



# HISTORY OF TRIPURA

Compiled by  
**E.F.SANDYS**

*Compiled and edited by*

**R. G. Singh  
&  
Arun Deb Barma**



**Tripura State Tribal Research Institute & Museum**  
**Govt. of Tripura**





# HISTORY OF TRIPURA

Compiled by  
**E.F.SANDYS**

*Compiled and edited by*

**R. G. Singh  
&  
Arun Deb Barma**



Tripura State Tribal Research Institute & Museum  
Govt. of Tripura



# **HISTORY OF TRIPURA**

Compiled  
from  
Authentic Sources

By  
**E.F. Sandys**



**Tripura State Tribal Cultural  
Research Institute & Museum  
Govt. of Tripura**



**First Print :**  
January, 1915

**1st-Re-Published in :**  
January, 1997

**2nd-Re print :** February 1997

**3rd Re print :** July 2008

**Published by :**  
Tripura State Tribal Cultural  
Research Institute & Museum  
Govt. of Tripura  
Agartala

**Printed by :** Print Best, Colonel Chowmuhani, Agartala, Tripura

**Price :** 75.00

**Copy right :**  
Tripura State Tribal Cultural Research Institute  
& Museum  
Govt. of Tripura





**E. F. Sandys**



## **INTRODUCTORY NOTE**

Tribal Research Institute had taken an innovative effort for reprinting the published book viz 'History of Tripura' compiled by E. F. Sandys (1915). This book had immense potential before the research workers, Historian and interested readers for getting knowledge on history of Tripura and the then period.

As the re-printed copies of this book is exhausted, another attempt has been taken for the interest of research workers and interested readers to reprint once again.

I think this attempt will be appreciated from all corners.

**Dated, Agartala  
19th June, 2008**

**( R.K. Acharyya )  
Deputy Director,  
Tribal Research Institute  
Government of Tripura**



## Foreward

History of Tripura has been a matter of great interest to Scholars and Academicians. Presently the history of Tripura is available in large number of records/documents such as note of Political agent, Rajmala, other such books written by the British Scholars. There has been a need to collect all such information and compile into a document which can be used by all people who are interested in knowing the subject.

2. An attempt has been made to compile all the relevant information and produce it in the form of book. The history of Tripura has been written in various chapters such as Mohammad period. Hindu Period & English period etc. Directorate of Tribal Research Institute has been taking step in order to compile various documents so as to provide necessary impetus to development of history and culture of the State. The present compilation would be a step in that direction.

3. I am sure that the present compilation of 'History of Tripura' would greatly help to scholars and academicians and fulfil the need for a consolidated information of historical facts about Tripura.

4. The efforts made by Shri Arun Debbarma & R.G. Singh in compilation of documents deserves commendation.

It is an excellent work done by Sri Arun Debbarma & Shri Singh for compilation of such documents.

Agartala  
1st January, 1997

(D.K. Tygai)  
Commissioner to the  
Govt. of Tripura  
Agartala

## EDITORS NOTE

**RAJMALA**, the Royal Chronicles of Tripura to be believed to be oldest book dealing with the history of Tripura. During the reign of Dharma Manikya who ascended the throne to Tripura in 1407 (1407) A.D. two Brahman Pandits of his Courts, Beneswar and Sukreswar wrote the book which contains the accounts of the Rulers in a chronicle order together, some important events of their times as narrated to them by Durlevendra Narayan, the Chantai or the Chief Priest of the Court.

Mainly on the basis of Rajmala many books dealing with history of Tripura have been written by many people. The present book, "History of Tripura" by E.F. Sandys in one significant addition to these corpus of books. Mr. Sandys was a Manager of Chakla Roshnabad, a British Officer and some time was private Secretary to Maharaja Bir Bikram Kishore. So, this book contains in addition to historical facts, his own perceptions about things that took place in Tripura.

E.F. Sandys has narrated the History of Tripura in three major chapters-the Hindu Period including Rajmala, the Mohamadan Period and the English Period. Regarding the antiquity of Tripura Kingdom, he mentioned, besides other sanskrit literature and the Mahabharata, the Ashok Pillar inscription, an order of Emperor Ashok addressed to the officials of Kausambi i.e.2300 years ago wherein Kartripura was mentioned.

Mr. Sandys also elucidated Tripura Era corresponding to other prevalent dates of the country. This will help to transfer Tripura Era to other dates easily.

Two significant facts of this book are his treatment of the Tripura-British relations, especially about state's Eastern Boundary issues and status of Chakla-Roshnabad vis-a-vis the Muslim ruler and the British Government. The detailed account for the succession of the throne of Tripura which the Dewani Adalat of the British Government settled may also be significant.

Like other history, this book is not also free from controversy. The period mentioned for Ratna Manikya dated 1279 A.D. is found controversial to the coin discovered later on which was struck and issued on the occasion of the coronation ceremony



of Ratna Manikya. Moreover, Sandys stated that Samarendrachandra Deb Barma lost the case claiming to the "ipso facto" successor of Jubaraj from Barathakur which post he had been nominated by his father Birchandra Manikya. This fact is also controversing as because we find a letter of Birendra Kishore Manikya conveying his gratitude and thankfulness to Barathakur and uncle Samarendrachandra for withdrawl of his claim from Privy Council. It is known fact that notwithstanding Samarendrachandra lost his claim of Jubarajship in the lower court, he filed the case to the Privy Council wherein it was still in process. But on the request of the elderly members of the royal family, he had withdrawn the case.

The British Administrators/Officers especially of the East India Company had very little orientation in the affairs of the state. As a result they considered intentionally the Ruler of Tripura just as a Zamindar under the British. This attitude of theirs astounded Mr. Sandys and Mr. Mackenzie. Sandys thinks, many acts of omission and commission of the British Officers in respect to Tripura resulted from this.

It is hoped that this book, long out of print, will shed new lights on many areas of Tripura's History.

We are personally thankful to Mrs. Jaya Deb Barma who has handed a copy of hand written manuscript of this Book and inform us the source of this book. According a photocopy of this book has been collected from National Library. Calcutta through Shri T.K. Chakma, Deputy Resident Commissioner, Tripura Bhavan, Calcutta, we are thankful to Shri Chakma and National Library for their assistance.

We are also thankful to Nirmalya Datta who handed over an original book of history of Tripura to us. But it was missing some pages and incomplete.

Finally, we are grateful to Shri Gautam Das (Managing Director, Tripura Printers & Publisher Pvt. Ltd.) who have taken active part in collection of this book.

Ram Gopal Singh  
Arun Deb Barma

# **CONTENT**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>HISTORY OF THE TRIPURA RAJ</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>ERA</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>THE RAJMALA</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>MOHAMEDAN PERIOD</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>ENGLISH PERIOD</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>APPENDEX G. THE EASTERN BOUNDARY</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>APPEXDIX G. THE EASTERN BOUNDARY</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>APPENDEX H. MAP OF DISPUTED EASTERN BOUNDARY OF TRIPURA STATE</b>	<b>113</b>

## **GENEOLOGY OF BIRENDRAKISHORE MANIKY FROM KALYAN MANIKYA**

- 114th - KALYAN MANIKYA (1625-1659)
- 115th - GOVINDA MANIKYA (1659-1660) Eldest son of Kalyan Manikya.
- 116th - RAM MANIKYA (1669-1682) Eldest son of Govinda Manikya.
- 122nd - MAKUNDA MANIKYA (1733-1737) 4th son of Ram Manikya.

**HARIMANI JAVARAJ** 4th son of Makunda Manikya

- 128th - RAJDHAR MANIKYA II (1785-1804) Juvaraj
- 130th - RAMGUNGA MANIKYA (1813-1826) Eldest son of Rajdhar Manikya II.
- 132nd - KRISHNAKISHOR MANIKYA (1830-1849) Only son of Ramgunga Manikya.
- 133rd - BIRCHANDRA MANIKYA (1862-1896) 3rd Son of Krishnakishore Manikya.
- 134th - RADHAKISHORE MANIKYA (1896-1909) Eldest son of Brichhanndra Manikya.
- 135th - BIRDENDRAKISHORE MANIKYA (1909) Eldest son of Radhakishore Manikya

**BIRBIKRAMKISHORE JUVARAJ** Eldest son of Birendrakishore Manikya.

The numbers preceding the names of the Rajas indicate the descent from Tripura the 1st Raja of Tripura who was 39th in descent from Chandra. Hence the Tripura Rajas are Chandravansi Kshatryas of the Vishnu sect of Hindus.



**LIST OF THE RAJAS  
OF  
TRIPURA**

Tripur  
Trilochana  
Dakhinna  
Taidakhina  
Sudakshina  
Traydakshina or Taradakshina  
Dharmmataru  
Dharmmapala  
Sudharmma  
Taranga  
Debanga  
Naranjita  
Dharmmangada  
Rukmanngada  
Svarnangada or Sowangada  
Navak or Naujoga  
Tarjungo  
Rajdharmma  
Hemaraja  
Biraja  
Sriraja  
Srimannanta  
Lakshhmitaru  
Rupaban  
Lakshmiban  
Nageshvara  
Jogeshvara  
Niladhaja  
Basuraja  
Dhanaraja  
Harihara  
Chandrashekhara  
Chandraraja  
Sumanta  
Dharmmanta  
Tarahum  
Hariraj

Kashiraj  
Madhab  
Chanraraj  
Gajeshvara  
Biraraj or Biraj  
Nageshvara  
Shikhiraj  
Debaraj  
Dhushharakhya or Dhusharaksha  
Barakirti  
Sagar  
Malayachandra  
Surjyanarayan  
Indrakirti  
Birsingha  
Surendra  
Biman or Bimara  
Kumar  
Sukumar  
Birchandra  
Rajeshvara  
Nagemdra  
Indarakirti  
Bimann  
Jasharaj  
Banga  
Ganga  
~~Chittarasena~~  
Pratita  
Marichi  
Gagana  
Kirti  
Himaticha  
Raj Chandra  
Partha  
Shibaraj or Sivaraj  
Siva  
Kirita  
Ramchandra  
Nrisingha  
Lalita  
Mukunda

Kamal	
Krishnadas	
Jashoraj	
Uddhava	
Sadhuram	
Pratab	
Bishnuprassad or Vishnuprasad	
Baneshvara	
Birabahu	
Shyamraj	
Champakeshvara	
Megharaj	
Dhammadhara	
Kirtidhar	
Rajsuriya	
Nahana	
Hari	
Ratana Manikya .....	1279 to 1323
Pratap Manikya .....	} 1323 to 1407
Mukunda Manikya.....	
Maha Manikya .....	
Dharamma Manikya.....	1407 to 1458
Interregnum .....	1458 to 1490
Dhanya Manikya .....	1490 to 1520
Deva Manikya .....	1520 to 1535
Indra Manikya .....	1535 to 1535
Bijaya Manikya .....	1535 to 1582
Ananta Manikya .....	1583 to 1585
Uday Manikya .....	1585 to 1596
Jai Manikya .....	1596 to 1597
Amar Manikya .....	1597 to 1611
Rajdhar Manikya .....	1611 to 1613
Jashadhar Manikya.....	1613 to 1623
Interregnum .....	1623 to 1625
Kalyan Manikya .....	1625 to 1659
Govinda Manikya .....	1659 to 1660
Chhattra Manikya .....	1660 to 1666
Govinda Manikya .....	1666 to 1669
(for the 2nd time)	
Ram Manikya .....	1669 to 1682
Ratan Manikya II .....	1682 to 1682
Narendra Manikya .....	1682 to 1684



Ratan Manikya	1684 to 1712
(for the 2nd time)	
Mahendra Manikya	1712 to 1714
Dharmma Manikya	1714 to 1732
Jagat Manikya	1732 to 1733
Dharmma Manikya	1733 to 1733
(for the 2nd time)	
Mukanda Manikya	1733 to 1737
Jai Manikya	1737 to 1739
Indra Manikya	1739 to 1743
Bijai Manikya	Uncertain
Krishna Manikya	1760 to 1783
Jahnabi Mahadevi	1783 to 1785
Rajdhar Manikya	1785 to 1804
Durga Manikya	1804 to 1813
Ramganga Manikya	1813 to 1826
Kasichandra Manikya	1826 to 1830
Krishnakishor Manikya	1830 to 1849
Isanchandra Manikya	1849 to 1862
Brichandra Manikya	1862 to 1896
Radhakishor Manikya	1896 to 1909
Birendrakishor Manikya	1909

## **HISTORY OF THE TRIPURA RAJ**

### **HINDU PERIOD**

The antiquity of a Hindu Raj can only be determined by looking into the ancient history of India, so fully recorded in the old books handed down to us, together with the inscriptions on old monuments and coins revealed to modern times chiefly by European research.

The history of ancient India is a record of thirty two centuries, and divides itself into five distinct epochs, each of which equals the entire history of most modern peoples. The greatest Sanskrit scholars have come to the conclusion that the first Aryan settlement of India was made in the Indus Valley about 2,000 B.C.

When the Aryans came to the Sutlej, having occupied all the land of the Punjab, they naturally crossed over and entered into the Gangetic Valley or the Doab. During the course of the next 400 years down to 1,000 B.C., the Hindus, by whom are meant the Indio-Aryans, spread down the Doab and founded powerful kingdoms and nationalities, who cultivated science and literature and developed new forms of religion and civilization wholly different from the Vedic period. Among the nations who flourished in the Gangetic Valley the most renowned have left their names in the literature of Hindu India. The Kurus with their kingdom round about their capital Hastinapur near the site of modern Dehli. The Panchalas settled round about modern Kanauj, called their capital Indraprastha to the South-East Delhi. The Kosalas occupied the country between the Ganges and the Gunduck, including modern Oude. The Vaidehis lived to the East of the Gunduck in what is now know as Tirhoot. The Kasis settled round their capital Kasi,

the modern Benares. Continuing further east and occupying what is now known as Bengal Proper and the Province of Assam, were to be found the kingdom of the Angas, Bangas (whose name has survived in the name of Bangladesh or Bengal), Karoli, Mritikayati, Mohana, Pattana, Tripura and Kosala. besides these in Northern India there were numerous great and small kingdoms in Central and Southern India.

It is unnecessary for our present purpose to describe the great war in detail, but a brief account is necessary to show what connection the Tripura Raj had with this ancient episode.

Turning to the Mahabharat we find that Yudhishthira sent forth to conquer and bring to tribute the lesser kings.

In the Sabha Parva, Chapter XXXI, the sixtinth verse, we read that Sahadeva, the younger brother of Yudhishthira among others, conquered the "immeasurable effulgent Tripura".

वैपुरं स्ववशेकृत्वा राजानममितीजसम् ।  
निजग्रहमहाबाहुस्तरमापौरवेशम् ॥

This epithet "immeasurably effulgent" clearly proves that Tripura was Kshatriya, as only such ever had this epithet applied to them.

After the departure of the Pandu brothers into forest exile (vanavas) Duryodhana became king and determined to have himself declared Samrat or Emperor. So he sent forth armies under various commanders, one of whom, Karana, as related in verses 9 to 11 of Chapter CCIII of Vana Parva of the "Mahabharat, after conquering various kingdom, came to the Batsabhumi or grazing country and subjugated Keroli, Mrittikavati, Mohana and Pattana, Tripura and Kosala, and made them all pay tribute.

पूर्वा दिशं विनिर्जित्य वभुतमिं स्तथागमत् ।  
वत्सभूमिं विनिर्जित्य केरलीं मृत्तिकावतीं ॥



मोहनं ऽपत्तनञ्जैव त्रिपुरां कोशलं तथा ।  
एतान् सर्वान् विनिर्जित्य करमादाय सर्व्वशः ।  
दाक्षिणां दिशमास्थाय कर्णो जित्वा महारथान ॥

In the great battle of Kurukshetra we find all the kings of the Lunar Race ranged either on the side of Duryodhana or on that of Yudhisthira, Bhishma, the Senapati or commander-in-chief of the Kuru (Duryodhana's) army, had under his command a number of subordinate generals. Three of these are mentioned in the undernoted quotation from the Bhishma Parava, Chapter LXXXIV, of the Burdwan Edition, in the 8th and 9th verses. These are Drona, Bhagadatta and Vrihatbala, the king of the Kosalas. The last named had in his division the kings of Melaka, Tripura and Chichila.

मागधैश्च कलिंगैश्च पिशाचैश्च विशाम्पते ।  
प्राग्जोतिषादनु नृप कौशस्थोऽथ वृहद्बलः ॥  
मेलकैस्त्रैपुरैश्च वचिचिलैश्च (चिच्छिलैश्च) समन्वितः ॥

From the foregoing facts and quotations it is undisputable-

Lastly, That whenever the great war of the Mahabharat took place or whether it took place at all or is merely a Lunar myth, collected by Vyasa, yet the Kingdom of Tripura in exist before Vyasa's time. That is before 600 B.C. Otherwise he could not have mentioned it in his list of Kings.

Consequently the Tripura Raj existed previous to 600 B.C. or 2,500 years ago, and was considered a kingdom of sufficient importance to have been invaded and made to pay tribute to Yudhisthira and to Duryodhana, the Samrats of India, and to have taken part in the great battle of Kurukshetra.

2ndly, That the Tripura mentioned in the extracts from the Mahabharat was in Eastern India below the Himalayas in the neighbourhood of Banga or what we now call Bengal, that is where

the present Raj of Tripura is now situated, even in its present shrunken dimensions. Furthermore, as there is no other raj or country or king to be found any where or at any time during the whole Hindu domination of India elsewhere and other than the Tripura Raj in question, it cannot be said that the Tripura of the Mahabharat is other than the Tripura of which we are now writing.

3rdly, That the use of the expression "immeasurably effulgent" applied to Tripura shows beyond dispute or Cavil that the king of Tripura was a recognised Kshatriya of the Royal Warrior Caste at least 600 years before Christ in Vyasa's time.

4thly. That the Rajput princes, though popularly considered the most ancient and honourable of all reigning Fendatory Rulers in India, only came into power as rulers about 750 to 950 A.D. or almost 1,200 years after the Tripura kings are cited in at least three distinct and far apart verses of the Mahabharat by Vyasa 2,500 years ago.

The Tripura Raj is mentioned in the list of kingdoms on the Emperor Asoka's Pillar in the Fort of Allahabad and is now, after a lapse of over 2,200 years, the only one State of all those mentioned, extant-another proof of its incomparable antiquity.

The following is the full inscription on the Asoka Lat or Pillar, at present in the Fort of Allahabad, built by the Mogal Emperior Akbar in 1557. But this pillar was originally set up at Kausambi, because it bears, in addition to other records, an order of Asoka addressed to the Officials of Kausambi, one of the most celebrated cities of ancient India, which probably stood on the sites of the present villages of Kosam Inam and Kosam Khiraj in the Manjampur tahsil of the Allahabad District, on the bank of the Jumna. The most recent location however is at Gurgi in the State of Rewah.

"Whose great good fortune was mixed with, so as to be increased by, his glory produced by the favour shown in capturing

and then liberating Mahendra of Kosala, Vyaghraraja Mahakantara, Mantaraja of Kerala, Mahendra of Rishtapura Svamidatta of Kottura on the hill, Damana of Erandapalla, Vishougopa of Kanchi, Nilaraja of Avamukta, Hastivarman of Vengi, Ugrsena of Palakka, Kuvera of Devarashtra, Dhananjaya of Kusthalapura, and all other kings of the region of the South."

"Who abounded in majesty which had been increased by violently exterminating Rudradeva, Matela, Nagadatta, Chandravarman, Ganapatinaga, Nagasena, Achyuta, Nandin, Balavarman, and many other kings of Aryavarta, who made all the kings of the forest countries to become his servants."

"Whose imperious commands were fully gratified by the payment of taxes and the execution of his orders by the frontier kings (Pratyanta Nripati) of Sanataka, Davaka, Kamaruya, Napala, *Kartripura*, and other countries; and by the Matavas Arjundayanas, Yadheyas, Madrakas, Abhiras, Prajunas, Sanakanikas, Kakas, Kharaparikas, and other tribes;"

"Whose tranquil fame pervading the whole world was generated by establishing again many royal families fallen and deprived of sovereignty, whose binding together of the whole world, by means of the ample vigour of his arm, was effected by acts of respectful service, such as offering themselves as sacrifices, bringing presents of maidens, giving Garuda tokens, leadering the enjoyment of their own territories, solicit out rending his commands, & c.-rendered by the Daivaputras, Shahis, Shahanushahis, Sakas, Murundas, and by the people of Sinhala, and all other dwellers in islands."

In the third paragraph among the Frontier kings it will be noticed that Tripura or as it was called *Kartripura* was named, followed by a list of Tribes, probably aboriginal, among which is mentioned the Kakas, which might possibly be the modern Kukis, who are vassals of Tripura and live in the N.E. of the Raj.



We gather from the Purans, that Pururavas was the, of the Chandravansa or Lunar line of kings. Fourth descent from Pururavas was Gritsamada, whose son was Saunaka. His second cousin once removed was Dirghatamas, who is said to have begotten on the wife of Bali, the 16th in descent from Pururvas, five sons, named Anga, Banga, Kalinga, Sumbha and Pundra, from whom the five countries of East Behar, East bengal, Orissa, Tripura and North bengal are named.

The Rajas of Tripura are Chandravansa Kshatriyas and their ancestor Tripur was descended from Pururvas :

CHITTRAYUDH was "immeasurably effulgent" or the Kshatriya Raja of Tripura who was subjugated by Sahadeva, the Pandu general sent forth with the white horse by his eldest brother Yudhishthira, the rival of his cousin Duryadhana the Kuru. The subjugation of Chittrayudh has been related in the quotation from the XXI Chapter of the Dipvijaya of the Sabha Parva of the Mahabharata. Whenever a Kshatriya Raja of ancient times wished to have himself acknowledged as Samrat (Emperor) by contemporary rulers, he sent forth a white horse to wander at will over the dominions of his neighbours for the space of a year. Should any ruler oppose the progress of the white horse he had to fight the accompanying army, sent for the purpose of subjugating refractory neighbours. When the wanderings of the white horse had been completed the animal was sacrificed with most imposing religious ceremonies at an Asuamedha (asu-horse and medha sacrifice). This sacrifice preceded the Rajasuya or Coronation of the Raja a Samrat. The Coronation ceremony, (described in the Aitareya Brahmana Chap. VIII verse 6 to 9 and also in the Vajasaneyi Samhita Chap. IX verse 39) was attended by all the Rajas, who owned allegiance, and to them were allotted all the great offices of the ceremonial as superintendents in various departments. At the close of the ceremony various honors were bestowed by the Samrat on each of the Rajas, before they returned to their

dominions Chitrayudh attended the Rajasuya of Yudhisthira, when according to the Kanva text, the priests addressed the assembly and said.

**"This is your king. O ye Kurus. O ye Panchallas"**

The honour, or as it would now be called the Khillat, bestowed on Chitrayudh by the Emperor Yudhisthira was the Svetachattrā (scet white and chattrā-umbrella) or royal white umbrella, which to this day is the chief insignia of the Rajas of Tripura and unfurled when he ascends the throne, now on his Installation by direction of the Emperor of India, who also bestows a Khillat of nine articles or parchas viz. the Nim Astin, the Jama, the Pagri, the Patka, the Sarpaich, Goshwara, the Shebandi, the Jiga with Sarpaich Morissa and the Mala Marwarid. These are Massalman names, as the Mogal Emperors of India also bestowed Khillats, a practice which, with many other ceremonial observances, its successors, the English Government, has continued.

## **ERA**

It should be noted that the Tripura is only ruling dynasty that has an era of its own. It dates from 590 A.D. when Rajah Birraj, from whom the present Rajah is the 117th in descent, extended his conquests beyond the Ganges. The months of the Tripura year are the same as those generally prevailing in Bengal.

The following corresponding dates illustrate the various Eras clearly :

1st September 1915	Christian Era.
15th Bhadra 1322	Bengali
15th Bhadra 1325	Tripura
8th Bhadra 1322	Fasli
8th Bhadra Budi 1972	Samvat.
15th Bhadra 1837	Saka.
20th Showal 1333	Hijri.

## **THE RAJMALA**

THE origin and history of the Tripura Raj is given in the Rajmala (literally meaning the "Garland of kings") or chronicles of Tripura. It is the oldest specimen of Bengali composition extant. It is in verse and was in a detached form, but was collected and written in sequence by the Brahmin officials of Rajah Dharma Manikya, the 102nd Rajah, who ascended the Tripura Gadi in 1407 A.D. His successors have continued the task year by the year until we have now one of the oldest, continuous chronicles of any Indian reigning family.

Making every allowance for poetic fancy, Brahminical love of the supernatural and courtly flattery, we have a written record stretching back to the Aryans in the Epic period or 3,000 years ago when Druhya, the second son of the Samrat or Emperor Yayati, a Kshatriya of the Lunar Race, was exiled, together with his elder and two younger brothers, as is related in the, Maharabhat (in Chapter LXXXIV of the Shambhava Parva of the Adi Parva), wherein it is described how the aged Emperor called upon his five sons, each in order of his age, to take upon himself his old age and give him his youth for a time. The eldest Yadu, then Druhya followed by his two next brothers, Turvasu and Anu, all refused, and were cursed by their father with various penalties and sent into exile.

