

Title	The Last Years of the Rana Regime of Nepal in 1940-51 : Reading Sagar S. J. B. Rana, Singha Durbar: Rise and Fall of the Rana Regime of Nepal, New Delhi: Rupa, 2017
Author(s)	Kuwajima, Sho
Citation	アジア太平洋論叢. 2021, 23, p. 87-109
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/95069
rights	
Note	

Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

Osaka University

The Last Years of the Rana Regime of Nepal in 1940-51

Reading Sagar S. J. B. Rana, *Singha Durbar: Rise and Fall of the Rana Regime of Nepal*, New Delhi: Rupa, 2017

Sho KUWAJIMA*

This is a story of the *Rise and Fall of the Rana Regime of Nepal* written by the author, Sagar S. J. B. Rana, who observed the last days of the regime with his own inquisitive eyes as a boy inside one of the Rana palaces, and who has utilized abundant related materials inclusive of the unpublished memoir of his father Mrigendra Shumsher. Besides the detailed introduction of the Nepali Congress leaders, the thrilling scenes in the process of the move of some Rana intellectuals into the side of the anti-oligarchy appear before our eyes. The author described with his penetrating analysis how the words were uttered in historic scenes, how these words were reacted by both known and unknown people, and as to what situation the fissures in communication led to a breaking point. At the critical moments of history after the middle of the 1930s we find the presence of the common people of Nepal who supported the anti-Rana struggle, and who have often played a remarkable role in it and led their leaders to action. Sagar, at the age of nine, heard with his feelings of unrest the overwhelming 'sound' of the people's revolt which reached the palace in 1947.

His narration of the topography of Nepal tells us the diversity of the people and their way of life in 'a small country' while his reference to the complex marriage relations of Rana rulers facilitates us to understand one of the main causes of the end of the Rana regime.

In this review, I mainly discussed the last phase of the regime in 1940-51.

1

Nepal's first and last Consulate General in colonial India, Lt. General Daman Shumsher Jang Bahadur Rana, who was once in the midst of the historic drama, wrote with his pride as a member of the Rana family, though he did not deny the negative aspect of its rule ⁽¹⁾,

The Ranas ruled Nepal as virtually absolute dictators for almost a century. Though there is a plenty of provocative writing against the Ranas for their despotic rule, one need not chary of giving them credit when due. It is to members of the Rana oligarchy that Nepal, ultimately, owes its position today as a Sovereign Independent State. --- Nepal's Legation in London and

* Osaka University of Foreign Studies, Professor Emeritus

the Consulate-General in India were established long before the Ranas were uprooted. This was a small window opening to the world, but a window nevertheless. As for the rest of the people of Nepal, they were debarred from mixing with foreigners freely during the period.

Perhaps the most remarkable achievement of the Ranas was the impact they made on the British with their generous offer of military help during World War I. This was renewed during World War II and was gratefully accepted. Gurkha troops were universally acclaimed as superior, fearless fighters.

Maharaj Chandra Shumsher (Prime Minister 1901-29) had a sovereign nation state as his cherished aim. The Anglo-Nepal Treaty of Friendship was signed in Kathmandu on December 21, 1923 by Chandra Shumsher and was later ratified by King George V ⁽²⁾. It was a departure from Nepal's subordinate status forced by the Treaty of Sugauli of 1816 ⁽³⁾.

However, the situation in Nepal on the eve of the Second World War was quite different. From the latter half of the 1930s the discontent against the Rana oligarchy began to appear openly in the streets, encouraged by the freedom movement in India and the quest of the people for justice and freedom. In 1938-39, *Nagarik Adhikari Samiti* (Civil Rights Committee) was set up with Shukra Raj Shastri as the Chairman. The speeches of its members started from religious discourses on the Hindu scriptures that condemned injustice and tyranny ⁽⁴⁾. Soon, in the meeting at Indra Chawk, Kathmandu, Shukra Raj made his speech before the huge crowds, quoted verses from the Bhagavad Gita, 'exposed the acts of tyranny of the Rana regime and extolled the citizens to fight and extract the rights and liberties as human beings'⁽⁵⁾. Shukra Raj was arrested the next day. Sagar Rana writes this turning point in the history of Nepal as follows ⁽⁶⁾.

