

CHAPTER-II

THE ERA OF CONFRONTATION

The advent of the East India Company in Cooch Behar marked a breach with the past and the relation between the Company's authority and the Raja Harendra Narayan, took a serious turn in 1801, the date of expiry of the minority and attaining of the majority of Raja Harendra Narayan. Though the personal administrative period of Raja Harendra Narayan (1801-1839) is termed "confrontation", it is to be remembered that this conflict was not limited to the political scene. This period witnessed a tremendous resistance against the attempt to introduce any change in the State by the British. The personal rule (1801-1839) also experienced a state of anarchy¹ and as such it may be called "non-modern" period. An analysis of the causes of the conflict will prove the fact that the ruler, both in mind and heart, opposed any change they (the British) wanted to introduce for the better

management of the State. The Raja favoured "traditionalism" which accentuated the conflict both in political and in social matters. The roots of the conflict were many and they developed surrounding the powers and functions of the Commissioners. The irregular interference by the Collector of Rangpur in the affairs of Cooch Behar under the cover of collecting the tributes from the State, occasioned the conflict between Raja Harendra Narayan and the East India Company².

The British officers were appointed in terms of the provision of the Commission of 1788 in order to resolve the internal dissensions and prevailing anarchy caused by the palace intrigue and the conflict among the nobles³ and above all to give a statusquo in the affairs of the State. Incidentally the Mercer & Chauvet Commission recommended some positive measures and accordingly Henry Dauglaus was appointed as Commissioner of Cooch Behar in 1789⁴. This corroborates the fact that from the years following arrangements were made to make room for direct participation of the East India Company into the affairs of Cooch Behar, did not evoke any resistance for (1) the ruler was a minor one; (2) the contemporary influential contending persons surrounding the throne of Cooch Behar did think it as an arrangement which could be temporary relief to the discontents already experienced; and (3) there was no sign of resistance both from within and

without the State of Cooch Behar based on the local natives and national sentiments.

The affairs of the State were managed by the "Queen Regent" on behalf ^{of} her son Harendra Narayan⁵. From 1789 to 1801, the Commissioners wielded the over all authority in the State. Raja Harendra Narayan after achieving majority decided to rule the State according to the customary fashion and with powers which his ancestors exercised before. Naturally the king demanded the withdrawal of the Company's official from the capital in accordance with the prior decision taken by the Company to this effect⁶. Consequently the Commissioner was withdrawn and the initial conflict was averted⁷.

The removal of the Commissioner from Cooch Behar allowed the Raja to manage the entire affairs of the State. From the removal of the Commissioner in the year 1801, upto the year 1802, the connection between Cooch Behar and the East India Company had been confined to the receipt of the annual tribute from the Raja, which was paid to the Collector of the adjoining district of Rangpur⁸. The Governor General in Council realised the necessity to introduce the proper rules for the collection of the public revenue and at the sametime it appeared to them that the establishment of regulations for the prompt and pure administration of justice by means of the Company's servants, would enable the Raja to provide for the

regular discharge of the tribute and promote the general prosperity of the kingdom. This consideration prompted the Company again to depute a Commissioner at Cooch Behar in 1802⁹.

The Commissioner was entrusted with the task of achieving the ends of the Governor General in Council in forming a concert with the Raja. But the king expressed his strong repugnance at the measure contemplated and insisted on his right as an independent ruler of his own territory. Notwithstanding the strong remonstrance of East India Company and their expressed determination of persisting in an arrangement Mr. Francis Pierard, then Commissioner of Cooch Behar, failed to procure the assent of the ruler and finally he was removed from the territory in August, 1804¹⁰.

The presence of the Commissioner at Cooch Behar had restrained the authority of the Raja. With the withdrawal of the Commissioner all checks were removed and duties connected with the administration had all along been performed by the native officers, as a result of which many of the old abuses crept into the Government of the State¹¹. Chaos and anarchy prevailed in the State. The consequence was that the administration became very loose and the revenue collection fell to an alarming stage.

As the revenue was the most vital matter of the British, they did not remain idle for a long time. Besides the revenue, the law and order in this strategically important State had been grave. To remedy the situation, in 1805 the office of the Resident Commissioner was again revived with the hope that he might introduce proper rules for the collection of the public revenue, and would try to establish Regulations so as to effect the speedy and pure administration of justice; but the attempt of the Company proved of no avail, in consequence of the Raja's aversion to reform. Naturally the appointment of a Commissioner as a separate office was abolished on the 25th June 1805¹².

