

Notes on the (Tibeto-) Mon and Sherdukpen Treaties with British India in the 19th Century

Lobsang Tenpa¹

This paper discusses the three treaties signed between (Tibeto-) Mon and Sherdukpen (Gsher stug spen) and British India in the mid-nineteenth century. Although these treaties have been recorded in Aitchison's treaties, the discovery of the original Tibetan copy of the 1853 treaty has broadened the contents and its significance which provides insight into the other.² As the signatories' names are corrupted in the English copies of those treaties, the Tibetan copy is helpful to reconstruct the names of those (Tibeto-) Mon and Sherdukpen. Moreover, the two different languages in which the copies of the treaties were written reflect the power relations in knowledge production and representations of the signatories. In the light of these points, this paper examines the treaties, i.e. the 1844 and 1853 treaties³, which are the first agreements to be signed between British India and Tibet, or more precisely the (Tibeto-) Mon and Sherdukpen chieftains of Monyul⁴. Neither

¹ I would like to convey my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Per K. Sorensen, Dr. habil Guntram Hazod, Dr. Jenny Bently, Dr. Melanie Vandenhelsken, and Kerstin Grothmann for a critical suggestion and editing for this paper.

²Shakabpa (2010: 592) mistakenly recorded another supplementary agreement, which was signed after the actual 1853 Treaty, and he considers that it was the actual 1853 treaty. See the appendix IV and the remarks section.

³See the reference for further details and also Mackenzie (1884) and Lamb (1964; 1966) for their observations on the 1844(a) treaty.

⁴In this paper, (Tibeto-) Mon and Sherdukpen refer to Monpa and Sherdukpen prior to 1914. These terms are corresponding to the English sources' usage of 'Bhutia', 'Bhotea', 'extra-Bhutia', 'Tawang Bhutia', 'Bhutia of Kurriapara', 'Bhutia of Charduar'. 'Thebangia Bhutia', and 'Tawang Deba Rajas' in the 19th century. The Monpa has been listed in the Scheduled Castes

Lhasa nor British Indian authorities appear to have openly acknowledged the existence of these treaties in the later British colonial period. Although the successive editions of Aitchison⁵, and the writings of Mackenzie (1884), and Allen (1905) did mention these treaties, it is not distinguished in the formal proceedings of the 1914 Simla Convention between Tibet and British India. However, it seems that British Indian authorities were informed of these treaties according to the circumstances leading to the formal drawing of the McMahon Line.

The signing of these treaties is traced back to the territorial rights of the 'trade-mart' (dvar), or the term *lass go* used in Tibetan literature⁶. The dvars are known as Bengali and Assamese dvars, and their status as sharing a common border was held held by the Bhutanese and (Tibeto-) Mon until the mid-nineteenth century. The dvar, which is related to present study, is recorded *A ma ta la'i las sgo* referring to Kuriapara dvar (in the English sources) in *Me rag mdzad rnam* (2012 [19th C.]: 10a). Kuriapara dvar and

& Scheduled Tribes Lists (Modification) Order, 1956 and inserted in the Act 69 of 1986 of the districts of West Kameng and Tawang. While Aka (Hrusso), Bugun (Khawa), Miji, and Sherdukpen are also listed as tribes in the district of West Kameng, these districts were once named 'the Tawang Tract' and 'Sela Sub Agency' from 1919-54 and Monyul or 'Eastern Mon' (Shar mon) in Tibetan sources. Aris (1979, 1980) termed it 'the Monyul Corridor', which is often used in the academic circle. The names 'Bhutia' or 'Bhotea' were mainly used until India gained independence from the British Empire. They refer to Bhutanese, Tibeto-Mon (Monpa and Sherdukpen), Sikkimese and to some extent, also to Tibetans. Nowadays, the name 'Bhutia' officially refers to the Bhutia 'Scheduled Tribe' of Sikkim and West Bengal states, and 'Bhotiya' to groups with this name living in hilly regions of Uttrakhand (see clause (1) of article 342 of the Constitution of India named 'the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order, 1950).

⁵ The third revised edition of 1892 Aitchison's *Treaties* has 11 volumes, while 13 volumes in the fourth edition of 1909 and 14 volumes in the fifth and last edition of 1929-38. For this study I used the third and fifth editions of 1892 and 1929[1938].

⁶ Rgyal rigs (1986 [1728]) recorded a number of *las sgo* in possession of the 'chieftain' (jo bo) of the Eastern Bhutan and (Tibeto-) Mon and Sherdukpen.

Charduar are among a number of dvars functioning in the nineteenth century. The two dvars were jointly held between the chieftains of (Tibeto-) Mon and Sherdukpen, until they were 'relinquish[ed]'⁷ in the 1844 treaties signed between the chieftains and the British officials. The 1853 treaty was based on the 1844(a) treaty, and it is the only treaty which was translated into Tibetan. While the 1844(b) treaty relates to Charduar, which had to be relinquished after the 'supposed murders' from the Monyul Region, was not able to be handed over to British India.

The Treaty seems to have remained unchanged since then, which is partly related to the 1853 treaty, as discussed in the following. In all of those treaties, 'Sat rajas/rajas' (sat raja/raja)⁸ or 'Gelling' (dge slong) who signed the treaties were supposed to be descendants of the chieftains, the jo bo/ rje/ gdung/ ba spu mentioned in Rgyal rigs or the 'King of Mon' (Mon rgyal po) recorded in Mkhas pa'i dga'ston, Deb ther sngon po and Lho rong chos 'byung. While the fate of those chieftains, particularly in "Eastern Bhutan... did not survive the imposition of 'Brug pa rule, but those of the Monyul Corridor seem to have outlasted the Dge lugs pa regime that trust upon them" (Aris 1979: 107). The latter chieftains gained mutual trust with the Lhasa authorities and seem to have fully respected the local chieftains (jo bo) until the 1852 incident.⁹ After the Lhasa's authority took over the responsibility and the posa – compensation amount received according to the 1853 treaty.¹⁰ The questions thus raised by Aris (1979: 107), who were

⁷ See the term in the appendices for the treaties.

⁸ In Hindi, sat means seven and raja means king, however, this 'seven kings' (satraja) seems to be merely a title, rather than reflecting the actual number of rulers. The oldest textual source, the 1844(a) treaty recorded only three satrajas.

⁹ See section remarks on the Tibetan copy of the 1853 treaty for the 1852 incident.

¹⁰ According to Mackenzie (1884:21), posa is "really a well ascertained revenue payment," which means the posa denotes a compensation amount paid for the relinquished area.

the 'Seven Rajas' [or those signatories of the treaties] of the area and can we identify them in the Rgyal rigs?" are discussed in the following, as per the contents of the treaties and its signatories.