The Civil Rights Committee could no longer sustain its programmes. However, during the past months its activities had stimulated the mind and spirit of a greater number of the citizens than ever before. As expected, the news travelled from Kathmandu beyond its ring of hills and reached the far corners of the kingdom and the eager ears of the Nepalese living in India. Never had such a sustained and pointed condemnation of the regime been exposed from an open public platform, and in Kathmandu! Right under the noses of the haughty Ranas!

Shukra Raj's father, Mahadev Raj Joshi was one of the Nepalese exiles in India, and *Shastri* was his academic qualification which he got after his study at Dehradun.

In 1936, the Nepal Praja Parishad was organized as the political party composed of five young men. Their main idea was converged at one programme, that is, to appeal to the people to rise against the tyranny and injustice under the Rana regime. Their means were bold and unique.

Sagar Rana describes the historic scene on the day of *Indra Jatra* festival in 1940⁽⁷⁾.

As darkness descended on the date of the *Indra Jatra* festival, when the night curfew is lifted to allow gambling for twenty-four hours, the volunteers moved silently along the dark streets sticking the pamphlets on wall and tree trunks and strewing them at the crossroads and vantage points.

At break of dawn ‘Kathmandu was stirred as never before,’ recalls one old timer. ‘I could hardly believe what I saw. The haughty Ranas were abused in a most derogatory way, condemned openly! It was unheard of! I quickly hid a few pamphlets inside my shirt and rushed home. I read them repeatedly. My neighbours had also surreptitiously collected the pamphlets. At last the pent-up rage of the people was expressed openly.’

On October 18, 1940, twenty persons were arrested and further arrests followed ⁽⁸⁾. Prisoners were later tortured and made to parade around the town. On January 19, 1941, the verdict was announced. Shukra Raj Shastri, who was not involved with any of the activities of the Praja Parishad, was also brought to the place. Sagar Rana reveals the fact that, before the announcement was declared openly, Baber Shumsher, son of Chandra Shumsher, asserted that it would ‘arouse greater indignation against the Rana regime’. But, ‘the majority followed the line of Juddha Shumsher’ (Prime Minister 1932-45) ⁽⁹⁾.

Four leaders who were sentenced to death were executed within 10 days. Ganga Lal and Deshrath Chand were shot to death. Dharma Bhakta Mathema was hanged, while Shukra Raj Shastri took the rope dangling from a branch of a tree with his own hands. Sagar Rana cites a recollection of Himalayan Shumsher, grandson of Dev Shumsher (Prime Minister, March to June 1901), then a teenaged boy. His father Laxman said, observing the corpse of Shukra Raj, “These members were foolish to think they would succeed”. But, after a few seconds, he added, “You may one day, see before you at a major public place---a statue of this tree with the body of Shukra Raj dangling from it” ⁽¹⁰⁾.

We know here that rage against the Rana oligarchy penetrated the wall of the Rana palaces in 1940. The cruel scene only instigated people’s indignation against the Rana regime, though they were able to be contained for some time.

2

The offer of the Nepalese soldiers to the warfront in Asia and Europe, and the development of friendly Nepal-British relations were the core of Juddha Shumsher’s policy during the Second

World War. Sagar Rana recognizes the positive results of the wartime policy, but does not deny its negative aspect, “They (Nepalese soldiers) remit part of their pay to help out their families back home, living in acute poverty. The remittances form a major source of support for both the local and national economy. The negative aspects include the exodus and loss of able-bodied men from the villages and down turn in productivity”⁽¹¹⁾. One lakh sixty thousand men, mainly from the ethnic hill community, went forth in Nepal with two million population. Sagar Rana concludes, “one can imagine the devastated state of the affected area”⁽¹²⁾.

The ‘Mutiny’ triggered off by the men of the Second Rifles of the Nepali contingent at Kohat, North West Frontier Province of India on January 1, 1941 needs to be examined in this context, though its details are not yet well known. Their complaint arose from the issuing of additional rations in lieu of cash amounting to one Rupee and six Annas. Prem R. Uprety writes the ‘Mutiny’ on the basis of the primary sources as follows⁽¹³⁾. Trouble arose when the men refused to drink the milk purchased from their increased messing allowance. They demanded their money instead. The Senior Special Service Officer, Colonel Briery went to the line himself as the Nepalese counterpart refused to go with him. When he appeared, a stone struck the Colonel’s head. The British Officer was then trampled. A little later Colonel Dawson, the District Commander, arrived on the scene. He together with Nepalese non-commissioned officers was able to disperse the unruly mob. The arrival of General Bahadur Shumsher, eldest son of Juddha, on January 3 put the matter right.