Jenkins mentions "the continual interference, though surely contrary to the spirit of the treaty, became almost unavoidable when connections were once established"¹³. During the period of nine years from 1805 to 1813 the Collectors of Rangpur carried on the duties in connection with Cooch Behar from Rangpur. They were not unprejudicial in their relation with the Raja and most of them seem to have lent their ears to many a complains against the functions of the Raja Harendra Narayan and sent reports to the President and his Council at Calcutta¹⁴. This made the matter worse. The defects and irregularities of Cooch Behar Court were often sent upto the East India Company's government in a highly exaggerated form. The Collectors sometimes interfered into matters of little importance in the internal administration and unduly aggrand-

ised the position of the Dewan Deo in the humiliation of the Raja. "Terms were dictated to the king and thus the patience of the ruler of the State was sorely taxed"¹⁵. In such state of affairs the government of Earl Minto recorded its Resolution in the Revenue Department dated, August 7, 1813 and determined upon exercising a thorough and efficient interference into the internal affairs of Cooch Behar with an eye to eradicate the evils of the administration¹⁶.

Thus, the disorderly state of affairs and outrageous conduct of the Raja Harendra Narayan led the Company's Government to adopt the measure of appointing another Resident Commissioner at Cooch Behar and accordingly Mr. Norman Macleod was selected for the office. He was specially instructed to introduce some reform in the administrative affairs of the state.

The mission of Macleod had met with little success¹⁷ as a result of the unbending attitude of the Raja and conflict became imminent. At this juncture Mr. Macleod was withdrawn from all concern in the management of the country and his interference was limited to advice and representation. But at the sametime the Raja was informed that "if through mal-administration he failed in the punctual discharge of his tribute, a correction admitting of no mitigation would be applied by the chastening hand of the feudal sovereign"¹⁸.

During the period from 1816 to 1839 the Commissioners carried on their business either from Rangpur or from Goalpara. The confrontation developed again between the Raja and the prejudiced activities of Mr. Scot, the Company's Agent in North East Frontier¹⁹. The relation between the king and the Company did not develop to harmony. The Raja during this time had to spend all his energies in resisting the advancing hands of the Company's Commissioners. The antagonistic attitude of the Raja was mitigated by the conciliatory attitude of Captain Jenkins who was appointed Company's Agent in North East Frontier and visited the State in the late years of the rule of Raja Harendra Narayan. He was successful in improving the relations and achieved better result than the strict and uncompromising attitude of his (Jenkins) predecessors²⁰.

Though administration and judiciary had been solely the internal matters of the State and the rulers were supreme in formulating the systems in these respect, there had been an unseen control of the British. This control quite obviously resulted in a controversy regarding the powers and functions of the Raja. In Cooch Behar the East India Company wanted to modernize the administrative and judicial systems, and Lord Cornwallis, when Governor General of India, had insisted upon the importance of infusing sound principles into the mind of the prince while he was a minor²¹. But as soon as he attained majority he gave himself up entirely to the affairs of his

Zenana. He is described by Buchanan Hamilton, "as poor creature, exhausted by drunkenness and debauchery" likewise the contemporary news paper Englishman shared the same view²².

The internal management in most of the princely states was slack and rotten to the core. "In most cases the princes were unenlightened and the administration was run on medieval lines and in a slipshod manner. Brought up in the vicious atmosphere of zenana influence the personal character of the princes developed on extremely unhealthy lines. Palace intrigues and personal jealousies bedeviled the Durbars of the Indian rulers. Surrounded by a band of uneducated parasites, buffoons and tale-tellers, the princes often indulged in costly but ugly merry makings, thereby draining the resources of the states. Naturally the administration was neglected and in such circumstances greedy courtiers and rapacious officials reaped the harvests. There was hardly any attempt at securing the welfare of the subjects; justice was perverted, and law and order collapsed. Trade and commerce languished for lack of safety"²³. This very characteristic of other princely states in India had been also the general feature of the State of Cooch Behar. The affairs of the State were entrusted to the hands of incapable or illdisposed people and the Judiciary and Administration were on the verge of ruin. To retrieve this state of affairs the Company was eager to bring about the

administrative and Judicial changes in the system as existed in Bengal²⁴.

