



---

THE DEPORTATION OF THE NAMDHARI STATE PRISONERS IN 1872 UNDER THE BENGAL  
REGULATION III OF 1818

Author(s): Swaran Singh Sanahi

Source: *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, 2011, Vol. 72, PART-I (2011), pp. 683-695

Published by: Indian History Congress

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44146761>

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Indian History Congress is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*

JSTOR

# THE DEPORTATION OF THE NAMDHARI STATE PRISONERS IN 1872 UNDER THE BENGAL REGULATION III OF 1818

Swaran Singh Sanehi

The British rulers had tried their best to make the native Indians believe that the new political dispensation was legal and just and in their interest but very often they either violated or at least manipulated those laws if they apprehended they would not serve their purpose. As far as the Namdhari Movement is concerned, a considerable number of examples may be cited in corroboration of assertion and the instance of the Amritsar Butcher Murder Case could be cited as the first glaring one in which confessions were extorted from twelve innocent persons both to conceal the failure of the police to trace the real perpetrators of the crime and to support its version of the case, as a consequence of which the police were discredited when the Namdharis confessed their crime at the Session Court resulting in the release of the condemned innocents. An explanation was sought by the higher authorities for the conduct of the police. Also, the Lt. Governor of the Punjab censured the police.<sup>1</sup> Likewise the application of the Bengal Regulation of 1818 to deport the eleven Kuka State Prisoners indicates similar approach by the government.<sup>1</sup>

It is a strange fact that most of the agitations, campaigns or the movements launched for the common cause which either assumed political character or declared its political motive later on by the respective leaders were started by the religious reformers. "It is curious that the greatest religious reforms have been effected by the laity" remarked Maculiffe.<sup>2</sup> Socrates was a layman. Christ was by trade a carpenter. Satguru Ram Singh also hailed from an artisan family.

Namdhari or the Kuka Movement, founded in April 1857 by Satguru Ram Singh, who was born at Bhaini (Sahib) in Ludhiana district of Punjab on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 1816, was the first systematically well organised attempt made by a religious leader (outwardly aiming at religio-social reforms but having a secret political aim) to overthrow British rule and restore Sikh rule.

This Movement, during its infancy, concentrated on religio-social reforms with a view to strengthening the people both physically and mentally which indubitably helped it in attaining the character of a mass movement within a very short span of time winning official laurels for the reforms and innovations introduced by the leader. "It appears

that Ram Singh is endeavouring to effect a reform in the Sikh religion and some of his doctrines and precepts are not only harmless, but also, beneficial.”<sup>3</sup>

Sataguru Ram Singh considered these reforms indispensable for preparing the masses for unswerving political struggle. This ploy had succeeded to a great extent in confusing the official machinery for quite some years. “I see in the earlier papers that Ram Singh was looked upon as a successor or actual re-embodiment of Guru Nanak, the saint.....”<sup>4</sup>

Though the Commissioner of Ambala, Col. R.G. Taylor had recommended to his Government to be ‘before hand with them’ as he had foreseen the dangerous character of the Namdharis and had observed that “It is my thorough belief that those lads mean war sooner or later”<sup>5</sup> but the government had adopted a lackadaisical approach confused as it seemed by their religious reforms. It was in 1871 when the slaughter houses at Amritsar and Raikot were attacked by Namdharis that the successor of Col. Taylor, Mr. J.W. Macnabb regarded those attacks as a ‘direct defiance of our authority’ as the slaughter houses were “expressly sanctioned by the British Government”.<sup>6</sup> The Deputy Commissioner of Ludhiana had seen in these attacks, the seeds of the ensuing revolt “for it is known that the beginning of this rebellion was the murder of butchers at Amritsar followed by a similar massacre at Raikot”.<sup>7</sup>

The challenge to the government by the Namdharis precipitated the former to observe a sea change in the ideology and conduct of Satguru Ram Singh and his ebullient followers and it revised its assessment by adding that “He is now the representative of Govind, the Warrior.”<sup>8</sup> He had imbibed his followers in patriotism.

The reports submitted by the subordinate officers to the Punjab secretariat and the communications of the provincial government to the various departments of the government of India make an interesting study showing the anxiety of the government over the mass happenings “... Whatever the original tendency of the Kooka doctrine may have been, they have now changed the designs of the leaders, more or less understood by the followers, being to attempt the restoration of the Sikh power in the Punjab.”<sup>9</sup>

“There is in addition, the unanimous belief among loyal and intelligent natives, that the Kooka movement is one which the Government cannot afford to treat with indifference; the conduct and bearing of the-Kookas themselves and the prophecies current among them of the near approach of the time when the English would be expelled from the country, and followers of Guru Ram Singh receive lands and honours.”<sup>10</sup>

The failure of the intelligence agencies in detecting the Namdharis' efforts in establishing fraternal relations with neighbouring state of Nepal and raising a separate Kuka regiment in Jammu and Kashmir<sup>11</sup> had tolled the alarm bell in the official circles and caused much headache and anxiety to the government which became extra ordinarily vigilant.

Now, the Government had sufficient cause to believe that Satguru Ram Singh was no more a religious reformer. The attempt of Ram Singh to get his followers armed in Kashmir, also a similar move in Nepal, goes far to show that he is working outside the sphere of a mere Guru or religious teacher.<sup>12</sup>

The Movement progressed by leaps and bounds which astonished the government. It was at its peak in 1872 when the Namdharis mustered unprecedented courage to revolt against such a great power in whose empire the sun did not set, and that too without any proper preparation or war weapons.

This event is known in the annals of history as the Malerkotla revolt in which two civil officers. Mr. L. Cowan, the Deputy Commissioner of Ludhiana, and Mr. Thomas D. Forsyth, the Commissioner of Ambala, shot the 65 rebels, from cannon mouths on two consecutive days on 17-18 January 1872 at the Parade Grounds at Malerkotla, without resorting to any legal procedure or obtaining prior approval from the higher and competent authorities.

One rebel was cut to pieces by the security guard for attacking Mr. Cowan and endangering the life of his victim to such an extent that the Mr Cowan himself reported it to be a 'furious attack', seizing him by the beard and endeavouring to strangle him.<sup>13</sup> The formal trial conducted and completed by the Commissioner as Session Judge within a few hours following their executions by cannon stigmatised the judicial process.

Such an act provoked the sane, sensible and sober Englishmen to raise hue and cry against such an illegal measure adopted by the civil officers. '... there was a panic, and so a civil officer blew from guns in cold blood and after a most wretched outbreak more men than were blown away at any single time and place during the mutiny when the very foundations of empire seemed to be breaking up under our feet,' wrote the *Friend of India* published from Calcutta.<sup>14</sup> The public condemnation of the action precipitated the government of India to dismiss Mr Cowan from the service and to transfer Mr Forsyth to Oudh after withdrawing the power to order excursions from him.

It caused a split between the government and its loyal Punjabi citizens as the latter opposed the said punishment tooth and nail in

their efforts to get the officers reinstated. On the other hand, they supported the action taken by the officials saying "We are happy that the government has adopted most appropriate and excellent measures for controlling this wicked and misguided sect, especially as the measures in question are calculated to deter ill-disposed people from committing mischief in future, and in the event of any member of this depraved sect committing crime to prevent suspicion falling on people of other sects, as happened in the case of the murder of the butcher at Amritsar .... And regarding the sect, as our enemies, we are thankful to the government for the measures which have been adopted whereby the desires of our hearts have been fulfilled." Was *inter alia* said in an Address presented by the Sikh Chiefs to the Lt. Governor of Punjab at Amritsar on 22<sup>nd</sup> March 1872.<sup>15</sup>

As a matter of fact, Satguru Ram Singh had become an eyesore for the rulers not merely for raising his hand against the authority but he had to pay the wages of his traits; including his organising technique, his command over the Hindus and Sikhs, appealing spirit of his mission to the people, the religious status being the main factor, prophecies in the scriptures regarding the incarnation of Satguru Ram Singh and the rule of Maharaja Dalip Singh as well as Namdharis' implicit faith in their correctness. Halo around the face of a person was perceived to be a cause of more concern for the rulers because they had already experienced that the dissociation of religiously attached people from any holy person was a hard nut to crack.

The alien rulers had learned much from the struggle launched earlier by Bhai Maharaj Singh whom the masses believed to be the successor of Guru Gobind Singh and religiously obeyed his commands during his struggle when the government had to eat many humble pies.<sup>16</sup> Exactly same was the case of Satguru Ram Singh whom too public took to be an incarnation of the tenth Guru<sup>17</sup> and the government was fully aware of it. Such a holy person neither could be prosecuted nor tried nor his unswerving followers weaned away from him.

The government dreaded the ideology of Guru Gobind Singh adopted and preached by the Namdharis. 'The prominence given by him in his preachings to the militant doctrines of Guru Gobind Singh revive the hopes of the more adventurous spirit who love to recall the transformation of their ancestors from Zemindars into sirdars. A common religion, nationality and ambition incline the secret sympathies of the non-Muhammedan population between the Jamna and Jhelam towards the new Guru's self reliant re-assertion of their own primitive mysticism, and they contemplate with troubled feelings of awe and admiration his practical confession of the faith that removes mountains,' had opined the Lt. Governor in his minutes.<sup>18</sup>

Satguru Ram Singh possessed an extraordinary organising skill. "No one who has seen and talked with Ram Singh will have failed to observe an intelligence, firmness, and decision of character, which coupled also with great self-restraint, do not belong to a mere religious enthusiast still less to a puppet."<sup>19</sup> Satguru Ram Singh had started his movement with recruitment of peasants and artisans who are regarded as the vertebrae of any movement. "In a sect which organizes itself into Districts, with rulers and sub-agents in each, and sends its emissaries to Lucknow or Hyderabad, or wherever Sikhs are to be found and arranges its tenets so that it carefully avoids anything really antagonistic to the Sikh religion, the political element cannot fail, after a while, to be the mainspring of action. Everything points to this, Ram Singh has no pretention to be the saintly fakir."<sup>20</sup>

"The movement was initiated by the anti-British activities of two different groups – Hindu Sanyasis and Muslim Faqirs, but they gained momentum from the support they received from the starving peasantry, dispossessed Zamindars and the disbanded soldiers." This assessment made by R.C. Majumdar about the Bengali movement aptly, accurately applied to the Namdhari Movement.<sup>21</sup>

The well to do families or Sikh Sardars and Chief had joined them later on which did not *augur* well for the government. "Now many men of position are joining the sect .... Ambala District swarms with men of good Sikh families, owning infinitesimal portion of "horsemen's share" in Jagirs, who have no ostensible means of livelihood, and who, though said not to be real fighters like the Majha Sikhs, form a population likely to favour a return of the Khalsa Raj. Amongst these people, the thing is likely to grow."<sup>22</sup> "... in the recent large accession to the numbers of the Kookas from the ranks of the Sikhs, and in the facts that while a few years ago, no men of good family and position had joined the new creed; there is now a considerable number of petty Sirdars and men of family among its avowed adherents".<sup>23</sup>

The organising skill of Satguru Ram Singh overawed the Government. The division of the entire land into twenty two sections, putting each under one lieutenant was remarkable. At a later stage, Lieutenant Governor had attributed the numerical fast progress of the Movement to also organising skill of the Guru adding that "Nor it must be forgotten that the strength of the Kuka sect is much increased by the completeness of its organisation."<sup>25</sup>

The popularity of Guru Ram Singh and objectivity of his mission was no less a headache for the Government which strove to cause communal differences and closely watched the proximity of the

orthodox Sikhs, who were regarded loyal to the British, to the Namdharis.

The Namdharis' faith in the scriptures and that the prophecies made in them regarding Guru Ram Singh and the rule of Maharaja Dalip Singh influenced the minds of the masses equally perturbed the government. "The real danger that creed in the form, which it has assumed consists in this, that it appeals strongly to the sympathies of large section of the Native community outside the circle of avowed Kookas. The denunciation of kine – killing and even the active measures taken against butchers at Raikote and Amritsar, have enlisted to a certain extent the sympathies of even well-disposed Hindoos; while the prediction of a restoration of the Khalsa appeal to the sympathies of all Sikhs who have not forgotten the traditions of the past."<sup>26</sup> "There is evidence... no doubt, to show that no general coalition exists at present between the orthodox Sikhs and the Kookas; but there is also evidence to show that the hostile feelings between these sects is less strong than before."<sup>27</sup>

His efforts to establish fraternal and political relations with neighbouring state of Nepal and raising a Regiment in Jammu and Kashmir army all exasperated the government. "There is no evidence further to show with what precise intention or with what success Kuka emissaries have visited distant parts of India or States on its northern border; but it may be safely presumed that the intention was political and not religious, from the open assertion of the Kookas, that they expect aid from Nepal and Kashmir, that the troops of Cis-Sutlej states would join them in the event of a rising and that the ranks of the British army contained numerous members of their creed."<sup>28</sup>

The credit for introducing some features for the first time in his Movement which the government could not expect, must go to Satguru Ram Singh. The government ostensibly was determined to punish the leaders of the Movement in a deterrent way. There was consensus on the trial of the Namdharis but the differences cropped up on the mode, places and timing of trial. Different officers had recommended various ways of trial which were pondered over seriously and adoptability was judged.

