The Long March of Progress

A Historical and Personal Account

Mahmood Hasan Khan

The Long March of Progress

A Historical and Personal Account

Mahmood Hasan Khan

Copyright © 2013 Mahmood Hasan Khan

All rights reserved.

Publisher: Createspace, Amazon.com, USA

ISBN: 10-1490333991

ISBN-13: 978-1490333991

Designed by Mahmood Iqbal

Contents

Acknowledgements v

Introduction

1 March to the Modern Age I 17

Ancient Greeks and Romans 19

Muslim Contribution to Philosophy, Science and the Arts 41

Europe in the 'Middle Ages' 46

2 March to the Modern Age II 67

The Italian Renaissance 67

Reformation and Counter-Reformation 71

The Age of Science and the Enlightement 79

Voyages of Discovery: Imperialism and Capitalism 95

3 Muslim Rule in India Before the Mughals 107

The Ghori Dynasty (1151-1205) 114

The 'Slave' Dynasty (1206-1290) 116

The Khilji Dynasty (1290-1320) 123

The Tughlaq Dynasty (1321-1414) 126

The 'Sayyid' Dynasty (1414-1451) 130

The Lodhi (Afghan) Dynasty (1451-1526) 131

Statelets at the end of the Delhi Sultanate 132

Muslims in India: Invasions and Consequences 140

4 Mughal Empire I: Babur to Akbar 145

Babur and Humayun (1526-1556) 148

Akbar 'the Great' (1556-1605) 154

5 Mughal Empire II: Jahangir to Aurangzeb 177

Jahangir (1605-1627) 177

Shahjahan (1628-1658) 184

Aurangzeb Alamgir (1658-1707) 197

6 Mughal Empire III: Disolution and Legacy 223

Decline and Dissolution 224

The Empire's Legacy 238

7 India in the Eighteenth Century 257

The Plight of Mughal Emperors (1720-1806) 258

Persian and Afghan Invasions 263

Sikhs in the Punjab 274

The Maratha Chiefs 275

Afghan Chieftains of Farrukhabad and Rohilkhand 280

Nawabs of Bengal, Hyderabad and Awadh 286

8 Rohilkhand from Foundation to Destruction 293

Rising Power of the Rohilas in Katehr 297

Decline and Fall of the Rohilas 311

The End of Rohilkhand 322

Rohilkhand: Administration, Economy and Culture 326

9 British Rule in India I: The Beginnings 333

Europeans in India: Arrival, Trade and Settlements 334

The Rise of English Power in India: Wars and Conquests 345

The 'Great Revolt' of 1857 and Its Aftermath 363

10 British Rule in India II: Consolidation 373

Evolution of Colonial Administration 374

Social and Educational Reforms 384

Economy and Infrastructure 393

Local Self-Government 401

Changes in Indian Attitudes and Responses 403

11 Partition of India and Independence 415

Movement towards Self-Rule in India 415

Constitutional Reforms and Indian Politics: 1909-1929 428

Movement towards Partition,1930-1940 436

Rebellion, Civil War, and Partition 443

12 Two Migrations in the March of Progress 455

Rampur State: Structure and Development 456

The First Migration: From the Roh to Katehr 466

The Second Migration: Back to the Roh in Pakistan 473

Pakistan: From Civilian to Military Rule 478

13 Third Migration in the March of Progress 489

Pakistan to the Netherlands: Learning about Progress 490

Progress Continues: Migration to Canada 511

Epilogue 535

References 539

Index 551

About the Author 565

Acknowledgements

This book has taken me many years to write and left me in debt to many. My parents and teachers, from the elementary school to university, inspired and encouraged me to gain knowledge. I have come to realise that knowledge does empower people in many and subtle ways. Since I have borrowed freely from a number of authors, whose works I have cited at the end, I thank them for their many and diverse contributions to our stock of historical knowledge. I am grateful to many librarians who helped me acquire much of the material I have used in the book. My friend S. Akbar Zaidi read an earlier draft and gave me many valuable comments for which I am much obliged to him. The book would have remained unpublished had Mahmood Iqbal not advised me to take a different route and then transformed my manuscript into its present form. I very much appreciate his encouragement and ungrudging help. Aiysha, my life's partner of over 45 years, has suffered much while giving me all the support I needed for my personal and professional life. I cannot repay the debt I owe her.

Introduction

> History is made in such a way that the ultimate result is invariably produced by the clash of many individual wills.... For what each individual wants is obstructed by every other individual and the outcome is something that no one wanted.
> *Friedrich Engels.*

I cannot recall exactly when and where I was first attracted to study the idea and history of human progress. I do know that it was after reaching the Netherlands from Pakistan in 1961 that I began to approach the issue seriously for two reasons. For one thing, I was able to compare the conditions of life I had left in Pakistan with those I found in the Netherlands: in almost every respect, they looked like two different worlds. The second reason was my exposure to the literature and discourse on why and how societies change or make progress. What ideas, values and conditions bring about progress? How can we explain differences between societies with respect to their standard of living and quality of life? Almost fifty years later, I started to look back at the history of human progress and my own march of progress. The result is this book as a narrative of my march of progress as part of a larger account of human progress. I hasten to add that it is not a scholarly book or written by a university-trained historian: it is simply an account of progress, weaving together my understanding of the historical processes and their impact on my own experience. Let me begin with a few words about the idea of progress.

Most people tend to agree that ideas have power. One such powerful idea in human history is the idea of progress. At its simplest level, progress means moving forward. It implies improvement from a presumed inferior to a superior state in both the material and moral conditions.

Progress has been both necessary and desirable, and in the opinion of some inevitable: humankind has advanced from some primitive (aboriginal) state and will continue to advance. Admittedly, progress has not been a linear or continuous process; there have been serious, even awful, regresses based on race, ethnicity, religion, nationalism, and ideology. Historically these divisive forces have been the pretexts for aggression, war and plunder. We can see many signs of material improvement, but we continue to debate about moral improvement. There are those who see an inverse relationship between the material and moral conditions: technical advancement and moral decay. Others tend to claim that humankind has made moral improvement as well. There is evidence on both sides, but far less convincing on the side of the doubters. Put it this way. Generally we do not now tolerate, much less accept, torture, slavery, denial of equal rights across the board, and arbitrary rule by divine or any other authority. There remains that moral sensibility to differentiate between right and wrong, notwithstanding the tension between the life here and the afterlife.

The problem is that while we can verify the change in material conditions—there are too many pieces of evidence to deny or doubt—it is hard to agree about the change in moral conditions. What are the essential ingredients of morality on which most people can agree irrespective of their cultural context or intellectual perspective? Morality means those principles of behaviour about right and wrong (or good and bad) that allow people to flourish. In other words, we should think of morality in terms of well-being. Evolutionary biology has produced good evidence that the process of natural selection underlies our moral sense (conscience) since it helps both individuals and groups to flourish. What we consider as moral (virtuous) conduct is of concern to individuals since it makes sense. Honesty, fairness, liberty, loyalty to family and friends, authority, and sanctity are on everyone's list. However, religion, sex, and drugs (alcohol included) are optional according to many. The essential ingredients of individual morality are necessary though not sufficient to make a society moral. The measure of our moral progress is that today we judge the moral character of a society by the Enlightenment values: tolerance, openness, fairness, and democracy. While the scourge of discrimination, based on race, caste, ethnicity, religion, gender, or lifestyle,

and violence are still with us, they are generally far less tolerated or accepted hence less prevalent. In some places, some form of discrimination is morally accepted and legally sanctioned. Discrimination tends to be more visible and acute in societies with sharp inequalities and in almost all societies during periods of economic stagnation. It is safe to say that improved material well-being allows people to be more receptive to the Enlightenment values.

There is broad consensus that from the beginning human beings have been struggling to improve the quality of their lives. They have not been in search of a utopia (in Greek it means 'no place'), an imagined perfect place about which one finds in the writings of Plato, Thomas More and Karl Marx. Instead, they are trying to make their life a bit better if not their nature perfect. Nature has endowed human beings with both the will and capability for progress. The idea of family—the basic unit of a society—was probably the first step in that struggle. Living in groups was one of the earliest and most important inventions of humankind. The idea of society, and its associated social and economic structure, is not an artificial construct: society is more than the sum of individuals. Individuals could not have survived for too long without deep interdependence, starting at infancy. There is good evidence that an individual's selfhood is created by the initial attachment to another individual, such as infant's attachment to the mother. In this perspective, society creates individuals and not the other way round. Self is realised through relationships, but everyone's self is unique though mutable. In fact, the slogan of liberty, equality and fraternity in the French Revolution focused attention on those dimensions of social relations that matter most to make a society better and improve the quality of life of individuals.

Why and how do societies diverge with respect to progress? There is no generally accepted grand theory or explanation of what forces (factors) cause or are essentially responsible for social and economic progress. A close examination of the history of progress sheds much light on one theme than any other: application of gradually accumulated knowledge (in the arts and sciences) to cope with the problems presented by Nature and social relations. Inventions and innovations—reflecting human ingenuity and capital—have been at the heart of the process of

progress. However, we also know that knowledge and its application to technologies gained unprecedented momentum only in the last 250 years or so and deep institutional and structural changes either preceded or accompanied it in some Western societies.

Religious, political and economic freedoms, buttressed by the Enlightenment ideas, were probably the major forces underpinning the creation and dissemination of technologies and the consequent experience of unprecedented economic growth. This is not to underestimate the role of modern slavery and imperialism in the accumulation of capital and economic growth. But there is also good evidence that the first Industrial Revolution could not have been initiated and sustained by slavery and imperialism. Slavery and imperialism existed for millennia without creating the conditions for an industrial revolution. But history also gives us copious evidence that, in the name of progress, large groups of humans have paid a very high price, e.g. by millions of indigenous people of the Americas and Africans for over three centuries and for that matter by millions of Russians and Chinese in the twentieth century. No less important were the millions of victims of wars in Europe.

Thanks to the overwhelming evidence on human progress, certain facts are well established. For one thing, today a network of economic, social and political infrastructure interconnects a majority of over seven billion people. The complex global network affects by its workings even those still on its margin or outside. The information and communication technology developed in the last 150 years—telegraph, telephone, radio, airplane, TV, satellite, internet, and cell phone—allows cross-border movement of information and finance in matter of seconds and carries millions of people and their cargo around the globe in hours. The world has shrunk and human beings are face to face in cyberspace. There are global institutions that monitor and facilitate exchange, and help reduce tensions and conflicts. Hundreds of millions of people are in contact with each other and have become part of a floating Diaspora. The electronic public space exposes millions of people to the plight of others and allows them to empathise and respond with compassion.

For the first time in history, more people are living in urban areas engaged in diverse economic and social activities. The growth of urban space has stimulated diversity and with it greater understanding and tolerance. Multiple identities and affiliations are a common feature of the expanding urban culture across the globe. At the same time, global production and exchange of goods and services has transformed the marketplace on the side of both supply and demand. National brands on goods for sale are often misleading because their production may involve labour, capital and material of more than one country. It is also a fact that the standard of living and quality of life of most people are far better now than they have ever been; almost everywhere on the globe, the average person enjoys a far higher standard of living today than in the past. This is not to deny or under-estimate the poverty and suffering of millions of people, but the condition of the poor of today is incomparably better than the mass poverty that a majority used to suffer in recent past.

I am not saying that generally people are living more happily than in the past. What I am saying is that people are living better now than in the past, enjoying (individual) rights and freedoms not recognised or enjoyed before. Human beings have made progress and it has been particularly impressive in the last 150 years compared with the preceding millennium. It is also safe to say that most rights and freedoms have followed rather than preceded material progress. The struggle to gain those rights has been long and costly and the legal and institutional support for many rights and freedoms is of recent origin. Let me cite some examples. Slavery as a normal institution, once generally accepted and legally protected, is no longer with us, although millions still suffer under the weight of bonded labour because of poverty and bad administration of law in several societies. Many countries have abolished capital punishment and, in others, it is no longer on display for public entertainment. In almost no country, we find debtors' jails today. No longer is torture sanctioned by law, though governments in many countries tolerate or use it as a means to punish people or extract information from victims.

Most societies today accept the principle of equality before the law, regardless of gender or ethnicity, although not implemented effectively

or universally. The right of free expression and association is far more commonly accepted and enjoyed than before. In many countries, the rights and freedoms of individuals, especially minorities, are enshrined in the constitution and there are laws to protect them. Brutality, ethnic cleansing and genocide are still with us, but there are now laws and institutions to deal with them and their perpetrators more effectively. While imperialism and wars in various forms have not (and perhaps cannot) be abolished, international institutions and mechanisms are in place to reduce their incidence and mitigate their impact on the victims. Hundreds of thousands of small and large, local, regional and international non-governmental (civil society) organisations are actively engaged in advocacy for and provide assistance to people with respect to human rights, hunger and famine, natural disasters, epidemics and basic health care and education, transfer of technologies, small loans, housing and public health, and conflict resolution.

Needless to add, the march of progress has not been linear: there have been many high ups and deep downs on the way. There are reminders of human regression, not counting civil wars, in recent history: African slavery, World Wars I and II, Jewish Holocaust, atom bomb attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Vietnam war, genocides in Armenia, Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia, and liquidation of millions in the former Soviet Union and China. In addition, proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction is a serious threat to security of life and property around the world. Likewise, there are too many signs of serious imbalance in the global ecosystem because of current patterns of production and consumption that do not take into account the enormous environmental and resource cost. The demographic transition underway, thanks to smaller families the world over, is a good omen for this to happen. Generally, people tend to underestimate the twin threat that the weapons of mass destruction and environmental imbalance pose to security of life and the means (resources) that sustain it. The great challenge to human progress in the future will be to harness the will and mobilise public opinion for political, economic and social adjustments necessary at the global, regional, national, and local levels. I am quite certain that we cannot enhance human well-being without meeting this challenge. The evidence on human behaviour

in the past is a reason for cautious optimism, but there is no assurance that it will be repeated to avoid or minimise catastrophic consequences.

I should now turn to the organisation and structure of this book. I have divided the narrative on progress into five interconnected parts, though each part can stand on its own. In Part I, I focus on the emergence of the 'Modern Age' in the West, including an account of the period from ancient Greece to the 'Middle Ages' (Chapter 1) and from the Italian Renaissance to the first Industrial Revolution (Chapter 2). The ideas and institutions evolved in Europe during the long period have played a central role in the rest of the world by their dissemination through modern imperialism. Man's long march of progress began probably with the migration of *Homo sapiens* from Africa some 60,000 years ago. However, in the context of my narrative, human civilisation had its beginnings with the first settlements between 10,000 to 12,000 years ago. The prominent settlements were in Iraq (Mesopotamia), China, India (Indus valley), and Egypt (Nile valley). These civilisations made significant contributions to human progress through ideas, structures and inventions, making life more liveable. They gave to the rest of humanity the building blocks for further progress. However, it is also fair to suggest that ancient Greece was the crucible for the study of man and Nature, hence its disproportionate influence on the emergence of Modern Age. Along with their own refinements and additions, Romans, Christians, Jews, and Muslims have played a major role in transmitting Greek knowledge and practices to the West. Muslims also acted as a conduit for transfer of knowledge and inventions of China and India to Europe. In Europe, centuries of turmoil created by political and religious rivalries, conflicts and wars led to an intense re-examination of values, relations and institutions. This process made people increasingly receptive to the ideas, artefacts and practices of Greeks, Romans, Arabs, and Chinese. Gradually people's focus shifted from the afterlife to life itself. Conflicts between faith and reason, religious and secular authority, state and individual rights were debated, contested and resolved over a period of over three centuries. The Modern Age owes its painful birth to this tumultuous period in European history.

How the Modern Age came to India is part of the narrative in Part IV of this book. To set the stage, in Parts II and III, I give an account of

conditions in India under the long Muslim rule. In Part II, I describe the arrival of Muslim invaders, their conquest and long rule in India to provide a contextual background to the evolution of an Indo-Muslim culture that moulded my ancestors and me. We can divide the Muslim rule in India into two parts. In the first eight centuries, after the Arab invasion of Sindh in the eighth century, most Muslim rulers were Turko-Afghans who managed to rule only some (mainly northern) parts of India. The Turko-Afghan rule in India (Chapter 3) was an 'arbitrary despotism' practically unchecked except by rebellion and assassination, notwithstanding the rulers' professed reverence for the Sharia (Muslim sacred law). The rulers and nobles, even those who valued learning, did not show much interest in encouraging the establishment and development of institutions of learning, except those that maintained a conventional or orthodox curriculum. The educated (learned) Hindus and Muslims were limited to a specific class or caste and almost all of their learning was based on traditions and sciences that had not changed for centuries. The rest of the society, men, women and children, depended entirely on this class since they had neither the opportunity nor the means to become literate. By and large, Muslim rulers did not interfere in many of the traditional practices or customs of Hindu society. I might add that, during the period of nearly three hundred years of the Delhi sultans (kings), many Hindu and Muslim men of reflection inspired ordinary people by words and deeds to live in harmony and discard divisive values and traditions. It was also during this period that the vernacular languages, Hindi and Urdu in particular, evolved as sister languages for popular discourse unlike the more exclusive Sanskrit, Arabic, and Persian.

The Turk and Afghan sultans used revenue farming as a means by which they extracted a large part of what the peasants produced and compensated the imperial amirs (nobles), mercenaries, civilian bureaucracy, and court retainers for their services. What is important is that there was little if any investment in agriculture or rural areas on behalf of the rulers. Much of the public investment was concentrated in the urban centres and some of it used for roads and communications to facilitate movement of armies and the court. A large part of the revenue extracted through taxes and cesses and personal wealth of the

ruler were devoted to the maintenance of armies and construction of forts, palaces, mosques, and tombs. Both private and state-owned industries catered to the needs of the rulers, nobility, court retainers, and town dwellers. There is almost no evidence that the standard of living of most people improved; there is some evidence that a small number in the society acquired lot of wealth and the rest struggled for survival. In the words of Amir Khusrau, 'every pearl in the royal crown is but the crystallised drop of blood fallen from the tearful eyes of the poor peasant'. Armed conflicts, including pillage and plunder, and natural calamities were a common experience and they inflicted much damage on the economy and society. Peace and prosperity were a rare experience. It is significant that the people of India had almost no knowledge or consciousness of the massive, almost revolutionary, changes under way in Europe towards the end of the Turko-Afghan rule in the early sixteenth century.

The second spell of Muslim rule in India (Chapters 4, 5 and 6) lasted effectively for over 175 years after Babur, the Mughal invader, defeated the Afghan Sultan Ibrahim Lodhi at the battle of Panipat in 1526. Babur laid the foundation of a Taimurid (Mughal) dynasty that ruled a large part of India until the death of Aurangzeb in 1707. The Mughal Empire continued to expand and deepen its control in India from 1556 when Akbar ascended the throne to 1689 when Aurangzeb went into the Deccan. At that time, the empire stretched from Kabul in the north-west, covering all of Punjab, Sindh and Kashmir to the east up to the end of Bengal and in the Peninsula up to the Kaveri River. The empire's governors and commanders directly administered most of the area; a small area was under the tributary chiefs and rajas who accepted the over-lordship of the Mughal monarch. The Western Ghats (Maharashtra) were, however, a contested region, thanks to the insurgent Marathas. The Mughal rule started to dissolve in the last years 25 years of Aurangzeb's long rule. Soon after his death, the empire turned into a battleground for several native groups along with the European trading companies to claim a piece of India. The state of combat and chaos lasted for almost one hundred years, culminating in the establishment of British Raj in India in the early nineteenth century.

The multi-regional and multi-ethnic Mughal Empire was a highly centralised state at the core of which was its army. Its administrative structure and institutions reflected the central position of the emperor backed by the nobles (amirs) and mansabdars governing the military and civilian arms of the state. Its fiscal resources were generated by loot in the process of conquest, tax on land cultivated by peasants and inland trade supplemented by tributes, gifts, indemnities, and sundry charges. Revenue from land was the largest contributor. The Afghans and Mughals had developed a complex but largely effective revenue system, extracting one-third to one-half of the produce from land. A very high proportion of the imperial revenue was used to maintain and mobilise the army and civil bureaucracy, followed by the imperial household, and the residual used for public works (e.g. sarais, roads and canals), charities, and grants. It is significant that the Mughal kings, their courtiers and Indians in general showed little or no interest in the ideas and institutions that were shaking European societies in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The relatively open courts of Akbar and his son Jahangir were favourably inclined to new ideas and practices, but the far more conservative Shahjahan and Aurangzeb followed them. What is most interesting is that the Mughal kings from the days of Akbar, when the first Europeans started to arrive at the shores of India, were unable to match the naval power of the new intruders. In time, Europeans started to make inroads on land as well and, by the beginning of eighteenth century, their superior war strategy, tactics and discipline were able to overwhelm the Indian armies.

In Part III, I focus on India in the eighteenth century after the death of Aurangzeb when the conditions of the economy and society deteriorated significantly due to massive disorder caused by regional revolts, wars and invasions. Widespread breakdown of social order and enhanced ethnic and religious divisions accompanied the economic impoverishment of India. The reasons for the economic decline included: disintegration of central authority, increased incidence of revenue farming, Persian and Afghan invasions, and the pillage by the Marathas, Sikhs, Jats and Afghans. The subversive activities of the European trading companies, particularly the British and French, such as piracy, abuse of dastaks and private trade, monopoly of trade of some commodities, and

competition for revenue and territory played their part in the denouement. In addition, the revenue from Bengal, a province relatively free of turmoil, was used to finance the wars in the Deccan and for succession. By the middle of the century, the Indian economy and society were in a deep and endless morass. It would be another one hundred years after which a new economic and social order would be in place under another alien power which, unlike the Mughals or other invaders before them, chose to rule but not settle. India would be under the British Raj, first through the Honourable East India Company and then govered directly by the British Crown.

In the process of disintegration of the Mughal Empire, among other regional powers and statelets in India, some Afghans (Pathans) carved out a state of their own, known as Rohilkhand (land of the Rohilas). It was during this period that two of my ancestors migrated from the Roh—which meant the hills in the north-western part of India—to the Gangetic plain to improve their lot and better prospects for their progeny. Their settlement became the nucleus of my family's march of progress, transforming from mercenaries, perhaps freebooters, into landowners in one generation. I describe the story of Rohilkhand in Chapter 8, from its foundation to destruction in the eighteenth century. A band of horse traders, mercenaries and freebooters, arriving from the northwest in the midst of a disintegrating central authority and warring local chiefs, sowed the seeds of Rohilkhand. At its zenith, Rohilkhand comprised the present districts of Moradabad, Badaun, Rampur, Pilibhit, Bareilly, and Shahjahanpur. The history of Rohilkhand was brief and quite tumultuous. However, the Rohilas were able to create a reasonably effective state administration, a thriving economy based on productive agriculture (including horse breeding), relatively free trade, and some industries. In their treatment of the ryot, Hindus and Muslims alike, Rohilas were apparently quite tolerant and fair: their fiscal administration was entirely in the hands of Hindus. They showed keen interest in patronising learning, music and architecture and built infrastructure. Generally, the Rohilas maintained a fair system of law and order, which enabled the state to prosper until the raids by the Marathas and Sikhs destroyed both peace and prosperity.

Rohilas and Rohilkhand were part of a shifting patchwork of statelets in India, each trying to increase its power and resources through alliances, deception and war. The increasing involvement and influence of European trading companies, particularly the East India Company, and the Persian and Afghan invasions created more instability and chaos throughout India. The contesting Marathas, Jats, Afghans, Persians, and Mughals sought shifting alliances with each other and the foreign powers to improve their own situation. Rohilas and Rohilkhand participated in this zero-sum game with much vigour and zeal. Eventually, the Persian Nawab of Awadh, with the help of East India Company, defeated the Rohilas and annexed their territory in 1774. The victors gave to one of the Rohila chiefs only the jagir (today's district) of Rampur to keep as a successor Afghan state in northern India, which lasted until 1949. Needless to add, the armed power and diplomacy of East India Company gradually took over the native statelets including Awadh. After my father's two migrant (Rohila) ancestors settled in Rampur, it remained our family's home (watan) for about two hundred years until my father with his nuclear family migrated to the newly created state of Pakistan in 1950.

In Part IV, comprising Chapters 9, 10 and 11, I give an account of the arrival of Europeans in India, the rising power of the East India Company, consolidation of the British Raj, and the events leading to the partition and independence of India in 1947. It was during the Afghan (Lodhi) rule in parts of India that some Europeans (Portuguese and Spaniards followed by the Dutch, English, and French) launched maritime expeditions to find new trade routes to Asia (India, China and the Spice Islands) free from the stranglehold of the Italian (Venetians and Genoese) merchants and Muslims (Turks and Arabs) in the Mediterranean Sea. These voyages led not only to the discovery of the New World but also set the stage for colonisation of lands and imperialism. Thus was set in motion the awful scramble for colonies and colonial possessions almost all over the world. The major weapons in the armoury of each contesting nation were monopoly trade backed by force of arms as extensions of European monarchies.

In the context of India and its future, the East India Company had won the contest against its European rivals (the Dutch and French in

particular) by the middle of eighteenth century. It gradually but surely subdued the fractious native princes and chiefs (rajas and nawabs) in India by means of arms, duplicity, bribes, treaties, and alliances. Most of India was under the British rule by the early nineteenth century. Once the British settled in the saddle, they began to dismantle or radically restructure Indian customs, laws, and institutions to serve their goal. In so doing, they opened the gates to new (modern) knowledge, technology and much else to which the Hindu and Muslim rulers of India had never exposed their subjects. Colonialism in India, though established for exploitation, became a powerful means for the social transformation of Indians; they were, admittedly as dependents, inducted into an expanding world of industrial capitalism or the Modern Age.

I think it is quite unfair to romanticise the social and economic conditions of India at the time when Europeans, the British in particular, established their foothold on the sub-continent. The long Muslim rule had contributed little if anything of substance to the emergence of a modern society and economy in India. Nor is it fair to suggest that the British colonial rule was not socially and economically beneficent for the people of India. It was during their rule that the British imported the ideas of progress from the West and grafted them on to a very diverse cultural and social landscape of India. My major contention is that the British imperial rule paradoxically laid the foundation for modernity in India: the processes of exploitation and transformation were at work almost simultaneously. I do not speculate about the future of India had the British not established their supremacy in the sub-continent at the time they did. However, I am quite sceptical about the thesis advanced by some that, had the Europeans not intruded, the social and economic conditions in India were ripe for self-induced progress.

By my father's time British rule in India and its colonial institutions dominated almost everyone's life. In the inter-war period during the last century, a majority of boys, though not girls, of middle-class families in Rampur state were exposed to secular education based on a modern (Westernised) curriculum. In our family, most boys of my generation were enrolled in schools whose primary object was to produce anglicised Indians equipped with knowledge and skills required for work in a rapidly changing world. At the same time, the political movement

towards independence from colonial dependence was gaining momentum. However, the movement was also hardening the divisions among Indians, particularly between Hindus and Muslims, about the constitutional structure of an independent India. The failure of Indian political leaders to resolve their differences led eventually to the partitioning of India into two dominions: India with a Hindu majority and Pakistan with a Muslim majority. Partition was a traumatic experience for millions because of communal violence, migration across the new borders and divided families.

Though my family did not experience the trauma of gruesome violence, we were among the millions who migrated from India to Pakistan. It seems that my father's decision to move from Rampur in India to Pakistan was based primarily on the expected prospects of a better life for his children. I do not have the counterfactual to say with certainty that had we stayed in India we would not have enjoyed the opportunities for advancement (progress) which came our way in Pakistan. Speaking for myself, the chances in India would have been far more limited, the struggle more difficult and the outcome far less certain. For someone like me, from a lower middle-class family, Pakistan turned out to be a land of opportunity to receive modern education, find a career of choice, and climb up the economic and social ladder. In fact, in less than eleven years after our family migrated to Pakistan, I was well equipped to compete for higher education in the West. This is what I did and arrived in the Netherlands in 1961 for a graduate programme. The next four years were transformational for me in almost every respect, progressing intellectually and socially from the pre-modern to modern age.

In Part V, I give first an account (Chapter 12) of the two migrations my ancestors, including my father, undertook in search of a better life (progress) which includes the story of Rampur state in Rohilkhand, to which my father's ancestors had migrated in the mid-eighteenth century, and of Pakistan to which my father with the family migrated in 1950. Both Rohilkhand and Pakistan played a formative role in my own march of progress. The final chapter (Chapter 13) is about my own migration from Pakistan to Canada via the Netherlands as a narrative of the last 52 years of my life in which I have witnessed and experienced

immense progress. I also take a brief walk through the history of both the Netherlands and Canada. I can say with some confidence that I am a product of an Indo-Muslim culture on which the British grafted ideas of progress inherited from the ancient Greeks and Romans, amply supplemented by Christians and Muslims in the Middle Ages, and modernised during the age of Renaissance and Enlightenment in Europe. The first and second Industrial Revolutions were products of the deep social and political changes that the people of Europe and North America had undergone since the mid-seventeenth century. Like many millions around the globe, I have been a beneficiary of the massive changes that these two revolutions unleashed on a global scale.

In the last thirty years or so, I have been a witness to and beneficiary of a third Industrial Revolution, one based on digital technology. It has blurred the lines between manufacturing and services and opened the gates to possibilities that existed only in science fiction. At the same time, almost revolutionary changes in values, customs, relationships, laws, and institutions for which people had struggled for generations, have affected almost all of us. In increasing number of societies, the rights and freedoms of individuals have taken the front seat. The enormous technological and socio-political changes under way show that human beings have taken another big leap forward towards making the world more liveable. However, there are at least two red flags in the way of this optimistic vision. The first one is probably part of human nature: the proclivity to group-based aggression and violence under one pretext or another, namely, religion, ethnicity, tribalism or nationalism, and ideology. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction tend to transform group conflicts into wars of various sizes, intensities and durations that end up wrecking human well-being. The second red flag is the pernicious effects of industrial production and mass consumption on the biosphere on which all life ultimately depends. The warning signs are quite ominous and they tend to point the finger at human activity as the main culprit. So far human beings have not responded effectively to contain the two threats to future prosperity. The mechanisms and institutions to address these issues need to be strengthened and made more effective at all levels from the local to the international.

1

March to the Modern Age I: From Ancient Greece to the Middle Ages

On the evolutionary scale, our march of progress started probably in Africa, but that part of our history is too remote and not well recorded. The world before the invention of writing was pre-history. We should thank the Sumerians (cuneiform), Egyptians (hieroglyph), and Phoenicians (alphabet), who gave us the art of writing some 5000 years ago. That's what started history as we know it, but it should be read with a pinch of salt since it is subject to all sorts of errors of judgement and biases. It is fair to start the story from ancient Greece and Rome since the pagan (pre-Christian) Greek and Roman philosophers, scientists, statesmen, and poets and artists laid the foundation of the modern industrial-democratic culture, particularly in the West. In turn, European colonial expansion carried Western culture and institutions to many other parts of the world. In this chapter, I attempt to address three related questions. First, what is the legacy of ancient Greeks and Romans? Second, how was this legacy 'rediscovered' by Europe? Finally, how have the Europeans used it in the march of human progress? A few words are in order as background to the narrative.

The contributions and legacy of Greeks and Romans were lost to Europe for about 800 years after the rise of Christian Church to power in the fourth century. All knowledge from outside the defined confines, framed by the Scripture and interpreted by the clergy, was regarded heresy and its claimant as heretic. Piety in this life to achieve salvation in afterlife became the only concern for every Christian: pagan (Greek and Roman) gods, thought and customs were disdained. People were guided by absolutes enforced by the Church; nothing was secular. All human knowledge based on reason and observation, but not supported by the Scripture, was regarded sinful: faith and not reason was the source of knowledge and above all salvation. An absolute feudal power enjoyed by a few, but subservient to the Church, regulated the structure and workings of societies. There was almost no room for dissent since the penalties were far too severe. If attempts were made to use the intellect (reason), its main purpose was to demonstrate the superior status of the Scripture and faith over the pagan (Greek and Roman) arts and sciences. We should thank Christian monks, Byzantine civil servants, and Muslims who preserved the ancient texts. However, only Muslim intellectuals challenged and improved what they found. Gradually this body of accumulated knowledge spread in Europe during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

I should add two important points here. First, on the death of Theodosius in 395 CE, the Roman Empire was split into Western and Eastern parts—the former given to Honorius and the latter to Arcadius—and the two halves were never to be reunited in spite of the heroic attempt by Justinian I in the sixth century. The 'barbarian' invasions from across the Rhine and Danube rivers for 80 years eventually demolished the Western Roman Empire in 476 CE. However, the Eastern part survived as the Byzantine Empire until 1453 CE. Second, after a long-drawn battle between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople for supremacy, the Church formally split between the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox factions in the year 1054 CE. The Greek patriarch in Constantinople played a subservient role to the Byzantine emperors—acknowledged as vicegerents of Jesus on earth—until the Ottomans dismantled the Byzantine Empire in 1453 CE. The bishop of Rome as Pope tried to maintain his supremacy over secular rulers in the West, based on a

forged imperial decree by which Constantine I supposedly transferred the authority (Constantine's donation) to Rome and the Western part of Roman Empire to the Pope. But it did not go unchallenged. The Holy Roman Emperor, Henry III, who saw himself as the representative of 'Christ on Earth', intervened in the affairs of papacy—which was in a scandalous state for over a century thanks to the abuses associated with simony, celibacy, and feudalism—when there were three rival popes in Rome. The Emperor presided over the synod of Sutri, marking the first step in the reform of papacy.

Ancient Greeks and Romans

The civilisations of ancient Greece and Rome are the anchors on which the modern Western culture and its consciousness have developed. We can count the contributions of Greek and Latin languages; Greek political theory and Roman law; literature (poetry and plays); the arts (glorification of the human body and Nature) and architecture (public and private structures); the Greek Olympic games, philosophic tradition of Plato and Aristotle; art of oratory and rhetoric; the epics and historical accounts of war and peace; and much else. Why restrict to Europe or the West? We can safely say that the ancient Greeks and Romans have shaped the modern world.

Ancient Greece is important to us in so many ways and its legacy is perhaps 'the greatest the world has yet known.' Greeks 'were the first to truly understand that the world may be known, that knowledge can be acquired by systematic observation, without aid from the gods, that there is an order to the world and the universe which goes beyond the myths of our ancestors.' The Greeks also thought that unlike Nature, which obeys set laws, man is not subject to this kind of order; but a mutable order can be set (by imposition or consent) in the affairs of man which can take various forms. This was a massive transformation in thought and approach to knowledge. Romans were obsessed with Greek achievements, but far more practical in their approach to life. Their legacy was in their codified laws, republicanism, and the empire.

However, in celebrating or romanticising the legacy of ancient Greeks and Romans, we should not ignore the fact is that their societies were not fair or just. Slavery was a central feature: women and slaves were not citizens and had no rights other than those given by their masters (or guardians). Outsiders were 'barbarians' subject to enslavement or death. Property no matter how acquired was the measure of rank among citizens. Gladiator sports in Rome were a brutal loss of human life. Tyranny and brutal civil wars were not uncommon. Pillage and loot were a major objective of wars brutally executed and often. The ancient Greeks and Romans borrowed from others, Phoenicians (Levantines), Egyptians, Persians and the Jews, but with two caveats. First, much in their philosophy, science, arts, and architecture was unprecedented and has had an enduring effect on Western civilisation. Second, Rome and its empire, except for its laws and administration, borrowed freely from the Greeks whom they greatly admired and emulated. We should look at the Greek treasure first and then the Roman gifts.

We can divide the political history of ancient Greece into distinct ages. The pre-historic age (associated with the Minoan and Mycenaean civilisations) ended in twelfth century BCE with the legend of Trojan War (at Troy) and its heroes, Hercules, Ajax, Achilles, and Agamemnon. The golden age of the Greek city-states (poleis) started probably with the first Olympiad in eighth century BCE and ended in fourth century BCE; of this the most glorious period lasted from about 480 to 338 BCE when the Greeks surrendered to Macedonia, a Hellenised country to the north of Greece. The Roman rule followed the Macedonian rule in the third century BCE. In the golden age, Persians invaded the Greek lands three times but were eventually repulsed in 480 BCE. The wars against Persians gave Greeks a permanent sense of identity and superiority over their eastern enemies.

The Greek city-states fought each other for supremacy almost continuously, of which the Peloponnesian War (431-404 BCE) was the longest in which Sparta and its allies (Corinth and Syracuse) defeated Athens—which was an imperial power in the Aegean—with terrible consequences. Threats came from Persia and Macedonia for almost 60 years while the Greek city-states were at war against each other, in particular Athens, Sparta and Thebes, with the Persian involvement in the

fray. There was large-scale disruption of communities and their rural economy with terrible waste of resources and people. King Philip of Macedon took advantage of the exhausted and divided Greek states and overwhelmed them in 338 BCE. All of Greece became a Macedonian colony. In the next 15 years, Philip's son, Alexander 'the Great', took the Macedonian Empire to Egypt and the Middle East and through Persia to Afghanistan and the left bank of the Indus in India. In 323 BCE, Alexander died somewhere in Mesopotamia on the way back from India, after which the Macedonian Empire was divided among his fighting generals and their descendents for over 100 years. The Romans soon overwhelmed and absorbed the Greek lands and colonies, Sicily and Italy included, into their expanding empire in second century BCE. Romans also defeated Carthaginians in North Africa and their colonies.

In Greek religion, deities (gods and goddesses) and men were part of the same world (cosmos). The Greek gods and goddesses—Plato implied that there was a Supreme Being—were anthropomorphic (human like), but superior, representing both *pathos* (passion) and *logos* (reason). The Olympian pantheon of gods and goddesses was the strongest: Zeus (father of gods), Hera his consort, ruled over Apollo, Artemis, Pallas, Athena, Ares, Poseidon, Hermes, Dionysus, and so on. Each was endowed with specific skills and powers and very competitive in dazzling the mortals. Cults, festivals, oracles, dramas, and animal sacrifices were integral part of the public religion and social cohesion. 'They fostered an outlook where courage and enterprise, tempered by respect, were thought to be rewarded by health and fortune.' There were no priests, no devil, no power of darkness, and no sin to prey upon people's vulnerabilities. Man's supreme vice was hubris, false pride, commonly punished by nemesis, the wrath of gods. It is significant that Greek religion set no limits to speculation about the natural, physical and moral world.

The love of wisdom (philosophy), knowledge for its own sake, grew up in a world of myths about gods, nature, and man: Aristotle thought that 'all men by nature desire to know.' Wasn't it Thales of Miletus, the first Greek philosopher, who asked: 'why the world is as it is?' Others followed him—Anaximander, Anaximenes, Pythagoras, Xenophanes, Heraclitus, Parmenides, Protagoras ('man is the measure of all things'), and Zeno (I)—in search of truth, cosmos, and order in life. The focus of

Greek philosophers was on the nature of universe—cosmos has order and it is knowable by reason and observation—and the right conduct (or search for morals and virtues) based on man's nature and not on the diktat of deities. There is an underlying ideology of secularism comprising relativism, eclecticism, and toleration. I should add that, for almost 100 years (431 to 338 BCE), the Greek city-states were at war against each other; it was 'a time of brutal military and geo-political upheaval.' Hence, in an uncertain world, search for certainty became an obsession. Belief in the omnipresent gods was being shaken; new cults and religious practices emerged; and intellectual scepticism shifted the focus to examining the self and the world around.

Socrates (469-399 BCE)—the giant we know through Plato, Alcibiades and Aristophanes—shifted the focus from studying the natural world to what it means to live a good life. Socrates believed that there is an unchanging 'absolute standard' for what is good and right; knowing oneself is the key to this standard: the barrier between man and good life is ignorance; and question everything and everyone ('the unexamined life is not worth living'), which is known to us as the 'Socratic method'. This method involves reasoned dialogue to find a secure foundation for knowledge about moral values. Eventually Athenians charged Socrates for mocking democracy (in Athens), undermining public morality and teaching the youth to disobey their parents.

It is fair to suggest that Plato (429-347 BCE) and his pupil Aristotle (384-322 BCE) laid down the foundation for speculative and natural philosophy and they have exercised enormous influence on the 'Modern Age'. Plato's Academy and Aristotle's Lyceum provided an enviable learning experience to seekers of knowledge. There was much of interest to posterity in Plato's metaphysical idealism and Aristotle's secular scepticism. We should first thank Plato for introducing Socrates to us. To Plato, understanding the natural order of things (ideal 'forms') will not only bring knowledge but also satisfaction at a deeper (religious) level, meaning unity with the divine—the most perfect of all forms. However, he maintained that we can perceive the world (reality) only indirectly, i.e. through the images that our senses see or feel. Plato's ideas about the ultimate 'Good' (supreme deity), immortality of soul and its separate existence from the body, and cosmos as handiwork of

a craftsman or rational god, have much impressed Christians, Jews and Muslims. Plotinus (204-270 CE) of Alexandria turned Plato's ultimate 'Good' into God who possesses the power of love reaching out to those who are searching for it. Politically, the aristocratic Plato was quite unhappy with the unstable democracy of Athens; his *Republic* was a blueprint for a communal utopia presided over by a philosopher-king or tyrant.

Aristotle, 'the master of those who knew', was too practical a man, not impressed by Plato's idealistic mysticism. Besides, he was a polymath with works ranging from metaphysics to logic, ethics and politics, astronomy, physics and biology, and literary criticism. Aristotle's works, as of no other philosopher, have influenced Western thought for over 2,000 years. His philosophy was grounded in both reason and observation with an sceptical eye. Abstractions (ideal forms) exist only in the mind and not in reality as animals and trees do. Aristotle, a very strict logician, was the first to explain deductive reasoning (from the general to particular) as a tool for understanding any subject; he was also wedded to inductive reasoning (from the particular to general) based on observation and experience. He held the view that there was an underlying unity in Nature and that Nature was constantly changing subject to cause and effect. But he saw a purpose in Nature (animals, plants, etc.): 'Nature does nothing in vain.' Change and purpose are in all living things, but God (the unmoved mover) is above it: God is pure reason and pure action 'without matter, accident or development.'

Aristotle's ethics reflects his common sense: happiness (harmony, virtue) comes with behaviour consistent with human nature, i.e. behaving reasonably. We can achieve happiness by controlling passions; follow the rule of mean (average), half way between the opposite excesses. Individuals can be ethically good since humans are born with potential to be harnessed by reason and good upbringing (education). Aristotle, unlike Plato, thought that the basis of morality was a sure (absolute) standard: difference in moral judgements is because of error. True well-being is to achieve the ideal values. He, unlike Plato, does not accept a transcendental moral law. Let us not forget that Aristotle justified both slavery and subjugation of women. Aristotle studied various political systems and his survey convinced him that the ideal city did

not and could not exist: all constitutions were imperfect and the form of government would depend 'on climate (geographical) conditions and historical precedents.' Aristotle's own preference was for democracy open to educated men only! In the sciences of biology and astronomy, Aristotle focused on the classification of animals, based on his study of 400 species of animals, and held to the view that cosmos was infinite with the motionless earth (a sphere) around which the sun and other stars revolved in circular motions.

The conceptual foundations of ethics in Greek philosophy are quite diverse and competitive. For example, Sophists were relativists who did not subscribe to an absolute code of morals; they were for pure reason and sceptical about gods. Protagoras (490-420 BCE) held that 'human being is the measure of all things: of things that are, that they are; and things that are not, that they are not.' He also thought that human nature is incomplete, so laws and conventions are necessary, but not based on moral absolutes. Scepticism was never too far from the reach of the wise. Socrates 'knew that he knew nothing.' Pyrrhon (365-275) was the most ardent of sceptics: 'Can you be certain of anything with senses?' The same things appear differently to different people. Who is right? Don't say: "This is so," but "So, it appears to me," or "It may be so." How about ugly versus beautiful, good versus bad, and right versus wrong? Suspend judgement!

In the Hellenistic period, perhaps as a reaction to the massive change that the Macedonian conquest brought about, the focus of philosophy shifted from life in the city-state (polis) to the well-being of individual. The cynics, led by Diogenes (in Alexander's time) reacted by 'withdrawal from the world altogether, renouncing material possessions and turning social conventions upside-down.' But there were two other quite different world views about good life in the post-polis world: Stoicism and Epicureanism. The former was advocated by Zeno of Cyprus (334-262 BCE) and the latter by Epicurus of Samos (341-270 BCE). They both share at least one thing: that the world is made of matter only and we can understand it by reason and knowledge. The Stoics, however, saw the world as a single enduring entity moving forward in time under its own purpose, i.e. ultimate goodness. For Epicureans the world was continually changing as atoms rearrange into new forms.

Following the moral philosophy of the Cynics (Diogenes), the Stoics held the view that what lies in our power, we should learn to control it; what lies outside our power, accept it (pleasure and pain included) with fortitude. Human beings are an integral part of the unfolding cosmos, hence their responsibility to contribute to the unfolding future. The indifference to pleasure and pain—since nothing could be done to avoid them—also meant that the individual lives a life of virtue, i.e. lives according to one's nature as a human being. Stoic philosophy made a very favourable impression on both Romans and Christians. Epicurus was a materialist *par excellence* in the mould of Democritus (460-370 BCE) of Abdera, 'father' of science: gods had little or no influence in a material world. The only purpose of life was to ensure survival through pleasure, i.e. freedom from pain or peace of mind. To ensure peace of mind, it was necessary to stop fearing death and enjoying life through friendship and rational thinking. Epicureanism was popular in the last years of republican Rome and has been a favourite of Utilitarians in the modern age.

Science was part of Greek philosophy: most philosophers were concerned with the abstract and physical world. Some of their science was speculative, but reasoned, and some was based on observation and experience. Heraclitus (535-475 BCE), for example, was all for observation using senses, but Parmenides (b. 515 BCE) held that the physical world is made of only what the mind (reason) can conceive. They gave posterity two different but necessary methods to find the truth. Greek science focused on the nature of the physical world, including physics, mathematics, biology, medicine, and astronomy. Thales (624-546 BCE) of Miletus thought that the source of everything is water and he predicted (correctly) a solar eclipse. Others thought fire was the basis of all matter. Empedocles (492-432 BCE) of Acragas proposed that the earth was made of four elements: fire, earth, air, and water; and these elements were in constant struggle of love and strife. Democritus of Abdera refined the atomic theory of Leucippus (also of Abdera), suggesting that all matter can be explained as collision of tiny particles (*atoma*). Atoms were of the same substance, but of different size, and there is empty space between them. Pythagoras (570-495 BCE), whose name is

associated with the theorem of the right-angled triangle, thought that the structure of things rested on numbers.

The three great mathematicians of the Hellenistic period were Euclid (323-282 BCE) of Alexandria, Archimedes (287-212 BCE) of Syracuse and Apollonius (262-190 BCE) of Perge. Euclid in the *Elements*, considered as the foundation of mathematics, devised an elegant method: set out a series of axioms, basic propositions that everyone must accept, and systematically deduce theorems from them through rational arguments. Archimedes—physicist and inventor whom Galileo called 'superhuman'—built on the work of Euclid: he was the first person who calculated accurately the size of *pi*, developed a formula for measuring the volume of a sphere, and devised ways for measuring the area of a circle. Apollonius' work with conic sections is still a hard task for advanced students in mathematics; he also found an approximation for *pi* closer than that of Archimedes. At that time, a problem with their theoretical work was that it was far more advanced than the available technology.

In astronomy, Greeks were perhaps even more successful. To begin with, they had no problem accepting the idea that the earth was round. Let us look at some of the Greek astronomers. Aristarchus (310-230 BCE) of Samos suggested that the world was heliocentric and geocentric, but his notion was rejected until the sixteenth century. Apollonius held the view, as did Aristotle before him, that the earth was at rest in the centre of the universe. Based on this proposition, he developed a system by which the movements of planets could be explained: they always moved in circles in a particular way. Hipparchus (190-120 BCE) of Nicaea spotted and defined the procession of equinoxes and made calculation of the speed of change. But it was Ptolemy (90-160 CE) of Alexandria who made a lasting impact in astronomy and geography, thanks to his monumental works, the *Almagest* (*The Syntaxis*) and *Geography*. Using the geocentric model, he carried forward with extraordinary mathematical rigour to account for more observed phenomena than the earlier astronomers were able to achieve. The *Almagest* remained the standard until Copernicus and Galileo. Ptolemy contributed to science in other ways as well, e.g. he proposed the first treatise on refraction; devised new geometrical theorems; and in *Geography* he introduced minutes

and seconds, translated them into degrees, and tackled the problem of presenting the globe on a flat surface.

In life sciences, Aristotle and his pupil Theophrastus of Lesbos (370-288 BCE) developed methods of classification of animals and plants, which inspired later zoologists and botanists. The birth of modern medicine can be associated with the name of Hippocrates of Cos (460-377 BCE). He rejected the idea that gods were the cause of disorders in human body. There were defined causes of diseases—he studied epilepsy (the 'sacred' disease)—which need to be understood and treated without resorting to 'magic' cures. The 'Hippocratic oath' for medical practitioners is a reflection of concern about the rights of patients to life and privacy and the responsibility of doctors. I should add that Herophilus of Chalcedon (335-280 BCE) and Erasistratus of Chios (304-250 BCE) worked together in Alexandria and are regarded as the first anatomist and physiologist. They were able to gain significant insights into the human body by performing surgery on human cadavers. Galen (129-199 CE) of Pergamum was a most remarkable man if one looks at his contributions covering every aspect of human health, including the functions of heart, liver, brain, and the digestive system. He was also a brilliant logician. His medical texts were standard reference for Christian and Muslim practitioners until the early modern age. The problem with Greek medicine is that it was circumscribed by (i) the idea that good health requires a balance between the four humours, namely, yellow bile, black bile, phlegm, and blood, and (ii) its dependence on the naked eye because of lack of instruments.

Turning to Greek literature, we can start with the epic poetry in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* attributed to Homer in eighth century BCE. Needless to add, much of it was transmitted orally for three centuries if not longer. It is not only the glorious ('sublime') language but also story of heroic virtue that remain enduringly influential to European literature and history. We see rational thought embedded in Homer's epics, i.e. mental activity independent of the whims of gods. Among other poets of Greece, the three most prominent were Hesiod (*Theogony* and *Works and Days*), Xenophanes, and Pindar best known for lyrical odes to victory at the Olympics. In Alexandria of the Hellenistic period, Callimachus of Libya (310-240 BCE) dwelt on intimacy, nostalgia and

friendship; Theocritus of Syracuse (310-250 BCE) admired nature and love making in a pastoral setting; and Apollonius of Rhodes (295-215 BCE) revived the epic form in his *Argonaustica*, Meda's love for Jason. Music—from the Greek word *musike* for melodious sounds—was very much part of poetry reading and 'a seven-stringed lyre served as a common accompaniment to the declaimed hexameters'.

In ancient Greece, drama grew out of religious festivals; the 'concept of *tragoidia*, literally "goat-song", was originally connected with ritual sacrifice'. Dramas were staged, like the Olympics, as competitive affairs and the tragedy in them explored some of the deep societal and personal conflicts. The three great tragedians, Aeschylus (525-456 BCE), Sophocles (496-406 BCE), and Euripides (480-406 BCE), have 'turned tribal myth and legend into the foundation-stones of world literature'. Their plays continue to be performed all over the world and inspire the human spirit. The writers of comedy, led by Aristophanes (450-385 BCE), mocked freely at philosophers and politicians alike and laced their plots with raw humour that is enjoyed with great laughter by audiences the world over. Menander of Athens (342-291 BCE) wrote *New Comedy* focusing on the daily life of ordinary people, but mainly at the expense of the well-to-do. His style has had great influence on Roman writers of comedy and satire. The important point in the Greek plays is the humanist tradition: in the words of Sophocles, 'Wonders are many, but nothing more wonderful than man'.

The art of oratory was fostered by the theatre and tradition of the open-air assemblies and law-courts in Greek city-states. Rhetoric, the 'art of words' (persuasion through oratory), was studied as a formal subject. Demosthenes (384-322 BCE) excelled in his skills everyone of the 'Ten Attic Orators' from Antiphon to Dinarchus in Corinth. In his series of *philippics*, he argued with eloquence and passion for resistance to King Philip of Macedon. His oration *On the Crown*, which he delivered in his defence at a trial in 330 BCE, was perhaps one of the best pieces in all literature. Rhetoric and oratory were to become very popular with Roman Senators.

The works of Homer and the great tragedians were a mixture of much myth and some real history. Two Greeks initiated the art of writing history (*historia* means investigation or research), trying to separate

real history from myth. The first, regarded as 'the father of history', is Herodotus of Halicarnassus (480-425 BCE), though his account is not always reliable given his love for a good story. His focus was on the wars of Greece, including the battles of Sparta and Athens and, more importantly, invasions of Greece by the armies of Persian kings (Darius I and Xerxes I). His work, *The Histories*, stands out for at least three reasons: his method of research included extensive travel around the Mediterranean, consulting archives, eyewitnesses, and literary sources, and checking land surveys; his approach included telling both sides of the story (heroes, strategy, weaponry, and skills); and his focus on *hubris*, arrogance among some men that would provoke gods. The role Herodotus assigned to divine intervention in human affairs weakened his account, but it was quite consistent with the understanding of his readers.

Thucydides of Athens (460-395 BCE), a general exiled for military failure, was the second great historian of Greece. He wrote an account of the Peloponnesian War (431-404 BCE), between the Spartans and Athenians, which he regarded as a 'possession of all time'. He invented contemporary history by writing about an event in his own time and he gave no room to gods in the war. In his analysis of the war, Thucydides highlighted its proximate and underlying causes, leaving gods out of the fray. It was probably the first piece of political history. Another contemporary historian was Xenophon of Athens (430-354 BCE) who wrote *Hellenica* picking up the narrative where Thucydides had left (411 BCE). In *Anabasis*, he wrote an eye-catching account of the march of 10,000 Greek mercenaries—he was one of them—to Mesopotamia and back in the service of a Persian pretender.

We cannot ignore Polybius of Megalopolis (200-118 BCE) and Plutarch of Boeotia (46-120 CE), two Greek historians in the Roman period. Polybius, impressed by the triumph of Rome, wrote in his *Universal History* how it happened. He was one of many noblemen whom Romans took as hostages to Italy. He managed to get to Rome, befriended some influential Roman families, and kept contacts with Greece. Polybius travelled extensively, allowed to return to Greece in 150 BCE and, after the humiliating defeat of Greeks in 146 BCE, he managed a fair settlement for the beaten Greeks. His history is about the conquest

of Greece and the two Punic Wars: he had no doubt that Romans deserved to defeat the Greeks, given the former's superior army, high spirit and a balanced constitution. Polybius also explored the role of chance in Roman victory. Plutarch stayed in Greece, serving as a priest at the Temple of Apollo in Delphi, but his writings turned him into a celebrity in the Roman Empire. He is best remembered for his immortal *Parallel Lives*, in which he paired a philosophical biography of a famous Roman with a comparable Greek. The intention was not to narrate historical events, but draw lessons for the living from the lives of these men. In the *Lives*, Plutarch delivers penetrating observations on human nature. The Romans loved the *Lives* and, at the beginning of the Italian Renaissance, its rediscovery greatly stimulated interest in the classics.

The fifth and fourth centuries (BCE) were the golden age of art and architecture, as for much else in Greece. The focus was on harmony in the form of human body, structures of temples and theatres, and images of gods and goddesses. Our appreciation of the Greek art owes to what has survived in stone sculpture and architecture, and figure painting on ceramic vases. Traditionally paintings of nude women were common on the vases, but not sculpted. The Greek sculptors shifted from the stylised (stiff and gloomy) form of human body to the observed body of heroes and common folks doing ordinary things. There was also a transition from the body of man in the nude, which was perhaps part of the culture of homosexuality, to include women in the nude. The statues of the 'Spear Bearer' by Polycleitus, Myron's 'Discuss Thrower', and Aphrodite for Cnidus by Praxiteles are among the most celebrated. Phidias, the great sculptor, architect, and painter, has left his grand marks on the statue of the goddess Athena on the Acropolis, Frieze of the Parthenon, and the statue of Zeus at Olympia, once regarded as one of the 'Seven Wonders' . The art and architecture of the Greek temple (e.g. the Temples to Poseidon at Sounion, Artemis at Ephesus, Apollo at Bassae, and perhaps the most glorious Parthenon at Acropolis), the remains of which are all over ancient Greece, became the model for posterity: gods (myth) and humans (reason) exist in a creative tension. The other architectural wonders include the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus, the Colossus of Rhodes, and the Lighthouse of Alexandria.

The Greek social structure was quite diverse, but shared some common features. By sixth century BCE, there were hundreds of city-states, self-governing towns, surrounded by farm or pasture land with sparse population. Each city-state was a community of citizens linked to each other by family, clan, work, and the shared experience in festivals, games, and war. The privilege of citizenship was extended to men with land (Sparta) or without (Athens) whose parents were citizens. Only citizens owned land and required to serve in the army. Slave labour was a central feature of the Greek economy and society; slaves had almost no rights and treated generally very harshly. In fact, slavery allowed the citizens, and among them the well-to-do in particular, much time for entertainment and politics. Women were subservient to men and were required to produce children and look after them, though allowed to participate in some of the religious festivals and rituals. They had almost no role outside the house, except for prostitutes and concubines that most men had access to. The notion of infidelity applied to only women. Besides men could and did engage in homosexual relationship quite openly. The Greek economy depended largely on farming (crops and livestock), including pastoral farming, mining, some manufacturing, and trade between the city-states and with distant lands around the Mediterranean.

The Greek political structure was characterised by experimentation and variety. Since each city-state governed itself, a range of political traditions developed, each with its variants, imitations, and derivatives. There were despotisms (tyrannies), especially among the cities of Asia Minor perhaps influenced by Persia. Tyranny was not uncommon in other states: Athens has had that experience in the sixth century (BCE). There were monarchies, like Samos or monarchies mixed with oligarchy as in Sparta. There were various types of oligarchies as in Corinth, Sparta, or Massilia. Finally, there was the Athenian democracy in its prime for about 140 years. The incessant wars, leagues and confederations among the city-states caused many changes and some were quite abrupt and long lasting. The Peloponnesian War between Sparta and Athens was a major disruptive event in Greek history. Weakened as they were by conflicts and wars, caused mainly by the imperial policies of

Athens and Sparta, the Greek city-states died after King Philip of Macedonia defeated the Greeks in 338 BCE.

The celebrated democracy at Athens started to emerge from a regime of aristocracy and tyranny in sixth century (BCE). In 594 BCE, Solon (638-558 BCE), an archon, lawmaker, poet and considered as one of the 'Seven Wise Men', introduced several changes to the Athenian system of government: he divided the Athenian society into five classes based on people's annual fortune and, according to class, one had certain obligations such as tax and contributions to the war-machine. Solon introduced the Aeropagus, the court, and the Council (*boule*) comprising 400 members, which made Athenian citizens, even the lower classes, more engaged in politics. However, Solon's reforms alienated both aristocrats, for making concessions to the 'mob', and ordinary citizens because many believed that they did not receive enough power. The result was that Solon had to go into exile and the democracy he envisaged turned into anarchy. In 546 BCE, to arrest the disorder, Peisistratid imposed tyranny (one-man rule) which lasted for over 30 years. In 510 BCE, the tyrannical rule of Peisistratid and his sons was overthrown.

Cleisthenes (570-507 BCE), the chief archon and aristocrat, is rightly given the credit for laying the foundation of Athenian democracy. After the fall of tyranny, he introduced radical reforms, giving greater power to the local citizen assemblies and councils. The citizen base was expanded from 4 to 10 tribes, each sending 50 members to the Council of 500. He also introduced the practice of *ostraka* (ostracism) to make the elected members accountable to citizens. The reforms of Cleisthenes alienated many aristocrats but gained popular support among citizens. But it was in 461 BCE, after the defeat of Persians by the Greeks, when Pericles (498-429 BCE), the 'first citizen' of Athens and a General in the golden age, led the 'democratic revolution' in Athens. The Aeropagus—council of the aristocratic magistrates or *archons*—was stripped of its powers, which were redistributed to the citizens' Assembly, the elected Council of 500, and the law courts. For the next 30 years, Pericles enjoyed great influence and served the interests of democracy in Athens and its empire in the Aegian. Pericles rebuilt the Acropolis with the great Parthenon to glorify gods, goddesses, and free men.

The structure of Athenian democracy was consolidated in the 450s (BCE). The Assembly, in which all citizens (men 18 years and over) participated, became the centre of power: it made the laws, imposed taxes, decided about spending, and conducted foreign policy. The Council of 500 elected by the Assembly was responsible for running the state and carrying out policies of the Assembly. But there was no independent judiciary: the citizen body acted as both judge and jury. One of the most important effects of the Athenian political system was the development of the art of rhetoric and oratory: debating effectively to persuade one's peers in the Assembly, Council, and juries to one's own point of view. We should see the democracy of Athens, undoubtedly an unprecedented achievement in that age, in the context of essentially a very unequal and unjust society almost constantly engaged in wars for pillage and plunder (slaves, precious metals, land). More importantly, in the absence of recognised individual rights, the rule by majority of citizens, which did not include probably more than two-thirds of the population, was not subject to any restraint.

The classical age of Greece ended with the conquests of King Philip of Macedonia and his son Alexander. Alexander marched east with his armies through Asia Minor to Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, India, and on his way back through Iran he died in Babylon in 323 BCE. Some of his leading generals soon divided his empire into dynastic states that lasted in one form or another until the Roman armies started their march in the third century (BCE); the last Hellenistic dynasty of the Ptolemys of Egypt was defeated in 30 BCE. It needs to be emphasised that the Hellenic and Hellenistic traditions—the Oracle at Delphi, Olympic Games every four years, the Athenian Academy, and the Library at Alexandria—persisted long after the Greeks were defeated by Romans and their lands incorporated into the Roman Empire by the middle of second century (BCE). The rise of Roman power was perhaps more impressive—Roman legions were unstoppable after the third century (BCE)—and their empire lasted far longer than of the Greeks, including the empire of Alexander and the states of his successors. Much of the Greek civilisation was either lost or absorbed by the Romans and eventually passed on to the Christian and Byzantine

traditions. The Greek legacy had to await rediscovery by Muslims in the Middle Ages, in the Italian Renaissance and after.

Let me turn to Rome, its empire and the contributions it has made to the 'Modern Age'. Unlike the scores of scattered cities of Greece, Rome grew from a single organism. Rome created a cohesive Roman world on a vast scale as no one else did before, linked by a network of stone-built roads and military garrisons, and based on fear and punishment under a common law and administration. Rome was driven by a 'territorial imperative' for which military organisation and orderly government were necessary. The Colosseum is the symbol *par excellence* of Roman civilisation. Romans borrowed heavily from the Greeks: their Olympian gods, their speculative philosophy (stoicism in particular) and science, their writers served as models—being fluent in Greek was the in thing for quite some time. Initially some of the Roman leaders abhorred certain aspects of Greek social life of luxury, nudity and the amorous relations between men and boys. However, with the passage of time and expansion of the Roman Empire, the mores and values of austerity and fidelity disappeared from Roman life as well. Rome made its own considerable contributions to posterity, particularly with its law codes, language (Latin), military organisation, republican administration, and engineering (structures, monuments, arches, domes, aqueducts, etc.).

The story of the foundation of Rome, probably in the mid-eighth century (BCE), is immersed in the myth of Aeneid's odyssey after the Trojan War. The city was transformed from provincial obscurity in 509 BCE—the last king was forced out and replaced by a republican system—to the mastery of the Mediterranean in less than 300 years. The republic lasted for 476 years when Octavian as Augustus began the imperial dynasty with Rome as its capital. The Roman Empire lasted for 450 years and it ran from Hadrian's Wall on the border between England and Scotland to Mesopotamia (all of Europe south of the Rhine and Danube rivers, the Balkans, Turkey, Syria, Iraq) and to Palestine, Sinai, and North Africa (Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco). The western part of the Empire ended in 476 CE, thanks to the 'barbarian' invasions from the north, but the eastern part (known as the Byzantine Empire) lasted until 1453 CE when the Turks conquered Constantinople. The Roman social structure was as differentiated and hierarchical,

if not more, as the one in Greece. Men were masters (*patres familias*) at home (in the family) of their women and children; and men with landed property and lineage dominated the state machinery. But not all men were citizens: slavery and slave labour were an integral part of the economy and society. Slaves were treated harshly and even brutally, but they could become freemen and citizens which was not the case in Greece. Also, unlike Greece, citizenship of Rome was not dependent on property or lineage; outsiders could become citizens or associates and enjoy the privileges that citizens had. Citizens of Rome were divided between two basic classes: *patricians* (patrons) and *plaebians* (clients), the former had property and rank and the latter depended mostly on the former. Patronage was the glue for social cohesion, particularly as the Roman imperial power extended beyond the city borders. With the expanding empire, military organisation became perhaps the most important vehicle for patronage, property and upward mobility.

In a divided and superstitious society, Roman religion and its rituals were instrumental for maintaining social cohesion. There were multiple gods and goddesses—many of them borrowed from neighbours in the north and the Greeks—for the family and the state. The state gods were honoured through complex rituals, including animal sacrifice and divination, to keep open their benevolence; priests chosen from patrician (aristocratic) families were the overseers of these rituals. This approach was reinforced by the imperial cult, which took different forms in different reigns according to the demands of the ruling emperor (*pontifex maximus*), and the degree to which he was prepared to foster the worship of his predecessors. A mass of temples, oracles, centres of healing, and remote shrines also survived alongside the official religion of the state. Unlike the Greek attitude of tolerance, the state religion of Roman Empire did not allow much room for pluralism. Also, women did not participate in public rituals and festivals, with the exception of *Vestal Virgins*, as much as their peers did in the Greek world. But both among men and women divination was a common practice to find the will of gods. Once Theodosius (347-395 CE), the last Roman Emperor of the eastern and western part, adopted Christianity as the state religion in 380 CE, the new religion soon wiped out the traditional (pagan) prac-

tices in the empire. Later the Bishop of Rome assumed the title *pontifex maximus* (chief priest).

The unwritten Roman constitution was republican with checks and balances between the legislative, executive and judicial arms of the state, and in which the supreme power rested with the people. It renounced arbitrary rule by an individual (monarchy or tyranny) or by a small group (oligarchy) and all adult male citizens had the right to take part in political life. Although the Roman system was nominally democratic in that all laws had to be approved by the assembly of citizens, the republic was organised as a broad-based oligarchy of aristocrats, governed by a fairly small group of patrician families who regularly held all the magistracies. There was a fixed order for holding magistracies before a candidate could hold the highest office of all, the consulship. The two consuls, who had equal authority, were in charge of the state for their year of office. Their powers were limited by the laws and by each other's potential veto and that of the ten tribunes. Citizens exercised their political rights in the assemblies based on tribes and centuries according to the nature of the assembly (comitia). Voting took place only at Rome with the consequence that those living in rural areas were usually unable to vote. The assemblies were not deliberative or debating bodies; they could only approve or reject policy decided elsewhere. Senate was the sole deliberating body that made decisions upon all policy matters related to both domestic and foreign affairs. This organisation was reflected in the towns (*municipia*) throughout Italy; their citizens were also (in the later republic) citizens of Rome but the towns retained local autonomy.

The republican system, dominated by the aristocracy, started to unravel first because of the reforms under the Hortensian Law in favour of the upwardly mobile *plaebians* and their assemblies. The more important reason was the unstoppable wars of conquest in the third and second centuries (BCE), first against neighbours on the Peninsula and then against Carthage and Greece. The inflow of slaves, plunder, tributes, and taxes on the subject populations created social and political tensions in Rome and Italy along with the revolts by slaves, the Italian allies of Rome, and the *plaebians* against the Senate. Sulla (138-78 BCE), after his victory against the king of Pontus, became the dictator, intro-

duced reforms in favour of the *patricians* and Senators, and then retired in 79 BCE. The next 50 years were dominated by wars abroad and a civil war at home among the leading Roman consuls (generals), particularly Cassius, Pompey and Julius Caesar (100-44 BCE). Their contest ended in the dictatorship of Caesar, who was assassinated by conspiracy in 44 BCE. Octavian (63 BCE-14 CE), grandnephew and designated heir of Caesar, managed to eliminate his competitors and was anointed by the Senate as Augustus in 27 BCE. Augustus assumed the title *pontifex maximus* (Chief Priest) in 12 CE—the title *pater patriae* was added in 2 BCE—and so started the imperial reign in Rome and its empire. Under the empire, the powers held by the assemblies were transferred to the Senate. Eventually the Senate and assemblies lost their power to the Emperor as the republic transformed into a glorified monarchy.

The civil and military administration in the Roman republic and empire evolved according to the needs of the state, its rulers and citizens. Romans developed a flexible but well structured civil administration for both the capital and provinces. The bureaucracy was specialised and a great deal of devolved authority rested with state officials. A major achievement of the Empire's civil and military administration was its professionalism and flexibility, integrating the diverse populations of the Empire under *Pax Romana*. However, with the passage of time, and given the discipline, training and incentives, the imperial army acquired a dominant position in the affairs of the state. The laws of Rome are perhaps 'most enduring contribution to world history'. The Twelve Tables (451-450 BCE) were the fountain of these laws, on which the republican assemblies and councils built the legal structure over time. But the emperors, beginning from Augustus, took the law-making powers into their own hands. Emperor Justinian I (483-565 CE) codified the corpus of Roman law finally—it was partially codified several times before—and published in 529 CE. The roots of modern law codes of several European countries are in the Justinian Code.

Romans were great builders, but they borrowed some of their architecture and town planning from the wealthy coastal settlements to the south. It is this area in which one finds the origins of the typical Roman stone-building, the amphitheatre, the theatre, the bath, the market building, the basilica, and the Roman house. While there was

the imprint of the Greek style in Roman temples, Romans introduced impressive innovations with secular buildings, roads and bridges, and town planning. They also mastered the art of designing and building the dome, the arch, and the vault, and they developed a strengthened form of concrete using volcanic ash mixed with lime as mortar. The Pantheon (27 BC), in honour of 'all the gods', carries a vaulted dome wider than that of St. Peter's. The Coliseum (80 CE), an amphitheatre with seats for 87,000 spectators, is a marvellous amalgam of Greek and Roman features. The unparalleled baths of Caracalla (217 CE) are a monument to the Roman lifestyle, but the baths of Diocletian (306 CE) are even more impressive. The great Circus Maximus, for chariot racing, was expanded to accommodate almost 400,000 spectators. The long-lasting and beautifully designed structure of the aqueducts built to supply water to the cities and the countless palaces and villas were no less impressive. Roman architecture has inspired builders of both religious and secular structures and emulated in the West.

A major Roman innovation, which affected learning and literacy, was the gradual replacement of the scroll with codex. The codex was much less bulky and sturdier than the scroll, handier in format for reference by page, and probably less expensive to produce. The papyrus rolls rarely lasted more than 300 years and the introduction of codex saved many classical texts. Another major innovation related to learning was the educational curriculum based on the encyclopaedia of Varro (116-27 BCE), *Nine Books of Disciplines*, incorporating the nine arts: grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, musical theory, medicine, and architecture. In Rome, by the end of first century CE, they had standardised education with seven 'liberal' arts, excluding medicine and architecture. The seven arts became the basis of medieval education, but separated in two parts: the more elementary *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric and dialect) and the more advanced *quadrivium* (arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy). The modern educational systems in the West are based on this curriculum.

Romans made almost no addition to Greek speculative philosophy and science. Roman philosophers embraced Greek stoicism, prominent among the stoics were Cicero (106-43BCE), Lucretius (99-55BCE), Seneca (1BCE-65 CE), and Marcus Aurelius (121-180CE). Stoicism had

great effect on 'natural law'. As in Greece, the art of oratory and rhetoric was much valued and Rome produced Caesar, Cicero, probably one of the best, followed by Cato the younger (95-46BCE) and Quintilian (35-100CE). Cicero, like other Roman intellectuals of the early period, assimilated the Greek culture and regarded as second only to Aristotle for intellectual content of the Western cultural tradition. He was a powerful writer and acknowledged as father of the liberal tradition of tolerance and education (humanism). Oratory held a prominent place in Roman life as indeed it did in Greece. Cicero was by far the best in Latin prose and his successor, the elder Seneca (55 BCE-37 CE), a rhetorician from Spain, compiled a great anthology of Greek and Roman orators.

While Greeks invented the main forms of literature, epics, comedy, tragedy, lyric, logic, didactic, and rhetoric, Romans made advance in love poetry and satire; otherwise it was all imitation from Greeks. In the republican age, we find four illustrious Romans. Terence (193-159 BCE), the playwright, celebrating man in these words: 'I consider nothing human foreign to me'. He adapted Greek comedies for the Roman stage. Cicero, a great champion of the rule of law and the republic, wrote several masterpieces in elegant language, including *On the Nature of the Gods*, *On Duties*, *On the Laws*, *On Fate*, and *On the Republic*. Lucretius (99-55 BCE), an Epicurean—'liberate humans from the fear of gods and death to achieve peace for the soul'—and poet who wrote *On the Nature of Things*, a book of verse that inspired generations and helped introduce the 'Modern Age'. Then there was Catallus (84-54 BCE) who wrote lyrical poetry of romance and love and celebrated 'bohemian' life. In the age of Augustus, the most celebrated included the poet Virgil (70-19 BCE), who wrote *Eclogues* (pastoral poems), *Georgics* eulogizing farming, and *Aeneid*, the voyage of Aeneas modelled on Homer. Horace (65-8 BCE), who was immersed in Greek poetry, authored the *Odes and Satires* and is the most translated and imitated of poets. Ovid (43 BCE-18 CE) celebrated sex and love in *The Art of Love*, for which he was banished by Augustus and *Metamorphosis* which is rated as the most influential book of the ancient world; and then there was Juvenal (47-130 CE) the poet of satire who said: 'it is difficult not to write satire'.

Some Romans not only made history but also wrote it. Julius Caesar (100-44 BCE) was a great maker and writer of history. It is worth adding

that Caesar's 'Julian' calendar was replaced by the Gregorian calendar in sixteenth century and in some countries it lasted until the twentieth century. His accounts of the Gallic War and the civil war are masterpieces of simplicity. Sallust (86-34 BCE) followed Caesar in politics and in writing history. The other two Roman historians of fame were Livy (59 BCE-17 CE) and Tacitus (55-120 CE). Livy, who glorified the dying Roman Republic, wrote an epic history of Rome in a grand style but with scarce analysis. Tacitus continued the annals of Livy to the first century of Roman Empire with little enthusiasm for Roman emperors, after Augustus eight of ten met a nasty end.

Music and theatre were the cultural inventions of Greeks and the Romans adopted them with fervor: recitations of episodes from Homer, mime acting, and pantomime dancing were very popular. The Greek athletic games came to Rome when in 186 CE Emperor Domitian founded the Capitoline Games, which offered contests in music, poetry and athletics for both men and women competing for prizes. The Olympic Games, founded in the mid-eighth century BCE, lasted until 395 CE. Romans adopted gymnasiums, but for debates and clothed activities. The interesting thing is that Romans reserved nudity for the public baths, constructed by successive emperors on a scale and facilities that the Greeks had not known. Chariot racing had a long history among the rich at Greek festivals and was an early import into Rome. Once in Rome, the sport developed into competition among peer groups and conducted in the Circus Maximus with spectators running into hundreds of thousands. Then there were the violent blood sports, including battles between wild animals, bloody hunts of wild animals by men, mock sea battles between armed combatants, and the notorious gladiatorial shows. These shows were patronised by the elite and emperors, staged in the Circus, Forum and later in the Colosseum, and watched by many thousands at a time. This public display of violence for eager crowds spread all over the empire. In the provinces, they took on religious significance, in which gladiators were associated with the cult of the emperor as a god. The spectacle of brutal and bloody combats of humans with each other and with animals tends to raise uncomfortable questions about human civilisation.

Muslim Contribution to Philosophy, Science and the Arts

The spread of Muslim rule outside the Arabian Peninsula was quite rapid. In just over a century, from 622 CE to 760 CE, it included the Middle East, Iran and parts of Afghanistan and India, North Africa from Egypt to Mauritania, and parts of the Iberian Peninsula. Muslims overtook the exhausted Byzantine and Persian empires and were knocking at the door of Western Europe. Some of the Muslim rulers in Baghdad (Abbasids), Cairo (Fatimids), and Cordoba (Ummayads), from eighth to thirteenth century, facilitated and patronised several Muslim intellectuals and scholars. Of course, not all Muslim rulers were receptive to new (alien) ideas and practices that could undermine the power of the religious and temporal elite. So the expounders took great risks and some of them suffered severe penalties. I should stress that Muslim scholars not only discovered and used the works of pre-Christian Greeks and Romans, Indians, and Chinese, but also made significant additions to the received knowledge, particularly in astronomy, medicine, mathematics, and metaphysics. Muslims were also important transmitters of some of the major ideas and practices from China (e.g. paper and printing) and India (e.g. arithmetic). Recent research has identified numerous contributions—paper and the art of printing, compass, stirrup, and gunpowder are among the most widely cited—that China made over the centuries.

The main political regimes in the Muslim world, under which most of the intellectuals did their work, included rulers of the Abbasid caliphate (754-945) in Iraq, Iran, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt; Persian Buwayids (945-1055) in Iran and Iraq; Fatimids (909-1169) in Egypt to Tunisia and Palestine; Ayubids (1169-1260) in Egypt, Palestine and Syria; Memlukes (1260-1517) in Egypt and Syria; Turko-Persian Seljuqs (1055-1194) in parts of Central Asia, Iran, Iraq, Syria, and eastern Turkey; Ummayad caliphate (756-1031) in Spain and Portugal, followed by the 'petty states' (1031-1061) and the dynasties of al-Marabitun (1061-1150) and al-Mowahidun (1150-1270). The great centres of learning and power were Baghdad, Damascus, Isfahan, Shiraz, Cairo, and Cordo-

ba. Some Muslim rulers (Arabs, Persians and Turks) facilitated, even fostered, joint ventures by Jewish, Christian and Muslim scholars who were familiar with diverse languages (Arabic, Persian, Hindi, Hebrew, Assyrian, Greek, and Latin) to translate manuscripts of the ancient Zoroastrian, Indian, Greek, and Roman philosophers, geographers, physicians, mathematicians, astronomers, and historians, the prominent among them were Plato, Plotinus, Aristotle, Archimedes, Pythagoras, Euclid, Hippocrates, Galen, and Ptolemy. Muslim intellectuals reviewed, interpreted and made additions to the received ideas, built on borrowed methods, and introduced inventions. Muslim societies, especially in the Middle East, also acted as major transmitters of many Chinese inventions in their original and modified (improved) forms, e.g. paper and printing, compass, gunpowder, stirrup, and the clock.

Among Muslim intellectuals, whose works have been widely cited and used by modern philosophers and scientists, I can cite the illustrious names of Hayyan (*Geber*), 'father' of chemistry, al-Kindi (*Alkindus*) the first Muslim philosopher, al-Ghazali (*Algazel*) in philosophy and mysticism, ibn Bajja (*Avempace*), ibn Tufail (*Abubacor*) and ibn Rushd (*Averroes*) in philosophy, al-Khwarizmi (*Algorismus*) 'father' of algebra., al-Uqlidisi in the geometry of Euclid and decimals, Omar Khayyam (mathematics and poetry), al-Razi (*Razes*), al-Zahrawi, (*Abulcasis*), and Ibn al-Nafis (pulmonary circulation of blood) in medicine, ibn Sina (*Avicenna*) in medicine and philosophy, al-Haitham (*Alhazen*) in optics, al-Biruni (anthropology and astronomy), al-Zarqali (*Arzachel*) in astronomy and invention of clocks, al-Bitruji (*Alpetrogius*) in astronomy, al-Idrisi in geography, and ibn Khaldun in history and sociology. Among non-Muslims, ibn Ishaq *(Joannitius*), a Christian, in Iraq was an eminent translator of Greek manuscripts and Moses Maimonides, a Jew, in Spain and Egypt was a prominent philosopher and physician.

The internal struggles for power among rulers and dynasties were almost a continuous source of instability and turmoil in Muslim societies stretching from Central Asia to North Africa and in the Iberian Peninsula. The Mongol invasions of the Khanates in Central Asia and the Abbasid caliphate in the Middle East (Iran, Iraq and Syria) in the thirteenth century had an enormously disastrous impact on these societies as were the Christian crusades against the Muslim rule in Spain

and Portugal from the twelfth to fifteenth century. Tamerlane's invasion of the Middle East and Asia Minor in the late fourteenth century was no less hellish in its effects. These invasions and crusades greatly destabilised the systems of government and wrecked these societies.

At the intellectual level, the *Mutazilite* school of Muslim theologians, who were patronised by the Abbasid rulers in Iraq during the late eighth to mid-ninth century, embraced the Greek rationalist (Aristotelian and Neo-Platonist) metaphysics and philosophy. Later many other philosophers in other parts of the Muslim world attempted to incorporate, in diverse forms, the rationalist approach to Muslim theology. However, some of the most influential Muslim jurists and theologians, most eminent among them Ahmed ibn Hanbal in the ninth century and Abu al-Hasan al-Ashari in the tenth century, fiercely attacked the *Mutazilite* philosophy and epistemology. These attacks formed the foundation on which al-Ghazali (*Algazel*), the great jurist, theologian, mystic, and philosopher, toward the end of eleventh century, brought to a head the conflict between speculative theology (*kalam*) and philosophy (*falsafa*), and in the process changed the structure of *kalam* as well.

In one of his most influential works, *The Incoherence of the Philosophers*, al-Ghazali took a direct hit at the Aristotelian and Neo-Platonic philosophy adopted by some of the leading Muslim philosophers, especially al-Farabi and ibn Sina. In twelfth century, ibn Rushd, Andalusian philosopher and commentator on Aristotle, confronted al-Ghazali's attack in his widely read *The Incoherence of the Incoherence*. Ibn Rushd thought that Aristotelian metaphysics could be accommodated in Islamic thought. While ibn Rushd gained popularity and is still widely read in Europe, al-Ghazali won the case against Greek (rationalist) philosophy in Muslim societies generally and the Sunni community in particular. Consequently, for about six long centuries, the door was shut tight on discourse and knowledge of philosophy outside the confines of approved Muslim (certainly Sunni) theology. Significantly, at the time when the Muslim quest for knowledge based on reason and senses started to recede, a beginning was being made in Europe (Spain and Italy in particular) to 'rediscover' the Greek and Roman treasure together with the wealth of knowledge that Muslims had accumulated over the centuries.

The rising tide of the Ottoman Turks first in Asia Minor, starting in the early fourteenth century, and expanding into the Middle East (to the border of Iran), North Africa, and southern Europe provided some sort of stability for people in the Middle East, Asia Minor and North Africa, but kept the pot boiling in southern and south-eastern Europe. It is significant that the Ottoman Empire contributed very little to the development of scientific knowledge and technology. Similarly, the Safavid and Mughal rulers of Iran and India and the Khans in Central Asia made few if any efforts to promote knowledge outside the confines of Muslim theology in the Sunni and Shia traditions approved by religious leaders and supported by caliphs, sultans, shahs, amirs, and khans.

The Muslim world—from the Arabian Peninsula to North Africa and Spain and from Turkey to Central Asia and India—has a shared cultural heritage of extraordinary richness. It is well reflected by the ever evolving Islamic art, including the art of the book (calligraphy, painting and binding), the decorative art (carvings, mosaics, pottery, textiles, carpets, and metal works), and the mosque and palace architecture from the Alhambra in Spain to Taj Mahal in India, from the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem to the Blue Mosque in Istanbul. The diverse art forms, reflecting the local cultural influence, have a basic unity inspired by the spirit of Islam. The art and artefacts are as representative of caliphs, sultans, kings, and princes as of the populace. Muslim artists and architects borrowed not only from each other in different regions and ages, but also from non-Muslims (Greeks, Indians and Chinese in particular). Equally importantly, Islamic art and architecture have been used as models for adoption and adaptation in diverse cultural settings outside the Muslim world.

Muslim men of letters made major contributions to world history and literature. In history, according to Franz Rosenthal (*History of Muslim Historiography*), Muslim historiography paved the way to go beyond characters (heroes) and events (wars) to social structure, culture, and geography. Ibn Khaldun of Tunisia (1332-1406), best known for his *Muqqadima* (Prolegomena in Latin), is regarded as the 'father' of historiography. Among Muslim historians, the three most venerated and cited are: al-Tabari of Persia (838-923), the first Muslim historian, who wrote the History of the Prophets and Kings (*Tarikh al-Tabari*);

al-Masudi of Iraq (896-956), 'Herodotus of the Arabs', was a great historian and geographer who authored *The Meadows of Gold and Mines of Gems*; and the polymath al-Biruni of Persia (973-1050) whose book, *Tahqiq Ma-lil-Hind*, is an extraordinary piece of research on ancient and contemporary Hindu society.

Most of the ancient Muslim literature, including religious and secular poetry, epics, and legends, is in Arabic and Persian languages. In Arabic, the most admired among the classics is the *Quran*, the word of God. Among numerous Arab poets, the three celebrated names are of Abu Nuwas of Iran (756-814), great anthologist Abu Tammam of Syria (804-846), and al-Mutanabbi of Iraq (915-965), perhaps the greatest of Arab poets. The Arabic and Persian versions of the *One Thousand Nights and One*, *Aladdin*, *Ali Baba*, and *Daastan Amir Hamza* are probably the most widely translated and read. In Persian poetry, the works of Omar Khayyam (*Rubayat*), Rumi (*Masnavi*), Firdausi (*Shahnameh*), Saadi (*Gulistan and Bostan*), and Hafez (*Divan-e-Hafez*) have inspired generations of storytellers, literati and mystics (sufis) in both the East and the West.

It is fair to say that, by the early part of fourteenth century, in almost every Muslim society gates were closed to seeking knowledge from outside the framework of the Quran and its approved interpretation by rulers and religious scholars. The result is that Muslims have made little if any contribution to the sciences and arts, except in art and architecture and weapons, since the end of fourteenth century. Muslim rulers, with minor exceptions of little consequence, of the Ottoman (Turkey and the Middle East), Mughal (India) and Safavid (Persia) empires turned their backs to the rich legacy of Muslim scholars and intellectuals for about 350 years. More importantly, they paid little or no attention to the growth of modern science and the social and political order emerging in Europe. Consequently, it was only in the eighteenth century that Muslims started to learn about modern sciences, arts and inventions based on knowledge developed by Europeans since about the fifteenth century. Paradoxically modern methods and practices were transmitted through imperial penetration of Europeans into Muslim societies. I describe this asymmetrical encounter in the next chapter.

Europe in the 'Middle Ages'

It was perhaps Petrarch (1304-74) who coined the term 'Middle Ages' for the period starting from the fifth century to about twelfth century. In this period, Europeans were by and large cut off from the legacy of ancient Greeks and Romans for about 700 years. Aristotle lay dormant in the West and philosophy was 'murdered' in the Byzantine Empire as well. The church authorities allowed little if any access to pagan literature, e.g. Pope Gregory I (590-604 CE) proscribed the writings of Cicero. In 529 CE Justinian had closed Plato's Academy in Athens, where philosophy atrophied and died. It was a very long and frigid winter for the intellect in Europe: faith and scripture, mediated through the Church, literally dictated the lives of Christians. The disputes were about God and Christ and not about philosophy and science. In this section, I will describe briefly the conditions in the Middle Ages as background to the transformation of European societies from a general state of absolute rule, buttressed by a hegemonic Church, to the rule by consent of citizens who had acquired freedom of choice in religion and much else.

We can identify at least four processes at work in the decline and fall of the Roman Empire. Three of these processes worked mainly against the empire in the West. First, the waves of barbarian migrants (Germanic tribes of various brands and the Asiatic Huns) from the east of Danube and north of Rhine deluged the empire, keeping it violently busy for almost a century. Second, there was growing rift between the western (Roman) and eastern (Byzantine) parts of the empire. Third, export of Christianity to pagans created new tensions. The Roman Empire in the west fell in 476 CE, following the invasions by Goths, Huns, Burgundians, and Vandals, including the sack of Rome by the Visigoths in 410 CE and by Vandals in 455 CE. The fourth process was the rise of Islam from the Arabian Peninsula and its conquests in the seventh century, which started to set new limits for the eastern part of Roman (Byzantine) Empire, and its penetration from North Africa into the Iberian Peninsula against the Visigoths in the eighth century.

From the point of view of ideas, Greek philosophy and science went into deep freeze by the middle of sixth century and a 'Dark Age' descended upon Europe that lasted until at least the middle of ninth centu-

ry. But thanks to men like Boethius (480-525 CE), Cassiodorus (485-585 CE) in the age of Theodoric, King of Ostrogoths, and Isadore (560-636 CE), Archbishop of Seville, that a portion of classical texts (tradition) was kept alive in an otherwise hostile environment for pagan thought and ideas. Two important inventions and their use made a big difference. The first one was paper, which came from China through Arabs, to replace papyrus in the late eighth century. The other was the cursive miniscule script to replace the majuscule (uncial) script in the early ninth century. Paper would last far longer than papyrus and the cursive script would save paper. In the Byzantine Empire, Bardas revived the university in Constantinople around 860 which became the repository of ancient Greek texts which were changed into cursive script. At the same time, in ninth century, a number of scholars recorded the books they had read, of which *Bibliotheca* of Photius (810-893) was among the most prominent. I should add that, notwithstanding the 'iconoclast controversy' from the mid-eighth to mid-ninth century, 'Christian art is one of glories of human achievement.' It was all the more significant when all other areas of intellectual activity were in decline.

After the barbarians dismantled the Western Roman Empire in the last quarter of fifth century, the Christian world was in acute turbulence for three centuries. There were (i) attacks by Muslims on the Eastern Roman Empire; (ii) almost constant dynastic conflicts and wars for the nominal Roman emperor in Constantinople; (iii) conflicts between the Pope in Rome and the emperor in Constantinople; and (iv) wars between various groups of Germanic rulers in Europe. In the eighth century, a major source of conflict among Christians was the 'iconoclast controversy' precipitated by Pope Leo III, which lasted for over 75 years. Eventually the icon lovers won the war. The most notable development in this century was the rise of the Franks, led by Pepin 'the Short' who created the Papal States in Italy. Pepin's son Charles or Charlemagne (742-814) succeeded him in 768 who expanded the Kingdom over most of Western Europe (excluding Spain). Pope Leo III crowned him as the Holy Roman Emperor in the year 800; there was once again an emperor in the West after nearly 400 years. By this action, Pope Leo III was implicitly showing his (pope's) unprecedented superiority over the Emperor of Romans! As for Charlemagne, 'in little more than a gener-

ation, he had raised the Kingdom of the Franks from being just one of many semi-tribal European states to a single political unit of vast extent, unparalleled since the days of Imperial Rome.' Since the 'indivisible' Roman Empire was no more and from now on there would be two empires, the Byzantine Empire was in a state of shock. The 'Christian world would never be the same again.'

Charlemagne, an otherwise unlettered man, was abundantly charismatic and possessed keen intellect. He was obsessed with ancient Rome and Christianity. He built monumental churches and palaces (Romanesque architecture); employed scholars to copy ancient texts, write grammars, histories, and ballads; revised the text of the Bible; codified Christian laws; and introduced monastic reforms. Charlemagne's reign lasted until his death in 814, after which, thanks to the intra-family disputes, the Carolingian empire split into three Frankish Kingdoms by 843. Vikings from the north took advantage of the division and made their march on different parts of Europe. At the same time, while the papacy in Rome languished, the Western Roman Empire recovered in the eastern part of the Carolingian dominion after the Franks and Saxons made Henry I (876-936) King of Germany and his (Saxon) dynasty lasted from 919 to 1024—from Otto I (936-973) to Henry II as Roman emperors. The Roman Church finally broke away permanently from the Byzantine Orthodox Church in 1054.

The papal monarchy in the West lasted from 1075 CE (Pope Gregory VII) to 1302 CE (Pope Boniface VIII) while battles were going on at least three fronts: between the popes and kings for supremacy; between kings and nobles; between the power of priest and individualisation of faith. The crusades against infidels (Muslims) and heretics (Cathars) were attempts to assert the supremacy of popes and maintain a universal Christian society at least in Europe. [Crusade—using the crucifix as its symbol—was a 'just war' against infidels and heretics, regarded as the highest act of piety. The popes offered three incentives for participation in the crusade: remission of sins, moratorium on debt, and the right to claim the forfeited property.]

The Crusades (from the eleventh to thirteenth century), five of them in all, against Muslims were undertaken for a number of reasons. I will not dwell on crusades against the Cathars in southern France in the ear-

ly thirteenth century, Hussites in Bohemia in the early fifteenth century and the Spanish Armada against England in 1588. The major reasons for crusades against Muslims were to (1) reclaim the Holy Land from the infidels, (2) channel the energy and resources of people (knights, nobles, lords, and peasants) away from almost perpetual violence in Europe, and (3) maintain supremacy of the Church or papal authority on Christians. The public face of the crusades had to be liberation of the Holy Land (Jerusalem in particular) from Muslims: it was supposedly the most pious act for every Christian. The crusades devastated the much diminished Byzantine (Greek) Empire—in particular the sack of Constantinople by the crusaders in 1204—and paradoxically helped the Muslim rulers (Turks in particular) expand their stronghold around the Mediterranean and their penetration into Europe. They also disrupted the existing social order in much of Europe by intensifying the conflicts between kings and nobles on the one hand and the Roman Church and secular authority on the other.

The initial call for the crusade against Muslims also provided great impetus to Christians in the Iberian Peninsula; get rid of the Moors (Muslim Arabs and Berbers) and re-conquer the Peninsula for Christianity. Moors had come in the eighth century and expanded their rule to a large part of Spain and Portugal in the next nearly 200 years. There is consensus that Muslim rulers had created a multicultural society of Muslims, Christians, and Jews within an atmosphere of relative tolerance, and where literature, science and the arts flourished. The decline of Muslim rule in Spain and Portugal started in the twelfth century. There were two major reasons for it. First, there were internal (dynastic, tribal and sectarian) conflicts and wars—Ummayad Caliphate followed by the Taifa Kingdoms, two Berber Moroccan dynasties of Almoravids (al-Murabitun) and Almohads (al-Muwahhidun), and finally the Nasrid Kingdom of Granada. Second, the war (crusade) that Christians from the north and east were able to sustain for over two centuries. The Inquisition—it lasted for over two centuries—that followed the final victory against Granada in 1492 was as much a tragedy for Muslims and Jews as it was a loss to Spain and Portugal. The practice of Inquisition—subjecting suspected offenders (heretics) among the old and new Christians against canon law to intense questioning and imposing severe penalties

including death by burning at the stake—by the Catholic Church has had a long tradition in other parts of Europe and was continued until the eighteenth century.

In the context of progress in the West, there were at least two important consequences of crusades against Muslims around the Mediterranean. First, some of the Europeans (in Italy and France in particular) were able to acquire a substantial body of literature introducing them to the contributions of Greeks, Romans and Muslims in various disciplines of the arts and sciences. The discovered ideas and images about Nature, society, religion, and much else provided the fuel for the Italian Renaissance and Enlightenment in Europe. The city-states of Italy and their merchants also played a major role in spreading new ideas and images. The ongoing conflicts among Christians about the role of Roman Church in private and public life, and the wars between competing principalities and kingdoms in Europe based on dynastic and feudal power, ignited the fire for change. The revolt by Luther, Zwingli and Calvin against the Catholic Church (Reformation) and the response, both violent and missionary (Counter-Reformation), of the Church and its followers lasted for almost 150 years from the 1520s, including a very bloody thirty-year war (1618-1648).

A second consequence of the crusades against Muslims was that the Arabs and Turks had effectively blocked the trade route for Europeans to the east (Middle East, India and China). The Christian rulers of Spain and Portugal started sponsoring trade missions around the western coast of Africa to go to the Indies on an unchartered sea route. The voyages of Christopher Columbus helped discover the 'New World', followed by Vasco de Gama to India around the Cape of Good Hope and Magellan to the Philippines around the tip of South America. They were soon followed by conquest, colonial acquisitions, large-scale migrations of people, European settlements, decimation of indigenous populations in the Americas, African slavery, and transfer of resources including precious metals. Following the examples of Spain and Portugal, other European countries (Holland and England in particular) entered the age of modern imperialism. At the same time, some European societies (led by Holland and England) began their march to capitalism with gradual dissolution of the feudal economic and social structure. In this

process of transformation, new ideas, expanded literacy and inventions played a major role. Needless to add, the resources (gold and silver), raw material and profits from colonies were by no means a meagre source of new wealth in Europe.

In the same context, it is important to mention the effects of bubonic plague (Black Death), a leveller and perhaps the most diabolical of afflictions. Plague used to decimate human populations on a very large scale in many parts of the Old World. The other infectious and contagious diseases (tuberculosis, cholera, leprosy, etc.) also caused large number of deaths until recent times. Malnutrition due to poverty and poor sanitation were almost constant companions of most people and exacerbated the effects of contagious diseases. It was not until the late nineteenth and early twentieth century that modern science started to discover the cause (micro-organisms) and establish methods to control and eradicate these diseases. Until at least the seventeenth century, the medical knowledge available to Europe was based on the ideas and practices of the ancient Greek and Muslim practitioners (Galen, Rhazes and Avicenna). Black Death (plague) was a dreadfully common experience in Europe from the mid-fourteenth to the mid-seventeenth century. In the first 100-150 years, nearly one-third of the population was lost to plague. The effects of recurrent attacks of the plague on people's religious, political and economic life were quite deep and long lasting.

On the religious side, the large number of deaths by plague made some people turn more to a private faith (mysticism) or more frequent communion, but others started to doubt about the existence of a Providential God. Another effect was the collapse of Catholic system of education since unexperienced young men replaced a high proportion of the educated and experienced priests who perished in the epidemic. On the socio-economic side, plague helped shake the feudal system—shortage of peasantry being a major factor—and the loss of population (labour) led to significant changes in agricultural technology and practices which improved resource productivity and increased the supply of food and raw material. The increased supply of food and higher wages (income) in turn helped replenish the population (hence labour) and improve the general standard of living.

In much of Christian Europe the ancient (Greek and Roman) arts, architecture and ideas (philosophy) were left in oblivion for centuries. Apparently there was little appetite for things that centred on the life here and now (the City of Man) since Christians focused almost entirely on their afterlife (the City of God). It is true that monasteries preserved some of the Greek and Roman manuscripts, but access to them was severely limited. The pieces of art and architecture gave little inspiration for imitation given their association with paganism. Things started to change in the eleventh century with the crusades against Muslims in the Middle East (for Jerusalem) and the Iberian Peninsula for *reconquista*. The crusades lasted for centuries and had lasting consequences for both Muslim and Christian societies. A major consequence was the discovery of manuscripts translated into Arabic together with commentaries by Muslim scholars and their own additions to the pagan literature on natural and moral philosophy.

However, it is unfair to ignore the contributions that the Roman Church made in different ways, but not without tension and conflict, to the dissemination of ideas, art and architecture of the ancients. The Church played an important role in the resurrection of civilisation in Europe after the barbarians had inundated Italy, France, Britain, and Spain. Its monks copied and preserved thousands of pagan manuscripts written in Greek and Latin. In the age of Renaissance, humanists used the pagan relics with great enthusiasm. The Roman Church built universities and cathedrals ending the 'Dark Ages'. The Scholastics renewed attempts to interpret the affairs of life and its purpose by reason. The Church patronised development of music and art through centuries. Perhaps most importantly, the Church provided to European societies a universal moral code and structure of government, but in which its own incontestable position and authority was above all institutions and individuals in each society.

The story of the rediscovery of the ancients (Greeks and Romans) and contributions (additions) of Muslim philosophers and scientists is not without controversy in terms of the facilitative role that the Catholic Church played between the twelfth and fourteenth century. It took Europeans nearly three centuries (twelfth to fifteenth century) to translate (retranslate) and use the unearthed treasure. Needless to add, the pro-

cess of acceptance and use of this body of knowledge was not smooth, given the power of the Roman Church to censure and impose penalties, ranging from excommunication to burning at the stake. The Scholastics, particularly Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), tried to synthesise (reconcile) the rational pagan (Neo-platonic and Aristotelian) philosophy and the Scripture on issues of God, man and the universe. By the end of fifteenth century, faith and reason took their separate route, for which there were multiple reasons. Among them were battles among Christian intellectuals (friars and lay teachers), contests for power between Cardinals for the Papal chair, rising tide of secular rulers (kings and nobles) against the hegemonic Church and the primacy of Popes in temporal affairs, and the general disenchantment with the power and wealth of the Church agents and the nobles in the face of mass violence and natural calamities.

Craving to understand rationally some basic issues of Christian Scripture and the Church doctrine started in earnest by the end of twelfth century, a time when translations also started to appear under the aegis of the Church. The main centre for the unearthed literature and its translation from Arabic and Greek languages into Latin was Toledo in Spain after its conquest in 1085. The libraries at Toledo, Cordoba, Lisbon and Segovia contained much of the Greek and Arabic treasure. There were Arabic translations of Ptolemy's *Almagest*, Galen's *On the Art of Healing* and *On Anatomical Procedures*, Euclid's *Elements of Geometry*, treatises of Archimedes, Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, *De Anima*, *Nicomachean Ethics*, *Politics*, *Book of Causes*, *Physics*, *On the Heavens*, *History of Animals*, and *On Generation and Corruption*. In addition, translations were made of numerous books and manuscripts of Muslim scholars, including al-Kindi, al-Farabi, al-Razi, al-Khwarizmi, ibn Sina, and ibn Rushd.

One individual stands out in the European venture for translations: Raymund, Archbishop of Toledo, who gathered a number of converts among Jews and Muslims and some Christians to translate the collected manuscripts. Arabic texts were translated into Castilian and then into Latin. The Spaniards, particularly Avendeuth and Gundisalvo, were joined by Robert of Chester, Adelard of Bath, John of Bresica, Daniel of Morley, Plato of Trivoli, Gerard of Cremona, Moses ben Samuel, and

John of Seville. Scholars like Michael Scot and Hermanus Alemannus were followed by James of Venice and William of Moerbeke (who translated Aristotle directly from Greek to Latin); Jews from southern France made translations from Arabic to Hebrew and then to Latin. Similar centres in southern France (Toulouse, Montpellier and Marseilles), Italy and Sicily joined these efforts. In Sicily, the Norman rulers, Roger and Frederick II, put together Catholics, Byzantines, Jews, and Muslims. The Byzantine Empire, though a major battleground for Crusaders and under attack by Muslims, contributed translators and scholars as well.

The Church in the West had enjoyed hegemonic power over the secular elite (knights and nobles) and rulers for centuries, but this started to change in the eleventh century with the final rupture (first Great Schism) with the Byzantine Church in Constantinople. For one thing, Muslim rulers started to threaten the shrunken Byzantine Empire in Asia Minor with the potential for their penetration into Europe. In Europe itself, the level of violence and warfare was rising among competing knights and nobles for territory (land) and power, entangling the Church because of its claimed supremacy in both the spiritual and secular affairs of individuals and societies. The Church and its office-holders (Pope, Cardinals and Bishops) had also become much like feudal lords with ownership of land and other forms of property and wealth. In fact, the secular elite were jockeying for positions in the Church itself given the overarching power of the Church in regulating the affairs of princes and ordinary people. In the three groups, peasantry comprised the largest group ruled by the knights and nobles (feudal lords) both of which were subservient to office-holders of the Church.

Besides Crusades, two other important movements were unfolding: the evangelical protest movements and invasion of Aristotaleanism and Averreosianism in the new universities (e.g. Bologna, Paris, Oxford, Naples, Solerno, Padua, and Toulouse). In the universities, particularly Paris and Oxford, the Dominican and Franciscan friars started using Aristotalean ideas (tools of reason) to advance religion: they became the most ardent advocates of the ‘new learning’, but with conditions. The new universities, which were controlled by the Church, became the battleground for ideas (learning) sanctioned by the Scripture and the Church on one hand and borrowed from Aristotle, Avicenna and

Averroes on the other. In the fray were involved students, lay masters, Dominican and Franciscan friars teaching theology, and the Church (Bishops, Cardinals and the Pope). Initially the Church banned Aristotle and the rest of the rationalists. In the twelfth century, the Pope excommunicated Peter Abelard for trying to fuse (pagan) philosophy and religion; Anselm of Canterbury did not fare any better though he escaped the fate of Abelard. In the thirteenth century, in the midst of the ongoing battle in the universities, we find Albertas Magnus in Paris and Roger Bacon in Oxford, both empiricists in natural philosophy but both regarded the study of Nature as a source to reach God. Thomas Aquinas made the most audacious attempt to reconcile faith with reason; he thought that only three doctrines of faith were beyond natural reason: creation of universe from nothing, God's nature as Trinity, and Christ's role in man's salvation. Reason and experience can explain all others. The battle of ideas continued throughout the thirteenth century and by the early fourteenth century Thomism became preferred philosophy of the Church. At the same time, faith and science (knowledge by reason) started to separate inside and outside universities.

Let me now turn to the other forces working in the transformation of the social order in Europe. There was much violence and disruption in Europe in the fourteenth century. Pope (Boniface VIII) was fighting against the secular rulers (King Philip IV, 'the Fair', of France and King Edward I of England). France and England fought a war of 100 years. Cardinals fought each other for the papal throne—Avignon and Rome had their 'antichrist' for over 70 years. Then there were the clergy's feudalism (property in land and much else) and simony. On top of these, Black Death (bubonic plague) decimated almost one-third of the population. By the early fifteenth century, the balance of power had shifted in favour of the secular rulers. National kingdoms, at least in France, England and Spain, started to emerge with the sovereign's claim to supremacy in the affairs of state and religion. At this time, faith and science also started to take separate routes.

John Duns Scotus rejected the Thomist approach—Thomas Aquinas had mystified nature and demystified God! Similarly, William of Ockham thought that both Boethius and Aquinas were wrong in attempting to reconcile faith and reason: de-intellectualise the Church

and spiritualise it. The Pope censured him, but he found refuge with King Ludwig of Bavaria. Ludwig fought against the Pope in Avignon and provided refuge to the fugitives who battled against the canon of infallibility of Pope and his power against secular rulers. King Ludwig and King Frederick II of Austria (two former enemies) came to Avignon where Frederick II was crowned as the Holy Roman Emperor. In turn, he settled a Pope of his choice at the Vatican. In Paris and other universities, natural philosophy survived, but the 'double truth' was to remain a source of conflict: a self-sufficient universe subject to laws versus a universe dependent on a personal God. The Scholastics, however, did not see this matter as either/or but both ('Aristotelian Christianity'). The inherent instability in this idea would eventually lead to its rejection by the seventeenth century. Materialism and scepticism became the main basis for seeking knowledge about the universe.

Ancient Greek and Roman Intellectuals

Greeks in the Pre-Socratic Age		
Solon	638-558 BCE	Athenian lawgiver, statesman; he gave a framework for democracy
Thales	624-546	Miletus: the "first" Greek philosopher (why the world is as it is?)
Anaximander	610-546	Miletus: philosopher (water is the basis of creation)
Anaximenes	585-528	Miletus: philosopher (material monism)
Pythagoras	570-495	Samos and Italy: philosopher, mathematician ($a^2 + b^2 = c^2$): numbers have power
Xenophanes	570-480	Ionian philosopher: supreme divine force is not like the anthropomorphic gods
Hecataeus	550-476	Miletus: historian and geographer of the Mediterranean; sceptic
Heraclitus	535-475	Ephesus: philosopher: truth may never be found; strife produces balance
Aeschylus	524-455	"Father" of Greek tragic plays (*The Persians*)
Cleisthenes	6th century	Athenian reformer: "father" of Athenian democracy
Pindar	518-438	Boeotia: lyrical poet; odes to victory (*Olympics*)
Parmenides	b. 515	Elea (S. Italy): sophist; senses not reliable for reality; use pure thought (*On Nature*)

Greeks in the 'Golden Age'

Pericles	498-429	"First Citizen" of Athens and General in the Golden Age; rebuilder of Acropolis
Sophocles	496-406	One of three great tragedians: highlights women's position (*Oedipus Tyrannus, Antigone*)
Empedocles	492-432	Sicilian philosopher: four elements (air, water, earth, fire) interact to change
Protagoras	490-420	Abdera (Thrace): philosopher sophist and sceptic; "man is the measure of all things"
Zeno I	490-430	Elea, S. Italy: how to reconcile reason with observation; known for his paradoxes
Herodotus	484-425	Halicarnassus (Bodrum): "father" of history (*Histories*)
Euripides	480-406	Athenian: one of three great Greek tragedians (*Helen, Electra, The Trojan Women*)
Socrates	469-399	Athenian: founder of Western philosophy, ethicist (living good life); Socratic dialogue
Thucydides	460-395	Athenian general and historian: *The History of the Peloponnesian War*
Hippocrates	460-377	Cos: physician; "father" of Western medicine; non-divine causes of diseases
Democritus	460-370	Thracian: "father" of science (atomist); truth is relative; reason and observation?
Alcibiades	450-404	Athenian: orator, statesman, and general, pupil of Socrates
Aristophanes	446-386	Athenian: playwright of comedy (*Frogs, Birds, Clouds*)

Isocrates	436-338	Athenian: orator, rhetorician, speechwriter
Xenophon	430-354	Athenian: historian, soldier, pupil of Socrates
Plato	428-348	Athenian: philosopher, mathematician; greatly influenced Christians and Muslims
Diogenes	412-323	Sinope (Turkey): virtue is in action only; cynic: withdraw from life; mocked Alexander
Aristotle	384-322	Stageira (northern Greece): polymath *par excellence*; most influential philosopher
Demosthenes	384-322	Athenian: one of the most eloquent orators; lawyer; speechwriter; statesman
Pyrrhon	360-270	Elis: founder of scepticism (can you be certain about anything with senses?); Travelled with Alexander

Greeks in the Hellenistic Period		
Epicurus	341-270	Samos: philosopher (don’t fear death and live a happy life without pain); knowledge can come from senses only
Zeno II	336-264	Citium(Cyprus): founder of stoic philosophy based on the moral philosophy of cynics

		cynics
Euclid	323-283	Alexandria: mathematician (his *Elements* is a foundation piece in mathematics)
Aristarchus	310-230	Samos: mathematician and astronomer; presented the first heliocentric model of universe
Archimedes	287-212	Syracuse: mathematician, physicist, inventor; greatest figure in Greek mathematics
Apollonius	262-190	Perga (Pamphylia): mathematician, geometer, astronomer

<u>Greeks in the Roman Empire</u>

Polybius	200-118 BCE	Megalopolis: historian and constitutionalist (*Universal History*)
Strabo	64 BCE-24 CE	Pontus (Turkey): Greek historian, philosopher and geographer (*Geographica*)
Philo	20 BCE-50 CE	Alexandria: Jewish Greek philosopher and theologian
Plutarch	46-120 CE	Boeotia: Roman citizen; Greek philosopher (sophist); historian (*Political Precepts*; *Lives*)
Epictetus	55-135 CE	Turkey: Greek stoic philosopher: pain is created by not accepting what is uncontrollable; all men are brethren as children of Zeus (*Discourses*)
Ptolemy	90-168 CE	Alexandria: Greek geographer; astronomer (*Almajest*): motionless earth at the centre
Lucian	125-180 CE	Samosata, Turkey: Greek rhetorician and novelist (*A True Story*)

Galen	129-199 CE	Pergamum: Greek physician; his works influenced practice of medicine for centuries
Plotinus	204-270 CE	Alexandria: Greek philosopher; founder of Neoplatonism (eternal one "God" of love)

Romans in the Republican Age

Terence	195-159 BCE	N. African: playwright in Roman republic; 'I consider nothing human foreign to me.'
Marcus Varro	116-27 BCE	From Reate (C. Italy): Wrote *Nine Books of Disciplines* as the basis for liberal arts
Cicero	106-43 BCE	Roman senator, orator (master of rhetoric), statesman, philosopher (stoic and humanist)
Lucretius	99-55BCE	Roman poet and Epicurean philosopher; author of *De rerum natura* (*On the Nature of Things*) a transformational book discovered by Poggio Bracciolini, a Florentine scholar and book-hunter, in the early 15th century.
Cato	95-46 BCE	Utica: orator, statesman, stoic philosopher: champion of republican ideals
Sallust	86 -35 BCE	Roman historian and *plaebian* tribune in the Republic and civil war
Catallus	84-54 BCE	Roman poet known for his romantic poetry and celebration of 'bohemian' life

Romans in the Imperial Age

Virgil	70 BCE-19 BCE	Rome: poet (*Eclogues* and *Aeneid*); celebrated by Dante in *Divine Comedy*
Horace	65 BCE-8 BCE	Rome: lyric poet who greatly influenced European writers (*Odes*)
Livy	59 BCE-17 CE	Padua: historian of Rome; glorified the dying Republic and epic history of Rome
Seneca (elder)	55 BCE-37 CE	From Cordoba (Spain): a rhetorician and anthologist of oratory
Ovid	43 BCE-18 CE	Rome: poet who focused on sex and love (*Amores, Art of Love, Metamorphoses*)
Seneca (younger)	1 BCE-65 CE	Rome: statesman, philosopher (he humanised stoicism for the Romans)
Quintilian	35-100 CE	Spain: orator and rhetorician
Juvenal	47-130 CE	Roman poet and satirist: 'it is difficult not to write satire'
Tacitus	56-117 CE	Rome: senator, historian (*Germania, Histories, Annals*); he has a high moral tone
Marcus Aurelius	121-180 CE	Roman general and emperor: stoic philosopher (*Meditations*); a "good" emperor

Note: Homer and Hesiod are the two great oral poets of Greece probably in the 7th or 8th century BCE. Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* remain classics.

Muslim Intellectuals in the Middle Ages (750-1400)

No.	Name	Dates	Region	Field
1.	Abu Musa Jabir ibn Hayyan (*Geber*)	721-815	Iran/Iraq	Polymath: “father” of chemistry
2.	Muhammad ibn Ibrahim al-Fazari	d. 796-806	Iran/Iraq	Philosopher, astronomer
3.	ibn Musa al-Khwarizmi (*Algorismus*)	780-850	Iran/Iraq	“Father” of modern mathematics
4.	(Imam) Ahmad ibn Hanbal	780-855	Iraq	Theologian, jurist
5.	Abul Hasan ibn Nafi (*Ziryab*)	789-857	Iran/Kurdistan	Polymath: poet, musician, etc.
6.	Abu Yousuf al-Kindi (*Alkindus*)	801-866	Iraq	Polymath: first Muslim Philosopher
7.	Hunayn ibn Ishaq (*Joannitius*)	809-873	Iraq	Nestorian Christian: physician and translator
8.	Abbas ibn Farnas	810-887	Spain	Polymath: physician, inventor, etc.
9.	Thabit ibn Qurra	836-901	Iraq	Astronomer, translator
10.	Abu Jafar al-Tabari	838-923	Iran/Iraq	First historian of Islam
11.	Abu Bakr al-Razi (Razes)	854-930	Iran	Philosopher and physician
12.	ibn Jabir al-Battani (*Albategnius*)	858-929	Turkey	Astronomer, mathematician, physicist
13.	Abu Nasr al-Farabi (*Alpharabius*)	870-950	Iran/C. Asia	Philosopher
14.	Abu al-Hasan al-Ashari	874-936	Iraq	Theologian, philosopher
15.	ibn Kathir al Farghani (*Alfraganius*)	9th century	Iran	Astronomer (astrolabe)

16. Abu al-Hasan al-Masudi	896-956	Iraq/Egypt	"Herodotus of the Arabs" and geographer
17. Abul Hasan al-Uqlidisi	10th Century	Syria/Iraq	Mathematician (decimals), copyist of Euclid
18. Abu al-Mansur Muwaffaq	10th century	Iran	Physician, chemist and pharmacist
19. Maslamah al-Majriti	d. 1008	Spain	Astronomer, chemist, mathematician
20. Ali Ibn Abbas al-Majusi	925-994	Iran	Physician
21. Abu al-Qasim al- Zahrawi (*Abulcasis*)	936-1013	Spain	Physician and surgeon
22. Abu Ali ibn al-Haitham (*Alhazen*)	965-1041	Iraq	Polymath: optician, engineer (Nile floods)
23. Abu Rayhan al-Biruni	973-1050	Iran/Afgh.	Polymath: anthropologist, astronomer
24. Abu Ali Husain ibn Sina (*Avicenna*)	980-1037	Iran/C. Asia	Philosopher, "Prince" of physicians, etc.
25. Abu Muhammad ibn Hazm	994-1064	Spain	Theologian, jurist, philosopher
26. Solomon ibn Gabirol (*Avicebron*)	1021-1070	Spain	Jewish philosopher and poet
27. Abu Ishaq al-Zarqali (*Arzachel*)	1029-1087	Spain	Astronomer (astrolabe), water clock maker
28. Omar Khayyam	1048-1130	Iran	Polymath: poet, mathematician, etc.
29. Abu Hamid al-Ghazali (*Algazel*)	1058-1111	Iran/Iraq	Philosopher, theologian, mystic
30. Abu Bakr ibn Bajja (*Avempace*)	1070-1128	Spain	Polymath: philosopher, astronomer, etc.
31. Abu Merwan ibn Zuhr (*Avenzoar*)	1091-1161	Spain	Physician and pharmacist
32. Muhammad al-Idrisi	1099-1165	Spain/Sicily	Geographer (cartographer)
33. Abu Bakr ibn Tufail (*Abubacor*)	1110-1185	Spain	Polymath: philosopher, physician, etc.

34.	Ahmad ibn Rushd (*Averroes*)	1126-1198	Spain	Polymath: philosopher, jurist, etc.
35.	Moses Maimonides	1135-1204	Spain/Egypt	Jewish philosopher, physician, mystic
36.	ibn Ismail al-Jazari	1136-1206	Iraq	Polymath: astronomer, inventor, and artist
37.	Fakhr al-Din al-Razi	1149-1209	Iran	Polymath: theologian, jurist, alchemist
38.	Muhammad ibn Arabi	1165-1240	Spain/Syria	Philosopher and mysctic
39.	Nur al-Din al-Bitruji (*Alpetragius*)	d. 1204	Spain	Astronomer (planetary motion)
40.	Yaqut a-Hamawi	1179-1229	Syria	Encyclopaedist and geographer
41.	Nasir al-Din al-Tusi	1201-1274	Iran/Iraq	Philosopher, mathematician, astronomer
42.	Jalal ad-Din Rumi	1207-1273	Tajik./Turkey	Poet, jurist, mystic
43.	Ala al-Din Ibn al-Nafis	1208-1288	Uzbekistan	Polymath: physician, surgeon, novelist
44.	Ahmad ibn Taimiya	1262-1328	Turkey	Theologian, jurist
45.	Abu Abdullah Ibn Battuta	1304-1369	Morocco	Traveller and narrator of tales
46.	Ala al-Din ibn Shatir	1305-1375	Syria	Astronomer, mathematician, engineer
47.	Abdul Rahman ibn Khaldun	1332-1406	Tunisia/Egypt	Polymath: historian, sociologist, philosopher

Note: The major Muslim intellectuals against dependence on Greek (rational) philosophy for knowledge include theologians like (Imam) ibn Hanbal, al-Ashari, ibn Hazm, al-Ghazali, Fakhr al-Din Razi, and ibn Taimiya. al-Ashari became the most dominant influence on the thought and tradition followed by most Sunnis to this day.

2

March to the Modern Age II: Italian Renaissance to the First Industrial Revolution

The Italian Renaissance

The Italian Renaissance (rebirth) was a cultural phenomenon known to us by its French name, celebrating the arts, architecture, and philosophy of the Greek, Roman and Arab civilisations. Renaissance was a compromise between Christianity and antiquity; its focus was on man's intellect and creative potential. Put it another way. It was humanist philosophy, which did not reject the claims of revealed religion but focused on rediscovering something old. There is general agreement that the Italian Peninsula served as the crucible for Renaissance for several reasons. For one thing, Italy had on its soil (above and under the ground) a large part of the treasure of Greek and Roman art and architecture. Also, the translators of ancient Greeks and Romans and their Arab commentators in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries had initiated the revival process in which Petrarch and Boccaccio acted as major catalysts. A second factor worth noting is that Italy had no single centralised structure of government: the Peninsula was divided into mini-states

in which the city-states of Venice, Florence, Milan, and Genoa were prominent. These city-states managed to maintain their independence because of the battles between papacy and the Holy Roman Emperor. Also, the long coast line of the Italian Peninsula—a large part of which is covered by hills and mountains not quite suitable for agriculture—encouraged seafaring, trade, commerce, and industry, which in turn induced the growth of reasonably large-size towns. The merchants of Italy were far better placed to profit from changes taking place in the Middle East and in the rest of Europe; they had developed a network with traders and manufacturers in all of these areas (from Bruges to Paris, Seville, Barcelona, Majorca, Marseilles, Cyprus, Constantinople, and Jerusalem). The Italian school system also changed quite rapidly and favourably in the wake of the plague, moving from the medieval to humanistic curriculum based on Latin which included liberal arts (poetry, history, reading and writing) and mathematics (including basic arithmetic, accounting, currency conversion, interest calculation, double-entry book-keeping, etc.). The liberal arts education was designed to ignite imagination and the business skills to accumulate wealth.

The commercial and organisational changes introduced by the leading merchants of Italy were almost revolutionary. They probably laid the foundation for industrial capitalism: accumulation of capital, use of credit, banking, separation of management from ownership, and expansion in the scale of operations. With the growth of commerce, there emerged a new class distinction based on earned wealth and not on birth or inherited property (land). The melding of the old aristocracy and the new bourgeois class fostered new values, qualities, and fashions. The new elite, more educated and liberal in outlook, represented a new order relying on their own strengths (virtues), rationality over tradition, and clocks over seasons. How did the new wealth and order help develop a new culture, led by Florence?

Some have suggested that a major reason for this was that the same families produced both wealth-makers and intellectuals. The wealthy were not only patrons of learning and arts but also participants as scholars, bankers, clerics, statesmen, and lawyers. The Medici family of bankers, particularly Cosimo de Medici and Lorenzo de Medici, was probably the most prominent of the new class as patrons of the arts and

architecture and deeply involved in Church and state politics beyond the borders of Florence for about four centuries. Individualisation of the demand for art, architecture and learning induced changes in the status of artists, architects and scholars and quality of products: the notion of genius emerged because of free and intense competition. The nature of art, architecture and scholarship started to change in many ways, stimulating intellectual innovation by different views of the world and purpose of life. Burckhardt went so far to say that 'in the Italian city, for the first time, we see the emergence of the state as a calculated, conscious creation, the state as a work of art' (cited by Watson, *Ideas: A History from Fire to Freud*, p.395). The emerging humanism in the Italian city-state provided an alternative to the divine order of fixed stations: a rational order based on experience and achievements. Status and virtue were personal achievements and not accrued by birth or the supernatural power.

The four 'fountains' of the Italian Renaissance were Dante Alighieri (1265-1321), Giotto di Bondone (1267-1337), Francesco Petrarch (1304-1374), and Giovanni Boccaccio (131-1375). Of these, Petrarch has been labelled as the 'father' of humanism. Giotto the artist made humans appear in their own right in dignity, glorifying man's reason and the beauty of his body, which was vile no more. They were followed by men who illuminated humanist values in their different ways: painter Sandro Botticelli (1445-1510), polymath Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519), the humanist doctor Pietro Pomponazzi (1462-1525), artist and architect Michelangelo (1475-1564), artist and sculptor Raphael (1483-1520), and the politician par excellence Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527). It is equally, if not more, important to remember that the House of Medici, starting from Cosimo (*pater patrie*) followed by his descendents like Lorenzo the Magnificent and Popes Leo X and Clement VII, played an unrivalled part in patronising the new learning, art and architecture.

According to Durant, humanists, Petrarch in particular, 'captivated the mind of Italy, turned it from religion to philosophy, from heaven to earth, and revealed to an astonished generation the riches of pagan thought and art.' (Durant, *The Story of Civilization: The Renaissance*, p.77). Humanism was about man 'in all the potential strength and beauty of his body, in all the joy and pain of his senses and feelings, in

all the frail majesty of his reason; and in these as most abundantly and perfectly revealed in the literature and art of ancient Greece and Rome.' (Durant, *The Story of Civilization: The Renaissance*, pp.77-78). Watson puts it in another way: 'Humanism was less concerned with the rediscovery of sciences of the ancients than with re-establishing a pagan set of values, in effect the secular outlook of the Greeks and the Romans, in which man was the measure of all things.' (Watson, *Ideas: A History from Fire to Freud,* p.398). It was in contrast to the Augustinian creed, seek the City of God and not the City of Man, which has had a firm grip on people's minds for over 800 years. Dante, Petrarch and Machiavelli in their own ways wrote about freedom of the intellect and speech and expressed doubts about the message from the Church.

The Italian Renaissance though volatile and uneven—looking back at the history of states in Florence, Venice, Genoa, and Milan—invigorated humanist and republican values together with inclinations to rise against absolutism both spiritual and temporal. Schools and not universities were the channels of liberal education with humanities at the centre as Cicero, Gellius and Quintilian would have liked. The purpose of humanism was to find a compromise between the classical antiquity and Christianity. The Italian city-states, Florence in particular, facilitated the arrival of Greek scholars from Asia Minor and used their services to edit and translate Greek texts coming from the east. A substantial amount of Greek material came to Italy after the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans in 1453.

Italy began to wane (decline) in terms of its influence on humanism from the middle of sixteenth century. The Peninsula became a backwater for several reasons. Invasions by outsiders led to Spanish control of Italy (Naples, Sicily, Sardinia, and Milan), with the exception of Venice and the Papal states. Genoa and Siena remained republican under Spanish protection. In other areas (Savoy, Mantua, Ferrara, and Urbino), the local dukes were allowed to keep their fiefdoms with King Charles' approval. Florence was given to another branch of the Medici family who survived by co-operating with Spain. Though relieved from foreign invasions and internal strife, the cost of peace broke the Italian spirit. The golden age of Italian city-states ended with the opening of new and cheaper sea routes for trade with the East (via the Cape of

Good Hope) controlled by Portugal, discovery of the Americas, Turkish hegemony in the eastern Mediterranean and Egypt, attacks by pirates, and presence of the much despised foreign troops on Italian soil. The movements of Reformation and Counter-Reformation were probably the final straws in the waning of Italy and its Renaissance.

The spirit of the Italian Renaissance—rediscovery of the ancient (Greek and Roman) arts and culture which focused on human glory—also infected through different routes (water and mountains), the societies in France, Germany, Holland, Belgium, England, Poland, and Cyprus. Everyone in Europe acknowledged Italy as the land that nursed a new civilisation of humanism. In spite of the tensions and wars unleashed by the Reformation and Counter-Reformation throughout Europe for over one hundred years, the spirit of Renaissance was marshalled with much enthusiasm by men like Erasmus, Bacon, Descartes, and Spinoza and was embraced with even greater zeal in the age of Enlightenment by men like Locke, Voltaire, Gibbon, and Goethe. Nor is it all. The arts (paintings and music), architecture, literature, and urbane lifestyle of the Italian Renaissance are a perpetual source of enjoyment and pleasure to the modern world.

Reformation and Counter-Reformation

The Reformation movement, ignited in the early sixteenth century, forever changed the map of Europe, structure of its society and set the stage for the 'Age of Enlightenment'. The movement had two basic aspects to it. One was a protest against some very unholy habits and practices of the Church hierarchy from the pope down to the parish priest. The other, and perhaps more important, aspect was the theology on which the power of Church hierarchy, pope in particular, rested. Let me first give a bit of background and then look at the Reformation and its consequences.

Dissent against theology and rules of conduct set by the Church was rare because of the risk of severe punishment imposed on the dissenter: starting from the fourth century, many so-called heretics suffered one or another form of punishment. By the late thirteenth century, the

popes were embroiled deeply in conflict with kings, particularly King Philip of France, with regard to their divine and temporal authority. In 1302, Pope Boniface VIII threatened to depose the King in these words: "We declare," so said Pope Boniface VIII, "proclaim, and define that subjection to the Roman Pontiff is absolutely necessary for the salvation of every human creature." In consequence, the 'very Christian king' of France brutalised the Pope who died soon thereafter.

The next Pope, Clement V, was a French cardinal who decided to stay in Avignon away from the politics of Rome. Avignon became permanent residence of the papacy—Petrarch called it the 'Babylonian captivity' of the Roman pontiff—for the next 70 years. The return of the popes to Rome in 1377 did not end the abuses in the Church: within a few months, some of the cardinals did not like Urban VI (from Italy) as the new pope and elected a new pope who took up residence in Avignon. The Church now had two popes and two holy seats. The schism continued: the Council of Pisa in 1408 not only failed to end the schism but added a third pope! The German Emperor intervened and arranged the Council of Constance in 1414, which settled the schism and supported the conciliar solution to Church's problems. However, the new pope did not accept the superior authority of the council, preventing the possibility of reform in Church's affairs.

The voices of clergy and laypeople demanding reforms were being heard all around in Europe for return to honesty and piety in the Holy See and the church at large, but most of these voices were not regarded heretic. Some 'heretical' voices received attention from a receptive audience outside the Church hierarchy. In fourteenth century, John Wycliffe (1328-1384) in England and Jan Hus (1369-1415) in Bohemia (Czech Republic) expounded heretical views on sacraments, condemned corruption in the Church, and claimed that the ultimate authority resided not with the pope but the Bible. In England following Wycliffe, the Lollard movement inspired the Peasant's Revolt, which was crushed in 1381. The Hussite movement in Bohemia, which followed Wycliffe in many respects, was similarly crushed with the help of German nobility after John Hus was burnt at the stake. The Renaissance papacy in the fifteenth century, thanks to its attachment to property, luxurious style of life, weakened the authority of the Church. In Italy, Savonarola, a rad-

ical monk, who had amassed a large following, was burnt at the stake for speaking out against the excesses of Bishops and Cardinals. William Tyndale (1494-1536) of England was burnt at the stake as a heretic in Flanders for his widely circulated English translation of the Bible from Greek and Hebrew texts—a large part of Tyndale's English text was included in King James' version of the Bible in seventeenth century.

