

Chapter 1

Situating Hadauti in Space and Time

I

The modern Indian historiography has constantly evolved in the recent times. Scholars have frequently questioned the reasons behind the fall of British Empire in India. But in the larger context it is more relevant to understand the reason behind their much longer stay in India. In order to consolidate their rule in the early nineteenth century the East India Company had used the erstwhile princely states as a ladder.¹ When the princes interacted with the East India Company it also created an area of conflicting values and principles while building communion with them. It is important to focus on the role of native princes which acted like a buttress for the East India Company and also it is essential to get into the basic structural difference of governance between the two. According to the Census of 1931 the population of India was 340 million, including 80 million governed by the princes of native Indian States. It means that around two-fifth of the nation was in the princely states.² For reciprocal advantages various treaties were signed between culturally different rulers. It provided the native rulers with autonomy to continue their dominance over their respective states and in

¹ Robin Jeffery ed., *People, Princes And Paramount Power: Society and Politics in the Indian Princely States*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1978, 1.

² *Imperial Gazetteer of India: Rajputana*, 1908; *Census of India*, 1931, Government of India and also refer to Sukhvir Singh Gahlot and Banshi Dhar, *Castes and Tribes of Rajasthan*, Jodhpur, Jain Brothers, 1989, pp. 27-83.

return they were to support British sovereignty in India.³ It is essential to get into the detail of what kind of political formation was prevalent in India prior to the British rule and what made the rulers to support the British which enhanced their stay in India? What were the reasons for the British to stay for reasonably longer time than any of their predecessor rulers? How both the British and the native states tried to influence each other? Why nationalism was not initiated as state nationalism and had to wait for agitations to start from the British Indian states?

As an Arab proverb goes: 'I against my brother; I and my brother against my cousin; I, my brother and my cousin against the outsider' it means that all political struggles are nothing less than meager struggle for power. It has the tendency to keep enemy at the position of ally and sometimes even higher. It points to the symbols hidden in the process of economic and political relations of the social order. Before the arrival of the British, there were small kingdoms or chiefdoms their geographical location maneuver their political expansion. The East India Company waged wars against these regional rulers while concretizing their base in the Indian sub-continent. The process of succession of the East India Company was more or less similar to the rise of rulers in the past. With the British becoming the sole authority of the civil and military power in India and introduced a steady bureaucracy

³ K. L. Sharma, *Caste, Feudalism and Peasantry: The Social Formation of Shekhawati*, New Delhi, Manohar, 1998, 207.

which was completely new for Indian rulers, helped the British procure a position with much less opposition.⁴

The intention of East India Company for India was clearly visible in the attitude of Lord Wellesley who worked through the system of subsidiary alliances which helped in structuring the 'princely India.' In the seven years of Wellesley as Governor-General, Aitchison is believed to have recorded about 100 treaties. This only shows the eagerness of the British to establish their stronghold over Indian States. Through these treaties a *jagirdar* or a chieftain or a feudal lord was raised to a position of ruler or it had the capacity to diminish the position of a ruler too. It thus becomes interesting to see roles of the native rulers of Hadauti in the wake of the new emerging power. In the course of time the rulers time and again changed places and profited from the available opportunity just to keep their position strong. There is an element of power visible in the relationship between the four major institutions of social order, viz. economic, political, kinship and rituals. The East India Company and the princes of the regional states were in relationship of what Cohen calls relationships of power between individual and groups. He describes them to be 'manipulative, technical, instrumental, as people involved tend to use each other as means to ends and not ends in themselves.'⁵

⁴ Robin Jeffery, *People, princes*, p. 5.

⁵ Abner Cohen, "Political Anthropology: The Analysis of the Symbolism of Power Relations", *MAN: The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, New Series, Vol. 4, No. I, March 1969, 217.

The British had made two different worlds within one nation with separate judicial system and laws through categorically grouping the princely states under 'indirect rule'. But practically, native states India was under 'direct rule'.⁶ The number of princely states might vary from 562 to 578⁷ Indian states, estates, *jagirs* and other land holdings differentiated on the basis of their size, location, power and authority, social structure and culture. Lord William Bentick the Governor-General of India in 1832, thought it to be the appropriate time to establish a separate administrative unit so as to deal with matters related with the Rajputana states. We find him declaring to place the Rajputana states under a political agency headed by the Agent to the Governor General (A.G.G.) for the states of Rajputana and a separate Commissioner for Ajmer.⁸ During the time of Governor-General Lord Dalhousie, the Doctrine of Lapse in 1848 gave powers to the Company to take over a number of native states where the ruler had died without a male heir. Even if the rulers had not appreciated the Doctrine they had to accept the British suzerainty as it was the only way to strengthen their authority over their kingdoms. By the 1840s most of the major states found themselves under the direct rule of British suzerains. The policy of subsidiary alliance

⁶ Manu Bhagvan, *Sovereign Spheres: Princes, Education and Empire in Colonial India*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 2003, 2.

⁷ K.L. Sharma, *Caste, Feudalism and Peasantry*, New Delhi, Manohar Publishers, 1998 mentions about Raghuvir Singh's classification of Princely States as 562 and Shanti Dhawan's as 571, 45-46. Also see Raghubir Singh, *Poorva-Adhunik Rajasthan, 1527-1947*, Udaipur, Rajasthan Vishwavidyapeeth, 1951 and his *Indian States and the New Regime*, Bombay, D.B. Taraporwala, 1938, 3-7.

⁸ Rima Hooja, *A History of Rajasthan*, New Delhi, Rupa & Co., 2006, 783.

according to William Lee-Warner was 'subordinate isolation' for the princely states between the periods 1820 up to the revolt of 1857.⁹

Even though the rulers found it hard to revolt against the British yet it became a challenge for the native rulers and the British to control the Indian contingent which revolted in 1857. Therefore, post-1858 one can notice a deliberate 'make-over' in the governance and relationship of the British especially with the native states. They never wanted to face similar kind of agitation against the British governance particularly from the princely states as they were intended to be the support system of the British rule. In 1862 the rulers were given back the right to select their successor and heir along with the rights of adoption of heir.¹⁰ Despite sheer anger, agitation and protests all over India against the British, the relation between the British and rulers remained mutually cordial. And the reason for such mutual 'respect' was simple: both needed each other's support to be able to continue dominating and exploiting the people.

It is but natural to see the culture and tradition of the ruler of the land directly or indirectly influencing the people of the region. That is why when the British became as rulers of India a direct influence was visible on the ruling elites as well as on the 'educated' segment of Rajputana. The propagation of the idea of 'modern' or 'western' style of education, administration, legal and judiciary system, land revenue and economic structures were enhanced. Stress was also laid on the construction of

⁹ Robin Jeffrey, *People, princes*, op. cit., 9.

