

Who Resisted the Rebellion of 1857 in Chhotanagpur?

Smita Tigga

Assistant Professor of History, St. Xavier's College Mahuadanr, Latehar, affiliated
College under Nilamber Pitamber University (NPU), Medinagar, Jharkhand, India

ABSTRACT

Serious attempts have been made in the national context of the historical analysis of the Revolt of 1857. There have also been serious attempts to understand the regional nature of the rebellion. The effort of scholars like Dr. Kalikikar Dutt on the freedom movement in Bihar is famous. Scholars like Dr. Rameshchandra Majumdar have worked on the national movement in India in several volumes and in this sequence have tried to include the regional nature of the national movement including 1857.

In the context of the rebellion of 1857 in Chhotanagpur, there is a tendency to admire and be self-obsessed by seeing the role of revolution heroes like Babu Kunwar Singh, Vishwanath Shahi, Pandey Ganpat Rai, Nilambar of Palamu, Tikait Umrao Singh and Shashekh Bhikhari in a historical context, both in general and in particular is prevalent. But from the point of view of self-criticism, there is often no tendency to review the role of those villains of the revolution, whose selfish pro-British acts made the rebellion unsuccessful and tightened the nose of the British rule. In the present form, a small attempt has been made to examine the extent of the feudal forces supporting the British interests present in the social structure of the then Chhotanagpur.

If it is assumed that there was no outline of Indian nationalism in the period of 1857. Yet it cannot be denied that British authority was imposed on Indian political groups from outside and was not universally accepted. Secondly, the British authority proved to nurture British interests and increase the problems of the local people in an unexpected way. On the other hand, the political classes and groups involved in the rebellion were unknowingly taking sides of wider interests such as the end of the misrule of the British power, solution of the problems imposed by the British power, the plight of the common people. Although the rebel groups also had a lot of feudal elements, but they were people-oriented, comprehensive and forward-looking in comparison to the British supporters.

KEYWORDS: Rebellion, 1857 Revolt, Chhotanagpur Santhal Pargana, Babu Kunwar Singh, Vishwanath Shahi, Pandey Ganpat Rai, Nilambar of Palamu, Tikait Umrao Singh, Shashekh Bhikhari

Serious attempts have been made in the national context of the historical analysis of the Revolt of 1857. There have also been serious attempts to understand the regional nature of the rebellion. The effort of scholars like Dr. Kalikikar Dutt on the freedom movement in Bihar is famous. Scholars like Dr. Rameshchandra Majumdar have worked on the national movement in India in several volumes and in this sequence have tried to include the regional nature of the national movement including 1857. The then Chhotanagpur-Sansthalpargana (roughly present Jharkhand state) has been almost neglected from the point of view of historical analysis. Material related to this has been presented occasionally by Western

and Indian scholars for the last two hundred years. But there has been a lack of systematic and exploratory representation."¹ Nevertheless, due to the commendable efforts made by scholars in cultural, anthropological, anthropological contexts, materials on the history of Jharkhand can be collected and analyzed meaningfully.

In the context of the rebellion of 1857 in Chhotanagpur, there is a tendency to admire and be self-obsessed by seeing the role of revolution heroes like Babu Kunwar Singh, Vishwanath Shahi, Pandey Ganpat Rai, Nilambar of Palamu, Tikait Umrao Singh and Shashekh Bhikhari in a historical context, both in

How to cite this paper: Smita Tigga
"Who Resisted the Rebellion of 1857 in
Chhotanagpur?" Published in
International

Journal of Trend in
Scientific Research
and Development
(ijtsrd), ISSN:
2456-6470,
Volume-7 | Issue-1,
February 2023,
pp.668-674,
www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd52741.pdf



URL:

Copyright © 2023 by author (s) and
International Journal of Trend in
Scientific Research and Development
Journal. This is an
Open Access article
distributed under the
terms of the Creative Commons
Attribution License (CC BY 4.0)
(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)



general and in particular is prevalent. But from the point of view of self-criticism, there is often no tendency to review the role of those villains of the revolution, whose selfish pro-British acts made the rebellion unsuccessful and tightened the nose of the British rule. In the present form, a small attempt has been made to examine the extent of the feudal forces supporting the British interests present in the social structure of the then Chotanagpur.