In the excitements and fears prevalent in the early 1500s, Erasmus (1466-1536) seemed to offer hope and possibility of a reasonable outcome in Europe. He best personified the intellect and spirit of humanism and wanted reconciliation of Christianity with Greek and Roman classics, but not the kind that Aquinas sought earlier and failed. He did not give up on his faith, but gave out two messages in his most famous work, *The Praise of Folly*: 'that the classics were a noble and honourable source of knowledge and pleasure, and that the church was increasingly empty, pompous and intolerant' (Watson, *Ideas*, p. 401). Erasmus was also the man who probably offered 'the possibility of a reasonable, moderate outcome to Europe's excitements and fears in the early 1500s' (MacCulloch, *Christianity*, p. 594). This assessment of Erasmus is well earned, given his well-articulated vision of a Bible-based and personalised Christianity unfettered by some of the corrupted traditions and a secular society in which the princes (rulers) and citizens are actively involved in the well-being of the commonwealth. Erasmus was an optimist about the human condition—his taste was of the Alexandrian Origen and not Augustine of Hippo—and had no appetite for violence and wars. It is not surprising that the contestants on each side of the Reformation movement wanted Erasmus on their side, but he avoided taking sides in the storm with the result that 'either side of the new divide regarded him as a time-serving coward who lacked the courage to take sides…' (MacCulloch, *Christianity*, p. 603).

At the end of fifteenth century, religious revival was driven by popular disgust with the decadent clergy: simonic bishops, nepotistic popes, promiscuous priests, idle monks, and worldly wealth (land, bullion and villas) of the Church and its fathers. The papacies of Alexander VI and Julius II—the former for women, wealth and nepotism for bastard children and the latter for his love of war and conquest—blemished the reputation of the Church. Martin Luther (1483-1546), Professor of Philos-

ophy at Wittenburg University in Saxony, visited Rome in 1510 and was apparently shocked by the opulence and ceremony he observed there. What disgusted him more, as it did many devout Christians in the north, was the sale of indulgences—certificates for remission of punishments for both the living and dead—and transfer of cash to Rome for rebuilding St Peter's basilica and supporting the opulence of priests.

Luther, a humanist to start, became the spark for change. He turned to the Scripture and the Church fathers, St Augustine in particular, and attacked the theology underlying indulgences. Indulgences freed the buyer from penance for a sin but not from the sin itself. Only inward contrition will work for the remission of sins by God's grace. According to Luther, the good news (evangelism) was of justification by faith alone. You need no intermediary, pope or anyone else, to seek penance or grace from God: every believer is his own priest. Luther did much more in the 95 theses he posted on the All Saints Day in 1517. He kept on attacking the pope and the Church through pamphlets in Latin and German on papal and conciliar infallibility, indulgences, transubstantiation, celibacy, monasticism, cult of Mary and saints, practice of simony, and feudal estates. Only Scripture was the authority and not pope or traditions of the Church. The pope excommunicated Luther who in turn burned the papal bull and later, thanks to the Elector of Saxony, managed to run into safety from Emperor Charles V.

In Zurich, Huldrych Zwingli (1484-1531) followed Luther with a similar message, but he was killed in an armed cantonal conflict between Catholics and Protestants. A more powerful voice was of Jean Calvin (1509-1564) in Geneva and a competitor of Luther in the movement against the Church. Calvin, unlike Luther, came up with the idea that humanity was divided into two groups, one the elect and the other condemned. His followers were the elect (righteous brothers) surrounded by a hostile world: they were 'strangers among sinners'. Both Luther and Calvin were for separation of state and religion, but with a difference. According to Luther, while the believer was privately free in religion, the state had the authority over the church: preachers were guardians of the individual's inner life only. Calvin, on the other hand, maintained that the religious precepts would inspire temporal power, which meant a puritanical lifestyle with focus of the individual and

society on godliness, joy from reading the Bible, sobriety, discipline, abstinence, frugality, and hard work. In Germany, several other sects of Protestantism mushroomed, among them the Anabaptists (re-baptisers) were the most radical and provided the base for the growth of related sects like the Baptists, Unitarians, Methodists, and Quakers.

The Reformation movement, though initiated by Luther, grew into competing Protestant sects and groups of dissenters. Lutheranism appealed to the princes of German states, Scandinavia and Prussia, and the northern cities; the more stringent Calvinism was popular with the urban bourgeoisie in the United Provinces (Netherlands), nobility in France, and the landed gentry in Scotland and parts of Eastern Europe. In France, the Huguenots were hounded, many brutally murdered, and finally expelled in 1685; in Scotland, thanks to John Knox (1513-72), Presbyterians took over the entire Church and political power; in the United Provinces, the Dutch Reformed Church came to dominate the state and society. In England, thanks to the conflict of King Henry VIII (1494-1546) with the Pope—who had previously called him 'defender of the faith'—about his divorce, the monarch imposed an Anglican form of Protestantism. The transition was by no means smooth or non-violent: the wars of faith and state lasted intermittently up to the middle of seventeenth century. During this period, many thousands of puritans (Calvinists) and other dissenters migrated to North America to avoid persecution; and the Catholics, Presbyterians, Calvinists, and Anglicans fought a civil war in Europe. .

Initially the response of Roman Church to the call of schism was quite predictable: there was to be no change in the Church and to fight the heretics in different ways. Dissent was to be crushed. The German Emperor tried to resolve the differences between Catholics and Protestants, but the compromise was not acceptable to either Pope Paul III or Luther. In the 1540s, the Emperor remained busy on the war fronts against the Turks and French King. He fought and defeated the combined forces of Schmalkalden League, formed by eight princes and eleven cities of Germany in 1531, but with no major consequence for the schism. Eventually the Emperor made peace with the opposition at the Diet of Augsburg in 1555, which lasted for sixty-three years. The parties agreed to tolerate both Catholic and Lutheran Churches in Germany,

based on the principle that each territory was to follow the religion of its prince; both confessions were to suffer each other in any city where they co-existed.

In the meantime, the pope took action on four fronts, two of which were punitive, one to define the doctrine and traditions of the Church, and one to spread Catholic education and the faith. Roman Inquisition—along the lines of the notorious Spanish Inquisition—to haunt and terrorise dissenters in the Italian states was combined with the 'Index of Forbidden Books' to censor printed thought and dissent throughout Europe. The General Council of Trent lasted from 1545 to 1563: its proceedings moved haltingly, given the political tensions between the pontiff and the emperor. The last aspect of Counter-Reformation was pontiff's patronage of the Society of Jesus (Jesuits). The last two had the more lasting consequences for Europe and Christianity.

The decisions of the General Council of Trent, which met in three sessions (1545-7, 1551-2 and 1562-3), divided Christians forever and prepared the ground for sectarian wars in seventeenth century. It gave no ground to the dissenters and resolved that:

- Church traditions had equal authority as the Scripture.
- Doctrine of 'justification by faith alone' was not valid; the Fall left the sinner with the capacity to choose good over evil which required Christ's example as interpreted by the Church.
- None of the seven sacraments would be excluded from Church's theology.
- Protestant view on Eucharist as alternative to transubstantiation was wrong.
- Doctrine of indulgences was valid since purgatory really existed, but the commercial use of indulgences should be banned.

The church also made some organisational changes, but it strengthened papal authority (monarchy). It gave no moral code (practical ethics), except blind obedience and uniformity in practice was emphasised.

The Society of Jesus, formed by Ignatius of Loyola (1491-1556), a soldier, hermit, and theologian, together with six committed young fol-

lowers, was approved by Pope Paul III in 1540. The Jesuits were an elite corps of men with fierce piety and military lifestyle to offer education at all levels (schools, colleges, seminaries, universities) and the mission to reconvert the lapsed and convert the heathen. Over time, they expanded their work from one end of the globe in the New World to Japan in the east and all the lands in between. The educational system of Jesuits developed into one of the most influential Catholic institutions for generations of young men in Europe and the rest of the world. However, they aroused fear among both Catholics and Protestants and were accused of money making and adopting native cults to win converts at any price ('end justifies the means'). Consequently, they were banished from Portugal, France and Spain in the mid-eighteenth century and the pope banned them for all European countries, except for the Russian Empire, in 1773. The banishment of Jesuits threw the Catholic educational and missionary activities into chaos, opening the gate for secular schools and universities. The Church eventually restored the Jesuits in 1814, but they were thrown out of Russia.

The various sects of Protestants and Catholics stayed in a state of tension and violent conflict throughout Europe for almost one hundred years. The most violent episode was the Thirty-Year War (1618-1648) fought on four fronts starting from Bohemia. The effects of this war were particularly harsh for Germany. It lost more than one-third of its population. German cities lay in waste; there was massive social and economic disruption; German culture was traumatised and replaced by French fashions; Germans saw the mouths of their three rivers held by the Dutch, Danes and Swedes. Austria was reduced to being just one of many German states. Eventually the Peace of Westphalia was concluded in 1648; it included, among other things, the following:

- Calvinists were granted the same rights as Lutherans and Catholics.
- It recognised ascendency of France and subordination of Habsburgs to German princes.
- German princes were given constitutional powers in foreign affairs and the imperial legislation was to be subject to approval by the Diet.

- Switzerland and the United Provinces were given independence.
- Territorial adjustments were made particularly in favour of France and Sweden.

The Peace of Westphalia made it clear that from now on the great European powers would settle their affairs without reference to the Holy See. It also set the ground plan of an international order in Europe for more than a century. Pope Innocent V was outraged for the concession to Protestants and France; he issued statements condemning the settlement. His hopes for a united Christendom were dashed forever. Power and intellectual leadership had moved north away from Rome. The idea of Christendom, almost irreversibly divided into three branches, was replaced by the idea of Europe. There were still other battles of ideas and territory to be fought and concluded. In the second half of seventeenth century, Poland-Lithuania were torn apart by the Cossacks, Swedes and Russians; Spain was at war against France and there were revolts by Portugal and Catalonia; France was rocked by the Fronde (revolts of the nobles and parlements); and England was engaged in a bloody civil war. Amidst the turmoil, revolutionary ideas based on reason and observation started to circulate about the natural and social order. The Age of Enlightenment was around the corner.

Europe was a cauldron for about 130 years—from 1520s to the end of the Thirty-Year War in 1648—of violent conflicts between princes and kings on one hand and the secular and religious elites on the other. At the heart of these struggles and wars were issues of power, territory, and sectarianism. Reformation was a revolution: it was not simply an anticlerical movement or against the outward behaviour of the Church, though moral indignation and (German) nationalism played a part. The focus on the individual guided by faith and the Scripture would become a very important element in the secularisation of society. The important point is that, with the breakup of monopoly of the Roman Church, the door was now wide open to diversity of opinion, toleration and respect for free conscience. The Reformation was not a movement for liberty of conscience or thought as reflected by some of the practices of various Protestant sects, but it seems to have facilitated, without intent or design, removal of religion from political control. It is fair to suggest that

Protestantism played a central role in the spread of literacy and education, individualism, enterprise, constitutional government, and helped foster the idea of Europe of nation-states to replace a united Christendom.

The Age of Science and the Enlightenment

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) defined Enlightenment as the age when 'mankind grew out of its self-inflicted immaturity': acquired ability to think and act for oneself. It meant to emerge from 'darkness' to 'light', from enthusiasm (certainty) to reflection (scepticism), and from absolutes to relatives. In practical terms, Enlightenment incorporated the ideas of religious toleration, scepticism toward the miraculous, freedom of expression, right of equality, and rule-based government. In terms of ideas, stoic philosophy and the scientific method were the two pillars of the ideology of Enlightenment. There was an underlying order, subject to discoverable laws, to the apparent chaos in the physical world and human affairs. Epistemology, theory of knowledge, was at the heart of the Enlightenment: how we know what we know.

From the Italian Renaissance to the Age of Enlightenment—from about the 1670s to 1770s—was a period of disenchantment of the European mind, moving from religious to secular outlook, from collective (social) identity to individual identity, from Christian commonwealth dominated by the Church (pope) to the nation-state, and from certainty (faith) to scepticism (science). The turbulent sixteenth and seventeenth centuries set the stage for Enlightenment. The Christian commonwealth centred at Rome started to crumble in sixteenth century, given the rising tide for reform of the absolutist Church and the state; Martin Luther and Jean Calvin dealt a final stroke in the Reformation movement. The Age of Enlightenment followed the twin separations in European thought and practice: on one hand science and religion and state and religion on the other. More importantly, Enlightenment was about freedom (liberty) of thought and action unfettered by the authority of an absolutist Church (Catholic and Protestant) and an absolutist ruler.

It is worth noting that the age of the Knight and the feudal lord was also passing, at least in some of parts of Europe, with deep changes in the structure of economy and society.

Once the focus shifted from the afterlife to life here on earth the question was how it could be lived. Montaigne (1533-1592), author of the inspirational *Essais* (Essays), was disgusted with the wars of religion around him. The world has to be made more liveable and forget about the soul, death and salvation. Body is not bad and sex should be dignified. (By the way, Montaigne did not disown God: 'God is a Gentleman.') Theology and philosophy should be replaced by human sciences. Diversity of cultures should be studied about how people live. Montaigne is regarded as father of modern scepticism: 'What do I know?' 'The only thing certain is that nothing is certain.' He argued that all doctrine was 'humanly invented', that nothing was certain because belief was determined by custom or tradition; sense could deceive and there was no way of knowing if Nature matched the processes of the human mind. But you do not give up the struggle!

Modern science was born in the period between Copernicus (1473-1543) and Newton (1643-1727), although the minds of some scientists were still divided between the worlds of religion, magic and science. Freedom of imagination was not achieved all at once: obstacles took time to dismantle the ideas inherited from antiquity—of Pliny, Ptolemy and Galen—and the speculations by Muslim philosophers. We should also remember that Kepler (1571-1630) believed in astrology and Newton in alchemy. Newton virtually gave up science in the last third of his life and spent time on the Book of Daniel to learn about Armageddon and the end of the world. Vesalius (1514-1564) and Bruno (1548-1600) were men who saw magic and sin in their activities. Paracelsus (1493-1541) was a great geologist, physician and chemist, but like other natural philosophers of his age was a believer in magic, God and immortality. Pascal (1623-1662) was a mathematician and a defender of faith. He was not sure if the method of science could be used for all experiences. 'The heart has its reasons that the reason does not know.' On the issue of God, the famous wager of Pascal is: 'if you disbelieve in God, you have no eternal life—you yourselves say there is none. But if you believe, you

have at least one chance out of two; for if there is no God, you are where you were before; and if there is, you have won salvation.'

Francis Bacon (1561-1626), father of empiricism, and Rene Descartes (1596-1650), mathematician and father of modern philosophy, provided the method on which natural and moral philosophy turned into science. According to Newton, philosophy until then was an 'impertinently litigious lady'; the book of Nature needed a 'right method'. To understand the Age of Enlightenment, we should first look at the 'Scientific Revolution', a radical shift in ideas about the nature of universe, including the physical, biological, chemical, social, psychological, political, and economic order. It demolished many of the core ideas of the ancients based on speculative philosophy and those accepted by blind faith from the Scripture. More importantly, discovery of the (scientific) laws of motion made it possible for humans to take a giant leap into the 'Modern Age'.

Bacon and Descartes were the new (modern) philosophers of science of which the foundations were laid by ancient Greeks, Romans and medieval Arabs. They were radical thinkers who made philosophy shift its allegiance from religion to science with the twin forces of empiricism and rationalism. Bacon and Descartes set a new view of humanity in that its fulfilment would come from engagement with the natural world and not from religious revelation. Francis Bacon equated knowledge with power, though Socrates regarded it as virtue. Bacon was also an empiricist: knowledge could be built only on observation of Nature and not by revelation or intuition. Explore the world by experiment without much concern for theory. Generalise from the concrete data and not premise on abstractions. Bacon was strictly for separation of science from religion. Matters of faith are appropriate for theology, but matters of Nature are different and have their own rules.

Descartes was an eminent mathematician: he introduced his contemporaries to analytical geometry and much else. Also he explained the laws of light (its refraction and reflection) and offered a quantitative explanation of rainbow. Like many of his contemporaries, Descartes was a sceptic: only geometry and arithmetic offered certainty. Otherwise, the only thing about which he was certain was his own doubt: 'I think, therefore I am.' He believed that God had created the universe and then left it alone, subject to laws like the laws of mechanics. The

workings of the universe can be discovered by human reason via mathematics. The truths of revelation needed to be authenticated by reason. Since God is perfect, he would not deceive man, hence what could be known by reason 'was in fact so'. Descartes had to flee France to avoid Inquisition, took refuge in Holland, and died in Sweden as a guest of Queen Christina in 1650.

The achievements of modern scientists covered a wide range of phenomena: view of the universe, laws of motion and gravitation, nature of light, nature of human body, taxonomy of plants and animals, microscopic life, nature of substances (chemistry), and differential calculus. In less than a century, Copernicus, Bruno, Kepler, and Galileo (1564-1642) brought about a revolution in our understanding of the nature and structure of the universe. Until then the larger picture was quite complex with awkward facts and contortions; stars were seen for their power on fate and events. In contradiction to the ideas and beliefs held by the ancients (Aristotle and Ptolemy) and the Scripture, the new science showed that the universe was limitless (infinite), the earth was not flat and it revolved round the Sun. Copernicus thought that Ptolemy got it all wrong about the heavens. He put the sun, replacing the earth, at the centre of an immense universe and reduced Ptolemy's 84 epicycles to 30. Bruno claimed that the universe was limitless (infinite) and full of inhabited worlds. He also subscribed to the idea that every existing thing is composed of animated atoms and there is purposelessness in Nature, though man sees a purpose. The implication being that an aimless universe frees the imagination: anything is possible. Bruno paid the price of his blasphemous propositions with life at the stake.

Galileo was as much of an inventor as he was a scientist: he laid his hands on telescope, a secret of war from Holland, improved it manifold and he did the same to the compound microscope. He found the celestial clock which offered navigators a way of finding longitudes at sea. In science, Galileo confirmed the views of Copernicus and Bruno: the heavens have far more stars than anyone had imagined. He also worked on laws of moving bodies: a spear thrown in the air comes down after a while. What about cannon balls? The path of projectile is a parabola. Galileo laid the foundation of new mechanics built on the principle of inertia. He discovered the square-root law: relation between the length

of a pendulum and its swing. But Galileo had to retract his statements about the nature of universe to save his life and spent many years at home without freedom of expression and movement. Kepler put together the theory of Copernicus and measurements of Tycho Brahe to conclude that planets have elliptical orbit around the Sun. The elliptical orbit of earth around the Sun meant that it travelled faster when it was nearer the Sun and slower when it was farther away. There was constancy in the system. Even moon's orbit of the earth is elliptical. These ideas stimulated study of dynamics and gravity and they also made untenable the theological argument of the hollow concentric crystal balls (substance of heavens).

In the realm of mathematics and physics, Descartes, Pascal, Mercator, Huygens, Boyle, Hooke, Newton, and Leibniz advanced the frontiers of knowledge without precedence: analytical geometry, logarithms and calculus were among the most influential contributions. Newton's laws of motion and gravity, differential calculus, and optics (structure of light) were by far the most revolutionary changes. His three laws of motion and the principle of universal gravitation sufficed to regulate the cosmos but with the help of God.

In medicine, Vesalius (1543) presented the structure of human body (anatomy) and corrected the mistakes of Galen. The Church attacked him for his views. William Harvey (1628) gave us a complete explanation of the circulation of blood in human body: beating of the heart is the propelling force for circular movement of blood in the body. Blood played a prime role in human physiology. Marcello Malphigi discovered (1660) capillaries connecting the venous and arterial systems. Antonie van Leeuwenhoek of Holland made the microscope (1673)—no better microscopes were made for another 200 years—and introduced us to the world of micro-organisms not observable by the naked eye; he isolated bacteria and protozoa and laid the foundation of bacteriology and proto-zoology. In medicine two different thoughts emerged about the workings of human body: it functions like a machine, an iatrophysical view promoted by Santorio Santorio (Padua); the other view (iatrochemical) was that life is a series of chemical processes. The second view was promoted by Jan Baptist van Helmont of Brussels, followed by Thomas Willis in England.

Thomas Sydenham (England), founder of clinical medicine and epidemiology, insisted on examining the patient and keeping good records. His greatest service was to divert physicians from speculation to the bedside, where the true art of medicine could be studied. Edward Jenner (England) discovered the vaccine for small-pox, which allowed preventive inoculations throughout Europe by the end of eighteenth century. But it was Louis Pasteur (France), a chemist and not a physician, who propounded the germ theory—that the processes of fermentation, putrefaction and infection are caused by living micro-organisms—and built on it the idea of vaccination as a measure of prevention against and a cure for fatal diseases. Probably no other individual until the end of nineteenth century had given so much for the benefit of humankind. The process of pasteurisation of milk and wine is also his legacy to humanity. Interestingly Pasteur refused to accept Darwin's theory of evolution since it left no room for God.

Europe had been in the midst of crises and turmoil for about three centuries after a period of general peace. The crisis involved several upheavals, including (i) the breakdown of feudal order, clashes between the divine and secular notions of political authority (separation of church and state), (ii) invention of the moveable print followed by mass reading and writing, (iii) discovery of the New World, (iv) fragmentation of a unified religious order (Reformation) followed by wars between Catholics and Protestants, and (v) the emergence of nation-states together with movements for constitutional governments to replace both the divine and temporal absolutisms. Knowledge and its sources became a subversive force against the existing order: state power and social order became the major issues. The establishment of scientific societies and academies—in Rome (1603), Florence (1657) and the more important ones in London (1660) and Paris (1666) outside the noisy universities where scholastic debate degenerated into nitpicking of little consequence—provided the forum in which natural philosophers could gather to examine and discuss new discoveries and theories. Here people and ideas got together on a growing scale, inspiring each other and creating new tensions for observation and experimentation.

The march of science speeded up in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, thanks to the works of many great men in the preceding two

centuries. In astronomy, Marquis de Laplace went beyond Newton in describing the stability of the solar system, requiring no divine intervention. Some French (d'Alembert, Lagrange and Laplace), and Swiss (Bernoulli and Euler) mathematicians attacked the problem of motion of the Sun-Earth-Moon system by developing and applying the calculus of variations. Many physical problems were reduced to mathematical ones for solution by sophisticated analytical methods. Euler and Lagrange are regarded as the greatest mathematicians of eighteenth century in terms of their contributions to analytic geometry, algebra, calculus, and their applications to mechanics.

Physicists started to come to grips with the mysterious phenomenon of electricity. Among the pioneers in the eighteenth century were Peter van Musschenbroek (Holland), Stephen Gray (England) and Charles Du Fay (France), the last two demonstrated in their experiments the existence of static electricity, positive and negative charges; anything could be charged with electricity if it was insulated. Benjamin Franklin (USA) showed that electricity was based on single fluid, had negative and positive charges, and could magnetise and demagnetise iron needles. Charles Coulomb (England), building on the work of Joseph Priestley and Henry Cavendish, showed that electric and magnetic forces obey the inverse square law. The most important technological breakthrough came toward the end of eighteenth century: invention of electric battery by Alessandro Volta (Italy), based on the work of Luigi Galvani (Italy). Volta's battery, unlike the 'Leiden jar', provided a more or less steady flow of electric current which could be turned on and off at will. Other researchers found out that electric current could be used to decompose water into hydrogen and oxygen.

In biology, Carolus Linnaeus of Sweden established the discipline of taxonomic biology: a system of classification for plants and animals beginning from species to genera, families, orders, and classes. His hierarchical system is still in use in a modernised form. Two French naturalists, Comte Buffon and Chevalier de Lamarck, moved the identification of species on the basis of external characteristics to the history of propagation. More importantly, Lamarck conceived the idea of the evolutionary tree and that acquired traits are inheritable. He imagined progression as a vast sequence of life-forms extending like a series of

staircases from the simple to the most complex. Lamarck probably laid the foundation for the study of inheritance and evolution in nineteenth century by men like Gregor Mendel, Charles Darwin and Alfred Wallace. Of these three perhaps Darwin has had the most enduring effect on the science of evolutionary biology.

In chemistry, there were literally revolutionary changes in eighteenth century. Torbern Bergman (Sweden) prepared a table of elements with quantitative values of the affinity of elements in reactions. The chemical fire was ignited by the theory of phlogiston, according to which phlogiston (a fiery substance) rises into the air in the processes of combustion, calcinations, and perspiration and air is a receptacle for phlogiston. Air became the focus of attention. Robert Boyle and Robert Hooke (England) discovered several physical characteristics of air, including its role in combustion, respiration and transmission of sound. One of their findings, 'Boyle's Law', expresses the inverse relationship between the volume and pressure of a gas. They also constructed their famous air pump and used it to study pneumatics. Blaise Pascal (France) composed treatises on the equilibrium of liquid solutions and on the weight and density of air. According to 'Pascal's Law', pressure applied to a confined liquid is transmitted undiminished through the liquid in all directions regardless of the area to which pressure is applied. Pascal also constructed mercury barometers to measure air pressure. Joseph Black (England) worked on the role of gases in chemical reactions. He showed that air with specific properties could combine with solid substances and then recovered.

Chemists soon discovered a host of specific gases and investigated their properties: some were flammable, others put out flames; some killed animals, but others made them lively. The works of Joseph Priestley (England), Antoine-Laurent de Lavoisier (France) and John Dalton (England) were perhaps the most significant. Priestly conducted experiments on gases; he discovered ten new gases in addition to hydrogen and carbon dioxide. His reputation is based on the discovery of a colourless gas in which a candle could burn and a mouse would thrive in it. Lavoisier repeated Priestley's experiment and gave the gas its name, oxygen. Combustion, according to him, was based on combination of oxygen with burning material and not the result of liberation of phlogis-

ton. Lavoisier is considered as the father of modern chemistry: among other contributions, he gave hydrogen its name, helped construct the metric system, made the first extensive list of elements, and helped reform the chemical nomenclature. He discovered that, although matter may change its form or shape, its mass always remains the same. Dalton proposed a chemical atomic theory and other chemists proposed that chemical forces were essentially electrical in nature. In addition, gravimetric methods made possible precise analysis: only when bodies were analysed into their constituent substances was it possible to classify them and identify their attributes logically and consistently.

Geologists discovered much about the earth's structure and history of its formation: rocks showed a record of the past. In seventeenth century, the ideas of Nicolaus Steno (Denmark) inspired others in the next century. John Strachey (England) made the first geological maps of rock strata. Others followed on stratified rocks to discover the age of the earth and its origin. James Hutton (Scotland) proposed that the earth is an ever-changing system subject to recurrent cycles of erosion and deposition and of subsidence and uplift. Also, he proposed that the processes occurring today had their counterparts in the ancient times. The publication of *Theory of the Earth* in 1795 established him as one of the founders of modern geological thought. Charles Lyell (Scotland) confirmed Hutton's work. The work on fossils helped in interpreting rock succession and addressing the question of the meaning of time in earth's history. Buffon was the first to reconstruct geological history in a series of stages and his notion of lost species opened the way to the development of palaeontology. George Cuvier (France) found that fossils do indeed record events in the earth's history and serve as more than just 'follies' of Nature. He also discovered that many fossils had no living counterparts: they seemed to represent extinct forms. William Smith (England), based on his extensive work on rock formation, concluded that there is indeed faunal succession and a consistent progression of forms from the primitive to the more advanced. The knowledge about successive formation of rocks and discovery of associated fossils helped the development of evolutionary biology.

While the soul-to-mind transformation took a long time, a number of moral philosophers and thinkers were quite convinced that, like

the physical world, human nature is subject to order and laws that can be discovered by scientific inquiry. The development of 'social sciences' (study of human nature and social structures) was greatly stimulated by the new focus on human happiness and the discovery of laws in physics, chemistry, geology, and biology. In eighteenth century, the modern disciplines of psychology, anthropology, sociology, politics, and economics, started to take shape. By the end of eighteenth century, the writings of Niccolo Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, David Hume, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Nicolas de Condorcet, Jacques Turgot, Francois Quesnay, Adam Smith, Immanuel Kant, Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, Johann Gottfried van Herder, and Giambattista Vico had laid the foundation for 'scientific' study of almost all aspects of human nature and society, its structure and its political and economic organisation.

In Europe the nation-state and absolute monarchy—epitomised by France of Louis XIV, the Sun King—emerged out of the feudal dynasties and city-states in the late seventeenth century, following a long period (almost two centuries) of turmoil, disorder, and wars. Until then most people were led to believe in an unchangeable and uniform order for living together since it was ordained by God. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, some people started asking: how could chaos and disintegration be part of any divine plan? The social and political disorder was the driving force for new ideas on the nature of state and governance not embedded in the Scripture or sanctioned by the Church. In other words, there was a clean break from religious authority and rules of behaviour: man-made laws and rules should govern the state. The focus shifted to natural law and natural rights: every human being has the right to live unmolested, that government was needed to ensure that right, and that man-made laws must serve and not subvert natural rights. If any civil law works against a natural right, the law of Nature warrants disobeying the law and even overthrowing the government. While there was consensus that a central sovereign authority was necessary to maintain order, there was division of opinion about who that sovereign authority should be and the basis on which this authority must rest.

Machiavelli (1469-1527) in Italy, Bodin (1529-1596) in France, Hobbes (1588-1679) in England, each in his own way, argued for an absolutist

sovereign authority (monarch) to restore order necessary for social life. The only object of the monarch is to preserve the state by enforcing laws that prevent men from harming other men. Needless to add Machiavelli and Hobbes had a pessimistic view of human nature: it is dominated by wickedness, selfishness and predation. Men must transfer their individual wills to one will of the monarch. The implied contract of the sovereign with the people is not based on divine rights of the monarch but on his/her usefulness (utility) to fulfil the common good. Machiavelli and Hobbes would like the monarch as sovereign authority to be neutral in enforcing the laws and not too concerned about the morality of means necessary to maintain order in the state. But Bodin would like the monarch to abide by natural law, fairness and accountability to God. The risk of tyranny in this scheme, for all three of them, is worth taking given the alternative of anarchy, wars and bloodshed.

Given the implied risk of 'servile absolutism' in the strong monarchy advocated by Machiavelli, Bodin and Hobbes, others argued that people must be the anchor of the state and its sovereign authority. Among them Baruch Spinoza (1634-1677), John Locke (1632-1704) and baron de Montesquieu (1689-1755) were perhaps the most influential. Spinoza believed that sovereign power (the state) is the price that humans must pay for order. The state exists for men and not the other way round. The true aim of government is to free men from fear, develop their minds and bodies in security and employ their reason unshackled. More importantly, government is an expression of the instinct to mutual aid, which is 'as natural to men as fear and pride.' Spinoza pronounced that 'the aim of life and the state is the fullest realisation of its own being.' Toleration and freedom of speech would make the state more secure. The political and ethical structure of the state should be based on knowledge about human nature and not on some exclusive dogma that robs men of their liberty. After all moral values are human creation. Spinoza emphasised the role of knowledge since it is the basis of change. For him natural science is incompatible with a literal belief in the Bible since it is full of contradictions: its moral teachings admirable, historical parts uncertain and the stories allegorical.

Locke is regarded as the advocate *par excellence* for the rule of law and toleration in England. He also inspired French thinkers of the En-

lightenment who generalised, from a local into world influence, the more liberal aspects of Locke's thought and English practice. Locke made the case that a government, be it a monarchy or republic, is legitimate only if it is ordered with people's consent. He reiterated the principle that people have civil and political rights and the so-called divine rights have no basis. Since man in nature sees no prohibition to every right that his individual power affords, the resulting free for all is bad for everyone. So men should get together and enter into an agreement to establish an authority that will restrain violence and settle disputes: this is the social contract or compact. This arrangement once established is binding on everyone forever unless the sovereign (an assembly or a person) misuses the conferred authority. The breach justifies overthrow of that authority. Locke identifies three (natural) rights of all men: life, liberty and property. The authority that enforces these rights is not an absolute ruler: sovereignty belongs to the people. Since it is inconvenient for them to exercise it they choose representatives; some of these men make the laws and others appointed to execute them.

Like Voltaire, Montesquieu was much impressed by his experience of England. The agent of king (Prime Minister) had to control the Parliament (House of Commons) to execute anything and he used this power often to oppose the king who tried to interfere in the legislative process. Judicial independence came from the jury system. Montesquieu took the argument of Locke forward and suggested separation of powers between the legislative, executive and judicial to ensure freedom and civil rights. Each of the three branches should enjoy equal weight to keep the state on an even keel. The American colonists adopted this formula for their republic after declaring independence from England. By the end of eighteenth century, there was consensus that the concept of divine right is a dogma without basis; the state (government) grew out of Nature itself, from reasonable motives and for the good of the people; and certain fundamental rights cannot be abolished including individual property and the right of revolution.

Pierre Bayle (1647-1706), from his refuge in Holland, inaugurated the world of the French encyclopaedists (philosophes) in the age of light (eighteenth century Enlightenment). He produced a massive dictionary in which he analysed familiar parts of the Christian revelation and left

the reader either as sceptical as himself or outraged by the blasphemy. Voltaire (1694-1778) carried this message to the ordinary educated reader. That the Book of Genesis is right in one thing only: God did create the universe, but no one knows how, and He set it going according to rules (laws of science) with which he had no reason to interfere. This is Deism: the religion of reasonable men. Drop the ritual, prayers, the candles, and the fears. Open your eyes to the fraud perpetrated on you by the Church for its beneficiaries (priests, monks, bishops and popes). Voltaire's slogan was *Ecrasez l'Infame* (crush the horror), meaning the 'dark and regressive alliance' of the Catholic Church and the French state. He condensed his argument in a serialised form in the *Dictionnaire Philosophique* (Philosophic Dictionary). After his exile in England, he published *Letters on the English*, in which Voltaire introduced with great enthusiasm the contributions of Newton to science and Locke's ideas on government. He also expressed admiration for the freedom of expression and diversity of faith that existed in England.

In France, following in the footsteps of Voltaire, a group of thinkers and activists, the philosophes, undertook a crusade-like mission to promote sceptical rationality and science and reject religion for achieving happiness. Science and science alone pitilessly destroys myths and brings the greatest of freedom (inner peace). Religion is the greatest superstition maintained by terror (death and afterlife): superstition and fanaticism are supreme threats to civilised life. It is fair to say that not all philosophes rejected God—some were Deists—but they did reject the superstructure of religion and the absolute monarchy (meaning the *ancien regime* of France). In addition, their focus on liberty and equality (natural rights) was much influenced by somewhat idealised experiences of France and England in the structure of their states (society and economy) in the eighteenth century.

The philosophes led by Denis Diderot (1713-1784), and supported by Baron d'Holbach (1723-1789) and Jean-Baptiste d'Alembert (1717-1783), launched an encyclopaedic dictionary (*Encyclopedie*)—prosperous grandchild of Bayle's *Dictionary*—in 1751; its last (35th) volume appeared in 1777. Among the major contributors, besides Diderot, d'Holbach and d'Alembert, were luminaries like Voltaire, Rousseau, Montesquieu, Turgot, Quesnay, Buffon, Marmontel, Helvetius, Condil-

lac, and Condorcet. They were a diverse lot: mathematicians, biologists, storey-tellers and satirists, pamphleteers, and polymaths. Rousseau was the odd man among these luminaries; he was of the Enlightenment and yet against it: against Condillac's mechanistic determinism and Diderot's elitism. He was in favour of total sovereignty of the state based on the general will—expressed in laws to which all submit for the public good—to sustain a democratic and egalitarian society.

The *Encyclopedie* included millions of words from A to Z covering a large variety of subjects in the sciences, arts, and crafts (inventions). The book and its editors, Diderot in particular, along with some of the close associates, suffered periods of extreme reactions by the Church and the state. But thanks to many subscribers and some determined supporters, *Encyclopedie* was a very successful intellectual and financial venture in France and other countries of Europe. The authors of *Encyclopedie* propagated three central ideas. First, science based on reason and not religious dogma (and superstition) can bring happiness. Second, since greatest good of the people is liberty, it must be the great purpose of government. Third, good education is the foundation of individual happiness and a good society so it should be available to all from a very young age.

Voltaire, Rousseau, and Diderot were perhaps the main inspiration for other people of reason to intensify their opposition to the *ancien regime* in France and ignited the fire for similar movements elsewhere for liberty and justice. They probably provided much intellectual powder for revolutions in the American colonies and France itself. The philosophes had a good company of similar minds in Scotland (David Hume, Adam Ferguson and Adam Smith), England (Edward Gibbon and Jeremy Bentham), Germany (Immanuel Kant, Gothold Lessing, Christoph Wieland, and Johann von Goethe), Italy (Beccaria), and the American colonies (Thomas Paine, Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson). It is fair to add that not all philosophes and their contemporaries in other countries spoke or fought for liberty and equality on a universal basis to include slaves, indigenous people in the colonies, serfs, and women. Only some of them expressed their disgust with persecution and oppression on the basis of colour, creed, religion, class, or gender.

We cannot complete the story of the age of science and the Enlightenment without including a brief narrative about the breathtaking ideas on political economy developed during the eighteenth century. As in other social sciences, the starting point was about human nature and behaviour. The human individual is a complex being, governed by both passion and reason, and the duality in human nature, being selfish and social, is a creative conflict. Mind possesses some innate powers (capacity for reflection), but ideas are a product of experience and not some innate reality. We reflect on the experiences (sensations) to form new ideas. Morality is not innate, but taught or learnt. It is convention and convenience by which languages are changed and developed. Happiness and the common good are best served by liberty (freedom) of thought, expression, association, and exchange (trade). These ideas were the seeds for the development of modern social sciences. Given the complexity of human brain and the genetic make-up of human body, there is still much about human nature (self, imagination, and thought) that remains unknown or known very tentatively. However, in the realm of political and economic organisation of society, much had been discovered by the end of eighteenth century. The political revolutions in England, America and France were more or less the culmination of the age of absolutism and the beginning of liberal and representative democracy. An equally, if not more, important development was in the realm of economic organisation: beginning of the industrial age (in England, Holland and parts of Germany) based on the factory system and new ideas in political economy.

The conventional wisdom was that a strong nation and state (monarch) should regulate both domestic and external trade, the former to raise revenue and control prices and the latter to maintain a net flow of resources (bullion) with excess of exports over imports. An intrusive state was the reflection of mercantilist ideology. A group of thinkers, in France and Britain, thought that this was against the natural order and the nature of man. Physiocrats, led by Francois Quesnay and Marquis de Mirabeau, in France argued that the state should allow freer trade within the country (*laissez faire*) and with other countries (*laissez passer*). However, they argued that land (agriculture) created all wealth (value) and manufacture was incapable of producing value (surplus). In

other words, labour engaged in agriculture was 'productive' and that working in manufacture was 'unproductive'. Agricultural surplus was essentially the basis of civilisation: this view clearly reflected the overwhelming importance of agriculture in France and its rural society. This was not the view of Adam Smith in Scotland: a new stage of civilisation epitomised by industry and commerce has emerged beyond agriculture. What matters is labour as the producer of value and wealth and not the activity (sector) to which it is applied. He was inspired partly by the ideology of freedom and partly by the emerging industrial economy in parts of England, Holland and Germany.

Adam Smith (1723-1790), more than anyone else, laid the foundation of modern political economy or economics. As a moral philosopher, he premised his study on his understanding of human nature: the creative conflict between the selfish (self-interest) and selfless (empathetic) parts is the basis of progress. The important point Adam Smith emphasised is that the individual in pursuing self-interest serves the interest of all if allowed to engage freely with others. The interdependence of needs induces specialised production and exchange of surplus. The economy and society are best served if the state, guided by equitable rules of behaviour, allows individuals freedom to produce and exchange goods and services. The freer the competition and co-operation the more it will induce division of labour (specialisation), raise productivity and produce increasing surplus. In the long run, the process of accumulation of surplus (capital) and specialised labour (through technical change) will raise wages, income and consumption.

Adam Smith assigned three basic roles to the state: maintain law and order (rule of law); provide level playing field to producers and consumers; and invest in the physical infrastructure and education. Like other thinkers of his age, he emphasised the role of education in raising productivity and improving the quality of life. In England, David Ricardo, Thomas Robert Malthus, Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill, and Alfred Marshall refined and expanded the frontiers of ideas underlying the workings of a profit-based (capitalist) industrial (modern) economy. At the same time, Karl Marx (1818-1883), equipped with the German philosophical tradition and perhaps inspired by the French Revolution, challenged the accepted ideas about the new industrial (capitalist)

economy and its consequences on societies. His writings, together with those of Friedrich Engels (1820-1895), provided the necessary brew for radical reforms to the system and even its overthrow.

Voyages of Discovery: Imperialism and Capitalism

With their conquest of the eastern Mediterranean, and particularly after the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the Ottomans set the terms for trade in the region and controlled trade links of Europe with the Levant, China, and India. That may have been one reason for the Portuguese and Spaniards to find an alternative route to the Orient (India and China); or they may have been pulled by the lure of beautiful islands in the Atlantic and slaves on the west coast of Africa. The Portuguese Prince Henry (1394-1460), known as the Navigator, sent several expeditions down the west coast of Africa and by 1471 they were able to wrest Tangier from Morocco. In 1486, sailing from the Portuguese settlements on the Gold Coast, Bartholomew Diaz, rounded the tip of Africa (named as Cape of Good Hope). In 1498, Vasco da Gama completed an unbroken voyage via the Cape of Good Hope to the western coast of India. Ferdinand Magellan left Saville in 1519, sailed around the tip of South America (from the Atlantic to Pacific Ocean) and reached the Philippines, where he was killed in a violent encounter with the indigenous people. Of Magellan's crew, Sebastian de Cano returned to Spain in 1527 with a handful of the original crew on one ship (out of five ships) via the Indian Ocean and around the Cape of Good Hope. It was the greatest voyage of all time and changed the way people thought about their world.

Queen Isabella of Castille and King Ferdinand of Leon, after their conquest of Muslim Granada in 1492, accepted the application of Christopher Columbus, a Genoese sailor, to sail across the Atlantic in search of Asia (China and India). Columbus had first tried with the Portuguese Crown in 1484 and 1488 but without success. Columbus and his crew in three tiny ships landed on an island in the Bahamas, named it San Salvador and laid claim on it for Castile and Leon. He thought he had

landed in a part of Japan. Columbus pressed on and found the islands of Cuba and Hispaniola (Dominican Republic and Haiti). He returned via Lisbon to Spain where he was asked to make a second voyage quickly to forestall Portuguese claims. Columbus made the second voyage in 1493, discovered Dominica, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Jamaica. [In 1494, the Pope helped Portugal and Spain to settle the boundary between their respective spheres of overseas interest: all land discovered to the west of a line lying 350 leagues beyond the Azores was to belong to Spain and everything to the east to Portugal.] In the third voyage of 1498, Columbus discovered Trinidad and returned to Hispaniola where the men he had left behind revolted and sent him back home in irons. He was allowed one more voyage in 1502 when he discovered the mainland of Honduras and Costa Rica. Columbus died in 1506. However, Amerigo Vespucci, another Italian explorer later sponsored by Spain managed to get his name attached as 'America' to the continent.

These voyages and others that followed them—led by men determined to subjugate and conquer—from Spain, Portugal, Holland, England, and France had immense consequences for people all over the world. Their immediate impact was on the technology of seafaring: structure of ships, navigational techniques and instruments, and charts (maps). The more substantial effects were felt on the negative side by the indigenous populations of the 'discovered' lands, the Caribbean islands, and South and North America: millions were killed during their resistance to the European conquest and by deadly diseases (e.g. smallpox, influenza) previously unknown to them. In some parts, the harsh treatment and forced labour in the mines and on land was no less devastating in its effects. Another group of people, about 15 million, were transported from Africa as slaves—both Europeans and Africans were involved as buyers and sellers in this abominable trade—to work in the mines and plantations for sugar, tobacco and cotton in the Caribbean islands and the South and North American territories for over three centuries. Not all of the slaves from Africa completed the awful journey on the sea—four to five million perished in the passage—and those who did survive had to work and live under the most inhuman conditions. It took nearly one hundred years of struggle by some in Europe and the Americas, including a civil war in the United States from 1861 to

1865, to get their governments to abolish the trade in slaves and slavery itself. The colonisers have left reasonably good record and narrative of the treatment meted out to the indigenous and African people. The economic and social damage of the slave trade to African societies must have been immense, though not as well recorded.

Needless to add, European settlements in the Caribbean islands and the Americas, with mines and plantations based on forced and slave labour, developed into very substantial source of wealth and income. For one thing, the 'New World' opened up vast territories and created new opportunities for European populations to escape poverty and oppression. The 'triangular trade' between Africa, Europe and the Americas, involving slaves, raw material and manufactured goods, generated unprecedented profits for merchants and revenue for European states. The colonial settlements gave some European monarchs the first taste of empire and with it additional wealth, glory and power. Finally, we should not underestimate the religious significance of European conquests: converting pagans to the true faith and civilising the savages noble or not.

The voyages to other parts of the world, particularly to the coast of East Africa and Asia (India, Sri Lanka, the Indonesian archipelago, the Philippines, and China), were as much for discovery as for trade (silk and spices) and colonial possessions. Initially the competition was between Portugal and Spain, but they were soon joined by Holland, England, and France. While Portugal and Spain contested for territory besides trade—Goa, Indonesian islands, and Macau by Portugal and the Philippines by Spain—the other three were initially contesting for trade, for which purpose a trading company with monopoly for trade was chartered in each country: England in 1600, Holland in 1602, and France in 1664. I describe the role of these companies, the English East India Company in particular, in a later chapter. The race for territorial (colonial) possessions and European settlements in Africa, the 'Scramble for Africa', was to come later, largely in nineteenth century, except for parts of southern Africa where the Dutch and Portuguese had settled or acquired colonies in seventeenth century. By the end of nineteenth century, Germany, Italy and Belgium had also acquired colonies as part of the settlement for peace in Europe in the 1880s. However, Britain

had the largest empire, which (excluding Canada and Ireland) included its own settlements in Australia, New Zealand, parts of southern Africa, and the colonial possessions in Asia (India, Burma, Sri Lanka, Malaysia), Africa (west and east), Middle East, Caribbean islands, and numerous islands in the Atlantic, Indian and Pacific Oceans. It is fair to say that the contest for colonies and colonial possession was a major reason for the 'Great War' (World War I) in 1914.

The first Industrial Revolution—a term used to describe a range of unprecedented technological and organisational changes—had its beginnings in England and parts of northern Europe (Holland, Belgium, Prussia) in the mid-eighteenth century. In the next one hundred years, the consequent changes in the economy and society were truly revolutionary not only in these countries but also in other parts of Europe, North America, and the rest of the world through the expanded commercial and political links established by trade and colonialism (imperialism). An important point is that the feudal and royal restrictions were swept away in England by the end of seventeenth century. Somewhat similar conditions prevailed in Holland, Belgium and Prussia. This process was delayed in other parts of Europe, particularly in France once the most powerful nation-state. The French Revolution in 1789 dismantled the *ancien regime*, but it had mixed consequences for the country and Europe. The recently independent United States of America turned out to be the second engine of the industrial age and started to surpass Britain by the end of nineteenth century.

There is no simple explanation for why the industrial revolution began in the mid-eighteenth century and not earlier and why first in England and in parts of north-west Europe and not somewhere else. Also, there is much controversy about the economic contribution of the triangular (Atlantic) trade and the Asian trade to the 'garden of nascent capitalism'. In our context, we can identify several major elements underlying the industrial revolution: changes in agriculture, demography, mobile surplus labour, mines and metallurgy, steam power and machines, transport and communications, and banking and finance. Let us look at them a little more closely.

The legally reinforced protection of private property, enclosure of the commons, and a friendly environment for private enterprise, innova-

tion and freer trade prepared the ground for rapid and transformational industrial growth. Scientific methods of farming—new implements (e.g. machine drill, steel-tipped ploughshare) and cultural practices (crop rotation, fertiliser, cattle breeding)—were introduced and adapted to raise farm production and productivity. Together with the enclosures, labour-saving and (more efficient) tools and practices helped push people off the land; the enclosures acts destroyed village life and forced an increasing proportion of the rural labour force to move to the city and into factories. In addition, increased production and productivity of food induced higher birth rate, which helped to increase the pool of surplus labour. In other words, agriculture started to produce surpluses of output, create more purchasing power in the rural economy, and release labour for the new (machine-based) factories.

Steam power was known since antiquity, but it had never been used for any practical application. In England, Thomas Newcomen (1711) made a steam engine for pumping flood water from the mines. James Watt, a Scottish instrument-maker, vastly improved this engine in 1763; the new engine could be used for power to operate all kinds of machines with great efficiency. However, steam power and machines could not be put into widespread use without ample supply of relatively abundant and cheap fuel. In England, coal turned out to be abundant (relative to wood) and the most efficient fuel to produce steam. Several innovations, including underground pumps, gunpowder for blasting and safety lamp, were introduced to improve the mining of coal and other minerals. Likewise, there were improvements in the production of iron and its conversion to steel, facilitating production of good quality machines. In the eighteenth century, a large number of innovations came on line, first in textile production followed by other industries. James Hargreaves, Richard Arkwright, and Samuel Crompton built respectively the spinning jenny (1767), the spinning frame (1768) and the spinning mule (1779). A new level of sophistication was reached in France with the silk loom (1804).

The concentration of workers in a factory was not a new phenomenon: silk, carpet, and porcelain factories had been common enough throughout the eighteenth century. However, there was a huge change in the industrial organisation or in the nature of factory. Machines

started to replace human effort and skills because they were quick, regular, precise, and unflagging; inanimate sources of power (water and coal) through engines (supplying power on a regular and reliable basis) substituted the animate ones (horses and cattle); there were new uses of raw materials (minerals) which were abundant. The sight of the 'dark satanic mills' came first to textile settlements in parts of England. Factories facilitated the growth of urban centres and in turn factories were drawn to the few large centres of existing population. These towns and cities were suppliers of a large pool of artisans and the poor for employers seeking workers in factories to build the infrastructure (canals and roads).

Huge loads of raw material (coal, iron) and other commodities (cotton, wool, and clay) needed to be moved from the source (mines and ports) to the factory and manufactured goods from the factory to towns and ports for domestic and foreign markets. Similarly people in ever larger number needed to travel more efficiently and comfortably. These needs created inducement for the growth of river, road and rail transport. Consequently, there were improvements in the waterways (canals), roads and development of a rail system based on the high-pressure steam locomotive by the early nineteenth century.

The accumulated private profits and savings, supported by a well-organised financial system, were reinvested in industry and commerce. While the risks were often high the returns were even higher, thanks to the fact that the earnings (wages) of workers lagged far behind the increase in their productivity, at least in the first 50 years, and there were low taxes on profits. In addition, relatively cheap raw material imported from the colonies, based on monopoly trade and slave-based plantations (of sugar, cotton, tobacco), and the rising demand for manufactured goods in Europe and elsewhere also made significant contribution to the growth of profits and savings. The boom in investment continued in private enterprise, infrastructure (canals, roads, rail), and innovations, together with employment of relatively cheap labour, including children and women, at home. The demographic change because of the rising birth rate was reinforcing the supply of cheap and malleable labour and at the same time expanding the size of market for goods.

The compound growth driven by technical change, new investment and inter-linked markets in England and north-western Europe had enormous economic and social consequences in these countries and the rest of the world. It is also fair to suggest that a truly world economy, linked by trade and investment, had emerged by the middle of nineteenth century. The first Industrial Revolution, based on men, machines and markets, unleashed forces of 'creative destruction' in which the lure of profit acted as its engine. But that was not all. Perhaps for the first time in history individuals and societies found a way to experience growth in their income and consumption levels on a sustained basis. For many it paved the way to unshackle their existence from abject poverty. At the same time, the important issue of who paid the cost for and who reaped the benefits from the Industrial Revolution came under critical scrutiny in the writings of men like Robert Owen (1771-1858), John Stuart Mill (1806-1873), Charles Dickens, (1812-1870), and Friedrich Engels. They were among the catalysts of mass agitation for political and social rights and broad-based reforms to put a human face on the new industrial (capitalist) society. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels were probably able to exercise the most influence on many minds to intensify the struggle against the emerging capitalist economy and society. The spirit of the French Revolution was also brought into service to galvanise the marginalised men and women (slaves, peasants, labourers) and their supporters to demand political and social change for a better (more liveable) world.

Philosophers and Scientists in Europe (From Fifteenth to Nineteenth Century)

No.	Name	Years	Country	Field
1.	Pietro Pomponazzi	1462-1525	Italy	Moral Philosopher
2.	Desiderius Erasmus	1466-1536	Holland	Humanist
3.	Niccolo Machiavelli	1469-1527	Italy	Moral Philosopher
4.	Nicolaus Copernicus	1473-1543	Poland	Astronomer
5.	Andreas Vesalius	1514-1564	Holland/Belgium	Physician
6.	Jean Bodin	1529-1590	France	Philosopher, lawyer
7.	Michael de Montaigne	1533-1592	France	Moral Philosopher
8.	Giordano Bruno	1548-1600	Italy	Astronomer
9.	Francis Bacon	1561-1626	England	Moral Philosopher
10.	Galileo Galilei	1564-1642	Italy	Natural Philosopher
11.	Johannes Kepler	1571-1630	Germany	Astronomer
12.	William Harvey	1578-1657	England	Natural Philosopher
13.	Hugo Grotius	1583-1645	Holland	Philosopher/Int. Law
14.	Thomas Hobbes	1588-1678	England	Moral Philosopher
15.	Rene Descartes	1596-1650	France/Holland	Philosopher
16.	Blaise Pascal	1623-1662	France	Natural Philosopher
17.	Robert Boyle	1627-1691	England	Natural Philosopher

18.	Christiaan Huygens	1629-1695	Holland	Natural Philosopher
19.	Baruch Spinoza	1632-1677	Holland	Moral Philosopher
20.	John Locke	1632-1704	England	Moral Philosopher
21.	Antonie van Leeuwenhoek	1632-1723	Holland	Natural Philosopher
22.	Robert Hooke	1635-1703	England	Polymath/Philosopher
23.	Isaac Newton	1643-1727	England	Natural Philosopher
24.	Gottfried Leibniz	1646-1716	Germany	Natural Philosopher
25.	Pierre Bayle	1647-1706	France	Moral Philosopher
26.	Herman Boerhaave	1668-1738	Holland	Physician
27.	George Berkeley	1685-1753	Ireland	Moral Philosopher
28.	Charles-Louis Montesquieu	1689-1755	France	Moral Philosopher
29.	Francois Arouet (Voltaire)	1694-1778	France	Philosophe
30.	David Hartley	1705-1757	England	Moral Philosopher
31.	Carl Linnaeus	1707-1778	Sweden	Biologist
32.	Georges-Louis Buffon	1707-1788	France	Natural Philosopher
33.	David Hume	1711-1776	Scotland	Moral Philosopher
34.	Jean-Jacques Rousseau	1712-1778	Switzerland	Philosophe
35.	David Diderot	1713-1784	France	Philosophe
36.	Claude Helvetius	1715-1771	France	Philosophe
37.	Etienne Condillac	1715-1780	France	Philosophe
38.	Jean-Baptiste d’Alembert	1717-1783	France	Philosophe

39. Baron d'Holbach	1723-1789	France	Philosophe
40. Adam Smith	1723-1790	Scotland	Moral Philosopher
41. Adam Ferguson	1723-1816	Scotland	Moral Philosopher
42. Immanuel Kant	1724-1804	Germany	Moral Philosopher
43. Jacques Turgot	1727-1781	France	Moral Philosopher
44. Gotthold Lessing	1729-1781	Germany	Moral Philosopher
45. Joseph Priestley	1733-1804	England	Natural Philosopher
46. Christoph Wieland	1733-1813	Germany	Moral Philosopher
47. Edward Gibbon	1737-1794	England	Philosophe
48. Cesare Beccaria	1738-1794	Italy	Moral Philosopher
49. Nicholas de Condorcet	1743-1794	France	Moral Philosopher
50. Jeremy Bentham	1748-1832	England	Moral Philosopher
51. Johann von Goethe	1749-1832	Germany	Polymath
52. Friedrich Hegel	1770-1831	Germany	Moral Philosopher
53. John Stuart Mill	1806-1873	England	Moral Philosopher
54. Charles Darwin	1809-1882	England	Naturalist
55. Karl Marx	1818-1883	Germany	Moral Philosopher
56. Gregor Mendel	1822-1884	Austria	Naturalist
57. Louis Pasteur	1822-1895	France	Naturalist
58. Alfred Wallace	1823-1913	England	Naturalist

Notes:

1. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) is not included in the list, although he was probably the first Christian scholar who tried to reconcile Aristotelian (rational) philosophy with the Christian (Catholic) faith.
2. Rene Descartes is regarded as the father of modern philosophy.
3. Francis Bacon is regarded as the father of empiricism.
4. Michael de Montaigne and David Hume are the modern sceptics *par excellence*.
5. The Catholic Church burnt Giordano Bruno at the stake for his "pantheism".
6. Numbers distributed by each century are: there were 6 (Erasmus to Bruno) in the 16th; 17 (Bacon to Bayle) in the 17th; and 243 (Boerhaave to Condorcet) in the 18th; and 9 (Bentham to Wallace) in the 19th century.

3

Muslim Rule in India Before the Mughals

The archaeological and scriptural history of India—named by Greeks after the River Indus—shows its ancient, complex and rich civilisation with diverse community of languages and religions going back to some 5,000 years if not earlier. India was not a stranger to migrants and invaders, almost all came from Persia and Central Asia through the passes in the west and north-west. For centuries, great Hindu empires were built and dynasties fought each other for supremacy. The social and economic structure evolved into a hierarchical caste system, reflecting the division of labour and power. Hinduism and later Buddhism spread out of India into South-east Asia and north Asia by sea and land. Then there was the rich stock of knowledge in philosophy, medicine, astronomy, and arithmetic, along with a decentralised governance structure (e.g. the village panchayat), and a multitude of arts (paintings and sculpture) and architecture (temples, forts, etc.). Indian society was connected to the outside world through commerce by the land routes with Central Asia and China and by the sea with South-east Asia and western Asia from at least the Roman times. The Arab contacts with the south Indian coastal towns and Ceylon (Sri Lanka) preceded Islam. After the advent of Islam in the middle of seventh century, some of the traders and oth-

ers migrated and formed settlements in the early part of eighth century. Before the imposition of Muslim dynastic rule, India was fragmented into strong independent states, based on ancient identities of lineage, language, dynastic tradition, and economic interest.

We cannot say with certainty when the first invaders came to India from the north-west. We do know about Alexander's invasion and his brief stay in 323 BCE. Muslims were the next group of invaders, starting in the eighth century with a toehold along the Makran coast and in Sindh west of the Indus. With the spread of Islam in Afghanistan and parts of Central Asia in the ninth and tenth centuries, Muslim invasions of India started from the north-west in the eleventh century. In the next four centuries, a number of Afghan and Turkish intruders managed to capture and rule a large part of northern India. However, successive Muslim rulers, with few exceptions, were not able to settle and build a reasonably well structured state or empire for too long. The Mongol raiding parties also descended on the Punjab every few years for about two centuries, including Chengiz Khan in 1221, but the Muslim rulers in Delhi did not feel unduly threatened. It was in 1398 that an army of Mongols led by Amir Taimur (Tamerlane) arrived at the bank of the Indus River. This time the circumstances were quite different for at least two reasons: first, Taimur—Marlow's 'scourge of God'—led the army and second, there were two puppet Sultans (kings) at Delhi each manipulated by a powerful noble.

In 642 Muslim Arabs defeated the Sassanid ruler of Persia and then moved north and east into parts of Central Asia and Afghanistan, including perhaps parts of Balochistan. By 732 they were masters of Balkh, Khorasan and Samarqand. The first armed encounter between Muslim Arabs and a Hindu raja, Dahir, took place in 711 after a punitive expedition, led by Muhammad bin Qasim, arrived at the port of Debal (near Karachi). Apparently, this expedition was in retaliation to piracy against the Arab boats laden with men and goods navigating in the Arabian Sea. The Arabs defeated the army of Raja Dahir, thanks to internal discord and treachery, and marched north occupying the territory of Sindh up to Multan. It is reported that the Hindu chiefs around Raja Dahir decided to forsake their king on the authority of astrology: 'Our wise men have predicted that Sind will come under the sway

of Islam. Why then should we battle against Fate?' For the next nearly 300 years, the Arabs stayed mostly in Sindh with some contacts with Rajasthan and Kashmir. The Arabs in Sindh fought among themselves (Hejazis versus Yemenis). In the mid-ninth century, while the Hibbari Sunni dynasty ruled Sindh at Mansura, Hindus were able to wrest Multan from the Arabs and re-establish themselves in upper Sindh. By this time, though separated from the Arab world, Sunni and Shia Muslims in Sindh were fighting each other, thanks to the intense rivalry between the Abbasid and Fatimid rulers in the Middle East. In 977, the Ismaili Shia captured Multan while the Hibbaris continued to rule lower Sindh from Mansura, which the Ismailis wrested in 985. All this was to change with the arrival of Mahmud of Ghazni (Afghanistan) in 1005.

In 962, Alptigin, a Turkish 'slave' of the Samanids, rebelled against the ruler and established himself at Ghazni. During this time, the Hindu Shahiyas ruled the area from Kabul in the west to the River Beas in the east with their capital in today's Mardan (Pakistan). In 977, Subuktigin, a Turkish slave and Alptigin's son-in-law, became the ruler of Ghazni. He annexed the trans-Indus region of the Shahiya kingdom besides some of the territory in Central Asia adjoining Ghazni. Jaipal, the Shahiya raja, alarmed by Subuktigin's territorial expansion, marched towards Ghazni, but was defeated and agreed to pay a large indemnity to the Turkish ruler. Jaipal defaulted on the indemnity and tried to avenge his defeat. He was again defeated decisively and had to cede some of his territory in Afghanistan. It is important not to view Subuktigin as a champion of Islam: his purpose was merely to secure and expand his dominion. He did not cross the Indus, but he built roads leading up to the Indian frontier, which paved the way for his son, Mahmud, to march into India. Ghazni, a small town, became a magnet for Turks and a springboard for military campaigns into India. It also became the seat of the Karamiyah sect, whose leaders were active in converting non-Muslims and fighting the Ismailis.

Subuktigin died in 997 and, after a brief struggle, his highly ambitious son Mahmud succeeded his father after a brief struggle. Mahmud was well aware of the weaknesses of Indian army and the riches of rajas since he had participated in his father's campaigns against the Hindus. While he made raids into Central Asia, his focus was to the south in

India. Initially Mahmud directed his expeditions to the neighbouring territory in the Punjab. The raids on Indian towns, apart from religious iconoclasm, were largely for plunder to replenish the Ghazni treasury. In the year 1001, he defeated Jaipal, the Shahiya king, near Mardan and captured him. Jaipal promised a large ransom for his release, appointed his son Anandpal as his successor, and burned himself to death following the Rajput custom. Mahmud was emboldened by what he had achieved. He defeated another Hindu raja who, once was his father's friend, did not come to assist him against Jaipal. On his way back, the Ismaili ruler of Multan attacked Mahmud and he lost much of his baggage across the rivers. A year later, he marched to Multan to punish the 'heretic' ruler for his audacity but pardoned him after payment of ransom and promise of good behaviour. Mahmud had to return to the Punjab in 1008 to deal with Anandpal who was defiant and ready to fight. This time several other Hindu rajas from northern and central India joined the Shahiya raja against Mahmud, but the Hindu confederacy was defeated conclusively. The outcome of this battle was a turning point in Mahmud's career: he returned home with vast amount of treasure and much inspired by the loot for more daring expeditions into India. So far the Sultan was raiding his neighbourhood.

The next time Mahmud marched to Kangra in East Punjab where, without any resistance, he raided an ancient Hindu temple, collected hoards of jewels and other valuables, and returned home with the booty. This raid increased his appetite for attacks on Hindu temples farther afield. Between the year 1010 and 1022, Mahmud raided the major temple towns, Tarain, Thanesar, distant Kanauj, and Kalinjar. All of these expeditions yielded him massive wealth. Apparently, Mahmud has had no prior plan to establish an empire in India east of the Indus until 1020 when he appointed a governor at Lahore. Of all of his campaigns, the most daring and dramatic was his march on Somanath, a well-known but distant Hindu religious centre in Gujarat: his army had to march through the desert of Rajputana and the marshes of Kutch. The reputation of the hoarded wealth in the temples of Somanath attracted Mahmud's attention to undertake a very risky expedition. Mahmud and his army left Ghazni in 1024 and returned home in the spring of 1026 with the wealth of Somanath which the people of Ghazni may not have even

dreamt about. Mahmud's raids into India, Gujarat in particular, caused enormous economic devastation and much instability in the area. However, his iconoclasm, and his crusade against the Ismailis, earned him a title from the Caliph in Baghdad and recognition as a champion of Islam. Mahmud built an enormously rich kingdom with Ghazni at its centre. Except for a punitive expedition in late 1026 against the Jats of Sindh, who harassed him and the army on their way back from Somanath, Mahmud did not return to India. He remained occupied in the battles against Muslims in Central Asia until his death in the spring of 1030.

We should see Mahmud's undefeated record as a daring and resourceful general for 30 years in the light of the devastation his expeditions caused to Hindu culture and society. He fought against the Muslim rulers of Persia and Central Asia as well for empire and maintained number of Hindu officers and troops in his armies. While Mahmud's empire in India did not go beyond Lahore, he used the riches of India to make his capital Ghazni a splendourous centre of architecture, learning, and culture. Mahmud was niggardly in his compensation to the poet Abul Qasim Firdausi (940-1020) for the great Persian epic *Shahnameh*. Sultan Mahmud built a fine library, based on books snatched from Persia and Central Asia, and left many landmarks of architecture. To his credit, Mahmud brought al-Biruni (973-1048) to India where he stayed for over ten years. al-Biruni's 'observations on Indian conditions, systems of knowledge, social norms and religion, discussed in his book, *Tahqiq-Ma-lil-Hind*, are probably the most incisive made by any visitor to India'. It is fair to add that the great author was not free from prejudice in his statements about the Hindu society. Mahmud's son Masud, unlike his father, appears to have shown favours to al-Biruni. What is significant is that al-Biruni had no good words for Mahmud or his destructive attacks on India:

> Mahmud utterly ruined the prosperity of the country, and performed there wonderful exploits, by which the Hindus became like atoms of dust scattered in all directions, and like a tale of old in the mouth of the people. Their scattered remains cherish, of course, the most inveterate aversion towards all Muslims. This is the reason, too, why Hindu sciences have retired far away from those parts of the country conquered by us, and have fled to Benares, and other places.

I should add two important points here. First, Hindu rulers were not unfamiliar with raids on rival temples in India. Second, India was in a state of 'big fish eats little fish' anarchy in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Lesser feudatories nibbled at greater feudatories; kingdoms swallowed other kingdoms; and dynasties devoured other dynasties. What is important is that the Hindu rulers disregarded the 'shark-like presence lurking in the Punjab'. Muslim invaders from the north-west proved superior to their Hindu opponents for several reasons. For one thing, their fighting strategy and methods, especially their cavalry marches based on horses, were far superior to that of the Hindu warriors on elephants. They were free from restrictions of caste and diet. They had a unity of command, unlike Hindus hampered by internal division based on caste, tribe and sect. Their fierce faith energised them because destruction of the 'infidel' was a service pleasing to God. Their imagination was fired by the opportunity to acquire much wealth considered a splendid reward for their valour. Finally, they knew that neither retreat nor a middle course was open to them.

On Mahmud's death, his descendents, sons down, engaged in horrific bloodbath. In 1031, his son Masud ascended the throne after the initial struggle with his brother Mohammad. Masud first recalled the Ghaznavid governor at Lahore and replaced him with another Turk. The new governor raided Benares and returned with rich booty, but remitted none of it to the Sultan in Ghazni. Masud sent one of his Hindu generals who defeated and killed the governor. In 1037, the Sultan came to India, raided and captured the reputedly impregnable Hindu fortress at Hansi. Taking advantage of his absence, the Seljuq Turks invaded the western and northern parts of the Ghaznavid Empire and occupied Nishapur. Masud returned to deal with them but was defeated at the battle of Dandanaqan in 1040, lost his territories in Persia and Central Asia to the Seljuqs, and eventually assassinated by his mutinous troops. His brother Mohammad occupied the throne for a while, but Masud's son Maudud defeated his uncle in 1042. During Maudud's reign the raja of Delhi, Mahipal, was determined to expel the Ghaznavids from the Punjab: he recovered Hansi, Thanesar and Kangra but was unable to take Lahore. Maudud appointed two of his sons in Peshawar and Lahore and sent one of his generals to deal with the resurgent Hindus

in the Punjab. In a span of nine years, Maudood lost more territory to kings who claimed the throne of Ghazni.

In 1059, Masud's other son Ibrahim re-established a truncated empire on a firmer basis by arriving at a peace agreement with the Seljuqs. He also married his son Masud II to the daughter of Sultan Malik Shah. Ibrahim enjoyed a peaceful reign of 40 years, regarded as a 'golden period' of Ghaznavid Punjab. Once Ibrahim was secure in Lahore, he crossed the southern border of the Punjab and captured Pakpattan and one of his generals carried out successful raids in the east. Lahore rose to be a great centre of culture during this period. Ibrahim and his successors saw a period of sustained tranquillity. The riches acquired in raids across northern India increasingly sustained the empire shorn of its western and northern lands. After Ibrahim's death, his son Masud III ascended the throne in 1099 and ruled quite peacefully for 16 years. Signs of internal weakness in the state became apparent when Masud III died in 1115 leaving his sons fighting and killing each other. Eventually Bahram Shah, after defeating his brother Arsalan, occupied the throne of Ghazni as a Seljuq vassal in 1118. He was the last Ghaznavid Sultan and had a troubled reign of 33 years. Bahram soon got into trouble with the chiefs of Ghor—it is the hilly area between Herat and Kabul— which proved fatal to his dynasty. The Ghori chiefs achieved independence because of the declining power of the Ghaznavids, thanks to their protracted fight with the Seljuqs. Bahram gave his daughter in marriage to Qutb-ud-din Muhammad, a Ghori chief who had taken the title 'Malik al-Jabal'. The Sultan became suspicious of his son-in-law and had him poisoned. The poisoned chief's brother, Saif-ud-din invaded Ghazni with a large force and forced Bahram to flee to India. Bahram returned to Ghazni in 1149 and surprised Saif-ud-din; the latter surrendered the capital, but was put to death. The brutal killing of Saif-ud-din invited the ire of his brother, Ala-ud-din Husain (known to us as 'jahan soz'), who sacked and burned the city of Ghazni in 1151. In the next year, Bahram died after having reoccupied whatever was left of Ghazni. The centre of Ghaznavid rule was left only at Lahore, but the Ghoris would conquer it too.

The Ghori Dynasty (1151-1205)

After the death of Mahmud in 1030, Hindu India enjoyed respite from foreign invasions for about 150 years. There were occasional incursions into the Hindu territory from the Ghaznavid base in Lahore, but no major territorial changes took place. However, Hindu rajas and chieftains did not develop a consolidated dominion or maintain cohesion. Several contending principalities grew in different parts of India, allowing a determined invader to subdue them individually or in tenuous alliances. Mahmud's last descendents were overthrown in 1187 and Lahore was taken by Shihab-ud-din Mohammad (better known as Mohammad Ghori), brother and deputy of Ghias-ud-din Mohammad who governed the extensive Ghori dominion. Mohammad Ghori did not confine himself to military raids in search of loot and glory: he was in search of a kingdom in India and not interested in merely carrying out plundering raids. In India, political fragmentation was accompanied by economic collapse, social repression and caste discrimination. But the conditions were not hopeless. In 1175, soon after the conquest of Ghazni, Mohammad Ghori defeated the Ismailis in Multan and occupied Uch. Then he moved south and occupied upper Sindh in 1178 and across the Thar to Gujarat where the Solankis defeated him. He had to change his strategy after the defeat and went back to the north.

Mohammad Ghori took Peshawar in 1179, followed by Sialkot in 1185 and Lahore in 1186. In the winter of 1190-1191, he marched on Bhatinda and conquered the Hindu fort there. He was returning to Ghazni when his governor at Bhatinda informed him of the movement of Prithviraja III of Ajmer and Delhi toward Bhatinda. Mohammad Ghori proceeded from Lahore south-east and met the Rajput forces at Tarain near Karnal, where he was wounded and his army of Turks, Afghans, Persians, and Arabs was defeated. He had to withdraw to Ghazni where he imposed a severe penance on himself and punished his generals who had fled from the battlefield. Next year, he returned with reinforcements, defeated and captured Prithviraja at the same battlefield. There was much loss of life on both sides.

It was a decisive battle for Muslims in conquering northern India: Mohammad Ghori became the master of Ajmer and Delhi. In 1192, he

returned to Ghazni, leaving one of his Turkish generals, Qutb-ud-din Aibak—he was brought up as a slave—who occupied Delhi in 1193 and appointed a son of Prithviraja (who was executed) as governor at Ajmer in return for a tribute. Two years later Mohammd Ghori returned to deal with the raja of Kanauj and Benares and, after defeating him, the Muslim forces added the Hindu kingdom to their expanding dominion in India. Mohammad Ghori destroyed many Hindu monuments in Benares and wrecked the Buddhist society. In the meantime, his Muslim generals captured Badaun and Awadh. In 1199, Bakhtiar Khilji, who had been assigned lands in Awadh, with his son Ikhtiyar-ud-din Mohammad Khilji and a number of new soldiers, invaded Bihar and conquered all of its southern part. Aibak conferred the conquered territory upon the Khiljis. This encouraged Mohammad Khilji to go further east. He marched into Bengal where he defeated the Sena king and conquered the kingdom in 1202: Bengal was now part of the Ghori kingdom. Aibak moved from Delhi to the Jat territory (Bundelkhand) in 1203, decimated the Hindu forces, destroyed temples and took slaves.

After his victory over the raja of Kanauj, Mohammad Ghori went back to Ghazni to attend the affairs of Central Asia. When his brother Ghias-ud-din Mohammd died in 1203 he succeeded him as master of a large dominion in India as well. In 1205 Mohammad Ghori suffered defeat at the hands of the Turks and rumours spread that he was killed. A renegade raja in the Salt Range organised a rebellion and the rebels plundered Lahore, defeated the governor of Multan and prevented remittance of revenue from the Punjab to Ghazni. Mohammad Ghori left Ghazni for India in late 1205 and, joined by Aibak and his Indian army, crushed the rebellion. Ghori arrived in Lahore in early 1206. On his way to Ghazni to deal with the affairs of Central Asia, probably an Ismaili zealot stabbed him to death somewhere in Jhelum district. Others had taken Ghori's empire in the west, but in India Delhi became the capital of the Turkish Sultanate. At his death, almost all of northern India was under Muslim rule and he left behind a group of capable officers. He had no regrets that he was without a son: all of the slaves whom he had brought up and trained were his sons and they proved their mettle after his departure. It is fair to suggest that Mohammad Ghori was the founder of a Muslim empire in India.

Several factors seem to have contributed to the success of Muslims in India. For one thing, the Hindu rajas could not muster a united front: they were fragmented and jealous of each other's power. On the Muslim side, a united group of devoted and capable generals and officers followed a determined leader. They amply demonstrated their determination and capabilities on the battlefields even after setbacks. Their strategies and tactics were far superior to those of the Hindu generals. There was also the difference between the two cavalries: nimble-footed Central Asian horses versus the slow-moving Indian elephants. There is no doubt that distance from home and religious zeal contributed a great deal to the performance of Muslim armies comprising Turks, Tajiks, and Afghans. The consolidation of Muslim rule in India was also helped by the influx of Muslim refugees from Central Asia in the wake of the Mongol invasion of that region and the devastation it caused. The immigrants made India their home and gave their best in the service of Muslim rulers. This was a recurring theme for centuries to come.

The 'Slave' Dynasty (1206-1290)

Mohammad Ghori's generals Aibak and Khilji took over where the Ghori chief had left. Qutb-ud-din Aibak took the title of Sultan after the death of Ghori in early 1206. He was the first independent Sultan (king) of Delhi and founder of the 'Slave' dynasty—he was originally a slave and the rulers who followed him were either slaves or descendents of slaves—that lasted until 1290. In the meantime, Mohammad Khilji took over eastern U.P., Bihar, Bengal, and Assam. He tried to take Tibet, but his adventure there failed; he died in shame probably in 1206. Aibak died playing polo in AD 1210, but left two great landmarks in Delhi: the Qutub mosque and the Qutub minar (tower). He was considered a very generous monarch. Aibak established marriage alliances with the rival chiefs: he gave his daughter in marriage to Shams-ud-din Iltitmish, one of Aibak's foremost slaves and a prominent commander. A son of Aibak (Aram) succeeded him as Sultan at Delhi, but was removed because of his incompetence. The nobles placed on the throne his sister's husband Iltitmish in 1211.

Sultan Shams-ud-din Iltitmish ruled the Delhi Sultanate until 1236. In the beginning he had to spend much of his time fighting his rivals in Bengal, Sindh and Multan and also some Hindu rajas. Iltitmish took his own time, but eventually overcame all of his opponents: by 1226 he had recovered all of the territories lost earlier and subdued the rivals. He not only brought under control the territory (Bengal and Gwalior) of his late master (Aibak), but added Sindh and Malwa to his Sultanate. It was during his reign that the great Mongol warrior Chengiz Khan (1155-1227), after devastating Central Asia, entered into India in 1221, but did not cross the Indus. At his death, Chengiz Khan left a Mongol dominion extending from the Pacific to the Black Sea. His movement through Central Asia, and the turmoil it caused ('the supreme catastrophe of Islam') forced many Muslims of Central Asia, Khorasan and Afghanistan to find refuge in India. The influx of these refugees, tragic though their condition was, contributed much to the consolidation of Muslim rule in India. Mercifully, Iltitmish escaped the wrath of the Mongol Khans; but the Sultans who followed him, especially Balban and Ala-ud-din Khilji, had to devote much attention and resources to avert the Mongol menace.

Since Aibak did not have the time to establish an administrative system in the conquered territories in India, Iltitmish laid down the foundation and built the basic structure. Sultan Iltitmish first studied much literature on Muslim statecraft and the government at Ghazni. Then he used his mild temperament, statesmanship and organisational skills to accomplish the task. He divided the central government into various departments and, given the occupation of large tracts of land by the nobles (officers and commanders), he established a loosely knit decentralised system. Iltitmish also expanded the city of Delhi to accommodate its rising population, built proper amenities and adorned the capital: he completed the Qutub minar in 1232, extended the Quwwat-i-Islam mosque and constructed a large reservoir for water supply to the residents. The Sultan paid special attention to the royal coinage as an important symbol of sovereignty: he adopted silver takka (tanka), precursor of modern rupiah (rupee), as the standard coin, discarded Hindu symbols and introduced Arabic inscription with the names of the Caliph and Sultan as 'Helper of the Commander of the Faithful'.

That he was open-minded is reflected by his decision not to be hostile to Hindus—he treated them as dhimmis like the people of the book—and he educated and groomed his daughter Razia as much as his sons. It seems that some of Iltitmish's courtiers, particularly his wazir Nizam-ul-mulk Junaidi whose wise counsel the Sultan took seriously and often followed, served him well.

In 1229, Iltitmish managed to receive the title of 'Sultan-i-Azam' from Mustansir Billah, the Abbasid Caliph at Baghdad. This gave him formal legitimacy against the claims of Ghazni and also silenced his local rivals. He was a devotee of Sufi saints, particularly Khwaja Qutb-ud-din Bakhtiar Kaki of Baghdad. In passing, the Sufi fraternities, especially of the Suhrawardi and Chishti silsilahs (orders), established themselves in India mainly during the Slave and Khilji dynasties. These Sufis and their followers played an important role in the development of the Indo-Muslim thought and practice, particularly in the context of Hindu-Muslim relations. In 1234, some Ismailis attempted to assassinate Iltitmish to re-establish their faith as the state religion, but the Sultan managed to escape to safety. Muslim historians have much admired this Sultan because of his stable and generous character.

Iltitmish died of natural causes in the spring of 1236. His eldest son had died during his lifetime so apparently in his last days the Sultan was much concerned about a successor. He had other sons, but without talents and competence, and a talented and able daughter Razia. Iltitmish had once left Razia in-charge of the capital when he went to Gwalior in 1231and was so impressed by her performance in his long absence that he thought of proclaiming her as his heir. But he stopped at that, maybe because of the opposition from his Turk nobles to this novel idea. Iltitmish died before he could make a final decision. His eldest surviving son, Rukn-ud-din Firuz, ascended the throne with the support of army commanders, but started squandering public money and abusing power. The provincial governors revolted against this behaviour and the wazir Nizam-ul-mulk, who was a Tajik, joined the rebels. Other Tajik nobles were equally disgusted. The Turkish soldiers accompanying the Sultan on his march west from Delhi were so enraged by the Tajik attitude that they massacred all Tajik notables present at the royal camp near Karnal. The Tajiks were Persian-speaking Turks who had made

significant contribution to the early Muslim state at Delhi by their intellect and literary skills. The massacre deprived the state of services of some of the illustrious men and impoverished its intellectual environment.

Razia made a bold bid for the throne while Firuz's men were engaged in the bloodbath: she appeared before the worshippers in the grand mosque at Delhi on a Friday and asked them to give her a chance to prove her mettle as the new ruler. The audacious gesture gained support from many, Firuz was imprisoned on his return, later put to death, and Razia ascended the throne. The problem was that her accession was effected without approval of the provincial governors, the wazir and prominent nobles. Some of the public acts and behaviour of Razia did not help her cause either: some of her senior appointments were as unacceptable as was her severity and the act of discarding the veil. All of this turned the public against her. In Bhatinda on her way to deal with the rebels, she was imprisoned and her Abyssinian 'Master of the Horse' was murdered. She married Altuniyah the rebel governor to weather the storm. But it did not help. Her half-brother Muiz-ud-din Bahram was proclaimed as the new Sultan in Delhi. Bahram gave the young Ulugh Khan Balban—his talents would later carry him to the throne of Delhi—the task of dealing with Razia and her husband's troops which he did with great success. Balban defeated Razia and some Hindus murdered both her and her husband in 1240. Razia's four years were as turbulent as the period following her death. During her reign, the Ismailis made another bid for power: in 1237 more than a thousand zealots entered the grand mosque at Delhi and fell upon the congregation murdering many. However, the troops of Turkish nobles managed to overpower and kill the insurgents.

The nobility had acquired much influence in its selection of Iltitmish as the Sultan in preference to the son of Aibak; its influence became more marked after the death Iltitmish. The issue was about the right and power of the nobility to determine the choice of Sultan and set limits to his powers. That Bahram was put on the throne in place of Razia with the stipulation that his deputy and the wazir would control the 'disposal of state of affairs' was a novel experiment which did not work. The problem was that the deputy, Malik Ikhtiar-ud-din Aetkin,

assumed unprecedented power threatening the monarch who in turn arranged the murder of the deputy and attempted murder of the wazir. But that was not the end of the struggle. The nobles reacted against the monarch and through a well-organised conspiracy deposed Bahram in 1242. One of the leading nobles tried to ascend the throne, but others repudiated him and chose Iltitmish's grandson Ala-ud-din Masud as the new Sultan. The nobles continued to fight each other for power at the court and they appointed Balban to the key post of Amir-i-Hajib. Masud continued as Sultan for over four years with some success. But when he tried to curb the power of the Turkish amirs (nobles) he lost the throne in the summer of 1246. The nobles, with Balban playing a leading role, put Iltitmish's youngest son, Nasir-ud-din Mahmud, on the throne.

Nasir-ud-din Mahmud managed to last on the Delhi throne for 20 years (1246-1265). The Sultan shared much of his power with his father-in-law, Ulugh Khan Balban—he was one of the 40 slaves attached to Iltitmish. The masters of Aibak, Iltitmish and Balban had manumitted the three slaves. The Sultanate of Delhi suffered grievously during the civil war that lasted for ten years after Iltitmish died. Mongols crossed the Indus and sacked Lahore in 1241. They harried central Punjab, Multan and Sindh for a number of years before leaving India. In the east, Bengal and Bihar became independent. To the south of Delhi, the Hindus wrested many Muslim strongholds and their resistance intensified in Katehr and the Gangetic Doab. Gwalior and Ranthambhor were lost during the reign of Razia. Internally the leading men contesting for absolute power greatly weakened the administrative structure built by Iltitmish. Eventually Balban emerged as the strong man, with character and talents, who dealt successfully with the internal strife, fought back the Mongol menace, crushed the Hindu resurgence, and made far-reaching changes in the system of government. Although Balban would ascend the throne in 1265, he exercised much power during the reign of Nasir-ud-din Mahmud. While the acute conflict between the Sultan and nobles ended after the accession of Nasir-ud-din Mahmud, complete order was not restored in spite of the measures taken by Balban. There was at least one attempt to dislodge Balban by one of the non-Turkish nobles in league with the Queen mother. Also, some Turk-

ish nobles and governors of Multan and Uch tried to persuade Helugu (Halaku) Khan (1217-1265), a grandson of Chengiz Khan and the wrecker of Muslim power in the Middle East, to invade the Sultanate more fully. This did not happen thanks to the measures taken by Balban. One of the much cited documents, *Tabaqat-i-Nasiri* by the historian Minhaj-us-Siraj, was written in the reign of Nasir-ud-din Mahmud.

Balban, who took the title, Ghias-ud-din, ascended the throne in 1265 and ruled for about 31 years. He was from a noble Turkish family of Central Asia, but was carried away and sold as slave in Baghdad during the Mongol devastation. In 1232, he reached Delhi where Iltitmish purchased him and appointed him as personal attendant. Balban rose to prominence in 1240 by successfully accomplishing his task in dealing with Razia and her supporters. He was raised to the post of 'Master of the Horse', then Ala-ud-din Masud appointed him as Amir-i-Hajib in 1244, and finally in 1246 Nasir-ud-din Mahmud gave him the most powerful position in the realm in which he remained until ascending the throne.

Balban faced at least three challenges: defend the realm against foreign aggression, crush the internal insurgents and opponents, and reorganise the administration. He was ruthless in eliminating his rivals; he brought the Hindu rebels in the Doab in his control and settled the Afghans in the garrisons; and he suppressed a rebellion by a Turkish noble in Bengal. Mongols were beaten back by Balban who then feted an embassy from Halaku Khan in 1260. Balban provided refuge to many Turkish nobles displaced by the Mongol invasions of Central Asia. Iltitmish had established a loosely decentralised system of government, treating the fief-holders as peers in sharing power. Balban changed this system completely; no more royal modesty and horizontal comradeship, but an assertive kingship with a rigid hierarchy. He regarded kingship next only to prophethood. To provide strength to the Sultan, Balban reorganised the army and strengthened it. He also took measures to enhance the awe and majesty of his court. He broke the power of nobles by means other than noble, including poison and assassin's dagger. But Balban was known for personal piety, though he did not like ulema to interfere in the affairs of state. The interest of the realm was above con-

sideration for religion; all measures, whether sanctioned by Islamic law or not, were legitimate to defend the public (i.e. his) interest.

Balban is very highly regarded by historians for his justice and impartiality. While Iltitmish honoured the Sufis, Balban reserved his highest honours for ulema, jurists, and the literati, the polymath Sufi Amir Khusrau (1253-1325) was one of them. Balban died a broken man at a very old age. He suffered a severe blow by the death of his son and heir-apparent Mohammad Khan who was slain in an encounter with the Mongols in 1285. This loss was unbearable for the stern and disciplined Balban. He designated his other son Bughra Khan as the heir-apparent and recalled him from Bengal, but the new heir was happier in Bengal and returned without permission. That was the last straw: Balban died soon after this event in 1287. On his deathbed, the Sultan named Kaikhusrau, son of Mohammad Khan, as his heir, but some influential nobles disregarded the king's will and put Qaiqubad, a 17-year old son of Bughra Khan, on the throne. The new Sultan had no inclination to be a king, given his devotion to excessive leisure and extravagant entertainment. His behaviour disgusted even his father, who came from Bengal to confront his son in combat, but better counsel prevailed and they met in a friendly way. Bughra Khan's advice to his son was to mend his ways. His son tried but failed and was soon paralysed. This opened a new struggle among the Turkish and Khilji nobles. The Slave dynasty ended because there was no heir fit for the throne. One of Balban's grandsons, Qaiqubad, tried but failed utterly and was murdered in 1290. Bughra Khan's descendents were able to rule Bengal for another forty years. Sir Wolseley Haig had this to say about the Slave kings:

> On the whole it may be assumed that the rule of slave kings…. was as just and humane as that of Norman Kings of England and far more tolerant that that of Philip II in Spain and the Netherlands.

The Khilji Dynasty (1290-1320)

After Qaiqubad's murder, in the ongoing struggle among the nobles, Firuz Khilji, a high official of the Khilji tribe, came out at the top and ascended the throne in the summer of 1290. That brought to end the 85-year rule of the Slave dynasty in northern India. Khiljis were Turks by origin, but because of their earlier migration from Turkestan they were erroneously regarded as non-Turkish and treated by Turks as inferior. Khiljis were an important part of the Muslim community in India since the days of Muhammad Ghori: they were the ones who saved his life in the first battle at Tarain and it was Muhammad bin Bakhtiar Khilji who added Bihar and Bengal to the Indo-Muslim empire. While Balban was able to contain the Turk-Khilji tensions, they resurfaced after his death. With the rise of Khiljis the Muslim government in India stopped to be a close preserve of the Turkish aristocracy: high positions were attained by not only Khijis but Hindustani (Indian) Muslims as well. While the Khilji rule lasted for only 30 years, its success brought about a social revolution and enabled the Sultanate to expand to the south with increased manpower.

Firuz Khilji took the title of Malik Jalal-ud-din Khilji, but his appointment was not popular—though a proven soldier and administrator but quite old—and he had to reside outside Delhi. Jalal-ud-din was regarded as too lenient even to thugs! However, he managed to defeat the Mongols in 1292; some of the Mongols converted to Islam and settled in India. The Sultan was surrounded by many plotters, among them his own nephew and son-in-law, Ala-ud-din Khilji, being the most active, who was much troubled by an unhappy domestic life. Ala-ud-din launched an expedition into Malwa, then crossing the Vindhyas, penetrated deep into the heart of the Deccan (Devagiri kingdom). He looted enormous treasure from Hindus, with no intention of sharing it with the Sultan. Ala-ud-din had undertaken this expedition without royal authority, but Jalal-ud-din Khilji was persuaded to meet his nephew at Kara (Allahabad). The lure of the riches of Devagiri blinded the Sultan who proceeded by boat to Kara to meet with Ala-ud-din who treacherously killed his uncle. The assassin bought the support of the army and the public at Delhi and ascended the throne in 1296.

Ala-ud-din proved to be a man without moral scruples; he was crafty, ruthless and cruel in his dealings with rebels and enemies alike; he killed everyone he thought could compete for the throne, not sparing even women and children. His view of kingship was simple: state, which meant Sultan, stood above the law of Islam. But Ala-ud-din was also a bold and resourceful general and capable administrator. He and his generals expanded his realm to Gujarat and some of the Rajput territories. Ala-ud-din's reign of 20 years can be divided into three phases. In the first eight years, he defeated the Mongols, conquered the Hindu kingdom of Gujarat, and reduced the Rajput strongholds of Ranthambhor, Chittor, etc. In the next five years, he focused on reforming the administration and securing his realm from inside. In the last phase, he completed the conquest of south India for which he had prepared the ground by his conquests in Central India and the annexation of Malwa. Ala-ud-din and his deputy Malik Kafur, a Hindu convert, managed to expand their conquests to the southern tip of the Peninsula. Their conquests of Gujarat, Devagiri and the south yielded massive treasure and loot that the Sultan used to strengthen his army and secure his realm. Zia-ud-din Barani's *Tarikh-i-Firuz Shahi* and Amir Khusrau's *Tarikh-i-Alai* are the two main sources of Ala-ud-din's many conquests in India. Ala-ud-din did not administer all of his dominion directly: he absorbed some areas but others he left to the local rajas in return for payment of annual tribute.

Ala-ud-din's conquests, ruthlessness, cruelty and organised intelligence gathering about his nobles and rebels should not diminish or eclipse his administrative reforms, care for the public food, and patronage of the literati, ulema and Sufis. He reformed his army, led by nobles of his choice, and paid in cash from the central treasury; he used an elaborate system of communication and intelligence for the army on the move. In the civil service, the Sultan introduced a system of selection of the ablest of men on whom the monarch could rely. Ala-ud-din introduced a land revenue system, extracting about one-half of the produce, based on land measurement. Some of its features did not survive the Sultan; the Afghan Sher Shah Suri incorporated them in the sixteenth century. He also tried to control prices of food grains, obtained from peasants as land revenue in kind, for which he main-

tained stores and used a rationing system to provide food to the needy. His price control system was flexible since he could use the vast stores of grain to affect the price. In the field of culture, Ala-ud-din used the riches from conquests to provide funds for architectural monuments and patronise religious and secular leaders and institutions. The development and promotion of Indian music was particularly impressive, thanks to the arrival of Hindu musicians from the south and contributions by men like Amir Khusrau. Similarly literature was patronised and much good work was done during Ala-ud-din's reign, though the Sultan was not well-versed in reading or writing. There was also revival of Sufism because of the efforts of Nizam-ud-din Auliya, a disciple of Baba Farid (of Pakpattan), who devoted most of his time to the spiritual uplift of Muslims rather than conversion of non-Muslims.

Amir Kafur enjoyed great power under Ala-ud-din—persuaded the Sultan to exclude his eldest son Khidr Khan from succession—and may have finally killed the Sultan in 1316. He put on the throne an infant son of Ala-ud-din, blinded, imprisoned and killed the rest of the family, including Khidr Khan and his brother. But Malik Kafur and his associates were killed by the palace (slave) guards in only 35 days after the event. One of the sons of Ala-ud-din, Qutb-ud-din, managed to escape and enthroned himself after blinding the infant Sultan in two months. The new Sultan took the title of Mubarak Shah. He had a rotten character and was eventually killed in 1320 by one of his own minions, Hassan or Khusrau Khan (a Hindu convert from Gujarat), aided by his outcast brethren. The usurper Khusrau Khan ascended the throne, put to death remainder of the family of Ala-ud-din and tried bribes and gifts for legitimacy. But most Muslims did not like what he did to the royal family and were highly suspicious of Khusrau Khan's companions because of their anti-Muslim behaviour. All of this offended the Muslim nobles and their leader Ghazi Malik, a Turk noble and governor of Dipalpur (Punjab), defeated and beheaded Khusrau Khan near Delhi in the fall of 1320. Since the low-caste usurper had extinguished the family of Ala-ud-din Khilji, the nobles asked Ghazi Malik, a title given to him for his victorious campaigns against the Mongols, to ascend the throne. He ascended the throne with the title of Ghias-ud-din Tughlaq Shah.

The Tughlaq Dynasty (1321-1414)

Ghias-ud-din Tughlaq Shah was born in India to a Turkish slave of Balban and his mother was a Jat woman. Tughlaq Shah founded a new (Tughlaq) dynasty. He reasserted the central authority to bring order after the death of Ala-ud-din, dealt with rebellious chiefs and annexed more territory in the south. His son Jauna Khan (also known as Mohammad) recaptured most of the Deccan. Amir Khusrau said many good things about him. Nizam-ud-din Auliya and Amir Khusrau lived and died in Delhi during the reign of Tughlaq Shah, but the Sultan did not have amiable relations with Auliya. He was a man of liberal and mild disposition. Historians have much good to say about his system of justice and administration and his treatment of cultivators. Ghias-ud-din died in 'Tughlaqabad' outside Delhi in 1325. According to ibn-Battuta (1304-1368), the renowned Moroccan (Berber) world-traveller, his son Mohammad planned his father's death and made it look like it was accidental.

Mohammad bin Tughlaq, known as the bloody (khooni) Mohammad, ascended the throne through cunning and bribery, following the footsteps of Ala-ud-din Khilji. He was an unusually strange Sultan 'shedding blood and giving presents': a cold-blooded murderer and a generous man. Mohammad Tughlaq wrought untold misery during his long reign. Some of the material misery was due to the long drought: there were no rains for seven long years with widespread famine. Mohammad Tuglaq was not entirely evil: he established hospitals and charity homes, and showed great generosity to Muslim scholars. He was simultaneously the 'humblest' of men and intense egotist. He was also a great writer in Persian and Arabic and had a thorough knowledge of Greek philosophy, logic and sciences (mathematics and medicine). He followed Islamic rituals quite regularly and abstained from alcohol and debauchery. Mohammad Tughlaq was also reasonably tolerant to Hindus and Jains, unlike his nephew Firuz Shah who followed him. However, he adopted a hostile attitude towards the Sufis in Delhi; many left the capital and others were forced to leave. Political considerations were probably the major reason for his anti-Sufi policy, but his association with philosophers and sceptics may have also played a role. Mohammad

Tughlaq was gallant in war, but his intoxication to power overwhelmed his judgement and character. His tyranny eventually broke the Sultanate of Delhi.

In the early years of his reign (1327), Mohammad Tughlaq moved the capital from Delhi to Devagiri (Daulatabad) in the Deccan, some 1,100 KM south of Delhi, to deal with repeated rebellions in the south. Daulatabad was a 'monument of misdirected energy', a very cruel and expensive adventure involving much loss of life and waste of resources. Mohammad Tughlaq had to move back to Delhi in just two years. Similarly, his change of coinage to copper from gold and silver brought tremendous economic dislocation: merchants did not like it and the government could not control the circulation of counterfeit coins. The purpose of this change was to deal with the shortage of funds in the treasury due to the prolonged famine and waste. The Sultan had to revert to the silver and gold coins in about four years, but the token currency had done much damage to the economy and his reputation. ibn-Battuta came to India in around 1333, stayed for over six years, and worked as the Chief Qazi (Judge) in the Tughlaq court. He retired in 1347 and left a rather sunny portrait of Mohammad Tughlaq.

By 1337, the unprecedented empire of Mohammad Tughlaq was starting to collapse. Rebellions and revolts became the order of the day after 1334: the empire built by Ala-ud-din and Ghias-ud-din started to break up. Rebellions in Multan, Gujarat and the Deccan, followed by cruel punishments, became a routine affair. Revenue farming only added fuel to the fire. Bengal separated completely in 1338. It was during his reign that Vijayanagar was established (1336) as the centre of a Hindu empire in the south: by1346 it had become an important power. The other development in the south was the founding of the Bahmani kingdom in 1347 with its capital at Gulbarga (Ahsanabad). Zafar Khan, an Afghan or Turk commander of the Sultan, rebelled against his master in the Deccan and took the title Abu Muzaffar Ala-ud-din Bahman Shah. In the meantime, the besieged Sultan managed to receive sanction from the Caliph in Cairo as his vicegerent in India and minted coins in caliph's name. Mohammad Tughlaq's last move was from Gujarat to Sindh to face another rebel where he succumbed to fever and died near Thatta in 1351. His misguided policies and cruelty destroyed

the supremacy of Delhi Sultanate. As an epithet, Abd-ul-Qadir Badauni (1540-1615) had this to say about Mohammad Tughlaq: 'The Sultan was freed from his people, and the people from their Sultan.'

At his death, his nobles, Hindus at the court and religious leaders decided to put on the throne the deceased Sultan's first cousin Firuz Shah, son of Ghias-ud-din Tughlaq's younger brother Rajab. At the same time, in Delhi Khwaja Jahan, a deputy of Mohammad Tughlaq, proclaimed a boy as the son of the late Sultan. There was a brief period of disorder and confusion. But Firuz Shah was able to bring back the army to Delhi and settled as the new Sultan. He was completely different from his predecessor: he was of a religious disposition and tried to run the government according to the Sharia (Islamic Law). Firuz Shah's rule, which was generally peaceful with general prosperity, lasted for nearly 37 years. He was not a great warrior and avoided war against rival Muslim rulers as much as he could. Firuz Shah's expeditions to Sindh and Bengal show that he was not a good general. He was soft in temper and benevolent and did not like torture.

Firuz Shah was a bigoted ruler, persecuted Hindus and tried to impose the Sharia throughout the Sultanate on Muslims and non-Muslims alike. He imposed the poll tax (jizya) on Brahmins and bribed the Hindus to accept Islam by removing the tax. He took much pride in acquiring slaves for service and converting them to Islam. Firuz Shah twice received the approval of Caliph in Cairo as his Deputy in India. But Firuz Shah is remembered more for the measures he adopted to enhance public welfare and general prosperity. Instead of wasting resources on expensive military expeditions, he put all of his energy to increase wealth in the realm. He initiated irrigation schemes (canals) to improve agriculture and established employment and marriage bureaus. Firuz Shah was also a great builder: he built several new cities (Jaunpur, Fatehabad, Hissar, Firuzpur near Badaun and Firuzabad not far from Delhi); he restored or built mosques, forts, palaces, hospitals, baths, bridges, gardens, and irrigation canals. Firuz Shah has received unanimous admiration for his kindness and sense of justice. He released people unfairly imprisoned by Mohammad Tughlaq, paid indemnity to the relatives of those who were wrongly put to death, and restored estates wrongful-

ly confiscated. But his indiscriminate generosity and concessions may have contributed to the dismemberment of Delhi Sultanate.

Firuz Shah died in 1388 at the age of about 83 years. He had left much of the court work in the hands of Khan Jahan Maqbool, son of a Hindu convert, and failed to prepare his sons for succession. There was much confusion following the Sultan's death: in the wars of succession, his son Nasir-ud-din Mohammad succeeded to the throne in 1389, but died of ill health in 1394. The last ruler of the Tuglaq dynasty was the youngest son of Mohammad, Nasir-ud-din Mahmud. All the successors to Firuz Shah were weaklings and utterly incompetent to save the Sultanate: they were mere puppets in the hands of unscrupulous nobles. There were six reigns in the decade that followed the death of Firuz Shah. The result was that the Sultanate was fractured and regional rulers, both Muslim and Hindu, firmly established themselves in the saddle. After ten years of turmoil and misrule, in 1398 Amir Taimur or Tamerlane (1336-1405), one of the most terrible warriors (a terrorist *par excellence*) known to history, invaded India. Taimur (a Barlas Turk) had attained the throne at Samarqand in 1369. The lure of wealth of India, battle against infidels and the power vacuum were probably good reasons for his invasion. In passing, Taimur had earlier inflicted a heavy blow upon the power and prestige of the Turkish (Ottoman) Emperor in the west. With a large army Taimur crossed the Indus and two of its tributaries, sacked Punjab, and descended upon Delhi toward the end of 1398. Sultan Mahmud Tughlaq, grandson of Firuz Shah, and Mallu Iqbal tried to resist, but both were defeated and fled to Gujarat.

Taimur occupied Delhi and proclaimed himself as King. Resistance invited massacre. For at least five days, Delhi was given to pillage, rapine and butchery on unprecedented scale. Taimur had probably no intention of staying in India. The cruel invader, on his way back, killed in Meerut and Hardwar as many people as he could and left India through the Punjab and Jammu 'leaving anarchy, famine, and pestilence behind.' In short, Taimur completed the dissolution of Tughlaq Sultanate. His raid left no semblance of government in northern India: Mahmud Tughlaq returned to Delhi to remain a puppet Sultan and several of his Hindu and Muslim chieftains divided the rest of his Sultanate among themselves. Mahmud Tughlaq died in 1413 after a nominal sovereignty

of about 20 years. The Tughlaq dynasty of Ghias-ud-din came to an ignominious end at Mahmud's death.

The 'Sayyid' Dynasty (1414-1451)

The Tughlaq rule had started to disintegrate after the death of Firuz Shah in 1388 and Taimur's invasion was the last tragic episode. Bengal had long been independent. Khwaja Jahan was the ruler of Kanauj, Awadh, Jaunpur, Bihar, Sandila, Bahraich, and Kara (Allahabad). In Gujarat, Muzaffar Shah owed allegiance to no one. In Malwa, Dilawar Khan was the ruler. Khizr Khan held the Punjab and upper Sindh with Taimur and his son. The nobles at Delhi acknowledged Daulat Khan Lodhi, an Afghan noble, as the ruler of Delhi, but he lasted for only few months. Khizr Khan wrested the Delhi throne from Daulat Khan in 1414 and sent him to prison. He became the ruler of the principality and founder of the Sayyid dynasty. Khizr Khan claimed, most probably falsely, descent from the Prophet of Islam. He united Delhi with the Punjab and ruled as viceroy of Taimur's son Shah Rukh to whom he paid tribute. Other parts of the Sultanate were independent and the Hindu rajas of Doab and Katehr also revolted and withheld tribute. Khizr Khan died in 1421 and was followed by his son Mubarak Shah as the ruler of Delhi principality (Yahya bin Ahmad Sirhindi's *Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi*). He remained preoccupied throughout his reign with the Khokar rebellion in the Punjab which threatened even Delhi.

The Muslim nobles killed Mubarak Shah in 1434 and put on the throne Mohammad, a grandson of Khizr Khan. Bahlul Khan Lodhi, governor of Lahore and Sirhind, came to help the new Sultan against Mahmud Shah of Malwa. Mohammad Shah's relations with Bahlul were uncertain because the latter had his eyes fixed on the throne of Delhi. Mohammad Shah came to the same end as his uncle: some of his nobles assassinated him in 1446. His son, Ala-ud-din Alam Shah, succeeded him, but his realm extended from 'Delhi to Palam'. Alam Shah retired permanently to Badaun, a place he liked more than Delhi, and his wazir and other nobles at the court invited Bahlul Khan Lodhi to Delhi. He responded with alacrity and ascended the throne in 1451.

There ended the Sayyid dynasty and the Lodhis took over what was left of the Delhi Sultanate, a small principality surrounded by other independent Hindu principalities. Bahlul wrote a letter to Alam Shah who replied that 'he himself freely and cheerfully resigned his throne to Bahlul as to an elder brother.' Alam Shah maintained a small court at Badaun until his death in 1478.

The Lodhi (Afghan) Dynasty (1451-1526)

Bahlul Khan was an Afghan of the Lodhi tribe. Thus for the first time in India's history an Afghan came to occupy the throne at Delhi. Bahlul started his rule over a mere fragment of the Delhi kingdom, but he was determined to restore the strength of the Sultanate. He was ambitious, energetic, vigilant, and a determined warrior. He spared no opportunity to expand his dominion. One of his first acts in Delhi to secure himself was to remove the wazir, Hamid Khan, who had invited him to the throne in the first place. But he was patient with his Afghan tribesmen and tried to run the government as a tribal chief. He subdued several Muslim and Hindu principalities and reduced to submission some of the provincial chieftains and fief-holders. He restored the prestige of Muslim power in India and infused vigour into his expanded kingdom, which extended from the foot of the mountains to Benares in the east and at the border of Bundelkhand in the south. He defeated the Sharqi Sultan of Jaunpur and reduced Dholpur and Gwalior whose rajas had become virtually independent. Bahlul Khan is admired for his modesty, kindness to the poor, respect for the learned, and sharing power and prosperity with his relatives and fellow tribesmen. He died of natural causes after a 38-year reign in the midst of intrigues for succession among his sons Barbak and Nizam.

After Bahlul's death in 1489, the nobles chose Nizam Khan who took the title of Sultan Sikandar Ghazi Shah, though on behalf of Barbak Khan some disputed his succession. The new Sultan expelled his brother to Jaunpur where he also quelled a rebellion. Then he expelled Sultan Sharqi from Bihar where he had taken refuge. He reached a peaceful settlement with Ala-ud-din Husain Shah of Bengal. Sikandar restored

Agra and, after spending four years at Sambhal to reorganise the administration of the trans-Gangetic province, shifted his capital from Delhi to Sikandra, a suburb of Agra named after him and a resting place for the Mughal Emperor Akbar. Sikandar Shah was the ablest of the three rulers of this dynasty. He stabilised the kingdom left by his father and improved the efficiency of his government, thus maintaining peace and ushering prosperity. He inherited from his father some fine qualities, but he also wrote Persian verses unlike his father. He patronised learning and attracted scholars to his court. While he exhibited impartiality in dispensing justice, he was not free from religious intolerance especially toward Hindus. But he also promoted mutual interest for each other's learning, language, music and medicine being the major areas. Sikandar Shah died of natural causes near Agra in 1517, striving until the end to enforce obedience on hostile chiefs.

Ibrahim Khan, eldest son of Sikandar Lodhi, succeeded him, and managed to eliminate his younger brother Jalal Khan in Jaunpur. Ibrahim Lodhi was able to capture Gwalior after Raja Man Singh's death. He possessed military skill, but lacked good sense and moderation that ultimately brought his ruin. His repressive measures against powerful nobles led to much hostility and disloyalty of the Afghan nobility. Ibrahim increased his repression and alienated the semi-independent Afghans in Bihar and Lahore. Among the disgruntled Afghan nobles, his uncle and governor of Lahore, Daulat Khan Lodhi sent invitation to Babur, the Taimurid ruler of Kabul, to invade India. After several indecisive incursions, Babur started his final invasion toward the end of 1525. In the spring of 1526, he decisively defeated and killed Ibrahim Lodhi at Panipat. I should add in passing that in the reigns of both Sikandar and Ibrahim grain was plentiful and its prices remained generally low.

Statelets at the end of the Delhi Sultanate

The end of Delhi Sultanate in 1526 had its beginning in the last days of Mohammad bin Tughlaq. As soon as the central authority began to weaken, thanks to the weaknesses of successive Sultans, the centrifugal

tendencies, so common in the history of India, were unleashed. A number of independent principalities and kingdoms—they included Bengal, Jaunpur, Malwa, Gujarat, Kashmir, Khandesh, and the five Bahmani kingdoms of the Deccan (Berar, Ahmadnagar, Bijapur, Golkunda, and Bidar)—sprouted on the ruins of Delhi Sultanate. Besides these, the great Hindu empire of Vijayanagar in south India managed to stay independent of the Turko-Afghan Sultanate for almost 300 years. The other Hindu kingdoms were Orissa, Mewar, and Nepal. In what follows, I give a brief account of the emergence and growth of several regional statelets that were to play an important role in the history of India after the arrival of the Mughal invaders.

A. Eastern India: Bengal

Bengal was always relatively independent and divided in fourteenth century between three or four Muslim rulers. Ultimately Haji Ilyas (known as Shams-ud-din Ilyas Shah) became the sole independent ruler of Bengal in 1345. At his death in 1357, his son, Sikandar Shah, followed him and lasted until 1393. He was killed in a fight against his son, Ghias-ud-din Azam who lasted until 1410 and was followed by his son, Saif-ud-din Hamza Shah. Raja Ganesh, a Brahmin zamindar, dislodged Saif-ud-din in just over one year. Then the Raja abdicated in favour of his son, Jadu who embraced Islam and took the title Jalal-ud-din Mohammad Shah. But he died in 1431, followed by his son, Shams-ud-din Ahmad, who reigned until 1442. Shams-ud-din was a bad ruler and killed by some of his nobles. There was struggle for power after his death, and eventually a grandson of Haji Ilyas, Nasir-ud-din was placed on the throne of Bengal as Nasir-ud-din Abul Muzaffar Mahmud Shah. He ruled peacefully for 17 years. After his death in 1460, his son Rukn-ud-din Barbak Shah ascended the throne. He employed a large number of Abyssinian slaves for his protection. Rukn-ud-din died in 1474 and succeeded by his son Shams-ud-din Yousuf Shah who reigned until 1481. His son Sikandar II did not last for long and replaced by Fateh Shah, a son of Nasir-ud-din Mahmud Shah. In 1486, some rebellious Abyssinians murdered Fateh Shah and one of the leading court eunuchs took over the throne with the title Barbak Shah, but he was soon murdered. He was replaced by

a sympathiser of Fateh Shah whose name was Indil Khan. He took the title Nasir-ud-din Mahmud Shah II, but he too was murdered in 1490. An Abyssinian managed to rule for three years. The nobles of Bengal put on the throne Ala-ud-din Husain Shah, a man of Arab descent, in 1493. His dynasty endured for 50 years. Ghias-ud-din Mahmud Shah was the last ruler of the Husain Shahi dynasty whom Sher Shah Suri expelled from Bengal in the 1540s. Eventually Mughal Emperor Akbar annexed Bengal in 1576.

B. Northern and Western India

1. Jaunpur

Firuz Shah Tughlaq founded the city of Jaunpur to perpetuate the memory of his cousin and patron Mohammad Jauna. It was here that Khwaja Jahan became independent of the Delhi Sultan, after Taimur's invasion of Delhi, and laid the foundation of the Sharqi dynasty in Jaunpur. Ibrahim Shah Sharqi, son of Khwaja Jahan, ruled Jaunpur for 34 years and is regarded as the ablest ruler. He made Jaunpur famous for Muslim learning and culture. His son, Mahmud Shah, replaced him in 1436, but who was defeated by Bahlul Khan Lodhi on the way to wrest Delhi. After Mahmud Shah's death in 1457 his son proved to be unscrupulous, was murdered and replaced by his brother Husain Shah. Bahlul Khan defeated Husain Shah, who fled to Bihar, and the Lodhi warrior annexed Jaunpur to the Delhi Sultanate. Jaunpur was regarded as the 'Shiraz of India', thanks to the general prosperity in the principality and the fine culture and architecture promoted by the Sharqi dynasty.

2. Malwa

Ala-ud-din Khilji had annexed Malwa in 1395. It continued to be governed by Muslim chiefs under the authority of Delhi, but gained independence during the disorder caused by Taimur's invasion. Dilawar Khan Ghauri, governor appointed by Firuz Shah Tughlaq, declared independence from Delhi in 1401. Dilawar Khan's son Alp Khan took over the reign in 1406. This man had a restless spirit, an adventurer and a determined warrior. He took on fights with the rajas in Orissa, Sultan at

Delhi and Muslim rulers of Jaunpur, Gujarat, and Ahmad Shah Bahmani. He died a defeated man and was succeeded by his son Ghazni Khan (assumed the title Muhammad Shah) who cared little about the affairs of the state. In 1436, his wazir, Mahmud Khan, usurped the throne and founded the Khilji dynasty at Malwa. Sultan Mahmud Khilji was the ablest ruler (1436-1469). He extended his territory and was recognised by the Caliph of Egypt. Ferishta is of full of praise for this man:

> Sultan Mahmud was polite, brave, just, and learned, and during his reign, his subjects Muslims as well as Hindus were happy and maintained a friendly intercourse with each other. Scarcely a year passed that he did not take the field, so that his tent became his home, and his resting-place in the field of battle. His leisure hours were devoted to hearing the histories and memoirs of the courts of different kings of the earth read.

Sultan Mahmud died in 1469 and was followed by his son Ghias-ud-din who was a lover of peace and devoted to piety. His two sons made his last days very unhappy by their struggle for power. One of them ascended the throne in 1500 and lasted for ten years. The second son followed his brother with the title Mahmud Shah II who expelled the Muslim nobles and appointed a Rajput Hindu as his wazir. This created much resentment among Muslim nobles who, with the help of the Muslim ruler of Gujarat, removed the Rajput minister. The Rajput ruler of Chittor invaded Malwa and the ruler of Gujarat captured Mandu; they both had grievances against Mahmud Shah II. Independence of Malwa ended in 1431 and eventually one of the commanders of Akbar annexed it in 1562.

3. Gujarat

Gujarat was an attractive area for invaders because of its ports (Surat, Broach and Cambay) and immense wealth. Ala-ud-din Khilji had annexed Gujarat in 1297 and ruled for a long time by Muslim governors appointed from Delhi. However, in 1401, governor Zafar Khan (a Rajput convert) formally assumed independence from Delhi and took the title of Sultan Muzaffar Shah. One of his sons revolted against him, who was killed by his uncle. After Muzaffar Shah's death in 1411, his grandson and heir-designate Ahmad Shah ascended the throne. Ahmad Shah

ruled for 30 years, during which time he vastly expanded his territory, improved the workings of his administration and system of justice, and built the beautiful city of Ahmadabad. But he did not show much tolerance to his Hindu subjects. His son Mohammad Shah followed him. After Mohammad Shah died peacefully in 1451, two bad successors followed him. The nobles deposed the last Sultan and put on the throne, Abul Fateh Khan, a grandson of Ahmad Shah, known as Mahmud Begarha. He proved to be the ablest ruler of his dynasty: he ruled vigorously, free from the influence of the harem and nobles, for 53 years. He was a man of valour in war, won many campaigns, and extended the boundaries of Gujarat to cover a vast area.

Toward the end of his reign, Mahmud tried, in alliance with the Sultan of Egypt, to check the rising power of the Portuguese who had monopolised the lucrative spice trade at the expense of Muslim traders in the Arabian and Red Seas. After their first defeat at the hands of the Muslim fleet, the Portuguese inflicted a decisive defeat on the joint Muslim fleet in 1509; Mahmud Begarha granted them the site for a factory at Diu. Mahmud died in 1511 and his son, Muzaffar II, succeeded him on the throne. He waged successful campaigns against the Rajputs and helped Mahmud Khilji of Malwa to regain his throne. After his death in 1526, Bahadur, one of his three sons, succeeded him. Like his grandfather, Bahadur was a determined and brave warrior: he annexed Malwa in 1531, overran the territories of the Rana of Mewar, and stormed Chittor in 1534. But the Mughal Emperor Humayun soon deprived Bahadur of Malwa and large part of Gujarat as well. Bahadur regained his Sultanate and turned his attention against the Portuguese whose help he had sought but not received against the Mughal Emperor. In 1537, the Portuguese treacherously drowned Bahadur and murdered his companions on his visit to meet with the Portuguese governor on board a ship. In the next 35 years, his weak and puppet successors weakened the state of Gujarat so much that Akbar was able to annex it to the expanding Mughal Empire in 1572.

4. Kashmir

In 1315, a Muslim adventurer from Swat, Shah Mirza entered into the service of a Hindu raja of Kashmir who died soon thereafter. Shah Mirza seized the throne in around 1346 and ruled Kashmir as Shams-ud-din Shah until his death in 1349. He managed his rule well. His three sons reigned successively for the next 46 years. Qutb-ud-din was the last of the three brothers and, after he died in 1394, his son Sikandar ascended the throne. He surrounded himself with learned Muslims from Persia, Arabia and Iraq, but he was not a man of liberal attitude. He died in 1416, followed by his two sons, one of whom dethroned the other after only a few years. The new ruler, Shahi Khan, took the title of Zain-ul-abidin, was a benevolent, liberal and enlightened Sultan. He was also a good ruler: enforced law and order through panchayats; stabilised the currency; regulated prices; lightened the tax burden; and completed public work projects. He granted complete religious freedom to Hindus, removed jizya and invited the Brahmins back to his kingdom. He had deep interest in languages—he was multi-lingual himself—and patronised literature, paintings and music. In his patronage, some of the Hindu epics were translated from Sanskrit into Persian and many Arabic and Persian books translated into Hindi. Zain-ul-abidin has been called the 'Akbar of Kashmir'. He died in 1470 and was followed by his son Haider Shah and other nominal Sultans: Kashmir was given to misrule and experienced much anarchy. Eventually, in 1540, a relative of Emperor Humayun conquered Kashmir, but some Kashmiri nobles removed him in 1551. Then the Chaks seized the throne and misruled Kashmir for several years. Emperor Akbar absorbed the troubled kingdom into his empire in 1586.

C. Southern India

1. Vijayanagar Empire

The origins of the kingdom are somewhat obscure, but it stood as a protector of Hindu religion and culture. The first two dynasties, the Sangama (1340-1486) and Saluva (1486-1505), engaged in wars against in-

ternal rivals and the Bahmani Muslim kings at the frontier to the north. Krishnadeva Raya (1510-1530) was deservedly the most famous of the Taluva dynasty: the kingdom reached its zenith during his reign. He maintained good relations with the Portuguese. The fall of Vijayanagar came after Krishnadeva's death in 1530. The successor kings got embroiled in conflicts among the Bahmani Sultanates of Bijapur, Golkunda and Ahmadnagar. The haughty conduct of the Vijayanagar army invited a joint response by the Deccan Sultanates (battle of Talikota) in 1565. In consequence, the Vijayanagar Empire suffered tremendous loss in the battle and the massive plunder of its territory that followed. The city of Vijayanagar was sacked and temples, sculptures, and other monuments were damaged, desecrated and demolished. The Hindu empire, though much damaged continued to exist until the early seventeenth century under the Aravidu dynasty that had wrested the throne in 1550. The rebellions inside the empire and the aggressions from the north continued. The last great ruler was Venkata II (1586-1614), with the exception that he allowed the founding of Mysore kingdom by Raja Ocdyar in 1612. The empire disintegrated after Venkata II: the Hindu feudatories proved to be its greatest enemies. Some of them carved out independent kingdoms of their own like the Naiks of Madura and Tanjore and the chiefs of Seringapatam and Bednur.

The rulers of Vijayanagar Empire left some brilliant cultural and artistic achievements. They were patrons of languages, fostering some of the finest literature, of poets and religious leaders. Along with the growth of culture, there was a remarkable development of art and architecture: a distinct style of architecture, sculpture and paintings by indigenous artists. The rulers, though devoted to Dharma, were not fanatics. Their attitude towards different Hindu sects and people of alien creeds, Jews, Christians and Muslims, was quite liberal.

2. Bahmani Kingdom

The Bahmani kingdom came into existence as a challenge to Mohammad bin Tughlaq and proved to be the most powerful of the independent kingdoms that arose on the ruins of Delhi Sultanate. The nobles of Deccan rebelled against the Tughlaq Sultan in Delhi: Ismail Mukh (an Afghan) proclaimed himself as the King of Deccan and took the title of

Nasir-ud-din Shah. He soon made room to Hasan (titled Zafar Khan) who was declared as the next king in 1347 and took the title Abu Muzaffar Ala-ud-din Bahman Shah. He claimed, but most probably falsely, his descent from Bahman, an ancient Persian hero, hence the name Bahmani kingdom. The first capital of the kingdom was at Gulbarga, followed by Bidar in the 1430s. Bahman Shah (Hasan) launched a career of conquests against Hindu rulers in the south. At his death, his dominion was from Daulatabad in the west to the River Krishna. He had divided the kingdom into four provinces with a governor in each of them. Hasan died in 1358 and was succeeded by his eldest son Mohammad Shah I. The new Sultan remained engaged in wars against Vijayanagar and Warangal, both of which finally submitted to the Bahmani king. The Bahmani kingdom went into disorder and decline by 1482 and the dynasty ended in 1527 after ruling for 180 years (1347-1527). From the ashes of the Bahmani kingdom there emerged five Sultanates, each known by its founder's name.

1. Imad Shahi of Berar (1484), named after Fatahullah Imad Shah. The Sultanate of Ahmadnagar absorbed it in 1574.

2. Adil Shahi of Bijapur (1489), named after Yousuf Adil Khan of the Shia sect. Emperor Aurangzeb annexed it in 1686.

3. Nizam Shahi of Ahmadnagar (1490), named after Nizam-ul-mulk Bahri. The Mughal Emperor Shahjahan annexed it in 1633.

4. Qutub Shahi of Golkunda (1518), named after Qutub Shah of the Shia sect. Emperor Aurangzeb annexed it in 1686.

5. Barid Shahi of Bidar (1527), named after Amir Ali Barid. The Sultanate of Bijapur absorbed it in 1618.

The kingdoms of Bijapur and Golkunda had some good rulers, but there was continuous quarrel with each other and wars against Vijayanagar. Generally the Deccan was in a state of war most of the time, lasting until the end of eighteenth century.

3. Sultanate of Khandesh

In 1388, after the death of Sultan Firuz Shah Tughlaq, Malik Raja an attendant of the deceased Sultan, declared himself the ruler of Khandesh, with its capital at Burhanpur, like Dilawar Khan in Malwa. Malik Raja was a liberal sovereign; he died in 1399. His son, Malik Nasir, expanded his territory but Ahmad Shah of Gujarat defeated him and he died in 1437. After two bad reigns of his son (Adil Khan I) and grandson, his great-grandson, Adil Khan II, occupied the throne in 1457. On his death in 1501, the baton passed to his brother Daud who was a bad ruler and died in 1508. Daud's son Ghazni Khan succeeded him, but he was soon poisoned and Khandesh plunged into disorder between rival factions. Eventually, Mahmud Begarha of Gujarat placed his candidate, Adil Khan III, on the throne. Adil Khan died in 1520 and his successors were not able to save the kingdom from outside aggression. In 1601, Emperor Akbar annexed the Khandesh Sultanate along with Gujarat, of which Khandesh was sometimes a dependency.

Muslims in India: Invasions and Consequences

The Delhi Sultanate lasted for over 300 years. Almost all Sultans were convinced Muslims and acted as such. Even Firuz Shah Tughlaq was not free from intolerance toward Hindus. The reigns of several Sultans offered little but bloodshed, tyranny and treachery. There were no fixed rules for succession, hence conspiracies and internecine wars. Most Sultans, including the ferocious, had taste for the Arabic and Persian literature and liked to be surrounded by men of learning and religious scholars. They were generous too for causes they liked. They introduced and patronised new architecture in which there is a mingling of the Hindu and Muslim influences.

It is hard to make authentic statements about changes in the economic and social life of people in India after the arrival of Muslim invaders and their settlement in many parts from the time of Mahmud of Ghazni to the end of the Lodhi dynasty in 1526. To begin with, In-

dian society was socially very diverse and politically fragmented: Hindus were by no means a homogeneous people. The caste and gender differences defined people's station in the economy and society. It was a hierarchical society with division of labour (profession) based largely on caste and gender. Most people were peasants and lived off the land and dependent on the moods of Nature and the superior castes for their survival. Urban life was limited to towns that had grown due to the stationing of troops, royal courts and the internal and foreign commerce. Industries were organised on small scale through guilds and crafts and a vibrant merchant class carried on the domestic trade and exchanged goods with foreign merchants (in the Middle East, Central Asia and South-East Asia) by land and sea.

The Muslim element in the population of India increased in three ways: by immigration, by conversion of non-Muslims (Hindus) with force, moral persuasion or material incentives, and by birth in India. But, unlike Sakas and Huns, Muslims were not absorbed into the Hindu caste system. Social intercourse was limited, though there was close interaction through employment of Hindus in diverse services, and the converts to Islam retained most of their old habits and some Hindu traditions. There was also influence of Islam on Hindu thinkers, absorbing monotheistic ideology and a Sufi-like view of life and relations with the deity. The waves of Muslims (Arabs, Turks and Afghans) that descended upon India were by no means monolithic, even homogeneous, in their religion and culture. They were also diverse in their professions: warriors, artisans, Sufis and mullahs, retainers, and slaves. It is also true that the religion of Islam with its associated culture were quite a new experience for the Indian society. Initially there was a wall of separation between the two cultures. However, over time, there evolved an Indo-Muslim culture reflecting conversions through coercion (by tax and occasionally force) and persuasion (by Sufis and traders) and economic interaction. It was a two-way street though: ordinary Muslims and Hindus learnt each other's ways and developed a *modus vivendi* if not complete harmony. It is fair to say that superstition, resignation and fatalism were the major forces influencing the rhythm of daily life of almost everyone from the ruler down to the peasant. Both Muslim and Hindu rulers employed in their military and civil service individuals

and groups from each other's community and they entered into military and political alliances across religious lines when deemed necessary or expedient. Deception and treachery were devices quite commonly used to meet one's objectives.

The Turk and Afghan rule was an 'arbitrary despotism', practically unchecked except by rebellion and assassination, notwithstanding the rulers' professed reverence for the Sharia (sacred law). The rulers and nobles, even those who valued learning, showed no interest in encouraging establishment and development of institutions of learning, except those that maintained a conventional or orthodox curriculum. The educated (learned) Hindus and Muslims were limited to a specific class or caste and almost all of their learning based on traditions and sciences that had not changed for centuries. The rest of the society, men, women and children, depended entirely on this class since they had neither the opportunity nor the means to become literate. By and large Muslim rulers did not interfere in many of the traditional practices or customs of Hindu society, like caste discrimination, female infanticide and burning of widows (suti). In fact, the practice of 'living behind the curtain' for women became more widely prevalent among the Hindus than it used to be.

I may add that, during the period of nearly three hundred years of the Delhi Sultans, many Hindu and Muslim men of reflection inspired ordinary people by words and deeds to live in harmony and discard divisive values or traditions. Men like Ali-Hajveri Data Ganj Bakhsh (990?-1077), Moin-ud-din Chishti (1141-1230), Qutb-ud-din Bakhtiar Kaki (1173-1235), Farid-ud-din Ganjshakar (1173-1266), Nizam-ud-din Auliya (1238-1325), Amir Khusrau (1253-1325) Swami Ramananda (1400-1476), Kabir Das (1440-1518), Guru Nanak (1469-1518), and Salim Chishti (1478-1572) professed and disseminated the universal message of unity and peace among people of diverse creeds and castes. It was also during this period that the vernacular languages, Hindi and Urdu in particular, evolved as sister languages for popular discourse unlike the more exclusive Sanskrit, Arabic, and Persian.

The economy of India changed as well, given the consumption requirements of the growing population and a disproportionately large civilian and military bureaucracy of Muslim rulers. Since land was the

most important source of food, fibre and state revenue, the landholders and peasants bore the major burden. The Muslim rulers used revenue farming as a means to extract a large part of what the peasants produced and compensated the amirs (nobles), mercenaries, civilian bureaucracy, and the court retainers for their services. What is important is that there was little if any investment in agriculture or rural areas on behalf of the rulers. Much of the public investment was concentrated in the urban centres, and for roads and communications to facilitate movement of armies and the court. A large part of the revenue extracted through taxes and cesses and the personal wealth of the ruler were devoted to the maintenance of armies and construction of forts, palaces, mosques, and tombs. Both private and state-owned industries catered to the needs of the rulers, nobility, court retainers, and town dwellers. The industries produced a large variety of manufactured goods. A chain of merchants traded products both inside India and sold abroad in exchange for commodities and bullion. Most of the population living in rural areas met its needs from local artisans and craftsmen on the basis of barter and some cash. There is almost no evidence that the standard of living of most people improved; there is some evidence that a very small number in the society acquired a lot of wealth and the rest struggled for survival. In the words of Amir Khusrau, 'every pearl in the royal crown is but the crystallised drop of blood fallen from the tearful eyes of the poor peasant'. Armed conflicts, including pillage and plunder, and natural calamities were a common experience and they inflicted much damage on the economy and society. Peace and prosperity were a rare experience.

It is significant that the people of India had almost no knowledge or consciousness of the massive, almost revolutionary, changes under way in Europe towards the end of the Turko-Afghan rule in the early sixteenth century. These changes would soon have life-changing consequences for India and the rest of the world. The reference here is to the effects of the Italian Renaissance, in the fourteenth and fifteenth century, the Reformation movement in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, and discovery of the sea routes to the East by navigators sponsored by the kings of Spain and Portugal in the late fifteenth century. Even the Mughal Emperors, who followed the Turk and Afghan Sultans, knew little if anything about the European achievements (Scientific Revolu-

tion and the Enlightenment) in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In the last chapter, I have described some of these epoch-making changes as part of the long human journey for progress. These changes ushered in a long period of European colonialism and the first Industrial Revolution. Both of these events were to have enormous consequences for Europe and the rest of the world.