¹⁰ Rima Hooja, *A History*, op. cit., 790.

hospitals, dispensaries, schools, post-offices and building of modern roads and railway lines etc. Customs such as widow immolation, child marriage, slavery were discouraged in all the states of Rajputana. Even practice of female infanticide was punishable by law in all the states between the years 1831-1844.¹¹

Post-1857 immediate effect was seen in the attitude of the British which made them cautious not to undermine the importance of the rulers of the native states, 'the natural leaders of the people'.¹² British began taking reformative steps with caution. In the year 1870 Lord Mayo, the Governor General, while declaring to enhance modernization kept it optional for states. It meant that the fate of the people of princely states was entirely dependent on the whims of the rulers. There were only some states where reforms were introduced including the adoption of the IPC.¹³ The dubious dual standards of the native princes got exposed when on one hand they 'pretended' to follow certain reforms prevalent in the British India while on the other they continued to practice feudalism.

The relation of these native states with the British have constantly raised serious questions regarding their attitude towards the people who were dependent on them. This can be seen after Minto's 'non-intervention' policy (1909) which made the rulers stand besides the British government. The rulers were used as a medium to represent the British as the saviors of the

¹¹ Rima Hooja, *A History*, op. cit., 790.

¹² Robin Jeffrey, *People, princes*, op. cit., 11.

¹³ Rima Hooja, *A History*, op. cit., 790.

states, therefore urged the rulers to hand over the rebels and agitators, described as threat even to them. The Chamber of Princes (1919) which was the result of events following First World War and the formation of League of Nations lost its valor soon as the Princes were more involved with the question of their status rather than their survival.¹⁴ British Government seems to have been driven away between the desire of imperial interest as a trading company and the 'zeal of a utilitarian reformer'.¹⁵ The tendency of dual standards maintained by the British towards the princely states is the result of this dilemma. As a trader they used the native states as their mode of accumulating wealth and power while as reformers it was their moral responsibility to uplift the dilapidated condition of the native states.

Much before the Government of India Act, 1935 the downfall of the princes was inevitable, argues James Manor. He says that the Act only made the way easier for the British to hand over the powers to the new democratically elected politicians of India. Taking the argument further, he points to the era between 1920s and 1930s when by not forcing the reforms in the native states the Political Department condemned the princes from continuing to be the rulers for the Independent India.¹⁶ The British Government on one hand never tried seriously in bringing the positive

¹⁴ Urmila Phadnis, *Towards the Integration of the Indian States, 1919-47*, Bombay, 1968, 24-37; William L. Richter and Barbara N. Ramusack, 'The Chamber and the Consultation: Changing Forms of Princely Association in India', *Journal of Asiatic Studies*, XXXIV, 3 May 1975, pp. 755-76 in Robin Jeffery, op. cit., 9, 28.

¹⁵ James Manor, "The Demise of the Princely Order: A Reassessment", in Robin Jeffery, ed., *People, Princes and Paramount Power: Society and Politics in the Indian States*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1978, 11.

¹⁶ Cited in Edward Thompson, *The Making of the Indian Princes*, Oxford, 1944, 283-87

change in the native states but also condemned the princes of not initiating reforms for the people. There were also many imperialists who wanted to continue their rule indefinitely but they had no other way out to continue other than keeping the rulers as their allies. And after the Haripura Session of Congress in 1938 the Political Department allowed the individual congressmen to agitate in some smaller states.¹⁷ There was dual policy of the British for the native states who were more concerned to maintain their status as the sole authority of their kingdom and could not perceive the 'change' which redefined the Indian politics post 1947. If only the states would have engaged some of their representatives to form responsible government then probably the picture of the native Indian States would have been different. The leaders then would have agreed to enter the Indian Union, which would not have been agreeable to the native rulers and by 1950s the state revenues went into the central government and the central government officers moved into the states. The huge gap which existed between the administrative and political modernization became the reason behind the fall of the rulers by the mid-twentieth century.¹⁸

The princely states which kept themselves aloof and separate from the rest of India regarded them to be first as regional heads as Travencoreans or Mysoreans and later as Indians. Nationalism mostly developed in the British India manifested amongst the service classes who were the first to attain western education. Being small in number they could not much oppose the

¹⁷ James Manor, "The Demise of the Princely Order", op. cit., 12

¹⁸ Ibid, 12

British authority. It was only under Gandhi when the number of the educated people joining the freedom struggle increased, threat for the British governance. In most of the states, education did not permeated as it should have been, therefore when in states like Travancore, Baroda and Mysore the percentage of the educated people grew the realization of the disadvantages of a princely rule also became visible.¹⁹ As soon as the idea of modernity penetrated into the minds of the educated men, it became impossible for them to stop and then refuse to accept the princely rule.

The fate of the people in a princely state was on dependent the ruler; if the prince was progressive and able like Rama Varma of Cochin (1895-1914) then people benefitted from his decisions. He was vigorous ruler ready to bring great reforms in land and legislature, demanded best educated men from the British service as his Dewans. His rule even made the governance of the British appear weak and dull.²⁰ To name some other rulers of the princely states as progressive are Travancore's Tirunal and Gaikwad of Baroda who are seen as the 'modern' rulers, both promoting education as the main element for the growth of the society. The three states of Baroda, Travancore and Mysore became the most literate areas as their rulers decided to spend large amount of their revenue in upgrading the education system, which was far better even than the British Indian provinces.²¹

¹⁹ Ibid. 12-14.

²⁰ Rama Varma's Diary, 23rd November, 1913 cited in Robin Jeffery, *op. cit.*, 16

²¹ Robin Jeffery, *op. cit.*, 16-17. Put forth the fate of the three rulers who could not sustain for long like Rama Varma abdicated in frustration and Tirunal died after five years of reign

The British needed rulers who could be educated as 'good rulers' and for them Rajkumar College, Rajkot and Mayo College, Ajmer were established for this purpose.²² Raja Jai Singh of Alwar, a minor in 1892, was removed from his 'unwholesome' environment was sent to Mayo for his education.²³ Similar development was seen in the Kota state after the death of Shatrusal on 11th June, 1889. He was an incompetent ruler without an heir but had introduced Udai Singh of *kotda* as his successor and after his coronation he became Umed Singh II.²⁴ It is interesting to note how after the death of Shatrusal his three queens played crucial role in trying to prevent the minor Maharao Umed Singh going to the Mayo College. This was objected by the British government which tried to take over the palace and forced the queens to allow the young prince to go for his further studies. They only allowed on the pretext of them losing their status as the Hada queens of the Kota state which they never wished for, therefore as per the chaotic chain of events they thought it to be practical to surrender to the British Government.²⁵

while Gaikwad of Baroda was blamed of being disgraceful in supporting the violent nationalist and was declared ill-efficient ruler.

²² Ibid. 17.

²³ Edward S. Haynes, 'Alwar Bureaucracy versus Traditional Rulership: Raja, Jagirdars and New Administration, 1892-1910', ed. Robin Jeffery, *People, Princes and Paramount Power: Society and Politics in the Indian Princely States*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 39.

²⁴ Jagat Narayan, *Kota ke Maharao: Umed Singh Dvitye evam Unka Samay*, Kota, Neha Vikas Prakashan, 1983, 8-10, 12-13, 15-17.

²⁵ In an interesting series of events the queens of the late Maharao played influential role to suggest the name of Udai Singh as the heir of the state. Even after adopting Udai Singh they made sure to sign the pact that would keep his father Maharaja Chhagan Singh of *Kotda* away from interfering in the political decisions of Kota, so that he may not be able to annex the throne. The following series of events which affected the politics of Kota state was governed and planned by the queens of the late Maharao working under the influence of Jugal Kishore the Superintendent of the Kota State. It mentions about the position of the mother of late Maharao Bhattiyani and the three queens, Jadon ji, 'Paatar' Gumanrai and

It is interesting to see that ambition of the rulers including queens was disliked by the British and was opposed time and again. The British government was able to thwart aspirations of the three queens who were apprehensive and disagreed to send the young prince Umed Singh II to Mayo College to attain western education. Umed Singh was sent to the Mayo College and become the 'perfect' ruler who would be fit to rule, of course with the restricted power. He too tried encouraging education but failed to become innovative and liberal for his citizens.²⁶ He can be termed as a 'perfect' model of the native princes as expected and needed by the British who shall never try to disobey them. To keep the political status high the

Gaurji. Bhattiyani agreed with the British soon after the demise of Shatrusal while the ambitious queens tried hard before submitting to the political agent of Rajputana and the British government. All the three after absconding from the *garh* palace took refuge in the *Amar Niwas*, the summer retreat of the Hadas. The first one to surrender was 'paatar' Gumanrai. She was bullied down by the other two, when the Political Agent, came to know about it, he wrote a letter to the queens stating that anyone who wishes to come out is free as no one has forced them to retrieve in seclusion. It is their self made fear against the British government, Ibid. 15-17.

²⁶ Munshi Shivpratap was designated as the State Inspector in 1893 and by 1902 he was promoted as Director of Education. He found the condition of the state schools highly deplorable and tried reforming it by increasing the number of State schools both for boys and girls. Munshi Shivpratap's tenure 1893-1917 saw progressive movement in this field. Number of schools increased from 20 to 89, number of students increased from 1116 to 6,146 and average attendance increased from 792 to 4402. Girls' school increased from 1 to 4 and number of students from 31 to 320 and average attendance from 22 to 268. Anglo-vernacular school increased from 1 to 4 and number of students from 119 to 774. Even for teachers training one normal school was started, state budget increased from 9,097 to 60,753. By 1939-40 (last year of Umed Singh) number of schools were 137 out of which 120 were government, 11 (*sahayata prapt*) and 6 (*swikrit*), girls schools were 12 out of which 5 were Anglo-Vernacular, 1 Sanskrit and 119 Vernacular. Boys Vernacular had 1 Intermediate College, 2 High Schools, 1 Middle and 1 Lower Middle School, number of students increased to 14,141 out of which only 8.76 were girls and 91.24% were boys. The state was so slow and showed poor results in girls' education that only one girl named Bhoori was able to clear her middle school examination in 1913-14 and was awarded 50 rupees by Maharao, Ibid. 178-82.

rulers of respective states were expected a particular kind of behavior by the British, failing it meant diminishing in their stature.

Umed Singh was learned and educated man. He had also understood the importance of education and was well versed with western culture and lifestyle but he did not attempt to act like a ruler was expected to do. He stood by his citizens like the rulers of Cochin, Travancore and Mysore did. Raja Jai Singh of Alwar and Maharao of Kota Umed Singh can be placed on same plinth, both western educated acted puppets of the British authority. Maharaja Jai Singh, Alwar was the result of the experimentation of the British in the princely states where a minor was a ruler. By late 1870s they realized to bring the necessary changes in princely states; the perfect time was the rule of a minor when the Political Agent to the Governor General acted some what like the *de-facto* ruler. Therefore, Alwar which was ruled for years by a minor Maharaja gave the British administration time to re-work on the bureaucracy of the State.²⁷ It can be seen in the role of the Council which was the face-changer for the state of Alwar and also for Jai Singh who was reduced to nothing. In an attempt to implement certain reforms in the administration, judiciary and finances there was a point when the Council overpowered the State administration. The aspirations of the Council made all kinds of efforts to take over the *jagirdars* who were unaware of the new methods of administration. There was a role reversal in the Alwar State of the Council taking the power to administer reducing the status of Jai Singh, who was

²⁷ Edward Haynes, Alwar Bureaucracy, Robin Jeffery, op. cit., 38.

detained in the Mayo College. In his absence from the State for his studies the role of the State Council increased so much so that after 1901 the Maharaja could rule with limited powers and taking decisions only for minor and petty issues. The entire life of Jai Singh was spent to restore his position and the positions of the *thakurs* but he failed in doing so. As a result he could not focus on the relevant social and economic reforms necessary for the people and State.²⁸ He spent all his life trying to uplift his stature as a ruler and re-inventing the traditional system of *jagirdari* system like any other feudal lord who was more concerned about his status.

Hadauti needs to be understood in its relationship with the British Government. As in other princely states the region of Hadauti was also devoid of opportunities available in the British India. Why the examples of progressive states of Travancore, Mysore and Baroda could not be replicated elsewhere especially Hadauti is an interesting probe. It is the intrinsic nature of the Hadas of not revolting against the imperial power despite the fact that they were competent enough to grow independently. This has been seen with the Mughals, Pindaris, Marathas and lastly British. They were successful in making wonderful friendly relations with all but found it hard to oppose; the allies in ruling the masses. Who were these Hadas and how did they establish their control over the region? What was their role as the ruler of Hadauti?

²⁸ Ibid, 40, 42, 60.

II

The region of Hadauti comprises of Bundi, Kota and Jhalawar lying in the south-eastern end of Rajasthan and was known by the name of the rulers, the Hadas. The region has gone through set of changes starting from the pre-historic civilization.²⁹ There are huge gaps in the chronology of the rulers for the period between the eighth to thirteenth centuries. And it is only with the rise of the Hadas who gained their authority over the region after capturing the local tribes of Bhil and Meena, that we get the clear idea of succession. Hadas are one of the twenty-four Chauhans descendants of Manik Rai, the king of Ajmer who faced the first volley of 'Islamite arms' in Samvat 741 685 CE.³⁰ Tod mentions about 'thirty-six royal races' in which according to Choond (bard) *Agnikula* are the greatest, as they were created by Brahmins and rest were created by woman.³¹ Tod in his explanatory notes has criticized the priestly class of portraying themselves to be 'co-equal to divinity or even superior to them,' taking the example from *Ramayana* where a deity acted as a

²⁹ For further detail see Rima Hooja, *A History*, op. cit., 124, the earliest traces of prehistoric civilizations from the sites around Kota, Jhalawar and Rawatbhata, Alaniya, Chattaneshwar and Kapildhara. The *Badva-Yupa* VS 295 298 CE, the rock-cut temples of Gupta period are in Kholvi, Binnayaga and Hathiagaur of Jhalawar district. An inscription from *Gangadhar* in the Jhalawar district dating 423 CE refers to the Aulikara dynasty that ruled this part of the region. The Bhim Chaunmari inscription from the Kota region records the fight of one Dhruvaswami against the Huns. The Hun coins in copper and silver have been recovered from Juna-khera near Jhalawar and the princely state of Kota. Around sixth century, the Mori dynasty, linked with the Imperial Mauryan dynasty ruled over the south eastern Rajasthan Kota and Chittor. The punch-marked coins found from Jhalarapatan V.S. 746 689 CE mention a chief named Durgagana. A later inscription from the same town of Jhalarapatan talks about the visit of a chief Sankargana and an inscription from Kansua dated VS 795 738 CE mentions about a Brahmin prince Sivagana, a feudatory of King Dhavala of the Mauryan lineage. A Naga family is mentioned in an inscription dated 790 CE from Shergarh on the river Parwan, 145 km south-west of Kota.

³⁰ James Tod, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, New Delhi, M.N. Publishers, 1978, 355.

³¹ James Tod, *Annals and Antiquities*, op. cit., 357.

mediator to please Brahmin Vashishta to accept king Vishwamitra's friendship. But he does not talk about the patriarchal mindset which puts the *Agnikula* superior to others only because they are born by the Brahmins and rest by woman! Just because their birth is associated with woman they are eligible to lose their superiority. Tod seems to have ignored this issue and got carried away by the arrogance of the priestly class highlighting them ahead of divinity. He also went into the history of the clan of Hadas and traces their migration from Ajmer under the ancestry to one Ajaipal. It is in his context that Tod mentions about him having twenty-four sons from a 'single wife' emphasizing the absence of polygamy.³² This is an insensitive description of women associating a man having twenty-four sons from a single wife as if she is some child producing machine. It only goes on to show their behavior toward their women, who have been reduced to nothing more than child producers and that too only sons. It is equally noteworthy that there were twenty-four sons with no mention about any girl child.

One of the descendants of these twenty-four sons was Manik Rai there is a fable connected with him that he was slain by *Asuras*. The latter actually happened to be an Islamite missionary. And it is believed that he came out of obscurity and re-established in Ajmer.³³ From here his various progeny settled in different parts of the country including the Haras capturing the region of Kota and Bundi. Hadas are known by *Hada Raj* who was sixth generation down the line from Manik Rai II. One of the descendants of *Hada Raj* was

³² Ibid. 358-59.

³³ Ibid. 359-60.

Deva who captured the Bunda Valley from the local Usra Meena led by their chief Jaita Meena in Samvat 1398, 1342 CE.³⁴ The capital was called Bundi because it is situated in the Bunda Valley inhabited by the Meena tribe. Samar Singh succeeded Deva and expanded his rule up to the Kota region. Akailgarh and the Mukundarra pass were conquered from the local *Kotia* Bhil tribe. The name Kota thus was retained by Surjan, grandson of Samar Singh.³⁵

The expansion of the region began with the expulsion of the Meena tribe from the region of Hadauti by the Hadas in the V.S. 1398, 1342 CE.³⁶ The Parmars and the Chahmans desperately acted to get their hold over the territory of the Meenas in the Bunda Valley. Rao Deva extended the support to the Meena chief against Harraj Dod (Parmar) and succeeded in subjugating the Parmars. He then invited the Meena chief Jaita Meena to marry his two sons Vigrah Raj and Indra Duman to two daughters of Golwal Chahman Jas raj. It is believed that they were deceived by Deva who set their camp on fire in which many men of the Meena tribe were treacherously massacred "*bhumiyas sara kut maria dharti ras padi*" (all the bhumiyas were butchered and the land started yielding) only shows the intensity of violence involved.³⁷

Although the Rajputs resisted any invasion but the feud between the clans made the infiltration easier. There is an interesting event which would

³⁴ James Tod, *Annals and Antiquities*, op. cit., 371 Anuraj obtained Asi or Hansi Ishtpal. A son of Anuraj was expelled from Asi Samvat 1081 1025 CE and obtained Aser. He was also the founder of the Hadas.

³⁵ Ibid. 360-61.

³⁶ Ibid. 372; Surya Mal Mishran dated it as V.S. 1298 *Vamsh-Bhaskar*, Jodhpur, 1899, p.1625.

³⁷ N. S. Bhati ed., *Nainsi ri khyat*, Jodhpur, 1974, 79, 87-90, Suryamal Mishran, *Vamsh-Bhaskar*, op. cit, 1611-16.

throw light on the psychology of the Hada rulers against the Mughal sovereignty. Rao Surjan of Bundi (1554-84)³⁸ came in confrontation with Akbar refused to surrender the fort of Ranthambor, besieged in 1569³⁹ The negotiations included:-⁴⁰

- Branding of the horses was not to be done with the Imperial brands.
- Exemption from the *jaziya* tax.
- No matrimonial relations with the Hada princesses.

The separation of Kota from Bundi took place under Shah-Jahan with Madho Singh as its independent ruler in V.S. 1621, 1565 CE.⁴¹ Slowly with the passage of time the establishment of the Hadas' authority over the region of Kota and Bundi got strengthened. Consequently, by the 19th century even the British perceived Hadauti as the "Country of the Hadas"⁴² refuting any other claim on the region.⁴³ It marked the beginning of their involvement in various kinds of interventions, trade and matrimonial alliances and treaties with chiefs of surrounding areas.

For a Rajput his clan is very important, it is the spine for his standing. The polity and kinship were intertwined in such a way that it strengthened

³⁸Tod mentions some other points of negotiations refer James Tod, *Annals and Antiquities*, op. cit., 383.

³⁹ See *Akbarnama II*, 495-96.

⁴⁰ Rima Hooja, *A History*, op. cit., 514.

⁴¹ James Tod, *Annals and Antiquities*, op. cit., 409.

⁴² *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Provincial Series, Rajputana, 1908, 282

⁴³ Madhu Tandon Sethia, *Rajput Polity: Warriors, Peasants and Merchants*, Jaipur, Rawat Publication, 2003, 23.

the familial ties.⁴⁴ In order to maintain it, the Hadas made it clear in the terms of negotiations that matrimonial relations with the Mughals would not be allowed. With other Rajput or Hindu rulers the matrimonial alliances had proved to be helpful and fruitful in building the base of the Hadas but with the Mughals it meant demeaning their 'clan.' Rajasthan being a feudal society where the clan was supreme, the genealogical blood-ties worked as the major bond between the members of the clan irrespective of the political hierarchy. The three-layered hierarchical division formed the ruling class with the *jagirdars* being the men of *thikanedar* who in turn were the men of the ruler.⁴⁵ The matrimonial relations between different clans brought the two clans into a mutual ambit. The ones accepting the suzerainty of the Mughal or Maratha rulers or were ambitious enough to strengthen their territorial hold developed their political relations through marriages. Barton observes:

The ancient kingships of Rajputana and Central India were based on the feudal system. The result is seen in the great aristocracies of Thakurs and Sirdars which surround the courts of the leading Rajput States and the Maratha States, carved later out of Rajput territory. The ancient feudal baronage adds allegiance, but secure under the aegis of

⁴⁴ Rajendra Joshi, 'Feudal Bonds', eds. N.K. Singhi and Rajendra Joshi, *Folk, Faith and Feudalism*, Jaipur, Rawat Publication, 1995, 150; Also see Richard G. Fox, *Kin, Clan, Raja and Rule: State-Hinterland Relations in Preindustrial India*, Bombay, Oxford University Press, 1971; Bernard Cohn, 'Political Systems in Eighteenth Century India: The Benares Region', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, LXXXII, 1962; K.N. Singh, 'The Territorial Basis of Medieval Town and Village in Eastern Uttar Pradesh, India,' *Annals of Association of American Geographers*, LVIII, 1968.

⁴⁵ Rajendra Joshi, *Feudal Bonds*, op. cit., 152.

imperial Britain, many of the princes now show an increasing tendency to depreciate the political and moral value of their aristocracies, and there has been a constant encroachment on baronial privilege and jurisdiction.⁴⁶

According to Tod there was a resemblance of *zamindars* of Rajputana with the fiefs of Europe. He further describes that castes played crucial role in the feudal system as it prevented the lower classes from being incorporated in the nobility.⁴⁷ As far as the Rajputana states are concerned it took some time to acknowledge the Mughal suzerainty and establishing cordial relations. But once established, these Rajputana rulers participated in the military and administrative services of the Mughals. The Rajputana rulers showed their loyalty during the time when there used to be fight amongst the Mughal princes for succession.

Similar political relations were maintained with the Marathas and the East India Company. But, this 'loyalty' too was temporary which depended on their ambitious need. Also the fact, that the imperial powers desired peace in their regions forcing them to find tactics which helped them in this regard. History possesses many such examples displaying the ambitiousness of the king/minister and sometimes queens too, this was witnessed when the faujdar of Kota '*Raj Rana*' Zalim Singh Jhala, the *de facto* ruler during the reign of Umaid Singh (1771-1819), faced the Pindari menace. He tried establishing cordial relations with the Pindari leaders Karim Khan and Mir Khan. Mir

⁴⁶ K.L. Sharma, *Caste, Feudalism*, op. cit., 48

⁴⁷ Ibid. 51-52.

Khan latter was even allowed to establish his authority in Shergarh. This proved helpful to defuse the danger for a while. On the other hand Jhala sided with the Marathas by paying them a sum of seven lakhs rupees annually. Zalim Singh was smart enough to realize the growing strength of the East India Company. On 26th December, 1817 he became the first to sign the treaty of subsidiary alliance with them accepting the paramountcy of the company by paying sum of Rs. 2,50,000 as *khiraj* annually.⁴⁸

The British were also realizing that just to impose peace in the region is not the solution to the problem of the Indian rulers. It was well understood that Indian rulers were to be brought out from the culture of age-old traditional way of living.⁴⁹ Both the Pindaris and Marathas by 1818 were left with no option but to accept the terms of the British in the context of Rajasthan. While the Marathas signed various treaties to hand over different princely states of Rajputana to the British, on the other hand the Pindari leader Amir Khan was made the first Nawab of the principality of Tonk in 1817.⁵⁰

The East India Company that aspired to rule the entire Indian sub-continent felt the challenge in making the native states accept their authority. Offending the rulers would have meant loosening their base; people too felt secure with the Indian rulers than with any foreigner. This made the British to follow the policy of non-interference which meant that although the rulers

⁴⁸ Rima Hooja, *A History*, op. cit., 751.

⁴⁹ Robin Jeffrey, *People, Princes*, op. cit., 9.

⁵⁰ *Revision of Aitchison treaties*, Basta No. 9/II, F. No. 3C/17, Mahakma khas, English office, RSAK.

could continue using their 'insignia of sovereignty' but they would accept the position of the 'subordinates' to the British.⁵¹ The signing of the 'Individual treaties' started between 1803 and 1823 with Kishengarh, Karauli and Kota signing it in 1817 while Bundi signed it in 1818. Slowly entire Rajputana signed it; it restricted the rights of the rulers. Thus, all the external disputes and matters were to be settled by the Company, although the internal affairs were still dealt by the native rulers due to the policy of non-interference. Alongside the British took control over the rights of the protection of the rulers and the successors, as well as the rights of succession.

Rajputana could not stay unaffected by the chaotic political events of India such as the formation and re-formation of the boundaries of certain political units of a region which defined and re-defined the regional kingdoms. Zalim Singh Jhala's ambition made him sign a secret treaty along with the subsidiary alliance in 1818, which made him and his successors the hereditary holders of the post of *dewan* of the Kota state. Later this led to the confrontation between the rulers of Kota and Zalim Singh's successors. It was only after the intervention of the Political Agent of Hadauti in 1838 during the reign of Maharao Ram Singh II that Madan Singh *dewan* '*Muhasib-Ala*' was made the first ruler of the newly formed Jhalawar State with seventeen *parganas* of Kota.⁵² British government was quite impressed by the attitude of Zalim Singh who saw and accepted the relevance of subordination to their growing strength. Tod mentions Zalim Singh's capacity to foresee the future

⁵¹ Rima Hooja, *A History*, op. cit., 779-80.

⁵² Ibid., 902-03.

when his friends and allies were moving against him for supporting British. And he quotes the Jhala who was trying to pursue the Maharao of Kota Umed Singh:

Maharaj, I cannot doubt you believe what you say; but remember what old Zalim tells you; the day is not distant when only one emblem of power will be recognized throughout India.

Tod seems to have been overwhelmed by the 'prediction' of Zalim Singh as he writes:

For although no absolute conquest or incorporation of Rajpoot territory has taken place, our system of control, and the establishment of our monopoly within these limits (not then dreamed of by ourselves), has already verified in part his prediction.⁵³

It helped the successors of Zalim Singh to procure a small principality in Jhalrapatan. Later during the reign of Umed Singh II of Kota it will be seen that British will change their side and would return most of the *parganas* back to the Kota State. Umed Singh became the 'ideal' example for the British who acted on their whims and fancy. This kind of support and cooperation was needed by the British to establish their control over India and princes of the native Indian States were the ideal medium for them. With little effort the

⁵³ James Tod, *Annals and Antiquities*, op. cit., 449.

British were able to gain their dominance over the princes which helped them to expand their rule over other regions of the country.

The pressure on the native states to prove their loyalty has been judged time and again by the British. The revolt of 1857 became the turning point for many native states as well as the British, who were able to realize what Thomas Munroe said in a speech in 1817 regarding his doubt for the policy of 'subsidiary alliance'. He said:

It has been a natural tendency to render the Government of every country in which it exists weak and oppressive; to extinguish all honorable spirit among the higher classes of society, and to degrade and impoverish the whole people. The usual remedy of a bad Government in India is a quiet revolution in the palace or a violent one by rebellion, or foreign and domestic enemy. It renders him indolent, by teaching him to trust to strangers for his security; and cruel and avaricious, by showing him that he has nothing to fear from the hatred of his subjects.⁵⁴

There were two developments in order to sustain the positions of both the native states and the British one which rose the expectations of the British

⁵⁴ Quoted in Edward Thompson, *The Making of the Indian Princes*, op. cit., 22-23.

to administer the princely states and other which Munro perceived the failure in effectively administrating the native states.⁵⁵

The Revolt of 1857 became the face changer for both the British government as well as the native rulers.⁵⁶ The latter were judged according to the position they took during that crucial time. Inquiry was held to know the stand respective states took and even actions were then taken against those found with dubious intentions. Bundi had not co-operated with the British East India Company during the revolt for which reason there was some displeasure for three years.⁵⁷ The Kota Contingent rebelled in 1857; it became quiet aggressive under the leadership of Mehrab Khan and Lala Jai Dayal sparing only Indian men and women. The mutineers rallied anti British calls and murdered Col. Major C.E. Burton, British Political Agent of Hadauti along with his two sons and an English doctor, capturing Maharao Ram Singh II in his own palace, and finally occupied the Kota state. The 'Kota Uprising' was curbed toward the end of March 1858 by Col. Robert after many arrests and both Mehrab Khan and Lala Jai Dayal were arrested, tried and hanged. The Maharao's rule could be restored only after six months.⁵⁸

After the events of 1857-58 British government was frightened by the series of events which occurred in various states of India for which they were least prepared. There was a deliberate attempt by the British authorities to

⁵⁵ Robin Jeffery, *People, Princes*, op. cit., 9.

⁵⁶ Ian Copland, *The Princes of India in the Endgame of Empire, 1917-1947*, New Delhi, Foundation Books, 1999.

⁵⁷ Rima Hooja, *A History*, op. cit., 900.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 903.

inculcate the feeling of guilt in the minds of the rulers. The British government started blaming the rulers for being insensitive not to curb the 'menace'. In reaction the British demanded reform from the princely states. The Kota and Bundi rulers were blamed of corruption and lawlessness in the state for which the Political Agent proposed some reforms and measures that were already prevalent in the other native states and British governed India. Subsequently the Mahaja Rana Ram Singh of Bundi and Maharao Ram Singh II of Kota decided to take some actions in reforming their states. Accordingly Kota decided to introduce reforms. For the administrative purpose the state was divided into districts with *Ziledars* as the heads. Office hours were fixed, police system was modernized, law and order was placed under the *kotwal* and bribery was declared as the legal offence.⁵⁹ Maharaj Rana Ram Singh of Bundi signed the 'Extradition Treaty' in 1869 according to which the rulers of Bundi were to hand over the criminals and culprits charged with specific offences. Even salt agreement (1882) was signed to restrict the import and export of the manufactured salt within the city of Bundi, which meant that only the British levied salt could be exported. This affected the economy of the state and also of the people who earned their living from it although in return of the treaty the Bundi ruler received a sum of 8,000 Rs. annually.⁶⁰

This tendency of surrendering to the British Imperial authority is visible amongst all the rulers. Following the example of Bundi Kota even Jhalawar rulers adapted the same policy. The fear of losing the stature made

⁵⁹ Rima Hooja, *A History*, op. cit., 903.

⁶⁰ Ibid. 901

the native princes meek and weak to rule their kingdoms. Maharao Raghuvir Singh succeeded Ram Singh in Bundi (1889-1927) while Ram Singh II was succeeded by Chhatar Sal II in Kota (1866-1889) and Maharaj Rana Madan Singh (1838-1845) succeeded Madho Singh in Jhalawar. All these rulers acted according to the diktat of the British. These rulers took some steps in reforming their states but within a prescribed limit. The rulers of Hadauti never showed any keen interest in initiating any reform which might hurt the Imperial authority. Hence the region has lagged way behind than the progressive states of Baroda, Mysore and Travancore. It will be interesting to draw a parallel between these native states with the princely states of Hadauti, it shall help in forming a picture of causes which effected the progress of these princely states.

Many times it has been observed that the British chose the rule of a minor to bring in reforms in a princely state as it was in the case of Sayajirao III (1875-1939) for Baroda,⁶¹ Umed Singh II (1889-1940) for Kota⁶² and Zalim Singh II (1858-1896) for Jhalawar.⁶³ Sayajirao Gaikwad's reign can be divided into four main phases when from 1875 to 1881 Sir T. Madhav Rao ruled the state. Then because of the difference between him and Sayajirao's tutor Elliot, Madhav Rao was dispossessed and from 1881 to 1895 Elliot took the charge. From 1895-1916, Sayajirao was alone in-charge of the state, this was also the phase when he earned disrespect from the British because of his lack of

⁶¹ David Hardiman, 'Baroda: The Structure of a 'Progressive' State,' ed., Robin Jeffrey, *People, Princes and Paramount Power*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1978, 114.

⁶² Jagat Narayan, *Kota Ke Maharao*, op. cit., 35-38.

⁶³ Rima Hooja, *A History*, op. cit., 906.

tactics. During the last phase of his reign he had two able Dewans Manubhai Mehta (1916-1926) and V.T. Krishnamachariar (1926-1944). They were able to regain the harmonious relations with the British and during this time Sayajirao spent most of his time away from Baroda.⁶⁴ On the scale of 'good governance' Baroda ranked two. Within the princely states some were termed as 'more progressive' than others, Mysore and Baroda were two such states which stood out in hierarchal classifications.⁶⁵

Udai Singh of *Kotda* was adopted as the successor of the State by Chhatrasal or Shatrusal who died heirless. He was forcefully sent to achieve western education in Mayo College, Ajmer. His is the era of 'progress' for the Kota state. Umed Singh was Sayajirao's contemporary, both more or less saw similar sets of events but the outcome was different for both. During Umed Singh's reign there were many reforms in almost all the spheres.⁶⁶ *Mahakma-Khas* and *Mahakma-Mal* were established; while the former was the highest judicial and executive authority in the state headed by the ruler himself, the latter was to look after the affairs of the revenues, forest and famines etc. There were various categories of the main land tenures such as *Khalsa*, *Jagir* and *Muafi* lands, in which the quarter of state's land were *Jagir* and *Muafi* lands, the holder of the land was banned succession power, the authority resting with the ruler. As the succession fee, the fief holder had to pay *Nazrana* to the ruler which included horseman and foot soldiers for the service

⁶⁴ David Hardiman, *Baroda State*, op. cit., 114.

⁶⁵ Manu Bhagwan, *Sovereign Spheres: Princes, Education and Empire in Colonial India*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 2003, 5.

⁶⁶ Rima Hooja, *A History*, op. cit., 904.

of the state. There was exemption too for a few fief-holders based on service to the country or gallantry etc. Due to the clan culture there were at least thirty-six *jagirdars* who were regarded premier in the state as they were Hada Chauhans who were termed as *Rajvi* and the senior nobles known as *Umrao*. No land revenue was charged for the *maufi* lands that were given in charity. For the *Khalsa* lands in the early nineteenth century the tenants paid two-fifth of the produce of land as land revenue to the state.⁶⁷

During the rule of Zalim Singh, the *Dewan-Faujdar*, the land revenue was taken in cash at fixed rates per *bigha* of land. He also abolished all the hereditary rights on tenures and brought the entire *Khalsa* lands under the management of the state. No tenants were removed from their land as long as they paid their revenues. For better administration, Maharao Umaid Singh II divided the state into *Nizammats* under the *nazims*, assisted by the *patwari* who were assisted by the *mozas*, who were further assisted by the *sehnas* or *sahanas*; they collected the land revenues. Other than these officers there were other functionaries like *lamberdars*, *gaon balai*, who were given *maufi* lands in lieu of their services. The laws were based on the lines of the British India. The *nazims* had civil and criminal powers, although their verdict could be challenged and final word lied with the *faujdar* who enjoyed the powers of jurisdiction in both civil and criminal matters.

Maharao Umed Singh II readily accepted the demands of the British authorities and introduced a substantial structural transformation in the

⁶⁷ Ibid. 905

administration of revenue and justice. Construction of irrigational reservoirs like Umaidsagar and Sahrid and the management of water supply in the capital city were undertaken in 1920; improved and better seeds for farmers were provided; many veterinary dispensaries were opened; co-operative societies were set up and a co-operative bank was established in 1927. The first High School of the Kota state was opened in 1911 and by December 1940 there were one Intermediate College, two high schools and 109 schools in the state. In 1927 an act prohibiting the marriage of minor children was promulgated.

For Zalim Singh II of Jhalawar who was also a minor the Regency Council carried on the administration on his behalf and in 1896 he was invested with full powers. But Zalim Singh II was a weak ruler who was disposed off and fifteen *parganas* out of seventeen which Jhalawar had received from Kota were returned to Kota during this time.⁶⁸ He was replaced by Bhawani Singh who resigned himself into art and music and nothing much can be associated with him. He too was submissive to the British dictates and did not attempt to rise his voice. The Maharaja High School was established in 1887 and the first girls' school was opened in 1883. This happened when British Regency was in-charge of the administration of the Jhalawar State.

The three cases of the princely states of India mentioned above exemplify a constant exercise of the Imperial authority in maneuvering these

⁶⁸ Rima Hooja, *A History*, op. cit., 905-906.

kingdoms for the goals of imperial domination. The rulers were supposed to explain the status of their administrations to the officials of the British government. The Political Agents and Residents grounded in the native states were expected to keep their superiors updated about the activities of the states as these administrators also conveyed the policies of the paramount power to the rulers.⁶⁹ It was a machinery of surveillance. The frightened rulers were hesitant going against the British thereby leaving the credit of the 'progressive' movement of their kingdoms to the British.⁷⁰ The Imperial system forced the rulers of the princely states to support the Imperial sovereignty.

III

Late nineteenth century is a very crucial period for the history of India, more so for the princely states that were unaware of the advancement of time that was about to 'change' their fate forever. Before discussing the transition into 'modern' India it is important to discuss the cause behind the fall of the British raj in India as well as 'traditional' system of domination in princely states.

⁶⁹ Ian Copland, 'The Other Guardians: Ideology and Performance in the Indian Political Service', ed., Robin Jeffery, *People, Princes and Paramount Power*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1978, 275-76.

⁷⁰ Rajat. K. Ray, 'Mewar: The Breakdown of the Princely Order' ed., Robin Jeffery, *People, Princes and Paramount Power*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1978, 205-207. He argues about the state of Mewar which was comparatively backward than the other princely states in India yet it became the source of major rural unrest in Rajputana which threatened the entire structure of the princely authority.

The double standards of the British of being both repressive as well as liberal enough to 'civilize' the people of India resulted in giving ideas to the educated elite of gaining independence of the foreign rule democratically. Therefore people in British India people were losing their patience with the Raj but the relations with the princes were growing strong as partners.⁷¹ Thus two different political advancements were visible. On the one hand the Indian National Congress with the idea of democracy was growing in popularity which threatened the British. On the other hand British gave free hand to the Indian rulers to get some leverage to continue their Raj in India.

Not all the princes were blindly following the British ruler. Krishnaraja Wadiyar IV who ruled Mysore from 1902 to 1940 realized the relevance of compulsory reforms in the native states as he could also perceive the end of the rulers in the near future.⁷² Even political officers could sense the fall of the princely order and criticized the policy of *laissez-faire*. R.E.L. Wingate in a secret note of August 1934 questions British policy towards the princely states and writes: 'How are we to save the States?' (Only by giving advice) 'Whether or not it is sought and...compel[ling] its acceptance'. The Political Secretary, Glancy rubbished his view and said: '[it appears that] Wingate has of late been suffering from strain...'⁷³ Linlithgow sensed the flaw by 1939 and expressed his view to Zetland: 'I cannot help thinking that we have ourselves to thank... for the pitch at which matters have reached in certain

⁷¹ James Manor, "The Demise of the Princely Order", op. cit., 308

⁷² Ibid. 302

⁷³ Ian Copland, *The Other Guardians*, op. cit., 296-97.

circumstances. The great mistake, I am now disposed to think, lay in the change of policy after Curzon's retirement, which led us to relax our control over individual princes and over happening inside their States... We, and the States, have now... to pay for 30 years of *laissez-faire*'.⁷⁴

The British experimentation with India was full of loops which entangled them and pulled them down. By the time they realized their mistake it was too late, the people under the influence of the Congress were able to sense their rights. While the princely states had become habitual with the policy of non-intervention, which had made them weak and selfish, they kept their desires before the need of their citizen. Rulers of some of the progressive states were less in number than the rulers of the smaller States. They were easy catch both for the British and later for Vallabhbhai Patel and V.P. Menon who tried to pursue them for parliamentary democracy.⁷⁵ They became the gateway through which the entire princely order was pulled in.

James Manor has gone into the complexity of smaller princely states which were less receptive toward change and feared it. The lack of administration by the British made them to further slow down the process of modernization especially in smaller states as they feared that disturbing the conventional mechanism might intensify the popular unrest of the British India in the princely states. The slow progress in some small princely states tied in their personal relation with the neighboring state. If it was not mutual

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ian Copland, *The Other Guardians*, op. cit., 310.

then it hampered the process of growth.⁷⁶ The three princely states of Hadauti, Bundi, Kota and Jhalawar were seen in many instances fighting and non-co-operative with each other. The Political Agents were instructed to discuss the reform first with the reformist ruler's neighbors. If they thought it to be fine for them and their citizen shall not be affected by it then only the interested ruler could implement it, it slowed down the intensity of the reforms even in a progressive state.⁷⁷

James Manor puts the larger share of blame on the British than on the rulers and points to two factors for the failure, firstly, the structure through which the British dealt with the states and secondly the circumstances in which the British found them to be in relation with the rulers.⁷⁸ During the gravest challenge between 1930 and 1940 even the Political Department needed reform; the officers were ill-informed, ill-equipped and incapable to manage the adverse situation of the princely states.⁷⁹ The Political Department was short of man-power were forced to implement reforms in the states; besides their regular duties it became difficult for them to focus on reform. Between 1940 and 1945 these agents were busy to gain the support of various states for their contribution in the Second World War that the concern for reforms became the secondary issue for them.⁸⁰

⁷⁶ James Manor, *The Demise*, op. cit., 311.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ James Manor, *The Demise*, op. cit., 311.

⁷⁹ Ian Copland, *The Other Guardian*, 286-89.

⁸⁰ James Manor, *The Demise*, op. cit., 312.

After signing of Instrument of Accession there were series of events in which the Congress leaders, British Government and princely India kept changing places with argument and counter argument, filled with both trust and distrust. The British Government and the Congress were able to sense the formation of the newly elected Government but the role and involvement of the rulers was unclear. One thing was sure that the princes never wished to be part of the new India as they tried in all possibility to avoid joining the Union. Even some of the officers in British Government expressed their sympathy toward the princely states and wished for a formation of a third dominion.⁸¹ Role of Vallabhbhai Patel and V. P. Menon has been questioned in influencing the rulers especially of the smaller states to join the Union by threat and blackmail. Even Sir Conrad Corfield criticizes the intention of the last Viceroy of India Lord Mountbatten to have deceitfully forced the rulers to sign the Instrument which has changed their fate. James Manor discusses the possibilities of why Patel, Menon and Mountbatten have tried forcing their desires on to the princes. The events which were occurring after the decision of the transfer of power to the newly elected government made them to act in such a way. Mountbatten feared disintegration of these princely states which would have had averse affect on them as well as on India at large. The 'change' was inevitable, the gap which has always existed between the princely India and the British India was about to be reduced. And for obvious reasons especially for rulers of these native states to accept the change at its face value was not easy, therefore there were many violations of the treaties

⁸¹ Ibid. 318

signed between the British Government and rulers. All this was done to maintain the integrity of the country.

The process of integration was completed in several stages; initially the ministry of the Government of India allowed all those princely states which had population of one million to formulate into a viable state so as to be able to retain their identity of princely state. By the end of the integration process the Government refuted this policy and ceased it, declaring that no princely state was allowed to retain their 'identity'.

There were five main stages of Integration of various states of Rajputana.⁸²

Alwar, Bharatpur, Dholpur and Karauli were the Eastern portion of Rajasthan combined to form *Matsya* Union or the United States of *Matsya* Union with Alwar as its capital. Ruler of Dholpur was made the *Rajpramukh* and Maharaja of Alwar as its *Up- Rajpramukh*.

Kota, Dungarpur and Jhalawar initiated to form a separate union, they also invited Udaipur to be the part of the Rajasthan Union but the Dewan of Udaipur suggested them to get merge into Udaipur which was not accepted by the other rulers. Thus the idea was refuted and a point was made clear to all larger states not the swallow smaller kingdoms. Then the rulers of Kota, Dungarpur, Jhalawar and Banswara including Kushalgarh, Pratapgarh, Lawa, Kishangarh, Tonk and Shahpura decided to form one union. Kota ruler was declared as the *Rajpramukh* with Kota as capital and rulers of Dungarpur and

⁸² Rima Hooja, *A History*, op. cit., 1134-38.

Bundi were the two *Up-Rajpramukhs*. Its constituent assembly had twenty-four elected representatives on the basis of one seat for every one lakh of people. The *Rajpramukh* i.e. the ruler of Kota had the authority to appoint four representatives to safeguard the interests of the land owning *jagirdars* etc.

Later Udaipur too became interested in joining the Rajasthan Union. It was agreed that the Rajasthan Union would be re-constituted to include Udaipur. Therefore in this re-constitution the Maharana of Udaipur was made the *Rajpramukh*, the Maharao of Kota was made as senior *Up-Rajpramukh* and the rulers of both Bundi and Dungarpur together were made the joint junior *Up-Rajpramukhs* with the capital of this sham Union at Udaipur. In order to compensate the loss of honour for the Maharao of Kota it was decided that at least one session of the legislature would be in the Kota city. It was also said that the units of state forces, departments and other institutions can be retained in the Kota city. Along with this it was also decided that when the union will declare its administrative boundaries, divisions and districts, one division level headquarters under the charge of the commissioner would be based at the Kota city. This union was then known as the Union State of Rajasthan and was inaugurated by Jawaharlal Nehru on the 18th April 1948.

After the formation of *Matsya* union and Union State of Rajasthan there were only four states remaining without any union. These were Jaipur, Jodhpur, Bikaner and Jaisalmer which according to the States Ministry justified becoming the viable states. Jaisalmer was a special case although it was suitable in becoming the viable state but it was hardly populated and

there was not much of its economic importance other than its traditional link up to Indus River. It was also useful in providing traditional trade routes as well migratory animal route than was either in Bikaner and Jodhpur and therefore it fulfilled the criteria for viable states. Negotiations for merging them got its pace. There were numerous meetings between the Government of India's Ministry of States and the rulers of different princely states to conclude the amalgamation for the State of Rajasthan. Finally these four states agreed to get merged with the Greater Union of Rajasthan which was announced by Sardar Vallabh bhai Patel on the 14th January 1949 at Udaipur in a public meeting. The designation thus after this merger were that the ruler of Udaipur would become the Maharaj *Rajpramukh* for life, the ruler of Jaipur as the *Rajpramukh* for life, rulers of Kota and Jodhpur as the senior *Up-Rajpramukhs* and rulers of Bundi and Dungarpur as the junior *Up-Rajpramukhs* for a period of five years. But the capital was now shifted to Jaipur instead of Udaipur.

The *Matsya* union with the rulers of Karauli, Bharatpur, Alwar and Dholpur too agreed to join the Greater Union of Rajasthan and on the 15th May 1949, the administration of the *Matsya* union was transferred into this new Union of Rajasthan. After all these shifts and transfers there were few other exceptional states such as Sirohi and previously British administered Ajmer-Merwara area and some boundary adjustment was needed for Tonk.

Finally the new state of Rajasthan had Five Territorial divisions with Kota, Jaipur, Bikaner, Jodhpur and Udaipur which were headed by the divisional commissioners. These five territories comprised of total of twenty-

four districts, the previously existing states were abolished on 15th October 1949. The new divisions had more than one princely state like the former states of Mewar, Dungarpur, Banswara, Pratapgarh and former Nimbahera pargana of Tonk were part of one unit with Udaipur as their headquarters. From the erstwhile princely states of Bikaner and Jodhpur districts of Barmer, Jalore, Pali and Nagaur were carved out. And Jaisalmer finally became one single district.

For Sirohi it was becoming little difficult to conclude whether to merge with Rajasthan or Bombay. The then Maharani Regent, handed it temporarily to the Government of India to administer on the 8th November 1948. It was then by the Government of India transferred it to the Bombay Government. The states of Gujarat and Rajasthan too kept their proposal of including Sirohi in their states respectively. Based on the recommendations of the Reorganisation Act the Commission decided to transfer parts of Dilwara and Mt. Abu along with some portions of Jhalawar and Tonk into Rajasthan on 1st November 1956. The concluding merger was of Ajmer-Merwara into Rajasthan giving it the present day form.

This process of integration came to its end for the rulers for whom it was entirely a new age where although they would still retain their property and prestige but they could no longer be the heads of their states as they were replaced with the elected representatives. The erstwhile rulers were given some amount for their privy purse the amount of which was later reduced. In December 1971 when the 26th Constitutional Amendment was passed the

luxury of privy-purse ceased to exist for the rulers⁸³. This further reduced them giving the last blow to the anarchy of 'feudalism.'

⁸³ Rima Hooja, *A History*, op. cit., 1139- 1141.