In Chhotanagpur Santhal Pargana, the people, especially the tribes, never accepted the authority of the company rule with ease. From the very beginning, the company rule in this area had to face an unbroken series of tribal rebellions. Waves of many tribal rebellions kept rising and falling like the Chuar-revolt, the Tamar rebellion, the famous Kol rebellions. It also took the form of volcano and storm. The people here never opposed the British rule unnecessarily. Almost all insurgencies that took place in this region were in response to external interference in the customs, way of life and natural way of the local people (with special reference to British interests and feudal interests of people outside the region) and unjustified corrupt practices of government officials.² In the movement of 1857 also, the people of Chotanagpur and the people of this place participated to express their real grievances. It was not just a riot of a few zealous soldiers and those conscious of the feudal interests involved, the zamindars-princely who were disgruntled with the Company's government for whom it was the last-ditch efforts to save their lost power. It is hard to believe that the residents of Chhotanagpur had to face government forces and loyal vassals for almost two years without any reason. At the national level, just as this revolution was anti-British, in the same way in Chhotanagpur also its form was anti-government. Also there were some local reasons for this revolution in Chhotanagpur which gave it a specific personal form.³ To conclude, it can be said that the Chhotanagpur rebellion was a mass rebellion. Everyone from the zamindar to the village headman, tribals and Muslims participated in it. It was not just a military rebellion. Nor was it merely a nuisance by small disgruntled tribal groups.⁴

The first spark of the Chhotanagpur rebellion of 1857 erupted in Hazaribagh (then known as Chhotanagpur Khas). On 30 July 1857, the soldiers mutinied. Located in Hazaribagh. The British officers were sensing the shape of the wind. That's why as soon as they got information about the rebellion, the British officials thought it appropriate to run away instead of facing the rebels. Officers like Surgeon Dr. Delprent, Commander Du, Hazaribagh Deputy Commissioner

Captain Simpson and coffee planter Libert etc. escaped through villages and forests. The Brahmins of Ichak warmly welcomed them and made arrangements for their onward journey. It was only with their help that the only safe route for them was through Bagodar and with the help of the civil and military officials of Govindpur and Raniganj, the above mentioned British officials could reach Kolkata safely.⁵ Otherwise he would have to fall prey to the rebels. On the other hand, the rebels in and around Hazaribagh started carrying out rebellious incidents like looting, arson, jail breaking and driving away the prisoners. The then Governor General Lord Canning did not get the first information about the rebellion in Hazaribagh from his trusted strong official system, but it is worth noting that the first information about the events of the rebellion was received by the Governor General from the then King Shambhu Narayan Singh of Ramgarh Raj. He himself went to Bagodar from Hazaribagh and gave this news to the Governor General by telegram. Then there was a facility to send telegrams in this area only in Bagodar. The Ramgarh Raja was then the owner of the largest zamindari estate and the most influential raja or zamindar not only in Hazaribagh but in the entire Chhotanagpur Santhalpargana. Lord Canning himself took interest and informed and encouraged the king by telegraph that adequate military support would be given to protect him against the rebels. In this context, the Governor General also directed the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, Frederick Halliday, to encourage the Raja of Ramgarh. The king, actively participating in the defense of the British, sent his brother Kumar Ramnath Singh to discuss with the prominent citizens of Hazaribagh and convince them against the rebels. But it did not have a favorable effect on the people. On the contrary, the rebels were not only angry with the activities of the king, but also the distraught zamindars who subordinated him also sided with the rebels. The disgruntled rebels began planning an attack on the king's palace. The king's spies were continuously conveying the information of all these incidents to the government. The king's condition had become so pathetic that he closed all the doors of his palace and spent the whole night praying for the protection of his zamindari and the British.⁶ A mile ahead, at a place called Jharpo, the house of the zamindar, a relative of the Ramgarh king, was surrounded. He could be saved with the help of Graham's army. The rebels were being led by a Santhal rebel leader named Rupoo Manjhi.⁷ In fact, the situation of the rebellion had become so dire that the British had started losing faith in the Indian soldiers. Captain Moncrieff wrote to the Lt Governor of Bengal that the Sikhs (soldiers) were associated

with the British only for pay. They could be easily purchased by the rebels.⁸

Encouraged by the success of Hazaribagh, the rebels reached Ranchi via Pithoria to meet the rebels of Doranda. Due to the encirclement of the village on the way to Ranchi Ramgarh, he thought it appropriate to go via Pithoria. But on the way to Pithoria Ghat, Parganait Jagatpal Singh of Syria was blocking the way. As a result, the rebels of Hazaribagh left for Lohardaga via Omidanda Ghat without reaching the antidote.⁹