4

Mughal Empire I: Babur to Akbar

> From the year 910 [1504-5], when Kabul was conquered, until this date I had craved for Hindustan…From the time of the Apostle until this date only three padishahs gained dominion over and ruled the realm of Hindustan. The first was Sultan Mahmud Ghazi…The second was Sultan Shihabuddin Ghuri…I am the third…In recognition of our trust, God did not let our pains and difficulties go for naught and defeated such a powerful opponent and conquered a vast kingdom like Hindustan. We do not consider this good fortune to have emanated from our own strength and force but from God's pure loving-kindness; we do not think that this felicity is from our own endeavour but from God's generosity and favour. *Baburnama.*

> Hindustan is a treacherous mistress who slays with smiles all who rest upon her bosom with too much confidence. H.G. Keene, *The Turks in India.*

I think the story of India in the eighteenth century should begin with a brief account of the Mughal (Turko-Mongol) Empire, starting with the arrival of Babur and his forces in Delhi in 1526. The decline and fall of the Mughal Empire in eighteenth century, from about the death of Aurangzeb in 1707 to the defeat of Marathas by the English East India Company in 1803, was characterised by much violence, pillage and plunder throughout India. In this tragic drama, the Turani (Central Asian) and Irani (Persian) factions at the imperial court, Marathas,

Rajputs, Jats, Sikhs, Afghans, sundry chiefs (rajas and nawabs), and the European trading companies (of Britain and France in particular) participated with unenviable gusto. This is not to suggest that the multi-regional Mughal Empire was always an orderly and peaceful state before the death of Aurangzeb in 1707.

Aurangzeb, followed by his successors, destroyed the Mughal Empire: it was a 'carcass in a condition to invite the birds of prey'. First, Aurangzeb annexed the (Shia) Muslim kingdoms of Bijapur (Adil Shahi) and Golkunda (Qutub Shahi), two of the five Bahmani states established in south-central India in fourteenth century. These states acted as buffers between Delhi and the Maratha territory (Maharashtra). In addition, Aurangzeb and his successors made the Sikhs, Rajputs and Jats their implacable enemies. After Aurangzeb, the empire 'became a mere shell empty of puissance'. The Mughal viceroys (subedars) of Bengal and Awadh became independent rulers (nawabs) of their territories as did wazir Nizam-ul-mulk the sovereign ruler of Hyderabad. Marathas, after the death of their leader Shivaji, became the most persistent and remorseless players in the wars for loot, territory and power. The Mughal king sanctioned the states assumed by his Viceroys and accepted the Maratha conquests. Then there were Sikhs in the Punjab who formed a new and increasingly powerful front against the Mughal power. The Mughal administration became 'a mere pretence that cloaked the marches and counter-marches of pillage and rapine by one group or the other'. Finally, the Persian and Afghan invaders, Nadir Shah and Ahmad Shah Abdali, wrecked the empire, by plunder and murder, and humiliated the person of the Mughal emperor and his court. The European trading companies, backed by their respective states (Portugal, Holland, Britain, and France) took full advantage of the denouement of the empire.

The seeds of disintegration were inside the structure of the empire itself. For one thing, there was a perpetual contest for the throne among rival claimants since there was no agreed formula (primogeniture or election) for succession. The transfer of power was rarely peaceful or smooth. It was not unlike the other Muslim empires and sultanates (Turkish Ottomans and Persian Safavids). Second, the emperors relied heavily on bands of mercenaries whose major interest was in the

loot (plunder, mansabs or jagirs) in return for the armies and services they provided. But the mansabs and jagirs were neither permanent for the individual nor hereditary. Farming for revenue was the major aim: extracting surplus from the output of land without regard to the well-being of peasants or zamindars and the fertility of land. Third, the emperors imposed a bundle of taxes on land and trade (internal and external) and the poll-tax (jizya) on non-Muslims (Hindus) and their pilgrimages. Akbar had abolished the poll-tax in 1564, but Aurangzeb re-imposed it in 1679. Fourth, the Mughal nobility was rife with ethnic and religious rivalries: Turani versus Irani; Indian versus foreign (Turani and Irani); Shia versus Sunni; and Muslim versus non-Muslim. Finally, the ideology and temperament of emperors were no less important: compare Akbar's secularism and tolerance with the bigotry of Aurangzeb. Personal character of the emperor also played a major role: compare the later Mughals (e.g. Farrukhsiyar, Mohammad Shah and Shah Alam II) with Babur, Akbar or Aurangzeb.

Babur, the ruler of Kabul, laid the foundation of the Mughal Empire in India, when he ascended the throne of Delhi after defeating the armies of Sultan Ibrahim Lodhi at Panipat in 1526. Following Babur, who died in 1530, the first five successors in the Taimurid dynasty—Humayun, Akbar, Jahangir, Shahjahan, and Aurangzeb—expanded the empire to an area covering almost the whole of the Indian sub-continent. By the end of seventeenth century if not earlier the centralised empire had outstretched beyond the capacity of Aurangzeb. After his death in 1707, the empire fragmented and a new chapter in the history of India started to unfold in which some European powers also played a major role.

Of Aurangzeb's five sons, Mohammad Sultan died in 1676; Moazzam ascended the throne as Bahadur Shah (also known as Shah Alam I) and ruled for just over five years (1707-1712). Muhammad Azam and Kam Bakhsh were killed in the war of succession. One son, Akbar, fled to Persia in the time of Aurangzeb. In 13 years (1707-1720), after the death of Aurangzeb, two of his sons (Kam Bakhsh and Azam), five of his grandsons, and one great-grandson (Farrukhsiyar) were killed in the wars of succession. The first six Mughal kings, the 'Great Mughals', ruled India for about 181 years (1526-1707). By the year 1720, the for-

mal apparatus of the centralised empire had collapsed and the emperors in Delhi, with ever shrinking territory, became pawns and puppets of their fractious and selfish nobles, Marathas, and the British. The British deposed the last nominal emperor, Bahadur Shah II, after the 'Great Revolt' of 1857 and exiled him to Burma where he died in 1862.

I. Babur and Humayun (1526-1556)

There was general continuity in Muslim history of India, but the foundation of the Mughal Empire was a political and cultural watershed. The succeeding three centuries differed from the Delhi Sultanate in several respects. For one thing, the Mughal period compared with that of the preceding Muslim dynasties is far better documented and researched. Second, there was much greater continuity in administration as members of the same dynasty occupied the throne for so long. Third, Mughals ushered in an era of much richer cultural life in India: they patronised music and painting and built some incomparably impressive monuments. But the differences extended beyond the visible and material: the Mughal period had 'a personality and an ethos of its own.'

In its beginning years, the Mughal Empire included Babur's Afghan kingdom (Qandahar, Ghazni, and Kabul) and a substantial area in northern India (Punjab, the Gangetic Doab, Kumaun, Awadh, Bihar, parts of Rajputana, and Bundelkhand). By Akbar's death in 1605, the empire had expanded from the Afghan territory to include Kashmir, Lahore, Multan, Sindh, Delhi, Agra, Awadh, Bihar, Bengal, Orissa, Ajmer, Malwa, Gujarat, and Berar. At Aurangzeb's death in 1707, the empire covered almost of India, except the Polygar statelets south of the River Kaveri in the Peninsula, but it had lost Herat and Qandahar to the Persians and parts of Turkestan to Uzbeks. The empire's massive edifice left few communities untouched. The Mughal Empire was characterised by a strong central authority with Islamic legitimacy: it was perhaps the largest centralised state in the pre-modern age. It was not only centralised but a complex and dynamic organisation.

1. Babur against Ibrahim Lodhi

By the middle of fifteenth century Afghan Lodhis had supplanted the Turkish sultans in northern India. In the Lodhi period of about 75 years, thousands of Afghans had moved from the mountain valleys of Afghanistan to the plains of north India. They were horse traders between Central Asia and India, mercenaries and freebooters. They settled in India as lords on lands of the Hindu peasantry. Babur, a Taimurid king of Farghana and Kabul, made several forays into India between1519 and 1526: the first four, probably exploratory, were not beyond the Indus. In the fifth expedition, with a determined and well-equipped army, Babur marched across the rivers of Punjab in the spring of 1526 and defeated a large army of Ibrahim Lodhi, the Afghan sultan, on the battlefield of Panipat. He occupied Delhi, defeated the Afghan chiefs in the Gangetic Doab, and his son Humayun captured Agra, the Lodhi capital, with enormous treasure. Babur enthroned himself at Agra and made it the capital of his dominion. He then defeated the joint forces of Rajputs, led by Rana Sangha the ruler of Mewar, at Kanau. In the battle Rana Sangha and some other Rajput chiefs were killed. In 1528, Babur marched to Chanderi, a stronghold of a feudatory of the raja of Mewar, defeated the Rajput army and captured the fort. Finally, he defeated the Afghans of Bihar and Bengal near Patna in 1529.

Babur now had northern India in his hands and became the master of a kingdom stretching from the Oxus to Gogra and from the Himalayas to Gwalior. Babur decided to stay in India and sent Humayun to defend Kabul against the Uzbeks khans. His kingdom was by no means stabilised by the time he died at Agra towards the end of 1530. Babur was the link between Taimur on his father's side and his own grandson Akbar. He is the only Mughal emperor who wrote in Turkish an extraordinary diary known by its title, *Tuzak-i-Baburi*, describing frankly his life adventures from a young age in Farghana to the conquest of India. In 1590, Abdul Rahim Khan-i-Khanan translated the Turkish original into Persian with the title of *Baburnama*. Babur carried an iron will, demonstrated his genius for military tactics, valued his faith and the Sufi (Naqshbandi) tradition, and kept a sophisticated cultural style of Samarqand. But he was not free from prejudice against the customs and traditions of India.

2. Humayun against Sher Khan Suri

Babur's son Humayun had a very difficult time holding on to the kingdom for many reasons. Humayun was a soft-hearted individual and not a determined fighter. Also, he made too many mistakes. For one thing, he distributed the provinces among his four brothers, Mirza Sulaiman (Badakhshan), Kamran (Qandahar and Kabul), and Askari and Hindal were given large districts in India. The brothers betrayed his trust. Kamran and Askari forcibly took the Punjab and removed Humayun's governor. They deprived Humayun of his contact with Afghanistan and Central Asia. But Humayun showed indiscriminate clemency towards his brothers to whom he had assigned their fiefdoms but they did not support him.

Then there were the Afghans to the east who looked to restore the Lodhi heir. Humayun beat them away, but then retreated to Agra and spent an indolent year with wine and opium. Two powerful opponents took advantage of the longish spell of inactivity. Bahadur Shah, ruler of Gujarat, took over Malwa and was negotiating with the Afghans in the north-east to dislodge Humayun from north India. Bahadur Shah had a strong army with Portuguese gunners and a Turkish engineer. Humayun met Bahadur Shah in Rajputana, defeated him and captured a fort in Gujarat. But again indecision followed the victory so he had to withdraw. The danger from Bahadur Shah ended luckily after the Portuguese drowned him.

The more serious challenge arose in Bihar in the person of Sher Khan Suri. While Humayun was busy in the south, Sher Khan had assumed leadership of the Afghans and gained in strength. Sher Khan invaded Bengal in 1537, defeated Sultan Mahmud Shah of Bengal and besieged him at his capital (Gaur). Humayun moved to help the ruler of Bengal and took the Chunar fort, but Sher Khan captured Bengal. After months of negotiations, Sher Khan moved to the west and occupied the Mughal territory up to Kanauj. In 1539, Humayun barely escaped alive from Buxar where the Afghans had defeated him. After his success at Buxar, Sher Khan became Sher Shah for the territories of Bengal, Bihar and some parts in the west.

In 1540, the Mughal and Afghan forces met again near Kanauj in which the Mughal army was crushed and Humayun fled first to Agra

and then to Lahore. Humayun received no help from his brothers. In fact, his brother Kamran stopped him from going to Kabul. Sher Shah pursued Humayun but the Mughals decamped from Lahore, leaving Sher Shah as the unchallenged ruler of northern India. Humayun moved to Sindh, back to Rajputana, again to Sindh and eventually took refuge with the Safavid Shah in Herat in 1544. Thus in 1540 Babur's work in India was undone and sovereignty passed on to the Afghans. Humayun remained a wanderer for the next 15 years.

3. The Afghan Interregnum: Sher Shah and Successors (1540-1555)

Sher Shah Suri represented the Afghan resentment in northern India against the Mughal invader. He was able to establish a glorious but short-lived rule. He was something of a Babur and Akbar combined. But who was Sher Khan? His given name was Farid Khan. His grandfather Ibrahim Khan and his son Hasan Khan (father of Farid Khan) came from Sur (Afghanistan) to India in the military service of Sultan Bahlul Lodhi. Sher Khan was born in the Punjab in 1472. At the age of 22, he moved to Jaunpur in the east because of a dispute with his father. He reconciled with his father and moved to Bihar (Sasaram and Khawaspur) where his father had a jagir. Sher Khan managed the jagir very well, but had to move to Agra because of problems with his step-mother. After his father's death in 1522, Sher Khan took over the jagir. He was employed by Bahar Khan Lohani, an independent ruler of Bihar, and became his deputy and tutor of the ruler's son Jalal Khan. But soon Bahar Khan deprived him of the jagir, so he moved into the service of Babur in 1527. Babur restored his jagir. Sher Khan left Babur's service after a year and went to Jalal Khan as his guardian and deputy governor. He fought the Lohanis and the Afghan ruler of Bengal and defeated them together at Surajgarh in Bihar. Sher Khan expanded into Bengal and acquired more territory. In 1540, after defeating Humayun at Kanauj, Sher Khan took the title of Sher Shah, conquered the Punjab, followed by Malwa and then defeated the Rajputs. The governor of Punjab captured Multan and Sindh in 1543. Sher Shah won Marwar and then moved into Ajmer and the region up to Abu, but he died in an accidental explosion in May of 1545.

Sher Shah proved to be a talented ruler, statesman, administrator and innovator. He had 'more of the spirit of a legislator and guardian of his people than any prince before Akbar.' He laid the foundation on which Akbar built. In the short time that he ruled, Sher Shah reformed the general and revenue administration, established a postal service, built many public works (roads, rest houses), encouraged the growth of agriculture, and patronised institutions of charity, the arts, and architecture. Sher Shah was not a bigot. He followed a tolerant and fair policy toward the Hindu population and used many Hindus in his service. He cared for justice and was moderate in his treatment of his nobles, servants, and subjects. Sher Shah's qualities as an administrator were far greater than as a warrior. In his reign of five years, he accomplished much that was important but some of it quite unprecedented.

- He upgraded the administrative system, divided the kingdom into 47 sarkars (districts) and each sarkar into several parganas (sub-divisions). The sarkars and parganas were assigned administrators and treasurers and writers (both Hindu and Muslim) to maintain the accounts and records. All officials were accountable directly to the sultan.
- Land revenue was settled directly with cultivators (peasants) after extensive land surveys. State's demand was set at one-quarter or one-third of the average produce, payable preferably in cash but in-kind was also accepted. The state officials, amins, muqaddams, qanungos, and patwaris, assessed and collected the revenue. Sher Shah wanted his officials to be lenient at assessment and strict at collection. Tenants were well protected and allowed remissions in adverse circumstances. The system was good for the state revenue and the interest of payers. The land revenue system served as a model for others in the future.
- He removed vexatious customs with a tax to be collected at the frontier in foreign trade and at sale point for domestic trade.
- He improved and constructed roads for defence and commerce. The Grant Trunk road from east Bengal to the Indus (1500 KM) was the longest and the others were from Agra to Burhanpur via Jodhpur, and from Lahore to Multan.

- He built sarais (rest houses) for both Hindus and Muslims. The sarais also served as dak bungalows (post houses).

- He organised a policing system for law and order giving responsibility to communities for local crimes: the village heads were responsible for law and order in their jurisdiction.

- Sher Shah had a good sense of justice: he was fair and even-handed. In each pargana, the Amin settled the civil cases and the Qazi and Mir-i-Adl decided the criminal cases. Several parganas were assigned to a Munsif-i-Munsifan (judge) for settling civil cases. There was a Chief Qazi at the capital, but the sultan was the ultimate judge.

- He established a regular army. A faujdar (military commander) was appointed at each garrison throughout the sultanate.

The Afghan kingdom after Sher Shah's death did not last for long. His weak successors and jealousies among the Afghan nobles plunged the kingdom into anarchy, allowing the Mughals to return to power. Sher Shah's second son Jalal Khan succeeded him as Islam Shah who was able to maintain his father's patrimony. But he died in 1553 and the dominion was divided into five regions, Punjab, Delhi, Agra, Bihar, and Bengal. By treaty, a son or close relative of Sher Shah ruled each of these areas, but could not bring order. The administrative system was crumbling into disorder. Then a famine struck in 1555: disease and death followed on a large scale. The ongoing disorder and demoralisation of the Afghans encouraged Humayun to attempt his restoration.

4. Humayun Returns to the Throne (1555-1556)

In exile, Humayun had to profess the Shia creed for survival. Shah Tahmasp of Persia gave him help to regain power in India. With a Mughal-Persian army and funds, Humayun seized Qandahar and then occupied Kabul. There followed an eight-year war with Kamran for dominance in Afghanistan. Finally, in 1553, Humayun reoccupied Kabul, became its unchallenged ruler, and blinded Kamran. In 1554, energised in Kabul, Humayun led his army into northern India. At Sirhind,

he met the army of Sikandar Shah Suri, ruler of the Punjab, and defeated him decisively. Then he moved into Delhi in mid-1555. Humayun was back on the throne, but he died in an accident in January of 1556. After a week of Humayun's death, the nobles agreed to crown Humayun's son Akbar who was only 12 years old at the time. In February 1556, Bairam Khan, a dominant member of Humayun's Persian nobility and Akbar's guardian and protector, proclaimed the young prince as emperor while they were still in the Punjab.

II. Akbar 'the Great' (1556-1605)

There were several independent rulers vying for power and territory in India at that time. Portuguese had established themselves in Goa and Dieu on the west coast. Even northern India was still divided since Humayun had recovered only a small part. Sword was now the only arbiter. After Akbar's enthronement, the emperor and not the place would be the capital: encampments of the court, household, chancery, treasury, armoury, and stables on the move and on sites according to need. In his reign, four successive sites were used as royal capitals: Agra, Fatehpur Sikri, Lahore, and Agra again. Akbar built a multi-regional empire out of a precarious kingdom. If Babur was the founder of Mughal Empire, Akbar was its builder.

1. Akbar's Conquests in India

The first opponent of Akbar was Hemu, a Suri general of mercantile caste from Mewat. Hemu had titled himself as Raja Vikramaditya after occupying Delhi and Agra. He marched west from Delhi with a huge army and met a smaller army led by Bairam Khan, with Akbar on his side, at the battleground of Panipat where Babur had defeated Ibrahim Lodhi in 1526. Hemu was wounded in the battle and captured; he was brought as prisoner to Bairam Khan and Akbar who had the helpless Sur general killed. Hemu's troops were demoralised and deserted the battlefield. Soon after the victory, the Mughal army won a major battle against Sikandar Shah, one of the Suri princes, who fled to Bengal. The two victories ended the Afghan-Mughal contest in favour of the Mu-

ghals. No Suri survivor was left to contest Akbar's claim to sovereignty over India.

After capturing Delhi and Agra, Bairm Khan and Akbar occupied Lahore and then seized Multan. They then took Ajmer, the door to Rajputana, after its Muslim ruler fled in 1558. In the same year, they annexed the sultanate of Jaunpur in the eastern Gangetic valley. By the end of the year, they captured the Suri fort at Gwalior north of the Narbada River. This aggressive flurry of activity brought a compact region stretching from Lahore, through Delhi and Agra to Jaunpur under the Mughal control. The drive south to Malwa and Rajputana began in the fourth year (1560). Then there was a halt because of the clash between Akbar and Bairam Khan. There were many reasons: the stern authority of Bairam Khan stifling Akbar at 17; ethnic and religious rivalry between the Turani Sunni and Persian Shia factions (Bairam Khan was a Persian Shia); and Akbar's alliance with Adham Khan, his foster brother, and his own mother Hamida Begum. In March 1560, Akbar demanded the protector's resignation to which Bairam Khan complied and chose to go to Mecca. But on the way he was killed by a disgruntled Afghan.

During 1561 and 1570, Akbar stayed at Agra and sent Adham Khan to invade Malwa where he defeated its ruler Baz Bahadur. The defeated Baz Bahadur fled to Khandesh for refuge and left his harem and much treasure behind. Adham Khan retained all of the loot and slaughtered men, women and children. Akbar was upset by this wanton act and confronted Adham Khan, relieved him of his command and high position and killed him in an awful way. This act was no compliment to Akbar, considering that later he forgave his rebellious half-brother Mirza Muhammad Hakim and his own son Salim (Jahangir). In the meantime, Pir Muhammad Khan pursued the Sultan of Malwa into the Deccan, but he was beaten back by a joint army of Khandesh and Berar. Baz Bahadur returned to Malwa, regained it for a year, but a new Mughal army annexed Malwa as a province into the empire. Baz Bahadur eventually took service with Akbar as a Mughal noble. In late 1561, Akbar assumed full executive power, abolished the office of wazir (vakil) which Bairam Khan and Adham Khan had served, and created four ministerial posts:

finance, military, household, and religious affairs. This change removed one focal point of discontent and rebellion by the nobles.

Sher Khan Suri, a son of Adil Shah Suri, who held the Afghan fort at Chunar moved towards Jaunpur. Two of Akbar's nobles defeated him and kept the loot without Akbar's permission. Akbar went and confronted them; they both submitted to him and handed over the plundered treasure. The victory at Chunar was the first phase of Mughal expansion in the east. By this time (1561), Akbar at 21 became his own strategist and commander-in-chief of the army. Akbar also acquired Tansen, the great singer, from Ram Chand Rajput of Kalinjar: Tansen, his sons and students helped develop the great art of classical music in India. In 1564, the Uzbek generals invaded the Rajput kingdom of Gondwana and annexed it into the empire as a large district in the province of Malwa. But Akbar had to face the Uzbeks and his half-brother, Mirza Muhammad Hakim, in the north-west.

The Uzbek nobles were from the stock of Shaibani Khan who was no friend of Babur. They were still rulers of Central Asia. Most of the Uzbek nobles came with Humayun on his return to India, but they did not like the imperial style of Akbar as they were accustomed to an egalitarian tradition. There was also the friction with the Persian (Shia) nobles. The Uzbeks wanted to test Akbar early in his reign. Abdullah Khan, governor of Malwa, revolted against the emperor. Akbar marched into Malwa and drove the rebel out who found refuge in Gujarat. In retaliation, in 1566 Akbar recalled a senior Uzbek from Awadh, igniting a united Uzbek revolt: confusion, battles and negotiations followed. At the same time, the emperor faced a challenge from his half-brother, Mirza Muhammad Hakim, governor at Kabul. The ruler of Badakhshan drove Hakim out so he crossed the Indus into Punjab. The dissenting (un-reconciled) Uzbeks asked Hakim to invade India, recognised him as its legitimate ruler and had the Friday khutba read in his name at Jaunpur. Hakim besieged Lahore; some of the Taimurid nobles in sympathy also rebelled and tried to seize Delhi. The loyalist commander drove away the rebels and captured their leader, Mirza Muhammad Sultan, who was from the Taimurid line. The remaining Mirzas found refuge with the Rajput raja of Mewar. Akbar ignored the Mirzas and made a surprise attack on the Uzbeks across the Ganges at Manikpur, killed or

captured the Uzbek nobles who had revolted. The rest of the Mirzas and their followers were driven south as refugees with the Sultan of Gujarat. Akbar realised that his ancestry is not enough to secure fidelity from the nobles: battle eventually decided the issue.

At first not all Rajputs accepted Mughal hegemony: Akbar used force against some of them in the 1560s. Rana of Mewar, Udai Singh (1540-1572) of Rana Sangha's lineage, was of the Sisodia clan and enjoyed high status among Rajputs in northern and central India. Akbar led a holy war (jihad) in 1567 and marched on Chittor, capital of Mewar, highly fortified and at some height from the plain. Akbar laid siege on the fort, devastated the countryside, and captured Udaipur. After a long siege at the Chittor fort, the Rajput garrison wanted to surrender, but Akbar turned down the overture. He managed to enter the fort after two months, killed the commander, but the Rajputs killed their families to protect their honour (jauhar). The Mughal army slaughtered thousands of civilians and destroyed the fort. But Udai Singh remained at large and died four years later in 1572. Mughals declared victory and issued a fatehnama to that effect.

In 1569, Akbar launched an assault on the fortress of Ranthambor—which together with the Chittor fort controlled the major trade route to the sea—where a Rajput raja was a vassal of Udai Singh. After a month's siege, the Rajput garrison surrendered and its raja (Raja Suran) accepted Mughal service in return for retaining his ancestral holdings. The significance of Chittor and Ranthambor was that it showed the Mughal might to every warrior in northern India: the alternatives were submission or death. At the same time, Akbar was fortifying his own network of strongholds. In 1573, the Agra fort on the banks of Jumna was completed and palace fortresses built at Allahabad and Lahore, followed by Ajmer, Rhotas (near Jhelum) and Attock in the Punjab and Rhotas in Bihar. The later Mughals built more bastions at Gwalior, Chittor, Ranthambor, Asirgarh (Burhanpur), and several hill forts in the Deccan.

In 1571, Akbar moved to Fatehpur Sikri, a newly built city some 42 KM from Agra, which remained his capital until 1585. It was from here he mounted campaigns of conquest and overcame his most dangerous political crisis. The city was also the site of significant administrative and organisational measures and innovations in the land revenue sys-

tem, coinage, military structure, and the provincial administration. Akbar did not rest with the conquests he had achieved by 1572. He then moved to Gujarat with the attraction of its fertile plain, textile industry and sea ports for trade. There was opportunity with the disintegration of the sultanate of Muzaffar Shah III into several Muslim principalities, including the rebellious Mirzas who had taken refuge in Gujarat. There was also the challenge posed by the powerful Portuguese fleets on the sea from their seat at Goa. Akbar was invited to Gujarat by one of the losing factions led by an Abyssinian noble. He occupied Ahmadabad, the capital, and other cities, proclaimed himself as the sovereign of Gujarat. But soon there was a revolt staged by some of the nobles and Mirzas, and the advancing march by Afghans on the governor of Gujarat. Akbar responded quickly, covering 800 miles in 11 days, crushed the rebellion in which many nobles were killed. The re-conquest of Gujarat further strengthened Akbar's reputation as a determined warrior.

In 1574, Akbar turned east to Bihar and Bengal where the Afghan rulers and nobles were nominal tributaries of the Mughal emperor. Akbar could not let the Afghans, his long-standing enemies, occupy this productive and strategic region. Daud Khan Karrani, Sultan of Bengal, repudiated Akbar's nominal sovereignty. The Emperor assaulted the Afghan-held fort at Patna and Daud Khan was forced to take refuge in Orissa. Akbar returned to Fatehpur Sikri and left Raja Todar Mal, his revenue minister, in command of his armies. Todar Mal defeated the Afghans near Midnapur in Bengal. The victory allowed Akbar to annex Bihar, Bengal and Orissa. The Mughal army retreated from Bengal because of an epidemic and Daud Khan reasserted himself. In 1576, Khan Jahan, governor of Punjab, led an army, routed the Afghans, and killed Daud Khan. The Afghan nobles and some Hindu rajas resented the Mughal occupation. Finally, in the late 1580s, Akbar sent Raja Man Singh, a reputed Rajput noble, to set up an imperial administration in Bengal and Orissa.

In 1585, Akbar shifted his capital to Lahore at the death of his half-brother Mirza Muhammad Hakim at Kabul. Akbar sent Raja Man Singh with an army to subdue the area around Kabul as an Uzbek ruler of Badakhshan posed a threat to that region. After this, Akbar stayed in Lahore for 13 years to bring the entire north-west under his control.

Punjab was a major trade route for caravans between India and Central Asia and a centre of many industries. Akbar undertook pacification campaigns against the rebellious Afghan tribes, Yusufzais in particular. Yusufzais had taken control of Bajaur, Swat and the Khyber route, occasionally plundering caravans or blocking the roads. It took Akbar's army six years to bring the rebels under control from the Attock fort he had built in 1581.

The emperor also sent the imperial army to Kashmir in 1585. There was struggle with the ruler, Yaqub Shah, who fought with dogged determination for four years. In 1589, Akbar moved from Lahore to Srinagar, took the ruler's surrender and annexed Kashmir. In the meantime, he turned his attention to the lower Indus valley (Sindh). The governor at Multan had failed to secure submission of Jani Bek, the ruler at Thatta. In 1586, Akbar sent a fresh army to Sindh that defeated the Sindh forces at Sehwan and eventually the ruler surrendered in 1593. Jani Bek came to Lahore, appointed as a mansabdar, included in the band of Akbar's disciples and given the governorship of Multan. The kingdom at Thatta became a province of Mughal Empire in 1595. The conquest of Sindh strengthened Akbar's resolve to retake Qandahar from the Safavid king. There the Persian commander, who had been disgraced by the Safavid king, Shah Abbas, defected and surrendered the fort at Qandahar to the Mughals. Shah Abbas did not react to this provocation.

When the Uzbek ruler of Badakhshan, Abdullah Khan, died in 1598, Akbar was no longer worried about an invasion from there. He moved to Agra as his new capital in place of Fatehpur Sikri. There were two reasons for the move from Fatehpur Sikri to Agra. First, Agra was more secure given his son Salim's rebelliousness. The other reason was that, since Fatehpur Sikri was a symbol of his attachment to the Chishti saints within the framework of orthodox (Sunni) Islam, Akbar was no longer eager to remain within the fold of orthodox Islam. At Agra Akbar could now devote his energies to the difficult frontier of the Deccan. The Deccan was a battleground for the Muslim wars against the infidel for centuries. It was a territory less hospitable to large armies than the Indo-Gangetic plain, but better than the mountainous territory of the north-west. The Deccan was also the area in which four Muslim king-

doms (sultanates) existed, three of which once comprised the Bahmani kingdom, and had to be brought under Mughal hegemony.

1. Malik Ahmad (Malik Raja) founded Khandesh as an independent principality around 1388 during the reign of Firuz Shah Tughlaq. Malik Raja claimed descent from Umar al-Faruq, the second caliph of Islam, hence the name Faruqi dynasty. The second sultan of Khandesh founded the city of Burhanpur and made it his capital in 1399. The sultan of this state was the only one who paid tribute to the Mughals, but the rest showed no inclination. In 1599, Akbar's army occupied Burhanpur and, after a long siege of the fortress at Asirgarh, the last ruler Bahadur Shah surrendered in 1601. Khandesh was absorbed into the Mughal Empire as a province.

2. The Nizam Shahi dynasty ruled Ahmadnagar, with capital at Ahmadnagar, from 1490 to 1637. A governor of the Bahmani kingdom revolted against Mahmud Shah Bahmani proclaimed himself sultan of Ahmadnagar as an independent kingdom. The founder took the title Ahmad Nizam Shah, hence the name Nizam Shahi dynasty that ruled this kingdom. In 1574, Ahmadnagar absorbed the sultanate of Berar, founded in 1490, which was once a province of the Bahmani kingdom. In 1600, after the death of Chand Bibi, Akbar's son Sultan Murad was able to bring Ahmadnagar into the Mughal Empire but only nominally. Shahjahan annexed it fully in 1637.

3. The Adil Shahi dynasty, named after its founder Yusuf Adil Shah, ruled Bijapur with capital at Bijapur. Like Ahmadnagar it was a province of the Bahmani kingdom until 1490 when its governor Adil Shah declared independence. In 1619, Bijapur annexed the sultanate of Bidar which was a small independent state carved out from the Bahmani kingdom in 1518. Bijapur became a tributary of Shahjahan in 1636 and finally annexed by Aurangzeb in 1686.

4. Golkunda was a province, like Ahmadnagar and Bijapur, of the Bahmani kingdom. Its governor Quli Qutb-ul-Mulk declared independence in 1518 and ruled until his death in 1543. The Qutub Shahi sultans of Golkunda took their name from their first ruler. The sultanate ceased to have separate history in 1611 when

its affairs got entangled with those of the Mughal emperors. Eventually Aurangzeb annexed Golkunda in 1687.

The Deccani states had a mixed social landscape, with the Persian Shia nobles along with Afghans and Hindu converts to Islam. None of these groups, Afghans in particular, liked the Mughals. Then there were the Marathas, heirs of earlier Hindu kingdoms defeated by Muslims, to the west along the Malabar Coast. In the east the Telugu warriors controlled the rural society. The urban-based Muslim nobles depended heavily on alliance with the rural aristocracies to rule effectively. The Deccan sultans were liberal about the local religious and cultural life. Ibrahim Qutub Shah (1555-1580) in Golkunda and Ibrahim Adil Shah II (1580-1626) in Bijapur tried to reduce Hindu-Muslim barriers as Emperor Akbar did himself.

In 1591, from Lahore, Akbar sent embassies to the Deccan sultanates to submit to the Mughal overlordship. In response, the sultan of Khandesh offered his daughter for Akbar's son Salim and sultans of Bijapur and Golkunda sent gifts, but they refused to submit formally. The sultan of Ahmadnagar dismissed the envoys in haste. In 1595, still at Lahore, Akbar ordered invasion of Ahmadnagar since it was in a state of turmoil after the death of Burhan Nizam Shah II. Sultan Murad, Akbar's second son, and Abdul Rahim Khan-i-Khanan, son of Bairam Khan, marched on to Ahmadnagar. Raja Ali Khan, sultan of Khandesh, joined them under coercion. The Mughals besieged Ahmadnagar where Chand Bibi, sister of the deceased sultan, defended the fortress together with the forces from Bijapur and Golkunda. The joint army forced withdrawal by the Mughal army. In a truce between the parties, sultan of Ahmadnagar ceded the province of Berar to the Mughals in 1596.

For the next several years, trouble continued between the Deccan sultans and the Mughals. In 1599, Sultan Murad died of alcoholism and Akbar gave the command to his third son Danyal. Soon the Emperor, who was now at Agra, with a huge army moved south to the Deccan. Chand Bibi, the Nizam Shahi ruler of Ahmadnagar, died in 1600 before Akbar wrested the fortress. Then he moved to Khandesh and Sultan Bahadur Shah, who had earlier repudiated his allegiance to the emperor, fled to the fort of Asirgarh near the capital Burhanpur. In early

1601, the sultan submitted and defenders of the fort surrendered. Now Khandesh and a large part of Ahmadnagar like Berar joined as imperial provinces. Akbar assigned the three provinces to Danyal and returned to Agra soon thereafter.

Akbar had left Agra in the charge of his eldest son Salim, who tried unsuccessfully to seize the fort and appointed his own officials in the province in defiance of his father's orders. When Akbar returned to Agra in 1601, Salim marched on the city with a large force of cavalry. Akbar warned him and offered the governorship of Bengal and Orissa. Salim refused the offer and retired to Allahabad. In 1602, Salim issued coins in his name and the Friday khutba as well. Akbar recalled Abul Fazl from the Deccan to send him to Salim. The rebellious prince sought help from the Bundel Raja Bir Singh of Orcha who intercepted Abul Fazl, killed him and brought his head to Allahabad. This act of rebellion incensed Akbar. However, thanks to the intercession of women of the harem, including one of his wives, the Emperor was reconciled with his rebellious son. Salim presented himself to the Emperor who designated him as his heir-apparent. But Salim returned to Allahabad, consuming opium and alcohol. In 1604, Danyal died of alcoholism and Salim returned to the court as he was concerned about the intentions of his own son Khusrau. Khusrau and Raja Man Singh wanted Akbar to give the throne to Khusrau. Salim submitted to Akbar and briefly confined to the palace in Agra while Akbar lay dying from dysentery. Salim visited his father who, though much aggrieved by his son's rebellion, placed the turban on Salim's head and gave him Humayun's sword. Akbar died in October 1605.

2. Akbar's Religious and Cultural Outlook

In the first 20 years, the grand mosque and the tomb of Salim Chishti, the venerated Sufi saint, reflected Akbar's devotion to Islam. He took personal interest in arranging the annual pilgrimage of Muslims to Mecca. After the conquest of Gujarat in 1574, the port of Surat became a very important access point to the Arabian Sea and Jeddah. Akbar also expanded the waqf, established earlier by the late Sultan of Gujarat, to give his donations to Mecca and Medina. In 1576, the first pilgrim caravan was launched by sea, for which Akbar paid all expenses for the

pilgrims and the ship *Ilahi*. Some of the Mughal Begums, including Empress Salima Sultan Begum and Akbar's aunt, joined the pilgrims. Akbar also walked every year to Ajmer at the tomb of Moin-ud-din, another Chishti saint. Devotion to the Chishti saints became a duty to the Emperor and his son Salim.

The cultural and religious climate in sixteenth century was more open and tolerant of change. Mystics, intellectuals, scholars and ordinary people were toying with the idea of an Indo-Muslim synthesis: men like Kabir and Nanak in the bhakti tradition and Sufi Daud Dayal were preaching peace and harmony under one deity. In 1575, Akbar started holding open debates on Muslim theology and some years later opened the assembly to Jains, Hindus and Parsees, joined by two Jesuit priests, for inter-religious debates and speculations. The debates became intense and bitter disputes emerged with the Muslim ulema at court. Since the ulema were not effective or persuasive, Akbar's impression of the orthodox Islam and its defenders gradually eroded. He started to move away from his devotion to Islam towards a self-conceived and eclectic form of religion and worship. He became more tolerant of non-Muslim practices and less insistent on enforcing discriminatory practices on non-Muslims.

Akbar's search brought him into fierce conflict with the imperial jurists and ulema. They wanted Akbar to (i) ensure that Muslims could live according to the Sharia as if they were in Dar-ul-Islam with a ruler who was pious and obedient to Islam, (ii) maintain tax-free grants to manage mosques, seminaries and trusts, and (iii) keep the ulema in charge of law courts to exercise social and moral leadership. Akbar became increasingly unsympathetic to the worldly ulema: they were not serious scholars and many were corrupt and had accumulated vast wealth. He discovered many of the ulema had tax-exempt religious grants, particularly lands, which they used illegally for personal gain. Among these were many Afghans, especially in the Punjab, who had obtained holdings earlier.

Akbar as king now wanted to maintain his Muslim identity as a ruler with support from both Muslims and non-Muslims (Hindus) who comprised the majority of his subjects. In the struggle against the orthodox Muslim opinion, a group of Akbar's advisors devised for him a

coherent doctrine. How could the emperor create an inclusive political community in the empire? In 1578, he addressed this question by first undertaking sweeping changes.

- All tax-free grants would be inspected and verified. Akbar took away all unauthenticated grants and holdings inherited or otherwise. He also awarded grants to Brahmins, Parsees and Yogis.

- The orthodox ulema wanted strict enforcement of the Sharia; even Sufis and Shias were suspect of heterodoxy. A new sect of Mahdawis, followers of Sayyid Muhammad of Jaunpur the self-styled Mahdi who rejected legalism of the ulema, were allowed by Akbar to defend their doctrine and practices.

- The ulema insisted on harsh treatment of dhimmis, Hindus and other non-Muslims, in all spheres of life. Akbar had a conflict with them even in 1563 when he removed the tax on Hindu pilgrims. He allowed Hindus to repair their temples and even build new ones, and to reconvert, if forced to convert in the first place, without fear of death or some other severe punishment for apostasy. He also prohibited enslavement of war captives and forced conversion to Islam.

- The most sweeping change was the abolition of jizya in 1579, removing basic distinction and discrimination.

- There were several symbolic changes as well. The Emperor with his courtiers celebrated Diwali; he was weighed in gold, silver, grains and other commodities once or twice every year and the valuables distributed as charity to the poor; and Rajputs and other high-caste Hindus were inducted into the military and civil administration.

Akbar went far beyond these changes. He crafted a radically new dynastic ideology, of which he as monarch would be the centre (the cult of monarch), and a new imperial creed. He assumed sweeping powers—proclaimed himself khalifa in place of the Ottoman caliph—and became the chief arbiter of religious affairs in his dominion over and above the ulema and jurists. The Chief Qazi and other eminent schol-

ars accepted the Emperor's farman under pressure of the court, though Shaikh Mubarak Ali, a liberal (heretical) theologian, accepted it willingly and even endorsed Akbar's doctrine of infallibility. This was a crushing defeat for the powerful (orthodox) religious hierarchy.

The reaction was fierce: the Chief Qazi and the Sadr fled, took refuge in a mosque and declared that they gave their consent under duress. At the same time, a group of imperial officers in Bengal and Bihar rebelled against the decree. The military commanders were also unhappy with new requirements of inspection and certification of horses since it entailed much expense. A Turkish tribal group led the nobles in the east. They killed the governor of Bengal and defeated the loyalists after crossing the River Ganges. They proclaimed Akbar's half-brother, Mirza Muhammad Hakim, at Kabul as the legitimate sovereign. The Muslim judge at Jaunpur issued a fatwa to enjoin Muslims to rebel against Akbar since he had become an infidel. The Afghans joined the rebel ranks. Akbar reacted in two ways: he proceeded to Kabul and sent Raja Todar Mal with a relief army to Bihar that took control of the major forts and cities. Akbar deposed his half-brother and delivered harsh treatment to the Muslim jurists and theologians who supported the rebels. But it took Akbar's army nearly five years to reassert control over west Bengal and put the rebels to flight. Akbar also stopped sending gifts to the Sharif of Mecca for distribution after the annual caravans of 1579 and 1580. In 1585 he abruptly ended his pilgrimages to the tombs of Chishti saints and was no longer eager to exhibit his Islamic piety in public. These actions signalled the end of Akbar's orthodoxy.

Akbar possessed a charismatic personality and had all the desired qualities of a warrior hero with exceptional ability for organisation and strategy. He was accessible, pleasant and affable to those who approached him. But his courtiers started building an ideological edifice centred on their monarch. Abul Fazl, one of the two sons of Mubarak Ali, became an ideologue and propagandist at the court. He started establishing a new basis of imperial legitimacy for Akbar and his successors. Abul Fazl along with his brother Faizee, the court poet, began to eulogize and propagate the divinely illumined right of Akbar as the ruler. In the *Akbarnama* (appended with *Ain-i-Akbari*), an account of the 47-year reign of Akbar, Abul Fazl laid out a systematic expression

of this doctrine. The underlying theme is that Akbar's right as ruler transcended accidents of conquest or succession. Akbar is portrayed not as a normal human, but a divinely inspired person who possessed esoteric knowledge beyond the interpreters of the Sharia (mujtahids, Sufis) or the anticipated Mahdi. Abul Fazl builds Akbar's ancestry as if divined by God and a majestic vision to Humayun of 'an illustrious successor whose greatness shone from his forelock'. Akbar was the receptacle for this hidden illumination passing through generations from Adam. This was the essence of Akbar's Din-i-Ilahi (divine faith). But this religious innovation died with Akbar, although it caused serious divisions among Muslims.

In the 1580s, Akbar's spiritual quest led to his invented rituals: worship of the sun; prostration four times a day before a 'scared' fire placed towards the east; and reduced sex and consumption of meat and alcohol. These rites were quite compatible with the ethos of Rajput nobles. Akbar involved his nobles and disciples in the daily ritual and initiation rites for the new disciples devoted fully to the master (Akbar) with life, property, faith, and honour. Muslim initiates had to repudiate the bond with orthodox Islam. Each initiate had to prostrate (sajda) at the monarch's feet. After the ceremony, the initiate received a turban with a badge carrying Akbar's portrait. Probably a majority of the amirs became his disciples. This was an effective way to glue together a heterogeneous body of nobles around the ruler. This bonded identity, in which service and worship of the emperor was the core, replaced all earlier identities. Akbar had several traditions to draw upon, military slaves, Sufi murids following the tariqa of their pir, and the Indo-Persian model of courtly behaviour—submission to the monarch by the nobles expressed at the court by various means like gift exchange, dress, etiquette etc.

3. Akbar's Imperial Administration: The Mansabdari System

Akbar established a centralising, bureaucratic and hierarchical structure with qualified officials working within standardised rules and procedures, producing and keeping copious written records of orders (farman) and actions. At the centre, Akbar very early in his reign removed the office of wazir (Prime Minister) and became the sole executive assisted by four co-equal and independent ministers for finance,

army and intelligence, judiciary and religious patronage, and the royal household. Other functions were given to specific officials under direct supervision of the emperor. The ministers and high-level officials were drawn from amongst the mansabdars (rank-holders) and each office-holder was assigned support staff.

Each province was divided into sarkars (districts), each sarkar was divided into numerous parganas (sub-divisions), and each pargana had numerous thanas (police posts). At the top were (i) the subedar (governor), accountable directly to the monarch and (ii) the diwan (finance officer) who reported to the central finance minister. As an important principle of imperial administration, there was separation of powers between the subedar and diwan. Then there were (i) the bakhshi (military paymaster and intelligence manager) who reported to the central minister for the army and (ii) the sadr (judge) who reported to the central minister for religious affairs. Finally, there were faujdars (militia chiefs) in the thanas throughout the province.

There was a hierarchical structure of high-ranking officials in the Mughal administration. It had the mature princes at the top, followed by amirs (nobles) and the high-ranking mansabdars. These three groups filled the high and responsible positions for both civilian and military purposes. They were paid lavishly and headed households and troops ranging from several hundred to several thousand. Their martial and administrative skills were the steel of the imperial system: it was a patrimonial-bureaucratic system. The mansabdars were responsible for not only recruitment and training of their armed troops, but also as holders of jagirs and assignments of salary. The land revenue system played a central role in the imperial administration. It involved two groups. The first group comprised central administration officials who were responsible for assessment, inspection, monitoring, and auditing. The other group comprised mansabdars (amirs and other high-ranking individuals) who used their staff or agents for tax collection; they were left independent to support themselves and pay their troops and staff from the revenue in their assigned area.

To cope with the complex and diverse nobility, Akbar created a ranking (mansabdari) system. All nobles held mansabs (ranks), but not all mansabdars were nobles. A noble in Akbar's time was someone with

a decimal rank of 500 zat and above, but in the next century the nobles' rank was elevated to 1,000 zat and above. Nobles and mansabdars were all required to act in military capacity: they maintained troops, sawars and sepahis. Besides, based on their rank, nobles were required to support war horses and elephants, transport animals, and carts. Towards the end of Akbar's reign, mansabdars consumed 81 per cent of the empire's budget for their pay and allowances. All officers were subject to assignment in any part of the empire. They were accustomed to frequent assignments.

A numerical rank was given to each person in the imperial service: each mansabdar was assigned a personal rank (mansab) defined by status, pay and range of official assignments. It was a decimal system borrowed from the Mongol practice for military commanders. The range was from a low of 10 to those of 100, 1000, 10,000 troops. There were 66 even-numbered ranks from 20 to 5,000 zats, except princes of the blood received 10,000. However, only 33 ranks were used. Soldiers and bureaucrats were all included. The move up or down the ranks was decided by royal favour. The Turani, Persian and Rajput nobles received higher ranks. The ranks were not transferable to sons or heirs. In 1590, Akbar introduced another decimal system for commanders: each mansabdar was required to keep sawars (armed cavalrymen), to train, command and pay the sawars. The mansabdari cavalry was at the service of the emperor and had to meet imperial standards. This system saved the monarch from a centrally recruited and paid standing army. The burden was shifted to individual mansabdars. There were serious issues of maintaining uniform standards, cohesion and discipline. In addition, the temporary and shifting mansabdari assignments, dependent on collection of land tax from peasants and zamindars, were not conducive to the well-being of land and its cultivators.

Akbar's preferred approach was material incentives and not coercion. Many rewards and honours were generously given according to performance. In the pre-Mughal Muslim period, the sultans used to give an area to their nobles and generals to control and collect taxes. These iqtadars (holders of iqta or fief) would collect taxes in their area, deduct all expenses, and transmit the surplus to the central treasury. The iqtas were held at the pleasure of the ruler, but in practice could last

for generations. Under the Afghan Lodhi and Suri sultans, their nobles held fiefs with local residence, identity and resources. Akbar separated tax collection from political and military control. A mansabdar could collect taxes only from a specific area (lands) as salary assignment. The minister for salaries matched the assessed taxes with specified salary and allowances of the mansabdar and issued a jagir document. Only mansabdars could hold jagirs and other members of the imperial staff were paid their salary in cash. Mansabdars used their agents to collect taxes on assessed lands in four instalments in a year. The jagirdar (mansabdar holding a jagir) had only the fiscal right and not the right of ownership or occupancy or residence: jagir was not a fief. A mansabdar could hold more than one jagir in non-contiguous areas. Jagirs were transferred after deaths, demotions, and promotions. Some high-ranking mansabdars could hold specific jagirs for long periods, but most of them held for two to three years. The provincial diwans monitored collection of taxes from jagirs to prevent excesses on landholders (zamindars) and peasants (cultivators). Moneylenders and currency dealers (sarrafs) would lend money to mansabdars pending the arrival of land revenue from their jagirs.

The amirs and mansabdars were subject of widespread attention at all levels. They were also centres of aristocratic life and culture at the court and in the provinces. Patronage was an important device for craftsmen, artists, musicians, religious scholars, men of letters (poets), and the rest. The noble households were divided between public for men and private for women. Inside the harem, behind the walls, there was an ordered community. Domestic slavery was quite widespread among the nobles. In all major cities, the nobles built an urban living that determined the pattern in each of them with mansions, houses and markets. Nobles and their wives spent generously on mosques, tombs, sarais and other similar buildings. Roads and stone bridges were also their subjects and they participated in commercial ventures through investments. Some were unscrupulous, and interfered in local markets and affected the supply and prices of commodities. The origin of many new towns and settlements (qasbas) was in the encampment of armies and entourage of the nobles with markets and transport on land and water.

The Mughal nobility in Akbar's time was drawn from very diverse groups: free men from Rajputs, Afghans, Indian Muslims, Arabs, Persians, Uzbeks, and Chaghatais. Most were Sunni Muslims, but there were many Shia Muslims and Hindus as well. Humayun returned to India in 1551 with 51 nobles, almost all foreign-born, of whom 27 were from Central Asia. These were high-status Sunni chiefs from the Chaghatai Turkish or Uzbek lineages. They brought with them an egalitarian tradition. A second group of 16 were Persian (Shia) nobles who were a counterweight to the Turks and Uzbeks. The Persians were willing to accede to the imperial (Padishah) tradition. Akbar recruited new nobles, including Indian Muslims but not Afghans, to serve the expanding empire: in 1580 there were 222 nobles, 48 Turanis, 47 Persian, 44 Indian Muslims, and 43 Hindus.

The significant change in the roster of Mughal nobles was the inclusion of non-Muslim (Hindu) Rajput leaders. Many Muslim rulers, except for the Sultans of Delhi, had included unconverted Hindu warriors, including the Suris who used the services of Hemu. In 1561, the Rajput chief of Amber of the Kachhwaha clan sought Akbar's help against a Muslim governor. Before him a Kachhwaha Raja (Bharamal) had supported Humayun against the Suris. When Akbar was marching on Jaipur, the Raja of Amber offered him one of his daughters in marriage which the Emperor accepted. In return, he recruited the Raja's son and grandson as amirs (nobles) in his service. As a result, the Raja was allowed to retain Amber. In the next twenty years, other Rajputs negotiated entry into the imperial service and offered their daughters as wives of the Emperor. Akbar went for Rajput nobles (thakurs) and not for obscure warriors of modest power. By 1580, 43 Hindus, mostly Rajputs, were listed in the register of nobles. The Rajputs acknowledged the Emperor, learnt Persian and imperial etiquette. They were assured to retain their faith, customs and honour as Hindu warriors.

In the Rajput states, the Mughal emperor claimed sovereignty and kept a governor at Ajmer. Marriage alliances and patrilineal brotherhoods among Rajputs created kinships holding power. However, men like the Rana of Mewar considered subordination through brides a shameful act for Rajputs. But for other thakurs Akbar became a Muslim Rajput who possessed far greater power than the greatest of Rajput

masters! The arrangement was beneficial to both sides. The Mughal emperor would not now face the potential threat from a Rajput coalition like Babur did at Kanua in 1527. The Rajputs became imperial generals, statesmen, high-level administrators and could avoid local internecine conflicts. They could also benefit from the stream of wealth transferred from the empire's largesse to their homelands and not remain dependent on the unreliable produce of the semi-arid lands of Rajputana. Akbar forged a political bond between the Mughals and Rajputs that lasted for over 100 years.

4. Akbar's Fiscal Administration

The minister of all revenue (diwan-i-kul) was responsible for the treasury, currency and expenditure. Akbar had some very competent, innovative and loyal imperial diwans: Muzaffar Khan, Khwaja Shah Mansur, Mir Fateh Ullah Shirazi, and Raja Todar Mal. Akbar valued them all. Three officials assisted the diwan-i-kul: minister of the crown revenue (diwan-i-khalsa) responsible for all lands and entities of revenue reserved for the central treasury; the minister for compensation (diwan-i-tan) for salary drafts and assignments; and the auditor general to monitor fiscal transactions and kept records. There was a network of the imperial treasury: central, provincial and local (pargana or town). Khatris, Kayasths and Brahmins, the service castes among Hindus, came to dominate the officialdom in the fiscal system once they had learnt Persian. These castes supplied much of the staff in most offices, except for the office of Muslim sadr.

The Mughal coinage was tri-metallic, copper, silver and gold, and the coins were minted in the central mints at Lahore, Delhi and Agra. By the end of sixteenth century, there were several open and free mints. Anyone could bring the metal, old coin or foreign coin to the mint, pay the mint charges and have the mint strike the coins. Coins were in three denominations: the lowest was paisa or dam—later displaced by anna—minted from copper, next was rupee in silver, and the highest was mohr in gold. The supply of gold and silver was not a serious problem because bullion came from abroad in return for Indian exports. Coins carried Islamic designs until the 1580s, but then Akbar changed the design with focus on the monarch, his Din-i-Ilahi and the Ilahi year.

The most important source of the imperial revenue was the tax on agricultural land or actually its produce. The monarch (state) had the traditional right to a part of the produce from land which was owned and cultivated privately. The monarch required that the landholder must cultivate the land; shirking his responsibility would invite moderate to harsh penalties. The other equally important responsibility of the landholder was to pay an assessed proportion of the produce, preferably in cash, to the imperial agent. Traditionally, there were diverse local lords, by lineage, force, settlement or immigration, in each pargana. They were designated as zamindars in their area of control or where they claimed a share in the produce of land. They claimed it as a hereditary right, and cultivated their lands through tenants or labourers. They also imposed a variety of taxes and cesses on peasants, craftsmen and traders in their parganas. Payments were made part in cash and part in kind. They would use, within limits, forced labour of the lesser castes. These lords (Rajputs, Jats, Indian Muslims, and Afghans) would use their numbers, force and custom as the basis of their power. The Mughal state brought these zamindars under its control. Most of these men did not aspire to large-scale state building. Before the Mughals, the Indo-Muslim rulers had arranged service agreements with the zamindar lineages. These zamindars would retain power in return for monetary payment to the ruler (state) through his officials. The ruler's officials, qanungos, kept records of each village for land in production and taxes paid. They worked with men of leading lineages or rajas in each pargana, called chaudhris or deshmukhs, and were paid five per cent of the revenue collected in their area. They also controlled lands exempt from tax. Qanungos were recruited from the Hindu higher castes and among Indian Muslims.

Sher Shah Suri had established a framework for the state to extract more from the produce of land. He introduced a cadastral survey of land; survey of crops grown; assessment of revenue by expected output; conversion of anticipated yield rates to cash value based on market conditions; and the demand for payment in cash from the peasant. The required data was collected carefully and checked at intervals. Sher Shah also gave incentives (tax reduction or exemption) for bringing new land into cultivation, sinking wells, and expanding the cultivated area. The

tax assessment was not too rigid but the collection of tax was subject to strict enforcement. In practice, one of the flaws of the system was the uniformity of assessment rates in the entire Afghan dominion. Converting harvest rates into cash based on a uniform schedule in the large dominion invited resistance because there were large differences in the fertility of land.

In the early years of Akbar's reign, Raja Todar Mal recognised the problems in the Suri system. He emphasised greater detail on land area and production, schedule of minimum and maximum market price, use of uniform weights and measures. But the salary assignments (for mansabdars) created problems: zamindars and peasants complained about excessive assessment. In 1581, Raja Todar Mal addressed this issue squarely. The emperor resumed all jagir lands (salary assignments) from mansabdars and put all lands under the control of treasury officials to administer the system directly. Contiguous parganas, with similar climate and soil fertility, were grouped into 'revenue circles'. Each circle was given a revenue officer (karori) with staff for parganas and villages to do the surveys. All circles were surveyed completely within five years. Other officials with the survey parties gathered data on crop output and the yield level for the past ten years. They also collected the price data for kharif (summer) and rabi (winter) crops for the same period. Using these numbers, the karori prepared a schedule of assessment for each crop in the circle: assessment was based on the average of ten years. The rate of assessment was lower the more valuable the crop: one-fifth for sugar, cotton, indigo but one-third for grains. There were separate unit rates for fruit trees and cattle. The central revenue ministry (diwani) established fresh assessment of revenue for each village, pargana, circle, sarkar, and province. The assessed demand was expressed in the copper dams and the payment expected in dams as well. Cultivators were given the assessment rates for each crop per unit of land (one biga = 0.375 acres) and the total assessment would be the crop rate multiplied by the crop area during the year. The tax collectors (amins) would use the assessment demand to collect the land tax (revenue) from the village or pargana headman.

However, in the late 1580s, the jagir system was restored after the experiment of direct administration of tax assessment and collection.

There was now a more accurate basis for expropriation of rural output through the market system. Moneylenders and grain dealers became important players in the transfer of rural surplus to towns and cities. The revenue of the state came at the expense of zamindars, their old claims and perquisites. Akbar also standardised land grants, madad-i-maash, to Muslim and non-Muslim religious leaders, men of learning, etc. These grants were exempt from payment of land revenue to the state: all revenue was appropriated by the grantees. The regulated system of land revenue applied to all lands claimed by the crown that were separate from the jagir and madad-i-maash lands.

5. Akbar's Legacy

According to Vincent Smith, Akbar 'was a born king of men, with rightful claim to be one of the mightiest sovereigns known to history. That claim rests securely on the basis of his extraordinary natural gifts, his original ideas, and his magnificent achievements.' Well, what was Akbar's legacy?

- He established a multi-regional empire that became the dominant power in India. At his death, the Mughal Empire stretched from Qandahar and Kabul, covering Kashmir, Punjab and Sindh, to the end of Bengal in the east and from the Himalayan foothills to the northern border of the Deccan.
- He acquired an aura of near-divinity and infallibility, the cult of monarch, because of victories and the court propaganda. His son Salim followed a similar method after ascending the Mughal throne.
- He built bridges between Hindus, particularly Rajputs, and Muslims.
- He imposed a new public order on a tumultuous society.
- He established a centralised political system with the monarch at the centre of power and legitimacy.

- He established an administrative structure for effective government.

- He developed a well-organised and mighty army, equipped with heavy cavalry, armoured men and horses with lance and sword, war elephants, musketeers and artillery, and new gunpowder weaponry.

- He patronised culture (music, painting, architecture, literature) and promoted secular and religious learning.

- Akbar's attempt to promote a syncretic religion in India, based on the cult of monarch, could not outlast him because the Hindu and Muslim clergy and his leading Muslim nobles opposed it vehemently.

5

Mughal Empire II: Jahangir to Aurangzeb

I. Jahangir (1605-1627)

As Akbar lay ill in Agra, his son and heir-designate Salim faced a revolt staged by his own son Khusrau. Raja Man Singh, a noble of high rank, and Mirza Aziz Koka (Khusrau's father-in-law) failed to persuade other nobles to support Khusrau's coup against his father. The Sayyids of Braha, representing the opposition party, brought Salim to his dying father. After a weeklong mourning of the death of Akbar, Salim mounted the throne at Agra as Nur-ud-din Jahangir. Man Singh submitted to Jahnagir as his sovereign and was given the governorship of Bengal. However, Khusrau managed to flee with many followers to the Punjab where he besieged Lahore. Jahangir sent a relief army and eventually Khusrau and companions were captured before they could go north-west to Kabul. Jahangir came to Lahore impaled his son's companions. He then moved to defend Qandahar against the Safavids and left Khusrau as prisoner in Lahore where the prince plotted against his father's life. Jahangir was informed of the plot: he executed several ringlead-

ers and blinded Khusrau. A more severe imprisonment of the blinded prince ended the succession struggle.

The more serious problem that arose for Jahangir, which would haunt the later Mughals even more, was the Sikh revolt against the Mughal rule. It followed from the killing of Arjun, the fifth Sikh guru, on the orders of Jahangir because apparently the guru had extended hospitality to Khusrau when he fled to the Punjab. The guru's property and children were handed over to the governor at Lahore. Hargobind, a son of the deceased guru, succeeded as the sixth guru. The new guru changed his style from the ascetic-religious to the royal-militaristic; he wore two swords, built a fort at Amritsar, and held a court. Jahangir arrested him and put him as prisoner in the Gwalior fort for two years (1609-1611). After his release, Hargobind moved north to the Himalayan foothills in Bilaspur beyond the Mughal reach. There he established himself like a Rajput ruler and zamindar with a network of supporters in the Punjab plain. Guru Hargobind laid the foundation of defiance and resistance by a determined and resilient community of militants against the Muslim rule in India for the next nearly two hundred years.

1. Jahangir's Court and Outlook

In 1611, Jahangir married Nur Jahan (Mehr-un-nissa), a Persian widow of Sher Afgan Quli Khan, who was young, beautiful, talented and ambitious. Her father, Itimad-ud-daulah, held a high position as a noble in Jahangir's court. Nur Jahan's father soon became the diwan-i-kul and her brother Asaf Khan quickly rose to be one of the leading and influential noblemen at the court. Jahangir's second son and heir-apparent, Khurram, married Arjumand Banu (Mumtaz Mahal), a daughter of Asaf Khan. There was now a strong alliance of the four, Nur Jahan, her father, Asaf Khan, and Khurram. Together they exercised great influence on Jahangir who relied heavily on their advice for the next eleven years. But there was a rival Persian faction led by Mahabat Khan, a noble at the court, on behalf of the blinded Khusrau who was still a popular royal figure.

Jahangir continued his father's practice of discipleship, with himself as a disciple of Moin-ud-din Chishti (which Akbar had given up) and others as disciples of Jahangir. Sir Thomas Roe, the first English ambas-

sador at Jahangir's court (1615-1618) saw and participated in the elaborate ritual of the initiation ceremony in which the disciple-designate would prostrate (sajda) at the Emperor's feet and receive a turban with Jahangir's image on it. Contact with the emperor in the court ceremonies was a badge of honour and affirmation of his care and regard for his servants. Rituals of obedience and respect of the ruler were performed even in the absence of the emperor.

It is fair to say that religious sentiments did not drive Jahangir against Guru Arjun as is reflected by his religious policy of tolerance and accommodation with the Hindus previously practised by Akbar. He did not much like the Muslim ulema who wanted imposition of the Sharia and persecution of Hindus. One of the most prominent among the ulema was Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi (1564-1624). The Shaikh took the position, almost heretical, that he had direct access to divine inspiration without prophetic mediation. He styled himself as Mujaddid-alf-i-thani (Renewer of the Second Millennium) to reverse the descent of Muslims in the second millennium. The Mujaddid did not like Akbar's deviance from Islam; he wanted the emperor to be a protector of Islam and persecutor of Hindus. Jahangir imprisoned Ahmad Sirhindi for a year, but restored him to favour. He took the Shaikh to the Deccan for a tour. I should add that, while some ulema did not accept or approve the self-styled mujaddid, many others venerated him as a persecuted champion of Islam. Ahmad Sirhindi, through his revivalist movement, probably contributed to a sharper division between the Hindu and Muslim communities in India.

2. Frontiers of the Empire

Jahangir maintained his policy of accommodation from Kashmir along the foothills to Bengal: acknowledge Mughal supremacy and maintain autonomy. However, in 1613 he had to confront the Rana of Mewar at Udaipur who had earlier defied Akbar. Jahangir sent first his son Parvez, but the imperial campaign failed. The Emperor moved from Agra to Ajmer and from there he sent his son Khurram to the hills of Rajputana where Rana Amar Singh capitulated. The defeated Rana sent his son Karan Singh to the court of Jahangir at Ajmer with oath of loyalty. Karan Singh was made a noble with 5,000 zat and 5,000 sawar be-

sides much else to honour him. Later, in the Himalayan foothills, Raja of Kangra defied the Mughal emperor, but defeated by prince Khurram in 1618. Many other rajas and potentates made submission under force or threat of force.

The north-west frontier was quite vulnerable to attacks by the Persian rulers in the west and the Uzbeks in the north. The strategy was to hold Qandahar, Ghazni, Kabul, and Peshawar within the Mughal Empire. There were two considerations: to protect both sides of the caravan trade and to reconquer the lands of Turan (Samarqand, Bukhara, Balkh, and Badakhshan), lands of Sunni Islam and the Naqshbandi order, that the Shaibani Uzbeks had snatched from the Taimurids. The relations with Persia were more complex and troublesome for several reasons.

- One source of friction was that the Safavid kings of Persia (Shah Ismail and Shah Tahmasp), who had helped Babur and Humayun in their struggle for survival, expected and even demanded adherence to the Shia creed.

- The presence of many Shia nobles in position of power at the Mughal court posed a risk to the Mughals.

- Persia's perceived cultural superiority over the Uzbeks and Taimurids, though accepted, was a constant irritant.

- Finally, there was the royal attraction to and competition for Qandahar town and province. Akbar had recovered Qandahar in 1595 and Jahangir was able to keep it because Shah Abbas preferred relations with Jahangir in spite of this irritant.

By Akbar's death the sultanates of Khandesh, Berar and a large part of Ahmadnagar were under Mughal control. But part of Ahmadnagar was in turbulence because of resistance by Malik Ambar who had helped the sultan to establish a new capital later called Aurangabad. Jahangir started campaigns against the sultan, but they went nowhere. However, in 1612, prince Parvez crushed the opposite forces; Mailk Ambar fled to the Daulatabad fort and began a guerrilla campaign with the support

of some Maratha families. At this stage, a new political chapter opened at the Mughal court.

When Jahangir asked Khurram to replace Parvez in the Deccan, Khurram refused to go there. But Nur Jahan managed to pacify the prince by handing over the blind Khusrau to the custody of her brother Asaf Khan. Khurram thus satisfied went to Ahmadnagar. There he defeated the opposition and took control of Berar and Ahmadnagar. In the meantime, Jahangir went to Mandu and then to Gujarat. The Emperor remained on tour in the area for five and one-half years and returned to Agra in 1619. Khurram's absence in the Deccan and Jahangir's tour gave Nur Jahan control of the court at Agra. When Jahangir fell seriously ill in 1620, Nur Jahan took charge of the day-to-day running of the empire. She also arranged the marriage of Jahangir's youngest son, Shaharyar (16 years old), with her daughter Ladli Begum from her first husband. This action made the rupture complete with Khurram. There were now three emperors in waiting, Khusrau, Khurram, and Shaharyar, each with his own coterie of supporters.

Soon after Jahangir's illness, the Deccan erupted again: Malik Ambar renounced the treaty with the Mughals and sought help from the sultans of Bijapur and Golkunda. Jahangir again asked Khurram to go to the Deccan, but the prince refused unless accompanied by the blind Khusrau. Jahangir reluctantly accepted the condition. Khurram launched a six-month campaign, reasserted Mughal control in Ahmadnagar and imposed heavy indemnities on Bijapur and Golkunda. The Deccan, however, remained in resistance for 30 years: violent resistance followed by submission and in which Marathas became actively involved. In fact, the inability of Mughals to impose complete control allowed the Marathas to plunder, gain wealth and acquire autonomy in the western part of the Deccan. In 1621, while still in the Deccan, Khurram received the news of Jahangir's serious illness so he had Khusrau killed, but reported later to Jahangir that the murdered prince died of illness. In 1622, Itimad-ud-daulah died suddenly at Agra, leaving Nur Jahan grieving.

3. Khurram's Revolt and Court Politics

Jahangir had retreated to Kashmir to recuperate in 1622. While Jahangir was ill and Nur Jahan and Khurram were locked in a struggle for dominance, Shah Abbas marched with the Persian army, besieged the fort at Qandahar and took possession of the city from the Mughal garrison. Khurram was ordered to go there, but he refused and stayed in the Deccan. Shaharyar was given the command of the imperial army with some nobles for the Qandahar expedition. He was also given Khurram's jagir in Hissar. Mahabat Khan returned from Kabul to support Nur Jahan and Shaharyar. In response, Khurram marched to Agra with an army of supporters—all the amirs in the Deccan, Malwa and Gujarat remained loyal to him. Mahabat Khan led the loyalist army and at Fatehpur Sikri defeated Khurram who retreated to Malwa.

Jahangir and Nur Jahan directed the loyalist army, recovered Gujarat and drove Khurram from Malwa. Khurram took refuge, after desertion of some of his officers, at Asirgarh in Khandesh. Once more, he had to flee and took refuge in Golkunda. With the help of Sultan Abdullah Qutub Shah, Khurram moved to Orissa and took over Bihar and Bengal. But then on the move west he was defeated at Allahabad and retreated to Bengal. The rebellious zamindars forced him to flee again. Leaving his wife, with newly born Murad Bakhsh, Khurram found refuge with Malik Ambar who was now fighting the sultan of Bijapur and his new ally the Mughal emperor. Khurram fell ill and engaged in negotiations with Nur Jahan who dictated the terms. Khurram agreed to remain governor of the Deccan provinces and sent his two sons, Dara Shikoh and Aurangzeb, as hostages to the court. All of this exposed a basic problem with the Taimurid system: threats to the occupant of the throne from mature princes with ambition and ability supported by factional manoeuvring.

The rebellion of Khurram and its outcome helped Parvez (seen as a drunkard mediocre), backed by Mahabat Khan, become a contender for the Mughal throne. Parvez and Mahabat Khan threatened Nur Jahan's plan for Shaharyar. In 1626, Nur Jahan found an excuse and humiliated Mahabat Khan who now moved north with an army of Rajputs, made Jahangir captive on the banks of River Jhelum. Nur Jahan submitted to Mahabat Khan. They all arrived in Kabul where Nur Jah-

an and Asaf Khan mobilised anti-Rajput sentiment among the troops, nobles and the population of Kabul. There were clashes in which many Rajputs died. Jahangir, coached by Nur Jahan, kept a cheerful pose to his servant and captor Mahabat Khan. In the summer, moving south to Lahore, at the fort of Rohtas (near Jhelum), Jahangir called a muster for review of troops and asked Mahabat Khan to keep the Rajputs separate. Mahabat Khan saw through the plot: he fled south to the Deccan. It is significant that, throughout the adventure, Mahabat Khan did not harm Jahangir as his captive or made attempt to dislodge the emperor from the Mughal throne.

Parvez died of alcoholism in the Deccan in 1626. Now there were two contenders for the throne: Shaharyar backed by Nur Jahan and the mature Khurram. Jahangir, who had moved to Kashmir in the hot months of 1627, died in October somewhere near Lahore. Soon after Jahangir's death, Asaf Khan put Nur Jahan under confinement in the camp with the body of her dead husband. Asaf Khan then obtained custody of Khurram's three sons from Nur Jahan and sent a messenger to Khurram in the Deccan. At the same time, with the agreement of majority of nobles, Asaf Khan proclaimed Dawar Bakhsh, a young son of Khusrau, as emperor, but this was a ruse for Khurram. He forced Shaharyar as a usurper against his cousin the new emperor. Shaharyar raised an army of mercenaries, but Asaf Khan and the mir bakhshi defeated him. He was captured, made to submit to Dawar Bakhsh, imprisoned in Lahore fort, and then blinded.

Khurram moved north in haste once he received the message from Asaf Khan. He was informed of Shaharyar's defeat when crossing the Narbuda River. Most nobles now came to his side. Khurram sent a farman to Asaf Khan, who had reached Agra, to blind and even kill Shaharyar, the puppet Dawar Bakhsh, and other mature Taimurid cousins. Asaf Khan imprisoned Dawar Bakhsh in January 1628 and proclaimed Khurram as emperor with the title Shahjahan. Two days after receiving the farman, Asaf Khan ordered execution of Shaharyar, Dawar Bakhsh and his brother Gahrasp, and two cousins (sons of Jahangir's brother Danyal). Khurram, now Shahjahan, arrived in Agra before the end of January 1628 and was hailed as emperor. Jahangir was buried in the Shalimar Garden near Lahore. Nur Jahan spent 18 years in contended

obscurity at Lahore, supported by a handsome stipend from Shahjahan. She died in 1645 at 68 years of age and was buried in the Shadarah Garden at some distance from Jahangir's mausoleum.

Jahangir's best years were from 1611, when he married Nur Jahan, to the outbreak of Khurram's revolt in 1622: these 11 years were of peace and prosperity in the empire and contentment for the emperor. Jahangir, unlike Akbar, was not a great general, organiser or builder. But he developed a new imperial court culture. He built many gardens in northern India and Kashmir and patronised miniature paintings. He was given to opium and alcohol from a young age which induced indolence, a trait his grandfather Humayun exhibited perhaps for the same reason. However, Jahangir's passivity helped the Mughal motifs: familial claim of the Taimurids and increasing inviolability of the person of the ruler. Jahangir was a strange mixture of generosity and justice with great cruelty and callous disregard for human life. He was an avid lover of art and Nature and at best a deist. In was in his reign that contacts with Europeans started in earnest.

II. Shahjahan (1628-1658)

Shahjahan set the precedence of blood sacrifice in the Taimurid family—eliminating two brothers, two nephews, and two cousins—as a succession rite for Mughal emperors in the future. He lived to see his two sons executed, a third driven to Persia, and himself spent his last years as captive of his son Aurangzeb. Shahjahan had given ample proof of his skills as a military commander, diplomat and politician, but he also showed ruthlessness in pursuit of power. The empire fitted well with the emperor, a skilled and aggressive man. Shahjahan maintained his capital at Agra for 20 years, but in 1648 shifted to a new city of Shahjahanabad (Delhi), more formal, more forbidding, grand monarchy for a grand empire.

After ascending the throne, Shahjahan had to deal first with a serious rebellion by one of the Afghan nobles, Khan Jahan Lodhi. This noble had entered the service of Akbar as a young man and rose to the title of Salabat Khan under Jahangir. He was much trusted by Jahnagir, though

he was not an impressive commander and governor. When Jahangir died, Khan Jahan rebuffed Shahjahan's overtures for support in his struggle of succession. He eventually came to Agra but then fled to the Deccan, when Shahjahan pressed him to disband his troops, and sought support from Murtaza II, Nizam Shah. In 1630, Shahjahan moved south to crush the rebellion; the campaign coincided with an unprecedented drought unleashing a calamitous famine that killed millions in Gujarat and the Deccan. Khan Jahan fled to the Punjab where he was captured and killed; his severed head was sent to Shahjahan.

1. Return of Islamic Political Culture

The reaction of orthodox Sunnis to the policies of Akbar and Jahangir started to have influence on official policy. In the forefront was the Naqshbandi order, emphasising the importance of the Sharia against extreme forms of mystical devotion along with the anti-Hindu and anti-Shia rhetoric of some of them (e.g. Khwaja Baqi Billah and Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi). The Naqshbandis, joined by followers of other orders, were the voice of Indian Muslims who wanted to move away from the heterodoxy of Akbar and Jahangir to the orthodox Sunni Islam. Shahjahan embraced this movement to define his Islamic idiom as a radical departure from his grandfather and father in their inclusive political appeal. Shahjahan made some important moves between 1633 and 1650 to demonstrate his allegiance to the Sunni orthodoxy.

- Non-Muslims were forbidden from building new temples and churches and repairing the older structures; many recently built temples at Benares were demolished.

- Islamic festivals were celebrated with enthusiasm; Milad-un-nabi (birthday of the Prophet) in 1633 was celebrated by the Emperor with great fervour and gifts and money were distributed generously.

- Royal interest in Mecca and Medina was revived which lay dormant for years. The Emperor sponsored the annual Hajj caravans: each year two Mughal ships sailed from Surat to Jeddah with pilgrims paid from the royal treasury. The Sharif of Mecca, Zaid bin Muhsin (1631-1660) sent a diplomatic mission

> to Shahjahan's court in 1643. In 1650, the head of the Mecca mission, Shaikh Abd-us-Samad, was given a mansab and made Chief judge of the imperial army.

Shahjahan also abolished the discipleship ritual and other practices of his father and grandfather. This pleased the orthodox Muslims immensely. The tradition of khanazadgi, born to the house, was maintained, in which high-ranking nobles (amirs) were identified as the emperor's extended household. Khanazadgi and the hereditary service associated with it applied to officers in high position and in financial administration (diwans, etc.).

2. Consolidation of Empire's Frontiers

In Shahjahan's reign, the empire continued to expand. He was in charge of the Deccan at Jahangir's death. As the new emperor, Shahjahan wasted no time in organising diplomatic and military pressure on the remaining Muslim sultanates in the Deccan. In 1632, the imperial army seized Daulatabad fort in Ahmadnagar, captured the Nizam Shahi sultan, a puppet of Shahji Bhonsle the Maratha commander and father of Shivaji, and sent him to Gwalior as prisoner. The Emperor annexed Ahmadnagar and established Mughal administration. Shahji tried to revive the sultanate but did not succeed. In 1635, the sultans of Golkunda and Bijapur tried to help Shahji, giving Shahjahan the excuse to move against the two Shia states.

Shahjahan then turned his attention to the sultanates of Bijapur and Golkunda and moved to the Deccan in 1636. The emperor demanded the two sultans to acknowledge Mughal hegemony: pay annual tribute and issue coins and the Friday khutba in emperor's name. The Qutub Shahi sultan of Golkunda complied with these demands. But the Adil Shahi sultan of Bijapur declined and had to face a Mughal army which devastated his territory before he capitulated. He was forced to submit and undertook not to help Shahji and molest Golkunda. Both sultanates were now within the Mughal sphere. Thus after 40 years (1595-1636) the affairs of the Deccan were settled. This stabilised the Mughal frontier in the south for decades. The Emperor appointed Aurangzeb as Viceroy in the Deccan, but because of Dara Shikoh's opposition and partiality of the Emperor, Aurangzeb left the Deccan in 1644. He was appointed as

governor of Gujarat in 1645. Aurangzeb was sent to the Deccan again in 1653. This time he organised its administration and stabilised the territory. But he also wanted to destroy the Shia sultanates of Golkunda and Bijapur. Shahjahan intervened against annexation of these states, thanks to Dara Shikoh's hostility towards Aurangzeb. Aurangzeb would return to the Deccan as emperor in the late-1680s and spend his energy and the empire's resources in wars against the two Muslim sultanates and the Marathas for nearly 20 years. In 1707 he would die in the Deccan because of utter exhaustion, dejection and old age.

In 1637, Shahjahan's son Aurangzeb annexed the Rajput kingdom of Baglana in the south-west and attached it to Khandesh. The raja was made an imperial noble (amir). In Sindh, Mughal authority was imposed and in return many amirs were given jagirs and payments. Jahangir had made the Bundela Raja Bir Singh Dev—Bundelas were Rajputs of low status—an amir and allowed to retain control over his kingdom as watan jagir. Bir Singh built a large fortune and achieved unchallenged domination in Bundelkhand. His son Jujhar Singh presented himself to Shahjahan at which time the Emperor asked for inquiry of his deceased father's estate. The reason probably was that the late raja tried to oppose Shahjahan when he had revolted against Jahangir. Jujhar Singh fled, so Shahjahan sent an armed expedition to Urchha. Many Bundelas died in the battle that followed. Jujhar asked for pardon, which he received in return for indemnity and annexation of a portion of Bundelkhand, but soon Jujhar Singh rebelled again. Shahjahan was incensed; Gonds joined the Mughal army and in the campaign killed Jujhar and his son. Two sons and one grandson of the dead raja converted to Islam and some women joined the imperial harem. Shahjahan went to Urchha in search of the Bundela treasure, demolished the main temple and erected a mosque there. Thus Bundelkhand and Gondwana were brought under Mughal control.

In the Himalayan foothills, Raja of Garhwal's army fought off the Mughal army in 1635. Eventually, in 1656 the raja submitted, agreed to pay tribute and sent his son to serve the imperial court. Akbar had annexed Kashmir from the Shia Chak ruler who found refuge with the Abdal of Baltistan (lower Tibet). The prince of Baltistan occasionally raided Mughal Kashmir, but he acknowledged Mughal sovereignty in

1634. However, when lapsed in this, Shahjahan sent Zafar Khan, governor of Kashmir, to invade Baltistan on a daring expedition in 1637. Zafar Khan defeated the Abdal, received one million rupees in indemnity and brought the Abdal and Chak princes as captives.

In the north east, the Burmese Ahoms were a source of almost constant irritation in the area. A war broke out in 1636 after the Ahoms killed a Mughal emissary. Next year a Mughal army drove the Ahoms back, captured Kamrup and killed its ruler Bali Narayan. However, in 1638 the Ahoms were back and inflicted severe losses on the Mughals. The two parties concluded a treaty, in which the Ahoms acknowledged Mughal rule in Kamrup and the Mughals acknowledged the Ahom monarchy. Ahoms were now outside the Mughal Indian political system. I should add here that Shahjahan drove the Portuguese out of Hugli in Bengal because of their aggressive piracy and religious activity.

A major goal of Shahjahan was to recover the Taimurid lands bordering the Persian kingdom on the west and those in Central Asia now in the hands of Uzbeks. But his campaigns outside India, three in Qandahar and two in Central Asia, were a massive failure: thousands of people were lost, millions of rupees wasted, and ten years lost in attention and resources. Shahjahan went for Qandahar first to wrest it from the Safavid rival. In 1638, Ali Mardan Khan, the Persian commander, fearing execution at the hands of the cruel Shah Safi (1629-1642), surrendered Qandahar to the Mughals. Shahjahan rewarded the commander with a noble rank (mansab) and governorship of Kashmir. In 1648, the next Persian king, Shah Abbas II (1642-1666) decided for a military campaign on Qandahar. He wrested the fort and city from the Mughals. Shahjahan was enraged and launched three campaigns, each of which failed badly. In 1649, Shahjahan was in Kabul and sent Aurangzeb with wazir Saad Ullah Khan, but they could not break the fort's defences. In 1652, Aurangzeb again failed to take the fort. The failed attempts reflected the weakness of Mughal artillery and Safavid determination to hold on to Qandahar. Shahjahan made one last attempt in 1653. This time his eldest son Dara Shikoh led the Mughal army, but it could not breach the fortress walls and had to withdraw. Eventually the Emperor was persuaded by his advisers to abandon the idea when he was about to make a fourth attempt in 1656. Qandahar stayed with the Persians

until the mid-eighteenth century when Ahmad Shah Abdali absorbed it in his Afghan kingdom.

In the mid-1640s (1645-1647), Shahjahan attempted to recover the Taimurid homelands in Central Asia ruled by Uzbeks. Their territory included north of the Oxus, Samarqand and Bukhara, and to the south in Balkh and Badakhshan. There was a civil war among Uzbeks at this time and one side asked for Mughal help. Shahjahan reacted positively. Prince Murad with Ali Mardan Khan and a large army were sent to the area. They occupied Balkh with little resistance, but Prince Murad did not like it there and returned to India. Shahjahan asked his wazir Saad Ullah Khan to replace the disgraced prince. Then Shahjahan called his other son Aurangzeb from Gujarat and sent him to Balkh as governor. Shahjahan also moved north to Kabul. The Mughals sat in Balkh and negotiated with the son of the Uzbek ruler of Bukhara. But the conditions at Balkh for food, etc. were horrible. The Mughals settled on a treaty with the Uzbek ruler and handed back Balkh to him in return for nominal submission to the Mughal emperor. The treaty allowed extension of the Mughal frontier only 30 miles north of Kabul. That was the end of the Taimurid attempt to reassert power over the Uzbeks and Turkomans. The expedition was expensive in human terms and demonstrated the difficulty of retaining the harsh and sparsely populated lands of the region.

3. The Shape of Shahjahan's Empire

In 1647, two decades after Shahjahan ascended the throne, Abdul Hamid Lahori, the court historian, summarised the salient features of Mughal rule:

- *Size of The Empire*: The empire stretched from Sindh to Sylhet and from Balkh to the Deccan provinces. There were 22 provinces and 4,350 parganas.

- *Expansion of Revenue*: The assessed imperial revenue had doubled in nearly 50 years: the total jama in 1595 was four billion dams (or Rs. 110 million), increased to seven billion dams (or Rs. 175 million) at the death of Jahangir in 1627 and was nearly nine

billion dams (or Rs. 225 million) in 1647. Part of the increase was due to expanded territory and growth in population. The revenue in Shahjahan's time was enough to support the army, buildings, gifts, imperial court, and add to the imperial reserve.

- *Emperor's Financial Skills*: Akbar had accumulated huge treasure in 51 years, but Jahangir spent most of the revenues in his 22-year reign. Shahjahan reversed this and brought prosperity: the imperial khalsa was about 30 million rupees or 14 per cent of the annual revenue. This came to the imperial treasury and was far more than before. Despite the heavy expenses on military and benefaction, Shahjahan accumulated reserves worth 20 million rupees in 20 years. He had spent 25 million rupees on gardens, palaces, forts, tombs, mosques, etc. in Agra, Delhi, Lahore, Kabul, and other places.

- *Military Strength of the Empire*: The Cavalry numbered 200,000, not including the local troops for the collection of revenue by faujdars and amils. Mansabdars had 8,000 horsemen and 4,000 un-mounted musketeers, gunners and rocketeers. The annual salaries paid in cash to the mounted infantry directly employed by the emperor amounted to 16 million rupees. The mansabdars received assigned ranks and jagirs from which they collected revenue and met their expenses, including salary for their armies. It needs to be emphasised that the two Mughal emperors after Akbar did not much improve their army's weaponry and discipline.

- *Change in Mughal Nobility*: In his historical account, Lahori listed the empire's nobles: Muslim ulema, shaikhs, poets, but avoids mention of non-Muslims: he focuses on only those amirs and mansabdars who had the rank of 500 zat and above serving Shahjahan. The list for 1647-48 has 578 men, of which 445 were in service. The imperial cadre had doubled in 40 years: from 283 in 1605 to 445 in 1647. Muslims comprised four-fifth of the mansabdars of 500 zat and above. One-half of the Muslim nobility comprised Iranis and Turanis and the rest were Afghans, who did not enjoy the trust of Akbar and Jahangir, and other Indo-Muslims. Among 90 Hindus, 73 were Rajputs. Seventy-three of the 445 high-ranking officers in service included the inner circle of princes and great amirs

(ranks of 2,500 zat and above). Needless to add, there was a high concentration of ranks and wealth.

I think it is fair to suggest that, in the mid-seventeenth century, the empire was expansive and wealthy, though not invincible, as never before. Imperial symbolism and ideology were returning to Islamic orthodoxy. However, by the end of Shahjahan's reign, the empire would face its greatest crisis and perhaps a watershed for the Taimurid dynasty and India itself. The war of succession was expensive to the empire and its revenue; it reduced agricultural output, increased prices and created food shortages. Besides, it divided the nobles and intensified the tension between Muslims and Hindus. Perhaps more important was the damage it caused to the glorified image and legitimacy of the Taimurid dynasty.

At least outwardly, Shahjahan showed devotion to his Sunni faith: he reintroduced the pilgrim tax and the jizya on non-Muslims (Hindus). He enjoyed a very loving life with Mumtaz Mahal for about 19 years, though after his wife's death he was quite indulgent. Except for the war of succession, Shahjahan's reign was without threat. Trade and economy did reasonably well. State finances were flourishing and pomp and splendour were on show with impressive pieces of architecture and some public works. The dark sides of Shahjahan's empire were the oppression and poverty of peasantry and the start of financial insolvency due to his failed campaigns for Qandahar and the expensive monuments he built for his personal pleasure and glory.

4. The War of Succession

Shahjahan had four sons, Dara Shikoh, Shuja, Aurangzeb, and Murad Baksh, and two daughters, Jahanara, and Roshanara—all of the same father and mother—living when he fell ill in September 1657. At that time, Dara, father's favourite and heir-apparent, was the only son present in Agra; Shuja was governor of Bengal; Aurangzeb was in the Deccan; and Murad Bkhsh was governor of Gujarat. Aurangzeb was perhaps the ablest of all: he seems to have possessed uncommon industry, profound statesmanship and military skills, and unquestionable capacity for administration. He also had the support of orthodox Sunni

Muslims. Shuja and Murad were able warriors and administrators, but weaker contenders for the throne. Dara Shikoh and Aurangzeb, both able and forceful, were in deep intellectual conflict: Dara espoused Akbar's eclectic ideology, syncretic religion and policy of inclusiveness, but Aurangzeb embraced the ideology of Islam including the rule by Sharia. Each of them enjoyed support of contending factions. The questions of conquest of the Deccan and relations with Bijapur and Golkunda were also part of this rivalry.

Dara as heir-apparent stayed close to the court and kept personal contact with his father: he strongly influenced his father. His elder sister, Jahanara, was his ardent supporter. In many ways, Dara was like Akbar but more intellectually developed. He was much influenced by two Sufis of the Qadria order. He also moved from the study of the Quran to the Hindu Upanishads. Dara claimed that Hinduism and Islam were identical in substance. His translations and writings convinced some Muslims that he was an apostate who did not adhere to the tenets of Islam and did not perform the basic rituals. He may have been a monotheist, but his association with the Jesuits and Brahmins only reinforced the Muslim sentiment. He was vulnerable to attacks by the ulema. His intellectual gifts were not matched by his behaviour with others, nobles in particular: he exhibited insensitivity, pride, vanity, and haughtiness. Besides Dara was a mediocre commander.

Aurangzeb, on the other hand, was a very different personality. He was energetic and driven by ambition but secretive and suspicious; extremely pious, searching for spiritual quest; scholar of Islamic religion and philosophy; given to simple ascetic life; and an experienced commander and administrator. He had under his belt the governorships of the Deccan (eight years) and Gujarat (three years) and led expeditions to Qandahar and Balkh. In spite of his impressive performance as administrator and commander, Aurangzeb was never on good terms with his father whose favourite was Dara. Shahjahan, encouraged by Jahanara, rebuked Aurangzeb frequently but probably unfairly. Roshanara, Aurangzeb's second sister was, however, his supporter, provided information to him about the affairs at the court and its politics.

In 1653, after the third unsuccessful campaign, led by Dara, to regain Qandahar, Shahjahan sent Aurangzeb again to the Deccan. For

the next five years, polarised tensions in the empire centred on the struggle between Dara and Aurangzeb in the Deccan. The Deccan was in a mess, thanks to mismanagement by others who had followed Aurangzeb in 1642. The region was in fiscal deficit in spite of Aurangzeb's efforts with the help of the able Murshid Quli Khan to improve agricultural productivity and land revenue. Aurangzeb suggested that, given the wealth of Golkunda, he invades and annexes the kingdom. However, Shahjahan ruled out invasion because Abdullah Qutub Shah gave refuge to the Emperor when Shahjahan had revolted against his father. Aurangzeb was undeterred: he started contacts with Muhammad Said, better known as Mir Jumla, the Qutub Shahi conqueror of Carnatic. Their contacts and relationship were a major part of the struggle for succession, hence worth describing here in some detail.

The northern frontiers of Golkunda and Bijapur were decided by the imposition of tributary status in 1636 protecting them from Mughal invasion. Each ruler was free to expand his frontier in the south. In Carnatic, political power was fragmented among a number of Telugu and Tamil naiks, descendents of nobles of the extinct Vijayanagar Empire. The armies of Bijapur, led by Shahji Bhonsle and supported by some other Maratha and Afghan generals, annexed lands in the area and made it a province of Bijapur, extending the sultanate to the south of River Kaveri. In the 1640s, Golkunda conquered Carnatic between the Krishna and Pillar rivers along the Coromandel Coast, a very fertile land with a thriving textile industry for overseas markets.

The pillar of this conquest for Golkunda was Muhammad Said, whose family was from Persia. He had moved to Golkunda as a young employee of a Persian trader. He moved upward very quickly and became governor of Machilipatnam and other coastal areas. In 1638, Muhammad Said became wazir of the sultan of Golkunda who gave him the title of Mir Jumla. He led the Golkunda armies for ten years (1642-1652) against the naiks and battered them. By 1652, Mir Jumla governed the territory of Hyderabad-Carnatic and accumulated much personal wealth from plunder and revenue. He was active in trade with the Mughal Empire and outside India. The sultan did not much like Mir Jumla's wealth and power. Escaping from an assassination attempt, Mir Jumla contacted Bijapur and the Mughals to negotiate for a position

in their domain. During 1654-1655, Aurangzeb proposed that he hand over his territories to the Mughals, attack Golkunda from the south while he (Aurangzeb) attacks from the north-west. Mir Jumla accepted the proposal.

In the meantime, the Sultan of Golkunda put into confinement Muhammad Amin, son of Mir Jumla, who was his envoy to the court. Aurangzeb, using this as pretext, asked Shahjahan to make the move into the sultanate. Mir Jumla and his son were enrolled as high-ranking amirs while Shahjahan ordered release of Muhammad Amin. Aurangzeb invaded Golkunda even before Shahjahan's order reached Abdullah Qutub Shah, the sultan of Golkunda. The Mughal army occupied Hyderabad and besieged the fortress in which Abdullah Qutub Shah had taken refuge. Mir Jumla and his force from the south arrived to join Aurangzeb. However, Dara and Jahanara persuaded Shahjahan to order Aurangzeb—Abdullah had contacted them—to withdraw and ask Golkunda to pay a large war indemnity, secede some of his border territory, and give a daughter in marriage to Muhammad Sultan, one of Aurangzeb's sons. Aurangzeb withdrew under protest. Mir Jumla brought his establishment at the court in Delhi (Shahjahanabad), where Shahjahan made him wazir, increased his rank, gave him the Hyderabad-Carnatic as jagir, and dispatched imperial officers to snatch it from Golkunda. Aurangzeb now had a powerful friend at the court.

In late 1656, Muhammad Adil Shah, sultan of Bijapur, died and his son, Ali Adil Shah II, faced rebellious nobles and zamindars. Aurangzeb and Mir Jumla, while preparing for invasion of Bijapur, were in contact with some of the nobles there. Shahjahan approved the invasion plan and sent Mir Jumla with troops. Again, Dara intervened and Shahjahan ordered Aurangzeb to refrain from final conquest. Aurangzeb was forced to accept war indemnity and some territory of Bijapur. Shahjahan ordered Mir Jumla to return to Delhi. The manoeuvrings by Dara and Jahanara at the court were clearly meant to undermine their brother's plans for conquest of Golkunda and Bijapur in the Deccan. But in the fall of 1657, soon after Mir Jumla's recall to Delhi, Shahjahan fell ill. The war of succession began in earnest. The otherwise 'magnificent' reign of Shahjahan was to end in chaos. The crisis was long anticipated given the conflicting ambitions and power of Shahjahan's

four sons: Dara Shikoh, heir-designate, was close to his father at the court against his three brothers; Muhammad Shuja was governor of Bengal, Orissa and Bihar; Aurangzeb was governor of four provinces in the Deccan; and Murad Bakhsh was governor of Malwa and Gujarat. The princes were determined individuals, so the war between formidable opponents was going to be bloody. Each claimed experience in war, statecraft and administration; each commanded a power-base, treasure and army. Only one of them could ascend the Mughal throne and the rest faced probably death.

Soon after Shahjahan fell ill, Dara took over the court, but the news spread far and wide. Dara seized the agents of his brothers and censored communication with their masters. Seclusion of the Emperor led to speculation that he was dead or near death. However, Shahjahan recovered sufficiently in a month's time to appear in public and moved to Agra to be near the tomb of Mumtaz Mahal. In the meantime, in early 1658, Shuja moved with an army to Agra. But they were intercepted by Dara's troops, led by his son Suleman Shikoh and Raja Jai Singh. Shuja was defeated near Benares and fled to Bengal. In the south, Murad Bakhsh declared himself emperor, plundered Surat and its merchants and prepared to march north-east. Aurangzeb, while in the process of concluding a treaty with Bijapur, contacted Shuja and Murad. Aurangzeb and Murad agreed as partners against Dara and Shuja: Murad would get the Punjab, Kabul, Kashmir, and Sindh to rule over these territories as independent king. Aurangzeb will be king of the rest of the empire. He received commitment of support from the nobles in the Deccan.

Aurangzeb then marched north joined by Murad. They were met by Shahjahan's army, led by Jaswant Singh Rathore, who was driven back to Delhi. Dara again assembled a large army at Delhi and moved south to Agra to intercept the joint forces of Aurangzeb and Murad. They met on the River Jumna near Agra, where Dara's army was routed and he fled the battlefield. Aurangzeb occupied Agra city and, after failed negotiations, besieged his father in the Agra fort. In the intense heat of the summer of 1658, Shahjahan's plea for reconciliation went unattended, and he was deprived of water from the Jumna. He with his daughter Jahanara would spend nearly eight years and die in confinement. Au-

rangzeb was now the master of Agra and its fort. Dara had fled to Delhi and then moved to Lahore. On the way from Agra to Delhi, Murad fell out because he became suspicious of Aurangzeb's designs. Aurangzeb confronted Murad near Mathura, captured him, quietly sent him as prisoner to the Gwalior fort, and took over the command of Murad's leaderless army.

Aurangzeb paused at Delhi, had himself crowned with the title Alamgir. This was the end of the first phase of the war of succession, but the end was still not secure. Aurangzeb's troops chased Dara in the Punjab. He ran south along the Indus into Sindh and abandoned at Bhakkar many of his dependents, some of his troops, guns and much treasure. Dara, with some retainers, took refuge with the governor of Gujarat. Aurangzeb sent his troops to track Dara, but faced a new threat from his other brother Shuja. Shuja rejected Aurangzeb's offer of his rule in the east and moved west with a sizeable army. In the early part of 1659, in spite of the defection of Raja Jaswant Singh, Aurangzeb and his son Muhammad Sultan defeated Shuja near Allahabad who fled with the remnants of his Bengal army. In the meantime, Dara raised an army in Gujarat and planned to go to the Deccan, but Raja Jaswant Singh Rathore lured him to march to Ajmer. But the raja was with Aurangzeb who moved to Ajmer where he defeated Dara who fled again. Aurangzeb, confident of his power and resources, returned to Delhi and organised his second and grand coronation in June 1659. Dara spent months in flight—Gujarat, Sindh and the Bolan pass—but received no help. Malik Jiwan, an Afghan whom Dara had once saved from execution, gave refuge to the prince. Dara's wife soon died there. Malik Jiwan betrayed Dara and handed him over, along with two daughters and his third son, to the imperial army. They were taken to Delhi where, after public humiliation, Dara was executed as an apostate and infidel on the authority of a fatwa issued by some ulema. His son, Siphir Shikoh, met the same fate.

In the summer of 1660, Mir Jumla pursued Shuja and his army in Bengal and defeated him near Dacca. Shuja fled with his family and took refuge with the king of Arakan (Burma) where for some reason that king eventually killed him. Aurangzeb's eldest son, Muhammad Sultan, had joined Shuja for a time, later imprisoned and died in 1676.

Toward the end of 1661, some of Murad's friends and Mughal nobles planned to rescue him but the attempt failed. Aurangzeb found the excuse to eliminate his brother. Apparently, when the war of succession began, Murad had killed the diwan of Gujarat suspecting him to be a supporter of Shahjahan. Diwan's second son, at the instigation of Aurangzeb, now demanded justice under the Sharia. The Qazi of Gwalior found Murad guilty of murder; the son of diwan did not accept blood money and asked for retribution, hence the execution of Murad.

III. Aurangzeb Alamgir (1658-1707)

There were two almost distinct phases of Aurangzeb's long reign of 49 years: 1658-1681 in northern India and 1681-1707 in southern India. In the first 20 years, the Emperor maintained his capital at Delhi, but for the next 29 years he had a moveable capital with grand encampments. In addition, in the first 23 years, he launched campaigns for expansion in the north, but spent the last nearly 26 years entirely in the Deccan fighting the Muslim sultans and the resilient Marathas who successfully exhausted him and his imperial resources. I suspect Aurangzeb's basic problem as emperor was that he equated his devoutly-held religious faith with the interest of the Mughal state.

1. Campaigns on the Northern Frontiers and Central India

The war of succession caused tremendous disorder and distress almost throughout the empire. So Aurangzeb tried initially to alleviate the burden of taxes, etc. At the same time, he launched campaigns to consolidate and expand the empire. The first of many campaigns was launched in the east and north-east. The imperial hold on Bengal and the north-east frontier had been weakened: the raja of Cooch Behar and the Ahom king took Kamrup. In 1660, Aurangzeb sent Mir Jumla as governor of Bihar, Orissa and Bengal who imposed the Mughal authority, revived revenues and restructured administration. The governor shifted the capital from Rajmahal to Dhaka, invested in trade with his own agents and the European trading companies. Soon Mir Jumla launched campaign in Assam: annexed Cooch Behar and converted the raja's son on

the side of Mughals. Then his army took control of Kamrup and its capital Gauhati, penetrated into the kingdom of Ahom whose king fled. While the heavy rains that followed caused much damage to the imperial army, the king of Ahom and his nobles sued for peace. But in the process of a phased withdrawal of his forces, Mir Jumla suddenly died in the spring of 1663. Aurangzeb did not replace Mir Jumla with an able commander and the Mughal faujdars could not face the resurgent king of Ahom. Eventually Kamrup was lost to the empire forever. In 1664, the Emperor sent Shaista Khan as governor of Bengal who rescued Bengali slaves from the Maghs of Arakan, annexed the Magh headquarters, and absorbed it into the empire. The new governor also fought the Arakan and defeated the chastised Portuguese pirates in the Bay of Bengal.

In central India, in Shahjahan's time (1620s), Cheros, a tribal people, had extended their domain to the southern part of Bihar (Chota Nagpur) and raided the Mughal districts for cattle. In 1640, the governor of Bihar led a punitive expedition that resulted in the submission of Raja of Cheros with war indemnity. Mughals intervened again in 1642 and attempted to dethrone the raja: Zabardast Khan, the Mughal commander, marched on Deogaon and Palamau, took Raja Partap Rao as prisoner to Patna where the Chero Raja accepted a mansab and his kingdom was converted into watan jagir in return for an annual tribute. However, the affairs of that part of central India did not stabilise. Aurangzeb ordered Daud Khan Panni, governor of Bihar, to conquer the Chero kingdom which the governor did in 1661. He appointed a Mughal faujdar to administer the kingdom as a district of Bihar. Eventually the Emperor annexed the Chero kingdom.

The north-west frontier was strategic area for the empire. The governor at Kabul had a vast semi-arid territory, but a major route for trade through the Khyber Pass. Its sparse population was Pashtun, pastoral nomads and traders, and Persian-speaking Tajiks who were sedentary cultivators. The Pashtun society was divided into patrilineal tribes (Yusufzai, Afridi, Wazir, Khattak, etc.) ruled by jirgas headed by sardars (khans). Pashtuns were active in trade: they brought horses from Central Asia and carried Indian goods in return. They were also mercenaries. Some of them had settled on this side of the Khyber Pass; others had

moved to the plains in the south and east; some had acquired high positions in the Indo-Muslim sultanates and the Mughal administration.

When a series of revolts against the Mughal rule erupted in this area, Aurangzeb reacted quickly and decisively, given the strategic importance of the region. In 1667, a Yusufzai chief and a self-styled king of Swat led the tribes against the Mughals in pitched battles near Peshawar and Attock. Muhammad Amin Khan, the mir bakhshi, brought an army from Delhi to crush the revolt. In 1672, the Afridis mounted a more serious threat: they massacred a Mughal army between Peshawar and Kabul. One Afridi chief declared himself as king and closed the Khyber Pass for the caravan trade. Others like the Khattaks, led by the poet Khushal Khan, joined the Afridi revolt. Another Mughal army was lost in the winter by the Afridi ambush. Finally, in the summer of 1674, Aurangzeb brought a large army under his own command. The route through the Khyber Pass was reopened for trade, but a Mughal force was badly mauled in Bajaur. Besides force, Aurangzeb used diplomacy and bribe to subdue the revolts; he offered gifts, gold and honours to induce the Pashtun chiefs to end the rebellion and submit. The Emperor returned to Delhi in 1675 after fortification of garrisoned posts in the area. After these encounters, the governor of Kabul, Muhammad Amin Khan, involved himself in local tribal politics: he paid lavish subsidies to tribal chiefs and took many Pashtuns into Mughal service. Amin Khan's policy worked well during his tenure for the next 20 years. Aurangzeb, unlike his father, gave up the dream of launching campaigns in Qandahar and Central Asia, given the turbulent conditions in the tribal areas.

2. Religion and Imperial Culture

The wars in the north were enormously expensive in finances and manpower; also they allowed the Rajputs and Marathas a free hand. Perhaps a more important reason for the rising opposition and resistance to the Mughal rule was Aurangzeb's religious attitude and policy. Shahjahan had clearly moved away from Akbar's ideology and inclusive political culture. Aurangzeb went for a more radical transformation of the empire: the Sharia must govern it for the benefit of Muslims. Conversion to Islam was an important strategy and the unconverted majority (Hin-

dus) dealt with fairly but sternly. Apparently, Aurangzeb's personal piety and outlook on life were the major influence on his goals. He had guilt on his hands: rebellion against his father and the shabby treatment given to him ran against the norms of filial piety and the Sharia. In 1659, Aurangzeb sought recognition from the Sharif of Mecca, who rebuffed him in turn. A second attempt worked and Aurangzeb became a generous patron of the holy cities of Mecca and Medina. Having done this to placate his conscience and public opinion, Aurangzeb was free to fulfil his vision of an Islamic empire.

In the eleventh year of his reign (1669), Aurangzeb discontinued the practices of Akbar and went beyond: preference for Muslim officials; no patronage for the arts, music, chronicles, book illustrations; few monumental buildings such as mosques as Islamic symbols; no celebration of Nauroz (beginning of the new year in Persian calendar); and prohibition of wine and opium. Aurangzeb's main achievement was his legal text, Fatawat-i-Alamgiri: it became a standard 'for making the general Muslim public act according to the legal decisions and precedents of the theological scholars (ulema) of the Hanafi School'. Aurangzeb created the office of mohtasib, censor, selected from amongst the ulema, and established a network of accountability in major cities and towns. He took measures to enhance the status, power and income of ulema and the institutions they served: tax-free grants were the most important material support. At the same time, Aurangzeb resumed the Hindu grants. In 1690, all tax-free grants were made hereditary, which was not liked by some of the nobles. Aurangzeb's Islamic policy included many decisions that affected non-Muslims quite adversely.

- All temples recently built or repaired—main objects were in Mathura and Benares—contrary to the Sharia were to be demolished and mosques built on the sites of razed temples.

- Tax on Hindu pilgrims, abolished by Akbar, was resumed.

- The internal customs duty was raised to 5 per cent for Hindus, but retained at 2.5 per cent for Muslims.

- Muslims replaced Hindu officers in the provincial revenue service.

- In 1679, against the advice of many nobles, the Emperor revived jizya on non-Muslims. Hindus protested, especially in Delhi, but to no avail.

These policies allowed some zealous Muslim officials to harass and terrorise Hindus. Aurangzeb was pragmatic as well. His basic objective was to convert non-Muslims to his faith. He offered many material benefits, e.g. gifts, honours, cash, and promotion on conversion. A shared faith was to be the main basis of a harmonious and strong political community. But this vision was not shared by the majority. The policies based on this vision alienated and antagonised the non-Muslim population in India. The imperial confrontation with the Sikhs, Rajputs and Marathas during the reign of Aurangzeb became major catalysts for the disintegration of Mughal rule, disorderly division of India into competing regional and local states, invasions from the north-west, increased influence of the European trading companies, particularly the English East India Company, leading eventually to the establishment of British Raj in India.

3. Sikhs in Turmoil

The murder of Arjun, the fifth Sikh guru, by Jahangir and Shahjahan's persecution created much tension between the Sikhs and Mughals. Aurangzeb's interference in the affairs of Sikh community in the Punjab exacerbated the tension and galvanised the Sikhs to resist and oppose the Mughal rule. Before his death Guru Hargobind bypassed two of his sons and nominated as his successor Hari Rai, a son of his own deceased eldest son. Hari Rai supported Dara Shikoh in the war of succession. After his accession to the throne, Aurangzeb demanded that Hari Rai send his eldest son, Ram Rai, as hostage to the imperial court. Hari Rai rejected the claims of Ram Rai, though some Sikhs supported him, and nominated a younger son, Hari Krishan, as his successor. In 1664, the Emperor summoned the guru and his young heir to the court at Delhi. In the meantime, Hari Rai died of natural causes. Before Aurangzeb

could decide about the successor, between Ram Rai and Hari Krishan, a faction of the Sikh community elected Tegh Bahadur—the youngest son of Guru Hargobind and brother of Hari Rai—as the new guru.

Tegh Bahadur, recognised generally as the Sikh leader, spent nearly a decade organising the community and converting to Sikhism people in other communities not only in the Punjab but as far away as Bihar and Bengal. It was during this campaign that many Jat cultivators began to convert; they received Tegh Bahadur with great enthusiasm and he attracted large crowds. In the 1670s, while Muslim officials were active pursuing anti-Hindu and anti-Sikh policies, rumours spread that the guru was converting Muslims to Sikhism. Aurangzeb ordered his arrest; Tegh Bahadur, along with some companions, was arrested at Agra and taken to Delhi. There a Qazi's court convicted the guru of blasphemy, sentenced him to death, and he was executed toward the end of 1675. This was the second martyrdom for the Sikh community. The Sikhs selected Gobind Singh, a son of Tegh Bahadur, as the new guru. The execution of Tegh Bahadur earned Aurangzeb the hatred of the Jat and Khatri Sikhs and had enormous consequences for the Mughals and India.

4. Rajput Rebellion

The rajas of Rajput states were allies of the Mughals from the days of Akbar: the mothers of both Jahangir and Shahjahan were from the families of Rajput nobles. The militantly orthodox policy of Aurangzeb would test the Emperor's relations with the Rajput nobles. On surface, at least initially, the Rajputs found no grounds for complaint. After 1679, when jizya was imposed on non-Muslims, Rajputs in the imperial service were exempt from the tax, although their subjects at home were not. However, the proportion of Rajputs in the list of nobles fell; imperial jagirs assigned outside Rajputana were reduced, affecting the subsidy for their barren homeland.

In 1678, Maharaja Jaswant Singh Rathore, elevated by Shahjahan some 40 years before, died as a military commander at Jamrud in the north-west. He had no living son, but two of his wives were pregnant. Aurangzeb formally transferred all of Marwar to the status of khalsa (crown territory), dividing the kingdom into jagirs. The Emperor

brought his court to Ajmer to supervise the transfer. When his troops occupied Jodhpur, they smashed temples and idols in the capital of Marwar. Aurangzeb then invested Indra Singh Rathore, a son of Jaswant Singh's deceased elder brother, as the new Rajput amir. This decision led to a full-blown revolt. The reason was simple: the Emperor ignored the fact that the two widows of Jaswant Singh, on return journey from Jamrud to Delhi, gave birth to a son each. The elder of the two boys, Ajit Singh, was the son of the Sisodia Rani of Mewar. Rajput nobles, led by Durgadas Rathore, pleaded the case for Ajit Singh as the new ruler of Marwar. Aurangzeb refused, but said he would rear the child and when he comes of age will get the title of Raja and given a noble rank on the condition that the child would be raised as a Muslim. Rajput officials rejected the proposal. Durgadas managed to take the two widows and Ajit Singh—the other infant had died—to Jodhpur and entrusted the mother and her infant to sympathetic Rathores. The Rajputs left behind a slave boy. Aurangzeb claimed that this boy was Ajit Singh and handed the baby over to the Muslim zennana as a Muslim Rajput prince.

In 1679, the Emperor sent his youngest son, Muhammad Akbar, to occupy Marwar. The Rana of Mewar intervened on behalf of the Sisodia Rani, mother of Ajit Singh. However, the joint Mughal army of Mewar and Marwar had occupied Udaipur, capital of Mewar, where the troops desecrated temples, large and small. The Rana fled to the hills and launched a guerrilla campaign. In early 1680, Aurangzeb returned to Ajmer and left the suppression campaign to Prince Muhammad Azam, recalled from Bengal, and his two brothers Muazzam and Akbar. The campaign against the Rajputs of Marwar and Mewar continued for a year but with mixed success. Aurangzeb reprimanded his sons and sent reinforcements. The war in Mewar continued until 1709 when Bahadur Shah I—Prince Muazzam who succeeded Aurangzeb in 1707—recognised the Rana of Mewar. The Rajput wars had devastating consequences in lives lost and expenses incurred besides the loss of prestige. Aurangzeb lost Rajput support against the Afghan tribes in the north-west and the Marathas in the south.

Apparently, during the imperial campaign in Rajputana, Prince Akbar was in secret communication with Rajput emissaries. The Rajputs pleaded with the prince to seize the throne with Rajput support

since the anti-Rajput and anti-Hindu policies of the emperor would destroy the empire. In early 1681, Akbar crowned himself as emperor and conferred titles on his officers. He then marched to Ajmer—it took two weeks to cover 192 KM—and confronted his father outside the city. Muazzam joined his father. At that time, a false letter reached the hands of Durgadas Rathore addressed to Akbar from Aurangzeb praising him for joining the plot to slaughter the Rajputs. Durgadas was unable to access the sleeping Akbar and fearing treachery the Rajputs fled to Marwar. Akbar's Mughal officers and troops surrendered to Aurangzeb and Akbar had to run with a few men. Aurangzeb sent Muazzam in pursuit. In the meantime, Rajputs had discovered the deception, so they kept Akbar safe in the hills. Durgadas took Akbar to the court of Shambhaji, the new Maratha ruler.

Akbar's rebellion became a full-blown imperial crisis. Muazzam and the governor of Deccan, Khan Jahan, could not or intentionally did not apprehend Akbar. Akbar's rebellion reduced the pressure on Rajputs. After months, Rana Jai Singh of Mewar agreed to a negotiated peace, surrendered a few parganas and agreed to pay jizya for Mewar. Aurangzeb sent Rana Jai Singh a robe of honour on his accession to his father's throne. But in Marwar, the Rajput resistance continued for a generation. The young Raja Ajit Singh was the symbolic focus of Rajputs (Rathores) in their guerrilla war. It was only after 20 years that a mature Ajit Singh would negotiate a settlement with the emperor. Aurangzeb could have avoided this rupture with the Rathore and Sisodia clans if he had been more sensitive. He was angry with Jaswant Singh Rathore for his support for Dara and held him responsible for letting Shivaji escape from Poona. Aurangzeb's religious ideology also played a role: his militant attitude helped Rajputs to align against his rule.

5. The Insurgent Marathas

Aurangzeb left the Deccan to the Mughal viceroys while he was busy in the north depleting his financial and human resources. The viceroys did not achieve much success against Bijapur, Golkunda and the insurgent Marathas. Aurangzeb spent (wasted) about 26 years in the Deccan engaged in wars against the parties and eventually died there in 1707 as a warrior, utterly exhausted and deeply disappointed. Shortly after

Aurangzeb's accession, a new source of resistance to the Mughal domination appeared in the hilly areas of western Deccan around Poona. The Maratha leader Shivaji Bhonsle (1627-1680) was carving a state within the enfeebled sultanate of Bijapur. He was born into a family involved in political activity for a long time, starting at least with his grandfather, Maloji Bhonsle (1552-1620). Shivaji's father, Shahji Bhonsle (1592-1664) began his career as a trooper in the army of Sultan of Ahmadnagar. He acquired vast territorial possessions as he rose through the ranks with the Nizam Shahi sultans. After Shahjahan's annexation of Ahmadnagar, Shahji entered the service of Bijapur in 1636. In return for his service in Bijapur, he received a fief in Carnatic besides an old jagir in Poona. Shivaji was the second son of Shahji Bhonsle, a general and aristocrat, and Jija Bai, daughter of a great Maratha nobleman in the sultanate of Ahmadnagar. Shahji moved to his new jagir with his second wife and left Shivaji with his mother Jija Bai under the guardianship of a Brahmin. Shivaji's mother and the Brahmin guardian had great influence on the young boy. He developed a streak for independence and glory at a young age.

The increasing weakness of the Deccan sultanates, thanks to the imperial campaigns from the north, provided opportunity for the rise of Maratha power. Shivaji started his military career in the mid-1640s, capturing forts by stealth, trickery and force. His forays into the Bijapur territory invited a strong response from the sultan who had Shahji arrested, but later released provided his son maintained good behaviour. This kept Shivaji somewhat inactive for a few years. In the meantime, Shivaji consolidated his power in the Maratha territory. In the 1630s, Shahji tried to set up a young Nizam Shahi puppet on the Ahmadnagar throne. When Ahmadnagar was absorbed in the Mughal Empire, Shahji joined the Bijapur sultan in his campaign in Carnatic. He maintained his fief near Poona: Sultan of Bijapur had ceded control of the Western Ghats to Maratha chiefs and deshmukhs. Jija Bai, Shahji's estranged wife, brought up Shivaji in Poona. Shivaji took over his father's fief at the age of 18 and attracted young Marathas in his service. He took advantage of the weak state of Bijapur and, as a rebellion against his father, started expanding his domain in the hills.

In 1646, Muhammad Adil Shah, Sultan of Bijapur, fell ill and remained incapacitated for ten years. Shivaji took advantage of the chaotic state of affairs and became completely independent of Bijapur by the late 1650s. He was no longer part of the Indo-Muslim culture defined by Bijapur. He used various tactics and force to dominate the Maratha deshmukhs and took 40 hill fortresses from the Bijapur commanders. Shivaji cultivated young Maratha warriors and Brahmin administrators and developed a large but light cavalry and infantry. He raised funds by plunder, extortion and taxes to recruit troops and pay them. He garrisoned fortresses in an interlocking network: the fort at Rajgarh served as the Bhonsle capital. Shivaji expanded his dominion into the fertile Konkan in the north, seized Kalyan, a rich trading town. With access to the sea, he acquired ships and started trading with merchants in the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea. He also mounted plundering expeditions in the Arabian Sea. During this period, Shivaji negotiated with the Portuguese and the English Company for guns and technical assistance.

In the early period, thanks to his father's influence at the Bijapur court, Shivaji avoided punitive actions. In fact, the Sultan used Shivaji to plunder the Mughal lands in the Deccan. Shivaji came into conflict with the Mughals for the first time in 1657 when he raided and looted the districts of Ahmadnagar and Junnar while Aurangzeb was busy invading Bijapur. Aurangzeb soon defeated the Maratha warrior who then submitted to the Mughal prince, but Aurangzeb never trusted him. Once Aurangzeb turned north because of his father's illness, Shivaji turned his attention to Konkan, captured several places and moved to Mahad. In 1659, the Sultan of Bijapur took advantage of Aurangzeb's engagements in the north and decided to crush Shivaji. But his general, Afzal Khan, after making unsuccessful attempts to get Shivaji out of his stronghold at Partapgarh, invited him to his camp for negotiations. Their meeting took place under suspicious circumstances and ended in the gruesome murder of Afzal Khan at the hands of Shivaji. The hidden Maratha troops attacked the Bijapur soldiers and slaughtered them. The sultan was incensed and tried to lead an expedition, but retired to attend to other problems. Shivaji was now an unattached Maratha chief who wanted to come to terms with the Mughals.

Between 1660 and 1674, Shivaji wavered between acceptance and repudiation of imperial authority. In 1660, Aurangzeb now emperor sent Shaista Khan as governor to the Deccan to destroy Shivaji's power. The new governor occupied Poona and garrisoned the northern parts. After a long siege, the Mughal army captured the hill fort at Chakan near Poona. In the meantime, Shivaji concluded peace with Bijapur, using his father's intercession, and became free to deal with the Mughals. Aurangzeb sent reinforcements to his commander Raja Jaswant Singh Rathore. Marathas attacked Shaista Khan at his residence in Poona. He managed to escape with some injuries, but the Maratha army killed his son and some others in the family (including the zennana). The Emperor recalled Shaista Khan and sent Prince Muazzam to replace him as governor. Needless to add, the daring attack at Poona raised Shivaji's fame and prestige. In 1664, Shivaji made a more daring attack this time on the thriving port of Surat. The Mughal governor and his officials fled without offering resistance and took refuge in the fort, leaving 200,000 people unprotected. Shivaji and his troops plundered the city and decamped with loot worth Rs.10 million. The British and Dutch factories escaped the looting thanks to their strong defences. The Marathas then seized Mecca-bound ships and took ransom from the pilgrims. Shivaji also attacked Aurangabad, but Prince Muazzam did nothing. The successful Martha attacks severely dented the image of the Mughal imperial power.

Aurangzeb was enraged by these insults. He sent two veteran commanders, Diler Khan and Raja Jai Singh Kacchwaha of Amber, with an expeditionary force to crush the Maratha forces and annex Bijapur. Jai Singh relieved Jaswant Singh in Poona in the spring of 1665. The Rajput raja first reached out to those Marathas not with Shivaji, asked the Sultan of Bijapur not to join Shivaji and the Europeans to obstruct the Maratha fleet. He then launched an all-out attack on Shivaji's fortresses; Shivaji was demoralised by the attack and, after negotiations, came to see Jai Singh and concluded a treaty at Purandar. The treaty required Shivaji to transfer many of his forts to the Mughals, provide a cavalry force for the Mughal army, and in return for the territorial losses collect 35 per cent (chauth and sardeshmukhi) of the revenue in some districts of Bijapur. Shivaji's son, Shambhaji, received a mansab to appear at the

Mughal court. Shivaji also agreed to join with his troops the Mughal army for invasion of Bijapur—the invasion ended in failure—in return for additional lands. The Maratha chief thus surrendered his independence and was now a chief in the Mughal imperial system.

Jai Singh persuaded Shivaji to go to the Mughal court at Agra along with Shambhaji, seven of his principal officers and some troops. They all reached Agra in May 1666. At the imperial court, Shivaji gave the Emperor his gifts of submission, but Aurangzeb offered only cursory acknowledgement. Shivaji had to line up behind other nobles to receive gifts from the Emperor. The Maratha chief felt slighted by the cold reception, loudly accused the Emperor of bad faith and fainted in anger. Shivaji was moved to his host's (son of Jai Singh) mansion where he was put under guard, refused private audience and denied gifts and robes of honour. Somehow, he and his son managed to escape from custody and ended up in Mathura where they took refuge with some Maratha Brahmins. There Shivaji left Shambhaji with a Brahmin and reached Rajgarh by a circuitous route. Shambhaji joined his father there in December 1666. Aurangzeb failed to act quickly, perhaps distracted by an uprising of Yusufzais in the north-west.

In the next three years, Shivaji remained at peace with the Mughals and kept himself busy with internal administration. Aurangzeb awarded him a jagir at Berar, bestowed him with the title of Raja and raised his son's mansab (rank). The Chakan fort was restored but not the other 22 forts occupied by the Mughal forces. Shambhaji went to Aurangzeb and met with Prince Muazzam with whom he formed a bond during the two years he served the Mughals. Soon there was rupture and the peace ended in 1670. The Mughal treasury tried to recover from Shambhaji's jagir the travel expenses paid earlier to Shivaji. Shivaji recalled his son and seized a number of fortresses. Then he sacked the port of Surat a second time and collected Rs.6.5 million worth of booty. The trade through Surat declined because the imperial forces could not defend the port. In the next four years (1670-1674), Marathas raided and plundered Khandesh and Kanar in Bijapur. The imperial power in the Deccan weakened also by the bitter quarrel between Prince Muazzam and his Afghan deputy Diler Khan. In addition, Mughal commanders in the Deccan carried on a poor campaign against Shivaji for nearly six

years while the Emperor was busy in the north-west confronting the rebellious Afghan tribes. Needless to add, Aurangzeb exhibited poor statesmanship in his dealing with Shivaji, galvanising the Maratha chief's resolve to oppose the Mughal authority.

In 1674, Shivaji crowned himself at Rajgarh as an independent Hindu monarch and assumed the title of Chhatrapati (king of kings). He managed to get the blessings of the foremost Hindu theologians at Benares. Shivaji then went through elaborate but symbolic rituals along with his wife Soraya Bai. His coronation was quite expensive, but it was perhaps one of the most important political acts of seventeenth century: a regional king claimed royal authority without reference to the Mughal emperor. Shivaji created a militantly Hindu monarchy independent of the Indo-Muslim authority and political culture. The new ruler was not a padishah but chhattrapati who became a rallying point against the Mughal rule.

In the next two years, Shivaji negotiated a truce with the Mughal governor of the Deccan province; agreed to a defensive alliance with the Brahmin (Telugu) wazir of Golkunda against the Mughals; and then went to Hyderabad to meet the Qutub Shahi sultan, Abul Hasan, of Golkunda, his Hindu wazir and his brother who commanded the Sultan's army. They agreed to annex Bijapur Carnatic on the Coromandel Coast ruled by the tributary rulers of Bijapur. This included Shivaji's half brother, Vyankoji Bhonsle, who had carved out a kingdom in Tanjore. The Maratha army marched south after a year's campaign and took possession of Jinji and Vellore, two bastions of Bijapur Carnatic. In Tanjore, Shivaji's brother rejected his claim to one-half of the patrimony and paid just a paltry sum to be left alone. Shivaji was going to share the new territory with Golkunda, but was not able to maintain the alliance. In 1678, Shivaji returned to Rajgarh. He and his council of ministers proposed division of the Bhonsle kingdom between his two sons after his death: Rajaram to get the home territories and Shambhaji the newly acquired lands in Mysore and Jinji.

Shambhaji was not happy with this arrangement and along with his wife, Yesu Bai, managed to join Diler Khan. Aurangzeb made him a Mughal noble and gave him the title of Raja. In 1679, Diler Khan and Shambhaji launched a series of campaign against the combined forces

of Bijapur and Shivaji. But Shambhaji was disillusioned and returned to the Bhonsle court. During this period, Shivaji wrote a long letter to Aurangzeb in which he rebuked the Emperor for reversing the policies of Akbar and Jahangir (e.g. imposing jizya) and pointed out that the God of Quran is god of both Muslims and Hindus. In the spring of 1680, Shivaji returned from a plundering expedition of Mughal territories to meet Shambhaji. His health was failing for some time and he died in 1680 at the age of 53 years. At Shivaji's death, his wife, Soraya Bai , proclaimed his son Rajaram as the new Maratha king at the Rajgarh fort. Shambhaji rejected this claim and assumed regal powers with support from a majority of Maratha officers. He occupied the capital, deposed Rajaram, but executed Soraya Bai and many of her followers. In early 1681, Shambhaji carried out his coronation as the legitimate successor to his father. He became the undisputed Bhonsle ruler of the Maratha kingdom.

Shivaji occupies a very distinguished position in the annals of Indian history. He was a man with strong but tolerant Hindu faith, free from the common vices, endowed with fierce determination, superior military and organisational skills, and an inspiring quality of leadership on and off the battlefield for his Maratha followers. He created a sense of common bond among the Marathas. Shivaji left a remarkable record of achievements: he built a unitary state; developed an effective civil administration; mounted a disciplined army; established an aggressive political and military centre against the Indo-Muslim powers; and acquired vast resources by plundering the Mughal and Bijapur territories. Marathas were no longer mere zamindars offering service to Muslim states: their deshmukhs could now look to a powerfully appealing alternative to submission to the empire. They could offer resistance that the Mughals found expensive and difficult to overcome.

Shambhaji (1657-1689) was the eldest son of Shivaji but he did not possess the metal his father had. Brave he might have been, he was better known as a lover of pleasure. In his reign, the Maratha power weakened quite a bit. He fought a resolute Aurangzeb, and was captured along with several of his chief followers by an energetic Mughal commander in early 1689. The captives, after suffering much humiliation and torture in the imperial camp, were executed. The Mughal army captured

many of the Maratha forts, besieged and seized the capital at Rajgarh. Members of Shambhaji's family, including his infant son Shahu, were captured, but his younger brother, Rajaram, managed to escape to Jinji in the Carnatic. Shahu and other captives stayed at the Mughal court for 19 years; he was released in 1708 after the death of Aurangzeb and the rest in 1718. The Maratha power was severely beaten at least for now, but that did not bring a lasting peace.

After the death of Shivaji, Shambhaji had confined Rajaram (1670-1700) second son of Shivaji by another wife. Rajaram became the Maratha king after the death of Shambhaji. Given that Aurangzeb had annexed Bijapur and Golkunda and the Mughal armies were pounding the Marathas, Rajaram fled to Jinji in the south while Shahuji and others were captured. In 1698, a Mughal commander captured the fort at Jinji that had withstood the Mughal siege for about eight years. Rajaram managed to escape to Satara, where he gathered a strong army and returned to the northern Deccan. The Mughals besieged the Satara fort in late 1699, but its defenders held on to it until after the death of Rajaram in the spring of 1700. The Emperor took the fort himself on certain terms, but the Mughal-Maratha struggle did not end there or then.

6. Aurangzeb's Long Deccan Campaign and Its Effects

In the 1680s, Aurangzeb's son Akbar became a focal point of opposition to his father: his presence in the Deccan was of grave concern and required action. Akbar had taken refuge at the Bhonsle court and posed a threat to his father's rule. Akbar could bring together the sultans of Golkunda and Bijapur in alliance with Shambhaji. The Golkunda and Maratha kingdoms were quite strong, but Bijapur and its sultan, Sikandar Adil Shah, were fractious and weak. The other worry was that if Akbar moved north, with the Maratha and sultanate forces, would the Rajas of Marwar and Mewar join them? How would the disaffected Mughal nobles, who disliked the power of ulema and the Emperor's anti-Hindu policies, behave? In fact, many Mughal nobles would have liked accommodation with the Marathas and the Deccan sultans.

In the beginning of 1681, when Akbar proclaimed himself as emperor, Shambhaji went deep into Khandesh, plundered Burhanpur and Bahadurpur, and his troops inflicted much violence on the population.

The acts of plunder, violence, burning and rape were carried out on a frighteningly large scale. The Deccan governor, Khan Jahan Bahadur, was slow to act which allowed Marathas to retreat safely. Perhaps the governor had received a bribe. The nobles and ulema of Burhanpur sent a petition to the Mughal court describing the destruction of property and honour of Muslims. If the Mughal emperor could not safeguard Muslim lives and property from the depredations of the infidel, then the question was: should Muslims continue to recite the Emperor's name in the khutba on Friday?

Aurangzeb acted after concluding peace with the Rana of Mewar: he moved south. The Emperor brought with him a huge army, imperial harem and household, and the central administration with its staff. He wanted to stabilise the southern frontier using all his resources. With this, the Mughal capital moved from Shahjahanabad (Delhi) to the tented moveable capital in the Deccan. Shambhaji did not support Akbar's idea to go to the north and meet the Mughal army on the way. Instead, he fought wars on the western coast for the next two to three years: one against the Siddis of Janjira and the English trading company and the other against the Portuguese at Goa. Each conflict ended in a stalemate.

For the first four years (1681-1685), Aurangzeb kept military pressure on the Marathas, but total conquest demanded resources and determination far in excess of what Aurangzeb thought was necessary. Frustrated with his Maratha campaign, the Emperor turned to the conquest of Golkunda and Bijapur. The sultan of Bijapur kept on giving support to Shambhaji. In the early part of 1685, Aurangzeb's army led by his two sons laid siege to the massive city wall of Bijapur. For the next 15 months, the imperial army held in spite of disease and near starvation. Aurangzeb sent one of his sons to Golkunda because of the threatened support to Bijapur. The sultan of Bijapur, Sikandar Adil Shah, eventually surrendered and Bijapur was annexed as a province of the empire in the fall of 1685. The Sultan was held in the Mughal encampment and the remaining Afghan and Indo-Muslim nobles of Bijapur were assimilated. A provincial administration was installed in the annexed sultanate.

Golkunda was next. The Sultan's army collapsed against Mughal invaders because of defection of Mir Muhammd Ibrahim, one of his Persian commanders. Sultan Abul Hasan Qutub Shah along with his

family and nobles fled Hyderabad to the Golkunda fort. The helpless sultan agreed to dismiss his two Brahmin ministers, pay a huge war indemnity and cede some border area to the Mughals. But the Hindu ministers and other Hindu officials were murdered by a faction of Muslims at the Golkunda court. The Mughal army withdrew to Bijapur. Aurangzeb paid visit to the tomb of Shaikh Gesu Daraz, a revered Sufi saint, at Gulbarga. Then he moved with his grand army toward Hyderabad. The Sultan and others fled to the Golkunda fort again. In the fall of 1687, the end came by betrayal: an open gateway permitted a surprise assault. Sultan Abul Hasan was taken captive and joined Sikandar Adil Shah in confinement. Aurangzeb annexed Golkunda as well. Mughals took a huge treasure of coins, estimated at Rs. 60 million, with gold, silver, etc. from the Qutub Shahi sultanate. Aurangzeb did not listen to or tolerate any pleas on behalf of the two Muslim sultans: he even confined one of his sons for seven years because of his conciliatory overtures. The Emperor reminded the petitioners of the sultans' association with Marathas. Here again Aurangzeb showed lack of good judgement. He could have brought the two sultans on his side, with political tact and material incentives, in the war against Marathas.

After annexing the Deccan sultanates, Aurangzeb turned his attention to the Marathas led by Shambhaji. Akbar was no longer a threat as he received no support from the Maratha leader; he left India by sea for Persia where the Safavid king gave him refuge. Shambhaji spent his time in indolence, drinking and womanising. In 1688, Aurangzeb sent Muqarrab Khan—a Golkunda noble who had deserted to the Mughals—with a big cavalry to the Maratha kingdom. His real task was to capture Shambhaji: Muqarrab Khan managed to capture Shambhaji and his Prime Minister (peshwa). The Maratha leader was brought to the imperial court and received no courtesy as a king. He insulted the emperor and the Prophet of Islam at audience. The ulema issued the fatwa for execution: Shambhaji and the peshwa were tortured and hacked to death.

By 1689, Aurangzeb had surmounted the rebellion of Akbar, which began in 1682, annexed Bijapur and Golkunda, and dealt a fatal blow to the Maratha state. The Mughal power was triumphant and had added 574,980 sq. KM, or one-quarter, to the empire. Maratha lands were

absorbed in the empire to which four provinces were added, i.e. Bijapur, Bijapur-Carnatic, Hyderabad, and Hyderabad-Carnatic. The empire's southern frontier now extended to the River Kaveri, the farthest extent of Muslim domination on the Indian sub-continent. However, the anticipated peace, stability and prosperity did not materialise in southern India. On the contrary, the reverse happened: Aurangzeb remained in the Deccan fighting endless war to reverse the descending imperial power and public order.

In early 1689, Rajaram, after the execution of Shambhaji, was hastily crowned and then fled to the extreme south where he took refuge in the Jinji fortress. It became the base for predatory raids into Mughal territory, making it difficult for imperial officials to defend and collect revenue. In the next nearly six years, Aurangzeb occupied several places between Poona and the city of Bijapur. In 1695, he made Burhanpur as his permanent base for the next five years (1695-1700). Aurangzeb campaigned against the hill fortresses in Maratha territories in the last six years of his life. In 1706, gravely ill, he retreated to Ahmadnagar and died there in the March 1707. When he died the precipitous decline and fall of Mughal Empire was on its way.

I think here it is important to examine in some detail the revival of Maratha power while Aurangzeb remained engaged in the south. The Emperor set up new administration in Golkunda and absorbed the Muslim nobles, most of them of Persian descent, into the imperial system. In 1688, Golkunda was renamed as Hyderabad and Hyderabad-Carnatic was made a separate province. The annexation of Golkunda invited Maratha raids. They plundered on the roads and in small towns but did not make attempt to seize Hyderabad or the port of Machilipatnam. In 1692, the Mughal siege of Jinji diverted the Marathas from Hyderabad. It is significant that very few Hindu (Telugu) aristocrats joined the Marathas: most Hindu chiefs participated in the imperial system. The revenues started flowing, including jizya imposed on Hindus. A new monetary system replaced the earlier gold standard: copper, silver and gold coins were in circulation. The Bijapur sultanate, before its annexation, had been in turmoil for nearly two decades because of a weak monarch and factional struggle. The entire administrative system was in disarray. Aurangzeb attempted to set the system to function well.

Mughals could not capture Rajaram at Rajgarh because he had fled to Jinji, but they did capture his wife Yesu Bai, her nine-year son Shahuji, and some other Marathas. Aurangzeb decided to raise Shahuji at his court and treated him well without pressure for conversion: Shahuji became a khanazad. In the meantime, Rajaram received help from his cousin Shahji II, the Raja of Tanjore. The Emperor sent one of his sons and wazir Asad Khan to join Zulfiqar Khan the wazir's son, but the reinforcements were not able to cut off the fort. Then two Maratha generals with a large army came south from the Deccan and managed to cut the Mughal supply lines. At this time, there were rumours of Emperor's death. Prince Kam Bakhsh tried to arrange a peace settlement with Rajaram, but Zulfiqar Khan did not like this move and arrested the prince and wazir Asad Khan brought him to Aurangzeb. The Emperor forgave his youngest son but confined him to the camp. In the next four years, Zulfiqar Khan kept up the pressure during which time the Raja of Tanjore stopped supporting Rajaram and paid tribute to the Mughals. Zulfiqar Khan had his own plans, in case the old Emperor dies, to carve out a state for himself, so he was making half-hearted forays against Jinji. In 1697, Rajaram offered a negotiated settlement, but Aurangzeb rejected it and ordered Zulfiqar Khan to make an all-out assault on Rajaram. Yet again, the emperor showed lack of good judgement. Zulfiqar Khan allowed Rajaram to escape, then captured the fortress, took unharmed four of Rajaram's wives, three sons and two daughters, and sent them all to the Emperor's encampment to join Shahuji.

Rajaram sent a stream of letters to his fortress commanders and others in the Maratha territory—Mughals had taken many fortresses, including Rajgarh—to reject Mughal authority, ravage and plunder the imperial territory. The Maratha commanders used a decentralised strategy using quick and light horsemen with lances, swords and muskets. They started plundering and imposing chauth (one-quarter of the revenue) which supported the Maratha raiding forces. The imperial troops could not match the Maratha irregulars in mobility, leadership, morale and supplies. The Mughal troops were not able to stop the raids in Bijapur and Khandesh. Aurangzeb could not devise an effective strategy to contain the insurgents.

In 1698, after his escape from the Jinji fort, Rajaram returned to the Maratha homeland and set up his court at Satara. Aurangzeb was beyond rage at this and decided at the age of 81 to declare jihad against the Marathas. He took personal charge of attacks on the enemy forts in the hills. He ordered all of his princes and nobles to leave their families in the fortified fort of Islampuri. Rajaram raided Khandesh and Berar territory, but was met by a strong Mughal army and barely escaped after defeat. The third Maratha ruler died in March 1700. Aurangzeb kept up the pressure to seize the strong fortress at Satara. Its Maratha commander, when he heard the news of Rajaram's death, surrendered to Aurangzeb and entered the Mughal service. The Emperor next seized the fort at Parligarh.

After Rajaram's death, his senior wife Tara Bai put her four-year old son, Shambhaji II, on the Maratha throne. As Regent Tara Bai offered peace to Aurangzeb with formal submission to Mughal authority. In return her son would be recognised as the Maratha ruler and receive an imperial mansab with exemption from imperial service. She also wanted her son to be the sardeshmukh of the Mughal Deccan provinces and receive ten percent of the revenue in return for maintaining order and collecting revenue. Aurangzeb rejected Tara Bai's proposal and put his efforts to winning the all-out war. He could or would not trust the other side: he let another opportunity for peace with the Marathas slip by. Instead, the Emperor used bribery and reinforcements from the north with horses and money to seize Maratha fortresses. He maintained two armies: one in the hands of Zulfiqar Khan and Daud Khan Panni, an Afghan from Bijapur service, and two Rajput commanders. The army fought and won many battles. Zulfiqar Khan was made mir bakhshi of the empire who worked with his father, Asad Khan, the wazir. Ghazi-ud-din Khan (Firuz Jung), a Turani noble, commanded the other army, along with his sons Chin Qilich Khan, Hamid Khan and Rahim-ud-din Khan, and a cousin Muhammad Amin Khan, and their followers.

Aurangzeb used his captive Shahuji to negotiate peace with the Marathas: he offered Shahuji freedom if he converted to Islam. Shahuji refused the offer. Then Aurangzeb tried to reach agreement with Maratha generals and offered Mughal service to the Raja of Tanjore, Raibhan Bhonsle, a son of Shivaji's brother Vyankoji. Raibhan Bhon-

sle would act as intermediary: Shahuji would be released, recognised as Maratha ruler, would have the right to collect chauth from the Deccan revenues. But both sides mistrusted so the negotiations failed. In 1706, a year before his death, the Emperor made the offer again but it failed to reach a successful end.

Aurangzeb's campaigns in the last phase weakened imperial authority all over, including the Deccan provinces. Agriculture suffered immensely because of continuous warfare, raids, etc. In addition the rains failed for two years (1702-1704), resulting in food shortages, and high prices; on top of all this misery the outbreak of plague took a heavy toll. Tara Bai, when rebuffed by Aurangzeb, crafted a new strategy for the Marathas. She adopted an aggressive policy focused on attacks penetrating into all provinces of the Deccan, Malwa and the east coast. In 1700, Marathas crossed the River Narbada and were mounting raids into Gujarat and Malwa. Two years later, they looted Hyderabad city, followed by other plundering raids. Some of the Telugu zamindars joined the Marathas in the plunder in 1704. The trade route from Hyderabad to Gujarat was completely closed. Peasants and zamindars stopped paying the revenue to Mughal officials. In Khandesh and Berar, Marathas imposed the chauth plus ten percent for the ruler. Tara Bai created and regularised a parallel administrative structure.

Aurangzeb's preoccupation with the Marathas made it easier for the European (Dutch, French and British) trading companies to gain footholds on the coast, which led eventually to the British rule in India. During the Deccan wars, these companies developed capacity to challenge imperial authority and negotiate from a position of strength. The European companies had always enjoyed dominance on the sea: they blockaded Indian ports and seized vessels if mistreated on land in India. They developed autonomous city-states similar to the Portuguese at Goa. In the early 1660s, the East India Company had acquired Bombay through a marriage settlement between Charles II and Catherine of Aragon. In 1690, John Child, governor of Bombay, got involved in a brief war with the Mughals, thanks to his aggressive policy. Aurangzeb was angry with what the British officials were doing to the Mughal vessels and ports: he stopped all British trade and ordered his officials to seize British factories. In response, the British agreed to pay reparations

to end the war. But they had made Bombay a stronger place than Surat as the leading port by the early eighteenth century.

On the east coast, the Dutch controlled Pulicat protected by a fort; south of it the British established themselves at Madras protected by a fort (St. George); still further south the French occupied Pondicherry fortified with a garrison. The cities of Madras and Pondicherry offered security to migrants fleeing from warfare and flourished as trading posts. Aurangzeb was incensed by piracy in the Arabian Sea, but he could not stop it. Consequently, in 1702 he ordered all trade by the Dutch, British and French companies to end in the empire. However, the Mughals failed to seize Bombay, Madras and Pondicherry. The main reason was the Emperor's ongoing war against the Marathas. These ports continued to flourish as Surat and Machilipatnam went into decline.

The long Deccan campaign took its toll on the cohesion and morale of the imperial elite. Aurangzeb's military strength declined, frustration among the ranks increased and camp life became harsh and insecure. After 1689, the Mughal elite were in two separate parts of the empire: those in the Deccan and others deputed elsewhere. In the first group, increasing number of mansabdars, governors and faujdars tried to find safety and avoid challenging the Marathas. Aurangzeb was unable to induce them or punish them for lacklustre performance and even cowardly behaviour. Given the length and inconclusiveness of the campaign, Mughal commanders and Maratha commanders interacted a great deal: some of the former even negotiated clandestine agreements with the latter. For example, Zulfiqar Khan was frequently in contact with the Marathas. The high-ranking nobles at the top split into two groups: there were those like Asad Khan and Zulfiqar Khan who favoured some kind of negotiated settlement that would end the drain of resources and the second group led by Ghazi-ud-din Khan (Firuz Jang) and his son Chin Qilich Khan insisted on maintaining a hard line. All these men were involved in the south for two more decades trying to stabilise the imperial rule. But Aurangzeb's policies and prolonged stay in the Deccan had turned priorities upside down.

Mansabdars in the south were not able to maintain armed cavalry according to the imperial regulations. This reduced the quality of

troops available for warfare. Aurangzeb also contributed to demoralisation by inflating honours and ranks: the new Deccan nobles created resentment among the Mughal khanazads. Marathas inducted into the imperial service and nobility added to the problem. Enrolment of the Deccani and Maratha nobles also created the problem of jagirs: the number of nobles claiming jagir exceeded the lands awaiting assignment. Most of the new lands in Golkunda, Bijapur and Maratha territory were reserved for the central treasury (khalsa). There was another problem. The predatory raids by the Marathas and the Mughal reprisals drove the peasants and traders away from land and trade. Revenue collection was disorganised: revenue collectors could not access some areas and fought each other for recovery.

7. Conditions in the Empire's Northern Parts

While the south was in turmoil, the northern parts of the empire had their problems which were by no means minor. The Emperor's involvement in the south after 1680 had subordinated his administration in the north. Aurangzeb kept himself informed and remained engaged through his sons, grandsons and capable nobles. But the empire's military focus on the south made the north vulnerable to disruption. In the north-west, Amir Khan, a Shia of Persian origin, maintained good administration by his shrewd policies: subsidies were the means to maintain peace. The trade route remained open and active. But Amir Khan died in 1698 and his widow took charge for nearly two years. Then Aurangzeb's son Muazzam arrived at Kabul. The prince kept a firm hand until the death of Aurangzeb in 1707. In the north-east, Mughals were driven back from Assam by a new Hindu monarch of Ahoms, Gadadhar Singh. Towards the end of Aurangzeb's reign, the Ahoms were preparing to invade Bengal.

Bengal was a rich and resourceful province of the empire. In 1696, a dramatic revolt exposed the difficulties of ruling from the Deccan. Some of the Afghan zamindars of Orissa, led by Rahim Khan, joined a Hindu zamindar, Sova Singh, of Midnapur and rebelled against the Mughal authority. Ibrahim Khan, governor of Bengal, was slow and weak in his response. He remained inactive at Dhaka while the rebels had free

hand for plunder in the western parts. Rahim Khan, who took the title of Rahim Shah, led increasing forces against the Mughals. Aurangzeb fired Amir Khan and sent his grandson Azim-ud-din to replace him; he ordered Zabardast Khan, son of the dismissed governor, to lead the Mughal army. The new appointees managed to crush the rebellion and killed Rahim Khan by the end of 1698.

But revenues from Bengal fell and did not revive since the governor and his supporters were using a large part of the collections. Aurangzeb sent Kartalab Khan, a converted Brahmin slave, from the Deccan to Dhaka to straighten out the fiscal arrangement in Bengal and Orissa. He found embezzlement by revenue officials and reduced revenues from jagirs. Kartalab Khan resumed jagir lands, adopted harsh punishments for default, thievery, etc. and appointed outside khatris as revenue officials. By 1702, he managed to raise the revenue to Rs. 10 million and sent the treasure to Aurangzeb. The governor tried to get Kartalab Khan killed but he survived. In 1703, Aurangzeb reprimanded his grandson and forced him out to Patna as governor of Bihar. The Emperor rewarded Kartalab Khan with honours and bestowed upon him the title of Murshid Quli Khan, after the name of Murshid Quli Khan, a much respected revenue official who completed revenue settlement in the Deccan some 50 years earlier when Aurangzeb was the province's governor. The Emperor allowed Murshid Quli Khan to name his capital as Murshidabad and made him governor of Bihar replacing Prince Azim-ud-din. He brought several of his adoptive kins—he was adopted by a Persian Mughal officer—from Iran and gave them service and mansabs. Murshid Quli Khan continued to give annual treasure to Aurangzeb and his successors for 20 years. In fact, he became the de facto ruler of Bengal as the imperial structure collapsed after Aurangzeb's death.

The route from Delhi to Agra, through Dholpur, and then through Gwalior to Burhanpur was a central conduit for the movement of treasure, troops, animals, and supplies. But it passed through some desolate hills, forests and ravine country of the River Chambal. The Jats in the districts of Aligarh, Agra and Sahar were proving to be troublesome. In 1685, Rajaram, a Jat zamindar, led his clansmen to plunder the traffic on the imperial road: they were able to block the route to the south. In 1687, Aurangzeb sent Bidar Bakht, one of his grandsons, to suppress the Jats.

The Jats occupied Sikandra and managed to loot Akbar's tomb. After this incident, Rajaram was killed but the Jat stronghold at Sinsini was untouched. The Emperor commissioned Raja Bishun Singh Kacchwaha of Amber (Jaipur) who led the Rajput troops and besieged Sinsini. By early 1691, the Jat revolt was suppressed, but only temporarily. The Rajput raja was not able to restore normal administration in the region for the next 15 years. A new Jat leader, Churaman Jat, joined by some Rajput zamindars who were against the Kacchwaha raja, made the administration and revenue collection almost impossible.

8. End of Aurangzeb

Aurangzeb's long absence from the north, and his obsession with an endless war in the south, strained the empire's resources and institutions, though the centralised state continued to function somehow. The war against the Marathas was prolonged as long the treasure and manpower were poured into it, but the war did not end. A major problem was the inability of imperial princes and nobles to prevail upon the Emperor to adopt a different course or challenge his plans. After 1689, in the old and new provinces of the Deccan, public order and production were in a downward spiral. They were also depleting the empire's resources, demoralising the imperial officers and men, and making the empire in the north more vulnerable to revolts and rebellions.

Aurangzeb died in Ahmadnagar in March 1707 and was laid to rest in Daulatabad. He was a very old and broken man, departed perhaps with a sense of genuine regret and remorse and certainly with much foreboding for the future of the empire. He wanted his three remaining sons to divide the empire, but that was not to be. The dissolution of the Mughal Empire—in the early 1690s it extended from Kabul to Chittagong and Kashmir to the River Kaveri—took its eventual course.

6

Mughal Empire III: Disolution and Legacy

The symptoms of social collapse are progressive declines in standards of conduct, public and private, and the superiority of centrifugal over centripetal forces. When the administrative machinery breaks down, law and order is the first casualty. And when respect for law and authority declines, the devil of force leaps into its place as the only possible substitute and in the struggle that ensues every standard of conduct and decency is progressively discarded. Men begin by being realists and end by being satanists. Sometimes synthesis takes place from within; sometimes it is imposed from without. If the original breakdown of authority is caused by a ferment of ideas, a genuine revolution like the French may result. If it is simply due to the decrepitude of authority, the solution is the substitution of a fresh authority, but whether that substitute is external or internal depends upon local circumstances. Percival Spear, *Twilight of the Mughals*.

The instant passed in power has left only sorrow behind. I have not been the guardian and protector of the empire. My precious time has been spent vainly.' 'I depart, and carry with me the fruit of my sins. I came alone, alone I go. Wherever I look I see nothing but God. I have committed numerous crimes, and I know not with what torments they may be punished. The guardianship of the people is the trust of God committed to my sons. Aurangzeb to his sons cited by H.G. Keene, *The Turks in India* (p.166).

I. Decline and Dissolution

The three sons of Aurangzeb, Muazzam, Azam and Kam Bakhsh, paid no heed to their father's counsel to divide the empire and avoid wars of succession that their father and grandfather went through to get to the Mughal throne. At the time of Aurangzeb's death, Muazzam the eldest son was in the Khyber Pass, Azam was governor in Gujarat, and Kam Bakhsh in Bijapur. Muazzam started the march to Agra and he declared near Lahore his accession to the throne, taking the title of Bahadur Shah. He occupied Delhi in June and soon arrived at Agra. Azam, supported by Asad Khan, also adopted royal titles, struck coins in his own name and marched north to Agra. Apparently, Muazzam suggested division of the empire as their father had wished, but Azam wanted the whole. In the meantime, Kam Bakhsh had crowned himself as independent ruler of Bijapur. Azim-ush-shan, who came from Bengal with much treasure, joined his father Muazzam. They both found a huge treasure at Agra as well. Azam and Muazzam fought at Jajau near Agra, like Aurangzeb and Dara Shikoh had done before, where Azam and his two sons were killed. Muazzam then moved to the Deccan and defeated Kam Bakhsh near Hyderabad. Kam Bakhsh lost two sons in the battle and died of wounds in early 1708.

Bahadur Shah (also known as Shah Alam I), the new emperor, was an old and generous man with a cool temper and mild manners. He accepted all the nobles whether on his side or not in the war of succession. Though far more moderate and tolerant than his father, Bahadur Shah did not abolish jizya formally but did not insist on its strict collection either. He was faced with a financial crisis: revenue in the Deccan had fallen because of Maratha insurgency for years and in the northern provinces the war of succession had reduced the revenue as well. In addition, political turmoil and instability affected assignment of jagirs, hence the loyalty and effectiveness of the nobles and mansabdars. If the state could not restore order, the zamindars were not inclined to pay land revenue. But the far more immediate and serious crises were confronting Bahadur Shah: Rajput disaffection, growing militancy of the Jats and Sikhs, and the expanding Maratha power.

1. The Defiant Rajputs

Ajit Singh Rathore, a Mughal noble and ruler of Marwar, took advantage of Aurangzeb's death and drove the Mughal force out of Jodhpur. He destroyed mosques built after Mughal occupation and forbade prayers in the city. He did not acknowledge Bahadur Shah's authority. Jai Singh Kacchwaha of Amber (Jaipur) and the young Rana Amar Singh Sisodia of Mewar (Udaipur) supported Ajit Singh in his defiance of the Mughals. The Emperor occupied Jaipur in 1708 and conferred its throne to Jai Singh's brother who had earlier served him. The Rana of Mewar fled to the hills and sent an envoy to the Emperor with gifts. Mughal troops occupied Jodhpur soon after which Ajit Singh came in submission to the Emperor. He was given the title of Maharaja and lucrative mansabs for his two sons. Imperial domination of Amber and Jodhpur were thus completed. Bahadur Shah took the two rajas to the Deccan campaign against his brother Kam Bakhsh, but they managed to escape to Rajputana. With the help of Rana of Mewar, the two rajas were able to recover their capitals. In 1709, in the face of Sikh revolt, the Emperor made an agreement with Ajit Singh and Jai Singh under which he gave them their homelands and capitals as watan jagirs. This was a hasty compromise and it did not bring the Rajputs back as Mughal warriors that they had once been. Bahadur Shah and his successors did not or could not rebuild the ruptured Rajput-Mughal relationship.

2. The Sikh Revolt

In 1708, the tenth Sikh Guru Gobind supported Bahadur Shah and joined the imperial entourage to the Deccan as the Emperor marched south to confront Kam Bakhsh. The guru's mission was to get redress against Wazir Khan, faujdar of Sirhind, who had executed two of his sons. Not sure of the justice, he sent message to the Punjabi Jats to revolt against tyranny if his mission fails. The emissary was Lachman Das, renamed as 'Banda' (slave) of the guru, who was armed with the guru's standard. While Banda and his companions were in Delhi the news of guru's assassination reached them. The assassin, a young Afghan, may have been a hireling of Wazir Khan. At the time of his death, apparently

Gobind told his followers that he was the last guru and they should now seek guidance from Granth Sahib, the holy book of Sikhs.

Banda started organising a resistance movement under his leadership and assumed a quasi-spiritual position. The Jat peasants and converts joined him as members of the Sikh Khalsa. They began raiding Muslim towns in the Punjab and then arrived in Sirhind to avenge Wazir Khan. In 1710, the Sikhs overran a Mughal army and killed many: they stormed Sirhind, looted the city, destroyed buildings and killed those who did not convert to Sikhism. Then Banda took the title of Padishah (king), adopted new calendar and issued coins: he became the millennial leader of Sikhs. After Sirhind, the Sikhs overran the Punjab plain from the Jumna to Ravi and beyond; only Lahore, Delhi and some other towns held out.

Towards the end of 1710, Bahadur Shah hurried to the Punjab with a large Mughal army and pushed Banda and his followers into the foothills. Banda and his comrades attacked the Punjab again in early 1711. His religious appeal and hatred of the Mughal (Muslims in general) bonded the diverse bands of Sikh rebels. In fact, Banda appealed to his followers with the Muslim concept of martyrdom (shahadat) in the cause of faith. Bahadur Shah's army swept the Sikhs back into the foothills. The Mughals could not crush the guerrilla movement with popular support. Many hill Rajput chiefs, unlike the Rajputs in the plain, were sympathetic and supplied information, material support, and refuge to the Sikhs. It was early in Farrukhsiyar's reign in 1715 that the governor of Punjab was able to surround Banda and his followers in their hill fortress. After a siege of eight months, the Mughal army captured Banda and his starving troops. Banda and hundreds of followers were publicly executed. The Sikhs were by no means finished. If anything, they regrouped and developed a mighty force against the declining power of Mughal authority in eighteenth century.

3. Maratha Power in the South

After the death of Rajaram in 1700, his very astute and able widow, Tara Bai, became the Regent of her 4-year old son Shivaji II (1696-1727). There were two other rivals for the Maratha throne: Rajas Bai, another widow of Rajaram and the mother of Shambhaji II versus a group that support-

ed Shahuji, son of the deceased Shambhaji, who was in Mughal custody. Tara Bai organised the Maratha administration and suppressed the other claimants. She then sent Maratha troops for plunder into parts of the Deccan and Malwa, areas the Marathas had once before invaded in 1699. A party of Marathas entered Berar in 1703 and raided Gujarat, sacked Baroda, and even threatened the imperial camp at Ahmadnagar. Marathas were now raiding and plundering a large part of the Deccan and even central India. At one stage, Tara Bai offered to submit to the Emperor if he would appoint her son as the sardeshmukh of the Deccan provinces, but the Emperor rejected the offer. However, Aurangzeb was unable to defeat the rising Maratha power; his successors were no match for the Maratha armies.

During the confusing period following the death of Aurangzeb, Prince Azam allowed Shahuji, son of Shambhaji, to leave the imperial encampment where he had been in confinement since infancy. He was free to claim Maratha leadership of the fractious and disunited chiefs and generals. Shahuji was pitted against Tara Bai, senior widow of Rajaram, who claimed the Bhonsle throne on behalf of Rajaram's son Shivaji II. The purpose of Prince Azam was to reconcile with Marathas unlike his father. Shahuji was raised in the Mughal imperial culture, treated warmly by Aurangzeb, not forced to convert, and given proper Hindu (Brahmin) learning in his faith. He was, therefore, not an avowed enemy of the Mughals. In 1709, Bahadur Shah conferred a high Mughal mansab upon Shahuji and obtained the service of Nimaji Sindhia in his campaign against Kam Bakhsh. After Kam Bakhsh's death, Bahadur Shah wanted to reach a settlement in the Deccan. He appointed Zulfiqar Khan as absentee governor of the Deccan and mir bakhshi of the empire. Daud Khan Panni served as Zulfiqar Khan's deputy from Aurangabad. Through his emissary, Shahuji proposed that he would like to be the sardeshmukh of the Deccan province with ten per cent of the imperial revenue as his allowance and he should have the authority to take the chauth (one-quarter of revenue) as well. In return, he would restore order and prosperity. At the same time, Tara Bai asked for her son only ten per cent of the revenue as sardeshmukhi in return for order and prosperity. Both proposals would place the Bhonsle ruler in a subservient position to the Mughal emperor. Shahuji and Tara Bai hoped to

strengthen their claim to sovereign power over the splintered Maratha chiefs and generals.

Bahadur Shah was indecisive and issued a sanad to each party for sardeshmukhi but not chauth: this meant that the two factions would fight for supremacy, a policy that damaged the imperial domains. In the last two years of Bahadur Shah's reign, Maratha armies of each claimant raided and plundered the Deccan and penetrated into Malwa as well. The Mughal response was quite ineffective to curb the devastating raids. Daud Khan Panni reached a private agreement with Shahuji to turn over 35 per cent of the revenue that Bahadur Shah had not conceded. In return, Shahuji agreed to restrain the Maratha chieftains and restore order. However, Shahuji could not bring the Maratha chiefs under his authority. The Mughal authority weakened even more than during Aurangzeb's last campaign against the hill fortresses. In time, Marathas would become major players in other parts of the crumbling Mughal Empire as well.

4. Wars of Succession

Bahadur Shah died in his seventieth year at Lahore in January 1712. He kept his four mature sons in close attendance: Jahandar Shah, Azim-ush-shan, Rafi-ush-shan, and Jahan Shah. His second son, Azim-ush-shan, had a vast fortune he had collected in Bengal and Bihar—where he was governor for 11 years—a large army, and was a close adviser to his father. But Zulfiqar Khan, mir bakhshi, absentee governor of Deccan and the most powerful noble at the court, was opposed to him. Zulfiqar Khan negotiated an agreement with the other three princes that they oppose their brother. If victorious, they would divide the empire: Jahandar Shah to occupy the court at Delhi with Zulfiqar Khan as his wazir, Rafi-ush-shan would get the north-west up to Kabul, and Jahan Shah to get the Deccan. This meant that Zulfiqar Khan would become the effective ruler, an ominous sign of things to come for the Mughal rulers: the rising power of competing nobles and puppet emperors. The Muslim nobles were a diverse lot, but two groups that dominated and fought each other for power were Turanis, central Asians, and Iranis, immigrants from Khorasan (Persia). They were a major cause for the decline and fall of the empire. The other two groups were Indian-born

Muslims, generally in inferior positions, who disliked the first two groups. The Afghans, though numerous in military service, would be a new element in politics after 1720. In any case, on behalf of the other three princes, Zulfiqar Khan managed to defeat Azim-ush-shan who then drowned in the Ravi while fleeing. Since Jahandar Shah was probably the most pliable of the three princes, Zulfiqar Khan came to his help. Within a month, the other princes, Rafi-ush-shan and Jahan Shah, died in combat. In five years, after the death of Aurangzeb, his two sons and four grandsons lost their lives in the wars of succession!

Jahandar Shah became the new emperor in March 1712. He found that he could not reward his close foster brother, Kokaltash Khan, and pushed him aside. Zulfiqar Khan promoted himself to the highest rank as mansabdar and wazir; he appointed Daud Khan Panni as governor of Deccan and his private fiscal officer, Ratan Chand, as diwan of khalsa (crown) lands. The new wazir then imprisoned several nobles of deceased princes and publicly executed two amirs. This was the first time that the nobles on the losing side were persecuted and punished. A new phase of the Mughal decline began as the court nobles became the kingmakers and the kings mere puppets.

Jahandar Shah moved from Lahore to Delhi, where many changes permanently damaged the central authority of the Emperor and his administration. The mighty wazir took over the authority from the Emperor, only the first time after the early years of Akbar under Bairam Khan. Zulfiqar Khan abolished jizya as a conciliation policy towards Hindus and gave concessions to Rajput rajas. He elevated the ranks of Ajit Singh to the title of Maharaja, and Jai Singh Kacchwaha, with the title Mirza Raja, and appointed the latter as governor of Malwa; he gave Shivaji II, son of Rajaram and Tara Bai, a noble rank, with the title Anup Singh, and appointed him as the deshmukh of Hyderabad province.

Jahandar Shah was not happy with the power Zulfiqar Khan exercised so he conspired with his foster brother, Kokaltash Khan, and his clique to undermine the wazir. But he also, more damagingly to the empire's authority and reputation, raised his favourite concubine to the status of queen, displayed drunkenness and celebrated expensive festivals. At the same time, the empire faced a severe administrative and fiscal crisis. The shortage of jagir lands in proportion to the inflated

ranks badly affected the revenue system, reducing the income from jagirs below the level assigned on paper; imperial regulations were violated in the zabt system and bribes became more common; and revenue farming (ijaradari) became common in which the agents of jagirdars settled the bids made by private revenue farmers (ijaradars). The only secure revenue came from Bengal. Prices of commodities rose sharply and the supply of food to major towns fell.

By the end of 1712, Jahandar Shah's end was around the corner. Farrukhsiyar, the second son of the slain prince Azim-ush-shan, started marching from his post as governor of Bengal and a new war of succession was on. He crowned himself at Patna for the throne. Two Sayyid brothers of Braha supported him: Husain Ali Khan, who owed his position as governor of Bihar to the late Azim-ush-shan, and Abdullah Khan, made governor of Allahabad under the same patronage. The Sayyids of Braha could depend on their kinsmen for solidarity and troops: they were at one time helpers of Prince Salim (Emperor Jahangir) to get the Mughal throne. In return for their help, Farrukhsiyar promised the two Sayyid brothers positions of wazir and mir bakhshi. Some Rajputs and Muhammad Khan Bangash, later Nawab of Farrukhabad, also joined Farrukhsiyar.

Jahandar Shah's son, prince Azz-ud-din, and some inexperienced officers confronted at Allahabad the troops coming from the east, but fled even before the battle. Many zamindars and nobles joined Farrukhsiyar. Jahandar Shah and Zulfiqar Khan did not have the money to muster an army to meet the rebel forces. They met the emergency by stripping the palace of jewels, vessels and articles of gold and silver. It was a bankrupt place. The Emperor's top commanders were divided and demoralised and the newly recruited troops of Chin Qilich Khan and other Turani nobles, who were out of favour since Aurangzeb's reign, were suspect of their loyalty. The two armies met at Agra in early 1713, where the Turani troops of Chin Qilich Khan betrayed the Emperor; Jahandar Shah fled the field even before the battle began and Zulfiqar Khan retreated to Delhi.

Farrukhsiyar enthroned himself as emperor at Agra, appointed Abdullah Khan as the wazir and diwan of the empire and Husain Ali Khan as mir bakhshi. The new emperor marched to Delhi, where Jahandar

Shah took refuge with Zulfiqar Khan who imprisoned him and offered him to Farrukhsiyar. When Farrukhsiyar arrived in Delhi, he executed Jahandar Shah the same day. At Mir Jumla's encouragement, several prominent courtiers and high-ranking officials, Zulfiqar Khan among them, were also executed. He blinded two cousins Azz-ud-din and Wala Tabar, and his own 12-year brother, Humayun Bakht, and confined them all as prisoners in Delhi fort.

Soon a tussle started between Farrukhsiyar and the Sayyid brothers for executive power. The single most important fact was that this struggle subordinated all else in the empire for almost seven years (1713-1719). The tension between the Emperor and his wazir was harmful to adopting a coherent policy towards the Rajputs and Marathas. Farrukhsiyar gave governorship of Malwa to Jai Singh Kacchwaha who accepted the assignment, but Ajit Singh Rathore rejected the offer for governorship of Sindh. In response, the Emperor sent Husain Ali Khan with a large army to bring Ajit Singh to court, but at the same time wrote to Ajit Singh to defeat and kill Husain Ali Khan. Ajit Singh chose to submit to Husain Ali Khan and agreed to give his daughter in marriage to the emperor, send his son to the imperial court to serve as a noble, pay tribute, and accept governorship of Sindh. But there was a secret term agreed as well: as soon as Ajit Singh marches to Thatta, he would be reappointed as governor of Gujarat. This condition meant an alliance between the Rajput raja and the Sayyids.

In 1714, after Husain Ali Khan returned to Delhi, the court struggle broke out in the open but they reached a compromise after a few months. Husain Ali Khan went as governor to the Deccan; Abdullah Khan remained as wazir at Delhi; and the Emperor made his two favourites Mir Jumla and Khan-i-Dauran governor of Bihar and mir bakhshi, respectively. Husain Ali Khan went to the Deccan with more powers. The Emperor moved Daud Khan Panni from Gujarat to Khandesh as governor under the Deccan administration. However, in secret Farrukhsiyar asked Daud Khan Panni to kill Husain Ali Khan and if successful in the act he would replace the slain Sayyid. But it was Husain Ali Khan who killed Daud Khan Panni in a battle near Burhanpur. He also found out the secret letter of the Emperor to Daud Khan Panni.

There was a brief thaw: Farrukhsiyar celebrated his wedding with Ajit Singh's daughter in which Abdullah Khan participated fully.

But soon the Emperor's treachery was exposed and hostility between the Sayyids and Farrukhsiyar was restored. For the next nearly two years (1716-1718) there was a stalemate between the Emperor and his wazir. Farrukhsiyar planned several attempts to seize and kill the wazir. The wazir protected himself by an army of his kinsmen and supporters and no noble accepted the Emperor's offer. There was a fiscal crisis as well: diwan Ratan Chand leased all revenue to the highest bidders. Farrukhsiyar tried to re-impose the jizya, but the Hindu officials opposed it vigorously. There was much disorder in the capital and the Emperor started to lose credibility even with his supporters. The Sikh revolt was suppressed temporarily and the Jats in and around Delhi and Agra rose against the imperial rule. Farrukhsiyar pressured Jai Singh to lead punitive campaign against the Jats, but the campaign could not suppress the Jat plunder and highway robberies. Abdullah Khan reached an agreement with the Jat leader, Churaman Jat, who paid an indemnity, gave bribe to the wazir, surrendered his fortresses, and agreed to serve wherever posted.

In the Deccan, Husain Ali Khan repudiated the pact between Daud Khan Panni and the Marathas that gave them 35 per cent of the revenue to keep order. So the Marathas kept up their raids and plunder. In the meantime, Farrukhsiyar wrote to Shahji Bhonsle and other Maratha chiefs to keep up the pressure on the forces of his own governor. The Mughal governor had lost authority in southern Deccan (Bijapur, Hyderabad and the two Carnatic provinces) while the Marathas were seizing more territory in northern Deccan. Husain Ali Khan then offered Marathas to come on his side, began negotiations with Shahuji and reached an agreement in early 1718. Under the agreement, the Mughal Empire gave Shahuji unchallenged authority over Shivaji's original dominion, ceded recent Maratha conquests in Berar, Gondwana and Carnatic, and the right of 35 per cent (chauth and sardeshmukhi) of imperial revenue in the six Deccan provinces. In return, Shahuji agreed to pay tribute, make troops available to the Mughal governor, and maintain order. Farrukhsiyar refused to ratify the treaty, but Shahuji went ahead as if the treaty was in force.

The enmity between the Emperor and the Sayyids came into the open again. Abdullah Khan refused to place new officials that the Emperor wanted in the Deccan. Farrukhsiyar sought help from Ajit Singh, Nizam-ul-mulk (governor of Moradabad) and Sarbuland Khan, governor of Bihar, who brought a large force to Delhi. But the Emperor was indecisive which alienated the nobles who either left the capital or went to the wazir's side. By the end of 1718, Farrukhsiyar could depend on Jai Singh with a much smaller force. In the meantime, Husain Ali Khan, at his brother's urging, moved north from Burhanpur. He was joined by Shahuji's peshwa, Balaji Vishwanath, with horsemen paid from the Mughal treasury. The Bhonsle ruler asked for an exchange: he would hand over the son of Akbar, the deceased rebel son of Aurangzeb in return for the release of his mother, Yesu Bai, and younger brother held in Delhi since 1689. But the so-called son of Akbar was an imposter. Husain Ali Khan entered Delhi in early 1719. Farrukhsiyar was now anxious to reconcile. He dismissed Jai Singh and all other officers with access to the fort and court. Abdullah Khan met the Emperor in person and abusive exchange followed after which the wazir seized control of the fort and palace and the Emperor retired to the zennana. After much confusion and some combat, the Sayyid brothers put Rafi-ud-darajat, a son of the late prince Rafi-ush-shan, on the throne. Their troops seized Farrukhsiyar from the zennana and brought him to Abdullah Khan who blinded him immediately, imprisoned him, and had him strangled and buried two months later. That was the end of the second puppet emperor.

The Sayyid brothers took control of Rafi-ud-darajat the puppet emperor, but he died of tuberculosis in the summer of 1719. In the meantime, some Hindus at Agra proclaimed Nikusiyar, the real son of Akbar and their prisoner, as emperor. However, the Sayyids soon defeated them and placed Rafi-ud-daulah, another son of Rafi-ush-shan, on the throne with the title Shahjahan II. Like his younger brother, the new emperor lived at the fort in Delhi as a prisoner. Apparently, Rafi-ud-daulah was much addicted to opium and died on the way to Agra with Husain Ali Khan in the fall of 1719. The Sayyids then settled on Roshan Akhtar, son of the late prince Jahan Shah, as the new emperor with the title Muhammad Shah. Under Muhammad Shah, the Sayyid brothers confirmed the treaty with Shahuji and, to conciliate Ajit Singh, allowed the widow of

Farrukhsiyar, who had converted at marriage, to renounce Islam and return to Jodhpur. This act greatly enraged many Muslims. The Sayyids made similar concessions to the Jats.

By this time, the imperial authority was gone and the subordinate provinces were no longer submissive to the centre. In addition, the Sayyids could not command loyalty of the demoralised Mughal nobility. These nobles found in Nizam-ul-mulk, a Turani amir, their leader. Nizam-ul-mulk was then governor of Malwa to whom Muhammad Shah, the young emperor, sent messages to get him out of the grips of Sayyids. The Nizam marched to Delhi and sought support from other nobles because the Sayyid brothers had ruined the empire, destroyed the Turani and Irani families, and followed a disastrous pro-Hindu policy. The Turani and Irani commanders responded to restore their status and the empire and remove the Indo-Muslim elite represented by the Sayyids. In August 1720, Nizam-ul-mulk defeated a joint Sayyid-Maratha army in the Deccan and, through Muhammad Amin Khan, secured assassination of Husain Ali Khan. Muhammad Shah appointed Muhammad Amin Khan as his minister and his son, Qamar-ud-din Khan, was given a mansab. Muhammad Shah returned to Delhi with the Turani party to join the insurgents against Abdullah Khan. The wazir had put on Delhi's throne as emperor a brother of Rafi-ud-darajat and Rafi-ud-daulah. But Abdullah Khan was defeated, captured outside Delhi in November 1720, and executed a few months later. Muhammad Shah forgave the puppet emperor. It is significant that Muhammad Shah abolished jizya on non-Muslims in early 1720.

From the death of Aurangzeb in 1707 and the accession of Muhammad Shah in 1720, the turmoil, disorder and instability created by the wars of succession and regional revolts had their predictably destructive impact on every part of the empire. In the wars alone, at least two sons, eight grandsons and one great grandson of Aurangzeb and many more relatives and nobles were killed. The administrative jurisdiction of governors, diwans, faujdars, bakhshis, and jagirdars were diluted and blurred. Imperial orders were ignored or not effectively executed. Information (secret news reports) declined in quality and frequency; the zabt revenue system transformed into revenue farming. Jagirdars assumed full military and police powers over their holdings to collect revenue;

tax collections became erratic and diminished. Zamindars and peasants rebelled and the level of violence increased almost everywhere. The weakened central authority created opportunities for officers in the provinces. All provincial authorities strengthened their powers while paying lip service to the emperor and his authority. Proto-dynastic figures established nascent regional kingdoms in several provinces. Some semblance of political stability started to appear in the northern provinces under a new loosened and decentralised imperial structure. They are worth noting here.

- *Rajputana*: The Rajput rulers, who were subject to administrative control from the imperial revenue administration in Ajmer, seat of the Mughal governor, started to extend their watan jagirs to build autonomous regional kingdoms, for example, Jai Singh of Amber (Jaipur).

- *Awadh*: There was considerable disorder in the area for a long time—15 governors in 13 years—so the later governors acquired expanded powers over the provincial diwan. This allowed governors Chabele Ram in 1714 and Girdar Bahadur in 1719 to use their kinsmen to control the provincial diwan and even faujdars. Eventually in 1722, governor Burhan-ul-mulk was able to lay the foundation of an autonomous and dynastic kingdom in Awadh. He acquired all imperial powers and administrative authority. During the period of instability, the local Afghan and Rajput zamindars and jagirdars transformed into lords of fiefdoms in perpetuity. However, Burhan-ul-mulk managed to beat down the resistance of the new lords.

- *Bengal*: The circumstances in Bengal and Orissa were quite different. As diwan, Murshid Quli Khan, an officer of Aurangzeb's time, maintained good order after 1707. Bahadur Shah had reappointed him as diwan in 1710 after two years' transfer. In 1712, when Farrukhsiyar demanded, in preparation of his bid for the throne, accumulated revenues of Bengal and Orissa, Murshid Quli Khan refused since the prince had no claim to the imperial funds. Farrukhsiyar's troops tried to force the diwan but were defeated. When Farrukhsiyar became emperor in 1713, Murshid Quli Khan sent him the revenue and in return he was elevated to the position of deputy governor of Bengal and governor of Orissa. He was promoted as governor of Bengal in 1717. Murshid Quli Khan was an excellent fiscal manager

and stayed loyal to the Mughal throne. During his tenure, from 1717 to his death in 1727, the governor sent annually Rs. 10.5 million to Delhi and all funds were meticulously accounted for. By 1727, his son-in-law Shuja-ud-din Khan—who was serving as governor of Orissa—seized the two provinces against the wishes of Murshid Quli Khan. Emperor Muhammad Shah ratified Shuja-ud-din Khan as nawab in Bengal paying tribute to the Mughal ruler.

- *Deccan*: The chaos in Delhi eroded the provincial administration in the Deccan as in the north. The Maratha raids had greatly weakened the administration in Khandesh, Aurangabad, Berar, and Bijapur. The provincial officers either accommodated or took shelter in their fortresses or even fled. The plundering raids combined with Maratha claims on the revenue were disruptive: claims and counter-claims ruined the peasants, thus reducing cultivation and production of crops. By the 1720s, many villages were deserted. The chaos and disorder was equally damaging the overland trade: banditry on trade routes against caravans became common. The port of Surat was the most affected by the massive disruptions, hence imports and exports suffered enormously. In fact, the British trading company shifted, as did the Dutch company, its activities to more secure ports like Bombay. The drain of silver in Mughal campaigns in the Deccan affected the money supply and trade. The eastern parts of the Deccan, like the west, also suffered after Aurangzeb. In Hyderabad province, Maratha raids and banditry took their toll and the strong and capable governor, Rustam Dil Khan, was killed in the war of succession in 1708. The governors who followed were incapable of maintaining any semblance of order. However, in 1713, Farrukhsiyar appointed a very determined and capable governor Mubariz Khan. He managed to hammer the Maratha and Telugu chiefs with their followers and bring order. In 1715, Mubariz Khan made accommodation with Sayyid brothers, who expanded his tenure in Hyderabad and gave him the post of diwan as well along with his son as commander of the Golkunda fort. In 1717, Marathas were prevented from collecting 35 per cent of revenue through their agents in the eastern part of the Deccan: no dual administration here. Mubariz Khan ignored the emperor as well; he sent only token payments to the central treasury. He appointed his family members and kins in important positions. By the end of Farrukhsiyar's reign, Mubariz Khan had restored his authority as governor, provided greater stability and security, and

> raised the revenue collections. The governor became a regional king. However, Nizam-ul-mulk, who was trying to carve out a domain of his own in the Deccan, defeated and killed Mubariz Khan in 1724. The Turani stalwart thus founded the state of Hyderabad.

In the 1720s, had the Mughal ruler(s) been charismatic and strong, the descent of the empire could have been halted or even reversed. As the examples of Murshid Quli Khan in Bengal and Mubariz Khan in Hyderabad clearly showed, other Mughal nobles could have resurrected the imperial service. However, in the long reign of Muhammad Shah, the empire transformed into regional (independent) successor states. In some of these states, like Bengal, Awadh and Hyderabad, the Mughal nobles established their autonomous rule and in others Rajputs, Marathas, Afghans, and the Sikhs. More than that the European trading companies, especially of Britain, France and to some extent Holland—the Dutch interest had moved to Indonesia and Ceylon (Sri Lanka)—got gradually involved in regional rivalries and combats, reflecting their divisions in Europe and the attraction of resources and territory of India. Profits from trade were no longer the main interest of these companies. In the next chapter, I describe the disintegration of Mughal Empire and the rise of the contesting indigenous and foreign powers.

The empire 'became a mere shell empty of puissance'; its condition was of 'a carcass inviting the birds of prey.' The Mughal administration became a mere pretence that cloaked the rapine, pillage, marches and counter-marches of armies of one power against another. It is fair to suggest that Aurangzeb and his successors destroyed the empire. Aurangzeb's destruction of the states of Bijapur and Golkunda in the Peninsula removed the two buffers between Maharashtra and Delhi. In addition, he and his successors made Rajputs and Sikhs their implacable enemies. The governors of Bengal and Awadh were independent rulers and Nizam-ul-mulk became a sovereign ruler of Hyderabad. Marathas, after the death of their leader Shivaji, became the most persistent and important player in the wars for pillage, territory and power. The Mughal emperor sanctioned the assumed sovereignty of the nawabs of Bengal, Awadh and Hyderabad. He had also to sanction the conquests by Marathas. In the process of disintegration, foreigners were no less

important as participants and beneficiaries: the Persian Nadir Shah and the Afghan Ahmad Shah Abdali from the north-west and the trading companies from Portugal, Holland, Britain, and France by way of the sea.

The seeds of its destruction were inside the empire itself. First, there was a fierce competition for succession: after Akbar, transfer of power was rarely peaceful or smooth. Second, the emperor relied on bands of mercenaries whose major interest was in the loot, jagirs or mansabs. The jagirs and mansabs were neither permanent for the individual nor hereditary. Farming for revenue became the major aim: extracting surplus without regard to the well-being of peasants and zamindars and the fertility of land. Third, there were bundle of taxes on land and trade and besides specific taxes imposed on non-Muslims (Hindus): jizya on individuals and tax on pilgrims. Fourth, Mughal nobility was quite diverse and rife with ethnic and religious rivalries. Finally, the ideology and temperament of emperors were no less important: compare Akbar's shrewd secularism and tolerance with Aurangzeb's rigid and almost uncompromising Sunni orthodoxy; and compare the personalities of Babur, Akbar and Aurangzeb with those of the later Mughals.

II. The Empire's Legacy

The Mughal Empire continued to expand and deepen its control in India from 1556 when Akbar ascended the throne to 1689 when Aurangzeb went into the Deccan. In 1689, the empire stretched from Kabul in the north-west, covering all of Punjab, Sindh and Kashmir to the east up to the end of Bengal and in the Peninsula up to the River Kaveri. The empire's governors and commanders administered directly most of the area and a small area was under tributary chiefs and rajas who accepted the over-lordship of the Mughal monarch. However, the Western Ghats (Maharashtra) became a contested region, thanks to the insurgent Marathas.

The multi-regional and multi-ethnic Mughal Empire was a highly centralised state at the core of which was its army. Its administrative structure and institutions reflected the central position of the emperor

backed by his nobles (amirs) and mansabdars governing the military and civilian arms of the state. Its fiscal resources were generated by loot in the process of conquest, tax on land cultivated by peasants and inland trade supplemented by tributes, gifts, indemnities, and sundry charges. Revenue from land was the largest contributor. The Afghans and Mughals had developed a complex but largely effective revenue system that extracted one-third to one-half of the produce from land. A very high proportion of the imperial revenue was used to maintain and mobilise the army and civil bureaucracy, followed by the imperial household, and the residual used on public works (e.g. sarais, roads and canals), charities, and grants.

1. Social Conditions

The main characteristics of the social structure, divisions based on religion, ethnicity, caste, class, and gender, did not alter by much if at all during the Mughal rule. The sharpest division was between Muslims and Hindus in faith, traditions, and customs. Hinduism and its practitioners did not much impress Muslims, divided though they were by ethnicity, sect and class. The arrogance of power and the dismal state of Hindu civilisation reinforced the Muslim prejudice against Hindus. The Hindu-Muslim divide was not as sharp among the elite as it was among the ordinary people: they coexisted without much sympathy for each other's traditions and customs. A vast majority of their religious guides emphasised the importance of division. Akbar and a few others among the Mughal elite tried to bridge the gulf, but a majority of them undermined these attempts. Hindu society itself was highly fractured because of the age-old caste system and there existed powerful resistance against movements to reduce these differences. It is also true that, though there were exceptions, the society and economy created few opportunities for upward mobility: divisions among Muslims and Hindus remained almost frozen. It was not a career-oriented society: birth and customs defined one's status in the community since there was little education and not many avenues to change one's place in the society. Only a minority was able to get to positions of influence and power by talents or sword.

In the pyramid of power and influence, the lot of women was at the bottom in both private and public spheres. Very few women acquired recognition or status in the public sphere among Muslims and Hindus. In the private sphere, generally men retained a dominant position no matter whether the household was of the elite or commoners. Among Hindus, the customs of female infanticide, child marriage, and sati remained untouched by the Muslim rulers. Similarly, among Muslims, strict segregation of sexes and inferior status of women were unchanged. However, some customs moved across religious lines: custom of dowry at marriage from Hindus to Muslims and the purda for women (behind the veil or confined within the four walls) from Muslims to Hindus. The practice of polygamy was not uncommon among the Muslim elite, a practice adopted by the Hindu elite, Rajputs and Jats chiefs in particular. Reliance on superstition, astrology and visits to the living and dead saints were quite common among Hindus and Muslims, perhaps more so among women of both religions. But there was a big difference between women of the ordinary and elite classes: the latter could afford a life of comfort and luxury without much or any labour and the former laboured most of their lives and achieved little or no comfort. It needs to be emphasised that in Mughal India slavery was not uncommon both in its traditional form—slaves treated as commodities—and somewhat modified form in which peasants and workmen often found themselves. The victors could treat men and their families of the defeated armies as slaves both in the traditional and modified form.

2. Culture in Mughal India

During the long Mughal rule, the Hindu and Muslim cultures did not change by much: they remained insulated from each other even after centuries of co-existence. They did influence each other but mainly on surface. The problem was the division of the ruling class (Muslims) and the subject class (Hindus). Hindus accommodated and passively adjusted and Muslims were equally unresponsive treating Hindu culture with disdain and not worth serious attention. Generally, the mood was of glum co-existence, but there were exceptions. The Muslim attitude towards Hindus was not only because of the arrogance of power but also because the Hindu civilisation was in a dismal state. Intellectually, ob-

scurantist pundits and mullahs led the two societies. The Mughal elite, commanders and rulers, came from a land where centres of learning and sophistication existed for centuries deriving strength from the intermingling of Greek, Arab-Persian and Chinese traditions. The rulers, Babur, Humayun, Akbar, Jahangir, and Shahjahan, each had major talents and accomplishments to his credit, as did some of the princes and princesses, and possessed libraries valuing books. Aurangzeb was perhaps the least interested, except in the narrow and rigid tradition of Islam, though his sisters and a daughter were patrons of learning and culture.

The most exciting period, culturally speaking, was of the 'illiterate' but inquisitive Akbar: inquiry and experimentation were encouraged and patronised in philosophy, religion, science, and culture. The emperor exhibited great interest in European religion though not so much in technology. He enjoyed inter-faith debates on a range of issues, collected and maintained translations, and participated actively in the meetings. But Akbar was an exception. Most of his contemporaries showed little interest in any of this. Akbar's attempt to fuse the Hindu and Persian-Islamic cultures yielded no enduring result. In fact, after him the Persian and Islamic cultural influence became more prominent if not dominant, except that Jahangir and Shahjahan maintained in some degree the cult of monarch. There is no doubt that all emperors, except Aurangzeb, were enthusiastic patrons of arts, music and poetry and richly rewarded writers, poets, musicians and other professionals. The amirs emulated their rulers. But it stayed only at this level since other groups, zamindars, traders, were parsimonious or rustic and the common people too poor to afford their meagre resources or energy for anything other than survival. The Mughal rulers were not tyrannical in their attitude to expression of dissent so long as they did not feel threatened by rebellion: there was enough latitude allowed. But the artists, poets, writers, etc. had to act as courtiers to enjoy favours or else; sycophancy was the usual attitude.

In the Mughal period an important development was the spread of Persian language among the Muslim, Rajput and Maratha elite and officials. In this, Akbar played a pivotal role by requiring the revenue records of all kinds written in Persian and preferred it as medium of

communication in other ways as well. Another development was the spread of Urdu as a medium of exchange among common people using the Hindi syntax and grammar, vocabulary from Arabic, Persian and local languages (Hindi in particular), and written in Persian script. Its patronage at the court started with Muhammad Shah in the mid-eighteenth century. The Dakhani dialect in the south developed separately as a mixture of Persian and Marathi to allow the Persian-speaking elite of Bijapur to communicate with their subjects, hence confined to Muslims of the region. It lasted for about two centuries from the fifteenth, then declined and was replaced by Urdu as the Mughals penetrated the Deccan.

Actually many of the vernacular languages of India owe their formation and growth to the Mughal period. The engine for this was the Bhakti movement, which used the vernacular to reach the common people. Hindi was thus patronised by Akbar and even Aurangzeb. Many great Hindu poets lived in this age, Mirabar, Surdas and Tulsidas, patronised by the Mughal and Rajput courts. At this time, as in Hindi, there was flowering of literature in Bengali, Marathi, Telugu, Malayalam, Tamil, and Punjabi. All of these languages had a very old literary history but seem to have languished in the pre-Mughal period. These languages drew their essence from Sanskrit and many of their works were translations from Sanskrit; there was also an anti-Sanskrit sentiment as resistance to Brahmins. While Sanskrit was a dying language, it passed on its substance and strength to the vernacular.

A major problem was that the literary output was like a spray on a vast desert of illiteracy. Books were still hand-written until the introduction of printing press in eighteenth century; only Christian missionaries used it from sixteenth century. The rulers wanted to protect copyists and themselves. Mughal books were pieces of fine art, confined to a few and not for common use. The very late adoption of mechanical printing in India reflected resistance not simply to new technology but to new (subversive) knowledge and ideas. The result was that there was no change in the age-old system of education in Mughal India. Only Akbar wanted a new curriculum for boys, but none was ever used. The traditional education system among both Hindus and Muslims was quite similar, though the former taught writing before reading and the

latter followed the reverse. The only change in the Mughal period was introduction of accountancy for the imperial bureaucracy.

Muslim boys and girls, in the families of nobles and ashraf in urban areas more than in rural areas, were educated at home by private tutors. The focus was on recitation of the Quran, but without understanding, and general proficiency in Persian and Urdu. In terms of knowledge, even boys received little else. Outside the home, maktabs (for boys only) mostly attached to mosques were places for reading and writing of the Quran and perhaps hadith. Madrassas, again for boys only, were for higher learning and the pupils could spend six to ten years learning the Quran and hadith in Arabic with meaning and grammar, fiqh (Islamic jurisprudence), and rhetoric. The curriculum was based on models adapted from the Middle East. Among Hindus, there was private tutoring at home for mostly boys in the Brahmin and Kayasth families. Boys of prominent Kayasth families were also tutored in Persian. Outside the home, the basic schools, tols, were attached to temples for Brahmin boys to learn about religion. For higher learning were the gurukala, in which boys were attached to pundits or gurus for ten to 12 years to study different disciplines, professions, and religious texts. The important point is that the educational systems of both Muslims and Hindus depended largely on rote and rod. In the curricula, the emphasis was on traditional texts and speculation with almost no knowledge of modern sciences or the arts.

The Mughal rulers provided reasonably generous support to Muslim institutions and some of Hindus as well. They gave endowments and grants to institutions for income to individual scholars. There were no universities, no formal examinations and degrees. Recognition was based on who one's teacher was. The Hindu learning was fossilised and preserved in a dead language (Sanskrit). Muslim learning was no less restricted to religious education and literature (Persian and Urdu). No new knowledge outside the defined disciplines was allowed to interfere. It is fair to say that there was no progress in any sphere of learning in the Mughal period. Medical knowledge and practice, of Unani hikmat among Muslims and Auyrvedic among Hindus, were not based on knowledge of human anatomy and physiology. Quackery was wide-

spread. Common people generally resorted to folk remedies and various forms of religious practices and rituals.

The Mughals, with the exception of Aurangzeb, were keen patrons of music and paintings, builders of gardens, and architecture (palaces, tombs, mosques, forts, and pavilions). Music was valued at the Mughal court as a source of aesthetic pleasure and for spiritual rapture. The rulers were extravagantly generous to musicians: Akbar to the great musician Tansen, Jahangir to Ustad Muhammad Nayi the flute player, and Shahjahan to poet Jagannath Misra. The patronage to music and musicians started with Babur and stopped with Shahjahan; Akbar among them was by far the most active promoter of music, be it of the Hindu religious tradition, or Muslim qawwalis or secular verse, or mixed Indo-Persian tradition, and musicians be they Irani, Hindu, Turani, Kashmiri, men or women. During the Mughal period, a number of books were written, but much of the music composed has been lost. Mughals also borrowed from Hindu songs and dances that were essential part of Hindu worship. Dancers were regular performers in the harem, even in open public spaces and dancing girls were favourites of Mughal princes and nobility. In the Mughal environment, the visual and performing arts changed from religious devotion to secular entertainment. Music and dance, much admired and patronised by emperors from Humayun to Shahjahan, were banned by Aurangzeb, but they revived after his reign.

By the time Mughals came to India, there was a long Muslim tradition of illustrated manuscripts after Muslims had introduced paper to India from Persia in the thirteenth century. Since Muslim traditionalists condemned the act of depicting living beings, Mughals concentrated on abstract art and calligraphy. It is significant though that in Persia and Central Asia, despite religious prohibition, figurative painting was patronised. The first Mughals, Babar and Humayun, were familiar with this art form. Humayun's interest in painting was deepened by his exile in Persia: he was able to attract some of the Persian painters to his court at Kabul where he and Akbar took lessons from them. Akbar started early with painting and his patronage of painters and interest in paintings of living beings grew with time. Numerous artists in Akbar's court made portrait and mural paintings, some of which have survived.

But his son Emperor Jahangir turned out to be the most ardent connoisseur of paintings: he favoured individual paintings to manuscript illustrations and European influence became more marked in his reign. Mughal miniatures were of such high standard that some of the leading European painters collected them. After Jahangir, the standards fell: overuse of colour and gilding became more common. Shahjahan, though an admirer of portraits, was too occupied with architecture, hence reduced the number of court artists. Aurangzeb had some of his own portraits painted, but publicly kept the orthodoxy in practice. I should add that unlike painting, sculpture found no favour with the Mughals.

In architecture, Mughals have left their mark almost everywhere in India: look at their numerous monuments and formal gardens. A distinctive contribution of the emperors was their refinement of the Indo-Persian styles rather than creating a new style. For Babur civilised life required formal gardens: he established a garden on the bank of Jumna near Agra. He and his grandson Akbar were avid horticulturists; horticulturists from Persia and Central Asia settled in India to promote plants and trees for flowers and fruits. But Jahangir had a passion for formal gardens: he laid out several, among them the Shalimar Garden at Srinagar is the most celebrated. His son Shahjahan laid out the Shalimar Garden at Lahore following the tradition. Fountains, flowers beds and trees were placed in symmetrical design with square or rectangular area divided into quadrants; each quadrant was divided into neat geometric forms using straight lines. A pool at the centre was the major source of water through broad but shallow channels to each segment. Mughal emperors built their great mausoleums in these gardens and regarded them as token of eternal spring or paradise.

Mughal architecture was radically different from that of Hindus: they were more open to the environment and had cheerful appearance reflecting zest for life. Mughals enjoyed Nature rather than avoid it. Water was as vital for architecture as for gardens to give life to structures and comfort to the occupants and visitors. Babur in his short and busy life in India was able to construct, using the services of a Turkish architect, several building complexes. Humayun apparently had grand building plans, especially a new city Dinpanah near Delhi, but almost no trace

remains of the construction. Much of it was demolished by Sher Shah whose own plan was to build a new city in its place, but only a shell of it, Purana Qila (Old Fort), remains with a noteworthy royal mosque. A new phase in architecture began with Akbar: the first piece in his reign was the mausoleum of Humayun in Persian style with the char-bagh (formal garden) in Delhi. Akbar did not like the Persian style and created a vigorously original Indo-Persian style. Akbar was a compulsive builder: citadel at Agra, palaces in Lahore, Ajmer, Allahabad as well as the elegant bridge on the Gomti at Jaunpur. But it was in Fatehpur Sikri, his new capital next to the abode of Shaikh Salim Chishti, that Akbar showed his vision. Sikri, like the Agra fort, was built of red sandstone with marble inlay for decoration. The palace complex is in the Hindu tradition, but the great mosque follows the Islamic style along with the tomb of the Chishti saint. Akbar's own tomb, mausoleum, with char-bagh, in Sikandra is perhaps the best monument to his personality.

Jahangir was not a keen builder though his wife Nur Jahan was an enthusiast. Nur Jahan built a fully marble mausoleum of her father on the bank of Jumna near Agra. She also built Jahangir's mausoleum at Shahdara near Lahore. Shahjahan more than compensated for his father's lack of interest in architecture. It is fair to say that, during his reign, Mughal architecture reached its zenith. He built mostly with marble, favouring geometrical precision and openness of Persian architecture. He demolished most of the buildings that Akbar had built in the Agra fort: the shish mahal is a fairyland pavilion. But it was in his new capital, Shahjahanabad, near Delhi, that Shahjahan built a marble complex of unparalleled luxury. The Diwan-i-khas has a Persian couplet engraved that says that if there is paradise on earth, then this is it. The emperor also built the largest mosque of India next to the citadel, huge in size and elegantly proportioned.

Around the time of completion of Shahjahanabad (1632), Shahjahan got the work started on Taj Mahal, a grand mausoleum for his deceased wife Mumtaz Mahal: it took 22 years (1631-1653) to complete. The Taj, all in marble, is in Persian style but tempered with some Indian elements. It shows the movement away from the cultural synthesis found in Fatehpur Sikri. The location of Taj on the Jumna allows its image shimmering in the River and offers an enchanting view from Shahja-

han's palace at the Agra fort. The Taj at a close distance is even more dazzling with matchless skills of craftsmen who had adorned it. Taj is a perfect structure: nothing about and around the Taj looks out of place or proportion. In building this magnificent monument, Shahjahan used the services of some of the best architects and craftsmen then available in India and abroad, as far as Baghdad and Constantinople, and the labour of 20,000 workmen. Needless to add, the expenses for Taj Mahal (estimated at Rs. 320 million) and other Mughal monuments were borne by peasants, zamindars and traders. Shahjahan also built the grand mosques in Delhi and Lahore. Mughal architecture after Taj Mahal could only be less than perfect. The austere Aurangzeb, though had little or no interest in art and architecture, left to his credit the small but elegant Moti Masjid in the Delhi fort and the tomb of his queen Dilras Banu Begum in Aurangabad.

It is obvious that Mughal emperors invested much energy, time and a vast treasure in building personal monuments but of little value to most of their subjects in India. Their investments on and attention to the public works were not proportionately as significant. They did improve or build new major roads for movement of armies and goods, sarais (rest houses) for travellers and traders across much of the north, a limited number of irrigation canals and diversion of waters, and encouraged growth of market towns and urban centres. They paid almost no attention to the development of sea-worthy ships and naval power, a handicap that had serious consequences for them and their empire. Likewise, their tactics of warfare and weaponry, dependent on large size infantry and cavalry, remained more or less unchanged. Their armies were in the pay of their nobles and mansabdars who in turn depended on the revenue from land to maintain themselves and the men who fought for them. Successive wars and the general state of disorder in the empire after Aurangzeb's move to the south lowered morale, quality and discipline of men in service.

3. Economic Conditions

The economy of India in the Mughal times remained largely dependent on cultivated land and its products. Land was the most important source of production and the state revenue. Most of the industry

was based on processing and manufacturing of raw material produced by peasants and material (minerals) extracted from the ground. There was substantial growth of finance and markets for internal and external trade.

Peasants cultivated a variety of grains and cash crops depending on climate, soil, and markets; only potato and tobacco were introduced in the early seventeenth century. Production was done on very small scale with little capital and a stagnant technology. Almost all farming depended on rains since little investment was made in surface irrigation. The problem was that peasants had to meet the demand of the state for revenue in cash, one-third of net income in Akbar's time rising to one-half by the time of Shahjahan. In practice most peasants had to pay most of what their labour produced, leaving them in poverty and misery. Locusts, droughts, wars, pillage and plunder only added to their misery. The demand of revenue by the state in cash worked both ways: it helped develop markets and finance but also made the peasant vulnerable to instability in prices.

The Mughal mansabdari (jagirdari) system—assignment of land revenue for imperial services instead of salaries or cash payment—worked against the interest of peasants and cultivation of land. It became even more so with the growth of revenue farming and dilution of mansabs. The mansabdars, and the revenue farmers used by them, had little interest in the productivity of land or in the well-being of peasants. Similarly, the primary interest of the state (emperor) was to maximise the yield from revenue, which it tried to do by extending the area under cultivation and increasing the revenue rate. The growth of exports of pepper, cotton and its products, indigo, and silk to Europe and parts of East Asia, thanks to the Dutch and British trading companies, brought some benefit to cultivators, but the cultivation of these crops was limited to certain areas only. Peasants were quite responsive to changes in the relative price of crops, say between grains and cash crops, which in turn affected their supply. But it is also true that producers were dependent on intermediaries, merchants and moneylenders, for credit and sale and had little or no leverage to get the best price or a fair deal. The state machinery was of little or no help in regulating the market.

There were numerous industries for manufacturing and processing of raw material for both domestic and foreign markets. Like farming they were also organised on small scale by artisans and craftsmen with traditional skills and almost no capital. To purchase raw material (supplies) and their tools, they depended on merchants, moneylenders or contractors. The growth of export markets, thanks again to the European trading companies, greatly influenced the production of yarn and fabrics (calicos, etc.), dyes from indigo, silk and silk fabrics, saltpetre, and iron. Production of cotton yarn and fabrics, dyes, silk and silk fabrics, grew the most because of rising demand for these products in Europe and East Asia. The small-scale producers, however, depended almost entirely on capitalists for advances. The greater competition among buyers, especially for exports, made life a little easier and better for producers. State intervention, through levies, taxes, monopolies, was always unpredictable and often capricious for artisans and craftsmen. Foreign demand for some of the manufactured products helped somewhat in improving technologies and practices used in dyeing, shipbuilding, rope making, and cotton fabrics.

The economy in Mughal times did not diversify by much because of lack of growth of income of a vast majority of households, especially those engaged outside the state service as producers in agriculture, manufacturing, and mining, and labourers without skills. There is no evidence that their lot improved by much if at all during the Mughal rule. Periodic famines, some more serious and wide-spread than others, caused by drought or flood, war and pests (e.g. locust), exacerbated by ineffective state administration and corruption, took their heavy toll on human life and livestock with lasting effects. While a high proportion of the population lived precariously, a thin crust consisted of very wealthy and extravagant upper class, princes, nobles, and hangers-on. A small proportion of the population, most of it in urban areas, was in the frugal middle class like merchants, financiers, and some professionals. The purchasing power of the majority of producers was limited because of transfer of their income to maintain about one-fifth if not more of the population in the state service for war, civil administration, and sundry imperial services. Since these groups produced almost nothing,

and often hindered production, the labour of peasants, craftsmen, artisans, and other similar groups had to bear their burden.

After the reign of Aurangzeb, the conditions of the economy and society deteriorated significantly due to massive disorder caused by regional revolts, wars and invasions throughout the eighteenth century. The economic impoverishment of India accompanied widespread breakdown of social order and enhanced ethnic and religious divisions. The revenue from Bengal, a province relatively free of turmoil, financed the wars in the Deccan and wars of succession. Several factors accelerated the economic decline. Prominent among these were: the disintegration of central authority; increased incidence of revenue farming; Persian and Afghan invasions; plunder and pillage by the Marathas, Sikhs, Jats and the Afghans; and the subversive activities—piracy, abuse of dastaks and private trade, monopoly of trade of some commodities and competition for territory and revenue—of the European trading companies, particularly the British and French. By the middle of the century, the Indian economy and society were caught in a whirlpool of morass. It would be another one hundred years after which a new economic and social order would be in place under another alien power which, unlike the Mughals or other invaders before them, chose to rule but not settle. India would be under the 'British Raj', first through the British East India Company and then directly by the British Crown.

4. The Revenue System

The Mughal revenue system was organised at two levels: the central system included revenue from land, customs, mint, inheritance, indemnities, plunder, state monopolies on salt, indigo and saltpetre, gifts, and the poll tax (jizya); the provincial or local system included minor duties and taxes on transport, crafts, occupations, and trade. The emperor discouraged collection and disbursement of the provincial or local revenue without reference to the central diwani (treasury). The Mughal administrative system was a system for gathering revenue and not a system of governing the state. The empire had a three-tiered structure below the centre: subas (provinces), sarkars (divisions), and parganas (sub-divisions). Each pargana was a union of villages. The central diwani kept large revenue staff, except for the village patwari (revenue accountant)

and muqaddam (village headman) who were servants of the village community.

Generally villages were based on clans or brotherhoods of peasants claiming common ancestry. In each village, the headman was recognised as manager of the village and representative for revenue administration. Each member of brotherhood possessed land which he cultivated. If there was extra land, the village headman could give it to tenants. In each village the patwari maintained records of cultivation, receipts and payments and assisted the headman. Each pargana had a chaudhri who received orders from the administration and enjoyed some local jurisdiction. There was also a qanungo (accountant) in each pargana. A peasant held land as his own, but had the obligation to cultivate it and pay revenue to the state. The owner could transfer the land by inheritance, sale, etc. subject to meeting his obligation to the village and the state. The peasant's obligation to cultivate land and pay revenue existed in Hindu law; non-cultivation of land and non-payment of tax were acts of rebellion. The state could use force, and it did when necessary, since its interest was to keep the peasant on the land and cultivate it. The tax rate in the Hindu period was one-sixth of produce from land, but rose to one-quarter and even one-third. In the Muslim period, it ranged from one-third to one-half. Payment of the revenue rate was set in cash. The raja and zamindars had the right to share the revenue of their ancestral domains.

The problem was that the Mughal rulers concentrated on collecting revenue and neglected to nurture the source, ravaging the body that sustained them and the empire. The main victims of the revenue squeeze were peasants: they had almost no rights, only obligations to zamindars and the state. But the rulers had to be careful: there was plenty of land and the peasants to cultivate it not as plentiful. If they squeezed a bit too much, the cultivators could migrate. The interest of the ruler was not in land per se but in its output. Likewise, the peasant's interest in land was its yield for which he needed protection of life and property. The Mughal land revenue system was built on this foundation, to which the Afghan ruler, Sher Shah Suri, in the Mughal interregnum had made substantial changes and improved the system for both peasants and

the ruler. During the long reign of Akbar, his functionaries made more changes after a period of experimentation.

Land fell into six revenue categories. The first category was of khalsa (crown) land, of which the revenue was reserved for the emperor; normally it contributed 12.5 per cent of all land revenue. Jagir (assigned) land was in the second category. Jagirdars (mansabdars) took the revenue from this land for their military service, maintaining infantry and cavalry, to the emperor. Jagirdars had either paid staff to collect the revenue or handed the collection to revenue farmers (highest bidders). The third category was of the watan jagir (ancestral land) of subordinate rulers in Rajputana and the Deccan where the revenue system had to be like the emperor's. The holder of watan jagir could bequeath the jagir but the emperor had to approve the successor. The fourth category was of altamgha (grant) land, which was given by the emperor to deserving officers with hereditary right of possession generally in their native districts. These grants were rare until Aurangzeb, but increased manifold after him.

The zamindari (hereditary) land was the fifth and important category. The revenue collectors had a hereditary right to collect revenue of an area, for which the zamindar had the customary right to share the produce of land, and keep a certain proportion of the revenue collected from peasants—it was one-tenth in Bengal—or he received rent-free land as his compensation. The zamindars were generally chiefs of a clan/brotherhood who settled a village or area and distributed its land among cultivators in return for their protection. Gradually the zamindars acquired rights to land and not simply to its produce. Likewise, some mansabdars invested their savings in acquiring zamindari rights. Zamindars could be a counter-weight to the state's authority, at least at the local level, since some of them maintained militias and forts. They were predatory towards travellers and merchants but protective to cultivators (tenants). The sixth and final category was of madad-i-maash (freehold) land assigned free of revenue obligation as a favour or as charity to men of learning, Muslims and Hindus, and their seminaries and schools. The grants were hereditary but not necessarily and could be reduced or resumed by the emperor. There was much room for

corruption in assigning these grants since it involved the office of chief sadr.

In 1582, Raja Todar Mal, the empire's chief diwan, revised and reorganised the land revenue system. He established a zabt (regulation) system in which the state officials surveyed, measured, and classified the land according to fertility, etc. for cultivation and the rate of revenue was set at one-third of the produce to be paid in cash or kind. Each pargana was divided into revenue circles according to agricultural homogeneity. The cash rates varied with type of crop. After Akbar's time, the land revenue system underwent changes in some major ways. Shahjahan shifted the assessment of revenue based on individual cultivator to the community in each village. The village headman fixed the dues for individual peasants and he paid the collected revenue to the state. In Aurangzeb's time, cash assessments on villages became increasingly common. The tax rate also tended to rise from Shahjahan's time, from one-third to as high as one-half, leaving almost no surplus for the peasant. The tax burden was even more oppressive when the price used for tax liability was higher than the market price. When the tax administration deteriorated, as happened more often because of turmoil and wars, the chiefs and officials extorted all sorts of illegal levies from peasants. This led to tax evasion. Aurangzeb tried to improve the tax administration to get the rightful dues, reduce corruption, and ensure a fair deal for the cultivator. But his directives often fell on deaf ears. The Marathas and Malik Amber in Ahmadnagar copied the Mughal land revenue system however imperfect it may have been.

As the Mughal rule started to weaken, the land revenue system changed as well: ijaradari (revenue farming), even on crown lands, became a common practice. Consequently, a relatively small number of revenue farmers acquired control of large tracts of land who then over time acquired hereditary rights—they became zamindars. Even the customs dues were farmed out. The bane of revenue farming was that the ijaradars (contractors) were only interested in revenue and not in the land and the shorter the tenure the more damaging it was for the peasant who bore the most burden. Jagirdars also adopted the practice of revenue farming: they gave their jagir lands to the highest bidder who could be a moneylender, merchant or zamindar.

Apart from land revenue, booty was a major source of revenue for the Mughals: conquest and plunder were major instruments by which the amirs and troops could be paid and the ruler could acquire new treasure and wealth. The state would keep one-fifth of the loot and the rest distributed among soldiers and hangers-on. But often the ruler did not keep this ratio: Mughal kings kept most of it and then distributed the rest as they pleased. Then there were the tributes taken from sub-ordinate rulers. Likewise, gifts from courtiers and nobles were important: the amounts were not trivial by any means. Still another form of revenue was escheat: confiscation of a noble's property at his death was a routine in the Mughal period, especially if the deceased did not leave an heir or the emperor did not approve the nominated heir. Debts of the deceased had to be collected from his or her property and the rest passed on to the approved heir. If the dead amir left indebted to the state, it attached his property in return. Aurangzeb did not like the abuse quite commonly observed: he let the heir(s) get the deceased's legacy and disallowed his officials from collecting state debts from the children of the deceased debtor. But in practice he himself ordered confiscations in selected cases. Taxes on trade, customs, transit dues, shop tax, etc., were far less important: the customs ranged between two to five percent, and import duties were even remitted or reduced, so the revenue raised was miniscule. The state mints and monopolies were also sources of some revenue but not much.

Apart from regular taxes, the emperor could impose special taxes on individuals or communities. The most significant among these was the jizya (poll tax) imposed on non-Muslims (Hindus). Akbar abolished it in 1564, but Aurangzeb revived it in 1679. The rulers after Aurangzeb paid little attention to its collection and Muhammad Shah abolished it altogether in 1721. Those without property or earned annually less than Rs. 52 did not have to pay the jizya. Also exempt were Brahmins, women, slaves, children under 14 years, and disabled persons. It was a graduated charge, but it hit the low-income earners far more severely (16 per cent of income) than it did the rich (less than one per cent of income). Probably the purpose of hitting the poor so hard was to pressure them into conversion. I should add that the jizya was not easy to collect. The revenue from jizya, spent only for charitable purpose, was three to four

per cent of the total imperial revenue. Muslims had to pay zakat or tax on wealth or property owned for a year. People used to avoid this tax by transferring their property or wealth to someone else at the right time. The zakat revenue financed various forms of charity. Significantly, Aurangzeb abolished collection of zakat from Muslims, while re-imposed the jizya on Hindus. Finally, Akbar had imposed levies on marriages, trees and horses, though later abolished them and not revived again.

7

India in the Eighteenth Century

> I am now not far from Delhi, once the capital of the largest empire in the world, Russia perhaps excepted. The present possessor of the throne (Shah Alam II), the descendent of Tamerlane, lives in darkness, surrounded with empty state and real penury, a pensioner on the niggard bounty of the Marathas, from whom he receives less than the Duke of Bedford does from his tenants. He supplicates me on the terms of royalty; and his son is here, a dependent on the benevolence of the Nabob (of Awadh), from whom he receives a comfortable subsistence. Wonderful are the dispensations of Providence, and I feel them in myself! Lord Cornwallis (1797) cited by Edward Thompson and G.T. Garratt in *Rise and Fulfilment of British Rule in India* (pp.184-5).

> If you will have a little patience the death of the Nizam will probably enable me to gratify your various appetites for land and fortresses. Seringapatam ought, I think, to stay your stomach a while; not to mention Tanjore and the Poligar countries. Perhaps I may be able to give you a supper of Oudh and the Carnatic, if you should still be hungry. Lord Wellesley in a letter to Henry Dundas cited by Denys Forrest in *Tiger of Mysore: The Life and Death of Tipu Sultan.*

The Mughal Empire as a dynastic, highly centralised and bureaucratic state ended with the death of Aurangzeb, last of the 'Great Mugha-

ls'. The empire started to break up due to the wars of succession that followed, sheer incompetence of emperors, selfishness, intrigues and treachery of courtiers, demoralised nobility and commanders, financial bankruptcy, and alienation of the subordinate Hindu rulers and commanders. When Muhammad Shah ascended the throne in 1720, he ruled a crumbling empire. At least three of the Mughal nobles had carved out autonomous states (Bengal, Awadh, and Hyderabad). Marathas were marching north after acquiring territory and resources in the south. The subordinate Rajput and Jat rulers and chiefs had declared their independence. The Sikh warriors were rising as a new force in the Punjab. In the latter part of the 1740s, some Afghans (Rohilas) started to take over the Katehr territory (known as Rohilkhand), spread over a large part of the Gangetic Doab and north of the River Ganges towards the Tarai. The Persian invasion, led by Nadir Shah, in 1739 and series of Afghan invasions, led by Ahmad Shah Abdali, from 1748 for over twenty years devastated the northern parts and clearly exposed the internal divisions and powerlessness of the Mughal emperor and his court. The increasing involvement of the European trading companies, especially the British and French, in the affairs of Carnatic, Hyderabad and Bengal was to have far more serious consequences for India. In fact, by the middle of 1750s, the British East India Company was emerging as the single most powerful force in the transformation of Mughal India. In chapter 9, I give a brief and contextual history of the arrival of Europeans to India by sea to understand fully their role in the tumultuous eighteenth century and the emergence of Britain as the supreme power on the sub-continent by the end of that century.

I. The Plight of Mughal Emperors (1720-1806)

Following the death of Aurangzeb and the tumultuous wars of succession and enthronement of puppet emperors for about 12 years, Emperor Muhammad Shah (1720-1748) had a long spell on the throne of Delhi. But the imperial authority was gone: subordinate provinces and the tributary states were no longer submissive to the centre. The Turani

(Central Asian) nobles were getting ready to fight the Sayyid brothers who were Indo-Muslims. When the two brothers started to split, the Irani (Persian) nobles along with the Turani (Central Asian) faction confronted the Sayyids. One of the two brothers (Husain Ali Khan) was murdered by the Turani faction and the other (Abdullah Khan) at Delhi was defeated by the emperor and the Turanis in late 1720. Abdullah Khan had earlier, when the emperor was away from Delhi, placed on the throne Muhammad Ibrahim, a brother of Rafi-ud-darajat and Rafi-ud-daulah, as emperor. However, Muhammad Shah, on his return to Delhi, forgave the puppet emperor.

Muhammad Shah's one claim to fame was that he abolished jizya in 1721. Otherwise, his reign was a period of rapid decline in the emperor's writ with the rising power of his governors in their provinces, rapid expansion of the Maratha confederacy in southern and central India, dominance of the Sikhs in the Punjab, rise of Afghans in Rohilkhand and Farrukhabad, and the increasingly autonomous Rajput and Jat rajas. The invasions by Nadir Shah, the Persian ruler, in 1739 and then by Ahmad Shah Abdali, an Afghan general of Nadir Shah, in 1748 were not only final blows to the person of Muhammad Shah but the honour and prestige of the Mughal Empire. In the spring of 1748, Muhammad Shah died in Delhi while his army, led by his son Ahmad Shah, was near Panipat. At the emperor's death in 1748, the empire was fragmented and the emperor a powerless pawn. The seed sown by Aurangzeb for the rupture was now coming to fruit. He more than any other Mughal ruler alienated the Rajputs and exasperated the Marathas by his orthodoxy and bigotry; his short sightedness encouraged the emergence of principalities. The emperor's army was demoralised because it did not have a system of training, discipline and punishment; emperor's tolerance of laxity among his army and its officers weakened its discipline even more. The demoralisation of the imperial army resulted from its dependence on nobles who maintained contingents from the revenue of assignments held by them for that purpose. Jealousy among and treacherous behaviour of the nobles and commanders was another factor.

By the time Muhammad Shah died, a Turani noble, Nizam-ul-mulk (Asaf Jah) ruled India south of the Narbada River and the west of the rivers Wainganga and Godavri, independent in all but name though

his power was in dispute by the Marathas. The Emperor had no say in this part of his broken empire. Another independent Turani noble ruled the three provinces of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, but the Marathas disputed his authority and held the province of Orissa in their hands. The power of the English East India Company was rising and would in time overthrow both Muslim and Hindu rulers. Awadh was almost independent under a hereditary Persian noble who was soon to absorb the province of Allahabad and the Afghan territory of Rohilkhand. The province of Malwa formed part of the dominion of Marathas who were contesting Muslim rulers in the Deccan, Bengal and Gujarat. Rajputana stood aloof from the empire ruled by the descendents of Rajput princes once loyal to the Mughal crown. Kashmir, Punjab, Multan, and Sindh lay at the feet of Ahmad Shah Abdali, the Afghan king. The Jats occupied the southern part of the Jumna River. The only region left to the Delhi throne was the northern half of the Gangetic Doab, southern banks of the Indus, Panjnad and Sutlej rivers. In these territories, the Emperor enjoyed authority to the extent allowed by his warring nobles and ministers.

After the death of Muhammad Shah, the Turani and Irani nobles proclaimed his son Ahmad Shah (1748-1754) as emperor. The new emperor was powerless and confined to Delhi while his nobles wrestled each other at the court and the rest of India was a deeply fragmented land. In 1751, Safdar Jang of Awadh, with the Emperor's sanction, called Marathas in support of his fight against the Bangash (Afghan) ruler of Farrukhabad. This was the first but not the last appearance of Marathas in the Gangetic Doab. In 1754, Ghazi-ud-din II (Imad-ul-mulk), a Turani noble, brought Marathas to Delhi, had Emperor Ahmad Shah deposed and blinded along with his mother. There was anarchy in Delhi. The blinded emperor was replaced by Aziz-ud-din, second and elderly son of Jahandar Shah and grandson of Bahadur Shah, as emperor with the title of Alamgir II. In the meantime, the Afghan chieftains (Rohilas and Bangash) were fighting each other, the Persian Nawab of Awadh was fighting the Afghans, and the Turani nobles against each other and against the Persian nobles.

Ghazi-ud-din II became the wazir and virtual ruler at Delhi during the short reign of Alamgir II. He mauled the Jats and then, accompa-

nied by Ahmad Khan Bangash, the Afghan Nawab of Farrukhabad, entered Awadh to punish its new Nawab, Shuja-ud-daulah—his father Safdar Jang died in 1754. Saadullah Khan, a Rohila chieftain, interceded on behalf of Shuja-ud-daulah who paid Ghazi-ud-din II to retreat. In the meantime, Ahmad Shah Abdali invaded the Jat territory south of Delhi and also Mathura where many Hindu pilgrims were killed and temples damaged or demolished. At the pleading of Alamgir II, Ahmad Shah Abdali appointed Najib Khan, a Rohila chieftain, as amir-ul-umara or protector of the emperor at Delhi. However, after Abdali's departure, Ghazi-ud-din II appointed Ahmad Khan Bangash as amir-ul-umara and sought help from the Marathas. Towards the end of 1759, Ghazi-ud-din II got Alamgir II assassinated and, with the support of Marathas, placed on the Delhi throne a grandson of Kam Bakhsh with the title of Shajahan III. In the meantime, Marathas were all over northern India from Bengal to the Punjab.

Shahjahan III (1759-1761) was emperor in name only and lasted for less than two years. The Muslim nobles and Hindu chieftains of Rajputana were weary of the Maratha pillage and plunder. Many of them, including the Rohila (Afghan) chieftains, invited Ahmad Shah Abdali to deal with the Maratha menace in the north. He came down to the plains of Punjab and with the Indo-Muslim armies fought a large and strong confederate army of the Marathas at Panipat—known as the third battle of Panipat—defeated the Marathas decisively and laid to rest the dream of a Maratha empire in India. In the spring of 1761, after victory at Panipat, Abdali put Ali Gauhar, a son of Alamgir II, on the throne of Delhi with the title of Shah Alam II, appointed Shuja-ud-daulah as his wazir, and confirmed Najib Khan Rohila as amir-ul-umara at the court where he ruled until 1770. Ghazi-ud-din II disappeared into obscurity and died in 1800. It is fair to say that the third battle of Panipat in 1761 effectively ended the Mughal Empire.

Shah Alam (1761-1806) was crowned as emperor not in Delhi but in Bihar where he had lived as a fugitive for some time. He was able to return to Delhi with the help of Marathas only in 1771. In the interim, Najib Khan was the virtual, though much harassed, ruler in the capital. In an attempt to recover Bengal from the British East India Company, Shah Alam along with the Nawab of Awadh fought the Company

at Buxar in 1764, but lost the battle decisively. In the settlement that followed, the Emperor obtained control of Allahabad and Kora and a tribute from Bengal. At the death of Najib Khan in 1770, Shah Alam decided to return to Delhi, not remain a virtual prisoner of the Company and accept the help of Marathas in his project. In retaliation, the Company handed over Allahabad and Kora to the Nawab of Awadh and stopped payment of tribute to Shah Alam.

In early 1772, Shah Alam made it to Delhi where Najaf Khan had replaced Najib Khan as the ruler and would remain in power until his death in 1782. Najaf Khan managed to repulse the Sikhs, suppressed the Jats, recovered Agra, and kept the Marathas at a distance. The Mughal control in India stretched from the Sutlej in the west to the Chambal River in the east and from Jaipur to the Ganges. But the widespread and devastating famine of 1782, and the misery that followed, encouraged a renewal of dissention with no capable leader at the court on whom the Emperor could lean. In 1785, Shah Alam invited Mahadji Sindhia, a Maratha commander, to Delhi and made him the empire's Regent. However, after his defeat in Rajputana in 1787, Mahadji Sindhia's hold was weakened which allowed Ghulam Qadir Khan, grandson of Najib Khan, to seize Delhi, humiliate the Mughal zennana, and blind Shah Alam in frustration because the renegade Rohila did not find the treasure he expected to take as booty. Mahadji Sindhia defeated and executed Ghulam Qadir Khan and restored the emperor.

From then on Shah Alam lived under the Maratha tutelage as a pensioner, respected but pitied and ignored, and received the English forces at Delhi in 1803. In the meantime, the Maratha leader grew stronger: he was recognised as the Mughal Regent and his dominion stretched from the Sutlej to the Narbada River. Mahadji Sindhia moved to the south in 1792 to assert his claim on Poona, but died there in 1794. In the 1790s, the Maratha power split into fragments, the Afghans had withdrawn from the Punjab, and the Mughal power had long disintegrated. By then the rising power of the British East India Company had subdued or captured almost all of the south, weakened the Marathas significantly, eliminated the Rohilas, and controlled Bengal, Bihar and Awadh, and marched into Delhi in 1803 as the new protector of the Mughal emper-

or. In 1806, Shah Alam died and his son succeeded him taking the title as Akbar II.

Akbar II (1806-1837) was emperor of a territory that did not extend beyond the Delhi fort as the British had taken effective control of several parts of India. The Mughal Empire had in fact ended long before: it was now left to others to legitimate their conquest and rule in the name of the Mughal emperor. His son, Bahadur Shah II, would be the last (nominal) emperor of the Mughal dynasty. Bahadur Shah II (1837-1857), like his father, was emperor only of the Delhi fort, certainly not much beyond the confines of Delhi. His end in 1857 was quite ignominious. The British managed to crush the 'Great Revolt' of 1857 in less than two years, killed two sons and one grandson of Bahadur Shah II and killed or exiled other members of the royal family. The British administration deposed the emperor and exiled him to Rangoon in Burma, where he lived in penury until his death in 1862. What a descent for the Timurid dynasty from Babur the invader and Bahadur Shah II the powerless captive. Only the legacy of the 'Great Mughals' and the glory of their 'Golden Age' were left for posterity to reflect on.

II. Persian and Afghan Invasions

The Persian and Afghan invasions of India helped the Sikhs to establish their rule in the Punjab and also allowed the Marathas to come and stay in north India, including Delhi where they controlled the nominal Mughal Emperor Shah Alam II from 1772 to 1803. Nadir Shah (1698-1747), the King of Persia (1736-1747), invaded India in 1739, defeated the Mughal army, humiliated the Mughal emperor, Mohammad Shah, plundered Delhi, and massacred thousands of its residents in very short time. The loot his army took back to Persia was high in value and massive in weight.

The next invader was Ahmad Shah Abdali (1722-1773), a Sadozai Afghan, who started his military career with Nadir Shah and rose to a high rank in Shah's army. In 1747, when Nadir Shah was assassinated by some of his own kinsmen, Abdali seized most of the territory of what became the state of Afghanistan in nineteenth century. He invad-

ed India nine times between 1748 and 1769: the first three of Abadali's invasions between 1748 and 1752 were limited to the Punjab. The first time the Mughal wazir (Qamar-ud-din Khan) and his son Mir Mannu managed to force Abdali to retreat from Sirhind. In the next two invasions (1749 and 1752), Abdali was able to annex Lahore, Multan and Kashmir. In the fourth and fifth invasions (1756-57 and 1759-61), he led his army's march into Delhi and south up to Agra. In 1757, in response to the appeals by Mir Mannu's widow, Mughlani Begum, Najib Khan (a Rohila chieftain) and the emperor, Abdali's army reached Delhi and plundered the city for a month. But, on its way back home with the loot, the Sikhs joined by Marathas molested the returning army and dispossessed it of much of its loot.

With the Sikhs and Marathas pillaging the territories of Rajputana, Rohilkhand and Awadh, the Rajput and Muslim rulers appealed to Abdali for help. In 1759, on his way through the Punjab, Abdali forced the Sikh armies to retreat into the hills. A decisive battle followed at Panipat in early 1761 in which a combined army of Abdali and Indian Muslims defeated a confederate Maratha army. It was a massive defeat for the Marathas. The next four invasions by Abdali were limited to the Punjab where the Sikhs confronted and harassed him and his army. In 1762, Abdali assisted by the Rajputs inflicted tremendous losses on the Sikhs in life and property. But the Sikhs did not give up. So Abdali returned in 1764-65 and, joined by the Khan of Kalat, entered Lahore and blew up the Sikh Har Mandir in Amritsar. After another incursion into the Punjab in 1766-67, to crush the Sikhs, Abdali returned to the Punjab to fight the Sikhs for the last time in 1769. In this encounter, the Sikhs forced him from the right bank of the Chenab to return to his kingdom in Afghanistan as a 'broken man'. Abdali's son Taimur Shah remained engaged against the Sikhs for about 20 years (1773-1793), but to no avail. His grandson, Shah Zaman (1793-1800), appointed Ranjit Singh (1780-1839) as governor of Punjab in 1798; he died in Ludhiana in 1800 after the rival clan of Barakzai Afghans had blinded him.

1. Nadir Shah's Invasion of India (1739)

The Safavid kings of Persia had taken away Qandahar from the Mughals in seventeenth century. Shahjahan undertook expensive expeditions to

recover the area but in vain. Thanks to the incapacity of Aurangzeb's successors and the selfish behaviour of nobles around them, the Mughal rule grew corrupt and inefficient. Mughal prestige declined within India and outside as well. The riches of India along with its fragmentation tempted invaders from the north-west. The decline of central authority and the weak defence of the north-west offered enviable opportunity to the Persian adventurer Nadir Shah who had become free from internal problems by 1736. The weak attempts of the Mughal governors of Kabul and Punjab to guard the provinces were futile and their appeals to Delhi for help went unheeded thanks to the machinations of rival parties at the court.

Nadir Shah rose from a humble background through hardships with talents, energy and courage. In 1727, he helped the Safavid king in recovering Persia from the Afghans and entered the service of Shah Tahmasp, son of the deposed king. Nadir soon became the virtual ruler of Persia, thanks to the incompetence of his master, and deposed the king in 1732. He crowned himself as king of Persia at the death of the infant son and successor of Shah Tahmasp. Nadir Shah marched towards India in 1738 with the excuse that Emperor Muhammad Shah had violated his promises and the Persian envoys were badly treated at the court in Delhi. Given the poor state of defences, the invader captured Ghazni, Kabul and Lahore in 1739. The province of Punjab fell into confusion and disorder without any help from Delhi to resist Nadir Shah and his forces. The imperial troops came to check the Persian advance only at Karnal, near Panipat, where they were routed in February 1739. Saadat Khan (Burhan-ul-mulk), governor of Awadh, betrayed the helpless emperor and encouraged Nadir Shah to go to Delhi after the battle at Karnal.

Nadir Shah entered Delhi along with the humiliated emperor, where the Persian king occupied Shahjahan's palace. Initially there was little disorder in the city, but soon a rumour about Nadir Shah's death spread. In the tumult that followed the rumour, the rowdy crowd killed some of the Persian soldiers. The sight of his murdered soldiers incensed Nadir Shah. He ordered a general massacre of the citizens. The slaughter lasted for a day in which thousands lost their lives, properties looted and burned. Nadir's troops plundered the city and villages around it and

made the life of the blockaded residents miserable. Persian soldiers tortured leading citizens for money and collected massive loot. The dreadful scene of carnage and arson lasted for eight weeks. Eventually, in response to the appeals by Muhammad Shah, Nadir ordered his soldiers to stop, but peace was restored only after the invader and his troops quit the city. Nadir Shah let Muhammad Shah occupy the Mughal throne, but he took from the emperor the Peacock Throne of Shahjahan along with an enormous treasure (cash, jewellery, furniture and other valuable articles). In addition, the invader took away thousands of cattle, camels and horses. The Emperor surrendered the provinces of Sindh, Kabul and the western parts of the Punjab. The Persian invasion was a very costly affair for the already drained and weakened empire. Whatever little prestige the Emperor enjoyed was lost beyond recovery and the country more vulnerable to future invasions.

2. Ahmad Shah Abdali's Invasions of India: 1748-1769

After the murder of Nadir Shah in 1747, one of his officers Ahmad Shah, a Sadozai Afghan, rose to power and managed to become independent ruler of Afghanistan. He crowned himself as the king of Afghans and made Qandahar his capital. Accompanying Nadir Shah in the invasion of India, he saw the decrepit state of Mughal Empire and its nominal ruler in Delhi. Abdali was tempted to invade India also to strengthen his authority among the Afghans by adding Indian territories to his kingdom and gaining resources to meet the expenses of his army and keep the Afghan chiefs satisfied. After conquering Qandahar, Kabul and Peshawar, Abdali marched into India for the first time in January 1748. In all Abdali invaded India nine times between 1748 and 1769, when he finally returned to his dominion as a 'broken man' because of the emerging power of Sikhs in the Punjab. Needless to add, the invasions of India by Nadir Shah and Ahmad Shah Abdali contributed a great deal to the decline of Mughal power in India and the losses suffered by ordinary people in the process.

First Invasion, 1747-48 (Lahore, Sirhind)

Towards the end of 1747, Shah Nawaz Khan, the Mughal governor at Multan, deposed his brother Yahya Khan from Lahore and invited Ah-

mad Shah to the Punjab to assist him in resisting the pressure of the Mughal court at Delhi. Ahmad Shah marched from Kabul through Peshawar arrived at the right bank of Ravi via Rohtas, Jhelum and Gujarat. In the meantime, Shah Nawaz Khan changed his mind about invitation to Ahmad Shah and fled from Lahore at the latter's arrival near the city. Abdali stayed in Lahore for five weeks during which his troops plundered the city. He then marched towards Sirhind and occupied it in March 1748. A large Mughal army, led by the wazir Qamar-ud-din Khan (Itimad-ud-daulah), along with Prince Ahmad Shah (son of Emperor Mohammad Shah), Safdar Jang of Awadh, wazir's son Muin-ud-din Khan (Mir Mannu), and Raja Ishwari Singh of Jaipur, arrived near Sirhind to confront the Abdali forces. In the ensuing battle, Qamar-ud-din Khan was killed and his son Mir Mannu took up the command of Mughal army, but the Rajput raja fled from the field. Luckily for the Mughals, a big fire on the other side created much disorder in the Afghan army and so Abdali was forced to retreat. Abdali decided to retreat also because of the revolt by his nephew Luqman Khan in Qandahar. On his return, he crushed the revolt and eliminated Luqman. The Mughal army did not pursue the Afghans because Prince Ahmad Shah and Safdar Jang wanted badly to return to Delhi, the former because of the news about his father's illness and the latter because he wanted to replace the late Qamar-ud-din Khan as the wazir.

Second Invasion, 1748-1749 (West of Chenab)

Emperor Ahmad Shah appointed Mir Mannu as governor of the Punjab before he left for Delhi. Ahmad Shah Abdali wanted to restore his prestige in India and the situation in Delhi was favourable for his second expedition. The new emperor Ahmad Shah was indolent and given to sensual pleasures. The new wazir Safdar Jang was interested only in his position and not the empire. He instigated Shah Nwaz Khan to take back Multan from Mir Mannu who could not expect any help from Safdar Jang given his intense animosity for the late Qamar-ud-din Khan. Abdali marched into India in late 1748 and Mir Mannu, with no help from Delhi, moved west from Lahore. One of Abdali's generals went up to Lahore but could not enter the city. In the meantime, with the consent of residents of Lahore, a Sikh commander took advantage of

the confusion and chaos. Mir Mannu surrendered to Abdali for which he had the emperor's consent: the aim was to ward off Abdali. Under the agreement, all territory west of the Indus would go to Abdali and the revenue from four important districts as well. These districts were a strong flank against the hill chiefs of Jammu and Kashmir. Abdali returned to Qandahar via Multan and the Deras where the chiefs and Mir Naseer Khan, ruler of Kalat, gave him assurances of support. On his return, Abdali dealt harshly with some of the Afghan chiefs because of a plot against his life. He also conquered Herat in 1749. But he was defeated by the Persians in Khorasan after which he reached for peace with Shah Rukh.

Third Invasion, 1751-1752 (Punjab)

The excuse this time was that Abdali was not paid regularly the revenue he expected from the four districts of Punjab. He moved to Kabul and arrived in Peshawar in September 1751. Mir Mannu started preparing for confrontation, while exchanged strong messages with the Afghan king who marched towards Lahore. This time the Sikhs joined the Indians, thanks to Kaura Mal the deputy of Mir Mannu. But in Delhi the Emperor wrote to Safdar Jang, who was fighting against the Nawab of Farrukhabad and the Rohilas with the help of Marathas. Safdar Jang concluded peace with the opponents, sent back his Marathas allies, and returned to Awadh: he was not in the least interested to give help to Mir Mannu. The battle for Lahore was lost even without a combat. However, some of the Afghans entered Lahore and managed to plunder the city. Eventually Abdali and Mir Mannu, without combat, concluded a peace agreement. Abdali gets Lahore, Multan, and parts of Hazara, and a huge war indemnity. Emperor Ahmad Shah ratified the agreement and Mir Mannu stayed as governor for Abdali at Lahore. Abdali put the scheming faujdar of Jullundur Doab, Adina Beg Khan, in confinement and released the two Rohila brothers, Abdullah Khan and Faizullah Khan. They were in custody of the Mughal court to assure good behaviour of their late father Ali Muhammad Khan. In this expedition, Abdali also annexed Kashmir.

Fourth Invasion, 1756-1757 (Punjab and Delhi)

Several important events took place after the last (third) invasion by Abdali. Mir Mannu died accidentally in November 1753 and his notorious widow, Mughlani Begum, took up the baton. After the death of Mir Mannu, there was a contest between Abdali and the Delhi court about the next governor of Punjab. Abdali appointed his infant son, Mahmud Shah, as governor and Mir Mannu's infant son as his deputy. In the meantime, Mir Mannu's brother, Mir Nizam-ud-din (Intizam-ud-daulah) replaced Safdar Jang as wazir in Delhi and also absentee governor of Punjab. There was much confusion in Lahore with this appointment. At the same time, the Sikhs took advantage and came down to the plains to harass and plunder. In 1754, Emperor Ahmad Shah was murdered and replaced by Alamgir II. The new emperor replaced Intizam-ud-daulah as wazir with Ghazi-ud-din Khan II (Imad-ul-mulk) who had placed Alamgir II on the throne.

Abdali sent his agent to Lahore to intervene on behalf of Mughlani Begum whose infant son had suddenly passed away, and appointed her as the governor. But Mughlani Begum clashed with the agent hence she was removed and the agent given the full charge. In retaliation, Mughlani Begum turned to wazir Ghazi-ud-din II for help against Abdali's agent. Ghazi-ud-din II marched towards Punjab and he was at Sirhind in early 1756 when Mughlani Begum joined him there. The wazir gave Punjab to Adina Beg Khan in return for annual tribute and then returned to Delhi. Abdali's agent fled to see the Afghan king and report what the wazir had done. At the same time, Mughlani Begum appealed to Abdali against the wazir. Abdali sent his envoy to Delhi, but received no satisfactory response until December 1756. In the meantime, an Afghan force from Kabul came to reinstate Abdali's agent. Adina Beg Khan fled to the hills. Abdali received not only a petition from Mughlani Begum but also from Emperor Alamgir II and Najib Khan, a prominent Rohila chief, because of the misbehaviour of wazir Ghazi-ud-din II. In fact, Najib Khan sent his brother Sultan Khan to Abdali with the petition.

It is against this background that Abdali came down to Lahore in December 1756, crossed the Sutlej and arrived in Sirhind in January

1757. He sent terms for peace to the Emperor in Delhi, but he and the wazir could not accept the terms given the expensive implications for which they did not have the capacity to meet. Abdali entered Delhi, confirmed Alamgir II as Eemperor and appointed Intizam-ud-daulah as wazir. He and his troops collected enormous booty from the nobles of the city. The Afghans marched towards Agra to confront Suraj Mal Jat while devastating Mathura on the way. But because of the spread of cholera in his army, Abdali moved back to Delhi in March 1757. There he appointed Najib Khan as his supreme agent in India. Abdali's kingdom now included Sindh, Multan, Lahore, Kashmir, Jullandur Doab, and Sirhind. He appointed his son Taimur as his viceroy. On the way back in the Punjab the Sikhs harassed and looted the returning Afghans who sacked Kartarpur and Amritsar. In retaliation, the Sikh misl led by Ranjit Singh's grandfather greatly harassed and mauled the Afghan troops on their way back from Lahore to Peshawar.

Adina Beg Khan, faujdar of Jullandur Doab, started creating problems for Taimur. He invited the Sikhs and Marathas to harass and plunder the territory of Taimur. While the news from the Punjab greatly disturbed Abdali, a rebellion by Mir Naseer Khan of Kalat distracted his attention. Abdali was always warm to Naseer Khan since he had represented his tribe at the election of Abdali as Afghan king and accepted Abdali as his suzerain. Naseer Khan had also participated in Abdali's campaigns so far. The Kalat Khan was emboldened by the news that the Sikhs and Marathas had defeated the Afghan army and driven Taimur from the Punjab. Consequently, he declared his independence. He was also interfering in the affairs of Sindh in partnership with the amir of Bahawalpur. Abdali had to suspend his expedition to the Punjab and he moved against Naseer Khan who had to submit given the siege of Kalat. Naseer Khan concluded a treaty in which he acknowledged Abdali as his suzerain and undertook to contribute troops to defend Abdali's kingdom against outside enemies. After this treaty, Naseer Khan was always loyal to Abdali.

In April 1758, the Sikhs and Marathas moved into Lahore and took control; one of the Maratha commanders even reached Peshawar. The invaders appointed Adina Beg Khan as governor in return for a hefty annual tribute. Soon Adina Beg Khan started to make moves against

the Sikhs to prevent them from becoming too powerful and entrenched in the territory. But Adina could not crush them and died in September 1758. Wazir Ghazi-ud-din II appointed his own men, but the Marathas came close to Delhi and demanded that their man should replace the deceased governor since they drove the Afghans out of the Punjab. In the meantime, the Sikhs found new opportunity to expand their power. In the early part of 1759, Abdali sent expeditions into the Punjab, but they all failed and with great losses.

Fifth Invasion, 1759-1761 (Punjab, Delhi, Aligarh, and Agra)

To avenge the expulsion of his son Taimur from the Punjab, Abdali invaded India again to regain the lost territory and punish the Marathas. He was also receiving petitions from Najib Khan and the Rajput rajas of Jaipur and Marwar to protect their territories from Marathas. Emperor Alamgir II had also written to Abdali for help. The King of Afghans entered the Punjab in late 1759. The Marathas gave no resistance to his advance force and retreated from Attock. On their way back towards Delhi, they incurred heavy losses. But the Sikhs gave tough resistance to Abdali near Lahore.

The news of Abdali's march to Delhi much disturbed the scheming wazir Ghazi-ud-din II. In a fit of madness, he got Emperor Alamgir II and Intizam-ud-daulah murdered in November 1759. This cruel act incensed Abdali and he moved to Sirhind in early December1759 following his advance forces. One of the Maratha commanders, Dattaji, prepared himself to meet Abdali after raising the siege of Sukkartal against Najib Khan. Shuja-ud-daulah decided to join Najib Khan against the Marathas. The allied forces of Abdali and the Rohilas met the Maratha forces, supported by Ghazi-ud-din II, at Taraori (in Karnal) where the Marathas were defeated incurring heavy losses. Following the battle, Najib Khan and other Rohila chieftains (Hafiz Rahmat Khan, Dhoondey Khan, Saadullah Khan, Faizullah Khan, Fateh Khan, and Sardar Khan) came to pay their respects to Abdali. Abdali encamped near Delhi and then moved south towards Agra by way of Aligarh.

Marathas made no concessions to Abdali and remained defiant. This made Abdali more determined to fight them. In January 1761, a large and well-equipped army of the Marathas met the Afghan and allied

forces at the historic battleground of Panipat, well known for Mughal victories of 1526 and 1556. Marathas were defeated decisively and lost heavily in men and treasure. The remaining men and families returned to their country in the south. They would not return to the north for a decade after their disastrous defeat at Panipat. The Muslim chiefs agreed to pay a sizeable annual tribute to the Afghan king. After the victory against the Marathas, Abdali and his Indian allies (Rohilas and the Nawab of Awadh) deposed Shahjahan III and proclaimed Shah Alam II (who was then in Bihar) as emperor and appointed Shuja-ud-daulah as his wazir. Since Shah Alam II was not in the capital, they installed his son Mirza Jawan Bakht as heir-apparent to carry on the government in the absence of his father. Shah Alam II would return to Delhi only in January 1772. In March 1761, on his way back home through the Punjab, the Sikhs harassed and looted Abdali's Afghan forces once again.

Sixth Invasion, 1762 (Punjab up to Sirhind)

The Sikhs upset the arrangements Abdali had made for the Punjab. In late 1761, he sent expeditions from Qandahar, but they were not successful. The Sikhs appointed Jassa Singh Ahluwalia as 'Sultan-ul-Qaum' and the Punjab passed into their hands from the Indus to Sutlej. Abdali moved to the Punjab after receiving series of bad news. He arrived in Lahore and then left in February 1762 after inflicting severe losses on the Sikhs in life and property. He sacked the city of Amritsar, blew up the Har Mandir and desecrated the sacred tank. He was also able to secure Maratha neutrality in the affairs of Punjab. But the Sikhs were not defeated. Abdali was in Lahore on the way back in April 1762, when the Sikhs defeated his commander in Sirhind. The Sikhs were on all sides while Abdali was in Gurdaspur. He marched again to Amritsar, but the Sikhs had evacuated the area. Abdali made arrangements for the administration of his dominion in the Punjab and Kashmir and returned to Qandahar via Multan, Bahawalpur, Dera Ismail Khan, and Ghazni.

Seventh Invasion, 1764-1765 (Punjab up to Sirhind)

The Sikhs re-emerged in full force soon after Abdali's departure. Their dals reached up to Saharanpur in February 1764; Najib Khan paid them a hefty tribute and induced them to return to their country. The Sikhs

then marched to Lahore and were in control of all the territory east of the Chenab and between the Jhelum and Indus Rivers. They extended their power into Multan and the Deras. Hearing about the loss of Sirhind and the Jullandur Doab and the uprising in Lahore and Multan, Abdali decided to come to the Punjab again. This time it was jihad against the infidel. Naseer Khan of Kalat joined him in response to Abdali's letter for support. Abdali arrived in Lahore in October 1764, but the Sikhs had moved from his path. There was no enemy to fight. There was only a small engagement outside Lahore. Abdali was informed that the Sikhs had moved near Amritsar so he marched to that city, but there were few Sikhs in the city. He blew away the Sikh temple again and then moved to the Sutlej Doab towards Sirhind. Naseer Khan wanted him to go to Delhi, but Abdali and his commanders decided to return to Afghanistan. He handed over the government of Sirhind to a Sikh chieftain Ala Singh of Patiala. The Sikhs harassed and plundered Abdali and his forces on their way through the Jullandur Doab. In March 1765, Abdali returned to Qandahar without going through Lahore to deal with a civil war in his own country.

Eighth Invasion, 1766-67 (Punjab up to Ambala)

The Sikhs had re-established themselves all over the Punjab. They entered Lahore and captured it in April 1765. Then they moved against Ala Singh of Patiala and carried their arms into the Gangetic Doab, ransacking Najib Khan's territory. They also engaged against the Marathas on behalf of Juwahir Singh of Bharatpur. In November 1766, Abdali descended upon the Punjab again to crush the Sikhs. He marched to Lahore, but the Sikhs had evacuated the city and they kept on harassing the Afghans. Abdali wanted to negotiate peace with them, but they refused; they even rejected the offer to Sardar Lehna Singh as governor of Lahore. Abdali marched to Amritsar and had many buildings blown up again, forts demolished and several thousand Sikhs killed. He then moved into Jullandur Doab, but the Sikhs allowed him no rest. He stayed for sometime near Ambala where he honoured Najib Khan and Raja Amar Singh of Patiala. In April, Abdali faced a revolt in his own army because of arrears of pay, forcing him to return to Afghanistan through Multan.

Final (Ninth) Invasion, 1769 (Punjab)

Abdali crossed the Indus and Chenab rivers and camped near Gujarat. Now the Sikhs were well entrenched in the Punjab and the Afghan king could not dislodge them without a determined force and much expense on the opposite side. Abdali was compelled to return to Afghanistan thanks again to dissension in his ranks. In fact, on the way back from Peshawar to Kabul, there were clashes among the Afghan troops who plundered each other's camps. Abdali made it to Qandahar from Kabul. This was his last visit to India. In 1771, Mir Qasim, the deposed Nawab of Bengal, and the Rohilas wanted Abdali to return to India to deal with the Marathas. Abdali decided not to get involved given the conditions in the Punjab, the fragile state of his own health and that of his kingdom in Afghanistan.

III. Sikhs in the Punjab

Banda's execution in 1716 had galvanised the Sikhs and Jats in the Punjab with greater determination to fight the Afghans and Mughals to the end. After Banda's death, initially the Sikhs withdrew to the hills, organised themselves into 12 misls (armies) under commanders drawn from prominent Sikh families, and acquired enough strength to engage the Mughal armies in a guerrilla war for decades. Their battles against the Mughals and Afghan invaders, led by Ahmad Shah Abdali, eventually won them the whole of Punjab north of the Sutlej. The Sikh commanders formed a loose confederacy of unequals in the areas they held. It is from one these families of commanders that Ranjit Singh emerged as perhaps the most charismatic and talented commander. He was first appointed governor of Punjab by Shah Zaman in 1798. It took him no time to become independent, subdue his rivals and crown himself as Maharaja (king) of Punjab in 1801. He ruled for nearly 38 years and is generally acknowledged as a skilled commander, able statesman, and a reasonably tolerant ruler. He expanded his kingdom to include all of Punjab, Kashmir, and parts of the territory beyond the Indus River up to the border with Afghanistan of today. The English East India Com-

pany concluded a treaty with him to keep his rule on the north side of River Sutlej and leave the small principalities on the south side unmolested. The agreement worked well until Ranjit Singh's death in 1839. After Ranjit Singh, his kingdom started to disintegrate by internecine wars, factional conflicts, and incompetence of his successors.

IV. The Maratha Chiefs

Apparently, the Mughals treated Shahu I well when he was in their custody. He developed a sympathetic attitude towards the Mughals and their culture. Shahu I was released by Bahadur Shah in 1708. A civil war broke out between Tara Bai and the supporters of Shahu on his return to the country. Shahu I came out victorious ultimately with the help and advice of Balaji Vishwanath (1660-1720), a Brahmin from the Konkan. Balaji had shown great skills as administrator and military commander, so Shahu I appointed him peshwa (Prime Minister) in 1713. Balaji and his son and successor, Baji Rao I (1700-1740), made the office of peshwa as the real head of the Maratha empire and the king (chhatrapatti) was relegated to the position of a figurehead. Shivaji had created the office of peshwa in 1674, but the first four peshwas (from 1674 to 1713) did not carry as much weight as the chhatrapatti.

The peshwaship became hereditary in the family of Balaji Vishwanath. Balaji and his son Baji Rao I in particular expanded Maratha power in the north far beyond the Deccan. In 1714, Balaji gained significant concessions from Husain Ali Khan, the protector of Emperor Farrukhsiyar, when he came to the Deccan as its governor. All territories that belonged to Shivaji would return with the added provinces of Khandesh, Gondwana, Berar and some districts of Hyderabad and the Carnatic that the Marathas had conquered. In addition, the Marathas would receive the chauth and sardesmukhi from the provincial revenue of the Deccan in return for keeping a cavalry force for imperial service, paying annual tribute, and maintaining order in the Deccan. A major condition attached to these concessions was that Shahu I would acknowledge overlordship of the Mughal emperor.

In 1719 for the first time, the Maratha forces moved to the north as allies of Husain Ali Khan when he marched to Delhi to deal with the emperor and the rival parties at the court. After deposing Emperor Farrukhsiyar, the Sayyid brothers put a puppet on the throne and had him confirm the treaty signed with the Marathas. The appearance of Marathas in Delhi raised their prestige and allowed Balaji Vishwanath to build a foundation for the establishment of Maratha empire. Balaji's son Baji Rao I was considered a military genius and an able statesman. He knew that the Mughal Empire was at its end hence an opportunity for the expansion of Maratha power north of Narbada River. Baji Rao I tried to attract other Hindu chiefs by playing the Hindu card against the Muslim invaders. In 1723, the Hindu zamindars supported him in the invasion of Malwa and he occupied Gujarat by taking advantage of a civil war in the province. By 1731, Baji Rao I had defeated his Maratha rivals decisively which left him as the undisputed Maratha leader. He then concluded a treaty with Nizam-ul-mulk, allowing the Nizam freedom to gratify his ambition in the south and that of the peshwa in the north. The peshwa also won the friendship of Jai Singh II of Amber and the Bundela leader and marched to the vicinity of Delhi in 1737. Emperor Muhammad Shah sought the help of Nizam-ul-mulk to get rid of the Maratha menace to which he responded with a force against Marathas. But the Nizam was defeated and Baji Rao I concluded a favourable treaty which was sanctioned by the Emperor. The treaty recognised Maratha supremacy in Malwa and gave them a hefty war indemnity as well. Soon after this victory, Maratha troops also captured Salsette and Bassein held by the Portuguese on the west coast.

Baji Rao I died in 1740 after his enormous achievements for the Marathas. However, thanks to the jagir system among Marathas since the time of Rajaram, semi-independent principalities grew up within the Maratha territory. The growth of these mini-states became a major cause of weakness of the central government and its eventual collapse. Raghuji Bhonsle took control of Berar (Nagpur); Gaekwads took control of Baroda; Ranoji Sindhia took part of Malwa with its capital at Gwalior; Malhar Rao Holkar took another part of Malwa with headquarters at Indore. Baji Rao I was succeeded by his eldest son Balaji II (1721-1761), better known as Nana Sahib, in spite of opposition by

some of the Maratha chiefs. The new peshwa, though fond of ease and pleasure, possessed good military skills and a determination to prosecute hostilities. The nominal Maratha king Rajaram II (1727-1777) was a posthumous son of Shivaji II and regarded as an 'utter imbecile'. He ascended the throne after Shahu I died in 1749. Shahu left the peshwa with supreme power in the state but with conditions. Tara Bai along with Damaji Gaekwad rose up in arms against the peshwa and confined Rajaram II, but the peshwa, Nana Sahib, defeated the opponents. Rajaram II remained a virtual prisoner now of the peshwa who became the real head of the Maratha confederacy. Nana Sahib made two sharp departures from the policy followed by his father. First, he opened the Maratha army to outside (non-Maratha) mercenaries and introduced Western modes of warfare. Second, he gave up the objective of building a Hindu kingdom and went back to the strategy of indiscriminate plunder and pillage ravaging Muslims and Hindus alike in the process.

Maratha forces continued to raid and conquer several parts in the south, though checked somewhat by Hyder Ali in Mysore, the French in Carnatic and the Nizam in the Deccan, including Bijapur, Aurangabad, part of Bidar and some of the strong forts. However, the more striking expansion of Marathas was in the north. Their forces, led by Malhar Rao and Ragunath Rao, with assistance from the Jats, made into the Gangetic Doab and captured Delhi from the hands of Ahmad Shah Abdali's agent Najib Khan Rohila in 1757. After placing Delhi in the safe hands of Imad-ud-daulah, the Maratha commanders directed their efforts to wresting Punjab from the Afghans. They managed to capture Sirhind and Lahore in 1758 and then retired after appointing a trusted Muslim governor who promised a large annual tribute. But this made another war with Ahmad Shah Abdali inevitable. In the meantime, after the death of the Maratha-appointed governor, Punjab went into a state of chaos to which the peshwa responded by sending another Maratha commander and governor.

Ahmad Shah Abdali invaded Punjab again in 1759, captured it and marched toward Delhi. This time, harassed by the Marathas, the Rohilas and Nawab of Awadh supported the Afghan king. The Rajputs remained neutral because of the unfriendly policy of the peshwa. Likewise, they could not forge an alliance with the Sikhs. Abdali and the al-

lied forces defeated the Maratha commanders in the beginning of 1760. Nana Sahib sent a larger force with Sadashivrao Bhau and his own son Vishwasrao as the nominal commander. The Maratha forces occupied Delhi, but Bhau alienated Suraj Mal (who abandoned the Marathas) and also antagonised Malhar Rao Holkar. Bhau and the Maratha army then moved to Panipat towards the end of 1760. Abdali was at Agra and moved north supported by the Nawab of Awadh and the Rohilas. The two armies met on the battlefield at Panipat and after two months of minor skirmishes the Afghan and allied forces defeated the large Maratha army decisively, killed Vishwasrao, many of the leading commanders along with a large part of the army, and captured much treasure. This was a massive disaster for the Marathas. When the news of the calamity reached Nana Sahib, suffering as he was from a wasting disease, he died heart-broken in the summer of 1761. The defeat at Panipat demoralised the Marathas deeply besides the great losses of human life and treasure. It damaged peshwa's authority almost beyond repair and the confederacy lost its cohesion. But the defeat at Panipat did not put an end to the Maratha power, though they could never return to their position held before 1761.

Madhav Rao I (1745-1772) succeeded Nana Sahib as peshwa at the age of 16. His uncle Raghunath Rao (1734-1783) wanted himself in that position and tried to control the young peshwa; it was a severe contest. Eventually, the new peshwa confined Raghunath Rao in 1767. Madhav Rao I proved to be a very powerful peshwa, thanks to his finance minister Balaji Janardhan Bhau (1742-1800), better known as Nana Fadnavis, a Machiavellian, who would emerge as one of the ablest and most powerful Maratha leaders. Nana Fadnavis, like Tukoji Rao Holkar and Mahadji Sindhia, had managed to escape after the defeat at Panipat in 1761. In the peshwahip of Madhav Rao I and his brother Narayan Rao, he did impressive work to hold together the Maratha confederacy in the face of internal power struggle and the growing power of the English East India Company. He also showed great military skills in the wars against the Nizam of Hyderabad, Hyder Ali and his son Tipu Sultan in Mysore.

Narayan Rao (1755-1773), the youngest brother of Madhav Rao I, was only 17 when he succeeded him as peshwa. Nana Fadnavis and Sakharam Bapu led him, controlled would be a better word. Raghunath Rao,

uncle of Madhav Rao I and Narayan Rao, had not given up his claim to the position of peshwa. Raghunath Rao, perhaps together with some other chiefs, instigated the murder of Narayan Rao within nine months. Everyone at the peshwa court in Poona, including Nana Fadnavis and the Chief Judge, was certain of the conspiracy. Raghunath Rao managed to occupy the office held by his murdered nephew, but soon the twelve Maratha elders and chiefs (Barabhais) chased him out of office. They proclaimed the infant son of the deceased Narayan Rao, Madhav Rao II (1774-1795), as the new peshwa under a regency council led by Nana Fadnavis. In fact, Nana Fadnavis became a virtual dictator for the next 25 years that he lived at Poona. But Raghunath Rao did not give up his intrigues and schemes to dislodge the young peshwa. He sought help from the British and was able to conclude a treaty with them at Surat in 1775. However, the Marathas rejected the treaty and the Company's Council in Calcutta annulled it in 1776. The British then signed a treaty with the peshwa at Purandhar to maintain peace between the two parties. Raghunath Rao became a pensioner of the British and died in 1795.

In 1777, Shahu II or Vithoji Bhonsle (1763-1808), an adopted son of Rajaram II, succeeded his father as nominal king of the Marathas. He put his brother Chattarsingh in confinement where he remained until his death in 1818. The Marathas were back in the north in just over a decade after the battle of Panipat. They restored Emperor Shah Alam in 1772 and then stayed with their forces in and around Delhi. In fact, one of the Maratha chiefs, Mahadji Sindhia made himself dictator of Delhi in 1789 after killing the Rohila rebel, Ghulam Qadir Khan, who had blinded the Emperor and humiliated the Mughal zennana. The British eventually drove the Marathas out of Delhi in 1803. After much internal conflict and struggle, Baji Rao II (1775-1851) succeeded Madhav Rao II as peshwa in 1797. The new peshwa and his party had to fight his 11-year old brother Chimnaji Appa—they were both sons of Raghunath Rao—for nearly two years. Nana Fadnavis did not want either of them as peshwa, but he died in less than three years after Baji Rao II was able to occupy the office. The new peshwa saw the end of Maratha independence during the wars against the British that lasted for over 15 years from 1803. Baji Rao II died in 1851.

Pratapsinh (1793-1847) succeeded his father, Shahu II, as the nominal Maratha king in 1808. The British gave him a small fief at Satara in 1818, but deposed him in 1839. After considerable warfare both regular and irregular, the leading Maratha knights, who had carved out their separate fiefdoms—Gaekwads in Baroda, Holkars in Indore and Malwa, Sindhias in Gwalior and Ujjain, and Bhonsles at Nagpur—had to submit to the English East India Company.

V. Afghan Chieftains of Farrukhabad and Rohilkhand

The history of Afghans in India preceded the arrival of Mughals from Central Asia. In the Mughal period, they were quite active as mercenaries and horse traders. Afghans do not appear among zamindars in the reign of Akbar in the sarkars of Sambhal and Badaun. Jahangir allotted zamindari to Afghans in what later became Farrukhabad to retaliate against the Rajput zamindars in the area. Emperor Shahjahan was perhaps the first Mughal ruler who encouraged Afghans to enter the imperial service and settle in northern India. The Afghan settlements spread as jagir assignments given by the Mughal rulers after the death of Aurangzeb. The Mughal kings encouraged Afghan settlements to curb the local Hindu chiefs. These Afghans continued to maintain links with their homelands and invited their kinsmen to join them. With the disintegration of central authority, Afghan immigration increased manifold: local chiefs needed Afghans as mercenary soldiers to fight neighbouring zamindars for supremacy. This service allowed the Afghans to share in gains and the more adventurous among them were able to acquire territory and establish their fiefdom. Many more Afghans came with Ahmad Shah Abdali and some of them stayed behind for a better future. In eighteenth century, groups of Afghans in the service of Mughals managed to carve out almost independent states in northern India: Farrukhabad in the Gangetic Doab and Rohilkhand in the ancient Hindu territory of Katehr. Here I relate briefly the rising power of the Bangash dynasty and the more numerous and perhaps more audacious Rohilas in Katehr and Saharanpur. Since the story of Rohilas is directly

relevant to the emergence of Rampur as a dynastic Rohila state, I give a fuller account of the formation and destruction of Rohilkhand in the next chapter.

1. Bangash Nawabs of Farrukhabad

Muhammad Khan (1663-1743) was a Bangash Afghan, whose family had its roots in Hangu (Kohat). He started his career as a mercenary soldier but rose to a high rank (governor of Allahabad and Malwa) in the Mughal service. In the early eighteenth century, his base was in Mau Rashidabad (Pargana Shamsabad) in the Gangetic Doab. He supported Farrukhsiyar in the war of succession in 1712, for which he was given the title of Nawab and a fief he named as Farrukhabad after his patron in 1714. In 1743, Muhammad Khan died fighting the Rohilas, the other Afghan group who had settled in Katehr. His son Qaim Khan succeeded him but who was killed in another war against the Rohilas in 1748. After Qaim Khan's death, Shuja-ud-daulah, Nawab of Awadh, annexed the state of Farrukhabad, but Ahmad Khan, the second son of Muhammad Khan, regained the state after defeating the Rohilas. He had earlier deposed his brother Imam Khan in 1749. Ahmad Khan took a prominent part on the side of Ahmad Shah Abdali in the third battle of Panipat. He died in 1771. Since the Nawab of Awadh and the English Company in Bengal made Farrukhabad an enclave of Awadh under a treaty, Nawab Muzaffar Jang, son of Ahmad Khan, became a tributary of the Nawab of Awadh in 1782 in return for his state's protection. At Muzaffar Jang's death in 1796, his son Imad Husain Khan (Nasir Jang) succeeded him as Nawab. In 1801, the Nawab of Awadh ceded the right of tribute to the English Company but it annexed Farrukhabad in the next year and made the last Nawab a pensioner. The sad story of Farrukhabad, however, did not end there. During the 'Great Revolt' of 1857, Tafazzul Husain Khan, a grandson of the last Nawab Imad Husain Khan, re-established the Bangash state. However, the British defeated him in 1858, deported him to the port of Aden in Yemen, and absorbed Farrukhabad in British India.

2. Rohilas and Rohilkhand

Since I give a detailed account of the arrival, settlement, rise, and fall of the Rohilas—people of the Roh or the mountainous area in the north-west of India—in the next chapter, here a brief introduction will suffice. The story of Rohila starts with the arrival of Daud Khan, a freebooter and horse trader, in the ancient Katehr territory probably in 1710. Like other Afghans before him he arrived in Katehr to try his luck. Daud Khan entered the service of a Hindu zamindar in Bioli (today's Badaun district) who gave the Afghan some villages 40 miles west of Bareilly. Soon Daud Khan built a fortress in the forest and attracted increasing number of Afghan soldiers. He worked with Afghan and Rajput fighters for Hindu zamindars, who had acquired considerable power fighting for territory and resisting Mughal authority. Daud Khan managed to acquire zamindari and, with increasing number of Afghans (Rohilas) together with some Rajputs, expanded his territory. The Afghan settlements increased with the new zamindari and ijaradari (revenue farming) that Daud Khan acquired. In 1720, Daud Khan was tortured to death by the Raja of Kumaun because the Afghan leader had apparently helped the imperial governor of Moradabad defeat the raja after he had overextended his territory with the assistance of Daud Khan as his retainer.

The leading Rohila chiefs acknowledged Daud Khan's adopted young son, Ali Muhammad Khan, as his father's legitimate successor and their leader. This young man proved to be a great warrior and able statesman. He expanded the Rohila territory (Rohilkhand), as jagirs and ijaras, with the support of the Mughal faujdars of Bareilly and Moradabad and made Bioli his capital. Ali Muhammad Khan was assisted by some able and committed commanders, among them Hafiz Rahmat Khan perhaps was the most influential. The Mughal wazir, Qamar-ud-din Khan, concluded peace with Ali Muhammad Khan and allowed him all the territory he and his sardars had annexed. In 1737, the Mughal emperor made Ali Muhammad Khan a mansabdar and gave him the title of Nawab with the right to naubat. The growing power of the Rohilas alarmed Safdar Jang of Awadh, who had joined the central government in Delhi. In 1745, he managed to organise an imperial campaign against the Rohila sardars and Qaim Khan Bangash also joined the Emperor's

party. But with the wazir's intercession the Emperor reconciled with Ali Muhammad Khan and appointed him as faujdar in Sirhind.

In 1748, the invasion by Ahmad Shah Abdali gave Ali Muhammad Khan the chance to return to Katehr: he escaped from Sirhind. Soon he was able to get in his control his old possessions in Bareilly and the jagirs of the wazir, Safdar Jang, and other jagirdars. The whole of Katehr and adjoining districts now passed into the hands of Ali Muhammad Khan while the Mughal armies were engaged in repulsing the Afghan king. In the same year, Ali Muhammad Khan sent Hafiz Rahmat Khan to Delhi with troops to support Safdar Jang as wazir to the Emperor after the death of Qamar-ud-din Khan. Soon after that, knowing he was quite sick, Ali Muhammad Khan assembled the Rohila sardars at Aonla and appointed Hafiz Rahmat Khan as custodian of Rohilkhand. After the death of the Rohila chief, who died at the age of 40, Rohilas faced problems on several fronts. Safdar Jang, though helped by Rohilas, was no friend of the Afghans: he wanted to destroy Rohilkhand. He now planned to divide the Rohilas and Bangash Afghans—they had been friends—and offered Qaim Khan a large part of the Rohilla territory. The Bangash Nawab accepted the offer without hesitation. Qaim Khan fought the Rohilas at Badaun where he was killed in combat toward the end of 1749.

In 1750, the crafty Safdar Jang took advantage of the situation and raided the Bangash territory against Nawab Ahmad Khan Bangash, stepbrother of the deceased Qaim Khan. The Rohila sardars came to the aid of Bangash Nawab and defeated Safdar Jang and his Hindu cohorts. The wazir was humiliated and in 1751 he invited two Maratha chieftains to join him against the Bangash and Rohila forces. The Rohilas with Ahmad Khan Bangash had to retreat to the hills, allowing Safdar Jang and the Marathas to plunder the Bangash territory and they occupied the Rohila territory in Aonla, Bareilly and Moradabad. Luckily, rumours of Ahmad Shah Abdali's new invasion helped the Afghans: the Emperor recalled the wazir and Marathas to Delhi. In early 1752, a treaty was signed in which the Rohilas agreed to remain loyal to the wazir and pay five million rupees in tribute. The wazir executed a bond of this amount and received the written consent of the Rohilas. The wazir annexed one-half the Bangash territory and gave it to the Marathas. The

Bangash Nawab was now exposed to Awadh and Marathas. Safdar Jang vacated the Rohila territory and expressed his friendship with them to divide the Rohila and Bangash Afghans.

In 1752, the Rohila sardars faced their first internal crisis when the adult sons of Ali Muhammad Khan demanded their patrimony in the lands of Rohilkhand. Hafiz Rahmat Khan and other sardars reluctantly divided the territory, but it did not satisfy any one, neither the sons of the late Rohila chief nor the sardars. In 1754, a new division of Rohilkhand was done in which the sons of Ali Muhammad Khan were deprived of a large part of the territory. Faizullah Khan received the jagir of Rampur and other sons of Ali Muhammad Khan and the sardars divided the remaining territory among themselves. The second division of Rohilkhand created much dissention and resentment among the sons of Ali Muhammad Khan. I should add that, by the mid-1750s, Rohilkhand comprised the districts of Moradabad, Rampur, Badaun, Bareilly, Pilibhit, and Shajahanpur. Najib Khan Rohila, son-in-law of Dhoondey Khan, had carved out his own fiefdom in the districts of Bijnor and Saharanpur. Najib Khan harboured ambitions to replace Hafiz Rahmat Khan and dominate Rohilkhand: he tried to incite Saadullah Khan (son of Ali Muhammad Khan)—he and Najib Khan were sons-in-law of Dhoondey Khan who was a first cousin of Hafiz Rahmat Khan—to displace the Hafiz and even moved his troops to Aonla area. The division and potential for war among the Rohila sardars eventually ended with Saadullah Khan blaming Najib and reconciling with Hafiz Rahmat Khan and other Rohila sardars. Najib Khan was obviously disappointed with the outcome.

In 1753, the Turani nobles at the court in Delhi managed to remove Safdar Jang as wazir so he again asked the Rohilas (Hafiz Rahmat Khan and Najib Khan) for help. The Turani faction at the court tried to get the Rohilas on its side, but Safdar Jang warned the Rohilas of serious consequences. The Emperor used pressure on Rohilas through ulema and offered Najib Khan jagirs and mansabs. Najib Khan secretly agreed to come on his side with his men and some other Rohilas joined him as well. Hafiz Rahmat Khan was not happy with this split, but withdrew on the pretext that it was a sin to fight the emperor. Najib Khan entered Delhi with his troops and received a mansab of 5,000 with the

title of Najib-ud-daulah in the summer of 1753. Many more (estimated at 25,000) Rohilas joined him in Delhi. All of them were taken into the imperial service with rewards and mansabs. The Rohilas thwarted Safdar Jang from entering Delhi. Eventually the Emperor and Safdar Jang reached agreement because the Emperor was getting worried about the rising power of his wazir Ghazi-ud-din II at the court. Needless to add, the civil war not only wasted the empire's resources but also led to damaging consequences.

Towards the end of 1756, Ahmad Shah Abdali crossed the Indus and entered the Punjab to deal with the wazir Imad-ul-mulk in Delhi. Najib Khan gave no support to Imad-ul-mulk in response to his appeal to stop Abdali. He entered into negotiations with Abdali who continued his march toward Delhi and Najib Khan joined the Afghan king at Sonepat in early 1757. Abdali restored Intizam-ud-daulah as wazir and deprived Imad-ul-mulk of his rank. Hafiz Rahmat Khan submitted to Abdali at his approach to Delhi. The Afghan king shed much blood in the city and stayed there for about four months in which time he restored Imad-ul-mulk as wazir and appointed Najib Khan as mir bakhshi. Emperor Alamgir II wanted Najib Khan to weaken the wazir. Abdali's invasion weakened the court further, drained the treasury and helped Najib Khan to acquire more territory in the Gangetic Doab, controlling the north Doab.

Abdali fought the Jats and then demanded peshkash from Imad-ul-mulk who had no resources. The wazir suggested a campaign against Shuja-ud-daulah, successor of Safdar Jang, who controlled Awadh and Allahabad but paid nothing to the imperial treasury. An imperial army, led by two Mughal princes and Ahmad Khan Bangash moved against Shuja who sought help from the Rohila sardars. They first assured Shuja of their help, but Imad-ul-mulk rushed to Aonla and was able to prevail upon them to change sides. Hafiz Rahmat Khan was more favourable to him, but others (Saadullah Khan in particular) were ambivalent. The Rohila sardars, though Saadullah Khan was still unsure, came on the side of the imperial army. Shuja-ud-daulah was angry at the Rohilas while Saadullah Khan tried to be the peace-maker. Shuja hoped for Maratha help, which did not arrive, so he agreed to pay one-half million rupees as peshkash to the Mughal princes. The hostilities ceased, which

Ahmad Khan Bangash did not like. The Awadh Nawab paid one-tenth of the peshkash with the promise to pay the rest later for which Saadullah Khan stood surety. It is significant that the Rohilas showed utter inability to act together to challenge Shuja-ud-daulah's power and made him their inveterate enemy. This was to have disastrous consequences for the Afghans, of which I give a detailed account in the next chapter.

VI. Nawabs of Bengal, Hyderabad and Awadh

As the Mughal Empire started to crumble after 1720, three Mughal nobles carved out quasi-independent (dynastic) states: Bengal, Awadh, and Hyderabad. The autonomy of each of these states from the Mughal central authority had several characteristics. First, the Nawab (governor) could appoint his own successor, pending emperor's confirmation. Second, he could nominate or appoint revenue officials and divert the revenue formerly given to the central treasury to the region and remit only ceremonial gifts and special contributions. Third, he could engage in independent diplomacy and military activity. Fourth, he could reside in the regional capital and not at the Mughal court. Fifth, he could mint and issue regional coins to replace silver rupees. Finally, he could have the Friday khutba recited in the name of the regional ruler and not the Mughal emperor.

1. The State of Bengal

Bengal was a revenue-rich province of the Mughal Empire. In 1703, Aurangzeb appointed Murshid Quli Khan, a Turani noble, as governor of Bengal as his reward for illustrious service in the Deccan. He had earlier worked with Aurangzeb in the Deccan and helped establish a sound revenue system for the territory. Throughout his service in Bengal, Murshid Quli Khan remitted to the Mughal treasury what was its due in the revenue of Bengal with honesty and diligence. The Bengal revenue was perhaps the most reliable and substantial source of treasure for the Mughal court. At the death of Murshid Quli Khan in 1727, Emperor Muhammad Shah appointed Shuja-ud-din Khan, son-in-law

of the deceased noble, as governor of Bengal. He proved to be a capable and loyal Mughal noble until his death in 1739. His son Sarfraz Khan succeeded him as governor, but was killed in a conspiracy led by Ali Vardi Khan, the deputy of Shuja-ud-din Khan, who was confirmed as governor of Bengal in 1740. Ali Vardi Khan was an able administrator in the mould of Murshid Quli Khan, but acquired quasi-independence from Delhi given the erosion of central authority.

Ali Vardi Khan died in 1756 and his baton passed into the hands of his very youthful and somewhat intemperate maternal grandson, Siraj-ud-daulah. The new Nawab of Bengal got himself involved very soon in a battle against the English Company and was killed at Plassey, thanks to a conspiracy of his courtiers, especially his general Mir Jafar, who went to the English side. After Siraj-ud-daulah's death in the spring of 1757, the English Company installed Mir Jafar as governor in return for his support and a hefty tribute he promised for the favour. Emperor Alamgir II gave the diwani—revenue collection—of four districts of Bengal to the English Company. Gradually but surely Mir Jafar became uneasy in his relations with the English. In consequence, the Company forced him to abdicate in favour of his son-in-law, Mir Qasim, in 1760. Mir Qasim lasted as governor for only two years and had to flee to Awadh; he died near Delhi in 1777. Emperor Shah Alam II was a powerless fugitive since his nominal accession to the throne after Shahjahan III was deposed in the spring of 1761.

After Mir Qasim fled Bengal in 1763, Mir Jafar negotiated his return with the English Company, but managed to stay for only two years before his patron removed him again. In 1765, Emperor Shah Alam II gave the diwani of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa to the English Company after he and the Nawab of Awadh were defeated at Buxar in 1764. Awadh was restored to Shuja-ud-daulah and the Emperor in exile was given Allahabad and Kora districts. Mir Jafar died of old age somewhere in the Punjab. The English Company appointed Mir Jafar's son, Najm-ud-daulah, as Nawab while the supreme control of Bengal had already passed on to the Company under its governor Robert Clive. The last nominal Nawab of Bengal was another son of Mir Jafar, Saif-ud-daulah, who lasted until 1770, but without involvement in the affairs of Bengal during his tenure of four years.

2. The State of Awadh

The Mughal province of Awadh, not unlike other provinces, was in a state of turmoil, hence successive emperors tried many governors to manage it. Mir Muhammad Amin, Nawab Saadat Khan Burhan-ul-mulk (1680-1739), a Shia adventurer from Nishapur in Persia, was made a mansabdar in the court of Emperor Farrukhsiyar, thanks to the patronage of Sayyid brothers. The next emperor, Muhammad Shah, made him governor first of Agra in 1720 and then of Awadh in 1722. In the next 15 years, he built a power base for himself and laid the foundation of dynastic rule in Awadh. In 1739, Saadat Khan betrayed Muhammad Shah at Karnal out of jealousy against Nizam-ul-mulk, advised Nadir Shah, the Persian invader, to demand Rs.200 million from the Emperor, and withdrew his army to Nadir Shah's camp. Nadir Shah marched to the Mughal capital to collect the reputed treasure as booty. Once in Delhi, his troops plundered the city and killed thousands of its residents, reportedly in retaliation of the ill-treatment they received from some of the agitated residents. The Nawab of Awadh, humiliated by Nadir Shah, perhaps poisoned himself and died soon after the tragic events.

Mirza Muhammad Muqim Abul Mansoor, known as Safdar Jang (1708-1754), succeeded his uncle and father-in-law Saadat Khan as governor of Awadh. In 1748, Safdar Jang managed to make himself wazir at Delhi and continued in Awadh as its effective ruler though he was nominally its imperial governor. As a result of factional rivalry between the Mughal nobles, Safdar Jang was removed as wazir in 1753, but stayed in Awadh where he strengthened his position as its quasi-independent ruler. He had earlier acquired the title of Nawab. Safdar Jang started to fight the Rohilas and Bangash Nawabs: he lost to the Bangash, called the Marathas to his help, and recovered Awadh from the Afghans. Safdar Jang died in 1754, leaving his son Jalal-ud-din Haider, Shuja-ud-daulah (1732-1775) as the ruler of Awadh.

In 1762, Shuja-ud-daulah managed to become wazir at the Mughal court in Delhi, in which position he remained until his death in 1775. In 1763, along with Emperor Shah Alam II, he fought the English Company at Buxar in Bihar, was defeated and became a subsidiary of the Company. In 1774, with the help of the English, he fought and defeated the Rohilas and annexed Rohilkhand. But he died soon thereafter, leav-

ing his inept son Asaf-ud-daulah (1748-1797) as Nawab of Awadh. His reign was quite tumultuous, dominated by bad relations with the English Company and his own mother and grandmother, enormous waste of revenue, and much disorder. Eventually, after a long spell of weak nominal Nawabs of the Persian dynasty, the English Company annexed the state of Awadh in 1856.

3. The State of Hyderabad

The Deccan was the main theatre of war between Aurangzeb, the Sultans of Bijapur, Golkunda and the Marathas after Shivaji. Aurangzeb annexed the Sultanates of Bijapur and Golkunda and made them into Mughal provinces. But he failed completely in his relentless efforts to subdue the Marathas. If anything, their power grew significantly after the emperor's death in 1707. The eastern parts of the Deccan, like the west, suffered after Aurangzeb. In Hyderabad province, the Maratha raids and banditry took their toll and its strong and capable governor, Rustam Dil Khan, was killed in the war of succession in 1708. The governors who followed were incapable of maintaining any semblance of order. In 1713, Farrukhsiyar appointed a very determined and capable governor Mubariz Khan. He managed to hammer the Maratha and Telugu chiefs and their followers and bring order. Mubariz Khan made accommodation with Sayyid brothers in 1715. His tenure in Hyderabad was expanded: he was given the post of diwan as well with his son as commander of the Golkunda fort. In 1717, Mubariz Khan prevented the Marathas from collecting 35 per cent of the revenue through their agents in the eastern part of the Deccan: no dual administration here. Mubariz Khan ignored the emperor as well; he sent only token payments to the central treasury. He appointed his family members and kin in important positions. By the end of Farrukhsiyar's reign, Mubariz Khan had restored his authority as governor, provided greater stability and security, and raised the revenue collections. The governor became a regional king.

Another prominent Turani noble, Chin Qilich Khan, Nizam-ul-mulk (1671-1748) was a tested Mughal commander for years. Earlier his father, Ghazi-ud-din Khan I, and grandfather, Abid Khaleej Khan, were Mughal governors of Gujarat and Ajmer respectively. In the reign

of Farrukhsiyar he was first made governor of Moradabad and then shifted to Malwa as governor in 1719. Emperor Muhammad Shah invited Nizam-ul-mulk in 1720 to deal with the Sayyid brothers whose unfettered power had much damaged the empire and weakened Mughal power. The veteran Turani commander and his troops defeated a joint Sayyid-Maratha force in the Deccan. His next combat was against Mubariz Khan to carve out a domain of his own. In 1724, Nizam-ul-mulk defeated and killed Mubariz Khan and became independent of the Mughal court. Thus the Turani stalwart founded the dynastic state of Hyderabad and titled himself as Asaf Jah I. During the next 24 years, the Nizam acquired the Carnatic territory as well in the south; he fought against but also accommodated the Marathas. Nizam-ul-mulk died in 1748.

At the death of Asaf Jah I, his second son Nasir Jang and his grandson, Muzaffar Jang (nephew of Nasir Jang) took up arms against each other for the throne of Hyderabad. At the same time, the province of Carnatic, which Nizam-ul-mulk had kept under his watch, started to simmer. There were two rival claimants there as sub-ordinate rulers, hence two wars of succession in southern India. The French Company entered the fray to impose a ruler of their liking in Carnatic. They also wanted to establish a French party in Hyderabad to which Carnatic was nominally sub-ordinate. The rivals in Carnatic were the ruler, Anwar-ud-din Khan, and Chanda Sahib, who enjoyed the French support. In 1749, Anwar-ud-din Khan was defeated and killed in combat. Muhammad Ali, son of the deceased ruler, laid claim to Carnatic against Chanda Sahib.

In Hyderabad, the contestants were the ruler, Nasir Jang, and his nephew, Muzaffar Jang, who had the support of Chanda Sahib and the French. Muzaffar Jang and Chanda Sahib approached the French with the offer of cash and territory in return for their support and the French agreed to lend. In Hyderabad, given the rivalry between Britain and France, the English Company took the side of Nasir Jang against Muzaffar Jang and the French. In the meantime, Nasir Jang assisted Muhammad Ali against Chanda Sahib. However, in 1750 his own mercenaries murdered Nasir Jang, so the French placed Muzaffar Jang as Nizam of Hyderabad and Chanda Sahib as Nawab in Carnatic. The English se-

cured Muhammad Ali, though precariously positioned against Chanda Sahib and the French, attacked and seized Arcot, capital of Carnatic. The Marathas, who had earlier joined Muhammad Ali, murdered Chanda Sahib and Muzaffar Jang was killed in Hyderabad. At the end, Muhammad Ali was acknowledged as Nawab of Carnatic.

In 1751, the French commander placed Salabat Jang, another son of Asaf Jah I, as the third Nawab of Hyderabad in return for the revenue of Northern Sarkars (north of Carnatic on the coast) to pay the French troops. The French commander established himself as dictator of Hyderabad. Soon the English Company managed to dislodge the French and their influence in Hyderabad. In 1762, Mir Nizam Ali Khan (Asaf Jah II) replaced his brother Salabat Jang who died a year later. The British recognised the dynastic rule of the Nizams in Hyderabad and it lasted until the state was absorbed into independent India in 1948 after a year's conflict between the eighth Nizam and the government of India.

Rohilkhand from Foundation to Destruction

> It is completely proved that their territory was by far the best governed part of India;…the people were protected;…their industry was encouraged;…and the country flourished beyond parallel. James Mill, *History of British India*, Vol.3 (1840).

> Then, in the bitterness of my heart, I gave up Shujah-ud-Daowlah to as many devils as chose to take him, and was about consigning the English to the same crew, for having expelled from a country which they had made populous and opulent, the extensive tribe of Rohillas. How insatiable, cruel, and how destructive, even of its purposes, appears ambition, when placed in this light. It prompted a prince, already possessed of an ample fair territory, to seize, with barely the colour of pretence, the domain of his neighbours, who, by a salutary system of government, had enriched their country, and had made their names respected. The conqueror, by the fortune of war, subjects into a province this flourishing territory, which is soon converted into desolate plains, and deserted villages. George Forster, *Journey from Bengal to England*, Vol. I (1808).

In our march of progress, the story of Rohilas and Rohilkhand is of interest to me for at least two reasons. For one thing, in the 1750s two of my father's ancestors had migrated from their homeland in the north-western mountains (Roh) to the Gangetic plain, south of the

Himalayan foothills, in the ancient territory of Katehr. This was their march of progress. The second reason is that they settled on lands that were part of Rampur in Rohilkhand. The tiny jagir of Rampur was the only part of Rohilkhand not annexed by the Nawab of Awadh after defeating the Rohila forces, with the support of the English Company, in 1774. Several generations of my family lived and prospered in Rampur, where I spent the first 13 years of life. However, in 1950 my parents with their children (all five of us) migrated to Pakistan: moving to Pakistan was the family's second migration in the march of progress.

The term Rohila was used first perhaps in the eighteenth century for the Pashtuns (Pathans or Afghans) who migrated to the ancient territory of Katehr, part of what is now the state of Uttar Pradesh, in India. But Afghans were not new in the plains of India: the Afghan Lodhi and Suri dynasties—the former before their defeat at the hands of Babur and the latter after they defeated Humayun soon after he ascended the Mughal throne—had ruled a large part of northern India up to Bengal. These rulers attracted many Afghans into India as part of their nobility and military forces. Afghans (Pathans) were perhaps also engaged in mercenary activities and the horse trade between Central Asia and India. Some of them may have joined the armies of Babur and then Humayun when he returned to India via Kabul after 15 years of exile in Persia.

There is good evidence that there were Afghan settlements in Katehr—area east of Ramganga dominated by rival Rajput, Jat and Banjara zamindars—during Emperor Jahangir's reign, but many more came in the reign of Shahjahan: the largest Afghan (Rohila) settlement (about 9,000 of them) led by Bahadur Khan was at Shahjahanpur in or around 1647. There was also an Afghan settlement in Mau Rashidabad led probably by Abdul Rashid Ansari (a non-Afghan) who came from the Hangu-Kohat region in the north-west. Many Afghans came after him, among them were the ancestors of Muhammad Khan Bangash who laid the foundation of Bangash dynasty in the state of Farrukhabad—named after Emperor Farrukhsiyar in whose service Muhammad Khan fought in 1713. More Afghans came to northern India in the reign of Aurangzeb and settled in Kanauj, Hardoi, and Malihabad (Awadh). The Afghan settlements spread after the death of Aurangzeb as the later Mughals gave jagir assignments in return for military service. The

most prominent was Farrukhabad, the seat of Bangash Nawabs, where Qaim Khan Bangash, son of Muhammad Khan attracted more Afghans to settle. One of the major reasons for Mughals to encourage Afghan settlements was to curb the local Hindu (Rajput) chiefs (rajas). In the early period of Mughal rule, certainly in Akbar's reign, they were put in bad light as freebooters, bandits and the like. To which the Afghans reacted by glorifying their nasab and heroic role in India. The Afghans continued to maintain links with the Roh (mountains and valleys in the north-west) and invited their kinsmen.

But with the weakening of Mughal rule, Afghan settlers began to create problems for the administration. Afghan immigration increased as the central authority was dissolving in the early part of eighteenth century because the local (Rajput) chiefs needed Afghans as soldiers to fight neighbouring zamindars for supremacy. It gave Rohilas new opportunities to share in the gains and establish a base for themselves. This attracted more immigrants from the Roh, expanding the Afghan settlements. Later the invasion by Nadir Shah of Persia and the invasions by Ahmad Shah Abdali brought more Rohilas to the plains and strengthened their power in northern India. But it also aroused jealousies among themselves in addition to their conflicts with the Mughal court and Nawab of Awadh and their battles against the Maratha invaders from the south.

The mercenary Afghan jamedar (small-scale cavalry officer) had under him silahdars and baargirs. Horse's life was a very important part of the life of its owner and rider. So there was a system of insurance—a common fund to replace horses. Economic growth and monetisation helped to expand recruitment of mercenaries: booty and payments in kind could be cashed easily, given the active Hindu credit and business market. Salary and plunder were the incentives. The hired mercenaries were not reliable: they could always be attracted by rivals bidding for their services. But corporate feelings could be developed by appeal to tribe, clan, honour, or religion. While Rohilas acquired reputation of (Sunni) orthodoxy, it did not prevent them from joining the local Rajput chiefs, Shias, and Marathas. The best way to keep the army together was success and opportunities for plunder. Rohilas (horse traders and mercenaries) became increasingly involved in local rivalries and conflicts

in India under conditions of a free and open military-market economy. Even after they had settled, and some of them acquired high-sounding titles, importation and breeding of horses and employment of mercenary armies remained important to them. Some acquired great financial fortunes for long-term investment to improve the newly established homeland (Rohilkhand) in Katehr.

Initially Rohilas began to arrive in India mainly as horse traders in the mid-seventeenth century, became mansabdars and founded Rohila colonies in Shahjahanpur and Shahabad bordering the Tarai and in Katehr: they settled in mohallas and ghers according to clans and sub-clans. It is estimated that over 100,000 Rohilas may have migrated to Katehr in seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Patronage, achievement, alliance and military service, not necessarily based on birth, ethnic or clan purity of blood, were the foundations of Rohila identity and riyasat. The Rohilas acquired a reputation for predation, hence the rising demand for military service and horse-trading. The successor states of the crumbling Mughal Empire were as much interested in Rohilas to serve as mercenaries (military entrepreneurs): private-enterprise warfare was in great fashion. The small-scale cavalry officers could rise quite quickly, acquire land rights and establish princely status (e.g. Bangash Nawabs, Daud Khan and his son Ali Muhammd Khan, and Najib Khan). They made money also as freebooters: warfare was an extension of trade. They came to command large-scale cavalry units on behalf of the local Hindu rajas and started to hold large tracts of lands as jagirdars, zamindars and ijaradars. Some settled down at the invitation of Mughal court to counter the rajas and some were encouraged to replace local peasants.

The Katehr territory was in great turbulence particularly after the death of Aurangzeb. Revenue farming was being encouraged recklessly which gave rise to conflicts between zamindars—most of whom were Hindu Rajputs—and Hindu amils (revenue collectors), resulting in great hardship to peasants who often fled. Some Hindu zamindars acquired services of Afghans (Rohilas) to protect or expand their hold on zamindaris: Mughal faujdars could not impose the imperial writ in many areas. The imperial revenue was falling because of the zamindar revolts in response to the rising revenue demand. The revolts also re-

duced employment opportunities for Afghans with imperial faujdars. The frequent transfer of faujdars—a reflection of political turmoil at the centre—from the territory offered great temptation to ambitious zamindars for self-aggrandisement. The Afghans also found it tempting to join the zamindars for plunder and increase their own strength.

I. Rising Power of the Rohilas in Katehr

It was during this turbulent period that, Daud Khan (d.1720), a horse trader-cum-freebooter, arrived in Katehr probably in 1710 in the reign of Emperor Shah Alam I. He came from the Roh where he was either an adopted son or chelah—which does not mean slave as some have mistakenly labelled—of Shah Alam Khan (a grandson of Shihabuddin Khan, a Qadriya saint) who lived in Toru-Shahamatpur (Hoti-Mardan area). Shah Alam Khan and one of his brothers had visited the Katehr region as horse traders probably in 1673. Daud Khan soon collected other Afghans, built a fortress in the forest and attracted more Afghans around him. He started working for Rajput zamindars—one of them was Madar Sahai of Bioli in Badaun—along with Afghan and Rajput fighters and managed to acquire zamindari villages near Bareilly. With the help of increasing number of Afghans from the Roh and some Rajputs, Daud Khan expanded his territory. The new zamindari and revenue farming he acquired helped to increase Afghan settlements: Daud Khan's success acted as a magnet for Afghans who settled down in villages and towns.

In 1713, Shah Alam Khan came to Katehr, but soon returned to his homeland in the Roh. He visited Katehr again, probably in 1718, and stayed with Daud Khan, but on his way back home he was killed in Badaun in dubious circumstances. Raja Debi Chand of Kumaon came into conflict with Azmat Ullah Khan, Mughal governor of Moradabad, about controlling an area adjacent to Moradabad. In 1720, in the battle many Afghan soldiers aided Azmat Ullah Khan, including Daud Khan, against the raja and his men. The raja was defeated and suffered much humiliation. Daud Khan's perfidy enraged the defeated raja because the Afghan leader was one of his retainers. Debi Chand enticed Daud Khan

into a paying him a visit which he accepted. The raja captured, tortured and killed the Rohila warrior.

At the time of his death, Daud Khan had some very dedicated Rohila sardars working with him: Painda Khan, Shadi Khan, Dhoondey Khan (nephew of Shah Alam Khan), Sardar Khan, Sadar Khan, Kabir Khan, and Fateh Khan, a Hindu convert. Daud Khan had reportedly adopted a young boy whom he named Ali Muhammad Khan (1706-1748). There are different versions about the event, but none of them could be verified or authenticated. No one can be certain about the boy's background—was he from a Syed family, or was he from a Jat (Hindu) family and how Daud Khan came to adopt him—and his age at adoption: he was probably born in 1706. Daud Khan also had a son of his own, Muhammad Khan, who was born after Ali Muhammad Khan's adoption. There is almost complete silence about Muhammad Khan: in the available narratives, he just disappears into obscurity after the death of Daud Khan.

In any case, after the death of Daud Khan, the leading Rohila sardars acknowledged Ali Muhammad Khan, the adopted son of Daud Khan, as their leader. With the encouragement of Azmat Ullah Khan, and active support of faujdars of Bareilly and Moradabad, Ali Muhammad Khan expanded the Rohila territory as jagir and ijara and made Bioli his capital. Soon the Rohilas, led by Ali Muhammad Khan, started to occupy more zamindaris, helping some zamindars against others. Their activities paralysed the Mughal faujdars. By 1737, Ali Muhammad Khan became a Mughal mansabdar, a rank-holder with imperial sanction to be called Nawab and the right of naubat. After repeated letters of invitation from Ali Muhammad Khan, Hafiz Rahmat Khan (1708-1774), a son of Shah Alam Khan, arrived in Rohilkhand probably in 1737. Given Hafiz Rahmat Khan's high status, this event enhanced the strength and repute of Ali Muhammad Khan among Afghans. By this time the Rohilas were in control of substantial territory in the districts of Bareilly, Moradabad and Badaun.

After Nadir Shah's invasion in 1739, the Mughal Emperor and his regents were gravely weakened which allowed Ali Muhammad Khan with his sardars to expand the Rohila territory. In 1742, Ali Muhammad Khan established complete control on the faujdaris of Moradabad and Bareilly and annexed Pilibhit. The wazir, Qamar-ud-din Khan, in

Delhi allowed the Rohilas to keep all the territory they had annexed. In return, Ali Muhammad Khan agreed to pay annual tribute to the Mughal court and gave one of his daughters in marriage to the wazir's son. This alliance with the wazir emboldened Ali Muhammad Khan further so he seized Kumaon. The raja of Garhwal submitted to the Rohilas, agreed to pay them annual tribute and in return they exited Kumaon. Ali Muhammad Khan settled in the town of Aonla in Badaun and assigned Bareilly and Pilibhit to Hafiz Rahmat Khan and Moradabad to Dhoondey Khan.

At this time an intense struggle between the Irani and Turani groups started at the Mughal court in Delhi. Safdar Jang, governor of Awadh, who had joined the central government in Delhi, was alarmed by the Rohila-Turani alliance and joined Amir Khan (Itimad-ul-mulk) to overthrow wazir Qamar-ud-din Khan; the Emperor also joined the two to clip the power of Ali Muhammad Khan. An imperial campaign was organised against the Rohila leader—supported by many whose jagirs Ali Muhammad Khan had seized—to which the wazir reconciled. Emperor Muhammad Shah, with the wazir and his son, Amir Khan, Safdar Jang and other nobles left Delhi in early 1745. Qaim Khan Bangash, Nawab of Farrukhabad, also joined the Emperor's party. But the wazir and Qaim Khan were secret allies of the Rohilas. They somehow managed to reconcile the Emperor with Ali Muhammad Khan: he was pardoned in the summer of 1745 and the wazir was able to get an imperial title for him. The Irani faction was disgusted with this outcome. In 1746, the Emperor gave Ali Muhammad Khan the faujdari of Sirhind (in the Punjab), where he managed to bring to heel several Rajput zamindars. Sending Ali Muhammad Khan to Sirhind was also a tactful move to subdue the Rohilas. Before his departure to Sirhind, Ali Muhammad Khan had to send two of his sons, Abdullah Khan and Faizullah Khan—who would later be the first Nawab of Rampur—to Lahore as hostages to assure good conduct by their father.

In 1748, the invasion by Ahmad Shah Abdali, King of Afghanistan, gave Ali Muhammad Khan the chance to return to Katehr (Rohilkhand). Soon he managed to gain control of his old possessions of Bareilly and jagirs of Safdar Jang, the wazir, and others: the whole of Katehr and adjoining districts passed into the hands of Rohilas while

the Mughal armies were engaged in repulsing Abdali. On his return to Afghanistan, Abdali took Abdullah Khan and Faizullah Khan from Lahore to Kabul. Soon after these events, Ali Muhammad Khan fell ill and gathered around him the Rohila sardars, Hafiz Rahmat Khan, Dhoondey Khan, Sardar Khan, Fateh Khan, Badar Khan, and others. In the gathering, the dying Rohila chief appointed his 12 or 14-year old third son, Saadullah Khan (1737-1763), as successor, but gave the governing powers to Hafiz Rahmat Khan as the custodian of Rohila country and deputy (regent) of Saadullah Khan. Ali Muhammad Khan died at Aonla in September of 1748. He left a well-earned reputation as a fearless and inspiring warrior, protector of the Rohila interests, a good and fair manager of agriculture and trade, and a builder of many public and private structures in the town of Aonla.

Following the death of Ali Muhammad Khan, Rohilas started to face problems on several fronts, including ominous cracks within their ranks. In 1749, to recover Katehr from the Rohilas, the deputy faujdar of Moradabad, Qutb-ud-din Khan (grandson of the late Azmat Ullah Khan), was sent with an army to establish the imperial rule. He was, however, killed and his army took flight at the hands of Rohilas. The deceased deputy faujdar had earlier refused to accept Hafiz Rahmat Khan's offer to surrender some jagirs. At the same time, Safdar Jang planned to divide the Rohilas and Bangash Afghans—they had been friends—and offered Qaim Khan some of the Rohila territory in return for his help. Qaim Khan accepted the offer, sent a message to Hafiz Rahmat Khan to surrender all of the imperial territories and promised him a jagir sufficient to maintain 50,000 of his troops. The Hafiz rejected the offer and warned Qaim Khan through a messenger that this was a plot hatched by the wazir (Safdar Jang) to weaken both of us Afghans. But the messenger instigated the Bangash Nawab to fight so he asked the neighbouring rajas to join him against the Rohilas. Hafiz Rahmat Khan still wanted to resolve the issue by negotiations, but he failed. The battle took place at Badaun towards the end of 1749 in which Qaim Khan was killed and his armies took flight. In spite of the pressure of some of his Rohila colleagues, Hafiz Rahmat Khan refused to go into Farrukhabad for territory because it belonged to the fellow Afghans.

In 1750, the perfidious Safdar Jang—he was earlier aided by Ali Mohammad Khan and Hafiz Rahmat Khan in his struggle to assume the position of wazir at the Mughal court—took advantage of the outcome and raided the territory of Ahmad Khan Bangash, step-brother of the deceased Qaim Khan and the new Nawab of Farrukhabad. The Rohila sardars came to the aid of Ahmad Khan and defeated Safdar Jang and his Hindu cohorts led by Suraj Mal Jat. In the following year (1751), after his humiliation at the hands of the Afghans, Safdar Jang invited Marathas (Jai Appa Sindhia and Malhar Rao Holkar) to join him against the Bangash and Rohila forces led by Saadullah Khan. In the battle that followed, Saadullah Khan was defeated, Ahmad Khan Bangash had to flee to Aonla and the Afghan troops had to retreat into the Kumaon forest. The wazir along with Marathas plundered the Bangash territory and sacked and occupied Bareilly, Aonla and Moradabad. The raja of Kumaon, however, helped the Rohilas in the forest.

While Safdar Jang and the Marathas were busy plundering the Rohila territories, rumours started to circulate about Ahmad Shah Abdali's march into India to help the Afghans. The Mughal Emperor, Ahmad Shah, recalled the wazir, Safdar Jang, and Marathas to Delhi. Malhar Rao Holkar started peace negotiations with the Rohilas in early 1752. A treaty was signed in which the Rohilas agreed to remain loyal to the wazir and pay five million rupees as tribute. Safdar Jang executed a bond of this amount signed by the Rohila sardars. The wazir annexed one-half of the Bangash territory and gave it to Marathas in lieu of five million rupees that he owed to his allies for their support. The Bangash now lay exposed to the Nawab of Awadh and the Marathas. The wazir vacated the Rohila territory and expressed his friendship with them as a strategy to divide the Rohila and Bangash Afghans. In the same year (1752), the Rohilas moved into the northern foothills and subdued Hindu (Rajput) zamindars who expressed their fealty to the Rohilas.

In 1752, Ahmad Shah Abdali invaded northern India for the third time and, to appease the Rohilas, released the two Rohila brothers (Abdullah Khan and Faizullah Khan) whom he had taken from Lahore to Kabul in his last retreat from India. Abdali ordered Hafiz Rahmat Khan to give them their due in the Rohila possessions. The Rohila sardars did not want partition of Rohilkhand and wanted Abdullah Khan, the

eldest son of Ali Muhammad Khan, to be their leader. But this proposal was not to the liking of Saadullah Khan and Faizullah Khan and there were signs of dissention among the ranks. Abdullah Khan turned out to be a very unlikable fellow among his brothers and the Rohila sardars. Finally, it was decided to split the personal territory of Ali Muhammad Khan among his six sons. The mahals of Badaun, Aonla, Manuana, Usehat, and Kot were given to Abdullah Khan and Murtaza Khan. The mahals of Bareilly, Agrat, etc. were assigned to Faizullah Khan and Muhammad Yar Khan. The mahals of Moradabad, etc. were allotted to Saadullah Khan and Allah Yar Khan. Each of these territories yielded almost equal annual revenue (estimated at Rs. 1.30 million). But Abdullah Khan created much trouble so he was forced to leave the area and he found refuge with Ahmad Khan Bangash. Saadullah Khan retained the nominal leadership of Rohilas. Eventually Abdullah Khan was allowed to return after Hafiz Rahmat Khan persuaded other sardars.

In 1754, in view of the conflicts between the sons of Ali Muhammad Khan and on return of Abdullah Khan, the Rohila sardars decided to divide their territory again. Saadullah Khan was given an annual pension (of Rs.800,000) to be paid by Hafiz Rahmat Khan, Fateh Khan and Dhoondey Khan, but he died at Aonla in 1761. Abdullah Khan received three jagirs in Baduan worth Rs.300,000 in annual revenue. Faizullah Khan was awarded the jagirs of Rampur, Shahabad and Chachhat in Bareilly (worth Rs.500,000 in annual revenue). It seems that the three younger brothers were deprived of their share in lands and became dependent entirely on their elder brothers. The rest of the Rohila territory was divided among the sardars: Hafiz Rahmat Khan (Bareilly and Pilibhit), Bakhshi Sardar Khan (Agrat, Kot, Sarbana and other villages), Fateh Khan (Aonla, Usehat, etc.), and Dhoondey Khan (Moradabad).

Hafiz Rahmat Khan and other sardars maintained their position of power after giving Ali Muhammad Khan's sons their shares in the territory and pensions. There are competing versions of the division of Rohilkhand in 1754 and none of them is quite clear about what really did happen, who lost and who gained. Some have maligned the Rohila sardars, especially Hafiz Rahmat Khan, and others have blamed the sons of Ali Muhammad Khan for division and bickering. In the long run, Faizullah Khan turned out to be the only winner—his patrimony

in Rampur survived as a princely state until 1949—and the rest vanquished in either self-inflicted misery or wars. It is worth adding that, in the mid-1750s, Rohilkhand comprised the present-day districts of Moradabad, Badaun, Rampur, Bareilly, Pilibhit, and Shahjahanpur.

One Rohila sardar, after Ali Muhammad Khan, who emerged as a major player at the Mughal court was Najib Khan (1708-1770). He was born probably near Peshawar, came to Rohilkhand in 1743 to join his uncle Bisharat Khan who had earlier joined the service of Daud Khan. Ali Muhammad Khan was impressed by Najib Khan's military skills and valour so he was soon raised to the rank of jamedar. He arranged Najib's marriage with a daughter of Dhoondey Khan. Najib Khan fought in the battles against Safdar Jang and the Marathas in 1751. Saadullah Khan raised his mansab (rank) to 1,000. Later Najib Khan made a name for himself as a skilled warrior and influential political operator. He carved out a family fief covering the districts of Bijnor and Saharanpur.

After his campaign against Ahmad Khan Bangash, Safdar Jang returned to Delhi where he faced fierce opposition by the Turani faction at the court. He arranged the murder of Javed Khan which created general revulsion against the wazir. In 1753, the Turani leaders, led by Ghazi-ud-din II (Imad-ul-mulk), removed Safdar Jang from the wizarat, put in place Intizam-ud-daulah as the new wazir and Imad-ul-mulk as amir-ul-umara. Safdar Jang asked the Rohila sardars Hafiz Rahmat Khan, Dhoondey Khan and Najib Khan for help and they went into battle with him against the Emperor and the Turani faction. The Turanis also tried to get the Rohilas on their side, but Safdar Jang warned the Rohila leaders of grave consequences for changing sides. The Emperor reached out to the Rohilas through ulema and offered Najib Khan a title and mansab who secretly agreed to go with his men to the Emperor's side. Some other Rohilas joined Najib Khan, but Hafiz Rahmat Khan was not happy with this and withdrew on the excuse that it was sinful to fight against the Emperor. Najib Khan entered Delhi and received a mansab of 5,000 along with the title of Najib-ud-daulah in June 1753. As many as 25,000 Rohilas joined him in Delhi: the Emperor took all of them into his service with much reward and honour. Safdar Jang was thus thwarted by the Rohila forces, but he soon reached agreement with the Emperor who had become weary of the rising power of Imad-ul-Mulk

at the court. This futile conflict wasted resources and produced some very nasty consequences for the empire.

Najib Khan settled in Delhi with some of his Rohila troops and Imad-ul-mulk now faced a new and major threat to his power. The financial resources of the court deteriorated, thanks to the payment of salary to many thousands of new recruits and the arrears to Rohilas that they now demanded. The Mughal court faced bankruptcy in the face of the settlement. Najib Khan was given the faujdari of Saharanpur in late 1753 to appease him: he used his troops to restore order and acquired control of many localities around Saharanpur. Najib Khan had harboured ambitions to replace Hafiz Rahmat Khan and dominate Rohilkhand: he even incited Saadullah Khan—who was like him a son-in-law of Dhoondey Khan—to displace Hafiz Rahmat Khan. But eventually Saadullah Khan moved away from him and reconciled with Hafiz Rahmat Khan and other sardars. Najib Khan returned to Delhi much disappointed with the outcome. The departure of Najib Khan from Rohilkhand removed a serious challenge to the authority of Hafiz Rahmat Khan and perhaps saved the Rohilas from dissention, division and even civil war.

In June 1754, Imad-ul-mulk removed Emperor Ahmad Shah, put Alamgir II on the throne and made himself the wazir. He summoned Najib Khan to Delhi to support him against the deposed Emper- or—who would remain a refugee until 1771—and deposed wazir Intizam-ud-daulah. He had now some powerful enemies to face: Najib Khan and the new Emperor wanted to contain his power, Safdar Jang was raising an army in Awadh to recover his position, and Ahmad Shah Abdali was enraged by his seizure of the Punjab. Abdali crossed the Indus and entered the Punjab in 1756 and Najib Khan entered into negotiations with the Afghan king who continued his march towards Delhi. Imad-ul-mulk sought Najib Khan's help against Abdali, but Najib joined the Afghan king at Sonepat in early 1757: Imad-ul-mulk was deprived of his rank as wazir and Intizam-ud-daulah returned to the wizarat. Hafiz Rahmat Khan submitted to Abdali as he approached the Mughal capital. In his four-month stay in Delhi, Abdali shed much blood, restored Imad-ul-mulk as wazir, and appointed Najib Khan as mir bakhshi (Commander-in-Chief). Abdali's invasion weakened the

court further—Alamgir II wanted Najib Khan to weaken the new wazir—drained the treasury and helped Najib Khan to get more territory in the Doab, controlling now much of the upper Doab (Meerut, Muzaffarnagar, Bijnor, and Saharanpur).

Abdali fought the Jats and then demanded peshkash (tribute) from a resouceless Imad-ul-mulk. The wazir suggested a campaign against Shuja-ud-daulah, successor of Safdar Jang, in Awadh who controlled large territory (Awadh and Allahabad) and paid nothing to the imperial treasury. An imperial army, led by two princes (Hidayat Bakhsh and Mirza Babar) and Ahmad Khan Bangash, moved against Shuja who appealed to Rohila sardars (Saadullah Khan and others) for help. They first assured him of help, but the wazir Imad-ul-mulk rushed to Aonla and was able to prevail upon them to change sides. Saadullah Khan was ambiguous, but Hafiz Rahmat Khan was inclined to help the wazir against Shuja. Rohilas, including the reluctant Saadullah Khan, came on the side of the imperial army. Shuja-ud-daulah was understandably angry at the Rohilas. Saadullah Khan tried to play the role of peacemaker while Shuja looked forward to receiving help from the Marathas but they did not come. Shuja agreed to pay one-half million rupees to the Mughal princes as peshkash and so the hostilities ended. Ahmad Khan Bangash did not like the arrangement. Shuja paid only Rs.100,000 with the promise to give the rest later for which Saadullah Khan stood surety. The Awadh campaign, which had threatened to break Shuja-ud-daulah's power, ended in a fiasco by the end of June 1757. The Rohila sardars showed utter inability to act together to challenge Shuja's power on the one hand and made him their inveterate enemy on the other. Shuja-ud-daulah's agreement with the English Company, after his defeat at Buxar in 1765, paved the way for the destruction of Rohilas and Rohilkhand.

The war of 1751-1752 between Safdar Jang and Rohilas offered an opening to the Marathas to come to the Doab. The alliance with Safdar Jang brought Marathas the prospects to collect one-quarter of the revenue (chauth) from the Punjab, Bihar and Bengal. But the alliance stayed dormant until the departure of Abdali in May 1757. Abdali left Najib Khan as his deputy at Delhi, but Imad-ul-mulk did not like this arrangement at all. The wazir wanted Marathas to help him remove Na-

jib. Ahmad Khan Bangash offered his help for the task. The Marathas, Malhar Rao and Rago Nath Rao, along with Ahmad Khan Bangash laid siege to Delhi in the fall and Najib had to flee to Saharanpur. Alamgir II was also not quite happy with Najib's power at the court. What the Marathas did then was to extend themselves into Najib's territory and then to the Punjab where they chased Abdali's son across the Attock on the Indus. In the meantime, Najib recovered his territory. Hafiz Rahmat Khan and Saadullah Khan remained passive and avoided the Marathas without realising the threat; Shuja-ud-daulah maintained a neutral posture. Abdali was the only counterweight to the Marathas. The Rohila sardars agreed with Najib to invite Abdali to save the Afghans. Najib Khan, supported by Shah Wali Ullah, perhaps the most prominent religious leader of Sunni Muslims, wrote to Abdali to come and rescue Muslims from the infidel (Marathas).

After their second campaign in the spring of 1759 in the Punjab, the Marathas turned to Najib's territory and occupied all of it. Najib wanted to reach agreement, but was not successful. His appeal to Hafiz Rahmat Khan for help brought no response and he had to face the Marathas alone. Imad-ul-mulk wanted Shuja-ud-daulah to join the Marathas in Rohila territory. But Shuja was fearful of the Maratha power and decided to rescue Najib Khan. Hafiz Rahmat Khan and other Rohila sardars also joined Najib's troops. Shuja-ud-daulah arrived, attacked the Marathas and saved Najib Khan from destruction. Hafiz Rahmat Khan and other Rohila sardars, who had retreated to the hills, joined the Nawab of Awadh. The news of Abdali's invasion of the Punjab changed the picture. Rohilas met him at Kanjpur toward the end of 1759 while Shuja returned to Awadh and avoided meeting Abdali. The joint Rohila and Abdali forces defeated the Marathas and moved toward Delhi. Meanwhile, Imad-ul-mulk had Alamgir II and Intizam-ud-daulah assassinated in Delhi. Abdali arrived in Delhi and deposed Shahjahan III, who was installed earlier by Imad-ul-mulk. The Abdali and Rohila troops plundered Delhi for three days and then Abdali moved south toward Agra to confront Suraj Mal the Jat leader.

Abdali reduced all the Jat strongholds around Agra and moved to Aligarh in the spring of 1760. There he received the news that Sadashivrao Bhau, accompanied by the peshwa's son, was moving north-

ward with a large Maratha army. Najib Khan asked Abdali not to go back to Afghanistan before dealing with the threat. In the meantime, Ahmad Khan Bangash joined Abdali as well. Najib Khan approached the Rajput rulers of Jaipur and Jodhpur for support against the Marathas, but they showed no interest. Shuja-ud-daulah was not decided so he stayed at Lucknow. Abdali sent Hafiz Rahmat Khan to negotiate peace with the Marathas, but they refused. He used Najib Khan to bring Shuja-ud-daulah around who was approached by Marathas as well. The Maratha army occupied Delhi in early August and then moved to Sirhind to forge an alliance with the Sikhs and Jats. The Maratha march alarmed Abdali, hence he reached Panipat in November of 1760. In the third battle of Panipat, Rohilas as allies of Abdali gave a good account of their valour in combat. There was a dispute in the Abdali camp about negotiating peace or fighting the Marathas: Ahmad Khan Bangash and Hafiz Rahmat Khan preferred settlement but Najib Khan and some of Abdali's nobles were for the battle. Abdali was persuaded to fight rather than settle. Marathas were defeated conclusively and suffered immense losses in men and material.

Abdali arrived in Delhi toward the end of January 1761, where he made Prince Jawan Bakht as Regent of Shah Alam II, who was proclaimed as Emperor in absentia. The Jat chief Suraj Mal through his vakil made peace with Abdali since he as an ally of the Marathas had kept away from the battle. Before his departure for Afghanistan, Abdali made Imad-ul-mulk again the wazir and Najib Khan as mir bakhshi, with the title of amir-ul-umara, to keep the wazir in check. After the threat of Marathas had receded, and given that Rohilas had played an important role in their defeat, Abdali rewarded them with jagir assignments, particularly in the lower Doab (Etawah, Shikohabad, Kara, Kanauj, Makanpur, Bihaur, Akbarpur, and Shahpur). This assignment would allow the Rohilas to control the highway to Bihar and Bengal and maintain the Jumna as line of defence against possible Maratha incursions. But in none of the assigned territory to Rohilas was Najib Khan given a share. Abdali then left for Kabul and instructed Najib Khan and Shuja-ud-daulah to take care of the imperial house. In the next ten years, Marathas remained busy in the south sorting out their internal divisions and conflicts, leaving the Delhi court, Afghans (Rohilas and

Bangash) and Nawab of Awadh to wrestle with each other and soon face the rising power of the English Company.

The politics at the court in Delhi brought Najib Khan and Imad-ul-mulk into open conflict in which Najib managed to get control of Delhi, which the exiled Shah Alam II liked, while the wazir was at Mathura. Imad-ul-mulk tried to get Suraj Mal and the Rohila sardars on his side, but both turned away from the offer. Najib Khan became master of a vast territory including areas around Delhi. In the beginning of 1762, Shuja-ud-daulah was successful in persuading Ahmad Shah Abdali to remove Imad-ul-Mulk and appoint him as wazir and the Afghan king approved. Shah Alam II liked the change as well. But Shuja-ud-daulah stayed in Lucknow and Najib Khan enjoyed the control in wazir's absence. Soon Suraj Mal Jat, aided by Imad-ul-mulk, took advantage of Najib Khan's absence from Delhi, moved north after occupying Agra and demanded faujdari of the area around Delhi. Najib Khan made overtures of reconciliation, but Suraj Mal insisted on his demand. Najib Khan gathered some of his Afghans, including his brother Afzal Khan and his son Zabita Khan, to face the Jat army. Luckily for him, Suraj Mal died and his Jat troops fled the battlefield. Najib Khan then went after Jawahar Singh, son of Suraj Mal, and seized some of the Jat territory in the beginning of 1764. Mohibullah Khan, son of Dhoondey Khan, joined him in the plunder and occupation. Najib's Jat campaign came to a sudden halt by a Sikh raid on his territory in Saharanpur for which he had to return to the area, giving Jawahar Singh a respite.

Najib Khan settled with the Sikhs by paying them over one million rupees and then moved to Saharanpur where he employed many Afghan mercenaries and increased his military strength. At that time (early 1764), he founded a new town, named Najibabad, as his capital. Najib Khan returned to Delhi by the middle of 1764 while he learnt on the way that Sikhs were returning to his area. Meanwhile Jawahar Singh was making preparations to avenge the death of his father and contacted the Sikhs and Malhar Rao Holkar (a friend of Najib Khan) for help to which they agreed. Najib Khan offered peace to Jawahar Singh, but he marched with a large army, joined by the Marathas and later by Sikhs. Najib Khan sent appeals to Abdali and the Rohila sardars (who were themselves quite alarmed by the triple alliance) for help. Malhar

Rao was still in contact with Najib, assuring him that he would delay the campaign as long as he could. The Sikhs arrived near Delhi and caused much destruction, but Jawahar Singh could not make progress from the east. Imad-ul-mulk and Malhar Rao were not too keen to see Jawahar Singh to get what he wanted so they kept in touch with Najib Khan in secret negotiations. These two suspended operations on the pretext that Abdali was already in the Punjab. Jawahar Singh had to open negotiations with Najib: at Khizrabad they reached a settlement in early 1765. A few days later, Imad-ul-mulk and Malhar Rao paid a visit to Najib Khan and they all entered Delhi together. The news of Abdali's arrival in Lahore greatly perturbed the Sikhs who vacated Jawar Singh's camp as he too left the vicinity of Delhi for his home at Dig. Abdali turned back from Nauna where he learned about the agreement between the Jat chief and Najib Khan. The Jat campaign came to a costly end (over three million rupees) for Jawahar Singh and then his early death followed by dissentions among the Jats wakened the Jat power for ever.

While Shuja-ud-daulah was occupied fighting a Bundela chief during almost the whole year in 1762, some of the Rohila sardars and the Bangash Nawab took advantage and seized some of the Maratha districts (Shikohabad, Sikanderabad, and Etawah) which were assigned to them after the battle of Panipat. At this time, one of the Hindu commanders of Shuja's army left him, joined with the Bangash Nawab and helped him seize Kanauj and Akbarpur. The rising power of the Afghans all along his western border alarmed Shuja-ud-daulah. He demanded that Ahmad Khan Bangash return the Hindu commander to which the Bangash Nawab did not respond so the Nawab of Awadh charged him with usurpation of imperial lands without tribute and inciting local chieftains against the imperial rule. Shuja also sent orders to Rohila sardars to join him in the campaign against the Bangash Nawab. Najib assured him of his support but asked him for restraint. In the spring of 1763, along with Emperor Shah Alam II, Shuja marched toward the Bangash territory and on the way sent an ultimatum to Ahmad Khan to vacate the imperial lands. The Bangash Nawab asked the Rohila sardars, Hafiz Rahmat Khan and others, to come to his aid which they did with a large army. Najib tried to pacify both sides and told Shuja that in case of conflict he would be on the side of the Afghans. Shuja changed his mind

and reached a settlement with Ahmad Khan Bangash who submitted to the wazir and banished the Hindu commander from his capital. Everyone retreated to his respective territory. The Afghans maintained their solidarity and Najib Khan increased his reputation further by his role in settling the ugly affair.

After the expulsion of Mir Qasim from Bengal, Shuja-ud-daulah was facing a greater threat from the growing power of the English Company in the east. He decided to join Mir Qasim and drive the Company out of Bihar and Bengal for which he also sought the help of Rohila sardars. Hafiz Rahmat Khan sent his son Inayat Khan with troops and several other young Rohilas joined the Awadh army at Allahabad. The joint forces of Shuja and Mir Qasim marched east, joined by Balwant Singh, zamindar of Benares, in April 1764. Shuja-ud-daulah's campaign against the English Company was a disaster: the joint forces were defeated near Patna in early May. To avenge this defeat, Shuja made grand preparations and the battle of Buxar followed in June 1764. The Rohila troops fought with great valour, but to no avail.

Shuja-ud-daulah fled toward Lucknow and eventually ended up in Bareilly (Rohilkhand) since the English were in his pursuit. He tried to get the Rohila sardars to help him against the English, but they were reluctant to get involved and so was Najib Khan. Shuja went to Farrukhabad where he reconciled with Imad-ul-mulk and they decided to get the help of Malhar Rao Holkar, the Maratha chief, who agreed to provide the needed support on payment of substantial funds. Shuja with the Maratha and some Rohila and Bangash troops met the English troops at Kora in early May of 1765 but was defeated a third time. He retired to Farrukhabad quite dejected. In the meantime, Maratha troops were also defeated at Kalpi. Ahmad Khan Bangash advised the Awadh Nawab to make peace with the English Company. He accepted the advice and concluded two treaties at Allahabad. One was between Robert Clive and Shah Alam II on 1 August 1765 and the other between Shuja-ud-daulah and the English two weeks later. The English restored Shuja's dominions, but transferred Kora and Allahabad to Shah Alam II, the Emperor in exile, who would remain in Allahabad under the protection of the English until 1771. The signed agreements greatly en-

hanced the power of the English Company and were an important turning point for everyone involved.

II. Decline and Fall of the Rohilas

Shuja-ud-daulah and the Rohilas maintained cordial relations for about a year. The English proposed a treaty of defence against the Marathas in which the English would join hands with the Nawab of Awadh, Rohilas and Jats in case of hostilities against anyone of the parties. But nothing came of it. In the face of financial stress—thanks to the war indemnity he had to pay to the English—and given the superior military power of the English, Shuja-ud-daulah began to adopt a hostile attitude towards Rohilas: they were no match for the English and he could secure money and territory at their expense. No other neighbour looked as attractive for aggression because he sensed that the Rohilas were divided as well. He also knew that he could not achieve his purpose single-handed. However, Harry Verelst, the English governor of Bengal in Calcutta, rejected Shuja's request for an English brigade. The Rohilas were suspicious of the intentions of Shuja-ud-daulah, hence they tried to make an alliance with the Marathas and Jats. Abdali's help was not on their minds given his troubles with the Sikhs in the Punjab. Abdali summoned Najib Khan and other Rohila sardars to his presence perhaps to remind them of the tribute they owed. Najib Khan sent three million rupees from Najibabad, marched slowly and met Abdali at Panipat in early March of 1767.

Abdali's campaign against the Sikhs and his movements in India alarmed the English enough to assure Shuja of their help against any attempt to invade the Awadh territory. Shuja-ud-daulah attempted to use the occasion to gain English help against the Rohilas. But they did not want to get involved in any unnecessary conflict. Shuja-ud-daulah then attempted to get the Marathas and Jats to his side, but there was no response. In fact, the English wanted Shuja to form an alliance with the Rohilas, Ahmad Khan Bangash and the Jats against Marathas because their activities in Rajputana and the south were their major concern. Nothing came of it, except it heightened mutual suspicions and

speculations. Meanwhile the English attempted to keep the Marathas divided and engaged at home. They wanted Shuja-ud-daulah to maintain friendly relations with the Rohilas to keep Abdali away. The Rohila sardars were also divided on the issue of their shares in the tribute to Abdali and some of them (Hafiz Rahmat Khan and Dhoondey Khan) wanted a treaty with the English similar to the one that Shuja had made. The English did not reject their overtures and sent letters to Rohila sardars, Shuja-ud-daulah, and Ahmad Khan Bangash to check Abdali's incursions. With the departure of the Afghan king from the Punjab in the fall of 1767, the Sikhs and Marathas became increasingly assertive. The Marathas intervened boldly in the affairs of Mewar.

In 1768, Marathas returned to the north, having stayed away to settle their internal disputes and confrontations with Hyderabad and Mysore. The peshwa organised an expedition commanded by Ram Chandra Ganesh, Mahadji Sindhia and Takoji Holkar. They first plundered the Rajput states, marched unchecked into the Jat territory, and advanced toward the Rohila territory in the Doab which the Rohila and Bangash Afghans had acquired after the battle of Panipat. Najib Khan, though in ill-health, moved to Aligarh to negotiate peace with the Marathas who were divided: Ganesh and Sindhia wanted to destroy the Rohilas, but Holkar wanted peace. The peshwa was on the side of settlement. But Najib Khan failed to persuade the Rohila sardars to return the Doab possessions to Marathas. The Rohila sardars were still divided on the policy to follow: Hafiz Rahmat Khan and Dhoondey Khan wanted to form an alliance with the English but Najib Khan (who was with Holkar against the Jats) wanted them to submit to the Maratha demands to save the country from destruction.

The Maratha threat and pressure of the English Company led to a temporary shift in Shuja-ud-daulah's attitude towards Rohilas. But there was no prospect of a lasting peace between the two. The refuge given to Mir Qasim by Rohilas was of great concern to both the Nawab of Awadh and the English Company. The Rohilas, threatened by Marathas in early 1770 and pressured by the English, let Mir Qasim go. The Rohila sardars kept on trying to form an alliance with the English against Marathas, but Shuja-ud-daulah was hostile to them. Meanwhile the death of Najib Khan in October 1770 left the Marathas to pursue

their ambitions. After having invested Delhi and imposed tribute on the Jat ruler, the Marathas launched an attack on the Doab possessions of the Bangash Nawab and Rohilas, plundered Shikohabad, Etawah and Kasganj.

Given the prospects of Maratha inroads into Awadh and with pressure from the English Company, Shuja-ud-daulah changed temporarily his hostile attitude towards the Afghans. But he was not reconciled to the idea of friendship with the Rohilas in spite of the English warning to him that, if the Marathas conquered the Rohila territory, his dominion (Awadh) would become open to their attacks and deplete his revenue. He was advised to form an alliance with the Rohilas because their independence and strength as neighbour will give him peace and prosperity. Shuja-ud-daulah then offered military assistance to Hafiz Rahmat Khan provided Rohilas fought the Marathas. The Rohila sardar did not accept the offer and showed no interest in the alliance. The English warned Shuja in early 1771 of the consequences of Maratha supremacy in Rohilkhand and held a meeting with him. Shuja-ud-daulah urged the English governor to form a three-party alliance (English Company, Nawab of Awadh and Rohilas) but he was himself only half sold on the idea. Soon a compromise was reached between the Marathas and Rohilas which Shuja-ud-daulah did not like at all: he watched the Maratha attack against the Rohilas with the secret hope for an opportunity to annex the Rohila possessions.

Imad-ul-mulk who was in Farrukhabad offered to negotiate a settlement between the Afghans and Marathas. He proposed that the Rohilas and Bangash Nawab should pay two million rupees to the Marathas who will in turn vacate the occupied lands. Ram Chandra Ganesh and Mahadji Sindhia accepted the proposal but, on the instigation of Zabita Khan who did not like the agreement, Takoji Holkar fought the Afghans with his troops, but was defeated. This deepened the division between Sindhia, who liked the settlement, and Holkar who sided with Zabita Khan a man with ambitions to control Delhi. The peshwa Madho Rao wrote to Ganesh in late December 1770 that he did not like the division between Sindhia and Holkar and he wanted them to take possession of Delhi; get possession of the holy cities of Benares and Prayag from Shuja-ud-daulah; give the wizarat to Shuja-ud-daulah; and control Zabita

Khan without indignity or harm. At the same time, Shah Alam II sent appeals to Ganesh to help him return to Delhi for which he offered four million rupees. Ganesh settled finally with the Afghans for three million rupees and left for Delhi, which was under Zabita Khan, towards the end of January 1771. The Maratha-Afghan settlement had weakened Zabita Khan's position and he was already in conflict with his brothers, Kallu Khan and Mallu Khan, who were raising troops to get a share in their patrimony.

After the settlement with the Afghans, Ganesh marched to Delhi and seized the fort after a brief siege and Zabita Khan had to retire to Sukkartal on the advice of Holkar. By the middle of February 1771, the Marathas had set up their administration in and around Delhi and gained control over its dependencies, including parts of Karnal district, along with Meerut, Saharanpur and even some villages of Sukkartal. However, the Maratha generals could not work effectively because of disputes among them. Holkar was isolated and could not help Zabita Khan who sent appeals for help to the Jat ruler, the Sikh chief, Ahmad Shah Abdali, and the Rohila sardars. The dissentions among Maratha generals and the rumour of Abdali's invasion led them to vacate the upper Doab by the end of June 1771. Zabita Khan, with the help of Holkar, reoccupied his territory, except Saharanpur. The peshwa recalled Ganesh and made Visaji Krishna his sole representative in Delhi, but it did not still remove the rift between Sindhia and Holkar. In the meantime, Marathas started thinking seriously about Shah Alam's return to Delhi to raise their own prestige: Abdali was too old and ill and occupied in domestic affairs; Najib Khan was dead; and the Rohila power had declined significantly. In mid-February 1771, they made an agreement with Prince Jawan Bakht that Shah Alam II would be enthroned in Delhi and gain control of the fort and adjoining districts held by Zabita Khan in return for payment of four million rupees. Shah Alam left Allahabad in April, contrary to the advice of his own men and opposition of the English, and stayed with Nawab Muzaffar Jang in Farrukhabad for two months. Sindhia marched with him to Delhi where they arrived in early January 1772.

Following the instructions of their peshwa in his letter of December 1770, the Maratha generals were negotiating with Shuja-ud-daulah

for the holy cities of Benares and Prayag, had control of Delhi, and the action against Zabita Khan was under way. Both Shah Alam II and the Marathas needed money badly and Zabita Khan was the only person against whom they could take action quickly. The Emperor summoned Hafiz Rahmat Khan, who did not respond. Along with Najaf Khan, Sindhia and Visaji, he marched against Zabita Khan who sent his family and treasure to the strong Pathargarh fort while he stayed at Sukkartal. His appeals to Hafiz Rahmat Khan went unheeded. But some other Rohilas, especially Faizullah Khan, came to his help. Zabita Khan fled from the open battlefield, leaving his men at the mercy of the enemy. He crossed the Ganges and met with some of the Rohila sardars, including Hafiz Rahmat Khan and Faizullah Khan who had probably left Zabita Khan earlier. Shah Alam II with the Maratha forces attacked the Pathargarh fort and, after a brief siege, Kallu Khan and Mallu Khan surrendered on condition of safe conduct for the garrison. However, after occupying the fort, the Maratha forces grossly mistreated the exiting occupants. Ghulam Qadir Khan, son of Zabita Khan, and his family were taken prisoner; Najaf Khan saved some of the Afghan refugees and sent them to safety; the invaders acquired over ten million rupees; and Sindhia desecrated the tomb of Najib Khan and scattered his remains as a revenge for the past humiliations.

Hafiz Rahmat Khan saw a great threat in the Maratha occupation of the Doab. He was now willing to form an alliance with Shuja-ud-daulah and prepared to pay two and one-half million rupees, an amount he did not have or could not probably obtain. Zabita Khan, now friendless, also appealed to Shuja for help. Shuja-ud-daulah kept their hopes alive, but he did not commit to any action. He secretly planned, in collusion with Sindhia, to seize as much Rohila territory as he could. However, Robert Barker, the English agent, declined to approve this plan simply because dismemberment of Rohilkhand would bring the Marathas that much closer to the borders of Awadh. Eventually Barker brokered an agreement between Shuja-ud-daulah and Hafiz Rahmat Khan to which Zabita Khan also became a party.

The parties signed the treaty at Shahabad in mid-June of 1772 in Barker's presence, but he was not a party (signatory) to it. It was in two parts. In the first part, they agreed to assist each other if one or both of

them were attacked and the Rohilas would join the wazir (Shuja-ud-daulah) in any measure he took to help Zabita Khan. In the second part, Shuja-ud-daulah bound himself to establish the Rohila sardars in their different possessions obliging the Marathas to retire by peace or war. In addition, if the Marathas retired (or crossed) due to rains and, after the rains entered the Rohila territory again, the wazir was duty bound to expel them. In return for this action, the Rohila sardars agreed to pay four million rupees to the wazir. The Marathas had vacated Rohilkhand by the time the treaty was signed, no doubt on the verbal assurances given by Shuja-ud-daulah about the promised payment. But the treaty came into force on 17 June, 1772 and not with retrospective effect, for which there was no provision in the treaty. The Maratha withdrawal was neither the result of the treaty nor an outcome of Shuja-ud-daluah's endeavour under the treaty. Therefore, he could not legitimately demand four million rupees promised by the Rohilas in the treaty. Moreover, Shuja did not move an inch from Shahabad to assist the Rohilas in returning to their possessions. The treaty gave Shuja-ud-daulah an upper hand over Hafiz Rahmat Khan. It would come to haunt the Rohilas in less than two years' time.

The other play in progress almost at the same time involved the Marathas and Shah Alam II after the defeat of Zabita Khan. The Maratha generals had divided the booty among themselves, depriving the Emperor of his promised share and even the peshwa received none of it. The Emperor, disgusted with the outcome of the campaign against Zabita Khan, returned to Delhi in early July 1772. The Maratha plan now was to weaken the Rohilas and put pressure on the Nawab of Awadh. To divide the Rohilas, they made the offer to Zabita Khan, in return for one million rupees, that he would get his jagirs restored and receive a pardon from the Emperor along with the title of amir-ul-umara. After Zabita Khan agreed to the terms, Visaji forced Shah Alam II to cede the districts of Kora and Kara (under the treaty of 1771), pardon Zabita Khan, appoint him as amir-ul-umara and restore his jagirs. Consequently, toward the end of the year (1772), Zabita Khan received the pardon and the office of amir-ul-umara at Delhi. After this, the Marathas decided to march against Shuja-ud-daulah, but they could not persuade the Emperor to lead the expedition. After the Nawab of

Farrukhabad refused to allow the Maratha forces to march through his dominion—they did not want to alarm Shuja-ud-daulah by invading the Bangash territory—the Marathas decided to approach Hafiz Rahmat Khan for alliance.

Visaji and Holkar together with Zabita Khan and Najaf Khan entered the Doab in early February 1773. Visaji sent his messenger to Hafiz Rahmat Khan with three options. First, if the Rohilas give active support against Shuja-ud-daulah they will receive one-half of the conquered territory. Second, they should allow the Maratha forces to march through their territory for which the Marathas would give up the claim of four million rupees the Rohilas had agreed to pay to Shuja-ud-daulah. Third, if Hafiz Rahmat Khan does not accept either of the proposals, Maratha forces would plunder the Rohila territory and then invade Awadh. The Maratha chief also renewed the claim over Kora and Kara with Shuja-ud-daulah and demanded their surrender. Hafiz Rahmat Khan did not trust the Marathas and informed Shuja-ud-daulah of the Maratha offer and his reluctance to accept provided the Nawab returned the bond of four million rupees. Robert Barker was suspicious, but without evidence, that Hafiz Rahmat Khan was engaged in double dealing. Shuja sent one of his favourite courtiers, Shah Madan, to Hafiz Rahmat Khan who was assured by Shah Madan that the bond of four million rupees would be returned and the Nawab would soon come to his side against the Marathas. The Hafiz accepted the overtures.

The Marathas waited until mid-March for the results of their negotiations with Hafiz Rahmat Khan. When they learnt about the deal between the Rohila sardar and Shuja-ud-daulah, Holkar along with Najaf Khan and two Rohila sardars (Abdullah Khan and Faizullah Khan) from Zabita Khan's army crossed the Ganges near Ramghat, inflicted defeat on one of the Rohila forces, and took their leader as prisoner. From the other side, the Anglo-Awadh forces (led by General Barker and Shuja-ud-daulah) reached Ramghat forcing the Marathas to vacate the other side of the bank. Barker and Shuja decided to press on against the Marathas and, two days later, Barker and one of Shuja's generals crossed the Ganges. Visaji had to retreat into the Doab near Aligarh since Holkar and his troops had already departed some distance. Barker then re-crossed the Ganges and took up his earlier position. Warren

Hastings, Governor of Bengal, had forbidden Barker to cross the Ganges in the first place so he called him back with censure. Hafiz Rahmat Khan, along with some other Rohila sardars, visited Shuja-ud-daulah and met Barker. Hafiz Rahmat Khan hurried back when the news arrived that Holkar with his army were plundering the Rohila territory (Moradabad, etc.). But Shuja-ud-daulah stayed put though he was obliged to protect the Rohila country under the Shahabad agreement. Holkar moved back and rejoined the main Maratha army near Aligarh.

While the Maratha army was busy in the north, the peshwa, Madhav Rao, died at Poona in mid-April 1773. He had nominated his younger brother, Narayan Rao, to replace him but his uncle, Raghunath Rao, was a claimant as well. Raghunath Rao succeeded to the high position after the assassination of Narayan Rao. Visaji decided to return to Poona to maintain his position at the Maratha court so he opened negotiations with the Nawab of Awadh in which the Nawab promised to secure two bonds from the Afghans, one from Hafiz Rahmat Khan for one and one-half million rupees and the other from the Bangash Nawab for one-half million rupees. Vesaji then left for Poona in early May. After the withdrawal of Marathas, Shuja-ud-daulah stayed at Ramgarh for a while and promised the Rohila leaders rewards and positions if they declared their loyalty to him. The Nawab knew that the Rohilas were divided, militarily weak, without dependable allies, and possessed few resources. At the same time, Warren Hastings saw opportunity to expand the English influence and increase the Company revenue. Shuja renewed his former plan to annex Rohilkhand and offered the English a major share in the spoils. Hafiz Rahmat Khan did not see the threat from Shuja-ud-daulah once the Nawab was free of the Maratha threat and concentrated only on the return of the bond for four million rupees. The Hafiz sent two Rohilas to Shuja-ud-daulah since Shah Madan had pledged its return on behalf of the Nawab. Shuja-ud-daulah denied having made any such commitment. Shah Madan was called and he confirmed the commitment in an open court which incensed Shuja-ud-daulah. The Rohila emissaries returned home and Hafiz Rahmat Khan now faced confrontation with a powerful enemy.

What was the role of Warren Hastings in all this is a question that has nagged generations. Both Shuja-ud-daulah and Hafiz Rahmat Khan

were anxious to secure English support, but Hastings was indifferent to the Rohila overtures since the ruler of Awadh was already his major ally. The Nawab knew that he could not stand by himself without the English support. It is also well known that when Hastings took charge of the government of Bengal in April 1772 the Company finances were in bad shape. 'I found it [Company] loaded with a debt of interest of nearly the same amount as the present…I found the treasury empty, the revenue declining, the expenses unchecked, and the whole nation languishing under the recent mortal famine.' The Company's Directors in London were asking for reduced military expenses and more remittances, but they did not give Hastings the powers he needed for the purpose. Shuja-ud-daulah approached Hastings in June of 1772 to support him in an expedition against the Marathas who were ravaging Rohilkhand and laying claims on Kora and Kara. At that time, Hastings did not respond positively to this request. But when the Nawab of Awadh asked Hastings to support him against the Rohilas in 1773 Hastings was more than receptive. He proposed a meeting at Benares in August and they signed a treaty there in September 1773.

There were two articles in the treaty of Benares. In the first article, the English Company sold Kora and Kara to the Nawab for five million rupees, of which two million rupees were to be paid in cash right away and the rest in instalments within two years. [In 1765, the Company had given Kora and Kara to Shah Alam II for his maintenance. But he assigned them, without the consent of the Company, to the Marathas in return for their assistance to him in his enthronement at Delhi in 1771.] In the second article, the English Company would provide one brigade—comprising two battalions of Europeans, six battalions of sepoys, and one company of artillery—to Shuja-ud-daulah on a monthly pay of two-hundred and ten thousand rupees. However, there was a secret article, not disclosed until January 1774, under which a joint campaign would be launched to destroy Rohilas and Rohilkhand. Hastings explained his position. 'This enterprise [the campaign against the Rohilas] the design of which furnished the first occasion of my meeting with the vizier, formed an article in the original draft of our treaty; but it was afterwards omitted at his desire; and I promised that it would still take place if it suited the affairs of the Company, at any other time when

he should find himself in a condition to resume it.' Hastings admitted to the Directors of the Company many advantages of the campaign against the Rohilas. The treaty would make the Nawab more dependent on the Company to protect his territory and the expanded territory would yield more revenue (which the Company will share) and act as a buffer for the English against possible invasions from the west.

The Company ratified the treaty towards the end of November 1773 on the ground that 'the terms proposed by the vizier appear to be highly advantageous to the Company.' But Shuja-ud-daulah was in no hurry to proceed with the campaign at that time; he preferred possession of Kora and Kara first. At the conference in Benares, it was understood that the wazir (Shuja-ud-daulah) would confirm Raja Chait Singh, and his son Balwant Singh as successor, in possession of Benares and its dependencies. Shuja did not like this interference, but he had no option since his major interest was the destruction of Rohilkhand.

The news of Narayan Rao's murder in Poona reached Delhi in early September 1773. In this Shuja-ud-daulah saw a good opportunity to grab the Maratha possessions in the Doab that they had retaken from the Rohilas. He wrote to Hastings for support in his planned campaign. The English Company, on Hastings urgings, approved sending a brigade in support. At the same time, Shuja wanted to isolate the Rohilas. He approached the Emperor for his support with the proposition that it would be done in his (Emperor's) name. At the same time, he offered an alliance to Muzaffar Jang, Nawab of Farrukhabad, under which he would get back all of his former possessions in the Doab. In January 1774, the Bangash Nawab and the Nawab of Awadh signed a treaty to this effect. Shuja-ud-daulah had already won over Zabita Khan, assuring him support in the future and promising him to restore Meerut to him. He also negotiated with Najaf Khan who was on a campaign against the Jats near Agra. In November 1773, after all this diplomacy, Nawab of Awadh marched with a large army into the Maratha territory in the Doab, demolished several fortresses and captured Etawah. The Maratha commander vacated the area with his men. After expelling the Marathas from the Doab, Shuja-ud-daulah did not fulfil the terms of his treaty with Muzaffar Jang: he gave him a small sum of money but no territory.

Shuja was now ready to launch his main project: he renewed his efforts for a war against the Rohilas. He wrote to Hastings to dispatch a brigade on terms included in the treaty of Benares and also sought the English governor's permission to have absolute authority over the brigade. In a subsequent letter to Hastings, Shuja-ud-daulah wrote: 'It is my resolution to employ the brigade in the reduction of the country of the Rohilas, which lies between my borders, the Ganges, and the mountains and shall not require them to pass these boundaries.' One wonders what harm had the Rohilas done to the English? In mid-February 1774, Hastings issued instructions to Colonel Alexander Champion, who had replaced Robert Barker as provisional Commander-in-Chief, to march. The condition was that, in return, the English Company would receive a monthly subsidy of two hundred and ten thousand rupees and four hundred thousand rupees on completion of the service. Shuja-ud-daulah approached the Emperor, with attractive enticements for him and his court, but the Emperor declined the offer because he did not trust the Nawab since he 'never kept his engagements'. Shuja did not give up: he sent another offer including one-half of the territory and millions of rupees for expenses. Shah Alam II agreed with this offer and wanted to discuss the plan. By this time, Shuja-ud-daulah had also won over Najaf Khan. Having isolated the Rohilas from all sides, he now pre-emptorily demanded from Hafiz Rahmat Khan the disputed dues of four million rupees by the end of March 1774. All was now set for the showdown.

Hafiz Rahmat Khan and the other Rohila sardars met at Aonla to raise four million rupees that Shuja-ud-daulah demanded or else face the consequences. Some of the sardars were already in league with the Nawab who had promised them hefty rewards, hence they declined to pay their share; others were unresponsive. Hafiz Rahmat Khan had no option but prepare for war which Shuja-ud-daulah was determined to launch. Shuja marched to Farrukhabad, met with Colonel Champion at Shahabad in mid-April 1774 and they marched together towards Bareilly. Hafiz Rahmat Khan moved to Bareilly and marched east from there. When he learnt of the arrival of the Anglo-Awadh party near Shahjahanpur, he settled at Miranpur Katra. Hafiz Rahmat Khan continued his efforts to reach a settlement with Shuja-ud-daulah through Colonel Champion. Shuja raised the demand to 20 million rupees. The Rohila

sardars made pathetic appeals to Colonel Champion who pleaded with the Nawab, who was however determined to impose a battle. Hafiz Rahmat Khan now had no alternative but to fight.

Hafiz Rahmat Khan was facing a large army that included some of the Afghans as well, like Zabita Khan, Abdullah Khan of Shahjahanpur, Muzaffar Jang of Farrukhabad, and some others. On his side were his own sons, two sons of Ali Muhammad Khan (Faizullah Khan and Muhammad Yar Khan), a grandson of Ali Muhammad Khan, three sons of Dhoondey Khan, one son of Fateh Khan, and some others. He had advised Faizullah Khan to continue to fight so long as he knew that the Hafiz was alive, but if he received news of his death then he should retreat to the forest with his family. The Rohilas fought with much courage and showed military skills. However, after Hafiz Rahmat Khan was killed along with two of his sons, the Rohila army was demoralised and took to flight. Shuja-ud-daulah watched the battle from a distance while his soldiers plundered the Rohila camp with great zeal to the disgust of Colonel Champion who remarked ‘we have the honour of the day and these banditti the profit.’ It was a decisive victory and it broke the power of Rohilas completely. Hafiz Rahmat Khan’s body was taken to Bareilly where he was buried with due honours. It is estimated that five thousand Rohilas were killed and wounded in the brief battle. Is it not ironic that the Rohila sardars had given refuge to Shuja with his family, ‘at the lowest ebb of his fortunes’, after the battle of Buxar? Besides what wrong had the Rohilas done to the English? Shuja-ud-daulah had no validity to his demand for money since evidently the Marathas had vacated Rohilkhand without the intervention of the Anglo-Awadh troops.

III. The End of Rohilkhand

After the Rohilas were defeated almost all of their surviving sardars fled to the Kumaun hills for refuge while the Awadh troops savagely burnt villages and destroyed houses and buildings; their atrocities uprooted probably 100,000 people. Luckily, but much to the chagrin of Shuja-ud-daulah, Najaf Khan at Agra gave refuge to 20,000 Rohilas. Colonel Champion’s protestations on ‘unparalleled misery’ went un-

heeded though he approached Hastings as well on the issue. The war led to more dissention and division among the defeated Rohilas: some of Hafiz Rahmat Khan's sons stayed in Bareilly and Pilibhit and approached Shuja-ud-daulah for favour. The Nawab took full advantage of the division among the brothers. He and his troops, while subjecting both men and women to much humiliation, extracted a lot of treasure and loot at Pilibhit. In other towns, like Bareilly, Bisauli and Aonla, Shuja undertook similar operations against other Rohila sardars, even those who did not participate in the war. He took some of them captive along with their families and imprisoned them in the Allahabad fort.

The fall of Bareilly, Pilibhit, Bisauli, and Aonla destroyed the Rohila confederacy. Shuja-ud-daulah declared himself as the sole zamindar of Rohilkhand. Of the leading Rohila sardars, Faizullah Khan—who held the jagir of Rampur worth about half a million rupees in annual revenue—was the only one at large. He had retreated to the hills at Lal Dang and was acting as the rallying leader of the defeated Rohilas. Faizullah Khan started negotiations with Colonel Champion for protection. He offered eight million rupees in three years to the English Company if he was given the Rohila country, excluding the territory of Zabita Khan, or annually two million rupees to Shuja-ud-daulah and agreed to serve the wazir and the Company with 15,000 troops. Both Hastings and Shuja-ud-daulah rejected his proposal. The Anglo-Awadh troops eventually marched on Lal Dang through Moradabad and on the way captured Pathargarh and Najibabad in Zabita Khan's territory. In spite of the earlier condition that English troops will not cross the limits of Rohila territory, the Company's Directors allowed Colonel Champion to continue into the hills to conclude the war. Facing a difficult terrain in the forested hills for combat, Shuja-ud-daulah made efforts to divide the Rohila sardars with enticements but did not get his way. Finally, Faizullah Khan asked Colonel Champion to intervene and reach an honourable accord with the wazir.

After long-drawn and tedious deliberations, a treaty was signed at Lal Dang in early October 1774. According to the treaty, Faizullah Khan received the assignment of a territory, with Rampur as its capital, with annual revenue of one and on-half million rupees; he was allowed to maintain a force not exceeding 5,000; he would give on demand

2,000-3,000 troops to Shuja-ud-daulah; and he would disband his present army of nearly 20,000 men. The treaty said nothing about the Rohila prisoners, especially families of Hafiz Rahmat Khan, Dhoondey Khan and others kept in the Allahabad fort. Also, no provision was made for other Rohila sardars who were with Faizullah Khan. Most Rohilas were expelled from Rohilkhand. Faizullah Khan took many of them to Rampur, others went to serve in the Afghan states of Tonk and Bhopal, and some settled in Delhi and Saharanpur. The treaty of Lal Dang completed the end of Rohilkhand. The Rohila dominion, except for the area under Zabita Khan, was reduced to Rampur as a subject state under the Nawab of Awadh. But the Rohilas were not done: they continued to be a dominant force in Rohilkhand and re-emerged as the leading rebels in the revolt against the English Company in 1857. After the treaty of Lal Dang was concluded, Shuja-ud-daulah retired in ill-health to Faizabad where he died in January 1775. Many members of Hafiz Rahmat Khan's family and others, arrested after the war, remained at Allahabad as prisoners in the times of Nawab Asaf-ud-daulah, son and successor of Shuja-ud-daulah.

The role of the English Company, Warren Hastings in particular, in the 'Rohila War', a project for self-aggrandisement on the part of Shuja-ud-daulah, was less than honourable in spite of the attempts by some to whitewash it with distorted interpretation of evidence otherwise so well documented by many non-partisan historians. This conclusion gains strength if the facts about the state of Rohilkhand for 25 years before its destruction are compared with the state of affairs in 25 years after its annexation in 1774. In view of the ruined state of Rohilkhand under Asaf-ud-daulah, eventually the English Company annexed the Rohila territory (excluding Rampur) in 1801. It is also worth mentioning that, in 1780 Asaf-ud-daulah demanded, contrary to the terms of the Lal Dang treaty, 5,000 troops from Faizullah Khan as a pretext to resume the dominion of Rampur. Warren Hastings, probably at the behest of the Court of Directors, intervened and, in early 1783, an agreement was signed between Faizullah Khan and Nawab of Awadh, under which the former had to pay one and one-half million rupees to the latter to be free of his obligations.

After the defeat of Hafiz Rahmat Khan, a completely new political situation confronted Zabita Khan, who was signatory to the treaty at Shahabad in June 1772 while he tried his best to keep his possessions. Shuja-ud-daulah did not spare him and seized his territories in the trans-Gangetic region, leaving Zabita Khan with the district of Saharanpur and some jagirs in Meerut. But Zabita managed to keep his position as amir-ul-umara at Delhi, thanks to the intense rivalry between the Persian Najaf Khan and Kashmiri Abdul Ahad Khan. His son, Ghulam Qadir Khan, was appointed faujdar of Meerut in early 1775. Zabita Khan did not take sides in the Sikh predation of the imperial central authority in Delhi. Abdul Ahad Khan was very angry with this behaviour and managed to squeeze Zabita Khan out: he stood alone as a rebel by early 1776. Zabita Khan made an alliance with the Sikhs to counter the pressure of Abdul Ahad Khan and defeated the new faujdar of Saharanpur who was appointed by Abdul Ahad Khan. In revenge, Abdul Ahad Khan planned to kill Ghulam Qadir Khan who was residing in Delhi. Ghulam Qadir escaped and joined his father in the spring of 1776. The father and son, together with the Sikhs, marched on Delhi where there was much panic. But Asaf-ud-daulah approached the Sikhs and a Gujar chief (Raja Nahar Singh) to seize Zabita Khan's territory in return for a share in the revenue and some cash. Zabita Khan, not able to enter Delhi because of the arrival of some Awadh troops, was unaware of these plans. Somehow, he managed to get Emperor Shah Alam's pardon and save his territory for now. But he was friendless and indebted to the Sikhs and the imperial treasury for which he did not have enough revenue.

Abdul Ahad Khan was able to persuade Najaf Khan and the Emperor to launch a campaign against Zabita Khan. But before that they summoned Zabita Khan to present himself before the Emperor. In the negotiations that followed, Zabita Khan was evasive and non-committal about payment of dues (arrears) because of his dire financial circumstances. There was also the problem of his two uncles, bothers of Najib Khan, who were not willing to pay: they and other Rohila sardars were too confident of the Sikh support against the Mughal army. In the meantime, Shah Alam II raised Najaf Khan to the position of amir-ul-umara, replacing Zabita Khan. The imperial army marched against

Zabita Khan, who received no help from his uncles and other Rohilas, and defeated him in mid-September 1777. Zabita Khan fled with his Sikh allies, but his family was captured and sent to Agra. Zabita Khan was deprived of the faujdari of Saharanpur and his main fort was given to Najaf Khan. He was now entirely dependent on the Sikhs whose religion Zabita embraced and changed his name to Dharam Singh. After a long spell of association with the Sikhs, thanks to the good offices of Abdul Ahad Khan, the Emperor pardoned Zabita Khan in the beginning of 1779. This shift made the Sikhs angry because they were left out of the loop.

Throughout 1780 and 1781 the Sikhs kept on raiding and plundering the Gangetic Doab, though they were unable to maintain a common front because of intense internal rivalries. Zabita Khan remained indifferent to the predations as long as they left his area alone. But Najaf Khan in Delhi was very unhappy and kept appealing Zabita Khan to assist the imperial forces in repelling the Sikhs from the Doab. Zabita Khan tried to purchase their friendship by allowing some of them towards the frontier of Awadh. The Nawab of Awadh, Asaf-ud-daulah, countered this move by providing support to Ghulam Qadir Khan who was estranged with his father. But the Sikhs did not spare the territory of Zabita Khan from plunder. It was clear that neither Zabita Khan nor the imperial army could check the Sikh raids into the Doab; they continued until Zabita Khan's death in early 1785. This ended the power of Najib Khan's house, although Ghulam Qadir Khan played some part in and around Delhi until 1789 when the Marathas brutally killed him in retaliation of his ugly treatment of the Emperor, Shah Alam II, and the imperial zennana.

IV. Rohilkhand: Administration, Economy and Culture

Rohilas were an independent-minded lot and much vulnerable to dissension and division within families and among sardars across the confederacy. The other problem was that the Rohilas enjoyed only a short

period of peace: they spent the first 30 years in building Rohilkhand after the death of Daud Khan under the leadership of his adopted son, Ali Muhammad Khan. In much of this period, their efforts were concentrated on consolidating gains through diplomacy and war. After Ali Muhammad Khan's death in 1748, the Rohila sardars were embroiled in internal disputes about the division of Rohila territory. They had probably 15 years of fragile stability until the Marathas started to return to the north in the late 1760s. The deaths of some of the leading sardars, Dhoondey Khan, Fateh Khan, Bakhshi Sardar Khan, and Najib Khan in 1770-1771 opened a new chapter of internal dissension and external threats by the Jats, Marathas, and Nawab of Awadh the evergreen enemy of Rohilas. After the defeat of Rohilas in the spring of 1774, there was nothing left of Rohilkhand, except for some possessions of Zabita Khan, son of Najib Khan, in the upper Doab which were also taken away by the 1780s.

At its zenith Rohilkhand, excluding the territory of Najib Khan in the northern Doab (districts of Saharanpur, Bijnor, Muzaffarnagar, and Meerut) comprised the present districts of Moradabad, Badaun, Rampur, Pilibhit, Bareilly, and Shahjahanpur. After Ali Muhammd Khan, none of the sardars enjoyed uncontested position of leadership, though Hafiz Rahmat Khan was apparently respected but not necessarily obeyed. The history of Rohilkhand was brief and quite tumultuous. But the Rohilas were able to create a reasonably effective state administration, a thriving economy based on productive agriculture (including horse breeding), relatively free trade, and some industries. In their treatment of the ryot, Hindus and Muslims alike, Rohilas were apparently quite tolerant and fair: their fiscal administration was entirely in the hands of Hindus. They showed keen interest in patronising learning and built infrastructure and architecture. A major problem documenting the society and economy of Rohilkhand is that most records were destroyed in wars, some taken away by the Nawab of Awadh, some were destroyed in the revolt of 1857, and others ended up in private hands.

Rohilkhand was not a centralised state: each sardar was master of his own territory. The sardars met together when taking major decisions on wars, treaties and the like. While the Rohila riyasat was not a centralised state, it was a quasi-feudal organisation based on the princi-

ple of dynastic patriarchy. Rohila sardars kept the Mughal tradition of government structure: the state was divided into sarkars, parganas, and villages assigned to their kinsmen in reward for their services and family bonds. The assignments were not very different from the jagirdari system in which the assignees were responsible for law and order. At the level of villages, the Rohilas maintained the traditional panchayat system for both judicial and non-judicial purposes. The chiefs of panchayats (chaudhris) were both elected and hereditary and their decisions were binding on the community. Above the level of panchayats, the judicial system was based on appointed qazis whose decisions were executed by the sardars who could also review judicial decisions. By and large the Rohilas maintained a fair system of law and order which enabled the state to prosper until the raids by Marathas and Sikhs destroyed both peace and prosperity.

Rohilas were mercenary soldiers and they maintained the Mughal tradition, requiring their military commanders to keep specified number of troops to be compensated with revenue assignments. The three major chiefs of the Rohilas, Ali Muhammad Khan, Hafiz Rahmat Khan and Najib Khan, had little difficulty in raising and maintaining strong and efficient armies which displayed discipline, skill and courage in numerous battles. The Rohila chiefs and their sardars maintained their troops separately and normally brought together under the command of their leaders according to need. Their armies together were estimated at 80,000 men on horse and foot and they were 'ranked in higher estimation than ordinary Hindustan troops.' The Rohila soldiers were paid reasonable salaries, except during the time of Maratha and Sikh raids which increased the expenses but reduced the revenue affecting adversely both discipline and morale, hence performance on the battlefield.

The land system in Rohilkhand had two main features. First, Rohila sardars recognised private proprietary (zamindari) rights in land: they did not abolish or abrogate these rights. [Faizullah Khan abolished these private rights and became the sole zamindar in Rampur after 1774.] Second, Rohila sardars depended almost entirely on revenue farming (ijaradari)—which had become quite common in the Mughal territories since the reign of Farrukhsiyar—even on jagir lands which the Rohilas

had acquired through conquest. Revenue farming was a convenient way of raising revenue because the Rohila chiefs were involved in military activity almost continually. The chiefs awarded long-term contracts (generally for ten years) to the highest bidders through auctions. The ijaradars had to sign a written document with strict conditions for compliance, including good agriculture, preservation of trees and fair treatment of cultivators (peasants). In normal circumstances, the highest bidders could not easily extort, though they tried, the surplus from peasants. Ali Muhammad Khan, and other Rohila sardars after him, protected the interests of their cultivators for good agriculture and regular flow of income from the ijaradars. No peasant could be dispossessed of his tenancy by a zamindar during the period of a lease provided the tenant paid his rent regularly. The peasantry suffered only when the outsiders pillaged the lands during raids or war against the Rohilas.

The revenue system was under the control of a diwan, who appointed amils, mostly Kayasth Hindus, for collecting the revenue and maintaining records. It seems that the Kayasths benefited a great deal from the Rohila rule given their patronage by Rohila sardars. There is scattered evidence that the revenue from land increased substantially—from just over six million rupees in 1710 to over nine million rupees up to the late 1760s—contributed by the expansion of agriculture through land reclamation, irrigation infrastructure (canals, wells and karez), improvements in farming (e.g. introduction of new crops), and the inflow of large number of Afghans. However, it is almost impossible to know how much of the impressive increase in the nominal revenue was due to inflation. The nominal revenue fell quite significantly in the late 1760s because of the Maratha raids and instability in Rohilkhand until the defeat in 1774. Besides the land tax, Rohilas imposed cesses and transit duties on trade. In 1766, Hafiz Rahmat Khan had abolished all customs duties to encourage trade and markets.

The economy of Rohilkhand stood on two pillars. The first pillar was trade in and breeding of horses, based on mainly pastoralist traditions, given the importance of cavalry for warfare throughout India and in which Rohilas participated as mercenaries with great zeal. The other pillar was cultivation of land, by forest clearance and reclamation of land and digging of canals to extend the margin in what was essentially

a fertile area south of the Tarai and north of the Ganges. Rohilas took great interest in making agriculture productive: many of them were cultivators along with the Hindu zamindars and peasants, except for the ashraf living in qasbas who did not manage or cultivate the land themselves. There is good evidence that, besides agriculture, there was thriving exchange of goods between domestic and foreign traders in the major towns of Rohilkhand. In these markets, a variety of local products were exchanged for foreign goods from Kabul, Kashmir, Lahore, Qandahar, and Persia. Sugar and indigo were exchanged for horses from the Punjab and Central Asia. Grains (wheat and rice) were exported to the south. Rohilas also encouraged the growth of crafts and small-scale industries: textiles in Bareilly and Najibabad in particular, bait matting, ornamentals, brass work, wood products (furniture, etc.) from the rich forests, glass and glass bangles, gold and silver jewellery, and matchlocks. The number of mint-towns reflected the expansion of agriculture, industry and trade in Rohilkhand. Rohilas used the Mughal monetary system, issuing precious (gold) coins for long-distance trade and silver and copper coins for local use. The success of the Rohila riyasat rested on a fortunate interlocking of wide trade relations, based on horses and mercenary services, with agricultural expansion fed by the proceeds of trade and mercenary income that in turn fed into farming and trade.

Socially Rohilkhand consisted of a caste-based Hindu culture and traditions in which the Rohilas did not interfere, though they were orthodox in their religious outlook and practice. The Rohila chiefs, Ali Muhammad Khan, Najib Khan and Hafiz Rahmat Khan, not only refrained from hurting the sensibilities of the Hindu ryot, but protected their festivals and pilgrimages and supported Hindu scholars and priests with grants. There is much evidence of general admiration that these chiefs received from Hindus. In fact, the amity between Hindus and Rohilas was in evidence even during the revolt of 1857: Hindus were offered a very handsome reward to rise against the Muslim rebels, led by one of the grandsons of Hafiz Rahmat Khan, but there were no takers. The Rohila sardars employed a large number of Hindus in not only the civil administration (revenue in particular) but also the military. Some Hindus occupied very high positions and they did much of the diplomatic work on behalf of the Rohilas. The Rohila sardars did not accept

occasional Muslim protest against Hindu officials involved in revenue administration, where they dominated, without careful inquiry.

Gradually the Hindu customs and manners influenced the Muslim social milieu. For one thing, the Afghan concept of social equality gradually disappeared and their society became increasingly hierarchical: distinctions between Sayyids, Afghans and Shaikhs grew with time. But many of the Afghan customs and traditions survived among the Rohilas, including part of their dress, hospitality, open-handed generosity, and sense of loyalty, honour and revenge. They also maintained clan and sub-clan solidarity through marriages, exchange of gifts, and sharing in times of peace and war. A vast majority of Rohilas were Sunni Muslims and held their religion as an indispensable part of their lives. The Rohila sardars were patrons of ulema and Sufis and gave generous stipends to theologians and students. Many ulema and scholars came to Rohilkhand and found much respect and support for their professions. All Rohila chiefs, Ali Muhammad Khan, Hafiz Rahmat Khan, Najib Khan, and Faizullah Khan, were very keen patrons of religious education and literary pursuits by theologians and scholars. They all attached themselves as disciples of several venerated Sufis and theologians of their time: many Afghans were attracted to Sufis and saints. Rohila sardars were patrons of the arts and literature as well. They supported Pushto poets in the beginning and then several Urdu poets and scholars; this tradition was followed by successive Nawabs of Rampur who attracted several eminent poets to their court. Some of the Rohila chiefs were lovers of music and supported musicians as well. Hafiz Rahmat Khan had a big library, containing several thousand volumes and paintings, unfortunately plundered by the Awadh troops led by Shuja-ud-daulah in 1774. His son Muhabbat Khan, besides being a patron of poets, was himself a good poet and well versed in several languages. Zabita Khan showed some taste for literature and patronised well-known poets.

The Rohila contribution to architecture, some of which was destroyed during raids and wars, was no less impressive. The only ones that survived were of religious or semi-religious nature, the rest (like palaces and forts) the Marathas and Nawab of Awadh either badly damaged or destroyed in their pursuit of hidden treasure. George Forster, a servant of the English Company, who passed through Aonla—capital

of Rohilkhand under Ali Muhammad Khan—in 1783 lamented that the town 'once crowned with inhabitants, and adorned with mosques and spacious buildings, is now verging to ruin, and many of its streets are choked up with fallen habitation.' In Aonla, Ali Muhammad Khan's tomb is about the only outstanding structure that has survived. The English destroyed all Rohila buildings in Bisauli in retaliation for the part the descendents of Dhoondey Khan played in the revolt of 1857. Hafiz Rahmat Khan built several structures in Pilibhit, including the grand mosque; he also built structures (mosques, etc.) in Shahjahanpur and Badaun and his own tomb near Bareilly is a fine specimen. Najib Khan built three impressive forts, of which one has completely disappeared. Besides building monuments, the Rohila chiefs also founded several towns and villages, of which Najibabad (near Bijnor) and Hafizganj (near Bareilly) are probably the best known.

9

British Rule in India I: The Beginnings

Neither intrinsic superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race nor its perfidy and wickedness can explain the fact that a merchant company from a distant country gained control of the Indian sub-continent in less than 80 years. One reason was the exceptional leadership of men like Clive, Hastings, Lord and Arthur Wellesley, Metcalf, and Elphinstone. But so were Indians like Hyder Ali and his son Tippu, Nana Fadnavis, Jaswant Rao Holkar, Madho Rao Sindhia, and Ranjit Singh. There were other factors: common outlook, self-confidence, optimism, and national pride; disciplined, trained and well equipped naval and land forces; unified resources. The contributing factors on the Indian side were division, instability, indiscipline, and no 'nationalism' across caste and religion, with the exception of Marathas. Source unknown.

We have at last arrived at that critical conjuncture, which I have long foreseen, I mean that conjuncture which renders it necessary for us to determine whether we can or shall, take the whole to ourselves…it is scarcely hyperbole to say, that the whole Mogul empire is in our hands. The inhabitants of the country…have no attachment to any Nabob whatever, their troops are neither disciplined nor commanded nor paid as ours are. Can it be doubted that a large army of Europeans would effectually preserve to us the sovereignty not only by keeping in awe the ambitions of any country prince, but rendering us so truly formidable that no French, Dutch or other enemy will presume to molest us? Robert Clive (1765) cited by

James Mill in *The History of British India*, Vol.3, Chapter 5.

> I am now not far from Delhi, once the capital of the largest empire in the world, Russia perhaps excepted. The present possessor of the throne (Shah Alam II), the descendent of Tamerlane, lives in darkness, surrounded with empty state and real penury, a pensioner on the niggard bounty of the Marathas, from whom he receives less than the Duke of Bedford does from his tenants. He supplicates me on the terms of royalty; and his son is here, a dependent on the benevolence of the Nabob (of Awadh), from whom he receives a comfortable subsistence. Wonderful are the dispensations of Providence, and I feel them in myself! Lord Cornwallis (1797) cited by Edward Thompson and G.T. Garratt in *Rise and Fulfilment of British Rule in India* (pp.184-5).

I. Europeans in India: Arrival, Trade and Settlements

The story of Europe's discovery of India goes back to the Crusades and the rising power of Ottoman Turks in and around the Mediterranean. Europe's trade with India and China had existed for centuries through land and sea routes, in which the Italian (Venetians and Genoese) and Arab merchants were interlinked with traders in India and China. Multiple spices, silk and similar exotic products were what the Europeans bought from the East in return for mostly gold and silver since there was little else of interest that Europeans could offer to their trading partners. The rise of Muslim Turks in the Mediterranean made life difficult and trade expensive for European traders. It was in the tiny Kingdom of Portugal that the seeds of sea-borne trade outside the Mediterranean were sown by Prince Henry 'the Navigator and Crusader' (1394-1460), son of King John I and Queen Philippa of Lancaster and brother of King Edward of Portugal. Prince Henry was driven primarily by the spirit of crusade against the 'infidel Moors' at the western end of the Mediterranean and the rising Ottoman Turks. He persuaded his father to build naval power to wrest the Moroccan territory in North Africa. This quest led to exploration of waters along the coast of Africa and in the Atlantic. It was in the time of King Manuel (1469-1521) that the Portuguese ad-

venturers discovered the sea routes to India and Brazil and established Portuguese monopoly on sea trade in the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf. Four names stand out: Vasco da Gama, Alvares Cabral, Alfonso Albuquerque, and Francisco de Almeida.

King Manuel told the sea adventurers 'to make discoveries and go in search of spices.' Cinnamon, cloves, pepper, mace, nutmegs, and cardamom were the spices to enhance the taste of food and its shelf-life. Vasco da Gama left Lisbon in the summer of 1497 and made the voyage round the Cape of Good Hope to Calicut on the west coast of India via Mozambique and Malindi on the east coast of Africa. He and his crew discovered a direct sea route to India, in which quest Christopher Columbus had failed going west in 1492 and landed instead on the Caribbean island of Hispaniola. In his second voyage to India in 1502, Vasco da Gama first sunk a pilgrim ship returning from Jeddah, devastated the Zamorin territory of Calicut, established a factory and made the raja there a Portuguese puppet. He returned to Lisbon in 1504.

The arrival of Portuguese in India paralysed the sea-borne trade of Muslim traders in the Arabian Sea and the Red Sea. The trading houses of Venice and Genoa were at the brink of ruin; and so was Persia threatened. The (Ottoman) Sultan Suleman, 'the Magnificent', though supported by Venetians, could not dislodge the Portuguese by the end of sixteenth century. Trade with Asia passed from Venice and Genoa to Portugal. In 1505, the Portuguese king sent Francisco de Almeida as his first viceroy to Estado de India (State of India). Almeida established Portuguese hegemony in the Indian Ocean, but he died in a battle in 1510 after having won a victory at Dieu a year earlier. Vasco da Gama made a third voyage to India as the second viceroy of the king of Portugal in 1524, but he died in Cochin and was buried there in the same year.

In 1515, Portuguese took the island of Goa from the Sultanate of Bijapur and made it a hub of their maritime empire in Indian waters. The Muslim Sultan of Gujarat, with the support of the Mamlukes of Egypt but without the Ottoman Turks, offered stiff resistance to the Portuguese, but failed in the venture. Sultan Bahadur Shah of Gujarat gave foothold to the Portuguese in Dieu and Bassein as a counter to the Mughal Emperor Humayun. However, in the 1530s, once Humayun

withdrew from Gujarat, Sultan Bahadur wanted the Portuguese to return the territory. But in 1537 the Portuguese managed to drown Bahadur Shah in a meeting on one of their boats. They now had the ports at Cambay, Surat and Broach and incorporated Bassein and Dieu in their Indian empire. In the 1530s, Portuguese commanded the west coast trade and established a monopoly on horse trade from the Persian Gulf into Vijayanagar. They also moved their headquarters from Cochin to Goa and made it their capital in India. By the 1550s, Portuguese took over Ceylon, dominated the Strait of Malacca and Spice Islands in Indonesia and established themselves on the Chinese island of Macau. In the west, they dominated the east coast of Africa, the Persian Gulf and the west coast of India. But the Portuguese power declined with time because of several factors. In India, it was their religious intolerance and mixed marriages and then Spain sapped their power completely by annexing Portugal in 1580. Spaniards concentrated on precious metals, silver and gold, from the Americas to hoard them and not take advantage of the sea trade with Asia. They thought that holding silver and gold gave them greater power. In the next century, the Dutch and British trading companies completely swamped the Portuguese position in trade with India and South-east Asia.

Traditionally the major products of Asia, India, South-east and East Asia, were a variety spices, porcelain, indigo, cotton and fabrics (muslin and calicoes), and silk and its products. In sixteenth century, the demand for these products in Europe increased with rising income of some sections of the population, inflow of the bullion (silver and gold) from South America, opening of the sea route through the Cape of Good Hope, and establishment of commercial organisations to transact trade on a large scale. Portuguese were the first Europeans to monopolise the Asian trade with Europe, thanks to their naval power and the use of brute force. Their new wealth, based on extraordinary profits from Asian trade, encouraged not only the Spaniards but eventually attracted the Dutch and English merchants who formed, with the help of their states, commercial organisations such as the Dutch East India Company and the English East India Company by the end of sixteenth century. Their arrival in Asia ushered in a new chapter in the sea-borne trade and bloody scramble for territory.

The Dutch merchants had several private companies trading in Asia by 1595; they were navigating probably with the Portuguese in the 1580s. In 1602, the Dutch formed the United Netherlands Chartered East India Company with sizeable amount of joint capital. The Dutch Company established factories (trading agencies) in Gujarat, Bengal and on the Coromandel Coast. Spaniards, who recognised the Dutch Republic in 1604, wanted the Dutch out of the waters of South and South-east Asia. The Dutch fought for and got recognition from Spain in trade with Asia. But they wanted monopoly on this trade, exclusive right of trade with the east via the Cape of Good Hope and west through the Magellan straits. They wanted to throw Spain and Portugal out from Asia. Initially, the Dutch and the English were partners, but soon they began to quarrel in Asia though they remained united in Europe.

Queen Elizabeth I of England recognised the Dutch Republic, which the people of Holland (Netherlands) had established in 1578. So the combined English and Dutch naval forces focused on the Portuguese settlements in Asia, Portugal being part of Spain. The English conquest over the Spanish Armada in 1588 gave them great confidence on the sea. Stimulated by the Dutch voyages of 1595 and 1598, some London merchants formed the English East India Company in 1599 and made submission to the Queen for grant of a charter to the Company with monopoly on Asian trade. In 1600, the Queen gave the English Company a charter for 15 years. There was fierce competition against the Portuguese and the Dutch: the two tried to restrict the English trade and growth of London as a rival to Lisbon and Amsterdam. The English Company went through difficult times throughout the seventeenth century, including its competition with the rival Levant Company of England that had existed since 1592. But by the end of the century, the two English companies had merged.

In 1611, the London merchants asked King James I to protest and redress against the Dutch, especially in the Indonesian archipelago. However, the attempts to resolve the dispute failed. In the same year, the English Company established its first factory in Surat—the first voyage to this port was made in 1608—and then on the Coromandel Coast in Golkunda (Masulipatam) and trading posts in the ports of small Hindu states in the south; one of these posts was to grow into the English

settlement of Madras. Initially the problem at Surat was to get permission of the Mughal court. Besides the Portuguese were well entrenched on the west coast of India and would resist the English trade. William Hawkins, Commander of *Hector*, went to Agra in 1609 and delivered letters of King James I to the Mughal Emperor Jahangir. In 1613, the Mughal court gave the English Company a grant of protection and right of trade from the port of Surat. In 1615, Sir Thomas Roe, English Ambassador, came to India and stayed until 1618. [His view was that 'if you will profit, seek it at sea and in quiet trade; for without controversy it is an error to affect garrisons and land wars in India.' By 1682 this view had changed: John Child wanted security of a fort; simply trading was a folly. Act as a sovereign power with secure bases, adequate firepower, or efficient government.] But Sir Thomas was unable to get a treaty signed formally confirming privileges. The Portuguese attacked the English Company's ships off Surat but were beaten off in 1612 and 1615. In addition, the Portuguese opposed English entry into the Persian Gulf through Hormuz, but the Persian court gave the English access to Hormuz in 1622. In 1635, the English and Portuguese formally agreed to end their fights. The Portuguese were having problems with the Mughal Emperor and their trade started to decay and fell to almost nothing by 1648.

The tussle now was between the English and the Dutch. By the middle of seventeenth century, the Dutch had wrested most of the Portuguese settlements. The English were relatively weak, given the half-hearted support of James I and his son Charles I, and had to withdraw from their stations in the Spice Islands (Indonesian archipelago) in response to a violently aggressive posture of the Dutch. The English made a permanent settlement at Surat and set up sub-stations inland at Agra, Lahore, etc. Indigo and cotton textiles (calicoes) became the major export from Surat, Masulipatam and, after 1639, Madras. In 1643, the English Company also established a factory on the Hugli River in Bengal. The Indian exports became popular in England and Europe: trade in calicoes was robust throughout the 1660s. The Company faced problems in England during the Civil War, but in 1657 another joint stock was established with monopoly of English trade in Asia. The Portuguese ceded Bombay to the English in 1661 as part of the marriage settlement

of Charles II with Catherine of Braganza. The English king gave it to the English Company in 1668. However, Bombay remained an undeveloped settlement for a long time.

The Dutch were not amused when Charles II gave to the English Company more power in 1661: a new charter with monopoly on trade, including shipping to transport goods, in the East Indies and the power of war and peace. Their quarrel with the English became sharper and more virulent. War broke out between the two in 1664 in which the French supported the Dutch; Louis XIV launched his own East India Company in the same year. The naval fighting weakened both the Dutch and English and helped the French to emerge as a sea power in Europe and Asia. In the meantime, the English settlement in Madras (Fort St. George) prospered because of the wars in Golkunda disrupted the trade from Masulipatam. Indian merchants also moved south under English protection. English traders on the Coromandel Coast had established their first factory in Bengal in 1651 at the port of Hugli and other factories inland followed. Bengal provided good quality textiles (muslin) and cheap silk compared to Persia. By 1680s, the trade with Bengal started to match that from Gujarat and Madras. In 1689, the English used force against the Mughals and established a settlement at Calcutta where they built Fort William in 1696.

Historically the French focussed on competition for colonisation against Spain under the aegis of the Crown throughout sixteenth century and part of the seventeenth. While in the beginning of seventeenth century the commercial companies of Holland and England were already wresting from Spain and Portugal the invaluable prize of the sea-born trade with Asia, the French merchants were deterred from entering the competition thanks to the misguided policies of their king. It was in the reign of Louis XIV that Colbert inaugurated two companies in 1664: one for the East Indies and the other for the West Indies. Colbert's East India Company—started with about 70 per cent of its capital given by the king—followed a similar charter to the one the Dutch company had since 1600: exclusive privilege of navigation in all Eastern waters with power to seize and confiscate any vessel that intruded into their domain. The French charter was for 50 years, with monopoly on trade in all lands and the seas beyond the Cape of Good Hope. The Company

also received a perpetual grant of Madagascar. [French had established themselves in Madagascar in 1650.] In 1668, the French Company established its first factory at Surat under Aurangzeb's farman, similar to the ones earlier given to the Dutch and English companies. I may add that by 1689 the Dutch had dislodged the Portuguese from Ceylon and the Coromandel Coast.

By the end of seventeenth century, the trade in textile became the basis of commercial success for the English Company: imported textiles and silk from India which were re-exported from London. The Company was winning markets in Europe against the Dutch. It had established itself in India: bring bullion in and take textiles home. But in 1700, domestic woollen and textile interests got the English Parliament to pass an act against imported items; the Company could only re-export the imported goods. Madras, Calcutta, and Bombay became important English settlements: private traders, including Company employees, used them for the inter-Asia trade. In addition, the English fortified their new settlements and garrisoned them with contingents of soldiers to support their trading activity. But they placed greater reliance on agreements and, unlike the Portuguese and the Dutch, less on the use of force. When the Company did use force, as in 1689, it failed against the Mughals who closed down the Surat factory and blockaded Bombay. The English learnt to seek peace and their trading rights were restored on Emperor's terms. It was not until the mid-eighteenth century that they used war (force) as a means for trade and profit. The principle was to take advantage of the weaknesses of indigenous rulers and use Calcutta, Madras and Bombay as secure bases outside the reaches of local political powers.

After the restoration of Charles II as King of England, the English Company re-established its support from the English state: it was assured of renewal of its charter and trade monopoly. By the 1680s, Company's links with the royal family became significant. However, the 'Glorious Revolution' of 1688 in England and the failure of its campaigns in India forced the Company to go on the defensive. Much opposition had developed to the Company's oligarchy: in 1691, about 70 per cent of the stock was held in large blocks of 2,000 pounds or more. In the meantime, in 1698 the English Parliament gave charter to a new

trading company in return for a loan of two million pounds. But the old and new companies merged in 1709 as the United East India Company. London business community invested heavily in this company in large blocks of its stock; its bonds and stocks attracted others as well. The Company became a pillar of the new structure of public finance as well as a great trading company. The English Company exported saltpetre, indigo, calicoes, muslin, raw silk, pepper, and spices from India. Tea and chinaware from China and coffee from Yemen became important commodities as well. But over 90 per cent of the Company's cargo was obtained from India. The Company paid 70 to 90 per cent of the value of these commodities in bullion. In the early eighteenth century, the Company's stock was at three million pounds, subscribed by 3,000 shareholders and it borrowed extensively through bonds. Its annual sales ranged between one and one-quarter to two million pounds.

Until the death of Aurangzeb, the European companies, except for the Portuguese possessions in Goa, Daman and Dieu, were engaged mainly in commercial activities with their factories on the coast, from Surat to Calcutta, and some fortifications for security. The Dutch Company, though rich and prospering commercially, held Ceylon and some Indian stations, but its centre of operations had shifted to South-east Asia (Indonesia). The Dutch naval power had also declined quite significantly. The French Company had suffered heavily from war in Europe and only recently recovered its base in Pondicherry; it was deep in debt and was in no position to push its enterprise in Asia. The English Company was flourishing and had obtained a firm foothold on the Indian mainland. The Mughal power was still strong enough to repulse serious territorial encroachment.

From 1709 to the middle of the century, the English Company prospered handsomely: the value of exports and imports more than doubled between 1708 and 1748, but over three-quarters of the exports of India were paid in bullion (silver and gold). The Company paid annual dividends of 8-12 per cent from 1708 to 1755. The English Parliament extended the Company's charter (monopoly on trade) three times between 1711 and 1744 extending it to 1783. Each time the Company had to extend loans to the Crown in return for extension of its charter. In 1717, the English Company acquired several concessions from Emperor

Farrukhsiyar. It could trade freely in Bengal in return for annual payment of Rs.3,000 and also in Hyderabad (Madras) on payment of rent; maintain its factory at Surat against payment of Rs.10,000 per year but no other duties, etc.; use its rupee coins freely in Bombay; and extend its settlement in Calcutta. This was the first time that a European company received formal permission from the Emperor to do business in India on such favourable terms. In about 100 years, the English company had established a vast network of factories and stations: Surat settlement with factories in Agra and Ajmer; Masulipatam; Madras (St. George settlement); Hugli settlement (Fort William at Calcutta) and factories in Qasimbazar and Patna; and the Bombay settlement. Bombay replaced Surat as headquarters of the Company in 1687.

After Aurangzeb's death, in the aftermath of the wars of succession and the division of Mughal Empire, regional revolts and wars became almost a normal state of life for most people. The English had stable trade until about the middle of eighteenth century, but then shifted to war and conquest in India. The French and English rivalry and their wars in Europe, and similar rivalries and the wars between indigenous rulers, turned south India into a battlefield for the two distant European nations for 20 years. Fighting between the French and English broke out at sea in 1744 and hostilities commenced on land in 1746. The French and English were first on the opposite sides in the Austrian War of Succession that began in 1740 at the death of the Habsburg Emperor Charles VI when the accession of his daughter Maria Theresa was disputed. In this war, Britain (George II) was on the winning side with Austria against France (Louis XV), Prussia, Bavaria, and Spain. It ended with the Treaty of Aix-le-Chapelle in 1748 and Maria Theresa's husband ascended the Habsburg throne as Holy Roman Emperor. Subsequently there were two other wars, in which France and England were on the opposite sides. In the first war, they fought each other for colonies in North America; it began in 1754 in the Ohio Valley and ended in 1765 when France capitulated after the battle on the Plains of Abraham in Canada. Britain established itself as the supreme colonial power in North America. In the second war, Seven-Year War (1756-1763), the Hohenzollerns (Prussia) fought the Habsburgs (Austria) in Europe, in

which France was on the Austrian side with Spain, Saxony, Sweden, and Russia and England was on the side of Prussia with Hanover.

It is in the context of these distant wars that France and Britain got involved in three Carnatic wars, 1746-1748, 1749-1754, and 1757-1763. In the early 1740s, the British got involved in the political turmoil of Tanjore, a Maratha kingdom, where the raja's brother had deposed him. The British involvement proved to be a military disaster and political blunder: it gave the French a pretext to intervene. In 1748, at the death of Nizam-ul-mulk (Asaf Jah I), his son Nasir Jang and his grandson, Muzaffar Jang (nephew of Nasir Jang) took up arms for the throne of Hyderabad. At the same time, the province of Carnatic, which Nizam-ul-mulk had kept under his watch, started to simmer. There were two rival claimants of the sub-ordinate rulership. The French governor Joseph Francois Dupleix jumped into the Carnatic scene to impose a ruler of French liking. He also wanted to establish a French party in Hyderabad to which Carnatic was nominally sub-ordinate.

Apparently, Dupleix's plan was to found a French Dominion in India. His defence was that otherwise the English would have taken the initiative. The rivals in Carnatic were the ruler, Anwar-ud-din Khan, and Chanda Sahib who enjoyed the support of the French. In 1749, Anwar-ud-din Khan was defeated and killed in combat. Muhammad Ali, son of the deceased ruler, laid claim to Carnatic against Chanda Sahib. In Hyderabad, the fight was between Nasir Jang and his nephew Muzaffar Jang who had the support of Chanda Sahib and Dupleix. Muzaffar Jang and Chanda Sahib approached Dupleix with the offer of cash and territory in return for his support; the French decided to support both of them. The English had to take the side of Nasir Jung against Muzaffar Jang and the French. In the meantime, Nasir Jang assisted Muhammad Ali against Chanda Sahib. However, Nasir Jang was murdered by his own mercenaries, so the French placed Muzaffar Jang as Nizam of Hyderabad and Chanda Sahib as Nawab in Carnatic.

In Trichinopoly, the English secured Muhammad Ali, though precariously positioned against Chanda Sahib and Dupleix. Robert Clive and Major Stringer Lawrence diverted attention of the opponents by attacking and seizing Arcot, the capital of Carnatic. This was a turning point: Marathas murdered Chanda Sahib on behalf of Muhammad Ali

and Muzaffar Jang was killed in Hyderabad. In the meantime, Charles de Bussy, the French commander, had placed Salabat Jang as the new Nizam of Hyderabad and in return acquired the Northern Sarkars (north of Carnatic on the coast) for revenue to pay his troops. This was to help the French Company which was financially in dire straits. In 1754, after Dupleix was recalled to France, the English and French concluded a treaty not to get involved in territorial gains and restrict to trade in India. Muhammad Ali was recognised as Nawab of Carnatic, but Bussy had established himself as dictator in Hyderabad. The French Company was in a financial mess and its naval power was very weak for support.

The peace between the English and French companies in India ended in 1756 with the opening of their war in North America. In Hyderabad, Salabat Jang and his nobles were tired of Bussy and his army. They were intriguing against him with the English and Marathas, but Bussy was not easy to dislodge. In 1758, Comte de Lally, the new French governor, asked Bussy to return to Pondicherry. As part of the French policy, Lally's main objective was to dislodge the English from India. So Bussy reluctantly moved out of Hyderabad. Had Lally come earlier to India, say in 1756, when Siraj-ud-daulah, had expelled the English from Bengal and Clive had to move north with the best fighting men to reclaim Fort William, Lally's chances of beating the English would have been far greater. But by the time Count Lally arrived in India in 1758, the English had beaten Siraj-ud-daulah and placed a new Nawab in Bengal, became its masters, and expelled the French from that province. Clive sent his army, drove the French out from the Northern Sarkars and took over Masulipatam. The loss of Northern Sarkars to the French was very significant in revenue. Bussy's withdrawal from Hyderabad gave the English a base and the French lost completely their influence.

In 1760, Lally could not take Madras, retreated to Pondicherry, and defeated by the English who captured Bussy. In the combat, the French naval support had disappeared and the English dominated the waters. The French were compelled to surrender Pondicherry in early 1761. That almost ended the contest between the French and English in India. In 1770, the French Company was dissolved, just over 100 years after Colbert had established it, having lost a lot of money and French reputation in India. After the end of the Seven-Year War with the Paris

Peace Treaty, England had established itself as the incontestable naval power and acquired a foothold in India that no rival European power could now challenge. In 1781, England fought almost simultaneously against France, Holland, Spain, and its American colonies and in India against Hyder Ali, Nawab of Mysore, and the Marathas. At the end of eighteenth century, England had acquired supremacy over its rivals and against several indigenous rulers in India.

The territorial expansion of the English power in India took place in two phases. In the first phase, the English Company competed for commerce against other Europeans, but it ended up in fighting for political superiority in India. The struggle with France, which laid the foundation for English dominion in India, lasted from 1745 to 1763. In the second phase, the English Company contested against native rulers for supremacy in India and not for commercial domination or strips of territory. This fight started in earnest in 1756, when Robert Clive and Admiral Charles Watson were dispatched from Madras to recover Calcutta (Fort William) from the Nawab of Bengal, Siraj-ud-daulah. It lasted until 1803 when the English defeated the Marathas in the north, occupied Delhi, and made the Mughal Emperor their pensioner. But the English continued expanding their dominion in India for another 40 years until their conquest of Sindh and Punjab in the 1840s. This chapter of Indian history was part of a tragic play in which the Mughal rule disintegrated, replaced by several state-lets contesting each other, and the English used their superior power and strategy to establish their hegemony on all of India through subsidiary alliances and annexation.