The curse upon Druhya is given in the 20th, 21st and 22nd verses of the above mentioned chapter. It is to the effect that, he should go into exile and spend his days in a pathless country, where the only means of conveyance were its or floats. Consequently, Druhya retired with his companions to the eastern parts of the Empire, where the floods the Brahmaputra submerged the surrounding country and necessitated water carriage.

Druhya's descendant Tripura settled on the banks of the Kapila a confluent of the Brahmaputra and founded the city of Tribeg (literally meaning the place where three streams meet) as

the capital of his kingdom, which became known thenceforth to this day as Tripura, after its founder, who lived over 3,000 years ago.

According to the legend Tripur was the grandson of Chitravudh who had attended the Rajasya or Imperial Assemblage of the Samrat Tudhishthira and had been granted the Svetachattr or white royal umbrella as his insignia by the Emperor, as already mentioned. Tripura is said to have been a passionate, tyrannical ruler, who neglected the due worship of Siva. His subjects were in great distress and appealed to the Raja of Hidamba (Cachar), which in those days was in the valley of the Brahmaputra, from which its Raja and people were driven by the oppression of more powerful princes. Under the ancestors of their Raja Govinda Deo who ruled in the first half of the 13th Century they migrated to the valley of the Barak which now forms the district of Cachar. The Raja of Hidamba could not or would not render the Tripuras any assistance and, as Tripura became more and more tyrannical and godless, they cried to Siva, who, when sufficiently provoked by Tripur shooting arrows at the Lingam, the emblem of Siva, and thus bringing his worship into contempt, slew Tripur in wrath. Tripur had left no son to succeed him but his Widow was pregnant. Great was the grief of the innocent and disconsolate Rani and her entreaties, joined to the prayers of the Tripuras allayed the wrath of Siva, who promised, that, the Rani's unborn child should be a son, who would be the recipient of his godship's favor. And as a sign, he should have the mark of the third or central eye, a distinguishing feature of Siva on his forehead. In due course Tripura's widowed Rani gave birth to a posthumous son, who bore Siva's promised token and was accordingly named Trilochana (Three-eyed) in compliment to the god, one of whose names is Tryambaka, having the same meaning. So that Tripur founded his Capital Tribeg and was succeeded by his son Trilochana, trio of trinities! Ancient history is usually veiled in myths and related in legends but facts in almost every case form the foundation of



these stories.

TRILOCHANA was placed on the throne amidst the rejoicings of the people and was distinguished for wisdom and piety at an early age. Neighbouring Chiefs paid him homage and the Raja of Hidamba (Cachar) offered Trilochana his daughter in marriage. The nuptials were celebrated with great rejoicings and twelve sons born of this marriage.

On the death of the sonless Raja of Hidamba a dispute arose as to which of his grandsons were to occupy the vacant throne. To solve the difficulty peacefully Trilochana sent messengers to the venerated shrine of Siva on Sagar island, to request the Priests to come and solve the difficulty. The name "Sagar" means the Sea, and situated, as it is, at the point where the holy Ganges once mingled its waters with the Bay, the island is regarded as peculiarly sacred. Thousands of pilgrims from all parts of India visit it annually to wash away their sins in the bengali month of Magh. In ancient times there were on Sagar Island a famous Tol or Sanskrit College" for Pandits and a Shrine of Siva, erected by the Rajas of Tripura when their dominions spread far more Westwards than they do now. The temple and tol were deluviated in 1842. The Dandis on Siva's Priests were called, remembering the persecutions of the godless Tripur, were afraid to send any Pandits to Tripura, until they learnt of Trilochana's piety and peaceful habit. 'So some of the Dandis returned with the messengers, settled and question of the succession to Hidamba and returned rejoicing with many gifts from Trilochana.

The cult of Siva still continues to be the State religion of Tripura but Rajas are now personally Vishnavas, probably since Chaitanya's time, 1485 as already mentioned. It should be noted, that when Siva promised Tripur's widow Rani a son, he stipulated, that, Surya and Chandra or the Sun and the Moon, as well as the Chaudadevtas should be duly and regularly worshipped. These gods are to this day so worshipped and their temples and priest duly provided for by the State.

Though the limits of the Tripura Raj have been altered, enlarged and reduced, as is only natural through the 30 centuries of storm and stress of the Hindu, Mohamedan and British dominations in India, yet this ancient Aryan Raj still survives in its present diminished territories, now bounded by the districts of Sylhet and Cachar on the north, Lushailand on the east, the Hill Tracts and Chittagong on the south, and by the districts of Noakhali and Tippera on the west. But so late as the 16th century the Raj stretched from Kamrup in Assam to the north up to Arakan in the south, from the Empire of Burma on the east to the then densely populated Sunderbans on the west.

The capital was gradually moved from Tribeg, on the Brahmaputra on the north, to Udaipur, on the Gumati on the south, and then back again to Agartala, on the Haura where the present Raja now has his seat of Government.

The early history of Cachar or Hidamba, as it was anciently called, is obscure. It would appear that it formerly belonged to the kingdom of Tripura. It is, however, certain that the last native king of Cachar was the descendant of a line of princes who originally came from the Assam Valley. The Cachar kings were forced, by the aggressions of the Ahoms on the north and to the Angami Nagas on the south, to remove and take up their abode on the Mahar river. While settled there, about the beginning or middle of the 17th century, the Cachari king married a daughter of the Tripura Raja and received the valley of Cachar as her dowry, and the capital was transferred to Kampur between 1700 and 1750. Govinda Chandra, the last Rajah of Cachar, was assassinated in 1830 and, as he left no heir natural or adopted, the country was annexed by the British Government on the 14th August 1832- (Aitchinson's Treatise, p. 213)

## MAHOMEDAN PERIOD

It is unnecessary to go through the detailed chronicles of the Rajmala until the first occasion of the Tripura Raj coming into hostile contact with the Mogal domination of Northern India which succeeded the Hindu Rulers.

About 1270 C.a Hindu choudhuri passing through the Tripura Raj, on his way to the Court of the Mogal Subadar at Gour, Complained, that, he had been robbed while passing through the Tripura Raj but had not been able to obtain justice at the hands of the Tripura Officials. The Subadar was only too glad to have an excuse for interfering and invaded Tripura with a large army but was repulsed.

Hari, the 97th Raja, had 18 son of whom Ratna was though younger considered the most intelligent and was sent by his father to travel abroad and gain experience. He visited and resided at the Court of the Mogal Subadar during which stay the Raja Hari died and an elder son ascended. Ratna asked Togrul Khan, the Subadar of the Emperor Balban of Delhi, to help him gain the Raj. This request afforded the Subadar an excellent opportunity for retrieving the before mentioned defeat of the Mogal army. As Stewart relates on page 70 of his 'History of Bengal.'

"In the year 678 Hijri (1279c) he assembled a very numerous army and invaded the Country of Jainagar. After having defeated the Rajah in a general engagement, he plundered the inhabitants, and brought away with him immense wealth and one hundred elephants."

Why Tripura should have been called "Jainagar" by the Mohomedans is not clear, though the historian Farishta mentions a 'Jainagar' to the East of the Brahmaputra and perhaps meant Tripura.

RATNA (1279-1323) having by the help of the Mogal army, defeated his brother had him beheaded and ascended the gadi as Raja in 1279C. Having presented the Subadar with a valuable

ruby the title of Manikya was bestowed on him. Manikya means a perfect ruby of a certain size and shape, and this title has been borne by the Rajas of Tripura ever since.

RATNA MANIKYA died in 1323 C. and was succeeded by his son PRATAP MANIKYA who was defeated by Sultan Iliya Shah, the ruler of Bengal. Pratab Manikya was succeeded by his younger brother MOKUT MOKUNDA who in turn was succeeded by his son MAHA MANIKYA who died in 1407 C. and was succeeded by his son.

DHARMA MANIKYA (1407-14580) Meanwhile Sultan Fakiruddin Sikandar having made himself independent of the Emperor of Delhi became king of Bengal and removed his seat of Government to Sonargaon, South of Dacca. Fakiruddin was taken prisoner by Ali Mobarak in Imperial Official after a short reign of 2 years and 5 months. Ali Mobarak was assassinated after 1 year and 5 months by his foster brother Haji, who took the title of Shamsuddin and made himself of Bengal.

After establishing his authority Shamsuddin invaded the dominions of the Raja of Tripura (Dharma Manikya) in 1483 C. and compelled him to pay a great sum of money and to give him a number of valuable elephants with which he returned in triumph to his Capital (Stewart Page 83). Dharma Manikya in turn attacked and defeated the king of Bengal, Sultan Ahmad Shah and plundered his Capital at Sonargaon. This Raja had the "Dharma Sagar" excavated at Comilla and reduced the great number of human sacrifices to a very small minimum. Dharma Manikya died in 1458.

An Interregnum occurred till 1490, when --

DHANYA MANIKYA (1490-1520) the brother of Pratap Manikya ascended the Gadi. The Tripura Raj was at its Zenith during Dhanya Manikya's reign. In 1512 the Raja sent his General Chuchug Rai, to attack and captured the important Mogal garrison at Chittagong or, as it was named by the Mogals, Islamabad (the Abode of the Faith). To avenge this disgrace Dhanya Manikya was



attacked three times by the Mogals. Hussan Shah the king Jaunpur, had contested the Empire with the Emperor Sultan Beloli and had, on being defeated, taken refuge at the court of Allauddin, king of Bengal. Hussan Shah was sent at the head of a vast army gathered from the 12 Provinces of Bengal to invade Tripura. He captured the fort at Meharkul, near Comilla, and proceeded up to Gumati River to attack the Capital at Udaipur. But the Tripuras dammed up the river at Sonamore, where the river debouches into the plains, and suddenly cutting the duke at night, the Mogal encampment was swept away and most of the Soldiers drowned. Shortly after this disastrous failure the Magals again invaded Tripura under Haitan Khan and attempted, to attack Udaipur but were similarly drowned by an artificial flood created in the narrow valley below Debtamore. A third invasion was defeated at Kasba.

Finding the Mogal horsemen such excellent cavalry and having none of his own, the Raja of Tripura engaged a large number of Mogal Sawars. When 1000 of them mutinied for arrears of pay and marched on Chittagong then a Tripura garrison, the mutineers were over taken and defeated and those of them captured alive were beheaded at the Temple of the Chaudadebta at Udaipur. To avenge this wholesale sacrificial slaughter the Mogal King sent a force of 3000 Cavalry and 6000 infantry, under Mohammad Khan. At first he was successful and the Tripuras lost their Commander, but shortly after the Mogals were defeated and the General captured. He too was sent in a cage to the Temple and sacrificed to the Chaudadevatas.

श्रीश्रीचतुर्दश देवताः ।

हरोमा हरिमा वाणी कुमार गणपा विधिः ।

क्षमाब्धि गङ्गा शिखी कामी हिमाद्रिश्च चतुर्दश ॥

शिव, दुर्गा, विष्णुः, लक्ष्मीः, सरस्वती, कार्तिकेयः, गणेशः, विरिञ्चिः,

पृथिवी, समुद्रः, गङ्गा, अग्निः, प्रह्वन्नः, हिमाद्रिः, एताः चतुर्दश देवताः ।

1. Hara or Siva, the Destroyer in the Hindu Trinity.
2. Uma or Durga the Consort of Siva.
3. Hari or Vishnu the preserver in the



Hindu Trinity . 4. Ma or Lakshmi, the Consort of Vishnu and the goddess of prosperity. 5. Bani or Saraswati goddess of knowledge. 6. Kumara or Kartikeya, the god of War and the Commander in-Chief of the gods. 7. Ganapa or Ganesha, god of Wisdom. 8. Bidhu or Chandra the Moon. 9. Ka or Brahma, the Creator in the Hindu Trinity. 10. Abdhi the god of the Ocean or Water. 11. Ganga, the most Sacred river of the Hindus. 12. Sekhi or Agni, the god of Fire. 13. Kama the god of Love. 14. Himadri, the Himalaya Mountains.

The images of these Chaudadevatas are made of Astadhanu an alloy of the eight (Sacred) metals viz, gold, silver, lead, tin, copper, iron, antimony and zinc. Originally the figures were about half life size, but now for some reason there are only the heads with a portion of the neck.

The sacrificial worship of these Devatas is duly maintained but goats are sacrificed now instead of human beings as in olden days. The Priests are a special class known as Chuntais and the Chief Chuntai, according to a very ancient custom, wears a golden sacred thread (Paitya or Janeo) and rules for 3 days in the year. This period is called the Ker during which he and his priests or Galims are supreme, now a days only symbolically.

Dhanya Manikya died in 1520 and was succeeded by his son---

DEVA MANIKYA (1520-1535 c.) - This Raja was defeated at Islamabad (Chittagong) by the Mogals under Sultan Nasrath Shah. On Deva Manikya's death the Chuntai High Priest set up the late Raja's nephew, Panchkauri Thakur as :-

INDRA MANIKYA, but both were killed by the Military Party within the year.

BIJAY MANIKYA (1535-1583) the son of Deb Manikya succeeded and was a powerful ruler. He defeated the Mughls at Chittagong. He also regained what are now the British Districts of Sylhet, Tipperah and Noakhali. He also had a canal excavated between the Hills and Kasba, known as the Bejai Naddi. Collecting

an army of 26,000. Infantry and 5,000 Cavalry the Raja crossed them over the Megna in, 5,000 boats to Sonargaon, the Mogal Capital of Bengal, but contented himself with laying waste the country. Crossing the Brahmaputra (then flowing in its old channel round the Garo Hills and through the modern district of Maimensing) into Sylhet. He had a large number of great tanks dug for the supply of good drinking water as an act of piety.

ANANTA MANIKYA (1583-1585) the son of Bijai Manikya declared war against the Mugh Raja Sikandar Shah (the Mugh Rulers gave themselves Mahammadan names) but was repulsed owing to the assistance of Portuguese gunners whom the Mugh Raja engaged. The Portuguese under the leadership of Sebastian gonsalez were mutinous sailors who killed their officers and going off with their ships and driving away the Mogal Fouzdar made their headquarters in the Island of Sandip Off the coasts of Chittagong and Noakhali at the head of the Bay of Bengal. Having built a fort and firmly established themselves the Portuguese became Pirates and preyed upon the Coasts from the mouth of the Hugli river along the Sunderbans, the mouths of the Ganges, Megna, Feni, Karnafully and Naaf rivers and from thence Southwards along the coast of Aracan. Being excellent gunners and having armed ships at their command these Portuguese took a large and deciding part in the politics and history of Eastern Bengal including Aracan. They entered the service of the Mugh Rajas, then of the Rajas of Tripura fighting for the against these potentates and impartially plundering every trader they came across. The Raja of Tripura engaged 8 of these Portuguese Ganners and their debased descendants by low women of the country. Still inhabit Miriamnaggar, between Old and New Agartala.

However to resume the history Annanta Manikya. Having been repulsed by the Mugh Raja, Sikander Shah, Annanta Manikya sent a larger army under the command of his three sons. One of the sons was killed by a wounded elephant and the Tripuras were repulsed. The Mughs followed up their victory marched on

Rangamati and Sacked the Capital. Gopi Prasad the Tripura Commander-in-Chief strangled his son-in-law Annanta Manikya and set himself up as--

UDAI MANIKYA (1585-1596) and changed the named of the capital from Rangamati to Udaipur, after himself, and it is still known by that name. He was succeeded by his son--

JAI MANIKYA (1596-1597) and in turn was succeeded by the brother of Bijai Manikya named :-

AMAR MANIKYA (1597-1611) fought the Mughls and was defeated. The Mughls took Chittagong and plundered Udaipur. The Zaminder of Taraf in Sylhet refused to supply labourers to dig tanks and was attacked by 12,000 Tripura troops, taken prisoner and brought in a cage to Udaipur. The great tank at Udaipur was excavated by this Raja and named after himself Amar Sagar. He was succeeded by his son--

RAJIDHAR MANIKYA (1611-1613) - The Mogals attacked the Tripuras but were defeated. This Raja was accidentally drowned in the river Gumti on which Udaipur the Capital is situated.

JASADHAR MANIKYA (1613-1623) the son of Rajdhar Manikya I succeeded and was at constant war with the Mogals. The Emperor of Delhi Jahangir required his Generals to procure elephants and a large army of Mogals under Nawab Futeh Jung invaded Tripura in 1620. After long and severe fighting Jasadhar Manikya was defeated and taken captive and together with a large booty and numerous elephants was sent to the Emperor at Delhi. Here the Raja was offered his freedom and restoration on condition of agreeing to paying an annual tribute of elephants. This the Raja declined and retired to Brindaban, where he died in his 72nd year, after having founded the *Kunja* of Rash Behari the Family God, and where the ashes (asti) of departed Tripura Rajas are buried to this day. Brindaban is peculiarly sacred to the followers of Vishnu, among whom the Rajas of Tripura rank very high. The descendants of Nityananda, whose name is associated with the great Vishnuvite. Revivalist Chaitanya are settled at the Court of

Tripura and are the Raja's *gurus* of Spiritual Guides.

Meanwhile the Raj was wasted by the Mogals and Sarkar Udaipur was formed and governed by Mogal Governors between 1623-1625 during which there was an Interregnum. It should be noted that, to avoid the attacks of the Portuguese Pirates, who sailed up the great Megna, river the Mogals had moved their Capital or seat of the Subadar from Sonargaon to Dacca, situated on the Buriganga a narrowee and Shallower river than the mighty Megna on which Sonargaon was situated. Sebastian Gonsalex the leader of the Pirates and founder of their fortified settlement in the Island of Sandip, had married a daughter of the Mugh Raja of Aracan and driven out the Mogal Fouzder from Sandip. This naturally enraged the Mogal Subadar and he determined to crush the Portuguese and punish all the Rajas who had either employed or sheltered them. Hence the fierce onslaught on Tripura and ultimate defeat and captivity of Jasadhar Manikya. Another and more frequent reason for invading Tripura was that the Emperor of Delhi required a great and regular supply of elephants for State and war purposes and the Hills of Tripura abounding then as now with great numbers of these animals, tempted the frequent Mogal invasions and demands for them as tribute.

KALYAN MANIKYA (1625-1659) a relative or gyanti Bhrata of the childness Jasadhar Manikya was elected by the Tripuras to be Raja, Kalyan Manikya defied the Mogals and refused to pay any tribute. During his reign of 24 years there was incessant conflict between the increasing Mogal Power and towards the end these persistent efforts succeeded and Kalyan Manikya had to submit to Sultan Suja Khan. The great tank at Kasba named Kalyan Sagar was excavated in this reign.

It may be noted here, that, the present Raja is descended from Kalyan Manikya through his eldest son Govinda Manikya.

GOVINDA MANIKYA (1659-1660) and again from (1666-1669) was the eldest son and Juvaraj of Kalyan Manikya. He was defeated and dethroned by his half-brother Nakshatra Rai who



usurped the Gadi as ---

**CHATTRA MANIKYA (1660-1666)** Chatrakhila near Comilla in the Raza's Zemindari of Chakla Roshunabad in the British District of Tipperah, is most probably named after Chattra Manikya. The French Traveller Tavernier (1605-1689) visited the Raj during this reign as is related in his Travels (between 1661 and 1668) in which he also gives an illustration of one of Chattra Manikya's coins.

On the death of Chattra Manikya Govinda Manikya the rightful Raja regained the Gadi and during his second reign of three years had the wash lands of Pargana Maherkul in Chakla Roshunabad brought under cultivation and also had the great tank in Jajiara excavated and named "Gun-Sagar" after his Rani Gunavati Mahadevi on the death of Govinda Manikya his eldest son and Juvaraj---

**RAM MANIKYA (1669-1682)** ascended the Gadi and caused the great tank in Majkhara, called 'Ram Sagar', to be excavated. He was succeeded by his eldest son and Juvaraj –

**RATAN MANIKYA (1682 - 1682)** – During his minority his Uncle Narendra, the second son of Govinda Manikya seized the Gadi.

**NARENDRA MANIKYA (1682-1684)** after an usurpation of two years was displaced by the Nawab Nazim of Bengal to whom Ratna had appealed for assistance.\

**RATNA MANIKYA (1684-1712)** regained the Gadi and had the great temple of Jaggernath called 'Sattr-Ratna' built in the neighbourhood of Commilla in :Pargana Maherkul, Chakla Roshunabad. Towards the end of the 17th century Ratna Manikya shook off the Mogal yoke. Stewart in his "History of Bengal" (page 372) based upon if not translated and arranged from the 14 best Mahamadan Historians of the Mogal Period, thus describes the relationship that existed between the Emperors of Delhi and the Rajas of Tripura during the long continued efforts made by various Mogal kings and Governors to bring the Tripura Raj under the



Mogal yoke— Writing of 1708 during the reign of Ratna Manikya and the Government of the Nawab Nazim Mahamad Murshid Kuli Khan, the greatest of the Mogal Subadars of Bengal Behar and Orissa and founder of Murshidabad, the last seat of the Mogal Government in Bengal, says---

"The Rajas of Tripura, Cooch Behar and Assam, whose countries, although they had been overrun by the Mahomedan arms, had never been perfectly subdued, and who therefore, continued to spread the umbrella of independence and to stamp the coins in their own names, were so impressed with the idea of the power and abilities of Mahamad Cooly Khan, that they forwarded to him valuable presents consisting of elephants, wrought and unwrought ivory, musk, amber and various other articles in token of their submission, in return for which the Nawab sent them *Khilats* or honorary dresses by the receipt, and putting on of which they acknowledged his superiority. This interchange of presents and compliments became an annual custom during the whole time of his government without either party attempting to recede from or advance beyond the implied line of conduct."

Ghaneshyam Thakur the 2nd son of Ram Manikya and next brother of Ratna Manikya murdered the Raja and usurped the gadi as --

MAHENDRA MANIKYA from 1712 to 1714 when Durjaya Deb as :-

DHARMA MANIKYA (1714-1733) the next younger brother of Ram Manikya and the Juvaraj appointed by him succeeded to the Gadi in lawful succession.

During this reign in 1730 Jagat Ram, the great grandson of Chattra Manikya and grand nephew of Govinda Manikya and according to the Hindu custom of relationship, nephew of Dharma Manikya, displeased his uncle (Dharma Manikya) and was banished from the country. Jagat Ram took refuge with a Mahammadan Zeminder named Aka Sadik and entreated him to assist him in recovering the *Gadi* usurped by his great grandfather

Chattra Manikya or Nakshattra Rai, the second son of Kalyan Manikya. The Zemindar being intimately acquainted with Mir Habbib, the Dewan of the Naib Nazim at Dacca, recommended the cause of Jagat Ram to the Dewan and pointed out the favorable opportunity it would offer of subjecting Tripura to the Mogals, Mir Habbib having represented the circumstances to the Naib Nazim, obtained permission to proceed with all the troops that were in the vicinity of Dacca to effect this objects. The Mogal troops crossed the Brahmaputra (which then flowed in its old course to the East of Dacca and joined the Megna, the western boundary of the Raj) and entered Tripura under the guidance of Jagat Ram before the Raja was aware of their intention. The Mogals reached the Capital before the Raja could make any preparations to oppose them and he fled to the hills and Jagat Ram was raised to the Gadi as --

JAGAT MANIKYA (1732-1733) upon condition of paying a large portion of the revenue to the Nawab Nazim. The whole country in the plains quietly submitted and thus the Province of Tripura, which from time immemorial had been an independent Kingdom became annexed to the Mogal Empire. Although the Northern and Western portions of the Tripura plains, or the modern British Districts of Sylhet Tipperah and Noakhali, had been included by Raja Todar Mall, the famous Finance Minister, in the Emperor Akbar's rent roll (*tauji*) in 1582, yet they were not conquered and brought into subjection by the British till long afterwards as will be related in due course. However the Naib Nazim was much pleased at Mir Habbib's success and changed the name of Tripura to Roshunabad or the "Abode of Light", probably because it was the Eastern limit of the Empire where the Sun first rose on the Mogal dominions; In order to support the young Usurper. Jagat Manikya against Dharma Manikya and at the same time to secure his fealty, a considerable number of Mahammadan troops were left in the country under the command of Aka Sadik, the Zemindar who had first befriended Jagat Ram, and who nominated Fouzdar. However in 1733 the Usurper was displaced from the Gadi by order of the

Nawab Nazim whose ear Dharma Manikya reached, through the great banker Jagat Seth of Azimgunj near Murshidabad.

