1-26
17-2-37.
M.R.O. 1—82 400—22-11-30

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 365 Press Mis.

Dated 30 — 3 — 1871.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

PR
17-2-37

Read the following papers:—

No. 118. Petition from SOOBRAMANEYA GURUKAL, MUTTOOSAWMY GURUKAL and others, of Kuhambattoor and other villages of Coimbatore. (Here enter, 20th Dec. 1869, No. 3118.)

No. 119. Petition from SIVARAMA IYER, of Nellicherry village, Palghaut Taluq, Malabar. (Do. 15th „ „ 3119.)

No. 120. From H. E. SULLIVAN, Esq., Acting Collector of Coimbatore, to the Acting Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated Coimbatore, 7th February 1870, No. 10.

As directed in Mr. Under Secretary Wellesley's Memorandum, dated 25th ultimo, I have the honour to report on petitions, Nos. 3118 and 3119 of 1869, which are herewith returned.

2. The accompanying letter, dated 29th ultimo, from Mr. Thomas, who was seventeen years Collector of this District, is sufficient to prove that the Peyroor Pagoda has always been considered a show place, and that no objection has hitherto been raised to Europeans visiting it and inspecting the stone carvings. It is moreover entered as such in Murray's guide book, it finds a place in the list of architectural structures worthy of being photographed, submitted under the Order of Government, Public Department, dated 29th October 1867, No. 1348, and where under a subsequent Order, dated 13th November 1867, No. 1427, Captain Lyon visited this district, it was photographed, and the fact reported to Government by Mr. Grant in his letter, dated 5th December 1867, No. 120. I am also informed that it was photographed by Dr. Hunter only a year ago.

3. Shortly after taking charge of the district last year the Dharmakarta Siva Ram Iyer applied to me to issue a notice prohibiting Europeans visiting the pagoda. As, from my previous knowledge of the district when employed in it as Head Assistant and Sub-Collector, I was aware that this would be an innovation, and as, on inquiry, I learned that no complaints had ever been made against persons visiting the pagoda, I declined to accede to his request. A short time after this, (the petition fixes the date as the 10th November,) Mr. Bourne, of the Firm of Bourne and Shephard, the Calcutta photographers, came to Coimbatore and asked me whether the pagoda at Peyroor which he had seen mentioned in Murray's handbook was worth photographing. I advised him to judge for himself and rode out to Peyroor with him the following morning. On our arrival a man, who I was informed was the Devassom Monigar, in the most insolent manner opposed our entrance, and flourishing an impertinently-worded notice (copy enclosed) in our faces informed us that the Dharmakarta had given orders that we were not to be admitted. The demeanour of this individual was eminently calculated to provoke a breach of the peace, but though much annoyed at the insult which had been offered to me, I contented myself with addressing the crowd who had assembled, asking whether any objection had ever been made to gentlemen inspecting the pagoda. Two or three came forward and informed me that no objection had ever been raised previous to the appointment of the present Dharmakarta, and that so

far as they the residents of the place were concerned we were welcome to inspect the building. We were then allowed to pass in, and the Brahmins who accompanied us were most civil and obliging in pointing out the different objects of interest to us. With regard to ascending the Kanakasabay I would observe that, previous to doing so, I asked the Brahmins who were with us whether there was any objection. They replied in the negative, and coming with us gave us information regarding the monolithic figures for which the pagoda is famous. This Kanakasabay is identical with the stone choultry referred to by Mr. Thomas to which free access has always been granted.

4. On my return to Coimbatore I informed the Members of the Temple Committee how I had been insulted, and told them that, as the Devassom Monigar had acted under the orders of the Dharmakarta, who, I may observe, is a native of, and resides in, the Malabar District, and as the notice bore his signature I would report what had occurred to Government unless they appointed another Manager. They expressed great regret for the insult to which I and the gentleman who accompanied me had been subjected, and asked me to allow them time to consider what to do. Of course this was granted, but as after the lapse of more than two months I had received no communication from them, a letter was drafted calling upon them to state what they proposed to do, but before it was despatched I received these petitions with the order of Government calling on me for an explanation. That which I have now submitted will, I trust, be considered satisfactory.