II. The Rise of English Power in India: Wars and Conquests

It would be wrong to suggest that Britain acquired India as part of its empire ‘in a fit of absent-mindedness’. From Robert Clive in Bengal onwards, the British never lacked the minds seeing and planning ahead of time. There was no absent-mindedness in men like Warren Hastings, Lord Wellesley and his brother Arthur Wellesley, Lord Hastings or Lord

Dalhousie. Trade monopoly, forts, armed men, and subsidiary alliances were instruments, used patiently but tenaciously, in the creation of British Empire in India. It needs stressing that India as a political entity did not exist until the middle of nineteenth century. The ancient Hindu empires and Muslim empires since the twelfth century, including that of the Mughals, were at best in control of parts of the Indian sub-continent. It is fair to say that, of all the conquerors, only the British were able to establish a largely stable order in the whole of India. The present states of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh are its successors.

In the preceding section, I have given a brief account of the arrival of the English in India, their trading activities, their competition with other Europeans (Portuguese, Dutch, and French), and their involvement in the violent contests for power and territory among indigenous rulers in the Peninsula after the death of Aurangzeb. But all of this was still no definite indicator of the rising power of the English in India. They fought and won their first battle in Bengal against Siraj-ud-daulah, the young and intemperate Nawab, at Plassey in 1757, received the Mughal diwani grant for four districts of Bengal in 1760, and defeated the joint forces of the fugitive Emperor Shah Alam II and Nawab of Awadh at Buxar (Bihar) in 1764. [Shah Alam II remained in English protection until 1771 when with Maratha support he was able to reach the Mughal throne in Delhi.]

The battle of Bengal against Siraj-ud-daulah was fought because the new Nawab did not approve of the English reinforcing their fortifications around their settlement, perhaps in anticipation of a war with France. The Nawab suspected that the English were involved in a conspiracy against his accession since the English had earlier dismissed his messenger in haste. He ordered the English to desist, but the English President Roger Drake took it lightly. Siraj-ud-daulah seized the English factory at Qasimbazar and marched to Calcutta with a large army. This is when the 'Black Hole' (prison room) episode occurred in August 1756. The President of Madras sent Robert Clive and Admiral Charles Watson with troops. The French in Chandranagar sided with the Nawab. Clive contacted Mir Jafar and other conspirators against their Nawab and, after the rout at Plassey, Mir Jafar joined the English. He was saluted as Nawab and then he moved to Murshidabad where he

killed Siraj-ud-daulah. The movement of Ahmad Shah Abdali's Afghan army kept the Emperor in Delhi occupied, hence unable to interfere in the affairs of Bengal. Thus the English ascendency in Bengal was established. After victory in Bengal, Robert Clive was made governor of the Company at Calcutta in which position he remained until 1760.

Of the indigenous groups, Marathas had emerged as the most vigorous power in south and central India and had penetrated into the north and north-west. They were the great wreckers of Mughal rulers and their power in India. The English managed to keep them on their side in the early years until their power increased significantly towards the end of eighteenth century. It has been suggested that, had Europeans (English and French) not been there, Marathas would have proved to be more than a match for the Mughal and generally Muslim power. Marathas were perhaps the greatest challenge to the English power in India. In 1757-1758, Marathas invaded northern India with probably plans for conquest. Emperor Alamgir II was his wazir's prisoner and the treacherous wazir then had him murdered. There was a state of free for all, when Abdali came and forced the Emperor to make Najib Khan as his wazir. He then left for Afghanistan after appointing a viceroy in Lahore to govern in his name several parts of the Punjab and Sindh.

Marathas took advantage of Abdali's absence under Balaji Baji Rao, the able peshwa, who long kept the Maratha royal family in a state prison. His brother Raghunath Rao led a large army northward, supported by Holkar and Sindhia. In 1758, Raghunath seized Delhi, expelled Najib Khan and swiftly marched to Lahore, drove off Abadali's governor, and established Maratha administration in the Punjab. This was the apogee of Maratha pre-eminence: 'the Deccan horses had quenched their thirst in the waters of the Indus.' It was also paradoxically a turning point for Maratha fortunes: they had provoked Abdali. The Muslims in India, led by Najib Khan, had to confront the Marathas as a united front under Abdali. The Afghan king hesitated for a while, but came sweeping down with an Afghan army in the winter of 1759-1760, retook Lahore and drove off Maratha officers, attacked Holkar and Sindhia, defeated one after another, occupied Delhi, and continued his march south and camped on the Ganges. The peshwa sent a large army from Poona under the command of his son, Vishvas Rao, with other commanders joining

him. Muslims of the north joined Abdali and his force. They finally met at Panipat where the Marathas were defeated decisively and many were killed. The Maratha power was badly broken. The news of the rout and massacre broke the peshwa utterly. Abdali returned to Afghanistan with much booty because his army was tired and his western provinces were exposed to revolt and invasion. Punjab relapsed into confusion for the next 40 years until it was consolidated by Ranjit Singh. This ended the invasions from the north-west, but invaders from the sea were able to establish themselves in Bengal.

Bengal became a client state of the English Company and in a few years turned into a dominion under direct rule. Successive puppet nawabs were deposed during 1760 and 1763 and the last deposed Nawab went to the Mughal Emperor and Nawab of Awadh. In 1764, the English army, led by Hector Munro, defeated the nominal Emperor Shah Alam II and Shuja-ud-daulah together at Buxar on the Ganges. The English army forced the Emperor to submit to the English Company, intimidated the Nawab of Awadh, and marched to Benares and Allahabad across the Ganges. In the treaty signed at Allahabad in 1765, the Mughal Emperor gave the diwani (administration) of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa to the English Company. In return, the Nawab of Awadh accepted a subsidiary alliance with the Company, allowing the Company to station a garrison in his territory for protection. This treaty gave the English Company an area of over 20 million people and revenue of three million pounds and took its influence up to Delhi. On the west coast, an expedition of the Company from Bombay had taken over the port of Surat in 1759. The concept of 'subsidiary alliance', meaning payment for military protection, became quite important for the English Company. It generated financial resources and often would lead to cession of territory instead of cash payments; it happened with Hyderabad, Awadh and later the Marathas. Lord Wellesley was the most ardent practitioner of subsidiary alliance, war and annexation.

The English have offered two reasons for their entry into the Indian system by force: fragmentation of Mughal rule in India and the war with France. However, recent research tends to revise this defence. The English Company had two components of its trade with India: a passive one was its own trade and the other was a dynamic private trade. The

Company's employees and others living in settlements carried on private trade on their own account. This trade brought the individual English trader on land and ports into arrangements with local merchants and moneylenders and in conflict with the Nawab in Bengal for customs duties, etc. and inland monopoly on trade. In addition, the local ruler faced the challenge of the enclave: Calcutta became the largest settlement in which close to 80,000 local merchants, artisans and labourers came to live by the middle of eighteenth century.

Some have questioned the argument that political authority in India had collapsed with descent into uncontrolled violence and endemic warfare verging on anarchy. Regional authorities (rulers) that had replaced the Mughal rule, e.g. Muslim nawabs in Bengal, Hyderabad and Carnatic, Hindu rajas in the south, and the Marathas, were capable of establishing a stable order. They maintained the outward forms of Mughal rule; developed new ways to extract resources from agriculture and trade; assessed and collected land revenue directly from cultivators in cash and not through mansabdars, etc.; could borrow directly from moneylenders against cash revenue; and paid the troops, armed and trained in European manner, directly in cash and not through jagir assignments. It is in this context that private traders of the English Company along with local traders could expand given the opportunities afforded by indigenous rulers. The English could act as banks to the state. This political infiltration could turn into domination and eventually outright rule. The British preserved an outward respect for Mughal forms, played partners with local merchants and moneylenders, and extracted revenue from agriculture and trade. The competing view is that there was break in continuity: the English were not mere actors in an essentially Indian play, but interlopers and aggressors who seized power by brute force. They used their power to force abrupt changes that impoverished the areas brought under their control (e.g. Bengal). They were not responding to conditions in India on which they had little control, but implementing their own designs for transfer of Indian resources.

The English Company, in its conflict with the French, received royal troops and ships, increased the supply of its own troops, and allowed its servants in Madras to augment their forces. With time the Company

asked for and received more royal help for the defence of its activities in India. The Ministers in England saw Asian trade in the national interest and gave support to the Company, especially in its fight with the French. After the Seven-Year War, the government in England began to formulate strategies of its own for operations in Asia. While English servants in India often made decisions—given the slowness of communications and their personal stakes for money and fame—the English government played a crucial role by providing forces to the men in India to act decisively. By the middle of eighteenth century, the English managed to put significant forces into the field in India. The Company also went into recruiting local troops—the Telugu-speaking in Madras and Rajputs in Bengal. The firepower of well-drilled infantry and field artillery with effective logistical support proved decisive against the much larger local armies.

In just over 20 years (1746-1765), the English Company became a territorial power in India. It held the Nawab of Arcot in its tight grip as a client, which gave the Company effective control in the south-east. It destroyed the rule of Siraj-ud-daulah, Mir Jafar and Mir Qasim in Bengal (Bihar and Orissa included) and acquired the diwani of Bengal in 1765. It took the Nawab of Awadh in its protection and stationed a garrison in his territory the same year. The Mughal Emperor started to receive a pension from the English Company after 1765. The Company thus became a major player in the post-Mughal India and its complex politics. While the Hyderabad and Awadh nawabs accepted the Company, the Marathas, led by their peshwa and autonomous commanders, and Hyder Ali, Nawab of Mysore, were their potential opponents. By the 1760s, India was not only important for the private and Company interests but of the English national interest, given the revenue collected by the government. The English fused together trade, revenue extraction and military power for their stake in India. According to some, by 1773 the loss of India would have meant 'national bankruptcy' for Britain.

It is fair to say that, if Robert Clive was the conqueror of Bengal, Warren Hastings, first as governor of the Company in Bengal (1772-1774) and then as Governor-General of Presidencies of Bengal, Madras and Bombay (1774-1785), was the founder of British Empire in India. For one thing, during his tenure, the English government in London

acquired greater control of Company's affairs in India and the governor at Calcutta was elevated to Governor-General at the renewal of Company's charter under the Regulatory Act of 1773. The India Act of 1784 brought the Company directly under the Board of Control, comprising six commissioners appointed by the English government, which in turn was answerable to the Parliament. The 1784 Act also established a Supreme Court of Justice, with four judges, in Calcutta. In 1786, the Governor-General was empowered to act on his own in 'extraordinary' cases without worrying about the Council in London. The double government—Governor-General responsible to the Minister in London and all officers in India responsible to Governor-General—lasted until 1858.

The India Act of 1784 stated clearly that for 'schemes of conquests repugnant to the wish, to the honour, and to the policy of the British nation, the Governor-General must not declare hostilities or enter into treaty for making war against a native state, or guaranteeing it against an enemy, except for the defence of British territory or of allies from imminent attack.' Lord Cornwallis (1786-1795), soon after landing in India, had no problem obliging the Nizam of Hyderabad who asked for protection against Tipu Sultan of Mysore. The above-cited statement of 1784 was reinforced by the Act of 1793 which declared that 'Forasmuch as to pursue schemes of conquests and extension of dominion in India are measures repugnant to the wish, the honour, and the policy of the nation, it shall not be lawful for the Governor-General in Council to declare war, or for guaranteeing the possessions of any country princes or states (except where hostilities against the British nation in India have been actually commenced or prepared), without express command and authority from the home government.' Evidently, officers of the English Company paid little or no attention to this declaration as well.

To be fair, Warren Hastings, the first and last officer of the Company to serve as Governor-General, showed much interest in India's diverse culture and languages: he not only tried to seek knowledge himself but also promote the study of oriental languages (Sanskrit, Persian and Arabic) and patronised indigenous scholars and men of letters for translations, etc. He did not subscribe to an utterly negative view of Indians, their history and culture held by several other Englishmen who followed

him. As Governor and then Governor-General at Calcutta, Hastings was confronted by financial difficulties for the Company in Bengal and faced determined opposition of some members of his Council who did not approve of his policies and actions. Hastings wanted to maintain good relations with Awadh to prevent the Marathas from making incursions into Bengal. He deprived Shah Alam II of the districts of Kora and Allahabad, because Shah Alam got himself placed on the throne in Delhi as Emperor by the Marathas. These districts were handed over to Awadh in return for a hefty annual tribute from the Nawab. In 1773, Hastings and Shuja-ud-daulah met at Benares and ratified this arrangement. It was also the occasion for a secret understanding between the two to destroy the Rohila confederacy.

Whatever the excuse of the Nawab of Awadh to attack the Rohilas—that they had reneged on a fiduciary promise witnessed by an English agent—the support of the English to his project was motivated most probably by financial gain for the Company to alleviate its financial distress. But the destruction of Rohilkhand, which the Rohila confederates had administered quite efficiently and fairly for about 25 years, and the misrule that followed in the territory was not in the English interest. The quest for material gain led Hastings to commit two more indefensible acts. The first one was against Raja Chait Singh of Benares, who had placed himself under the English over-lordship in 1775 in return for a handsome annual tribute to the Company. But Hastings kept on demanding more from the raja and eventually imposed an unbearable fine. The raja submitted quietly when Hastings went to Benares to arrest him, but the indignity inflicted upon him infuriated raja's troops who killed a number of soldiers and some English officers. Hastings retired to the Chunar fort for safety and used heavy force to suppress the uprising. Chait Singh was deposed, found refuge in Gwalior, and his fiefdom was given to his nephew in return for four million rupees, twice the amount Hastings had demanded from Chait Singh.

The second act in which Hastings played a less than honourable role was that of the Begums of Awadh. In 1775, after the death of Shuja-ud-daulah, his son Asaf-ud-daulah unwisely agreed with the English (Treaty of Faizabad) to pay a much larger subsidy for the English troops stationed in Awadh. The new nawab was a bad administrator and let his

revenue drain by corrupt practices, hence the subsidy payable to the English fell into arrear. The desperate Nawab wanted to seize the jagirs and wealth that his mother and grandmother inherited from his father; his excuse was that the Begums had unjustly deprived him of his share. In 1781, Hastings had no hesitation in withdrawing British protection for the Begums promised to them after they had earlier paid a hefty sum to the Nawab. Towards the end of 1782, the Begums' servants were forced by most cruel means to surrender the treasure. The excuse that, since the Begums had supported Chait Singh in his rebellion, of which there was little evidence, they had forfeited their claim to English protection was not accepted by anyone. The Company's Court of Directors ordered partial restitution and removed the British Residency from Awadh and established an agency of the Governor-General which proved to be a heavier burden on Awadh.

There was also the case of Nand Kumar, a Brahmin who held a high position in Bengal. In 1775, he accused Hastings of accepting gifts worth hundreds of thousands of rupees from different individuals, the widow of Mir Jafar among them. The Brahmin was angry with Hastings because he had been deprived of his house and one of his rivals, Mohan Prasad, was given special favours. The Company's lawyers in England found the charges to be false, though some of the Councillors in Calcutta thought the charges were true and Hastings be tried. Then Mohan Prasad charged Nand Kumar with a forgery of a will some years ago. The Supreme Court tried Nand Kumar, found him guilty, and had him hanged. The trial and punishment were both criticised on several grounds. There was suspicion that Hastings instigated Mohan Prasad and perhaps influenced the judges. Some members of Parliament and other Englishmen were angry enough at Warren Hastings for his role in these episodes to call for his impeachment. The proceedings took a number of years, but at the end Hastings was exonerated of the main charges against him. Eventually he retired, though with a stained reputation, to an honourable and peaceful state, unlike Robert Clive, the first 'Nabob' of Bengal, who took his own life perhaps in a state of deep depression.

The rule of British Parliament in India, though it did not claim paramountcy, began with the arrival of Lord Cornwallis as Governor-Gen-

eral in 1786. At this time, the English Company was confronting the Marathas in the west and north-west and Tipu Sultan of Mysore, son of Hyder Ali, in the south. The Nizam and Marathas joined hands against Tipu while he wanted a united front against the English. Tipu was in touch with the French—he sent envoys to the Court of Louis XVI in 1787—and sent a mission to the Ottoman Sultan. The Nizam asked the English to protect him from Tipu under an existing treaty. Tipu attacked the Raja of Travancore who was under English protection. In 1791, Cornwallis formed a league against Tipu and marched with the Nizam and Marathas. Tipu was forced to sign a treaty that crippled his resources and stripped one-half of his territory.

The Sultan of Mysore wanted to avenge his humiliation and contacted Mahadji Sindhia, a Maratha chief, Zaman Shah (the Afghan king), and the French republican regime after the Revolution. In 1793, Cornwallis seized all French settlements in India and was prepared to react more aggressively at any hint of collaboration of Indian states with the French. During the tenure of Cornwallis, Mahadji Sindhia had raised a large and disciplined force, along European lines trained and led by the French, and occupied Delhi and areas around it. He was asking the English to pay tribute to his appointed Emperor in Delhi. His armed predominance alarmed other Maratha chiefs, including the peshwa in Poona, as much as the English Company. Luckily for them Sindhia died suddenly in 1794. By the time Cornwallis left India, the English were on the threshold of an era of wide-ranging hostilities and immense annexations.

Sir John Shore, the interim Governor-General (1793-1798), was a far more cautious individual: in 1795, he refused to help the Nizam when the Marathas attacked him. Marathas forced surrender on the Nizam on extortionate terms. Nizam's defeat emboldened the Marathas and provided stimulus to Tipu to recover his losses by attacking Hyderabad if the English could be prevented from opposing him. He approached Shah Zaman to invade India and the Afghan king did invade the Punjab and occupied Lahore in 1797. But he had to return to his kingdom in response to the Persian threat to his western borders. In response to Tipu's missions to the French, in 1799 Napoleon sent a letter from Cairo assuring Tipu of his help in 'releasing you from the yoke of the English'.

Since Napoleon had to withdraw from Egypt, Tipu was left all alone to face the English.

In 1798, Lord Wellesley, an ambitious and combative individual, replaced Sir John Shore as Governor General. Wellesley landed in Madras and learnt about the deal between Tipu and the French and the arrival of some French troops from Mauritius. Wellesley used this as excuse for hostility: he demanded that Tipu remove the French from his army and then marched, with his brother Colonel Arthur Wellesley and the forces of the Nizam and the Maratha peshwa, against the Sultan in 1799. Tipu died in his capital fighting the aggressors. Wellesley broke up the state of Mysore: each of the three partners took some territory and the rest given to the Hindu family that Hyder Ali had removed from power in 1761. Lord Wellesley also took Carnatic under English administration as a penalty on the Nawab for carrying on secret correspondence with Tipu Sultan. In the same way, the states of Tanjore and Surat were incorporated into the British dominion. Subsidiary alliances were adopted as a means to acquire complete dominance in India; British protectorate for all native rulerships was now the declared policy.

Lord Wellesley used subsidiary alliances with Hyderabad and Awadh to capture revenue and territory: in the former case revenue assignments on land were taken in some areas and in the case of Awadh he took away the territory of Rohilkhand (except Rampur) lying along the Ganges and its tributaries west of Benares up to the foothills of the Himalayan range. It yielded much revenue and confronted Sindhia, the Maratha chief, in northern India; the Maratha confederate states were the only power (barring Sindh and Punjab) left in India independent of English protection. Luckily, for the English, the Maratha chiefs (Sindhia, Holkar and Bhonsle) were fighting each other for supremacy. It was an opportune time to offer British protection to the peshwa in Poona to prevent the other Maratha chiefs from seizing command of the Maratha empire. Peshwa Baji Rao was facing Holkar, his brother the peshwa had cruelly executed, who was marching on to Poona. Sindhia came to the side of the peshwa, but Holkar managed to put the combined army on the run leaving all their guns and baggage. In 1802, the peshwa contacted the English from his refuge in Bassein and the two parties concluded a treaty under which the peshwa ceded districts with rich revenue in

return for a subsidiary force permanently settled in his territory and all his external relations sub-ordinated to the English Company. The peshwa returned to Poona under English protection. At the same time, the Company gave protection to Hyderabad against the Maratha demands.

The English subsidiary forces were now settled in the capitals of Mysore, Hyderabad, Poona, and Lucknow. All their disputes were to be arbitrated by the English and all other European nations rigidly excluded from interference. The Maratha chiefs were alarmed by the paramount power of the English as their own independence was on the line. Raghuji Bhonsle of Berar (Nagpur) at once combined with Daulat Rao Sindhia, but Jaswant Rao Holkar of Gwalior and Gaekwad of Baroda stayed out of the conflict with the English. The Governor-General ordered Generals Arthur Wellesley and Lord Gerard Lake to reduce Sindhia—who was still a protector of the blind Emperor Shah Alam II—in western and northern India (Delhi and surrounding area) and get the combined army of Sindhia and Bhonsle out of Nizam's frontier station. General Lake moved in the north-west direction, took Agra and occupied Delhi after dispersing Sindhia's forces. By the end of 1803, the two Maratha chiefs concluded peace on terms dictated by General Wellesley. The parties recognised the treaty of Bassein. Sindhia gave up all area in the north on both sides of the Jumna and ceded parts on the west coast in the Peninsula, handed over Delhi and custody of the Mughal Emperor, dismissed all French officers from his service, and accepted at his own cost a large English force stationed near his frontier. The Raja of Nagpur returned Berar to the Nizam and surrendered the province of Cuttack on the Bay of Bengal. General Lake then attacked Jaswant Rao Holkar who eventually ran away to the Punjab.

Lord Wellesley's policy now was to rearrange the political map of parts of India in which the English had established supremacy. The objective was to contain the native rulers in defined boundaries on terms that the English would dictate. This process was carried on by Lord Hastings (1813-1823) and consummated by Lord Dalhousie (1848-1856). Lord Wellesley's general plan for settlement, except for Sindh and Punjab, was followed for the next 40 years and beyond. The English dominion stretched in a broad unbroken belt from the Himalayas downward to the Bay of Bengal and the southern-most district of Madras; the

cessions obtained on the west coast gave command of the whole Indian littoral. The English Company assumed protection of Shah Alam II and his court at Delhi. The Emperor was now a pensioner of the English with a royal rank. In 1804, Lord Wellesley sent a long dispatch to the Court of Directors of the Company in England:

> A general bond of connection is now established between the British government and the principal states of India, on principles which render it the interest of every state to maintain its alliance with the British Government, which preclude the inordinate aggrandisement of any one of these states by usurpation of the rights and possessions of others, and which secure to every state the unmolested exercise of its separate authority within the limits of its established dominion, under the general protection of the British power.

The three Presidencies of the English Company comprised (1) Madras with part of Mysore, Tanjore, ceded parts of Hyderabad and whole of Carnatic, (2) Bombay with valuable districts of Gujarat and strong dominance on the two Maratha capitals, Poona and Baroda, and (3) Calcutta, extending from the Bay of Bengal to the Himalayas up to the frontier of Punjab. The only territories outside the paramount influence of the English were Punjab under the Sikhs, Sindh under the Amirs and the mountains of Nepal. The seven years of Lord Wellesley were perhaps the most critical in building the English dominion in India. His two predecessors, Lord Cornwallis and Sir John Shore, were far more circumspect and reticent. Wellesley adopted an aggressive posture: he changed the nominal equality of Indian rulers with the English to supremacy of the latter. The House of Commons in London recognised handsomely the achievements of Lord Wellesley. Its resolution said that, among other things, 'he has established on a basis of permanent security the tranquillity and prosperity of the British Empire in India.'

While the English Company's agents in India were busy in subduing indigenous rulers and acquiring territory, the Court of Directors in London were unhappy with the increased debt of the Company. Lord Wellesley was understandably angry at this expression. In 1805, Lord Cornwallis returned and slowed down the whole movement that Wellesley had put in place. Cornwallis found an empty treasury in Calcutta, rising debt, and exports arrested because of enhanced demand

for money to conduct military operations. The new Governor-General did not like the subsidiary treaties since they entangled the Company in responsibility to defend and prop up impotent or unruly princes. He thought that the English protectorate should not go beyond the limits of its possessions. In fact, Cornwallis tried to create the impression that the English government did not contemplate controlling every state in India. But he died within three months of his arrival. In the next decade, the English government tried his experiment of isolation. Sir George Barlow, who followed Cornwallis, adopted his predecessor's policy: he even abandoned the subsidiary alliance with Sindhia; left minor principalities adjacent to Maratha possessions to their fate; and designed to keep out of the quarrels of neighbours. He maintained the alliances with Hyderabad and Poona in the south.

In 1807, Lord Minto replaced George Barlow as Governor-General, but a crisis next door in Persia confronted him right away. The Persian Shah had suffered heavy losses in a war with Russia in 1804-1805 and sought help from Napoleon and the English Company in Calcutta. The Company gave no encouragement, but the French, who were themselves involved in a desperate war against Russia, offered an offensive treaty to Persia against their common enemy (Russia). Napoleon actually intended to make a triple alliance, France, Persia and Turkey, to open a road to India. But in 1807 France and Russia became allies and Napoleon turned to Tsar Alexander for an alliance against the English in India. Russians showed little interest in the proposed alliance. Napoleon sent a strong mission to Persia which startled the English in London and India. Lord Minto sent missions to the rulers of states on and beyond the north-western borders, Ranjit Singh in Lahore, Amir of Afghanistan, Amirs of Sindh, and Shah of Persia. The Shah turned to the English again, given the alliance between France and Russia. The English settled with Persia to subsidise in the event of unprovoked aggression. The treaties with Punjab, Afghanistan and Sindh were dropped because the tide of events began to turn in Europe. Napoleon waged war again on Russia now aligned with the English in a grand coalition that finally defeated Napoleon. The English concern in India was thus greatly relieved. There followed a period of 14 years (1812-1826) without anxiety in India. When Russia attacked Persia in 1826 and its likely movement

eastward revived the English anxiety in 1828. In the meantime, Lord Minto concluded a treaty with Ranjit Singh in 1809 to protect the territory south of the Sutlej River, while Ranjit Singh annexed Kashmir, and the Sikhs and English lived in peace for the next 40 years.

The English had established undisputed supremacy in India by the beginning of nineteenth century. At the same time, they started to move their attention to the land route into India in the north-west that a hostile European rival could use. On the seas, English naval supremacy was well established: they occupied the Cape of Good Hope in 1806 and Lord Minto's expedition of 1810 ejected the French from Java and General John Abercromby captured Mauritius. By 1815, England had secured undisturbed possession of the Cape, Ceylon and Mauritius; it had disarmed all foreign settlements on the Indian Seaboard; and no state in India could challenge its power. Six Indian principalities were under English suzerainty and protection: Mysore and Travancore in the south, Baroda, Poona and Hyderabad in western and central India, and Awadh with many minor chieftaincies in the north and north-west. The only principalities, though surrounded by English possessions, outside the circle of English dominion were of three Marathas: Sindhia in Gwalior, Holkar in Indore, and Bhonsle in Nagpur. The ruling house of Gaekwad at Baroda was under English protection. Beyond the English frontier were the Gurkhas in Nepal, Ranjit Singh in the Punjab, and Talpur amirs in Sindh. The stage was now set for the English in India to organise new administration in the possessed territories during this tranquil period.

Lord Minto left India in 1813 and made over to Lord Hastings. At the same time, the English Crown renewed the Company charter with two conditions: abolishing Company's monopoly on trade in India and allowing Christian missionaries to come to India. It was at a time when a new menace was on the rise in the form of pindaris. Pindaris were unattached plunderers who engaged in widespread pillage, ransomed territories of the Nizam and the peshwa and threatened the English province of Bihar. Many of the pindaris were disbanded freelancers looking for means to support themselves by plunder. Central India had become their home and their only aim was general rapine. No indigenous power was strong enough to suppress them and some even sup-

ported them. The marauding bands had multiplied and prospered. They were mounted robbers, led by men like Chitu, and secretly encouraged by the Maratha rulers in Poona, Nagpur and Gwalior. Pindaris generally spared the Maratha districts but harried the English and Nizam territories. They had even penetrated into Madras Presidency and plundered on the frontiers of Bengal.

Lord Hastings turned his attention to the pindari menace. Amir Khan, an Afghan, was one of them, living upon Rajputana with an army of 30,000 men. He was besieging Jaipur state whose ruler asked the English for help against him. Lord Hastings entered into a treaty with Jaipur for protection and a subsidiary treaty with the Bhonsle Raja of Nagpur. At the same time, the Raja of Nagpur and the peshwa in Poona corresponded in secret against the English, taking advantage of the English engagement against the Gurkhas in Nepal. Eventually in 1817, the English subdued the peshwa who signed a treaty under which he ceded more territory and accepted an increased subsidiary force. Amir Khan was persuaded or intimidated to settle down in Tonk as his state in Rajputana. By 1818, the English Company had achieved significant changes. It had dislodged the peshwa from his territory and exiled him from Poona, extinguishing his rulership over the Marathas. The state of Satara was given to the descendents of Shivaji. The Bhonsle state of Nagpur had to cede districts and its army placed under the English control. Sindhia, Holkar and Bhonsle were now bound to keep peace in India. The tributes from the lesser Maratha states were fixed and payments to be made through the English treasury. The Rajputana states, long spoiled and ransomed by the Marathas and Amir Khan, were brought under English protection. Finally, pindaris were dispersed and exterminated. From now on, every state in India, except Sindh and Punjab, had to hand over its foreign relations to the English, submit its disputes to English arbitration, and seek advice from the English on their internal affairs. An English Resident was appointed at each court.

The English Company had come a long way: in 1765, its land revenue from Bengal amounted to three million pounds to subsidise trade and keep up its dividend in London whereas in 1818 the Indian revenue was around twenty-two million pounds to cover trade deficits with India and China. A completely new phase began with the arrival of Lord Bentinck

as Governor-General in 1833. For one thing, the Company received a new Charter for 20 years under which it lost its right to trade in India and its monopoly on trade with China. The Company became a special agency of the British government to rule on its behalf a vast Asian dependency (India): possession of India held in trust for the Crown. The English Crown became virtual ruler of India if not in name. Legislative powers were centralised—a Law Commission was established to codify the laws—in which the Governor-General and Council in Calcutta were given legislative powers: this was the first small step to legislative development and a parliamentary system in India. Lord Bentinck introduced several reforms anglicising administration and much else: he imposed a vision of westernised India. He also entered into a commercial treaty with Ranjit Singh and a convention with the Amirs of Sindh to navigate on the Indus for commercial purposes. But there were ominous developments on the border with Afghanistan and Persia. In 1828, the English had withdrawn their support to Persia and then Russia subdued Persia and annexed some of its north-western districts.

In 1838, Persia wanted to recover Herat from Afghanistan, where Amir Dost Muhammad Khan had replaced Shah Shuja who was a refugee in India. Shah Shuja asked the Sikhs and the English to support him to regain his throne in Kabul. The English wanted to maintain Afghanistan as an independent buffer, so they attacked Persia in the south and the Shah withdrew from Herat. The English concluded a tripartite treaty with Ranjit Singh and Shah Shuja to put Shuja on the throne in Kabul by force of arms. Lord Auckland sent an army through Sindh and the Baloch passes to Qandahar to expel Dost Muhammad and restore Shah Shuja. The English army in Afghanistan was able to achieve its aim with relative ease; it stayed around Qandahar and Kabul for almost two years. The presence of English troops made the Afghans hostile to both the new Amir (Shah Shuja) and the English. Meanwhile Dost Muhammad was in the north and perhaps being encouraged by Russians. In 1841, a general insurrection, led by powerful clan chiefs, developed in Kabul against Shah Shuja. The English force had to make a hasty retreat during which it was wiped out between Kabul and Jalalabad in the winter of 1841.

It is important to add that Lord Auckland brought the territory of the Amirs of Sindh under English control in 1839 as a stepping stone for operations in south Afghanistan. The port of Karachi was seized and the Indus thrown open to English commerce. All this was a temporary arrangement under the treaty. In 1842, Lord Ellenborough replaced Lord Auckland and the new Governor-General was reluctant to give up the position in Sindh. He took advantage of the delay in payment of tribute by the Amirs and pressed for cession of territory. Sir Charles Napier was sent as the demander: in a memorandum to Lord Ellenborough he made the case for use of force for cession of territory as a 'humane' act. The Governor-General empowered Napier to press upon the Amirs of Sindh a new treaty exchanging tribute for territory. The Amirs signed the new treaty, but then attacked the English Residency. Napier found the excuse for aggression, battled the Amirs and eventually defeated them at Miani in early 1843. The English deposed the Amirs, annexed the lower Indus Valley, and took possession of Karachi and the estuary of the Indus. Earlier Lord Ellenborough ordered withdrawal of all English troops from Qandahar and Jalalabad. Dost Muhammad was restored in Kabul and the English abandoned at least temporarily the idea to keep Afghanistan in its sphere of influence.

Meanwhile the Sikh kingdom of Punjab started to disintegrate. It is worth remembering that originally the Sikh dominion was established as a religious brotherhood in revolt against the Mughals. It was, however, transformed into a dynastic state by Ranjit Singh in the early nineteenth century and he ruled the dominion until his death in 1839. Soon his dominion fell into violent contests for territory among several contending claimants. One chief after the other was overthrown and assassinated. None of Ranjit Singh's sons was talented enough to hold on to power. His authentic son, Kharak Singh, died in 1840 and his other son, Sher Singh, was soon murdered along with his son and his prime minister. Those who followed him were removed by assassination in the internecine strife. The Sikh state was in the process of dissolution, while the widow of Ranjit Singh and her infant son were recognised nominally. Their advisers encouraged the Sikh army to march across the Sutlej against the English. On the other side, the English were bringing troops

as reinforcement. The Sikh army moved across the Sutlej against the terms of the treaty that Ranjit Singh had signed with the English.

The English took the breach as an act of war and their troops met the Sikh army toward the end of 1845. In fierce battles, costly to both sides, the English troops managed to drive the Sikhs across the Sutlej. Lord Hardinge, who had replaced Lord Ellenborough as Governor-General in 1844, occupied Lahore in early 1846, placed the infant son of Ranjit Singh on the throne under English tutelage. The Sikh army was reduced; some territories were ceded; and for two years Punjab was administered under the general protection of the English. However, the new arrangement did not bring peace outside Lahore. In 1848, after two English officers were murdered in Multan, there was a general uprising of the old khalsa army against the English. In the meantime, Lord Dalhousie replaced Lord Hardinge as Governor-General in 1848. In early 1849, the English lost a large number of their troops at Chilianwalla, but soon they managed to defeat the Sikh army at Gujarat. The English were now the undisputed masters of the Punjab. Lord Dalhousie proclaimed annexation of Punjab in 1849. The last native kingdom was thus absorbed under English sovereignty: the English standard was now flying at Peshawar. Their dominion in India had its frontier across the Indus in the foothills of Afghanistan. In passing, Lord Dalhousie annexed Burma in 1852 after nearly 35 years of on and off wars in the region.

III. The 'Great Revolt' of 1857 and Its Aftermath

After his arrival in India, Lord Dalhousie addressed several issues and made final settlements in India. First, he applied to native states the principle of 'lapse' in case of adopted heirs in the absence of natural heirs unless strong reasons existed. This was euthanasia by lapse. However, Dalhousie did not completely refuse to accept succession by adoption, but it had to be accepted and confirmed by the English. Following the principle of lapse, Lord Dalhousie absorbed three native states: the

state of Satara, ruled by the descendents of Shivaji since 1818, was absorbed in 1848; Jhansi followed in 1853; and then Nagpur in 1854. In early 1856, the state of Awadh was annexed on grounds of misgovernment or maladministration. The Nawab of Awadh (Wajid Ali Shah) had paid no attention to a treaty with Lord Wellesley to reform the state administration and follow the advice of Company officers.

Soon after the annexation of Awadh in early 1856, Lord Dalhousie left India and Lord Canning (1856-1860) took over as the new Governor-General. Some historians have labelled Lord Canning as 'father of modern India' for his contribution to the building of roads, railways, telegraph, and postal service, and introducing primary education. He also suspended the doctrine of lapse under which his predecessor annexed several native states into the English dominion. At his departure, the British Empire in India was at its zenith of peace, power and prosperity. The surface calm had hidden cankers in it: several undercurrents were in operation for some time that need examining in some detail. Many changes took place in India after the removal of the Maratha peshwa at Poona in 1818 to the revolt of 1857.

India was subjected to many changes (some radical) to draw it closer to the Western (English) norms and forms: there was growing confidence in the imperial project of civilisation as English destiny. The colonial state withdrew from its neutrality to Hinduism and Islam and promoted evangelical Christianity and utilitarian rationality. Social and educational reforms were undertaken to reflect the new posture. Some Hindus in Bengal responded with enthusiasm as they saw in it their renaissance, but most others responded quite negatively or not at all. Revivalist and fundamentalist currents in Hinduism and Islam became more prevalent and emphasis on sectarianism increased. The caste and hierarchies did not dissolve but somewhat enhanced. Paradoxically the Indian society, to which Bentinck and Macaulay were sermonising, became more and not less 'oriental and backward'. The assault of Western modernity was so fierce that resistance and rejection were widespread to defend the tenaciously held traditions. But many of the so-called traditions were a construct of accommodation and adaptation to the colonial form of structures; some were simply imposed on the Indian society by the economic and social conditions created by colonial rulers and their

functionaries. An equally important change took place in the attitudes of the English towards Indians, shifting from outwardly neutral even respectful to outright denigration of everything Indian.

India became a sub-ordinate colony under the dominance of the metropolitan and industrial England: its cultural institutions were disempowered and fixed in traditional forms and its civil society subjected to the suzerainty of a despotic military state. The Indian economy was opened up for competition and the process of de-industrialisation and de-urbanisation of the hinterland, excepting Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, contributed to a prolonged economic recession in the second quarter of nineteenth century. Resumption of lands from jagirs and enhanced rates of revenue extraction, with gradual exclusion of Indians from the administration, alienated many groups dependent on land for living and status.

The unprecedented armed revolt ('Great Revolt') in parts of central and northern India in 1857 almost effectively crippled the British rule until the spring of 1858 when order was restored by the imperial armies. The revolt and the response to it were extraordinary in violence and cruelty inflicted on both sides. The rebels indulged in much destruction of property and infrastructure and massacre of Europeans; the counter-measures included public executions, blowing up of rebels (actual and suspected) from canons, indiscriminate burning of villages and killing of innocent people, and destruction of (urban) centres of rebellion. Parts of the Mughal capital (Delhi) were demolished and their residents, especially Muslims, were killed or forced to flee and not allowed to return for over a year. In letters to friends, Asad Ullah Khan Ghalib, the much celebrated Persian and Urdu poet, has left his memorable lament about Delhi whose residents disappeared in thousands (killed or exiled) and mohallahs (neighbourhoods) ravaged: 'The dust of Delhi thirsts for Muslim blood.' Lord Canning appealed to his troops and their leaders to curb their incited emotions for revenge and retribution without justice, but most of it fell on deaf ears. On the contrary, many Europeans inside his government and outside much ridiculed and even maligned him. The revolt ended the rule of the English Company and after pacification the English Crown (Queen Victoria) took over the affairs of India by an act of Parliament in 1858.

The revolt of 1857 was not a mere mutiny by Indian sepoys of the Bengal army but a desperate reaction of different sections of the society who felt affected adversely by various policies and actions of successive officers of the English Company in India for decades. It is fair to suggest that the general discontent in parts of the country would not have burst into a 'devouring flame' if the Bengal army had remained loyal to the Company and its officers. The attitude of sepoys toward their European officers and the Company had transformed from loyalty to hostility for several reasons. The Company had raised a standing army, comprising high-caste recruits (mostly from Awadh and North-West Provinces) whose caste rules regarding diet and travel abroad the army administration had respected from the times of Warren Hastings to the 1820s. The army reforms in the 1820s and 1830s concentrated on a more universalised military culture, sub-ordination to native officers and increased distance from European officers, tighter control of pecuniary benefits and caste privileges, numerous prolonged foreign (Burma and Afghanistan) engagements, and annexation of native states, Awadh in particular. Sepoy mutinies on small scale were not unknown, but their main reasons were grievances regarding benefits and allowances and foreign engagements (1806, 1832, 1844, 1849, 1850, and 1852). There was also a general suspicion about the westernising posture adopted by the Company since the 1820s and spread of missionary activity for the Christian religion. England's foreign engagements in wars outside India probably created an impression on the sepoys that the safety of the English empire in India depended on them. Besides, stationary armies can become ungovernable if their command and discipline sag a bit. The infamous Enfield rifle, its cartridges greased with animal fat, was the spark that lit the fire of discontent fanned among the sepoys and other Indians by some native leaders like Nana Sahib, Rani of Jhansi, partisans (rural and urban elite) of the Nawab of Awadh, and some prominent descendents of the extinguished Rohila chiefs.

The political causes of the revolt of 1857 had their origin in the annexation of native states, using the doctrine of lapse or escheat and misrule. For one thing, the resumption of jagirs by Lord Bentinck, while increased the Company revenue, had reduced many dispossessed landlords to state of penury. Then in Awadh, Lord Dalhousie deposed Nawab

Wajid Ali Shah, exiled him to Calcutta and annexed the state in 1856. Annexation of Awadh—the western part (Rohilkhand) was annexed in 1801—led to unemployment of many thousands of soldiers and court retainers, expropriation of jagirdars and taluqdars, and transfer of about ten million pounds in revenue. Awadh became a hotbed of discontent because the nawab's officers, soldiers and receivers of stipends were deprived of their pensions, salaries, incomes, and status. Many descendents of the Rohila sardars extinguished by the joint Anglo-Awadh forces in 1774 harboured deep grievances against the English Company. Then there were other disgruntled native rulers, among them the Rani of Jhansi, whose estates were transferred to the Company under the doctrine of lapse between 1846 and 1856. Similarly, Nana Sahib, the adopted son of the last peshwa Baji Rao II, in Kanpur was refused the title and failed to get the pension his father was receiving. The wife (Hazrat Mahal) and son (Birjis Qadr) of the exiled Nawab of Awadh (Wajid Ali Shah) and supporters of Firoz Shah, one of the Mughal princes, were also in the forefront of resistance and rebellion, joining hands with other prominent rebels.

There were rural grudges as well related to the high level of land tax and the predatory role of merchants and moneylenders in the alienation of land due to arrears and debt. A large section of the Hindu and Muslim population was alarmed by the rapid spread of Western ideas and practices, including inventions like the railways and telegraph, spread of English education, prohibition of certain native customs and traditions, and aggressive behaviour of some Christian missionaries. Some of the orthodox Hindus and Muslims (Wahabis in particular) expressed hostility and showed open defiance to much of what they regarded as cultural aggression. Rumour and suspicion played a catalytic role. The introduction of English to replace Persian in 1833 and the judicial reforms had adverse economic and social effects on the salaried class of Hindus (kayasths) and Muslims. The Muslim discontent was brewing probably right from the early days of the Company as their power and status began to slide in India.

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, a loyal English servant, wrote a long memorandum in which he identified five major reasons for the revolt of 1857.

- Apprehension among Hindus and Muslims due to proliferation of missionary activities through various guises, direct attacks on Islam and Hinduism through speeches and lectures, changes in school curricula replacing languages and religions by English and secular subjects.
- The Company enacted laws, regulations and procedures not in harmony with the indigenous mores and customs. For example, the Religious Disabilities Act XXI under which no convert to Islam and Hinduism could inherit his parents' estate but it did not apply to a Christian convert; Hindu Widows Remarriage Act XV; Act VI of 1819 for resumption of rent-free lands of individuals and institutions; Acts affecting succession rights of adopted sons; and the Marriage Age Act.
- The English indifference and insensitivity to Indian public opinion: communication between the government and the governed was non-existent. The government was impervious to the fear of religious interference and economic loss suffered by various groups due to Acts and regulations about the sale of land to cover arrears of land revenue and resumption of jagirs of individuals and institutions.
- There was mismanagement of the army reflected by changes in the balance between Indians and Europeans, insensitive and even humiliating treatment of sepoys by English officers, imposition of secularised rules and regulations, and retrenchment and reduction in privileges and allowances.
- Indian participation in the government was not there as reflected by the absence of Hindus and Muslims from the Legislative Council and high administration. Some of the administrative reforms reduced the services of local officers.

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan wrote the memorandum in 1859, translated into English in 1873, and sent many copies to England though not circulated in India. In terms of its lasting effects, perhaps it resulted in the Indian Councils Act of 1861, allowing three Indians to join the 18-member Legislative Council and inspired men like Allen Octavian Hume, a retired civil servant, to establish the All India National Congress in 1885.

The English were able to suppress the revolt of 1857 in less than a year with ruthless and indiscriminate use of force and violence. The

revolt failed for several reasons. The first reason was that Indians were not united: the feeling of dislike of the English did not translate into common action. The insurgents did not or could not secure general support of the civilian population in most parts of India also because of the confusion and disorder that followed the revolt involving much distress, suffering and loss. The unrestrained violence and destruction perpetrated by the rebels was not agreeable to many Indians. The English were able to secure the loyalty of a majority of the feudatory chiefs, including much valuable assistance from powerful men in Jodhpur, Gwalior and Hyderabad and the Sikhs in the Punjab. Jang Bahadur of Nepal provided help and Amir Dost Muhammad Khan in Afghanistan stayed neutral. While several influential descendents of the Rohila sardars in Bijnor, Meerut, Bareilly, Moradabad, and Shahjahanpur were in the forefront of the revolt, the Rohila Nawab of Rampur assisted the English with zeal for which the English administration rewarded him handsomely with titles and territory.

Second, the revolt was fragmented and unco-ordinated: leaders of the insurgents, unlike the English, were not good or efficient; they were unable to clearly define the goal or establish a coherent strategy. The decrepit and old Mughal Emperor, Bahadur Shah Zafar, confined to the Red Fort in Delhi, carried no weight even as a legitimate symbol of united India.

Finally, the organisation, equipment and weapons of the insurgents were far inferior to that of the English. Most of the insurgents did not understand, even dreaded, the contemporary technology that the English possessed and utilised to their advantage such as the telegraph and postal communication.

The revolt of 1857 was in many ways an important watershed in Indian history. For one thing, it ended the rule of the English Company in India. The British monarch became the sovereign of India; the British government appointed a Secretary of State for India to be a member of the Cabinet. In November 1858, Queen Victoria—who assumed the title of Empress of India in 1876—issued a proclamation regarding India. She promised religious toleration, proposed to govern Indians according to their customs and traditions; confirmed treaties and engagements with the Indian princes; disclaimed desire for expansion of

English territorial possessions in India through encroachment; granted general amnesty except to those responsible for murder of English subjects; and declared that all irrespective of creed or race may be freely and impartially admitted to offices to serve the imperial government according to their talents, abilities and education. The proclamation created a well-structured imperial hierarchy.

Second, at the end of the revolt, the phantom of a Mughal Emperor and his court vanished completely from India. He was dethroned and dispatched to Burma, some of his princes and prominent courtiers were killed and others disappeared into obscurity. The last pretender (Nana Sahib) to the honours of peshwa disappeared from Kanpur.

Third, the revolt and its end created much ill feeling and hatred between the English and Indians, especially Muslims: it led to a more defined difference between the English and Indians, the former being superior and the latter as their inferior subjects. This division would become a basis for the rise of extreme politics in India. The English also tried to differentiate between Hindus and Muslims in assigning the blame: Hindus were blamed not as much as Muslims who were made the main target of revenge and retribution.

Fourth, the army in India was thoroughly re-organised: numbers of Europeans were increased and some services (artillery) were handed over exclusively to English officers and soldiers.

Fifth, the English government adopted a new attitude towards the native (princely) states: they were 'parts of a single charge' and had to recognise the paramountcy of the English Crown.

By 1860, the English had calmed India and a compact and largely peaceful rule followed that lasted until the partition and independence of India in 1947. Lord Canning conveyed assurances to all princes that their rulership would continue and succession, including by adoption according to their own customs, was recognised and confirmed. By the first decade of twentieth century the princely states, about 675 of them if not more, had a population of 66 million (one-fifth of the population of India) and occupied an area of one million square kilometres. When Lord Canning, first Viceroy of India, departed from Calcutta in 1862, he left a very different government organisation for his successor than what was given to him by Lord Dalhousie in 1856.

The only restless area was on the north-west frontier: the Afghan (Pathan) tribes, Mohmands, Afridis, Khattaks, were almost a constant irritant to the English rulers even in twentieth century. By 1876 a treaty with the Khan of Kalat and lesser chiefs settled the area of Balochistan in peace. The area beyond the frontier, Afghanistan, was in turmoil and Russians were expanding their dominion in Central Asia: after conquering the khanate of Khiva they were at the border of Afghanistan. The Russian Emperor settled his frontier with Afghanistan in 1873. However, in 1878 a war was precipitated with Afghanistan from events inside Afghanistan and misunderstandings. Amir Sher Ali had emerged as the king of Afghanistan in 1868 after a prolonged period of civil wars. He met with Lord Mayo (1869-1872) at Ambala in 1869, but the Governor-General could not grant a treaty with subsidy. In 1873, Lord Northbrook (1872-1876) offered to Sher Ali a guarantee against foreign aggression, but the English government in London refused this sanction. This left Sher Ali with much resentment.

By 1876, the English government realised the need to enter into an agreement with Sher Ali. Lord Lytton (1876-1880) proposed a mission to Afghanistan, but the Amir reacted unfavourably to this overture. In 1877, Russia went to war against Turkey and in 1878 the English government prepared for armed intervention by sending Indian troops to Malta. The Russians moved their armies closer to the border with Afghanistan and sent an envoy to Kabul to draw up a treaty with the Amir. Lord Lytton demanded immediate admission of his envoy in the Afghan capital, but the envoy was turned back from the outpost. The Amir was given an ultimatum to respond by a fixed date, but no reply came. The British declared war on him towards the end of 1878.

The English troops, marching through Quetta, arrived in Qandahar, occupied the city, and threatened Kabul from Kuram and Jalalabad as well. The Amir took refuge in the north and sought help from Russia. After the Treaty of Berlin was concluded, Russia lost interest on this frontier and advised the Amir to make peace with the English. Sher Ali died in 1879. His son Yaqub Khan offered peace to the English and wanted to be recognised as the new Amir. After negotiations, a treaty was concluded by which the Amir ceded some of his territory and agreed to receive an English envoy in Kabul. But Afghanistan was in

turmoil after the death of Sher Ali. Some Afghans killed the English envoy so the war was renewed: Kabul was captured and Qandahar remained occupied. The problem was to find a ruler who could pacify the Afghans and enjoy their trust. Luckily, there appeared Abdul Rahman, nephew of Sher Ali's predecessor, who had been a refugee in Central Asia throughout the period of Sher Ali's rule. Lord Lytton made overtures to Abdul Rahman and invited him to the English headquarters in Kabul to discuss the terms of his accession to the throne. In 1880, Lord Lytton resigned and Lord Ripon (1880-1884) replaced him as Governor-General who proclaimed Abdul Rahman as the new Amir with support of money, etc.

When the English troops started to return to India, the news came that Ayub Khan, the younger son of Sher Ali, had moved with an army from Herat to Qandahar, but he was defeated. The English troops withdrew from Kabul and Qandahar, leaving Afghanistan in the hands of Amir Abdul Rahman. Ayub Khan returned but Abdul Rahman drove him out of the country. In 1881, the new Amir rapidly consolidated his power and, with skill and ruthlessness, established a strong independent kingdom. The Afghan frontiers with Russia in Central Asia and with the English in India were defined and agreed in 1892. By 1897, the English managed to extend their sphere of influence to the borders of the Chinese empire in Kashghar, including the state of Chitral on the Indian side.

10

British Rule in India II: Consolidation

Indian nationalism owes its origin to the British rule in India: India never existed as a political entity earlier in its history. The seeds of Indian awakening and consciousness were planted by the English imperial system, its policies and actions during its long reign. I should now turn to an account of those changes in policies and actions right from the days when the English Company acquired effective control of Bengal after defeating the Nawab and his forces. It is fair to say that the British rule in India transformed its polity, economy and society from the medieval to modern age. Had India not been colonised by the English would it have made this transformation autonomously? Some have argued vociferously that India would have been far better off had it been left alone by European imperialists. I am sceptical, but I better leave this thorny issue for others to contemplate and conjecture.

It can be argued that for several years the English Company functioned in a way in which it recognised the authority of the Mughal emperor, struck coins in his name, used Persian as the official language and administered Hindu and Muslim laws in the courts. The anglicisation of the system progressed gradually but surely as the circumstances allowed or thought necessary. Initially the Company officers worked

within the system they received in Bengal, decayed though it may have been, and there was an urge to know about Indian culture and tradition. Institutions like the Calcutta Madrassa (1781), the Asiatic Society of Bengal (1784) and the Sanskrit College at Benares (1792) were established to study Indian languages and scriptures to eventually use this knowledge to serve the colonial state. Warren Hastings was a great promoter of the idea that the conquered people should be ruled by their own laws. It was with this vision that Fort William College was established in 1800 to train Company's servants in Indian languages and tradition. One of its objectives was to create sympathy and understanding on both sides. However, Lord Cornwallis abandoned this approach to governing people in India; he went for anglicisation of the administration based on principles practised in England. Lord Wellesley supported these moves. The aim was to move away from the 'despotic' tradition of Indian rulers and ensuring separation of powers between the executive and judiciary. The role of the state would be basically to maintain order for protection of individual rights and private property.

I. Evolution of Colonial Administration

The process of anglicisation and the colonial administration under Cornwallis and Wellesley reflected the dominant (conservative) ideology of the time. But two distinct trends, not entirely unrelated, gradually emerged in the Company's administration in India. One of these was the Cornwallis system in Bengal which emphasised the rule of law and private property rights to liberate individual enterprise from the fetters of custom and tradition. On the other side, there were Company officers like Thomas Munro in Madras, with followers like Mountstuart Elphinstone, John Malcolm and Charles Metcalfe, who thought it necessary to introduce suitable reforms in the Indian context (traditions and customs). Therefore, contrary to the zamindari system that Cornwallis created in Bengal under the Permanent Settlement, Munro introduced the ryotwari system in Madras to preserve the Indian village communities. Both land systems were based on the principles of centralised sovereignty, legally protected right of private property and

aimed at getting the most revenue. In northern and north-western parts of India, a third system of revenue settlement, called the mahalwari system, evolved by trial and error. In the mahalwari system, the assessment of village communities was done in a defined area (mahal) and revenue was collected either directly from individual small owners or through taluqdars. By the mid-nineteenth century, the Company's administration had created private property in land and conferred that right on three groups: zamindars (Permanent Settlement), ryots or peasant-proprietors (ryotwari Settlement), and with the village community (mahalwari Settlement). With the passage of time and experience, these settlements were refined or modified in different parts of the country. But the basic purpose of these settlements remained unchanged: maximise the revenue yield, foster private property, encourage agriculture, and expand markets.

1. Civil Administration

As the British Empire in India grew so did the need to control its resources through an efficient but authoritarian administrative system. Initially in Bengal, after the grant of diwani to the Company in 1765, a dual system stayed in place for some time, in which the Company assessed and collected revenue and the Nawab maintained the Mughal administrative system, including civil and criminal justice. But when Warren Hastings took over charge in 1772, he decided to take full control of the justice system to assert Company's sovereignty. In the new system, each district was to have two courts, a civil court (diwani adalat) and a criminal court (faujdari adalat). The civil courts were to be presided over by European Collectors, assisted by maulvis and pundits to interpret their customary laws. The criminal courts were to be under a qazi or mufti but supervised by the Collector. Later both Hindu and Muslim laws were codified to avoid confusion. The appeal court in Calcutta was to be presided over by the Company President and two Council members.

Lord Cornwallis changed the system of both civil and criminal courts: a hierarchy of civil courts was established, rising from the district and city to four provincial courts and an appellate court (sadar diwani adalat) in Calcutta. Similarly, criminal courts (courts of circuit)

were established with an appellate court (sadar nizamat adalat) under the supervision of Governor-General. The jurisdiction of these courts did not extend to English subjects: only the Supreme Court established in 1774 had the jurisdiction over them, though in practice it was involved in other cases as well. The judges in all courts were to be Europeans. Lord Cornwallis also divested the Indians of any real authority or responsibility in the revenue and judicial administration. In the 1830s, a Law Commission appointed under Lord Macaulay codified the laws for a uniform judicial administration and civil authority throughout India. It was, however, implemented after the revolt of 1857. By the early 1860s, three uniform codes, civil procedure, penal code, and criminal procedure, were in place for India under the English rule. If there was greater movement towards equality in the civil justice system, racial privilege for rulers (English subjects) in various forms remained in place in criminal courts.

The civil bureaucracy ran the Indian empire with army's help and implemented policies framed in England. Given the problems of communication between India and England, the bureaucracy enjoyed considerable discretion and initiative. Initially it was a patronage bureaucracy since members of the Court of Directors nominated the recruits. The system was quite inefficient and corrupt and it excluded Indians from any position with annual salary of 500 pounds or more. To improve the quality of bureaucracy, Lord Wellesley required all civil servants to go through three-year training at Fort William College before their posting. The Court of Directors did not like this programme and closed the College in 1802; it would continue only as a language school. In its place, the Company established the East India College in England in 1805. All nominated candidates were required to be trained for two years in the College and pass a final examination for appointment in the civil service for India. The training was based on a generalist curriculum and practically nothing of relevance to India, but the college became an exclusive club for civil servants.

By the middle of 1830s, the responsibilities of District Collector had become quite complex, revenue collection, magisterial authority and some judicial powers. The Charter Act of 1833 introduced limited competition for recruitment among the nominated candidates, but

it did not improve the system. With the Charter Act of 1853, an open competition system was introduced: civil servants were to be recruited through examination open to all natural-born English subjects. The East India College was abolished and a Civil Service Commission recruited civil servants through annual examination and the selected candidates were to spend one-year probation also in England. In 1866, the age of competition was reduced from 22 to 21 years and successful candidates were required to complete a two-year course at an approved university in England. In 1869, three Indians, all English-educated Bengali Hindus, were successful, but in 1870 only one Indian out of seven passed the examination. Indians were accommodated in the administrative structure in subordinate positions (known as the Uncovenanted Civil Service as opposed to the Covenanted Civil Service reserved for Europeans). The introduction of open competition in 1853 opened the gates for Indians, but they could not participate in the examination since it was held in England. In response to petitions from Indians, a compromise was reached by which a Statutory Civil Service was introduced in 1870. This would allow Indians of ability and merit to occupy a few positions reserved for the European Covenanted civil servants. The Indians nominated for these positions were mainly from 'respectable' family background or belonging to 'princely' families. By 1879, the experiment of nominating the Statutory civil servants for Covenanted service positions was found to be a failure.

Lord Ripon realised the political importance of the rising middle class in India. His efforts to bring more Indians into the Covenanted Civil Service, by introducing simultaneous competitive examination in India, were thwarted by European civil servants and others in England. It is significant that while Indian National Congress in 1885 demanded that examination be held in India, Muslims, particularly Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, opposed this demand since they were far behind the Hindus and other non-Muslims in education. In 1886, a commission recommended a Provincial Civil Service, reducing the number of positions requiring Covenanted Service, and each province would have separate civil service. In 1892, following the recommendations of a Public Service Commission, the structure of civil service was finally reformed. The Covenanted Civil Service was labelled as the Indian Civil Service

(ICS) and the Uncovenanted Civil Service was labelled as Provincial Civil Service (PCS). The Statutory Civil Service was abolished and in its place PCS officers could fill through promotion the positions reserved for ICS. Indians could enter the ICS through open examination held in London but their representation remained low. Finally, the Government of India Act of 1919 provided for a separate but not simultaneous examination for the ICS to be held in India: the first examination was held in 1922. The composition of ICS officers changed significantly: up to World War I no more than five per cent of ICS officers were Indians; their proportion rose to 25 per cent at the beginning of World War II in 1939; and in 1947 over one-half of 939 ICS officers were Indians. While the gradual Indianisation of the ICS may have reduced its value as an apparatus for authoritarian imperial rule, the civil service has remained the 'steel-frame' of the state on the sub-continent even after independence in 1947.

2. Police and Army Administration

The Mughal police system was under the control of faujdars when the English Company took over the diwani of Bengal in 1765. Faujdars were in charge of their sarkars, kotwals were in charge of towns, and the village watchmen were paid and controlled by zamindars. But the Mughal system was in decay and the Company faced an acute law and order situation. In 1781, magistrates replaced the faujdars and the zamindars made subservient to magistrates for keeping order. But Lord Cornwallis took away the policing responsibility from zamindars and divided each district into thanas (units) of police jurisdiction. Each thana was placed under a darogha who was appointed and supervised by the magistrate. There emerged a patchwork of policing arrangements in different parts of India, but none of the experiments was quite successful in most areas. In Sindh, after its conquest, Sir Charles Napier developed a new system: he created a separate police department with its own officers, along the lines of the Royal Irish Constabulary, for colonial control. The Inspector General (IG) would supervise the provincial police system; each district would be in charge of a Superintendent of Police (SP) to be accountable to the IG and District Collector. The soldiers were Indian but officers

European. The Sindh model was extended to the Punjab after 1849, Bombay in 1853 and Madras in 1859.

In the face of the revolt of 1857, the colonial government found the existing policing system quite deficient, leading to the appointment of a Police Commission in 1860. The Commission proposed a new policing system for the empire that was incorporated in the Police Act of 1861. Each province was to have its own police, with the IG answerable to provincial government and the SP answerable to District Collector; the darogha became inspector or sub-inspector in charge of a thana. The Police Commission of 1902 provided for educated Indians to the position of officers though subservient to European officers. The hierarchical police system became a powerful apparatus for the colonial state to control crime, political resistance, and rebellion. There was, of course, always the army in case the situation went out of hand.

The Company's army evolved according to changes in the balance of power in India and growth of the empire. In eighteenth century, the Company depended on the support of Royal forces, especially the navy, but this arrangement was not altogether satisfactory because of conflicts between the Royal and Company officers. Therefore, the Company tried to raise a permanent army of its own in India. In the Mughal times, armies were raised primarily from among peasants through revenue contracts with trusted and powerful individuals: there was a thriving market for mercenaries in many parts of India. However, in eighteenth century the rulers of some of the successor states in the north raised trained peasant armies distanced from civilian populations. The French were the first in recruiting the sepoy army in the early part of eighteenth century. It was this model that the English Company followed to raise a permanent army against the French and native rulers. Robert Clive, after defeating the Nawab of Bengal, focused on raising the sepoy army trained and disciplined according to European standards and led by European officers. Some of the officers were drawn from the Royal army but a majority was nominated by the Court of Directors much like the Company civil servants. In the early nineteenth century, in addition to the increasing number of Company's own army, some twenty thousand men were sent to India to be paid by the Company for their service. As the Company's territory expanded beyond Bengal, the size of its

own army increased from 82,000 sepoys in 1794 to 154,000 in 1824 and 214,000 in 1856. The army claimed the largest share of Company budget in India for which it not only conquered territory but also protected the empire as it grew: military became the single most important instrument of coercion and monopoly of force.

The three Presidencies (Bengal, Madras and Bombay) maintained separate armies, although the Commander-in-Chief of Bengal army in Calcutta was nominally the head of all armies in India. It was only in 1895 that the Army of India came under the direct control of the Commander-in-Chief and divided into four territorial units (Bengal, Madras, Bombay, and Punjab) each under a Commander. Initially the three Presidency armies had locally recruited Indian troops, European units of the Company, and the all-European Royal regiments. In 1858, amalgamation of the Company and Royal units sparked the 'White Mutiny'. The Indian troops employed in the Madras and Bombay armies were far more heterogeneous than the high-caste army of Bengal.

In the early years, recruitment of sepoys focused on the stereotype upper-caste Brahmins and Rajputs and some Muslims from Bihar and Awadh. These recruits were given better salary, allowances, pensions, etc. than those offered by the native states and they received their salary on a regular basis. A policy of respecting caste, diet, travel, and other religious practices fostered discipline and loyalty. Lord Cornwallis, though a promoter of anglicisation, did not disturb the high-caste identity of the army. Any change affecting the privileges enjoyed by sepoys could mean rebellion and mutiny as it happened in the 1820s when their pecuniary benefits and social privileges were reduced. As the Company defeated more of the native rulers in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, new reservoirs of recruits became available from among the surplus (disbanded) soldiers. The Company also sought recruits from the hill tribes, Gurkhas in particular, in the north. They became perhaps the most disciplined and trusted soldiers. In the 1830s, Company's attempt to streamline the army, promoting a universal military culture, created much discontent among the sepoys which was expressed through mutinous incidents in the 1840s and may have prepared the ground for mutiny in the Bengal army in 1857.

After 1857, the Indian army was thoroughly re-organised. For one thing, the ratio of Europeans to Indians was raised significantly: in 1863, there were 65,000 Europeans and 140,000 Indians and this ratio was maintained until the outbreak of World War I. European troops controlled the artillery exclusively. Second, the Peel Commission recommended that the army should be composed of different castes and creed and generally well mixed in each regiment. Consequently, the regiments which had mutinied were disbanded, castes were more evenly mixed through regiments and recruitment shifted to the Punjab where the population remained loyal during the revolt of 1857. Third, by the 1880s, the colonial government started to follow the 'martial race' idea in its recruitment policy: certain groups such as the Jats (Sikhs in particular), Rajputs, Pathans (Afghans), and Gurkhas were thought to be warlike and loyal hence best suited for the army. The loyalty of these soldiers was fostered by symbols (uniforms and insignia) and reinforcement of their self-image of valour. These groups replaced the Hindustani and Telugu groups who had dominated the Bengal and Madras armies.

The army, even as its size and power increased, was kept under the civilian authority: in the very early period, the Commander-in-Chief was under the authority of Governor-General. But the relationship between the civilian and military authority at the top depended on personalities. In 1861, a Military Member, an army officer and through whom the government supervised the army, was added to the Executive Council of Governor-General. This created an anomalous situation in that the Commander-in-Chief was also an extraordinary member of the Executive Council and senior in rank to the Military Member. This arrangement may have suited the conditions when the three armies were separate, but with the integration of armies into one in 1895, there was need to redress the anomaly. In 1904, Commander-in-Chief Lord Kitchener proposed that on military matters he should be the sole adviser to the government. Lord Curzon, the Viceroy, opposed the proposal, but the Secretary of State for India in London agreed with Lord Kitchener. His decision was not at all agreeable to Lord Curzon so he resigned as Viceroy in 1905. In 1907, Commander-in-Chief became the sole authority

for military administration, but the financial authority stayed with the (civilian) Finance Member of the Executive Council.

The issue of balance between Indian and English soldiers remained quite critical since the army was the ultimate weapon to impose order in grave emergencies in India. There was strong opposition within the army to the idea of 'Indianisation' of the chain of command. Indian non-commissioned and junior-commissioned ranks were used as the filter between Indian soldiers and English officers. The training and appointment of Indian officers started hesitatingly and selectively only after the First Round Table Conference in 1931. The pressure of Indian political leaders and increasing demand for army service in the 1940s gave impetus to changing the balance between Indian and English officers in the army.

3. Indirect Rule of Native States

By the middle of eighteenth century, there were three kinds of native (princely) states in India. There were the 'antique' states (Vijayanagar, Rajput and Jat states) which had existed long before the arrival of Mughals in India. Second were the 'successor' states (Bengal, Awadh and Hyderabad) which were carved out of Mughal provinces by their governors or noblemen. Finally were the 'conquest' states (Maratha, Afghan and Sikh states and Mysore) which regional insurgents had established. The relations between the English Company and these states started to evolve from the time the Company got actively involved in their conflicts in southern India. However, the victory in Bengal was the watershed in defining the relations between the Company and native rulers. Essentially, it helped to develop the notion of 'indirect' rule based on the principle of paramountcy: the rulers enjoyed sub-ordinate sovereignty in that they were sovereign for all affairs inside their borders but the English had the exclusive sovereignty on affairs beyond the borders of these states. However, in practice the English Company and later the British Crown, depending on treaties and circumstances, could reduce native rulers to de facto puppets or confine them to their palace. The most important tool of indirect rule was the Company's agent, Resident, appointed at each native court. There were three phases in the evolution of the Residency system. In the first phase, the Company placed

its Residents at the courts of Bengal (Murshidabad), Awadh and Hyderabad. The second phase was of aggressive expansionism followed by Lord Wellesley and his policy of subsidiary alliances: the role of Residents changed from diplomacy to indirect rule. The third phase was during consolidation rather than expansion after the Afghan war: it was spearheaded by Lord Dalhousie's forward policy of annexation of native states (Awadh, Jhansi, Nagpur, Satara, and a number of smaller states in the Punjab).

The revolt of 1857, in which the policy of annexation played an important role, was the watershed in the evolution of relations between the English and native rulers. Lord Canning, following Queen Victoria's proclamation of 1858, reassured the rulers that their dynastic rule would continue. The princes became natural allies of the British Crown and their grooming and protection through indirect rule its responsibility. In some states, Residents exerted pressure for reforms and most rulers gave in, knowing well the paramount power of imperial authority. The imperial durbars and the table of gun salutes were used to express solidarity. At the same time, there was increasing encroachment of domestic sovereignty of native states that reached its height during Lord Curzon's tenure of seven years. While he recognised the princes as integral parts of the imperial system and gave them due honours, he brought them under greater control which quite a few princes likened to tyranny. Lord Mayo relaxed Curzon's policy, given the rising tide of Indian nationalism.

The treaties between the Indian princes and the Company and later the Crown defined the rights and responsibilities of native rulers. These treaties were not similar, though with time revised to achieve greater uniformity. All princes had to recognise the English as the suzerain power; relinquish their foreign relations of peace and war to the Company (or Crown); pay for imperial troops in their service; make military contribution in the defence of the empire; relinquish sovereignty over railway tracks; and share control over the communication system (post, telegraph, telephone, etc.). In return, the imperial government would provide protection from external threat and internal revolt and respect internal autonomy. But in practice the states were not very autonomous, given the presence of Residents and Political Agents who

exercised imperial supremacy over the princes. The relations were not always smooth because they depended on the Resident's personality and his perception of good government and likewise the prince and his perception of obligations. The colonial intrusion in the governance of princely states brought significant changes in the internal structure of power and relations between the ruler and his subjects disturbing social equilibrium. The pressure for 'modernisation' was a very powerful element in the process of social and political change and the imperial agent had a difficult task of protecting the ruler while inducing change. Two contending systems of values continually confronted the societies of princely states: defending customs and traditions favourable to certain groups against creating new traditions based on talent and merit favourable to other groups.

II. Social and Educational Reforms

In the early period, the Company maintained a neutral policy with regard to the social customs and traditions of Indians (Hinuds and Muslims). In fact, Warren Hastings showed much respect for the Indian culture reflected by his promotion of knowledge in Sanskrit, Persian and Arabic and the Hindu scriptures. The aim was to use this knowledge to serve the English administration. Hastings tried to pursue a policy to govern the conquered people in their own ways and not impose European innovations on the indigenous traditions and institutions without first understanding them. Men like Sir William Jones, Horace Hayman Wilson and Jonathan Duncan were in the forefront of the 'orientalist' movement. The establishment of Calcutta Madrassa, Asiatic Society of Bengal, and Sanskrit College at Benares signified this interest. After Hastings, there was gradual move towards cautious intervention in Indian social institutions and practices in response to the rising voices inside India, though small in number, and more numerous and influential voices in England. At the same time, there was a shift from emphasis on learning and promoting oriental knowledge and practices to English education and Western sciences and technology. Lord Minto (1806-1813) made serious attempts to expand oriental education to preserve

Indian culture and knowledge, but by then the currents had started to move in the other direction.

1. Social Reforms

In India, Raja Ram Mohan Roy (1772-1833) best articulated the reformist agenda in his double-sided movement of Brahmo Samaj. On one side, he was against certain customs and traditions such as images and idols and practice of caste discrimination, widow burning (sati), female infanticide, marriage ban on Hindu widows, and polygamy, but on the other he wanted freedom of speech and the press, English education, promotion of vernacular (Bengali), and introduction of Western values (individual rights). Other reformers, mostly Bengali Hindus, followed him with the growth of English education in India. In England, the voices of evangelicals, utilitarians and free traders were rising: evangelicals demanded that the government should liberate Indians from idolatry, superstition and tyranny of priests (pundits and maulvis) and the utilitarians and free traders wanted the government to allow freedom to individuals to pursue their happiness and the economy a free hand. The Company's government, however, was quite tentative about interfering too much or too quickly for fear of adverse reaction in India. There were Indians, both Hindus and Muslims, who did not approve of the winds of change and some continued to oppose quite vehemently because they suspected a hidden colonial agenda to subvert the much cherished indigenous values, customs, and traditions. More than that, they regarded the expanding work of Christian missionaries and spread of Western education as two powerful instruments for achieving the hidden colonial agenda against their religions.

The Company's benevolent attitude to Indian customs and traditions started to shift in the early nineteenth century as it acquired more territory and power in different parts of India. In the early 1830s, government abolished the pilgrim tax; removed control of religious endowments; removed all disabilities due to change of religion; and stopped showing favour to religious ceremonies in public. Though the practice of female infanticide was declared as murder in the late eighteenth century, it would take nearly 70 years for the Viceroy's Council to pass the Female Infanticide Act in 1870. In 1829, Lord Bentinck issued Regula-

tion XVII which made the practice of sati (widow burning) illegal and punishable by courts. He also started a campaign to suppress the thugee movement, in which organised bands of thugs used to rob and kill travellers. Most but not all of these thugs were devotees of the goddess Kali as if she had sanctioned the abominable practice. The Thugee Act (XXX) of 1836 provided for policing and prosecution of gangs committing this crime in the name of religion. The Company's government, following the instructions in the Charter Act of 1833, abolished slavery by Act V of 1846. The movement to help Hindu widows to remarry took longer to be legislated, but eventually it was done under the Hindu Widows' Remarriage Act of 1856. Needless to add, these practices, against which the government legislated, did not effectively end, though their prevalence fell with the enforcement of laws, education, industrial growth, and urbanisation. Some practices (female infanticide, sati, and caste taboo) have lasted on a small scale to this day.

2. Educational Reforms

It is fair to say that, in the transformation of Indian society, introduction and spread of 'modern' (Western) education seem to have played a far more important role than the legislated social reforms noted in the preceding section. The separate and two-level indigenous educational systems of Hindus and Muslims were in the process of decay in the eighteenth century along with the disintegration of social and political order almost throughout India. Even at their best indigenous systems were limited in their focus, scope and coverage: the emphasis was on scriptures, classical languages and other traditional subjects and the focus was on boys and not girls from mostly well-to-do families and mainly in urban areas. The primary method of learning was by rote and the rod.

After acquiring the diwani of Bengal in 1765, the English Company turned against Christian missionaries coming to India to maintain religious neutrality. [Protestant missionaries were working in India for a long time before that: the Danish station in Madras was busy running schools for boys and girls since the early eighteenth century.] The Company went into supporting oriental education for Hindus and Muslims, but Christian missionaries in England launched a campaign against the

Company. Charles Grant, a civil servant of the Company, was most vocal advocate of English (Christian) education in India. He created a stereotype of Indian society as morally depraved, barbaric, superstitious, etc. The reason, Grant argued, was lack of proper religion and knowledge. Indians should be educated and then converted! The English language would bring light and knowledge. Having failed to persuade the Company and the British Parliament in 1793, Grant's influence paved the way for incorporation of the educational clauses in the Charter Act of 1813. In the meantime, the Danish settlement near Calcutta became a refuge for three Baptist missionaries, William Carey among them. Lord Wellesley appointed him at Fort William College to teach Bengali to Company's servants under training. The missionaries, besides translating the Bible into Bengali, ran schools for both boys and girls; the Company did not interfere in their work as long as they did not offend directly religious sensibility of the local population. The Company supported these schools in various ways on a limited scale, but took no interest in or responsibility for the education of indigenous population.

The Charter Act of 1813 introduced two significant changes. First, it allowed missionaries to travel to India to do their work and establish schools. Second, the Act provided for Rs.100,000 to be spent annually for the 'encouragement of the learned natives of India and the revival of and improvement of literature; secondly, the promotion of a knowledge of the sciences amongst the inhabitants of that country.' However, orientalists still dominated the Committee of Public Instruction; they interpreted the vague provision on education to mean advancement of Indian classical literature and sciences. Their programme was to establish a Sanskrit College in Calcutta, one oriental college each at Agra and Delhi along with patronage for the Hindu tols and Muslim madrassas as institutions of indigenous learning. Meanwhile, Christian missionaries and men like David Hare started opening English-medium schools all over India. Some Indians like Raja Ram Mohan Roy also opposed the orientalist agenda: they strongly opposed the idea of opening institutions for learning of Indian classical languages and sciences. David Hare and Ram Mohan Roy were instrumental in establishing English schools, including the Hindu College in Calcutta (established in 1817) which was renamed Presidency College in 1855 and opened to

non-Hindus as well. The Calcutta Book Society and the School Society began to promote vernacular schools for elementary education. In 1823, a state system of education was begun in the three Presidencies which continued to expand until 1833 when the Company grant was raised from Rs.100,000 to one million rupees.

In the 1830s, there were three views on the educational system for India. The orientalist view was to preserve and promote Hindu and Muslim culture, hence educate in relevant disciplines through Sanskrit, Arabic or Persian. The Anglicist view was to replace oriental education completely by Western education through English. A third (compromise) view was to preserve all that is good in the oriental literature and superimpose upon it all that is good in the western system. There were other burning questions as well. Should anything be done for mass education? Or should it be left to the unaided indigenous schools? Should the idea of grafting Western learning on the ancient learning of the East be abandoned since it was impracticable? Should the 'downward-filtration' theory be adopted and all funds given to advance Western education among the upper classes through the English medium (maybe vernacular languages can be used later)?

Eventually the balance shifted in favour of the Anglicists with the arrival of Lord Bentinck to India as Governor-General (1828-1835), reinforced by the appointment of Alexander Duff on the Committee of Public Instruction, and Thomas Babington Macaulay, the Law Member, as President of the Committee in 1834. In a lengthy brief (Minute on Indian Education), Macaulay vehemently denounced oriental learning and eloquently pleaded for Western education. He asserted rather arrogantly that 'a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia'. Macaulay insisted that the aim of education in India should be to form a class 'Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinion, in morals and in intellect.' They would refine the vernaculars, enrich them with Western terms of science and make them good vehicles to convey knowledge to the masses. He wanted to abolish Calcutta Madrassa and Sanskrit College and stop stipends for students studying at colleges in Benares and Delhi.

On the other side, H.T. Princep, Secretary of the government and a member of the Committee of Public Instruction, defended the oriental-

ist cause: do not abolish the colleges and do not stop stipends but promote learning in Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian. He wanted free choice available to Indians. Most Muslims were opposed to Macaulay's proposal on English. In the spring of 1835, Lord Bentinck came on the side of Macaulay, despite loud protests by orientalists, and his Council decided that public funds should be spent on English education. The oriental colleges were to continue, but no new stipends would be given to students in these institutions and no support extended to publish classical texts. The funds thus released were to be spent 'in imparting to the native population knowledge of English literature and science through the medium of the English language.' Lord Bentinck established a Medical College in Calcutta and an Engineering College in Rourki.

The new education policy was premised on the downward-filtration theory. The 'rich, the learned and the men of business', once they are trained, could act as teachers and through them elementary education would percolate in the vernacular at a low cost. This policy would allow indigenous society to benefit from Western knowledge and superior moral and ethical ideals. This approach was also extended to the Madras and Bombay Presidencies. The reports of William Adams, a missionary and journalist in Bengal, recommending improvement of vernacular education through indigenous schools, were ignored for being expensive and impractical. Lord Auckland (1836-1842) decided to keep open the Arabic and Sanskrit colleges and maintain support for oriental learning; promote education through English but concentrate on higher education for the rich and upper middle-class in English and then let the elite promote mass education; and shelve the proposal to use vernacular languages. However, in Bombay, it was decided to retain the vernacular up to the secondary level and use English at the college level. Likewise, James Thomason, Lt. Governor of North-West Provinces, introduced vernacular elementary schools in 1853 and Lord Dalhousie (1848-1856) later recommended its extension to Bengal and Bihar.

The cause of English education was advanced by Lord Harding (1844-1848), who introduced regulations that all public services were to be filled by open competitive examination held by the Council of Education with preference given to the knowledge of English. English education became the only passport to higher appointments available

to Indians, hence its popularity and rapid adoption. There were several problems associated with this approach. English education at the top ignored the education of masses through vernacular schools, especially in Bengal. The advantages of English education were reaped mainly by the upwardly mobile middle-class Hindus with very little participation by the Hindu aristocracy and Muslim community. The curricula were biased in favour of literature and not science and they were exclusively secular to avoid religious controversy. It needs to be added that missionaries and local private educators, mostly Hindus, were the major sources of schooling for boys and girls in both English and the vernacular. But many indigenous private schools were not well organised and systematised. Generally, Muslims kept away from Western education until 1854: maktab and madrassa remained the only institutions of learning and knowledge.

The education policy for India took a significant turn away from the downward-filtration approach to extension of vernacular education, thanks to the 'Education Dispatch' written by Charles Wood, President of the Board of Control in London, in the summer of 1854. He recommended a uniform educational system from the primary to university level throughout India. His Dispatch became the foundation stone of the educational system of British India. The main recommendations were:

- Expand educational institutions, from the primary to university levels, with secondary and college education in the middle, each leading to the next step on the ladder. Each district was to have schools.
- Use English at the higher (college) level and vernaculars for mass education at the primary and secondary levels.
- Improve the indigenous schools and integrate them with the state schools.
- School curricula should be exclusively secular since education was for the benefit of the whole population of India.
- Encourage enrolment of girls in schools.

- Establish a scholarship system for meritorious students to pursue higher levels of education and give grants-in-aid to private institutions.
- Establish Education Department in each province and provide resources for training of teachers and inspection of schools to maintain standards of education at the school level.
- Establish a university in each Presidency capital to be the Examining Body for higher education in colleges. These universities may establish professorships in Civil Engineering, and Classical and Vernacular languages.
- Increase expenditure on education.

Following the Dispatch, three universities were established one each in Calcutta, Madras and Bombay in 1857; provincial Education Departments were created; grants-in-aid were introduced; primary and secondary education was promoted; and teacher training was started. The grants-in-aid programme greatly facilitated the growth of private schools and colleges, including secondary schools using English as medium of instruction. It should be noted that even primary education was not entirely free: a fee rate was charged from students across the board. Lord Dalhousie acted with dispatch, especially about the expansion of vernacular education. In 1859, the Secretary of State for India reconfirmed the education policy and Lord Canning pursued it with much interest and attention. The number of schools and colleges grew rapidly, some financed entirely by the government and others by private bodies and individuals with or without grants-in-aid.

In 1884, the Indian Education Commission, chaired by Sir William Hunter, reviewed progress of education in India since 1854 and made three major recommendations in its report. First, it was not satisfied with the progress of primary education and emphasised the need for its expansion and improvement. Second, it recommended that the management of primary education should be handed over to the Municipal and District Boards under the supervision and control of provincial government. Third, it emphasised the role of private initiative in education, from the primary to college level, through grants-in-aid and withdrawal of government from competition. But Lord Curzon (1899-

1905) favoured active involvement of the state in both primary and secondary education and not leave it to private enterprise. He also emphasised the use of vernacular up to the middle level at least and maybe use of English for some subjects in the two years of high school. He appointed a Universities Commission in 1902 to review the conditions of universities (Lahore and Allahabad were added in 1887). Based on the Commission's report, Lord Curzon passed the Universities Act of 1904. Universities were assigned expanded role in regulating colleges and opening up direct instruction for students in various disciplines with appointment of professors and lecturers.

The growth of national political organisations and a somewhat reluctant response of colonial government for greater participation of Indians in the governance of India created increasing pressure for better state support in expanding and improving the provincial education systems. The political reforms of 1919 and 1935 placed education in the provinces in the hands of their Ministers of Education. In the meantime, while enrolments rose, especially of boys, in the school system there remained the issue of quality and access. While the issues of free and compulsory primary education and adult literacy were high on the agenda of Indian political and social leaders, little progress was achieved because of inadequate resources in most of the provinces. On the other hand, attention was focused on the expanded use of the vernacular in the provincial school systems along with better access to education by women. Of course, progress of school education depended not only on the supply side, but perhaps more on the demand side in which differences of caste, income, gender, religion, and rural-urban residence played a major role. In spite of imbalances and inadequate resources, introduction and gradual expansion of modern education in India, particularly after the revolt of 1857, created an entirely new world. It allowed increasing number of people to find new opportunities to enrich their lives and those of others, revive their cultural treasures, reform all aspects of life, promote the arts and literature, adopt new (scientific) methods and technologies, demand and enjoy expanded freedom, and acquire greater influence on the social, economic and political milieu. All of this has been reflected in some of the great achievements and con-

tributions of Indians, some more eminent and influential than others, in literature, philosophy, arts and sciences, and politics.

III. Economy and Infrastructure

The British interest in the economy of India, until the English Company acquired the diwani of Bengal in 1765, remained focused on trade in raw material and some manufactured products for European markets. Europeans came to India to engage in this trade in the first place. For more than a century Europeans competed with each other for the Indian trade until the English Company acquired political control of Bengal. By this time, it enjoyed monopoly of foreign trade along the coast from Gujarat to Bengal and a network of stations inland in different parts of India. The Charter Act of 1813 abolished the Company's monopoly on Indian trade; the Charter Act of 1833 ended its commercial activities and made the Company an agent of the Crown to rule India for the British. By the early eighteenth century, Bengal had become the most lucrative area for foreign trade and remained very important for the English Company. This region of India was a major supplier of cotton and silk piece goods, fine cotton cloth, raw silk, jute, sugar, salt, saltpetre, and opium. The trade with Bengal, down to the eve of British rule, was voluminous, thanks to its flourishing agriculture and manufacturing industry.

With the establishment of British rule, Bengal experienced large economic drain, estimated at thirty-eight million pounds, in a variety of ways. For example, puppet nawabs made payments to the Company in return for its support. The diwani grants to the Company transferred surplus revenue, which the Company invested in export trade. Bullion was exported to China to buy goods from there for use outside India. The Company's servants made private fortunes and a large portion of profits so earned were transferred to England. The Company received significant royal concessions on customs duty, though the Company was not allowed to use dastaks for internal trade. The Company's servants abused dastaks for private trade: they sold them to local merchants to help them evade customs duty. The servants also claimed ex-

emption from duty on internal trade and came to monopolise the trade. The nawab and the Indian traders suffered significant economic loss due to these practices. Mir Qasim retaliated and abolished duty on all domestic trade, resulting in his dethronement. To secure regular supply of cotton goods, the Company entered into forward contracts with weavers and suppliers of raw silk, which in turn became a source of oppression and extortion and led to the destruction of cotton and silk industry in Bengal.

In addition, in response to the pressure of English manufacturers, the British Parliament had earlier banned the import and use of cotton and silk cloth in England. The Company re-exported its imports from India to other European countries to meet their demand for these goods. However, with the onset of wars between England and other European countries, the imports from Bengal fell. The ban on imported cotton goods in England gave stimulus to the growth of local manufacturing and the use of power-driven (mechanical) innovations. The Company shifted to importing raw cotton and silk from India to feed the growing home industry and the English textile exports kept on rising rapidly. It did nothing to protect the textile industry in India or to stimulate improvement in the methods of production. Within half century after the battle of Plassey, the industry and trade of Bengal were almost completely ruined and could not ever recover later.

As in Bengal, the decay of industry and trade in the rest of India set in towards the end of eighteenth century and their ruin was almost complete by the middle of nineteenth. The causes were more or less similar in most places. Economic historians have debated the question of the extent to which practices of the English Company in India, and the protectionist policy of the British government and Parliament, were responsible for the decay of Indian industry and trade. The argument that the Industrial Revolution in England was a major cause of what happened to the industry in India has been countered by the argument that the Industrial Revolution was itself 'a consequence of the plundered wealth of India' and the English policy of protectionism at home. The underlying sources of the Industrial Revolution in England (1760-1840) were primarily domestic, resulting from changes in the preceding one hundred years or so, although outside forces (favourable trade and rev-

enue) did probably make significant contribution. However, the fact remains that India was transformed into a plantation economy geared to the production of raw material and a dumping ground for the cheap manufactures from abroad, England in particular.

While the English Company lost its trading monopoly in 1813, foreign trade of India had passed into foreign hands, notably the English, and stayed that way until the end of nineteenth century. The volume of trade increased enormously after the opening of Suez Canal in 1869. But the composition of imports and exports had changed: India now exported raw material (grains, jute, cotton, oilseeds, etc.) and imported manufactured goods. There was also expansion of inland trade with the gradual abolition of transit duties and development of transport (roads and railways) and communications (post and telegraph) largely after the revolt of 1857. The indigenous industry was destroyed first by the Company's discriminatory practices against Indian manufactures, which were produced by small-scale craftsmen, and then by the factory-produced and relatively cheaper imports. The home-produced manufacturing had become negligible and there was little if any private investment made in creating a new industrial base in India. Towards the end of nineteenth century, factories started to be built and composition of imports and exports changed as well. Most of the large-scale industries were based on jute, cotton, pulp and paper, leather, and iron and steel. In the beginning, these industries were based on investments by Europeans and not Indians, though gradually more Indians came into the field. The government, however, was not very friendly in its commercial policy to the development of cotton textiles and similar industries that could compete favourably against producers in England.

Land and its products through farming were the dominant source of incomes of a vast majority of households and the most important source of revenue for the state. The armed conflicts, and the general disorder created by them almost throughout India in the eighteenth century, were extremely injurious to peasants and zamindars in at least two ways. First, pillage and plunder greatly disrupted cultivation of crops and their marketing. Second, claims of the state and its agents on the output of land kept rising to meet their military and civil expenditure. At the same time, layers of conflicting claims of different groups on

land, with increasing dependence on revenue farming, created much confusion and uncertainty about the right of ownership and usufruct of land. Jagirdars, taluqdars and ijaradars (moneylenders and merchants included) were on the backs of cultivators (small owners and tenants) without at the same time making investments to raise the fertility of land or the well-being of peasants. As long as land was plentiful and the pressure of population on land light, there was room for peasants to bargain and extend cultivation. However, their bargaining position vis-à-vis the state and merchants was always weak and grew weaker because of extortion and rising debt.

Initially, after acquiring the diwani of Bengal in 1765, the English Company was interested mainly in extracting as much surplus from land as circumstances would allow. It tried various experiments to establish a viable land revenue system for the purpose. All of the early experiments resulted in ruining agriculture and the peasants. Lord Cornwallis came to India in 1784 to streamline the revenue administration. A number of Company officers before him were arguing for fixing the land tax on a permanent basis. In 1793, Cornwallis introduced Permanent Settlement in Bengal with the hope that it will yield secure revenue and give incentive to landholders for investment in agriculture. There were two issues to be resolved. The level of tax rate was one issue. The other was who should pay the tax. Subsequently, the Company fixed the tax rate at a very high level, much higher than existed in Bengal at the time. In the Mughal period, zamindars big and small paid the land tax either directly to the state or through assignees of the state. Peasants cultivated the land and paid the customary dues to their zamindars. The English Company had confused the situation by retaining some zamindars and replacing others by revenue-farmers. Lord Cornwallis gave proprietary rights to zamindars (to sell, mortgage, transfer to heirs, etc.) throughout Bengal, Bihar and Orissa in return for payment of the permanently fixed rate to the Company. If the zamindar failed to pay the revenue demand, the Company would auction the estate and the new owner would be liable for payment. The idea was that private property in land would create incentives for owners to invest in land and improve agriculture.

Permanent Settlement proved to be bad for cultivators since their occupancy rights disappeared and they were left at the mercy of zamindars. Their condition deteriorated. At the same time, sales of the zamindari rights became more frequent because they could not meet the high and fixed revenue demand in the face of uncertainty in production, prices and sales, and difficulty in collecting rents. Auction sales wiped out more than one-half of the original zamindars and developed multiple tenures increasing the demand on peasants. The officers in the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay did not repeat the experience of Permanent Settlement, while they recognised and encouraged private property in land. By the 1830s, the revenue settlements were made temporary, ranging from 10 to 20 years, everywhere, but the methods of revenue assessment and collection were allowed to evolve according to the experience and circumstances of the Presidency and later of each province. I should emphasise that the response of rural population, landowners and peasants, to changes in the structure of ownership and use of land engendered by the English Company was not subdued acceptance. Organised and not so organised rebellions on small and large scale were not infrequent throughout the period in almost all parts of India. The rebellions were not directly anti-colonial movements but against policies and conditions of the colonial rule. The motives of the rebels were not always the same or even similar, but they were able to mobilise sizeable groups to engage in open and covert operations involving different degrees of violence or forms of resistance.

Until the revolt of 1857, the principal aim of the English Company was to maximise land revenue for which it conducted many experiments and introduced changes in the ownership and tenurial rights of individuals as the empire expanded. The administrative system focused on maintaining law and order (peace) to let agriculture stabilise and yield the revenue that the new rulers wanted or required for the Company, its military and civil administration in India. In this period, almost no attention was paid to stimulate agricultural growth and raise productivity. However, once the revolt was crushed and stability restored, the colonial government started to invest and encourage private investment in the construction of infrastructure to improve agricultural output and productivity. Sir John Lawrence (1864-1869) initi-

ated public investment and loans to improve and expand the irrigation system, especially in northern India, including the Agra canal, Lower Ganges Canal and Sirhind Canal, and a more extensive network of Canal Colonies in the Punjab to reclaim waste land and settle yeoman farmers. Lord Curzon (1899-1905) opened a new chapter in the irrigation policy for India after the report of a Commission on Irrigation in 1903 for construction of protective irrigation works in regions subject to uneven rainfall, facing periodic droughts and floods, and sketched out a long-term (20-year) programme to add irrigation to almost three million hectares of cultivated land. After the reforms of 1919, provincial governments took over the responsibility for irrigation and completed several large-scale projects during 1925-1935, e.g. the Lloyd Dam in Bombay, Sukkur Barrage in Sindh, Sutlej Valley project in the Punjab, Kaveri Reservoir and Mettur project in the south, and Sarda-Awadh canals in the United Provinces.

Lord Curzon paid particular attention to the advancement of agricultural research, education and extension service. He created the first research institute and college at Pusa (Bihar), established a co-ordinating board in the centre for provincial governments, established provincial departments of agriculture, and constituted the Indian Agriculture Service. Several regional agriculture colleges were established in places like Poona, Kanpur, Nagpur, Coimbatore, and Lyallpur. In the late 1920s, following the recommendations of the Linlithgow Commission, an Imperial Council of Agricultural Research was established to guide and co-ordinate agricultural research and extend help to the provincial departments and institutes. In each province, a Board of Economic Inquiry was established to collect and provide information to the government for formulating agricultural policy. Agriculture Extension Department and Agricultural Marketing Service were added to help cultivators receive the best information on new and improved methods of cultivation and marketing of produce and get credit to meet their financial needs.

In the context of rural indebtedness, a pervasive and chronic problem faced by small cultivators and landowners throughout India, the colonial government attempted to regulate money lending and passed Land Alienation Acts to restrict transfer of land due to debt; the Act

in the Punjab prohibited transfer of land, by sale or long-term mortgage, to non-agricultural groups (moneylenders). To expand the availability of credit to farmers, the Imperial Legislative Council passed the Co-operative Credit Societies Act in 1904 to facilitate establishment of rural and urban credit societies. These societies did very well in some but not all parts of India, depending on the structure of rural society, its traditions of co-operation, and the effectiveness of the provincial departments. After the reforms of 1919, each provincial government established a Co-operative Department to supervise and regulate the credit societies and provincial co-operative banks. In some provinces, Land-Mortgage Banks were established for long-term credit to provide relief from old debts.

Historically famines were a major threat to the lives of people and their causes rested on the moods of Nature (weather cycles) and the functioning of the state and markets. Most poor people, including small cultivators and landless workers, were vulnerable to changes in the availability of food. The famine of 1770 in Bengal wiped out about one-third of its population and in the 1866-1876 period famines took a heavy toll in Orissa and down on the east coast up to Madras, in the United Provinces, Rajputana, Punjab, northern Bihar, Hyderabad, Mysore, and Bombay. The famine relief efforts were found to be quite ineffective and expensive. Lord Lytton (1876-1880) appointed a Famine Commission, which submitted it report in 1880; its recommendations were the basis of the Indian Famine Code of 1883 followed by provincial famine codes. There were two basic principles: (i) the state is responsible for providing relief and (ii) famine relief should take at least three forms, employ the able-bodied on public works, distribute food or cash to the infirm and aged individuals, and suspend or remit land revenue and rents and give loans to cultivators for inputs (seeds and draft animals). The financial resources required for famine relief were to be shared by different levels of government and the tax-payers. The Famine Code was used to mitigate the effects of minor famines and the major ones in 1896-1897 and 1899-1900. Two subsequent Famine Commissions, particularly of 1900, recommended some changes in the Famine Code, with emphasis on early signs and preparedness to provide quick and effective relief. The reforms of 1919 and 1935 required provincial governments to reserve

adequate annual funds for famine relief and maintain adequate capability to mitigate the effects of famines. The experience of the Bengal famine in 1943, however, exposed the ineffectiveness of the state machinery; it killed many millions of people and devastated the lives of millions who survived.

The English Company in its period of expansion did not have the means or the will to do much about the public infrastructure for communications and transport. It took the first major steps in nineteenth century with the construction of telegraph in 1851 and establishment of a postal system with relatively cheap postage in 1854. Lord Dalhousie (1848-1856) organised the Public Works Department in 1855 for the improvement of roads and canals. At about the same time, navigation by steamboats on rivers like the Ganges and Indus was organised. However, it was after the revolt of 1857 that the public works were undertaken in earnest. By 1865, the internal postal and telegraphic systems had been expanded and improved and India connected with Europe through telegraph. Until 1858, railways were practically unknown to India, except for a few miles of tracks around the cities of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay. The initial efforts for building railways were left to private (English) hands. The investors were guaranteed a return of five per cent: if the profit fell below this level investors would be compensated and, if the profit was above five per cent, the government would receive one-half of the excess profit. The government could exercise control over the management of railway tracks and purchase them at a fixed rate at the end of 25 years. In some frontier areas, public investment was undertaken to build and extend the railway system.

By the end of nineteenth century, the state had acquired or purchased most of the railways from private companies, but left the management with the private sector subject to government control through the Railway Board created in 1905. There was rapid expansion of railways and profits from it until the beginning of World War I, followed by a period of inaction for a decade. Eventually, thanks to the rising pressure of Indian opinion, the government took over management of railways in the 1920s. The government re-organised the Railway Board and the railway budget was separated from the general budget. In spite of the initial

losses to the government, the railways became a source of revenue. Far more important was their role in carrying people and goods to long distances, promoting growth of agriculture, industry and trade and fostering relations between people of different ethnic, religious, linguistic, and professional backgrounds. At the time of independence in 1947, India had just over 65,000 of railway tracks covering over three-quarters of the area. The railway system also stimulated development of feeder roads, connecting inland markets and towns. But the gradual decentralisation and development of the local self-government gave real stimulus to road construction and improvements. In addition, the colonial government used increased rates of import and excise duties on motor fuels to provide funds for road development throughout India. After the India Act of 1935, provincial governments increased their interest in building and improving highways and arterial roads.

IV. Local Self-Government

After the revolt of 1857 ended, the colonial government remained very much in a paternalistic mode; partnership with Indians was not on the horizon and certainly not on its immediate agenda. The dreams and aspirations of increasing number of awakened Indians for partnership with the colonial government would have to wait many decades for fulfilment and require much organised advocacy, mass mobilisation and agitation. I address this issue in the next chapter. The immediate agenda was to make improvements in the structure and functioning of local self-government within a constrained structure of overall governance in India.

Most rural communities (villages) in India had a system of local governance through panchayats, but they started to decay with the dissolution of Mughal Empire in eighteenth century. In Bengal and outside, the Company began to involve local committees, those that existed and others newly formed, to help improve and build roads, bridges and similar local infrastructure. Funds were generated by imposing local levies or cesses. Bombay was the first Presidency where legislation was passed in 1869 to establish a basis for the evolution local self-government. Cess-

es were legalised and committees were set up to administer the funds so raised for public works. In the following year, Government of India's Resolution gave impetus to the development of local self-government. Provincial governments enacted legislation along the lines of Bombay, but the government nominated the official and non-official members and controlled the district-level committees. In most provinces, except Bengal, these committees built and improved roads and sanitation and provided primary education. But the system was defective for two reasons: the committees were dominated by appointed officials and other (private) members were not familiar with the conditions outside their own area hence showed little interest.

Lord Ripon (1880-1884) introduced a new plan in 1882: he created two smaller Boards, one at the sub-divisional level and the other board under it for much smaller area; each local board was to have a majority of elected non-official members and presided by a non-official member. In practice, except for Bengal, most provinces kept the earlier system of District-level boards with small number of elected members. However, the town municipal committees, except for Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, were reconstituted along the lines proposed by Lord Ripon and a firm foundation laid for the development of local self-government in which elected members would dominate the municipal committees.

Lord Chelmsford's government recognised the defects of the local self-government system in the Resolution of 1918 and proposed to make these bodies representative, remove unnecessary restrictions on local taxation, budget and sanction of works, expand the franchise for elected representatives, and replace nominated Chairmen by elected non-officials. In 1921, the local self-government departments in the provincial governments were given to Ministers and several changes made in the structure and operations: Municipalities and Local Boards were given enhanced powers and functions, relatively freed from official control, made accountable to enlarged electorate, and chaired by elected non-officials. Provincial governments took increased interest in making the local bodies work more effectively, though the outcomes were not entirely satisfactory in some provinces.

V. Changes in Indian Attitudes and Responses

The initial responses of Indians, divided as they were by religion, ethnicity, caste, and class, to the establishment of British rule in India were quite diverse since there were winners and losers. The Indian reaction to the establishment of English hegemony ranged from one extreme of rejection of the whole system (Muslim ulema) to the English-educated (reformist) Hindus for its wholesale acceptance. The Muslim rejection was led by Shah Abdul Aziz and Shah Ismail Shaheed, who regarded the English as despots—since they are not guided by the Sharia—and India under their rule as the 'land of war' (dar-al-harb). Raja Ram Mohan Roy took the other (liberal) view, advocated radical changes in the archaic Hindu and Muslim traditions and helped establish the Hindu College in Calcutta in 1817. The new (middle) class of Hindus wanted their sons to have liberal Western education.

To Muslims in India the loss of political power was not simply a matter of hurt pride by subjugation—their leaders (ulema in particular) kept reminding them of their 'glorious' past—but it was a heavy cultural and material shock, particularly to the advantaged groups of nobles, courtiers, retainers, jagirdars, soldiers, scribes, and ulema. The gradual exclusion of Muslims from gainful employment in both civilian and military spheres exacerbated their resentment. The liquidation of successor Muslim states by the English conquest left them with almost no alternative sources of patronage, employment and income. The British understood it and sought allies among Muslims, but more among Hindus who were likely to offer their co-operation and loyalty more readily.

Generally, Muslims showed little inclination to welcome the change or to seek conciliation with the new rulers. Nor did the new rulers make much effort to get the Muslims on their side since they suspected them of disloyalty. A substantial proportion of British officials held the view that Muslims were a united body antagonistic to the British rule. This view was reinforced by the events of 1857, the anti-Muslim writings of W.W. Hunter (*The Indian Musalmans*, 1871), Chairman of the 1882 Education Commission, and the assassination of Lord Mayo, the fourth

Viceroy, by a Muslim convict in the Andaman Islands in 1872. In India, Muslims were now a ruled minority and were trapped in a vicious circle of mutual suspicion and hostility with the new rulers. There was also a long history of conflictive interaction between Christians and Muslims whereas no such history of interaction between Christians and Hindus existed. If anything, Europeans had shown much interest in and sympathy for Hindu philosophy and Sanskrit literature.

However, once the English had established their hegemony in India, their attitude towards Indians in general and Muslims in particular underwent a massive change: they convinced themselves that it was their mission to transform the natives into a civilised people. By the 1830s, this conviction was translated into policies and actions to anglicise not only the administrative and judicial structure but also the Indian society. Christian missionaries played a leading role in this process. In fact, both Muslims and Hindus were alarmed by the expansion of missionary activities because they came to suspect that their charity and educational agenda were tools to propagate Christianity through conversion, especially of the poor and marginalised populations of India. This was also an important reason for Muslim resistance to learning about Western knowledge particularly in the English language. Adoption of English, replacing Persian, in the administrative and judicial system not only deprived many Muslims and some Hindus of their employment and status; it became a major hurdle for Muslims in particular to enter into state service since they showed much greater reluctance to learn English and acquire Western knowledge than Hindus especially of the new urban middle class. A substantial proportion of the rising groups of Hindus, merchants and moneylenders, were major beneficiaries of the new economy created by the English Company in India.

1. The Hindu Responses

The Hindu response to the British rule was not entirely uniformly hostile or receptive. Initially it was far more receptive because of the more favourable or at least neutral policy followed by the English Company with regard to the culture, language and religion of Indians. Certain class of Hindus, among them merchants and moneylenders, in Bengal made gains in the emerging economy. Also there was a burgeoning class

of Hindus who were not entirely happy with some of the religious and cultural practices. These groups and others who were formerly in the employment of Mughal rulers saw new opportunities under the new rulers. Introduction of English education and growing interaction with the English stimulated interest in new perspectives on the Hindu religion and culture.

Raja Ram Mohan Roy, thinker, educator, reformer, and regarded by some as 'father' of modern India, influenced partly by his interaction with Muslim and Christian religions and their practices, argued strongly for reforming Hinduism in the light of reason. His monotheistic reformist movement of Amtiya Sabha (formed in 1815) eventually grew into Brahmo Samaj in 1828 which was embraced by increasing number of middle-class Bengalis. There is no doubt that Ram Mohan Roy initiated a process of change in the way that traditional Hinduism was practised and stimulated acceptance of Western knowledge and English education for progress in India. Among other things, in 1817 he played a leading role in the establishment of Hindu College at Calcutta, the forerunner of Presidency College, which imparted more modern (secular) education than did the Sanskrit College opened by the English Company in 1826. In 1831, Ram Mohan Roy went to England—Emperor Akbar Shah II, the titular Mughal king, paid for his journey—and he died there in 1833. During his stay in England, he met the royalty and other eminent personalities and pleaded on behalf of the Mughal king for increase in his pension. The cause of modern education for Hindus was promoted by two other Bengalis, Ishwarchandra Vidyasagar (1820-1891), educator and reformer—his unrelenting advocacy bore fruit with the passage of the Hindu Widows' Remarriage Act in 1856—and Bankimchandra Chatterji (1838-1894), a magistrate-cum-novelist.

In Poona, unconnected to these Bengalis in background and circumstances, Jotiba Phule (1820-1890) launched a movement to educate girls and low-caste boys and girls to empower them. Jotiba's father—who belonged to the mali-kunbi (peasant) community—sent him to an English school at a very early age, but soon he was forced to move him to a Scottish Mission school. Jotiba's aversion to the caste system grew with his experience of discrimination and humiliation. In 1848, a year after graduating from school, Jotiba opened a school for girls, with the

help of a well-wisher. In the next few years, he opened some more—some for boys and girls and one for so-called untouchables. He took as his mission the cause of female gender and the low-caste 'to better their conditions through means of education'. No other Indian had opened schools for girls or low-caste boys or girls. He and his wife, who worked with him, took much abuse on a daily basis. Soon Jotiba won over some Brahmins in Poona to his side, though others were livid. Some Englishmen lionised him, but the English educational policy did not yet favour reaching out to the low-caste. It would have meant provoking the Brahmins, but that was not on their agenda, not yet. Jotiba also promoted the vernacular (Marathi language), again in the face of much opposition by Brahmins, and was able to persuade the English to provide funds for original and translated works in Marathi. He became a source of inspiration to many for promoting the cause of education of girls and the low-caste Hindu boys and girls.

After the death of Raja Ram Mohan Roy in England, Devendranath Tagore (1817-1905), father of the illustrious Rabindranath Tagore, gave the progressive movement a better organisational form and ideological consistency. Ram Mohan Roy and Devendranath Tagore, more than anyone else, were initiators of the 'Bengal Renaissance' and Hindu reformation. The Brahmo Samaj movement started to change more radically in the 1860s, when Keshub Chandra Sen (1838-1884) focused on carrying the movement to the non-Westernised Bengalis and from Bengal to other provinces. Keshub also laid greater emphasis on social reforms, including attacks on the caste system and improvement in women's rights. But others in the movement did not approve of this shift in emphasis: they wanted to maintain their identity within the broad Hindu society and not separate from it. The movement was weakened further by even sharper division in the ranks between the 'reformists' and 'revivalists'. By the 1880s, Brahmo Samaj, the reformist movement, was confined to a small elite group. Outside Bengal, the Brahmo Samaj movement took a deep root in Maharashtra as Prarthana Samaj founded in 1867. This movement had the same basic ideology of one God and social reform, but within the general Hindu body.

The Prarthana Samaj movement became a major source of social welfare and reform in western India. Its most influential leader was Justice Mahadev Govinda Ranade (1842-1901), an English-educated and enlightened activist, who devoted his entire life to promote the objectives of the movement. His focus was on strengthening the structure of Hindu society by blending Western ideas and values with the Hindu tradition: 'not to break with the past and cease all connection with our society.' The movement spread quite rapidly in Maharashtra and Gujarat and then into Madras Presidency among the Telegu-speaking people, where Veerasalingam Pantula was its leader. Justice Ranade inspired formation of the Deccan Education Society in 1884: its members undertook long-term service on nominal salary and helped build endowments for colleges and preparatory schools. Gopal Krishna Gokhale (1866-1915), an eminent and influential Indian, was one of many 'life-workers' of the Society.

There was rupture in the reform movement in 1875 led by Swami Dayanand Saraswati (1824-1883), a Sanskrit scholar but with no exposure to English education, who founded the Arya Samaj movement. He claimed that the Vedas contained scientific truths and these texts were superior to both Islam and Christianity. Like other reformists, the Swami attacked many of the Hindu practices, but upheld the fourfold varna (caste) division. Unlike Mohan Roy and others, he took the message to the masses and laid the foundation of Arya Samaj as a reactionary Hindu movement with the aim of bringing back every convert to the fold of Hinduism to 'realise the ideal of unifying India nationally, socially and religiously.' The aggressive and populist approach of the Swami did not attract many followers in eastern and southern India, but received warm acceptance in the Punjab and United Provinces. By the time of his death in 1883, the Arya Samaj movement had become more popular and aggressive. The moderates among his disciples, whose major focus was on education and reform, were gradually marginalised and a militant group under Pandit Guru Dat (d.1890) launched an aggressive campaign for preaching the Vedas, fiercely attacking other religions, and initiating reconversion of those lost to Islam, Christianity and Sikhism. By the end of nineteenth century, the movement was transformed from reformism to revivalism or cultural chauvinism: cow-protection,

among other things, became its battle cry. Its politicisation in the twentieth century, sharpened by its Punjabi Hindu leaders from the Punjab like Swami Sraddhananda (1856-1926), Lala Hans Raj (1864-1938) and Lala Rajpat Rai (1865-1928), was to have important consequences for the nationalist movement in India.

In nineteenth century, there also emerged among Hindus a movement which attempted a synthesis of the traditional and Western values. Ramakrishna Paramahansa (1836-1886), an ordinary Hindu priest in Bengal, started this movement, hence its name the Ramakrishna Mission. He adopted practices from different religions, because he believed in their inherent truth, to lead a deeply spiritual life. He attracted a small band of devotees by his pithy sayings and parables, collected and published before he died. His most illustrious disciple was a graduate of Calcutta University, Narendranath Dutta (1863-1902), more commonly known by the name of Swami Vivekananda who carried the message of Ramakrishna all over India and beyond. His attractive personality, combined with his intellect, learning and spiritual fervour, won him increasing number of disciples rich and poor, educated or not. His visit to the United States in 1893 won him more fame and friends, followed by formation of missions and monasteries. His catholic view of religious truth was mixed with the vedantic tradition in Hinduism. Perhaps the more important reasons for his success were that he did not try to proselytise people and put the idea of social service in the forefront as an essential part of religious and spiritual life and not as mere charity. The Vivekenanda Mission opened schools, dispensaries and provided ungrudging help to helpless people in distress. He argued that the teachings of India, given its rich culture and tradition, if imparted truthfully can save the warring world, but Indians have to acquire a respectful status by alleviating ignorance, poverty and misery.

Annie Besant (1847-1933), a writer and women's rights activist from England and a member of Theosophical Society, initiated another revivalist movement. Two Americans, Madame Helena Blavatsky and Colonel Henry Steel Olcott, brought the Society to India in 1886 and established its headquarters in Adyar (near Madras) in 1889. Annie Besant used the Society's platform and argued that a revival of ancient ideals and institutions can overcome the Indian condition of subjugation. But

her appeal was not to Hindu chauvinism like that of the Arya Samaj. To fulfil the objective of the movement, Annie Besant opened the Central Hindu School in Benares and turned it into a college with her energy and resources. Eventually the college acquired the status of a university (Benares Hindu University) in 1915. The Theosophical Society opened several branches all over India and became an important source of social and religious reform, especially in South India. Its message of reverting to the old and (anti-Western) revivalism and occult-like mystical practices alienated a substantial portion of the Hindu population. It is fair to say that in the long run it was the personality of Annie Besant than the inherent strength of the Society which came to play an important political role for the independence of India.

2. The Muslim Responses

Muslim attitudes to the English were not uniform: it depended on the understanding or interpretation of Islam and the experience of British rule. These attitudes were also subject to change. Some took the attitude of resigned acceptance, but others took the route of resistance. Islamic renewal and 'reformism' was another response with elements of adoption and rejection. Initially the uncompromising rejectionists were led by certain groups of influential ulema like Shah Abdul Aziz (1746-1804), one of three sons of Shah Wali Ullah (1702-1762), an influential religious leader and founder of the Rahimya Madrassa in Delhi. Shah Abdul Aziz declared that since Islam did not enjoy sovereign authority and political power, India was dar-al-harb and not dar-al-Islam any longer. This fatwa prepared the ground for some to offer resistance and wage jihad against the non-Muslim powers in India, including the Sikhs and the English. Among the followers of Shah Abdul Aziz's edict in northern India were his nephew Shah Ismail (1779-1831) and Syed Ahmad of Rai-Bareilly (1786-1831), who were both killed later in the north-west. Others included Mir Nisar Ali or Titu Mir (1782-1831), the jihadist-peasant leader in Bengal, who developed a large following; the English forces eventually killed him in a battle. In fact, in the revolt of 1857, ulema played a prominent role, the foremost among them was Maulana Ahmad Ullah Shah (known to the English as the 'Maulvi of Faizabad'). The jihadist attitude among some groups, particularly Pa-

thans (Afghans) in the north-west frontier, remained a constant source of resistance to the British rule in India.

A second group of religionists took the attitude of resigned acceptance but emphasised reformism like Haji Shariat Ullah (1781-1840), founder of the Faraizi movement, and his son Muhammad Mohsin or Dudhu Mian (1819-1862) who were not antagonistic to the English rule in Bengal. Likewise, the advocates of the Wahabi tradition, weaning people away from worship of priests and saints, accepted the English rule, but they focused their attention on Islamic education. After the closure of Rahimya Madrassa of Delhi in 1858, some of its teachers, particularly Maulana Muhammad Qasim Nanatawi, took up the baton and established a new madrassa at Deoband with private resources in 1866. The basic philosophy followed in the madrassa was to learn about Islam (how to be a good Muslim); it became a prominent and influential institution for training students, through the medium of Arabic, Persian and Urdu, to serve as imams in the mosques and teachers in schools and colleges. Later sister institutions on the model of Deoband were established throughout India. However, the Wahabi teachings were opposed by a large proportion of Sunni Muslims accustomed to practices eulogising the person of the Prophet (his hadith and sunna), the early Caliphs, saints, and priests. Ahmad Raza Khan Barelvi (1856-1921) emerged as the leading advocate of this tradition and opponent of the Wahabi teachings. This division among Sunni Muslims has remained in the sub-continent to this day.

A third group of Muslims took the attitude of coming to terms with the British rule and adopting Western learning within a Muslim-controlled environment. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan (1817-1898)—who served the English in reasonably high judicial positions in the United Provinces—was the most ardent advocate of this viewpoint. He argued that Muslims should become modern while maintaining their cultural identity in India. The rejectionist attitude had severely damaged the community while Hindus had advanced and acquired positions of influence and power. Syed Ahmed Khan wanted Muslims to match the 'Word of God' with the 'Acts of God': use reasoning to faith, an attitude much opposed by the mainstream ulema. However, he was strongly supported by Khwaja Altaf Husain Hali (1837-1914), poet and celebrated author of

the *Musaddas* (first published in 1879), in which he describes the rise and fall of Muslims and pleads with them to give up the life of indolence and rejection and learn from the West (English). Sir Syed's college at Aligarh—established as a school for boys in 1875—provided students a Muslim identity and ethos at the same time as it exposed them to modern knowledge, science and technology. His example inspired many other Muslims who established schools and colleges following the Aligarh model throughout India.

In an account of the transformation of Muslim attitudes to modern learning and education, it is fair to go back to the Ghazi-ud-din Madrassa at Delhi, founded by the son of Nizam-ul-mulk in 1772. In 1825, the English Company christened it as Delhi College and it was well-endowed. It was a vernacular school, in which Arabic and Persian were used to teach sciences as well. In 1834, the College introduced Western education in English: it maintained a dual educational system with the Oriental Department focusing on Arabic, Persian and Sanskrit, and the Western Department offered modern education through the Urdu medium. Books were also translated into Urdu to facilitate this education. The College attracted young men mostly from the upper middle-class, but scholarships supported those from the lower middle-class. Delhi College was an inspiration to Sir Syed Ahmed Khan. The College was eventually merged with the Government College at Lahore in 1877.

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan experimented with at least two schools before he established the Aligarh School. In 1860, in Moradabad he founded the Panchayati Madrassa that the government absorbed into a high school in 1862. In 1863, he founded an English High School (Victoria High School) in Ghazipur. Private donations were the only source of finance for the school which enrolled both Hindu and Muslim students. The school exposed students to English, Sanskrit, Persian, Arabic, and Urdu but not Hindi. At Ghazipur, Sir Syed also established the Scientific Society, which translated books and documents on science into Urdu. He then submitted a proposal to the government for a vernacular university, but the government rejected the proposal.

Sir Syed became a convert to English education during his seventeen-month visit to England in 1869, where he gathered, among other things, valuable information about the English education system. On

his return to India, his project of modern education for Muslims within their own cultural environment eventually led to the creation of Aligarh School in 1875, renamed as Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental (MAO) College two years later. The College was affiliated first with the University of Calcutta and then with the new University of Allahabad in 1888. The MAO College received its university charter from the government in 1921, thanks to the efforts of Sultan Muhammad Shah, Aga Khan III (1877-1957), and was named Aligarh Muslim University. In his pursuit to spread modern education among Muslims, Sir Syed was helped and followed by many other prominent advocates of modernisation such as Nawab Mohsin-ul-mulk (1837-1907) of Hyderabad State, Nawab Abdul Latif Khan (1828-1893) and Syed Ameer Ali (1849-1928) of Bengal, and Badruddin Tayabji (1844-1906) of Bombay.

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, much as he was an advocate of modern education, was also a defender of traditional elitism in Hindu and Muslim communities. At the same time, he was a staunch and vocal spokesman for the rights of Muslims in British India as a distinct community separate from Hindus. Sir Syed kept on reminding the English rulers that there were two separate communities (nations) in India and the rights of Muslims as a relatively backward minority should be recognised and protected. His fear of dominance by Hindus was aggravated by, among other things, the demand of Hindus to replace Urdu by Hindi in the courts and his suspicion about the role of Indian National Congress formed in 1885. His unrelenting advocacy for the rights of Muslims and the Aligarh movement he initiated became the foundation stones of Muslim politics in India until its independence in 1947.

The story of modern Muslim education in India did not end with the college Sir Syed Ahmed Khan established at Aligarh. In the period following World War I, Mohandas Gandhi, leader of the Indian National Congress, and some Muslim leaders launched a protest (non-co-operation) movement against the British colonial rule in India. Almost simultaneously in 1920, a group of 'nationalist' teachers and students at Aligarh Muslim University, who were unhappy with the 'pro-British inclinations' of the University and inspired by the anti-colonial protest movement, formed a separate educational institution, Jamia Millia Islamia, at Aligarh. Two prominent Muslims, Hakim Ajmal Khan (1863-

1927) and Maulana Muhammad Ali (1878-1931), became respectively the first Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor of the Jamia. However, soon the Jamia faced a serious political and financial crisis once the non-co-operation (Khilafat) movement ended and Turkey became a Republic in 1924. In 1925, founders of the Jamia shifted it from Aligarh to Delhi. Gandhi and the Indian National Congress came to its rescue with financial support and Hakim Ajmal Khan contributed his own funds to sustain the institution. But many Muslims saw the Jamia as a tool of the Indian National Congress and kept away from it or withdrew their support. It is fair to say that the dedication of its founders and some new teachers with nationalist outlook, especially Zakir Husain, Abid Husain and Muhammad Mujeeb, saved the institution. In fact, the Jamia Millia became a major platform for the pro-Congress Muslims opposed to the pro-Muslim League tendencies of Aligarh Muslim University and so it remained opposed to the partition of India or emergence of Pakistan in 1947.

11

Partition of India and Independence

All political power which is set over men, being wholly artificial, and for so much a derogation from the natural equality of mankind at large, ought to be some way or other exercised ultimately for their benefit…such rights… are all in the strictest sense a trust, and it is in the very essence of every trust to be rendered accountable. Edmund Burke on India in 1783.

As long as we rule in India, we are the greatest power of the world. If we lose it we shall drop straight away to a third rate power. Lord Curzon, cited by David Dilks in *Curzon in India*.

I. Movement towards Self-Rule in India

Edmund Burke, Thomas Babington Macaulay and John Stuart Mill looked forward to the day when Indians will rule themselves and India would be independent. It was probably in the tenure of Lord Ripon (1880-1884) that the British rulers took the first though meagre steps

from paternalism to partnership with Indians. The revolt of 1857 exposed the 'dangers arising from the entire exclusion of Indians from association with the legislation of the country.' Among others, Sir Syed Ahmed Khan argued that the exclusion of Indians deprived them of the means by which they could express their protest against any unpopular measure and the English government had no opportunity of explaining their aims and intentions. In 1860, Sir Bartle Frere (Member of Viceroy's Council) endorsed this view to include Indians in the Legislative Council to do away with 'the perilous experiment of continuing to legislate for millions of people with few means of knowing, except by rebellion, whether the laws suit them or not.' Until the British Crown took over the government of India in 1858, the executive and legislative power was vested in the Governor-General-in-Council in Calcutta. The Council comprised the Governor-General and four ordinary members with the Commander-in-Chief as an extraordinary member. In 1853, six new members joined the Council for legislative purposes and the legislative process became a little more open and independent, but Indians had no representation in it.

The Indian Councils Act of 1861 was a landmark in the evolution of the Executive and Legislative Councils. It added a fifth ordinary non-official member to the Executive Council and provided for six to twelve additional members with no less than one-half to be non-official. The Viceroy would nominate the additional members to a two-year term. However, the powers of both the Executive and Legislative Councils were subject to many restrictions. For one thing, the powers of Governor-General were enlarged. Lord Canning used a 'portfolio system' in which each member of the Executive Council was allocated responsibility for one or more departments and be answerable to the Viceroy. The function of the Legislative Council was strictly limited to legislate with the Viceroy enjoying veto power and authority to issue ordinances in emergency without the approval of the Council. Of course, the Crown had the ultimate veto power.

The Act of 1861 also gave to the governments of Bombay and Madras the power of making laws and regulations subject to the same restrictions. In addition, the provincial Councils had to obtain prior sanction from the Viceroy. The provincial Executive Councils were expanded

for legislative purposes from four to eight additional members, not less than one-half being non-official members, nominated by the Governor. Legislative Councils were established in Bengal (1862), North-Western Provinces (1886) and the Punjab (1898) and provision was made for new provinces as well. While the Act of 1861 limited the independent power of Legislative Councils, it was an important milestone: it opened the door for Indians with their possible inclusion in the Councils since non-official members were not defined. Lord Canning included the Maharaja of Patiala, Raja of Benares and Sir Dinker Rao of Gwalior in the new Legislative Council. These Indians had proved their loyalty to the English government in the revolt of 1857. The Indian Councils Act of 1870 more clearly defined the overriding power of Governor-General over the Legislative Council and the Act of 1874 added a sixth ordinary member (for Public Works) to the Executive Council.

In the next thirty years, several important legislative changes and events took place that influenced the process by which Indians could exercise greater influence on the government. Some of them reflected the tension between the Indian aspirations and demands and the perceptions of English rulers, but others clearly indicated progress gradual and slow though it was. The Income Tax Act, first introduced in 1860, was withdrawn in 1865 in response to strong Indian protests. The Act of 1860 was reintroduced in 1867 in a new guise as certificate tax of one per cent on all trades and professions; it was converted into a full-fledged income tax in 1868 with increased tax rate. In 1870, in response to the propaganda of the Anglo-Indian press that higher education only bred discontent, the government decided to re-direct its funds to promote mass education through the vernacular. These changes incensed the educated Indians, but their protest did not bear any fruit. The government soon made a concession to the educated class through municipal reforms in the 1870s introducing limited elections. However, in 1876, the government lowered the age for the ICS examination from 21 to 19 to the disadvantage of Indians and their earlier demand for simultaneous examination in England and India remained unfulfilled. Perhaps Lord Lytton (1876-1880) made the most vicious attack on Indians by passing, against the advice of the Law Member, the Vernacular Press Act in 1878. This Act was intended to gag the Indian press: it required printers and

publishers to make a deposit that could be forfeited and machinery confiscated if they published any objectionable material. There was massive protest by educated Indians against the Act for which the opposition Liberal party in England showed much sympathy. The passage of the Arms Act in the same year (1878) put more fuel on the fire because it required Indians to obtain licence for firearms but exempted Europeans and Eurasians.

In 1880, with the victory of Liberal party to power in England, Lord Lytton resigned and was replaced by Lord Ripon (1880-1884). The new liberal Viceroy repealed the Press Act of 1878 and modified the Arms Act by removing the racial exemption. More importantly, in 1882 Lord Ripon in a Resolution proposed introduction of local self-government. By the end of 1884, in spite of the opposition by ICS officers and the India Council in London, 'the mosaic of local self-government covered almost the whole of British India'. In early 1883, C.P. Ilbert, Law Member in Viceroy's Council, introduced a bill to give powers to the Indian District Magistrates and Sessions Judges in smaller towns to try European offenders as was already the case in the three Presidency towns. In response to the loud protest by many Europeans and Eurasians against the proposed bill, exposing their racial prejudice, Lord Ripon withdrew the bill and substituted a milder compromise. The failure of the Ilbert bill made the educated and politically conscious Indians painfully aware of their sub-ordinate position. The protests they launched through speeches and the press were a significant landmark in the evolution of political history of India.

1. Genesis of the Indian National Congress

Meanwhile new associations in India dominated by the middle-class professionals were replacing the older ones controlled by the landed elite. The British Indian Association of Calcutta, controlled by the zaminari interests, came under challenge from the new professional class who, under the leadership of Surendranath Banerji (1848-1925)—earlier removed from the ICS—formed the Indian Association of Calcutta in 1876. In Bombay, Naoroji Ferdunji and Dadabhai Naoroji gave new life to the Bombay Association, but western-educated individuals like M.G. Ranade, P.M. Mehta and K.T. Telang challenged it. In Madras, after the

demise of the Madras Native Association in 1862, there was little political activity until 1884 when the Madras Mahajan Sabha was founded. Outside these three Presidencies too, political life started to organise and new associations formed. However, both new and older associations remained engaged in competitive activities. The new associations rose above the local and regional issues to the national level, demanding more representation by Indians in the government and bureaucracy, separation of judicial and executive powers, imposition of import duties on cotton textiles, reduction of expenditure on 'home charges', rationalisation of expenditure, and protesting against the Press and Arms Acts Act, and so on.

The new professional class faced many dilemmas and contradictions. Some of them could not completely divorce from their links with the landed elite, as for example their opposition to the Bengal Tenancy Bill of 1885 to protect occupancy rights of tenants. The Age of Consent Act of 1891 sharply divided the dominant high-caste Hindus, as for example the conservative B.G. Tilak and the liberal G.K. Gokhale in Bombay. There was also the schism between Hindus and Muslims, exacerbated by the attempt of many Hindus to express their budding nationalism through Hindu symbols and images. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, among some other Muslims, was a leading advocate for the protection of Muslim identity and rights in the emerging political environment dominated by Hindus. The cow-protection and the reconversion movements led by the Arya Samaj resulted in large-scale communal riots in northern India. There was yet another dimension of divisions in India. The upper-caste Hindus, many of them educated and professional, did very little to enlist the support of the lower castes and dalits (untouchables). But the Christian missionary activity, charity and education, and colonial educational policy sparked awakening among the lower castes as well. They started to organise movements against Brahmins and high-caste Hindus because they perceived the nationalist movement as a conspiracy to establish Brahmin hegemony over the new institutions and regarded the colonial (English) government as their protector and liberator. It is against this background that the Indian National Congress (INC), which would play a dominant role in the struggle for In-

dia's independence, was formed at a convention held at Bombay towards the end of 1885.

The most important early demands of INC were to reform the Legislative Councils to make them more representative and assign to them powers to discuss the budget and receive information from the executive. To accommodate these demands, Lord Dufferin (1884-1888) suggested to the government in London to make changes in India. This led to the Indian Councils Act of 1892, another landmark in the constitutional development of India. The number of the additional members was increased slightly in the central and provincial Councils. More importantly, the Act provided for the Viceroy to prescribe the method of appointing additional members, including election. Lord Landsdowne (1888-1894) opted for eight members of the provincial Councils to be elected by Municipalities, District Boards, Chambers of Commerce, Universities, etc. and four members of the Viceroy's Council to be elected by non-official members of the provincial Councils. The Act also conceded the right of Council members to discuss the budget and ask questions of public interest.

Surendranath Banerji, founder of the Indian Association of Calcutta, was perhaps the first Indian who organised a protest campaign in 1877 against the government's decision to reduce the age for the ICS examination. It brought on one platform many educated middle-class Indians in the north from Bengal to the Punjab: the anti-ICS agitation 'was the awakening of a spirit of unity and solidarity among the people of India.' A similar agitation was then organised against the Vernacular Press Act and the Arms Act. These agitations definitely influenced the colonial government to change its earlier decisions. The Ilbert Bill and agitation of the Anglo-Indian community against it precipitated counter-agitation by educated Indians. In 1883, Banerji again took the lead and organised the Indian National Conference at Calcutta with representatives from all parts of India.

