CHAPTER 1

Introduction

What is history? This question has agitated the minds of the historians, philosophers, sociologists, and social thinkers through the ages. Without going into detail it is generally accepted that history is a subject which studies the evolution of society and its evolving processes. The Marxists have characterised history as a succession of social formation, the classical sequence of which has been established as Primitive Communism, - Slavery,- Feudalism,- Capitalism. The orthodox Marxists have been criticised for holding a unilinear view of history by the ideologues of historical materialism who have refuted that Marx and later Marxists are not firm on this issue. According to them historical evolution, need not necessarily be unilinear. It was multilinear or plural. The study of social formation as a concept has come into vogue in recent times - it made a beginning only with the modern structuralists. The introduction of this new concept was necessitated by the limitation of the mode of production theory.
To understand history it can be studied from structural as well as functional perspective. History, ideally, should be 'total'—a combination of both structural and functional explanations. However, the present day Indian historiography relies more on functional aspect of history. But functions have to be seen against the backdrop of the structure in which it is taking place, otherwise one gets only partial history. Levi Strauss has pointed out that history's only distinctive position is a heterogeneous collection of chronological codes. Yet chronology attains meaning as a method of formulating the historical character of structures. Thus in a minimal sense, all great history is structural history. The study of the complex structural dynamics of every social formation was the progressive discovery of another dimension of Marxist method. Marx's primary concern and interest was also in this particular aspect of human history. And the study of structures inevitably necessitates the use of conceptual tools like mode of production, class conflicts, consciousness etc. History is an objective record of the development to higher social formations and these tools help us to explain why societies change. In fact the immense strength of Marx lies in his insistence on both the existence of social structures and internal dynamics of social change. Nowadays, the existence of social formation is generally accepted. Marx's insistence on history as a necessary dimension is perhaps more essential than ever. The road to the development of mankind has witnessed several changes. It is also a story of specific structures developing into higher specific structures.
Debate on Mode of Production vis-à-vis Social Formation:

The most important element in the materialist conception of history is the mode of production. Most of the classical Marxists agree that the term constitutes the main element of the systematic account of history as a succession of the mode of production. One might ask what constitutes a mode of production? A mode of production is defined as an articulated combination of relations and forces of production structured by the production relation. This constitutes the structure which determines what form the growth of the productive forces and the distribution of the surplus will take place, how a society can or cannot change its structures and how at suitable moments, the transition to another mode of production will take place. It implies a particular said arrangement of production in a society. In short, the mode of production is the core to our understanding of human societies and their interaction as well as their historical dynamics. However, the concept of mode of production is not free from controversies, even though it forms the core of Marxian theory. Even Marx himself did not use the concept in a single consistent sense, the ongoing debate on the mode of production shows that it is far from being a clearly understood analytical tool. The view which sees the stages of historical evolution as being ‘economically determined’ the model of ‘base and superstructure’ as a simple dominance and dependence between
the 'economic base' and 'superstructure' mediated by 'class interest and class struggle' and the succession of social formation as a rigid social analysis. It has resulted in the reduction of Marxian theory into a crude, deterministic economic theory. Some are of the opinion that the straight-jacket application of Marxist ideas and tools of social analysis has led to vulgar Marxism. But the most glaring example / criticism against mode of production has been 1) that seldom a society is made up of one single mode of production. Historical experiences have shown that there can be one dominant mode of production and other less articulated modes of production in a society; 2) although mode production establishes the range of superstructural possibilities, it does not really include superstructural features of the society e.g. State, Law, Ideology within its purview. Scholars like Asok Sen argued that the features of a society which are usually treated as part of the superstructure has to be included within the mode of production. He speaks of Marx's category of mode of production with its techno-economic, juridico-political and ideological dimensions. In other words, strictly speaking, a study of the mode of production does not necessarily inform us about the polity, legal system etc. of a particular society. However it is being recognised that one cannot understand history without taking into consideration all kinds of superstructural features. Hence, the study of social formation assumes significance in understanding the dynamics of a society.