The loyalty of the Nepalese soldiers to their duty did not mean that they were supportive of Juddha’s war strategy. It is not clear whether the Nepalese soldiers and officers already had knowledge of the situation in Nepal after the *Indra Jatra* in October 1940, but it cannot be denied that the Rana regime could not overlook the serious meaning of the ‘mutiny’ in the Nepali contingent which had so far supported the Rana regime.

On February 18, 1941, within one month after the execution of the three leaders of the Nepali Praja Parishad and Shukra Raj Shastri of the Civil Rights Committee, the ‘ringleaders’ and the officers of the Second Rifles were presented publicly in the parade ground of Tundhikher. The guilty officers were beaten publicly, and Megh Bahadur Thapa, *Subedar*, was hanged at twelve noon⁽¹⁴⁾.

Major General Brahma Shumsher, who was the General Officer-in-Command of the Nepali contingent in the North West Frontier Province, said in his interview with Uprety that the ‘mutiny’ was a too serious word to describe so simple an event, and to label it as ‘mutiny’ was to see ‘a tempest in a tea pot’⁽¹⁵⁾. However, Juddha Shumsher knew well the serious meaning of a ‘tempest in a pot’ which occurred when the simmering discontent against the Rana regime was spreading out.

3

In this painstaking work, Sagar Rana writes about himself in a few scenes of history. One of these is an eyewitness account of the revolt of the people in Kathmandu in April 1947⁽¹⁶⁾.

Each succeeding day the crowd got bolder and bigger, the noise louder. The combined roar of the huge assemblage inside the narrow streets of Kathmandu resounded and reverberated throughout the valley, penetrating deep into the Rana palaces.

The youngest grandson of Baber Shumsher, Sagar, was about nine years old at this time. Around four in the afternoon, he was at play at the palace grounds of Baber Mahal. He sensed an unusual sound, like the rumble of thunderclouds far away. Curious, he moved towards the main gate of the palace, Aath Paharia dai, his personal guard, by his side. "What is it?" the boy queried. An evasive answer followed. The matter was too sensitive, complicated to explain. At the main gate the sound was like the roar of thunder before it strikes. But it was obvious now that it rose from a huge crowd, the Kangresis, he had heard about obliquely. His mind raced, so did his lithe body, towards the palace at full speed, barely conscious of the curious stares of the palace guards and servants scattered on both sides. Once inside, he slowed down and gathered his thoughts; he saw glum and worried looks of the family members and the serving maids alike. Gradually it dawned upon him that resounding sound he had heard was the war cry of a revolution.

This first wave of the people's revolt against the Rana regime occurred under the background of the birth of the Nepali National Congress on January 25, 1947. Mahavir Shumsher and Subarna Shumsher, grandsons of Bhim Shumsher (Prime Minister 1929-32), who had been working against the Rana regime in Calcutta, did not join the Congress due to their disagreement to non-violent struggle, but provided monetary assistance for the meeting. Despite some hurdles to be cleared, the resolution adopted at the meeting sent its clear message, which was appealing the people of Nepal to revolt against the Rana regime for the establishment of a government responsible to the people under the King Tribhuwan⁽¹⁷⁾. Response was immediate. In March, the movement for the reforms of labour conditions in Biratnagar developed into the Satyagraha against the Rana regime with the participation of B. P. Koirala and other Congress leaders. B. P., Girija Koirala, Manmohan Adhikary and three others were arrested and taken to Kathmandu by three weeks of trekking through hill areas. Sagar Rana writes that this first tryst of B. P. with these harsh mountain terrains left a lasting impression and in later years helped him formulate the concept of Democratic Socialism espoused as 'B. P. Baad' (B. P. ism)⁽¹⁸⁾. At the behest of Indian socialist leaders, Gandhi

wrote a letter to Prime Minister Padma Shumsher (1945-48). B.P. was released from jail in September 1947. Here we can note that Gandhi was a mentor when the Nepali Congress leaders requested his advice, and B. P. was a socialist who was stimulated by Gandhi's idea to uplift people's lives with *Charkha* (spinning wheel) which was applicable in Nepal. He later recollects that the American nor Russian model did not suit Nepal and India, too ⁽¹⁹⁾.