DHARMA MANIKYA (1733-1733) ascended the *gadi* for the second time. The great tank of Kasba called the 'Dharma Sagar' was excavated by this Raja, who appointed Chandramaani, his younger brother, Juvaraj. In due course Chandramaani Juvaraj ascended the *Gadi* as --

MUKUNDA MANIKYA (1733-1737) and after a short reign was displaced by Rudramani Thakur a great-great-grandson of Kalyan Manikya by his 4th son Rajballov Thakur and who ascended the *Gadi* as --

JAI MANIKYA (1737-1739) and named the Pargana Maherkul, of Chakla Roshunabad, after himself as "Jainagar". After an equally short usurpation, Jai Manikya was displaced by the assistance of the Naib Nazim at Dacca in favour of Panchkouri Thakur, a son of Mukunda Manikya and who ascended the *gadi* as;;

INDRA MANIKYA (1739-1743) - The country was rent between the followers of Jai Manikya & Indra Manikya and Jai Manikya again received the *Sannad* of the Naib Nazim, but Gadadhar Thakur, the son of Dharma Manikya managed to *secure* the favour of Nawab Nazim and ascended the *Gadi* for a short time as--

Udai Manikya and was displaced by --

JAI MANIKYA (for the second time) and who in his turn was deposed, by the assistance of Ali Verdi Khan Nawab Nazim of Bengal.

INDRA MANIKYA returned to the *Gadi* for the second time and in turn was displaced by --

JAI MANIKYA who ascended for the third time, when Haridhan Thakur, his youngest brother, deposed Jai Manikya and usurped the *Gadi* as--

BEJAYA MANIKYA and received *Sannad* from the Nawab, but falling into arrears of revenue was sent as a prisoner to Delhi and --

**SHAMSHER GAZI**, a notorious Mussalman plunderer in the districts of Tipperah, Noakhali and Chittagong, having obtained authority in Pargana Dakhinsik, proclaimed himself ruler of Roshunabad and agreed to pay revenue to the Mogals. He caused great tanks to be excavated in Dakhinsik, his native Pargana and named after himself. Shamsheer was at the same time generous with his plunder to both Hindus and Mahammadans.

Shamsheer Gazi set up Banamali Thakur the elder son of Gadadhar Thakur (the Usurper Udai Manikya) the son of Dharma Manikya as a Raja with the title of -

**LAKSHAN MANIKYA** but the Tripuras would not accept him as Raja or follow his standard- But his many cruelties and oppressions caused the Nawab to have Shamsheer Gazi arrested, sent to Dacca and blown away from a cannon after 12 years of lawlessness.

Meanwhile the Emperor of Delhi in 1740 conferred on Nawazish Khan, the nephew and eldest son-in-law of Nawab Nazim Ali Verdi Khan (1740-1756) the titles of Shahamat Junj (Stewart Pages 446-447).

"And that these titles should be supported with proper dignity the Nawab (Ali Verdi Khan) conferred on Nawazish Khan the Government of Dacca to which he annexed the districts of Sylhet, Trippera and Chittagong with permission to perform the Office (of Naib Nazim) by deputy.

After Shamsheer Gazi's arrest and execution at Dacca, Krishnamani Thakur brother of Indian Manikya and grandson of Makunda Manikya, ascended the Gadi as :-

**KRISHNA MANIKYA** (1760-1783)- A year after this Raja's accesssion in 1761, the English East India Company appeared on the scene, being invoked by the Mogals under the following circumstances. A Treaty dated 7th February 1759 had been entered into between the Nawab Nazim Siraj-ud-Daula (the grandson and successor of Nawab Nazim Ali Verdi Khan, who died in 1756) and the English East India Company. Circumstances



with which this history has no concern, led to the downfall of Siraj-ud-Daula and the putting of his brother-in-law Mir Jafer in the Nizamat. A Treaty was entered into with Mir Jafer confirming the one made with Siraj-ud-Daula. The II Article of this Treaty recites "that the enemies of the English are my enemies whether they be Indians or Europeans." And by an additional Article XIII, the English Company agreed as follows:-

"And further that we shall assist him to the utmost against all his enemies whatsoever, as soon as he calls upon us for that end."

It was this addition of Article XIII that led to the English Company interfering with Tripura affairs in a most high handed and unscrupulous manner in 1761.

Chittagong was one of the first Districts of Bengal which passed into the possession of the East India Company. In 1760 the Company deposed Mir Jafer and elevated his son-in-law Mir Kasim Ali to the Nizamat. By an Article of a Treaty, dated 27th September 1760 the concluded with Mir Kasim Ali, the Districts of Burdwan, Midanpore and Chittagong were ceded to the Company by the Nizam and this cession was finally confirmed by the Emperor Shah Alam by a *Firman* dated 12th August 1765 granting the Dewani of the 3 Subas to the English Company.

The outlying and remote position of Chittagong led the Company to give a strong Government to Chittagong. On the 8th November 1760 Mr Verelst was appointed Chief of Chittagong and together with a Council managed the Company's affairs on the spot.



## ENGLISH PERRIOD

On the 20th January 1761 Governor Vansittart wrote from Calcutta to the President and Council of the Factory at Islamabad (Chittagong) as follows :-

“With regard to the Tipperah Rajah, as the Nawab’s Foujdar has been obliged from his ill behaviour to take up arms against him we desire that you will use your endeavours to reduce him due state of obedience to the Government of Islamabad, acquainting us then what advantages may accrue to the Company from the possession of that Country, and we will answer any representations the Nawab (the Nizam) may make on the subject.”

This frank exposition of the greed for their neighbour’s property, which alone seemed to guide the action of the Company’s representatives and the calm assumption, that, because the Nizam had ceded, “the Thanna of Chittagong” to the Company the Government of Islamabad became the lords of the whole of Eastern Bengal and required to reduce him (the Independent Raja of Tripura) to his due obedience to the Company, not to the Nawab Nazim, is as astounding as it is shameless. There never could be any dispute about what the Nizam granted to the Company as the “Thanna of Islamabad or Chittagong” by a *Sanad* (see Aitchison Vol.1 page 48) . The river Feni had been its Northern boundary from time immemorial, separating it from the Tripura Raj and the rest of Eastern Bengal. Further the concluding words quoted-”and we will answer any representations the Nawab may make on the subject” clearly show, that, a guilty idea was at the back of Governor Vansittart’s mind.’

“In accordance with this order Mr. Verelst, the Chief at Islamabad despatched Lieutenant Mathew with 200 Sepoys and two guns to Tipperah where he found the Nawab’s Dewan was already operating with Mohammedan troops. The Dewan had

reported that he had oblige the Rajah to take to the mountains, and had got possession of every fort in the country. On the arrival of our troops the Rajah at once put himself in their hands.

Poor innocent ! No doubt, trusting to the supposed notions of English honour and honesty, as contrasted with that of the Mogals, Krishna, Manikya expected to get fair treatment, but found that he had only escaped from the cruel claws of the Moghal tiger to fall into the rapacious jaws of the English lion!

"A Collector of revenue was despatched from Chittagong with instructions to enquire into the resources of the country and demand payment of the expenses of the expedition. The Collector found the province desolated by the Nawab's troops and was compelled to take payment by installments 'as the Rajah was very low in cash.' The revenue for the first year was fixed at one lakh and one Sicca rupees."

This callous disregard of the crudest ideas of chivalry and honesty by a treading Company's servants, shown in the above quotations from Meckanize (pages 271-272), is followed by two equally shameless paragraphs, showing how even a high official of the Crown had become infected with no higher ideas and his sentiments are those of one who would appear to have suffered a personal loss by the Rajas of Tripura being allowed to retain even a scrap of their immemorial Raj, after the Mogals had robbed them of the fairest and greatest portions and the English Company had intervened, under the hypocritical guise of respecting " a more scrap of paper," the Treaty with the Nizam of Bengal, and robbing the robbers !

However to return to the unfortunate Krishna Manikya in 1761, when the Mogals had forced him into the Hills and the English had deprived him of the Plains. Being thus restricted in territory, subjects and revenue the Raja had next to contend against Balaram Thakur, the son of the usurper Jagat Manikya, who collected a considerable following of Hill tribes and ousted Krishna Manikya and proclaimed himself-

**BALARAM MANIKYA** in 1876 for a year or so when he in turn was ousted by the rightful Raja.

**KRISHNA MANIKYA (1777 to 1783)**. Having refused to settle with the English for his Plains territory, of which the Company had so unjustly deprived him, these were “attached” and placed under the direct control of the Company’s local Officer, who took all the revenue and doled out a pittance to the rightful Raja ! After having a tank excavated in Comilla and naming it after his Consort “ Rani Dighi” the Raja died childless leaving his widow, the Rani Jahnabi Mahadevi, and a nephew Rajdharmani Thakur. Several Claimants came forward for the vacant throne each putting forward a different, and, in his own estimation, a better title than his rivals ! However the Company’s Resident took the view, that, no one could deny that the widow was the Rani and recommended her being placed on the disputed throne. The Rani, as a pious Hindu Widow, wished to be cremated with her husband, but acceding to the prayers of her subjects, who had just grounds for fearing that, the Company would have an excuse for taking the Kingless Hills, as they had taken the Plains territory, she unwillingly agreed to occupy the vacant throne till a male occupant was found. Meanwhile she had the *Chito* or funeral pyre kept alight, in order to be cremated when left in peace to follow her Hindu wifely wish and actually became a *Sati* in 1785.

**JAHNABI MAHADEVI** reigned from 1783 to 1785 and, with a woman’s common sense and regard for justice and equity, requested the Company to accept Rajdarmani Thakur, her childless husband’s nephew and successor, selected by himself, as the Raja and Durgamani Thakur, son of Lakhan Manikya, who had been pitchforked on to the throne by Shamsheer Gazi, as Juvaraj, so that both the Principal Claimants should be satisfied ! The Company accepted the Rani’s suggestion and consequently-

**RAJDHAR MANIKYA (1785-1804)** as Rajdharmani Thakur called himself, ascended the vacant throne but had hardly seated himself thereon when he was accused by the Company’s Officials

of "harbouring Dacoits" and deported to Chittagong while the Plains territory was again promptly "attached". Thus the unfortunate Raja was deprived of his *Gadi* and of his Plains territory as well till 1792, when, by some miracle of right dealing, he was restored his liberty and his territories. But not until the Raja had perforce entered into a "settlement" whereby he had to agree to pay an annual revenue for Chakla Roshanabad, as, in the words of Mackenzie. "The Company sought rupees, not elephants, and so the hills were left to their native rulers !"

A Rajbati and Tehsil Cutchery were built at Mugra in Porgana Meharkul, Chakla Roshanabad and the Bazar attached was named "Rajdharganj". In 1800 the Raja empowered his son Ramganga to exercise full authority. This act of paternal affection led to very serious trouble on Rajdhar Manikya's death, in 1804, when instead of allowing the recognized Juvaraj Durgamani to succeed, Ramganga, formulated the doctrine, that, the Raja's son was, as the Raja's son, the rightful successor and that the title if Juvaraj was merely a honorific. Being in possession of Chakla Roshnabad, from which the main income of the Raj was derived, Ramganga paid the Company's Collector the revenue and was acknowledged by that Revenue Official as the *de facto* Raja- But the Company's Judge, having a judicial way o viewing such questions, took a legal rather than a pecuniary view of Durgamani's Juvarajship and championed his cause. The higher Officials, representing the Company of Traders, "sought rupees, not elephants" consequently they took a very benevolent view of Ramganga's doctrine, since he was the one who gave them the coveted rupees. So Durgamani Juvaraj, the legal minded *Judge's de jure protege* was referred to the Civil Court to prove his legal claims to the Revenue paying Chakla Roshanabad, promising to recognize him as Raja, if the courts declared him to be the legal revenue paying person for the Chakla, as the rightful Raja.

The Company was yet only the Emperor Shah Alam's revenue collecting Dewan, by virtue of the Firman of 12th August



1765, granted by His Majesty in gratitude for the Company defeating the rebellious Wazer of Oudh and restoring to him the Districts of Allahabad and Kora and contributing 26 Lakhs of rupees a year to the Imperial purse from the Revenues of Bengal, Behar and Orissa. Furthermore the Company were yet essentially Traders, seeking rupees or that which produced them. Consequently the ideas of justice, equity and fair dealing with Indian Rajas and other Rulers found no place in the mercantile and pecuniary minds of its officials, who shuffled out of the difficulty of enquiring in an imperial and political manner as to whether the Juvaraj was the rightful successor to the vacant throne or he who bluntly stated, that a Raja's son was the Raja's successor and strengthened his argument by paying the necessary rupees to the Company. Thus the deciding of a claim to a throne was relegated to a Municipal Court in 1805, until the High Court at Calcutta throw out a similar suit about 80 years, later, by stating that a Municipal Court could not be used as a Kingmaker :

However to return to the concrete example of Durgamani Juvaraj claiming the throne of Tripura *via* the Zemindari of Chakla Roshanabad. On Rajdhar Manikya's death, as has been stated, Ramganga seized the throne, having possession of the Zemindari during his late father's reign. Had he been able to seize Durgamani Juvaraj as well he would speedily have made himself *de jure* as well as *de facto* Raja ! Durgamani, however escaped and lost no time in gathering together men and means for the expulsion of the usurper. All the feelings of the people turned to the anointed Juvaraj. Ramganga was disliked for the sacrilege of his conduct and the tyranny and suspicion which he so frequently evinced. Durgamani was soon able to advance on his expedition, but the British Officials interfered and insisted on his bringing a suit to establish his right to the Zemindari, promising to postpone recognition of the Raja until the case was concluded. Durgamani perforce had to acquiesce in this decision and Ramganga remained in possession of Chakla Roshanabad. The evidence of the principal Officers of



the Raj was entirely in Durgamani's favour. At length on the 24th March 1809 the Sadar Dewani Adalat, the highest Court in India, as its successor the High Court is now, gave judgement in Durgamani Juvaraj's favour, declaring the "Zemindari to Chakla Roshanabad to be an integral portion of an impartible Raj to which he, as nominated Juvaraj, should succeed. The Company accordingly invested him with the insignia of Kingship as regards the Hill Territory, while the Civil Court gave him possession of the lands in the Plains." As Mr. Meckenzie remarked "years of misery might have been avoided had the company assumed the paramount position which the application for recognition had virtually recognized. The Raj and the Zemindari being treated as impartible the Company might well have decided at once whom it would accept as heir." But the Trader mind and instincts had not risen to such a political height and no more rupees were to be had from Durgamani than from Ramganga.

During the year Ramganga had been in possession of the Chakla he erected several houses, a temple and excavated the great tank named "Ganga Sagar" after himself at Mugra, completing what his father Rajdhar Manikya had begun.

DURGA MANIKYA (1809-1813) the son of Lakhan Manikya, the Juvaraj nominated by Krishna Manikya and his Consort Rani Jahnabi Mahadevi, was a peaceful and pious Raja and named the Bazar at Sib Sagar "Mahadayagunj" after his Mother. Being childless he went on a pilgrimage to Kasi (Benares) and died *en route* of cholera at Patna on the Ganges. He had made no appointment of Juvaraj, hoping for a son, but had left Ramganga in charge of the Raj during his absence.

RAMGANGA MANIKYA (1813-1826) naturally asked for recognition and investiture from the Company. But the poison of litigation having once entered the Raj there were several Claimants to the throne and Ramganga's title was disputed by Arjunmani Thakur and others. But so strong appears to have been the reverence entertained by the people for the customs of the Raj,

that Ramganga had now no difficulty in securing their allegiance as the son of Rajdhar Manikya, the Raja before Durga Manikya, who died childless and had made no appointment of a successor. However Arjunmani Thakur, claimed the vacant throne among other Claimants.

In order to understand Arjunmani's claim we must go back to Haramani Juvaraj the son of Mukunda Manikya (1733-1737). Haramani died during his Juvaraji leaving two sons, Kanthamani and Rajdharmani. The former and elder son was born lame and therefore according to Hindu law and custom, could not become a Hindu Raja, being maimed. Consequently the younger brother Rajdharmani was selected as a successor by Krishna Manikya and also by his Rani, Jahnabi Mahadevi. But Kanthamani Thakur had a son Arjunmani, the first cousin of Ramganga. So that, when Durga Manikya died childless and having nominated no one as a successor, then Arjunmani of the elder branch claimed the throne as preferential to Ramganga of the younger branch. But, as Ramganga was in possession, having been left in charge by Durga Manikya, when he went on a pilgrimage, during which he died, as already related, and had been paying the revenue of Chakla Roshanabad to the Company and no doubt also owing to his being Rajdhar Manikya's son and *de facto* Zemindar, if not Raja, before Durgamani Juvaraj was able to substantiate his claim to the throne in a civil Court, as the rightful Zemindar, the Company's Officials continued to accept the revenue from Ramganga, and, as before, referred the Claimant Arjunmani to the Civil Court, to substantiate his claim, meanwhile postponing formal recognition of Ramganga or whoever might succeed. The Sadar Dewani Adalat (Select Reports for 1815-Vol.II page 177, Urjun Munik Thakur and others *versus* Ramganga Deo) decided that Ramganga had the preferential right to the Zemindari. However as this decision of the Sadar Adalat was only a summary decision in Ramganga's favour, the unsuccessful Claimants filed three regular suits, which were not finally decided till 1821, when the Company formally invested

Ramganga as the Raja. Ramganga Manikya then formally appointed his younger half brother Kasichandra as the Juvaraj and his own son Krishna Kishore as Bara Thakur. This latter dignity, as will be seen later on, was the cause of an immense amount of litigation, trouble and expense. Ramganga Manikya was a very peaceful man, who practically left the conduct of affairs to his younger half brother Kasichandra after appointing him Juvaraj. The large tank to the South-West of the Palace at Notunhaveli (New Residence) or New Agartala, was excavated by Ramganga Manikya and named after himself. During this reign a great injustice was committed by the company's local Officials against the Tripura Raj by lopping off a large portion of the territory in the Northern portion of the State south of the Kusiya River, which formed for centuries the Northern boundary of the State and the southern boundary of the district of Sylhet. It will be necessary to go back for several centuries to understand how the Kusiya River became at length the Northern boundary (in part) of the Tripura Raj.

Previous to the Mogal occupation of portions of India to the East of the Brahmaputra, which originally flowed round the western end of the Garo Hills and then nearly due south, through the British district of Maimaansing, and then curved west and flowed into the Megna, and thus formed the western boundary of the Tripura Raj. In 590 A.D. Raja Biraj extended his conquests beyond even the Ganges, which also then flowed in a S.E. course, through the districts of Faridpur and Bakargunj, before entering the Bay of Bengal, the Tripura Raj comprised the present British districts of Chittagong, Noakhali, Tipperah, Sylhet, Cachar, the Garo-Khasia and Jaintia Hills, Lushailand and the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Consequently the district of Sylhet formed a part of the Raj. Subsequently "the district (Sylhet) was at one time divided into at least three petty kingdoms :- Gor or Sylhet proper Laur and Jaintia; and the Country south of the Kusiya seems to have been under the control of the Raja of Hill Tippera "(See page 191 Volume XXIII Imperial Gazetteer of India) " Gor was conquered by the

Muhammadans in 1384 A.D. the last Hindu King Gour Govinda being overcome more by the magic of the Fakir, Shah Jalal, than by the prowess of the Officer in command of the expedition, Sikandar Ghazi. After the death of Shah Jalal, Gor was included in the kingdom of Bengal and placed in charge of a Nawab. In the reign of Akbar (Emperor of Delhi) it passed with the rest of Bengal into the hands of the Mogals; and, in the time of this Emperor, Laur was also conquered, though its rulers were for some time entrusted with the charge of the frontier, and were exempt from the payment of land revenue." However the district of Sylhet was not finally lost to the Tripura Raj till the Nizamat of Nawab Ali Verdi Khan, who in 1740 A.D. conferred on his son-in-law, Nawzish Khan the government of Dacca, to which he annexed the districts of Sylhet, Tipperah and Chittagong (see Stewart's History of Bengal page 447). Gor (Sylhet) and Laur were included in Bengal when the British obtained the Dewani of that Province in 1765. Jaintia was never conquered by the Mohammedans and retained its independence till 1835, when it was annexed by the British Government, as no satisfaction could be obtained for the murder of three British subjects, who had been kidnapped and sacrificed to the goddess Kali. During the early days of British rule, Sylhet, lying on the outskirts of the Company's territories was much neglected. The population was turbulent, means of communication were difficult, and the arts of civilization were in a backward condition. The savage tribes living in the North and South of the valley disturbed the peace of the plains and there were continual disputes as to the boundary between British territory and the Native State of Hill Tippera (the Tripura Raj).

In 1820 Lieutenant Fisher of the Survey Department, was deputed to ascertain the boundaries of Sylhet and sent in a Report and a Map through the Magistrate of Sylhet. Although, as appears from the quotation above made, (from the Imperial Gazetteer of India Vol. XXIII page 191 New Edition 1908 published under the authority of His Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council)



“and the Country South of the Kusiara (river) seems to have been under the control of the Raja of Hill Tippera” yet by a process of reasoning and action peculiar to the Company’s Officials and in spite of this well known fact of the Tripura Raj extending North to the Kusiara river, Lieutenant Fisher laid down and the various higher Officials calmly lopped off hundreds of square miles of most valuable agricultural land, as well as an equal or greater area of hill land on which there are now all the Tea Gardens of South Sylhet with their thousands of acres of the finest tea land, both worth crores of rupees, the revenues and rents, of which are enjoyed by the Company’s successors :

This robbery of territory on the Tripura- Sylhet border did not stop there, for when the neighbouring district of Cachar came into the Company’s possession, by the assassination of the last and heirless Raja, Govind Chandra, in 1830, in the reign of his successor Kasichandra Manikya the same process, but if anything on a larger scale, was adopted.

KASICHANDRA MANIKYA (1826-1830) appointed his own son Krishanchandra the Bara Thakur but he pre-deceased his father and Krishnakishor the son and Bara Thakur of Ramganga Manikya was appointed Juvaraj by his uncle now sonless. Kasichandra Manikya begun building a palace on the Eastern bank of the “Amar Sagar” the great tank at Udaipur but removed his residence to Agartala. The origin of this name, that of the present Capital of the Tripura Raj, is obscure, but the most probable derivation is from the name of a respectable landholder, one Agar Mahammad, whose descendants are still living and in Raj employ. It may be mentioned, that the original Agartala or Puranhaveli (old Residence) as it is popularly called, is some four miles East up the Haura river and that the Notunhaveli (New Residence) or what is now officially known as Agartala and the residence of the late and present Raja, is lower down the Haura River. About the only event of this reign was the offer made the Company by Sambhuchandra Thakur the grandson of Bijai Manikya (Haridhan



Thakur) the youngest brother of Jai Manikya, both father and son being usurpers during the troublous times from 1737 to 1760, when six members of the Tripura Raj family and the notorious Shamsheer Gazi, in turn usurped the throne or power of the Raj, chiefly through the machinations and assistance of the Mogals. Sambhuchandra Thakur offered the Company's local Officials to farm, as an Ijaradar or Thikadar (Farmer), the Hill territory at an annual rental of Rs.25,000/- : As Mackenzie explains "This offer was rejected as they had been so long unasessed and had come to be looked upon as independent territory". This was not the first example of such impudence, directly encouraged by the behaviour of the Trading Company's Officials towards the Rajas of Tripura. The former instance happened when Ramganga was trying to oust Durgamani Juvaraj. At Ramganga's request the local Officers lent him troops and police and but for this assistance he would have been expelled, for the whole country was hostile to him and his claims. Durgamani Juvaraj had obtained the assistance of the Poitu Kukis, whom Ramganga had oppressed, to help him enforce his right to succession as the Juvaraj. When the Company's troops and police confronted the Kukis, these Hillmen did not understand the Company's action and boldly charged its Officials with inconsistency, for they had been told some years before that "the Company had no concern with the Tripura territory"! On this Mackenzie remarks in a foot note to page 274 of his "North East Frontier of Bengal."

"How much doubt as to our (the company's) position existed is seen from the fact that in 1800 (during Rajdhar Manikya's troublous reign) offers were made to the Board (of Revenue) for a farm of the mountains of Tipperah. In rejecting this the Board say that "they conclude that the mountains form a part of the Estate (Not State be it noticed) : of the Raja of Tipperah, (Rajdhar Manikya) and that they are included in his existing engagements executed by him for the general settlement of his Zemindari". In reply to this the Collector reports, that, "on a reference to the *tahood* etc.

executed by the Raja for the general settlement of his Zemindari (in 1792 while he was a deportee at Chittagong, on a trumped up charge of harbouring dacoits): it does not appear that the mountains of Tipperah were included, but they always have been considered as constituting his property; neither does it appear from the records that he ever paid any revenue to Government for them for the last twenty two years (since the time of Mr. Camphell)". It has been mentioned in the previous reign of Ramganga Manikya, that the Raj was deprived by Lieutenant Fisher's Survey of large tracts of agricultural and tea lands to the South of the Kusiara river and that the some process of spoliation was adopted in this reign.

It should be noted that the River Barak flows Westwards out of the Manipur Raj, through the district of Cachar and then bifurcates at Badarpur. The Northern branch, the Surma, curves round the Northern Portion of the district of Sylhet and the Southern branch, the Kusiara, pursues a similar course along the Southern parts of Sylhet.

Fisher's Survey of the Sylhet boundary was laid far south of the Kusiara, as already stated, and he was appointed to the newly acquired district of Cachar in 1830 or thereabouts as Superintendent, subordinate to the Governor General's Agent in Assam.