5. I now leave it to His Excellency in Council to decide whether the insolent terms in which this man has presumed to speak of European visitors to the temple in paragraph 5 of his petition, and the insult which under his orders was publicly offered to myself, are to pass unnoticed. I would respectfully suggest that nothing short of his removal from office, which I originally demanded at the hands of the Committee, will meet the exigencies of the case. Throughout my career in India I have always most scrupulously respected the religious prejudices of the Hindoos so that the insult offered to me on this occasion was wanton and unprovoked, and unless it is seriously noticed, the man who dares, in a petition addressed to the Governor in Council, to characterize English gentlemen as " persons of doubtful extraction," will not hesitate to repeat it.

6. I have further to request an expression of the opinion of Government as to whether a temple largely endowed from Imperial revenues, which for years has been open to the public for inspection, can be closed to them by the authority of a fanatical bigot residing in another part of the country. I have visited the temples of Strirungum, Madura, and Humpy, places of far greater note and sanctity than Peyroor, and never until now, during the course of nearly twenty years' service, have I ever met with any thing but the greatest civility at the hands of the Pagoda Managers.

From E. B. **THOMAS**, Esq., late of the Madras Civil Service, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated Coonoor, 29th January 1870.

I am in receipt of your demi-official letter, requesting me to give you my experience, during the seventeen years I held the Coimbatore Collectorate, as to the custom of visiting the Peyroor Pagoda, and its stone carvings, as a sight for visitors and travellers. I can only mention, as a

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Department,
30th March 1870.

simple statement of facts, that I have visited the pagoda, (the only thing worth seeing in the neighbourhood,) FREQUENTLY, with strangers from Europe, or Bengal, or Madras ; if my memory serves me, at least two Governors, Sir Charles Trevelyan and Sir William Denison, were among the number. *No* objection was *ever* offered.

Though not required to be so, the pagoda officials were some of them, usually present, in courtesy, or to answer any questions asked about dates, carving, &c. We did not, of course, enter the penetralia or inner portions where the idol was, but were allowed *freely* to inspect the stone choultry (within the gate) famous for its groups of carved figures, and also used to walk all round the enclosure within the outer wall. The Brahmins always seemed to think the visit rather a compliment. You are welcome to make any use you like of the above statement.

Copy of Notice issued by Siva Ramayer, Dharmakarta in the Peyroor Pagoda.

As is contrary to the Hindoo religion and doctrine to allow all those gentlemen professing Christian religion to see the beautiful works worked in the rocky poles of this temple except Hindoos who are attached to the same religion, all others must not come beyond the gate ; in case of their entering into the temple they should have to pay not ony 300 rupees, which would be the whole sum for purifying it, but also they would have to undergo the punishment fixed in obedience to Indian Penal Code Act.

1*st November* 1869. (Signed) SIVA RAMAYER,
Dharmakarta.

No. 121. ORDER THEREON, 30th March 1870, No. 368.

From these papers it appears that, shortly after Mr. Sullivan's appointment to the Coimbatore District, Siva Ramayer, the Dharmakarta of the Peyroor Pagoda, applied to that officer to issue a notice prohibiting Europeans from visiting the Pagoda.

2. As the Pagoda had been always an object of interest for travellers in the Coimbatore District, and had, for many years past, been open to the inspection of Europeans, Mr. Sullivan declined to accede to the request, and shortly afterwards, in company with Mr. Bourne, the Photographer, visited the Pagoda in person.

3. On this occasion he was met by a person styled the Devassom Monegar who opposed his entrance to the Pagoda producing a notice signed by the Dharmakarta Siva Ramayer giving orders that gentlemen professing the Christian religion were not to be admitted.

4. Mr. Sullivan addressed the crowd of residents who by this time had assembled, and with their consent inspected the structure, himself and his companion being treated with perfect civility by the resident Brahmins who accompanied them round the structure, and pointed out to them its most remarkable features.

5. It would appear, from Mr. Sullivan's report, that he committed no intrusion on what may be considered the sacred penetralia of the Pagoda, as he was accompanied throughout his inspection by the attendant Brahmins, who raised no objection to his proceedings.

6. Mr. Sullivan on his return to Coimbatore reported to the Temple Committee the manner in which he had been opposed by the Dharmakarta of the Peyroor Pagoda, and demanded his dismissal and the appointment of another Manager. The Committee expressed their regret at the opposition to which the Collector of the

District had been subjected, but have as yet taken no steps for the removal of the Dharmakarta, Siva Ramayer.

7. The Government are of opinion that this person has shown himself quite unsuited for his responsible position. It is clearly proved that the Peyroor Pagoda has, for a length of time, been open to the inspection of Europeans, and has been considered an object of public interest on account of the specimens of ancient sculpture which it contains. It is also highly probable that such inspection of the building is in no way objected to by the resident Brahmins. Under these circumstances it would be altogether opposed to the policy of Government, and the liberal spirit of the times, to permit a place which has long been open to Christian visitors to be withdrawn from the public view. If such a course was sanctioned in the present case it would be in the power of Dharmakartas of rigid and fanatical views to exclude travellers and even the European officers of Government habitually from the most celebrated seats of Hindoo art and worship which have hitherto been accessible without, it is believed, any offence to the principles of the Hindoo religion, or to the feelings of its reasonable votaries. The Government need only point to the vast extent, mysterious character, and peculiar population of these edifices to prove that they could not be converted into inaccessible enclosures or sanctuaries without results much to be deprecated. The officers of the Magistracy and Police, whether European or Native, could not, of course, at any time be excluded in the prosecution of their official duties, but the Government consider that the habitual publicity which these places now enjoy must exert a wholesome influence on the character of those who dwell in them or repair to them. A subversion of the liberal usage now prevailing and the substitution of a system of secresy and sequestration could not fail to be attended with a development of religious bigotry and of caste pride and intolerance perhaps even of malpractices and crimes difficult to penetrate. The Government are determined not to permit a reactionary movement of this nature.

8. The Government have, on broad motives of policy, severed themselves from all interference with the religious institutions of the country, and have no power to remove the Dharmakarta. But the Temple Committee of the Coimbatore District hold under Act XX. of 1863 all the powers formerly vested in the Board of Revenue for the removal of Temple Managers; and the Government leave the question for the present in their hands with the expression of their opinion that Siva Ramayer, the present Dharmakarta, has committed a serious error in wishing to exclude European visitors from those parts of the temple which have hitherto been open to inspection, and that he ought to be removed from a position for which he has proved himself unfitted.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Collector of Coimbatore.

,, Members of the Temple Committee of the Coimbatore District.

Exd. J. Wright.

Govt. of {1870} Madras.

PUBLIC.

To

THE COLLECTOR OF COIMBATORE.
&c., &c., &c.

Dated March, 30th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G. O., 30th March 1870, No. 368.

MARCH.
Nos. 118—121.

Passing orders regarding the conduct of the Dharmakarta of the Peyroor Pagoda, Siva Ramayer, in having opposed the entrance of the Collector of the District into it while it had been previously open to inspection by Europeans.

Corfu 29 Sept 70

My dear Mother

I received your kind letter, & dear Mary's, yesterday, & Fine Gun Mary Lyttleton, during the 19 years I've had the Corps B. Collection, no b the Custom of visiting the Prison Ships, & like Mine Camping, as a sight for visitors & Inspections I can only mention, as a simple Statement of Facts, that I have

You are welcome to
make any use you like
of the above statement.
I remain faithfully
S. B. Hurd M.D.
M.C.S. Retired.

The object of planning this notice to the publick by the Tharmakartha Sevaramyer of the Temple of Parvoor is as follows.

It is contrary to Hindu religion and doctrine to allow all those gentlemen professing Christian religion to see the beautiful works worked in the rocky poles of this Temple except Hindus who are attached to the same religion all others must not come beyond the gate; in case of their entering into the Temple they should have to pay not only 300 Rs. which would be the whole sum for purifying it but also they would have to undergo the punishment fixed in obedience to Indian Penal Code Act.

November 1st 1869.

(Signed) Sivaramyer
Tharmakartha.

[illegible]

[illegible]

(Signed) Swaramyer
[illegible]

(True Copies)
[illegible]

70. Dispatch

One letter from the Collector of Coimbatore

Dated 7th February 1807

No. 10.

Copy of Notification issued by the Dewan Sheristadar in the Peppoor Pagoda.

Enclosure No. IV.

1870.

Dispatch

In a letter from the Assistant Collector of Coimbatore dated 5th February 1870

Vide-10.

Noted

Lt. Col. Thomas Esqr.
Coonoor.

H. E. Sullivan Esqr.
Coimbatore.

Giving his experience as to the custom of visiting the Pagoon, Pagoda & its stone Carvings in the Coimbatore District.