In Biratnagar, Satyagraha produced many leaders in the process. Girija Koirala, a clerk at the cotton mill⁽²⁰⁾, and Divya, mother of B. P., are also among these leaders.

As for the birth of the women leaders in Kathmandu, Sagar Rana recorded his interview with Sahana Pradhan, who belonged to a middle class Newar family in Kathmandu ⁽²¹⁾. Pradhan's family decided to move to Burma after her mother's death when she was five, and she and her sister Sadhanah went to school there. When Japanese bombings in Burma from December 1941 devastated their house and the business of the family, they returned to Kathmandu ⁽²²⁾. But, while their brothers joined the Durbar High School again, two sisters were 'packed off into the family home, not permitted even to touch books'. They joined the Satyagraha. When they were asked by one of the generals, "Why you women, too, are involved in this?" Sahana replied, "Men and women are equal and we joined because we cannot even go to school for studies." Mrigendra, the Director of Education who was there, said "All right, we will make some arrangements within fifteen days." Hence, within fifteen days special morning classes for girls were started at the Durbar High School ⁽²³⁾.

This strength of the Satyagraha led the Prime Minister Padma Shumsher to announce his statement to promise constitutional reforms on May 16, 1947. Assured by Jawaharlal Nehru who said that India was sending a constitutional advisor, the Nepali Congress withdrew the Satyagraha on June 2⁽²⁴⁾.

4

The second phase of the post-war anti-Rana struggle covers the period from June 1947 to April 1950 when the Nepali National Congress and the Nepal Democratic Congress (started by Subarna Shumsher and Mahavir Shumsher) merged together to form the Nepali Congress at the meeting in Calcutta. In the meantime, the reformist Prime Minister Padma Shumsher stepped down in February 1948 and left for Ranchi with tears. Now the hard liner Mohan Shumsher assumed office as the Prime Minister (1948-51). The independence of India on August 15, 1947 had also a complex impact on the relations between the Indian Government and the anti-Rana movement in Nepal.

B.P. Koirala after his release found that the condition of the Nepali National Congress as the

anti-Rana organization was in disarray. The Nepal Democratic Congress was there after August 1948. D. R. Regmi had recruited young leftists in the NNC into his group, and the Nepal Communist Party was formed in September 1949. This situation forced B. P. to take unforeseen steps to dislodge the Rana rulers. The first step was taken when Basanta, Padma's only one A-class son, approached B. P. with a plot to assassinate high-level Rana rulers with grenades. After he consulted with Ram Manohar Lohia, he procured and handed them to Basanta in Calcutta. Even the news of the assassination of Gandhi, and his meeting with Gandhi only a few days before, could not dissuade him from assisting this plot. We feel something inconvincible in B. P.'s rather abrupt involvement with this plot. What occurred thereafter in Kathmandu is not correctly known, but there is probability that the plot was detected, and this provided Mohan and his men a chance to pressure Padma into his resignation within a month of his proclamation of the Constitution on January 26, 1948⁽²⁵⁾.

The second step that B. P. took was to proceed to Kathmandu, and talk with the leaders of the Nepal Praja Panchayat (NPP) which appeared on October 12, 1948, the day of the *Vijaya Dashami*, as the result of the agitations that started in Kathmandu since April in the same year. B. P. and K. P. Bhattarai reached Kathmandu in the beginning of November, but their meeting with the NPP leaders could not produce any positive conclusion, and Bhattarai returned to Lucknow. Sagar Rana surmises that 'one main aim of Koirala was to try and meet Prime Minister Mohan in Kathmandu.' While B. P. was seeking an appointment with some precondition, his hiding place was detected, and he was arrested. His suffering in jail followed, and after a 28-day fast, he was released in the end of May 1949. Now, Mohan responded to B. P.'s request for appointment, but his demand for the government responsible to the people was met with a curt refusal. We also note here that Mohan said, "I have not released you under pressure from any quarter"⁽²⁶⁾.