The British rule in Chhotanagpur was apprehensive that the rebel soldiers of Ranchi-Doranda and the local zamindars could join hands with the rebels of Shahabad to carry out a major upheaval. That's why commissioner Dalton was trying to pacify them. On August 2, 1857, Ranchi Doranda was completely captured by the rebels under the leadership of Madhav Singh Jamadar, Jaimangal Pandey and Subedar Nadir Ali. On the other hand, Tikait Umrao Singh, the landlord of Khatanga Patar near Ormanjhi, his brother Ghasi Singh and Diwan Sheikh Bhikhari and their followers had blockaded the Chutupalu valley with the intention of preventing the British from running away. In Doranda (Raandhi) the rebels were lacking leadership. The rebel soldiers expected leadership from Nagvanshi Maharaja and his relatives. But none of them stood in favor of the rebels. Finally, the rebels got help from Thakur Vishwanath, the zamindar of Barkagarh through Pandey Ganpat Rai of Bhauron, former Diwan of the Maharaja contacted Shahi and Jeetnath Shahi. After initial reluctance, Vishwanath Shahi eventually accepted the leadership of the rebels. The British rule almost ended in the entire Chhotanagpur Khas. The Nagvanshi king and his main followers, the zamindars, sided with the government and helped them in suppressing the rebels. Although the rebels had established their influence in Ranchi and forced all the leading British officers to flee, Dorba, not finding his position safe at Ranchi, left for Shahabad via Palamu to join Kunwar Singh's rebels. On the way, Bhola Singh, the zamindar of Kauria, a supporter of the British, blocked his way and engaged him in a serious struggle for 5 days.¹⁰ On the way forward, they suffered heavy losses at the hands of the British army near Chatra.¹¹ The British deployed their supporters, the Ramgarh Raja, Nagvanshi Raja, on almost all the major routes to besiege the rebels leaving Ranchi towards Shahabad to meet Kunar Singh. The landlords and followers were engaged.

The news of rebellion at places like Danapur, Shahabad, Hazaribagh, Ranchi etc. was reaching up to Palamu. The mutual kings and landlords of Chero

and Kharwar descendants of this place were angry with the British for one thing or the other. That's why Chero and Bhogta Kharwars openly participated in the Palamu rebellion. And perhaps that is why the support base of the Palamu rebellion was wider than that of the rebellions in other parts of Chhotanagpur. In September-October 1857, under the leadership of Nilambar Pitambar Bhogta brothers and Chero Bhavani Bakya Rai of Chakala, the bugle was blown against the company rule in this area. The rebels started targeting government stations, godowns and supporters of the British. The rebels attacked the fort of Thakurai Raghuvar Dayal Singh, a big landlord of Chainpur Garh, a strong supporter of the British power of Palamu and caused a lot of loss to the people.¹² When the rebels attacked the divisional revenue headquarters at Lesliganj, the government servants there were sheltered by Thakur Kapilnath, the Tehsildar of Karar, some were rescued by Shivcharan Rai of Navagarh. After being completely surrounded by the rebels in November 1857, the main responsibility of suppressing the Palamu rebellion was given to Lieutenant Graham. He was given protection in the Chainpur fort. The rebels were also angry with Kishundayal Singh, the Thakurai of Rankagarh. They burnt some of their godowns and mahars. In this incident Nilambar Pitambar was leading the rebels. However, the attack was repulsed due to Kishundayal's stout resistance.¹³ But Graham was still surrounded and the whole of Palamu was in flames of rebellion by the end of November. To the aid of Lt. Graham, the army led by Major Cotter sent from Sasaram, he got full military support from Dev Raja and Sarbarkhar of Surguja, so that Graham was released and the Kharwar locality of Kunda and his rebel allies could be captured.¹⁴ Looking at the massive public support for the Palamu rebellion, it can be said that if Cotter and Graham had not got the support of Devaraja and the local landlords, the story of the rebellion would have been different. The British were not able to establish any control over the activities of Nilambar Pitambar. The number of his followers was increasing. He was also getting cooperation from Jashpur. On the other hand, Thakur Vishnath Shahi of Ranchi and Pandey Ganpat Rai were hiding in the forests of Lohardaga after the Chatra war and were fueling the Palamu rebellion. All these rebels were about to gather in the Palamu fort to discuss a new plan. Manika's landlord Bhikhari Singh conveyed the information about this secret plan of the rebels to the British.¹⁵ In order to thwart the plans of the rebels, Commissioner Dalton, Major McDonnell and Lt. Graham took military action in which Jagatpal, the Parganate of Pithoria gave full cooperation. Camped at Lesliganj, Dalton ordered

almost all the Jagirdars of Palamu to assemble. Accordingly, most of them also met on Dalton's call. However, of the Chero kings. Descendant Bhavani Baksh put up some resistance. Nevertheless, finally the rebels were forced to disperse by February 1858 with the help of Raghuvār Dayal, Kisundayal, Dev Raja and other pro-British landlords. Although the rebels kept fighting a guerrilla war for almost two years, the British would resort to their well-known 'divide and rule' policy in finally suppressing the rebels of Palamu. The strong Chero-Bhogta alliance of the rebellion had to be broken and aided by the rebels.¹⁶

The zamindars had to be separated from them." Administratively, Manbhum was an important part of Chhotanagpur division in 1857 and Purulia was its main centre. In August 1857, inspired by the rebels of Hazaribagh Ranchi, the fire of rebellion broke out in Purulia. The rebels looted the government treasury., started burning state archives and attacking jails and releasing prisoners. To suppress the rebellion of Purulia, the British sought help from Raja Nagmani Singh of Panchet. But the king himself had become a supporter of the rebels. On September 16, 1857, Principal Assistant Commissioner Ox, who took command to suppress the rebels in Manbhum, sent a list of those landlords of Manbhum who were supporters of the Company government to Commissioner Dalton. Among them were Raja Mukund Narayan Dev of Manbhum, Raja Shatrudhan Dutt of Patkam, Raja Radhanath Singh of Bagmundi, Dayal Singh of Sirkabad and Zamindars of Raipur and Kashipu.¹⁸ The rebels freed him by attacking the prison. But after being freed, he did not support the rebels and supported the British. Accordingly, all the ghats and places between Purulia and Ranchi were blockaded. So that between Ranchi and Purulia, the mutinous soldiers and other mutineers could not mix. Ox convinced the king of Alda that in exchange for his co-operation he was finally acquitted.¹⁹ The rebellious Santhals of Manbhum attacked the British-backed Raja of Jaipur and looted here. In suppressing the Santhal rebels of Jaipur, Manbhum Narayan Dev and Badabhum's Zamindar Ox (on) The pressure of the Santhal rebels was increasing in this area.²⁰ The zamindar of Barkagarh, Vishwanath Shahi and the king of Panchet, were secretly inciting the Santhal rebels. Due to this, there was a possibility of disturbances in the entire Manbhum. To suppress the rebels, through Raja Chakradhar Singh of Seraikela had sought the cooperation of the local landlord, but this policy of Ox could not be successful due to mutual enmity between Seraikela Raja and Porhat Raja Arjun Singh and he did not get special help from them.²¹ The fire

of Manbhum's rebellion could be extinguished by March 1859.