This led to further complications in the relations with the Raja. On the expiration of the minority, when Raja Harendra Narayan took the reins in his own hands in 1801, it appeared to the Governor General in Council to be highly expedient, that some regulations should be adopted for the future management of an efficient police throughout the country, and to provide for pure and impartial administration of Justice, both in Civil and Criminal cases²⁵. Accordingly, in 1803 Mr. Francis Pierard was deputed to Cooch Behar with instructions to endeavour to obtain the assent of the Raja to the introduction of the general regulations, in force in the province of Bengal, into the territory of Cooch Behar. This was done with some modification in view of the position of the Raja and according to the terms of the treaty, concluded in 1773²⁶. But the attempt of the Company to infuse this change met with strong resistance from the Raja who was against any change proposed by the Commissioner. It is to be noted that these regulations, the Company's government wanted to introduce into the territory of Cooch Behar, for the better management and as per the expressed will of the Raja Harendra Narayan. It can be mentioned here that the Raja wrote to the Governor General that "the government would be pleased to establish such Permanent Regulations for Cooch Behar, as

they might think proper"²⁷. In spite of the declaration, the Raja was reluctant in introducing any change proposed by the Commissioner.

The contemptuous attitude of the Raja against any change is also revealed in the letter of Montgomery, the Commissioner of Cooch Behar, to the Secretary to the Government, Revenue Department, dated 28th July 1805. He wrote that "since my arrival at this place, I have had two interviews with Raja Harendra Narayan, and have conversed with him on the great benefit, his family and country could derive, by a general introduction of the Regulations, now in force in the province of Bengal; but I am sorry to say, all my endeavours to get his acquiescence to that important measure have proved in futile"²⁸. He was of the conviction that the Raja failed to realise that the proposed regulations would be of greater interests to the great body of the natives, and the permanent welfare and prosperity of the Raja himself. The real motive of the Company, introducing the regulations, prevailed in Bengal, was to bring out some changes into the collection of public revenue which was considered to be dwindling²⁹. Moreover the ryots of the State were suffering from oppression, from undue exactions from the officers or farmers employed in making the collection. Thus the motive of the British was also to protect the interest of the ryots who were the main source of revenue³⁰. To achieve their ends the Company wanted

to hand over the administration of Justice and the superintendence of police in the hands of their own servants. But Raja Harendra Narayan refused to give into the proposals of the Company. His reluctance to change the traditional system is revealed through the letter to the Governor General in which he mentions "Your Excellency has written with your friendly pen, that it is not the wish of the British Government to subject me to the jurisdiction of the Courts, which may be empowered to take cognizance of Civil and Criminal causes; but, my Lord, when my relations, dependants, servants and subjects shall be amenable to Civil and Criminal Courts, established by the Company, where will be my dignity and authority"³¹ ? This reveals the intention of the Raja who was not in favour of increasing the British influence through the cover of reforms as proposed by them.

The Company was very eager to improve the then Judicial Administration along with the Civil and Criminal affairs. But the efforts of the Company to this direction was barred on the said "Treaty" which recognised the sovereign authority of the Raja. The mal-judicial administration ran by the Raja may be depicted as under.

Firstly, the subjects did not enjoy free and fair justice from the Raja³². Secondly, the Judiciary was left in the hands of the native servants of British administration of

Bengal³³. Thirdly, the Raja paid little attention to the administration and did not appear before the regular Durbar, the administration was solely conducted by the official such as Dewan and Bukshi through whom only the petition could reach the Raja³⁴. Fourthly, the Judiciary became complicated in dealing with the Hindus and the Mahamedan subjects³⁵.

Under circumstances, the Company intended to bring about certain modifications in the field of Judiciary. These were (a) separate systems of the law, as a general principle of the British, for the Hindus and the Mahamedans especially in the field of civil justice Hindu law for the Hindus and the Mahamedan law for the Mahamedans³⁶; (b) in respect of the Criminal cases, the Company's authority was intended to be expanded after curtailing the judicial power of the king³⁷. The intention has been clear from the fact that, "no capital punishments should take place, but with the knowledge and under the seal and signature of the Rajah, and that he should exercise the privilege of remitting or mitigating punishments, even when the law itself may condemn. But it will be one of the most important duties of the Commissioner to aid the Rajah with the best advice in the discharge of those solemn functions, to induce him, as circumstances may require, to temper justice with mercy but to prevent the misuse of the privilege of pardon, lest the mistaken application of mercy, by encouraging the commission of crimes, should become a scourge to the

unoffending part of the community"³⁸. Thus, the judicial measures, cherished by the Company formed one of the major sources which laid the foundation for confrontation with the Raja. The Raja repeatedly asked the Company to adhere to the terms of the "Treaty", so that he could be able enough to steer the judicial administration in an independent manner.