Sagar Rana raises a question, "The wisdom of Mohan's rigid stand, backed with tough measures in the following weeks and months, was debated then, and continues to be a point to ponder about, even today. A conciliatory line then might have led a smoother transition of power, one in which foreign interests or royal ambitions would have lesser space to play. B. P., too, is known to have made a remark many years later, 'If I had known the tree (of the Rana oligarchy) would fall so quickly, I would not have pushed so hard'⁽²⁷⁾.

Simultaneously, Sagar Rana describes, "the common citizens of Kathmandu had raised their voice and standard of revolt for five cold months of winter against the might of the Rana oligarchy. The *andolan* (Praja Panchayat movement) convinced Koirala in the damp, freezing prison cell, that Kathmandu is a critical factor for the success of the revolution"⁽²⁸⁾.

After confirming that Mohan was not ready for any constitutional concession partly 'encouraged' by the cordial reception extended by the independent Indian Government, and

reflecting on the failure of the NNC to support the *Andolan* in Kathmandu, B. P. was inclined towards the line of armed struggle. Now the young leaders and activists from Kathmandu and the western hills also came to join the NNC. In the meantime, the *Jana Mukti Sena* (People's Liberation Army) of the Nepal Democratic Congress could not work effectively due to the lack of weapons. On the Indian side, Jaya Prakash Narayan and Ram Manohar Lohia in particular encouraged this process of unity ⁽²⁹⁾. Indian socialists were also in a position to make request for arms to the Burma Socialist Party.

Finally the Nepali National Congress and the Nepal Democratic Congress formed the Nepali Congress at a meeting in Calcutta on April 8-10, 1950. People's sovereignty, a government elected by and responsible to the people, and a society built on the principles of socio-economic equality were decided as the objective of the Nepali Congress. The means of their final struggle was defined as 'by all available means,' taking into consideration India's non-violent struggle ⁽³⁰⁾.

Earlier, the Independence of India on August 15, 1947 was differently received by the people in general and in the Baber Palace where Sagar spent his boyhood. The people of Nepal were awake to hear 'awakening of freedom' resonating through the All India Radio, and 'in many of the towns, especially in the Terai, people rejoiced.' They were now free from the restrictions imposed on the citizens from possessing a radio set only a few months earlier ⁽³¹⁾. Atmosphere was quite different in the Baber Mahal. Sagar found 'grave and unsmiling faces of the adults,' though seniors were summoned by the Prime Minister and went out early ⁽³²⁾. To his nervous question, "Have the Bara Sahibs (British) really left Hindustan?" the senior Didi (elder sister) Pansy responded, "Yes! Now the Indian Kangressis will be the rulers of India, and stronger here." This view correctly reflected the feelings of unrest of the Rana family who had long taken for granted the stable Anglo-Nepalese relations as the basis of the Rana regime.

When Gandhi was assassinated on January 30, 1948, people of Nepal were sunk in grief. In Kathmandu, there was the first 'bandh' (general strike) in memory of the Mahatma, spontaneous and peaceful ⁽³³⁾. In Baber Mahal, Mrigendra called a family meeting. When his mother heard the news, she moaned 'Hey Ram'. Sagar Rana records, "For the first time I was able to learn about the great man and his deeds. I also learnt that the Mahatma's last two words were 'Hey Ram' ". There was no boundary in sharing the sorrow of the death of Gandhi. He wrote, "Gandhi never concealed his sympathies for the democratic movement in Nepal, yet Rana rulers were sincere in their grief of his assassination, at least in Baber Mahal" ⁽³⁴⁾.

However, after India's independence, state to state relations appeared, and the 'Indian Kangressis' and Jawaharlal Nehru in particular, on whom the Nepali Congress leaders had had hopes, advised them to act cautiously, while pressing Mohan to start constitutional reforms in which the representatives of the people of Nepal can join the government. Already on August 8,

1947, as for the future of the Gorkha soldiers, the army headquarter in Delhi decided that the first two battalions of the 2nd, 6th, 7th and 10th regiments were to become part of the British Army and all others were to be passed to the army of the Independent India⁽³⁵⁾. Again, on July 18, 1948, Memorandum of Agreement was signed between Nepal and India in which the Government of Nepal agreed in principle to the loan of a contingent of Nepali troops consisting of ten battalions. Some of its units assumed combat roles in the Hyderabad Action in September⁽³⁶⁾. Mohan tried to maintain good relations between both countries. The birth of the People's Republic of China on October 1, 1949 made Indian foreign policy very sensitive in Indo-Nepal relations too. When Mohan made a state visit to India in February 1950, he was given a red carpet reception⁽³⁷⁾, and the Treaty of Peace and Friendship between Nepal and India was signed on July 31, 1950.

