors of the League were barred against him because of the revengeful and vindictive attitude of Jinnah. So they should write to Jinnah for the withdrawal of expulsion order on him. He had not only criticized Jinnah, but also exposed the conspiratorial activities of Suhrawardy and Nazimuddin, and the selfish purposes of other persons for joining the League. He was quite sure that they had not entered the League for rendering any service to Islam. In this connection Fazlul Huq also reminded them of his services to the Muslim community.³⁶ Perhaps, for attaching due importance to his contributions to the advancement of the Muslim community he had claimed that he was not only the mover of the Lahore Resolution, but had also drafted it. So, the main credit for defending Muslim interests through this Resolution should go to him, not to Jinnah. Fazlul Huq made this comment at a time when he was almost isolated from the main currents of Muslim politics and the Muslim League under the efficient guidance of Jinnah organized the Muslim masses behind the demand for Pakistan. Just at this moment Fazlul Huq made a feeble attempt to re-establish himself in Muslim politics by pointing out that he had an important role in this achievement.

But Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada, Ex-Foreign Minister of Pakistan, referred to the observation of Abdul Rab and commented: "No corroboration is available of these claims. From the reports it appears that Mr. Huq arrived in the meeting from Calcutta when the draft resolution was under discussion. He, therefore, could not have a hand in its drafting".³⁷ Just before the session of the All-India Muslim League at Lahore on 21 March 1940, the Working Committee of the League had formed a committee with Jinnah and Sir Sikander Hyat Khan as its members to draft a resolution on the

Indian Constitutional problem. Sir Abdullah Haroon claimed that he had drafted a resolution and submitted it to Jinnah on 11 February 1940, and on the basis of his draft the Lahore Resolution was composed. On the other hand, Sir Sikander claimed that he had composed the draft and the Working Committee gave a final shape to that. He wrote: "I have no hesitation in admitting that I was responsible for drafting the original resolution. But let me make it clear that the resolution which I drafted was radically amended by the Working Committee, and there is a wide divergence in the resolution I drafted and the one that was finally passed. The main difference between the two resolutions is that the latter part of my resolution which related to the centre and co-ordination of the activities of the various units, was eliminated".³⁸

It was reported that Liaquat Ali Khan placed the draft of the main resolution written in English before a meeting of the Subjects Committee held on 22 March at about 8 P.M. Maulana Zafar Ali Khan translated it into Urdu and that was also circulated among the members. The meeting was adjourned to the next day for giving time to the members to consider the resolution. On 23 March at 11 A.M. the meeting resumed and the discussion continued for a long time. The resolution, with some alterations, was adopted. Pirzada stated that Fazlul Huq reached Lahore from Calcutta 'when the draft resolution was under discussion' and therefore, he had no hand in composing it.

It is difficult to say anything from the Proceedings of the Muslim League whether Fazlul Huq was present at the meeting of the Subjects' Committee or not. If he was present, did he express his opinion on it? Perhaps, Fazlul Huq arrived at the end of the meeting and took part in giving a final touch to the Resolution by changing words here and there or by moving minor amendments. For this reason afterwards he claimed that he was the author of the Resolution. Though facts are not available, yet we

can form an idea about the decisive factor behind the Resolution. It is known that the Resolution could be placed before the All-India Session of the Muslim League with the approval of Jinnah. Besides that, as a member of the Committee Jinnah was actively associated with the drafting of the Resolution. There was no doubt that the final shape to it was given with his advice and consent. In order to strengthen his position in the north-eastern parts of India, particularly in Bengal, and considering the necessity of mobilising the Muslims of this region behind the demand for Pakistan, Jinnah thought it wise to move it by an influential Bengali leader like Fazlul Huq. Simple-minded Fazlul Huq was not aware of Jinnah's trickery.³⁹ In spite of that it was not possible to conceal the fact that both of them approached the problems from different angles. Another important feature of the separatist movement was ignored by

scholars and politicians. It is worthy of note that all the propounders of the schemes for a separate homeland for Muslims belonged to the north-western areas of India, the United Provinces and Hyderabad. None of them had any serious discussion with Fazlul Huq on this matter. Nor did Fazlul Huq or any other Bengalee take any initiative to prepare such a scheme. Indeed, they gave no currency to the concept of separatism. This idea was mainly propounded by non-Bengali Muslim theoreticians. The Bengal Provincial Muslim League began to mobilise the Muslim masses in support of Pakistan only after the adoption of the Lahore Resolution, not before that. Thus the concept of separatism originated and reared up in non-Bengali quarters outside Bengal and they successfully imposed it on the Bengali Muslims after isolating the great Bengali leader Fazlul Huq from the Muslim masses.

REFERENCES

1. Khaliqzaman, Ghoudhury, *Pathway to Pakistan*, Lahore, 1961, P. 237.
2. Pirzada, S. S., *The Pakistan Resolution and the Historic Lahore Session*, Karachi, 1968, PP. 17-18.
3. Presidential Address of M. A. Jinnah at the All-India Muslim League, Lahore Session, March, 1940. Vide Ahmad, Jamil-ud-din (collected and edited), *Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah*, 6th edition, Lahore, March, 1960, Vol. I (1935-44), PP. 143-163.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Time and Tide, 13 February, 1940.
7. Ibid.
8. Mitra, N. N., *The Indian Annual Register*, Calcutta, 1940, V. I, PP. 305-306.
9. Ibid. P. 311.
10. Resolution on Pakistan, File No. F. 163/40-R. A big file on this subject is preserved in the National Archives of India, New Delhi. (I am grateful to the Director of the National Archives of India for allowing me to consult this file).
11. Ibid; vide also Mitra, *Annual Register*, 1940, V.I.P. 312.
12. Presidential address delivered by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad at the All-India National Congress, Ramgarh Session, March 1940. Vide Mitra, *Annual Register*, 1940, V.I., PP. 286-300.
13. Ibid, PP. 295-297.
14. Ibid, P. 297.
15. Ibid, PP. 297-298.
16. Ibid, PP. 299-300.
17. Ibid, PP. 312-313; File No. F. 163/40-R.
18. Ibid, P. 313; Ibid.
19. Ibid; Ibid.
20. Ibid, PP. 313-314.
21. Ambedkar, Dr. B. R., *Pakistan or the Partition of India*, 3rd ed., Bombay, 1946, PP. 4-5.
22. Coupland, R., *The Constitutional Problem in India*, Oxford University Press, January 1945, Pt. II, Chapter, XVII, P. 206.
23. Khaliqzaman, *Pathway to Pakistan*, P. 344.
24. Ispahani, M. A. H., *Qaid-e-Azam Jinnah, As I Knew Him*, Karachi, 1966, P. 159.
25. Ibid, vide footnote.
26. Pirzada, *Pakistan Resolution*, PP. 27 and 64.
27. Ibid. PP. 22-26.
28. The Statesman, 19 August, 1947.
29. 'The Challenge', A manifesto published by the Awami League, reprinted in the 'Nabajatak', edited by Maitreyi Devi, Bangla Desh Sankhya, Saptam Barsha, Pancham Sankhya, 1377 B. S., PP. 223-244; vide also Bangla Desh Documents, published by the Government of India, New Delhi, 1971, P. 166.
30. Rahman, Sheikh Mujibar, *Awami League Chai Dafa Karmasuchi O Tar Byakhya*. Reprinted in Calcutta 1971, PP. 3-48 (In Bengali).
31. Bhasani, Maulana Abdul Hamid Khan, *Dasher Samasya O Samadhan* (Dacca, 1962, PP. 1-48) and *Ekmatra Samajtantra Kaemer Madhyame Desher Sakal Samasyar Susthu Samadhan Sambhab* (Ghosanapatra 1, Dacca, 1964, PP. 1-6). (In Bengali).
32. Lahore Prastab Bastabayan Committee: *Ki O Kena?* Published by Prochar Sampadak, Dacca, 1970, PP. 1-30 (In Bengali).
33. Abdur Rab, A. S. M., *A. K. Fazlul Huq (Life and Achievements)*, Barisal, 1966, P. 101.
34. Ibid., PP. 159-161.
35. Ibid., P. 161.
36. Ibid., PP. 159-161. Fazlul Huq had referred to Abdul Qaiyum, Mian Itikharuddin and Sir Feroz Khan Noon, who had joined the League for selfish purposes (vide Ibid, PP. 160-161).

37. Pirzada, *Pakistan Resolution*, P. 14.

38. Ibid, P. 13.

39. Interview with Khan Bahadur A. H. M. Wazir Ali, I.A.S. (Retd.) and Late Khan Bahadur A. N. M. Yusuf Ali, Ex-Registrar of Assurances, Govt. of West

Bengal. They were Fazlul Huq's own nephews. Besides Wazir Ali was his son-in-law. Fazlul Huq discussed important matters with them. Yusuf Ali was one of the closest advisers of Fazlul Huq. Both of them supplied me valuable information.

BUDDHISM AND OTHER RELIGIONS IN MALWA

S. M. PAHADIYA

(University of Ujjain)

The sixth century B.C. was an age of far-reaching religious reforming activity over the whole of the Ancient World. As in the period of the Philosophers¹ in China, and in the Age of the Sophists in Greece, there was a remarkable intellectual and religious ferment in India in this period. Consequently, there took place a reaction against orthodoxy. In the main, there arose six heretical sects² headed by Purana Kassapa, Makkhali Gosala, Ajita Kesakambali, Pakudha Kachchayana, Sanjaya Belatthiputta, and Nigantha Nataputta. Buddhism, which in many ways carried the revolt to its logical conclusion, surpassed them all.

Buddhism, however, did not exist in isolation, but flourished along with other religions. In Malwa, and its neighbourhood, we have several instances of the existence of Buddhism, Jainism, Vaishnavism, and Saivism in unison. The co-existence of these religions shows the spirit of co-operation and tolerance among their followers.

Under the Pradyotas and the Mauryas (600 B.C.—187 B.C.)

In the time of the Pradyotas, Buddhism, flourished in Ujjayini. Besides, there existed Jainism and Saivism also, as is evident from the traditions. Traditionally, it is believed that the Jaina *tirthankara* Mahavira performed his penances at Ujjayini³, and that Pradyota installed images of Mahavira there, and also at Vidisa and Dasapura. The existence of Saivism also at Ujjayini becomes clear from the traditions which tell us that Pradyota's younger brother Kumarasena was killed in his attempt to put an end to the evil practice of selling human flesh in the Mahakala temple at Ujjayini. But, the

traditions are often found to be farfetched, and hence we cannot and should not solely rely on them.

Under the Mauryas, Buddhism was popularized at Sanchi. Along with Buddhism, there existed the cult of Yaksha and Yakshi also, as is clear from a number of sculptures.

At Vidisa, which is in close vicinity of Sanchi, there prevailed Jainism in accordance with the traditions which speak of the liberation of Vajraswamin and other Jaina pontiffs at the hills Kunjaravata and Rathavarta in its neighbourhood.⁴ But, these traditions too seem to be far from being historical facts.

At Ujjayini also there prevailed Jainism and Saivism along with Buddhism. It is believed that Asoka's grandfather Chandragupta Maurya was initiated into a Jaina monk at Ujjayini⁵. Samprati, the grandson of Asoka, is also supposed to have patronized Jainism owing to the influence of a Jaina saint Arya Suhasti at Ujjayini.⁶ Some Ujjayini coins, which represent Siva anthropomorphically as well as symbolically, speak of the prevalence of Saivism there.⁷

Under the Sungas, the Satavahanas, and the Western Kshatrapas (186 B.C.—318 A.D.)

During the Sunga-Satavahana period there prevailed Vaishnavism, Saivism, Puranic worship, and the cults of Naga and Yaksha at Sanchi along with Buddhism, as evidenced by some of the votive inscriptions.⁸

Besnagar was a centre of Buddhism, but other

religions also prevailed there. The Besnagar inscription⁹ of the last quarter of the second century B.C. refers to *garuda dhvaja* raised in honour of Vasudeva by a Greek devotee Heliodorus, an inhabitant of Takshasila in Gandhara. Another inscription¹⁰ of the same period at the same place also speaks of the erection of the Garuda column of an excellent temple of the Bhagavat (Vasudeva) by Gautamiputra. The existence of the cults of *Naga-Nagis*, *Yaksha-Yakshi* becomes clear from a number of statues found there.

From the traditions recorded in the Jaina *Nibandhas*, we know that Kalkacharya, a great Jaina saint, propagated Jainism in the area round about Ujjayini. Even Vikramaditya¹¹ is known to have been a convert to Jainism¹². From the *Mahabharata*¹³, which refers to Kotitirtha Mahakala and Bhadravata as sacred sites of Ujjayini, we come to know of the prevalence of Saivism there.

Madhyamika (known as Nagari), situated near Chitor in the neighbourhood of Malwa, was another centre where Buddhism existed along with other religions. From the remains of a Buddhist stupa, we know of the existence of Buddhism at Madhyamika. Jainism also prevailed there. The Majamika branch of Jaina church organization (as mentioned in Sthiravali of the Kalpasutra), founded by Priyagrantha probably in the second century B.C., becomes famous after the name of this place¹⁴. There prevailed Vaishnavism also, as is evident from the Ghosundi inscription¹⁵ of the second or first century B.C. We also know that precisely about the same time, Gajayana Sarvatata performed Asvamedha at Madhyamika.¹⁶ This shows the revival of Vedic religion. Patanjali's *Mahabhashya*¹⁷ and Kalidasa's *Malavikagnimitra*¹⁸ also refer to the resuscitation of Vedic sacrifices.

During the Western Kshatrapa period, Sanchi continued to be a Buddhist centre. At Vidisa, there prevailed Vedic religion, as is evident from the remains of *Yainakundas* or sacrificial

pits of the second or third century A.D. From the discovery of the images¹⁹ of Yakshas and Nagas there, the existence of the cult of Yaksha and Naga becomes evident. At Pawaya, there existed Vaishnavism and Saivism, as is clear from the coins and monuments found there.

Under the Guptas (319 A.D.—700 A.D.)

During the Gupta period also, Buddhism existed along with other religions in Malwa. At Sanchi, Buddhism continued to exist. Round about this area, there existed other religions. The discovery of the three Jaina images²⁰ made by Maharajadhiraja Ramagupta in the fourth-fifth century A.D. at Vidisa shows the prevalence of Jainism. The existence of Jainism in this area is evident from the Udaygiri inscription²¹ of 425-26 A.D. Another inscription from the same place of Sambhu or Saba, minister of peace and war of Chandragupta II, and a *Siva-linga* in one of the caves show the existence of Saivism. The images of Mahishasuramardini and Saptamatrikas have also been found there. This shows the prevalence of the cults of Durga and Saptamatrikas or rather the practice of Sakti worship. The existence of the worship of Ganesa there becomes clear from an image of him found in cave No. 8. The famous images of Varaha and Seshasayi Vishnu hint at the prevalence of Vaishnavism.