From the very beginning, the people, especially the tribals, continuously opposed any attempt to integrate the Kolhan region of Singhbhum under the Company's rule. In this area, the Bhumijo Chuars and Colos forced the British to chew iron gram. Even after the suppression of the famous Kol rebellion of 1831-32, the people here did not accept the British rule from their conscience. The spark of rebellion against the British in Kolhan practically never died down. Therefore, when there were rebellions in other parts of Chhotanagpur in 1857, spontaneous conditions of rebellion were created here too. As a result, in August 1857, about 100 soldiers of Chaibasa declared a rebellion. Due to the fear of rebels, Chaibasa's Principal Assistant Commissioner Major Shismore fled to Calcutta with his family. Raja Chakradhar Singh of Seraikela helped in his escape. Subedar Harnath Singh and Jamadar Harshnarayan Singh of Chaibasa's soldiers were in favor of the British government and tried unsuccessfully to control and dissuade the soldiers from rebellion. But the rebel soldiers raised the flag of rebellion on 3 September 1857 under the leadership of Bhagwan Singh and Ramnath Singh. In fact, these soldiers remained in Uhapoh for about 1 month, but finally they decided to leave for Ranchi and join the rebels. Raja Chakradhar Singh of Seraikela and Thakur Hari Singh of Kharsanwa blocked their way with cannons and soldiers when they were trying to cross the raging Sanjay river near Dumrachatti. The rebels crossed the river with the help of Raja Arjun Singh of Porhat and proceeded further.²²

The faith of the Mundas, Mankis and their followers of Kolhan region was in King Arjun Singh. They considered him a symbol of divine powers. Munda Manaki also turned against the British because the British were giving protection to the Raja of Seraikela and the zamindars, the enemies of the Raja of Porhat. In fact, the Raja and Zamindar of Singhbhum were divided among themselves into two factions and the British were supporting the faction of Seraikela Raja. Rebel soldiers, Munda, Manki and other rebels were urging Arjun Singh to take command of the rebellion, but the king was initially not ready for it. After the absconding of Uchhar Sishmore, the Company Government appointed R.K. C. Handed over the command of Singhbhum to Birch. Birch started crushing the rebels along with the Rajas of Seraikela-Kharsawan and their followers Zamindars and Ho fighters. By October 1857, the rebel soldiers of Chaibasa were caught by the British and were sentenced to death, rigorous imprisonment and black

water. Subedar Harnath and Jamadar Harshnarayan showed special activism in this work. Since Arjun Singh had become the universal leader of the rebels and revolutionaries in Singhbhum, the incidents of the above punishment made him a rebel. In this Arjun Singh's younger brother Baijnath Singh and Raja's Supporters Jaggu Dewan, Raghudev and Shyamkarn played special roles. Now Arjun Singh was openly standing in favor of the rebels. The king's brothers Baijnath and Jaggu Diwan, Raghudev and Shyamkarna were particularly active. Ultimately, the British prepared Arjun Singh for surrender with the help of Raja's father-in-law Mayurganj Raja, who was later sent to Varanasi in political exile after giving annual pension.²³ For about one and a half years, the struggle for rebellion in Singhbhum came to an end till the surrender of Arjun Singh in February 1859.

Administratively, in 1857, Sabalpur (present Orissa) was a part of Chotanagpur division. There also, as a result of the news of rebellion in Chhotanagpur, the soldiers came down on the rebellion. They were led by Surendra Shahi and Udwant Shahi. Surendra Shahi's strings were directly connected with the rebels of Hazaribagh. After September 1857, Sambalpur fell into the hands of the rebels for a few days.

The purpose of the present form is not to present the list of British patrons, local landlords, princely states and their followers who opposed the rebellion of 1857 in Chhotanagpur. Rather a serious political analysis of their conspiratorial exploits is important. It has been almost established by serious investigative analysis of history that the Revolt of 1857 was not just a conspiracy of some disgruntled zamindars, nor was it just an attempt to overthrow the government by enthusiastic soldiers living in military cantonments. It was not even an activity of robbers who took undue advantage of the anarchic situation prevailing in 1857, but it was a kind of mass movement. It would also be appropriate to say that this was the starting point for the identity of Indianness and the continuous development of emancipatory nationalism.

Almost all the incidents related to the Revolt of 1857 were basically political. The challenge of any established authority by the rebels was a very big political event. On the other hand, the Paktipali British power adopted all political methods and tactics to crush the rebellion. Therefore, an analysis of the events related to the rebellion is required from the point of view of political science.