Enclosure No III

Arch.
B 41.5
Dec 12 1809

B (1)

The following is a Maharazamana of the ~~Dewasthanam~~ of the ~~Pagoda~~ ~~Temple~~ ~~Establishment~~ ~~Establishment~~ of the Pagoda by ~~the~~ ~~Chetti~~ Pálayam ~~Chetti~~ Patti, Nara. ~~Chetti~~ Chetti ~~Caravadi~~ Pálayam Patti in the Province of Jaffna

~~The~~ religious rites to be performed in the Pagoda Devasthanam had been long neglected in consequence of the Devastha~~m~~ ~~Agent~~ having been till recently ~~managed~~ by Vadras; since the appointment of ~~Vadra~~ Vanniya Pandara Pillay a ~~Vadra~~ wealthy respectable ~~and~~ Native of Palaikaut, well versed in the Vedas and ~~is~~ ~~styled~~ as the Manager of the Pagoda, the several Ceremonies have been properly conducted and ~~are~~ performed according to the ~~Vedas~~

It is also ~~praiseable~~ to admit ~~the~~ ~~Europeans~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~Pagoda~~ ~~and~~ ~~to~~ ~~allow~~ ~~them~~ ~~to~~ ~~see~~ ~~the~~ ~~Pagoda~~ ~~and~~ ~~the~~ ~~Images~~ ~~and~~ ~~the~~ ~~Ceremonies~~ ~~performed~~ ~~therein~~ ~~but~~ ~~not~~ ~~to~~ ~~admit~~ ~~them~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~Kumbha~~ ~~Sabha~~ ~~which~~ ~~is~~ ~~the~~ ~~Holy~~ ~~of~~ ~~Holies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~Pagoda~~ ~~and~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~the~~ ~~Natives~~ ~~alone~~ ~~are~~ ~~admitted~~ ~~to~~ ~~enter~~ ~~and~~ ~~perform~~ ~~their~~ ~~worship~~ ~~and~~ ~~Ceremonies~~ ~~and~~ ~~to~~ ~~make~~ ~~their~~ ~~offerings~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~Idols~~ ~~and~~ ~~to~~ ~~receive~~ ~~the~~ ~~Theertham~~ ~~and~~ ~~Prasadam~~ ~~from~~ ~~the~~ ~~Priests~~ ~~and~~ ~~to~~ ~~see

shared.

[illegible] this
[illegible] the
[illegible] ce of
[illegible] chang
[illegible] ted
[illegible] and
[illegible] pub-
[illegible] ty and
[illegible] r
[illegible] r to
[illegible]

noxious to the feelings of the Hindus, as
three important idols Vakkapati, Bhatte-
Mudi & Gomuru are established there in
and worship carried on by Brahmins.
Government have with marked liberality
made a grant of land paying an assess-
ment of Rupees as darra
Minniyam [illegible] than 84 servants
will be kept on the Pagoda establish-
ment to carry on the daily work of
the Pagoda and [illegible] arrangement
made for the due performance of the
Poojahs Ceremonies &c as enjoined in the
Shastras by Government when it had
the management of [illegible] transferred
subsequently to certain Hindu Pro-
prietors. The administration of Christians into

into such an important Pagoda as this besides the
being highly opposed to our Charter is a ce of
positive encroachment on our vested rights; Chang
and would tend to interfere seriously with ted
the present management of the Pagoda and reli-
the performance of its Ceremonies besides treated
directly wounding the religious feelings pub-
of Siva Rama Ayyar and ourselves
The Pagoda lands attached to the
had been long lying uncultivated owing
to the irrigation works on which their
cultivation depended having been long neg-
lected. The loss of revenue to the Pagoda
has in consequence been very great. The
present Dharma Kartha has taken steps
to have these lands properly cultivated
and to carry out the much-needed re-
pairs to the irrigation channels and
reservoirs and has already expended a
large sum of money in the
Mantapams, Gopuramsetc. These works
are now vigorously pushed on. The

Dharmakartha

Dharmakarttar while raising the salaries of the Pagoda establishment in consideration of the insufficiency of the former allowance has also taken various measures to enlarge the revenue of the Pagoda.

5. The Devotees on the occasion of these improvements presented a Petition to the Collector of Coimbatore on the 26th October praying that orders might be issued prohibiting Christians from entering the Temple on the ground of its being objectionable to the Hindu religion as already stated in Para 2. The Collector however before issuing final orders on the subject as prayed for came to the Temple himself and polluted it to the great disappointment & grief of the undersigned and accasioned the large outlay incurred in purifying the Temple & making it fit for [illegible] ces of worship.