5

In earlier pages, Sagar Rana describes one hundred year history of the Rana regime, and the topography of Nepal which fosters diverse ways of living and the political consciousness of the people of Nepal in western terrains, eastern mountains, and Terai areas, besides the Nepalese people in India including Banaras and Calcutta where they originally came for higher studies or as political exiles. These are a fascinating introduction to a history of Nepal in 1945-51.

Thus, we know that the Mulki Ain (National Law) of 1854, 'a comprehensive and uniform legal code which covered the entire country,' that was completed by a 230-member council during the rule of Jung Bahadur Rana (the founder of the Rana regime), who visited England and Europe in 1850, limited the arbitrary action of Mohan Shumsher at a crucial moment of Nepal history after one century⁽³⁸⁾.

Also, we are led to Palpa, the headquarters of the central (now the mid-west) region, which unlike Terai, is 'not too near the Indian border and shielded by the Shivalik range. Sagar Rana writes, "The Palpa governor was appointed by the prime minister from among his trusted and ablest Rana generals. During extraordinary circumstances, those cousins exiled from Kathmandu were assigned governorship as a consolation posting"⁽³⁹⁾. A popular and able Rudra was Commander-in-Chief, the fourth in line on the Roll of Succession to the Prime Minister, and a friend of Juddha Shumsher since boyhood but a C-class (born out of wedlock and from lower caste mother) nephew⁽⁴⁰⁾. In the year 1934 when the earthquake devastated the life of the people in Nepal, Rudra was purged in Palpa as its Governor. Mrigendra is an eyewitness of a closed meeting of only A-class Ranas where Juddha notified his decision beforehand. Sagar Rana concludes that 'this en masse expulsion of the C-class from the Roll and its banishment from Kathmandu is one of the causes of the fall of the Rana regime and the dawn of democracy of Nepal'

(41).

In the 'Preparation for the Final Assault' by the Nepali Congress, B. P.'s mission to Palpa guided by Rudra's son Gopal brought back Rudra's support for the cause of democracy, and co-operation with the escort of the King to Palpa.

Then, the turn of Ganesh Man Singh with Sunder Raj Chalise, a trusted assistant of Subarna Shumsher, and five combatants from the Jana Mukti Sena. Their mission was to contact with the King, meet with the Indian Ambassador and consolidate their link with the supporters in Kathmandu. As for the third task, Sagar Rana writes ⁽⁴²⁾, "It was reckless and not in line with the policy guideline set by the CWC (Central Working Committee)." It was a plan to 'approach the old palace on the day of *Indra Jatra* mingling with the procession and launch a sudden attack on the unsuspecting Ranas,' but, upon hearing an information from the Indian Ambassador that the government was already suspecting that they were hiding in Kathmandu, their plan was given up.

In their contact with the King, Chalise was able to receive a message from the King through a trusted palace secretary, stating that the King is ready to proceed to Palpa if the Government of India could arrange a helicopter to Palpa. Ganesh Man sent a message to Subarna with satisfaction. But, soon, Chalise and other team members were arrested, and Ganesh was arrested on his way back. Sagar Rana is forced to reach his conclusion, writing, "Perhaps the most damaging outcome was the loss of confidence of the royal family on the competence and capabilities of the Congress" ⁽⁴³⁾.

The grand design of the Indian Ambassador to move the King to Delhi was proceeding simultaneously⁽⁴⁴⁾. Sagar Rana adds in the same page, "It will not be amiss to speculate whether the strategic design of C.P. N. Singh to take the king to Delhi jeopardized the attempt of Nepali Congress to take him to Palpa and scuttled the mission of Ganesh Man."

In the process of interrogation at the special judicial court, Hari Shumsher used lashes on a belligerent Ganesh Man. He 'withstood the lashes longer than any known prisoner in Nepal,' and lost consciousness. