

# COLONIAL ARUNACHAL PRADESH AND CONTESTED SPACE: TIME IN REFLECTION

Prasanta Kumar Nayak\*

## Abstract

India might look like a phenomenon totemising a unified, integrated, all-embracing independence, and appear macrocosmically one, but, in reality, it is microcosmically many - a typically polycentric construct. Such polycentrism invites a dispassionate analysis of the nuances of the Indian states and their society. It too by itself warrants a relooking through the lens of historical reconstruction. This paper looks at a multitude of events, metaphors, memories and the magnitude of affairs, policies, strategies, skirmishes, quelling and treaties in colonial Arunachal Pradesh reflected through a critical thinking of the period with theorization of time and also attempts to analyze selected events, processes and structures to develop a perspective on an emerging Arunachal Pradesh.

*Key words:* Occident, Utilitarian School, Colonial Politics, Polycentric Construct, Historical Construction, Theorization of Time

## Colonial Arunachal Pradesh and Contested Space: Time in Reflection

Quite apropos is the disposition in the pedagogic and institutional world that stereotypes about the East are the result of the historical, cultural and political legacies of colonialism. The Occident overpowered the Orient and the latter could be constructed and construed as a protégé-transposition of the former, symbolizing the portrayal of the 'other' of western culture (Bery & Murray, 2000). The ideology of the Colonial Empire nomenclated and transfixed the

\*Department of History Rajiv Gandhi University (Central) Rono Hills, DOIMUKH Arunachal Pradesh - 791 112

image of the East, decimating its entity to an understanding of 'the other', particularly with regard to intellectual discourse on Indian society, culture and systems which Richard King calls 'the politics of representation' (King, 1999), the 'othering' of the East and the colonial discourse analysis of Western fantasies and constructions about India and Europe.

'Self' and 'other' in the rubrics of postmodernism represent the restrictive relationship between subjects who occupy opposite positions on the centre/margin models of race, gender and political power relations. The concept of self or other is a binary ideological, linguistic, philosophical, psychoanalytic and social construction that talks of a state of ideal existence against one of non-existence. The relationship between the 'self' and the 'other' goes to suggest that the 'I' of the self cannot exist without the 'non-I' or the non-entity of the other. Hence, self is 'self to other' and other is 'other to self', one ascertaining the existence of the other and vice versa. Scholars of Marxist, postcolonial and race theories see the self vs. other debate as one of domination and exclusion that holds inequitable power relations in favour of imperialistic, racist and other ideologically oppressive conditions. The feminists call it patriarchal. Ashis Nandy makes valid observation in the context of the above discussion held. He writes:

It did make Western man definitionally non-Eastern and handed him a self image and world-view which were basically responses to the needs of colonialism....The 'discovery' of the Orient... was designed to expel the other Orient, which had once been a part of medieval European consciousness as an archetype and a potentiality (Nandy, 1983).

The multitude of events, metaphors, memories and the magnitude of affairs, policies, strategies, skirmishes, quelling sand treaties in Arunachal Pradesh during the colonial period still reverberate. The volume of research and the broader spectrum of cogitation cascade across the lanes of memory. Some get snapped, stalled and obscure avenues to comprehend and grapple with the challenges to the state and society, polity and culture. The continuation of 'Posa' (type of taxation where certain commodities are paid to tribals of nearby hilly areas to stop them from raiding) by the Ahom administration; establishing relations with the tribes; organizing trade fairs at several *duars* (foothills of the eastern Himalayas in North-East India; *duar* means 'door'); skirmishes and resistance of the tribes as recalcitrant measures; the institutions of NEFT, Hopkinson's Proposals, Inner Line, Outer Line, McMahan Line, Simla Conference etc.; the

Anglo-Abor War; and the expeditions carried from time to time by the British were but the events to follow in Arunachal Pradesh. Hence the task of reflecting on the period with theorization of time seems provocatively challenging as it requires new conceptual tools for critical thinking. This paper is a modest attempt at analyzing selected events, processes and structures to develop a perspective on an emerging Arunachal Pradesh and its people who take up the daunting challenge while facing the million mutinies in the course of their otherwise uneventful daily lives.

Centuries of foreign (mis)rule relegated the average Indian to an indeterminate state with all possible escape-routes blocked. 'Enlightenment', 'Civilising Mission', 'Downward Filtration Theory' and few other piece-meal philanthropic projects that the British undertook, elevated India to a temporary flight. Cultural subjugation was in the process of beginning. The mask of the 'greatest good of the greatest number' of the Benthamite Utilitarianism was to shortly explode into fission. The Kiplingian dictum 'East is East, West is West and Never the Twain shall meet' spoke the mind of the 'self' world. The identity politics or ethics was seen schooled out there from all such projects schemed by the British.

In academic usage, the term 'identity politics' has been used to refer to a wide range of political activities and theoretical analysis rooted in experiences of injustice shared by different social groups. In this usage, identity politics typically aims to reclaim greater self-determination and political freedom for marginalized groups through understanding their distinctive nature and challenging externally imposed characterizations, instead of being organized solely around belief systems or party affiliations (Heyes, 2016). Identity is used "as a tool to frame political claims, promote political ideologies, or stimulate and orientate social and political action, usually in a larger context of inequality or injustice and with the aim of asserting group distinctiveness and belonging and gaining power and recognition" (Neofotistos, 2018).

Kwame Anthony Appiah, British-born American philosopher and a Laurance S. Rockefeller University Professor of Philosophy at Princeton University says that there is a way of explaining why identity matters. 'Identity' may not be the best word for bringing together the roles gender, class, race, nationality, and so on play in our lives, but it is the one we use. One problem with 'identity': it can suggest that everyone of a certain identity is in some strong sense *idem*, i.e., the same, when in fact; most groups are internally quite heterogeneous, partly because each of us has many identities (Appiah, 2006).

### Structures and Processes

For a discussion of the issue in the light of contested historical space, we need to look at the era of liberalism and utilitarianism that England was to pass through during her period of colonial expansion and consolidation. Structures were served ready with new trends of political philosophy and stages of economy (mercantilism-capitalism-finance capitalism) that Europe experienced and was impacted upon. England was a major beneficiary of the same trend which almost became the *modus operandi* of its colonial policy towards India. Subsequently, political, administrative, economic, evangelical, and philanthropic processes were undertaken for the governance of the colony in a liberal and utilitarian mode. War, diplomacy, strategy, isolation, subjugation, buffering, intervention, no-intervention, insularity and compensation became the viable alternatives to implement their processes. Events happening in India received the attention of the British with such structures and processes as the backdrop.

Liberalism is a political and moral philosophy based on liberty, consent of the governed, and equality before the law. Associated with thinkers John Locke and Montesquieu, it is a political movement that has spread over the last four centuries. The Glorious Revolution of 1688 in England brought in the modern liberal state, constitutionally limiting the power of the monarch, affirming parliamentary supremacy, passing the Bill of Rights and establishing the principle of “consent of the governed”. Liberalism became a distinctive movement in the Age of Enlightenment, when it became popular among Western philosophers and economists. Liberalism sought to replace the norms of hereditary privilege, state religion, absolute monarchy, the divine right of kingship, traditional conservatism with representative democracy and the rule of law. Liberals also ended mercantilist policies, royal monopolies and other barriers to trade, instead promoting free markets (Gould, 1999).

French intellectual Michel Foucault locates the emergence of liberalism, both as a political philosophy and a mode of governance, in the sixteenth century (Foucault *et. al*, 1991). To him, it was through a double movement of state centralization on the one hand and of dispersion and religious dissidence on the other that this problem of government presented itself clearly for the first time (Foucault *et. al*, 1991). Liberalism, as a ‘rationality’ of governing was, in Foucault’s mind, unique from other previous technologies of governing, as it had as its foundation the assumption that human behaviour should be governed, in the pursuit of fostering the idea that society be

understood as a realm separate from the state, not just something that was drawn of and violated in order to strengthen the state (Rose *et.al*, 2006). In a Foucauldian sense, liberalism did not emerge as a doctrine of how to simply govern people, but rather as a technology of governing that arose from the timeless critique of excessive government- “a search for a technology of government that could address the recurrent complaint that authorities were governing too much” (Rose *et.al*, 2006).