The south boundary of Sylhet had ended at the Chattanhura peak, some 2069 feet high, and formed the trijunction of the three boundaries of Tripura, Sylhet and Cachar. Starting from this trijunction, by some clever juggling, another block of several hundreds of square miles of hills and valleys, as also some more agricultural and tea lands, were lopped off the Tripura Raj. There can be no contesting this statement or any other statement similarly made. Chapter and verse from Government publication have been given, as will also now be quoted to prove this last statement.

In Pemberton's Report, dated 1835, we find that all the Lushai country, situated directly South of Cachar belonged to the

Tripura Raj. Mackenzie on page 286 N.E.F. of Bengal writes with regard to the south eastern southern boundaries of Cachar, Tripura and Manipur as follows :-

"In Pemberton's Report we find that all the Lushai country East to Manipur was once considered to belong to Tipperah. The south-eastern and southern boundaries of each are thus given by Pemberton in 1835."

"From the source of the Juree river along the western bank to its confluence with the Borak; then south to the western bank of the latter river to the mouth of the Chekoo (or Tipai) Nullah which marks the triple boundary of Manipur, Cachar and Tipperah."

The southern extremity of the Suddashur Hills was the south-east corner of Cachar. It would appear from this that the narrow hilly tract running down between Hill Tipperah and Manipur, and represented in our most recent maps as part of Cachar, was in Pemberton's considered to be part of Hill Tipperah."

If there is any meaning in the above quotations from Official Report and statements in books published under authority, such as are the Imperial Gazetteer and Mackenzie's North-East Frontier of Bengal, it must be that-

"The river Kusiara (tracing upstream) formed the Northern boundary of the Tripura Raj) in a general direction from (West to East) till its junction with the Surma at Badarpur. Then the Barak (or combined streams of the Kusiara & Surma) from Badarpur to the Manipur frontier.

This was the boundary when the Company took possession of the districts of Sylhet and Cachar and not a single argument except *the argumentum baculum* and *argumentum ad crumenum* to support the "might is right" procedure, adopted by the companies Officials, when dealing with the Raja of Tripura's territories, whether on the South, West or North.

As to the hills an Valley on the East, we will come to how they were divorced from the Raj in the region of Maharaja Birchandra Manikya (1862-1896) and thw "Eastern Boundary"

question arose and has been dragging along for 50 years or so and is yet unsettled.

However to return to Kasichandra Manikya-As has already been stated Krishnakishor, the son and Bara Thakur of Ramganga Manikya, had been appointed Juvaraj by his uncle. So that when Kashichandra died in 1830 he was succeeded by.

KRISHNA KISHOR MANIKYA (1830-1849) - It was during this reign that Mr. Dampier the Commissioner of Chittagong, to which Division the district of British Tipperah belongs, made an attempt to prove, that, the Raja of Tripura was merely a Zemindar with no Independent Raj whatsoever. This matter is very lucidly and at considerable length set out in a letter No. 121 dated 27th December 1833 from the Secretary to the Government of Bengal, acting under the orders of Lord Auckland, the Deputy Governor of Bengal and Governor General of India from 1836 to 1842, and addressed to the then Commissioner Mr. Harvey from which the following quotations of the most prominent points of the controversy have been made.

This voluminous correspondence began with Mr. Dampier's letter dated 10th October 1836, in which complaint was made that the Raja of Tipperah levying *saverat* duties within his Zemindary on Cotton and other produce although at the time of the perpetual settlement, "(made with Raja Rajdhar Manikya in 1792 as already related in that reign)" a remission to a large amount was granted on the jumma of his Estate as a compensation for the abolition of the *sayer mehal* and the collection of such duties has been expressly prohibited by law."

(Para 5.) "But it was remarked the Rajah has two capacities one that of Zemindar within the pale of the Permanent Settlement, the other that of an Independent Prince in his own Hill Territory and it was clear, from a petition presented by his Attorney, (Mr. Bignell) that the Rajah now claimed to levy transit duty on produce within his own Territory, it being stated to be his only source of revenue."



(Para 30) "On the 9th January 1833 all the papers in the case were transmitted to you for your opinion's to the right of the Rajah of Tipperah to leavy transit duties within his Hill Territories; this call was answered by you on the 2nd May last in the letter now under consideration."

(Para 31) "It appears that not content with the arguements, proofs, and illustrations continued in the papers made over to you, you sought for additional information in the record of the Chittagong and Tipperah Offices. You arrived by these means at the conclusion (for beyond the question proposed) that the Rajah of Tipperah had no Independent Territory whatever. To prove this you quoted as following papers" : --

These "papers" are (1) Mr. Vansittart's letter dated 20th January 1761 (already quoted in the beginning of the English Period) (2) Mr. Verelst's reply dated 17th March 1761. (3) Instructions to Mr. Marriot, the Official deputed by Mr. Verelst to Tipperah (4) Mr. Marriot's Report and his letter dated 5th April 1761. (5) Certain documents procured by the Commissioner from the Sudder Board of Revenue, "showing that, in consequence of rebellious practies long subsequents to the above transactions, the reigning Rajah Kishen Manik, had been dispossessed of the Zamindary of Roshnabad, and KISHEN Manik appointed in his stead." (6) The *Sunnud* of Investitures of 1785 in favour of Rajdhar Manik.

(Para 39). "This man; (Rajdharmani Thakur who commenced his reign, as Rajdhar Manikya, in 1785)" you observe, is shown by other papers to have been, in the year 1783 or 1784, apprehended and sent to Chittagong to answer a charge of harbouring docoits."

(Para 40) "From all this you infer that no independence was left to the Rajah that no distinction was drawn between Hill Territory and Plains Territory; that the Rajahs submitted to investiture at the hands of the British Government ; and that one of them was actually apprehended and tried by British Officers of Justice"



(Heaven save the mark !). "It is also plain, you remark that Odeypore" (Udaipur), "which the Rajah now, claims as part of his Hill Territory, gave a name to one of the Mogal divisions of the country and that *therefore* the town of Odeypore must have been within, and subject to the Mogal Empire, "I find" you proceed to say "every proof that the Rajah of Tipperah was as dependent as any in the Company's dominious, and that too to the Mogal Government as well as to the British."

Before quoting any further and giving His Lordship's decision it will be as well to crush the arrogant and illogical presumptions of the Commissioner of Chittagong in the last quoted paragraph, by quoting what is laid down at page 77" *Treaties Engagements and Sunnuds*" compiled from Official Papers in the Foreign Office and published in 1862 in the First and original *Edition*, before Mr. C.U. Aitchison B.C.S. Under-Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department "compiled" the Edition of 1892 and imitted and added whatever he thought proper and stated, that, *third Edition was* "Revised and continued up to the present time By the Authority of the Foreign Office, " that is practically by *himself*!

The following quotation states clearly and concisely the relationship existing between the British Government and the Tripura Raj and the Raja :-

"The British Government has no Treaty with Tipperah. The Raja of Tipperah stands in a peculiar position, in as much as in addition to the Hill Territory known as "Independent Tipperah" he is the holder of a very considerable Zemindary in the district of Tipperah in the plains; he receives his Investiture from the British Government, and is required to pay the usual *Nuzzerrana*. The succession has been usually determined by the appointment of a "Joob-Raj" or Heir Apparent, whom the Rajah is considered incompetent to appoint, until he has himself been invested by the British Government. The present Rajah" (Isanchandra Manikya 1849-1862) "was recognised by the Government in 1849. *Independent Tipperah is not held by gift from the British*

*Government or its predecessors or under any title derived from it or them, never having been subjected by the Mogal."*

To resume the questions from the Government of Bengal's letter abovequoted.

(Para 41) "It is impossible, therefore, you argue that he can claim any independent power and, of course impossible, that he can have any right to levy on any part of the country *sayer duties* which have been expressly prohibited by the British Government."

(Para 42) Accordingly you proceed to recommend --

First, -- That as forming a part and portion of the British Empire in the east, provision should be made for the administration of justice in the hills (hitherto supposed independent).

Secondly,-- That provision be made for levying a revenue from this new acquisition which you divide into two kinds-- revenue from the plains, not hitherto settled; and revenue from the hills, not hitherto settled. The right to revenue from these lands, you conceive, should, without delay, be asserted.

(Para 43) As for the duty on cotton, which all the authorities from Mr. Buller downwards have so strongly object to, it would seem that, considering it as a due of the Government, and not of the Rajah, you rather approve of it than otherwise, and recommend that it be kept up, collected by the Rajah, and appropriate by Government.

(Para 44) It will be observed that, in the original question between Mr. Dampier and Mr. Bignell or the Rajah, the independence of the latter within the hill territory was an admitted point. The question was simply, being as he is independent in other matters, is he or is he not bound by a special contract to refrain from levying *sayer duties* within his independent territory. But you incline to believe that in fact both parties are wrong; that the Raja is not independent at all; and that, whatever might be the expediency of the duties on cotton, bamboos & c. when enjoyed by the Rajah, they clearly are very fit and power duties (that on cotton at least) to be levied and enjoyed by the British Government.

(Para 45) Upon this the Deputy Governor remarks, in the first place, that by prescription at least the Rajah of Tipperah has a claim to independent possession of a certain territory, exclusive of the zemindary in the plains or district of Tipperah, of which he is the recorded proprietor : whatever may be the origin of this possession, it is admitted by all, and it is indeed matter of notoriety for that, a great number of years, extending certainly as far back as the decennial settlement, the possession has been enjoyed without challenge, and untill your last letter, no one ever thought of challenging the right. Under such circumstances, His Honor deems it undeniable that the burthen of proof lies with the challenger and not with the Raja.

(Para 46) Now it appears to the Deputy Governor that you have proved absolutely nothing. You have proved that in 1761 the British Government took possession of the Province of Tipperah, and commenced administering its revenues on its own behalf. There is nothing in your report to show what was included in this *province*, and what was taken possession of and administered can only be inferred from the circumstances since known to exist. These circumstances are, as has been observed, that the country administered by the British Government is that below the hills heretofore known as the zillah of Tipperah exclusive of a certain territory in the hills held independently by the Rajah. *Why* the British Government did not take possession of the rest is not known though it may be supposed that they refrained, partly in order to conciliate the Rajah, or from generosity to a foe in their power, and partly *because the hill territory was not worth taking*.

(Para 47) That the British forces proceeded to Nunagar, would be (even if that place were, as you assume, within the hills) of no value in proof of your position, since subsequent events show that the British force, if they *did* reduce the hill country nevertheless afterwards withdrew from it and left it to the Rajah. But the Deputy Governor is disposed to think that Nunagar is in fact nothing more than the corrupt mode of writing Noornuggur,



the name of a town in the plains, situated within the zemindary and zillah of Tipperah, and at present the head quarters of a Moonsiff.

(Para 48) The only other fact brought forward by you to prove that the Rajah ought rightly to have no independent territory is, that the Rajah, after 1761, or at least in 1785, received investiture as Rajah from the hands of the British Government, and that he was once apprehended and sent to Chittagong a prisoner to answer a charge of harbouring dacoits.

It was not the Rajah who was arrested and sent to Chittagong but Rajdharmani, th nephew of Krishan Manikya and his eventual successor in 1785.

(Para 49) To this argument His Honour cannot attach any weight. If the investiture of the Rajah *per se* was symbolical of the conveyance of his independent territory to the British Government, what would become of the chiefs and Rajahs and jageerdars all over in India, who habitually receive investiture from the paramount government without ever supposing that, by so doing, they are making over their independent territories to territories to be brought in judicial and revenue matters under the general laws and regulations ?

(Para 50) The history of India, from the days of Timour downwards, is full of instances of investiture by the paramount power of inferior princes, Rajahs, *soobadars*, *jageerdars* and others; but there is nothing. His Honour thinks, that can bear out your supposition that, by receiving a *khillut* of investiture, the right of administering the *raj* or *jageer* of the inferior feudatory passes in effect into the hands of the superior State. It is notorious, indeed, that the very contrary has been the case; and that the practical exercise of power by the inferior is in reality confirmed and corroborated by the ceremony in question.

Note : - An ancestor of this very Rajah, in 1708, A. D., received investiture from Moorshed Kolly Khan without relinquishing, or being supposed to relinquish, his independent jurisdiction. The

circumstance is mentioned by Stewart (History of Bengal, page 372), and it is distinctly stated that no encroachment on the Raja's rights was attempted, though the 'khillut' was annually renewed. In fact, the Province of Tipperah was not conquered and added to the Mogul Empire until 1733, when it was overrun and subdued by Meer Hubbeeb, Dewan of the Naib Nazim of Dacca (Id., page 427).

(Para 51) In the case of the Rajah of Tipperah there was a special reason for investiture by Government. The most valuable possession of the Rajah was his estate in the British territory; as a zemindar of that estate he was a subject of the British Government. Succession to the estate was of course regulated by the general laws of the British territory and enforced by the British tribunals. As a matter of course, therefore, the succession to one property carried with it succession to the other, and in effect this has always been the case.

Vide Sudder Dewanny Adawlut Reports Volume I, page 270 Ram Gunga Deo versus Durgamunee Jobraj. In this report the existence of the independent hill territory is expressly declared.

(Para 52) The Rajah had therefore two capacities - one as a subject and Zemindar of the British Government, the other as an independent Rajah in the Hills. But as the succession to the latter was nearly certain to depend on the succession to the former capacity, he might very well be disposed to receive investiture and do homage at one and the same time, and in one or both capacities, to the ruling and paramount government.

(Para 53) As for the arrest of the Rajah in 1783-84 the case explains itself. As zemindar and as a British subject, the Rajah was and is answerable to the British tribunals. In these days, when forms and more attended to and minute distinctions more carefully kept up than in 1783, the apprehension of the Rajah for a crime committed by the zemindar would, of course, be conducted with more regularity, more attention to technicalities, and less confusion of departmental authority ; but it would not less certainly take



place (if necessary) now than in 1783, though no one would suppose that the Government, by exercising jurisdiction under the regulations over the zemindar, necessarily enforced the same jurisdiction over the independent Rajah.

(Para 54) On the other hand, besides the notorious fact of independence, there is the testimony of good authority to the existence of the Rajah's right since the accession of the British.

(Para 55) 'the manik or zemindar of Tipperah,' says Hamilton, speaking of the year 1801, 'is an independent sovereign of an extensive territory in the hills, but usually resides in the town of Comillah, which is the head-quarters of the Judge and Magistrate.

(Para 56) Again in 1808 Mr. Melvill, Second Judge of the Dacca Provincial Court, under date 9th October, is found reporting to Government on the subject of disturbances that had taken place in the hill territory of Tipperah, and throughout the letter speaking of the territory as independent as to jurisdiction, though held according to custom by investiture from the British Government as successor to the Mogul. Still more strongly the same functionary writes a few days afterwards (19th October 1808). He gives an account of the inhabitants of 'the Tipperah independent territory,' which he also describes as 'the Hill territory comprehended within the boundaries of Tipperah Proper, or the country subject to the authority of the Tipperah Raja,' This territory, he goes on to say, 'is in length about one hundred and twenty miles and in breadth seventy to eighty miles.' He explains the customs of the territory, the officers of the government and their functions, military, judicial and revenue and he described the army entertained by the Rajah, of whom, he says, 'a number are of course at Augurtollah, the seat of the Rajah.'

(Para 57) He elsewhere mentions Odeypore as the place within the territory where the 'soobah' (defined by him as 'commander-in-chief') had assembled forces during the disturbances on which he was reporting, and in the following

passages he announces distinctly the real circumstances of the Rajah's tenure of the territory in question.

'The Tipperah hill territory is certainly independent of the delegated judicial authority; but although it pays no tribute, that it has a certain dependence on the sovereign or supreme power of the State, is established by tradition as well as by the testimony of witnesses. The inhabitants perhaps consider themselves dependent on their Chief only, but they know he holds his authority under a superior, and that the confirmation of the Bengal Government is necessary to the validity of his title to that authority.

'It appeared, on judicial investigation from the most remote period to which the produced records or tradition ascended, that the hill territory of Tipperah, and the estate or zemindary of Roshanabad, were always held by one or the same person; the Rajah of that hill territory was uniformly the zemindar of Roshanabad.'

"In investigating, therefore, the claims to that zemindary, the Dacca Court of Appeals although they could pass no order relating to the disposal of the hill territory, were (as it was a point of fact disputed, and still undetermined), under the necessity of ascertaining if the claimant was or was not the person (by local custom respecting the succession) entitled to be considered Rajah of Tipperah, as on that depended his right to be zemindar of Roshanabad."

'That the circumstances of the hill inhabitants, having been a considerable time without an acknowledged local superior, and in a state of uncertainty respecting the person to whom they were to look as to their immediate chief, may have somewhat unhinged their relative situations, and have produced something like a feeling of irritation amongst them, will readily be admitted.'

'The right to the succession to the Tipperah Rajah has remained undertermined for a period of four years, and on the recurrence of similar cases - and instances will frequently occur, particularly in the Cuttack and other provinces - it may perhaps be

found more expedient, as judicial proceedings are necessarily dilatory, that Government should, on an authenticated report of relative circumstances, give the hill territory to the person they might consider entitled to the possession, and leave the claims to estates within the Company's provinces to be subsequently decided by the courts of justice.'

Still more to the purpose is the following :-

'I cannot, however, in any case recommend, as a temporary measure, even the assumption of the management of the hill territory, as in my communications I could perceive a positive embarrassment in the hill people, lest by too great an exposure of the faults of the existing authority Government might be induced to take the internal management into its own hands, and deprive them of the immemorial privilege of being ruled by a chief of their own, and in retaining which privilege their pride and prejudices seemed deeply interested.' And lastly, the reply of Government to this report is altogether decisive of the question.

"The right to the succession to the zemindary of Tipperah, situated within the limits of the British possession, being at present under investigation by the courts of judicature, the Governor General in Council is unwilling to adopt any measures with respect to the succession to the independent territory while that case is pending. But whenever the Sudder Dewany Adawlut shall have passed its decision on that suit, Government will of course issue such orders as may then appear to be necessary and proper, with respect to the succession to the latter territory. Nothing can be farther from the intentions of Government than to assume the internal management of that territory."

(Para 58) It is obvious, therefore, that your proposition for taking possession of the Rajah's territory, and your plans for the administration of justice and revenue within it, must fall to the ground.

(Para 59) The questions at issue between the late Commissioner, Mr. Dampier, and the Rajah, are of two kinds –

1st - Whether the Rajah has, under present circumstances, any right to levy duties at discretion in his own territory, or has surrendered the right by special compact ?

2nd -Has the Rajah, as an independent chief, encroached upon the Company's territory, and wrongfully taken from it and added to his own the towns of Odeypore and Augurtollah?

(Para 60) The first of these questions is in a great measure decided by the result of the enquiry into your propositions. It has been shown that the Rajah has an independent territory; and it follows that *within that territory* he may levy such duties as he pleases, unless there be any special compact to the contrary, Mr. Dampier endeavoured to prove that there was such a compact. He stated that the Government of 1788, having at that time the management of the Raja's property in the plains, and being convinced that the levy of duties, such as then existed within that property, was impolitic, abolished them, thereby giving up Rs. 30,000 per annum, which was the average produce of the duties when they were abolished.

(Para 61) This sum of Rs. 30,000 has been represented as a remission granted to the Rajah in lieu of the duties ; and from the decided objections expressed by the Government of that time to the levy of transit duties, it has been argued that the Government would never have given up, or in a manner paid over, to the Rajah Rs. 30,000 per annum if they had supposed that the consequence would have been the levy of the same or similar duties in the neighbouring hill territory therefore, it has been concluded the Government must have intended the remission as an equivalent for the levy of these duties in the hills as well as in the plains.

(Para 62) This argument appears to the Deputy Governor untenable.

(Para 63) The case, it may be gathered from the correspondence, and from the documents brought forward on both sides, is this. The Rajah, previous to 1788, certainly had the right of levying any duties he thought proper in his hill territory. He



had also the right (possessed by all zemindars at that time) of levying *sayer* duties within his zemindary. He might therefore, in this double capacity, either levy a portion of the duties in the hill territory, and another portion in the plains, or he might levy all in the hills, and none in the plains; or lastly, he might levy the duty in the plains, and forego it in the hills.

In his choice between these three plans, at a time when the distinction between the dependent territory was not so clearly marked as it subsequently became, the Raja would of course be guided by convenience and economy. Accordingly, he seems to have placed all his *chowkies* in the plains, and, in consequence, not to have levied any *sayer* duties in the hills.

(Para 64) The *chowkies* so placed seem to have yielded on an average about Rs. 28,000, or Rs. 30,000 a year, and they were clearly in those days a legitimate portion of the assets of the zemindary. His *sudder jumma* to Government on the zemindary was at this time about Rs. 1,65,000 of which about Rs. 28,000 was assessed on the *sayer* assets; and this, be it remembered, was a circumstance common to all zemindaries before abolition of the *sayer* duties; their *sudder jummas* being all made up of the two items of land and *sayer* revenue as in the case of the Rajah of Tipperah.

(Para 65) Things were in this state when the estate was taken into *khas* management by Government, as happened to a great many zemindaries in Bengal, particularly in the eastern districts : and in this zemindary, as in others, the *sayer* assets as well as those of land revenue came into the *khas* management of Government. While, under that management, the Government, objecting to the nature of the *sayer* assets, abolished them, and the *jumma* of the zemindary became in consequence Rs. 1,65,000 minus Rs. 28, 000 or Rs. 1,37,000, and therefore, when the zemindary came to be restored to the Rajah, he engaged for the lesser *jumma*, as a necessary consequence of the diminution of the assets by the hands of the Government itself. This was no

*compact*, such as it has been sought to prove. Still less was it a remission to the Rajah of Rs. 28,000 or Rs. 30,000 per annum, as has also been imagined, and not being a *compact* of the kind sought to be proved, it can have no possible effect upon the admitted right of the Rajah to levy within his hill territory such duties as he might think proper.

(Para 66) If there be any doubt of this, let it be supposed for the sake of argument, that the Government in 1788, while managing the zemindary *khas*, has chosen of the two assets, land revenue and *sayer* revenue, to abolish, not the last but the first ; and that, retaining the *sayer*, they had, at the conclusion of their *khas* management, restored the zemindary to the Rajah at the *jumma* which such an arrangement had brought about, i.e. at Rs. 1,65,000, *minus* land revenue, or Rs. 1,37,000=Rs. 28,000.

(Para 67) Would anybody have argued that this was an annual donation to the Rajah of Rs. 1,37,000 ? Or that this measure for ever bound the Rajah to abstain from levying a land revenue on neighbouring and independent territory ?

(Para 68) Would anybody, in short, have talked of a *compact*? Surely not ; yet the two cases are precisely parallel. Or take another illustration. Suppose that in 1788, when the right of levying *sayer* duties was allowed to every zemindar, a given zemindar, A, had possessed two contiguous zemindaries, of which one in the year in question was in the *khas* management of Government, and had assets equal to Rs. 2,000 of which Rs. 500 were derived from *sayer* duties ; then suppose that the Government close in this one zemindary to abolish *sayer* duties, thereby giving up Rs. 500 of the assets, and making the assets, when the estate came to be restored, to A only Rs. 1,500 instead of Rs. 2,000 would any one imagine that by this measure A had become bound to give up the *sayer* duties in his second *zemindar* ? Would any one talk in such a case of a *compact* ? Assuredly not. Yet this, like the last, is a perfectly parallel case to the one now under consideration.

(Para 69) This of itself would suffice to show that the Rajah is under no engagement, expressed or implied, to refrain from the *levy of sayar* duties within his hill territory; and when considered in connection with the strong arguments produced by the Rajah himself, through Mr. Bignell, will fully warrant the opinion to which, after due consideration. His Honor has arrived, that there is no ground whatever to interfere with the 'Rajah's right of levying, within his own hill territory, whatever taxes or duties he may think proper.

(Para 70) For the decision of the second question, whether the Rajah has or has not encroached on the Company's territory, the data produced do not appear sufficient. But the Deputy Governor is clearly of opinion, both that such an invidious enquiry should not be prosecuted without some *prima facie* evidence of its necessity, and that in the present instance no such *prima facie* ground for enquiry has yet been shown.

(Para 71) To conclude, therefore, His Honour decides that the Rajah has an independent hill territory ; that your propositions for its resumption are totally inadmissible ; that the Rajah has a full right within his hill territory to levy any duties he pleases ; and that there is no ground at present for setting on foot an enquiry into supposed encroachments by the Rajah on the Company's territory.

No doubt the above quoted very important State Document, for such it is, though in the form of a Secretary's letter to a Commissioner, was one of the chief documentary proofs of the very explicit statement already quoted, that :-

*"Independent Tipperah is not held by gift from the British Government or its predecessors or under any title derived from it or them, never having been subjected by the Mogul."*

So the question, so often raised and argued, generally to the disadvantage of the Raja, as to the Independence of any portion of the former Kingdom left by the rapacity, of the Company's Officials, may be said to have been finally settled - And the delimitation of the Hill from the Plains Territory taken up, as usual

to the disadvantage of the Raj, However it must be admitted in all fairness, that, the Rajas were badly served by their Employees, who resorted to questionable methods to try and protect the Raj from the constant encroachments of its all powerful neighbour's Officials. But it was the usual conflict between the weak and the strong, of cunning and deceit against might. Had the Company's Officials been less rapacious the Rajah's Employees would have been encouraged to be more straightforward.