All political progress requires high aspirations, an enterprising spirit. "The will to do the soul to dare" and the purity and integrity of private and public life, and any movement which contributes to the growth of these virtues in a people, qualifies them for political effort and advancing on the path of political glory.<sup>29</sup> This was what Satguru Ram Singh had done and which frightened the rulers most.



The first problem was regarding the charges to be leveled against these rebels and it was understood that the subversion could be the best charge. "Nevertheless there can be no doubt, I think, from these papers that his (Guru Ram/ Singh) ultimate object and that of his whole sect was the subversion of all existing government and the establishment of his own political and religious supremacy and that the language and conduct of the entire body of leaders has been as seditious as could well be."<sup>30</sup> The government was of the view that the prisoners could be charged under the several clauses of the Penal Code with special stress on the following:

- (a) Waging war, attempting to wage war or abetting such war against the Queen. For this the punishment may be death. Act XLV of 1860 Section 121.
- (b) Conspiring to commit to any of the foregoing offences, or to deprive the Queen of Her over eighty, or to overawe the government by force. For this punishment may be transportation for life, Act XXXVII of 1869 Section 121A.
- (c) Preparing to wage war. For this punishment may be transportation for life, Act XLV of 1861 Sec.122.
- (d) Waging war, attempting to wage war, or abetting war against an allied Asiatic power, For this the punishment may be transportation for life, Act XLV of 1861 Section 125.
- (e) Committing depredation, or preparing to do so, on the territory of any such power, For this the punishment may be imprisonment for 7 years and fine, Act XLV of 1860 Section 126.
- (f) Exciting disaffection to Government by words. For this the punishment may be transportation for life. Act XXVII of 1860 Section 124A.
- (g) Abetting any of such offences, Act XLV of 1860 Section 107, 108.<sup>31</sup>

The government had two options before it regarding the punishment to these insurgents: One to try them in the court of law Two: to be deported outside the province or even India. The government seriously pondered over the question of trial in various ways one of which was to try them in open courts. But the Lieutenant Governor did not agree. He argued, "To bring the Kuka leaders to open trial would, in the opinion of the Lt. Governor, have a most disquieting effect..... and an acquittal, which in some cases, however strong the evidence, can not be considered impossible, would have a very undesirable effect."<sup>32</sup>

The recommendation for trial was discussed thoroughly at various levels, and objected to for certain reasons, the religiosity of the rebels being the main hurdle. It was argued that nobody in India could dare to



depose against the holy persons. In corroboration the case of Baba Sahib Singh Bedi of Una and descendent of Guru Nanak was cited against whom nobody was ready to fight when he had attacked Malerkotla in 1794.<sup>33</sup> So was the expectation with regard to Satguru Ram Singh.

Third proposal was something astonishing from the legal point of view. It was proposed that these leaders should be tried in those parts of the country where no Namdhari resides. In this way the government could enjoy the freedom in abusing its authority. At a later stage, when all the prisoners were confined at Allahabad, it was proposed to try them there,<sup>34</sup> “but supposing that satisfactory evidence could be procured against the prisoners at Allahabad, I think that it would be advisable to punish them and stamp out for ever all vestiges of the sect,” opined Burney.<sup>35</sup> Another suggestion was to file the case at the present moment but the trial should be started after a very long duration when the people, might have forgotten as to what had been said at the time of filing the case.<sup>36</sup>

The conviction of a person and the punishment awarded to a culprit is the outcome of legal procedure based on the strength of the evidence regarding one’s character, influence on the society and the quantity as well as the quality of his share in the crime leading to his prosecution.