The existence of Vaishnavism during this period in the area round about Sanchi becomes evident from a number of inscriptions²². From the discovery of two images of Ganga (standing on Makara) at Vidisa, it becomes clear that there was in prevalence the worship of Ganga. The images of Ganga-Yamuna have been found at Udaygiri also.

At Ujjayini also there prevailed other religions with Buddhism. From the *Padma-prabhritakam* and *Padataditakam*²³, we know of the existence of Vaishnavism. The *Meghaduta*²⁴ alludes to the prevalence of Saivism. There was in existence the Purnabhadra Sringataka chaitya²⁵. This shows that the *chaitya* worship was prevalent

among the people of Ujjayini. From the *Mrichchhakatika*²⁶ we know of the existence of Sun-worship, and the Puranic form of Brahmanism.

Mandsor was another centre where Sun-worship, and Saivism prevailed along with Buddhism. The existence of Sun-worship becomes evident from an inscription²⁷ which tells us that the guild of the silk-weavers that migrated from Lata built the temple of Sun in V.S. 493 (437-38 A.D.). One inscription²⁸ from Gwalior also throws light on the practice of Sun-worship. From Yasodharman's inscription²⁹, we know of the existence of Saivism at Mandsor. A large and imposing sculpture of Siva³⁰ too has been found there.

At Bagh also, Buddhism existed along with some minor cults of Naga and Yaksha, as is known from a number of sculptures³¹.

During the Early Medieval Period (701—1305 A.D.)

During the early medieval period, Buddhism continued to co-exist with other religions. A number of monasteries, temples and images of this period found at Sanchi show the continuance of Buddhism there. Buddhism existed at Bhojpur, as is evident from an inscription on the image of Buddha. Gyaraspur was another place where Buddhism was extant. Jainism was also practised there, for we have Jaina idols of this period³². Two temples there, one Vaishnavite and another Saivite, prove the existence of Vaishnavism and Saivism. The worship of Maladevi, Bhairava and Ganesa at Gyaraspur becomes evident from the monument and the images³³. The ruins of the temple called Bajramatha show the popularity of Sun-worship.

That the worship of Surya was in existence in the neighbouring area becomes evident from a temple just close to the Udayesvara temple at Udaypur (where Saiva and Vaishnava temples also exist, and in the side of an adjoining hill,

there exists a panel of Saptamatrikas also)³⁴, and also the Bhailsvamin temple at Vidisa.

Side by side Buddhism, Jainism also prospered at Ujjayini during this period. Sarasvatigachha, and Balatakaragana of the Mulasamgha of Jainism originated here³⁵. Many Jaina pontiffs of the Mulasamgha resided at Ujjayini³⁶. In the thirteenth century, there existed a Jaina monastery the head of which was Devadhara³⁷. From the copper plates³⁸ of Vakpati II found at Ujjayini, the existence of Saivism also becomes clear. The Paramara ruler Dhanika of Arthuna is known to have built the temple of Dhanesvara near Mahakala³⁹. Ujjayini was a seat of the Kapalikas also who seem to have worshipped Bhairava⁴⁰. The Mattamayura sect of Saivism also flourished there. One Rudrasiva of this sect is known to have adorned the place Amardaka for a long time; and this Amardaka is identified with Ujjayini⁴¹. It is also believed that the Adi Sankaracharya vanquished in argument a Pasupatacharya⁴². There was also, a reputed Saiva monastery, called Chandikashrama⁴³ where the following *acharyas* successively assumed the headship: Tapasa, Vaklavasi, Jyeshtharasi, Yogesvararasi, Maunirasi, Yogesvari (a woman), Durvasarasi, and Kedararasi. From the *Skandapurana*, we know that Devi Vindyaivasini (i.e. Durga) resided at Avanti. This shows the existence of the worship of Durga.

Brahmanical religion prevailed at Dhara (Dhar) also. From the *Navasahasanka charita*⁴⁴, we know that Sindhuraja established a Sivalinga there at Dhara. The worship of Sakti and Saraswati was also popular, as is evident from the images found there.

Jainism also existed at Dhara. Several scholars like Devasena⁴⁵, Samudravijaya⁴⁶, Jinavallabhasuri⁴⁷, Jinapatisuri⁴⁸, Manikyanandi⁴⁹, Sri-chandra⁵⁰, Prabhachandra⁵¹, Ashadhara⁵² etc. lived at Dhara. Badwani was another important centre of Jainism. The Jaina holy place of Bavanagaja named after the big image at Badwani is quite well-known. The existence of

Jainism at Un near Badwani is evident from the Jaina temples, and two inscriptions of Udyaditya, and a Sarpabandhu inscription of Naravarman⁵³. The temples of Mahakalesvara, Vallesvara, Nilakanthesvara, and a small temple of Siva at Un prove the existence of Saivism⁵⁴. In the niches and on the doorframes of some of these temples, there are images of Ganesa, Brahma and Saptamatrikas⁵⁵. This shows that these deities were worshipped by the people there. At Mandu, the worship of Saraswati was popular, as is evident from an inscription⁵⁶ found there.

At Dhamnar, Buddhism existed along with other religions. The Dharmanatha temple⁵⁷ containing an image of four-armed Vishnu shows the existence of Vaishnavism. The existence of Saivism becomes clear from the presence of a *linga* in the shrine of the temple. In its neighbourhood, Jainism prevailed, as is clear from the testimony of Jinaprabhasuri who mentions Dasapura as one of the holy places of Jainism.

Shergarh was another important place where traces of the co-existence of Buddhism, Jainism and Brahmanical religions are found. The existence of Jainism becomes evident from an inscription⁵⁸ of 1134 A.D. which records how a great festival of the Jaina *tirthankara* Neminatha was celebrated at the new *chaitya* during the reign of Naravarman. Devapala is also known to have performed the installation ceremony of the images of Jaina *tirthankaras* Santinatha, Kunthalanatha and Arhanatha, in association with his son, parents, and *goshthis* at Kosavardhana (mod. Shergarh). From many Saiva images, and an inscription⁵⁹ of Udyaditya, we know of the existence of Saivism. Bhattaraka Naganaka⁶⁰ of Pasupata sect also lived there. In its neighbouring area also Saivism and Jainism existed, as is evident from the Jhalara-patana stone inscription of V.S. 1143 (1086 A.D.).

That was how Buddhism existed along with other religions all through the ages till at last it died out.

REFERENCES

1. Cf. Fung Yu—Lan: *A History of Chinese Philosophy*, p. XVII.
2. SBE., XII, p. 93; CHI., p. 150; A. L. Basham : *History and Doctrines of the Ajivikas*, pp. 10-11.
3. S. Stevenson (Mrs.) : *The Heart of Jainism*, p. 33.
4. JTSS.
5. IA., 1892, p. 157.
6. IA., XI, p. 246.
7. J. Allan : *A Catalogue of the Coins of Ancient India* (in the British Museum), p. 168, 85, No. 2, XI, 2; p. 233, Nos. 154, and 1549, Pl. XXXV, 5, and p. 243, No. 19, Pl. XXXVI, 15.
8. MMS., pp. 386-87; EI., II, p. 95.
9. JBBRAS., XXIII, p. 104; ASI., 1913-'14, p. 190.
10. ASI., 1913-14, p. 190.
11. His date is not certain. Yet, majority of scholars believe that he probably flourished in the first century B.C.
12. *The Pattavali Samuchhaya*, pp. 46, 106.
13. Mbh., III, 80 68-9.
14. Kailash Chand Jain : *Ancient Cities and towns of Rajasthan*, p. 60 (type script).
15. EI., XIII, p. 198.
16. Ibid. XII, p. 204. Gajayana Sarvatata is supposed by some to be a Kanva ruler. But this view is untenable, for no ruler of this name has been mentioned in the list of Kanva rulers. He was, probably, a local ruler. See, Sel. Ins., p. 92, fn. 1.
17. Patanjali : *Mahabhashya* III, 2, 123.
18. Kalidasa : *Malavikagnimitra*, Act V.
19. ASI., 1915-'16, p. 105 ; JMPJP., 1960, p. 19ff.
20. JOIB., XVIII, p. 247.
21. CIL., III, p. 61.
22. Ibid., pp. 15, 20, 25, 75, 89.
23. *Chaturbhani*, pp. 81-2.
24. Kalidasa : *Meghaduta*, Act I, Lines 33-'5.
25. *Chaturbhani*, p. 82.
26. B. C. LAW, Volume One, p. 406.
27. CIL., III, p. 81ff.
28. Ibid., p. 162 ff.
29. Ibid., p. 146 ff.
30. M. B. Garde : *Archaeology in Gwalior*, p. 24.
31. D. R. Patil : *The Cultural Heritage of Madhya Bharat*, p. 127.
32. PRAS., WC., 1913-'14, p. 60; D. R. Patil : *The Cultural Heritage of Madhya Bharat*, pp. 106-'07. The temples wherein Jaina idols have been found at Gyaraspur seem, originally, to have been of Brahminical religion.
33. D. R. Patil : *The Cultural Heritage of Madhya Bharat*, pp. 106-'08.
34. D. R. Patil : *The Cultural Heritage of Madhya Bharat*, p. 105; ASI., 1923-'24.
35. JSAL, p. 391.
36. Paterson's Report, 1883-84; IA., XX, IA., XXI, p. 58.
37. IA., XI, p. 255.
38. Ibid., VI, p. 51.
39. EI., XXI.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABORI	— Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
ASI.	— Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Reports.
CHI.	— Cambridge History of India, Ed., Rapson, E. J.
CIL.	— Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum.
EI.	— Epigraphia Indica.
GGVS.	— <i>Guru Gopaladasa Vairaya Smritigrantha</i> .
IA.	— Indian Antiquary, Bombay.
JBBRAS.	— Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay.
JMPJP.	— Journal of the Madhya Pradesh Itihasa Parishad.
JOIB.	— Journal of the Oriental Institute of Baroda.
JSAL.	— <i>Jaina Sahitya Aur Itihasa by Premi N. R.</i>
JTSS.	— <i>Jaina Tirtha Sarva Samgraha</i>
KB.	— <i>Khertaragachcha Brihadaguruavali</i> .
Mbh.	— <i>Mahabharata</i> .
MMS.	— Marshall : The Monuments of Sanchi.
PRAS., WC.	— Progress Report of the Archaeological Survey of Western Circle.
SBE.	— Sacred Books of the East.
Sel. Ins.	— Select Inscriptions by Sircar, D.C.

MUHAMMAD ALI SHAH AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF OUDH

DR. ANSHUMAN MUKHERJEE

(*Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan*)

King Nasir-ud-din Haider who ruled Oudh for ten years from 1827* breathed his last at about midnight of July 7, 1837. Immediately after his death Badshah Begum,¹ the queen-mother, and her armed retainers tried to seize the throne for Faridun Bakht by a *coup-de-main*. Faridun Bakht was declared by them to have been the legitimate offspring of the deceased and a rightful heir to the throne; but Colonel Low, then Resident at Lucknow, could not agree with them. He made an armed intervention, subdued the rebellion and placed the pretender and his patroness under duress. He then placed on the throne of Oudh a fairly aged man, Nasir-ud-doula.²

Born in 1774 Nasir-ud-doula was third among the sons of Nawab Saadat Ali (1798-1814) and an uncle to the deceased. A little after his father's accession to the Nawabi of Oudh he had been married to Jahan Ara Begum, daughter of Nawab Husain-ud-din Khan** with great rejoicings, and he had received the title of Faras-ul-mulk Mirza Muhammad Ali Khan Bahadur. After his enthronement he assumed the regal style of Abul Fatah Muin-ud-din Sultan-i-Zaman Nausherwan-i-Adil Muhammad Ali Shah, and struck silver coins with the following inscription on them composed by Raja Ratan Singh Hoshier Jung, the Chief of the royal scribes:—

“Bajud wo Karm Sicca Zad
dar Jahan,
Muhammad Ali Padishah-i-Zaman.”³

Muhammad Ali Shah's elevation to the throne

should not be viewed as an act of magnanimity on the part of the English East India Company's government. It was solely for the furtherance of their interests in Oudh that they made him king. They secured from him a promise in writing that in the event of his accession to the throne he would always listen to their advice in matters relating to his kingdom and its administration.⁴ He had also agreed to accept any new treaty which the British might dictate to him.⁵

The government at Fort William were willing to remould their relations with Oudh by amending the treaty of November, 1801. This was because the treaty which formed the basis of Anglo-Oudh relationship had failed in its objectives.

According to its terms the Company's government had stationed a portion of their troops in Oudh for protecting its ruler against external aggression and internal rebellion. But they had been frequently employed to help the oppressive revenue-contractors in collecting the revenues. The ruler of Oudh was bound by the treaty to listen to and act according to the advice of the British Officers. But he had disregarded this provision of the treaty either by rejecting or evading all British advice for the good government of his country.⁶ Moreover, the treaty had not given the Company's government the right to intervene in the event of gross misrule in Oudh.

A fresh treaty was therefore concluded by which Articles 3 and 4 of the treaty of 1801

were annulled. Consequently, it became discretionary on the part of the British government to keep their troops in or out of the territories of Oudh though they agreed, as before, to defend Oudh against foreign aggression and internal commotion. The king of Oudh was to organize in lieu of a portion of his troops a military force comprising not less than three regiments of cavalry, six regiments of infantry and two companies of artillery for the duties of his palace and for the maintenance of law and order in his realm. The force called Oudh Auxiliary Force was to be officered by the British for inculcating discipline in its members. He was also to pay for its expenses and to quarter it at such places in Oudh as might be considered convenient by the Resident. It was never to be employed in the ordinary business of revenue-collection. Article 6 of the treaty of 1801 was modified, and it became obligatory for the king of Oudh to collaborate with the British Resident in finding ways and means to remove the defects in the Police, Judicial and Revenue branches of his administration. It was also agreed upon that if he dared to neglect the Resident's advice or if misrule and anarchy prevailed in his kingdom the British government would take upon themselves the administration of the whole or a part of Oudh for so long a time as might be considered necessary. The surplus receipt of revenue after meeting all administrative expenses in such a case would be paid in the Oudh treasury. The native institutions and forms of government in the territories of Oudh would be maintained so that they might be restored to the King of Oudh when proper time for it should arrive.⁷ The question of organizing the Auxiliary Force at the expense of the government of Oudh estimated at sixteen lacs of rupees per year caused difference of opinion regarding its economic effects. Colonel Low was of opinion that it would severely tell upon the exchequer of Oudh. Fortunately for the ruler of Oudh the government at Fort William changed their mind and relieved him from paying this lump sum.⁸ Thus withdrawal of the British troops

from the interior of Oudh, formation of the Auxiliary Force, and direct assumption of Oudh administration in the event of gross misrule were sought by the Company's government with a view to modification of their relations with Oudh. But that was not to be. The new treaty was abrogated by the Court of Directors in London which was communicated to the Government at Fort William; but it was never formally notified to the ruler of Oudh.⁹

Muhammad Ali Shah had inherited from his predecessor a legacy of evils such as an empty treasury, a disaffected landed-aristocracy, defaulting revenue-farmers, and worthless and profligate public officers. Before his elevation to the throne Roshun-ud-doula had been holding the Prime Minister's office for five years on a monthly salary of Rs. 25,000/-, over and above which he had been drawing five per cent on the country's annual revenue. His son as the Commander-in-Chief was earning Rs. 5000/- per month without performing any duty. Besides, the monthly allowances drawn from the public treasury by his first and second wives were Rs. 5000/- and Rs. 3000/- respectively.¹⁰ Moreover, Roshun-ud-doula was in close contact with the Kamboh. His deputy Mir Subhan Ali belonged to that community. The Kamboh, a fine cultivating caste and converts to Islam, had come down to Oudh from their original abode in the Punjab. They had earned not only a wide notoriety for their cunning and deceitfulness but also some power and position. Dignitaries like Muntazim-ud-doula Hakim Mehdi Ali Khan were said to have suffered public scorn at their hands.¹¹ Partly because of Muhammad Ali Shah's aversion to them and partly because of his zeal for economy, retrenchment and reform Roshun-ud-doula was replaced by Muntazim-ud-doula Hakim Mehdi Ali Khan.¹² He was imprisoned but afterwards allowed to settle in Kanpur on payment of 20 lacs of rupees to the state treasury, and 2 lacs to the royal favourites in gratuities. His buildings in Lucknow valued at 3 lacs of rupees were

confiscated. Subhan Ali was similarly dealt with.¹³

Muhammad Ali Shah dismissed from his service Major Davidson of the Engineering department, Mr. D'Clarkson and other Europeans attached to the Court.¹⁴ At the time of his accession to the throne he was aged sixty-three, ill of rheumatism and a cripple. He could neither walk nor could he eat with his own hands. His faithful attendant, Rafiq-ud-doula, used to feed him. But he was very strong in mind. During his father's regime he had assisted him in the revenue administration of the country and had gained considerable experience. His manners were good, his conversation that of a man of good sense and judgement. He personally attended to the work of administration. He curtailed a variety of useless expenditure of his government and ordered payment of all arrears of pay to his troops and public servants within two months.¹⁵ His efficiency in and attention to administrative work impressed the Resident so much that in a letter to the Government at Fort William, dated July 26, 1837, he could not but remark:

"The old king is getting on admirably in his public acts and arrangements ..."¹⁶

At the time of his predecessor's death the army in Oudh numbered 69,956 men. Muhammad Ali Shah wanted to reduce it to 40,000.

A fortnight after his enthronement he disbanded 19,000 sepoys and continued further retrenchment.¹⁷ Besides, he maintained his army at an expense surprisingly small in comparison to its number. The privates of the *Najib* battalion received Rs 3/- each per month and a *Sehbundi* stationed in the interior districts got only Rs. 2/- per month.¹⁸ He also tried to replenish his treasury which had been drained almost to the last penny by his predecessor. He tried to reform the Police, Finance and Judicial departments of his government. He put an end to the old practice of giving the Intelligence

Department in farm to the highest bidder.¹⁹ He gave impetus to trade and industry, and relief to the agriculturist. He founded schools, constructed inns, and dug wells and tanks.²⁰ During the first two years of his reign the public revenue increased and the general affairs of his kingdom assumed a much better aspect. Prices of articles of food fell and despite a general scarcity prevailing in the neighbourhood early in A.D. 1838 gram in Lucknow sold at seventeen and a half seer a rupee. Standing crops in the field looked fine.²¹ The character of his durbar was high. The royal palace no longer remained a place for fiddlers, buffoons and dancing girls.²² Riots and bloodshed ceased in Lucknow. Navigation in the Gomati became secure from molestation by the zamindars. Military operations for suppressing the highway robbers were made. The districts of Sultanpur, Pratapgarh, Gossaingunj and Safipur were taken under *Amani* system of revenue-collection, a *Sadar Amin* with subordinate officers having been appointed to collect revenues and dispense even-handed justice.²³ All this became possible because of the ageing and ailing king's moral scruples and singleminded devotion to the task of administration lasting from eight to ten hours a day.

But unfortunately the reforms detailed above could not last. Muhammad Ali Shah's temporary abstinence from work owing to worsening of his already enfeebled health as a result of long hours of work, and the death of his Prime Ministers Muntazim-ud-doula Hakim Mehdi Ali Khan and Nawab Zahir-ud-doula in quick succession threw the affairs in a mess.

Munwar-ud-doula, who succeeded Nawab Zahir-ud-doula to the office of Prime Minister, was a nephew of Muntazim-ud-doula Hakim Mehdi Ali Khan. Although a man of integrity, he was an inefficient administrator being slow, suspicious and inexperienced though ripe in years.²⁴ During his premiership the Court of Oudh degenerated into a hotbed of intrigue and rivalry among a number of contestants for

power. The country's interior presented a horrible picture, being a favourite haunt of thieves and robbers. The talukdars of Ramnagar-Dhunri, Rampur, Hasanpur, Balrampur and several other places attacked the revenue farmers and fought a sort of civil war against them.²⁵ As many as eleven battles were fought by the talukdars against the revenue officers of their lawful sovereign from the beginning of December, 1839 to the end of January, 1840.²⁶ A number of affrays broke out among several zamindars as a result of their mutual enmity arising from their disputes on land. A clash of arms took place between Sheodut Singh and Zorawar Singh, zamindars of Mouza Bansi in Sultanpur, over purchase of cattle in which the former was killed with two of his men wounded. In a dispute arising from such a petty cause as getting the grass cut from a piece of land between Ram Sahaya and Bhairava Dutt the latter lost two of his men.²⁷ Oudh was further torn by robberies and arson committed by the disaffected zamindars.²⁸ Conditions in the interior of Oudh worsened so much that Colonel Caulfield remarked that only relatives and immediate dependents of Muhammad Ali Shah and the army had benefited by his accession to the throne; that opposition to the exaction by the revenue-farmers and the necessity of supporting them by troops very much prevailed. The zamindars when ousted from their holdings by the king's troops for such opposition became worst rebels.²⁹

Having realized the failure of his administration Muhammad Ali Shah became anxious to resume the task of administrative reform. But there was not a single man about him on whom he could have relied. The Court of Oudh had come to be divided into two distinct factions—one headed by his favourite wife Mulka Jahan Fakhr-uz-zaman Hamida Sultan Begum, and the other by Raja Balkrishna and Azinulla Khan.³⁰ Raja Balkrishna was the revenue minister. By his tact and talents he had gained an upper hand in all financial matters of the government and exercised tre-

mendous influence over the principal servants of the durbar, and over Raja Darshan Singh and all other revenue-farmers in Oudh. Every year he received from them huge sums of money for allowing them to rack-rent the ryots. He hindered every attempt at reform in the financial administration of the country. Moreover, the government had some claim on the late Prime Minister Muntazim-ud-doula Hakim Mehdi Ali Khan who had failed to deposit into the royal treasury a portion of his revenue dues to the government at the time of his farming the district of Khaireegarh. Taking undue advantage of this Balkrishna threatened Munwar-ud-doula that he would force him to pay the balance on behalf of his deceased uncle if he tried to circumscribe his power and influence.³¹

No less averse to administrative reform was Azimulla Khan. An old and confidential domestic of Muhammad Ali Shah, he held charge of the *Diwankhana* and collection of revenue of certain lands not included in any particular district, and of the *Abkari* for 20 miles around Lucknow. The Ordnance and Building departments were also under his charge, but as he was completely unlettered the business of his office was transacted through a deputy called Ashiq Ali who had earned a countrywide notoriety for his high handedness.³²

Jagannath, the *Daroga* of the markets in Lucknow, was Collector of town duties and taxes levied on houses, shops, gardens, and all escheats of the king. He also committed acts of glaring injustice while performing the duties of his office.³³ Tika Ram, collector of transit duties, was unscrupulous and leagued with the Daroga of Diwankhana.³⁴ The Prime Minister who was weak could not control his subordinate officers who openly defied "his feeble attempts to correct and punish the misconduct of their associates and dependents".³⁵ The Resident at Lucknow in his earnestness to reform the Oudh administration asked the king to set up a Board of Revenue consisting of from three to five members for making an enquiry into and

reporting on the state of the country so that a fair assessment of revenue could be made for a term of three or five years. He also advised him to constitute a Board for investigating the state of judiciary and for framing such regulations as might introduce some justice and equity into the proceedings of the law Courts. Withdrawal of troops from the *Amil's* control and their placement under honest and efficient officers were suggested. He wrote to the government at Fort William, "unless a moderate interference be sanctioned at present the time is not far distant when a decided and extensive interference will be forced upon the British Government ...³⁶. Lord Auckland was against following a policy towards Oudh which his predecessors had carefully avoided. The forward policy towards Oudh had been given up by Lord Hastings; and his successors, Amherst and Bentinck, proceeded along the beaten track. They did their best to advise, warn and remonstrate with the ruler of Oudh so as to influence him morally. Auckland had come to believe in the efficacy of "plain and clear remonstrance" because that had produced good effects on Nagpur and Indore governments. So he refrained from interfering even on a moderate scale in the affairs of Oudh awaiting a greater crisis to come.³⁷

But Muhammad Ali Shah could not rest content with what obtained in his kingdom. He removed Munwar-ud-doula from the Prime Minister's situation and having failed to find an abler man for premiership installed his son and heir-apparent in that office, appointing Shurf-ud-doula his deputy³⁸. It was with Shurf-ud-doula's assistance that he framed a code of regulations for the better government of his kingdom. The code contained the following important points :

- (a) division of the entire country into districts and parganas for the facility of administration;
- (b) appointment of *Nazims* by the Wazir,

and that of the officials in the *Diwani* by the Diwan;

- (c) protection of the ryots from over-exaction of the *Amils*, and land revenue assessment by the zamindars;
- (d) abolition of the practice of having landed property by the government officers in the districts under their charge;
- (e) cessation of remission of dues to the government;
- (f) repairs and preservation of roads;
- (g) regulation of the collection of transit and *Abkari* duties;
- (h) adjustment of disputes between ryots on account of rent.

Besides these, the Europeans were prohibited from holding landed estates in Oudh under any pretext. The *Nazims* were forbidden to collect revenues. Rules were prescribed for resumption of *Lakhiraj* lands. Regulations for the administration of Criminal Justice were framed. In each district thanas were placed under the *Nazim* and *thanadars* were held responsible for efficiency of the Police. Suitable measures were taken for the apprehension and arrest of criminals and vagrants. A commission of ten percent on the value of stolen articles was allowed to thanadars in case of conviction of the person or persons accused of theft. Trial by ordeal, Sati-sacrifice, infanticide and every kind of self-immolation were stopped.³⁹

Muhammad Ali Shah appointed Raja Darshan Singh *Amil* of the districts of Gonda and Bahraich. Darshan Singh crushed the rebellious talukdars by capturing their guns and forts, and regularly paid his revenue dues to the government. He stopped intestine fightings among the zamindars and consequent sack and plunder of the ryots. The general result of his administra-

tion, as Colonel Low pointed out, proved far more beneficial to the common people than that of his imbecile predecessor. Muhammad Ali Shah introduced the *Amani* system of revenue-collection in the districts of Sultanpur and Pratapgarh, having appointed two *Amani Amils*, namely Wazid Ali Khan and Mahmud Ali Khan, who excellently managed the districts under their charge and punctually paid the revenue.⁴⁰ Thus the affairs of Oudh definitely improved towards the close of his reign which was strikingly clear in such large districts as Gonda, Bahraich, Sultanpur and Pratapgarh.

Muhammad Ali Shah was a patron of learning. He ordered the foundation of a public library at Lucknow.⁴¹ In 1840 the La Martiniere was opened in Lucknow for the promotion of Western learning^{41a}. He granted a lac of rupees for the erection of an iron bridge on the Gomati, parts of which had been imported by Nawab Saadat Ali, and thirty thousand rupees for construction of a road between Kanpur and Lucknow⁴². He gave the British his estate called Digba farm (situated between Patna and Khagaul in Bihar) as a free gift for building a penitentiary there.⁴³ He lent to the Company's government a considerable sum for financing their operation against Afghanistan.⁴⁴ He laid

out lavish sums in buildings, tanks and roads in Lucknow. He built the great Husainabad Imambara with a magnificent tank in its neighbourhood. Construction of a mosque designed to match the Juma Masjid of Delhi, and a curious seven-storied tower was begun⁴⁵, but before the completion of these buildings Muhammad Ali Shah passed away on May 17, 1842. Though he was not so thrifty as his father, yet he bequeathed seventy lacs of rupees in gold and silver to his son and successor, Amjad Ali Shah who at his accession to the throne found the kingdom in a far better condition than what his father had found at the beginning of his reign. Colonel Low very rightly observed, "Very few sovereigns ever succeeded in India in so tranquil a manner, in such comfortable circumstances and with such pleasing prospects before him for the happiness of his subjects as did the present king of Oudh (Amjad Ali Shah)".⁴⁶

But this happy state of affairs was not allowed to continue. Once again muddle and corruption crept into the Oudh administration. Lawlessness stalked the land. There was an appalling decrease in the amount of public revenue, and for all this Amjad Ali Shah was to blame because he did not follow the policy of his father.

REFERENCES

- * Vide the writer's article on King Nasir-ud-din Haider in J. I. H. August, 1967.
- 1. Nawab Rudshah Begum was the legally wedded wife of Ghaziuddin Haider (1814-1827) and the daughter of Mubashir-ud-doula, the Court astrologer of the Mughal Emperor Muhammad Shah.
- 2. Foreign Secret Consultation (F.S.C.) No. 1, the 24th July, 1837.
- ** He was a descendant of Qamr-ud-din Khan, the Wazir of the Mughal Emperor Muhammad Shah.
- 3. Tarikh-i-Awadh by Moulana Najmul Ghani Rampuri, Vol. V, pp. 1-2.
- 4. Foreign Secret Letter to the Court of Directors, the 5th August, 1837, No. 8.
- 5. F.S.C., No. 4, the 24th July, 1837.
- 6. F.S.C. No. 9, the 24th July, 1837.
- 7. F.S.C. No. 13, the 24th July, 1837.
- 8. Foreign Political Consultation (F.P.C.) Nos. 98-99, the 27th April, 1840.
- 9. *Garden of India*, by H. C. Irwin, p. 131.
- 10. Sleeman's Journey through the Kingdom of Oudh, 1849-50, Vol. II, pp. 183-84.
- 11. Tarikh-i-Awadh by Najmul Ghani Rampuri, Vol. V, pp. 7-8.
- 12. Ibid, also Vide, F.P.C. Nos. 73-74, the 2nd October, 1837.
- 13. Sleeman's Journey etc., Vol. II, p. 184.
- 14. India Despatches to the Secret Committee of the Court of Directors, No. 11 of 1837, para 10.
- 15. F.S.C. No. 8, the 24th July, 1837.
- 16. F.S.C. No. 14, the 7th August, 1837.
- 17. F.P.C. No. 60, the 27th December, 1837, para 21.
- 18. Ibid, para, 19-20.
- 19. F.P.C. No. 72, the 3rd July 1839 and F.P.C. No. 86, the 14th Oct. 1839.
- 20. *Dacoitee in Excelv.*, by S. Lucas, pp. 93-94.
- 21. *The Englishman*, February 26, 1838.
- 22. *Garden of India*, by H. C. Irwin, p. 131.
- 23. F.P.C. No. 57, the 23rd November, 1840.
- 24. F.P.C. No. 59, the 3rd August, 1840.
- 25. F.P.C. No. 62, the 3rd August, 1840.
- 26. F.P.C. No. 64, the 3rd August, 1840.
- 27. Ram Sakaya was *Karinda* of Shital Singh, *Tafrikdar* of Bhoputpur. Bhairava was his partner.

28. The disturbance caused by Rajrang Bali, talukdar of Goura in the district of Dalmau, may be cited for example.
29. F.P.C. No. 66, the 3rd August, 1840.
30. F.P.C. No. 70, the 3rd August, 1840.
31. F.P.C. No. 67, the 3rd August, 1840, para 13.
32. Ibid., para 14.
33. Ibid., para 15.
34. Ibid., para 16.
35. Ibid., para 17.
36. F.P.C. No. 71, the 3rd August, 1840, para 10-13.
37. F.P.C. No. 74, the 3rd August, 1840.
38. F.P.C. No. 77, the 3rd August, 1840.
39. F.P.C. No. 56, the 23rd November, 1840.
40. F.P.C. No. 77, 1st February, 1843, para 5.
41. F.P.C. Nos. 102-103, the 3rd July, 1839.
- 41a. *Armenians in India*, by Mesroby Jacob Seth, Pp. 562-63.
42. Foreign Political Letter to the Court of Directors, No. 56 of 1840, para 128.
43. Ibid., No. 77 of 1842, para 91.
44. Ibid., para 104-105.
45. F.P.C. No. 77, the 1st February, 1843, para 8.
46. Ibid., para 9.

DISPOSAL OF THE DEAD AMONG THE AHOMS

SUNIL KUMAR DAS

Early in the thirteenth century, the Ahoms, a branch of the Shans of Upper Burma, crossed the Patkai range and settled in the Brahmaputra Valley. Originally animistic believers, they followed their old tribal practices in all the ceremonies ever since they laid the foundation of their rule in Assam. But in course of time, as soon as the Hindu religion had crept into the royal palace, it brought in a considerable alteration in almost all their ceremonies. The aspect under study has had its special significance, for it underwent a considerable amalgamation and conversion consequent upon the adoption of the Hindu religion by the Ahoms. An attempt has, however, been made also to show here how their beliefs and practices passed into oblivion through the encervating power of the Hindu religion. Their deviations from the old practices became so distinct that at the end of their rule, they may well be designated as Hindu rather than Ahom.

The Ahoms had their system of burying the dead—a practice followed by them rather scrupulously. In this connection it may be noted that when the king fell ill or appeared to be on the verge of death either caused by protracted illness or by any other means, the nursing and treatment of the ailing monarch who was supposed to have been suffering from his last illness in this world, were conducted very guardedly. No other *bij* or physician save the very old one was allowed to doctor the dying king.¹ This practice was due to an anxiety to ensure the safety of the king's life from various underground intrigues. Similarly, no other attendants except those female attendants who had served the king prior to his dying condition were permitted to nurse him².

An interesting aspect of the Ahom administration is the fact that the news of the death of a monarch was not publicly announced till the selection and appointment of his successor by the *Dangariyas* (ministers)³, for the Ahoms regarded the kingship as continuous in conformity to the dictum, 'the king never dies'. It was only the newly enthroned king who could promulgate an order directing the disposal of the dead body of his predecessor⁴. In addition to the selection and appointment, the construction of a *maidam* or vault required a long time especially in the case of royal personages⁵, during which the dead body was carefully preserved by means of local methods of preservation. It was kept in a *pera* or coffin made of a single plank which was highly decorated and embellished with gold⁶. It is also interesting to note that in order to preserve the dead body from natural erosion or decay, the Ahoms, like the ancient Egyptians, used certain chemicals prepared mainly by *hingul* (cinnabar) and *hailal* (yellow arsenic)⁷. Sgt. C. Clayton who conducted the excavation of some of the Ahom tombs observed that some system of embalming was practised for the royal family. If there were any such system, it must have been imperfect⁸. However, the *Buranjis* are silent whether this practice was invented by the Ahoms or borrowed from elsewhere.

Having received the order of disposal, the ministers arranged the construction of a lofty vault almost similar to that of a pond, covering an area of about one or one and half *kathas* of land, at Caraideo, the ancient cemetery of the Ahoms, by the *Kanris* and *Hajuas*, to house the remains of the sovereign⁹. It may be noted that the Ahoms prior to beginning the construction of the vault consulted omens or calcu-

lated the auspicious time—a practice which they used to follow in the case of any work of importance.¹⁰

At any rate, the vault thus constructed was equipped with wooden pillars and several apartments, each connected by a door. There was one main door which closed the whole vault.¹¹ Each tomb having eight-sided brick wall around it was divided mainly into five parts: (a) *garbha* or *gavohar* (pit); (b) *tak* (upper storey); (c) *daul* (temple-like small building at the top); (d) *gada* (brick wall); and (e) *ga maidam* (body of the vault). Of the building materials, mention may be made of *lathasil* (boulders), *patsil* (flat stone), *ita* (brick) and *sil cuna* (stone lime). At the same time materials used for mortar were *guda* (molasses), *mah* (pulse), *san* (sun hemp or *crotalaria juncea*), *samuk cuna* (shell's lime), *Pathar cuna* (stone lime), *caka cuna* (cutting baste like lime), *mach* (fish), *tel* (mustard oil) and *dhuna* (resin)¹². In this connection it is to be noted that the *maidam* of Sivasimha was a three storeyed building¹³, while that of Gadadharasimha (1681-96 A.D.) was the highest and biggest in structure and took a long time to be completed¹⁴.

Then the arrangements were made to bring the coffin from the palace to the burial ground. The burial mourning ceremony was attended by a large number of subjects, though the carrying of the coffin was strictly confined to the people belonging to the *Gharphalia*¹⁵ and *Lukhurakhun*¹⁶ *khels*¹⁷. The procession started from the city in usual grandeur as if the king was on an excursion to distant parts of his country. The procession was attended by a gradation of officers with body-guards of the king. During the journey from the city down to the burial place, if the night falls in the way, the procession was bound to halt and due respect and courtesy were rendered to the coffin as if the king was passing the night in the *bahar* or temporary halting camp. As the king in his life-time enjoyed the services of several attendants, his coffin was also attended by at

least ten attendants in the usual manner¹⁸. The pall-bearers or privileged carriers of the royal hearse, passed an order on complaints submitted to them during the progress of the funeral cortège to its resting place and their verdict was fixed and unalterable¹⁹.

With the slow and steady march, the procession would reach Caraidoo, the necropolis of the Ahom royalty. The coffin was then placed on a *mecan* or *khat* (a raised bamboo platform) with the usual paraphernalia of a royal bed chamber²⁰. The *mecan* was prepared not in the centre of the room, but much nearer to the north side, and from the upper edges of the *mecan* rose a wall of thin rough boards enclosing the coffin or shell on all four sides but open at the top which, however, rose to within a foot of the main roof²¹. The coffin was placed in the *mecan* in such a manner that the head of the deceased was kept towards the east and feet towards the west. But there was nothing in the shape to show the head from the foot²². However, the head of the deceased was covered very strongly within stout poles²³. The coffin was something wider at the top than bottom and the lid was slightly curved inside and hallowed within. It rested on a groove cut round the edge of the coffin to receive it without any other fastening. Under the coffin were four legs or stands with a cross bar connecting each pair²⁴. The workmanship of the carpenter depended on the rank of the deceased²⁵.

The articles of daily use necessarily required by the king when alive were supplied in his resting place with the idea that his departed soul should confront no difficulty in the other world. Sometimes the articles supplied in duplicate or triplicate were *rup sonar maihang* (a dish with a foot), *bati* and *lota* (a kind of water pot and cup), *bhogjara* (cooking vessel), *taokin* (water vessel with a spout), *pagjema* (a turban and a long coat reaching below the knee), and other articles. The *hengdan* (the ancestral sword) was also given to the king in his grave.²⁶ The rich people gave with the

coffin water pot, *da*, *jhapi* and a *pira* (wooden stool) which were put inside the box with the corpse.²⁷ Personal ornaments such as rings, tooth pick case, ear ornaments, etc. were all in one spot about the middle of the coffin or placed under or near where the hand might have been and not in their usual places on the person²⁸. According to the *Arunoday*²⁹, the mouth-piece of the American Baptist Mission, the dead body was buried with the articles of daily use, cooking vessels, etc., which were placed in the following manner:

- (a) A canopy (*Candratapa*) was placed over the bed where the coffin was kept.
- (b) There were silver mat (*pati*) and a pillow (*garu*) studded with gold and jewels which were kept on the *mecan*.
- (c) The *hengdan* of the king which was embellished with valuable stones was kept on the platform.
- (d) A set of 4-5 silver *sarais* (native pots with raised platform), meant to contain certain specific articles for the use of the deceased, were kept on the floor corresponding to the waist.
- (e) Moreover, reference is found to a *sarai* containing a golden *bata* (flat pot) for keeping articles for preparing betels. This *bata* also contained a lime pot of gold and studded with jewels, and a golden betel leaf pot having a golden *katari* (a knife for cutting betel nut).
- (f) The *sarais* containing *bhogjara* and ornaments were also placed in the vault.
- (g) In addition to that, a golden *dhouwa khawa* (hubble-bubble)³⁰ having a gold and silver embroidered pipe and a *cilim* (bowl) was kept towards the leg of the deceased.

Besides the articles generally given in tomb, the ministers, Phukanas and Baruas and other officers of the State presented various articles to the deceased³¹. Shihab-ud-Din Talish, the admiring *waqia navish* of Mir Jumla, wrote that the Ahoms placed the dead body inside the vault together with necessary articles for a few years including various kinds of gold and silver vessels, carpets and cloths and foodstuff³².

The most striking phenomenon relating to the disposal of the dead by the Ahoms was the burying alive of human beings and quadrupeds. Along with the articles referred to, an attendant was placed inside the vault towards the head of deceased with a fan made of Yak tail, the handle of which was of gold to cool the king³³. The Ahoms also buried in the vault a lamp with plenty of oil and one living lamp bearer to remain engaged in the work of trimming the lamp.³⁴ The personal attendants of the king such as *tamuli-parcani* (betel-nut bearer), *pikdandhara* (bearer of a spittoon where the king kept juice of betel nut, chewed and spat out), *hingdardhara* (bearer of ancestral sword), *jaradhara* (attendant used to supply drinking water to the king), *conwardhara* (fan-bearer), *dhanw-khowadhara* (bearer of hubble-bubble), *cangmai-randhani* (valets and cooks), *gacowa ligira* (personal attendant) and *fulcowa ligira* (supplier of flower to the king) and others who served the king in his life-time were buried alive in the vault with the king. In every case not less than ten to twelve attendants were required to be interred into grave in order to perform specific duties³⁵. But this policy was not strictly followed by the Ahoms³⁶. They were recruited from the *Lukhurakhun*³⁷ and *Gharphalia Khels*³⁸. Not only the attendants, but the queens of the deceased were also buried alive in the vault³⁹. It was the practice of the people, observes Mannucci, that when the master of the house expired they buried with him all his wives, concubines and servants together with the tailors, washermen, barbers and others, who served the deceased's house, 'setting them all on fire after binding their feet'⁴⁰. Jadunath Sarkar also pointed out that

the dead body was placed in the vault with the wives and servants of the deceased 'after killing them'⁴¹. The statements of Mannucci and Sarkar that the persons to be buried with the deceased king in the vault were killed beforehand appear to be untenable due to the contradiction with the native sources. At any rate, the antiquity of the custom of burying living persons in the tomb may be traced to the Egyptian method of the disposal of the dead⁴². In this connection, the remarks of the unnamed Dutch sailor who accompanied Mir Jumla in his expedition to Assam seem to be significant. "It was this people's custom to inter with their dead the greatest part of their servants, whom they buried alive, to bear their master's company. So far were these poor wretches from bemoaning their condition in this respect, that they were on the contrary exceedingly joyous, to follow their masters into the country, where they hoped in three days time to become great personages, which were not to be had here"⁴³. However, it is interesting to note that the attendants who were selected to serve the king in his voyage through the eternity would get whatever they demanded⁴⁴. In addition to human beings being placed inside the tomb, references to quadrupeds like elephants and horses being put in the grave are also found⁴⁵. Not only the articles, royal paraphernalia, attendants and other men of the deceased king were buried with him, but a considerable amount of treasure also was interred in the grave. During his stay at Garhgaon Mir Jumla learnt from some Ahoms of the treasures deposited in the *maidams* or graves of the Ahom princes and nobles. The exact spots being detected, he had them dug up and secured property worth of Rs. 90,000.00 including a gold betel casket of a queen buried about 80 years ago and he removed even the bones of the deceased⁴⁶. The unnamed Dutch sailor also referred to the immense quantity of treasures deposited in the *maidams*⁴⁷. The *maidams* of Rajesvarasimha (1751-69 A.D.) and Laksmisimha (1769-80 A.D.) were supposed to contain the largest quantity of treasures⁴⁸. Having

learnt of untold wealth stored in the graves, the people began to exhume the tombs where in some cases mishaps befell on the pillagers.

Having arranged all the essentials regarding the placement of the remains of the deceased in the vault, the door would then be shut and earth piled up on the wooden roof of the funeral chamber. The processionists then left the place with *Kauris* and *Hajuas*⁴⁹. It is said that after the construction of the *maidam* guards were placed to protect it from pillaging⁵⁰. However, the people also dreaded the spirits and ghosts of the deceased and remained far away from the *maidam*⁵¹.

But in course of time the Ahom system of disposal of the dead underwent a considerable change. The conversion of the Ahoms into the fold of Hinduism was considered to be the greatest land-mark in their cultural history. At an early period of their settlement in Assam, the Ahoms became converted to Hinduism and in consequence their old tribal practices gradually went into oblivion and these were replaced by Hindu rituals. So long as the Ahoms followed the burial system they did not pay any regard to the cumbrous Brahminical ceremonies save the very short rituals which were completed as soon as the dead body was placed in the vault. It is interesting to note that on the death of Gadadharasimha (1681-96 A.D.), his body was entombed and an effigy of him was made, adorned with fine clothes, and men were appointed to make to it daily offerings of pigs, fowls, fish and wine. At the same time, the Ahoms were feasted on the flesh of swine and buffaloes.⁵² With the gradual Hinduisation, the Ahoms adopted the Hindu system of burning the dead bodies. In fact, it was the injunction of Rudrasimha (1696-1714 A.D.) which introduced the system of disposing of the dead by cremation⁵³. In spite of the fact, it was only in the reign of Rajesvarasimha that the practice was actually carried into effect⁵⁴. But it was an irony of fate that the dead body of the pioneer was placed in a mound.

Again it was Rudrasimha who having been inspired by the Hindu religion prohibited the burying alive of attendants, guards, slaves, queens, elephants, etc., at his decease.⁵⁵ In spite of the fact, as many as four skulls of human head are said to have been unearthed from the grave of Rudrasimha⁵⁶. Even though this injunction was not carried into execution in the reign of the inaugurator himself, the gravity of it was later felt by his successor who put a stop to this inhuman practice of burying human beings. Ever since the introduction of cremation by Rudrasimha, the burial system among the Ahoms gradually died out, although it was in evidence till the reign of Pramattasimha⁵⁷. Rudrasimha's injunction prohibiting the burying alive of human beings and quadrupeds resulted in an alteration in the size and arrangement of the tombs, since a number of apartments would not be required⁵⁸. The Hindu influence on the burial system of the Ahoms had its beginning in the reign of Rudrasimha. In the month of *Agrahayana*, 1636 Saka (1714 A.D.), the *sraddha* ceremony of the latter was performed after burning his effigy⁵⁹. Further, his ablest son Pramattasimha built the temple of Rudrasvara on the spot where his late father's remains were entombed⁶⁰. The construction of a Hindu temple on the resting place of the king was undoubtedly an innovation in the cultural history of the Ahoms, for ever since the inception of their rule, no reference is found to the erection of a temple on the resting place of the king. However, the Hindu influence was more marked in the *sraddha* ceremonies of Siva⁶¹ and Rajesvarasimha,⁶² where all the Gosains of the Vaisnavite *sattras* or monasteries were invited and an elaborate arrangement was made for the recitation of hymns to the glory of Hari for the benefit of the deceased's soul. This disposal of the dead by cremation in conformity with the Brahminical rites actually came into practice in the reign of Rajesvarasimha. His body was cremated under a *simalu* tree on the bank of the Lohit, and his funeral obsequies including the *sraddha* ceremony were performed according to the Brahminical code⁶³. On the

death of Laksmisimha his dead body was cremated at *Hatikhok-ghat* on the bank of the Dikhu. It deserves to be noted that the rites and ceremonies connected with the death of a Hindu monarch were performed, and according to the *Danasagara*, alms and presents were also distributed among the Brahmanas, religious teachers and preachers. The musical *soirée* or recital recounting the praise of Hari was also made by the Mahantas invited specially for the occasion⁶⁴. Rudrasimha created a class of people called *Baragi* or *Khaond*⁶⁵ whose main duty was to place the bones of the deceased kings and *Dangariyas* or ministers in the sacred Ganges and to perform rituals through the Brahmanas according to the injunction of the Hindu Sastras, begging emancipation of the deceased's soul, and also to make gifts to the Brahmanas for the benefit of the deceased⁶⁶.

This was the system of disposal of the dead prevalent among the higher section of the Ahoms. It is significant to note that the Deodhais, the orthodox tribal priests of the Ahoms, endeavoured to regain their former influence by attributing the misfortunes into which the country had fallen to the adoption of Hindu beliefs and practices and the abandonment of the old tribal observances of their forefathers. They laid special stress on the fact that the late kings' bodies had been cremated instead of being buried as those of their ancestors had been. To undo the mischief, the Deodhais made an effigy of the late king in clay and having performed the *Rikkhavan* (life giving) ceremony for the restoration of life and offered sacrifices to the gods, they buried it with the rites usually observed at the interment of an Ahom king⁶⁷. In spite of the protracted and prolonged hindrances offered by the Deodhais against the spread of Hindu religion, its enervating power not only frustrated the designs of the Deodhais but also made the ruling class, the Ahoms, to become an adherent to the Hindu faith.

The general Ahom populace did not follow any of the practices very rigidly. It is said

that the funeral ceremony to a poor man would cost three to five rupees. According to their means and ability, they either buried or cremated the dead bodies. Sometimes, the remains of the

deceased were placed with or without *maidams*, coffin, and articles⁶⁸. But no reference is found to a living person placed into the vault by the common people.

REFERENCES

1. *Deodhai Avam Buranji*, ed. S. K. Bhuyan, 1962, p. 155.
2. *Loc. cit.*
3. *Loc. cit.*
4. *Loc. cit.*
5. For instance, the construction of the vault of Sivasimha (1714-44 A.D.) began on Friday, *Agrahayana* 8, 1666, Saka and was completed in the same year in *Falgun* 15, 1666 Saka (*Chang-rung Phukanar Buranji*, ed. B. C. Handique, 1961, p. 12).
6. *DAB*, *loc. cit.*
7. *Loc. cit.*
8. *JASB*, vol. XVII, p. 476.
9. *DAB*, pp. 155f.; *Asamar Padya Buranji*, ed. Bhuyan, 1932, p. 40.
10. See *CRPB*, p. 3.
11. *DAB*, *loc. cit.*
12. *CRPB*, pp. 1, 6, 11-12.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 1, 11-12.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 3. According to a *Buranji*, it was a huge mound erected by employing a large number of people and was sufficient to cover a building of much larger dimension. Further, it is stated that Purandarasingha (1818-19) employed one hundred people who worked for two months to open the vault of Gadadharasingha which was sixty cubits in height (*APB*, *loc. cit.*; *JASB*, vol. XVII, *loc. cit.*; *DAB*, p. 159).
15. A class of people assigned for the performance of various menial works of the royal household.
16. The members of this *khel* or unit were recruited from various families and performed almost similar work to that of the Gharphalias.
17. *DAB*, p. 156.
18. *Loc. cit.*
19. *Loc. cit.*
20. *Loc. cit.*; *JASB*, vol. XVII, p. 475.
21. *JBORS*, vol. I, p. 193.
22. *Loc. cit.*; *JASB*, vol. XVII, p. 473.
23. *JBORS*, vol. I, *Loc. cit.*
24. *JASB*, vol. XVII, *loc. cit.*
25. *Loc. cit.*
26. *DAB*, *loc. cit.*; see also *APB*, p. 41.
27. *ERE*, vol. I, 1908, p. 235.
28. *JASB*, vol. XVII, *loc. cit.*
29. Cf. *DAB*, pp. 157-58. For varieties of articles see *JASB*, vol. XVII, pp. 473-75.
30. The use of it seemed to have been introduced only after the Ahoms came in contact with the Muslims.
31. *APB*, *loc. cit.*
32. Cf. *Loc. cit.*
33. *DAB*, p. 158.
34. *JBORS*, vol. I, *loc. cit.*
35. *DAB*, p. 155; *APB*, *loc. cit.*
36. For instance, in the vault of Gadadharasingha (1681-96 A.D.) as many as thirty attendants were given to be buried alive (*DAB*, p. 156).
37. *Satsari Assam Buranji*, ed. Bhuyan, 1969, p. 12.
38. *DAB*, pp. 155; *APB*, *loc. cit.*
39. *Assam Buranji*, ed. Bhuyan, 1938, p. 35.
40. *Storia-do-Magor*, ed. W. Irvine, Vol. II, p. 100.
41. *JBORS*, Vol. I, *loc. cit.*
42. *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. J. Hastings, Vol. IV, pp. 458-64.
43. *BPP*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 24f.
44. *DAB*, p. 156.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 157; *JASB*, Vol. XVII, *loc. cit.*; *ERE*, Vol. I, p. 235. In the tomb of the Ahom princes and nobles, we find from the report of Sgt. Clayton, the space of elephants and horses (*JASB*, Vol. XVII, *loc. cit.*).
46. *JBORS*, Vol. I, *loc. cit.*; *JASB*, Vol. XLI, p. 82; *JIH*, vol. V, pp. 368f.; Tavernier, *Travels*, ed. V. Ball, vol. II, p. 280; *Assam Buranji* (Sukumar Mahanta), ed. Bhuyan, 1960, pp. 80f.; *DAB*, pp. 160f.
47. *BPP*, vol. XXIX, p. 24.
48. *DAB*, p. 159.
49. *Loc. cit.*, p. 156.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 158; *JASB*, Vol. xvii, p. 474.
51. *DAB*, *loc. cit.*
52. E. A. Gait, *History of Assam*, 1968, p. 176.
53. *DAB*, pp. 156-57 and note.
54. *Assam Buranji* (Harakanta Barua), ed. S. K. Bhuyan, 1962, pp. 60f.; *Tungkhungia Buranji*, ed. Bhuyan, 1963, p. 56.
55. *JASB*, Vol. xvii, p. 475, *IIA*, p. 265.
56. *DAB*, p. 159.
57. *AB (HB)*, *loc. cit.* Harakanta Barua (*loc. cit.*) was of the opinion that the burial custom of the Ahoms continued till the reign of Gadadharasingha (1681-96 A.D.). But this appears to be untenable for the system of cremation was actually carried into execution only in the reign of Rajesvarasingha (1751-69 A.D.).
58. *JASB*, Vol. XVII, *loc. cit.*
59. *TB*, p. 37.
60. In Saka 1673, Pramattasingha, with a view to commemorate his father's name, raised a temple at north Gauhati which stands on the spot where Rudrasimha's remains were entombed. An image of Siva and Rudresvara was enshrined there (*Ibid.*, p. 45; *IIA*, pp. 187, 190).
61. *TB*, p. 42.
62. *Ibid.*, p. 56.
63. *Loc. cit.*; *AB*, pp. 292f. The introduction of the *sraddha* ceremony desiring emancipation of the deceased's soul dates back to the reign of Pratapasimha at Shu-sheng-pha, 1603-41 A.D. (*AB (HB)*, p. 41).
64. *AB*, p. 135; *TB*, pp. 84f.
65. *ABS*, p. 41.
66. *AB (HB)*, p. 61.
67. *IIA*, p. 199.
68. *DAB*, p. 157.

THE SEPOY MUTINY AND THE PORAHAT CHIEF OF SINGBHUM

NIKHIL SUR

The part played by Chotanagpur, and specially by Singbhum, in the history of the Sepoy Mutiny (or Freedom Movement of 1857 as it is sometimes called), has not been well appreciated. Some of the European chronicles have tried to show that the movement having lacked mass support was put down very easily. But some of the original records and authentic documents throw a flood of light on the movement in Chotanagpur, particularly in Singbhum.

During the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857, Rajah Arjun Singh of Porahat played an important role. It was, however, the partisan policy of the British that forced Rajah Arjun Singh to revolt. Before entering into the details of the events, two important facts should be mentioned here which influenced the relations between Porahat and the British Government. One was the hereditary feud that existed between Saraikela and Porahat, and the other was the British policy of strengthening Saraikela.¹

More than 200 years ago, prior to the establishment of the British rule over Singbhum, one Jagannath Singh was the Rajah of Singbhum-Porahat. He had two sons, the elder Purusottam succeeded him as Rajah of Porahat, and the younger Kunwar Bikram Singh (Bura) obtained a portion of the Porahat Raj and founded the Saraikela branch of the family. Since then there had existed a hereditary feud between these two families. And the elevation of Chakradhar Singh of Saraikela to the position of a Rajah widened the already existing gulf of difference between the two families.²

The insurrection in Singbhum broke out, when, on hearing of the mutiny at Ranchi³ and Hazaribagh, Captain Sissmore, Senior Assistant Commissioner at Chaibassa, immediately abandoned his station for fear of a rising there and fled away with his family to Calcutta, leaving the station and treasury in the charge of a native named Mewa Lal and the Kuar of Saraikela.⁴ Before leaving the place, however, he sent a perwanah⁵ to Rajah Arjun Singh of Porahat desiring him to assist the Kuar of Saraikela in taking care of Government property. On receipt of the perwanah Rajah Arjun Singh sent 200 men to Chaibassa, but they returned owing to an outbreak of cholera.⁶ Emissaries from the Ranchi revolutionaries began to arrive at Chaibassa to organise the movement and to take the treasury to Ranchi. At that time Rajah Arjun Singh was selected to lead the movement in Singbhum by the people. Rajah Arjun Singh was urged to proclaim himself the ruler of the country. A proclamation⁷, "the people belonged to God, the country to the king, and Arjun Singh is Ruler thereof", was issued by the people in his name but not under his authority or with his concurrence.⁸ "His learning, enlightenment and above all, his strong sense of justice had well qualified him for this honour from his people."⁹ The Kuar of Saraikela felt insecure and abandoned the civil station at Chaibassa into the hands of the sepoys.

Rajah Arjun Singh still remained behind the picture. There is no doubt that from the very beginning he tried to be loyal and took no decision to revolt although his brother Byjnath

Singh continued exerting his influence on him to join the revolution¹⁰.

In September, 1857, the sepoys looted the treasury at Chaibassa, marching off immediately afterwards along the Ranchi road with the intention of joining the mutineers at headquarters¹¹. But the Sanjai river in full flood blocked their way. At this juncture Arjun Singh met them. They were compelled to surrender their arms, ammunition and the treasure containing Rs 1,85,514-8/- in cash.¹² It was his intention to give up these arms and treasure to the British authorities when they returned¹³.

Things rapidly changed with the arrival of Lt. R. C. Birch who was sent as the Senior Assistant Commissioner of Singbhum in place of Captain Sissmore. The Kuar of Saraikela had already, before the arrival of Lt. Birch, been engaged in turning the course of events in his favour. It appears that Dalton's (Commissioner of Chotanagpur) source of information was the Kuar of Saraikela who sent a wrong information to Dalton to the effect that it was he who had been holding the ground and that the Rajah of Porahat was doing very little for the British¹⁴.

On the arrival of Lt. Birch at Chaibassa the Mocketear of Rajah Arjun Singh made over to him Rs 11,000 of the plundered treasure that had been collected from the sepoys. But no sooner had Lt. Birch come to Chaibassa than the Kuar of Saraikela began to influence him, and without trying to have a correct picture Lt. Birch gave a hasty order to the Rajah of Porahat to deliver himself up¹⁵ which definitely offended his dignity. It is, however, on evidence¹⁷ that the sepoys were rearmed on intelligence being received that the Saraikela forces were about to attack Porahat. But Rajah Arjun Singh sent a petition to Lt. Birch promising to attend soon with the mutineers.¹⁸

On the Rajah's not presenting himself in person before Lt. Birch, he was, on 23rd September, 1857, proclaimed a rebel, and a

reward of Rs 1000/- was offered for his apprehension and his estate was confiscated.¹⁹

The fact is that Rajah Arjun Singh, having believed that the said order was issued at the instigation of the Kuar of Saraikela, was afraid to obey the summons and as a result of such disobedience he was victimised in a way which led him to doubt the impartiality of Lt. Birch's action. There was, however, sufficient ground for such a conviction on the part of Rajah Arjun Singh for the order for his attendance at Chaibassa went direct from Saraikela by the hands of a *Chaprassie* who was in Chakradhar Singh's (the Kuar of Saraikela) service.²⁰

By an *urjee*, dated the 25th September, 1857,²¹ Rajah Arjun Singh reported that he had been diverted from his intention of proceeding to Chaibassa and was about to proceed to Ranchi to the Commissioner to whom he would make over the treasure and the sepoys and then return to Chaibassa. It might be disrespectful and improper, but it was not treason.

It appears that Lt. Birch held very strong views regarding the conduct of Rajah Arjun Singh. Dalton realised: Birch's high-handed policy of declaring Rajah Arjun Singh a rebel and confiscating his estate. In a letter to the Secretary to the Government, dated the 1st October, 1857,²² he stated, "to declare him a rebel, confiscate his estate, and offer a reward for his apprehension are measures that should not, I think, have been so hastily resorted to." He strongly criticised Lt. Birch's action of superciliously exceeding authority. "In declaring the Porahat Estate confiscated, Lt. Birch has, exceeded his authority and it was not necessary for him to have proceeded to such extremities without previously submitting his proceedings for the consideration of his immediate superior or to Government."²³ He also blamed Lt. Birch and made him responsible for the conversion of Rajah Arjun Singh's loyalty to the British into enmity. He stated, "I am inclined to regret his having offered a reward for the Rajah's

apprehension as calculated to drive that chief at once into violent measures."²⁴

Rajah Arjun Singh with his faith in the equity and justice of the British Government, decided to proceed to Ranchi to the Commissioner. The Commissioner gave him permission to go to Ranchi.²⁵ Ultimately Rajah Arjun Singh saw Dalton on the 11th October and surrendered the prisoners and looted treasury to Captain Davies²⁶.

Dalton's letters²⁷ apparently plead his innocence in this affair. But we find no reason in Dalton's yielding to Lt. Birch when he was in a superior position. The conspicuous service rendered by Rajah Arjun Singh was ignored and earned for him no admiration from Dalton. His non-submission to Lt. Birch was perhaps considered by Dalton an affront to the British officialdom. That is why the Rajah was directed by him to go "to Chaibassa as a suppliant."²⁸ It cannot but be admitted that Dalton proved his inability to have an impartial view, specially after Rajah Arjun Singh had seen him and produced before him the prisoners and looted treasury. It was quite natural for Rajah Arjun Singh to think that by producing the prisoners and looted treasury before a higher official his bonafide would be proved and Lt. Birch's proclamation would be revoked.

Up to this time Rajah Arjun Singh was loyal to the British Government and harboured no ill-designs. A few days after he had taken the mutineers and the looted treasure in his custody, he received a letter from Thakur Biswanath Sahi of Chotanagpur stating that the British would never return and calling upon him to send him the sepoys and the treasure. Rajah Arjun Singh was also threatened by the Thakur if he did not do so. On the other hand, Lt. Birch's version was that Arjun Singh had sent a messenger to Doranda for the purpose of inviting Thakur Biswanath Sahi to reinforce him with men and guns.²⁹ The Rajah, however, denied the charge³⁰. Acknowledging the

Rajah's loyalty Dalton observed, "If there be still room to doubt in regard to his loyalty, I have only to reflect on Lt. Birch's unguarded position at Chaibassa up to the 10th October, 1857, and to compare what Urjoon Singh, with his influence in Singbhum and the force at his absolute disposal, might have done, with what he did do to acquit him of all hostile or treasonable intention."³¹

Dalton's direction for going "to Chaibassa as a suppliant" was not acceptable to the Rajah as he feared that he would not be justly treated by Lt. Birch³². He returned to Singbhum and heard that his only son had died suddenly at the very time when the prisoners had been hung at Ranchi³³. This shock led him to believe that the death of his son was a divine judgement for the betrayal of the mutineers. He made up his mind to join the revolution³⁴.

As a precautionary measure he first removed his ladies from Chakradharpur to Porahat, leaving the former under Jaggoo Diwan. The messengers from the British officials were not received by him and were told, "they were prepared to fight"³⁵. The police *Chouki*, established by the Senior Assistant Commissioner during the Rajah's absence, was driven out by Jaggoo. The British forces wasted no time. The Senior Assistant Commissioner immediately attacked Chakradharpur, captured the town along with Jaggoo and hanged him³⁶. Next day when the British forces attacked the Rajah at Porahat he escaped, after some resistance, leaving his palace to be burnt down including the adjoining villages³⁷. Dalton observed,—

"Up to this period, he (Arjun Singh) had probably not quite made up his mind to rebel, but driven from his house and his property seized, he and his followers appear to have flung themselves headlong into revolt"³⁸.

Only a few days later Lt. Birch began to be paid back for the havoc he had committed at

Porahat. Lukhun Tantee, the man who had acted as a spy and guide to the expedition under Lt. Birch, became the first target³⁹. After murdering him the mutineers went on the offensive. The Thakur of Kera was marked out as the object of vengeance for having aided Lt. Birch. His house and the adjoining *Bazar* were plundered and burnt by a force under Kunwar Byjnath Singh, brother of Rajah Arjun Singh⁴⁰. He then marched to Ajoodhia and collected about 2000 men. The news was received by the Government on the 24th December, 1857, and immediately a Sikh contingent under Captain Hale aided by the forces of the Kuar of Saraikela advanced from Chaibassa with Mr. Lushington⁴¹.

The mutineers retired but soon regained confidence to attack and destroy the Jyuntgurb police station which was, according to the Commissioner of Chotanagpur, a signal for an outbreak in the South Kolhan⁴². The Commissioner's inference was not wrong. South Kolhan now witnessed an open revolt which threatened even Chaibassa itself.

The Commissioner took immediate action. He himself, accompanied by the Senior Assistant Commissioner, together with the Sikh contingent under Captain Hale attacked a place called Bur Peer⁴³. On the other side Chakradharpur, which had been placed under occupation of the Kuar of Saraikela, went out of control. The British force which was directed against the Southern Coles was attacked by Rajah Arjun Singh's party and suffered severe losses. Thus Singbhum passed under the control of the insurgents. British authority disappeared from Singbhum till further reinforcements arrived and succeeded in dispersing the Porahat insurgents⁴⁴.

On the 24th March, 1858, Chakradharpur was attacked by Byjnath Singh at the head of a force estimated at 2000⁴⁵. Soon it became the target of another attack made on the 10th June, 1858, by a force under Ruggoo Deo.

This attack was organised by Rajah Arjun Singh at Jumroo four miles west of Chakradharpur⁴⁶.

When Chakradharpur was reoccupied by the British force, Porahat itself was made headquarters of the insurgents. In July a force under the Commissioner of Chotanagpur attacked Porahat and the insurgents had to take refuge in the hills⁴⁷. Yet the rising was not fully suppressed till January, 1859, as during these months the insurgents made frequent guerrilla raids and harassed the British forces⁴⁸. Byjnath and Raggoo Deo captured Anandpur and successfully kept the British on the tenterhook by constant attacks from different posts.

Dalton made an effort to make Rajah Arjun Singh surrender. He authorised the Rajah of Mayurbhanj, the father-in-law of Rajah Arjun Singh, to promise to Arjun Singh that on condition of his surrender his life would be spared⁴⁹. But the effort failed. Meanwhile Lt. Birch improved his position by occupying Kordiham and capturing a huge quantity of arms and ammunition but he failed to capture Rajah Arjun Singh, who had already escaped with his men⁵⁰. Dalton declared that if the Rajah surrendered within the time allowed by the amnesty declaration, he would be treated with as much consideration as his case admitted of⁵¹. The Commissioner waited for some time expecting Rajah Arjun Singh's surrender. But the date fixed by the Queen's declaration expired without any sign of the Rajah's surrender. Lt. Birch in a letter dated the 29th November, 1858, wrote that he had received reliable information that Rajah Arjun Singh was determined not to come in on other terms than the restoration of his entire estate⁵². The Rajah's position, however, was getting desperate by this time. In February, 1859, nearly all the insurgents surrendered⁵³. And on the 15th of February, 1859, Rajah Arjun Singh went to his father-in-law at Karaikela from where he was brought to the British camp at Chakradharpur⁵⁴.

On Dalton's recommendation⁵⁵ the lives

of the Rajah and his brother were spared for the services rendered to the Government immediately before the rebellion and for the circumstances under which they were induced to throw off their allegiance. But Dalton maintained, "not one acre of the confiscated Estate should ever be restored to them, and that they should both be for ever debarred from setting foot in the Singbhum District"⁵⁶.

This case has its parallel in the case of Kuar Singh of Jagadispur in Sahabad district. He was also forced to revolt. Rajah Arjun Singh had to spend the rest of his life at Benares as a political exile on an allowance of Rs. 110/- per month⁵⁷. Shortly after his exile at Benares he submitted several petitions to the Government of Bengal and to the Government of India praying for a reconsideration of the orders passed with regard to him and for the restoration of his estate. But the Governor General-in-Council considered "it impossible, in the face of the opinions given by Captain Dalton and Lieutenant Birch, to permit Urjoon Singh, or any of his family during his life-time, to return to Singbhum."⁵⁸

The story of the movement in Singbhum makes a sad tale of unnecessary interference by the British administrators in the petty jealousies among the chiefs. Bradley Birt ob-

serves, "It was evident that the premature placing of a price upon his head had driven him against his better judgement into the arms of the mutineers."⁵⁹ The insurrection in Singbhum assumed the character of a mass movement in which a great portion of the aborigines had joined with much enthusiasm⁶⁰.

The documents⁶¹ collected from various places of Arjun Singh's retreat by the British officers operating against him throw a flood of light on the character of this movement. Arjun Singh kept himself in close contact with Kuar Singh and other revolutionary leaders from whom he had expected a large force for his assistance⁶². He also received intelligence about the position of the British in India and particularly in the adjoining districts through anonymous letters written by Deonath Sahi, a cousin of Thakur Biswanath Sahi, the famous leader of Ranchi who was hanged on a charge of rebellion⁶³. All these prove that in Singbhum the insurrection conducted by the Porahat Chief and other local leaders in the name of their common leader Babu Kuar Singh, contributed to a well concerted move in Chotanagpur. It is unfortunate for both Kuar Singh and Rajah Arjun Singh that they could not come in close contact and there is no doubt that if Rajah Arjun Singh had joined Kuar Singh through Ranchi they could have put up a formidable resistance to the British.

REFERENCES

1. Judicial Criminal Proceedings, 16th June, 1835, No. 34, Para 5.
2. Judicial Criminal Proceedings, 27th October, 1858, No. 67.
3. The main body of the Ramgarh Light Infantry mutinied at Ranchi early in August, 1857.
4. Birt, Bradley: *Chotanagpur*, London, 1903, pp. 203-228.
5. Dated the 6th August, 1857. Judicial Cr. Proceedings, 27th Oct., 1859, No. 167, para-14.
6. Deposition of Sahib Ram before Senior Assistant Commissioner, Singbhum, on the 8th March, 1859. Jud. Proceedings, 27th Oct., 1859, No. 1 of 168.
7. Deposition of Madhab before the Court Martial at Ranchi on the 26th Sept., 1857. Jud. proceedings, 27th Oct., 1859, No. 2 of 168.
8. Ibid.
9. Dutta, K. K. : *Unrest Against the British Rule in Bihar*, 1831-59.
10. Judicial Proceedings, 27th October, 1859, No. 167, para-14.
11. Birt, Bradley, *Chotanagpur* pp. 203-228.
12. Mutiny Papers, Vol. 14Q No. 42, para-4.
13. Deposition of Sahib Ram.
14. Mutiny Papers, Vol. 14Q No. 41, para-7. Jud. Proceedings, 4th February, 1858, No. 144.
15. Ibid. No. 42, para-4.
16. Deposition of Beharee Lall before Sr. Asstt. Commr. Singbhum dated the 24th February, 1859. Jud. Proceedings, 27th October, 1859, No. 168.
17. Dalton's report, dated the 30th September, 1859. Jud. Proceedings, 27th October, 1859, No. 167.
18. Mutiny Papers, Vol. 14Q, No. 41, para-7.
19. Jud. Proceedings, 4th February, 1858, No. 144.
20. Jud. Proceedings, 27th Oct., 1859, No. 7 of 168.
21. Ibid. Appendix B, 6A/12.
22. Mutiny Papers, No. 42, para-2.

23. Ibid. Vol. 14Q, No. 42, para-6.
24. Ibid. No 41, para-7.
25. Jud. Proceedings, 27th October, 1859. Appendix B 68/A21.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid.
28. Mutiny Papers, Vol. 14Q, No. 46.
29. Home Public Const. 8th January, 1858, No. 145.
30. Defence made by Rajah Arjun Singh before Sr. Asstt. Commr. Singhbhum, dated the 21st March, 1859. Jud. Proceedings, 27th Oct., 1859, No. 169.
31. Dalton's Report dated the 30th September, 1859, para-25. Jud. Proceedings, 27th Oct. 1859, No. 167.
32. Arjun Singh was in doubt in regard to his reception by Lt. Birch. Ibid. para-20.
33. Birt, Bradley. *Chotanagpur*, London, 1903. pp. 203-228.
34. Ibid.
35. Jud. Proceedings, 27th Oct., 1859, No. 167, para-28.
36. Deposition of Kurrum Ali before the Sr. Asstt. Commr. of Singhbhum dated the 29th Feb., 1859. (Jud. Proceedings, 27th Oct., 1859).
37. Selection from Official Letters and Records Relating to the History of Mayurbhanj. Vol. II, No. 631.
38. Jud. Proceedings, 27th Oct., 1859, No. 167, para-32.
39. Ibid., para-7.
40. Deposition of Hari Das, 5th March, 1859. Jud. Proceedings, 27th Oct., 1859. page-377.
41. The officiating Commissioner of Burdwan, who had been appointed special Commissioner for the suppression of munity in Singhbhum and Manbhum.
42. Letter from Commissioner to Govt. of Bengal, dated the 30th September, 1859. para-33. Jud. Proceedings, 27th October, 1859, No. 167.
43. Jud. Proceedings, 17th February, 1859, No. 55.
44. Ibid. 27th October, 1859. No. 167. para-34.
45. Jud. Proceedings, 8th April, 1858, No. 205.
46. Byjnath Singh's letter to Rajah Arjun Singh dated the 16th June, 1858. Jud. Proceedings, 27th October, 1859. page-420. Appendix-C, 4X/13.
47. Dalton's letter dated the 30th September, 1859, para-36. Jud. Proceedings, 27th Oct., 1859, No. 167.
48. Ibid.
49. Jud. Proceedings, 24th June, 1858, No. 118.
50. Selection from official Letters and Records Relating to the History of Mayurbhanj. Vol. 11, No. 656.
51. Ibid.
52. Home Proceedings, 17th December, 1858. S. No. 615, para 5.
53. Jud. Proceedings, 3rd March, 1859, No. 106.
54. Ibid.
55. Dalton's letter dated the 30th September, 1859. para 48. Jud. Proceedings, 27th Oct., 1859. No. 167.
56. Ibid. para 51.
57. Singhbhum Old Records, Vol. VII. Vide Letter to the Commissioner of Chotanagpur from E. H. Laughton, officiating Secretary to the Govt. of Bengal, dated the 2nd December, 1859 (Judicial).
58. Home Department, 9th August, 1861. No. 1519, para-2.
59. Birt, Bradley: *Chotanagpur*, London-1903, p. 228.
60. Home Proceedings, 17th December, 1858, S. No. 615, para 8.
61. Selection from Official Letters and Records Relating to the History of Mayurbhanj. Vol. 11, No. 631.
62. Rajah Arjun Singh's letter to Byjnath Singh, dated the 17th November, 1858. Jud. Proceedings, 27th Oct., 1859. Appendix 'A' 29/9, page-410.
63. Ibid. Appendix 'B' 19/A74
20/A75
21/A59
25/A68

HOW GANDHIJI VIEWED HISTORY

DR. R. K. DHARHIYA

(Gujarat University)

It is very difficult to analyse Gandhiji's views on History as he has hardly discussed it as a subject or a science useful to human life. Of course a lot of material expressing Gandhiji's views on various aspects such as state, government, economics, society, culture and religion, has been published. Particularly the volumes of "The Selected Works of Mahatma Gandhi", published recently, cover up almost all the aspects of the ideology of Gandhiji, but unfortunately they rarely refer to Gandhiji's opinions on history. His other works also reveal the same type of difficulty. Therefore, the only thing that a student of history can do is to collect stray references about history from the speeches and writings of Gandhiji just to have glimpses of Gandhiji's views on history.

There is no need to mention that the core of the Gandhian Philosophy is TRUTH and one of the fundamental ideas which Gandhiji derives from it, is non-violence. According to Gandhiji truth and non-violence combined together form Dharma of an individual as well as of the nation. Truth is realistic and natural and so it does not require any documents to prove its character.¹ Gandhiji remarks: "History has failed to represent the realities of life. It means that it is not able to bring out truth. It describes wars and violence, rise and fall of the dynasties, while it hardly mentions any thing about hundreds of nations who have been living in peace for centuries together. When the flow of truth, love or mercy is interrupted, it is recorded in history. Thus it is a narration of unnatural things which cannot help the development of the human life²".

When Gandhiji was in the prison of Yeravada in 1922, some of his European friends suggested to him to read the Roman History of Gibbon just to avoid his misconceptions about history. Gandhiji gladly following the advice found to his pleasant surprise that Gibbon's history was as a whole a revelation of the inner voice of a human being and it had a considerable value as a moral teacher. Gandhiji liked Gibbon's description of the fall of the mighty Roman empire. He appreciated Gibbon's accuracy which was almost near the truth. Gandhiji felt that history could also suggest the religious sense. Gandhiji admired Motley also for his natural narration of the rise and fall of the republics. He realised that nations were developing by virtues and were decaying by vices. He also found Roseberg to be interesting, but he was unhappy to note that all the three had given exaggerated descriptions and had mostly missed the main facts of human life. Therefore, Gandhiji thought that there was little difference between history and imagination and so Truth was different from history.³

Gandhiji frankly opines that History records conflicts in human life but hardly suggests any solutions for the same. So such a history cannot play any role in the development of a nation. Therefore, he feels that a nation which has no history is the happiest. He is not at all sorry to note that the ancient Indian thinkers had not written any books on history. He argues that the Indian thinkers of the ancient times had tried to see the life in a wider and realistic way and so they had emphasised the value of Truth

and Dharma in the human life. As a result, they were not fascinated by history which liked to describe the unrealistic affairs of human life⁴.

But sometimes Gandhiji evaluated history otherwise also. He once stated that the change from cannibalism to hunting and from hunting to agriculture is a sign of progressive non-violence. The whole history of civilization is marked by the replacement of conflict by co-operation⁵. Perhaps these remarks of Gandhiji are more applicable to civilization rather than history.

Gandhiji drew his philosophy of life mostly from the *Mahabharat*.⁶ After studying it, he derived the following two groups as the moral of the *Mahabharat*:

Truth is	Untruth is
Light	Darkness
Life	Death
Goodness	Evil
Existence	Non-existence
Love	Hatred

He is inclined to feel that history narrates the forces of the second group. So it cannot serve humanity.

However, Gandhiji considers the *Mahabharat* a great treasure-house of history, and he is greatly fascinated by its ideology of Truth and Dharma. He does not bother about the historicity of the characters like Vishma, Yudhisthira and Harishchandra. He thinks them to be more than real because they are the real inspirers of the *Manav-Dharma*.⁷

Thus it is quite clear that Gandhiji laid a great stress on the moral values of any science. Therefore he did not agree with the ideology of Marx that all ills in the society were due to the institutions of private property. He believed that it was partly true. He argues, "Was not Helen of Troy the cause of the Trojan war? Were the wars of the Rajputs related to the

institution of Private Property? No. To banish war we have to do more. We have to eradicate possessiveness, greed, lust and egoism from our own hearts". We have to carry war within ourselves to banish it from the society⁸.

So Gandhian ideas about life and history cannot be understood in terms of Marx or Hobbes, nor in terms of Kant, Herder or Hegel. They may be said to be somewhat similar to those of Ranke and of Toynbee who take history mainly as the search for truth. But Gandhiji's views about history are original and his own and they are based on truth, non-violence and the Indian concept of Dharma⁹. They have not been derived from any historians, but they have been drawn from Harishchandra, Yudhisthira and Rama who sacrificed the dearest for the sake of the fulfilment of their vows and for Dharma. That is why Gandhiji praised Socrates as the greatest *satyagrahi* and the greatest historian¹⁰.

Once a follower of Gandhiji doubted the relevance of Gandhiji's ideas of non-violence to history and requested him to furnish a single illustration of a nation who had won freedom by non-violent means. Gandhiji at once retorted that India was making a new history by resorting to such an effort. However, he replied that the examples of Harishchandra and Prahlada were the symbols of the victory of non-violence over violence. When the worker argued that they were legendary figures rather than historical ones, Gandhiji replied that he considered them more than historical as they had greatly contributed in moulding his character and career.¹¹

Gandhiji was greatly grieved to learn the disunity revealed by history in general and Indian history in particular. He was of the opinion that the English people could establish their rule in India because of the disunity of the Indian people and princes. They had no idea of what *Swarajya* was and how it should be maintained¹². He preferred an anarchy to autocracy and idealism to motiveless activity. That

is why he appreciated Mazzini's ideas of gaining freedom for Italy and disapproved the activities of Cavour and Garibaldi for the same because these led to the establishment of monarchical rule in Italy¹³.

Gandhiji was not prepared to believe that history taught lessons of nationalism. On the contrary, the reverse is the case. There is cramming of events and dates in history and Gandhiji was tired of the cramming of the names of the counties of England. It is just a poisonous dose of so called learning and one has to read other sciences for learning lessons of nationalism¹⁴.

Gandhiji agreed with the common definition of history that it is a record of the past but he was sad to learn that it did not reveal the past in its true sense. History has mostly talked of kings and nobles and rarely of the common people. To Gandhiji's mind such a history is just like an abscess on a human body which should be removed immediately to keep the body free from the disease. We are lacking in history which should describe the details of brotherhood, compromise, adjustment, cooperation and sacrifice among the nations¹⁵.

It is to be noted that all these stray remarks of Gandhiji should not be taken as his final views on history. Most of these remarks were

made by Gandhiji before 1940. After this time he was so deeply involved in the political affairs of the country that he could hardly spare time to revise his views on history. Unfortunately, he could not read the works on philosophy and methodology of history, otherwise it is very likely that he would have changed his viewpoint about history. He himself has said that his earlier utterances need to be understood in the light of his later ones, not vice versa. Gandhiji's ideas are in the main of an existential kind. They grew as he grew up¹⁶.

Professor R. C. Parikh rightly remarked that Gandhiji's views on history should not be viewed separately, but they should be analysed in the context of his ideology of life as a whole¹⁷.

In conclusion the views of Dr. R. C. Majumdar, the eminent historian, may be quoted as they corroborate the other views for understanding the ideas of Gandhiji about history. He remarks, "Gandhiji did not propound any of the approaches or methods of viewing history, but he created one i.e. human approach which includes almost all the other approaches to history. Thus he had a great impact on the approaches to history¹⁸". A historian cannot neglect this contribution of Gandhiji in viewing history.

REFERENCES

1. *Gandhiji, Theory and Practice* (1969), pp. 46-47.
2. *History of Satyagraha Movement in South Africa* (1950), p. 9.
3. *My Experience of Yavada*, pp. 76 to 78.
4. *Hind Swarajya*, pp. 182 to 184.
5. *Harijan*, dated 11.8.40, p. 245.
6. *Gandhi, Theory and Practice*, p. 50.
7. *My Experiences of Yavada*, pp. 77-78.
8. *The Selected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, Vol. VI (1969) pp. 244-245.
9. *Gandhiji, Theory and Practice*, p. 50.
10. *A Story of a Satyagrahi* (1960).
11. *Characteristic Incidents of Gandhiji's Life* (1964), pp. 208-209.
12. *Hind Swarajya*, p. 29.
13. *Ibid*, p. 65.
14. *Gandhi Education*, Part IV, p. 37.
15. *Gandhi Vichar Dohan* (1963), pp. 166-167.
16. *Gandhi, Theory and Practice*, p. 46.
17. Presidential Address at the Seminar on Gandhiji's views on History.
18. *Struggle for Freedom Movement*, Vol. XI.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Napoleonists—A Study In Political Disaffection, 1760-1960 by E. Tangye Lean, Oxford University Press, London, New York, 1970; pp. xiv+402; Price—£ 3.50.

E. Tangye Lean's *The Napoleonists—A Study In Political Disaffection* is not conventional history, but a fascinating study of the careers and opinions of a wide group of individuals who have never before been compared or studied together by any historian. They are the English admirers of Napoleon, people like Charles James Fox, Byron, Hazlitt, William Godwin, Lord and Lady Holland and others less prominent who preferred the French Emperor to their own king George III. These people, according to Tangye Lean, "had intriguing resemblances of character but across a gulf of social and intellectual difference".

In the opening chapter the author describes the unsuccessful French landing in Wales in the period of the Directory (1797), and refers to the abandoned invasion plan of Napoleon of 1798 which had the support of the English radical thinker Tom Paine. Napoleon's attempts to cross the Channel ended in failure; but for a long time he kept up the appearance of invading England which helped him indirectly by pinning down as many British troops in the island as possible, while he went on conquering the Continent. It also appeared to Napoleon "the obvious way of heightening the respect of his sympathizers in England".

In the chapters which follow Mr. Lean discusses in detail the careers and opinions of Napoleon's leading English admirers like Charles James Fox, Byron, Hazlitt, Mrs. Elizabeth Inchbald (an actress and novelist), William

Godwin, Samuel Whitbread (the Whig Parliamentarian), Princess Caroline (wife of the Prince Regent, a niece of George III) and Lord and Lady Holland, many of whom remained loyal to the French Emperor even after his final defeat and abdication. The author discusses briefly the careers and opinions of two Italian admirers of Napoleon who had settled in England at this time, namely Aglio, a bankrupt painter, and Foscolo, a neo-classical poet, and he also refers to certain obscure Englishmen, tinged with Jacobinism, who settled in a square on the outskirts of London, built allegedly by an agent of Napoleon.

From the activities, private and public, of all these admirers of Napoleon the author then proceeds to draw up, in the chapter entitled "The Napoleonist Syndrome", a composite portrait of the English Napoleonist in the late 18th and the early 19th centuries. The Napoleonists "did not behave like a group. As individuals they were independent and ... often at daggers drawn". At first sight they seem to have "nothing else in common than their admiration of Napoleon". But, looking beneath the surface, we find that all these people were non-conformists, either literally or by being shut off since their birth from the main body of the community, and that unwilling to make compromises which would have undermined their self-respect, they stood firmly against the views of the majority. They insisted on seeing evil within the community and virtue outside, and were committed to opposition. At the same time, they were intensely ambitious, and all established a key institution, which our author calls 'the rival court', over which they ruled like dictators. Their mercurial nature led them to make swift reversals and changes of direction. They had a gift for languages, a passion for

foreign travel and a strain of violence which tempted some of them to suicide. Some of these people came to be branded as traitors while others were regarded as statesmen, but almost all were "generous benefactors and dedicated reformers". They admired Napoleon not because they were convinced of his chances of final victory, but because they thought that the French Emperor was, like them, a champion of the outcasts and committed to opposition to the existing regime. Unlike the great majority of the English people they saw Napoleon not as an aggressor to their country's freedom, but as a champion of human rights whose appearance would remove all the obstacles in the path of reform in their own country. Unlike other English Romantics (with whom they shared many traits of character) the Napoleonists were committed to politics, and their Napoleonism was an act of political desperation. They saw the world reduced to slavery by Napoleon's defeat and downfall.

In a brilliant final chapter, entitled 'The Moderns' Mr. Lean traces the lives and opinions of some neo-Napoleonist figures of the post-First World War period such as Lloyd George, Oswald Mosley (who led the British Fascists from 1932 to 1940), Kingsley Martin, Kim Philby (a Communist agent) and others who always saw virtue outside the community, in unprivileged classes and under-privileged nations, and vice in the strong-holds of power within their community.

The Napoleonists is, on the whole, a very interesting study in social psychology, based on original investigation, which throws new light on the causes of disaffection in Englishmen. Those who are interested in biographical literature will also find it refreshing. A large number of illustrations, reproduced from contemporary cartoons and sketches, have greatly added to the interest of the book which also contains a detailed bibliography and a good index.

AMITABHA MUKHERJEE

History and Contemporary India edited by John C. B. Webster: Asia Publishing House, 1971, Price Rs. 18; Pages 123.

The volume under review is the outcome of a Seminar held at Baring Union Christian College, Batala in 1967, the purpose of which was to consider "The Meaning of History for Present Day India". It is, in fact, a collection of papers presented in that seminar on assorted topics and not on the various aspects of a common theme designed to give a full picture of a problem, historical or sociological. The title "History and Contemporary India" is indeed an impressive one, but the contents do not reflect any integrated idea. One would get disappointed if one tries to get an idea of relevance of history to present day India which such a title should convey to him.