However it is of little practical use deploring the morality and methods employed by either party in days when India was in the melting pot and Eastern Bengal not yet recovered from Mogal days and ways. The Company was grabbing an Empire and the Native Rulers were trying, by every means, to withstand an overpowering dragon from swallowing them up and their territories completely. To make the constant complaints that Mackenzie does against the Rajahs and their Employees reminds one of the fable of the Wolf and the Lamb. Or of the Burglar complaining, that, the Householder attempted to prevent himself from being completely robbed of all his valuables by every artifice he could invent. Mackenzie's invective on page 272 :-

"Not a word is found in these old papers recognising the independence of the Rajah in any part of his dominions. In fact, no reference is made to the hills in connection with the arrangements. The officers of the Company had more regard to substantial advantages than to theoretical symmetry. The paying part of Tipperah lay on the plains, and appeared in the Mohamedan revenue roll as pergunnah Roshanabad. For this of course a settlement was made. We found it a zemindary, and as such we treated it. But of the barren hills that fenced it to the east we took no cognizance. Covered with jungle and inhabited by tribes of whom nothing was known, save that they were uncouth in speech and not particular as to clothing, the hills were looked upon as something apart. The Rajah claimed to exercise authority within them, but did not, as it seemed, derive much profit from them.



Accordingly the hills became 'Independent Tipperah,' and the Rajah who is an ordinary Bengali zemindar on the plains, reigns as an independent prince over 3,000 square miles of upland, and was for many years a more absolute monarch than Scindia or Pattiala, - owning no law but his sovereign will, bound by no treaty, subject to no control, safe in his obscurity from criticism or reform. And yet nothing can be more certain than the fact that the Mogul Government, through whom our paramount title comes, would have recognized no such vital distinction between the highlands and lowlands of the Tipperah State. It may be true that they never carried their armies in victorious march through the bamboo thickets of the hills, or harried with fire and sword the wattled wigwams of the Kookie trines ; but when they appointed whom they would as Rajah, both hill and plain passed with the one *sunnud* they gave. They would have scoffed at the idea of independence of any fragment of the entity they conveyed. Indeed the chief object of their invasion having been to secure horses and elephants for purposes of state or war, to have excluded the hills from the periphery of their conquest would have cut them off from the very source of these \* supplies.

The Company sought rupees, not elephants, and so the hills were left to their native ruler, and so misgiving seems to have cropped up that trouble would hereafter result from such a course. Trouble did result, not so much from the actual independence of the Rajah as from a want of definiteness in our relations to him, from the absence of any means of knowing what went on in his territory, and from the denial of that salutary control and advice, without which our best feudatories come to certain grief."

The above is the most damning proof of the contempt and utter want of consideration shown to the Rajahs of Tripura. Mackenzie cynically admits that "the barren hills" were allowed "to become Independent Tipperah" because "the Company sought

---

\* For elephant-catching in Tripura, see Volume III of the *Asiatic Research*, 1782.

rupees, not elephants, and so the hills were left to their Native ruler" and every acre of rupee producing land, whether in the West, in Tipperah, or in the North, in Sylhet and Cachar, was systematically filched from the Raj, right up to the "barren hills."

Having accomplished a good deal of this land rabbing by main force a more refined method was adopted by the Company's Officials, by standing upon boundaries thus laid down, not warranted even by Government records, already quoted, and then "informing the Rajah that, although he could not himself be sued in the Courts of Sylhet" (or anywhere else, except under very special circumstances, as laid down in the Civil Procedure Code, in Suits against Ruling Chiefs) "yet, he was at liberty to sue the Government and the Zemindars jointly in those Courts, if he thought he could establish his claim to any lands outside the line" (laid down by Lieutenant Fisher between 1820 and 1822 in Ramganga Manikya's reign) and Government would honour the decision of its own tribunal and make over to him any lands he might prove to be his." To show how fruitlessly harassing such a procedure was, and it is incredible, that, the Company's Officials were ignorant of such an inevitable result, it is sufficient to mention, that, after years of expensive litigation "The question of jurisdiction was then taken up by a Full Bench" (of the Sadar Dewani Adalat at Calcutta) which ruled, on the 19th September 1848, that questions affecting the boundary of two Independent Powers were not properly cognizable in Municipal Courts and the Rajah's suits were dismissed after being pending for sixteen years.

It is easy to see from above, among many other instances, that, the Company's Officials were arrogantly and unjustly treating the Rajas of Tripura as anything but Independent Rulers and, that, the Supreme Court at Calcutta, presided over by independent Judges from England, who were not subservient to the Company in its search after rupees, declared the Rajah to be an "Independent Power" just as much as the Company ; whose Officials never seemed to be able to clear their minds of the simple fact, that the

Raja of Triura was just as much, politically if not as powerful, an Independent Sovereign as was the King of England, and certainly much more so than a Company of Traders, seeking rupees, by fair means or otherwise, under the Royal Charter to trade in India. This arrogance is justified by Mackenzie when he writes on page 272 "And yet nothing can be more certain than the fact that the Mogal Government, through whom our paramount title comes" (but which was robbed of its intended Tripura booty by the instructions issued by Governor Vansittart to President Verelst in 1761 as already mentioned in Krishna Manikya's reign), 'would have recognized no such vital distinction between the highlands and lowlands of the Tipperah State' (not Estate be it noted). "They would have scoffed at the idea of independence in any fragment of the entity they conveyed." This Mogal idea of political morality is what Mackenzie adopts and tries to stify the Trading Company's officials adopting towards the Rajah of Tripura.

In Order to clearly show the various openly defiant and cunningly devised steps by which the Company's Officials clipt off revenue yielding and potentially valuable lands from the Tripura Raj on the three sides adjoining Company's lands, however doubtfully acquired these may have been, it will be necessary perhaps to recapitulate events that took place many years previously, since then there have been chronic boundary troubles. This nibbling process ceased only lately, leaving an equitable Eastern boundary yet unadjusted.

The apology for partial recapitulation is, that, were this process described chronologically under each reign, it would be difficult to grasp it as a whole and also belittle the injustice done the Tripura Raj.

The Company's Officials began with the North boundaries, adjacent to Sylhet and then Cachar. They would probably have begun with the West had they not arrogantly assumed, that, the whole Raj was swallowed up with Chakla Roshanabad in 1761, as already related. Messrs. Vansittart and Verelst grabbed the



Plains Territory, which in justice, equity and common honesty, the Sadar Dewani Adalat in 1809 declared "the Zamindari" (the Plains Territory) "to be an integral portion of an impartible Raj. " But these Officials continued, as we have seen from Letter No. 121 dated 27th December 1838, to regard the Plains and Hill Territories as "one lot," as an Auctioneer would describe it, until so sharply rapped over their rapacious knuckles by Lord Auckland and English Nobleman who did not see only through the Company's official spectacles. And thus foiled in swallowing the Hill *Shikar* they next devised a delimitation of the boundary between Plains and Hill Tripura, to see how much of the latter they could nibble off, as they had done on the North, through the ingenuity of Lieutenant Fisher and his outrageous boundary, while the Kusiara River was the true boundary all the time, as acknowledged in the Imperial Gazetteer (Provincial Series) of 1908 or nearly 200 years later : (see Sylhet District History page 420 Eastern Bengal and Assam, already quoted).

Of course the Rajas have been in some measure to blame for allowing the Raj to have been so systematically and steadily nibbled. But they were so harassed and terrorized by the Company's Officials, in succession to the Mogal plunderers, and were so badly served by weak and ignorant Indian Employees, who could only oppose cunning and deceit against the Company's *Zulm*, that these Rajas are more to be pitied than blamed. And perhaps even the Company's Officials may, in some measure, be excused for having their sense of justice, equity and chivalry blunted by their Mogal predecessors and examplers, and their perceptions, as Englishman, dimmed by the demoralizing demands of their Trading Company Employer, who "sought rupees" however obtainable. Another great disadvantage these Officials labored under, was their want of any *Political training* or knowledge of how to deal with Ruling Princes, as deferentiated from mere Landholders, whether Rajas or untitled Zemindars. Even Mr. Mackenzie, although he was in "immediate charge of



the Political correspondence of the Bengal Government" (see preface to his book. "The North East Frontier of Bengal") yet, had he any glimmerings of *Political* knowledge, he could never have written in the arrogant and contemptuous tone that blemish his lucubrations regarding Tripura. And considering, that he rose to be Sir Alexander Mackenzie, the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, he must be considered above the average Bengal Civilian, serving the Crown and not a Trading Company. It is just this want of the rudiments of *Political* training and knowledge that has been the bane hitherto of the Tripura Raj, when in contact with the local District Magistrate - Political Agents and Divisional Commissioners, who have all their official lives been in contact and dealing with mere *Zemindars, Talukdars, Ijaradars et hoc genus* in the "*JoKukm*" and "*Ji Huzur*" style they usually adopt, generally through the medium of their *Amla*. None but Officials trained in the Political Department of the Imperial Government of India, to be Political Agents and Residents should ever come into contact with Ruling Chiefs, if their welfare and that of their Raj and subjects is desired. And, if the writers presumption be pardoned, Military Officers, *so trained*, are as generally successful Political Officers, as Civil Officials are generally the reverse. But in the Trading Company's days there was no such thing as Politics and Political training. And seeking rupees its Officials procured the rupees *per fas et nefas. Hinc Illa lacrima !*

However to return to the subject of rectifying the boundaries arise of the Raj so as always to deprive the Raj and benefit the Company. We have seen how Fisher in 1822 helped to deprive the Raj of an extensive tract of agricultural and potentially valuable tea lands, from the Kusiya river Southwards to the 'barren hills, How, having adopted this unjust boundary line, the Raja was referred to the Civil Courts, in which after 16 years of fruitless and expensive litigation, it was decided by the Sadar Dewani Adalat (the predecessor of the High Court of Calcutta), that, boundary questions between two 'Independent Powers' could not be

decided in Manucipal Courts and dismissed all the suits, which the Raja had been forced by the Company's Officials to bring.

The next move was an Arbitration and of course the Arbitration went against the Raj, except for a few insignificant plots in South Sylhet. About 30 years ago a Tea Company applied for and received a lease of 60,000 acres in the Balisera Hills. The Sylhet Officials gave the Company to understand, that, the land leased to them was not Raj land but unsettled land belonging to Government and of course a number of petty local landholders chimed in and claimed portions to belong to their individual holdings.

The Tea Company naturally refused to pay the rent to the State and the Raja was compelled to sue. But before doing so the whole matter was put in a petition to the Government of India and it was distinctly shown, by citing Official documents and Judicial proceedings, that, the local Sylhet Officials had frequently tried to assert possession of these very lands and had failed each time. Adverse possession against the Secretary of State for India of over 60 years was clearly established, among many other facts and yet the Raja was forced into Court and after much and money had been misspent, an arrangement was come to by which the State was deprived of the land but received a porportion of the rent.

### **Survey of Tipperah boundary :**

"On the side of Tipperah the boundary between the hill territory and the plains was quite as illdefined as it had been on the Sylhet frontier ; but this had not given rise to the same amount of mischief, as the zemindary of Roshanabad belonged to the lord of the hills, whose interests were identical on upland and lowland. In 1848, doubts were entertained whether the general indebtedness of the Rajah would not speedily bring the settled estate to the hammer, and in view of this contingency a speedy demarcation of the boundary line was urged upon Government. The measure was sanctioned, and the survey was ultimatey

carried on till the whole boundary between independent Tipperah and the British Districts of Tipperah, Bullooah, (or Noakhali) and the remaining portion of Sylhet had been laid down. It was completed in December 1852, and arbitrators were immediately appointed to settle all disputed lines. Every obstacle was thrown in the way of a final settlement by the Rajah's native agents, and it was only when Lord Dalhousie peremptorily ordered the adjustment to proceed whether the Rajah were represented or on that any actual progress was made and the Rajah's arbitrator attended. In January 1855 the results were reported. It had been discovered that no definite boundary between the hills and the plains had heretofore existed ; but as the Government arbitrator liberally gave the Rajah the benefit of every' doubt, no application to a referee was found necessary. Agurtolla, the Rajah's place of residence, was by the line now laid down included in the hill territory."

It will be seen from above, that, in spite of the decision of the Sadar Dewani Adalat of 24th March 1809, "declaring the Zemindari an integral portion of an impartible Raj," the local Officials still arrogantly maintained the pleasing fiction so late as 1848 or nearly 40 years after the abovequoted decision, on which Government had acted in recognizing and installing Ramganga Manikya, Kashichandra Manikya and Krishnakishor Manikya as Rajahs, "whether the general indebtedness of the Rajah would not speedily bring the settled estate (Roshanabad) to the hammer" : This only shows, that the local Officials were not only ignorant of political matters but also perversely blind to the final decision of the highest Civil Court of the land, in even imagining, that, "an integral portion of an impartible Raj" and not only an ordinary Zemindari Raj but the State an Independent Power, with whom the Government had not even a Treaty, could be sold to pay the Rajah's debts to money lenders, Or even for the Government revenue for the payment of which the Company had forced the Rajahs to make settlements, if the Rajah did not choose to pay.

No doubt a Revenue Official would be horrified at such a proposition! But if he will only think instead of blustering, he will begin to see, that, the proposition, that, *Chakla Roshanabad cannot* be sold for arrears of Government Revenue is perfectly legal proposition, in as much as (1) Chakla Roshanabad is not a permanently settled estate, as ordinary Zemindaries are. (2) that no permanent settlement exists or ever has existed (3) that an engagement was made with each individual Rajah from Rajdhar Manikya (1785-1874) to Isanchandra Manikya (1849-1862) to pay the revenue (4) that no such or similar contract has been entered into by the last three Rajas, and (5) that without a specific contract for payment no payment could be enforced by attachment, sale or otherwise by Government or private persons, like money lenders under any Revenue or other Law or Regulation. Or in plain language - if the Rajah were to refuse to pay the Revenue demand, for the payment of which he has made no contract, such demand could not be enforced by any law or regulation.

On this flimsy excuse, that, "the settled estate might be brought to the hammer a boundary was laid down," "the Arbitrator (with gratuitous generosity) liberally gave the Rajah the benefit of every doubt' (and the Capital of the State) "Agartala, the Rajah's place of residence, was by the line now laid down included in the Hill Territory."

On page 285 Mackenzie gives his version of how the Southern boundary was fixed in his own amiable way !

The Eastern Boundary, as already state, has never been justly or equitably settled to this day - As the position of affairs has practically remained the same since 21st September 1899, when Mr. Sandys, Superintendent of the Public Works Department of the Tripura State wrote a "Report on the Eastern Boundary of the Tripura Raj." From para 3 and the Appendix G of the said Report are quoted below in the hope that this Eastern Boundary may be fairly settled in the near future.

3. The district of Sylhet formerly included the three divisions



of Gor, Lour and Jainta (Hunter's Assam, Vol. II, page 260). Of these Gor was invaded by the Muhammedans in 1384 A. D. in the reign of Shams-uddeen, the King of Bengal. However, the district of Sylhet was not finally lost to the Tripura Raj till the Nizamat of Ali Verdi Khan, who in 1740 A. D. conferred on his son-in-law, Nawzish Khan, the Government of Dacca, to which he annexed the districts of Sylhet Tipperah and Chittagong (Stewart, page 447). Sylhet passed into the hands of the British in 1765, together with the Dewani of the rest of Bengal. Jaintia came into British possession in 1836, when the Rajah Indra Sing was deposed, and that portion of his territory that lay in the plains was forthwith annexed to the district of Sylhet (Hunter's Assam, Voll.II, page 206).

4. Sylhet having become a British district, the Government ordered the boundaries to be ascertained, and for this purpose Lieutenant Fisher, of the survey department, was deputed and sent in a report and map through the Magistrate of Sylhet. Mr. Secretary Princep, writing on the 6th June 1822 to the Magistrate of Sylhet, remarks in para. 3 : "The map would seem to comprise the whole Southern and Eastern Frontier of the Zillah as well as that towards the Cachar territory as. the boundary line between the Company's districts and the Independent country of Tipperah." Para 4. states, "that the boundary was laid from the Chattachura Hills to the Western extremity of the Zillah Sylhet." And it has been seen from para. 3 that the Eastern boundary between Sylhet and Cachar (then an Independent Raj) was also laid. Consequently Chattachura (a peak marked on the maps as 2,069 feet high) was, and still is, the junction of the boundary between Sylhet and Cachar with that of Tripurah.

5. Cachar, or as it was known in Hindoo times as Hiramba, formerly belonged to the Tripura Rajahs. It would appear that a Cachar Rajah married a daughter of the Rajah of Tripura and received the valley of Cachar as her dowry (Aitchinson's Treaties, page 213). In the reign of Pratit, the 67th Rajah of Tripura, a treaty

was made with the King of Cachar, the object of which was to prevent disputes as to the boundary between the territories of the two sovereigns (Hunter's Bengal Vol. VI page 464). During the period when Cachar was governed as an Independent State by its own hereditary line of princes its area was far more extensive than now. In 1809 a complicated series of disputes arose between the Rajah of Cachar and the Rajah of Manipore and the Burmese. The two latter powers successively revaged the country for years, and the Burmese ultimately succeeded in maintaining possession, the legitimate Prince being compelled to take refuge in the district of Sylhet. In 1824, when the British declared war against the Burmese, the Cachar Rajah Govinda Chandra applied to the British for assistance, and a series of operations were undertaken against the Burmese, which resulted in their expulsion from the country, and Govinda Chandra was reinstated, on his throne by treaty of 1826. Govinda Chandra was assassinated in 1830, and as he left no heir, the British took possession of the country in accordance with the conditions of the treaty. Captain Fisher, of the Survey Department, was appointed the Superintendent, subordinate to the Governor General's Agent in Assam.

6. In Pemberton's Report, dated 1835, we find that all the Lushai country belonged to the Tripura Raj. He writes with regard to the South-Eastern and Southern boundaries of Cachar, Tripura and Manipore as follows: - "From the source of the Juree River along the western bank to its confluence with the Borak ; thence South to the western bank of the latter river to the mouth of the Chekoo (or Tipai) *Nullah* which marks *the triple boundary of Manipore, Cachar and Tripura*. On the South the limits have never been accurately defined, and we only know that on this side the line is formed by the northern foot of lofty mountains inhabited by the Poitoo Kookies and by wild and unexplored tracts of territory subject to Tripura. This densely wooded and mountainous region appears to commence at a distance of between 40 and 50 miles from the southern bank of the Soormah."

7. It is absolutely clear, from the above extract from Pemberton's Report, that in 1835 when Cachar had been annexed by the British for the past 5 years, and had been under the regular administration of British officials, a British officer, authoritatively lays down that *the mouth of the Chekoo or (Tipai) Nullah marks the triple boundary of Manipore, Cachar and Tripura*. And Sir Alexander Mackenzie, writing in 1884 as Secretary to the Government of India in his official 'North- East Frontier of Bengal,' comes to the conclusion that "the Southern extremity of the Saddashur Hills was the southeast corner of Cachar. It would appear from this that the narrow hilly tract running down between Hill Tipperah and Manipore and represented in our most recent maps as part of Cachar was, in Pemberton's time, considered to be part of Hill Tipperah" (North-East Frontier, page 286).

8. An inspection of the map accompanying Sir Alexander's volume shows that Tipai Mukh marking "the triple boundary of Manipore, Cachar and Tripura" is 36 miles due East of the Chattachura Peak (2,069 feet). This is a most important fact, and absolutely annihilates all other contentions as to what is the North-East corner of the Tripura Raj in British times, to which period this discussion must perforce be limited. Unless and until it can be shown, beyond doubt, that this point (Tipai Mukh) has been abandoned by the *mutual consent* of the British Government and the Tripura Raj, as the North-East corner of Tripura, so long it must be held to be what Pemberton found it in 1835 to be "*the triple boundary of Manipore, Cachar and Tripura*."

9. Sir Alexander's Chapter XXI so fully relates the history of the Lushai tribes and their connection with the British Government and the Tripura Raj, that it is unnecessary to repeat the information here. Since the events recorded in this chapter, there has been a final subjugation of all these Lushai tribes, and the country inhabited by them lying between Manipore on the North; Burma or the Chin Hills on the East; Arakan on the South; and Chittagong and Tripura on the West, is now the regularly administered district

of Lushai land. One of the consequences of this annexation, and reduction of the Lushai country to an ordinary British district, is that its boundaries, especially any abutting on non-British territory, must be clearly defined. A topographical survey of Lushai land is being carried out, and before long it will be necessary to demarcate the boundary between Lushailand and the Tripura Raj:

10. In 1849 a Joint Commission consisting of Mr. Yule, the Magistrate of Dinajpore, on behalf of the British Government, and Mr. Campbell, the Raja's Manager, on behalf of the Tripura Raj, was deputed to lay down the boundary to the North of the Tripura Raj. In a Report, dated the 14th January 1851, Mr. Yule writes in para 30 : "Lieutenant Fisher fixed as the boundary (continuing through Pharna Dharmanagar Valley) a line running east from the source of the Thal Naddi mentioned in the preceeding case, to the Chattachura Hill and thence to the Dhalleswari, a stream running nearly due south to north whose eastern bank belongs to Cachar." And again in para. 48 as follows :- "Throughout the' disputed part of the boundary there the line is determined as follows :- (*vide* the annexed complete sketch) commencing from the east at the Dhalleswari River it runs from the Chattachura Hill," &c. From the above extracts it would seem that for absolutely no reason that can be discovered, the 1835 boundary of the Tripura Raj was shifted about 36 miles west, from Tipai Mukh to the Dhalleshwari River.

11. Mr. Edgar, Deputy Commissioner of Cachar, in his Notes on his tour among the Lushais in 1871, Part I, writes as follows :-

"East of the district of Comillah is a hill tract known as Independent Tipperah or Hill Tipperah, as it has been the fashion to term it for two or three years back. This is inhabited partly by Tipperahs and partly by Kookies under Chiefs of the Poitoo family. The best known and most influential of these is named Mischilon or Grushailon or Mischoilab."

"To sum up what I know of the Southern tribes. North, East and South-East of the villages inhabited by Tipperahs are Poitoo



and cognate Kookie villages. East of them and apparently west of the head waters of the Gootur are Syloos, among whom the leading Chief is Savoong. East of them and South of Mate Khlong (shown in Major Macdonald's map) are the Howlong Chiefs, among whom the most prominent are Vandulah and the sons of his cousin Lalpitang."

12. In part II. Mr. Edgar explains how "the Lushai Chief Lalul began to push towards the North and West. The hills East of the Dhalleshwari were occupied by villages under a family of Poitoo chiefs, the most influential of whom was named Laroo."

13. Further down Mr. Edgar suggests the policy that he considers should be adopted to protect Cachar, Manipore and Tripura from the Lushais.

14. *Extract from Report of Political officer with the left Column of the Lushai Expedition, dated 3rd April 1872, para 59.*

"In the accompanying map an attempt has been made to lay down approximately the western limits of Sookpilal's territory, but it is little more than a guess. He says himself that he has no influence west of the range on which Chatterchura is situated, but we do not accurately know what direction the ridge takes South of that peak. The country to the west of Sookpilal's territory is nominally subject to the Tipperah Chief, but the Eastern boundary of the territory of the latter is very uncertain. According to Pemberton and all the earlier maps, Independent Tipperah, as it was then called, extended as far as Tipai Mukh. *But some years ago the name of Hill Tipperah was in some mysterious way substituted for the older name, and all the hills between the South of Cachar and the Chittagong Hill Tracts seem to have been at about the same time silently included in the Cachar District.* The boundary between Cachar and Hill Tipperah shown in the maps of that period is the same as the line I have assumed to be the western boundary of Sookpilal's territory, but in the maps published lately a 'supposed water-shed and boundary' is laid down west of the supposed course of the Lungai, a little stream flowing into the

Sylhet District. I should think that the best geographical boundary between Hill Tipperah and the Lushai Hills would be the continuation of the water-shed that divides Sylhet from Cachar I cannot say what amount of authority the Tipperah Chief actually has over the Kookies living in the hills west of Sookpilal."