The next legal requirement was reliable evidence against the prisoners. The government thought that in case of cases related to waging war against the Queen ‘the direct evidence would be the proceedings at Bhaini’...., the Headquarters of the Movement.<sup>37</sup> The government was not sure that the prosecution evidence would stand firm in the law courts. It was also afraid of the English Barristers ‘who not content with justly defending their clients (which is quite right) will go beyond all legitimate bounds, and raise a sort of political excitement, very detrimental to the minds of native people. Still sooner than let proven criminal go free, I would face the evils of a prosecution,’<sup>38</sup> was objected by a member, Richard Temple on the report submitted by J.W. Macnabb about the prisoners.

Some of the officials however were confident about the evidence of those persons who were under its control. Those were of the view that such persons would not go back in open court from their previous statements. It is probably known in their villages that they have given such evidence. They are for the most part persons connected with Government, as Zaildars and Lamberdars, who would have nothing to gain by unsaying what they have already stated.<sup>39</sup>

Major E.J. Miller, D.C. Gujranwala was also doubtful on this question and suspected if ‘the deposition taken by me on the 20<sup>th</sup> and

30<sup>th</sup> April and 22<sup>nd</sup> May last, in regard to the conduct of the Kukas Subah, will be adhered to in open court,' because the people who had deposed against the Wahabee Moulvie preaching sedition in the district Gujranwala gave a 'different colour to their statement, changing one of the expression entirely', as men got frightened at the idea of judicial enquiry, acted to lessen the risk of the Moulvie being brought to open trial.<sup>40</sup>

The government had tried its best to implicate Satguru Ram Singh first in the butcher murders or attacks on the slaughter houses. He was summoned at Bassian by the Deputy Commissioner Mr Cown in the same connection.<sup>41</sup> Thereafter the Government became extraordinarily active in the case of Malerkotla revolt but to its chagrin his complicity could not be proved in any case. There was no specific evidence against him in the latter case too.<sup>42</sup> Such was the situation in cases related to Hukma Singh, and Pahara Singh. '... there is not much evidence.' Against Kahn Singh Nihung as well.<sup>43</sup>

The Lieutenant Governor therefore was not sure of the success in court cases against the Namdhari rebels. He on the contrary remained apprehensive about the evidence 'which proves this is not at all of such a nature as to be placed on formal record' although the Lt. Governor believes that sufficient material has already been submitted to convince the Government of India of its corrections.<sup>44</sup> Lord Northbrook on 19<sup>th</sup> July 1872 tried to explore another possibility: that was 'whether there is sufficient evidence to commit them under Act of 1870?'<sup>45</sup>

The British political opinion, based on the apprehensions of the native Chiefs and Sardars, that if not exiled, disaffection caused by Satguru Ram Singh in the entire population eventually would result in the subversion of the British rule... "it is undoubtedly some such alarmed sense of the potency of the spell wielded by the Guru," apprehended the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, "that finds expression in the general relief experienced by the gentry of all denominations, not only in the deportation of himself and his leading Subahs, but also in the wholesale and terrifying execution precipitated at Kotla. It is to them as of some monstrous dragon had been killed, the very breath of which, had it been suffered to live, would have bred pestilence and mortality throughout the country."<sup>46</sup>

The Maharaja of Patiala, Mohindra Singh, who had been bestowed with a title of 'Farzand-i Arazwand Daulte Englishia'<sup>47</sup> was perhaps the most obedient and loyal ruler in the Punjab whose opinion was seldom ignored or disregarded by the government particularly in the context of the Namdharis and their Movement perhaps due to his inimical attitude towards them.... He had rammed the idea of an

imminent revolt into the minds of the higher authorities by equating the seriousness of the prevailing surcharged political atmosphere with that of 1857.

“In exciting this prejudice his (of Satguru Ram Singh) motive was (as under the religious pretext, the “cartridge” prejudice subverted and visited the whole of India in 1857) that by means of this ignitable match he may stir up and excite the feelings of the Hindu community (including the nobility, gentry and the troops) to sympathise and stand up in support of this common cause of hatred against the rulers of the country, anticipating a result from this confusion that in every class and grade of the community he would be held with respect and awe, and thus establish a powerful sway over them, of which he was long in earnest. Had not this appalling punishment been inflicted so promptly upon the insurgents as had been the case, and had not Ram Singh been instantly deported with his Subas from his home, there was no hope of the disturbance being quelled so soon, and no doubt there would have been an endless waste of money and life before full tranquillity and confidence would have been restored.”<sup>48</sup>

The government therefore was contemplating and concentrating on the exemplary and deterrent punishment to these rebels, not only for attempting waging a war against the Queen but also for the proximity, which the authorities presumed to be recently developed, of the masses to the Namdharis, particularly that of the Hindus to the Sikhs and of the latter to the Namdharis with special emphasis on those orthodox Sikhs, who were regarded as the most loyal subjects of the British but who now were looked upon with some suspicion due to their closeness to the Namdharis.