The conflict between the Raja and the Company was again aggravated when the very basic principle of divide and rule of the British imperialist power seemed to be exposed by certain activities of the Collector of Rangpur who was incharge of Cooch Behar affair on behalf of the Company. The Collectors on the one hand maintained a good liason with the king, but, on the other hand, instigated the other personalities and even assisted them to get hold of power from the king³⁹. But the king proclaimed that as the "Treaty" reads, "no question of power division within the palace personalities can be raised", but the intentions of the Company were otherwise. The Rangpur Collector was authorised, if he thought it necessary to send a detachment of troops from Rangpur to protect the position of Nazir-Deo which has been curtailed by the Raja⁴⁰.

This policy prescription of the Company gave birth to two basic things; firstly, the British was able to manage the loyalty of Nazir-Deo who happened to be one of the influential persons of Cooch Behar administration; and secondly, the

establishment of the authority of Nazir Deo in Cooch Behar, with the help of the Company, resulted in an adverse relationship between the king and the Company⁴¹.

Another important fact may be substantiated which would reveal that owing to the internal personality clashes the Company started direct intervening into the affairs of Cooch Behar administration. The mal treatment made by Raja upon the Muktear⁴² (pleader) of Dewan Deo gave the opportunity to the Collector of Rangpur to proceed to Cooch Behar and after an investigation ordered the Muktear to be released from prison and the Company made proper arrangement to protect his family. It is interesting to note that with the removal of security the Muktear was again arrested by the Raja and he was conspicuously murdered. This caused the Dewan Deo to be frightened and considered his own life in danger and a second military party was sent by the Company for the protection of Dewan Deo⁴³. The outrageous conduct of the Raja induced the Company again to adopt the course of appointing a Resident Commissioner at Cooch Behar⁴⁴. This interference of the British directly into the internal management, infuriated the Raja and led to further confrontation.

The administrative encroachment made by the Company over the Raja contributed a further point of confrontation. This fact may be substantiated as follows; firstly, the case of Guruprasad, an important office bearer, who was nominated as

Dewan of Cooch Behar State by the Raja did not receive approval of the Company⁴⁵. Ultimately Raja's will was superseded by the Company's reluctance in this direction and Guruprosad was removed from the office⁴⁶. Secondly, the "Khas Sepoys" of the State used to be recruited by the Raja, but the Company intended to put bar to this power of the Raja with an understanding that the "Khas Sepoys" would place the Commissioner in an adverse situation. Evidently, the Company wanted to take the responsibility of recruitment and the Raja had to conform to the Company's direction in spite of his vehement reluctance⁴⁷.

Consequently the relation between the Raja and the East India Company turned worse during the Commissionership of Mr. Scot. He came with a prejudiced mind and provoked the Nazir Deo and Dewan Deo against the Raja⁴⁸.

In the matter of succession question which had developed towards the closing years of Raja Harendra Narayan, the Company played an active role and exerted its fullest influence over the succession issue. It is interesting to note that the Company's intention was to breach the internal harmony among the inheritors to the throne. This may be revealed from the fact while Raja Harendra Narayan intended that his son Rajendra Narayan⁴⁹ should inherit the throne, the Company favoured the claim of Shibendra Narayan over the throne of Cooch Behar⁵⁰.

The attitude of the Company has been manifested from the letter of Mr. Swinton, Secretary to the Government, 22nd October, 1824 to Mr. Scot., the Agent to the Governor General on the North East Frontier, "if the Rajah of Cooch Behar should make any proposition to you or take any measure to set aside his eldest son in favour of any other child, such an act of injustice cannot be tolerated, and you will be prepared to inform the Rajah that the British Government is determined to support rightful claims of Seeb Inder Narain to the succession. Our right of interference in the affairs of Cooch Behar under the treaty of 1772 is indisputable, and the future tranquillity of the country, as well as the legal right of Sheeb-Inder Narain, demand the exercise of that right, if circumstances should arise to render it necessary"⁵¹ (sic). Thus, over the question of succession also the Raja's will was thwarted by the desire of the Company.

The basic economic confrontation between the Raja and the Company's Authority had centered round the issue of "Tribute". As the "Tribute" issue was very much interconnected with the augmentation of revenue, the Company gave due emphasis for the maximum reformation possible for the acceleration of revenue resources. The Company painfully realised that revenue being administered by the Raja had been an example of native extravagance on the one hand and on the other the mal treatment by the Raja on the ryots in relation to revenue collection⁵².

But the British attempt to introduce any reform in the revenue administration was foiled by the reluctant attitude of Raja Harendra Narayan.

The coining of money had been experienced as one of the most profound issues through out the personal reign (1801-39) of Raja Harendra Narayan after he attained majority and became the most sensitive matter for certain obvious reasons. While the Raja wanted to keep the flag of tradition and the long-practised coinage system high, the Company wanted to bring about changes in the currency system for their own administrative convenience⁵³. This led to further confrontation between the Raja and the East India Company.

The prevailing medium of exchange in this region was Narayani Mudra (coin)⁵⁴. The Company's government decided to stop the Narayani coin. In stopping the Narayani coin, the East India Company put forward their argument on the basis of the "Treaty" (1773) in which the right of coinage was not acknowledged. At one time at the request of Nazir Deo Khogendra Narayan, the Company's authority sanctioned the request without any limitation in regard to the amount to be coined⁵⁵. The coining of Narayani Mudra continued at intervals under several of the Commissioners appointed during Raja Harendra Narayan's minority until the year 1800⁵⁶. It is interesting to note that in between 1773 to 1789, the Company

while admitting the right of coining money by the Raja, took ^{several} attempts in reducing the minting of Narayani coin⁵⁷.

The motives behind the desire in stopping the Narayani Mudra were many. It was in the first place that the Company was facing difficulties in the shapes of counterfeit coins; secondly, the ultimate aim of the Company was to bring the fiscal system in regular order as was prevalent in the Company's territory. Thirdly, the Company was eager to introduce Sicca and Furukkabad coins which were the chief medium of exchange in the areas directly governed by the Company⁵⁸.

Admittedly while introducing any change or reform, the British always took the opportunity of the minority of a ruler of the princely states⁵⁹. During the minority rule of Raja Harendra Narayan, the British authority almost stopped the minting of Narayani coins⁶⁰. But just after attaining majority Raja Harendra Narayan tried to regain the power of minting the coins on the ground that it was acknowledged by the Government of Bengal and accordingly his plea was sanctioned by the Company's authority. Accordingly in 1802 A.D. the Raja was accorded with the minting right, but within a short period in 1805 A.D. the right to coining money was revoked. In this connection the Company wrote to the Raja requesting him not to insist in the matter again⁶¹.

Raja Harendra Narayan was firm in his cause of preserving the sovereign rights in the financial management of the State. Thus the British attempt to curb the right of minting of the Raja ultimately resulted in the usual confrontation. Raja Harendra Narayan was bent on reviving the right of minting and in 1821 A.D. he wrote to the Company's authority narrating the fact that "the stopping of Narayani Coin would be derogatory to his dignity and injurious to the state's agricultural and commercial interests. At the same time this would lead the trade with Bhutan to a halt, as the coin was the main medium of exchange"⁶². But the attempt of the Raja was unheeded by the Company. The Company not only negated the Raja's request at the same time informed the Collector of Rangpur to ask the Raja not to make further request in this respect. The Rangpur Collector, who had been incharge of Cooch Behar reported that "with regard to the effects of an altered currency upon the inhabitants of Cooch Behar, it would not be injurious to the interests of Cooch Behar"⁶³.

It is most interesting to note that though the right of minting was not restored to the Raja, he paid the State's "Tribute" to Rangpur in Narayani Coin⁶⁴. The Raja even did not allow the Company's rupees to flow in the State. The Government however tolerated the insolent attitude of the Raja considering his age and at the request of Colonel Jenkins, the Company's Agent in the North East Frontier⁶⁵. Thus the whole

period (1801-1839) of Raja Harendra Narayan witnessed remarkable check to the policy of the British to infuse fiscal reforms. The attempt of interference in the issue of minting money, although it faced with stiff opposition from the Raja, became so extensive that the Bengal Government actually imposed restraints, nearly amounting to an entire suppression of the mint of Cooch Behar. However, throughout the reign of Raja Harendra Narayan the old system continued and it took some few more years in 1845, when the Cooch Behar mint was finally stopped⁶⁶.

Besides political interference the Company also attempted to infuse some socio-economic changes in the traditional system which had been considered as the element of "non-modernity". The age old motheaten social customs used to be cherished by the Raja Harendra Narayan. The statement may be substantiated from the existing factual analysis. Firstly, the existence of slavery deserved to be mentioned⁶⁷. The existence of slavery and the practice of human beings selling as commodities signifies, no doubt, the denial of the modernity.

Secondly, the traditional system prevailing in the state was the practice of polygamy. The Raja also had fifty wives of his own⁶⁸. In the nineteenth century the intellectuals of Bengal having modern education, mostly Brahmos devoted themselves to the cause of women and fought against this practice of polygamy. The wind of change also sailed into the State during the second half of nineteenth century. But it was

widely practised during the rule of Raja Harendra Narayan.

Thirdly, while secularism has been considered as the most significant sign of modernity, the said Raja was Hindu fundamentalist, strongly opposed the British intention to appoint Osmutullah as Dewan of the State on the pretext that it was not the custom of Cooch Behar to appoint any Muslim in such an important position of the State⁶⁹.

Fourthly, the fiscal administration of Raja Harendra Narayan was sought to be reformed by the Company in the following manner (1) The prevailing Abowabs and extra cesses were abolished by Mr. Purling in 1780; (2) soon Mr. Douglas, appointed as Commissioner of Cooch Behar, was directed by the Company to prohibit the exactions of Nuzzur, Selami, Khalsah and Khanagi⁷⁰. This reform in the fiscal system led to the confrontation and the Raja re-enforced all the traditional system prevailing in the State and the old distinctions of Khalsah and Khanagi Mahals were renewed, which were abolished by the Company's Agents⁷¹.

The confrontation ultimately led to the fact that for the last thirty three years of Raja Harendra Narayan's regime, the affairs of Cooch Behar had been left to the sole conduct of the Raja and his officers, without any direct interference of a Commissioner, and for 26 years there had been no Resident Commissioner at Cooch Behar⁷².

This long period of Harendra Narayan was not a peaceful one owing to the foreign (Bhutan) and domestic feuds; but it is note-worthy that the end of his reign marked the beginning of the period of transition from the old to the new system, i.e. from non-modern to pre-modern period. During the rule of Raja Harendra Narayan the policy of the Supreme Government towards the country was finally decided upon, and its formation was greatly influenced by the attitude of the ruler of the kingdom. The question regarding the status of Cooch Behar cropped up several times and it was largely owing to the endeavour of Raja Harendra Narayan that it became a feudatory State uncontrolled in its internal administration, and having a constitution independent of foreign interference⁷³. Raja Harendra Narayan died in 1839 at Benares and with him the era of traditionalism and the period of non-modernity came to an end and a new era of transition started.

On a superficial vision the above mentioned depiction of the element of tradition in the whole management of the affairs of Cooch Behar by Raja Harendra Narayan and the attempts of modifications made by the Company, would reveal the proposition that during the reign of Raja Harendra Narayan, the Cooch Behar State had been experiencing the vices of the traditional administration and the corrections made by the Company to this effect resulted in tension. Given a proper insight to the then affairs imparted both by the Company and

the Raja would reveal a proposition which is not actually conducive to the proposition made above. As it is said that contradiction paves the way to the path of perfection and thus was the case of the period mentioned. The continuous contradictions between the Company and the Raja Harendra Narayan on almost every aspect of state management have had their positive outcomes. The positivity sometimes came under compulsion, sometimes for keeping their respective interests high and sometimes it is the time and situation which necessitated this path. Thus, after having interacted with the elements of positivity, the ground had been set for the State of Cooch Behar to start its journey from the state of promiscuity, aboriginal society having all the necessary evils to the path of transition which had its auto-mechanical system to reach the path of modernity.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Campbell, A.C., Glimpses of Bengal, Vol.I, Calcutta, 1907, p.297.
2. Proceedings of the Government of Bengal, General (political) Department, December, 1861, No.51, p.38.
3. Mercer & Chauvet, op.cit., p.202.
4. Proceeding of the Government of Bengal, General (political) Department, December, 1861, No.51, p.38.
5. Mercer & Chauvet, op.cit., p.188.
6. "The Governor General has assumed the temporary management of the country, with a view to prevent its being ruined by the ignorant and designing man; and that as soon as he is capable of taking charge of it, he will be restored to the full management there of, and to all the independent rights and privileges which have been secured his family by the treaty of 1773", Mercer and Chauvet, op.cit., p. 205.
7. Proceedings of the Government of Bengal, General (political) Department, December 1861, No.51, p.38.

8. Ibid., p.37.
9. Letter from G.Dowdeswell, Chief Secretary to the Government, to J.Digby, Commissioner of Cooch Behar 12th June, 1913, No.1929 SRC, Vol.I, op.cit., pp.125-126.
10. Letter from Dowderwell, Secretary to the Government, to Francis Pierard, Commissioner of Cooch Behar, 1st August, 1904, SRC, Vol.II, op.cit., p.148.
11. Choudhury, Harendra Narayan, Cooch Behar And Its Land Revenue Settlements, Cooch Behar, 1903, p.256.
12. Proceedings of the Government of Bengal, General (Political) Department, December, 1861, No.51, p.38.
13. Jenkins, Francis, The Selections of the Government, No.5, Report On Morrung, Sikkim and Cooch Behar, Calcutta, 1851, p.37.
14. Hunter, W.W., op.cit., p.423; Bandopadhyaya Bhagabati Charan, op.cit., p.86.
15. Choudhury Harendra Narayan, op.cit., p.256.
16. Proceedings of the Government of Bengal, General (Political) Department, Dec. 1861, No.51, p.38.
17. Letter from J.Adam, Secretary to the Government, to Norman Macleod, Commissioner of Cooch Behar, 24th February, 1816, SRC, Vol.I, op.cit., p.98.
18. Proceedings of the Government of Bengal, General (Political) Department, Dec. 1861, No.51, p.38.
19. Hunter, W.W., op.cit., p.424.
20. Choudhury, Harendra Narayan, op.cit., p.258.

21. Hunter, W.W., op.cit., p.422.
22. Cited in Hunter, W.W., op.cit., p.422; Englishman, 22nd June; 1839, in Sambad Patre Sekaler Katha, 3rd volume, Edited by Brojendra Nath Bandopadhyaya, Calcutta, 1342 B.S., pp.361-362.
23. Neogy, A.K., The Paramount Power And The Indian Princes, First published, K.P.Bagchi, Calcutta, 1979, pp.18-19.
24. Resolution of The Revenue Board, 3rd May 1787, No.21, SRC, Vol.II, op.cit., p.153.
25. Letter from Dowdeswell, Secretary to the Government, to John Franch, Commissioner of Cooch Behar, 18th February, 1805, SRC, Vol.I, op.cit., p.149.
26. Ibid., p.149.
27. Extract from the proceedings of His Excellency the Most Noble the G.G. in Council in the Revenue Department, 26th August, 1802, SRC, Vol.I, op.cit., p.134.
28. Letter of Montgomery, Commissioner of Cooch Behar, to Dowdeswell, Secretary to the Government, Revenue Department, 28th July, 1805, SRC, Vol.I, op.cit., pp.155-156.
29. Hunter, W.W., op.cit., p.422.
30. Letter from Dowdeswell, Secretary to the Government, to Francis Pierard, Commissioner of Cooch Behar, 23th July, 1803, SRC, Vol.I, op.cit., p.137.
31. Letter from Maharaja Harendra Narayan, to G.G. of India, 9th August, 1803, SRC, Vol.I, op.cit., p.144.
32. Jenkins Francis, op.cit., pp.19-20.

33. Bandopadhyaya Bagabati Charan, op.cit., p.36; Munshi Jaynath, op.cit., p.129.
34. Letter from Francis Jenkins, Agent of the G.G., N.E.F, to the Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Political Department, No.23, SRC, Vol.II, op.cit., p.70.
35. Letter from J.Adam, Secretary to the Government, to Norman Macleod, Commissioner of Cooch Behar, 27th May 1814, SRC, Vol.I, op.cit., pp.316-317.
36. Letter from Dodeswell, Secretary to the Government, to Macleod, Commissioner of Cooch Behar, 2nd August, 1814, SRC, Vol.I, op.cit., p.311-322; Misra, K.P., Benares In Transition, Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi, 1975, p.29.
37. Ibid., SRC, Vol.I, p.323.
38. Ibid., p.323.
39. The Nazir Deo claimed, larger share of the revenue and at the same time some judicial power at the inspiration of the Collector of Rangpur; Dewan Deo also showed the sign of insubordination not obeying the settlement made by Mercer and Chauvet Commission and sought the assistance of the Company in the land question of Atharokotha; Letter from Montgomery, Commissioner of Cooch Behar, to G. Dowdeswell, Secretary to the Government in the Revenue Department, Fort William, (Date and Year Not mentioned), SRC, Vol.I, op.cit., pp.159-160; Hunter, W.W., op.cit., p.424; Choudhury Harendra Narayan, op.cit., pp.261-263.
40. Sen, Dr. S.N., op.cit., p.23.
41. Chaudhury, Harendra Narayan, op.cit., pp.260-261.
42. Jenkins Francis, op.cit., p.43.