The 1844 and 1853 Treaties and their Signatories¹¹

The signatories were known as babu (bha bu; ba spu) or dzongpon (rdzong dpon) in the Monyul region, while they are mentioned as sat rajas/ rajas and gelling in the British Indian records. Among the titles, the rarah/rajas.raja usually refer to a king, prince or chieftain; as for the term satraja, it is further examined below. The term gelling was first mentioned in the 1853 treaty referring to dge slong.¹² Aitchison (1892:209) stated that "one of the Gelongs, Tibetan officials appointed from Lhasa to supervise the local chiefs", in his discussion on the incidents of 1852. Mackenzie (1884:16) further elaborated the nature and designation of this official as "one of these Sath Rajas, known as the Gelling or Gelong, who had been entrusted by the Lassa authorities with control over the other Chiefs and jurisdiction in the hills near Kuriapara." This leads us to understand that prior to the 1852 incident these officials were mistakenly identified as "[Tawang] Deba Rajahs," as recorded in the 1853 treaty.

With regard to the title satrajas, since Mackenzie had met one of these satrajas, he keenly observes that the title "'seven princes' [is] a common title of the Bhutia Chiefs in this quarter, not necessarily implying the existence of the precise number seven." Gait (1906: 36) also thinks that it has "come to be used in a purely conventional sense," taking the example of

However, in a number of literatures, it has also been translated as 'blackmailed' money or simply retained as posa (Mumtaza 1997).

¹¹See the appendices for the treaties. Only the technical issues are discussed here.

¹²In the revised edition of Aitchison (1892: 209) the gelling has been defined as gelong (dge slong). The edition probably depends on the work of Mackenzie (1884:16), where he records that the gelling refers to a dge slong.

baro bhuiya (twelve chiefs) in Assam and panch pir (five pirs) among the Indian Muslim rulers in the South Asian subcontinent. The observations made by Mackenzie and Gait are helpful to understand the satarajas, contrary to the common narrative of the existence of seven brothers among the Sherdukpen rulers' family and thus being called satarajas. Moreover, the textual sources such as Rgyal rigs and Me rag mdzad rnam, did not support a methodology and clan history on 'seven brothers'.

In the 1844(a) treaty only three individuals were titled with satarajas, which are the oldest textual sources to the term, but it has been used randomly in English sources. In the twentieth century, the title is specifically used to refer only to the chieftains of Sherdukpen (Kingdon-Wars 1941:19), which is not traditional custom, because Mackenzie (1884: 18) records that "like those chiefs of the 'Kuriapara Bhutia', [Sherdukpen chiefs] are also called 'satarajas.'" Therefore, what could be origin of the title satarajas? Is it the 'Council of Seven' (bdun sbrel) of the ancient administration of the Mon region, headquarter at Tawang monastery until 1951? The 'Council of Seven' was formed by the addition of the 'Tsona rice-official' (Mtsho sna 'bras sgrub pa) in the 'Council of Six' (drug sbrel). The latter council consists of the 'lay and ordained rdzong dpon of Tsona' (Mtsho sna ser skya) in the 'Council of Four' (bzhi sbrel), which was the core council. It was constituted by the 'lay and ordained officials of the Tawang's Ecclesiastical office (Rta dbang dgon pa'l mkhan po) and the 'governing council of the Tawang monastery' (Rta dbang dgon pa'i bla spyi).¹³

Since the list of members of the various councils is unavailable, the assumption of satarajas origin to the 'Council of Seven' is not definitive. However, Mackenzie (1884: 18) did record that in 1843-44, prior to the signing of the 1844(a) treaty, "the Sath Rajas, in company with

¹³For details on the council, refer to Ye shes 'phrin las (1983: 132-163) and Thub bstan chos 'phel (1988: 24-23)

representatives of the Towang Durber [council], had an interview with Captain Gordon." This information suggests that among the six listed signatories, some might have represented the 'Council of Four/Six/Seven' in the 1844(a) treaty.

The 1844(a) Treaty¹⁴

The 1844(a) treaty is the oldest textual source of the term satrajas, where out of six signatories in the treaty, three names are attached with 'satrajah', one with 'Rajah' and the last two with 'Bramee' titles. These three satrajas were 'Changjoi [phyag mdzod] Satrajah, Sreng [seng ge] Satrajah, and Cheeng Dundoo [Sangs don grub] Satrajah.' The other three without the title satraja were 'Tong Dabee [Rta dbang deva] Rajah, Cheng Dundoo Bramee [Sangs don grub drag mi] and Poonjai Bramee [phun tshogs drag mi].' The first three were representing Naragoon, referring to Rupregooan (Ru spre sgang), the ancient name of the Sherdukpen region, presently Rupa and Shergooan, and the latter three Takhal Toorom, which probably refers to Stag lung dharma. i.e. the Dharmaraja of Stag lung rdzong.¹⁵ I may note that these signatories from the list were (Tibeto-) Mon officials and chieftains of Sherdukpen and Stag lung rdzong. However, the names 'Changjoi Satrajah' and 'Tong Dabee Rajah' are not individual names, but rather denotes a position, i.e. phyag mdzod – the treasurer and the devaraja of Tawang (Rta dbang deva). The latter could be the 'in-charge' of the Tawang monastery, titled bla gnyer in Tibetan, who was directly appointed from Lhasa. (Thub bstan chos 'phel was the last one to be appointed to this position from 1949 to 1951.) The last two, 'Cheng Dundoo Bramee' and 'Poonjai Bramee', and the second, 'Streng Satrajah', likely to belong to certain chieftains. The last title 'bramee' is close to drag mi or mi drag, a common aristocrat's title used

¹⁴ See the Appendixi for the full text

¹⁵ Similarly suggested by Lamb (1966: 293)

in the southernmost part of Tibet. It could also refer to 'dasho' (drag shos), which is an aristocratic title commonly used in Bhutan. Among the six signatories, only the third 'Cheeng Dundoo Satrajah' also signed the 1853 treaty.

Prior to the meeting to sign the 1844(a) treaty, Captain Gordon met the (Tibeto-) Mon and Sherdukpen chieftains after getting useful insight from the British officials' sources (Mackenzie 1884: 18). This is particularly from the Robinson's (1841: 292) note of 'the Towung [Tawang] Raja [is] a chieftain immediately dependent upon Lassa,' which might have helped him to get a meaningful dialogue. Based on Robinson, Lamb (1966: 298-9) writes that those signatories "appear to have been members of the Sherchokpa and Sherdukpen Monpas from Dirangdzong, Rupa and Shergaon," whereas Mackenzie (1884: 19) and Reid (1942: 302) note that Sherdukpen of Rupa and Shergaon had signed a separate treaty with British India.¹⁶ Nevertheless, captain Jenkins states that they were "not under the Government of Bootan, but were a feudatory of the Raja or Governor of Lassa" (Mackenzie 1884: 16-19). Captain Francis Jenkins, the Governor-General's Agent for the North-East Frontier, therefore, was happy enough to sign a treaty with the six representatives from Monyul. However, besides their names, not much is known about those who had signed the 1844(a) treaty along with Captain Francis Jenkins in early 1844.

The 1844(b) Treaty¹⁷

The signatories of the 1844(b) treaty were Durjee (rdo rje) Rajah, dukpak (grub pa) Rajah, Joypoo (Rayal po) Rajah, Chang Khangdoo (sangs mkha' 'gro) Rajah, Saugja (Bsod rgyal) Rajah, Rooprae Gyatooung Bhungdoo (Ru

¹⁶See the last paragraph of the 1844(b) treaty.