It is evident from the documents that the government though was determined to get rid of the Namdhari leaders for good but the lack of reliable evidence that could stand the trial in the court of law was a great impediment. It had examined all the options before it carefully but on this question it had been stumbling along.

“... it may perhaps be deemed a strong measure to use Regulation III of 1818 to the extent contemplated. But it is to be remembered that almost beyond moral doubt all the prisoners have been concerned in crimes which would have subjected them to transportation for life if proved conspiring to wage war against the Queen, seditious preachings and teaching, abetment of murder and of rebellion with murder. These are the offences with one or more of which everyone of the prisoners is at least on strong grounds charged....”<sup>49</sup>

The government had made up its mind to apply the Regulation of 1818 even in case of failure in the court. The argument to be extended in that case was that ‘the verdict could not possibly be an acquittal, but merely a record of “not proven” ....’<sup>50</sup>

All these factors cumulatively emboldened otherwise an infirm government to get rid of all the legal perplexities by resorting to the deportation of all the leaders with the exception of Sardar Mangal Singh of Bishanpura, under the Bengal Regulation III of 1818, as the State Prisoners to very distant and different places in India and abroad. This was perhaps the largest number of the rebels arrested at a single place and time and deported at State Prisoners under the said Regulation during our freedom struggle Sardar Mangal Singh being a relative of Maharaja Patiala, was arrested and released on the recommendation of the Maharaja on the fulfilment of the condition of Kukaism.<sup>51</sup>

The government actually aimed at killing two birds with one stone. On one hand the deportation would have relieved it from the onerous task of coping with the leaders. On the other, it presumed that in this way it may succeed in severing the contacts between the leaders and the led "... the Hon. Lieut. Governor is convinced that the removal of the Kooka leaders from India is necessary in the interest of general tranquillity. As long as Ram Singh and his Lieutenants remain in the country, so long will his followers predict and expect his speedy return, and will continue to intrigue against the Government and remain a constant source of anxiety. With his absolute removal from India, the restless and excited feelings now in existence in the Punjab may reasonably be expected to decline and in time to disappear."<sup>52</sup> Captain Cecil Beadon seemed to be very sure in his assessment. 'It is my private opinion that in another ten years Kukaism, wanting a recognised head, will die a natural death.'<sup>53</sup>

It is evident that the Government had no evidence against the leaders of the Movement that may prove them guilty in the court of law of the charges they were prosecuted for.

Unfortunately the available documents pertaining to these cases show that the might had become the right and as the government was determined to get rid of such dangerous rebels by hook or by crook, it did what it wanted to do. One of the periodicals which pleaded the Namdaris' case in many ways was deprived of its editor, Mr. James Routledge, who had to leave India<sup>54</sup> evidently for his bold stand against the official policy and actions.

Legality of the punishment was questioned in the columns of a contemporary periodical. Why does not our contemporary inform us of the reports regarding the Raipore Kukas, and where does he tell us that an application from Ram Singh to a court of law "will not be permitted." In this last sentence in spited; Do we not know that Courts of law are the "instruments" by which the British Government preserves order, or in a general kind of way does justice? Yes we know this, but

if Ram Singh, whom we have deported to Rangoon, without the intervention of the aforesaid instruments, venture to apply to them for aid, we will show you how we can stretch our broad principles.<sup>55</sup>

It also appears that the said rebels were not given an appropriate opportunity of defending themselves or of cross-examining the witnesses as is provided in the British legal system as a right of the accused. Impossibility of trial in the courts of law itself proves the hollowness of legal validity of the application of the Regulation III of 1818 in the cases under discussion ..... for the Government itself violated it (sacred principle of trial under the law) by detaining Baba Ram Singh and his ten Subas for life under Regulation III of 1818.<sup>56</sup>

### NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Sanehi, Swaran Singh, 'Forgery in Amritsar Butcher Murder Case, 1871', *Punjab Historical Conference Proceedings*, session xviii.
2. Macauliffe, M.A., *The Sikh Religion*, Oxford, 1902 Int. liv.
3. Memoranda regarding Guru Ram Singh, 28 Jan 1863 NAI.
4. Home Deptt., Judicial A. June 1872, Nos.112-32.
5. From Commissioner Umballa to Secretary, Government of Panjab, dated 11-9-1866.
6. Ibid.
7. From L. Cowan to T.D. Forsyth dated 17 February 1872.
8. Home Deptt., Judicial A. June 1872, Nos.112-32.
9. Home Deptt., Judicial Part A, Feb. 1872, No.7-20.
10. Ibid.
11. Home Deptt., Judicial Part A, 13 January 1872, No.52-63.
12. Home Deptt., Judicial Part A, June 1872, No.112-32.
13. Home Deptt., Judicial Part A, June 1872, No.107-111.
14. Friend of India, Calcutta, 8 February 1872.
15. Home Deptt., Judicial Part A, 1873, No.124-26.
16. Nahar Singh, ed. Documents related to Bhai Maharaj Singh, Ludhiana nd
17. Bawa Nihal Singh, Khurshid-i Khalsa, Foreign Deptt., June 1886.
18. Home Deptt., Judicial, Part A, June 1872, No.107-111.
19. Home Deptt., Judicial Part A, June 1872, Nos.112-32.
20. Ibid.
21. Majumdar, R.C., *History of the Freedom Movement in India*, Calcutta, 1971, p.116.
22. Home Deptt., Judicial Part A, June 1872, Nos.112-32.
23. Home Deptt., Judicial Part A, February 1872, No.7-20.
24. Home Deptt., Judicial Part A, August 1872, No.273-84.
25. Home Deptt., Judicial Part A, June 1872, No.107-111.

26. Home Deptt., Judicial Part A, February 1872, No.7-20.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid.
29. Narang, Sir Gokal Chand, *Transformation of the Sikhs*, Lahore, 1945, p.26.
30. Home Judicial, August 1872, Progs. 273-84.
31. From Lapel Griffin to the Officiating Secretary, Government of India, Home, dated 28 June 1872.
32. From Lapel Griffin to H.L. Dampier, Secretary to Government of India, dated 30.9.1872.
33. Lapel Griffin, Rajas of Punjab, Patiala, (r), 1970, p.72.
34. From R.W. Trafford, Officiating D.C. Sialkot to C.M. Rivaz, Officiating under Secretary, Punjab, 23.9.1872.
35. Mr. R.T. Burney, Officiating D.C. Ferozepur to Officiating Under Secretary, Government of Punjab, dated 23.9.1872.
36. From Lapel Griffin to H.L. Dampier, Secretary to Government of India, dated 30.9.1872.
37. From Lapel Griffin to the Officiating Secretary, Government of India, Home, dated 28 June 1872.
38. Remarks by Sir Richard Temple on the Report submitted by Macnabb, dated 27.2.1872.
39. From R.W. Trafford, D.C. Sialkote, to Under Secretary, Government of Punjab dated 23.9.1872.
40. From Major F.J. Miller, D.C. Gujranwala to Under Secretary, Government of Punjab dated 23.9.1872.
41. Nahar Singh Namdhari Itihas, Delhi, 1965, p.334.
42. From Lapel Griffin to the Officiating Secretary, Government of India, Home, dated 28 June 1872.
43. Ibid.
44. Home Deptt., Judicial, Part A, Feb. 1872, No.7-20.
45. From Lapel Griffin to the Officiating Secretary, Government of India, Home, dated 28 June 1872.
46. Home Deptt., Judicial, Part A, June 1872, No.107-111.
47. Bilga, Bhagat Singh, Anfole Warke, Jalandhar, 1989, p.240.
48. From Maharaja of Patiala to Lapel Griffin, dated 12.2.1872.
49. Home Judicial, August 1872, Progs. 273-84.
50. Home Deptt., Judicial A, June 1872, Nos.112-32.
51. Foreign Deptt., Pol. Pt. B, July 1873, Nos.102-3.
52. Home Deptt., Judicial, Part A, February 1872, No.7-20.
53. From C. Beadon, D.C. Ludhiana to the Officiating Secretary, Government of Punjab, dated 22.9.1872.
54. *The Hindu Patriot*, dated 25 Nov. 1872.
55. *The Englishman*, Calcutta, dated 14.6.1872.
56. Fauja Singh, *Dr. Kuka Movement*, Delhi, 1965, p.111.