At about this time, Allan Octavian Hume, a retired officer of the Bengal Civil Service, invited educated Indians, with the possible encouragement of Lord Dufferin, to organise an association for moral, social and political regeneration of the people of India. In 1885, with the help of some prominent Indians, a national convention was held

at Bombay with W.C. Bonnerji, a Bengali barrister, in the Chair. The Indian National Congress (INC) was formed at this convention. The Indian Association of Calcutta subsequently merged into the Congress. The INC played a major role in the passage of the Indian Councils Act of 1892, but it was unable to achieve much else until the end of nineteenth century. One of the reasons was that the attitude of colonial government turned against its agitation: these educated Indians did not represent the masses was its argument. It was countered by some INC members with the argument that they were far better representatives of the opinions of Indian masses than outsiders working for the colonial administration.

In the initial years, moderates dominated the INC who emphasised playing the game according to rules: they did not want the British rule to disappear any time soon. They only wanted to improve the colonial rule by demanding increased representation for Indians in the decision-making institutions and processes. They also focussed their attention on the economic issues of poverty, transfer of resources, unfair trade practices and taxes, wasteful government expenditure on wars from revenues collected in India, and so on. While lack of response by the government raised the spirit of agitation, it also led to divisions in the Indian ranks. The colonial government's non-response or at best lukewarm response to the demands of INC started to open cracks within its ranks. Some members argued for action in place of submission of resolutions, petitions, and appeals to an unresponsive government.

There was also a revivalist movement to create a strong national feeling with appeal to Hindu symbols, mythology and history. It grew as a reaction against the reformist movements and government policies on social reforms: nationalism and social reforms were incompatible. The late nineteenth century saw a gradual weakening of the reformist trend and strengthening of the revivalist forces among Hindus. The central personality of the revivalist movement in Maharashtra was Bal Gangadhar Tilak. He led the opposition to social reforms initiated by the government (interference in social matters) and organised festivals celebrating Shivaji's achievements. By his speeches and writings, Tilak ignited communal chauvinism and radicalised some members of the INC as well in many parts of India. The rhetoric of nationalism and

militant opposition to foreign rule had to be based on the defence of Hinduism, its symbols, mythology and history. The emerging radical Hindu groups, both inside and outside the Congress, vociferously challenged the moderates in the INC.

The emergence and growth of Hindu revivalists was no less a threat to the interests of Muslim community in India. The cow-protection movement, and the Hindu-Muslim riots that followed in 1893, put an unmistakable Hindu stamp on nationalist agitation. Prominent leaders of the movement attended the INC session in 1893 and members of INC like Tilak closely associated with them. Another movement putting a wedge between the two communities was the Hindi-Urdu controversy—which had first risen in the United Provinces in the 1860s in which Sir Syed took the side of Urdu—was revived in 1882 and spread to the Punjab and Central Provinces: in northern India Hindi came to be identified with Hindus and Urdu with Muslims. In 1900, the government of the United Provinces gave to Hindi (Nagri) the same official status as Urdu. The Hindu revivalist movement, and activities of the Arya Samaj in the Punjab, alienated the Sikhs as well: they moved to establish their identity different from Hindus, including adoption of Gurmukhi script for the Punjabi language. A separate Sikh identity, different from both Hindus and Muslims, would play an important role in the independence movement.

The rise of Hindu extremism was a reflection partly of the failure of moderates in the INC, which itself was financially in distress, and the reformist agenda of moderates went against popular orthodoxy. The extremists like Tilak in Maharashtra, Lala Rajpat Rai in the Punjab and Bepin Chandra Pal in Bengal took full advantage of the situation. The administration of Lord Curzon (1899-1905), perhaps the last champion of British imperialism, exacerbated the Hindu nationalist feeling. He undertook several administrative and legislative measures that hurt the Hindu susceptibilities. For one thing, he increased government control of the Calcutta Municipal Corporation and Calcutta University and reduced press freedom in 1904. But more important was his decision to partition Bengal in 1905 which allowed the Hindu extremists to take over the INC to commit it to the path of belligerent confrontation with

the colonial government: their goal would be swaraj (self-rule) with or without the support of British rulers.

The partition of Bengal, approved by the Secretary of State in London, involved creation of a new province of Eastern Bengal and Assam, which was part of Bengal until 1874. Eastern Bengal included all districts in the Divisions of Chittagong, Dhaka and Rajshahi as well as Hill Tippera, and Malda. The new province would have 18 million Muslims and 12 million Hindus while the remaining part of Bengal was left with 54 million, 42 million of them Hindus and the rest Muslims. Most Bengali Hindus did not buy the administrative argument for partitioning Bengal since they thought that the real reason was to break their power and that of the INC. According to Lord Minto (1905-1910), partition would destroy the power of the Bengali landowning, money-lending, professional, and clerical classes. They had monopolised education and employment, by which they exercised political power, to the exclusion of other groups, Muslims in particular. Muslims in eastern Bengal were understandably in favour of the partition of Bengal along proposed lines.

The anti-partition movement transformed into a wider swadeshi movement in which moderates took the lead: Surendranath Banerji gave a call for boycott of English goods and institutions. Mass mobilisation also became an important tool for promoting the objective: develop indigenous alternatives to foreign goods and institutions at each level including villages. The idea of self-reliance included not only production of goods but education, arbitration courts and village organisations. But this approach was criticised by the extremists who wanted to go for independence first and then re-organise national life: it was not about the partition of Bengal any more, but about achieving swaraj or complete independence. The anti-partition movement flowered into three different approaches. One was of moderates through mass mobilisation but without aggressive resistance; the other was of the extremists for complete independence through violent and non-violent agitation using Hindu religious symbols; and the third, which branched out of the extremist movement, was revolutionary terrorism. The terrorists achieved materially very little, but the movement did not disappear: it went underground and decentralised. For some organised terrorism be-

came a useful alternative to other approaches. It is fair to say that the anti-partition movement intensified tensions within the INC between moderates and extremists weakening the organisation. It took the INC more than a decade to establish a common platform, with moderates and extremists together, for confrontation with the colonial government in their demand for self-rule in India.

2. Genesis of the All India Muslim League

A major problem for the Hindu-dominated INC was to persuade Muslims to be part of the organisation to form a genuine national front: most Muslims were indifferent to the INC and only a few joined it or attended its annual sessions. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan was opposed to the INC, in spite of his earlier views on nationalism, because it was dominated by educated Hindus and its political demands on the colonial government, towards popular government, could hurt the Muslim community in the long run since Muslims had much catching up to do through education. Sir Syed emphasised on the Muslims the need to focus their attention on education and not politics. He publicly expressed his fears that under a democratic order 'the larger community would fully override the interests of the smaller community'. The symbolic gestures of INC towards Muslims did not remove Muslim apprehensions and the INC's silence about the cow-slaughter riots of 1893 only added to Muslim misgivings. Whatever little representation Muslims had in the INC it started to decline after 1893, but the Congress adopted a complacent attitude since no rival Muslim organisation existed. At this stage, it is important to turn to the development of Muslim politics and formation of the All-India Muslim League in 1906.

As mentioned earlier, Muslims in India were not a homogenous community. They were divided in many ways: uneven demographic distribution in India; sectarian division between the Sunnis and Shias; linguistic differences; and economic and social disparities. But these differences did not extinguish their consciousness of separateness from Hindus, which was awakened by increased tendency among Hindus to use their religious mythology, traditions, and history as symbols of their identity. In addition, Muslims developed a communally shared fear of being submerged by the majority (Hindus) in the absence of political

power that they had enjoyed for centuries before the English displaced the Mughal rule. Their falling behind the Hindus in several respects strengthened this feeling. The English did not promote or craft this perception or image as some have argued. The partition of Bengal in 1905 and its annulment in 1911 certainly added a sense of urgency among many Muslims in Bengal.

A sense of distinct Muslim identity among ordinary Bengali Muslims started to develop through Islamic reform movements in the early nineteenth century. The Muslim elite in Bengal, who had started to lose their position of economic and political power to Hindus, soon linked their sense of loss to the rising sentiment of Muslims in Bengal. The first Muslim organisation, Anjuman-i-Islami, was formed in 1855 to promote the interests of the community and preach loyalty to the English. The organisation wanted a 'fair field' and not 'exclusive privilege' to compete with Hindus: it advocated special measures to spread education and condemned the 1857 revolt. The modernisation campaign gathered momentum in the 1860s. However, two different approaches were adopted: Nawab Abdul Lateef Khan's Mohammedan Literary Society (1863) emphasised the role of Western education within the traditional Islamic education system, but Sayed Ameer Ali's Central National Mohammedan Association (1877) advocated secular Western, completely Anglicised, education for Muslims. By this time, some of the colonial officers were sympathetic to the idea of promoting Muslim education to counter the appeal of the anti-British Wahabi and Faraizi movements.

The colonial government, in response to the advocacy of men like Sayyid Ameer Ali and others, shifted its policy in favour of Muslim education and employment. At the same time, the Muslim educated elite in Bengal intensified their campaign to attract ordinary Muslims through expansion of anjumans and their branches in small towns, in which they forged alliances with the local ulema and mullas. Some of the influential elite, Nawab Salimullah of Dhaka among them, mobilised Muslim opinion in favour of partition of Bengal. Hindu revivalism and the arrogant attitude of Bengali (Hindu) bhadralok towards Muslims helped the movement of mass mobilisation of Muslims. Several Hindu-Muslim riots in Bengal between 1897 and 1907 were the result

of accumulated tensions between the two communities. The swadeshi movement exacerbated rather than alleviated the communal split. Even the more secular Muslims became conscious of their otherness.

In a somewhat similar way, a new Muslim identity was being crafted in northern India, particularly in the United Provinces (U.P.). Here a vibrant regional press and the flourishing popular Urdu poetry were helping to create a 'religiously informed cultural identity'. There was also mushroom-like growth of local anjumans, religious festivities, and festivals attracting increasing number of Muslims. The communal riots in U.P. during the 1870s and 1880s, resulting from contests for public space between Hindus and Muslims, acted as catalysts for crystallisation of separate identities. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and the Aligarh movement he initiated were perhaps the transformative forces not only in U.P. but all over India. Sir Syed saw India as a geographic entity in which Hindus and Muslims lived as different communities (aqwam). He could not see India as a nation-state based on individual citizenship: Hindus would dominate it without protection for the rights of Muslims. His argument was gaining strength with the growth of Hindu revivalism and chauvinism. Sir Syed did not buy the proclaimed nationalism of the INC, dominated as it was by the upper-caste Hindus and some of its influential members were involved in anti-Muslim causes. Sir Syed was against the INC and he formed the Mohammedan Educational Conference in 1886 (called Congress after 1890) with branches in different cities all over India. The cow-salaughter riots of 1893, and the silence of INC on the issue, led Sir Syed to form the Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental Defence Association in that year.

Some have insinuated that Theodore Beck, Principal of Aligarh College and one of the founders of the Indian Patriotic Association in 1888, was the moving force behind Sir Syed's opposition to the INC. He may have been a sympathiser, but Sir Syed's views on the issue of separate communities were in the public domain since the early 1860s. Generally, the ulema did not approve of Sir Syed's educational agenda, his religious writings and his acceptance of the British rule. Similarly, some of the western-educated Muslims, Badruddin Tayabji in Bombay being one of them, joined the INC and many newspapers in the Punjab did not accept Sir Syed as a representative of Indian Muslims. Even among

some students and alumni of Aligarh, after Sir Syed's generation, did not follow his line: some took the route of the ulema and Pan-Islamism and others took the INC route. But a vast majority of the Aligarhians imbibed the ideology of Sir Syed.

Bengal's partition unleashed a persistent and aggressive Hindu campaign against the new Muslim-dominated province. The first major casualty was the province's first Lt Governor, Sir Joseph Fuller. He resigned in less than a year because he strongly differed from the central government on its policy against agitation. Rumours were also rife that the government would rescind the partition of Bengal. In addition, the Secretary of State for India in London indicated in his budget speech that the colonial administration would introduce representative government in India. This last item alarmed Muslims across the board. Consequently, a Muslim delegation, led by Sir Sultan Muhammad Shah (Aga Khan III), met with Lord Minto at Simla in early October of 1906. The Viceroy gave patient hearing to the Muslim demand for proportional representation in the public bodies and employment and assured Muslim Bengalis that their rights would not be jeopardised. The thirty-five delegates followed it up with the decision to form an organisation for independent political action. So it was at the annual session of the Mohammedan Educational Congress at Dhaka (capital of Eastern Bengal and Assam province) in December of 1906 that the All India Muslim League (AIML) was formed. Nawab Salimullah wanted to establish a Muslim political party to defend the existence of Eastern Bengal in the face of anti-partition agitation of Hindus. The defined goals of AIML were to safeguard the interest and political rights of Muslims, promote inter-community harmony, and preach loyalty to the British rule. This is what Sir Syed was preaching and demanding.

In the first four years, AIML existed only as an adjunct of the Mohammedan Educational Congress, but they separated in 1910. In the first decade of its existence, Muslim leaders of northern India (U.P. in particular) dominated the League: Viqar-ul-mulk and Mohsin-ul-mulk led the provisional committee that drafted the constitution of AIML; the draft was approved in the session at Karachi in December 1907. In the early years, the power structure of AIML stayed with 'men of property and influence'. Provincial Muslim Leagues were formed with relative

freedom to frame their own constitutions: the central and provincial Leagues did not interfere in each other's affairs. The relations between the INC and AIML remained on shaky grounds for about two decades and they departed from each other completely after the Khilafat movement (1920-1924). The foundation for their separate routes was laid by events during the decade following the Morley-Minto reforms of 1909.

II. Constitutional Reforms and Indian Politics: 1909-1929

Lord Morley, Secretary of State for India, and Lord Minto (1905-1910), Viceroy of India, had doubts about the political future of India because of the fragmented nature of its society, especially the deep division between Hindus and Muslims. They made several proposals for reforming the structure of government in India, which the Indian Councils Act of 1909 incorporated:

- It gave increased representation to Indians in the Executive and Legislative Councils. One seat in the Viceroy's Executive Council was reserved for an Indian—Lord S.P. Sinha was the first Indian inducted as Law Member. The size of the Madras and Bombay Executive Councils was increased to four and an Executive Council was introduced in Bengal. While the Act did not specifically provide for appointment of Indians to the provincial Executive Councils, they were included.
- The Legislative Councils were changed more radically. The size of Central Legislature was increased from 16 to a maximum of 60, of which no more than 28 were to be official members. Twenty-seven seats were to be filled by non-official elected members with separate representation for different constituencies (groups or communities). The Viceroy could nominate five non-official and official members. In the provincial Legislative Councils, the number of additional members was raised to a maximum of 50 in the major provinces, but the nominated non-official and official members would constitute a majority, except in Bengal, over elected non-official members. The elected members were to represent various constituencies.

- Three other important provisions of the Act were: (i) there would be separate electorate, by which the Muslim electorate would elect the Muslim members of Councils, (ii) Muslims would also have the right to vote in general constituencies, and (iii) Muslim representation in the Councils would be weighted.

The last three provisions gave the Muslims official legitimacy to their separate political identity, a protected minority community, and a sense of achievement for AIML as the public face of Indian Muslims. But this achievement was marred by the British government's annulment of the partition of Bengal as a concession to Bengali Hindus, given their agitation and acts of terror perpetrated by some of the extremists. The annulment was announced at the Durbar of 1911 as a 'coronation boon' from King George V. The government used the occasion to move the imperial capital from Calcutta to Delhi, where it held the Durbar with all the imperial pomp and show. The shifting of capital was the end of the Bengali (Hindu) domination in Indian politics. Besides the Bengali Muslims, understandably appalled by the government's decision on Bengal, some English and Indian administrators did not much approve this action either. In passing, I should note that the annulment of Bengal's partition did not put an end to terrorism in Indian politics. The centre of activities soon shifted to the Punjab and U.P. where some of the Bengali terrorists joined the revolutionary (Ghadar) party formed by some Indians in North America. During World War I, some individuals in Bengal and parts of northern India attempted to instigate armed revolt, possibly with the help of Germany or Japan. The colonial government, under its Defence of India Act of 1915, either nipped in the bud or crushed the terrorist attempts.

The Act of 1909, though it opened a window of opportunity for Indians to be represented in the Councils and heard, maintained ultimate power with the Viceroy in India and more importantly with the Secretary of State for India and Parliament in London. Indian politicians were not satisfied with the limited provisions of the Act and during World War I they renewed their claims. In response to the demands of Indians and their loyal co-operation during the War, Edwin Montague, Secretary of State for India, made an important announcement in the Parliament in August 1917. The British government in London and in India wished to increase the involvement of Indians in every branch of

administration and foster the growth of self-governing institutions for 'progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire.' He later came to India, ascertained public opinion and published the Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms (also known as Montague-Chelmsford Reforms) in the spring of 1918. This report formed the basis of the Government of India Act of 1919, which came into effect in 1921.

- The Act laid out a clear division between the centre and provinces and it delimited for each the sources of income and revenue with income tax assigned to the centre and land revenue to provinces. In the provinces, certain departments (like health, education, agriculture, local bodies) were transferred to Cabinet Ministers who were responsible to the provincial Legislative Assembly while the more weighty departments (law and order, finance) were left with the civilian bureaucracy.
- The Central Executive Council was enlarged to include more Indians, but the Viceroy would remain answerable to the Secretary of State in London.
- The Central Legislature was made bi-cameral, Council of State as the upper chamber and the Legislative Assembly as the lower chamber. The Legislative Assembly would have an elected majority but have no control over Cabinet Ministers. Elections were to be based on a franchise of 1.5 million property owners. The Viceroy could dissolve the two chambers.
- The communal principle of separate electorate for Muslims was extended to the Sikh community as well. In addition, seats were reserved for non-Brahmins in Madras and the 'depressed' classes were offered nomination in the legislatures.
- In the provinces, the government was split into two parts. The Governor and his Executive Council would retain the 'reserved' subjects and the Ministers appointed by the Governor from among members of the provincial Legislative Assembly would oversee the 'transferred' subjects. The Governor would enjoy extensive powers.
- The legislature in the provinces would be uni-cameral and its membership was increased in each of the nine provinces (Bengal, Madras, Bombay, United Provinces, Bihar, Orissa, Punjab,

> Central Provinces, and Assam). Seventy per cent of its members would be elected and among the nominated no more than 20 per cent would be officials. The principle of separate electorate would be used for the election of members to the Legislative Assembly. The Assembly was given powers to approve bills on 'transferred' subjects but the Governor would have the last word on 'reserved' subjects. The same principle would apply to the provincial budget.

The problem with these reforms was that, by this time, the Indian elite and their followers had moved beyond the idea of self-government within the British Empire: for many the goal was complete independence (swaraj). Several factors were at work in India during the decade between 1909 and 1919. One of them was the military contribution of Indians in World War I and the effect of the War on India itself. The Indian army had helped the English in the Middle East (Palestine and Iraq) against Turkey and in East Africa against Germany. The War induced industrial growth in India and it opened up new markets (Japan and the United States) for its products, all of which benefited mostly the business groups dominated by Hindus who supported the INC. On the other side, the rising expenditure on defence through loans added to the public debt and with it the burden of increased taxes, duties, etc. The ordinary Indians bore the brunt of unprecedented inflation, food shortages and falling real wages. The forced recruitment of people, mostly from rural areas, for the War effort added to the resentment of ordinary people. There were thus major economic and social dislocations for most of the population in India, preparing a fertile ground for mass mobilisation.

It was also the period in which men like Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi (1869-1948) and Mohammed Ali Jinnah (1876-1948), both Gujaratis and educated in England, emerged on the centre stage and started to exert their influence on political affairs in India. The war between Turkey and Britain aroused negative feelings of Muslims for the British rule and paved the way for co-operation between the INC and AIML. In 1916, both parties held their sessions in Lucknow and concluded the famous 'Lucknow Pact' in which Jinnah acted as the bridge between the two parties. Their united aim was self-government for India. The INC conceded separate electorate for Muslims, which would massive-

ly increase Muslim representation in the Muslim-minority provinces. Muslims would obtain one-third of the seats in the central legislature by separate Muslim constituencies. The INC also agreed that no bill or resolution concerning a community could be passed if three-quarters of the representatives of that community were against it. The Act of 1919 incorporated these and other conditions of the INC-AIML pact. In addition, B.G. Tilak and Annie Besant, both members of Congress, organised Home Rule Leagues aimed at mobilising the public to demand self-rule for Indians. The October 1916 Revolution in Russia may have also affected the colonial government's decision to placate the sentiments of Indians, especially of the increasingly vocal political class.

The year 1919 was to be a turning point for India in many ways. For one thing, promulgation of the Rowlatt Acts in that year to continue repressive powers—doing away with the ordinary legal procedure and authorising imprisonment without trial—of the government first used during the War enormously agitated the Indians. In response to Gandhi's call for passive resistance (satyagraha), there were mass protests, strikes and riots in several parts of India. Muslims joined him as well because they were deeply hurt by Turkey's surrender and the rumours that the British wanted to abolish the caliphate—Turkish Sultan was regarded by most Sunni Muslims as the caliph of Islam. This would form the basis of the Khilafat movement in India. In 1919, riots in the Punjab, Amritsar in particular, became the focal point for the government, seen by some as an insurrection to overthrow colonial rule. The Governor of Punjab called into service Brigadier Reginald Dyer at Amritsar. The riots there were a response to the imprisonment of two leaders of satyagraha, resulting in looting, arson and killing of some Europeans. Dyer had 1,100 troops, one-third European, and two armoured cars with machine guns. Meetings and processions were banned and curfew was clamped on 13 April. In defiance of the curfew, 15,000 to 20,000 souls came to the meeting held at Jalianwalla Bagh. The Gurkha and Sikh soldiers were ordered to shoot at the crowded Bagh: 379 were dead or dying and another 1,500 wounded. Punjab was now in open rebellion: Martial Law was imposed for almost two months in which shootings, bombing from the air, severe sentences, and hangings were the

government's response to the rebellion. Gandhi suspended satyagraha given what had happened in the Punjab.

The atrocities in the Punjab stirred anti-British sentiment throughout the country. At the same time, some prominent Muslim leaders, Muhammad Ali, Shaukat Ali and Abul Kalam Azad closely associated with the Congress, tapped into the anti-British Muslim attitude ignited by the dismemberment of Ottoman Empire: they launched the Khilafat movement among Muslims towards the end of 1919. Gandhi supported the movement at the Khilafat Conference held at Allahabad in the summer of 1920. Other prominent Hindu leaders, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Motilal Nehru, Annie Besant, Lala Rajpat Rai, and C.R. Das, of INC endorsed the stand. Subsequently members of Congress adopted a resolution supporting Hindu-Muslim co-operation in the special session of INC at Calcutta and affirmed it with a majority vote in the regular session at Nagpur in December 1920. But some like Jinnah did not support the Khilafat movement because they thought that the agitation would be disastrous for the Indian cause and it would eventually divide Hindus and Muslims. Jinnah resigned from the Congress after the session. The mass movement of passive resistance, boycotts, hartals, and civil disobedience became widespread since a majority of Hindus and Muslims supported it. Some Muslims saw it a religious act since Jamiat Ulema-i-Hind issued a fatwa endorsing the anti-British movement of non-co-operation. The movement eclipsed the political career, at least for a while, of men like Jinnah, Sir Mohammad Shafi and Sir Fazl-i-Husain. In the meantime, many thousands of Muslims in the North-West Frontier and some in Sindh migrated to Afghanistan because for them India was dar-al-harb. The Afghan government could not accommodate so many and compelled them to return to India.

Some very violent incidents marred and eventually ended the non-co-operation movement. First, in the summer of 1921, Mophlas (Muslim peasants) on the Malabar Coast rose against their Hindu zamindars, moneylenders and the police: they went on a frenzy of burning and killing. Their movement turned into a guerrilla war against the British rule as well. They forced conversion on thousands of Hindus and wanted an independent Muslim state in the region. The Mophlas made a deep dent in the general spirit of Hindu-Muslim co-operation. In ear-

ly February of 1922, a very violent incident followed it in the village of Chauri Chaura in Gorakhpur, U.P. The villagers confronted the police and, after the police responded with bullets, they burnt 22 policemen at the local police station. Gandhi terminated the movement of protest and was sent to prison for six years in March. Gradually, the Khilafat movement petered out for several reasons. There were serious incidents of violence; the government dealt harshly with the leaders; factionalism within the Khilafat Committee; differences between Gandhi and the Khilafat leaders on the use of religious rhetoric; communal riots in different parts of India; and abolition of the Ottoman sultanate and with it the caliphate in Turkey in 1924. In passing, Jinnah wanted Hindu-Muslim unity maintained to fight for self-government and a dominion status for India through constitutional means; in 1923 he wanted to participate in the Councils, but was opposed inside the AIML.

The Khilafat movement ended in 1924 with major consequences: it halted the political career of Gandhi for the next four years; widened rather than narrowed the gap between Hindus and Muslims; intensified the religious movements of tabligh among Muslims and shuddi among Hindus; and damaged the lives of many thousands of Muslims in India. There was now a rising sense of frustration among both Hindus and Muslims affecting their relations adversely. The two major parties, INC and AIML, adopted very different strategies from now on. Neither side made any serious attempt to get back to the same platform for independence.

There was a crisis of division after 1924. Congress was divided between those who wanted to follow the Gandhi route for change and those who wanted to revert to constitutional politics. The latter group, led by Motilal Nehru and C.R. Das, formed the Swaraj Party within INC. There was also the right-left split with rising influence of men like Subhas Chandra Bose and Jawaharlal Nehru on the left. Likewise, the AIML was divided between supporters of joint and separate electorate. More importantly, there were communal riots in almost all parts of India, stretching from Bengal to the North-West Frontier, for over six years. Hindu and Muslim extremist voices were gaining strength at the expense of moderate and secular voices. At the same time, both inside and outside INC, some voices started to speak on behalf of the low-caste

and untouchables among Hindus: B.R. Ambedkar (1891-1956) organised them into an All India Depressed Classes Congress. Towards the end of the 1920s, India also started to experience the adverse effects on prices of its exports (most of them were raw material) because of the Great Depression. So while the income of people in rural areas was going down, thanks to falling commodity prices, the revenue demand on them stayed at the same level when prices were high. On the other hand, a new class of businessmen (most of them Hindus) emerged as a consequence of government's industrial and commercial policies necessitated by World War I. Many of these businessmen started to align themselves with the Congress.

The Raj recovered its former composure by 1923-24 because the opposition fell into disarray. In 1926, the new Viceroy Lord Irwin (1926-1930) went back to follow the provisions of the Act of 1919. In 1927, during a state of cluttered events and suspended political activity in India, the Conservative government in London appointed an all-white Statutory Commission under Sir John Simon to review the implementation of constitutional arrangements put in place since 1921. All shades of Indians launched a countrywide boycott of Simon Commission when it came to India in early 1928. This opened a window of opportunity for the INC and AIML to work together to frame a constitution for India, but the events that followed divided the two parties even more.

In the summer of 1928, the All-Parties Convention at Lucknow established a committee of nine members, chaired by Motilal Nehru, including two Muslims (Ali Imam and Mohammed Shoaib Qureshi), to frame a constitutional framework for an independent Indian Dominion. The committee's report stated that India would be a secular state with equal rights to men and women. It would be a federation with residuary powers vested in the centre but without defining the extent of provincial autonomy. Muslims would have no more than one-quarter of the seats in the central legislature. There would be joint electorate, without weightage for minorities, for all legislative bodies. Finally, seats would be reserved in each province for minorities (with at least ten percent population) in proportion to their size.

The position of AIML was that it was willing to give up the separate electorate if seats were reserved in proportion of the population of

different communities. Hindus in Sindh, North-West Frontier and Balochistan would have reserved seats over and above their proportion in the population as Muslims would get in the Hindu majority provinces. Muslims would constitute not less than one-third of the central legislature. On communal matters, no bill or resolution would be passed if three-quarters of the members of that community were opposed to it. Sindh would become a province and there would be reforms in the North-West Frontier and Balochistan as in other provinces. Finally, the AIML made no mention of Bengal and Punjab, where the Muslims were in majority.

The failure to reach a compromise between the INC and AIML in Calcutta at the All-Parties Convention towards the end of 1928 united the Jinnah and Shafi factions within AIML and it held its meeting in March 1929 to reaffirm Jinnah's 14 points. Motilal Nehru was caught in two traps: the Hindu backlash (Hindu Mahasabha, etc.) against compromise with Muslims and his mistaken view of India somewhat like Britain where a strong unitary government worked well. Besides the gulf between INC and AIML, Gandhi did not endorse the Nehru Report: for him swaraj was not a constitutional matter that the British government could give, but it had to be achieved by mobilising the masses (satyagraha). Gandhi's re-entry point in Indian politics was the Bardoli satyagraha, after which he re-emerged as a national leader ready to pick the baton for gaining independence on his terms. It is also fair to say that it was a crucial turning point for the relations between Hindus and Muslims (INC and AIML) in terms of their strongly held views about the political and constitutional structure of India in or out of the British Empire.

III. Movement towards Partition,1930-1940

Since Indians boycotted the proceedings of Simon Commission, and given the prospects of civil disobedience led by Gandhi and INC, in October 1929 Lord Irwin (1926-1931) proposed a Round Table Conference to consider Simon Commission's recommendations. In its session

at Lahore towards the end of 1929, INC decided to start a civil disobedience movement to achieve complete independence. There was some division among its ranks and the Muslims, especially AIML, vehemently opposed the proposed movement. Likewise, Sikhs and non-INC Hindus (Hindu Mahasabha) were not in favour of the INC's decision. In the spring of 1930, Gandhi began the disobedience movement in Gujarat with his famous 'salt march' against government regulations. The march triggered mass boycotts, strikes and even bombings in several parts of India. The government adopted some harsh measures to end the movement.

The Simon Commission Report was released in the summer of 1930. It suggested replacement of diarchy with full responsible government in the provinces, with some emergency powers left with the Governors. Legislatures were to be based on a wider franchise and the official bloc would be removed. No change was proposed in the structure of central government: complete British authority and control would be retained. The Commission emphasised the importance of contacts with the Indian (princely) states and envisaged a programme of an All-India Federation, including the princely states, in some distant future. The nationalists in India rejected the Report. The government in London held the First Round Table Conference to consider the Simon Commission Report from November 1930 to January 1931. The INC boycotted the Conference and it achieved nothing at the end.

Eventually Lord Irwin and Gandhi reached a compromise in March 1931. In the Gandhi-Irwin pact, INC agreed to participate in the Second Round Table Conference to discuss the future constitution of India. Gandhi's decision to return from confrontation to the negotiation table was probably the result of violence and radicalism which INC leaders could not control and was tearing apart the fragile unity among diverse Hindu groups. The Second Round Table Conference, in which Gandhi was the only INC representative, was held in London in the last three months of 1931. Gandhi and leaders of other groups at the Conference could not reach agreement on the communal question. He was adamant about not conceding the principle of separate electorate demanded by Muslims and other minority communities, including the untouchables. In the meantime, the government in India continued its harsh treat-

ment of people involved in boycotts, etc. On Gandhi's return to India, the Viceroy refused to meet with him and the colonial government banned the INC after its decision to renew the disobedience movement in January 1932. The government arrested Gandhi with several other INC leaders and, in the next one year, thousands more were arrested and severe punishments meted out.

The constitutional history of India took a dramatic turn when Ramsay Macdonald, Prime Minister of Britain, announced the 'Communal Award' in August 1932. It apportioned representation among communities and extended the principle of separate electorate to untouchables as well. Gandhi was appalled by the announcement, but Ambedkar was happy with the provision of separate electorate for the depressed classes. However, Ambedkar and Gandhi compromised on this issue: there would be increased reserved seats for untouchables and a two-tier election system to ensure proper representation of these groups. The Third Round Table Conference, held in London towards the end of 1932, was a mere formality because less than one-half of the delegates attended the session. The British government, based on deliberations and declarations of the last three years, published a White Paper on constitutional reforms in the spring of 1933. A Parliamentary Joint Select Committee reviewed it with the help of some Indians. The Committee submitted its proposals in October 1934. Based on its recommendations, the British Parliament passed the Government of India Act of 1935 in August. Though the Act of 1935 satisfied neither the INC nor AIML, it included many new features.

- It started with two principles: an All-India federation to include all provinces and the federating Indian (princely) states and provincial autonomy with a government responsible to an elected legislature.
- The federal structure would come into effect only if more than 50 per cent of the princely states signed the Instrument of Accession. The Act introduced diarchy at the centre subject to certain safeguards with certain subjects (foreign affairs, defence and internal security) to remain under Viceroy's control. The financial control was transferred from London to Delhi, giving the government of India fiscal autonomy.

- The central legislature would be bi-cameral with 30 to 40 per cent members nominated by the princes. The franchise was enlarged to 30 million (about 10 per cent of population), but retaining a high property condition for voters. Separate electorate was provided for Muslims and reserved seats for the untouchables (scheduled castes) in the federal and provincial legislatures.
- The Viceroy and provincial Governors were invested with special powers, over the legislatures and ministers, for which they were responsible directly to the British Parliament.
- Two new provinces (Sindh and Orissa) were created, increasing the number of Governors' provinces from nine to eleven and six Chief Commissioners' provinces which were administered by the Viceroy through his agents (Chief Commissioners).
- The Act did not make India a dominion: the only change was that the imperial control moved from London to Delhi.

Lord Linlithgow (1936-1943) summed up the essence of the Act of 1935 in these words: 'After all we framed the constitution…of 1935 because we thought it the best way…to hold India to the Empire.' The Act became a foundation stone for the constitutions of independent states of India and Pakistan in 1947.

The constitutional provisions of the Act of 1935 for provincial governments came into effect in the spring of 1937. At the beginning of 1937, in the provincial elections, the INC swept the polls and AIML did not do well at all. The Congress claimed to be the sole representative of Indians and formed the government in eight out of 11 provinces, with clear majority in five and coalitions in three provinces. The leaders of AIML wanted to be included in the government of Congress-held provinces. Jinnah was outraged by the claim of some of the leaders of INC that it was the sole representative of all people and that it did not include AIML in the coalition. Even in U.P., the INC offered only one cabinet post to the AIML, which it declined to accept. Jinnah and his party claimed that the Congress Raj meant 'Hindu Raj'. The attitude of Congress in power transformed AIML into a nationwide popular party among Muslims. Muslim distrust of INC increased by several new developments: the INC Ministers displaced Muslims and distributed offices to their supporters; Muslim zamindars in some provinces were

hurt by INC's fiscal policy; in Bihar cow slaughter was banned; and INC hoisted its flag on public buildings and introduced singing of *bande mataram* in schools.

Muslims were not on the same platform even after the elections of 1937 because the AIML did not lead even in the Muslim majority provinces of Bengal and Punjab. A.K. Fazlul Haq in Bengal and Fazl-i-Husain in the Punjab had their coalitions with peasants and lower-caste Hindus. AIML as the sole representative of Muslims was defeated in the elections. The resounding victory of INC and arrogance of its leaders led by Jawaharlal Nehru created a new sense of alienation among Muslims. Nehru launched his Muslim Mass Contact campaign, but it failed partly because the Mahasabhites sabotaged it from within. Jinnah, who returned from England in 1934, started to articulate Muslim fear and dissatisfaction after he became President of AIML in 1935. He was willing to work with INC at the centre for revising the federal constitutional structure. The passage of the Shariat Application Act of 1937, which Jinnah advocated, gave a sense of Muslim solidarity symbolic though it was. Jinnah launched a mass contact campaign, galvanised by the ulema and Aligarh students, to tap into the general feeling of Muslims overwhelmed by the majority given its uncompromising posture. In the fall of 1937, at the annual session of AIML in Lucknow, Jinnah received support from the Punjab, Bengal and Assam: their Premiers advised the Muslim members of their parties to join AIML. By 1939, Jinnah was the voice of Muslims in India: he had given the community a sense of identity and purpose. Jinnah still believed in one India with protection for minority rights of Muslims. But INC leaders were not willing to accommodate the AIML demands.

In September 1939, Lord Linlithgow declared that India like Britain was at war with Germany. But he failed to get the INC and AIML to participate in the central executive: INC wanted unconditional pledge that India would be free to write its constitution once the War was over and Jinnah wanted AIML recognised as the sole representative of all Indian Muslims. Two months later, the provincial governments of INC resigned in protest on the War issue: India was dragged into the War without consultation with Indians. But the provincial governments of Bengal, Punjab and Sindh and the princely states supported the war

effort. AIML, by now a mass party, announced 'Deliverance Day' on December 22, 1939 to celebrate the dissolution of provincial assemblies and the end of INC governments. The provincial administration passed into the hands of bureaucracy, most of which was now in Indian hands: there were more Indian than British ICS officers and less than one-tenth of India's judges were British. In the summer of 1940, the Viceroy offered to expand the Executive Council by including more Indians, appoint a 'War Advisory Council' consisting of representatives of British India and princely states, and set up, after the War, a representative body to devise a new constitution for India. INC rejected the offer and started a civil disobedience movement led by Gandhi.

Probably Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, following the revolt of 1857, had implanted the idea of Muslim nationhood, an identity separate from Hindus. In his writings and speeches, he advocated for the rights of Muslims vis-à-vis Hindus in the context of the widening gap between the two communities and the revivalist tendencies among Hindus. The partition of Bengal, formation of AIML and annulment of Bengal's partition gave Muslims an organised voice for their protection as a minority in an India moving towards responsible government and eventually self-rule. The more the INC looked like the steamroller dominated by Hindus, especially of the upper-castes, the more Muslim opinion galvanised in opposition. After the three Round Table Conferences had failed to resolve the differences between INC and AIML on the constitutional future of India, the idea of a separate homeland for Muslims started to germinate. Sir Mohammed Iqbal (1877-1938), the illustrious Muslim poet-philosopher, spoke of a Muslim state in India in his Presidential address to the annual session of AIML at Allahabad in December 1930:

> I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind, and Baluchistan into a single State...The formation of the consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims, at least of the North-West India.

Iqbal expanded this idea a little more and expressed it in a letter to Jinnah in the summer of 1937. Among other things, he wrote: 'To my mind the new constitution with its idea of a single Indian federation

is completely hopeless. A separate federation of Muslim provinces, reformed on the lines I have suggested above, is the only course by which we can secure a peaceful India and save Muslims from the domination of non-Muslims. Why should not the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal be considered as nations entitled to self-determination just as other nations in India and outside India are?' It should be added that in 1933 Choudhri Rahmat Ali, a Cambridge student, coined the word Pakistan in a pamphlet ('Now or Never'). He later explained that 'Pakistan is both a Persian and Urdu word, composed of letters taken from the names of our homelands: that is, Punjab, Afghania (N.-W. Frontier Province), Kashmir, Iran, Sind, Turkharistan, Afghanistan, and Balochistan. It means the land of the Paks, the spiritually pure and clean.'

The experience of Muslims during the period of 1937-1939, when INC leaders showed no inclination to accommodate the demands of AIML together with some of the biased policies and actions of Congress ministries, created momentum for the partition of India. AIML went into high gear to tap into the wave of popular Muslim emotion. In March 1940, at its session in Lahore, the AIML delegates adopted the 'Pakistan Resolution'—the word Pakistan was not used in it—in favour of the sub-continent's partition. The Congress made many mistakes during this period. It remained blind to a decisive change in Muslim sentiment to which its arrogance had contributed much; left the field open to AIML by resigning from seven provincial ministries, followed by its civil disobedience movement of 1940-1941; and after the abortive Cripps Mission of March 1942 its open rebellion in the summer. The Anglo-Japanese War in South-east Asia precipitated the Cripps Mission as the Japanese overran Malaya and were moving into Burma. [Subhas Chandra Bose and his Indian National Army, backed by the Japanese, were emerging as a threat to British rule in Burma and India.] In the spring of 1942, the British government made a conciliatory gesture. Sir Stafford Cripps, a Labour Member of Parliament in London, led a mission to India, which proposed a Dominion status for the Indian Union within the Commonwealth; the Indian (princely) states would be free to join the Union; the provincial legislatures would elect a constituent assembly; and the provinces could opt out of the Union after accession.

However, there was almost no hope for any immediate change in the government of India. Both the INC and AIML rejected the proposals.

In August of 1942, Congress, led by Gandhi and Nehru, launched a 'Quit India' movement, to which Lord Linlithgow responded quickly and harshly. Widespread violence and disruption continued, but the government was determined to keep it under wraps and sent most of the Congress leaders to prison. The League would have no part of the Congress-led agitation: it was in favour of dissolution of the colonial regime but against any deal with the Congress at its expense. The Sikhs also distanced from the insurrection. Needless to add, the Bengal famine of 1943, in which probably three million people died and many more were hungry and destitute, posed a great threat to the government's war effort. While the deadlock between the INC and the invigorated AIML continued, Rajagopalachari, a prominent Congress leader, brought Gandhi and Jinnah together for talks in Bombay during the summer of 1944 to find a way towards agreement. But nothing came out of these talks. Meanwhile, Jinnah strengthened his hold on Muslims and was able to impose his will on their behalf in the conference called by Lord Wavell (1943-1947) to discuss the future of India. Lord Wavell's attempt to form an interim government of national unity ended in failure: Jinnah insisted that all 15 Muslims in the Viceroy's Executive Council be from AIML and neither Maulana Abul Kalam Azad from the Congress nor Sir Khizar Hayat Khan from the Unionist Party then ruling the Punjab could represent the Muslim electorate. In the elections of 1945-1946, Jinnah proved his claim: that his party was the sole representative of Muslims in India. AIML swept to victory among Muslims as Congress had achieved among Hindus in 1937. The two parties were now on a collision course.

IV. Rebellion, Civil War, and Partition

After World War II ended in May 1945, the colonial government was confronted by two ominous developments on the sub-continent. The first one had to do with the armed forces after demobilisation during the winter of 1945-1946. A far more serious and consequential event

was the civil war between Muslims and Hindus (including Sikhs) during 1946-1947.

Mutinies and rebellions among soldiers were not unknown: they happened several times during the Raj, the most threatening was the revolt of 1857. The British military had suffered the biggest defeat in its history in the loss of Malaya and Singapore to Japan in early 1942: more than 70,000 Indians out of 130,000 military men were in the hands of Japanese after the defeat. The Japanese segregated the prisoners by race and they were able to persuade by various means 20,000 men to join the Japanese-sponsored Indian National Army (INA) to overthrow the Raj. However, the British imperial forces eventually defeated the Japanese in the summer of 1945. The British forces arrested some of the INA officers, except the leader of the movement Subhas Chandra Bose. While fleeing in a Japanese plane from Saigon (Vietnam), he died when the plane crashed in Taipei (Taiwan) on the way to Tokyo. The British government in India decided to court-martial the remaining ringleaders among the INA members. It chose the Red Fort at Delhi as the site for the trial. As if this was not bad enough, the decision to try three officers, one each from the Hindu, Muslim and Sikh community, was even worse. Members of the INC, Jawaharlal Nehru amongst them, offered their service to defend the three accused men. Muslim League, perhaps reluctantly, joined the Congress in their cause. The trial lasted for three months with the sentences pronounced in early 1946. Even some prominent British officers ridiculed the sordid drama.

A mutiny, apparently sudden and unforeseen, in the Royal Indian Navy (RIN) soon followed the INA trial. It started at Bombay in mid-February of 1946: three tense and dangerous days followed with much damage to property and men. But it was eventually quelled. Meanwhile, two other things were happening: an outbreak of civilian rioting in Bombay and extension of the naval disaffection to other parts of India, of which the mutiny at Karachi was the most serious. The naval mutinies and the INA trials were troubling enough for some to doubt the loyalty of Indian forces in the trying times ahead, especially with communal violence already raising its ugly head and might get worse with the charged political atmosphere in the country. Following the naval mutinies, the mood of Congress leaders shifted away from de-

fending or encouraging uncontrolled behaviour of rebellious elements in the Indian armed forces. Favourable political developments were in the wind for both the INC and AIML and they did not need the support of armed spoilers.

The non-military carnage and commotion on the sub-continent between 1946 and 1948 was clearly a civil war between Muslims on one side and the Hindus and Sikhs on the other. It took the lives of no less than one-half million men, women and children, besides the migration of about 14 million people from one new state to the other. When in 1946 the end of the British rule in India looked imminent, most western-educated Hindus looked forward to inheriting the substance of power and the Muslim minority would have to accept it. They opposed partition with vigour. But Muslims still did not think of partition very seriously, despite the Lahore Resolution of 1940, and wanted to reach a compromise, say a loose federal arrangement. Rajagopalachari's efforts to bring INC and AIML closer failed because most other Congress leaders dug their feet deeper into an unmodified and rigid ground of the idea of one Indian nation. To them the idea of Pakistan was absurd both emotionally and intellectually. The dominant attitude was that this idea would disappear once we gained independence. Rajendra Prasad, a colleague of Jawaharlal Nehru and the first President of independent India, wrote a book arguing against Pakistan. Among other things, he wrote: 'It cannot be denied that, irrespective of who rules, and what were the administrative or political divisions of the country, the Hindus have never conceived of India as comprising anything less than what we regard as India today.' The reference here is to the notion, real or illusory, of Bharat mata (mother India). The Hindu Mahasabha also did a good job in inciting Hindu fanaticism. The Muslim reaction to this attitude, with repeated failure at reaching a compromise, started to shift to defiance and aggression. Some among Muslims started to feed 'Islam in danger' as a strong stimulus.

In Britain, Labour party won the general election in July 1945. In the context of India, the party's slogan was 'transfer of power', but the question was transfer to whom? There were now several players. On the British side, there were two teams: the Cabinet's India Committee headed by Prime Minister Clement Attlee, sympathetic to transfer of power

within an undivided India friendly to Britain, and the Viceroy of India and his team of army and civilian officers. On the Indian side, the players included representatives of INC, AIML, rulers of the princely states, and others on the periphery, like the Sikhs and leaders of the scheduled castes, who could upset the moves by major players. The Labour party was probably on the side of the Congress, but many in the Conservative party were perhaps sympathetic to AIML. In the fall of 1945, the Cabinet's India Committee asked Lord Wavell to hold elections for the central and provincial legislatures before the end of the year. The 1945-1946 election results showed that the Congress party controlled Madras, Bombay, Orissa, U.P., C.P. and N.W.F.P. where AIML gave stiff opposition. AIML dominated the Muslim vote, secured Bengal and Sindh and gained 79 of 175 seats in the Punjab, but excluded from power by a coalition of the Unionist Party with Hindus and Sikhs. Lord Wavell was pessimistic about peace in the streets: the Hindu-Muslim division started to take an ugly shape. At the same time, there were naval mutinies followed by some copycat mutinies in the army and air force.

At this time, the British Prime Minister announced that a three-member mission of the cabinet (Cabinet Mission) would visit India 'to promote, in conjunction with the leaders of Indian opinion, the early realisation of full self-government in India.' The Cabinet Mission, comprising Sir Stafford Cripps, Pethick-Lawrence and A.V. Alexander, arrived in Delhi in March 1946. After the talks throughout April, it became obvious that INC and AIML could not reach agreement in spite of the Mission's efforts. Accordingly, the Mission decided to put forward its Plan or Statement in May. It had two parts to it. In the first part, it included (i) an All-India Union responsible for defence, foreign affairs, and internal communications and (ii) three clusters of provincial governments: Group A (Bombay, Madras, Orissa, U.P., and C.P.), Group B (Balochistan, N.W.F.P., Sindh, and Punjab) and Group C (Bengal and Assam). Hindus dominated Group A, Muslims dominated Group B and Group C was favourable to Muslims. The Union constitution was to be framed by a Constituent Assembly of 196 members elected on a communal basis by members of provincial Legislative Assemblies and representatives of the princely states joining the Union. Representatives of the three groups of provinces were to meet separately to draw up the

constitution of provinces in each group. Each province had the right to opt out of the Federal Union after the first election of the Legislative Council under the new Constitution. The second part of the Mission Plan was to reconstitute the Viceroy's Executive Council to act as interim government including representatives of different communities. The Mission made a supplementary Statement in June about the interim national government: if both INC and AIML or one of the two parties refuse to participate in the coalition government, the Viceroy was to proceed with the formation of an interim government 'which will be as representative as possible of those willing to accept the Statement of May 16.'

AIML accepted the Cabinet Mission Plan unequivocally, seeing in it the seeds of Pakistan. But INC rejected the second part, though it showed willingness to participate in the proposed Constituent Assembly to frame the Dominion constitution. Two important points need to be noted here. First, though INC had accepted the first part of the Mission Plan, Jawaharlal Nehru as President of INC declared in early July that 'We are not bound by a single thing, except that we have decided for the moment to go to the Constituent Assembly.' A few days later, at a press conference he added that probably no grouping of provinces such as the Plan provided for would occur, and that inevitably the federal government would gain in strength at the expense of provinces. He reiterated that Congress would enter the Constituent Assembly 'completely unfettered by agreements, and free to meet all situations as they arise.' Meanwhile, in mid-July, Lord Wavell offered the League certain proportion of representation in the interim government, but it differed from the one offered earlier in May and June. Jinnah refused the new offer and asserted that the Viceroy had deviated to placate the leaders of INC.

The statements of Nehru and the new attitude of the Viceroy led Jinnah to review the position of AIML. So when the Muslim League Council met towards the end of July, it decided to withdraw its approval of the Cabinet Mission Plan: the League would neither enter the proposed interim government nor participate in the Constituent Assembly. The League asked, 'in token of their deep resentment of the attitude of the British' Muslims of the sub-continent to renounce all titles and urged

them to take or support direct action for attainment of Pakistan within the terms of the Resolution of 1940. Sixteenth of August was fixed as 'Direct Action Day'. Jinnah declared, 'What we have done today is the most historic act in our history. Never (hitherto) have we in the League done anything except by constitutionalism. But now we are forced into this position. This day we bid goodbye to constitutional methods.' The League's drastic action put the Viceroy and the British Cabinet in a quandary, which the INC resolved for them in August. It passed a new resolution in which, while maintaining its objection to the grouping of provinces, INC declared that its earlier resolution was meant to accept the Cabinet Mission Plan 'in its entirety'. Jinnah was not impressed. He said, 'If Congress could change so many times, while the British were still in the country and power had not come to its hands, what assurance could the minorities have that once the British had left, Congress would not again change, and go back to the position taken up by Jawaharlal's position?' Within days after the INC volte-face, Lord Wavell asked Nehru to form the interim government in which it would be generous in offering seats to AIML. Jinnah on behalf of the League spurned Nehru's offer to AIML.

Communal disturbances and riots had begun in the early part of 1946. But they took a new turn after the massive Muslim-Hindu orgy of bloodletting in mid-August. Jinnah made it clear that the Direct Action Day was not a declaration of war, but a day to hold meetings to express Muslim resentment against the British government and the Congress. The provincial government in Bengal headed by AIML declared public holiday on August 16 and what followed in Calcutta was appalling, given the intensity, size and savagery perpetrated by communal gangs that no one had imagined. Three days of brutal violence left over 20,000 dead and injured. Apparently, the administration collapsed completely: where were the forces of police and the army? Following the riots in Calcutta, there were riots mostly against Hindus in Noakhali and some other parts of eastern Bengal. In retaliation, the Hindus went on the offensive in Bombay, Bihar followed by the Muslim slaughter in U.P. (Garhmukhteswar). These anti-Muslim riots ignited anti-Hindu and anti-Sikh riots in the north-west, including the Punjab, from December 1946 to April 1947. The communal disease and savage frenzy spread

throughout the upper half of the sub-continent, fed by rumours and propaganda on all sides (Hindus and Sikhs on one side and Muslims on the other). By the time of partition and soon after, 'all communities had blood on their hands'. The civil war also exposed the incapacity of colonial administration to control the mayhem.

In early September, amidst the riots, an interim Cabinet led by Nehru took office in Delhi. The Cabinet included three so-called nationalist Muslims as an affront to AIML. On that day, Muslims all over India hoisted black flags in bitter protest. A civil war followed the Calcutta riots that lasted for over a year. In mid-October, apparently after much coaxing by the Viceroy, AIML decided to enter the interim government with five seats in the Cabinet. The AIML took this decision probably for two reasons. The first reason was not to leave the field open to INC at the helm of power and the second was to get 'a foothold to fight for our cherished goal of Pakistan'. After the League's decision to join the Cabinet, an acrimonious dispute broke out over the allocation of portfolios. Congress did not want to surrender any of the three senior ministries, Home, Defence and External Affairs, but it agreed to give Finance to Muslim League. The coalition Cabinet could not and did not function as one body: the League ministers worked in almost total disconnection with the rest of the Cabinet. In addition, AIML refused to budge from its position against entering the Constituent Assembly. The debates between INC and AIML continued without resolution while the general commotion and bloodletting also continued almost unabated over greater part of northern India.

In November 1946, given the deadlock between INC and AIML in Delhi, British government took the initiative once more. In early December, it managed to get together the Viceroy, Jinnah, Nehru and four other members of the Cabinet for meetings in London. But nothing was achieved and everyone, except the Viceroy, returned to India within few days. After this failure, the Constituent Assembly met twice but each time AIML kept out of its proceedings. After the second meeting, Nehru declared that 'no work will be held up in future, whether anyone comes or not.' Muslim League maintained its position throughout January of 1947 to which the Congress leaders, Nehru and Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, responded with the demand that the Viceroy should insist

on League's participation in the framing of constitution or expel it from the Cabinet. If he failed to meet its demand, INC would resign from the government. Meanwhile, the British Prime Minister and his colleagues in London were developing new ideas and, towards the end of February 1947, they disclosed their decision. Britain would cease to rule India by June 1948 and it would appoint a new Viceroy in India not later than the end of March 1947.

A strong difference of opinion between the views of Lord Wavell and members of the British Cabinet in London about the approach to self-rule in India had precipitated the second decision. In any case, the change of Viceroy, from Lord Wavell to Lord Mountbatten (1947-48), in March of 1947 was perhaps the most important event for the end of British rule in India and the fortunes of INC and AIML in the end game. The new Viceroy did not prove to be an impartial referee: he turned out to be a partisan for the Congress. Lord Mountbatten arrived in India with a clear mandate to expedite the process of British withdrawal. Soon after his arrival, he knew that a united India was virtually impossible and he had to find an alternative way to transfer power in India. By this time, many of the Congress leaders, except Gandhi, had reconciled to the idea of conceding Pakistan as a preferable option to the uncontrollable communal violence and irreconcilable differences between the perspectives of INC and AIML. In April, Lord Mountbatten prepared his partition plan. It proposed partitioning Bengal and Punjab, and handing over power to the provinces. They would be free to join one or more of the groups of constituent assemblies based on the principle of self-determination. In the interim, government would remain until June 1948. Meanwhile, thanks to the divisions between the INC and AIML ministers, the interim government was totally dysfunctional: each side was working against the other. The March Budget presented by Finance Minister Liaquat Ali Khan showed the extent of the division.

In view of the proposed partitioning of the Punjab and Bengal, many in Congress thought that Jinnah and AIML would back down and accept the Cabinet Mission Plan because a truncated Pakistan would not be viable. But towards the end of April such expectations had faded and the Congress leaders were resigned to Pakistan. Gandhi was adamant

on his position even towards the end of May, saying 'Even if the whole of India burns, we shall not concede Pakistan, no, not if the Muslims demand it at the point of the sword.' But by June 4 he had begun to swing around. There were hasty exchanges between the Viceroy and British government in London on a framework for the partition of India during the months of April and May after which Lord Mountbatten announced the British plan on June 3, 1947. An important point in the announcement was that it advanced the date of transfer of power from June 1948 to August 15, 1947. The proposed plan included partition of Punjab and Bengal provinces and a Boundary Commission would determine the new borders. The Muslim-majority provinces (Bengal, Punjab, Sindh, N.W.F.P., and Balochistan) would decide through their provincial assemblies whether to join the existing or form a separate (new) Constituent Assembly for Pakistan. The Hindu-majority provinces, which had accepted the existing Constituent Assembly, would have no choice. There would be a referendum in the N.W.F.P. and in Balochistan tribal leaders and the Quetta municipality would be consulted. All political parties, INC, AIML and the Akali Dal, accepted the plan. But disunity in the interim Cabinet continued much to Viceroy's consternation.

In the Punjab, there was increasing anxiety about the Sikh intentions since they were organising for hostilities. The Muslim-Sikh relations had deteriorated after the Unionist Party government, led by Khizar Hayat Khan, had resigned in March. The Sikhs opposed the partition of Punjab on population alone since it would mean loss of properties and shrines for the community. But Sikhs were divided: some were with the Congress, others were pro-Unionists Khalsas, and still others belonged to the Official Akalis (offshoot of the Central Akali Dal), of which Master Tara Singh was the leader. Sikhs were unhappy with the rise of Muslim League in the Punjab and the British marginalised them in the negotiations for self-rule in India. Most Sikhs reacted strongly against the idea of Pakistan. Some wanted a Sikh majority province with option to merge with India or Pakistan and still others wanted an independent Sikh homeland. An attempt was made to cut a deal between the League and Sikh leaders: Jinnah offered total Sikh autonomy within Pakistan, but the Sikhs refused to accept Pakistan at all. Tara Singh took a very aggressive posture against Muslim League and made provocative state-

ments which probably contributed to the anti-Sikh rampage of burning and killing by Muslims in Rawalpindi district. Armed gangs on each side backed by communal leaders of Muslims, Sikhs and Hindus unleashed a savage campaign almost all over the Punjab.

The assemblies of Bengal and Punjab decided in favour of partition: west Punjab to Pakistan and west Bengal to India. Later Sindh, Balochistan and then the N.W.F.P. opted to join Pakistan. Lord Mountbatten appointed Sir Cyril Radcliffe to delineate the boundaries within six weeks. The Sikhs submitted a memorandum to the Boundary Commission suggesting that a frontier along the Chenab River would keep Nankana Sahib out of Pakistan and allow 90 per cent of Sikhs to remain inside India. This suggestion was unacceptable to Muslims. Rumours started floating that a part of Ferozepur district east of the Sutlej would be included in west Punjab, which is what Radcliffe had first decided. This piece of news upset the Sikhs enormously and provoked an upsurge of violence. All of Punjab was now engulfed in an orgy of killing, rape, burning, and looting. Apparently, Sardar Patel, the Home Minister, was taking sides in the Punjab during this period.

The final Radcliffe Award on the partition of Punjab has created much controversy because of the change Radcliffe made in the boundary (in Ferozepur district), apparently at the behest of Lord Mountbatten, to placate INC and the Sikhs. The final award was announced on August 17 after Pakistan and India became independent states on August 14 and 15, respectively. The two states had to wait for two to three days to find out where their frontiers were! In any case, the two independent states were born after an extended period of discord and bitter disputes between the protagonists, enormous dislocation and unprecedented communal savagery. A nagging question remains. Why did the British administration in India, and the Indian political leaders (Muslim, Hindu and Sikh), fail to secure a relatively peaceful transition to independence, especially when a decision had been made that partition was the only acceptable option?

After the lapse of British paramountcy, the two successor states had to resolve the thorny issue of the fate of some 565 princely states. In the Cabinet Mission Plan, the princely states were free to enter into either a federal arrangement with the successor state(s) or some other arrange-

ment suitable to their interests, including independent existence. The partition plan of Lord Mountbatten retained this condition. However, under pressure from Nehru and Patel, the Viceroy decided to persuade the princes to accede to the successor states by surrendering defence, foreign affairs and communications. The rulers of states like Bhopal, Kashmir, Hyderabad, and Travancore wanted to remain independent. The Viceroy and his ministers exerted relentless pressure on the rulers to accede.

In India, Kashmir and Hyderabad chose to remain independent, Junagarh signed the instrument of accession with Pakistan, and some smaller states did not sign by the due date. The Nawab of Junagarh was forced to flee to Pakistan, Maharaja Hari Singh of Kashmir—majority of its population was Muslim—acceded to India after a period of uprisings and indecision, and India invaded Hyderabad—majority of its population was Hindu—in the fall of 1948 and smashed the Nizam's dream of independence. On the side of Pakistan, the new government had to wrestle with the Khan of Kalat, though there were rumours about the Nawab of Bahawalpur going his own way. The accession of all other states went smoothly. The divided Kashmir, after the war between India and Pakistan in 1948, has remained perhaps the most obstinate obstacle to normalising relations between India and Pakistan. The two countries also suffer from an undercurrent of communal mistrust with deep roots in history. The dispute remains alive thanks to revisionist history and propaganda on each side.

After the Viceroy's June announcement about the partition plan, perhaps the most important issue, at least from the point of view of Pakistan, was to get its fair share in the civilian and military assets, including finance and other resources to make the new state function without serious bottlenecks. But almost nothing was achieved without controversy and dispute, in spite of an elaborate organisational structure established for the purpose, given the sharp division within the interim government and the staff representing the Indian and Pakistani sides. Many on the Pakistan side suspected that the other side was determined to undermine the new state. In his parting letter to the British Prime Minister, Sir Claude Auchinleck, the Commander-in-Chief, wrote that he had 'no hesitation whatever in affirming that the present

Indian Cabinet are implacably determined to do all in their power to prevent the establishment of the Dominion of Pakistan on a firm basis'. The first to be divided were the armed forces, with soldiers given only a few days to decide whether to opt for India or Pakistan. But that was much easier to do than to divide the military equipment and stores: in spite of the efforts of Auchinleck, India retained the bulk of country's military hardware, including much that had been (legally) allocated to Pakistan. On the civilian side, the so-called optees for Pakistan were thrown out of their offices within days. The disputes on fixed (unmoveable) assets were far less serious than on the transfer of stocks, services, and finance (cash balance) since most of them were on the Indian side. Among other things, India withheld a large part of its agreed share in the net cash balance, which forced Pakistan to beg and borrow. It was on Gandhi's intervention that India eventually transferred the cash. But many other grievances, even those that the judicial tribunal had agreed with, were not addressed and Pakistan was deprived of resources that should have been given to it.

12

Two Migrations in the March of Progress

So far I have described the march of progress, beginning with Europe, and its consequences for India and its people. My family and I were products of two very different streams: the older Indo-Muslim milieu (values and institutions) on the one hand and the more recent stream of European values and institutions transmitted through the long British rule in India. But the influence of these streams on each generation was conditioned by the nature and timing of the encounter. My exposure to the two streams has been quite different from my father and his generation as was his exposure quite different from his ancestors in the eighteenth century. The account of my march of progress involves three migrations, of which the first two my family's ancestors undertook in the mid-eighteenth century and my father in the mid-twentieth century. The third migration was my decision alone. In order to set the stage for the narrative I should first describe the setting for the first two migrations, in which the starting point has to be the Rohila state of Rampur (now a district in the state of Uttar Pradesh, India).

I. Rampur State: Structure and Development

The story of Rohilas I briefly narrated in Chapter eight leads directly to the successor (Rohila) state of Rampur, a place in which two of our ancestors, both brothers, decided to settle after they left the Roh in the 1750s. After the death of Ali Muhammad Khan, Rohila sardars divided the Rohila territory, not without controversy, among themselves and the sons of the deceased Rohila chief. Faizullah Khan, the second son, was given the jagir of Rampur—among several small settlements one was called Rampura—while residing in Bareilly and later in the qasba of Shahabad. After the defeat of Rohila forces in 1774, Faizullah Khan concluded a treaty with the Nawab of Awadh, which the English Company approved. By this treaty, the Nawab acknowledged Faizullah Khan as ruler of Rampur under certain restrictive conditions. In 1775, Faizullah Khan moved to Shahabad and, in consultation with his companions—thousands of Rohilas joined him there—established his headquarters very close to the River Kosi. The name of the Rohila settlement was shortened from Rampura to Rampur by which name the state was known until its accession to the Indian dominion in 1949. The settlement was divided into ghers and mohallahs named after some of the prominent Rohilas. Rampur became a (princely) dynastic state when the English Company separated the territory of Rohilkhand from Awadh in 1801. Rampur has an area of 2,318 sq. Km (or 895 sq. miles), bordered by Naini Tal in the north, Bareilly in the east, Badaun in the south, and Moradabad in the west.

Nawab Faizullah Khan died in 1793 and left a good name for himself as a fair ruler for not only the Rohilas but the Hindu ryot as well. He took keen interest in the development of agriculture and patronised religious and secular learning. His eldest son, Muhammad Ali Khan (1751-1793), known for bad temper followed him. The new Nawab lasted for probably only 24 days; he lost his throne and was stabbed to death in a violent coup engineered by his brother in league with some of the influential Rohila sardars. That brother was Ghulam Muhammad Khan (1762-1828) who became the new Nawab, but the Anglo-Awadh forces

removed and exiled him in about four months. Thus two nawabs were forcibly removed in less than five months after the death of their father the first Nawab.

In late 1794, following the ouster of Ghulam Muhammad Khan, Nawab of Awadh and the English confirmed Ahmad Ali Khan (1787-1840), the eldest son of Muhammad Ali Khan, as the fourth Nawab. Since Ahmad Ali Khan was a minor, they appointed Nasrullah Khan, a grandson of Ali Muhammad Khan and nephew of Faizullah Khan, as Regent of the state and nawab's guardian. Nasrullah Khan managed the state for about 16 years until his death. The young Nawab turned out to be a good for nothing playboy. In his long reign of 46 years, Ahmad Ali Khan achieved very little, except for building a few structures. At his death in 1840, an English force along with the Commissioner of Rohilkhand Division entered Rampur to take control of the state. Ahmad Ali Khan had no male heir and the English did not recognise his young daughter as a legitimate heir to succeed her father. The Commissioner placed Muhammad Saeed Khan (1786-1855), eldest son of Ghulam Muhammad Khan and cousin of Ahmad Ali Khan, on the throne as the fifth Nawab of Rampur. At the time of his ascension, Muhammad Saeed Khan was in the service of the English Company as Deputy Collector in Badaun. He introduced several reforms in the administration of land revenue system, including division of the state into five tehsils and established police posts in five major towns. He re-organised the judicial system and established a regular army for the state. His land revenue reforms raised the annual revenue quite significantly. Muhammad Saeed Khan built new roads and improved several buildings. It is fair to say that this Nawab took the first steps in building a modern administrative structure in Rampur.

At his death in the spring of 1855, his eldest son Yusuf Ali Khan (1816-1865) succeeded him. The new Nawab ruled for about ten years. He brought much credit to himself and the state in return for his help to the English Company during the revolt of 1857. He kept a lid on his own territory, managed the administration of Moradabad during the tumult, and provided food and shelter to some English men, women and children facing extreme distress and danger. Much of what Yusuf Ali Khan did was not popular with his Rohila compatriots inside

Rampur as well as outside with Muslims in general. In 1859, in return for his loyal services to the English Company in its most trying time, Lord Canning recognised the Nawab with privileges and titles (e.g. farzand-i-dilpazir) and added 149 villages of Bareilly district to Rampur state yielding about Rs.129,000 in annual revenue. The land revenue system in the new territory, called ilaqa jadid, was based on individual proprietary rights similar to those prevailing outside Rampur. In the rest of the area, called ilaqa-qadim, proprietary right belonged only to the Nawab since Rampur was originally his jagir. The land in this area was auctioned in large blocks for ten years to earn income for the state. Yusuf Ali Khan was a scholar and patron of learning in Arabic, Persian and Urdu. He was, apparently like his father, a good administrator surrounded by talented advisors. In 1864, Lord Elgin appointed the Nawab to the Legislative Council as an additional member, but he soon resigned because of his inability to travel to Calcutta for the meetings. According to contemporary accounts, Rampur was generally in a very good state when Yusuf Ali Khan died in 1865.

Kalb-i-Ali Khan (1835-1887), the eldest son and heir-designate of Yusuf Ali Khan, occupied the throne at the age of 31. He confessed the Sunni creed unlike his ancestors since Muhammad Ali Khan converted to the Shia creed at the court of Assaf-ud-daulah in the 1770s. The new Nawab was a well-recognised scholar of Arabic, Persian and Urdu and an accomplished poet, a generous patron of religious learning and teachers, and promoter of oriental and religious education. One of his great achievements was the expansion of the now famous Raza Library he inherited from the days of Nawab Faizullah Khan. Kalb-i-Ali Khan gave generously to the cause of Islam even outside the boundaries of India. He was known for being fair and liberal though privately a strict observer of his faith. The Nawab was also an able administrator surrounded by some competent sub-ordinates: significant financial resources were added to the state during his reign. He was in ill health for over 10 years and had his second son Mushtaq Ali Khan (1857-1889) recognised as his heir-apparent in 1880.

Mushtaq Ali Khan ascended the throne in 1887 after his father died, but the new Nawab was a victim of paralysis. He depended on a Council of five experienced servants of the state, including his Prime Minis-

ter, General Azim-ud-Din Khan who enjoyed considerable autonomy and power. The delegated authority caused much discontent in Nawab's family and the Lt. Governor of the North-Western provinces received petitions to redress the situation. In consequence, the Nawab constituted a Council of Administration (sort of a cabinet) of which he was President. The Council worked well enough to improve the land revenue system and finances of the state. Besides, it re-organised the army and launched a programme of public works under the supervision of an English engineer who added to the state's architectural assets, supervised construction of a canal system for irrigation, improved the road network, and laid a drainage system in the city of Rampur. After another attack of paralysis, Nawab Mushtaq Ali Khan died in the early part of 1889.

The successor to Mushtaq Ali Khan was his eldest son Hamid Ali Khan (1875-1930). Since he was still a minor, the English authorities appointed a Regency Council comprising four members, including one of Nawab's great uncle and General Azim-ud-Din Khan. An English officer, appointed to look after the education and grooming of Hamid Ali Khan, retained various tutors to help him learn English, Arabic and Persian. He became the first English-educated Nawab of Rampur and, as part of his education and growing-up, went to England for a few months in 1893. The Regency Council managed to increase the annual revenue from around two million rupees to three million rupees. An English engineer was brought to the state for the public works department. The department completed construction of several new buildings, including court houses, a post and telegraph office and the headquarters for each tehsil besides royal residences and guest-houses, opened up the countryside with roads, and expanded the irrigation network with new or improved canals and channels. In the summer of 1896, Hamid Ali Khan assumed full powers as Nawab and dissolved the Regency Council: he was now his own master. He appointed a Ministerial Council to assist him in the affairs of the state. The English government recognised the Nawab as a loyal prince and conferred titles and honours upon him.

Abdul Samad Khan, who was elevated from the post of nawab's Private Secretary to the position of Chief Secretary in 1906, re-organised the structure of government: the state was to function through a Sec-

retariat in which secretaries would be responsible for different portfolios. Rampur also started to enter the modern era with electricity (1899-1902), telephone (1903), and then a railway track was laid between Moradabad and Bareilly which connected Rampur to these and other places by rail. A landmark in education was the establishment of an English high school along with many vernacular and religious schools throughout the state. Most of the vernacular schools were at the primary level and only a few at the middle level. But almost all schools, religious or otherwise, were for boys and young men. The annual income of the state was mostly from land revenue and estimated at Rs.4.5 million in 1914. Nawab Hamid Ali Khan, besides his patronage of learning inside the state, donated significant funds to institutions of modern education outside the state. He was also quite active in the literary and cultural life of his times, but also remembered for his indulgences and the large harem he kept. Apparently, he was quite tolerant and fair, without discrimination between Hindus and Muslims or between Shias and Sunnis among Muslims. The Nawab died in 1930 after a reign of 36 years. His son Raza Ali Khan (1906-1966), succeeded him and was the last Nawab of Rampur until the summer of 1949 when the state, like other princely states, was absorbed into the Indian dominion.

Raza Ali Khan was the first ruler of Rampur born in the twentieth century, though his outlook was probably not much different from his father's in the affairs of the state. However, he did not possess his father's intellect and political acumen. During Raza Ali Khan's reign the structure of top administration was re-organised into a Ministerial Council of seven members, presided over by a Chief Minister, who were appointed by the Nawab. The Ministers depended for administration on the Secretariat and their assigned departments. The decentralised revenue system remained unaltered in both the mustajiri (revenue-auction) system for lands in the old area (ilaqa qadim) and the zamindari system in the new area (ilaqa jadid) which was added to the state after the revolt of 1857.

There were notable changes in two areas during the reign of Raza Ali Khan: education and industries. Some new English schools for boys, along with at least one English school for girls, were opened and a college (from ninth to twelfth class) was established. A four-year degree

college was planned at the very end, but it stared functioning only after the accession of the state in 1949. Two prominent institutions of religious education kept attracting students from many parts of India and some from abroad. There was, perhaps for the first time, a perceptible growth in industries with the establishment of reasonably large-scale factories (mills) for textiles, sugar, iron and steel, etc. These factories provided employment, created skills and processed locally grown raw material. The public infrastructure, roads in particular, was expanded and improved. The Nawab also presided over the modernisation of army, most of it infantry with limited artillery, which participated along with the Indian army in World War II.

Soon after the partition of India, an internal rebellion shook the Nawab's state. Some influential (Sunni) Muslims led the rebellion as a protest against Nawab's decision to let the state be absorbed into the dominion of India. The issue divided the Muslim population along sectarian lines: many Sunnis were sympathetic to the rebels while the Shias were on the other side. The division and civil disorder were serious enough for Nawab to suspend his military force and seek help from the Indian government to restore order. It took months to recover from the tumult, which displaced people and damaged private and public property. The partition of India led to the migration of many Muslim families, probably the vast majority, to Pakistan, which divided families and property and caused unprecedented disruption to normal life of most people. However, luckily Rampur did not experience the communal bloodletting unlike many other places. In fact, the Nawab and people of Rampur gave much help and comfort to Muslims in distress outside the state and provided refuge to Muslim families coming from the riot-affected areas.

The state of Rampur was well endowed with good soil and plenty of water from rains and numerous rivers, Ramganga and Kosi being the major ones, rivulets and channels that traversed the territory. Since the state was vulnerable to periodic floods, dams and canals were constructed to control the water flow and provide reliable irrigation to a large part of the state. These factors, along with a suitable climate and a network of markets (mandis, fairs, etc.), enabled farmers in Rampur to double crop on a major portion of the cultivated land and produce a

number of field crops, including grains, sugarcane, indigo, cotton, fodder, and various vegetables and fruits (mango in particular). There was also ample supply of livestock for draft power, milk and meat. Rampur was a net exporter of agricultural products. Most of the cultivators (tenants in both the old and new areas) were Hindus who did not own much land. In the old area, the Nawab was the sole landowner but, in the new area, the landowners were descendents of the Rohilas who had settled in the area by force or purchase. Generally, most Muslims were employed in the state service, especially the police and army, and some were engaged in limited number of crafts and manual labour; only a small proportion of them were involved directly in farming as landowners, tenants or ijaradars. Small-scale industries and mills were also a source of Muslim employment. Most of the landowners in the new area were small and had to depend on civil or military employment. Hindus were prominent, besides cultivating land, in commerce (trade and money-lending) and some were employed in the state service particularly in revenue and education.

According to the first estimate of its population, Rampur had 507,004 souls in 1872 and at the first census in 1891, the number rose to 551,249. But then the number kept on falling to 539,212 in 1901, 531,217 in 1911, and 469,225 in 1931. According to the last state wide census of 1941, the headcount was at 477,042. In the next ten years, there was large exodus of Muslims who migrated to Pakistan and some inflow of Hindu and Sikh refugees from Pakistan: there were 508,318 people in Rampur according to the Census of India in 1951. There were three important characteristics of the state population. First, Hindus were in majority but not by a wide margin: the ratio of Hindu to Muslim population stayed at around 54 to 46 per cent. Second, there was a high ratio of males to females, 111-114 males to 100 females, perhaps a reflection of under-enumeration of girls and a higher infant mortality among females than males. Third, a high proportion of the population lived in villages and qasbas though the rate of urban growth was rising with new opportunities for education and employment. A related feature was that a higher proportion of Hindus than Muslims lived in villages because of their attachment to agriculture as cultivators.

The social structure of the state population was quite diverse and complex, consisting of highly differentiated groups of Hindus and Muslims. Hindus made up 54-55 per cent of the population and a high proportion (75-80 percent) of them lived in villages and qasbas. As in other places, Hindus were divided into castes and sub-castes adhering quite closely to their traditions and customs. Mulims comprised 45-46 per cent of the population and a vast majority of them were Sunnis; they were also divided by nasb and clans as Afghans (Rohilas), Sayyids, Shaikhs, Mughals, etc. Successive Nawabs encouraged immigration of people, most of them Afghans (Rohilas) and later other Muslim groups, into the state. The first generation of Rohilas maintained most of the characteristics and traditions, dress, language, festivals, etc. they inherited from their migrant ancestors. But there was a gradual process of adaptation without substantial assimilation. Clan and family structure were rarely disturbed even after several generations: social intercourse, weddings, festivities, and the like, was largely restricted to the extended and cohesive family system. There were few if any close social encounters or relations between Hindus and Muslims, though Rampur reportedly almost never experienced the Hindu-Muslim tensions more commonly observed in other parts of India. Generally, Hindus seem to have enjoyed reasonable freedom to observe their rituals, festivals, etc. Both Hindu and Muslim social structures were strongly patriarchal and hierarchical: most people, women in particular, were quite aware of their place on the totem pole. Brahmins and Rajputs among Hindus and Afghans and Sayyids among Muslims were generally at the top or near the top.

The administrative structure of the state evolved with new demands on the system and injection of new personalities from outside the state. By the early twentieth century, the state had developed a secretarial system of administration, with each secretary given the responsibility of a specific department. The judicial system was based on civil and criminal courts rising from the lowest level of the Assistant and Special Magistrate to the highest appeal court presided by the nawab. In addition, tehsildars enjoyed certain civil jurisdiction in each of the six tehsils. The state had a dual land revenue system. In ilaqa qadim, where the Nawab alone owned the land, mustajirs or revenue farmers collected the

revenue. The Nawab's agents farmed out the villages for ten years to the highest bidder at public auction. In ilaqa jadid, where the proprietary tenure was recognised, individual zamindars (landowners) paid the revenue of the village directly to the state. Land revenue was the largest source of income for the nawab: it rose from Rs.1.53 million in 1879 to Rs.2.35 million in 1910, and from Rs.4.50 million in the early 1930s to Rs.7.81 million (or was it Rs.8.16 million?) in 1943-44. In addition to land revenue there were a number of other cesses and taxes.

Much of the physical and social infrastructure of the state, except for the irrigation canals and channels and some roads, was developed only after 1890 first with the establishment of a postal system, telegraph office (1891), followed by telephone, electricity, and the main rail-track passing through the state in the early twentieth century. Of course, electricity and telephones were not in common use even until the early 1940s. However, the road network was much expanded and improved, within the city of Rampur and linking the tehsils. The drainage and sewerage system in Rampur city though improved over time remained dependent on open but lined channels. Rampur did not have good physical infrastructure and services for education and health, especially for females. It is also true that Rampur city was a famous centre of 'oriental' learning: almost all Nawabs were keen patrons of literature and men of learning. Several Persian and Urdu scholars from Delhi and Lucknow entered the service of Nawabs at various times and made significant contributions to the literary climate of the state.

One of the rare treasures of learning and literature is the Raza Library in Rampur which was founded by Nawab Faizullah Khan in 1775. Successive Nawabs kept on adding to the original collections. The Library contains many thousands of volumes of rare manuscripts in Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Urdu, Sanskrit, Hindi, and English along with miniature paintings, illustrations, and pieces of Islamic calligraphy. The Raza Library is one of the few repositories of rare pieces of learning, history and literature in India. It has been well kept and is used by Indian and foreign scholars, researchers and students. The other institution of repute was Madrassa Alia, an Islamic College, established in the 1870s. The Madrassa was later remodelled and its curriculum copied from the curricula used in the oriental colleges at Calcutta and Lahore. The Ma-

drassa, funded by the state, used to attract students from all over India and other countries and prepared them for examinations for oriental degrees awarded by the Punjab University. Several famous scholars and ulema were associated with the Madrassa. There were two other schools, not as well known, for oriental and religious education in the state.

With regard to modern (Western) education, there were a number of vernacular primary and middle schools until the 1880s: these were boys-only schools and only few funded by the state. There was probably no English school at that time. It was in the late 1880s that the state started to take any interest in public education. By 1900, there were about 100 state-funded schools, but most of them were still in Persian and Urdu: only two English schools and two schools for girls were established. The first high school (up to tenth class), with multi-disciplinary education in English and vernacular languages catering to boys only, was established in 1887. A number of vernacular middle schools (up to eighth class) existed in 1900. By the late 1940s, only Rampur city had an intermediate-level college (two years after matriculation), one high school, and three middle-level schools for modern education of boys; there were only two middle-level schools, but a number of primary schools, for girls. Outside the city, in each tehsil there was a middle-level school for boys and a number of primary schools for boys but not for girls. While limited private tutoring was available for boys and girls, there was almost no privately funded educational institution in the state.

The fact that there was little modern education reflected both the limited demand for education, especially among Muslims, and the number and capacity of existing institutions. The demand for education increased gradually: boys from the new middle class, mostly residing in the city or large towns, started to enrol in schools for modern education. Education for girls, both among Muslims and Hindus, remained limited to a miniscule proportion of the population, thanks to the stigma attached to modern education for girls. Their low status and seclusion were the two main bottlenecks. The data on literacy in the decennial censuses show that, for males and more so for females, Rampur remained at or near the bottom in the United Provinces even after 1947.

The population of Rampur suffered the attacks of endemic diseases (dysentery and malaria) and periodic epidemics (cholera, smallpox and plague) because of lack of adequate medical facilities, poor public health infrastructure, lack of awareness and education, especially among females, and poor nutrition. High infant mortality was a common experience of most families: chances of death within a year or so after birth were generally very high. Most people depended on oriental (unani and ayurvedic) medicine and methods or shamans and quacks of one kind or another. Modern medicine was slow in coming: the first set of public dispensaries were established in the city of Rampur in the 1890s but with few facilities and fewer qualified health practitioners. While these dispensaries provided medical treatment and medication free of charge to patients, their quality was often quite unreliable. There were no more than five qualified private health practitioners in the state even in the 1940s, but they were far too expensive for ordinary people. The state of medical services in the countryside was abysmal up to the time of independence in 1947: it was in the city of Rampur or out of state (Moradabad, Bareilly) where people could find some relief but was too costly for most people. It seems that, at the time of partition of India, the state of Rampur was far below the average of the United Provinces in terms of facilities for public education and medical services.

II. The First Migration: From the Roh to Katehr

History of the Afghan migrations from the Roh in the north-west to the Gangetic plain over the centuries, perhaps even before the times of Mughals, is by now well documented. But the personal story of the ordinary Afghans is limited and murky at best. Very few of the personal stories have been stored or told. Luckily for us, on our father's side, we have found a bit of documentation thanks to the efforts of some dedicated disciples of our father's eldest uncle. Apparently, a large number of Muslims across northern India venerated that uncle as a pir (Sufi). His urs is celebrated ever year at his tomb in Lucknow, where he reportedly died in 1911. From the records, it seems that two brothers left their

ancestral home, qasba of Shaikh Jana—which is located on one side of the main road between Mardan and Swabi in the Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa (formerly called North-West Frontier) Province of Pakistan—sometime in the early to mid-1750s. One of their brothers stayed back and his brood apparently prospered on whatever little land (most of it quite good in quality) there was in the family.

The two relatively young brothers left their home in the Roh for the same reason as many other Afghans (Pashtuns or Pathans) were doing for centuries: to find greener pastures in the Indian plains compared to the hard life and meagre living in their homeland. After all, many thousands of their compatriots were joining the ranks of migrants for service as mercenaries with the Afghan armies. In addition, there were stories being told and retold about the growing Rohila settlements in the fertile plain of the Ganges up to the Tarai in the Himalayan foothills. Migration was a risky business, but given the difference between their precarious existence in the Roh and the reported rewards in the new land, money, land and probably status, the risk was worth taking.

The two brothers settled in the village (later qasba) of Bhainsori (Tehsil Milak) which was then most probably a part of Bareilly district. The records of Rampur state show that in 1860 the British government in India awarded 149 villages of Bareilly to the Nawab of Rampur (Yusuf Ali Khan) in return for his service to the English during the revolt of 1857. Our family record shows that several members of the extended family made their homes in qasba Shahi, not too far from Bhainsori, in Bareilly district. It is a good guess that the family of our ancestors (the two brothers) found a bit of land besides serving in the Rohila armies. They probably did not cultivate their land, like almost all other Rohilas, but shared the output with their tenants most of whom were Hindu peasants. We do not know if the two brothers moved from the north-west already married with their women and children, or they married after their arrival in Rohilkhand, apparently a common practice, bringing brides later from the homeland in the Roh. This practice was quite common at least among the first generation of migrants. There were at least two good reasons for the practice. First, since marriages in Afghan families were arranged between first or second cousins (or within the sub-clan), the chances of such matches were very small in the new set-

tlements. Second, unmarried young men had to save funds to pay for the bride and support the family.

The scanty record about the family tends to reveal three important aspects of relevance here. First, the village of Bhainsori (about 33 KM south east of Rampur city and 3 KM south of the town of Milak) was part of an Afghan (Rohila) settlement on lands cultivated by Hindu tenants. By the early twentieth century, the village population of nearly 2,100 was divided between Hindus and Muslims (most of them Afghans) in the ratio of 60 to 40 per cent each. Most of the land was cultivated and farming depended on both natural precipitation and irrigation by wells and a canal. Second, the men in the family including our grandfather, spent only a part of their life in Bhainsori, where they owned a bit of land, and the rest of the time they spent in military (cavalry) service: our grandfather and his elder brother served for a time in the Bengal lancers. But our grandfather, more than his elder brother, spent most of his time managing his part of the patrimony and also leased some land in the area to supplement his income. We know that they were all reasonably well educated in Urdu and Persian and practiced quite earnestly their faith in the Sunni tradition. It seems from the record that men of our family, at least of our grandfather's generation, were well respected and connected clan-wide to some quite prominent families in Bareilly, Badaun, Naini Tal, and Rampur. Third, very few members of the extended family of our grandfather were exposed to modern education until the early 1930s. Our father spent his early years in Bhainsori so his exposure was almost exclusively to the traditional system of learning in Urdu and a bit of Persian after attending the maktab a few years learning to read the Quran and receive religious instructions.

But signs of change started to emerge generally in the society and in our family in particular when my father was in his early teens. His mother died quite young, leaving him and one younger sister with their father. Our grandfather married again and, probably around the year 1926, our father's two maternal uncles (his mother's brothers) took him to Rampur city to live under their guardianship. One of the uncles was serving in the Rampur state infantry. It seems that, since our father did not make perceptible progress in his education at school, his uncles decided, perhaps in consultation with his father, to enlist him as a

foot-soldier (recruit) in the state army. He had completed eight years' of education by that time, including some modern subjects and some familiarity with the English language. Our father was probably fifteen when he entered the military service. Luckily for us, he soon started appreciating the value of modern education and grabbed every opportunity for learning and knowledge that came his way in the military. In the spring of 1936, our father was married—his bride (later our mother) was his second cousin on mother's side—all according to the family custom. By then he had achieved a senior NCO rank (havaldar) in the Rampur state infantry. During World War II, he went with the Rampur army (as part of the Indian army) to the Middle East where he spent more than three years. It was during the War that our father saw glimpses of modernity in Egypt, Cypress and Aden, working with and for English officers. After he returned to India, with the rank of senior JCO (subedar), just before the end of the War, he moved quickly into the educational service for soldiers in his battalion for which he had received prior training at two military schools in India.

Our father's younger cousins and his two younger brothers were the first generation in the family who were getting school education with a modern curriculum right from the beginning. It was in this stream that I was placed at the age of about six after completing a year or two of religious instruction, which focused mainly on learning to read the Quran. At school, English language (its grammar and composition but not ordinary conversation) was a compulsory subject and some of the other subjects (science and mathematics) were taught partly in English. Urdu was the lingua franca of Muslims in Rampur and medium of instruction for most subjects at school. Generally, girls in the family stayed at home and received basic literacy in Urdu. In our mother's generation—she was one of the few who could read and write Urdu—this was a great privilege even in the middle-class Muslim families of Rampur. Our father was sold on the idea that modern education, at least for boys, was the most important source of material progress and civilised life. At the same time, it was important for a Muslim to adhere to the basic tenets of Islam as his or her anchor. In speech and practice, we saw our father doing just that and more: he was generous and kind to those, Muslims and non-Muslims, who needed help. Our father told us repeatedly how

fair and compassionate his own father was to his Hindu tenants and maintained harmonious relations in the community. We never saw any sign of religious or ethnic prejudice or bigotry in our father's speech or behaviour. The overriding emphasis was on polite speech and civilised behaviour, values of the Muslim ashraf (urbanised middle-class).

My early school education followed the general pattern as in most middle-class urbanised Muslim families. Boys, reaching the age of five, went first to a neighbourhood maktab for religious education, particularly reading of the Quran, for a year before they enrolled in primary school. The two could overlap as well for a year or two. School education from the beginning was based on a modern secular curriculum. My middle school was co-educational up to eighth class (grade), something of a novelty in conservative Rampur at that time (1946-1948). By the time I was in eighth class I had been exposed to a bit of Shakespeare, Wordsworth, Tennyson, quite a bit of Indian and some world (especially European) history, local and world geography, basic arithmetic, geometry and algebra, arts and crafts, civics, and some elements of science. The medium of instruction was Urdu. While English was a required subject, Persian, Hindi and Arabic were optional. Generally, the pedagogic method laid great emphasis on learning by rote without much concern about comprehension. Most of the time we were learning to regurgitate the material at examinations held once every quarter. Public education up to matriculation (tenth class) was quite inexpensive, but my father always provided a paid tutor to help me maintain respectable grades. It is fair to add that, at home and school, our guardians and teachers would use corporal punishment if necessary but not necessarily as the last resort. At home and school team sports, particularly field hockey and cricket, were part of the growing up experience in which almost all of the family youth participated with much interest and some even excelled. There were more than adequate facilities along with a friendly environment for organised sports at school.

We lived in reasonable comfort and, after my father's return after the War ended, we experienced gradual improvement in our standard of living with running water supply and electricity in a house of pucca structure with a servant or two for help. Like most other houses, ours had a latrine, cleaned daily by a bhangan or bhangi (a woman or man

from the dalit or untouchable caste) who disposed off other household waste as well. Rampur could be quite hot for at least two months in the summer and quite cold for about equal time in winter. Our house like most others was not equipped to cope with the extreme weather so various improvised means were used to mitigate the effects. Sharing was one of the most common and emphasised experiences for almost all of us from a very young age: it helped in coping with scarcity and induced family or clan solidarity. But living together and sharing in the extended family system—there were few if any nuclear families—had its downside as well: there was little regard for or sensitivity to one's identity and privacy. To make the sharing experience bearable, even enjoyable, parents and guardians made every attempt to be fair to everyone. There was always someone in the family with authority or respect to whom one could go for justice at the end of the day.

In our family, as was the custom in almost all Muslim families, females observed strict purdah—they were secluded from all non-related males—from a very young age. They spent most of their life within the four walls of the house and they were married soon after they reached puberty to one of their own first or second cousins and rarely outside the Afghan clans. Since women could not go out of the house even in a burqa (veiled robe), they were transported in enclosed tongas (horse-driven buggies) accompanied by a male on special occasions. Boys and men depended on their feet for short distances, tongas for long distances and some, like our father, had bicycles. Motorcycles and cars were a rare sight until the early 1950s. The most enjoyable time of the year was the monsoon season, when the heavy rains brought relief from heat and offered mango—a fruit for which Rampur was well known—to enjoy. But often it came at a cost: rain water used to paralyse normal life for days, cripple transport, damage homes and other buildings, and leave many young and old quite sick from infections of the stomach and skin. Our houses, both the allotted one in the army and our father's own, were far better than the average thanks to their sturdy brick and cement structure. We also had access to better than average medical services though they were by no means quite up to date compared to those available in the neighbouring cities like Moradabad or Bareilly.

The rather stable social and political environment in Rampur started to change once the news of India's partition and independence started to circulate. The rebellious response of some Muslims to the Nawab's decision to accede the state to Indian dominion shook Rampur with much tension and some violence but it was not communal. Muslim families started to consider the options before them at the time of partition: should they stay in India or migrate to Pakistan? Surely, this was going to be a crucial turning point in their lives. Initially few individuals in our extended family decided to migrate, but it started to change in 1948 when it was decided that Rampur state would be absorbed into the Indian dominion by the middle of 1949. My father showed no sign that he wanted to move with his nuclear family to Pakistan until he was told that the Rampur army would be absorbed in the new Indian army. The option was either to stay in the army in India or retire by which time he had served in the Rampur infantry for almost twenty years. He decided to retire in 1949, but we do not know what made him decide to migrate to Pakistan.

Apparently, he made this decision in spite of the advice of some of his elders in the extended family—our grandfather died in early 1947—to stay in Rampur as many of them had decided. Some of them genuinely believed that they could live in a multi-ethnic and secular India, prosper and maintain their culture. Others probably did not want to uproot from the land in which they had deep roots. Still others had valuable assets (land or business), or secure employment, on which they could live comfortably and did not want to take the risk involved in moving to Pakistan. It was almost ten years later that my father told me about the reason for migration to Pakistan: that his children would have a better cultural environment and chances to prosper in a Muslim-majority state. For him we were his most important asset: he was betting on our future. He knew that it was a big bet, considering the enormity of physical and social dislocation. He was probably encouraged by the signals he received from some of his friends who had earlier migrated to Pakistan.

III. The Second Migration: Back to the Roh in Pakistan

Eight days after the Nehru-Liaquat (Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan) pact was concluded on April 8, 1950, our family—minus my father who would join us in Pakistan in about three weeks—boarded a train at Rampur along with the families of our father's sister and mother's sister for the border of Pakistan at Khokrapar in Sindh. It took us just about eight days to reach the town of Allahabad (in Bahawalpur State) where a friend of our father—who had settled there earlier—received us and settled the families in prearranged accommodation. What a change it was for all of us in so many ways. The house where we spent about three months, though pucca, had neither running water nor electricity and the weather was already very hot. The locals, though all of them Muslims, were culturally so different from us in respect of language, dress and manners. Initially it was a letdown for both men and women of the family, but perhaps not so much for us youngsters. Soon after my father joined the family, we moved to Lahore where his sister and her husband had decided to settle. Lahore was the first big city that I had seen and much impressed by some of its parts: they combined the ancient and traditional architecture with the colonial and modern. Our life in Lahore was quite eventful and not much was going right for us: my father lost his only sister to tuberculosis. She was then in her late twenties and left four very young children behind.

By October of 1950 we were again on a train, this time going to a place (Haripur, Hazara) in the north close to the mountains much like the Roh those two brothers had left in the mid-eighteenth century. The new abode turned out to be a very good beginning in Pakistan for my father and the rest of us. In fact, my mother never lost her nostalgia for Haripur, where she lived for 16 years, until she died in Karachi some fifty years later. Once in Haripur, our family started to make progress though it came in small steps. In 1950, Haripur was a small town with a population of about 15,000, spread out on both sides of the main road from Rawalpindi (80 km) to Abbottabad (35 km). The town was not too far from the mountains and it was surrounded by green fields and

orchards watered by small size canals. Most people depended on small plots of land, but many had to supplement the household income with salaried employment or wage labour in and outside Haripur. The society was both hierarchical and patriarchal and people quite conservative in their outlook: in this respect, Haripur was not very different from Rampur. It was a much smaller town and not known for literary or cultural achievements. The town had two government-run (public) high schools along with four or five middle and primary schools for boys. There was a middle school for girls, upgraded to the high school level in the early 1950s. It is fair to say that Haripur was probably no better than Rampur in terms of literacy and education.

A bit of history of Haripur may not be out of place here. The settlements in the southern plain of Hazara are reportedly quite ancient, probably going back several centuries before the arrival of Islam in the area. However, the town of Haripur was founded by Hari Singh Nalwa, one of the leading commanders of Maharaja Ranjit Singh, a year after he completed his tenure as governor of Kashmir and received a jagir grant in 1821. Hari Singh built a walled town in the plain along with a fort on a site which had seen some fierce encounters between the local (Muslim) tribes and the Sikhs. In 1835, Baron Heugel, a German traveller found only remnants of a four-metre thick and fifteen-metre high wall built to protect the new town. After the British annexed Punjab in 1849, Haripur became the headquarters of Hazara district. However, in 1853 Major James Abbott, a favourite of the local people and first Deputy Commissioner of Hazara, shifted the district headquarters to Abbottabad, a cantonment Major Abbott had established in the hilly tract north of Haripur a few years earlier. At the time of partition, probably a majority of the population of Haripur town consisted of Sikhs and Hindus. In passing, Haripur's central jail acquired notoriety throughout British India for some of its famous occupants, including M.K. Gandhi and Abdul Ghaffar Khan.

On arrival in Haripur, our father was allotted a house and some agricultural land based on the written claim he had submitted to the government as a Muslim refugee from India: the properties allotted to him were part of the evacuee property of Hindus and Sikhs who left for India after partition in 1947. Life in Haripur was good at least for

us youngsters: a good climate, plenty of relatively inexpensive food, including fresh vegetables and fruits, to eat and a reasonably commodious pucca house to live in. The open latrine and the arrangement for waste disposal were similar to the ones we left behind in Rampur. A few years after our arrival, the house was connected to the water supply and electricity lines. My father kept himself busy supervising cultivation of small parcels of land, including an orchard, and also tried his hands on some small businesses to maintain financial stability for the growing family: there were four boys and two girls when we arrived in Haripur and two more boys joined the family by the mid-1950s. Soon after our arrival in Haripur, all the boys were enrolled in schools, ranging from the first to ninth class. Once my sisters reached school age, they were also sent to schools. For our family this was a big leap forward: girls joined the ranks of boys though in separate schools. The social and academic environment in these schools was quite different from the one I had left in Rampur. While the social conditions were somewhat challenging in the beginning the academic levels were not as high as those of the schools in Rampur. School education in Haripur was almost free, except for the cost of books and supplies. But I missed the sport facilities of Rampur because schools in Haripur had at best pedestrian amenities for organised sports.

The year 1952 was special for me in that I graduated from high school. At that time, our father did not have the means to finance my post-secondary education outside Haripur, say in Abbottabad or Rawalpindi. [Haripur did not then have a college.] One of my father's relatives in Karachi advised him to send me for induction into the merchant-marine service relieving him of the financial burden. So it was. I boarded a train at Rawalpindi for Karachi, in the midst of intense summer heat, all by myself while I was still under 16. The train took about 36 hours to cover a distance of about 1,500 km. Karachi was then the capital of Pakistan and in the five years since independence its population had grown enormously—from about 450,000 in 1947 to 1.2 million in 1952—due to the influx of Muslim refugees from India and others who followed from the upcountry.

Initially I was mesmerised by the sounds and lights of the city, which stayed awake round the clock. Meanwhile, I had to give up the mer-

chant-marine project because nothing came of the effort. I had to settle in a three-year diploma programme for mechanical engineering at the city's engineering college. No one ever asked me whether I liked the idea or tested my aptitude for the proposed programme. Nor did I offer any alternative: it was quite normal for a young man to accept the decisions of his elders be it for education or something else. Generally, college education in Pakistan was not very expensive, especially if the student resided at home with parents or guardians. Somehow my father managed to provide the necessary financial support during the year when I stayed with relatives. Life at home was easy, but the environment was not the best for study. The academic year passed almost without notice and I knew well in advance the outcome: it was a wasted year due to inexplicable lack of interest and effort. I discovered though painfully that I did not have the forte for mathematics and physics. But that was not the end of the world. Understandably, father was deeply disappointed, but he did not give up on me. I would soon give him the good news.

An acquaintance, who was a senior-level student at the King George V Agriculture Institute at Sakrand (about 20 km from Nawabshah) in Sindh, advised me to apply for admission to the Institute's four-year degree programme. The most appealing aspect of the proposal was that the institution offered stipends to and required no tuition fees from students for four years in return for a bond to serve the government of Sindh for five years after graduation. In other words, there was also a job guarantee attached to the bond. There was, however, a Sindh residency (domicile) requirement for the stipend and tuition waver. One of my resourceful uncles (mother's brother-in-law) who had settled in upper Sindh managed to get a domicile certificate for me to fulfil the residency requirement. Given my above-average marks (grades) in the matriculation examination and active involvement in sports (field hockey and cricket), there was a good chance for admission to the college provided the interview with the Principal went well. Luckily it did and I was asked to join the college in August of 1953, which I did with great enthusiasm and anticipation.

Getting into the college was a watershed for me and a beginning for what turned out to be a wonderful learning experience in both social and academic respects. The college, established at Sakrand in 1939,

was an English-medium institution in which we followed a curriculum crafted by academics and researchers during the British rule. The college was a boarding school and what a good place it was. The Spartan living conditions and solidarity among boarders brought out the best in most of us. It transformed me from a youth of about seventeen into an adult who managed to do very well in his studies and sports. The knowledge and experience gained in those four years were truly transformative. I spent the first two years in Sakrand and then the college was shifted to a new and better campus at Tandojam, about 17 km from Hyderabad city, on the road to Mirpurkhas. The next two years in Tandojam were even better than the first two in terms of education: in 1955, nine American teachers joined the faculty in an exchange programme with the New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts. This addition did much to improve the quality of my education and opened up new prospects for those of us who wanted to grow into serious scholars. Some of the Pakistani and American teachers inspired me and I did my best to excel in studies. Almost all of them appreciated merit and rewarded those who demonstrated it by performance. At the end of four years at the college, there was a sense of great achievement and much optimism about the future given the opportunities the new country was then offering to the educated class, especially in agriculture, which was then the dominant sector of the economy.

Graduation meant a job offer without applying for it! That was another great part of the bargain with the government at the time of admission to the college. In the late summer of 1957, I was appointed as a demonstrator (graduate assistant) at the college. After a year in service, I was certain that I wanted to pursue graduate work in economics. While the college did not offer a graduate programme, the University of Sindh (to which the college was affiliated) did but in Hyderabad city. Classes for the Master's programme were held from mid-afternoon to about eight in the evening. Somehow, I managed to get admission into the graduate programme in economics at the university and for the next two years commuted by train between Tandojam and Hyderabad almost six days a week. It was a very hectic period, working full time at the college in Tandojam and then taking classes as a full-time student in Hyderabad. It involved lot of walking, sweating and riding trains. There

was little time to relax, but the effort was as rewarding as it was challenging. The programme ended in the summer of 1960 with a Master's degree in my hands. There was more optimism now and sky seemed to be the limit.

Meanwhile I started teaching economics at the college and looking around for opportunities to go abroad for further education. One of those opportunities opened the door on a very hot day in May 1961. By chance, I laid my hands on a circular with a blank application form for admission to a Master's degree programme in social sciences at the Institute of Social Studies at The Hague in the Netherlands along with the offer of scholarship. The Institute accepted my application for admission and awarded the scholarship. There was just enough time to arrange for a passport, an air ticket—trips to the Dutch Embassy in Karachi yielded the necessary funds for it—some new clothing, good-byes to teachers, colleagues and friends at the college, and finally take leave from the family in Haripur. I landed at Schiphol airport in Amsterdam on September 14, 1961 and took a bus to the Institute in The Hague. It was a dream come true, but realised with a bit of stubborn determination and relentless effort. At that time I was quite certain that I would return to Pakistan after completing the graduate programme, but that was not be: there would be a third migration perhaps more eventful than the last two, one in the mid-1750s and the other in 1950. But at this juncture a pause in the story of personal progress is in order: I should return to the story of Pakistan where I lived for over eleven good years and my future looked wedded to it.

IV. Pakistan: From Civilian to Military Rule

Pakistan came into existence after a period of uncertainty, disorder and much violence. The decision to partition British India led to gruesome communal violence in several parts of northern India (Bengal, Bihar, U.P., Punjab, and N.W.F.P.) and millions of Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims crossed the new borders. At its inception, Pakistan was without the rudiments of a government. It possessed neither a treasury nor resourc-

es. It was dependent upon the Indian government's division of finances and stores. It had to assemble quickly a civilian bureaucracy and the army from remnants of the colonial system. It had to care for millions of refugees arriving from India. It had to contain communal riots, particularly in the Punjab. In addition, hostilities had commenced with India over Kashmir. Sceptics believed that the country would crumble and indeed it could have gone into chaos had the spirit of survival and Jinnah's inspiration not been there to sustain it in the critical first year. The death of Muhammad Ali Jinnah in less than 13 months after independence created many new challenges. For one thing, after Jinnah's departure there was almost no one who enjoyed similar moral and political authority.

The other Muslim League leaders could not function as a team because many of them were soon embroiled in political intrigues and subversive acts. It seems that the political elite and civil servants kept a united front only to separate from India. After independence, they started jockeying for positions and fighting for regional and class interests. Muslim League proved to be a party of the elite with very weak foundation in the public. It started to fracture, thanks to the contests among the elite and its increasing distance from the ordinary people. More importantly, underneath the veneer of Islam there were diverse ethnicities with distinct social structure, culture, language, economic interests, and natural and human resources. The first generation of political leaders had a double task: to build a new (multi-ethnic) nation and a new (decentralised) state. A centralised state in the face of regional disparities was a prescription for disaster in the long run. It seems that the leaders had no clear vision so they adopted strategies and policies, which exacerbated rather than resolved many structural issues of the society and economy. They have left copious evidence of their failure.

It was one thing for the AIML leaders to mobilise Muslim masses in India against recalcitrant Hindu forces for fear of domination in undivided India without adequate and constitutionally guaranteed protection to Muslims as a sizeable minority. Once they had acquired a separate country the task before the Muslim elite was far more difficult for which evidently they had not done their homework. While Jinnah

had delivered the new country, he was handicapped by ill health and limited time to face a mountain of problems that needed immediate attention. But he also took some missteps. For one thing, he took upon himself two enormous tasks at the same time as Governor-General and Speaker of the Constituent Assembly; he also continued to be President of Muslim League until December 1947 when the party elected Khaliq-uz-zaman to that position. In addition, given the physical and cultural heterogeneity of the country, he grossly underestimated the need to establish a decentralised constitutional structure unlike the Government of India Act of 1935, which became the model in practice. In response to the provincial governors' complaint that the provincial political cabinets' interference in the machinery of the government were badly affecting bureaucratic efficiency, Jinnah opted not for improving the Muslim League party machinery but placed politicians under bureaucratic tutelage. It probably resolved the problem in the short term but set an example for successor governments to follow with disastrous results.

Also, by discarding the provincial cadre, the Civil Service of Pakistan (CSP) became a more centralised bureaucracy than even the Indian Civil Service (ICS). The dominance of civil service by the Punjabi and Urdu-speaking officers and functionaries in a highly centralised bureaucracy only added to the growing grievances in East Bengal and the smaller provinces. Jinnah was also ill advised in trying to impose Urdu as the only national language given the place that the Bengali language enjoyed in the cultural and social life of Bengali Muslims. Perhaps Jinnah was not well aware or informed of the immense social and economic diversity of the society that comprised Pakistan. But the problem was more complex as the events after Jinnah's death unfolded. They exposed the incompetence of political leaders and their capricious greed for power.

At inception Pakistan was a predominantly agrarian society but with significant diversity. In its western part, the society was multi-ethnic and multi-lingual (Punjabi, Sindhi, Pashtun, and Baloch). People were linked horizontally through tribes, clans, castes and baradiris and vertically through a hierarchy based on resources (mainly land) with khans, sardars, chaudhris, jagirdars, and waderas at the top and ordi-

nary cultivating zamindars, muzara, haris, non-cultivating craftsmen, kamis, and labourers at the bottom. There was a very thin crust of the professional, merchant, and salariat (service) class. In much of southern Punjab, almost all of Sindh, and parts of N.W.F.P. a quasi-feudal social and economic system existed and a somewhat more primitive sardari system in many parts of Balochistan. In western Pakistan, there were few large-scale industries, but many small (market) towns and few cities. Punjab was the most populous province, followed by Sindh, N.W.F.P. and Balochistan. More importantly, Punjab dominated the other provinces by far in the army and civil service especially in the central government. The Punjabi-speaking Muslim refugees settled in the Punjab in both rural and urban areas, but a vast majority of the Urdu-speaking refugees settled in urban Sindh. The latter group had a more than proportionate representation in the civil service and professions. Politically, large-scale zamindars (jagirdars and waderas) and urban-based professionals dominated the Muslim League. There were few large-scale Muslim merchants and industrialists and most of them were refugees (mainly from Bombay and Gujarat) and some Punjabis. Literacy was very limited, almost non-existent among females, and a very small proportion of the school-age children, especially girls, were in schools. Likewise, there were few institutions for post-secondary education. Most of the rural areas had few if any schools and their quality was inferior to those in urban areas. Pirs, sajjada-nashins, ulema and maulvis played a very important role in the lives of most people both in rural and urban areas.

The society and economy of the eastern part (East Bengal) were in many ways far different. For one thing, this part had a larger population but was much smaller in area than the western part. East Bengal was also an agrarian society but it was culturally relatively homogeneous and socially much less differentiated than the provinces in western Pakistan. The society here was also more fluid compared to the rigid (stable) social structure in the western provinces. While its economy was more dependent on agriculture with very few if any industries, its agrarian structure was far more egalitarian. In terms of representation in the government, the western part (particularly Punjab) dominated the civil service and even more the army. This made a big difference because

the provinces had very little power and the civil bureaucracy, in which the Bengalis had limited representation, dominated the central government. It is also a fact that the leadership of Muslim League in Bengal started to fracture openly between the vernacular and non-vernacular elite, the latter group closely allied with the central elite in the Muslim League. The vernacular elite in Bengal started to express their sense of frustration against a system of centralised government in which they enjoyed little if any power along with repeated signals on the sensitive issue of language.

There were two other important contributors to the rising tide of resentment in East Bengal. One was constitutional and the other economic. The Lahore Resolution of 1940 had left the door open for independent Muslim states, autonomous and sovereign. But in 1946 the Muslim League Legislators' Convention adopted unanimously a resolution for one Muslim state after it was known that Bengal would be partitioned. The Bengali elite expected that the state of Pakistan would constitutionally be a federation, in which most of the powers would reside with the provincial and not federal government. After Pakistan came into existence, the first Constituent Assembly dragged on its work until abolished in 1954 and Pakistan still did not have a constitution. Meanwhile the political elite ran the country as a centralised state under the Government of India Act of 1935: the Governor-General, assisted by provincial Governors and the civil bureaucracy (the CSP class) held the reins. More importantly, in the machinery of this centralised state, Bengalis constituted a small minority with little influence on the state affairs. The inability or unwillingness of political leaders to craft a constitution for Pakistan as a strongly decentralised federation was a fatal mistake.

The economic factor had two parts. For one thing, East Bengal was a relatively less developed area than the Punjab or even Sindh. Like Balochistan and N.W.F.P., it needed more public attention and resources for development. Initially the governments paid limited attention to development, partly because of lack of resources and partly their agenda was full with other issues. They based their strategy of development on two pillars: active involvement of the state and subsidised industrialisation. Translated into practice it meant flow of resources from the raw

material-producing sector (agriculture) into manufacturing industries. East Bengal was the major earner of foreign exchange (jute exports) but the central government allocated a large portion of the foreign exchange earnings for industrial imports mostly into western Pakistan. In addition, private entrepreneurs, most of them from Punjab and Sindh (Karachi), were given massive incentives in the form of cheap credit, overvalued exchange rate, and distorted export and import duties, to establish manufacturing plants, factories, etc. East Bengal received a miniscule part of both private and public investment for industrial development. In addition, a large part of the central government spending was on the civilian and military services in which Bengal's representation was quite limited. The issue of widening economic disparity between the eastern and western parts of the country would become a major Bengali grievance.

The constitutional development was thwarted first by the failure of Muslim League leaders to agree on the basic principles and then it was subverted by the rising power of some in the civilian and military service who became major actors in national politics. After Jinnah's death in 1948, Muslim League, which had not developed deep roots in the public, began to fracture in the Punjab, East Bengal and Sindh because of the tussle for power among contesting elites. Liaquat Ali Khan (1895-1951), however close he may have been to Jinnah, as Prime Minister, and Khwaja Nazimuddin (1894-1964) as Governor-General, were both without strong constituencies and unable to control the drift. Maybe the two were themselves part of the problem. After Liaquat Ali Khan's assassination in 1951, Nazimuddin took over as Prime Minister and handed the reins of power to Ghulam Muhammad (1895-1956), a man not constrained by scruples, as Governor-General. In his short tenure, Khwaja Nazimuddin had to confront several serious incidents: the language riots in East Bengal, anti-Qadiani agitation in the Punjab, student riots in Karachi, and food (grain) shortages in the country. Except for the language problem, in which he was himself a culprit, Nazimuddin was a victim of betrayal by colleagues. In any case, using his vice-regal powers, in 1953 Ghulam Muhammad dismissed Nazimuddin and replaced him by Muhammad Ali Bogra (1909-1963), a Bengali political non-entity. The Governor-General did not stop there: he then dissolved

the first Constituent Assembly, a decision upheld by the Supreme Court, and declared emergency in 1954.

The field was now open for adventurers at the centre, the likes of Ghulam Muhammad, Iskander Mirza (1898-1969), Chaudhri Muhammad Ali (1905-1980), General Muhammad Ayub Khan (1907-1974), Mian Mumtaz Daultana (1916-1995), and Mushtaq Ahmad Gurmani (1905-1981) to further undermine the representative structure of the country. Muslim League went into obscurity in East Bengal after its massive defeat in 1954 and a new coalition of parties, the United Front, emerged to represent Bengali aspirations. But the strong centre managed to change provincial governments by political manipulation of the Bengali political elite, particularly stalwarts like H.S. Suhrawardy (1892-1963), A.K. Fazlul Haq (1873-1962) and Maulana Abdul Hamid Khan Bhashani (1880-1976), and by strong arm tactics under available legal powers. Likewise, in the western part, Muslim League was on a downward spiral. In addition, men like Chauhdri Muhammad Ali and Mian Mumtaz Daultana hatched a plan of merger of the provinces and (princely) states into 'One Unit' or West Pakistan. The purpose was to limit Bengal's ability to form anti-Punjab coalitions and give the new province of West Pakistan parity of representation with East Bengal.

In spite of substantial opposition in the smaller provinces, the political schemers were able to impose the province of West Pakistan in the fall of 1954. The One Unit document prepared by Daultana suggested the use of skilful propaganda, but the civilian and military bureaucrats were in a hurry: they went about using arbitrary methods to dismiss governments in Sindh, N.W.F.P. and even Punjab. Ghulam Muhammad issued an Ordinance in the early spring of 1955, amending the Government of India Act 1935, to establish the province of West Pakistan and provide a constitution to the country. But the federal court made it clear that the constitution could only be made by a Constituent Assembly and it must also validate the integrated province of West Pakistan. The new Constituent Assembly had only two Muslim Leaguers from East Bengal and all others were from West Pakistan. In the summer of 1955, Ghulam Muhammad appointed Chaudhri Muhammad Ali as Prime Minister in place of Muhammad Ali Bogra and Iskander Mirza replaced him as Governor-General. The two appointees were civil ser-

vants, indicating clearly the weakened state of politicians due to deep divisions in their ranks.

The internecine feuding among politicians from both East and West Pakistan crippled the political process: it allowed Iskander Mirza to create a new political party, Republican Party, to counteract and disrupt the Muslim League in West Pakistan. Only some Sindhi and Pashtun politicians were united in their opposition to the integrated province. In spite of their massive victory in the 1954 provincial elections in favour of maximum regional autonomy, Bengali politicians displayed equal division in their ranks. Most Bengali politicians, but not all, accepted the parity principle (in all spheres) in return for Bengali as national language with Urdu, joint electorate, and regional autonomy for East Bengal. It was on these principles that the second Constituent Assembly gave Pakistan its first constitution in early 1956, nine years after independence. The political schemers managed to subvert the plan for holding the first national elections—they were expected in early 1957 and then in early 1958—and hatched a counter-plan to overthrow the civilian rule in Pakistan.

Needless to add, the country remained unstable from 1954 to 1958: there were five governments at the centre and three in East Pakistan, including governor's rule for two years. President Iskander Mirza exploited thoroughly the weaknesses in the Constitution and had almost all political leaders exposed and discredited. He could not have accomplished all this without the tacit support of the military elite led by General Mohammad Ayub Khan. Then, in September 1958, the legislative process in the provincial assembly of East Pakistan broke down completely and its members engaged in violence against each other at the same time that the province was in the grip of acute food shortage, floods and epidemics. The military elite used this incidence as a major excuse for staging the first *coup d'etat* on October 8, 1958. Initially they used Iskander Mirza as the screen, but then removed him from the stage in less than three weeks.

In the first eleven years of Pakistan, the leading players spent a considerable part of the time in political gamesmanship to stay in power. A major part of the central government budget was spent on the armed forces and the rest on maintaining law and order, leaving mea-

gre resources for public services. Public investment went mostly into building and improving the irrigation system, roads and railways. Education and health-care services did not receive government's attention while the demand for them kept rising. It seems that building human capital was not considered a worthwhile investment, in spite of public pronouncements. The failure of successive governments was even more glaring on what was probably the most important social and economic issue for the agrarian society in West Pakistan: a high concentration of landownership in the hands of a few thousand powerful zamindars and jagirdars and millions of sharecropping tenants with few or no rights. The owners of large landholdings dominated the assemblies, thanks to their vote-banks and unholy alliances. While successive governments paid much lip service to the issue of land reforms to transform the society, they achieved almost nothing except for some changes in tenancy rights in the early 1950s. In practice, however, the new tenancy acts were not effectively enforced. The grossly distorted agrarian structure of West Pakistan was a major and tenacious obstacle to economic and political progress.

The failure of politicians to purge the schemers and control the bureaucracy, because of the constitutional structure to which Pakistan remained shackled, and their inability to represent the public interest gave the army generals the opportunity to stage a coup in the fall of 1958. The army was probably waiting in the wings for some time to step in. The 1958 coup was as much a culmination of political follies as it was the beginning of breakup of the country in 1971. The army's intervention halted the political process, however flawed it may have been, and set a precedence for other men 'on horse back' to repeat the act in the future. The army not only co-opted the civil bureaucracy but also attracted political opportunists and then fostered new political supporters. In East Pakistan, it set in motion a separatist movement which could have been avoided had the political process of give-and-take been allowed under the 1956 Constitution. More important, the army generals and their supporters adopted policies and took actions that gradually but surely disaffected increasing number of Bengalis and alienated them from Pakistan.

After the coup of October 1958, General Muhammad Ayub Khan and his cohorts had no plans to transfer power to civilians any time soon: they settled in the saddle for a long haul. Their initial strategy was to sideline the politicians and deactivate political parties. They imposed the so-called Basic Democracy system on the country within months for at least two reasons: (i) to emphasise the point that the parliamentary system was not suitable for the people of Pakistan—they needed a guided political system—and (ii) to foster a new cadre of supporters while depoliticising the country. The second strategy was to put economic development on top of the agenda: pursue planned economic growth, leaving sufficient room for private enterprise under state patronage. Economic well-being was considered a far better glue than religion or culture for national unity. To achieve these aims the military rulers brought into partnership about four hundred CSP officers who controlled the sinews of Pakistan government.

The Constitution of 1962, which came after about forty-four months of Martial Law, clearly reflected the intentions of the rulers, which was to maintain a centralised structure of power and administration. All of these policies and related actions laid the foundation for further alienation of Bengalis along with the demand for restoration of provinces in West Pakistan. The rising economic inequalities accompanying the experience of somewhat impressive overall economic growth added fuel to the fire. Political repression and muzzling of dissent were indicators of how far the regime had gone wrong. I should add that when I left Pakistan for the Netherlands, almost three years after the coup, there were few if any palpable signs of general disenchantment. Probably most people, at least in West Pakistan, were still in a euphoric state, but that did not last for too long.

General Ayub Khan, supported by the army and civil servants, maintained a strong-fisted attitude to deal with the opposition right from the beginning. The rigged Presidential election of 1964, a brief and inconclusive war with India in 1965, followed by the Tashkent Declaration in 1966, galvanised the opposition not only in East Pakistan (where the regime was not much admired from the beginning) but also in West Pakistan. In the next two years, Ayub Khan raised the level of repression, as the opposition, especially in East Pakistan, grew

more confident. Bengalis and some politicians in Sindh and N.W.F.P. demanded with increasing vehemence regional autonomy to weaken the hold of centralised power and reduce economic disparities. In 1968, mass protests in East and West Pakistan confronted the beleaguered regime, while Ayub Khan and his supporters were celebrating ‘Decade of Development’. Consequently, Ayub Khan transferred the reins of power to General Agha Muhammad Yahya Khan in March 1969 after his senior military colleagues persuaded (or forced) him to exit gracefully.

The first general elections of December 1970, which by consensus were relatively free and fair, proved to be the last chapter in the story of a united Pakistan. The outcome of elections—not anticipated by those in power—created an untenable and polarised situation in the country: military leaders and some of the leading politicians in West Pakistan were unwilling to share power with leaders of the majority party from East Pakistan. They decided to use force against Bengali leaders and their supporters in March 1971. The military action led to a bloody civil war in East Pakistan and ended in the creation of Bangladesh as an independent state in mid-December 1971. The end of united Pakistan was by no means inevitable, but it happened because of multitude of avoidable blunders committed by men dedicated to protecting their personal and parochial interests above all else. Almost no one, except the victims, was blameless for the tragic end. The story of Pakistan after its dismemberment at the end of 1971 is not of direct relevance to our narrative. It is the next migration in the march of progress to which I turn in the next chapter.

13

Third Migration in the March of Progress

The first two migrations in my family were made under circumstances and in a world so different from the one in which I found myself in the mid-twentieth century. In the first migration, it is fair to guess that the reason was almost entirely economic: the lure of immediate gain with bright prospects for the future. The downside was the risk of cultural assimilation. The outcome was both material prosperity and cultural assimilation. In the second migration, the lure was not of immediate gain—the risk of immediate loss was great—but the long-term prospects for the next generation. In moving to Pakistan, there was a strong desire to protect the cultural heritage. The outcome was materially good and probably culturally as well. I can now turn to my eventual migration to the West (Canada). I should stress here the fact that my decision to go to the Netherlands was motivated primarily by my desire to build human capital for advancement of career on return to Pakistan. At that time, I had no plan or even thought of migrating to the West on a permanent basis. In this narrative, I have included a brief history of the Netherlands and Canada to highlight the progressive march of these societies and my major learning experiences since I first landed in the Netherlands as a foreign student in the fall of 1961.

I. From Pakistan to the Netherlands: Learning About Progress

I left Pakistan to pursue graduate studies in the Netherlands almost three years after the first military coup of October 1958. In these three years, General Ayub Khan and his cohorts were well settled in the saddle and put in place a more centralised political system than the one they had abolished. The economic gains, so much publicised during the first decade of army rule, were more than offset by the highly unequal distribution of those gains between provinces and between different groups in each province. More than that: people were denied the exercise of their basic political rights, especially in East Pakistan. My limited awareness of and sensitivity to these issues and problems was gradually sharpened and deepened once I was exposed to the intellectual environment at the Institute in the Netherlands.

It was almost a habit with me to spend the afternoons at the college in Tandojam while most of my colleagues and friends enjoyed the daily siesta, particularly in the very hot months of summer. It was in one of these afternoons that a long note—probably passed on to me routinely by my boss—caught my eye very quickly. The note, with a blank application form, was regarding a graduate (Master's) programme in Social Sciences at the Institute of Social Studies at The Hague. I thought for a while and, after a bit of reflection, decided to complete the application form for admission and mail it to the Institute. I knew of no other opportunity to pursue higher studies and none had come my way since I graduated from the university more than four years earlier. I had to try. So I dispatched the application in a hurry, informing no one about it, and waited for response. I did not inform any one simply because I was breaking the service rule, which required a person in government service to send all correspondence through the 'proper channel', i.e. with the boss's approval. Well, I did not. I suspected that either I will not get the approval or would be delayed to meet the deadline for submission of application to the Institute. As luck would have it, I did not have to wait for too long: about two weeks later I received a telegram from the Insti-

tute that they had accepted my application for admission to the degree programme with scholarship.

The 13-hour air travel from Karachi to Amsterdam—yes it took that long in 1961—was a transformational leap (of centuries) for me in almost every respect. Pakistan and the Netherlands were two very different worlds, no matter what criteria or aspects of life one used to compare them. One was a very low-income agrarian economy and other a high-income industrial economy; a predominantly rural and conservative society versus a predominantly urbanised and progressive society; a repressed political system versus a democratic system with guaranteed freedoms; an un-inquisitive versus an inquisitive intellectual environment; and much more. The decade of the 1960s was a period of not only robust economic growth and expanding prosperity but also significant social and cultural change in the Netherlands as in other countries of Western Europe.

But Holland (a more commonly used name for the Netherlands) is unique in Europe in its geography. One-half of the area is less than one metre above the sea level, lands reclaimed from the sea and protected by an extensive system of sea walls, coastal dunes, levees, and dykes. People had lived at the edge of extinction by floods since the end of the Ice Age. Since at least the thirteenth century, settlers were building the dykes to keep the sea at bay and digging canals to drain the bogs behind dykes. With the invention of windmills in sixteenth century, their work became far less arduous and they started reclaiming land on a large scale. Between 1590 and 1740 more than 125,000 hectares were added to the Netherlands, increasing its arable area by about one-third. But the Dutch had to keep their struggle going against water until the Delta Plan of 1957, after the devastating flood of 1953, was implemented in the next nearly 30 years. There is much substance to the saying that 'God created the Earth and the Dutch created Holland'!

1. History of the Netherlands

A bit of history of Holland (holt-land = marshland) will reveal the underlying reasons for the extraordinary progress the Dutch were able to make in a very inhospitable natural environment. It was one of the most undeveloped parts of the Holy Roman Empire: lowest of the low lands

(Nederlanden = low lands). The people of the Netherlands (Belgium included) were autonomously organised in a republican fashion, but their territories were absorbed into the Burgundian (French) and Spanish Habsburg empires from about the mid-fifteenth to mid-seventeenth century. The relatively rapid conversion of a majority of the Dutch to Protestantism (Calvinism) in sixteenth century was perhaps their first revolt against their Catholic (Spanish) rulers. The Protestant citizens of the provinces rebelled in a 'hysterical rage' against the Spanish rule in 1568 to which the Spanish Inquisition responded by condemning about three million Dutch men, women and children to death as heretics. William the Silent, Prince of Orange (1533-1584) led the fight against Spaniards. After a period of great violence, fire and plunder, arrests, and killings, while the ten southern provinces accepted Spanish terms and recovered their freedoms in 1578 the seven Northern provinces resolved to fight for their independence. The determined Dutchmen, aided by the French and English, fought the Spanish army, which could not overwhelm the Dutch fighters. There was an eleven-year truce in 1609, but the Dutch had to fight again from 1621 to 1648. They eventually prevailed and a new nation was born. But that was not the end: in 1672, the year of catastrophe, a new wave of violence began in which the country's former rulers were hunted down and butchered.

The tiny Dutch Republic was the envy of all Europe and wonder of seventeenth century. A secret to the Dutch victory was that throughout the 80 years of their fight for independence their disposable resources kept on growing. Holland became a major maritime power in its own right against the Portuguese and the English. Its sturdy burgher society widely practised the virtues of prudent management, toleration, and democracy. Its engineers, bankers and sailors justly acquired fame. Its constitution (1584) ensured that the governments of the seven provinces (United Provinces) remained separate from a federal council of state (States-General), chaired by the Stadhouder (executive officer), whose office was generally held by the House of Orange. The Dutch Republic in its heyday—its Golden Age was a rival of the Italian Renaissance—was famous for numerous achievements. They included commerce, cities, sea power, canals, and windmills; philosophers (Spinoza and Grotius) and scientists (who gave among other things both telescope and mi-

croscope to the world); art and painters (Hals, Ruysdael, Vermeer, and Rembrandt); religious tolerance and puritan culture of the elite; and the Friesen cattle. The Dutch society was relatively relaxed and free; families were not rigidly hierarchical, women relatively liberated and children cherished; a frugal, God-fearing and hard-working ethos was combined by its storehouses of riches; and municipal lotteries and auctions were used to help the poor.

The rise of the Dutch Republic was one of the most remarkable phenomena in the history of civilisation. The Hollanders worked like 'supermen' to build the state from almost nothing. They founded five state universities; led the world in scientific research; experimented with advanced political and social theories; developed important theological and legal viewpoints; offered freedom of religion to Jews, Anabaptists, Puritans, and Lutherans; possessed a famous school of painting; built a highly efficient navy; and operated significant commercial establishments. Their merchants shared in this burst of activity with the result that Spinoza and Descartes basked in the glory reflected by Dutch civilisation. In short, the Dutch 'became the envy of the world'. Some have argued that the reasons for the success of the Dutch Republic, its power and fame, at a particular point in history were not its geography (location) or religion (Calvinism). We can divide the reasons into two groups. First, there was the peculiar nature of the Dutch government, which adopted enlightened policies for religious liberty and freedom of speech and the press and free flow of commerce and trade in the age of mercantilism. Second, there were also fortuitous circumstances outside Holland, like the economic disasters in the southern Netherlands, decline of Germany and Italy, bad policies of the Stuart monarchs in England, and the war-like propensities of Louis XIV in France. But these circumstances were only secondary to the internal institutional structure.

The Dutch Republic was the first modern state, but its political power began to wane, thanks to the four Anglo-Dutch wars between 1651 and 1684, in one of which France and England were together. The Anglo-Dutch alliance of 1688 was perhaps the beginning of the end of Dutch Republic. William III, Stadhouder-king, of the House of Orange and his wife Mary (daughter of James II, King of England, and next in

line for the English throne), invaded England in 1688 and unleashed the Glorious Revolution; they established an anti-Catholic Parliamentary monarchy in England, Scotland and Ireland. Louis XIV also recognised William III, who died in 1702, as King of this dominion. William III died childless which precipitated a crisis in the House of Orange and, after a period of internal contests, William IV was proclaimed Stadthouder first of only four provinces in 1722. He was restored as hereditary Stadthouder of the entire Dutch Republic when the French invaded Holland in 1747. William IV died in 1751, leaving his three-year-old son, William V of Orange, as the new Stadthouder.

Since William V was still a minor, the regents reigned for him. He grew up to be an indecisive person, a character defect which would follow William V for his whole life. His marriage to Wilhelmina of Prussia relieved this defect to some degree. The decade of the 1780s was turbulent for Holland. First, there was the 'Patriot Revolution', in which some influential citizens rose and mobilised public opinion against the House of Orange as undemocratic and anti-people. Second, the Dutch received serious setbacks in the fourth Anglo-Dutch war (1780-1784), for which the citizens blamed the Stadhouder for the poor state of Dutch navy. Third, the Dutch East Indies and West Indies Companies failed to maintain and defend their fortifications. Finally, there was a serious recession in parts of the country. As the protest movement gained momentum, the Republic began to polarise into pro-Patriot and pro-Orangist camps. Eventually the King of Prussia, Wilhelm II, brother of Wilhelmina, along with the English, helped to subdue the democratic revolutionaries and restore the Orangist order in the Republic.

While William V survived the Patriot Revolution, thanks to the army of Prussia and the English cash, the French invasion of the Dutch Republic in 1794-1795 forced him to flee. The Dutch republicans joined the invaders: the French came as liberators but stayed as conquerors. The overthrow of the Orangists was seen as a continuation of the Patriot Revolution with the added inspiration provided by the French Revolution. The republicans renamed the Dutch Republic as the 'Batavian Republic', but the general structure of administration and procedures remained unchanged. After 1795, the House of Orange-Nassau faced a difficult period, surviving in exile mainly at the courts of Prussia and

England. In 1802, William VI, son of William V, unconditionally renounced the Stadthoudership in return for a few territories (Principality of Nassau-Orange-Fulda) from Napoleon Bonaparte in the Treaty of Amiens.

The opposite forces of Napoleon and the British power crushed the Batavian Republic. The British had William V sign an order for the Dutch colonial governors to place all their harbours, ships, and forts at British disposal, which meant literally the end of the Dutch East Indies Empire and its trade. The Dutch shipping and overseas trading system were devastated with its crippling impact on the economy of Batavian Republic. Napoleon put the last nail in the Republic's coffin after he proclaimed himself Emperor of the French in 1804. He made his brother Louis Bonaparte as emperor of Holland in 1806, the year in which William V also died. The French replaced all of the decentralised and autonomous structures by a uniform centralised structure of governance, judiciary and administration: Holland became a unitary state. Louis Bonaparte was a reluctant ruler of an unwilling people; he abdicated the Dutch throne in 1810 because of his differences with Napoleon. Holland was now part of the French empire and paid a heavy price for its subordination to the Emperor.

Towards the end of 1813, as part of the European uprising against Napoleon, a rebellion broke out in Holland but suppressed. However, the Dutch drove the French away with the support of the Prussian and Cossack troops. Although most of the Dutch leaders were the same men who had driven out William V, they decided to return to the House of Orange and invited his son William VI, Prince of Orange, to come from England. All agreed that, in the long run, it would be better for the Dutch to restore William VI themselves rather than have him imposed by the allies. William VI proclaimed himself the hereditary sovereign prince of the Netherlands, having previously declined the offer of kingship. In 1814, the former Austrian Netherlands (today's Belgium) was added to his realm. In 1815, with the support of European powers gathered at the Congress of Vienna, William VI proclaimed himself King William I. He was also made Grand Duke of Luxembourg and the title 'Prince of Orange' was changed to 'Prince of Oranje'. A commission comprising equal number of Dutch and Belgian members drafted a constitution

for the new monarchy, which was promulgated five months later. The principal object of the Allied Powers, especially England, was to bring into existence a state in the Low Countries, which would be sufficiently strong to constitute a barrier against possible French aggression.

As king of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, King William I tried to establish one common culture. This provoked resistance in the southern parts of the country, which had been culturally separate from the north since 1581. The separation of the two groups of provinces tied together at Vienna was inevitable. Friction between the Dutch and Belgians was obvious from the outset and the King's honest though mistaken efforts to bring about a genuine amalgamation only emphasised the irreconcilable differences of his subjects in language, religion, economic interest, and political inheritance. In the summer of 1830, the Belgians broke into open revolt at Brussels. A hastily elected congress proclaimed Belgian independence, adopted a liberal constitution and crowned Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, under the title of Leopold I, as the King of Belgians. In 1831, a conference of the Allied Powers in London drew up a treaty of separation, recognising both independence and neutrality of the new Belgian monarchy.

King William I fought a disastrous war to regain the lost territory until 1839, when he had to settle for peace. He was disgusted with the circumstances that compelled him to acquiesce in the defection of his southern provinces and chagrined by constitutional changes to which the Liberal party compelled him to submit. Eventually William I abdicated the throne in 1840. During the reign of his son William II, the new king ordered a new constitution, which curbed the monarch's power to prevent the 1848 Revolution from spreading to his country. William III succeeded his father after William II died in 1849 and ruled until 1890. He was a conservative man and tried to form his own royal governments since he did not like the constitution. He was twice married, but his sons by his first wife, Sophia of Wurttemberg, did not survive him. This raised the possibility of the end the House of Orange-Nassau so, after the death of his first wife in 1877, William III remarried to Emma of Waldeck-Pyrmont in 1879. Queen Emma gave birth to a daughter and royal heir Wilhelmina in 1880.

Queen Wilhelmina succeeded her father in 1890. Since she was only ten-year old, her mother, Queen Emma, acted as her Regent until 1898. Queen Wilhelmina married Prince Henry of Mecklenburg-Schwerin (Prince Hendrik) in 1901. A daughter, christened Juliana, was born to them in 1909. During World War I, while Germans invaded Belgium they respected Wilhelmina's neutrality sparing her country of devastation and killings. But in World War II, when Germany invaded the Netherlands, Queen Wilhelmina became a symbol of Dutch resistance. The moral authority of monarchy was restored because of her rule. In 1948, after fifty years on the throne, Wilhelmina—who wrote her biography titled 'Lonely but not Alone'—abdicated in favour of her daughter Juliana. Queen Juliana soon developed reputation for making the royal house closer to the public than it had ever been. Hers has been called the 'cycling monarchy': members of the royal family were often seen on bicycles in cities and countryside. In 1966, the decision of Princess Beatrix, the eldest daughter of Queen Juliana, to marry Claus von Amsberg, a German diplomat who was once in the Hitler Youth, stirred the emotions of the normally hardworking, moderate and cool-headed people of Holland. The memories of German occupation in World War II were still quite fresh and the wounds raw. The country went through a period of public debate, after which the Dutch Parliament endorsed Beatrix's decision.

To get back to the Institute, which I came to attend in the fall of 1961, a brief excursion into the Dutch colonial history is of relevance here for at least two reasons. First, it reveals how the Dutch in the north-western corner of Europe, while fighting the sea and Spanish Habsburgs, were able to establish an empire in South-east Asia which lasted until the late 1940s. Second, the Institute was established in the early 1950s as part of a new beginning after the trauma and dislocation suffered during World War II and at the end of the Dutch colonial empire in South-east Asia (Indonesia).

The coastal provinces of Holland were important hubs of the European maritime trade network long before the Spanish rule: their location provided convenient access to the markets of France, Germany, England, and Baltic states. The war with Spain forced many financiers and traders to move from Antwerp, then one of Europe's most import-

ant commercial centres, to Amsterdam, a city which became Europe's foremost centre for shipping, banking, and insurance. Efficient access to capital enabled the Dutch in the 1580s to extend their trade networks beyond northern Europe to new markets in the Mediterranean and the Levant. In the 1590s, Dutch ships began to trade with Brazil, African Gold Coast, India and the Spice Islands in South-east Asia. All of this activity brought the Dutch into direct competition with Portugal, which had dominated these trade networks for several decades, and had established colonial outposts on the coasts of Brazil, Africa and the Indian Ocean to facilitate them. The rivalry with Portugal, however, was not only for economic reasons. The Portuguese crown submerged with that of Philip II of Spain in 1580. The Dutch attacks on the Portuguese overseas possessions forced Spain to divert its financial and military resources away from attempts to quell the Dutch revolt for independence.

In 1594, a private 'Company of Far Lands' was founded in Amsterdam, with the aim of sending two fleets to Maluku in the Spice Islands. The first fleet sailed in 1596 and returned in 1597 with a cargo of pepper, which more than covered the cost of the voyage. The second voyage (1598–1599), returned its investors a profit of 400 per cent. The success of these voyages led to the founding of a number of companies competing for the Asian trade. The competition was counter-productive as it threatened to drive up the price of spices at their source in Indonesia while driving it down in Europe. To address this problem, the merchants established a joint-stock company and named it the Dutch East India Company, *Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie* (VOC) in 1602. The States-General gave VOC its first charter for an initial period of 21 years with monopoly for navigation and trade east of the Cape of Good Hope and west of the Straits of Magellan. The directors of VOC were given legal authority to establish fortresses and strongholds, sign treaties, enlist its own army and navy, and wage defensive war. In 1621, another joint-stock company, called the Dutch West India Company, was set up with a 25-year charter for monopoly trade, etc. with those parts of the world (the Atlantic, Americas and the west coast of Africa) not controlled by VOC.

The Dutch war against Spain for independence made all the Spanish and Portuguese trade and possessions legitimate targets for the Dutch

trading companies. From 1517, the port of Lisbon was the only European market of products from India: other European nations had to purchase their needs from that port. The market of Lisbon was closed to the Dutch because of their war against Spain. So in 1595 the Dutch decided to set sail on their own to acquire products for themselves, making use of the knowledge of Portuguese trade routes secretly acquired earlier in Lisbon. Pursuing their quest for alternative routes to Asia for trade, the Dutch disrupted the Spanish-Portuguese trade and finally reached the Philippines. The Dutch sought to dominate the sea trade in South-east Asia even by piracy. They invaded many Portuguese-held territories in Asia (India, Ceylon, Malaya, Spice Islands, and the Philippines) and commercial interests in Africa and South America. Taking advantage of Portuguese weakness in the early part of seventeenth century, the Dutch occupied Portuguese territories and their sugar plantations. The Dutch intrusion into Brazil was long lasting and troublesome to Portugal. Holland had captured a large portion of the Brazilian coast while Dutch privateers sacked Portuguese ships in both the Atlantic and Indian Oceans. However, after the dissolution of Iberian Union in 1640, Portugal was able to re-establish its authority over lost territories.

In Asia, the VOC began immediately to prise away the string of coastal fortresses that, at the time, comprised the Portuguese empire. The settlements were isolated, difficult to reinforce if attacked, and prone to being picked off one by one. But the Dutch Company had mixed success in its attempts to do so: Amboina was captured from the Portuguese in 1605, but an attack on Malacca the following year narrowly failed in its objective to provide a more strategically located base in the East Indies with favourable monsoon winds. In 1619, the Dutch found and conquered what they were looking for, Jakarta. Later they named it Batavia after the putative Dutch ancestors (Batavians) and made it the capital of the Dutch East Indies (Indonesia). The Dutch colonised Mauritius in 1638, several decades after three ships of the Dutch Second Fleet sent to the Spice Islands were blown off course in a storm and landed in 1598. They named it in honour of Prince Maurice of Nassau, Stadhouder of the Netherlands, but found the climate hostile and abandoned the island after several decades.

Meanwhile, the Dutch continued to drive out the Portuguese from their bases in Asia: Malacca in 1641, Ceylon in 1658 (Colombo in 1656), and then in the Indian Peninsula (Nagapattinam, Cranganore and Cochin) all in 1662. They had earlier tried to capture Goa, capital of Portuguese empire in the east, but failed. In the Far East, after the Japanese had expelled the Portuguese in 1639, the Dutch were the only European power allowed to operate in Japan for the next 215 years. In 1646, the Dutch tried to take the Spanish colony of the Philippines: they had a large force at their disposal, but when they tried to take Manila they were defeated. After their defeat, they abandoned efforts to take Manila and the Philippines. Since its inception, VOC was in competition with its counterpart, the English East India Company, founded two years earlier but with a capital base eight times smaller for the same goods and markets in the East. In 1619, the Anglo-Dutch rivalry resulted in the infamous Amboina massacre, in which the Dutch agents executed several Englishmen. The event remained a source of English resentment for several decades, and in the late 1620s the English Company shifted its focus from Indonesia to India.

In the Atlantic, the Dutch West India Company concentrated on wresting from Portugal its grip on the sugar and slave trade and opportunistic attacks on the Spanish treasure fleets on their homebound voyage. In 1640, the Dutch captured Portuguese settlements in Angola and Axim on the Gold Coast (Ghana). By 1650, the West India Company was firmly in control of both sugar and slave trades, and had occupied some of the Caribbean islands. But unlike Asia, Dutch successes against the Portuguese in Brazil and Africa were short-lived. Years of settlement had left large Portuguese communities under the rule of the Dutch who were by inclination traders rather than colonisers; they had to vacate Brazil by 1654. In the intervening years, the Portuguese sent an expedition from Brazil to recapture Luanda in Angola and they managed to expel the Dutch from there as well by 1648. The Dutch were also active in the north-east coast of North America and had established some settlements in the early seventeenth century. To protect its precarious position at Albany from the nearby English and French, the Dutch West India Company founded the fortified town of New Amsterdam at the mouth of Hudson River in 1625, encouraging settlement

of the surrounding areas of Long Island and New Jersey. The fur trade ultimately proved impossible for the Company to monopolise due to the massive illegal private trade in furs and the settlement of New Netherlands as unprofitable.

By the middle of seventeenth century, the Dutch had overtaken Portugal as the dominant player in the spice and silk trade, and in 1652 founded a colony at Cape Town on the coast of South Africa, as a way-station for its ships on the route between Europe and Asia. After the first settlers spread out around the Company station, the white trekboers (nomadic pastoralists) moved into the interior, leaving the richer though limited farming lands of the coast for the drier tableland. In 1795, the heavily taxed boers (farmers) of frontier districts, who received no protection against Africans, expelled the officials of VOC and established independent governments. These Dutch settlements and governments were the foundation stones for the racist Dutch Republic of South Africa.

The rivalry between the Dutch and English for trade and settlements had its roots in their wars in Europe. In 1651, British Parliament passed the first of the Navigation Acts, which excluded Dutch shipping from the lucrative trade between England and its Caribbean colonies. This led directly to the outbreak of hostilities between the two countries in the following year, the first of three Anglo-Dutch Wars that would last on and off for two decades and slowly erode Dutch naval power to England's benefit. The Second Anglo-Dutch War ensued in 1665, when the English forces moved to capture New Netherlands (New York). Two years later, under the Treaty of Breda, the Dutch ceded New York to England in 1667 in exchange for English settlements in Suriname conquered by the Dutch forces earlier that year. Though the Dutch would again take New Netherlands in 1673, during the Third Anglo-Dutch War, they had to return it to England the following year. That ended the Dutch empire in continental North America, but left behind a large Dutch community under English rule that persisted with its language, church and customs until the mid-eighteenth century.

The Glorious Revolution of 1688 saw William of Orange win the English, Scottish, and Irish crowns, ending eighty years of rivalry between the Netherlands and England. But during the American Revolutionary

War, Britain declared war on the Netherlands, the Fourth Anglo-Dutch War, in which Britain seized the Dutch colony of Ceylon. However, in 1783 under the Paris Peace Treaty, Ceylon was returned to the Netherlands and Nagapattinam ceded to Britain. In 1795, when the French invaded Holland, Britain at war with France soon moved to occupy the Dutch colonies in Asia, South Africa and the Caribbean islands. In 1802, under the terms of the Treaty of Amiens signed by Britain and France, Britain returned the Cape Colony and the islands of the Dutch West Indies to the Dutch Republic. However, Britain did not return Ceylon to the Dutch and made it a British crown colony. After the outbreak of hostilities between Britain and France again in 1803, the British retook the Cape Colony. In 1811, the British also captured the island of Java. A year after the liberation of Holland from France in 1813 an independent Netherlands signed the Anglo-Dutch Treaty with Britain under which all colonies, except Guyana and the Cape Colony, seized by Britain were returned to the Netherlands. After Napoleon's defeat in 1815, the Congress of Vienna redrew Europe's borders. For the first time since declaring independence from Spain in 1581, the Dutch were reunited with the ten provinces of the south (Austrian Netherlands) in a constitutional monarchy called the United Kingdom of the Netherlands. But the union lasted just 15 years. In 1830, a massive revolt in the southern half of the country led to the independence of the new Kingdom of Belgium.

In early 1800, the Dutch government liquidated the bankrupt VOC and nationalised its territorial possessions as the Dutch East Indies. The Anglo-Dutch rivalry in South-east Asia continued to fester over the port of Singapore, which the Sultan of Johore had ceded to the English East India Company in 1819. The Dutch claimed that a treaty signed with the Sultan's predecessor the year earlier had granted them control of the region. However, the impossibility of removing the British from Singapore, which was becoming an increasingly important centre of trade, became apparent to the Dutch. The Anglo-Dutch Treaty of 1824 settled the dispute, under which the Netherlands recognised the British claim on Singapore and ceded Malacca and their bases in India to the British. In return, the British handed over Bencoolen and agreed not to sign treaties with rulers in the 'islands south of the Straits of Singapore'. Thus the Archipelago was divided into two spheres of influence: a Brit-

ish one on the Malay Peninsula and a Dutch one in the East Indies (Indonesia). For most of the Dutch East Indies history, and that of the VOC before it, the Dutch control over these territories was often tenuous. But it was expanded over the course of nineteenth century and it covered all of the territory of today's Indonesia by the early twentieth century. I should add that Java, a densely populated and agriculturally productive island, was under Dutch domination for almost 350 years. Other areas, including Aceh, Lombok, Bali, and Borneo, remained independent for much of the time.

The Dutch government abolished the Dutch West India Company in 1791 and brought under its direct control the colonies in Suriname and the Caribbean islands. The economies of the Dutch colonies in the Caribbean were based on smuggling of goods and slaves into Spanish America, but with the end of the slave trade in 1814 and with the emergence of new independent states in South and Central America profitability declined rapidly. Dutch traders moved en masse from the islands to the United States or Latin America, leaving behind small populations with little income requiring subsidies from the Dutch government. The Antilles were combined with Suriname under one administration from 1828 to 1845. Slavery was not abolished in the Dutch Caribbean colonies until 1863. In Suriname, slaveholders demanded compensation from the Dutch government for freeing slaves, whilst in Sint Maarten, abolition of slavery in the French half in 1848 led slaves in the Dutch half to take their own freedom. In Suriname, after the abolition of slavery, Chinese and Javanese workers were encouraged to settle as indentured labourers during 1890 and 1939.

The Dutch rule in the East Indies (Indonesia), established by force and cunning, was both repressive and paternalistic: it first destroyed the indigenous political and economic system and then imposed a centralised colonial government and a plantation economy on the islands. There was little if any attention paid to the well-being of colonised people: the Dutch treated them as indolent children deprived of opportunities for progress. Some of the colonial administrators and intellectuals promoted the notion of social and economic 'dualism' in the East Indies: the Western (occidental) man was a rational, social and economic agent whereas the Eastern (oriental) man was not. In other words, there

was little or no scope for autonomous progress (development) among the indigenous people. Not only was their history put under the carpet in one full sweep but the so-called evidence was patently false as well.

Indonesia proved to be a very profitable colony for the Netherlands, particularly in the nineteenth century. The Culture System was one of the most ingenious ways to extract surplus for transfer from Indonesian peasants (cultivators). The colonial government, through its Directorate of Culture, required peasants to produce cash crops (for processing and export) on their fields or pay land rent (two-fifth of the crop sown). If freed from working on government-assigned fields the peasants were required to work in government processing factories at low wages. In other words, the involuntary labour of Indonesian peasants was used to earn profit for the Dutch colonial government. Wages in factories were kept low because it was argued that the Indonesian workers had limited wants! The Netherlands treasury reportedly received Fl 823 million from Indonesia during 1831 and 1877 or about one-third of the annual expenditure of the Netherlands government.

Until about the end of nineteenth century, the Dutch colonial government showed little interest in the general well-being of Indonesians. Until 1854, the only schools maintained at public expense were elementary schools for European children. Elementary schools for Indonesians came only after 1893. In 1901, the colonial government declared that the 'moral duty of the Netherlands toward the people of the Indies' would be one of the principles on which it would base its future policy. In 1905, the Dutch treasury gave Fl 40 million to the colony for 'the amelioration of economic conditions in Java and Madura'. But it was getting late: resentment against the colonial rule started to gradually get organised and its vocal expression became louder starting in the early part of twentieth century. Nationalist organisations emerged under different banners to demand emancipation and self-rule.

Indonesians who regarded the Japanese as their liberators much celebrated the Japanese invasion of the East Indies in 1942. After occupation, the Japanese dismantled completely the Dutch colonial state and its institutions and replaced it with its own colonial system. While the Dutch had managed to suppress the rising tide of a nationalist movement in Indonesia (e.g. Communist Party and Sarekat Islam) in the

decades before World War II, the Japanese occupation reignited the nationalist sentiment, which eventually led to independence. The Japanese encouraged and backed Indonesian nationalism, in which new indigenous institutions were created and nationalist leaders like Achmed Sukarno (1901-1970) promoted. The internment of Dutch citizens during the occupation meant that Indonesians filled many leadership and administrative positions, although the Japanese held the top positions.

Two days after the Japanese surrender in August 1945, Indonesians led by Sukarno and Mohammad Hatta (1902-1980) unilaterally declared independence from the Netherlands. The Dutch tried to re-establish their rule against which an armed struggle was launched which lasted for over four years. The Dutch forces eventually re-occupied most of the colonial territory and a guerrilla struggle ensued. Since a vast majority of Indonesians, supported by international opinion, wanted independence, the Netherlands had to recognise Indonesian sovereignty. They reached an agreement in December 1949 under which the Netherlands remained only in western New Guinea. The Indonesian President Sukarno pressed for the territory to remain a part of Indonesia as the nationalists initially intended. Eventually the Netherlands, under international pressure, transferred the territory to Indonesia in 1962. After Indonesian independence, the Dutch were left with a few territorial possessions in the Caribbean and South America, of which most have gained independence.

2. The Dutch Educational Experience

Generally, the Dutch do not celebrate their imperial past: since 1960s, anti-colonial sentiments have been far more dominant than nostalgia for the lost empire. In the contemporary Dutch schoolbooks, colonial history does not feature prominently. However, I arrived in Holland at a time when there were still people with recent memories and mementos of the Dutch empire in the East Indies. The two educational institutions, Institute of Social Studies in The Hague and the Agriculture University in Wageningen, at which I later studied, many of my teachers have had links with the Dutch empire. The post-colonial world of Holland was still full of reminders of its imperial past. However, Holland like other Western European countries had undergone massive reconstruction

after the devastating World War II ended in 1945. In 1961, at the time of my arrival in Holland, Western Europe was entering a period of unprecedented economic growth, prosperity, optimism, openness, and social liberation. The age of acute economic austerity, poverty, pessimism, narrow nationalism, and social orthodoxy was past in these societies. Holland was no exception. There was sweet smell of a glorious spring in the air during the time I lived in Holland until the spring of 1966.

The Dutch government had established the Institute of Social Studies (ISS) in 1952 to address two issues of concern in a post-colonial world: (i) to use productively the stock of human capital with colonial experience and (ii) to participate actively in the training of civil servants and intellectuals from underdeveloped countries that started to gain independence after World War II. The ISS began as an international English-medium post-graduate institution to bring Dutch knowledge to bear in a distinctive (multi-disciplinary) brand of higher education focusing on the problems of underdevelopment. It was an experimental enclave outside the Dutch university system: the Institute was very much a pioneering venture, finding its way in development studies the pedagogic needs of its subject matter. Queen Juliana donated part of the royal Paleis Noordeinde to house the Institute. This building—which housed many colonial mementos and legacies—was ideally suited for a residential institution in which students from 30-35 countries lived and worked together. The park-like setting in the centre of the city was unbeatable for its location. A resident could walk outside at any time of the day and enjoy the hustle-bustle until late at night. The experience was all the more pleasant because of the freedom one enjoyed without any fear of molestation.

The Institute went through a short evolutionary period before 1956 when Professor Egbert de Vries, a former colonial scholar and civil servant, was appointed as its Rector. In a short time, he used his energy and skills to transform the Institute into an acknowledged leader for development studies at least in Europe. Many renowned Dutch and foreign scholars, academics, civil servants, and technical experts supplemented the small core of permanent faculty. The Institute offered short-term (four to six months) diploma programmes in public administration, regional planning and social work and two Master's programmes, one in

Social Sciences and the other in Public Administration. Most students were holders of scholarships funded by the Dutch government as part of its aid programme to underdeveloped countries. By the early 1960s, ISS had made its mark as a very respectable place of learning and cross-cultural interaction. I was thus exposed to a world I had never thought existed. The Institute's environment was intellectually as challenging as it was socially enriching. The world outside the Palace was no less enjoyable, given the general openness and tolerance of the Dutch society. My experience was that the Dutch admired and practised hard work, frankness and independence, and acknowledged merit.

My two years at the Institute included study-cum-leisure tours with other students to Greece, former Yugoslavia, Belgium, Luxemburg, and West Germany. Visits to some of the ancient sites in Greece gave me a glimpse of its rich history, including architectural monuments, philosophers, muses, Olympians, and gods. Marshall Tito's Yugoslavia was a novel experiment in building a multi-national socialist state: at that time, there were almost no signs that its breakup would be as traumatic as it turned out. In the neighbourhood of Holland, a new and united Europe was trying to emerge from the ashes of two inglorious wars. At the Institute, I became aware of many ideas and approaches about the complex process of progress (development) in societies. The pedagogic approach was based on open and free discourse unlike the method used in Pakistan with stress on rote learning and regurgitation. Curiosity and questioning were rarely if ever encouraged or much tolerated. The peculiarity of the Institute in Holland was that one worked within a group of immense cultural diversity and used a multi-disciplinary approach to understand the phenomena of underdevelopment and development. The permanent faculty and visiting experts acted as catalysts in seminar-like settings with copious examples of country experiences of early developers and late comers. No question was silly or bad, except if it was completely irrelevant. Equally, no answer was complete or final: there was ambiguity and tentativeness. We examined and discussed the complex process of human progress through lenses of different angles and shades, philosophic, political, social, and economic. At the end of the two-year programme, I felt that I had experienced much intellectual and social transformation.

In the summer of 1962, I took advantage of an opportunity to attend a two-week international training programme at the Landbouwhogesschool (high school of agriculture) in Wageningen near the city of Arnhem. My stay in Wageningen allowed me to get a glimpse of higher (university-level) education in various disciplines of agriculture. What that school offered in education and research much impressed me. By the time I started work on my Master's thesis at the ISS in early 1963, I was quite sure I wanted to seek admission for a Ph.D. programme in agricultural economics. There were two interesting features in the Dutch university system. First, the doctoral programme did not require any course work: students entering the university at that level would have completed the required course work at the Master's level. A student in the doctoral programme had to conduct only supervised research on an approved topic and write a thesis based on his or her research. At the end, the candidate had to defend the thesis in an open assembly. Second, students could write the thesis in a language other than Dutch provided the supervising professor and the university approved it. English was by far the most common medium after the Dutch language. In Wageningen, I had to find a professor of economics at the Landbouwhogeshool who would be willing to supervise my doctoral thesis. I managed to meet with Professor Th.L.M. Thurlings (1916-1997), Head of the Department of Economics, in the spring of 1963. Professor Thurlings liked the thesis proposal, but he had no funds to finance my doctoral research. Since the Technical Assistance Bureau of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which had financed my study at ISS, was willing to give funds for research work for another six months, Professor Thurlings agreed to supervise my work: for me this was the beginning of an entirely new life experience in a Dutch university town.

Wageningen is a historic town in the central part of the Netherlands, situated on the north banks of the lower Rhine Riverand at the border between Gelderse valley and the Veluwe. The town received its city rights in 1263. A wall and a mote protected the town and a castle was built in 1526. The castle was dismantled during the eighteenth century, but the foundations of three of the towers and part of the wall remain visible. In 1876, the state of Netherlands took over an agriculture school run by the local council of Wageningen and initiated agriculture educa-

tion in the country. The government raised the status of the school, ratified it as an institution of higher education for agriculture and named it Landbouwhogeschool. The town of Wageningen also gained fame for its role in World War II: it was the site where General Johannes Blaskowitz of the German army surrendered to General Charles Foulkes of the Canadian army in Hotel de Wereld (near the town centre) on May 5, 1945. The Dutch and Canadian flags adorn the war memorial. In the mid 1960s, almost one-half of nearly 15,000 people residing in Wageningen were associated with the Landbouwhogeschool and its associated research institutes and laboratories. Another important point about agriculture education and research facilities in Wageningen is that it was one of the few places in Europe where tropical agriculture and forestry were major disciplines because of the Dutch empire in the East Indies (Indonesia). Many graduates and researchers of Wageningen used to get their field training to serve in Indonesia.

The university life for most students, particularly those in the undergraduate programme, outside their academic commitments, revolved around denominational fraternities which served as centres of social interaction, including dining, entertainment, and sports. There was only one non-denominational fraternity, Ceres, which attracted the largest crowd of students particularly on weekends. Graduate students and short-term visitors (researchers) from outside Holland like me spent most of their evenings at the International Club, but they could also participate in the Dutch student clubs or fraternities. The town centre had the historic Hoogestraat (High Street) on which most of the shops were located. At its northern end in the Mei Plein was Hotel de Wereld and at the other end the town's central plaza where a fruit and flower market was held once a week. In the same neighbourhood were the historic Schimmelpenninck cigar factory and the main Bus Station for out-of-town trips. There was one cinema and a good-size open-air public swimming pool, which operated in the summer months. For someone with a bit of money to spend, there was 'Hotel De Wageningsche Berg' on General Foulkesweg, sitting on a hill with a beautiful view of the Neder Rijn River below. The occasional visit to the hotel during the summer months for a cup of coffee in the afternoon was a great treat. One could always go to Arnhem by bus or by electric train

(from Ede-Wageningen station) and to many other towns or cities in the Netherlands. Needless to add, almost everyone had a bicycle for local transport or even long trips.

I spent over two years in Wageningen, thanks to a handsome monthly stipend, which Professor Thurlings managed to procure from the Landbouwhogeschool. The academic and social life in Wageningen was vastly different from the ISS in The Hague. For one thing, I lived as a boarder with a multi-lingual family in which the parents were Russian émigrés and their three children Dutch by birth. All of them spoke at least three languages: Russian, Dutch and English without the slightest effort. Their outlook on life was progressive in some respects but conventional though not rigid in others. One could engage in argument and debate about all kinds of issues—excluding religion—at the dining table and in the living room. I felt as one of the family and not an intruder. The hospitable and warm environment provided by that family was a major factor for me to concentrate almost exclusively on my study and research. In the academic sphere, there were no deadlines to meet: I was free to search for relevant literature, read, digest and write. The occasional meetings with the supervising professor and others in the department helped me greatly in keeping on track. Librarians at the school library (Bibleothek) were of immense help in procuring books and documents that I needed or wanted. My short visits to England (London), France (Lyon and Paris) and Switzerland (Geneva) were as valuable for academic pursuit as they were culturally enriching. Learning through travel to diverse lands is a unique experience if one keeps the mind's eyes and ears open. That human nature is similar everywhere was probably the more important lesson I learnt from these and other encounters.

II. Progress Continues: Migration to Canada

I stood at crossroads once my thesis was near completion and ready for public defence: would it be back to Pakistan or what? The return plan for Pakistan soon failed thanks to the deafening silence at that end for months. I had to search other venues for both academic and economic reasons. At that time, there was no dearth of opportunities in North America, particularly in Canada, for a young graduate with a Ph.D. degree to pursue an academic career. New universities were being established and the old ones expanding. I took a chance and, after a brief interview in Amsterdam, was offered a teaching position at Simon Fraser University on the west coast of Canada, which opened its gates in the fall of 1965. The decision to accept the offer meant a migration very different from the ones that my father's ancestors and my father undertook earlier on the Indian sub-continent. Going to Canada was altogether a different cup of tea: it meant perhaps a permanent cultural break from the past. It was also an opportunity to pursue a much-anticipated academic career in an environment where knowledge was valued. In some ways living in the Netherlands as a transient for over four years was a good preparation for life in Canada in spite of the differences between the two countries. My new home is indeed different if one takes a glimpse at its history.

1. History of Canada

Perhaps the most striking feature of Canada—derived from the indigenous word 'kanata' for village or settlement—is its geography: it has the second largest land area in the world, but most of it is without people. Most of its population lives not too far north above the border with the United States—most of it runs along the 49th parallel—from the Atlantic in the east to the Pacific in the west. The rest of the land, up to the North Pole, is mostly uninhabited and uninhabitable because of the cold climate and geology. A second important feature is that most Canadians are either descendents of immigrants from Europe who started to settle in the early seventeenth century or recent immigrants most

of them arriving after World War II. In the early twenty-first century, Canada is officially a bi-lingual country and a multi-cultural society with a patchwork of diverse ethnic minorities.

The original people (first nations), wrongly called 'Indians', much smaller in number, came from Euro-Asia via Alaska and settled in the Americas some 11,000 to 13,000 years ago. There were probably 500,000 people living very sparsely and in small settlements on the land when the first Europeans started to settle in what is now Canada. The encounter would turn out be a catastrophe for the first nations, thanks to European germs, guns, the cross, and alcohol. Finally, the Dominion of Canada was founded in 1867—I participated in the centennial celebrations—after almost two hundred and fifty years of both friendly and war-like relations with the indigenous tribes and periods of peace and war between the French and British settlers. That the British monarch remains the titular Head of State in Canada is a reflection of the outcome of conflicts between France and Britain after the two warring countries had wrested much of the territory from the aboriginal tribes by different means, including trade, wars and deceptive treaties.

Europeans were not aware of the land mass of the Americas until the voyages of late fifteenth century intended to reach China and India via the west. The brief Norse settlements in Greenland and Newfoundland around 1,000 CE may have been the exception. Some five hundred years later, European (Portuguese, Basques, French, and English) fishermen started to extend their fishing from the north-west to the west of Iceland into the Atlantic in search of reliable supply and discovered the off-shore and inland fishery of Newfoundland. In the context of Canada, about five years after the 1492 voyage of Christopher Columbus, King Henry VII of England sponsored John Cabot, also a Genoese mariner, to find the passage to China and India that had eluded Columbus. Cabot did not find China, but probably landed in Nova Scotia or 'rediscovered' Newfoundland. The discovery of land, however, was not as important as the rich catch of the northern cod (stockfish).

The rich harvest of the codfish in Newfoundland acted as a magnet for fishermen from northern Spain (Basque country); cod fishery remained profitable for the French and English fishermen as well. The European fishermen consolidated their hold over the growing fishery of

Newfoundland and started to come ashore in search of water, wood and meat. In the course of these visits, a growing trade developed between them and the indigenous people who wanted items of clothing, knives, mirrors, beads, and other things in exchange for furs, which they had in abundance. At first Europeans did not put much value on the furs, but soon the North American fur, especially of the beaver, became a valuable commodity in Europe and a major reason to attract Europeans to the territory for trade and settlement. The trade in fur required stable indigenous suppliers, hence a partnership of French traders with the native hunters including co-habitation with women. The trade was profitable to both parties, though over time their contact would turn out to be very costly to the natives.

For the indigenous tribes, the first interaction with Europeans was perhaps an ominous beginning because of the unshakable European assumption of superiority and their determination to possess the land and other resources. It needs to be stressed that there were numerous indigenous tribes quite diverse in terms of their occupations and cultures (languages and customs); their relations with each other were both peaceful (exchange) and combative (wars), depending upon their economic and cultural interests. While they lived in small, and some time transitory, settlements, and technologies they used in peace and war were primitive, their societies were quite complex. In the beginning, their interaction with European settlers was a mixture of business-like exchanges, limited social mingling, occasional indifference, and mild to severe hostility leading to open warfare. In the long run, 'Indians' of the Americas would find themselves greatly reduced in number, dispossessed of most of their resources, and made in almost every way subservient to the new settlers and their descendents. Their living conditions on and off the 'reserves', though they have improved in the last forty years or so, are incomparably inferior to those of most other people in Canada.

In 1534, following the example of other European monarchs, Francois I, King of France, sponsored Jacques Cartier to sail west in search of the passage to Asia. Cartier made three voyages to the 'New World' between 1534 and 1541, in which he helped to define the map of eastern North America, discovered the St. Lawrence River, and attached the

name Mont Royal to the large mountain in the middle of the island where eventually the French settlement of Montreal was established. He was probably the first European who made extensive contacts with local inhabitants along the St Lawrence. On his return to France Cartier had little to show, two aborigines he had kidnapped and furs of little value rather than gold and silver. But his explorations marked the beginning of a process that would transform Canada: for Cartier Canada was the future and it was French. Once the religious war in France ended by the end of sixteenth century, King Henri IV started to pay attention to North America.

In 1604, the French mounted an expedition, which after bad experiences established a settlement, named Port Royal, on the south shore of the Bay of Fundy. The leader of the settlement was no other than Samuel de Champlain, a navigator, mapmaker and lieutenant of the monopoly. Originally he favoured the Fundy Basin, Acadia, but it proved unfruitful. So he sailed down the St Lawrence River in 1608 and built a trading post at Quebec ('narrowing of the river' in the Algonquin language) and then with other Frenchmen started marching into the interior along with some natives (Hurons and Algonquins). Champlain acquired the backing of some powerful Frenchmen to preserve the Quebec colony and explore the interior more deeply. He managed to secure the favour of Cardinal de Richelieu, Chief Minister of Louis XIII, who organised a commercial outfit (monopoly) to manage and finance the Quebec colony or New France, which would flower haltingly throughout the seventeenth century. The French colony offered trade and salvation (Christianity) to the natives and to France profit and souls in return for investors, soldiers and settlers.

Over time, French settlers got embroiled in the rivalries and wars between native tribes (Huron and Iroquois) and pushed by their zeal to convert the natives to Catholicism. The settlers had to fight the Iroquois as well for survival. In the 1663, King Louis XIV made New France (with three fortified posts at Quebec, Trois-Rivieres and Montreal) a royal province to be governed directly from Paris given the large presence of the English on the east coast. But fewer than 5,000 Frenchmen had settled during the first part of seventeenth century. Then the French government poured money into New France and subsidised migration

from France: between 1660 and 1700 about 10,000 Frenchmen migrated to the French province in North America. There were agricultural settlements on the banks of St Lawrence from Trois-Rivieres to Quebec and around Montreal.

In the 1660s, European settlements in North America started to transform from dependencies to the status of provinces of England and France. The events in Europe would determine what happened next in North America. In 1670, King James II gave charter to the Hudson Bay Company (HBC) to trade in the northern interior of North America through Hudson Bay, an interior sea discovered by Henry Hudson in 1610. The King also claimed the lands of the Hudson Bay watersheds, a vast real estate, and assigned the territory to HBC, which managed to establish a series of trading posts. HBC's fur-trading activities with the Cree nation drew the attention of New France, but commercial rivalry between England and France in North America was not allowed to turn into war because of amiable relations between Louis XIV and James II. The English had earlier arrived in New York and that too started worrying the French close to the border since they were at war with the Iroquois. In 1688, when James II fled to France and William of Orange from Holland became William III of England, the two countries were again at war.

There were two wars in Europe: War of the League of Ausburg (1688-1697) followed by the War of Spanish Succession (1702-1713), giving occasions to the French and British settlers in North America to fall upon each other with great enthusiasm. The ongoing global rivalry between France and Britain and Spain and Britain were the major causes of these wars. They also marked the rise of Britain and decline of France in terms of its ability to sustain the overseas empire. For over 100 years, from 1689 to 1815, North America would remain a theatre of wars, which also involved indigenous tribes against each other and against Europeans colonisers as allies of one side or the other. France and Britain were at peace after they concluded the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713: France had lost the war and needed time to recover. Similarly, New France needed peace in North America. France paid their losses in Europe by giving up possessions in North America: it surrendered Hudson Bay and Acadia to Britain and gave up settlements in Newfoundland. The cession

of Acadia and Newfoundland to Britain imperiled sea communications between France and New France. But France could not risk a war given the immense power Britain had acquired to interrupt maritime transport on which the French depended.

New France flourished in the 30 years of peace following the Treaty of Utrecht. Peace allowed the French population and settlements to grow—there were about 50,000 Europeans in 1740—and the Governor-General in Quebec presided over a vast empire in area with a majority of subjects being native and not European. New France extended from Louisburg at the tip of Cape Breton into the Great Lakes region and out on to the Great Plains. French Canada controlled the entire Mississippi basin southward to Louisiana and west as far as New Spain. British traders to the north (Hudson Bay) and south (Ohio Valley) of New France challenged the French domination in fur trade without which their empire would have collapsed. By the middle of eighteenth century, a robust well-fed and reasonably prosperous community of farmers, artisans, townsfolk, and fur trade workers flourished along the St Lawrence River. Contact with the upcountry gave birth to the entirely new Meti (mixed blood) societies. The extraordinary colonising thrust of the French disrupted indigenous communities but did not destroy them. The fur trade, in exchange for European goods, reoriented the native life, but European diseases, guns and alcohol took a heavy toll: disintegrating the social structure and effectively emptying space for the colonisers. It was not only the French expansion but also the British and Spanish penetration into the continent that brought about massive restructuring of native cultures and economies whether in the north, the Great Plains or along the west coast.

There was another war in Europe, the War of Austrian Succession, between Prussia and Austria, also involving France and Britain on opposite sides. The war lasted for over four years (1744-1748). In North America, the British captured Louisbourg and the French captured Madras in India. The warring parties exchanged the two following the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, which ended the war in 1748. However, the Seven-Year War (1755-1762), between France and Britain ended with complete British victory over New France. In this war, the former indigenous allies of the French joined the British side. The final episode in

the conquest of Canada occurred when three British armies converged on Montreal in the fall of 1760 and the French duly surrendered without combat. The terms of surrender included: obedience of French population to the British; no change in existing laws and customs; and guarantee to the inhabitants of New France to keep their property and Catholicism, though the British state would be Protestant. If Canada was so thoroughly French in 1740, how did it become demonstrably British over a century? The simple answer is: by conquest! The French empire in North America survived as long as it did mainly because the British settlers in America could not launch a determined and united campaign. But that would change.

In 1762, the French invaded Newfoundland, but had to surrender it because they were too few: this was the last incursion of the French military power on what would be Canada one day. The British wanted to make peace for domestic reasons and made concessions to get it. After the Seven-Year War, in 1763 France and Britain signed the Treaty of Paris to settle accounts not just in North America but elsewhere as well. France lost ground in India, the Caribbean and Canada: in North America, the French lost New France (to Britain) and Louisiana (to Spain); Spain lost Florida (to Britain) but regained Cuba as compensation. The French kept only two islands off Newfoundland (St Pierre and Miquelon) and landing rights for fishermen on the north coast of Newfoundland. Britain gained the most in the war: the entire continent east of the Mississippi became British.

Under the new dispensation, the inhabitants of New France could go back to France or stay: they chose to stay which gave the British colony a special character with significant implications for the future. A major consequence of the defeat of the French in North America was that the political and economic links with the French of France were completely broken. But the cultural (language, religion, law, and customs) ties did not break. In 1763, the northern part of North America had about 300,000 people of which two-thirds were natives. It had two colonies, Nova Scotia (including former Acadia or New Brunswick) and Quebec besides Newfoundland for fisheries and the very large commercial domain of HBC. The British government had uneasy relations with the natives and treated them as wards for protection. However, it did not

always work that way: its proclamation of 1763 to reserve the lands west of the Appalachians for natives did not stop the British settlers in the 13 colonies from moving west. Consequently, in 1768 the British concluded a treaty with the Iroquois to cede the Ohio Valley.

The new colonial masters (i.e. British) had now new problems on their hands in their vastly expanded empire in North America. A major question was how to pay for the war and bear the cost of maintaining the vast empire? The other was how to absorb Catholics in a Protestant empire? The British government lost its American colonies on the issue of 'taxation without representation'. In 1776, Americans (British settlers) declared independence from Britain and the colonial government lost decisively the bloody war that followed. France and Spain joined the American rebels in 1778 and 1779, respectively. The British Declaratory Act of 1778, conceding the right of taxation to the colonies, came too late to retrieve the lost American colonies. In the northern part, the Quebec Act of 1774 resolved the question of Quebec: it recognised the distinctive character of the French (Quebecois) in the British Empire. Britain shifted its policy of conformity (1763) to exceptionalism (1774) for the French population. The Quebec Act lifted restrictions on Catholics in Quebec; extended the borders of Quebec; authorised the use of French civil (but not criminal) law; and established the rule by a military governor and an appointed (not elected) council.

The provinces of Nova Scotia and Quebec were targets of American rebels. However, their attempt to lure the two colonies (Nova Scotia and Quebec) on their side against Britain did not work. Instead, these colonies became a refuge for about 70,000 loyalists after the defeat of Britain at the hands of American rebels. Their settlement in Nova Scotia and Quebec would have important consequences for the future dominion of Canada. The Treaty of Paris in 1783 ended the American Revolution formally and Britain ceded the Ohio Valley to the United States. It was also a formal recognition of two English-speaking nations occupying North America. It is worth noting that the indigenous people were not invited to the peace talks at Paris: none of the participants (Britain, France, Spain, and United States) recognised their sovereignty and their lands were parceled out like any other. A large part of the North American continent in the west remained unexplored with sparsely populated

Indian territories and Spain on the west coast. In 1784, New Brunswick had to be carved out as a separate colony to accommodate the loyalists; Prince Edward Island had already been separate and its land given to a handful of landlords who parcelled it out to settlers for rent.

The peace of 1783 ended with the French Revolution in 1789. Britain joined other monarchies of Europe and went to war against the new regime in France. The American republicans, though sympathetic to the new regime, did not join revolutionary France in the war. Nor did the French Canadians join France to overthrow British rule in Canada. They enjoyed almost complete autonomy in the province of Lower Canada in which they were in majority. The war in Europe continued, with a slight break in 1802-1803, until 1815 when Napoleon Bonaparte was defeated and the French empire in Europe ended with the Treaty of Ghent. Americans joined the French side in 1812, but were not able to conquer Canada. The indigenous people were perhaps the biggest losers in the Anglo-American War of 1812. After the loss of the United States, British North America was undergoing many changes. During the 1780s and 1790s, British government took the first steps toward consolidation of British North America under a single government. The Constitutional Act of 1791 created two colonies, Upper Canada and Lower Canada, each with its own administration and legislative assembly. In Upper Canada, British (common) law and institutions would prevail whereas in Lower Canada there would be a mixed system of the British criminal and common law with the French civil law for Catholics (French Canadians). In the two colonies, an upper house representing the propertied class was added to check the power of the legislative assemblies, of which the members were elected on a limited franchise.

The economy of British colonies grew rapidly after 1815 for several reasons. For one thing, there were massive changes in technology, steam engines in lumber mills and factories, steamships and railways, and telegraph, affecting the economy and society. In addition, governments increased investments in transport, canals and then railways. The post-war years saw a significant boom in export of forests products to Britain. Forest industry became the largest employer of wage labour. But agriculture was the engine of economic growth as the principal occupation of the population and a leading export industry. For almost

thirty years after 1815, there was a huge inflow of immigrants from Britain and Ireland into Canada because of economic opportunities in the colonies and the post-war economic distress in Britain. There were also longer-term push factors working in the British Isles for the rising tide of migrants. By the 1840s immigration had raised the population to about 1.7 million and also changed completely the demographic complexion of British Canada. The indigenous people were experiencing massive changes as well, especially with the rapid expansion of business by HBC and the Northwest Company and their rivalry in the fur trade. The native population declined sharply; its economic system dislocated; and its social and family structure disrupted. The social interaction of many French fur traders with native women produced a crossbred group of men and women (Metis) who would play an important role in the history of Canada.

Politically British North America was only a name. The Governor in Quebec City (Lower Canada) was as powerless as were Lieutenant Governors in Upper Canada and the Atlantic provinces (Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland): they all took direction from London. In the 1830s, popular campaigns gained strength to obtain greater self-government and to curb the authority of governors and their councils. The struggle turned to armed rebellion only in Upper and Lower Canada, but the general population in either colony did not respond favourably to the call of rebels to rise. Consequently, the rebellion of 1837 discredited the rebels and restored colonial authority. While the two rebellions were crushed decisively, military action continued for several years but with no major consequence. British government sent out Lord Durham, a liberal-minded reformer, as Governor-General in 1838. After a brief tour of duty, he recommended that (1) provinces should receive full autonomy and (2) Lower Canada and Upper Canada should merge into one English-speaking province with almost no regard for the rights of the French, which they had enjoyed for so long. British government implemented most of Lord Durham's recommendations, especially those that sub-ordinated French Canadians.

The Act of Union of 1840 merged the two newly named colonies, Canada East (Lower Canada) and Canada West (Upper Canada) into

one entity and named it Province of Canada. The Upper Canada assembly voted for the merger with great enthusiasm. The new province would have an appointed executive and elected assembly of equal members even though the French population was 30 per cent larger. English became the only official language and the revenues of the two regions merged into one consolidated revenue fund to live off its own resources and subject to British government's overall authority over trade. British government did not accept the idea of 'responsible government': it gave Governor the means of producing an assembly of his own liking. The indigenous people looked to the Crown to respect their treaties and protect them from new settlements. British imperialism would become impervious to inequities suffered by the French and indigenous populations since they could not imagine a better alternative. The chaos caused by the gold rush forced the British government to take direct responsibility for the HBC domain on the West Coast: Queen Victoria personally changed the name from Columbia to British Columbia for the proposed colony.

Political developments in the colonies eventually led to the idea of a united Canada, a confederation of the existing provinces. The breakthrough came first in Nova Scotia where the governor chose his council from among the assembly members who had won the majority: essentially Nova Scotia became a self-governing province in early 1848. Similarly, in East and West Canada the reform-minded groups joined hands and won the elections of 1848. Lord Elgin, the Governor-General, asked them to form a government. But the new government did not work out quite smoothly and the reform government did not last for too long. In the 1850s, since Canada West outstripped Canada East in population, the former had become under-represented in the joint assembly. The economy of Canada West was also growing more rapidly. Many radicals wanted to escape 'French domination' through representation based on population. This allowed conservative groups in the two parts to join and form a governing majority throughout the 1850s. Responsible governments followed in Prince Edward Island in 1851, New Brunswick in 1854, Newfoundland in 1855, and the Vancouver Island colony in 1856. British Columbia remained under the direct control of an appointed governor and Rupert's Land in the western interior stayed with HBC

under a charter from the Crown. By the 1860s, most of the colonies had self-government and many experienced robust economic growth with strong trading ties with the United States.

The idea of a political union among colonies gained momentum with the onset of civil war in the United States: confederation became a plausible objective since British policy was also conducive, thanks to the growing tension with the northern states of the United States. The Maritime colonies of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island took the first concrete step towards a union. In 1864, the three governments met in Charlottetown to explore the possibilities of amalgamation. At the same time, the movement towards a wider union started to grow in the two Canadas since they wanted to go their separate ways. The coalition government developed a proposal for a federation and placed it before the Maritime colonies, which responded with enthusiasm. In the fall of 1864, a constitutional conference in Quebec City debated and passed resolutions. Eventually the four former colonies (Canada East, Canada West, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick) decided to form a confederation, though French Canadians expressed anxiety about cultural autonomy under a centralised constitution.

In March of 1867, under the British North America Act, British Parliament approved the establishment of Dominion of Canada and the occasion was celebrated on July 1, 1867. By 1896, the Dominion of Canada was the third largest political entity (after Russia and China) with 77 million hectares and included Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario—the united province of Canada had split into two provinces—Manitoba, the prairie territory (split into Saskatchewan and Alberta in 1905). British Columbia joined in 1871 in return for extension of the railway track to Vancouver (completed in 1886). Prince Edward Island joined in 1873. In 1880, British government transferred the Arctic Archipelago as well to Canada. The Dominion of Canada now stretched from the Atlantic to Pacific Ocean and from 49th parallel to the North Pole. Newfoundland would join the Confederation in 1949.

Settling the west posed many challenges to the government. The HBC territory was transferred, without a clear title, through the good offices of British government in 1870; there were about 50,000 indigenous people who depended on its resources. In 1871, to avoid conflict

and war between European settlers and natives, government agents started to negotiate a series of treaties with the indigenous people. By 1877 seven treaties were signed, extinguishing the aboriginal title to most of the Prairie West; and in four more treaties between 1899 and 1921 the North and North-west Territories were surrendered. The indigenous people agreed to surrender all their rights to the land forever in return for exclusive reserves of land for themselves, initial cash payments to band members and continuing annuities. The indigenous leaders agreed to surrender their land rights peacefully because there was no better alternative to protect their people against the influx of Europeans as settlers, traders and surveyors. The Indian Act of 1876 made the indigenous people as wards of the state and confined them to limited reserves. The health, welfare, education, and spiritual services of Christian missions played a major role in the process. The notorious Church-run residential schools for indigenous children were a way to 'de-Indianise' them. The indigenous population believed the treaties formed the basis for their survival, but Canadian officials believed that the treaties and the Indian Act would serve as means to eventual assimilation. This is not how it turned out in the long run.

Canada was an under-populated territory and more of its people were migrating to the United States than coming into Canada. It was also a divided country based on racial, linguistic, religious, and regional differences along with the tussle between the Dominion and provincial governments. But there were factors uniting the people across Canada: the party system, economic advantages, technologies and railways, and the Dominion government in Ottawa. The psychological benefit of the British flag and the Queen was quite substantial as well: being part of the British Empire meant identity, tradition, and stability. The fact that no one wanted to attack Canada from outside also provided stability to the new country. In its first forty years, Canada was also lucky with leaders like Sir John A. Macdonald (1815-1891), Scottish-Conservative, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier (1841-1919), French-Liberal, as outstanding Prime Ministers. Canada opened its doors more widely for immigrants to foster economic growth through farming on the prairies, building railways and roads, and expanding industries. This also changed the composition of immigrants since more were coming from Eastern and Southern

Europe. But immigration of Asians was discouraged by various means: e.g. head tax on the Chinese, quota for the Japanese, and impossible travel conditions on the so-called East Indians. So were the blacks from the United States discouraged. Canada was still a white man's country.

There was an economic boom in the country, interrupted only slightly in some years, for almost forty years until World War I: private Canadian, British, and American investors together with government investments in infrastructure kept on fuelling growth and the rapidly expanding population acted as supplier of workers and consumers. Canada had a fast-expanding but primarily resource-based economy (farms, mines, forests). But it also experienced simultaneously the full force of the first Industrial Revolution (textiles, iron and steel) and the second Industrial Revolution (electro-mechanical) accelerated by the rapid expansion of a highly productive agriculture sector and a major investment boom. The robust and growing demand for products from Canadian farms, forests, mines, and factories in foreign markets also acted as strong stimulus to economic growth. Canada was transforming into an industrial economy with rising incomes and demand for new goods and services. A rapidly growing economy attracted more immigrants into the country reinforcing the virtuous cycle of economic growth and transformation. Needless to add, not all regions or social classes shared equally or fairly the rewards of rapid industrialisation and growth. The trade union movement had to fight hard and long for the rights of workers and their wages.

As in many other countries, Canadian society and economy underwent a very disruptive period of nearly twenty years, barring the decade of the 1920s, from 1914 to 1945: the country was involved in two world wars (1914-1918 and 1939-1945) and a deep, prolonged and global economic recession (Great Depression) in the 1930s. Canada got involved automatically in World War I once Britain declared war against Germany in early September 1914. Most Canadians, French Canadians included, responded with enthusiasm. The war effort was quite costly to Canada in terms of casualties, about 56,000 dead and 150,000 injured. In addition, the issue of conscription in 1917 exposed a deep division between French and British Canadians. The War also transformed the economy and society: women joined the labour force as never before

and the increased international demand for food and raw material provided new income and higher wages. However, for nearly four years after the War ended in 1918, the Canadian economy and society were in turmoil. Workers, farmers and women—who gained the right to vote during the War period—were not happy for one reason or another. The economic revival after 1922 infused a new sense of optimism for the future. Several factors fuelled the economic expansion: grain exports, a booming pulp and paper industry and mining, heavy investment in hydroelectric facilities, foreign (U.S.) investment in branch plants, and the rise of auto industry in central Canada.

The Liberal political party, first led by William Mackenzie King (1874-1950) and then by Louis St. Laurent (1882-1973) as Prime Ministers, played a major role on the Canadian political scene for nearly 25 years. During the inter-war period, British government decided, after several conferences, to grant complete autonomy to its dominions within the British Commonwealth—replacing the term British Empire—with common allegiance to the British Crown. Mackenzie King was entirely satisfied with this approach. In 1931, British Parliament enacted the Statute of Westminster, renouncing its right to legislate for the Commonwealth. The self-governing dominions (Canada included) became legally and constitutionally self-sufficient with some exceptions. Since the federal and provincial governments in Canada could not agree on how to amend the Canadian constitution, the British Parliament retained the right to amend the British North America Act of 1867. Eventually proclamation of the Canada Act of 1982 would be the constitution of Canada, with a Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and an amending formula for the constitution. This was one of the major achievements of another Liberal Prime Minister, Pierre Elliot Trudeau (1919-2000). The problem of Quebec as a constitutionally protected 'distinct society' has remained the Achilles heel for Canadians.

In 1930, a worldwide economic collapse hit Canada with vengeance. The Great Depression of 1930s, together with a severe drought on the prairies, devastated the farm sector, created massive unemployment, lowered wages, bankrupted businesses, and forced many hundreds of thousands into dependence on the doll and soup kitchens. The Great Depression revealed painfully the vagaries of 'free' markets and the

need for the state to engage more actively in regulating the economy and providing a safety-net to vulnerable groups in society. Canadian government followed the lead of the U.S. government and introduced its own New Deal to alleviate the economic and social malaise, but it encountered constitutional barriers thus leaving provincial governments to adopt the necessary measures. In 1933, certain progressive groups formed a social democratic party, Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF), to replace the failed capitalist economy with a state-regulated co-operative economy. By 1939, the Canadian economy began to recover slowly and haltingly, without any major ‘socialist’ experiment, and the income and employment levels returned to the pre-1929 level. However, soon Europe and the rest of the world descended into another war that lasted from the fall of 1939 to the summer of 1945.

For Canada World War II was not as divisive as World War I, thanks to the prudent policies of Mackenzie King, but more transformative for the economy and society. King refused to impose conscription for overseas service and kept the Canadian commitments to a minimum to avoid the division and instability caused by conscription in World War I. Canada, while providing economic help and defense services to Britain, did well from the War in economic terms. But the indiscriminate internment of immigrants from Japan, Italy and Germany, deemed as threat to security, during the war was a dark and embarrassing episode. The war also transformed the role of government in the economy: it emerged not only bigger in size but also with more prestige and influence. Wartime conditions rapidly advanced the development of social policy in Canada. The idea of the ‘welfare state’, which preceded the Great Depression by decades, was translated into policy and action partly during the Depression and partly after World War II. The earliest measure was the old-age pension plan introduced in 1927, joined by all provinces by 1936. After the war, there was a baby and consumption boom, reflecting pent-up demand for marriages and goods. The federal government introduced a universal Family Allowance system under which families would receive a monthly allowance for each child under the age of 18 years. These changes set in motion many new social and political developments, especially in the 1960s.

In 1951, the federal government replaced the Act of 1927 by the *Old Age Security Act* which introduced a universal, flat-rate pension for people 70 and over, with 20 years of residence in Canada immediately prior to the approval of an application as sufficient qualification. In 1935, the federal government attempted to introduce an unemployment insurance programme, but the Supreme Court ruled it unconstitutional. The federal government amended the Constitution Act of 1867, brought unemployment insurance under its jurisdiction and introduced the Unemployment Insurance (UI) system in 1940. Pierre Trudeau extended the system and made it far more generous in 1971. However, since the 1980s the system, renamed Employment Insurance (EI), has become far more stringent and less generous. In the 1960s, Lester B. Pearson (1897-1972), another Liberal Prime Minister, introduced two important schemes for personal security, namely, universal coverage of health care and a contributory post-retirement pension for Canadians. There were two major factors inducing the government to adopt these measures: one was rapid economic growth, which began soon after the end of World War II and lasted until the early 1970s and the other was the rising demand, buttressed by political pressure, for Canada to be a welfare state.

In the early 1960s, Canadian government started to open the door for immigrants from outside Europe. Its immigration policy shifted from a discriminatory quota system to an open system based on skills and labour requirements in the country. The Liberal Prime Ministers Pearson and Trudeau were the drivers who put the new policy into effect and changed the demographic and social landscape of Canada in the next 30 years. There were challenges as well. For one thing, in the unbroken era of economic growth and prosperity the indigenous people on their reserves and in the North did not benefit. Rapid migration of people from farms, thanks to capital-intensive agriculture, to urban areas also expanded pools of the urban poor. In the 1960s, perhaps the greatest challenge confronting the government was the rising tide of assertive nationalism among the French-speaking people of Quebec. The 'Quiet Revolution' transformed Quebec society, unleashed a new culturally vibrant nationalist spirit and demanded constitutional change: 'equality or independence' became a blunt but popular slogan. In fact, many in Quebec started to espouse separatism. Prime Minister Trudeau took

the challenge head on: he fought the ultra-nationalists with his vision of Canada as a bi-lingual and bi-cultural country. To this end, he had the Official Languages Act passed in 1969.

It was also in the 1960s that women's organisations gained momentum in their demand for equal rights: the Royal Commission on the Status of Women made the case for redrafting of laws, social programmes and employment practices that discriminated against women. Finally, the awful conditions of the First Nations, the Third World of Canada, and the attempt of federal government to make them full citizens galvanised native organisations across the country. They wanted their collective rights recognised, reminding new Canadians their historical nationality as confirmed by treaties that Canadians could not extinguish.

In the mid-1960s, Canada was paradoxically in a state of bliss and ferment when I came to the country as an immigrant. Since then the social and economic transformation of Canada has been so radical that a returnee after forty-five years might find hard to believe: it has become a thoroughly multi-cultural society in which the rights of individuals, irrespective of their gender, age, religion, colour, ethnicity, health, or profession, are legally protected and socially accepted. The Canadian judicial system, especially the Supreme Court, is the watchdog of the federal Parliament and provincial Legislative Assemblies within the framework of Charter of Rights and Freedoms laid down in the 1982 Constitution. Canadian economy has become far more diversified, much less dependent on the United States for investment and trade, and more oriented towards the Far East (Japan, China, South Korea). The basic role of the state in the economy and the structure of social safety-net have remained more or less unchanged, though the pressure to alter the structure has palpably increased in the twenty-first century. Apparently, tolerance for increased income inequalities and persistent poverty among certain groups seems to have increased. Perhaps a major reason for change in attitudes is mobile capital and global competition. The vagaries of 'free' markets remain a constant reminder of the need to keep the state active in both the economic and social spheres.

2. Contemporary Life in Canada

In the fall of 1965, the opening of Simon Fraser University, named after the nineteenth century Scottish fur trader and explorer of British Columbia, had much to do with the rapid growth of demand for higher education in all parts of Canada. The demand for higher education reflected not only rapid growth of population in the area outside the greater Vancouver area but also a response to the need for building human capital in a technologically fast-changing world. Increased investment in higher education and state support were no less important for providing stimulus to high school graduates to participate. In view of the acute shortage of Canadian educators, new universities attracted academics and scholars from the United States, Europe and Asia. I was one of those immigrants working in academia.

Simon Fraser started as a liberal arts and science university with two special features: undergraduate education imparted through a tutorial system and the academic year divided into three equally independent semesters. The tutorial system facilitated student participation and acted as provider of jobs to graduate students as teaching assistants. The trimester system was flexible enough for students and faculty alike to organise their academic work on their terms. In its first three years, Simon Fraser also gained a name (notoriety) for itself as 'Berkeley of the North' and a battleground for competing ideologies. Some of the departments of social sciences had attracted quite a few left-leaning academics and activists and so were some of their graduate and undergraduate students. However, the popular image of Simon Fraser as the hotbed of radicals did not entirely fit the reality. Its intellectual and social environment was quite vibrant and pluralistic. Some of this reflected progressive social and political currents in the society including widespread protest against the Vietnam War.

After arriving in Canada, I experienced a massive change in my life considering the wide social, political and economic differences between Pakistan and Canada. They were like two different worlds. Mercifully, there was minimal cultural shock for at least two reasons. For one thing, the time I spent in the Netherlands made me quite familiar with many of the social and cultural values and practices generally prevalent in the West. Second, the Canadian society was starting to move from a

primarily bi-cultural state, divided broadly between the French-speaking and English-speaking peoples (besides the relatively small and scattered indigenous population), to a multi-cultural state after the doors to immigration were opened to non-Europeans, mainly Asians. The sense of exclusion for people of other cultures had started to recede because of the changing social environment. I did not have to make much effort to be a part of the emerging social fabric. More importantly, public policy was starting to create space for individuals to exercise rights not formally recognised before. But it would take another twenty-five to thirty years for some rights to be recognised under the law, thus gradually removing the burden of discrimination on the basis of gender, age, ethnicity, religion, health, or sexual orientation.

In the 1960s, the question of Quebec's place in the Canadian confederation, after remaining in a state of quiet uncertainty for almost 100 years, started to take the centre stage. Political leaders in Quebec took up the slogan of 'equal rights or independence', which unsettled the rest of Canada for almost 40 years. French-Canadians were deeply concerned about protecting their distinct cultural identity and language in the face of their declining numbers compared to the non-French Canadians whose population was rising because of new immigrants as well. The federal government, supported by the rest of Canada, conceded the right of people of Quebec to receive all public services in French and the provincial government of Quebec the right to regulate certain services to which only the federal government had the right in other provinces. The separatist political leaders were not satisfied with the concessions: they wanted the power of veto on constitutional amendments, but the federal government rejected this demand.

The separatist Parti Quebecois (PQ) government in Quebec enacted the French Language Bill (Bill 101) in 1977 to assert French identity in the province: French became the only language for public business, school education, signposts and much else. The PQ governments, led by Rene Lavesque in 1980 and Jacques Parizeau in 1995, put the question of sovereignty to the people of Quebec through referenda, but each time a majority said no to sovereignty. It seems that the French-speaking Canadians have decided to stay in Canada for economic benefits and perhaps confident that they have enough political clout to maintain their

distinct identity in a multi-cultural Canada in which they are a substantial minority. The defeat of Bloc Quebecois, a political party wedded to Quebec's independence, in the federal election of 2011 and its replacement by the New Democratic Party, a federalist and mildly socialist political party, seems to reflect the political mood of the French-speaking majority in Quebec. The recent election of Parti Quebecois as the ruling party in Quebec seems to have re-ignited the issue of sovereignty.

The age of expanding economic prosperity in the decades of the 1950s and 1960s ended in the early to mid-1970s by the inflationary consequences of Vietnam War, starting in the United States, and its global effects. The oil price shock of early 1973 exacerbated the economic denouement worldwide. Many economies went into a serious downturn with high inflation and rising unemployment, but not in Canada. Robust economic growth and low unemployment stayed until 1981, except for the brief hiccup in 1974. There were visible signs of prosperity across the country: farmland vanished into suburbs or industrial parks; cities were sprawling both horizontally and vertically; and migration from the countryside and from abroad filled the cities. Urbanisation also meant changes in people's life style and their outlook on life. But some regions of Canada, Newfoundland and other Maritime provinces, were less prosperous than others. The only pockets of poverty and deprivation were the native reserves or slums of larger cities. The second oil price shock of 1979 was worse than the first one and this time Canada joined other countries confronted by high inflation and rising unemployment or 'stagflation'. The National Energy Programme (NEP) of Prime Minister Trudeau to induce investment in oil and gas industry (concentrated in Alberta), protect Canadian consumers from high price of oil and appropriate a large share of the oil revenue for federal government was politically divisive, hence abandoned in 1985.

In the 1980s, the Canadian economy was highly dependent on the U.S. economy—80 per cent of its exports went to the U.S. and a high proportion of its manufacturing plants were owned by American corporations. In response to the rising voices of protectionism in the U.S., Brian Mulroney (b.1939), Prime Minister of Canada, initiated negotiations with Ronald Reagan (1911-2004), President of U.S.A., to conclude a free trade agreement to remove tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade

between the two countries. The countries signed a Free Trade Agreement (FTA) in 1987. The two countries then extended this arrangement to Mexico in 1992; the three countries signed the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) that came into force in 1994. NAFTA has been a divisive factor in Canadian politics because its overall effect on the economy has remained controversial. It has also been an irritant in the economic relations between Canada and U.S.A. In the meantime, changes in the information and communication technology on a global scale started to bring about almost a revolutionary transformation of Canadian economy and society. In addition, rapid and sustained economic growth in the East Asian economies, China in particular, became a new and expanding market for Canadian exports and a major source of cheaper manufactured goods for its consumers. These developments also necessitated major adjustments in the industrial structure, investment pattern, educational programmes, and social networking. The adjustments have been both disruptive and creative at the same time.

While globalisation—meaning freer trade, rapid movement of financial capital and instant exchange of information across borders—has been a source of economic growth, it is associated with increased income inequalities within countries, changes in industrial structure and employment patterns, financial instability, and pressure on national governments to deregulate, reduce their size and make downward adjustments in the social safety-net. However, the financial crisis of 2008, with its depressing global effects, has exposed the myth of efficient (rational) markets and highlighted the need for governments to maintain the basic structure of welfare state to mitigate the adverse effects of economic and social instability. The Canadian economy was spared the financial and economic meltdown, that some other countries have experienced, is a reminder to political leaders of the advantages of a well-regulated market economy and public policy to maintain an accessible system for education, universal health care and social safety-net for seniors, low-income families, and the disabled or the unemployed. Excessive fiscal restraint by reduced spending alone would be a recipe for low economic growth and reduced quality of life especially of vulnerable groups in the society. Public investment in maintaining a progressive social policy tends to have a fairly high return in the long

run since it focuses on improving the quality of human capital necessary to sustain economic growth with social justice. A major challenge is to maintain a financially sustainable social policy, especially as the proportion of seniors in the population is rising: one in five Canadians is above the age of 60 years.

Restoring environmental sustainability is one important area in which Canada has fallen far behind many other industrially advanced countries. Both its energy consumption and level of environmental pollution (CO_2 emissions) per capita are higher than the average of this group of countries. Public policy has been at best ambiguous in reducing the resource and environmental cost of economic growth and prosperity while the evidence of damage to the ecosystem through pollution and resource depletion is far too widely spread and rising to ignore. One-step forward followed by two-steps backward policy is compromising not only the welfare of future generations but affecting adversely the present generation as well. There is good evidence that an environmentally sound policy is also good for economic growth in the long run, if the society makes necessary adjustments in producing and consuming goods and services. It can be argued that an industrially advanced and prosperous country like Canada has the resources to make these adjustments but somehow has failed to muster its political will. It seems that political leaders are unwilling or unable to take the lead and are being led by short-term (myopic) interests of certain influential groups. The ominous signs of climate change if ignored for too long might make the damage irreversible and threaten prosperity, social harmony and political stability both nationally and internationally.

According to a recent OECD report on its ‘Better Life Index’, Canada is in the top three countries. It is worth adding that, in the last twenty years, most Canadians have not seen much improvement in their standard of living and the social safety-net has become far less generous. At the end of the first decade in the twenty-first century, Canada is far different from and in almost every respect better than what it was in the early 1960s. Most Canadians now work off farms and factories, engaged in providing a variety of services, and live in an urban environment. Canadian population has aged and the proportion of foreign-born Canadians has gone up—one in five Canadians was born in a foreign

country. Canadians are living longer, thanks to low infant mortality, better nutrition and universal access to health care. Two-thirds of Canadians own their homes and these homes are not crowded; almost all households have direct connection to a reliable water and sewerage system; almost all of them have colour TV sets with access to cable, refrigerators, washing machines, microwave ovens, and at least one automobile. Most Canadian households have personal computers with access to high-speed internet and wireless phones, including cell phones.

Traditional marriage, divorce and family structure have changed as well: more women and men are living together as common-law partners, a higher proportion of married couples are divorced, and one-quarter of the families have a single parent, 80 per cent of them are women. The average number of children per family has gone down and fewer families have children. Almost all school age (6-18 years) children are in school up to grade 12 and two-thirds of the 18-24 age groups are in post-secondary institutions. Three-quarters of women participate in the labour force and more of the families depend on more than one earner: two-thirds of both parents in the two-parent households are working. The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms has removed constraints on minorities and much greater understanding and tolerance have developed for ethnic minorities, gays and lesbians, and same-sex co-habitation. In addition, numerous civil society institutions outside the government have grown to protect individual rights and work for progressive social and economic policies. I should add that the heightened concern about national security since September 2001 has put certain restrictions on Canadians to which they have responded with little dissent.

Epilogue

The ancient Greeks and Romans, however much we admire their gifts to humanity, were by today's standards neither very civilised nor democratic. The Greek and Roman societies practised slavery as a prize institution—some people deserved to be slaves!—and treated women only slightly better. 'Barbarians', i.e. those who were not citizens, were denigrated no less. Their festivals and sports were exhibitions of man's raw power and cruelty inflicted on humans and animals alike. We have come a long way globally in almost every respect: the world of today, notwithstanding its many blemishes and imperfections, is a far better place for the vast majority of its human residents than ever in the past. Yes, the journey has not been smooth or linear, given the fickleness of Nature and the complex human nature itself. The good thing is that scientific knowledge has given us better understanding of both and is likely to keep unravelling their mysteries. In the last one hundred years, human curiosity, imagination and ingenuity have unravelled many mysteries, thanks to research in disciplines like cosmology, physics, chemistry, climatology, palaeontology, molecular biology, and psychology. In the last nearly sixty years, the inventions and innovations based on this knowledge have ushered in the third Industrial Revolution on a global scale.

The world of my father's migrant ancestors in India in the eighteenth century was far worse than of my father's in British India in twentieth century. In my own case, the Indian sub-continent of today, with warts and all, is incomparably better than it was in eighteenth century after a long spell of despotic rule by the Turko-Afghan intruders and their successors. These rulers relied on the surplus they extracted from peasants, tributes, and plunder to support their civil and military bureaucracy and an elite culture including grand monuments. They treated

their ryot (subjects) as an exploitable resource with little concern about its well-being. Likewise, they paid little if any attention to improve the means by which peasants, artisans and labourers (slaves included) met the needs and tastes of the ruling elite. The highly centralised and dynastic system of governance left little or no room for acquiring new knowledge except that the rulers prescribed or allowed even to the elite. Unquestioned and unquestionable customs, traditions and knowledge maintained a stranglehold on Indian society for centuries. Needless to add, my Rohila ancestors were very much a product of that society. In fact, the ruling elite showed little or no interest in or expressed any curiosity for the advances made in Europe even after at least a century's interaction with European traders. They kept themselves and their ryot almost completely ignorant of the possibilities that were already at work in several European countries from at least the mid-seventeenth century. It was not until the British East India Company acquired supremacy in Bengal in the mid-eighteenth century that a window started to open for new ideas and ways of doing things.

The new foreign rulers of India had their focus on two objectives, of which the primary one was to profits first from trade and then acquire control over territory and revenue. To this end, they made new institutional arrangements and adopted policies to enhance the productive capacity of Indian resources. Another objective was to westernise Indian society by laws, institutions and education that would, besides 'civilising' the Indians, help achieve their primary imperial objective. By the middle of nineteenth century, after the British Crown took over the imperial reins, a colonial system of governance was more or less in place. In the next fifty years, the experimental grafting radically altered most of the Indian traditions, customs and institutions.

My grandfather's generation was perhaps the first one affected by these changes, except for the western secular education that only my father's generation would start to encounter. The new dispensation also laid the foundation for development of political consciousness among Indians, leading to the demand for expanded rights and self-rule. While the British rule in India was in its twilight by the time of my birth, I among millions of my generation became part of a world dominated by the values and institutions of the imperial powers of Europe, Brit-

ain in particular. The global transformation that I have observed and experienced in the last nearly 65 years has been a great leap forward for millions like me around the world. More importantly, my children and grandchildren are participating in an inter-connected world even I could not have imagined when I moved from Pakistan to the West some fifty years ago. What the future holds for them and others of their generation is beyond me even to speculate. However, I can say this much that, if we take human history as our guide, we have almost no reason not to be optimistic about the future. Human imagination and ingenuity are capable of discovering and devising the means by which human well-being can be improved more or less continuously. At the same time, I do not think that the process of improvement (progress) would be linear or smooth. The mysteries of Nature and human nature would probably remain our constant challenge.

References

Introduction

Boehm, Christopher, *Moral Origins: The Evolution of Virtue, Altruism, and Shame,* 2012

Diamond, Jared, *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed,* 2011

Haidt, Jonathan, *The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion,* 2012

Haris, Sam, *The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human Values,* 2010

Nisbet, Robert, *History of the Idea of Progress,* 1980

Pinker, Steven, *The Better Angels of Our Nature,* 2011

Ridley, Matt, *The Rational Optimist,* 2010

Stager, Curt, *Deep Future: The Next 10,000 Years of Life on Earth,* 2011

Wilson, Edward O., *The Social Conquest of Earth,* 2012

Chapter 1 March to the Modern Age I: Ancient Greece to the 'Middle Ages'

Asbridge, Thomas, *The Crusades: The Authoritative History of the War for the Holy Land,* 2010

Brownworth, Lars, *Lost to the West: The Forgotten Byzantine Empire that Rescued Western Civilization,* 2009

Cahill, Thomas, *Mysteries of the Middle Ages,* 2006

Cantor, Norman F., *Civilization of the Middle Ages,* 1993

Collins, Roger, *The Arab Conquest of Spain 710-797,* 1989

Copleston, Frederick, *A History of Philosophy: Greece and Rome* (Volume I), 1985

Davies, Norman, *Europe: A History,* 1996

Everitt, Anthony, *The Rise of Rome: The Making of the World's Greatest Empire,* 2012

Fakhry, Majid, *A History of Islamic Philosophy,* 2004

Ferry Luc, *A Brief History of Thought: A Philosophical Guide to Living,* 2011

Fletcher, Richard, *Moorish Spain,* 1992

Fox, Robin Lane, *The Classical World: An Epic History of Greece and Rome,* 2006

Freely, John, *Aladdin's Lamp: How Greek Science Came to Europe Through the Islamic World,* 2009

Freeman, Charles, *Egypt, Greece and Rome: Civilizations of the Ancient Mediterranean,* 1996

____, *The Greek Achievement: The Foundation of the Western World,* 1999

____, *The Closing of Western Mind: The Rise of Faith and the Fall of Reason,* 2002

Greenblatt, Stephen, *The Swerve: How the World Became Modern,* 2011

Hannam, James, *God's Philosophers: How the Medieval World Laid the Foundations of Modern Science,* 2009

Harvey, L.P., *Islamic Spain 1250-1500,* 1990

Heather, Peter, *The Fall of the Roman Empire: A New History of Rome and the Barbarians,* 2005

Hindley, Geoffrey, *A Brief History of the Crusades,* 2004

Hodgson, Marshall G.S., *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization* (Three Volumes), 1974

Kadri, Sadakat, *Heaven on Earth: A Journey Through Shari'a Law from the Deserts of Ancient Arabia to the Streets of the Modern Muslim World,* 2012

Kamen, Henry, *The Spanish Inquisition: A Historical Revision,* 1998

Kennedy, Hugh, *The Great Arab Conquests: How the Spread of Islam Changed the World We Live In,* 2007

____, *Muslim Spain and Portugal: A Political History of al-Andalus,* 1996

Lapidus, Ira M., *A History of Islamic Societies* (Second Edition), 2002

Lewis, David L., *God's Crucible: Islam and the Making of Europe, 57-1215*, 2008

Maalaouf, Amin, *The Crusades through Arab Eyes,* 1983

MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *A History of Christianity: The First Three Thousand Years,* 2009

Mann, Michael, *The Sources of Social Power: A History of Power from the Beginning to A.D. 1760,* 1986

Masood, Ehsan, *Science and Islam: A History,* 2009

McNeill, William H., *Plagues and Peoples,* 1989

Menocal, Maria Rosa, *The Ornament of the World,* 2002

Morgan, Michael Hamilton, *Lost History: The Enduring Legacy of Muslim Scientists, Thinkers, and Artists,* 2007

Needham, Joseph, *Science and Civilisation in China* (Multi-volume Series), 1954 onwards

Netanyahu, B., *The Origins of the Inquisition in the Fifteenth Century Spain,* 1995

Norwich, John Julius, *Byzantium* (Three Volumes), 1989-1996

Paris, Erna, *The End of Days,* 1995

Parsons, Timothy H., *The Rule of Empires,* 2010

Rubenstein, Richard E., *Aristotle's Children: How Christians, Muslims and Jews Rediscovered Ancient Wisdom and Illuminated the Dark Ages,* 2003

Scott, Michael, *From Democrats to Kings: The Brutal Dawn of a New World from the Downfall of Athens to the Rise of Alexander the Great,* 2009

Sheikh, M. Saeed, *Islamic Philosophy,* 1962

Tyerman, Christopher, *God's War: A New History of the Crusades,* 2007

Watson, Peter, *Ideas: A History from Fire to Freud,* 2005

Watt, W. Montgomery, *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought,* 1973

Wheatcroft, Andrew, *Infidels: A History of the Conflict between Christendom and Islam,* 2004

Chapter 2 March to the Modern Age II: Italian Renaissance to the First Industrial Revolution

Bakewell, Sarah, *How to Live: Or A Life of Montaigne in One Question and Twenty Attempts at an Answer*, 2011

Barzun, Jacques, *From Dawn to Decadence: 500 Years of Western Cultural Life*, 2000

Bergreen, Laurence, *Over the Edge of the World*, 2003

Blom, Philipp, *A Wicked Company: The Forgotten Radicalism of the European Enlightenment*, 2010

Burckhardt, Jacob, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, 1981

Cantor, Norman F., *Civilization of the Middle Ages*, 1993

Carlyle, Thomas, *The French Revolution: A History*, 1974

Clark, Gregory, *A Farewell to Alms: A Brief Economic History of the World*, 2007

Davis, David B., *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture*, 1988

Diaz, Bernal, *The Conquest of New Spain*, 1989

Durant, Will, *The Story of Civilization: The Renaissance*, 1981

____, *The Story of Civilization: The Reformation*, 1985

Edelstein, Dan, *The Enlightenment: A Genealogy*, 2010

Elton, G.R., *Reformation Europe, 1517-1559*, 1999

Gay, Peter, *The Enlightenment* (Two Volumes), 1966-1969

Gribbin, John, *Science: A History*, 2003

Hibbert, Christopher, *The French Revolution*, 1980

Kamen, Henry, *Spain's Road to Empire*, 2003

Landes, David S., The Wealth and Poverty of Nations Why Some are so Rich and Som*e so Poor*, 1998

MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *The Reformation: A History*, 2003

Mann, Michael, *The Sources of Social Power: A History of Power from the Beginning to A.D. 1760*, 1986

Morison, Samuel Eliot, *The European Discovery of America*, 1986

Padgen, Anthony, *The Enlightenment: And Why It Still Matters*, 2013

Pakenham, Thomas, *The Scramble for Africa: White Man's Conquest of the Dark Continent from 1876-1912*, 1992

Porter, Roy, *Greatest Benefit to Mankind: A Medical History of Humanity*, 1998

____, *Enlightenment: Britain and the Creation of the Modern World*, 2000

Roberts, J. M., *The Triumph of the West: The Origin, Rise and Legacy of Western Civilization*, 2001

Schama, Simon, Citizens: *A Chronicle of the French Revolution*, 2004

Segal, Ronald, *Islam's Black Slaves: The Other Black Diaspora*, 2002

Shapin, Steven, *The Scientific Revolution*, 1996

Stannard, David E., *American Holocaust: The Conquest of the New World*, 1993

Strathern, Paul, *A Brief History of Medicine from Hippocrates to Gene Therapy*, 2005

Thomas, Hugh, *The Slave Trade: The History of the Atlantic Slave Trade, 1440-1870*, 1999

Watson, Peter, *Ideas: A History from Fire to Freud*, 2005

Williams, Eric, *Capitalism and Slavery*, 2008

Wright, Ronald, *Stolen Continents*, 2005

Chapter 3 Muslim Rule in India before the Mughals

Fredunbeg, Mirza Kalichbeg, *The Chachnamah: A history of Sind* (Two Volumes), 1902

Ikram, S.M., *History of Muslim Civilization in India and Pakistan* (Fifth Edition), 1993

Keay, John, *A History of India*, 2000

Majumdar, R.C., H.C. Raychaudhuri and Kalikinkar Datta, *An Advanced History of India*, 1963

Qureshi, Ishtiaq Husain, *The Muslim Community of the Indo-Pakistan Subcontinent* (Second Edition), 1977

Rizvi, S.A.A., *The Wonder that Was India* (1200-1700), 1987

Spear, Percival (Editor), *The Oxford History of India* (Third Edition), 1965

Thapar, Romila, *The Penguin History of Early India: From Origins to AD 1300*, 1965

Thapar, Romila, Somanatha: *The Many Voices of History*, 2005

Chapter 4 Mughal Empire I: Babur to Akbar

Burn, Richard (Editor), *The Cambridge History of India: The Mughal Period* (Volume IV), 1968

Eraly, Abraham, *The Mughal Throne: The Saga of India's Great Emperors*, 1997

____, *The Mughal World: India's Tainted Paradise*, 2007

Erskine, William. *A History of India under the Two First Sovereigns of the House of Taimur* (Two Volumes), 1854

Gascoigne, Bamber, *The Great Mughals*, 1971

Keene, Henry George, *The Turks in India*, 1879

Majumdar, R.C., H.C. Raychaudhuri and Kalikinkar Datta, *An Advanced History of India*, 1963

Richards, John F., *The Mughal Empire*, 1993

Chapter 5 Mughal Empire II: Jahangir to Aurangzeb

Eraly, Abraham, *The Mughal Throne: The Saga of India's Great Emperors*, 1997

____, *The Mughal World: India's Tainted Paradise*, 2007

Majumdar, R.C., H.C. Raychaudhuri and Kalikinkar Datta, *An Advanced History of India*, 1963

Moreland, W.H., *From Akbar to Aurangzeb: A Study in Indian Economic History*, 1923

Richards, John F., *The Mughal Empire*, 1993

Sarkar, Jadunath, *Fall of the Mughal Empire* (Four Volumes), 1964

Sarkar, Jadunath. *A History of Aurangzeb* (Five Volumes), 1916

Chapter 6 Mughal Empire III: Dissolution and Legacy

Alam, Muzaffar, *The Crisis of Empire in Mughal North India: Awadh & the Punjab, 1707-1748,* 1986

Irvine, William, *Later Mughals*. Edited and augmented with the History of Nadir Shah's invasion by Jadu Nath Sarkar (Two Volumes), 1971

Khan, Seid Gholam Hussein, *Seir Mutaqherin* (View of Modern Times: The Reigns of Seven Last Emperors of Hindostan). Translated from Persian (Four Volumes), 1832

Chapter 7 India in the Eighteenth Century

Barnett, R.B., *North India between Empires: Awadh, the Mughals and the British 1720-1801,* 1980

Cunningham, J.D., *History of the Sikhs,* 1849

Sardesai, Govind S., *New History of the Marathas* (Three Volumes), 1986

Singh, Khushwant, *A History of the Sikhs* (Two Volumes), 1966

Singh, Ganda, *Ahmad Shah Durrani: Father of Modern Afghanistan,* 1959

Tate, George P., *The Kingdom of Afghanistan,* 1911

Chapter 8 Rohilkhand from Foundation to Destruction

Brelvi, Syed Altaf Ali, *Life of Hafiz Rahmat Khan*, 1966

Buhadoor, Nuwab Moostujab Khan, *The Life of Hafiz ool-Mulk, Hafiz Rehmut Khan* (Translated from Persian by Charles Elliott), 1831

Forster, George, *Journey from Bengal to England Through the Northern Part of India, Kashmir, Afghanistan, and Persia, and Into Russia by the Caspian-Sea* (Two Volumes), 1808

Gommans, Jos J.L., *The Rise of the Indo-Afghan Empire, c.1710-1780*, 1999

Hamilton, Charles, *An Historical Relation of the Origin, Progress and Dissolution of the Rohilla Afghans*, 1787

Husain, Iqbal, *The Ruhela Chieftaincies: The Rise and Fall of Ruhela Power in India in the Eighteenth Century*, 1994

Khan, Najmul Ghani, *Akhbar al-Sanadeed* (History of Rohilkhand: Two Volumes), Republished in 1997

Nichols, Robert, *A History of Pashtun Migration 1775-2006*, 2008

Strachey, Sir John, *Hastings and the Rohilla War*, 1892

Chapter 9 British Rule in India I: The Beginnings

Bayly, C.A., *Indian Society and the Making of the British Empire*. 1988

Bowring, Lewin B., *Haidar Ali and Tipu Sultan and the Struggle with the Musalman Powers of the South*, 1899

Cliff, Nigel, *Holy War: How Vasco da Gama's Epic Voyages Turned the Tide in a Centuries-Old Clash of Civilizations*, 2011

Dalrymple,William, *Return of a King: The Battle for Afghanistan, 2013*

Dodwell, H.H. (Editor), *The Cambridge History of India: British India* (Volume V), 192

Forrest, Denys, *Tiger of Mysore: The Life and Death of Tipu Sultan*, 1970

Gandhi, Rajmohan, *Tale of Two Revolts: India's Mutiny and the American Civil War*, 2009

Jackson, A.V. Williams, (Editor), *History of India* (Volumes VII and VIII), 1907

____, *The Rise and Fall of the British Empire*, 1994

James, Lawrence, *Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India*, 1998

Keay, John, *The Honourable Company: A History of the English East India Company*, 1994

Louis, Wm. Roger (Chief Editor), *The Oxford History of the British Empire* (Five Volumes), 1998

Lyall, Alfred, *Warren Hastings*, 1907

Malik, Hafeez, *Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan and Muslim Modernization in India and Pakistan*, 1980

Mann, Michael, *The Sources of Social Power: The Rise of Classes and Nation States, 1760-1914*, 1986

Mill, James, *History of British India* (Six Volumes), 1826

Moon, Penderel, *Warren Hastings and British India*, 1949

Parsons, Timothy H., *The Rule of Empires*, 2010

Tate, G.P., *The Kingdom of Afghanistan: A Historical Sketch*, 1911

Wink, Andre, *Al-Hind: The Making of the Indo-Muslim World*, 2002

Chapter 10 British Rule in India II: Consolidation

Allen, Charles and Sharada Dwivedi, *Lives of the Indian Princes*, 1984

Bagchi, Amiya Kumar, *Colonialism and Indian Economy*, 2010

Clive, John, *Macaulay: The Shaping of the Historian*, 1973

Dalrymple, William, *The Last Mughal: The Fall of a Dynasty*, 2006

Dodwell, H.H. (Editor), *The Cambridge History of India: The Indian Empire* (Volume VI), 1968

Graham, G.F.I., *The Life and Work of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan*, 1885

Hali, Altaf Husain, *Musaddas* (Flow and Ebb of Islam). Translated by Christopher Shackle and Javed Majeed, 1997

Lelyveld, David, *Aligarh's Fist Generation: Muslim Society in British India*, 2003

Nurullah, Syed and J.P. Naik, *A History of Education in India During the British Period*, 1951

Pasha, Mohamed Abdulla, *Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, His Life and Times: A Historical Survey*, 1998

Rahman, Tariq, *From Hindi to Urdu: A Social and Political History*, 2009

Spilsbury, Julian, *The Indian Mutiny*, 2007

Thompson, Edward and G.T. *Garrat, Rise and Fulfilment of British Rule in India*, 1962

Chapter 11 Partition of India and Independence

Bose, Sugata, *His Majesty's Opponent: Subhas Chandra Bose and India's Struggle Against Empire*, 2011

French, Patrick, *Liberty or Death: India's Journey to Independence and Division*, 1997

Hasan, Mushirul (Editor), *India's Partition: Process, Strategy and Mobilization*, 1993

Khan, Yasmin, *The Great Partition: The Making of India and Pakistan*, 2007

Moon, Penderel, *Divide and Quit: an eye witness account of partition of India*, 1998

Schweinitz Jr., Karl de, *The Rise and Fall of British India: Imperialism and Inequality*, 1983

Tunzelmann, Alex von, *Indian Summer: The Secret History of the End of an Empire*, 2007

Chapter 12 Two Migrations in the March to Progress

Bahadur, Syed Ali Hussun Khan, *Brief History of the Chiefs of Rampur in Rohilkhand, N.W. Provinces*, 1892

Jahan, Rounaq, *Pakistan: failure in national integration*, 1972

Jones, Owen Bennett, *Pakistan: eye of the storm*, 2002

Khan, Najmul Ghani, *Akhbar al-Sanadeed* (History of Rohilkhand: Two Volumes), Republished 1997

Qureshi, Ishtiaq Husain, *Education in Pakistan*, 1975

Saif, Lubna, *Authoritarianism and Underdevelopment in Pakistan 1947-1958*, 2010

Sayeed, Khalid B., *Pakistan: The Formative Phase 1857-1948* (Second Edition), 1968

____, *Politics in Pakistan: The Nature and Direction of Change*, 1980

Symonds, Richard, *The Making of Pakistan*, 1950

Williams, L. Rushbrook, *The East Pakistan Tragedy*, 1972

Chapter 13 Third Migration in the March to Progress

Bothwell, Robert, *The Penguin History of Canada*, 2006

Dekker, Eduard D. (Multatuli), *Max Havelaar*, 1968

Hyma, Albert, *A History of the Dutch in the Far East*, 1942

Israel, Jonathan L., *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477-1806*, 1995

Nelles, H.V., *A Little History of Canada* (Second Edition), 2011

Ricklefs, M.C., *A History of Modern Indonesia*, 1981

Vlekke, Bernard H.M., *Nusantara: A History of Indonesi*a, 1960

Index

A

Abdul Ahad Khan *325–326*
Abdul Ghaffar Khan *474*
Abdullah Khan *156*, *159*, *230–234*, *259*, *268*, *299–302*, *317*, *322*
Abdullah Qutub Shah *182*, *193–194*
Abd-ul-Qadir Badauni *128*
Abdul Rahim Khan-i-Khanan *149*, *161*
Abdul Rahman *372*
Abdul Samad Khan *459*
Abid Husain *413*
Abul Fazl *162*, *165–166*
Abul Kalam Azad *433*, *443*
Abu Muzaffar Ala-ud-din Bahman Shah *127*, *139*
Achmed Sukarno *505*
Adam Smith *88*, *92*, *94*
Adham Khan *155*
Adil Khan II *140*
Adil Khan III *140*
Adina Beg Khan *268–270*
Aeschylus *28*
Afzal Khan *206*, *308*
Age of science and enlightenment:
  birth of modern science *80–87*
  moral philosophy *87–94*
Ahmad Ali Khan *457*
Ahmad Khan Bangash *261*, *283*, *285–286*, *301–303*, *305–307*, *309*, *310–312*
Ahmad Raza Khan Barelvi *410*
Ahmad Shah *259–260*, *267–269*, *301*, *304*
Ahmad Shah Abdali *146*, *189*, *238*, *258–261*, *263*, *266–267*, *274*, *277*, *280–281*, *283*, *285*, *295*, *299*, *301*, *304*, *308*, *314*, *347*
Ahmad Shah Bahmani *135*
Ahmed ibn Hanbal *43*
Ajit Singh Rathore *225*, *231*
Akbar:
  conquests *154–162*
  legacy *174–175*
  mansabdari *166–171*
  religious and cultural outlook *162–166*
  revenue administration *171–174*
Akbar II *263*
A.K. Fazlul Haq *440*, *484*
Alamgir II *260–261*, *269–271*, *285*, *287*, *304–306*, *347*
Alam Shah *130–131*
Ala-ud-din Husain Shah *131*, *134*
Ala-ud-din Khilji *123–124*
al-Biruni *42*, *45*, *111*
Alcibiades *22*
Alessandro Volta *85*
Alexander *21*, *24*, *33*, *73*, *108*, *321*
Alexander Duff *388*
Alfonso Albuquerque *335*
Alfred Wallace *86*
al-Ghazali *42*, *43*
Aligarh Muslim University *412–413*
Aligarh School *411–412*
Ali Muhammad Khan *268*, *282–284*, *298–300*, *302–303*, *322*, *327–332*, *456–457*
Ali Vardi Khan *287*
al-Khwarizmi *42*, *53*
al-Kindi *42*, *53*
Allen Octavian Hume *368*, *420*
All India Muslim League *424–428*
al-Masudi *45*
al-Mutanabbi *45*
al-Razi *42*, *53*
al-Tabari *44*

Alvares Cabral *335*
Amerigo Vespucci *96*
Amir Ali Barid *139*
Amir Dost Muhammad Khan *361*, *369*
Amir Khan *219–220*, *299*, *360*
Amir Khusrau *9*, *122*, *124–126*, *142–143*
Amir Taimur *108*, *129*
Ancient Greece:
  art and architecture *30*
  city-states *20–21*
  historians *29–30*
  literature *27–28*
  philosophy and science *21–27*
  religion and gods *21*
  social and political structure *31–34*
Ancient Rome:
  architecture *37–38*
  foundation *34–35*
  literature and philosophy *39–41*
  music and theatre *40*
  religion *35–36*
  republic and empire *36–37*
Annie Besant *408–409*, *432–433*
Antonie van Leeuwenhoek *83*
Anwar-ud-din Khan *290*, *343*
Apollonius *26*, *28*
Archimedes *26*, *42*, *53*
Aristarchus *26*
Aristophanes *22*, *28*
Aristotle *19*, *21–24*, *26–27*, *39*, *42–43*, *46*, *53–55*, *82*, *542*
Arjun *178–179*, *201*
Arya Samaj *407*, *409*, *419*, *422*
Asad Khan *215–216*, *218*, *224*
Asad Ullah Khan Ghalib *365*
Asaf Khan *178*, *181*, *183*
Asaf-ud-daulah *289*, *324–326*, *352*
Asiatic Society of Bengal *374*, *384*
Aurangzeb:
  conditions in northern parts *219–221*
  Deccan campaign *211–219*
    annexation of Bijapur and Golkunda *214–215*
    confrontation with Marathas *204–211*, *213–219*
  northern campaign 197–199
  Rajput rebellion *202–204*
  religion and imperial culture *199–201*
  Sikhs in turmoil *201–202*
Azim-ud-Din Khan *459*
Azmat Ullah Khan *297–298*, *300*

B

Babur *148–149*
Badruddin Tayabji *412*, *426*
Bahadur Shah I *150*, *160–161*, *203*, *224–228*, *235*, *260*, *275*
Bahadur Shah II *148*, *263*
Bahadur Shah Zafar *369*
Bahmani kingdom *127*, *138–139*, *160*
Baji Rao I *275–276*
Baji Rao II *279*, *367*
Bal Gangadhar Tilak *421*
Bali Narayan *188*
Bankimchandra Chatterji *405*
Baron d'Holbach *91*
Baron Heugel *474*
Bartholomew Diaz *95*
Baruch Spinoza *89*
Baz Bahadur *155*
Beccaria *92*
Benjamin Franklin *85*, *92*
Bhainsori *467–468*
Bodin *88–89*
Boethius *47*, *55*
Brahmo Samaj *385*, *405–406*
B.R. Ambedkar *435*
Brian Mulroney *531*
Brigadier Reginald Dyer *432*
British North America Act of 1867 *525*
British rule in India:

economy and infrastructure *393–402*
economic changes *393–395*
infrastructure *400–401*
land revenue and agriculture *395–400*
evolution of administration *374–384*
civil administration *375–378*
indirect rule of native states *382–384*
police and army administration *378–382*
Indian attitudes and responses *403–413*
Hindu responses *404–409*
Muslim responses *409–413*
local self-government *401–402*
social and educational reforms *384–393*
educational reforms *386–393*
social reforms *385–386*
Bruno *80*, *82*
Bughra Khan *122*
Burhan Nizam Shah II *161*
Burhan-ul-mulk *235*, *265*, *288*
Byzantine Empire *18*, *34*, *46–48*, *54*
Byzantine Orthodox Church *48*

C

Cabinet Mission Plan *447–448*, *450*, *452*
Calcutta Madrassa *374*, *384*, *388*
Canada:
arrival and settlement of Europeans *511–517*
British supremacy *517–522*
changes in economy and society *524–528*
confederation *522–524*
contemporary life *529–534*
Carolus Linnaeus *85*
Cassiodorus *47*
Catallus *39*
Chanda Sahib *290–291*, *343*
Chand Bibi *160–161*
Charlemagne *47–48*
Charles Darwin *86*
Charles de Bussy *344*
Charles Dickens *101*
Charles Grant *387*
Charles II *217*, *339–340*
Charles Lyell *87*
Charles Metcalfe *374*
Charles Watson *345–346*
Charles Wood *390*
Charter Act of 1813 *387*, *393*
Chaudhri Muhammad Ali *484*
Chengiz Khan *108*, *117*, *121*
Chin Qilich Khan *216*, *218*, *230*, *289*
Choudhri Rahmat Ali *442*
Christopher Columbus *50*, *95*, *335*, *512*
Churaman Jat *221*, *232*
Cicero *38–39*, *46*, *70*
Civil Service of Pakistan *480*
Cleisthenes *32*
Clement Attlee *445*
Clement V *72*
Colonel Alexander Champion *321*
Comte de Lally *344*
Congress of Vienna *495*, *502*
Copernicus *26*, *80*, *82–83*
Cosimo de Medici *68*
C.R. Das *433–434*
Cripps Mission *442*

D

Dadabhai Naoroji *418*
Dante *69–70*
Dara Shikoh *182*, *186–188*, *191–192*, *195*, *201*, *224*
Daud Khan *282*, *296–298*, *303*, *327*
Daud Khan Karrani *158*
Daud Khan Panni *198*, *216*, *227–232*
Daulat Rao Sindhia *356*

David Hare *387*
David Hume *88*, *92*
Delhi College *411*
Democritus *25*
Demosthenes *28*
Denis Diderot *91*
Dhoondey Khan *271*, *284*, *298–300*, *302–304*, *308*, *312*, *322*, *324*, *327*, *332*
Diet of Augsburg *75*
Dilawar Khan Ghauri *134*
Diler Khan *207–209*
Dilras Banu Begum *247*
Din-i-Ilahi *166*, *171*
'Direct Action Day' *448*
Dudhu Mian *410*
Durgadas Rathore *203–204*
Dutch Republic *337*, *492–494*, *501–502*

E

Eastern Roman Empire *47*
East India College *376–377*
East India Company:
  background *334–341*
  'Great Revolt' of 1857 and aftermath *363–372*
  rising power in India *341–345*
  wars and conquests *345–363*
Edward Gibbon *92*
Egbert de Vries *506*
Empedocles *25*
Epicurus *24–25*
Erasmus *71*, *73*
Euclid *26*, *42*, *53*
Euripides *28*
European voyages of discovery *95–99*
Europe in the Middle Ages:
  bubonic plague *51*
  crusades against Muslims *49–52*
  faith and science *55–57*
  papal monarchy *47–49*
  Roman church and its contributions *52–54*

F

Faizee *165*
Faizullah Khan *268*, *271*, *284*, *299–302*, *315*, *317*, *322–324*, *328*, *331*, *456–458*, *464*
Farrukhsiyar *147*, *226*, *230–236*, *275–276*, *281*, *288–290*, *294*, *328*, *342*
Fatahullah Imad Shah *139*
Fatehpur Sikri *154*, *157–159*, *182*, *246*
Ferdinand Magellan *95*
Ferishta *135*
Firdausi *45*, *111*
First Round Table Conference *382*, *437*
Firuz Khilji *123*
Firuz Shah Tughlaq *134–140*
Fort William College *374*, *376*, *387*
Francis Bacon *81*
Francisco de Almeida *335*
Francois Quesnay *88*, *93*
Franz Rosenthal *44*
Frederick II *54*, *56*
Friedrich Engels *1*, *94*, *101*

G

Galen *27*, *42*, *51*, *53*, *80*, *83*
Galileo *26*, *82*
Gandhi-Irwin pact *437*
General Agha Muhammad Yahya Khan *488*
General Council of Trent *76*
General Mohammad Ayub Khan *485*
George Barlow *358*
George Cuvier *87*
Ghazi-ud-din II *260–261*, *269*, *271*, *285*, *303*
Ghazi-ud-din Khan *216*, *218*, *269*, *289*

Ghias-ud-din *126*
Ghias-ud-din Mohammad *114*
Ghulam Muhammad *483–484*
Ghulam Muhammad Khan *456–457*
Ghulam Qadir Khan *262*, *279*, *315*, *325–326*
Giovanni Boccaccio *69*
Gobind Singh *202*
Gopal Krishna Gokhale *407*
Gothold Lessing *92*
Government of India Act of 1919 *378*, *430*
Government of India Act of 1935 *438*, *480*, *482*
Gregor Mendel *86*
Guru Gobind *225*
Guru Hargobind *178*, *201–202*

H

Hafez *45*
Hafiz Rahmat Khan *271*, *282–285*, *298–307*, *309–310*, *312–313*, *315–318*, *321–325*, *327–332*
Haji Ilyas *133*
Haji Shariat Ullah *410*
Hakim Ajmal Khan *412–413*
Hamid Ali Khan *459–460*
Haripur *473–475*, *478*
Hari Rai *201–202*
Hari Singh Nalwa *474*
Helugu (Halaku) Khan *121*
Henry Cavendish *85*
Heraclitus *21*, *25*
Herodotus *29*, *45*
Hesiod *27*
Hipparchus *26*
Hippocrates *27*, *42*
Homer *27–28*, *39–40*
H.S. Suhrawardy *484*
H.T. Princep *388*
Hudson Bay Company *515*
Huldrych Zwingli *74*
Humayun *150–151*, *153–154*
Husain Ali Khan *230–234*, *259*, *275–276*
Hyder Ali *277–278*, *333*, *345*, *350*, *354–355*

I

ibn Bajja *42*
ibn Khaldun *42*
ibn Rushd *42–43*, *53*
ibn Sina *42–43*, *53*
ibn Tufail *42*
Ibrahim Khan *132*
Ibrahim Qutub Shah *161*
Ibrahim Shah Sharqi *134*
Ignatius of Loyola *76*
Immanuel Kant *79*, *88*, *92*
India in eighteenth century:
  Afghan chieftains *280–286*
    Bangash of Farrukhabad *281*
    Rohilas *281–286*. *See also* Rohilkhand
  Marathas *275–280*. *See also* Mughal empire in India
  Nawabs of Bengal, Awadh and Hyderabad *286–291*
  Persian and Afghan invasions *263–274*
    Abdali's invasions *266–274*
    Nadir Shah's invasion *264–266*
  plight of Mughal emperors (1720-1803) *258–263*
  Sikhs *259–291*. *See also* Mughal empire in India
Indian Councils Act of 1861 *368*, *416*
Indian Councils Act of 1870 *417*
Indian Councils Act of 1892 *420–421*
Indian Councils Act of 1909 *428*
Indian National Congress *418–423*
India's independence:
  civil war and partition *443–454*
    Cabinet Mission Plan *446–449*
    mutiny and rebellion *443–445*
    partition of Bengal and Punjab

450–454
movement towards partition *436–443*
movement towards self-rule *415–418*
political changes *428–436*
Indra Singh Rathore *203*
Industrial Revolution *98–101*
Institute of Social Studies *478*, *490*, *505*, *506*
Intizam-ud-daulah *269–271*, *285*, *303–304*, *306*
Isadore *47*
Ishwarchandra Vidyasagar *405*
Iskander Mirza *484–485*
Islam Shah *153*
Italian Renaissance *67–71*
Itimad-ud-daulah *178*, *181*, *267*
Itimad-ul-mulk *299*

J

Jacques Cartier *513*
Jahanara *191–192*, *194–195*
Jahandar Shah *228–231*, *260*
Jahangir:
court and outlook *178–179*
court politics and rebellion *181–184*
frontiers of empire *179–181*
rebellion and ascension *177–178*
James Hargreaves *99*
James Hutton *87*
James Watt *99*
Jamia Millia Islamia *412*
Jamiat Ulema-i-Hind *433*
Jang Bahadur *369*
Jan Hus *72*
Jani Bek *159*
Jassa Singh Ahluwalia *272*
Jaswant Rao Holkar *333*, *356*
Jaswant Singh Rathore *195–196*, *204*, *207*
Jawaharlal Nehru *434*, *440*, *444–445*, *447*
Jean-Baptiste d'Alembert *91*
Jean Calvin *74*, *79*
Jean-Jacques Rousseau *88*
Jeremy Bentham *92*, *94*
jizya *128*, *137*, *147*, *164*, *191*, *201–202*, *204*, *210*, *214*, *224*, *229*, *232*, *234*, *238*, *250*, *254–255*, *259*
Johann von Goethe *92*
John Cabot *512*
John Child *217*, *338*
John Dalton *86*
John Duns Scotus *55*
John Knox *75*
John Locke *88–89*
John Malcolm *374*
John Stuart Mill *94*, *101*, *415*
John Wycliffe *72*
Joseph Francois Dupleix *343*
Joseph Priestley *85–86*
Jotiba Phule *405*
Jujhar Singh *187*
Julius Caesar *37*, *39*
Justinian I *18*, *37*

K

Kalb-i-Ali Khan *458*
Kam Bakhsh *147*, *215*, *224–225*, *227*, *261*
Karl Marx *3*, *94*, *101*
Kartalab Khan *220*
Kepler *80*, *82–83*
Khaliq-uz-zaman *480*
Khan Jahan *158*, *185*
Khan Jahan Bahadur *204*, *212*
Khan Jahan Lodhi *184*
Khan Jahan Maqbool *129*
Khilafat movement *428*, *432–434*
Khizr Khan *130*
Khushal Khan *199*
Khusrau *162*, *177–178*, *181*, *183*
Khusrau Khan *125*

Khwaja Altaf Husain Hali *410*
Khwaja Nazimuddin *483*
Khyber Pass *198–199*, *224*
King Ferdinand *95*
King George V *429*, *476*
King George V Agriculture Institute *476*
King Henry VIII *75*
King James I *337–338*
Krishnadeva Raya *138*

L

Lachman Das *225*
Lahore Resolution of 1940 *445*, *482*
Lala Hans Raj *408*
Lala Rajpat Rai *408*, *422*, *433*
Lamarck *85*
Lavoisier *86*
Leeuwenhoek *83*
Leonardo da Vinci *69*
Lester B. Pearson *527*
Liaquat Ali Khan *450*, *483*
Linnaeus *85*
Livy *40*
Lord Auckland *361–362*, *389*
Lord Bentinck *361*, *366*, *385*, *388–389*
Lord Canning *364–365*, *370*, *383*, *391*, *416–417*, *458*
Lord Cornwallis *257*, *334*, *351*, *354*, *357*, *374–376*, *378*, *380*, *396*
Lord Curzon *381*, *383*, *391–392*, *398*, *415*, *422*
Lord Dalhousie *346*, *356*, *363–364*, *367*, *371*, *383*, *389*, *391*, *400*
Lord Dufferin *420*
Lord Durham *520*
Lord Elgin *458*, *521*
Lord Ellenborough *362–363*
Lord Gerard Lake *356*
Lord Harding *389*
Lord Hastings *346*, *356*, *359–360*
Lord Irwin *435–437*
Lord Kitchener *381*
Lord Linlithgow *439–440*, *443*
Lord Lytton *371–372*, *399*, *417–418*
Lord Mayo *371*, *383*, *403*
Lord Minto *358–359*, *384*, *423*, *427–428*
Lord Morley *428*
Lord Mountbatten *450–453*
Lord Northbrook *371*
Lord Ripon *372*, *377*, *402*, *415*, *418*
Lord Wavell *443*, *446–448*, *450*
Lord Wellesley *257*, *346*, *348*, *355–357*, *364*, *374*, *376*, *383*, *387*
Lorenzo de Medici *68*
Louis Pasteur *84*
Louis St. Laurent *525*
Louis XIV *88*, *339*, *493*, *494*, *514–515*
Lucretius *38–39*
Luigi Galvani *85*

M

Machiavelli *69–70*, *88–89*
Madhav Rao II *279*
Madras Mahajan Sabha *419*
Mahabat Khan *178*, *182–183*
Mahadev Govinda Ranade *407*
Mahadji Sindhia *262*, *278–279*, *312–313*, *354*
Maharaja Hari Singh *453*
Mahmud Begarha *136*, *140*
Mahmud of Ghazni *109–112*
Mahmud Shah *269*
Mahmud Shah Bahmani *160*
Mahmud Shah II *134–135*
Major James Abbott *474*
Malhar Rao Holkar *276*, *278*, *301*, *308*, *310*
Malik Ambar *180–182*
Malik Kafur *124–125*
Malik Raja *140*, *160*
MAO College *412*
Marcus Aurelius *38*
Marquis de Laplace *84*

Marquis de Mirabeau *93*
Martin Luther *73*, *79*
Master Tara Singh *451*
Maulana Abdul Hamid Khan Bhashani *484*
Maulana Muhammad Ali *413*, *433*
Maulana Muhammad Qasim Nanatawi *410*
Menander *28*
Mian Mumtaz Daultana *484*
Michelangelo *69*
Mir Jafar *287*, *346*, *350*, *353*
Mir Jumla *193–194*, *196–198*, *231*
Mir Mannu *264*, *267–269*
Mir Naseer Khan *268*, *270*
Mir Nizam Ali Khan *291*
Mir Qasim *274*, *287*, *310*, *312*, *350*, *394*
Mirza Jawan Bakht *272*
Mirza Muhammad Hakim *155–156*, *158*, *165*
Mohammad bin Tughlaq *126–128*
Mohammad Hatta *505*
Mohammed Ali Jinnah *431–432*, *434*, *436*, *439*, *441*, *443*, *447–451*, *479–480*, *483*
Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi *412–413*, *431–434*, *436–438*, *441*, *443*, *450*, *454*, *474*
Mohsin-ul-mulk *412*, *427*
Montague-Chelmsford Reforms *430*
Montaigne *80*, *542*
Montesquieu *89–91*
Moors *49*, *334*
Mophlas *433*
Moses Maimonides *42*
Motilal Nehru *433–436*
Mountstuart Elphinstone *374*
Mubarak Shah *125*, *130*
Mubariz Khan *236–237*, *289–290*
Mughal empire in India:
  dissolution of empire *224–238*
  empire's legacy *238–255*
    culture in Mughal India *240–247*
    economic conditions *247–250*
    revenue system *250–255*
    social conditions *239–240*
  introduction *145–148*
Mughlani Begum *264*, *269*
Muhammad Adil Shah *194*, *206*
Muhammad Akbar *203*
Muhammad Ali *290–291*, *343–344*
Muhammad Ali Bogra *483–484*
Muhammad Ali Khan *456–458*
Muhammad Amin Khan *199*, *216*, *234*
Muhammad bin Bakhtiar Khilji *123*
Muhammad bin Qasim *108*
Muhammad Khan Bangash *230*, *294*
Muhammad Saeed Khan *457*
Muhammad Shah *233–234*, *236–237*, *242*, *254*, *258–260*, *265–266*, *276*, *286*, *288*, *290*, *299*
Muhammad Sultan *156*, *194*, *196*
Muiz-ud-din Bahram *119*
Mumtaz Mahal *178*, *191*, *195*, *246*
Muqarrab Khan *213*
Murad Bakhsh *182*, *195*
Murshid Quli Khan *193*, *220*, *235–237*, *286–287*
Mushtaq Ahmad Gurmani *484*
Mushtaq Ali Khan *458*, *459*
Muslim contributions in the Middle Ages *41–45*
Muslim rule in India before the Mughals:
  arrival of Arabs *108–110*
  Delhi sultanate *114–132*
    Ghori dynasty *114–116*
    Khilji Dynasty *123–125*
    Lodhi dynasty *131–132*
    Sayyid dynasty *130–131*
    Slave dynasty *116–122*
    Tughlaq Dynasty *126–130*
  Ghaznavid dynasty *109–113*
  Muslim invasions and

consequences *140–144*
Statelets after Delhi sultanate:
eastern India: Bengal *133–134*
northern and western India *134–137*
Gujarat *135–136*
Jaunpur *134*
Kashmir *137*
Malwa *134–135*
southern India *137–140*
Bahmani Kingdom *138–139*
Khandesh *140*
Vijayanagar *137–138*
Mutazilite philosophy *43*
Muzaffar Jang *281*, *290–291*, *314*, *320*, *322*, *343–344*
Muzaffar Shah III *158*

N

Nadir Shah *146*, *238–239*, *258–259*, *263–266*, *288*, *295*, *298*
Najaf Khan *262*, *315*, *317*, *320–322*, *325–326*
Najib Khan *261–262*, *264*, *269–273*, *277*, *284–285*, *296*, *303–312*, *314–315*, *325–328*, *330–332*, *347*
Najm-ud-daulah *287*
Nana Fadnavis *278–279*, *333*
Nana Sahib *276–278*, *366–367*, *370*
Nand Kumar *353*
Naoroji Ferdunji *418*
Narayan Rao *278–279*, *318*, *320*
Nasir Jang *281*, *290*, *343*
Nasir-ud-din Abul Muzaffar Mahmud Shah *133*
Nasir-ud-din Mahmud *120–121*
Nawab Abdul Lateef Khan *425*
Nawab Salimullah *425*, *427*
Nawab Wajid Ali Shah *367*
Netherlands:
educational experience *505–510*
history *491–497*
rule in Indonesia *503–505*
trade and colonies *497–503*
New Amsterdam *500*
Newton *80–81*, *83–84*, *91*
Nizam-ul-mulk Bahri *139*
Nur Jahan *178*, *181–184*, *246*

O

Octavian *34*, *37*
Omar Khayyam *42*, *45*

P

Pakistan:
formative stage *478–480*
Martial Law of 1958 *487–488*
political developments *483–486*
society and economy *480–483*
Pandit Guru Dat *407*
Panipat *9*, *132*, *147*, *149*, *154*, *259*, *261*, *264*, *265*, *272*, *278–279*, *281*, *307*, *309*, *311–312*, *348*
Paracelsus *80*
Pascal *80*, *83*, *86*
Peace of Westphalia *77–78*
Peel Commission *381*
Pericles *32*
Peter Abelard *55*
Petrarch *46*, *67*, *69–70*, *72*
philosophes *90–92*
Pierre Bayle *90*
Pierre Elliot Trudeau *525*
Plato *3*, *19*, *21–23*, *42*, *46*, *53*
Plutarch *29–30*
Polybius *29–30*
Pomponazzi *69*
Pope Alexander VI *73*
Pope Boniface VIII *48*, *72*
Pope Gregory VII *48*
Pope Leo III *47*
Pope Paul III *75*, *77*
Pratapsinh *280*
Presidency College *387*, *405*
Prince Henry *95*, *334*, *497*

Progress: meaning and achievement *1–7*
Protagoras *21*, *24*
Ptolemy *26*, *42*, *53*, *80*, *82*
Pyrrhon *24*
Pythagoras *21*, *25*, *42*

Q

Qaim Khan *281–283*, *295*, *299–301*
Qamar-ud-din Khan *234*, *264*, *267*, *282–283*, *298–299*
Quebec Act of 1774 *518*
Queen Elizabeth I *337*
Queen Isabella *95*
Queen Juliana *497*, *506*
Queen Victoria *366*, *369*, *383*, *521*
Queen Wilhelmina *497*
Qutb-ud-din Aibak *115–116*
Qutb-ud-din Muhammad *113*
Qutub Shah *139*, *161*, *182*, *193–194*, *212*

R

Radcliffe Award *452*
Rafi-ud-darajat *233–234*, *259*
Rafi-ud-daulah *233–234*, *259*
Raghunath Rao *278–279*, *318*, *347*
Rahim Khan *219–220*
Rahimya Madrassa *409–410*
Raja Amar Singh *273*
Raja Bishun Singh Kacchwaha *221*
Raja Chait Singh *320*, *352*
Raja Dahir *108*
Raja Ganesh *133*
Rajagopalachari *443*, *445*
Raja Jai Singh *195*, *207*
Raja Man Singh *132*, *158*, *162*, *177*
Raja Ocdyar *138*
Rajaram *209–211*, *214–216*, *220–221*, *226–227*, *229*
Rajaram II *276–277*, *279*
Raja Ram Mohan Roy *385*, *387*, *403*, *405*, *406*
Raja Todar Mal *158*, *165*, *171*, *173*, *253*
Rajendra Prasad *445*
Ram Chandra Ganesh *312–313*
Rampur state:
  economy and population *461–462*
  Nawabs and administration *456–461*
  physical and social infrastructure *464–466*
Ramsay Macdonald *438*
Rana Amar Singh Sisodia *225*
Rana Jai Singh *204*
Rana Sangha *149*, *157*
Rani of Jhansi *366–367*
Ranjit Singh *264*, *270*, *274–275*, *333*, *348*, *358–359*, *361–363*, *474*
Raphael *69*
Raymund *53*
Raza Ali Khan *460*
Raza Library *458*, *464*
Razia Sultana *118–120*
Reformation movement in Europe:
  dissent and protest *71–75*
  reaction of Catholic Church *91*
  thirty-year war and peace *77–79*
Rene Descartes *81*
Rene Lavesque *530*
Richard Arkwright *99*
Robert Barker *315*, *317*, *321*
Robert Boyle *86*
Robert Clive *287*, *310*, *333*, *343*, *345–347*, *350*, *353*, *379*
Robert Owen *101*
Rohilkhand:
  administration *326–329*
  decline and fall *311–322*
  economy *329–330*
  end and destruction *322–326*
  foundation *293–297*
  peace and war with Awadh *309–311*
  rising power *297–305*

society *330–332*
wars with Marathas *305–309*
Roman Empire *18–19*, *30*, *33–35*, *40*, *46–48*, *491*
Roshanara *191–192*
Rumi *45*
Rustam Dil Khan *236*, *289*

S

Saadi *45*
Saadullah Khan *261*, *271*, *284–286*, *300–306*
Sadashivrao Bhau *278*, *306*
Safdar Jang *260–261*, *267–269*, *282–285*, *288*, *299–301*, *303–305*
Salabat Jang *291*, *344*
Salim Chishti *142*, *162*, *246*
Samuel Crompton *99*
Samuel de Champlain *514*
Sanskrit College *374*, *384*, *387–388*, *405*
Sardar Lehna Singh *273*
Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel *449*
Sarfraz Khan *287*
Sayyid Ameer Ali *425*
Scholastics *52–53*, *56*
Second Round Table Conference *437*
Seneca *38–39*
Seven-Year War *342*, *345*, *350*, *516–517*
Shah Abbas II *188*
Shah Abdul Aziz *403*, *409*
Shah Alam I *147*, *224*, *297*. *See also* Bahadur Shah I
Shah Alam II *147*, *257*, *261–263*, *272*, *279*, *287–288*, *307–310*, *314–316*, *319*, *321*, *325–326*, *334*, *346*, *348*, *352*, *356–357*
Shaharyar *181–183*
Shahi Khan *137*
Shah Ismail Shaheed *403*
Shahjahan:
consolidation of empire's frontiers *186–189*
return to Islamic political culture *185–186*
shape of empire *189–191*
war of succession *191–197*
Shahjahan III *261*, *272*, *287*, *306*
Shahji Bhonsle *186*, *193*, *205*, *232*
Shah Mirza *137*
Shah Nawaz Khan *266–267*
Shah Shuja *361*
Shahu I *275*, *277*
Shahuji *211*, *215–217*, *227–228*, *232–233*
Shah Wali Ullah *306*, *409*
Shah Zaman *264*, *274*, *354*
Shaibani Khan *156*
Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi *179*, *185*
Shaikh Jana *467*
Shaista Khan *198*, *207*
Shambhaji *204*, *207–214*, *216*, *226–227*
Shambhaji II *216*, *226*
Shaukat Ali *433*
Sher Ali *371–372*
Sher Shah Suri *124*, *134*, *151*, *172*, *251*
Shivaji *204–211*
Shivaji II *226–227*, *229*, *277*
Shuja-ud-daulah *261*, *271–272*, *281*, *285–288*, *305–325*, *331*, *348*, *352*
Shuja-ud-din Khan *236*, *286–287*
Sikandar Adil Shah *211–213*
Sikandar Shah *132–133*, *154*
Sikhs. *See* India in eighteenth century
Simon Commission Report *437*
Simon Fraser University *511*, *529*
Siraj-ud-daulah *287*, *344–347*, *350*
Sir Bartle Frere *416*
Sir Charles Napier *362*, *378*
Sir Claude Auchinleck *453*
Sir Cyril Radcliffe *452*

Sir Dinker Rao *417*
Sir John A. Macdonald *523*
Sir John Shore *354–355*, *357*
Sir John Simon *435*
Sir Joseph Fuller *427*
Sir Khizar Hayat Khan *443*
Sir Mohammed Iqbal *441*
Sir Stafford Cripps *442*, *446*
Sir Sultan Muhammad Shah (Aga Khan III) *412*, *427*
Sir Syed Ahmed Khan *368*, *377*, *410–412*, *416*, *419*, *424*, *426*, *441*
Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru *433*
Sir Thomas Roe *178*, *338*
Sir Wilfrid Laurier *523*
Sir William Hunter *391*
Sir Wolseley Haig *122*
Socrates *22*, *24*, *81*
Solon *32*
Somanath *110–111*
Sophocles *28*
Subhas Chandra Bose *434*, *442*, *444*
Subuktigin *109*
Sulla *36*
Sultan Abul Hasan Qutub Shah *212*
Sultan Bahadur Shah *335–336*
Sultan Mahmud Khilji *135*
Suraj Mal *270*, *278*, *301*, *306–308*
Surendranath Banerji *418*, *420*, *423*
Swami Dayanand Saraswati *407*
Swami Sraddhananda *408*
Swami Vivekananda *408*
Syed Ahmad of Rai-Bareilly *409*

T

Tacitus *40*
Taimur Shah *264*
Taj Mahal *44*, *246–247*
Tandojam *477*, *490*
Tara Bai *216–217*, *226–227*, *229*, *275*, *277*
Tashkent Declaration *487*
Tegh Bahadur *202*
Thales *21*, *25*
Theodore Beck *426*
Theophrastus *27*
Theosophical Society *408–409*
Third Round Table Conference *438*
Thirty-Year War (1618-1648) *77*
Th.L.M. Thurlings *508*
Thomas Aquinas *53*, *55*
Thomas Babington Macaulay *388*, *415*
Thomas Hobbes *88*
Thomas Jefferson *92*
Thomas Munro *374*
Thomas Newcomen *99*
Thomas Paine *92*
Thomas Sydenham *83*
Three migrations:
  first migration *466–472*
  second migration *473–478*
  third migration *489–534*
Thucydides *29*
Tipu Sultan *257*, *278*, *351*, *355*
Titu Mir *409*
Torbern Bergman *86*
Treaty of Paris *517–518*
Treaty of Utrecht *515–516*

U

Udai Singh *157*
Urban VI *72*

V

Vasco da Gama *95*, *335*
Venkata II *138*
Vesaji *318*
Vesalius *80*, *83*
Viqar-ul-mulk *427*
Virgil *39*
Voltaire *71*, *90–92*

W

Wageningen *505*, *508–510*
Warren Hastings *317–318*, *324*, *345*, *350–351*, *353*, *366*, *374–375*, *384*
Wazir Khan *225–226*
W.C. Bonnerji *421*
Western Roman Empire *47–48*
William Harvey *83*
William Hawkins *338*
William III *493–494*, *496*, *515*
William IV *494*
William Mackenzie King *525*
William Smith *87*
William the Silent *492*
William Tyndale *73*
William VI *495*
William V of Orange *494*

X

Xenophanes *21*, *27*
Xenophon *29*

Y

Yaqub Shah *159*
Yousuf Adil Khan *139*
Yusuf Ali Khan *457–458*, *467*
Yusufzais *159*, *208*

Z

Zabardast Khan *198*, *220*
Zabita Khan *308*, *313*, *317*, *324–327*, *331*
Zafar Khan *127*, *135*, *139*, *188*
Zakir Husain *413*
Zeno *21*, *24*
Zulfiqar Khan *215–216*, *218*, *227–231*

About the Author

Mahmood Hasan Khan has been studying the human condition for over 50 years. His education, nurtured first in Pakistan and then in the Netherlands, equipped him to explore the conditions of rural poverty in diverse social and economic milieu. The author's choice of an academic career at an early stage in life facilitated his professional growth through university teaching and research. Mahmood Hasan Khan retired in 2002 as Professor of Economics at Simon Fraser University (Canada), after working there for 37 years. He has published 13 books—of which he authored eight and co-authored or co-edited the rest—and 33 articles in professional journals. He has also served as a consultant to the FAO, ILO, IMF, UNDP, the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, the aid-agencies of Canada and the United States, and some non-governmental organisations working in rural Pakistan. Much of this work involved field research and has been published. In the last five years, Mahmood Hasan Khan focused his attention on the history of human progress and reflected on his own long march of progress. This book is the outcome of his understanding and interpretation of progress at the societal and personal levels.

It is a historical narrative of human progress, in which the author has included his own experience on three continents. The first part of this book focuses on the emergence of the 'Modern Age' in the West. In the second part, the author describes the arrival of Muslim invaders, Arabs, Afghans and Turks, their conquest and long rule in India to provide a contextual background for the evolution of an Indo-Muslim culture. The third part includes a description of the conditions of India in the eighteenth century, including the disintegration of Mughal Empire and the contest for power and territory among the native regional groups (Afghans, Marathas, Sikhs, and Jats) along with the European trading companies. It was during this period that two of the author's ancestors migrated from the Roh (hills in the north-west) to the Gangetic plain: Rohila settlements in the Gangetic plain were the foundation for his family's march of progress. The fourth part comprises an account of the arrival of Europeans in India, rising power of the East India Company, consolidation of the British Raj, and the events leading to the partition and independence of India in 1947. It was during the British rule that the ideas of progress imported from the West were grafted on to a very diverse cultural and social landscape of India. Paradoxically the British imperial rule laid the foundation for modernity in India. In the final part of the book, the author writes about his family's three migrations, the first two of his ancestors on the sub-continent and the last his own to Canada via the Netherlands. The narrative ends with optimism about the future, given the experience of progress so far and the great potential that humans possess.

Mahmood Hasan Khan is professor emeritus at Simon Fraser University (Canada). He has authored eight books and numerous articles in professional journals. In his long academic career, he has also worked as a consultant to several international organisations and some bilateral aid agencies and Pakistani NGOs supporting the rural poor. Mahmood Khan lives in Metro Vancouver (Canada).

Bar Code