¹⁷See the Appendix II for the full text. All the non-marked quotations in this session are from the treaty.

spre brgya stong don grub) Rajah and Sauryah (Bsod rgyal).’ The personal names here are more legible than the listed names in the 1844(a) treaty. However, not a single signatory of the 1844(b) treaty is found recorded in either of the languages of the 1853 treaty. The 1844(b) treaty’s focal clause is no. 5, stating “I, Durjee [Rdo rje] Rajah, am content to receive a monthly pension of 25 Rupees; and for the rest of my people 20 Rupees each, altogether 145-13 Rupees in lieu of our black-mail, and we relinquish every other right in Chardoar.”¹⁸ The treaty came into existence when the ‘supposed murderers’ were not able to handover to British India, which led to the dvar annexed and the listed signatories being forbidden to visit the plains. The treaty further notes that the arrival of any of the (Tibeto-) Mon and Sherdukpen chieftains would be reported to the patgarrec (aristocrats of Tezpur, Assam) and would be confirmed within the market, and they were not to indulge in trading with the ryot (peasant).¹⁹ The mention of these patgarree and ryot in the treaty is important, because it shows that the relationship between them was in existence prior to the regulation. The signatories of this 1844(b) treaty were the various chieftains of the Rupa and Thembang Circle Areas of West Kameng district, who were recorded as ‘Thebengia Bhutias (Them spang ba spu), Rooprai Ganw [Ru spre sgang] and Sher Ganw [gsher sgang] Bhutias (Sherdukpen)’.²⁰ Among those signatories, the Durjee Raja’ and the Rooprai region chiefs represented the Sherdukpen, which is rightly observed by Mackenzie (1884:18). And he states that “eastward of Kuriapara lays the extensive division of Char Dwar

¹⁸Chardoar functions as minor dvar, but is not listed in the nineteen dvars (aitchison 1929).

¹⁹Captain Welsh (1794: 3) notes that ‘Patrah-Muntree’ or ‘Gohains’, referring to ‘Patgarree’ were the leading aristocrats, who ‘were permanent and hereditary counselors of state.’ ‘Muntree’ is the ‘mantri’ in Hindi, meaning minister. ‘Pykes’ is also noted as peasants or the subjects in Welsh’s report. See Mackenzie (1884: 377-394) for ‘Welsh’s Report on Assam, 1794’.

²⁰See Mackenzie (1884: 19) and the Appendix II.

or 'the four passes,' on the borders of which are the Rooprai Ganw and Sher Ganw Bhutias who claim to be independent of Towang [Tawang]. Their Chiefs, like those of the 'Kuriapara Bhutias' are called 'Sath Rajas,' the principal one having the title of Durje Raja."²¹ Here the 'Bhutais of Charduar' in the treaty refers not only to Sherdukpen, but it also included the Thembang's babu. However, the title of the 1844(b) treaty indicates that it was only an 'agreement with the Shergaon and Rupriagaon Bhutias to refrain from aggression', but actually it includes the Thembang babu too. In the meantime, it is observed that the posa of Rupees '145-13' was given only to 'Thebengia Bhutia', but since when it was given, is not clear. It came to be known only through the Captain Navill's annual report for the 1914-15 and 1922-23 periods, where he records the same amount of Rupees given to 'Tembang Bhutia' (Reid 1942: 302).

The Sherdukpen chieftains being recipient of posa amount of Rupees '2526.7', which dates back to an unwritten or non-existent arrangement reached between the chiefs of the other 'Bhutias of Charduar' [=Sherdukpen and Captain Matthie in 1826, is recorded (Mackenzie 1884:19). Even though a written copy has not surfaced or was not written at all, Reid (1942: 302) discussed the incident in the following lines:

The Rupa and Shergaon Monbas [Sherdukpen] receive Rs. 2526-7.0. this was originally paid to them in lieu of goods obtained by black-mailing the plains people. It is hard to conceive why these two very insignificant villages should receive so large a sum, especially as they are a very timid people and quite incapable of ever causing much trouble on the Frontier.

²¹ In 1844 a certain 'Durje Raja' played an important role in the settlement of the 1844(b) treaty. His name as 'Durji Raja' also played a role in the settlement of Rs. 1740 to the initial Rs. 2526-7, the non-written 1826 'arrangement' (Mackenzie 1884:19). Interested readers are suggested to read further in Mackenzie (1884: 18-20) and Reid (1942: 301-302).

Apparently, Reid seems unknown about that the posa given to Sherdukpen, because they owned considerable territorial rights over the region running between the “boundary line of the Char Dwar Bhutias ... laid down in 1872-73 from the Rowta River on the west to the Ghabroo River on the east” (Mackenzie 1884: 18). The large sum was given to them in 1826 in order to relinquish this large tract of territory owned by Sherdukpen. Albeit after the death of British subject Madhoo Sykeah, who was ‘murdered’ by the ‘Bhutias’ (?) in 1839, posa amount to Sherdukpen was reduced to Rs. 1740 (Mackenzie 1884: 19). At the same time the joint Sherdukpen and Thembang babu had to sign the 1844(b) treaty. They had thus relinquished every other right in Charduar for not being able to handover the culprit. Although Sherdukpen’s posa was raised back to Rs. ‘2525-7-0’ as documented in Reid (1942: 302),²² based on Captain Nevill’s 1914-15 and 1922-23 reports, the Thembang babu were only paid Rs. 145-13. Even today, as a legacy of the region, the token of this amount is still paid, without any adjustments.

The 1853 Treaty²³

Among the signatories of the 1844(a) treaty, as mentioned before, only one signatory is identifiable in the 1853 treaty. In the English copy, the signatories names are clearly corrupted, which can only be obtained through examination of the Tibetan copy of the treaty, where the listed signatories are easy to identify. Their names are identified as following: ‘Changdangdoo’ is Mu shing bha bu Sangs Don grub. ‘Namang Leden’ is Bho kha kho che

²²See Richardson (1998 [1945]: 639).

²³See the Appendix III for the full text. All the non-marked quotations in this section are from the treaty.

Ngag dbang Tshe thar and 'Dao Nurboo' is Gdong khog ' Brug Nor bu.²⁴

Unlike in the Tibetan copy, in the English copy their names are not attached to the region and their chieftainship title. In the 1844(a) treaty those six signatories were noted as representing two regions. i.e. 'Naregoon' (Ru spre gang) and 'Takhel Tooram' (Stag lung dharma), which means in the 1853 treaty, the two parties in the 1844(a) treaty were merged into one party. The listed above three chieftains, as counterparts of the British Captains Reid and Campbell, had signed the 1853 treaty. Neither the Tibetan nor English copy of the treaty however states precisely that this 1853 treaty is a renewal of the 1844(a) treaty is recorded. Nevertheless, the resumption of the posa, which is a "sum of 5,000 Rupees, and [will] relinquish all right over any proceeds that may accrue from the [Kuriapara] dvar", is the crucial point to be made here.