6. The very officers who is bound to award punishments under the Penal Code to persons committing offences similar to

(2)

to what he himself has committed in this instance has forced his way into the Temple and polluted it in defiance of the solicitations of the servants in charge of the Pagoda, we have been subjected to the great humiliation and heartfelt grievance of seeing our Pagoda treated with no more consideration than a public thoroughfair.

7. As we deeply feel this indignity and deplore our misfortune, it is our [illegible] and sincere prayer that Government will compassionate our condition and take measures to keep our sacred place of worship free from all trespasses of the kind aforesaid.

to the great divaspasit-
ment and grief of
Petrs & occasioned
the great outlay incur-
red in purifying the
temple & rendering it
fit for worship —

Pray that the Govt
will be pleased to
take measures to
keep their Sacred place
of worship free from
all trespass alluded to.

No 3.

From Soobramaniya
Gurukal, Muttoosamy
Gurucal & others of
Huliambattoor &
other villages of
Coimbatore.

Dated 20 Dec 1869
Recd
With 2 Pets.

S.C. 3/1/70

States that it is ob-
jectionable to admit
Europeans entering the
Pagoda particularly
to Karuthasabhai
a sacred place;
while to the collegiate
plied to for an order
preventing Christians
from entering the
temple, came to the
temple & polluted it

C 17/2/70
K 2/3

A

Inclosure

No 9.

Office of Devasom Committee
Coimbatore
13th May 1869.

Seal

Mookliyar Sunnad executed by Devasom Com-mittee of Coimbatore Talook to Shiva Ramayen son of Nelisherry Chidambarayen of Palghat Talook.

Whereas you have been appointed Dharma Kartava of Perur Devasom situated within Coimbatore Talook you are authorised by the Committee to have the established custom of Religious ceremonies appertaining to the above Devasom duly exercised, to have the temple as well as the Eri, Watercourses &c appertaining to the temple, repaired when necessary, and to have the sole controle over the Establishment of the temple, their dismissal & entertainment as you may seem proper and the management of the affairs in general connected with the temple as required by the Shastrom. You are also at liberty to conduct the annual settlement affairs of the lands allowed to the temple on Manyam, the issue of their Pattas and the recovery of their rents pursuant to the Regulation and Act relating the duties of Dharma Kartava. You are likewise required at the end of each fusly, in accordance with the provisions of Sec: 13 of Act 20 of 1863 to submit to the Committee an Account Current of Receipt & Disbursment of the temple with your Annual Report. The Committee Authorises you to hold the appointment of Dharma Kartava to such time as you may seem desirable to retain the same.

Signatures of the parties comprising the Committee

Sig^d Shrivedanyava Perumala Muttar
" Nanjonda Goiper
" Marooda Challa Kavonden
" K. Kanaga Sabapadi
" Ananda Shell
" Nada thoni Kavonden
" Pallanyappa Shetty
" Moodooora Shetty
" Sooprya Pillay
" Vingida Shamy Kavoota

Sig^d Moorgasha Moodaly.
Secretary.

(True Translation)

To,

His excellency the Right honorable
the Governor of Madras.

The humble memorial of Sivarama Iyer of Nellicherry Iramam,
Palghaut Taluk, Malabar District.

Most respectfully sheweth.

That your memorialist was appointed Dharmakartha or manager of the very extensive and highly celebrated Pagoda at Perur in the Coimbatore District by its Devasthanam Committee who gave him a deed, copy enclosed marked A, making over all their rights in the management of the Pagoda affairs to your memorialist and empowering him to exercise those rights till such time as it may please him to retain the power conferred by the deed.

2. That the Committee were induced to take such a step owing to the affairs of the Pagoda having fallen into confusion by mismanagement during a long series of years and owing to the charities and ceremonies connected with the Pagoda having been for a long time utterly neglected

neglected or only very superficially attended to.

3 That your memorialist after assuming the management of the Pagoda has with earnest solicitude for the strict fulfilment of the trust imposed on him, striven even at great personal inconvenience and pecuniary loss to himself to improve the resources of the Pagoda and to see to the performance of the charities connected with it in a manner becoming the high esteem in which the shrine is held by the natives as evidenced by the people of the place in the enclosed Kroha: Larinamah marked B.

4: That among the many improvements effected by your memorialist the most important and by far the most desired of all was the strict exclusion from the temple of all persons whom it is most objectionable according to the Hindu tenets to admit into the sanctuary.

5. That this measure as your Excellency must be aware being absolutely necessary to preserve the holiness of the shrine, your memorialist has endeavoured to enlist the cooperation and aid of the authorities by a petition to the Collector of Coimbatore requesting that officer to issue orders to afford aid to your memorialist in preventing men of objectionable extraction from entering the temple and had also a notice in Tamil and English stuck up prominently at the entrance to the Pagoda to warn the aforesaid people from inadvertently entering a place strictly reserved for caste people.

6. That [illegible] from the memorialist's [illegible] support in a measure that involved the dearest interests of the native community viz the preservation of the sacred shrine from pollution, came to the Pagoda on the morning of the [illegible] on working to enter it, was requested not to do so by the Maniyar who called his attention to the notice put up by your memorialist.

7 That Mr Sullivan in spite of the humble remonstrances of the servants in charge of the temple, entered it, passed through a part called Kanakka-

where some of the idols of the temple are placed and worshipped and where the Brahmins assemble and chant out the Vedas and carry on the worship.

8. That the Collector before leaving the temple called on the trustees to withdraw from the hands of your memorialist the power they had made over to him which they declared themselves unable to do.

9. That by taking the step he did Mr. Sullivan has defiled the favorite sanctuary much to the sorrow and heartfelt discontent of the native community.

10. That your memorialist begs to refer your Excellency to the necessity of performing the expiatory ceremonies enjoined by the Shastras so as to render the temple fit for purposes of worship, and incurred a large expenditure which under the present straitened circumstances of the temple, is felt to be a heavy and grievous charge on its slender resources.

10. That your Excellency can gather from the enclosed Mahazarnama the sense of injury felt by the native community without exaggeration. — No 211 of 1869.

community at the outrage perpetrated on their favorite shrine.

11. That your memorialist although himself a land holder and never willing to propitiate the local authorities as far as lay in his power, is yet bound in duty as a sincere believer in the Hindu faith and as the accredited agent and Manager of the Sivasthanam to resolutely carry out all measures to preserve the sacred character of the shrine according to Hindu ideas and Hindu Shastras.

12. That as his right to keep out from the temple whomsoever it will be to admit, is undoubted; and as the enlightened spirit of your Excellency's administration will not as your memorialist humbly trusts, suffer a wilful and unprovoked insult on the religious faith of any portion of Her Majesty's subjects in India to pass unnoticed, it is your memorialist's humble prayer that enquiries will be instituted into the subject of the existing grievances herein brought to notice and that ready redress will be granted to your unfortunate memorialist, and his coadjutors & Co-religionists, for which act of kindness

Where same as this deed [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Draft as proposed by H.E.
The Governor

Read letter from Sobbramanya Gurukal
" " Ramasawmy Gurukal & others
of Siva Subbaya and other Pagodas
of Coimbatore } Here enter 20 Dec. 1869 No 3118.

" " Ramasawmy Iyer of Nallicaudapy
" " Sri Ranga Sawmy Naicker } " " 15 " " 3119.

" " from the A. Collector of Coimbatore " " 4 Feb. 1870 No. 10.

No 368 Dated 30 March 1870

From these papers it appears that shortly after Mr. Sullivan's appointment to the Coimbatore District Siva Ramayan the Dharmakarta of the Perpoor Pagoda applied to that officer to ~~prohibit~~ issue a notice prohibiting Europeans from visiting the Pagoda.

2. As the Pagoda had been always an object of interest for travellers in the Coimbatore District and had, for many years past, been open to the inspection of Europeans, Mr. Sullivan declined to accede to the request and shortly afterwards, in company with Mr. Bourne the Photographer, visited the Pagoda

May any doubt is, whether, as we cannot Empower Dismissal, we should demand it of

person.

3. On this occasion he was met by a person styled the Devadasa Monegar who opposed his entrance to the Pagoda producing a notice signed by the Dharmakarta Siva Ramayan giving orders that gentlemen professing the Christian religion were not to be admitted.

4. Mr. Sullivan addressed the crowd of residents who by this time had assembled, and with their consent inspected the Structure, himself and his companion being treated with perfect civility by the residents. Brahmins who accompanied them round the Structure and pointed out to them its most remarkable features.

5. It would appear from Mr. Sullivan's report that he committed no intrusion or act which may be considered sacrilegious of the Pagoda, as he was accompanied throughout his inspection by the attendant Brahmins, who raised no objection to his proceedings.

6. Mr. Sullivan on his return to Coimbatore reported to the Temple Committee the manner in which he had been opposed by the Dharmakarta of the Perur Pagoda and demanded his dismissal and the appointment of another Manager. The Committee expressed their regret at the opposition which the Collector of the District had been subjected to but have as yet taken no steps for the removal of the Dharmakarta Siva Ramayan.

7. The Government are of

opinion that this person has shown himself quite unsuited for his responsible position. It is clearly proved that the Peyson Pagoda has for a length of time been open to the inspection of Europeans and has been considered an object of public interest on account of the specimens of ancient sculpture which it contains. I think also highly probable that such inspection of the building is in no way objected to by the resident Brahmins. Under these circumstances it would be altogether opposed to the policy of Government and the liberal spirit of the times to permit a place which has long been open to Christian visitors to be withdrawn from the public view. If such a course was sanctioned in the present case it would be

the power of Dharmakaras of rigid and fanatical views to exclude Travellers and even the European Officers of Government habitually from the most celebrated & sacred Hindu art and worship which have hitherto been accessible without, it is believed, any offence to the principles of the Hindu religion or to the feelings of its reasonable votaries. The Government would only point to the vast extent, mysterious character and peculiar population of these edifices to prove that they could not be rendered inaccessible or converted into inclosures or sanctuaries without resolutely & deliberately violating the most cherished principles of the Magistracy. Officers of the Police whether European or Native could not, of course, at any time be excluded in the exercise of their official duties by the Government nor could they consider that the habitual "public" which these

[illegible] enjoy must
& evil & poisonous
influence on the character
of those who dwell in
it or resort to them.
2 Extension of the liberal
usage now prevailing and
the substitution of system
of secrecy and registration
could not fail to be
attended with a
development of religious
bigotry and of caste
pride and intolerance
perhaps even of malpractices
and crimes difficult
to penetrate. The
Government are determined
not to permit a reactionary
movement of this nature.
3. The Government have
on broad notions of policy
severed themselves from
all interference with
the religious institutions
of the country and
have no power to remove
the Dharmakarta.
But the Temple Committee
of the Coimbatore District

held under Act XX of 1863
all the powers formerly vested
in the Boards of Revenue for
the removal of Temple Managers
and the Government leave
the question for the present
in their hands with the
expression of their opinion
that Siva Ramayer the
present Dharmakarta has
committed serious error
in wishing to exclude
European visitors from those
parts of the Temple which
have hitherto been open
to inspection and that
having it to be removed
from a position for which
he has proved himself
unfitted.

[illegible] } dispd 4/11

Public Department

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following papers

Petitions from Sivarama dyer, Palghaut Taluq, and Subramuniya & others — (M.E. 15 & 20 — 6th Dec. 1869 — Nos. 3119 & 3118.)

Letter from the Ag Collr of Coimbatore — (M.E. 9th Feb 1870, No. 10)

Order thereon Feb. 1870, 16

From these papers it appears that the Subdivisional Officer of the Coimbatore District Siva Rama Iyer, the Dharmakarta of the Pappur Pagoda applied to that officer to issue a notice prohibiting Europeans from visiting the Pagoda.

2 As the Pagoda had

had been always a show-
place for travellers in
the Coimbatore District
and had from time
immemorial been open to
the inspection of Europeans.
Mr. Sullivan declined
to accede to the request,
and shortly afterwards,
in company with Mr.
Bourne, the Photographer
visited the Pagoda in
person.

3. On this occasion
he was met by a person
called the Devasam
Moneygar who opposed
his entrance to the Pagoda,
producing a notice
signed by the Dharmakar-
ta Siva Rama Iyer,
giving orders that he was
not to be admitted.

4. Mr. Sullivan
addressed the crowd of
residents who by this time
had assembled and
with their consent
inspected the building
himself and his
companion being treated
with perfect civility
by the resident Brahmins
who accompanied them
round the building
and pointed out the
objects of general
interest.

5. At his departure
Mr. Sullivan's report
that he committed
no intrusion on what
may be considered
the sacred penetralia
of the Pagoda, as he
was accompanied
throughout his inspec-
tion by the attendant
Brahmins, who raised
no objection to his
proceedings.

6. Mr. Sullivan
on his return to
Coimbatore reported
to the Temple Com-
mittee the manner
in which he had been
insulted by the Dhar-
= makarta

Dhammakarta of the Peyton Pagoda, and demanded his dismissal and the appointment of another Manager. The Committee expressed their regret at the insult to which the Collector of the District had been subjected, but have as yet taken no steps for the removal of the Dhammakarta Sira Rama Dyer.

7. The Government are of opinion that the person has shown himself quite unsuited for his responsible position. It is clearly proved that the Peyton Pagoda has from time immemorial been open to the inspection of Europeans, and has been considered an object of public interest

sculpture N

ref B[illegible]

This seems to me uncertain - MM

I would modify the Paragraph in the Secretariat indicated N. in the Minute

I do not think there is any ground for saying this. If there is any occasion for an official visit - such as an [illegible] of Pagoda property, a crime committed in the Pagoda precincts or harbouring a criminal the Police would of course enter the precincts. (See the order on the Tripatite case)

interest on account of the specimens of ancient architecture which it contains. It is also evident that such inspection of the building is in no way objected to by the resident Brahmins. Under these circumstances it cannot be permitted to be kept out of date, to close the access of Europeans to a place of general interest. Were this tolerated it would be in the power of Dhammakartas of this description to shut up every Pagoda in the country from the inspection of European authority, and to convert them into sanctuaries inaccessible even to the Police.

If para 8 (alternative) is adopted I would modify this and leave the matter to the Trustees. MM

for a temple

explanation N.

Proposed substitute for the 2d Class Para 8

8. It is not in the power of the Government to abandon the Dharmakarta, Siva Rama Iyer. But the Temple Committee of the Coimbatore District hold, under Act XX of 1863, all the powers formerly vested in the Board of Revenue for the Removal of Temple managers - and the Government have no hesitation in stating their opinion that the Dharmakarta, Siva Rama Iyer, has shown himself quite unfitted for his position and ought to be removed

9. It may be brought to the notice of the Temple Committee that if this objectionable manager is left in charge of the Peyroor Pagoda it may become necessary for

Under these circumstances it would be attempted, opposed to the policy of Government and the liberal Spirit of the times to permit a place which has long been open to Christian visitors to be withdrawn from the public view. If such a course was sanctioned in the present case it would be the source of Scandals & regret and practical evils to exclude Travellers and even the European officers of Government (whose duty in the most celebrated seats of Hindoo art and worship which has hitherto been accessible without it) & to withdraw any grant of the principles of the Hindoo religion or to the feelings of its respectable votaries. The Govt need only point to the last Census, which shows Christians and Mussulmen deputation there exists to prove that they will not be converted into inaccessible inclosures or sanctuaries and security must be requested. The officers of the Magistracy and Police, whether European or Native would not be excluded from the prosecution of their official duties but the Govt consider that the habitual publicity and open places was a salutary influence on the character of those who should attempt a repair to them. A suspension of the liberal usage now prevailing and the substitution of a system of secrecy and seclusion would not fail to be attended with a development

religious bigotry & of caste pride and intolerance - perhaps even of many barbarities and cruelties difficult to restrain. The Govt are determined not to permit a quarter of movement of this nature

for the Government to resume, at least for a time, the large landed endowment at present enjoyed by the Pagoda.

Would omit Para 7 & the words in Para 8

Alternative para to the draft on the Peyroor Pagoda Case.

I would pass the alternative para, with the other modifications I have indicated in the margin of the draft. I do not think the Govt have the legal right to claim the admission of European visitors to any part of the Pagoda, unless by long usage there was such a right of way thro the Pagoda - in events the law officers should be consulted before the Govt pronounce their opinion.

Para 8. The Government have on broad grounds of policy, severed themselves from all interference with the religious institutions of the country and have no power to remove the Dharmakarta. But the Temple Committee of the Coimbatore District hold under Act XX of 1863 all the powers formerly vested in the Board of

forms one of the enclosures.
appears that the new Dharma
Kurta has been putting the
affairs of the Pagoda into more
that among other reforms, he
has given a Writ conformable
with the Shastras as to the persons
admitted within the walls. He
is to go in as of right - can Native
Indians, of Native Indians can be
non-caste Natives.
Mr Quick M. Sullivan should
have referred the question, to Lord
when he was first addressed by
Peter (before his visit) and
tendering the decision of Lord Harold
have obtained from native
Trade — — — &c.

of Revenue for the
removal of Temple
Encroachments and the
Encroachment leave the
request cancelled (entirely)
in their hands with
the Expression of their
opinion that Sivia
Rama Iyer the
present Dharma-
karta (as shown
his case) is quite unfit
for his position, and
that he ought to be
removed.