The Glorious Revolution of 1688 in England laid the foundations for the development of the modern liberal state by constitutionally limiting the power of the monarch, affirming parliamentary supremacy, passing the Bill of Rights and establishing the principle of “consent of the governed”. Historically, the term referred to the broad liberal political alliance of the nineteenth century, formed by Whigs, Peelites, and radicals. This alliance, which developed into the Liberal Party, dominated politics for much of the reign of Queen Victoria and during the years before the First World War. In the United Kingdom, scholars use the term *liberalism* to refer to *classical liberalism-economic liberalism, social liberalism or political liberalism*. The British politician William Wilberforce (1759-1833) talked of liberal parliamentary reforms. He and Zachary Macaulay (1768-1838), the Scottish statistician founded the anti-slavery society. The British Parliamentary Act of 1833 went liberal by abolishing slavery. The Luddite Movement of 1812 which emerged during the harsh economic climate of the Napoleonic Wars objected primarily to the rising popularity of automated textile equipment, threatening the jobs and livelihoods of skilled workers as this technology allowed them to be replaced by cheaper and less skilled workers (Conniff, 2011).

Utilitarianism is a moral theory that advocates actions that promote overall happiness or pleasure and rejects actions that cause unhappiness or harm. A utilitarian philosophy, when directed to making social, economic, or political decisions, aims for the betterment of society. “The greatest amount of good for the greatest number of people” is a maxim of utilitarianism. It is a tradition stemming from the late 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century English philosophers and economists Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and John Stuart Mill (1806-73) that an action is right if it tends to promote happiness and wrong if it tends to produce the reverse of happiness - not just the happiness of the performer of the action but also that of everyone affected by it. Bentham’s major philosophical work, *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1789) speaks about the

greatest happiness of the greatest number playing a role primarily in the art of legislation, in which the legislator would seek to maximize the happiness of the entire community by creating an identity of interests between each individual and his fellows.

With Bentham, Utilitarianism became the ideological foundation of a reform movement, later known as “philosophical radicalism” that would test all institutions and policies by the principle of utility. Bentham attracted as his disciples a number of younger (earlier 19th-century) men. They included David Ricardo, who gave classical form to the science of economics and James Mill, father of John Stuart Mill. James Mill argued for representative government and universal male suffrage on utilitarian grounds; he and other followers of Bentham were advocates of parliamentary reform in England in the early 19th century. John Stuart Mill was a spokesman for women's suffrage, state-supported education for all, and other proposals that were considered radical in their day. He argued on Utilitarian grounds for freedom of speech and expression and for the non-interference of government or society in individual behaviour that did not harm anyone else. Mill's essay “Utilitarianism”, published in *Fraser's Magazine* (1861), is an elegant defense of the general Utilitarian doctrine and perhaps remains the best introduction to the subject. Utilitarianism is viewed in it as an ethics for ordinary individual behaviour as well as for legislation.

To understand the nature and character of the British policy in India, it is necessary to acquaint ourselves with the major assumptions, attitudes and purpose of the administrators and policy-makers, and the dominant schools of thought they belonged to. During the first phase of the empire in the pre-1857 period, three schools of thought - the Orientalist, the Evangelists and the Utilitarian competed to control British attitude and policy towards India. The views and sympathy of the Orientalists (Charles Wilkins, William Jones, Henry Colebrook, Thomas Munroe, H. H. Wilson etc.) for the Indians and their ancient institutions came to be challenged by the other two schools. The 18<sup>th</sup> century age of reason asked the West to put India in the category of a static culture. Evangelists like John Shore and Charles Grant and the missionaries urged the application of Christianity and Western education to change Indian society. They found that their objectives had to reckon with the rationalist-utilitarian. Benthamite utilitarian philosophy held above all that the test of anything - any institution whether political, religious or social - is its utility. A thing, if useful is to be accepted and if not, to be reformed or discarded. Reform could be effected through

universal education and governmental legislation. The utilitarians believed with evangelical zeal in the efficacy of laws, and of reform on utilitarian lines to make whole societies and civilizations.

For James Mill's *The History of British India* (1817), the infusion of Western ideas and knowledge into Indian culture by proper laws administered by a despotic government became the ideological feeder. His predominant motive in writing this book was his desire to apply the utilitarian doctrine to the governance of India. He saw in the new Indian Empire, a fertile space for utilitarian reform toward which arguments were to be supplied by the decadent state of life and culture in India. Ricardo praised Mill's work to the skies. Macaulay spoke of it in the House of Commons as "the greatest historical work which has appeared in our language since that of Gibbon" (Philips, 1977). The work became so popular that it went into many editions - 1818, 1820, 1826, 1840, 1848 and 1858. It was also prescribed as a standard textbook at Haileybury College upto 1855, where the Company's civil service recruits were trained (Sreedharan, 2014). The radical alteration of Indian society on utilitarian lines recommended by Mill seemed to suit the aims and needs of British imperialism. The British administrators who came out to India began to entertain illusions of the permanence of that rule. The British Indian administration moved into a phase of imperial dogmatism and complacency regarding its achievements in India.

The belief in race superiority and its relation to imperial domination was nourished by pseudo-scientific evolutionary theories such as the 'survival of the fittest', the Aryan master-race, and Social Darwinism. The very fact that Europeans were able to beat non-Europeans in war told them that in terms of evolution and progress, they were better fit to survive than the non-Europeans. They felt that white men were simply better specimens of the human species than coloured men, and this racial superiority carried with it a mandate to rule over those thought to be racially inferior. The imperialist argument based on the White man's special right to rule was given a moral and humanitarian cover. Ethical imperialism emphasized the humanitarian task of bringing about good governance, education, material improvement and moral elevation of the colonial peoples under the White man's care.

## Events

Keeping all such structures and processes discussed above as a backdrop we can move on to the policies, strategies, expeditions,

explorations, missions, wars and battles, I call them as events, undertaken by the British in India. Events themselves as viewed by the Annales, are constituted largely by the force of many different conjunctural and structural circumstances. These circumstances outweigh the reasoning and choices of individual men and women and do so differently in different epochs (Sreedharan, 2014). For this reason the historian would be in complete error to think of the springs of action as uniform. The events highlighted earlier in the paper that were happening in India during the colonial period were but the expeditious outcomes of the ongoing academic and political expediency arising out of the political and economic structures and processes followed subsequently.

But we see a different experience of the term 'identity' whereby the Western-self is victimized by the 'othering' of the East and hence goes on to claim greater self-determination and political freedom for itself, say England as an example, which professes the same for the entire period of colonial India. To prove its identity over India, Britain transforms its character from a 'trading company' seeking Mughal patronage from time to time to an 'established power' controlling the political space after the Carnatic war. Confronted by France, the European contours of the power struggle proved tough for Britain. The same was the situation experienced here in India, neither negotiated with the other. It is the 'means' which justified the 'end', rather than the 'end' justifying the 'means'. It is the identity of power which constructed the identity of the British in India and coerced them to strategize structures of their policies, and streamline them through nodal processes for their own benefit. Events were bound to follow when their interests clashed and things did not develop as they desired.

The spiritual soul on which the very Indianness was constructed came to be enmeshed with the complexities of colonial politics in 19th century India. But such complexities could be challenged by the socio-religious reform movements - the Brahmo Samaj, Prarthana Samaj, Arya Samaj, and the Theosophical Society which largely turned revivalist, advocating the cause of India's rich cultural heritage and the pioneers of such movements - Raja Rammohun Roy, Keshab Chandra Sen, Swami Dayanand Saraswati, Madame Blavatsky and Annie Besant went on pursuing social reforms to unite different ethnic communities who were discriminated against on the basis of language, traditions and practice. Other reformers like Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar, Acharya Vinoba Bhave, Jyotiba Phule, Baba Amte and Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar worked hard against



social discrimination and sought amelioration of the sufferings of the depressed - the widows, the dalits and the downtrodden. Since religion was a core element of Indian life, all such initial movements questioned the activities of the religio-cultural micro-centres and helped them move onto the path of unity.

The last decades of the nineteenth century witnessed the awakening of an unprecedented political consciousness among the Indian elite who spoke of native identity and nationalism. The formation of the Indian National Congress in 1885, despite being termed 'a microscopic minority' was a right move on such a path of providing space for political liberalization, increased autonomy and social reforms. Away from the moderates' mendicancy, prayer and petition methods, the nationalist movement assumed a radical and violent colour in Bengal and Punjab. Partition of Bengal in 1905, schemed to cleave unity, backfired and stimulated radical nationalist sentiments to go revolutionary. The pre-Gandhian *Swadeshi* movement was an economic strategy to boycott foreign goods and popularize indigenous ones through domestic production. The 'Spinning Wheel' became Gandhian by soul and national by spirit. Gandhi could not think of *swaraj* (self-rule) without *swadeshi*. *Swadeshi* was the soul of *swaraj*.

The British policy of subjugation and suppression was countered by the Gandhian concept of *Satyagraha* (power of truth) with strict adherence to *ahimsa* (non-violence). Leading a revolution against the alien government without resorting to violence was an incredible culture that the British found developing in India. Gandhi's equally strict adherence to democracy, religious and ethnic equality, brotherhood and his absolute rejection of caste and untouchability worked miracles on the path of unity. His success in the Champaran and Kheda movements encouraged people to have enough confidence in him, leading to protests against the alien rule. His historic 'Dandi March' in 1930 leading the Salt Satyagraha that took off across the Indian coastline, gave the younger nationalists courage to counter the British regime. Equally significant was his Quit India Movement, the last nail in the coffin of British Imperialism which inspired almost all sections of the Indian society to get involved in it for the sole cause of India's independence. The analysis of major events during the period in question leads us now to explore the processes and structures which eventually helped in the assertion and articulation of Indian identity. After consolidating their position in the Indian territories, the British intervened in social life and took numerous steps to improve the socio-economic and political systems. Bentinck's 'Prohibition of Sati and Female Infanticide' (1829),

Dalhousie's 'Doctrine of Lapse' (1848), Canning's 'Indian Council's Act' (1861), Ripon's 'Ilbert Bill' (1883), Morley-Minto Reforms (1909), Dyarchy (1919) and Government of India Act (1935) created the space for the enlightened Indians to introspect. Similarly, the Macaulay Minute of 1835 (a take away from the Orientalist-Anglicist Controversy) and Wood's Dispatch of 1854 (often known as the Magna Carta of English education in India), apart from promoting English education also made the upward progression of a rising middle class possible. Though these measures are viewed at times, as an excuse for British misrule and racism. Lord Macaulay exhibited great contempt for Indian customs and literature and made a prejudiced statement, "a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia". (Grover & Grover, 2003; in reality, these tenets of liberal imperialism promoted 'rebellion and resistance' (Mantena, 2010).

If we look into British relations with Arunachal Pradesh, we find the same being established in a different space and time. The British negotiated with the Aka in Western Arunachal as early as 1825, followed by the Sherdukpen in 1836 and the Bhutia in 1838; in the Central region, British relations began with the Adi as early as 1825, with the Nyishi in 1835 and with the Apatani in 1895; in the East, they had established relations with the Mishmi and Singpho as early as 1825 and with the Khampti in 1830 (Bose, 1979; Pandey & Tripathy, 1997; Singh, 1989).

The British policy on *Posa* depended on the then prevalent structures and processes of the British Imperial state. Continuation of *Posa* bequeathed to them by the Ahom legacy spoke enough of civil libertarian attempts undertaken in the state. Misconstrued by the conflicting visions of the British administrators, the *Posa* got portrayed by different connotations - "blackmail" or "an uncertain ill-defined exaction" or "a well ascertained revenue payment on account of which a corresponding remission was made in the state demand upon the ryot" (Barpujari, 1970) or was compared with 'the Chouth of the Mahrattas and blackmail of the ancient Highlanders' (Mills, 1984). It was the first priority of the local British officers "to maintain intact the arrangements of their native predecessors and to avoid the appearance of anything like radical or unexpected change" (Mackenzie, 1979). The regulation of *posa* served the British purpose of maintaining peace on the frontier. Changes were made from time to time to suit the existing demand of the situation. Collection of *posa* in due course was commuted to cash. The recipient of *posa* and the state came to be directly related (Jha, 1996).

Why would the British go for a commutation? Captain Vetch, the Collector of Darrang proposed in 1838 that the Bhutia (commonly referred to as Monpa and Sherdukpen during the Ahom and British regimes) should instead be paid in cash in lieu of their right to *posa*. He estimated the revenue collection to reach somewhere between ten to twelve lakh rupees, and if the lands were settled with the cultivators that would leave a good surplus after paying the *posa* to the Bhutia. That would also lead to the extension of British authority upto the foot hills and the right of the British army to march through the Bhutia hills when that was deemed necessary (Pandey & Tripathy, 1997). In 1844, a series of treaties, popularly known as the Aitchison's Treaties were signed by the British with different tribes such as the Monpa, the Sherdukpen and the Aka, presently living in the western part of the state.

Initially, the British desired to raise revenue collection through extension of cultivating areas which could not materialize unless ryots were allowed to feel secure in an atmosphere of peace. Since the state was Imperial under the British, the strategic interest of the empire and the economic interest of the capital invested in Colonial India as a sequel to the transformational economic changes experienced in England and Europe, were the motivating processes behind the changes in the *posa* system. Cash payments were introduced to encourage use of British products in the hills (Bose, 1979) and to reorient the trans-border trade (Mills, 1984). Payment of *posa* to the tribal chiefs in the annual fairs was spent by them immediately there itself (Bose, 1979) and the gifts given to them on the occasion gradually induced them to use cheaper British factory products. Such events naturally helped draw out the stratification within the tribal societies. The power of the state was indirectly used to strengthen an economic nexus between the Imperial State and the chiefs monopolising the payment of *posa*. The kingship and kinship combined into the institution of traditional chiefs was gradually made to serve the interest of the state. That was the need of the time.

The British followed the Ahom policy of non-intervention and conciliation towards the tribes. Since the hills of the Assam Frontier were neither contributing to the economic advantage of the British nor even threatening them, they wished not to disturb the British-tribal relationship continuing until then. The relations of the tribes towards the British hence remained the same as earlier. But the relations began to change after the discovery of the wild tea-plants in Assam, mostly situated in the foot-hills. The British could neither

leave these foothills to their fate nor endure tribes raiding them now and then. They were not even in a position to subjugate the tribes by sending troops into the hills. Hence, a policy of reconciliation towards the tribes of Arunachal backed by the display of force when necessary started to be followed.

In 1862, Col. Henry Hopkinson, Commissioner of Assam, had proposed to the Government of Bengal a mechanism of how to administer the North-East Frontier Tract (presently Arunachal Pradesh). Looking at the nature of language used by him in his proposal, one can easily understand the politics of 'self' and 'other' created by Western fantasy towards the East, i.e., India. He writes that, "in restraining the savage tribes, which infest our frontier, reliance cannot be placed in one course of policy, but there must be a ready adaptation of expedients to suit ever varying circumstances; sometimes we must apply coercion, pure and simple, sometimes blockade; very often a judicious system of subsidizing will keep the tribes quiet for long while, but still the surest foundation on which to build our control over them will be their fear of us" (Pandey & Tripathy, 1997).

The economic viability of Assam with her rich minerals, oil fields and tea encouraged the British colonialists to ensure that the people of the hills did not resent the entry of the outsiders into the hills. They also had the desire to exploit the forests to the benefit of the British exchequer. Trade fairs were organised along the foot hills where the tribes could do business. All such events proved to be the prelude to the promulgation of the Inner Line Regulation in 1873. The first administrative measure adopted by the British inside the tribal area was the appointment of J. F. Needham as Assistant Political Officer at Sadiya in 1882. The status quo was maintained until 1911-12 when the British felt alarmed at the presence of the Chinese and Russians on the borders. Mobilisation of forces and missions on to the borders to deter the foreigners' presence across the Abor (Adi) hills led to the murder of Captain Noel Williamson and Medical Officer Dr. J. D. Gregorson on 31<sup>st</sup> March, 1911 in the village of Komsing, an event the state records as a policy of resentment against British incursion and imperialism.

At about the same time, in 1911, the Zinhai Revolution had made inroads in China and the British had apprehended the downward movement of the Chinese towards the borders, close to the Adi and Mishmi hills. To check their movement down south and to obtain information about the strategy of the Chinese forward movement plans upto Wallong, Noel Williamson was asked to captain the

team. His murder expedited the punitive British expedition into the Abor country. Two of the exploratory missions to Mishmi hills also came in quick succession in 1911-12 and 1912-13 and succeeded in mapping the entire Mishmi country and the course of the river Dibang. In 1912, the events in the Adi hills compelled the British to bring about a change in the system of administration in the Frontier Tract. The immediate result was the creation of new administrative zones - the 'Central and Eastern Sections of the North-East Frontier' with Sadiya and the 'Western Section' with Balipara as the respective headquarters, controlled by the Political Officers. In 1914, the two zones were nomenclated as the 'Sadiya Frontier Tract' and 'Balipara Frontier Tract'. All these events go to suggest that there was a strong action of colonial intervention, consolidation and expansion of the British Empire up to the Chinese southern frontier across the present state of Arunachal Pradesh as felt required from time to time with changes of administration introduced and made effective on areas the British had control over.

The policy of 'non-intervention' was changed to the policy of 'active intervention'. Lord Minto, then the Viceroy of India capitalized this opportunity to drive his policy towards the North-Eastern Hills. Subsequent expeditions prepared the space for the Simla Conference to materialize on 6<sup>th</sup> October, 1913, to finally delineate the McMahon Line as the International Boundary between India and China. The onset of the First World War and subsequent departure of Henry McMahon, Foreign Secretary, Government of India to Egypt relegated the issue of the McMahon Line into files until 1937 when the Survey of India authenticated it as the north-eastern boundary of India. It continues to remain the same till today.

The above discussion in the context of colonial India and Arunachal Pradesh sketches out the fundamentals of the schemes of the Occident to overpower the Orient, symbolizing and portraying the latter as the 'other' to the Occident 'self'. The ideology of the Colonial Empire nomenclated and transfixed the image of the East, and could decimate it down to an entity-non-entity-understanding and accordingly structures, processes and events were planned, structured, and effected by taking into consideration their nature and expediency. India as a state (despite being treated as less than a state) stood vulnerable to the Imperial power to receive such treatment as and when thought expedient. It was the receptacle to accommodate the political, administrative, social and economic transformations that the British felt like introducing in India with the change that England was to go through in tandem with the

then contemporary dialectics prevalent within Western politics, philosophy and economy. Structures like Mercantilism-Capitalism-Finance Capitalism were proceeding towards encouraging processes like Liberalism-Utilitarianism-Colonialism as a sequel to change and allowed the other colonial states to be influenced, no matter what the nature of the states was. Intervention or non-intervention, isolation or non-isolation, coercion or non-coercion, expansion or non-expansion, conciliation or non-conciliation were but the byproducts of the changing colonial administrative policies implemented from time to time. Arunachal Pradesh too had the same kind of experience as the other areas of the country experimenting with the colonial 'self'. Events followed in various forms as discussed in the paper towards response and reaction against the colonial rule. The British policy in the North East and Arunachal Pradesh went beyond independence; it is still seen to have its impact while deciding issues in the socio-political and cultural arena. Time and space, theorized in history over the ages have provocatively challenged the scholars to conceptualize tools for critical thinking. The state as an individual entity looks out for a necessary concomitant position within the contested space.

## References

- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. (2006). The Politics of Identity, *Daedalus*. The MIT Press on behalf of American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Vol. 135. No. 4.
- On Identity (Fall, 2006). p.15; <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20028068>, accessed on 04.08.2019.
- Barpujari, H. K. (1970). *Problem of the Hill Tribes of the North-East Frontier (1822-42)*, Vol. I. Gauhati. p. 71.
- Bery, Ashok and Murray, Patricia.(2000) (ed.). *Comparing Postcolonial Literatures: Dislocations*, Basingstoke: Macmillan. pp. 1-17.
- Bose, M. L. (1979). *British Relations with Tribes of North-East Frontier*, New Delhi. pp. 48-85, pp. 176-77 & pp. 181-82; Pandey, D. & Tripathy, B. (1997). *A Comprehensive History of Arunachal Pradesh*, Pasighat. pp. 258-299 & pp. 340-41; Singh, Chandrika (1989). *Emergence of Arunachal Pradesh as a State*, Delhi. pp. 32-58.
- Conniff, Richard (2011). What the Luddites Really Fought Against, *Smithsonian Magazine*. March, smithsonianmag.com, Retrieved on 18 June 2013; <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/what-the-luddites-really-fought-against-264412/?all>; accessed on 18.8.2019.
- Foucault, M., G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (1991). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality: With two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*, University of Chicago Press. Chicago. pp. 88 & 92.

- Gould, Andrew. (1999). *Origins of Liberal Dominance*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. p. 3.
- Grover, B. L. & Grover, S. (2003). *A New Look at Modern Indian History*, S. Chand & Company Limited. New Delhi. p371; [http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00generallinks/macaulay/txt\\_minute\\_education\\_1835.html](http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00generallinks/macaulay/txt_minute_education_1835.html); accessed 'Minute by the Hon'ble T. B. Macaulay, dated the 2nd February 1835' on 18.08.19.
- Heyes, Cressida.(2016). Identity Politics, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab. Stanford University. 1 January, Archived from the original on 27 March 2017, Retrieved 3 May 2017; <http://stanford.library.sydney.edu.au/archives/sum2010/entries/identity-politics/>, accessed on 04.08.2019.
- Jha, B.N.(1996). Politics of Posa: A Case Study of Pre and Post Independence Scenario in Arunachal Pradesh and Assam, *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*. 57th Session. Madras University. p. 452.
- King, Richard.(1999). *Orientalism and Religion: Postcolonial Theory, India and the Mystic East*, Delhi: OUP. p. 3.
- Mackenzie, A.(1979). *The North-East Frontier of India* (first published in 1884 as *History of the Relations of Government with the Hill Tribes of North-East Frontier of Bengal*). Delhi. p21. Mantena, K.(2010). The Crisis of Liberal Imperialism, *Historie@Politique, Politique, Culture and Societe*. Web.
- Mills, A.J.M.(1984). Report on the Province of Assam, Second Edition. Gauhati. pp. 169 & 171.
- Nandy, Ashis.(1983). *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*, Delhi: OUP. p. 71.
- Neofotistos, Vasiliki. (2018). Identity Politics, *Oxford Bibliographies*. Oxford University Press. Archived from the original on 27 October 2018, Retrieved 18 February2019;<https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199766567/obo-9780199766567-0106.xml>, accessed on 04.08.2019.
- Philips, C.H.(1977).(Ed.) *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon*, Oxford University Press. London. p. 219.
- Rose, N., O'Malley, P. & Valverde, M.(2006). Governmentality, *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*. 2 (1). 83-104. p. 84.
- Sreedharan, E.(2014). *A Textbook of Historiography, 500 BC to AD 2000*, Orient Blackswan. New Delhi. pp. 275 & 404.