The compensation amount was based upon one-third of the whole amount of proceeds of Kuriapara dvar per annum. It became necessary to re-establish the treaty's obligation, because it was lately disturbed by the misbehavior' of 'Gelling' (-dge slong) Shes rab Grags pa, who was the 'magistrate' (rdzong dpon) of Rtag lung rdzong in the year 1851. The desired outcome of the treaty was "that the former friendly relations which existed between the Government of India and our Lhasa Government (lately disturbed by the misbehavior of one of our Gellings) should be again resumed, and being ourselves desirous above all things that peace should exist between our Government and that of India."²⁵ It is not clear why two different titles were used for the treaties of 1844(a) and 1853, which are the Engagement of the Towang Bhutia Regarding Compensation for the Kariapera Duar-1844,' and

²⁴All the signatories were from the Murshing and Domkho valleys of present-day Kalakteng Circle Area of West Kameng district. All of them traced their lineage to a single descendant, the 'King of Mon' Sprang po dar.

See Appendix III.

²⁵See Appendix III.

the 'Treaty with the Sat Rajas of Charduar Acknowledging submission, dated 28th January 1853,' respectively. The records of two different titles to the same purpose of a treaty do lead to confusion, but the contents of the treaties refer to same objective, which was the obligation to the annexation of the Kuriapara dvar and paying some of 'Rs.5000' as compensation amount to the (Tibeto-) Mon chieftains.

In the following, the amended and annotated translation of the 1853 treaty in Tibetan is presented, which is followed by remarks on the treaty. The presentation of the translated Tibetan copy of the treaty is important to understand how knowledge is reproduced or how it is distorted or understood in the other language. The treaty is written in dbu can script with a title and is measured as 66cm x 86cm. The main part of the treaty can be divided into three parts in which part two corresponds to the English copy of the 1853 treaty. Part one is a 'preliminary report and discussion on the year 1852.' And the last part is the acknowledgment of the treaty with the presence of Tibetan officials (see the remark section). It consists of twenty-eight lines, including the two lines of title.

The Amended and Annotated Translation of the 1853 treaty in Tibetan copy

Copy of the treaty signed between the Great Government of Dga 'Idan pa pho brang [Tibet] and the [British East India] company to not [oppose] each other on the borderland.

[The Main text, Part I (I-II): The Preliminary Report on the Year of 1852]

An address to the precious 'Governor-General', who is experienced with great wisdom,

[We] hope that your circle of beautiful body is fine without any strain and all the subjects are in a happy mood in the garden of 'Kun zla', where the radiance of the space of the auspicious dual tradition [spiritual and temporal] is spread in all directions. Here too, [we are] without any affliction

or violence, [however,] by distractions, we are attached to the material world. In between, we are heartily satisfied with the [letter] given on the date of the 9th day of the 1st month [of the Water-Mouse 1852], which is written/edited in Tibetan [according] to the Indian [Bengali] translation is precisely pristine as to its contents. Similarly, the contents of the undertaking [proposal] letter given by the two [British] officials stating that the two nations will not have any rivalry to each other at the border, is similar to the contents of the agreement letter, which was recently given by the [same] two officials. Here is the precise translation of the undertaking [proposal] letter, which is attached along with the copies of the agreement [given to us] by the 'babu raja' (Ra tsa bha bu), who recently arrived at Udalguri.

It is not our regulation and custom to return [someone], because dge slong Shes rab Grags pa requested the [East India] Company to save his life. Moreover, the relationship between the Emperor (gong ma) at the top and Dga' Idan Dharma Raja (Rdo rom ra dza), and the supreme, Great Company is irreversible, like the milk and water, even [if] it is defiled. There is not any rivalry to each other along the border between our nations. With mutual understanding, the trades at the dvars and annual territorial taxes of Rupees Five Thousand from Tezpur to Kuriapara (Ke ra pa ra) will be given every year, as before to the Stag lung rdzong [dpon]²⁶ and the babu of the border.²⁷ We, the two [British] Sahibs, Gauhati Commissioner Sahib Major Doranji (Mer theg rdor jen rtse?) Sahib have solely undertaken and decided that Shes rab Grags pa will not again altercate and mischief, directly in the

²⁶Although it is not clear who was rdzong dpon at the time, it directly denotes to the usual norms of payment, up until then.

²⁷Ke ra pa ra is written Kuriapara dvar in English. Presently, it is known as Bhairabkunda in the district of Udalguri, Assam.

territory and with the subjects of Dga' Idan pa.²⁸ On the day [?] of the month [?] of the Water-Mouse year [1852/53].

On the 7th day of the 12th month of Water-Mouse year [1853], with a copy of the previously given agreement [letter] by the three babus at the border place of Udalguri, the three representatives [i.e. three babus] representing the two senior 'governor-generals' (spyi khyab): Gdong khog 'Brug Nor bu, Mur shing Bha bu Sangs Don grub [and] Bho kha kho che Ngag dbang Tshe thar from Kalaktang (Kha legs steng) reached in front of and handed the decree to the Sahib [British officials].

[The Main text, Part II (11-23): The Summary of the 1853 Treaty]

This is the brief content [of the agreement],²⁹ which is given to us: the three [the two Phogs mda' officials and] 'Rajas of Hajo' (Ha to ra dza).³⁰ It is [hoped that this report] has not come to be known as unheard by the two seniors 'governor-generals':

[It is to state that] Shes rab grags pa's retinue, those armies from the nearby region of Kalaktang will be allowed to return; and except for the Stag lung rdzong dpon³¹ not any other single new soldier will be allowed to

²⁸ The subjects of the Dga' Idan pho brang's Government, i.e. the Tibetans or the Monpas in the Mon region until 1914 or 1951.

²⁹According to the English copy of the 1853 Treaty, the Tibetan version is "copied out in Bhutia [i.e. Tibetan] language from the Bengali copy made by Tuckha Mahomed Darogah." Tuckha Mahomed Darogah, who made the Bengali translation, is likely the name of a Bengali Police Officer, because in Urdu darogah stands for police.

³⁰ The 'Raja of Hato' probably refers to the raja of the defunct 'Kingdom of Koch Hajo' in the late 16th Century. Does this mean that bha bu/jo bo mentioned in the text were descendants of the king of the Kingdom of Koch Hajo, which is not supported in Rgyal rigs text (1986)?

³¹ This phrase denotes that a new Stag lung rdzong dpon (the magistrate of the Stag lung fortress) was already appointed in place of dge slong Shes rab grags pa. Stag lung rdzong is one among the four administrative rdzong, beside the Rdi rang rdzong, Seng ge rdzong and Rgyang mkhar rdzong. These rdzong were administrators jointly under the 'Council of

remain here. Besides that both seniors 'governor-generals' were not only to return again, [but also] the subjects of Shes rab Grags pa, and all the [other] 'babu raja' who were with him will be allowed to return to their respective place. He³² may not to be dragged and taken along; however, from now on, if any soldiers did not go back [further] from Kalaktang, no one will conflict against the Company. If any conflict happens [again], the [posa] Rupees Five Thousand of Kuriapara will not be received and [you] will not be allowed to do trading [in the dvar]. If it does not remain on this agreement, it is a false statement given by three of us.

Placing Dharma protectors (chos skyong) as witnesses, we three: Gdong khog 'Brug Nor bu, Mur shing bha bu Sangs Don grub [and] Bho kha kho che Ngag dbang Tshe thar affixed the seals (si ri) by representing the two great seniors 'governor-generals'. The seal affixed by 'Captain Reid Sahib' (kab tang rib sahib), 'Captain Campbell Sahib' (Kab tan skyems bho la sahib) as second and thirdly, 'Udalguri Police Station House Office' (O ta la ku ri than a rdar ka) as third, we three, the 'Rajas of Hajo', in the presence of these three officials, have made [this agreement] in the presence of all [of them] on the 7th day of the 12th month of Water-Mouse year [1853]. [Therefore,] as the mind and heart are likewise [inseparable as of] the milk and water, [so likewise it is between] the Emperor (gong ma) at the top and regime's Dharma Raja (Sde pa Rdo rom ra dza), and the supreme Company.

Similarly, the Sahibs and we, all the 'Raja of Hajo' have taken a vow to be harmonious [to each other]. With that we received the above stamped letter of agreement. As based upon this treaty, we were also in mutual trust, thus, we are thankful for receiving the status of grandfather Mgon po (Mes mes

Four/Six' (bzhi rbrel or drug sbrel) of Tawang monastery and the rdzong dpon of Seng ge rdzong. The rdzong dpon of Rdi rang rdzong and Stag lung rdzong were appointed by the 'Council of Four/Six' based at the Tawang monastery (see Map; Tenpa 2014, Mizonu & Tenpa, 2015)

³²Refer to Shes rab Grags pa.

mgon po), the Thangka (zhal thang) and continuation of the Rupees Five Thousand of the territorial tax of Indian Kuriapara.

Therefore, both nations will not have rivalry against each other at the border and through mutual understanding there will not have any hindering trading at the dvar trade for the benefit of the ruler and the subjects of both [the nations]. This is also requested to be kept in mind by the Rinpoche (?) himself. We [(Tibeto-) Mon officials] were happy to have this letter and the treaty; and furthermore all those who flee for safe haven will not be barred to come back to their respective place. Besides that dge slong [Shes rab grags pa and his] Raja's retinue who became the subjects under the Company's service were not allowed to altercate and mischief in the territory and the subjects, who are directly under the precious Dga' Idan pho brang [Government of Tibet]. A strict order to be given is in the hand of the Gauhati [Commissioner]. Hereafter, the trade-routes will remain as usual in junctions; it is [also requested to meet this [treaty's obligation] now and in the future.

From the exalted supporter, the Deputy Commissioner of Indian Gauhati on the date [?] of the month [?] as this vast Bhi la rdi [area] is not need to cover for a mere service observation.

[Main Text, Part III (line 24-26): The Seal and Remark by the two Tibetans Officials]

The agreement made by the Great Dga' Idan pho brang Government [of Tibet] and the Foreign [British East India] Company to not hold enmity against each other at the border. Upon the seal and signature signed by the Gauhati Sahib on the copy [of the original agreement], we, the 'Governor-Generals' in the rank of phogs mda'³³ have affixed the red seal. In the

³³The sixth rank official in the Dga' Idan pho brang Government of Tibet (1642-1959) was called 'phogs mda'. In the treaty this term is referring to 'phogs dpon – the treasury and Mda' dpon – the captain. They were 'phogs dpon Skyid stod pa Lha idan 'chi med and mda

future, this treaty must have registered and properly retained in the registration of the succeeding resident of Stag lung rdzong dpon and the descendants of babu.

On the date [?] and the month [?] of the Water-Ox year [1853] [the Red Seal]

Remarks on the Tibetan Copy of the 1853 Treaty

The 1853 treaty is one of the foremost copies, which Tibetan officials took time to copy “out in Bhutia [Tibetan] language from the Bengali copy” (see App. III). It must have been at the British officials’ insistence that a Tibetan version be produced or it could also have been the Tibetans insisting on a copy in their language, because we observe that neither of the 1844 treaties are translated into Tibetan. It is particularly the 1844(a) treaty, and dge slong Shes rab Grags pa’s miscalculation of the treaty in 1852 (discussed below), that might have led to the production of the 1853 Tibetan version. Whatever the reason behind the Tibetan translation may be, it is one of the first treaties to be signed between British India and Tibet, represented by the satrajas of (Tibeto-) Mon. Although the 1844(a) treaty could be recorded as the first treaty, it seems that it remained outside of Lhasa’s authorities notice until the dge slong Shes rab grags pa’s episode. With the representation and the seals of the ‘Governor-Generals’ in the sixth rank of phogs mda’ position (see note 33), it can also be stated that the 1853 treaty is a reaffirmation of the knowledge of Lhasa of the 1844(a) treaty after the 1852 incident. This can be ascertained from specific phrases used in the treaty, such as “former friendly relations which existed between

‘dpon gung Bshad sgra ba Dbang phyug rgyal po. Both of them were promoted to the third and second rank officials, and the latter became a minister (bka ‘blon) and regent (sde srid) from 1862-1864. See Petech (1973: 164-76).

the Government of India and our Lhasa Government should be again resumed" or "will be given as before" (sngar srol sprad 'ong) (see App.III). The necessity of the 1853 treaty can also be traced back to the 1852 incident, in which a border war nearly broke out between the Government of Tibet and the British East India Company. The crisis was caused by dge slong Shes rab grags pa (who was the rdzong dpon of Rtag lung rdzong) and his retinue when they decided to keep the posa amount paid by the British India as per the 1844 agreements, which was supposed to go to Tawang Monastery and further on to Lhasa. However, the dge slong kept it for himself and fled to Guahati, British India territory for safety after (Tibeto-) Mon armies had reached the Indo-Tibetan border in 1851.³⁴ It was this event, basically the dge slong rebelled against Lhasa and secured himself under British India's protection, to which Mackenzie (1884: 16-17) describes the British Indian response:

An army was pushed down towards the plains, and there was at one time imminent prospect of a Thibetan [sic] invasion of Assam. Four hundred light infantry and a couple of six pounders were hurried up to the frontier, and served the ardour of the hillmen, who after much bluster and many demands for the Gelling's [dge slong] head, said they would be content with a document from the governor General's Agent, certifying that the Gelling was no longer in life. They were not particular as to the actual fact; but wished to save their honor by an appearance of success; in this being perhaps not less diplomatic than more civilized nations. The desired certificate they did not obtain.

As the British Indian officers declined to issue a statement, the first part of the Tibetan copy states that "it is not our regulation and custom to return

³⁴ See further discussion in Mackenzie (1884: 16-18), Allen (1905: 54-55) and Lamb (1964: 118-9; 1966:300). Shakabpa (2010:591) wrongly notes that the dge slong "refused to pay the district taxes."

[someone], because dge slong Shes rab Grags pa requested the [East India] Company to save his life." Thus, he was protected from the (Tibeto-) Mon authorities. The Tibetan copy of the treaty primarily follows the same initial contents of the 1853 treaty in English; however, its information on the negotiation stage is helpful to understand the context some of the 1852 incident. For example, it notes the presence of 'Guahati Commissioner' and 'Major Doranji (Mer zeg rdor ren rtse)' during the negotiation stage, though the 1853 treaty was signed by the Captains Reid and Campbell. The list of officials during the negotiations stages is contained only in the Tibetan version, while the latter list is mentioned in both sources.

The content of the text corresponds in the Tibetan and the English copies of the 1853 treaty. The text of the 1853 treaty retains exactly what has been discussed and written in the 1852 negotiation stage, except for the fate of dge slong Shers rab grags pa. The negotiation resumed 'the former payment of Rs. 5,000, and guaranteeing, on the other, to the followers of the Gelling [dge slong] Raja immunity for their rebellion. It was agreed also that the Gelling himself should live under British protection and restraint to the south of the Brahmaputra" (Mackenzie 1884: 17). The English copy records that "with Brahmaputra" (Mackenzie 1884: 17). The English copy records that "with regard to the followers and others of the Gelling who have come down to the Plains for protection, we promise not to molest them, but hope, with the good help of the Agent, Governor-General, to make friends with them and persuade them to return to their own country."³⁵ However, in the Tibetan copy, it appears that (Tibeto-) Mon officials and chieftains were not happy about him and his followers.

Although the Tibetan copy mentions that "the subjects who came along with Shes rab grags pa and all the "babu rajas" (Ra tsa bha bu) were

³⁵ See Appendix III

allowed to return to their respective place,"³⁶ Mackenzie (1884: 17) informs us that "the Thibetans did not respect the stipulations of the treaty as regards the Gelling [dge slong]'s partisans, for seven of these were brutally murdered as soon as they returned to the hills." However, the identities of the seven slaughtered partisans remain unclear, except that they were probably the 'babu rajas' of the region, who were in collaboration with dge slong Shes rab grags pa to go against the revenue of Rs. 5,000 posa to be dispatched further to north.³⁷ This leads us to assume that they were likely among the signatories of the 1844 treaties, who were recorded as 'bha bur a dza' in the Tibetan copy of the 1853 treaty.

Between 1853 and 1864, dge slong Shes rab grags pa had reached a separate agreement with the officials of the 'Councils of Four/Six/Seven', and was allowed to come back to Monyul. Prior to the initiative he briefly travelled along with Schlagintweit (1857:555) in 'Nurigoon', referring to Sherdukpen region from Udalguri in 1856. Schlagintweit was conducting geological surveys of the region and respectfully addressed dge slong Shes rab grags pa as the 'former Rajah of Tawang Chang-To'. Thus, began his reconciliatory initiative, but this failed again after he was "involved in quarrels with the Sath Rajas, whom he defrauded of certain dues upon caoutchouc and once more he had to fly into Durrang."³⁸ Yet, after his short reconciliation initiative (beginning in 1861) with the (Tibeto-) Mon officials and chieftains failed, and he was killed in April 1864 near Kuriapara dvar.

³⁶See the 'Amended Tibetan Copy of the Treaty and its Annotated Translation' section.

³⁷Mackenzie (1884:16) records that "the Gelling [dge slong] took advantage of his position to declare himself independent, and to intercept the money paid by the British authorities," which is followed in the words of later authors, like Allen (1905: 55), Reid (1942: 36) and Lamb (1964: 119; 1966: 299).

³⁸ It is reported in Mackenzie (1884: 17); however, he did not provide the sources. Mackenzie also did not elaborate on what caoutchou is, besides noting the term in brackets as 'an important staple in those parts'. See also Lamb (1966: 300-1).

Whatever the case, after the violation of British territory by (Tibeto-) Mon authorities in the pursuit of dge slong in 1864, initially “the Government of Bengal ordered a demand to be made for the surrender of the murderers” (Mackenzie 1884: 18). However, the British authorities did not bother to press further, because even if stopping the annual payment of the posa may have been “likely to lead to further raids,... it was [thus] deprecated by the local authorities” (Mackenzie 1884: 18). Moreover, the (Tibeto-) Mon officials and chieftains may have had knowledge of the violation of the treaty, because a translation of the treaty clearly records that “if any conflict happened [again], the Rs. 5,000 of Kuriapara will not be received and will not be allowed to do trading [in the dvar]. If the term does not remain on this undertaking, it is a false statement given by three of us.”³⁹ The violation did not lead to the stalling of further payments as a consequence, which is even still today paid annually as a legacy through the district’s main office.

Coming back to the treaty, the Tibetan copy mentions those three signatories represented by the two ‘Governor-Generals’ (spyi khyah),⁴⁰ whereas the English copy records that they were “being deputed by the Deba Rajas (deva raja).” These deputies may refer to multiple identities, like the two ‘Governor-Generals’, the Tawang monastery officials and the authorities of Lhasa of the ‘Deba Rajas’ as the ‘Tawang Deo or Deb Raja of Tawang’ (in the understanding of Mackenzie 1884: 17). However, it is difficult to identify, because the Tibetan copy does not particularly support the Mackenzie’s observation. Furthermore, a single authoritative person being the chief of the region is not supported at all in the studies of the administrative functions of the region, as briefly discussed in the functions of

³⁹ See the amended and annotated section. It is the same in the English copy, as ‘should the peace be ever broken by us, we shall consider that all claims to the Rs. 5,000 hitherto yearly paid to our Government by the Government of India shall be forfeited, and that our trade with the people of the plains shall be put a stop to’ (see Appendix III)

⁴⁰See further in note 33.

'Council of Four/Six/Seven.' However, what can be observed is that for the British, the understanding of the 'Deba Rajas' refer to someone in Tawang, while to those three signatories, it was the two 'Governor-Generals', and for the two Tibetan officials – 'phogs dpon Lha Idan 'chi med and mda' dpon gung Bshad sgra ba Dbang phyug rgyal po, who were then in Udalguri, it was the 'the great Governor-General' (dmag sgar spyi khyab chen mo) in Lhasa.

The representation of the deputies also led us to a vague understanding of the 'letters of friendship' being noted in the English copy, which the British authorities recorded as being 'carr[ied]' forward by the three signatories from the 'Deba Rajas.' It is likely that the 'letters' could be no other than 'a copy of the previous agreement letter given by the three babu rajas,' as recorded in the Tibetan copy (Part I). Based on those letters, probably the Tibetan copy of the treaty seems to be produced after an edition by the two Tibetan officials, which is similarly used for the negotiation stage, because the Tibetan copy notes that the 'agreement letter' was based on the earlier 'proposal letter' submitted by the two British officials in 1852 to resume the formal relations. The wording in the 1852 'agreement letter' states essentially the same thing as the 1853 Tibetan copy of the treat. This again leads to the assumption that a 'proposal letter' submitted by the two British officials in 1852 was similar to the 1853 treaty, which British officials had forwarded to the (Tibeto-) Mon officials and the chieftains to discuss among themselves. It is also known from the specific statement contained in the Tibetan copy that.

[We are] heartily satisfied with the [letter] given in Tibetan on the date of the 9th day of the 1st month [of the Water-Mouse, 1852], edited in Tibetan to Indian [Bengali] translation is precisely pristine to the contents. Smilarly, the contents of the undertaken [/proposed] letter given by the two [British] officials stating that the two nations will not have any rivalry to each other

on boundary, is as similar to the contents of the agreement, which was recently given by the [same] two officials.⁴¹

Based on the above paragraph, it is clear that the actual draft of the 1853 treaty was finalized through the initial exchange of letters. This 'letters of friendship' resulted in the English copy of the 1853 Treaty.

In the Tibetan copy, there is the clear marking of four various dates, which correspond to the Tibetan lunar calendar. The first is 'the 9th day of the 1st month [of the Water-Mouse year, 1852]'; the second is '[without day and month in] the Water-Mouse year [1852/53]'; the third is mentioned twice of 'the 7th day of the 12th month of Water-Mouse year [1853]' and last is '[without day and month in] the Water-Ox year [1853].' The first two dates of the Tibetan year of the Water-Mouse clearly fall in the year 1852, but the remaining two dates fall in 1853, where the 12th month of the Tibetan lunar calendar usually corresponds to late January or February. 'The 7th day of the 12th month of the Water-Mouse year' may correspond to 'the 25th January 1853', as mentioned in the English copy of the treaty. The first date in the document leads us to understand that dge slong Shes rab grags pa and his group had gone against the Tawang monastery officials and Lhasa authorities in late 1851 or early 1852. Thus, it took nearly one year to settle the dispute and come to an agreement. The agreement was signed before the Tibetan calendar's New Year.

We do not know what led the two Tibetan officials to report to the senior officials in the 'Water-Ox year [1853]'. Could it have been in the month of March of 1853 that the two Tibetan officials chose to report to their seniors about the treaty? It seems to be the case, because just twenty-three days after the treaty date, the Tibetan New Year occurs. I am sure that the celebration would have included ongoing festivities for the Tibetan and (Tibeto-) Mon officials and chieftains, because it was after the resumption of

⁴¹See the Annotated section

the Rs. 5,000 posa and the peaceful resolution of the border and trade agreement with the British East India Company. Not long after the three month of the signing of the 1853 treaty, however, the chief dissident dge slong seems to have not given up his truce against the (Tibeto-) Mon authorities, because on the 1st day of the 3rd month of 1853, a supplementary treaty was signed, which states that Shes rabs grags pa 'will not be realized or escape" from the British India's custody (Shakabpa 2010: 592). However, Shakabpa understands that this supplementary treaty is the actual 1853 treaty, which it is not (see Appendix IV). It is not clear whether Shakabpa was selective in the inclusion of this supplementary treaty and ignored the actual 1853 treaty, which is signed on the 25th of January 1853, or he does not know about the actual treaty, which is widely published in the English sources.

As per the English and Tibetan copies of the 1853 treaty, the treaty was signed between the British East India Company and the local (Tibeto-) Mon chieftains, which was witnessed by the Tibetan authorities in, what was then, 'Kurreahpara [dvar], Zillah Darrung'. The supplementary treaty was signed directly between the British India and Tibetan authorities on the 1st day of the 3rd month of 1853 in Tezpur. Thereafter, Shakabpa (2010: 592-3) states that a follo- up 'supplementary treaty' was signed,⁴² but without any records of dates. It was actually signed in 1854. As the two latter treaties recorded in Shakabpa (2010: 592-3) are not published in the Aitchison's collection of treaties, one can observe how concerned authors were selective in the publication of documents. Shakabpa (might) have published only the

⁴²The contents of the treaty show that it is a supplementary agreement (Shakabpa 2010: 592-3), which he considers as the actual treaty. As the Aitchison's collection of treaties did not recorded such an agreement signed in the year 1853, in his notes on the translation of this particular treaty (of Shakabpa, 2010: 592-3), Maher (2010: 592, n. 27) staes that "I have been unable to locate the original English translation of these documents and have, therefore, retranslated them."

treaties which were signed directly by Tibetan and British India's authorities. While the British India's collection of treaties in Aitchison's publication included only the 1844 and 1853 treaties, in which they gained territories, and ignored the other 1853 supplementary and 1854 repatriation treaties, which were signed directly by the Tibetan authorities.

Conclusion

The study shows that an important historical relationship existed between the (Tibeto-) Mon, the Bhutanese, and the foothill people of the Bengali and Assamese dvars throughout the centuries. The relationship dramatically changed after the arrival of the British East India Company. This led to a number of treaties and agreement signed between British India and Bhutan, and the (Tibeto-) Mon and Sherdukpen's chieftains of Monyul to maintain trans-border trade as well as settlement of the territorial rights of the dvars. Be it the Bengali or Assamese dvars. It is observed that, besides the 1852 incident, the obligations of the treaties were met without any further hindrance from either side. Among the number of treaties that British India had signed with the Bhutanese, Tibetan and (Tibeto-) Mon in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, very few were translated into Tibetan. The 1853 treaty is one among the translated treaties. As discussed above, it is not explicitly mentioned in the 1853 Treaty, but the content of the treaty implies that it is a renewal of the 1844(a) treaty. The treaty's obligation is the same as the 1853 treaty and the central theme was "to be satisfied, now and forever, with a sum of 5,000 Rupees," which is still maintaining cross-border relations today (see App. III). It is not known what Lhasa understood in the treaties at the time, whereas to British India, it is the clear demarcation of a border after the relinquishment of the dvar.

It still remains unclear whether the 1844 and 1853 treaties, and in particular the 1853 treaty, could be considered the first Anglo-Tibetan treaty

or a treaty signed between British India and (Tibeto-) Mon and Sherdukpen. The 1853 treaty was the first treaty to be concluded between the British India and Tibet, which was represented by the two "Governor-Generals" and their Monyul chieftains. This occurred prior to what is usually considered the first 'treaty' the 'Convention between Great Britain and Tibet dated 7th September 1904'.⁴³ The signing of the treaty was without the intercession or interference by the Qing dynasty and without their knowledge. The Tibetan copy of this 1853 Treaty underlines that the Tibetan government was representative in 1853, showing that the Tibetan government has a stronghold (may be stronger than in 1844) in the region (Shakabpa 2010: 592-3), whereas the English copy simply notes that it was an agreement reached between the British India and (Tibeto-) Mon chieftains, who were "deputed by the Deba Raja". The English copies of the treaties have already been published in the Aitchison's collection, probably since first edition of 1867, which is quoted in the works of Mackenzie (1884), Allen (1905), Gait (1906), Reid (1942) and Lamb (1964; 1966), but these 1844 and 1853 treaties have drawn less attention and have not been discussed in the Tibetan and Himalayan Studies. I hope that this preliminary study will attract more attention to less studied area in the modern Tibetan Studies, in particular to the Eastern Himalayan region.

⁴³Refer Aitchison (1929 [1938]: 23-26) for the full contents of the treaty.

Appendix I.
The 1844[a] Treaty⁴⁴

An Agreement entered into by Changjoi Satrajah Sreng satrajah, Cheeng Dunndoo satrajah, of Naregoon and Tong Dabee Rajah. Cheng Dundoo Bramee, Poonjai Bramee, of Takhal Tooroom, dated 24th Maug.⁴⁵ 1250 B.S., - 1844.

It having been ordered by His Lordship the Governor-General in Council that we should be allowed annually one-third of the whole of the proceeds of Koreeahpara Dwar, viz, 5000 Rupees, we voluntarily pledge ourselves to adhere to the following terms most strictly.

1st- We pledge ourselves to be satisfied, now and forever, with the above-mentioned sum of 5000 Rupees, and relinquish all right over any proceeds that may accrue from the Dwar.

2nd- In our traffic we pledge ourselves to continue our dealings to the established market places at Oodalgooree and Mungle Dye, and never interface with the Ryots, neither will we allow any of our Booteahs to commit any acts of oppression.

3rd- we have relinquished all power in the Dwar, and can no longer levy any rent from the Ryots.

4th – We agree to apply to the British Courts at Mungle Dye for redress in all our grievances in their Territories.

5th- should we ever infringe any of the foregoing terms, we shall forfeit our right to the above pension.

Frans Jennkins,
Agent, Governor-General

⁴⁴See Aitchison (1892a) in the reference

⁴⁵The Maug, the 11th month of the Hindu lunar calendar falls on Jan/Feb

Appendix II. The 1844[b] Treaty⁴⁶

AN AGREEMENT entered into by DURJEE RAJAH. TAUGJOOG RAJAH, DUKPAK RAJAH, JOYPOO RAJAH, CHANG KHANGDOO RAJAH, SAUGJA RAJAH, ROOP RAE GYA TOOUNG BHUNGDOO RAJAH, SAURGYAH, of BHOOTAN, dated 29th Maug 1250 B.E., — 1844.

Under the supposition that we were concerned with Niboojoo Rajah, Kawree Bhoot, and Bogah Bhoot, in the murder of Maddoo Sykeah, of Ooang, in Char- doar and therefore required to give up the above mentioned supposed murderers, which we were unable to do, in consequence of which the duars were attached, and we forbidden to frequent them, and it being now ordered that we be allowed a pension in lieu of black-mail and may again visit the Plains for the purposes of traffic under a sworn agreement, to ensure the ryots from any oppressions from us: - We hereby pledge ourselves to act up to the following terms, swearing according to our custom by placing salt on a daw or Bhootan sword, and biting it, and cutting the skins of a tiger and bear.

1st – We pledge ourselves to report our arrival in the Plains to the Patgarree, and never to commit any fraud or theft against any ryot or Patgarree in trafficking with them, or any other act of oppression. Neither will we allow any of our people to do so, or we shall forfeit our privilege of visiting the Plains.

2nd – We pledge ourselves never to join any person or persons that may be at enmity with the British Government; and furthermore to oppose every effort made against the Government the instant it shall be brought to our knowledge, and report faithfully any intelligence we may get of any conspiracy being carried on. We also pledge ourselves to act up to any

⁴⁶See Aitchison (1892b) in the reference

orders we may get from the British authorities. Should it ever be proved that we have joined in any conspiracy, we shall not be allowed to visit the Plains.

3rd – We will never come into the Plains armed, and in our traffic confine ourselves exclusively to the established market places at Lahabarree, Balle, Barah, Oobung, and Tezpur, and not deal with the ryots in their private houses, neither will we permit any of our people doing so.

4th – We consider ourselves in all civil aggrievances bound to abide the decision of the British Courts.

5th – I, Durjee Rajah, am content to receive a monthly pension of 25 Rupees; and for the rest of my people 20 Rupees each, altogether 145* Rupees in lieu of our black-mail, and we relinquish every other right in Chardoar.

6th – The moment we hear that any of our people have been guilty of any crime in the Plains, we engage to give up the offender.

7th – We pledge ourselves to act up to the foregoing terms, or forfeit GUI* pension.

FRANS. JENKINS,
Agent, Governor-General

Appendix III. The 1853 Treaty⁴⁷

Treaty signed by Captains Reid and Campbell and Changdandoo, Namang Leden and Dao Nurhoo, Bhutia Rajas, on the 25th January 1853, at Kurreahparah, Zillah Darrung.

We, Changdandoo Raja, Namang Leden, Raja Dao Nurhoo Rajah, being deputed by the Deba Rajas to carry letters of friendship to the Agent, Governor-General, North-East Frontier, desiring that the former friendly relations which existed between the Government of India and our Lhasa Government (lately disturbed by the misbehavior of one of our Gellings) should be again resumed, and being ourselves desirous above all things that peace should exist between our Government and that of India, do (now that we are assured the Government of India do not intend to invade our country) hereby solemnly declare that all military force in excess of what is required to maintain order in our country shall be immediately withdrawn, and the soldiers sent to their houses, and should the peace be ever broken by us, we shall consider that all claims to the Rs. 5000 hitherto yearly paid to our Government by the Government of India shall be forfeited, and that our trade with the people of the plains shall be put a stop to.

And all this we of our own good will agree to and swear to in the presence of Captains Reid and Campbell, signing the agreement as copied out in Bhutia language from the Bengali copy made by Tuckha Mahomed Darogah.

And moreover, with regard to the followers and other of the Gelling who have come down to the Plains for protection, we promise not to molest them, but hope with the good help of the Agent, Governor-General, to make friends with them and persuade them to return to their own country.

⁴⁷See Aitchison (1892c) in the reference

Appendix IV. [supplementary 1853 Treaty]⁴⁸

The treaty concluded on the first day of the third month of 1853 confirms: The company cannot give Sherab Drakpa to the Tibetan Government, as the company is not in the habit of extraditing individuals. Still, the company will not support Sherab Drakpa in any new attacks, unrest, or destruction in Tibetan territory. Peaceful mutual relations between the company and Tibet should be improved. Given that Ganden Pede, the monasteries, and the people will be suspicious if Sherab Drakpa is kept near the border and given that Sherab Drakpa may create further troubles, he will be taken to Guwahati (Gho ha kri) where he will be detained for life. The British Sahib guarantees that he will not be released or escape. The two Devarajas of the Gandenpa army and the Commander Sahib of the company army have amicably resolved the issue in such a decisive manner, we, the undersigned swear this oath with Nyenshar Ama, the god of the Kerapara region as a witness.

Signed and sealed by Darka the English Administrator of the Otalakura border region, Tragur Kendura the popular leader, Ratibir, Mindha, and Lautop, and sealed by Namde Laratsa and Drungyik Gyeltsen.

⁴⁸This Tibetan copy is quoted from Shakabpa (1986 [1976]: 19-20), while the English translation is from Maher (2010: 592). I have not amended anything in both the Tibetan and English's translation of this appendix.