Karl Marx had rarely used the term 'social formation', rather
he frequently referred to society. In the 1859 Preface of Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy he used the term interchangeably. Having discussed the conditions of bourgeoisie society as a 'last antagonistic form of the social process of production' which will disappear, Marx concluded that with this social formation human society comes to an end. Structural Marxists since then adopted this model of analysis. At all events social formation in actual usages refers to two phenomena - namely two types of society (e.g. feudal, capitalist etc.) and to particular societies (e.g. Britain or France).

Maurice Godelier had further developed the term social formation or socio-economic formation and says that 'it seems useful above all in the analysis of concrete historical realities' and applied it in the study of the Inca Empire in the sixteenth century. Bottomore's view is that the term social and economic formations may have a certain value in so far as it expresses explicitly the idea present in the Marxist concept of society that economic and social elements are inter-related and articulated in a structure but it still does not mention the ideological elements, and in short, like all concepts, it does not provide a comprehensive description.

The dictum 'no theory no history' has gained wide acceptance among the historians in recent years. There are number of models and models. However one has to decide on the most suitable which can be used as effective tools of analysis. Inter-disciplinary approaches are more becoming a necessity. During the last one hundred years great progresses have been made in the field of historical knowl-
edge, starting from Gordon Childe to Hinest and Hirst via Althusser has occasionally resulted in altering the model of social formation provided by historical materialism. In spite of all these changes the basic remain intact and the term social formation is used to categorise real society as a system of different structural levels containing a number of practices—economic, political and ideological\textsuperscript{14}. Economic practice necessitates a transformation of natural resources into economic products through the organised use of human labour. Ideological practice exists as a transformation of subject of lived relations to the world through means of ideological struggle and political practice exists as a transformation of existing social relations into a new and more developed form of social relations.\textsuperscript{15} Ideology includes among other organised ideas, norms and notions generated by the dominant class of human beings engaged in conflict and reconciliation with those who have been deprived of the means and fruits of production. Ideology can be still understood as a part of superstructure, and the debate over base and superstructure still continues\textsuperscript{16}. Hence social practice is the sum total of these practices as reflected in the class/caste structure of a given society. The unity of the abovementioned practises constitutes the structure of the social formation wherein the economic practice play a dominant role, though not the exclusively determining factor which shaped/influenced the interrelation of various practices.
The Indian Context:

It is no denying fact that Indian historiography has been strongly influenced by the British Schools of historiography. As a result of the continuing influence of British historiography, Positivism has deeply influenced the historical writing in India. However, positivism as a tool for conceptualisation in history proved inadequate to understand human society. It is increasingly realised that if history is to be studied in a more scientific manner one has to move out from the realm of traditional methodology and experiment with new concepts, new models and interdisciplinary approach has resulted in adopting and exploring more and more new approaches. In the case of India, the Marxian approach has provided an alternative model to traditional historiography for a fruitful historical research.

Indian historians concerned with the study of social formations are confronting with the task of distinguishing the succession of social formations in India. As of now the Indian historians are yet to clearly delineate the fundamental characteristics of various phases of development of Indian society. This has caused considerable debate over issues like fixing the time span of the ancient, medieval period and of characterising the then prevailing mode of production. Based on Marx’s occasional writings on India and Asian societies attempts have been made to study the mode of production and medieval Indian social formation during the last fifty years or so. Marx himself during his course of study had found a contrast in Indian situation as against the social formation of medieval Europe. While
the former was termed as ‘Asiatic’ the later was called ‘Feudal’. In fact Marx and Engels in course of their writings had never clearly formulated the paradigm of ‘Asiatic Mode of Production’ (A.M.P.) but only made scattered references to its components such as state controlled irrigation, absence of private property in land, autarchic villages, absence of towns and trade etc. so as to explain the phenomenon of ‘Oriental Despotism’ and often expressed divergent views on their relative importance. Marx did not think pre-colonial India was ‘feudal as it lacked serfdom and there was identity between tax and rent’.18

Most of the Indian historians have rejected the concept of ‘Asiatic Mode of Production’ as being unapplicable to Indian society.19 By rejecting the concept of A. M. P. Irfan Habib argued that there were many questions which have been left unresolved and Marx even developed certain reservations about the ‘Asiatic’ concept after 1867.20 According to Habib why Marx and Engels had abandoned this concept is that they had come to realise the obvious limitations of their theory.21 Later Marx himself questioned the notion of a continuing and total absence of private property in land. Another reason put forward by Habib is that both Marx and Engels recognised that their concept of A. M. P. would render their theory of class struggle and social change as being only a European phenomena.22 However, Amalendu Guha, a renowned Marxist economic historian has accepted the concept of Asiatic Mode of Production with some reservations. While rejecting the accompanying characteristics of Asian societies being static, unchanging and classless Guha accepts the
concept of A. M. P. as being applicable to pre-colonial Asian societies. The periodisation of Indian history within the classical model of Primitive Communism—Slavery—Feudalism—Capitalism, has also not found acceptance or favour with Indian historians. Except S. A. Dange Indian historians are agreed that there never was a slave mode of production in India. Though there are evidences of slave trade at different times, mostly in ancient and medieval India, it was mostly domestic slavery, not productive, neither agrarian nor industrial. R. S. Sharma has recently characterised Indian society from the sixth century B. C. to fifth century A. D. as a Vaishya–Sudra society in the sense that Vaishyas were peasants and Sudras were slaves, hired labourers, sharecroppers, serfs of artisans touchable and untouchable.

Among the Indian Marxist historians it was Damodar Dharmanand Kosambi who for the first time expressed certain reservations about Marx’s concept of Asiatic Mode of Production. The characterisation of Indian society as static, unchanging with an isolated self-sufficient village economy based on state ownership of land was rejected by him. According to Kosambi, the simple structure of the closed village economy was disturbed during the early period of the Christian era. A new avenue to land ownership emerged and gradually by the post-Gupta period it became so predominant that it changed the nature of land relations. When the kings began to transfer their fiscal and administrative rights over land to their sub-
ordinate chiefs the later came into direct contact with the peasantry. Kosambi termed this process as “feudalism from above”. As class of land owners developed within the village as intermediaries between the state and the peasantry and gradually gained hold over the local populace at a later stage which he termed as “feudalism from below”. Kosambi thus regards these stages as successive phases, the latter succeeding the former. This feudal system broke down around the middle of the 17th century particularly during the reign of Mugal emperor Aurangzeb.

Though in India Col. Tod visualised the development of classic European feudalism in his own day, in the 1820’s in Rajasthan, credit, however should be given to R. S. Sharma for providing a systematic and pioneering work on Indian feudalism whose view has been strongly reinforced by B. N. S. Yadava and D. N. Jha etc. The application of the concept of Indian feudalism became possible partly because of the European conquest of India or contact with these regions and therefore the analysis of their history and society in terms of European categories and partly also because ‘feudalism’ was a universal concept that could range an entire range of situations. From European historians the concept was taken over by Indian historians and its meaning somewhat enlarged.

In the Indian context the term Indian feudalism portrayed the picture of an economy where trade had declined and thus a shortage of currency resulted. This obliged the state to give land to Brahmins in charity and to a lesser extent to officials. These land assignees subjected the peasants to their own control and thus established
feudalism. By the eleventh century trade began to revive, the peasant labour was subjected to commutation and feudalism declined.

According to R. S. Sharma, Indian feudalism originated during the second half of the first millennium A. D. when kings started granting lands both for secular and religious purposes and reached its zenith during the eleventh and twelfth century A. D. Both Sharma and Yadava reinforced by Jha have showed the subordination of the peasantry to the landed interests and the development of almost all the components of West European model of feudalism in India. Apart from declining trade and urbanisation there were serfdom, manor, self-sufficient village units and feudalisation of crafts and commerce. The underlying factors of feudalism in India such as the revival of trade and towns, the mobility of the peasantry to the towns as a result of impoverishment at the hands of the landlords and the process of commutation of forced labour into monetary payments have been shown to be of much similarity to those of western Europe. Another factor which Yadav added to it was the foreign invasions to India, particularly the Hun invasion which almost brought to an end of the Gupta Empire and contributed to the growth of feudalism. The critically assessed view of both the scholars on Indian feudalism is the growing dependence and subjection of peasantry to the landed interests owing to the state patronage, dependence manifested in terms of increasing restrictions on peasant mobility and their subjection to forced labour which in turn was becoming increasingly intensive.

Irfan Habib while not totally rejecting the arguments of R.S.
Sharma and B.N.S. Yadava cautions against arriving at a definite conclusion. To him it was not fully established that serfdom, an essential element in European feudalism, was as in the case of India marked by its absence though there was some evidence of the existence of individual bondage, thus a large number of gaps are still needed to be filled. Even Sharma and Yadava are led by their evidences to conclude that serfdom was far from being a dominant factor in India. According to Habib while secular land grants were a device for dispersal of power, these cannot by themselves be regarded as the key causative element in 'Indian Feudalism'; these were rather a consequence of it. The decline in internal trade had led to the rise of supremacy of village which was characterised by social stratification. With the rise of cavalry in the 8th century A.D. a new feature in the control of villages and concentration of powers could also be seen. The rise of cavalry enabled the control over the villages to be concentrated in fewer hands, and the new knights i.e. Rautas (variant form of Rajputas) who formed the warrior class over northern India and larger parts of the Deccan, were possibly established in many areas owing to clan conquests a kind of 'feudalism from above'. Once the process of stratification took place the Rautas could easily replace or lord over the upper elements already established in the village. So long as internal trade remained sluggish, political power could not spontaneously centralise, and the evolution of local despoticisms (winning recognition through hereditary land grants in the later period) would be natural.

Habib on the basis of a critical study of the labour process and
extraction of surplus during the medieval period, finds its justifiable
in classifying the medieval Indian economy as a separate social for-
mation. But he cautions against designating this society ‘feudal’ pre-
ferring instead the term ‘Indian medieval economy’ or medieval In-
dian system. Habib rejected the characterisation of Mughal period as
feudal on the ground that the Mughal society did not possess the
potentialities of the kind of industrial and capitalist development
that European feudalism gave rise to.\textsuperscript{33}

As already stated the concept of ‘Indian feudalism’ has been
criticised in recent historiography. It has been argued that this con-
cept implies a dichotomy between trade and feudalism. The criticism
follows the argument that Indian ecology, technology and social sys-
tems are fundamentally different from those of Europe and there-
fore the attempt to understand the pre-modern history of India as of
other regions must be on its own terms rather than on the terms
derived from Europe.

Initiating a debate against the notion of ‘Indian Feudal-
ism’ Harbans Mukhia finds it debatable that the assignment of
land grants by the state and the action of the grantee in sub-
jecting the peasantry by means of legal rights assigned to them
by the state could give rise to feudalism and the establish-
ment of such complex social structure.\textsuperscript{34} The contention that
landed assignments could be treated as the counterpart of European
benefice has been found absurd by Ashok Rudra.\textsuperscript{35} The concept of
peasantry’s dependence as manifested in an extraneous control over
the peasants process of production, is yet to be proved in the Indian
context. To Mukhia, ‘free peasant production’ was the characteristic of medieval Indian economy.\textsuperscript{36} Free peasant production which started from the post–Mauryan times continued to characterise the agrarian economy of ancient and medieval India.\textsuperscript{37} It has been emphasised that production process in medieval India was different from the production processes in medieval Europe which was characterised by serf occupied menses in contrast to peasant families in India who constituted the units of production and seigniorial taxation and developing close economic ties of interdependence\textsuperscript{38}.

The preceeding discussions have clearly shown that discussions on early and medieval Indian social formations is far from being over. Both the critics and apologists of medieval Indian social formation are yet to arrive at a synthesis of the issue.\textsuperscript{39} The nature of the ongoing debate is best summed up in the words of T. J. Byres as ‘shadowy, impressionistic and problematic which suffers from incomplete examination of the problem in its totality’.\textsuperscript{40} Lack of sufficient historical data has also compounded the problem. Though it is generally agreed that India bypassed the Slave Mode of Production, the application of the concept of Asiatic Mode of Production is not accepted, the characterisation of Pre–colonial India beginning from the 5\textsuperscript{th} century A.D. as feudal remains a subject of controversy which calls for further critical enquiry.

Why Such A Need for Regional Studies:

A brief outline of the major works so far done on early and late medieval period of India have been reflected on the preceeding paras. But works already cited are generally based on all India level
study. To be precise most of the discussions on medieval Indian economy reflected the conditions of Northern India. Such an all India level study has led to over generalisations without taking into consideration the regional specificities or variations. India being a vast country the stages of social evolution/formation of the regions varied from one another. Though limited to the scope of economic history a recent study sponsored by the Cambridge University is a significant attempt in this direction. There are gaps which still requires to be filled up. To fill this gap regional studies which would take into account the regional peculiarities becomes highly essential. The present work is just a beginning in this direction because Manipur, now, the easternmost state of Indian Union is of theoretical and practical relevance.

The need to study the medieval social formation of Manipur separately, arises because Manipur had maintained her political isolation from the rest of India till the outbreak of the First Anglo-Burmese War, 1824–26 and its conclusion in the Treaty of Yandaboo. Even after the treaty Manipur continued to enjoy her de jure sovereign status pretty for a long time till her defeat in the hands of British in the eventful Anglo–Manipur War of 1891. Moreover, with a few exceptions a scientific study of medieval socio-economic system of Manipur has been lacking. Some scholars had already made attempts to reconstruct the ancient and medieval history of Manipur which culminated in Gangmumei Kabui’s monumental work which has now become a source of reference for further research studies. Gangmumei Kabui devoted a substantial portion of
his work to the reconstruction of ancient history of Manipur particularly the seven regional principalities which later on integrated to form the Meitei Kingdom under the leadership of the Ningthoujas.

A cursory look at the historiography of Manipur will enable one to have a better understanding of the state of historical research in the history of Manipur. The historiography of Manipur can be divided into three sections viz, i) traditional Meitei historiography, ii) colonial historiography, and iii) contemporary historiography. The ancient Meiteis had possessed a strong sense of history. Their traditional concept of history is Pu–Wari (story of forefathers) which is more or less nearer to Sanskrit concept of Itihasa–Purana rather than Greek concept of ‘historia’ or English ‘history’. The Meitei concept of Pu–Wari consists of legends, genealogy and historical accounts of their country besides the cosmological traditions, origin and genealogies of the clans, the religious accounts, the dynastic accounts of the clan chieftains are given prominent place. Chronicles with or without chronology form the core of historical literature. There was no separate discipline of history as such, history or historical knowledge was a part of the whole knowledge. The sanskritisation of Manipur which was a direct outcome of the large scale conversion of Meiteis into Hindu religious fold in the 18th century had given a sanskritised orientation to the growth of historical knowledge. Attempts were being made by scholars with royal patronage to identify land and people which was reflected in the chronicles and genealogy of the ruling Ningthouja dynasty. The Hindu eras were adopted thereby giving a chronological sequence to the traditional Meitei/Manipuri practice of keeping chronicles.
The best example of this new practice was found in *Cheitharol Kumbaba*, the royal chronicle of Manipur kept and maintained by the *Pandit Loishang* (Royal College of Priests). Haodeijamba Chaitanya’s ‘History of Manipur’ 1890 was the first attempt at writing history of Manipur based on indigenous sources. It was followed by Pukhrambam Parijat’s Manipur Purabritta (1917), Manipur Itihas (1918), Kaomacha’s Manipur Ittibritta (1933), Mutum Jhulon’s Vijay Panchali (1939) and Atombapu Sharma’s Manipur Itihas (1940) which were influenced by Indian historiography. Religious ethos of pre-Hindu Meitei religion, Vaishnavism and Aryanism etc. played a very important role in the traditional Meitei historiography.46

With the formal commencement of Anglo-Manipuri relationship after the conclusion of the First Anglo-Burmese War (1824–1826), colonial historiography had germinated its seed. R.B. Pemberton’s Eastern Frontier of British India (1835) was the first attempt in this direction. It was based on James Mill’s History of British India (1819) which were followed by W. McCulloch’s Account of the Valley of Manipur and Surrounding Hill Tribes (1859), R. Brown A Statistical Account of Manipur (1874), E.W. Dun Gazetteer of Manipur (1886,1891), James Johnstone’s My Experiences in Manipur and Naga Hills (1895) whose writers were British officers posted as Political Agents in Manipur. These works deal with a portion of Manipur history but history as such was not attempted. In Alexander Mackenzie’s History of the Relation of the Government with Hill Tribes of North Eastern Frontier of British Bengal (1884) devoted a portion on the history of Manipur which is considered an important contribution to
the colonial historiography. However, 'Mackenzie as a chronicler and annalist was quite successful, but as an analyst and critical historian much remains to be desired.'

Robert Reid's History of Areas Bordering Assam (1942) which contains a portion of Manipur history was a mere documentation work. Of the ethnographic accounts mention may be made of T.C. Hodson's The Meitheis (1908), The Naga Tribes of Manipur (1911), John Shakespear's Lushai Kuki Clans (1913) provides valuable information on the life, beliefs and practises of the ethnoses.

The publication of R.K. Sanahal's Manipur Itihas (1947) marked the opening of an important chapter in history writing in Manipur. J. Roy's History of Manipur (1958), though mainly based on British colonial writings was a serious attempt to look afresh at past history of the land. An alternative approach of studying Manipur's past history was provided with the publication of R.K. Jhalajit Singh's A Short History of Manipur (1965) which was mainly based on indigenous sources, particularly Cheitharol Kumbaba and Ningthourol Lambuba. Jhalajit's objective of writing history was to present a history of Manipur in the perspective of the growth of the Meitei kingdom and expansion of Aryan culture in Manipur. It was mainly a history of the Ningthouja dynasty from the early period to the middle of the twentieth century. The publication of the history may be considered as another important landmark in the historiography of Manipur in the post independence period. The establishment of a centre of Post-Graduate Studies in History at Imphal under Jawaharlal Nehru University and establishment of History Department in Manipur University
(1980) provided real impetus to the growth of historical studies in Manipur. Professor Gangmumei Kabui’s recently published work ‘History of Manipur: Pre-colonial Period (1991) marks a departure from the earlier published works on history of Manipur. It deals with the history of ancient and medieval Manipur based on a clear cut historical methodology which is a critical study of the evolution of the kingdom of Manipur with emphasis on state formation process. It has become a source of reference for further research studies. However, the work does not satisfy the present need of a scientific study of Manipur from the point of political economy and social history.

A few words about the periodisation of Manipur history may not be out of place. The scholars of Manipur history do not subscribe to the time frame of the periodisation of Indian history. Suggestions has been made by some scholars on the following time frame:

i) Ancient period: From the earliest time to the 12th century A. D.

ii) Medieval period: From the 12th century A.D. to 1819, the beginning of Seven Years’ Devastation.

iii) Modern Period: From 1826 Treaty of Yandaboo to the present.

Rejecting the above scheme of periodisation as lacking justification both in time-frame and theme of history Professor Gangmumei Kabui have proposed the following model for adoption.

i) Ancient period: It covers the period from earliest prehistoric time down to the completion of the formation of Manipur as a
sovereign state in the later part of 15th century A. D.

ii) Medieval period: From the last quarter of the 15th century A. D. to the British conquest of Manipur in 1891 A. D.

iii) Modern period: From 1891 A. D. to 1947 A. D. the period in which British Colonialism, Feudalism and Indian administration were fully operated.

iv) Contemporary period: From 1947 onwards to the present, the period in which colonialism of the Indian type, feudalism and monarchy have been replaced by the internal colonialism.48

Looking to the past proved to be an arduous task and endless journey one has to look for other possibilities before arriving at any pre-mediated conclusion. This is more true in the case of the history of Manipur. The objective of the present study is to examine the Social Formation of Manipur during the eighteenth and nineteenth century in the light of regional variations and the validity of the assumptions regarding Feudalism or Asiatic Mode of Production. The study has certain limitations. It covers only the period of eighteenth and nineteenth century in which the kingdom had reached its zenith of power and glory and subsequent process of decline and downfall. The conclusion that are drawn and arrived at will have to take the time constraint into consideration. Some of the source materials though of primary nature are already published and this work is more in the nature of an analytical study. Reports and accounts written in the nineteenth century by the British officials and reporters having posted or connected with Manipur are extensively used.
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