15. It will be seen from the correspondence that took place between the Government of India and Bengal, after the first Lushai Campaign when the question of Frontier Defence Lines were being discussed. The Government of India in its No. 1883 P., dated 4th September 1872, remarks in para. 7, "whatever may be the Eastern boundary laid down for Hill Tipperah, His Excellency in Council considers, as you have been already informed in my letter No. 17 C, dated 11th April 1871, that the responsibility for the defence of Tipperah must in the first instance rest with the Rajah under the guidance and advice of the Political Agent." Again in the Government of Bengal's No 3149, dated 19th August 1873, to the Government of India, in para. 4, "The Lieutenant-Governor agrees with all the officers whose opinions he has had that we cannot expect the Rajah of Tipperah to organise an efficient frontier defence, and that it would not be much use if he could so long as the country is uninhabited. It is shown conclusively in the reports that a chain of posts along the Hachick or Jampai Range, that is on the Eastern Frontier of Hill Tippera, could only be kept up at an enormous expense which that State certainly could not support, and which would be almost certainly useless if established." In para 10, "The Eastern frontier of Tipperah should, however, be now defined as the Government of India has repeatedly desired. In some maps the Jampai Range and in some the Hachick, Chattachura Range, has been put down as the limit and the question has hitherto been considered to be, which of these two ridges should be accepted as the boundary. Hill Tippera was formerly demarcated up to the Jampai, a general geographical line was loosely run down on the map as the boundary between British territory and the wild country to the south. All that time

nothing was known of the Lushais, and the line running North and South between them and Tipperah could in no wise be effected by the general East and West line above mentioned. As it is clear that the country on the border, especially to the West of it, is uninhabited, and not in the actual possession of anyone, we may, in settling the details, *be guided by geographical and political convenience*, though we may hope that this country may again be inhabited as it once was. Captain Badgley shows, in para 29 of his report, that in these tracts a river is by far the best and a hill range the worst form of a boundary, as the tops of the ranges generally come to be occupied by villages and cultivation, while the river sides are not occupied. The Lieutenant-Governor agrees with this view, which indeed he has had occasion to express on several occasions in dealing with these Eastern Frontier countries, and he would take for the Eastern boundary of Hill Tipperah neither the Jampai nor the Hachik, Chattachura Range but the Lungai River, which runs between them and is described by Captain Badgley as 'a clear stream with a sandy bed and good current.' After being carried up the Lungai to its sources in the Betling Shib Peak, the line would run across by the water-shed to the Peak of Dolajuri and thence follow the recognised Southern border of Hill Tipperah by Sardeng to the Fenny. Mr. Chennel will probably be able to give a clear definition of the line from Betling Shib. But the Lieutenant-Governor would ask the Government of India's approval of the general direction indicated."

16. It should be noted that the *Lungai River is about 48 miles West of Tipai Mukh*. Therefore (a) Pemberton in 1835 finds the North-East corner of the Tripura Raj to be at Tipai Mukh. (b) It may be inferred from Yule's Report in 1851 that he considered this point to be where the Northern boundary of the Tripura Raj crossed the Dhalleshwari or 36 miles West of Tipai Mukh. And now we see (c) that the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal suggests that this North-East point should be on the Lungai River or about another 12 miles West or about 48 miles West of Tipai Mukh.

And all this slicing off of huge strips of country was being done by the British officials without the smallest reference to the Tripura Rajah, whose territory is reduced on its North-East Frontier by about one-half to *suit the administrative and political convenience of the British Government.*

17. The government ideas as to an expedient boundary were communicated to the Rajah of Tripura by the Political Agent with the request that His Highness should establish some guard posts beyond the Lungai.

His Highness replied in No. 21 of 9th February 1874 (Appendix A) that he understands "the River Lungai between the Jampai and Hachik Ranges being fixed by the Government of India as the Eastern boundary." His Highness did not see what he had to do with the country beyond.

18. Captain Lillingston, the Political Agent, in his No. 60 of 3rd March 1874 (Appendix B), wrote to His Highness in para 2: "Mr. Power informs me that he has already pointed out to you that you are in error in supposing that the country East of the boundary line marked by the Lungai River has been taken up by Government," And the letter goes on to explain the objects of Government in clear and unmistakable terms,

19. In reply to communications (Appendices C, D, E) on the subject of this boundary, the Tripura Administration in its No. 646 of 15th March 1887 (Appendix F), to the Political Agent at Agartala, gave a short history of the question, and ended by expressing the hope that "*the Government will be graciously pleased to accept the River Dhalleshwari as the Eastern boundary of this State and pass orders accordingly.*"

20. The Assistant Political Agent forwarded the above letter to the Political Agent with certain remarks.

21. The Darbar submitted a reply (Appendix G) which was considered at a conference at which the Commissioner of Chittagong (Mr. Lyall), the Political Agent (Mr. Price), the Assistant Political Agent (Rai Umakanta Das, Bahadoor), and His Highness's



Manager (Mr. Sandys), were present at Commillah and fully discussed the whole question.

22. Rai Umakanta Das, Bahadoor, became Minister of the Tripura Raj, and addressed a demi-official communication, dated 20th September 1890, to the Political Agent (Appendix H) asking for the restoration of the country to the East of the Lungai.

23. In the following year the Darbar again addressed the Political Agent in No. 406, dated 6th April 1891 (Appendix I), pointing out that, as peace had been established in the Lushai country, His Highness thought the time had come when he might have back the country beyond the Lungai.

24. In reply the Minister was informed by the Commissioner in his No 1046 H. T./IX-14 dated 3rd August 1891 (Appendix J), that hostilities had again broken out in the Dhalleshwari Valley, and that affairs were worse than they had ever been.

25. In reply to the demi-official correspondence between the Political Agent and the Commissioner (Appendix K and L) enquiring whether the administration thought it could cultivate up to the left bank of the Dhalleshwari River, the Minister in his demi-official, dated 11th October 1891 (Appendix M), wrote fully all details required, and gave satisfactory reasons why the country beyond the Lungai should be restored.

26. This matter stayed in abeyance until the Darbar in its letter of 1st December 1897 (Appendix N) pointed out that, as peace had been finally established in Lushai land, *"the Darbar earnestly hopes that you will move the Government to order a restoration of the part of the country cut off from the State by the Notification"* dated 23rd June 1874 (Appendix D).

27. To the above representation the Chief Commissioner of Assam simply declines to re-open the question of the Eastern boundary.

## APPENDIX G

### THE EASTERN BOUNDARY

THE Political Agent having asked for remarks on the Assistant Political Agent's No. 254, dated 28th May 1887, being a report on the Maharajah's request as contained in his English Office No. 646, dated 15th March 1887.

This report is a special plea, gleaned from Government records chiefly quoted in Mr. Mackenzie's North-East Frontier of Bengal, against the Maharajah's request to have the Dhalleshwari River recognized as the substantive boundary instead of the Lungai River temporarily fixed after the Lushai Campaign of 1871-72, by the orders of the Government of Bengal No. 3149, dated 19th August 1873 (para 10, Mackenzie, page 483).

The two arguments adduced by the Assistant Political Agent are: 1st, the inexpediency of going too near the Lushais and provoking complications with them: and 2ndly, the impossible costliness of the Maharajah's maintaining proper out-posts along the extended frontier line. It will be attempted to be shown that both these arguments are untenable *now*, no matter how much force they may have had 15 years ago.

*Lushais* — Owing to a variety of circumstances the Lushais have divided themselves into two main bodies, each embracing many clans.

*Kukies* — There are the Kukies inhabiting the mountain ranges west of the Ainkung Range, and acknowledging the supremacy of the Maharajah under their clan chieftains. The Lushais live in the hills to the east of the Ainking Range, chiefly about the head waters of the Dhalleshwar. To the north of Lushailand is Cachar and Manipore; to the south the Syloos and Howlongs living north and east of the Chittagong Hill Tracts; to the east the Shans of Burmah. Consequently the Lushais are

now hemmed in on three sides by British territory.

*Sukpilal*. — Fifteen years ago Sukpilal was the great Chief who made himself the greatest of the Lushais. He died in 1881, and his power and influence went with him, as he left many sons and successors, who, as usual, are jealous of each other and all thoroughly cowed by the Lushai Campaign, since which they have never attempted raids beyond their own borders; they have moved off further south, being now on the southern extremity of the Ekrulpuri, the Parbatal and Rai Ranges, all nearer the Chittagong Hill Tracts than to Sylhet and Cachar.

The *Dhalleswari*, the most important stream in Lushailand, flows northwards and enters Cachar, after its confluents on the west bank the Pukwa and the Gatur join it. Tracing the Dhalleshwari from Cachar up or southwards, we find that it takes a due east bend round the north end of the Ekrulpuri Range and then flows between the Ekrulpuri and Darlong Ranges. Bepari Bazar is situated about the middle of this valley and is the great trade mart of the Lushai.

*Gatur* — Just before the Dhalleshwari takes the eastern bend above described, it receives the Gatur which, except for its inferior size, looks like the main course of the Dhalleshwari, and with it forms nearly a straight due north and south water line.

*Pukwa* — The westernmost tributary of the Dhalleshwari joins it as it flows past the north end of the Ainkung Range, and drains the valley between the Hachik and Ainkung Ranges.

*Lungai* is the next river eastwards of the Pukwa and drains the valley between the Hachik and Jampai Ranges, and is the temporary boundary alluded to above.

*Chattachoor*a — For no particular reason that the writer has been able to discover the Chattachoor Peak on the north end of the Hachik Range was selected as the starting point of Lieutenant Fisher's boundary between Sylhet and Tipperah. It is

presumed that this Peak was selected because it was a point beyond dispute, where the Sylhet Cachar and Tipperah boundary met. But that is no proof, and it has never been categorically asserted (but, nevertheless, tacitly acted upon as a latent idea in the minds of most British officials) that this Chattachoor Peak was the eastern end of the northern and northern end of the eastern boundary of Tipperah. The Government of Bengal in its latter above quoted says: "The eastern frontier of Tipperah should, however, be now defined as the Government of India has repeatedly desired. In some maps the Jampai and in some the Hachik-Chattachoor Range has been put down as the limit, and the question has hitherto been considered to be which of the two ridges should be accepted as the boundary. Hill Tipperah was formerly demarcated up to the Jampai; but east of the Jampai a general geographical line was loosely run down on the map as the boundary between British territory and the wild country to the south. At that time nothing was known of the Lushais, and the line running north and south between them and Tipperah could, in nowise, be affected by the general east and west line above-mentioned. As it is clear that the country on the border, especially to the west of it, is uninhabited, and not in the actual possession of anyone, *we may in settling the details be guided by geographical and political conveniences*, though we may hope that this country may be inhabited as it once was." From the above quotation it will be seen, 1st, that the Government of Bengal presumed, for no proof is adduced, that either the Jampai or the Hachik Range was the eastern boundary of Tipperah; 2ndly, that an arbitrary line was drawn east of the Jampai Range to separate Cachar from Lushai land; 3rdly, that nothing was known about the Lushais; 4thly, that though this line might be accepted as the one separating Cachar from Lushai land, yet that acceptance had nothing to do with the boundary between Tipperah and Lushai land; lastly, that the country on the border, i.e., the Ainkung Range, was uninhabited.



*Lungai boundary* — For good and sufficient reasons, according to the circumstances of the case, *the Lungai was fixed as the temporary east boundary of the region to be guarded.* Those circumstances have now changed, and it is not recognizing this change that deprives the Assistant Political Agent's arguments (against shifting the east boundary more eastward) of any force they may have had fourteen or fifteen years ago.

*Lungai Valley closed* — At present, though the Lungai is supposed to be the east boundary, yet the refusal of the Sylhet authorities to allow access to it by its only line of communication, the Lungai itself, practically makes the Jampai Range or the Deo River the east limit of Tipperah of rather of the Maharajah's two chief sources of income, forest produce and royalty on elephants. It may seem a harsh and unjust accusation to make, but the action of the Sylhet authorities would seem to justify the idea that they prohibit the free navigation of the Lungai in order to get toll for all the forest produce out of the Maharajah's Lungai Valley territory. The only excuse offered for this churlish refusal is that the Jungle north of the line from Bangsool to Chattachooria is "reserved forest." Private proprietors are made to give up towing paths 20ft. wide on each side of any navigable stream that runs through their property for the convenience of the public. Why should not a similar rule be observed along the banks of the Lungai except for the reason above given?

(Sd.) E.F.SANDYS,

*Manager, Chakla Roshanabad.*

Krishnakishor Manikya had nine sons viz., Upendrachandra, Isanchandra, Birchandra, Chakradhaj, Madhabehandra, Jadabchandra, Nilkrishna, Sureshchandra, and Sivchandra. Upendrachandra the eldest was appointed Juvaraj and Isanchandra the next younger the Bara Thakur. Upendrachandra Juvaraj died during Krishnakishor's life time, so that he was

succeeded by his second son.

**ISANCHANDRA MANIKYA (1849-1862)** — It has been alleged, that Isanchandra promised his father Krishnakishor Manikya, that he would appoint Nilkrishna, then a young boy and the son of the *Patrani* or senior Rani, and his (Kasichandra's) successor, as by that time he would be old enough to manage affairs. But for some reason or another this appointment was not made and Nilkrishna left Agartala and lived in Comilla, the Head quarters of the district of (British) Tipperah.

Isanchandra Manikya was an exceedingly devout Hindu and devoting himself almost exclusively to religious affairs left the conduct of the Raj almost entirely in the hands of his Guru (Spiritual Guide,) Banwarilal Goshwami. For some time before his death Isanchandra Manikya became paralytic. As the Raja's end approached he was urged to appoint a successor but put it off till a day or two before his death, when Nilkrishna was sent for from Comilla. But Nilkrishna delayed his departure and as the Raja's end was very near, a *Rubakari* or proceeding was drawn up by which Birchandra, the Raja's own younger brother was appointed Juvaraj, while his own elder son Brajendrachandra was appointed Bara Thakur and a younger son Navadipchandra the Barakarta, thus adding a 3rd eventual claimant to the throne.

The institution of Bara Thakur had been made in troublous times so that in case the Juvaraj pre-deceased the Raja, the Bara Thakur should succeed to the vacant throne on the death of the Raja if no one else had been appointed the Juvaraj and there being no Juvaraj living.

It is to be presumed, that the creation of this new dignity of Bara Karta was to provide a 3rd nominated successor, in case the Juvaraj and Bara Thakur both pre-deceased the Raja and no other successors had been nominated by the late Raja during his life time.

It will not be amiss here to give an outline of the rules and

custom of succession to a Hindu Raj in the olden time.

In the *Smritis* and other works dealing with *Raja-dharma* or the Raja's rights, duties and privileges, the qualifications of a person for the office of the Raja are laid clearly down. In the Institutes of Yajnavalkya is the following passage:—

महोवाहः स्थूललक्षः कृतव्री वृद्धसेवकः  
विनीतमत्वमम्पतः कुलीनः मत्यवाक् शुचिः ॥  
अदीर्घमुत्रः स्मृतिमान् अक्षुद्रीऽपुरुषस्तथा ।  
धार्मिकोऽव्यसनश्चैव प्राज्ञः शूरो रहस्यवित् ॥  
स्वरन्त्रगोप्ताऽऽन्वीक्षिक्यां दपडनीत्यां तथैव च ।  
विनीतस्त्वथ वार्तायां तय्यां चैव नराधिपः ॥

Which briefly means, that, a person should be possessed of excellent physical, intellectual and moral qualities, both natural and acquired, to be fit for the office of a Raja or Ruler.

In the Sanskrit Epic the Ramayana of Valmiki in the Second Book Chapter I, the Prince Rama, the eldest son of the King Dasaratha is described as possessed of all those qualities both natural and acquired that should adorn a Raja; it is then stated :—

तं समीक्ष्य तदा राजा युक्तं समुदितैर्गुणैः ।  
निश्चित्वा सचिवैः सारहं यीवराज्यममन्यत ॥

अयोध्याकाण्ड, प्रथमः सर्गः, ४२ श्लोकः ।

Which means: — “Then the Raja (Dasaratha) finding him (Rama) endowed with all good qualities, discussed with the Ministers and decided (Rama's) appointment as Yuva-raja.”

It is clear that this decision in Rama's favor was not only because he was the eldest son, but because he was also possessed of the requisite qualifications.

The ceremonial of appointing a Juvaraj is mentioned in the 8th, 9th & 10th Slokas of the 5th Canto of the Ajaddhya Kanda of

the Ramayana is the following passage :-

स चैनं प्रप्रित दृष्ट्वा सन्भाष्याभिप्रसाद च ।  
प्रियाहं हर्षयम् रामम् इत्युवाच पुरोहितः ॥

प्रसन्नस्ते पिता राम ! इत् त्व राज्यमवाप्तासि ।  
उपवासं भवान्द्र करोतु सह सीतया ॥

प्रातरत्वामभिषेक्षा हि यौवराज्ये नराधिपः ।  
पिता दशरथः प्रीत्या ययातिं नहुषी यथा ॥

Which may be translated :— “The said Priest (Vasistha), finding the Prince Rama polite, humble and amiable, greeted and praised him, and then causing him delight spoke to him thus :— O Rama ! Thy Father is kind, so thou shall get the Empire. Thou must fast today together with (thy Wife) Sita; thy Father Raja Dasaratha will tomorrow morning anoint thee in the office of Yuvaraja out of affection, as Nahusa did Jajati.”

This anointing is an essential part of the ritual in the appointment of a Juvaraj. In Tripura the twining of a chaplet of ceremonially pure flowers round the *Pagri* of the Juvaraj elect by command of the Raja in open Darbar, and the proclamation by the State Crier of his name' and new dignity, is the official and essential concluding part of the State Ceremony — *Nazzars* are then presented to the Juvaraj.

In the other great Hindu Epic, the Mahabharata, is given the reply of Jajati, from whom the Tripura Rajas are descended, when asked his reasons for superseding his four eldest sons and appointing his youngest son as his Yuva-raja

ब्राह्मणप्रसूख्वावर्णाः सर्वे क्षणस्तु मे वचः ।  
न्येष्टं प्रति यथा राज्यं न देयं मे कथञ्चन ॥  
मम ज्येष्ठेन यदुना नियोगी नानुपालितः ।  
प्रतिकूलः पितुर्वक्ष्ये न स पुत्रः सतां मतः ॥  
मातापित्रोवचनकृत् हितः पथ्ये यः सुतः ।  
स पुत्रं पुत्रवदस्त्व वक्ष्ये ते पितृक्षमातृवु ॥  
यदुनाहमवज्ञानस्तथा तुल्यसुनापि च ।  
दुदूना चानुना चैव मय्यावज्ञा कृता भृशम् ॥  
पुरुषा तु कृतं वाक्यं मानितञ्च विशेषतः ।  
कनोयान् मम दायदो दृष्ट्वा येन जरा मम ॥

आदिपर्वणि, सम्भवपर्वणि पञ्चाशीतितमाध्याये

२३-७ श्लोकाः



The above passage means :— “Ye heads of the Brahmana and other classes, all listen to my words why the Empire cannot be made over to the eldest. My order has not been obeyed by Yadu the eldest. He who is hostile to the Father is not recognised as a son by the virtuous. That issue Who is obedient, affectionate and friendly to the Father and to the Mother, and who abides by them as such is a son. I was disrespected by Yadu and likewise by Turvasu. And great disrespect has been shown me by Druhya and Anu. But Puru (the youngest) has obeyed my word and shown me special respect. Though the Youngest, yet he is to become my heir, as he has relieved me from the state of decrepitude that) untimely overtook me owing to a curse) by having the same transmitted to himself.”

In the 140th Chapter of the. Sambhava-parva of the Adiparva of the Mahabharata, there is also given an account of the appointment, by Dhritarashtra, the *de facto* King (after the abdication and retirement of his brother Pandu) to the dignity of Yuvaraja of Yudhishthira, the subsequently born eldest son of Pandu, on account of his good qualities, in supersession of his (Dhritarashtra's) own sons :—

ततः संयत्सरस्यान्ते यौवराज्याय पार्थिव ।  
स्थापितो घृतराष्ट्रेण पाण्डुपुत्रो बुधिहिः ॥ १ ॥  
घृतिस्थैर्यसंष्ठिनुत्वाद आनृत्यं स्वात्तथार्जवात् ।  
भृत्यानामनुकम्पार्थं तथैव स्थिरमौहदात् ॥ २ ॥

Meaning :— “Maharaji ! Then after a year Pandu's son Yudhishthira was appointed by Dhritarashtra to the office of Yuvaraja, for the sake of compassion for (public) servants, by reason of (his being endowed with good qualities, namely) patience, firmness, fortitude, sympathy, candour, as well as steady good-heartedness.”

The appointment of Bhimasena by his elder brother Yudhishthira to the office of Yuva-rajā is related in the 9th verse of the XLI Chapter of the Rajdharmanusasan-parva of the Santi-

parva, as follows.

पीरबानपदान् सर्वान् दिमृन्व कुम्भन्दनः।  
यौवराजन्येन कौन्तेयं भीमसानमबोधयत् ॥  
शान्तिपर्वणि, राजधम्मामुशासनपर्वणि,

४१ अध्याये ८ श्लोकः।

Which may be translated — “The descendant of Kuru (Yudhisthira) having dismissed all the citizens and villagers, appointed (his younger brother) Bhimasena, the son of Kunti, to the office of Yuva-rajā.”

In the 6th Sloka of the. 7th Canto of the Nitisara, a work on Polity by Kamandaka, a disciple of the celebrated Chanakya Pandit, who raised the first Maurya King, Chandragupta, to the throne of the Empire in 319 B.C., it is laid down :—

विनीतमौरसं पुत्रं यौवराज्येऽभिषेचयेत्।

सप्तमसर्गे षष्ठेश्लोकः।

Which may be translated — “The king shall appoint to the office of Yuva-rajā, one of the sons of his loins, who is endowed with good qualities, both natural and acquired.”

The 3rd Canto, 35th Sloka of the Raghuvansa of Kalidasa the greatest of Sanskrit poets and who was honored by the King Vikramaditya, about 1900 years ago, there is an account of how king Dilipa appointed his son Raghu as his Juvaraja and also clearly defines the reason for, the meaning of and the duties of the office :—

Which translated :— “Then, the King being desirous of lightening the heavy burden of looking after the welfare of the subjects, so long borne by himself, and finding him (his son Raghu) endowed with the requisite qualifications, both natural and acquired, (through education) appointed him Yuvaraja or his associate in the Empire and successor designate.”

ततः प्रजानां चिरमात्मना धृताम्  
नितान्तगुर्वी लघयिष्यता धुरम्।  
निमर्गसंस्कारविनीत इत्यसी  
नृपेण चक्रे युवराजशब्दभाक् ॥

It will be clearly seen from the above authoritative quotations that according to the ancient law and usage of the Hindus, the reigning Raja had the prerogative of appointing the Yuva-raja or his "designated successor and associate in the empire," (Colebrooke's miscellaneous Essays Vol. II page, 286. Madras Edition, 1872) — this being the ordinary meaning attached by usage to the word, which by derivation signifies "young king." The office of the Raja resembles the ordinary impartible estates in this, that, it can be held only by a single person, but nevertheless it is unlike it in so far as succession is concerned. For, succession to estates partible or impartible is regulated by definite rules of descent, whereby they devolve on a person standing in a particular degree of relationship to the last holder; but the royal office could be held only by one endowed with certain qualification, which may not be possessed by such a person. This forms the foundation of the prerogative which conferred on the reigning Raja the power of selecting his successor, when the Raja was not a mere figurehead, but was expected to perform personally important functions constituting the royal office, the discharge of which required qualities both natural and acquired. The Raja was not merely the head of the Executive Government, but he had to look after the administration of Justice, by presiding personally in his Court of Justice; and he was also the Commander-in-Chief of his army. The rule of inheritance according to primogeniture, which regulated the succession in case no Juvaraj had been nominated by a deceased Raja, also guided the choice of the Raja in making the appointment to the office of Yuva-raja, provided the eldest son was properly qualified. It was a matter of vital importance to the kingdom, that a fit and proper person should be appointed to this office; and exercise of the prerogative was regarded as a sacred duty on the part of the 'reigning Raja, so that if notwithstanding the care taken by him for the education of his sons, he found that effect could not be given to primogeniture, or that none of them proved to be worthy of that high office, he had to

supersede him or them in favour of a younger son, or a brother or other member of the royal family, who deserved to be, and so was, appointed to this high office. The Tripura House has retained the ancient usage in this matter.

It should be observed that the term Yuva-raja, which literally means, the "young raja," is used in contradistinction to the reigning king who must, by necessary implication, be the elder of the two. The etymological import of the word suggests the reason underlying the technical meaning of the word, namely, that Yuvaraj is the person who is appointed to assist the reigning Raja in the discharge of his royal functions when he is old and so unable to perform all the duties imposed on him as Raja: he is therefore, at first the Raja's associate in the work of Government; and then his successor after his retirement. He must therefore be a person in whom the Raja reposes full confidence, so that he may be trusted with the position and power of his high office as the Raja's assistant and is not likely to abuse it with the object of supplanting the old Raja and usurping the throne before his retirement or voluntary resignation. This ancient usage was conducive to the welfare of the State, as it secured continuity of policy and of the machinery of government, and prevented a bloody dispute for succession to the throne after the reigning Raja's death.

The ancient literature on the subject leaves no doubt in the mind of the reader that the reigning Raja enjoyed perfect freedom in the matter of selecting and appointing his Yuvaraja from amongst his sons or other members of the royal family, whomsoever he thought fit, as a proper and trustworthy person to be eligible for this high office. And the same conclusion must follow from a consideration of the reason object and end of the institution. To say that the reigning Raja has the right to nominate not only his own assistant and successor, but also the assistant and successor of his successor would be a contradiction in terms; for, his own successor would then cease to have all the prerogatives of a reigning Raja inasmuch as he would not have



the right of choosing his own trusted Yuva-raja in whom he may repose full confidence, while his predecessor's nominee might be inimical to him. This would be an anomaly which is inconsistent with the principle underlying the usage and which defeats the very object sought to be accomplished by it.

In the Srimat Bhagvat Purana, 9th Part, XIX Chapter, . 22nd and 23rd Slokes the following :—

दिशि दक्षिणपूर्वस्यां दुह्यं दक्षिणतो यदु ।  
प्रतीच्यां तुर्वसुं चक्रे उदोच्यामनुशरं ॥  
भूमण्डलस्य सव्यस्य पूरुमर्हतमं विशाम् ।  
अभिषिच्याग्रजांस्तस्य वशे स्थाप्य वनं ययौ ॥

Which may be translated :- “The Emperor Jajati made Druhyu the Governor of the South-Eastern borders; Yada of the Southern; Turvasu of the Western; and Anu of the Northern, and having installed on the throne Puru as the lord of the whole Empire, entitled to the highest respect of the subjects, and placing his (said four) elder brothers under his control the Emperor retired to a forest.”

The Emperor appears to have had recourse to the expedient of making his elder sons Rajas of territories, inhabited by turbulent peoples as dependencies under his youngest son, who was made the Emperor, with a view to conciliate them, and keep them engaged in governing their kingdoms.

The circumstances under which the Tripura Rajas came to reside in the South-East mountainous borders of the Empire left a deep and lasting impression and as a tradition the practice of appointing a Yuva-raja has been maintained by this dynasty, as none but a properly qualified person could rule the people of a hill country. So the Rajas of Tripura are found often to exercise this prerogative as a sacred duty, sacrificing their natural affection in its discharge, by appointing their brothers and cousins as their Yuva-rajās to the exclusion of their own sons.

It appears that the unsettled state of things during the latter period of the Mogal rule made it necessary to take greater

precaution in this respect, for the purpose of preventing a break in the continuity of government and avoid disputes with regard to succession, in case the Yuva-raja died shortly before the death of the Raja or under circumstances in which a fresh appointment could not be made to fill the vacancy thus caused in the office of Yuva-raja. The Rajas of Tripura therefore created a new office and introduced the innovation of appointing what was called a Bara- Thakur who was to succeed to the throne in case the Yuva-raja predeceased the Raja, and the latter could not or did not appoint any other person as Yuva-raja, and also in case the Yuva-raja after becoming Raja failed to appoint any other person as his Yuva-raja. In the latter case the fact that he was once considered by a reigning Raja to be worthy of being his successor in a certain contingency, gave him preference over other members of the family, who did not hold a higher title.

As regards the exact position of the Bara Thakur it should, in the first place be observed, that the term is a very modern one. It consists of two Bengali words formed by the corruption of two Sanskrit words of which the latter, namely, *Thakkura* is a word which is found only in very recent Sanskrit works. It is not found in any of the wellknown ancient Sanskrit lexicons. In the Bengali form it is used to mean the image of a deity; it is also found as a family name implying respectability, of which "Tagore" is a further corruption in English. It appears that the Bengali form *Thakur* is used as the family honorific by the members of the Raj family of Tripura. As regards the word 'Bara' it is a corruption of either *Briddha* or *Brihat* or *Badr* three Sanskrit words of which the latter two mean large or great or chief, and the first ordinarily means old or senior.

The term Bara Thakur therefore means a chief Thakur and does not imply an office of succession: it does not mean an heir-apparent, (Yuva-raja) or successor to the heir apparent, (Bhabi Yuva-raja). It seems merely to signify that the holder of this title has precedence over the other Thakurs.

That this innovation is recent is clear from the fact the term used is Bengali, and there is no corresponding expression in Sanskrit. A post next to Yuva-raja in respect of succession is not mentioned even in the latest Sanskrit works. There is no rite prescribed for the appointment of Bara Thakur as in the case of the Yuva-raja.

Hence the practice of appointing a Bara Thakur cannot be clothed with the character of *Kulachar* or a family custom or usage having the force of law. Nor can the limited number of instances of this appointment afford any data Justifying the deduction of rules relating to its incidents, whereby the wellknown ancient prerogative of the Raja with respect to the appointment of the Yuva-raja, can be curtailed.

It cannot but be admitted that a "Bara Thakur" became a Yuva-raja only when so appointed by the reigning Raja, but never without such appointment. Assuming, as is stated by some, that in the instances set forth by them, the reigning Raja did select the person appointed "Bara Thakur" by his predecessor, for the office of his own Yuva-raja, that fact cannot by itself be sufficient to establish the right of the Bara Thakur to be so appointed even against, the will of the reigning Raja. All that can be fairly deduced from the said fact is that in those instances the reigning Raja was of opinion that the person who happened to have been appointed Bara Thakur, was amongst the members of the Raj family, the best qualified for the office of Yuva-raja, and therefore in the exercise of his free and independent discretion he appointed him. The appointment would be unnecessary if the Bara Thakur had the right to step into the position of the Yuva-raja as soon as the latter became Raja. For if the opposite contention was correct then immediately on the death of the reigning Raja, the Bara Thakur became the Yuva-raja, in the same manner as the Yuva-raja became the Raja. Hence, the claim on the part of a Bara Thakur that he has a right to be appointed Yuvaraj, is opposed to the admitted fact that he cannot become Yuvaraja, unless he be

so appointed by the Raja.

The argument advanced on the strength of the instances in which Bara Thakurs were appointed Yuvarajas, is exactly of the same character as that put forward on behalf of Nilkrishna before the Privy Council in the case reported in 12 Moore's Indian Appeals, page 523. It is noticed and answered by the Judicial Committee, thus, —

“On the argument of this appeal before their Lordships, the appellant's preferential title by seniority to the Yuvarajship was sought to be established by evidence of a family custom to be collected from the instances given in the geneology of actual successions. But where there is evidence of a power of selection, the actual observance of seniority even in a considerable series of successions cannot of itself defeat a custom which establishes the right of free choice, and had the instances been uniform and without exception, that alone would not have been sufficient to support the Appellant's case.”

It has already been observed that there is a religious rite prescribed by the Shastras for the formal appointment of a Yuvaraj; and that this ceremony has uniformly been observed in all cases by the Rajas of Tripura, save and except in the instance of Rajdhar Manikya, in which the ceremony could not be performed by reason of the mental incapacity and subsequent death of the reigning Raja whose expressed desire had been to appoint him his Yuvaraj was held sufficient to establish his claim to throne at the request of the Rani Janhabī Mahadevi (1783-1785).

It should be observed that the question of succession to the throne of Tripura must be decided according to the law and custom by which that house is governed. The family is governed by the Bengal school of Hindu law, except so far as the same is controlled by *Kulachar* or family custom having the force of law under the principles of Hindu Jurisprudence.

If is therefore necessary to consider what customs have the force of law according to Hindu Jurisprudence and are binding



on the Tripura Raj. It should however, be borne in mind in the first place, that Hindus believe their law to be of divine origin, and their Shastras, and the customs recognised as having the force of law, are regarded simply as evidence of divine commands communicated to man (Manu) by God at the beginning of this world.

Manu says :—

वेदः स्मृतिः सदाचारः स्वस्य च प्रियम् आत्मनः ।  
एतच्च चतुर्विधं प्राहुः साक्षाद् धर्मस्य लक्षणं ॥ २।१.२ ॥

"The Vedas the Smritis, the approved usage, and what is agreeable to one's own soul (where there is no other guide, the wise) have declared to be quadruple direct evidence of law."

So Yajnavalkya says :-

श्रुतिः स्मृतिः सदाचारः स्वस्य च प्रियम् आत्मनः ।  
सम्यक् सङ्कल्पजः कामो धर्ममूलम् इदं स्मृतं ॥

"The Sruti, the Smriti, the approved usage, and what is agreeable to one's own soul, and desire sprung from due deliberation are ordained the foundation (or evidence) of law."

Manu thus explains what is meant by approved usage :-

सस्वतीदृषयोर्देवनद्योर्यद् अन्तरं ।  
तं देवनिर्मितं देशं ब्रह्मावर्तं प्रचक्षते ॥  
तस्मिन् देशे य आचारः पारस्पर्यक्रमागतः ।  
वर्णानां सान्नायालानां स सदाचार उच्यते ॥

॥ १७-१८

"The holy country lying between the holy rivers Sarasvati and Drishadvati is called Brahmavarta : the custom in that country which has come down by immemorial tradition and obtains among all classes pure and mixed is called approved usage."

The word usage here means all kinds of usage ; Yajnavalkya thus declares the sacredness of all sorts of usages :-

यस्मिन् देशे य आचारो व्यवहारः कुलस्थितिः ।  
तथैव परिपाल्योऽसी यदा वशमुपागतः ॥

"Whatever customs, practices, and family usages prevail

in a country shall be preserved intact, when it comes under subjection by conquest.

It has already been observed that the theory of the origin of Hindu law is, that the same has emanated from the Deity. The divine precepts were communicated in the Sanskrit language the precepts embodied in the very words of the Deity are called Sruti, meaning what was actually heard ; the precepts, however that had been handed down by the tradition, but not in the very words of revelation, until compiled and recorded by the Sages in their own language, are called Smriti or what was remembered; while there are other precepts that were not recorded at all, but have been observed in practice by learned and pious men, from ancient times. Hence from an approved usage which is ancient and of which the origin cannot be traced, a presumption is raised, that the same is founded on divine precept. This is what is intended by Manu and Yajnavalkya by saying that an approved usage is evidence of law, that is to say, of revelation.

Hence under the Hindu law, a usage cannot have the binding force of the law, unless it be ancient and immemorial, so that its origin is lost in antiquity and impossible to trace.

It is therefore clear that a modern innovation like the usage of the appointment of a Bara Thakur, cannot have the force of a *Kulachara* so as to be binding as a rule of positive law.

Although there is a tradition in the family as to the object with which the practice of appointing a Bara Thakur was introduced by its founder, still it cannot be expected that such a recent innovation would be entitled to much respect from the members of the family. Accordingly it is found that although Harimani the Juvaraj or Raja Krishna Manikya predeceased him, still his Bara Thakur Birmani who survived him did not lay any claim to the throne; he very naturally thought that the predeceased Juvaraj. Harimani's son, Rajdhar, who was the late Raja's nephew, had a title by inheritance in preference to himself who was a very distant cousin. There was, no doubt, an informal appointment made by the deceased Raja, of Rajdhar, but the circumstance does, as

already observed, strongly supports the view that the Bara Thakur is not entitled to become Juvaraj, in the absence of appointment; and that in the estimation of the members of the family this innovation did not, as it could not, acquire the binding force of a legitimate family usage, according to the principles of Hindu law. The only instance in which the original intention with which the title of Bara Thakur was created was given effect to, is the case of succession by Raja Ramgunga Manikya after Raja Durgamani Manikya, who died without appointing a Juvaraj, as he had waited in expectation of getting a son for whom the post was kept vacant. In this case Ramgunga's position was strengthened by the fact that his father was the Raja by whom he was appointed Bara Thakur, and on whose death he had taken possession of the throne, but was compelled by the decree of the Court, to give up the same to the said Durgamani.

Birman was the younger brother of Lakhan both being the sons of Gadadhar (Udai Manikya) the son of Dharma Manikya (1714-1733). Udai and Lakhan were both usurpers among those scrambling for the Raj during the troublous times between 1743 and 1761, chiefly assisted by the Mogals, whose fingers were itching to be in the Tripura pie, until the Company eat it up !

Hence the conclusion that legitimately follows from the foregoing is that the ancient prerogative of a reigning Raja of Tripura with respect to the appointment of his Yuva-raja, cannot in any way be curtailed by the fact of a person having been appointed Bara Thakur by his predecessor, the innovation not having the force of law, even assuming that in many instances the Bara Thakurs were appointed Juvaraj upon the ground that they were supposed to have the right to be so appointed. But nevertheless, it may be contended that this much effect should be given to the innovation as a family arrangement by consensus of opinion of all its members for so many years, namely, that the Bara Thakur of a Raja may succeed him in case he dies without leaving behind him his Juvaraj, and that the Bara Thakur of a

predecessor may also succeed when the last Raja dies without leaving a Juvaraj or Bara Thakur of his own: the reason being, that, inasmuch as succession by nomination is the rule in this Raj, one who has been nominated by a Raja, so as to become his successor in a certain contingency, is entitled to have preference over all others who have not been considered to be so deserving by any Raja.

The *Kulachara* or Family Custom governing succession to the Tripura Raj, was never in its entirety, the subject of enquiry before a Court of Justice, nor is there any recorded statement of the same. It appears to be desirable and useful to fully set forth the same here. It is as follows :—

(1) The reigning Raja has the prerogative of appointing his successor, or more properly speaking a Yuvaraja, who is not only his successor designate, but also his associate or assistant in the work of government.

(2) The reigning Raja has the power of dismissing a Yuvaraja, for misconduct or for any other cause such as incompetency. This is a necessary corollary to the prerogative; it is like a Review of Judgment. It is proved by subsequent events, that the person appointed is not really possessed of the good qualities with which he was supposed to have been endowed, then the appointment must fail, in consequence of its foundation being wanting.

(3) In case the last Raja dies without formally or informally appointing his successor, the rule of ordinary primogeniture applies.

(4) No female can succeed.

(5) No Congnate relation can succeed as long as an Agnate or descendant of the main line exists.

(6) The succession must be confined to the members of the Raj family, that is to say, to the agnate relation of the deceased Raja.

(7) No *Dattaka* or adopted son can succeed, as there has



never been the custom of adoption in the family, nor can such an adopted son succeed to the throne.

As regards a Bara Thakur's position, it has already been said that the innovation of his appointment cannot rank as *Kulachara* under Hindu law. The circumstances under which it was introduced have now entirely ceased to exist. For the British rule has established peace in the country, and has ensured its continuance, so that there is no apprehension of a bloody contest for the throne of Tripura which enjoys the blessing of protection from the paramount power of the British Government. This novel practice may therefore be henceforth discontinued without any disadvantage to the state.

Assuming however that this new usage is binding like a family arrangement which may be deemed to have presumably had the assent of all the members of the Raj family, from its commencement till the present time, then the Bara Thakur's rights can legitimately, as has already been shown, modify the *Kulachara* to this extent, namely:

(1) That the Bara Thakur appointed by a Raja succeeds him if he dies without leaving a Juvaraj surviving.

(2) That if a Raja dies without leaving either a Juvaraj or a Bara Thakur, then the Bara Thakur of a predecessor succeeds him.

But the Succession Sanad granted by the Government of India on the 21st June 1904 puts the succession in a simple and definite basis. It is as follows :—

**SUCCESSION SANAD** granted by the **GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.**

Dated 21st June 1904

**SANAD**

To

His HIGHNESS THE RAJA OF HILL TIPPERA.

Whereas, with a view to continuing the representation of the ruling house and dignity of the State of Hill Tippera, it is desirable

to remove all doubts as to the rule of succession to the Chiefship of the said State and the ownership of the Zemindaries and the property in British India which appertain thereto and are held therewith, it is hereby declared :—

(1) That the Chiefship of the said State is and shall ever be hereditary in the Deb Burman family of Hill Tippera, of which His Highness Radhakishor Manikya; the present Chief of the said State, is now the lawful and acknowledged Head.

(2) That the Chief of the said State, for the time being, may, from time to time and at any time, nominate and constitute any male member of the said family descended through males from him or any male ancestor of his, to be his Juvaraj or successor to the said Chiefship.

(3) That in the event of His Highness Radhakishor Manikya or any succeeding Chief of the said State dying without having nominated and constituted a Juvaraj or successor, his nearest male descendant descended through male, according to the rule of lineal primogeniture, and in default of such descendant, his nearest male heir descended through males from any male ancestor of his, according to the said rule, shall succeed to the said Chiefship, preference in either case being given to those of the whole blood over those of the half blood.

(4) That in matters relating to the appointment of a successor and the succession to the said Chiefship not heretofore expressly provided for, the usages of the said Raj family shall prevail.

(5) That every succession to the said Chiefship shall, as heretofore, require the recognition of the Government of India.

(6) Raja Radhakishor Manikya may rest assured that nothing shall disturb the operation of this *Sanad*, so long as he and his heirs are loyal to the Crown and faithful to the British Government.

(Sd). AMPHILL.

Simla, Viceroy and Governor-General of India. the 21st June, 1904:.

To revert to the death of Isanchandra Manikya in 1862 and what occurred thereafter.

Nilkrishna, a younger son of Krishnakishor Manikya by his Patrani or senior Rani, had been sent for from Comillah by Isanchandra Manikya, as already related, but he did not come. To avoid any mishap attending a vacant throne, to which no successor had been duly nominated, the *Rubakari* or Proceeding had been drawn up by order of Isanchandra Manikya nominating Birchandra, his uterine younger brother as Juvaraj and his sons Brajendrachandra and Navadwipchandra respectively as *Bara Thakur* and *Karta*.

The British Officials were duly notified of these appointments and Birchandra Juvaraj took possession of the Raj. Nilkrishna protested and impugned the genuineness of the *Rubakari*. Instead of the Government immediately assuming the paramount position, which the application for investiture by the Rajas since 1804 had implied and deciding, in its political capacity, who it considered the rightful successor to the Raj among the Claimants, its officials, in their usual political purblindness, followed the former mischievous precedent and referred Nilkrishna, as they had previously directed Rajdharmani in 1804, to the Municipal Courts, to ascertain whether he was entitled to succeed to Chakla Roshanabad, the revenue paying portion of the Raj in British Tipperah. All the Officials seemed to care about were the rupees from the revenue assessed portion in the plains, apparently not caring a jot for the *Raj, per se*. So Birchandra Juvaraj was acknowledge in possession as being the revenue payer.

Nilkrishna lost all his money and died litigating unsuccessfully and then Navadwipchandra. Brajendrachandra his elder brother having died, took up the legal burden and thus litigation was prolonged for eight years in all, until 1870, when Birchandra Juvaraj was acknowledged the rightful successor and was duly invested as Raja.

BIRCHANDRA MANIKYA (1862~1896). During the pending

litigation as has been mentioned, Brajendrachandra, the elder son and nominated Bara Thakur of Isanchandra Manikya, had died. Consequently Navadwipchandra as nominated Karta, claimed to succeed to his deceased brother's office of Bara Thakur and when Birchandra Juvaraj became Raja, Navadwipchandra claimed to be the Juvaraj. The Privy Council dismissed his suit and when Birchandra Manikya appointed his eldest son Radhakishor to be the Juvaraj, Navadwipchandra sued to be declared the lawful successor to Chakla Roshanabad on the Raja's demise. At length the High Court of Calcutta threw out the suit, on the common sense ground, that it had no jurisdiction, being a Municipal Court, to decide the succession to the throne of a sovereign State in a round about way, by being asked to declare a certain person the lawful successor to an integral portion of an impartible Raj !

It may be remembered, that, the Sadar Dewani Adalat, the predecessor of the High Court, had taken up the question of jurisdiction by a Full Bench, and had "ruled, on the 19th September 1848, that questions affecting the boundary of two Independent Powers were not properly cognizable in Municipal Courts." How much less jurisdiction had this same Municipal Court in deciding claims to an integral portion of an impartible Raj and thus to its throne?

So legal peace reigned for the remainder of Birchandra Manikya's reign until it was broken again in his successor's time, by exactly a similar declaratory suit being filed.

We must now turn to other and far more turbulent peacebreakers of the Tripura Raj, commonly known as the Kukis or more correctly as the Lushais living to the East of the State. A great deal of ingenuity has been employed to define and derive the name Kuki. The simplest and apparently correct derivation is that from the Persian word Koh (a hill or mountain) and Ki (of). The word should therefore be Kohki (of the mountain) that is, Mountaineers or Highlanders, who seem the world over to be naturally truculent marauders. The Persian Kohki of the Mogals



has been vulgarized by the Bengali speaking inhabitants of neighbouring districts into Kuki, meaning the savages from the hills generally.

The derivation of Lushai or more correctly Lusai is from Lu- the head and sai-to.lop off. So that Lushais or Lusais mean the headloppers, the fiercest of all Kuki or Hill Tribes.

Of these tribes Colonel Lister in 1853, enumerates as the principal, the Chilu (Chulon), the Rankhal (Rankul), the 'Tangue, the Chansen, the Tadoes or Tewtangs and the Poitu Kukis (Poitoo Kookies). These tribes were stated by Lister to reside both "within our boundaries (Cachar), to the South and South-east, in the Independent Tipperah Hills and in the Manipur territories."

It would take up an undue amount of space to enlarge on these Hill Tribes. Those interested are referred to Mackenzie's- Chapter XXI and Appendix E. Suffice it to say, that, the Government of India ordered the Lushai Expedition on 11th July 1871 and that this successful campaign has resulted in thoroughly subduing these formerly troublesome savages and reducing Lusai land to a peaceful frontier district.

However this happy conclusion usual ended in depriving the Tripura Raj of a large tract of territory all along its Eastern frontier. It has already been mentioned, when dealing with Tripura boundaries in the reign of Krishnakishor Manikya, that the Eastern boundary has never been Justly or equitably settled to this day and a reference was made to a Report on the subject dated 21st. September 1899 by the superintendent of Public Works of the Raj.

To quote the covering letter forwarding the Report to His Highness, We read :-

"It will be seen from Pemberton's Report, dated 1835, on the boundaries of the then lately annexed district of Cachar that the Tipai Mukh or confluence of the Tuevai or Tipai and Barack Rivers was found to be the "triple boundary of Manipur , Cachar and Tripura."

"In consequence of Lushai Raids the 'Inner Line' or defence for this Raj was fixed in 1874 to be the Lungai River, a stream about 48 miles to the West of Tipai Mukh."

"A careful examination of all available British official documents relating to the subject has shown that no boundary has yet been *mutually agreed* upon between the British Government and this Durbar as dividing this Raj from Cachar on the North and Lushailand on the East. In other words, the boundary has not yet been *mutually defined* as running West to East from the Lungai River to Tipai Mukh and southwards from Tipai Mukh."

"As the survey and demarcation of Lushailand is now being made by the British Government, it is urgently necessary that these two boundary lines should be mutually agreed upon and defined once for all between British territory and this Raj." Referring to the Report itself we read :—

"In Pemberton's Report, dated 1835, we find that all the Lushai country belonged to the Tripura Raj. He writes with regard to the South-Eastern and Southern boundaries of Cachar, Tripura and Manipore as follows :—' From the source of the Juree River along the western bank to its confluence with the Barak; thence South to the western bank of the latter river to the mouth of the Chekoo (or Tipai) Nullah which marks *the triple boundary of Manipore, Cachar and Tripura*. On the South the limits have never been accurately defined, and we only know that on this side the line is formed by the northern foot of lofty mountains inhabited by the Poitoo Kookies and by wild and unexplored tracts of territory subject to Tripura. This densely wooded and mountainous region appears to commence at a distance of between 40 and 50 miles from the southern bank of the Soormah."

It is absolutely clear, from the above extract from Pemberton's Report, that in 1835 when Cachar had been annexed by the British for the past 5 years and had been under the regular administration of British officials, a British officer, authoritatively lays down that *the mouth of the Chekoo or; (Tipai Nullah marks*

*the triple boundary of Manipore, Cachar and Tripura.* And Sir Alexandar Mackenzie, writing in 1884 as Secretary to the Government of India in his official 'North-East Frontier of Bengal,' comes to the conclusion that "the Southern extremity of the Saddashur Hills was the southeast corner of Cachar. It would appear from this that the narrow hilly tract running down between Hill Tipperah and Manipore and represented in our most recent maps as part of Cachar was, in Pemberton's time, considered to be part of Hill Tipperah" (North-East Frontier, page 286).

"An inspection of the map accompanying Sir Alexander's volume shows that Tipai Mukh marking "the triple boundary of Manipore, Cachar and Tripura" is 36 miles due East of the Chattachurra Peak (2,069 feet). This is a most important fact, and absolutely annihilates all other contentions as to what is the North-East corner of the Tripura Raj in British times, to which period this discussion must perforce be limited. Unless and until it can be shown, beyond doubt, that this point (Tipai Mukh) has been abandoned by the *mutual consent* of the British Government and the Tripura Raj, as the North-East corner of Tripura, so long it must be held to be what Pemberton found it in 1835 '*the triple boundary of Manipore, Cachar and Tripura.*'"

Sir Alexander's Chapter XXI so fully relates the history of the Lushai tribes and their connection with the British Government and the Tripura Raj, that it is unnecessary to repeat the information here. Since the events recorded in this chapter, there has been a final subjugation of all these Lushai tribes, and the country inhabited by them lying between Manipore on the North; Burma or the Chin Hills on the East; Arakan on the South; and Chittagong and Tripura on the West, is now the regularly administered district of Lushailand. One of the consequence of this annexation, and reduction of the Lushai country to an ordinary British district, is that its boundaries, especially and abutting on non-British territory, must be clearly defined. A topographical survey of Lushai land is being carried out, and before long it will be necessary to

demarcate the boundary between Lushailand and the Tripura Raj."