About the papers the reviewer is struck by the scrappy nature of tackling an issue like "Historical Thought and Indian Heritage in Nineteenth Century Social Reform Movements" by S. C. Misra. Misra laid great emphasis on one particular point—idealization of the past. Social reform movements in the 19th Century reflected numerous shades of thinking which varied from time to time and place to place. Analogy with Graeco-Roman or Chinese civilisation is really out of place. J. S. Grewal is more objective in his treatment of his subject. He has ably brought out a case in favour of the theory of continuity and change in Indian History. Christian response to Hinduism, though a debatable theme, has been studied carefully by Kaj Baago. But he magnified the impact of Christianity when he wrote, "the attacks from the missionaries first of all produced a sense of communal solidarity among the Hindus" (p. 31). To support this blanket statement he has leaned heavily on what Panikkar wrote, though ignoring the context of the writings of that great historian. It would be out of place here to write in details to contradict the idea of "consolidation of Hindu religious thought" as expressed by the writer. W. H. McLeod has beautifully

drawn the distinction between a religious preacher and a historical figure. These two facts may combine in a single person like Guru Nanak. We fully agree with him that "the truth of the Sikh religion would not be affected by even the most radical historical scholarship on the life of Guru Nanak". It is difficult to agree with the contention of Fauza Singh Bajwa's contention in his paper "History and Moral Judgement". The main task for the historian is to search for truth even if it contradicts a moral judgement of an event. If history is interpreted in terms of a scientific analysis of facts, it cannot be affected by considerations of a moral judgement. Moreover, history with a specific mission or purpose tends to degenerate into, in my opinion, a propagandist literature. In his painstaking analysis of "Hindu and Christian Views of History" A. M. Mundadan has tried to show how religious faith may have its effect upon the study of history. Lack of objectivity in research may, in his opinion, flow from a particular faith itself. He, however, cautions the historian to rise above the dictates or peculiarities of faith. In another paper S. C. Misra examines the "class-concept" in Zia Barni's idea of History. It must, however, be noted that this "class" was not a class in the Marxist sense of the term. John C. B. Webster's paper on "The Role of History in Christian Higher Education in India" is exhaustive. Though he propagated a religious view of history's role in Christian education, he was not dogmatic in his approach. He wants to link it up with "a creative contribution to national development in partnership with men of other faiths."

About the general programming of Seminars the products of which are brought out in book-form, the reviewer has his distinct opinion. Such Seminars must have a common integrated theme and the various papers must cover the different aspects of it. If that is done, a full picture would emerge much to the benefit of the students of history.

TARASANKAR BANERJEE

Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru, Vol. I, Edited by S. Gopal (General Editor): Orient Longman, 1972, Price Rs. 60.00 : Pages 410.

It is indeed refreshing to get a volume of the selected works of Jawaharlal Nehru at hand when the country is celebrating the Silver Jubilee of her Independence. It is needless to emphasise the role of Jawaharlal Nehru in the history of Indian struggle for freedom and such a "selected work" of that great historical figure is welcome. A project of the Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund, this volume covers a period from 1903 to 1924 which corresponded to what is called in the Editorial Note "the formative years" that determined Nehru's life and outlook to a large extent. The Foreword by Sm. Indira Gandhi, our present Prime Minister, has added to its attraction. Correspondence, speeches and writings of Jawaharlal Nehru have been edited with occasional biographical and explanatory footnotes. The 'Glossary' at the end would be helpful to a non-Indian reader. The contents are classified under five sections. Section 1 dealing with 'Early Years' contains only correspondence with his parents. Section 2 captioned 'The Young Lawyer and Nationalist' contains his first public speech and depicts the gradual involvement of Nehru in public life. Nehru 'among the Kisans' is the content of Section 3. The subject matter of Section 4 is his involvement in the non-cooperation movement. The Nehru papers relating to the Nabha trial have been classified under Section 5.

Such a project-work as the volume under review is, is the resultant of a painstaking and careful collection and processing of materials by a band of devoted research assistants who, however, remain obscure. It would have been better if mention could be made of them in the proper place. A word about the editing, now! It is a generally accepted practice all over the world to leave out unimportant, short letters, etc., in a selected work of this nature. While letters No. 1 and 2 may be included for their historical and emotional interest, other short

and unimportant letters like No. 22 and 25 could have been left out. It becomes sometimes difficult to leave out even the smallest details of a person whom we revere. But the reviewer remains unconvinced about the wisdom of an editing of the type we find in the present volume.

Tarasankar Banerjee

Selection from Banera Archives, 1769-1805 A.D., Vol. II. Edited by Dr. K. S. Gupta, Prachya Vidya Prakashan, Udaipur, 1971. Pages XXI—121. Price Rs. 15/-.

The present Volume of the Selections from Banera Archives deals with the period beginning from 1769 to 1805 A.D. This is a very crucial and critical period in the history of Mewar. With the death of Maharana Raj Singh II the civil war between Rana Ari Singh (Arsi) and his nephew Ratan Singh, the posthumous son of Rana Raj Singh II, ensued. The nobles of the state sided with one party or the other. The Marathas, who were coming in big hordes year after year also interfered and aggravated the situation. Before the civil war could come to an end the rivalry between the Chundawats and the Shaktawats took a serious turn causing needless commotion and wanton destruction in the state of Mewar.

With the death of Mahadji, the family feuds, bickering and bitterness in the house of Sindhia increased and had its repercussions on Mewar, so much so, that Ambaji Ingle and Lakhwa Dada, the generals supporting respectively the claims of Daulat Rao and Mahadji's widows, fought bloody battles on the soil of Mewar to establish the supremacy of their respective masters. This shattered the economy of the state, causing untold misery and suffering to the people of the state.

The letters, numbering 105 from the Archives of Banera, have been scientifically edited and in a chronological order. So published, the present volume throws a flood of light on the events that took place in Mewar during this

period. Apart from this they provide valuable information with regard to the institution of the nobility (a very important phenomenon in the history of Mewar), particularly the relations of the nobles vis-a-vis the Maharana in a proper historical perspective. The letters being contemporary documents, the facts brought to light by them are of immense value to the students of Maratha and Mewar history.

The author should be congratulated for taking a lead in exploring and bringing to light such material lying in depositories of these erstwhile Thikanas of the States of Rajputana. It is hoped that others would follow his example and endeavour to explore such valuable material.

R. P. Vyas

Indo-Pakistan Relations (1960-1965) by Dinesh Chandra Jha, Bharati Bhawan, Patna-1, PP. 418, Price Rs. 30.00.

The work under review is a doctoral thesis of the author for which he received the Ph.D. Degree from the Indian School of International Studies in 1969. In discussing the Indo-Pakistan relations from 19 September 1960 to 6 September 1965 the author has consulted all the available published materials and thoroughly analysed the forces and factors responsible for the deterioration of Indo-Pakistan relations. The issues taken up by him in this big volume are: The Kashmir Problem, Border Problems, Minority Problem, Problem of Deportation of Alleged Pakistan Muslims from Eastern India, Alleged Interference in Each Other's Internal Affairs and the Outbreak of Conflict.

Before entering into the subject itself the author has discussed in detail the factors that were mainly responsible for generating ill-feeling between the two countries. Referring to the internal and external factors that contributed to this conflict the author commented: "The study of Indo-Pakistan relations thus has been mainly a study of Conflict."

Actually the main theme of the book commences with the amicable settlement of the Indus Waters on 19 September 1960. Thus the era of better relationship which had begun in September 1958, reached its culmination in September 1960. The Indus Waters Treaty strengthened the hope that all the major issues including the Kashmir problem would be solved very soon. The author stated that "in September 1960 the relations were at a near-amity point". Unfortunately, the period of amity was short-lived. From October 1960 they began to move in opposite directions. From the beginning of 1961 to the outbreak of the Sino-Indian Conflict in October 1962, India and Pakistan were practically involved in a cold war over Kashmir. At the time of the Sino-Indian Conflict the pace of deterioration in Indo-Pakistan relations was slightly accelerated. But they were kept within their limits by the good-offices of the U.S.A. and the U.K. These Powers took the initiative for talks between India and Pakistan towards the end of 1962 to solve their problems. But the efforts failed in August 1963. Again, a hopeful phase began in April 1964 when the Indian and Pakistani leaders sat together to find some solution on Kashmir. This lasted till the last days of Pandit Nehru and the early days of Shastri's Prime Ministership. The Ayub-Shastri talks of 12

October 1964 had failed to stabilise peace in this area. As the result of a series of events the process of deterioration gained strength. An armed clash over the Rann of Kutch in April-May, 1965 and the re-arrest of Sheikh Abdullah made the situation complex. At this stage a general conflagration was averted only by the pressure of the Big Powers. The Kutch Agreement was signed on 30 June 1965. According to the author this was an unreal treaty because "by that time Pakistan had already made plans, and was preparing for the seizure of Kashmir". In fact, from 5 August 1965 large scale infiltration of armed Pakistanis began in Kashmir. Events moved very fast. The Indian Security Forces entered into the Azad Kashmir area. On 1 September came the Pakistani armoured thrust in the Chhamb sector. On 5 September 1965 the Indian Army moved towards Lahore. In this way India and Pakistan entered into "a full-fledged undeclared war". There is no doubt that this book will be liked both by scholars and general readers. The Bibliography and the inclusion in Appendix of a chronological survey of events conditioning Indo-Pakistan relations from September 1965 to September 1971 have enhanced the usefulness of the book. The printing and get-up are good.

AMALENDU DE

FELLOWS OF THE INSTITUTE

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| DR. B. K. APTE (Nagpur) | PROFESSOR H. NAKAMURA (Tokyo) |
| PROFESSOR M. ARA (Tokyo) | DR. K. A. NIZAMI (Aligarh) |
| DR. S. S. BAL (Ludhiana) | DR. P. N. OJHA (Ranchi) |
| DR. K. A. BALLHATCHET (London) | DR. G. C. PANDEY (Jaipur) |
| DR. A. C. BANERJEE (Calcutta) | DR. RICHARD L. PARK (Michigan) |
| DR. H. K. BARPUJARI (Gauhati) | PROFESSOR A. G. PAWAR (Kolhapur) |
| DR. A. L. BASHAM (Canberra) | DR. C. H. PHILIPS (London) |
| SHRI B. K. BASU (New Delhi) | DR. K. K. PILLAY (Madras) |
| PROFESSOR O. P. BHATNAGAR (Allahabad) | MM. D. V. POTDAR (Poona) |
| PROFESSOR N. K. BOSE (Calcutta) | DR. AMBA PRASAD (Delhi) |
| PROFESSOR WILLIAM N. BROWN (Pennsylvania) | DR. BISHESHWAR PRASAD (Allahabad) |
| DR. SUDHAKAR CHATTOPADHYAYA (Visva-Bharati) | DR. S. N. PRASAD (Delhi) |
| DR. S. B. CHAUDHURI (Burdwan) | DR. K. RAJAYYAN (Madurai) |
| DR. ROBERT I. CRANE (Syracuse, U.S.A.) | DR. O. RAMACHANDRAIYA (Waltair) |
| DR. M. N. DAS (Utkal) | DR. R. NARASIMHA RAO (Hyderabad) |
| DR. K. K. DATTA (Patna) | DR. M. RAMA RAO (Tirupati) |
| PROFESSOR V. N. DATTA (Kurukshetra) | DR. V. D. RAO (Nashville, U.S.A.) |
| DR. C. G. DAVIES (Oxford) | DR. V. N. HARI RAO (Tirupati) |
| DR. V. G. DICHE (Bombay) | DR. N. R. RAY (Delhi) |
| DR. G. S. DIKSHIT (Karnatak) | DR. SHIBNARAYAN RAY (Australia) |
| PROFESSOR J. P. D'SOUZA (Bombay) | DR. T. RAY CHOUDHURY (Delhi) |
| PROFESSOR J. FILLIOZAT (Paris) | DR. V. M. REDDI (Tirupati) |
| DR. HOLDEN FURBER (Pennsylvania) | DR. DIETMAR ROTHERMUND (Heidelberg) |
| PROFESSOR G. A. GALLAGHER (Oxford) | DR. N. K. SAHU (Sambalpur) |
| DR. D. K. GHOSE (Burdwan) | DR. B. P. SAKSENA (Allahabad) |
| DR. KRISTOF GLAMANN (Copenhagen) | DR. PARAMATMA SARAN (Hyderabad) |
| DR. S. GOPAL (New Delhi) | DR. D. R. SARDESAI (Bombay) |
| DR. J. S. GREWAL (Amritsar) | DR. J. N. SARKAR (Jadavpur) |
| DR. H. L. GUPTA (Saugar) | DR. B. C. SEN (Calcutta) |
| DR. P. C. GUPTA (Visva-Bharati) | DR. S. P. SEN (Calcutta) |
| PROFESSOR MOHIBBUL HASAN (Kashmir) | DR. DASARATH SHARMA (Jodhpur) |
| DR. S. NURUL HASAN (Aligarh) | DR. G. N. SHARMA (Jaipur) |
| DR. V. G. HATAKAR (Bombay) | DR. R. S. SHARMA (Patna) |
| DR. P. M. JOSHI (Poona) | DR. H. K. SHERWANI (Hyderabad) |
| DR. M. KRASA (Prague) | DR. M. SHESADRI (Mysore) |
| DR. A. KRISHNASWAMI (Annamalai) | DR. B. P. SINHA (Patna) |
| DR. A. R. KULKARNI (Poona) | DR. D. P. SINHA (North Bengal) |
| DR. K. S. LAL (Delhi) | DR. FAUJA SINGH (Patiala) |
| PROFESSOR D. A. LOW (Sussex) | DR. GANDA SINGH (Patiala) |
| DR. T. V. MAHALINGAM (Madras) | DR. H. L. SINGH (Banaras) |
| DR. R. C. MAJUMDAR (Calcutta) | DR. D. C. SIRCAR (Calcutta) |
| PROFESSOR TORU MATSUI (Tokyo) | DR. T. G. P. SPEAR (Cambridge) |
| DR. P. L. MEHRA (Chandigarh) | DR. A. L. SRIVASTAVA (Agra) |
| MM. DR. V. V. MIRASHI (Nagpur) | DR. H. S. SRIVASTAVA (Gorakhpur) |
| DR. B. B. MISRA (Delhi) | DR. N. SUBRAMANIAN (Madurai) |
| DR. G. M. MORAES (Goa) | PROFESSOR P. S. VELAYUDHAN (Kerala) |

A Monumental Publication

THE DICTIONARY OF NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY

- ★ Contains biographical sketches of about 1400 Indians (and also foreigners who made India their home) who had achieved eminence from 1800 to 1947 in any sphere of work — politics, education, social and religious reforms, literature, science, journalism, law, administration, industry etc.
- ★ This monumental work is the first of its kind in India, on the lines of the Dictionary of National Biography in foreign countries.
- ★ DNB is being published in 4 Volumes of approximately 550 pages each, the size of the page being 24 × 18 cm. (Double-Crown), with two columns per page. It is being printed in one of the best presses in India, and the quality of production will conform to the best international standard.
- ★ Vol. I covers biographical sketches from A to D; Vol. II from E to L; Vol. III from M to R; and Vol. IV from S to Z.

Price for Full Set of 4 Volumes :

India — Rs. 400/-. (Postage Extra).
Foreign Sale — U.S. \$ 80 or its equivalent in any foreign currency.
(Postage Extra).

Vol. I came out in August 1972; Vol. II will be out in February 1973, Vol. III in June 1973, and Vol. IV in October 1973.

Special Discount of 10% if full amount is paid in advance by February 1973.

For registering your order, please write to :

Registrar,
Institute of Historical Studies,
35, Theatre Road,
Calcutta-17 (India)