43. Ibid., p.43.
44. Hunter, W.W., op.cit., pp.422-423.
45. Sen, Dr. S.N., op.cit., pp.37-38.
46. Ibid., p.37.
47. Ibid., pp.37-38.
48. Hunter, W.W., op.cit., p.424.
49. Jenkins mentions that Raja Harendra Narayan wanted to make his younger son Burjendra Narayan as his successor; Letter of Jenkins G.G.'s Agent in N.E.F., to the Secretary to the Government of Bengal, 3rd Oct, 1838, No.106, SRC, Vol.II, op.cit., p.82; The Letter of Jogendra Narayan, another son of Raja Harendra Narayan, reveals that he was another contender to the throne of Cooch Behar; Letter of Jogendra Narayan to Lord Auckland, G.G.I., 4th Oct., 1839, SRC, Vol.II, op.cit., p.86.
50. Foreign Consultation (Political), 25th March, 1834, No.54, (N.A.I); Proceedings of the Government of Bengal, General (political) Department, February, 1864, No.50, p.27.
51. Letter from the Secretary to the Government of Bengal, to D.Scot, G.G.'s Agent to N.E.F., Dated 22nd Oct, 1824, SRC, Vol.II, op.cit., pp.45-46.
52. Hunter, W.W., op.cit., p.424.
53. Proceedings of the Government of Bengal, General (political) Department, August, 1864, No.11B, p.137.
54. Ahamed Amanatulla, op.cit., p.291; In Saka era 1497

Maharaja Nara Narayan first introduced the coin at the time of his installation to the throne of Cooch Behar; Barman, Kshitish Chandra, See Article "Koch Behar Adhipati Sri Mannar Narayan Deber Namankita Roupya Mudra" in Bharat Barsha, 1st issue, 1st Volume, 32 year, 1351 B.S., p.39.

55. Proceedings of the Government of Bengal, General (political) Department, August, 1864, No.11B, p.137.
56. Ibid., p.137.
57. Letter from the Honorable Vice-President, to the Raja of Cooch Behar 13Nov. 1805, SRC, Vol.I, op.cit., p.161.
58. Proceedings of the Government of Bengal, Political Department, July, 1835, No.6, pp.151-152.
59. Jeffrey Robin; People, Princes And Paramount Power; Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1978, p.20.
50. Ahamed Amanatulla, op.cit., p.294.
61. Ibid., p.294.
62. Proceedings of the Government of Bengal, Political Department, July, 1835, No.6, pp.151-152.
63. Ibid., pp.151-152.
64. Letter from Jenkins G.G.'s Agent to N.E.F., to the Accountant General, 16th November, 1837, SRC, Vol.II, op.cit., pp.75-76.
65. Ibid., p.76; Proceedings of the Government of Bengal, Political Department, July, 1835, No.6, pp.151-152.
66. Ibid., p.76. Ahamed Amanatulla, op.cit., p.296.

67. One of the traditional vices that had been existed in the State was slavery. Raja Harendra Narayan had about one thousand slaves at his residence and through out the country the total number of slaves estimated at about three thousand men; Letter from Norman Macleod, Commissioner of Cooch Behar, to J.Monckton, Acting Secretary to the Government in the Secret Department, 26th April, 1915, SRC, Vol.I, op.cit., p.338.
68. Martin, Montgomery; The History, Antiquities, Topography And Statistics of Eastern India, Vol.V, Reprint, Delhi, 1976, p.419.
69. Letter from Raja Harendra Narayan, to His Excellency the Vice-President, Received 17th December, 1914, SRC, Vol.I, op.cit., p.85.
70. Jenkins, F., op.cit., pp.22-23.
71. Ibid., p.23.
72. Ibid., p.46.
73. Unwin Bros; The State of Cooch Behar, London, (Year not mentioned), pp.2-3.