"In 1849 a Joint Commission consisting of Mr. Yule, the Magistrate of Dinajpore on behalf of the British Government, and Mr. Campbell, the Raja's Manager, on behalf of the Tripura Raj, was deputed to lay down the boundary to the North of the Tripura Raj. In a Report, dated the 14th January 1851, Mr. Yule writes in para 30: "Lieutenant Fisher fixed as the boundary (continuing through Pharna Dharmanagar Velly) a line running east from the source of the Thal Naddi mentioned in the preceding case, to the Chattarchura Hill and thence to the Dhalleswari, a stream running nearly due south to north whose eastern bank belongs to Cachar." And again in para 48 as follows :- "Throughout the disputed part of the boundary there the line is determined as follows :- 'Commencing from the east at the Dhalleshwari River it runs from the Chattarchura Hill,' &c. From the above extracts it would seem that for absolutely : no reason that can be discovered, the 1835 boundary of the Tripura Raj was shifted about 36 miles west, from Tipai Mukh to the Dhalleshwari River."

"Mr. Edgar, Deputy Commissioner of Cachar, in his Notes on his tour among the Lushais in 1871, Part I, writes as follows :— 'East of the district of Comillah is a hill tract known as Independent Tipperah or Hill Tipperah, as it has been the fashion to term it for two or three years back. This is inhabited partly by Tipperahs and partly by Kookies under Chiefs of the Poitoo family. The best known and most influential of these is named Mischilon or Grushailon or Mischoilab.' To sum up what I know of the Southern tribes. North-East and South-East of the villages inhabited by Tipperahs are Poitoo and cognate Kookie villages. East of them and apparently west of the head waters. of the Gootur are Syloos, among whom the leading Chief is Savoong. East of them and South of Mate Khlong (shown in Major Macdonald's map) are the Howlong Chiefs, among whom the most prominent are Vandulah and the sons of his cousin Lalpitang. In part II. Mr. Edgar explains how "the Lushai Chief Lalul began to



push towards the North and West. The hills East of the Dhalleshwari were occupied by villages under a family of Poitoo Chiefs, the most influential of whom was named Laroo." Further down Mr. Edgar suggests the policy that he considers should be adopted to protect Cachar, Manipore and Tripura from the Lushais.

*Extract from Report of Political Officer with the Left Column of the Lushai Expedition, dated 3rd April 1872, para. 59.*

"In the accompanying map attempt has been made to lay down approximately the western limits of Sookpilal's territory, but it is little more than a guess. He says himself that he has no influence west of the range on which Chattarchura is situated, but we do not accurately know what direction the ridge takes south of that peak. The country to the west of Sookpilal's territory is nominally subject to the Tipperah Chief, but the Eastern boundary of the territory of the latter is very uncertain. According to Pemberton and all the earlier maps, *Independent Tipperah*, as it was then called, extended as far as *Tipai Mukh*. But some years ago the name of Hill Tipperah was in some mysterious way substituted for the older name, and all the hills between the South of Cachar and the Chittagong Hill Tracts seem to have been at about the same time silently included in the Cachar District. The boundary between Cachar and Hill Tipperah shown in the maps of that period is the same as the line I have assumed to be the western boundary of Sookpilal's territory, but in the maps published lately a 'supposed water-shed and boundary is laid down west of the supposed course of the Lungai, a little stream flowing into the Sylhet District. I should think that the best geographical boundary between Hill Tipperah and the Lushai Hills would be the continuation of the water-shed that divides Sylhet from Cachar. I cannot say what amount of authority the Tipperah Chief actually has over the Kookies living in the Hills west of Sookpilal."

"It will be seen from the correspondence that took place between the Governments of India and Bengal, after the first Lushai Campaign when the question of Frontier Defence Lines

were being discussed. The Government of India in its No. 1883 P., dated 4th September 1872, remarks in para 7, "what-ever may be the Eastern boundary laid down for Hill Tipperah, His Excellency in Council considers, as you have been already informed in my letter No. 17C, dated 11th April 1871, that the responsibility for the defence of Tipperah must in the first instance rest with the Rajah under the guidance and advice of the Political Agent." Again in the Government of Bengal's No. 3149, dated 19th August 1873, to the Government of India, in para, "The Lieutenant- Governor agrees with all the officers whose opinions he has had that we cannot expect the Rajah of Tipperah to organise an efficient frontier defence, and that it would not be much use if he could no long as the country is uninhabited. It is shown conclusively in the reports that a chain of posts along the Hachick or Jampai Range, that is on the Eastern Frontier of Hill Tippera, could only be kept up at an enormous expense which that State certainly could not support, and which would be almost certainly useless if established." In para 10, "The Eastern frontier of Tipperah should, however, be now defined as the Government on India has repeatedly desired. In some maps the Jampai Range and in some the Hachick, Chattarchura Range, has been put down as the limit and the question has hitherto been considered to be, which of these two ridges should be accepted as the boundary. Hill Tippera was formerly demarcated up to the Jampai, a general geographical line was loosely run down on the map as the boundary between British territory and the wild country to the South. All that time nothing was known of the Lushais, and the line running North and South between them and Tipperah could in no wise be effected by the general East and West line above mentioned. As it is clear that the country on the border, especially to the West of it is uninhabited, and not in the actual possession of anyone, we may, in settling the details, *be guided by geographical and political concenience though we may hope that this country may again be inhabited as it once was.* Captain Badgley shows, in para 29 of

his report, that in these tracts a river is by far the best and a hill range the worst form of a boundary, as the tops of the ranges generally come to be occupied by villages and cultivation, while the river sides are not occupied. The Lieutenant-Governor agrees with this view, which indeed he has had occasion to express on several occasions, in dealing with these Eastern Frontier countries and he would take for the Eastern boundary of Hill Tipperah neither the Jampai nor the Hachik Chattarchura Range *but the Lungai River* which runs between them and is described by Captain Badgely as 'a clear stream with a sandy bed and good current.' After being carried up the Lungai to its source in the Betling Shib Peak, the line would run across by the water-shed to the Peak of Dolajuri and thence follow the recognised Southern border of Hill Tipperah by Sardeng to the Fenny. Mr. Chennel will probably be able to give a clear definition of the line from Betling Shib. But the Lieutenant-Governor would ask the Government of India's approval of the general direction indicated."

"It should be noted that *the Lungai River is about 48 miles West of Tipai Mukh*. Therefore (a) Pemberton in 1835 finds the North-East corner of the Tripura Raj to be at Tipai Mukh. (b) It may be inferred from Yule's Report in 1851 that he considered this point to be where the Northern boundary of the Tripura Raj crossed the Dhalleshwari or 36 miles West of Tipai Mukh. And now we see (c) that the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal suggests that this North-East point should be on the Lungai River or about another 12 miles West or about 48 miles West of Tipai Mukh. And all this slicing off of huge strips of country was being done by the British officials *with out the smallest reference to the Tripura Rajah, whose territory is reduced on its North-East Frontier by about one-half to suit the administrative and political concenience of the British Government*.

"The Government ideas as to an expedient boundary were communicated to the Rajah of Tripura by the Political Agent with the request that His Highness should establish some guard posts



*beyond the Lungai."*

"His Highness replied in No.21 of 9th February 1874 (Appendix A) that he understands "the River Lungai between the Jampai and Hachik Ranges being fixed by the Government of India as the Eastern boundary." His Highness did not see what he had to do with the country *beyond*. Captain Lillingston, the Political Agent, in his No. 60 of 3rd March 1874 (Appendix B), wrote to His Highness in para 2: "Mr. Power informs me that he has already pointed out to you that you are *in error* in supposing that the country East of the boundary line marked by the Lungai River has been *taken up by Government*. And the letter goes on to explain the objects of Governor in clear and unmistakable terms. "

"In reply to communication on the subject of this boundary, the Tripura Administration in its No. 646 of 15th March 1887 to the Political Agent at Agartala, gave a short history of the question, and ended by expressing the hope that "the Government will be graciously pleased to *accept the River Dhalleshwari* as the Eastern boundary of this State and pass orders accordingly." The Assistant Political Agent forwarded the above letter to the Political Agent with certain remarks. The Darbar submitted a reply (Appendix G) which was considered at a conference at which the Commissioner of Chittagong (Mr. Lyall) the Political Agent (Mr. Price), the Assistant Political Agent (Rai Umakanta Das Bahadoor), and His Highness's Manager (Mr. Sandys), were present at Commilla and fully discussed the whole question.

"Rai Umakanta Das Bahadoor, became Minister of the Tripura Raj, and addressed a demi-official communication, dated 20th September 1890, to the Political Agent *asking for the restoration of the country to the East of the Lungai*. In the following year the Darbar again addressed the Political agent in No. 406, dated 6th April 1891 pointing out that, as peace had been established in the Lushai country. His Highness thought the time had come when he might have *beck the country beyond the Lungai*. In reply the Minister was in-formed by the Commissioner



in his No <sup>1046H-T</sup><sub>ix-14</sub> dated 3rd August 1891 that hostilities had again broken out in the Dhalleshwari Valley, and that affairs were worse than they had ever been. In reply to the demi-official correspondence between the Political Agent and the Commissioner enquiring whether the Administration thought it could cultivate up to the left bank of the Dhalleshwari River, the Minister in his demi-official, dated 11th October 1891 (Appendix M), wrote fully all details required, and gave satisfactory *reasons why the country beyond the Lungai should be restored.*"

This matter stayed in abeyance until the Darbar in its letter of 1st December 1897 (Appendix N) pointed out that, as peace had been finally established in Lushailand, "the Darbar earnestly hopes that you will move the Government to order a restoration of the *part of the country cut off from the State* by the Notification" dated 23rd June 1874 (Appendix D).

"To the above representation the Chief Commissioner of Assam simply declines to re-open the question of the Eastern boundary."

## APPENDIX G.

### THE EASTERN BOUNDARY

**THE** Political Agent having asked *for* remarks on the Assistant Political Agent's No. 254, dated 28th May 1887, being a report on the Maharajah's request as contained in his English Office No. 646, dated 15th March 1887.

This report is a special plea, gleaned from Government records chiefly quoted in Mr. Mechanize's North-East Frontier of Bengal, *against the Maharajah's request to have the Dhalleshwari River recognized as the substantive boundary instead of the Lungai River temporarily fixed after the Lushai Campaign of 1871-72, by the orders of the Government of Bengal No. 3149, dated 19th August 1873 (para.10, Meckenzie, page 483).*

The two arguments adduced by the Assistant Political Agent are : 1st, the inexpediency of going too near the Lushais and provoking complications with them and 2ndly, the impossible costliness of the Maharajah's maintaining proper out-posts along the extended frontier line. It will be attempted to be shown that both these arguments are untenable now, no matter how much force they may have had 15 years ago.

Lushais — Owing to a variety of circumstances the Lushais have divided themselves into two main bodies, each embracing many clans.

Kukies — There are the Kukies inhabiting the mountain ranges west of the Ainkung Range, and *acknowledging the supremacy of the Maharajah under their clan chieftains.* The Lushais live in the hills to the east of the Ainking Range, chiefly about the head waters of the Dhalleshwari. To the north of Lushailand is Cachar and Manipore ; to the south the Syloos and Howlongs living north and east of the Chittagong Hill Tracts; to

the east the Shans of Burmah. Consequently the Lushais are now hemmed in on three sides by British territory .

Sukpilal — Fifteen years ago Sukpilal was the great Chief who made himself the greatest of the Lushais. He died in 1881, and his power and influence went with him, as he left many sons and successors, who, as usual, are jealous of each other and all thoroughly cowed by the Lushai Campaign, since which they have never attempted raids beyond their own borders; they have moved off further south, being now on the southern extremity of the Ekrulpuri, the Parbatal and Rai Ranges, all nearer the Chittagong Hill Tracts than to Sylhet and Cachar.

The *Dhalleshwari*, the most important stream in Lushailand, flows northwards and enters Cachar, after its confluents on the west bank the Pukwa and the Gatur join it. Tracing the Dhalleshwari from Cachar up or southwards, we find that it takes a due east bend round the north end of the Ekrulpuri Range and then flows between the Ekrulpuri and Darlong Ranges. Bepari Bazar is situated about the middle of this valley and is the great trade mart of the Lushai.

Gatur — Just before the Dhalleshwari takes the eastern bend above described, it receives the Gatur which, except for its inferior size, looks like the main course of the Dhalleshwari, and with it forms nearly a straight due north and south water line.

Pukwa — The westernmost tributary of the Dhalleshwari joins it as it flows past the north end of the Ainkung Range, and drains the valley between the Hachik and Ainkung Ranges.

Lungai is the next river eastwards of the Pukwa and drains the valley between the Hachik and Jampai Ranges, and is the temporary boundary alluded to above.

Chattachoor — For *no Particular reason* that the writer

has been able to discover the Chattachoor Peak on the north end of the Hachik Range was selected as the starting point of Lieutenant Fisher's boundary between Sylhet and Tipperah. It is presumed that this Peak was selected because it was a point beyond dispute, where the Sylhet-Cachar and Tipperah boundary met. But that is *no proof*, and it has never been categorically asserted (but, nevertheless, *tacitly acted upon* as a latent idea in the minds of most British officials) that this Chattachoor Peak was the eastern end of the northern and northern end of the eastern boundary of Tipperah. The Government of Bengal in its letter above quoted says: "The eastern frontier of Tipperah should, however, be now defined as the Government of India has repeatedly desired. In some maps the Jampai and in some the Hachik-Chattachoor Range has been put down as the limit, and the question has hitherto been considered to be which of the two ridges should be accepted as the boundary. Hill Tipperah was formerly demarcated up to the Jampai; but east of the Jampai a general geographical line was loosely run down on the map as the boundary between British territory and the wild country to the south. At that time nothing was known of the Lushais, and the line running north and south between them and Tipperah could, in nowise, be affected by the general east and west line above-mentioned. As it is clear that the country on the border, especially to the west of it, is uninhabited, and not in the actual possession of anyone, we may in settling the details be guided by *geographical and political conveniences*, though we may hope that this country may be inhabited as it once was." From the above quotation it will be seen, 1st, that the Government of Bengal *presumed, for no proof is adduced*, that either the Jampai of the Hachik Range was the eastern boundary of Tipperah; 2ndly, that an *arbitrary* line was drawn east of the Jampai Range to separate Cachar from Lushai land; 3rdly, that nothing was known about the Lushais; 4thly, that



though this line might be accepted as the one separating Cachar from Lushai land, yet that acceptance had *nothing to do with the boundary between Tipperah and Lushai land*; lastly, that the country on the border, i.e., the Ainkung Range, was uninhabited.

Lungai boundary. — For good and sufficient reasons, according to the circumstances of the case, the Lungai was fixed as the *temporary east boundary of the region to be guarded*. Those circumstances have now changed, and it is not *recognizing this change* that deprives the Assistant Political Agent's arguments (against shifting the east boundary more east-ward) of any force they may have had fourteen or fifteen years ago.

Lungai Valley closed — At present, though the Lungai is supposed to be the east boundary, yet the refusal of the Sylhet authorities to allow access to it by its only line of communication, the Lungai itself, practically makes the Jampai Range or the Deo River the east limit of Tipperah or rather of the Maharajah's two chief sources of income, forest produce and royalty on elephants. It may seem a harsh and unjust accusation to make but the action of the Sylhet authorities would seem to justify the idea that they prohibit the free navigation of the Lungai in order to *get toll for all the forest produce out of the, Maharajah's Lungai Valley territory*. The only excuse offered for this churlish refusal is that the jungle north of the line from Bangsool to Chattachoorra is "reserved forest." Private proprietors are made to give up towing paths 20ft wide on each side of any navigable stream that runs through their property for the convenience of the public. Why should not a similar rule be observed along the banks of the Lungai except for the reason above given?

Apparantly this *non possumus* attitude has been strictly maintained to this day but it is high time that the Government removed this cause of reproach.

BIRCHANDRA MANIKYA having been duly recognized and installed as Raja in 1870 appointed his eldest son Radhakishor as Juvaraj and some years later his fourth son Shamarendrachandra as Bara Thakur. This second appointment, as might have been expected, led to trouble and litigation, when the Juvaraj became Raja and in his turn appointed his own son as Juvaraj, instead of promoting his brother from Bara Thakur to Juvaraj.

For the first time in 1878 a Political Agent was appointed to reside at Agartala, the Raja's Capital. The main object of the appointment was the protection of British interests on the Eastern Frontiers, which were in special danger from Lushai raids. It was explained to the Raja that the Government of India, in sending an Agent to Agartala had no intention of adopting a policy which would prejudice his interests or which would interfere with the exercise of authority with his State.

Her Majesty Queen Victoria was pleased to assume the Imperial crown as *Kaiser-i-Hind* or Empress of India at an Imperial Assemblage, the first of the three great Darbars held respectively in 1877, 1903 and 1911. The Ruling Chiefs of India attended and received various honors, dignities, titles, salutes and banners. Among them Birchandra Manikya received the title of Maharajah as a personal distinction, a Salute of 13 guns and the Banner.

In 1878 the Political Agency as a separate post was abolished and the Magistrate of the adjoining district of British Tipperah was appointed *Ex-officio* Political Agent, while an Indian Deputy Magistrate, Umakanta Das, was stationed at Agartala as Assistant Political Agent. In March 1890 the Maharajah selected Rai Umakanta Das Bahadur as Minister and all duties in connection with the Political Agency were transferred to the *Ex-officio* Political agent at Commilla, the Headquarters of the district of British

Tipperah.

One of the results of a Political Agency was the extradition of criminals escaping into British territory according to the general Law and Rules on the subject for trial in the Tripura Courts. Offenders escaping from British territory into the State are similarly surrendered to the British Courts, through the Political Agent.

The practice of Sati in Tripura was forbidden in 1888. The abolition of Slavery had been ordered many years previously by the Raja. Both prohibitions are still in force in the State.

As already mentioned, seriously raids were committed on Tripura, Sylhet and Cachar by the Lushais and especially by the two cognate tribes of Sailus and Howlongs. A strong British force in two Columns were directed against the offending tribes. The Raja supplied transport for the Northern Column. The tribes of Vonpilal, Poitoo and Vonolel, the most powerful Chiefs, were reduced to submission; the fines imposed were paid; captives were recovered; and verbal agreements were taken from the Chiefs to live amicably with all British subjects from Manipur to Arracan and to allow free access to their country. The expedition produced for a time the desired effect as it showed the Lushais that, their recesses were not inaccessible and that their inroads into British territory or into Allied states would be duly punished. Since that time no raids have been made into Tripura. During Birchandra Manikya's reign a regular Military force was organised by the assistance of the Political Agent Captain Lillingston. Several Frontier and Sub-Divisional Guards are maintained and a body of armed and drilled troops are kept at Agartala. Courts of Civil, Criminal & Revenue jurisdiction, presided over by trained Officers were established and a Jail built, superintended by the State Physician. Civil, Criminal and Revenue Laws and Rules have been framed and are administered at the Headquarters and Sub-

divisional Courts of First Instance and Appeal. A final appeal lies in all cases to the Raja, whose sanction is required before sentence of death passed by the Sessions Court can be executed.

After a long reign of 34 years Maharaja Birchandra Manikya died at Calcutta on the 11th December 1896 and his remains were cremated at Kalighat and *Samadhi* erected over the Chita, close to that of the Maharaja of Mysore, who had also died at Calcutta in 1894.

RADHAKISHOR MANIKYA (1896-1909) the duly appointed Juvaraj of his father Birchandra Manikya, was duly installed on the throne on 5th March 1897. Shortly after, on the 12th June, an Earthquake reduced the palaces and other masonry buildings of Agartala with one or two exceptions, to a heap of ruins in a few seconds! This catastrophe entailed enormous expenditure on the State, but on the other hand gave the Raja an opportunity of having a Palace and other public buildings erected, more dignified and suitable than his predecessors had been able to provide. Of course all the buildings required could not be erected during his comparatively short reign but the present Raja is continuing the policy of his revered Father in this and several other respects. In addition to the Palace and commodious Family Quarters, the Victoria Memorial Hospital, the Temple of Jaggannath, a School and Museum were built and the Jail removed and rebuilt on a more suitable site. Administration buildings were commenced and a Technical School was established. The former Cremation Ground and its *Samadhis* at Old Agartala were being endangered by the river Houra. A new site was selected at the Capital, safe from similar encroachments.

Radhakishor Manikya gave a handsome donation towards the Victoria Memorial at Calcutta, besides giving munificently to deserving Institutions and helping Scientists and Scholars and



the cause of Education generally.

It has already been mentioned in the previous reign, that, Birchandra Manikya while appointing his eldest son Radhakishor Juvaraj also nominated his fourth son, Samarendrachandra the Bara Thakur and thus caused trouble when Radhakishor Manikya naturally desired to nominate a successor and to appoint his son Birendrakishor as Juvaraj. Persisting in the claim, that, when the Juvaraj became Raja, the Bara Thakur became *ipso facto* the Juvaraj or next successor, Bara Thakur Samarendrachandra petitioned the Government, claiming to be recognised as Juvaraj. As has been shown in the reign of Birchandra Manikya the *Kulachara* or Family Custom and the *Shastras*, not only did not support this contention but absolutely refuted the claim. Consequently after the fullest consideration the Government rejected the claim of Samarendrachandra Bara Thakur to be declared the Juvaraj. On the 8th February 1899 Radhakishor Manikya appointed his son Birendrakishor the Juvaraj. Considering that a due cause of action had arisen the Bara Thakur Samarendrachandra filed a suit for a declaratory decree, in the Court of the Subordinate Judge of Alipur, as a certain house property was situated in Ballyganj in the district of the Twentyfour Parganas, of which Alipur is the Headquarters. The Bara Thakur sued to be declared the proprietor of Chakla Roshanabad and all other State property in British India on the demise of Radhakishor Manikya. Accepting the precedent of the High Court, when appealed to in the Suit of Navadwipchandra, for a similar declaratory decree, the Sub ordinate Judge decided, that, his Court had no Jurisdiction in virtually declaring the Plaintiff to be successor to the throne and dismissed the Suit.

Radhakishor Manikya performed pilgrimages to Tribeni, near Prayag (Allahabad) Brindaban, Gaya and Kasi (Benares) . It was during this last pilgrimage and on the very last day of his stay that

a most regrettable motor car accident caused His Highness' death on the 12th March 1909. The Raja's remains were cremated at a *ghat* on the banks of the holy Gunga and *Samadhi* erected over the *Chita* by his sorrowing Son.

Only a few days before his lamented death, a Conference of Pandits from many lands assembled at Kasi, conferred a title on the Raja, in recognition of his piety and benevolence.

Radhakishor Manikya was an exceedingly kind hearted and generous character. No needy hand was withdrawn empty and no cry of distress went unheard. Though personally a pious Hindu and a staunch follower of Vishnu, yet as a Ruler all Religions received his unprejudiced benevolence and generosity and all truly pious persons he came across received his respect and reverence. True piety, need and unselfishness received his full sympathy. Any place of worship, consecrated ground or mausoleum received as much respect as his own sacred temples, before entering such removing his shoes and in a reverent posture. His tastes and dress were simplicity itself and marked him out in any assembly. Scientific facts and artistic objects always excited his interest and admiration. Radhakishor Manikya was in every sense of the word, a thorough Gentleman, detesting everything mean, vulgar and deceitful. His memory will be revered and loved for many a year by his people and those who had the honor and pleasure of knowing Swargia Radhakishor Manikya.

**BIRENDRAKISHOR MANIKYA (1909)** His Highness was installed on the Throne (Singhasan) by His Honor Sir Lancelot Hare, the Lieutenant Governor of Eastern Bengal and Assam, on behalf of His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor General of India on the 25th November 1909.

His Highness the Raja of Manipur, honored the Installation

ceremony with his presence and His Highness Birendrakishor Manikya paid Manipur a return visit, thus continuing a friendship begun in Radhakishor Manikya's reign between the two Rulers. It may be mentioned that several thousands of Manipuris settled in Tripura in the last century.

His Highness appointed his eldest son Birbikramkishor Juvaraj immediately after his own Installation on the 25th November 1909.

In former times, owing to remoteness and want of convenient means of communication, the Tripura Rajas were compelled to seek marriage alliances with the Kshatriyas of Manipur, as intermarriages in Tripura itself had come within prohibited degrees according to Hindu Law. But with modern amenities of travel the field has been enlarged and His Highness has been able to form alliances with Kshatriya families of Upper India and Nepal.

Birendrakishor Manikya restored family concord after years of discord and determined to administer the State with the assistance of the members of the Raj Family. With this view His Highness appointed Raj Kumar Navadwipchandra, His Highness' Uncle the Minister and his younger brother Raj Kumar Brajendrakishor his Private Secretary, who was subsequently promoted to the Ministry when Raj Kumar Navadwipchandra retired. His Highness has lately taken the administration into his own hands, and has appointed Babu Prasannakumar Das Gupta, a member of the Bengal Provincial Service, as Chief Dewan, for His Highness' personal assistance. The appointment of a Resident Political Agent has been revived since the year 1910, ensuring direct friendly co-operation between the State and the Imperial Government.