In 1857, armed mutiny of soldiers in the course of rebellions, freeing unjustly jailed prisoners by attacking them, motivating local landlords dissatisfied with British occupation and disturbing them to revolt, bringing various tribes and religious groups of

Chhotanagpur to their side. Even attempts by the rebels to kill their opponents, loot, create anarchy, all these were important political events from the modern political classical point of view. From political sociological point of view, it would not be appropriate to dismiss them as unusual anti-British incidents. Secondly, all the above mentioned political incidents were not isolated incidents. Rather, these incidents were articulated in the form of a great objective like freedom from the unholy nexus of the British colonial system and the Indian feudal powers and the vicious cycle that was destroying the common people. The actual degree of articulation of all these events may be a matter of dispute. On the other hand, in 1857, in rebellions in different areas of Chhotanagpur, rebel soldiers came out after breaking the barracks, local small and big landlords, Raja, Diwan, Tikat etc., tribal groups like Chero, Kharwar, Bhogta, Santhal, Munda, dissatisfied with the British rule Minor villagers etc. were participating in the incidents of rebellion in various ways. Literally, all the above mentioned groups participating in the above events or activities of the rebellion were political groups from the point of view of modern politics. of participation in the above mentioned political events or activities context of the study and analysis of the behavior of the said political groups, the real nature of the rebellion in Chhotanagpur in 1857 will be clear. A similar analysis would be able to present the historical revolt of 1857 in the context of updated knowledge and science.

The political groups that participated in the Revolt of 1857 have been discussed. All of them were involved in the activities of rebellion in the context of their own reasons, selfishness and interests. It is possible that in those circumstances, he may not have been inspired by ideological, political values and highs like nationalism, as it happened during the nationalism movement run by the Congress after the rise of Indian nationalism. In fact, in the language of modern politics, it can be called interest-orientation. For example, the local zamindars became pro-British and pro-rebellion due to their own interests. Sometimes, due to conflict of interests and mutual rivalry, they became pro-British and anti-British. The British support of the Raja of Seraikela of Singhbhum and the leadership of the opponents by Raja Arjun Singh of Porhat is proof of this. The tribes of Chhotanagpur had a tradition of rebellion against the British due to interference in their special way of life and other special reasons, so naturally the interests of the tribes were in accordance with the rebels.

From the point of view of political theory of political group, the process of interest articulation (interest

articulation) of the above mentioned political interests is completed, then the background of a big political movement is prepared. In fact, after a point, the interest groups turn into pressure groups, thus leading to a larger political movement. Political communication is a major medium in the process of interest mobilization. Various media are the means of political communication.

If we analyze the interests of the rebel groups participating in the rebellion in Chhotanagpur in 1857 and their activities in terms of coordination and aggregation, then the importance of the role of communication media will be revealed. In fact, there was a severe lack of communication and coordination at the local level as well as at the regional level among the rebel soldiers, rebels, landlords and their followers, tribes participating in the rebellion and common villagers operating in different parts of Chhotanagpur. This is the reason why the rebels ultimately could not prove to be the decisive force. Firstly, they had a severe lack of means of communication because they were either soldiers who rebelled against the government or organized small and big groups. They had severe lack of these things at least in comparison to the Imperial power or its supporters. Secondly, whatever half-baked communication resources they had, the pro-British local landlord Raja and his followers did not leave any stone unturned in disrupting and failing them. Whatever way the rebels used to contact each other, he used to make them ineffective from his level due to his better knowledge. On one hand, they used to play their role in dispersing the power and capabilities of the rebels, and on the other hand, on the contrary, they contributed to the strengthening of the power and potential of the relatively resourceful British Raj power. That's why British patron local king Zamindar and his followers can be called landlords of double crime. The role of Ramgarh Raja and his followers, Thakurs and zamindars of Palamu, Dev Raja and Singhbhug-Manbhum's supporters, zamindars and rajas should be seen in this context.

There were insurgent groups operating in Chhotanagpur as in other parts of India, especially insurgent soldiers wanted to meet each other for creating a big power. A common trend could be seen in the rebels of Hazaribagh, Ranchi, Doranda, Palamu, Singhbhum and Manbhum, that they all wanted to meet Babu Kunwar Singh of Shahabad, that means from Hazaribagh to Sherghati the insurgent groups of Varna, Dhara, Palamu and Shahabad were trying to create a wider insurgency network. But the biggest obstacle in this ambitious effort of the rebels was the local zamindar and Raja,

who was strengthening the position of the British by becoming vested personal selfishness. In fact, they cut off the sources of a potentially wider insurgency network with their pro-British actions here and there. At some places they spied against the rebels, at others they blocked the way in the campaign to meet each other. Somewhere by supporting the British soldiers in direct struggle, they were forced to retreat, run away or lose. Sometimes he conspired to arrest the rebel leaders and sometimes by giving protection and security to some British officers on sensitive officers, he saved them and strengthened their position. Overall, the zamindars and kings who resisted the rebels, commit a serious crime of dispersing the rebel force and not allowing it to unite.

The final question is what should be the criteria of crime? In the then perspective, can they be called criminals who were opposing those who uprooted the legally established British power? Or were they criminals who wanted to overthrow the lawfully established British authority? In the above mentioned historical context, how can the crime-guilt be decided from the point of view of political science? Is this a fundamental question?

If it is assumed that there was no outline of Indian nationalism in the period of 1857. So any attempt to overthrow the established monarchy will be considered as rebellion and nuisance. Yet it cannot be denied that British authority was imposed on Indian political groups from outside and was not universally accepted. Secondly, the British authority proved to nurture British interests and increase the problems of the local people in an unexpected way. That's why its political justification could not be proved in India. Pro-British kings, landlords and their followers were supporting them for very personal reasons and years of selfishness. They were not concerned with the interests and problems of broad political groups. On the other hand, the political classes and groups involved in the rebellion were unknowingly taking sides of wider interests such as the end of the misrule of the British power, solution of the problems imposed by the British power, the plight of the common people. Therefore, it can be said that the pro-British groups and their interests were politically feudal and regressive, while the interests of the rebel groups were collective, if not national, at least inspired by Indianism and progressive from modern political point of view. Although the rebel groups also had a lot of feudal elements, but they were people-oriented, comprehensive and forward-looking in comparison to the British supporters.

Reference list:

- [1] B. Birottam, Jharkhand: History and Culture, Bihar Hindi Granth Academy, Patna, 2003, p.no. V.
- [2] Same, p. no.269.
- [3] S.B. Chowdhary, Civil Revelation in the Indian Mutinies, Calcutta, 1957, p. no.186.
- [4] Same, p. no. 191-92.
- [5] Judicial Consultation no. 950-51 d. 10 August 1857.
- [6] Whereas no. 1178-79 d. 10 September 1857.
- [7] Home Public Consultation No. 05. The 25 September 1857. National Archives of India, Delhi.
- [8] Judicial Consultation No. 1148 dt. 10 September 1857.
- [9] Military Consultations, No, 350, 4 September 1857 (Lay, Graham's letter to the Commander in Chief).
- [10] Judicial Consultation no. 94 days 22 October 1857.
- [11] P.C. Rai Chaudhary, Bihar District Gazetteer Hazaribagh Pu. 68.
- [12] Parliamentary Papers, Vol. 44, No. 1 (Letters of Graham Oak and Dalton in enclosure, 417, 428, 434)
- [13] Military (Proper) Proceedings, 27 Nov. 1857 no. 415, Letter from the Military Secretary to the Government of India.
- [14] k. k. Datta, Unrest against British in Bihar (1831-57) Secretariat Press Incident 1957. V.78.
- [15] B. Beerottam, above, p. no.297.
- [16] k. k. Datta. The Biography of Kunar Singh and Amar Singh, p. no. 127–28.
- [17] Manbhum District Office Correspondence, 1857-57; Assistant Commissioner G. N. Ox's Letter to the Secretary to the Government of Bengal, dt. 24 September 1857.
- [18] ibid, Oxe's letter to Dalton 16 December 1857.
- [19] ibid, Oxe's letter to the Bengal Secretary, 18 September 1857.
- [20] ibid, letter from Ox to the Bengal Secretary, 20 September 1857.
- [21] Spare Copies of Porhat Papers, 1857-62. Letter from Dw Gray to Dw Seton Carr d. 18 April 1861.
- [22] B. Birottam, ibid, p. no. 305–306.
- [23] Reference Spares Papers 16 February 1859.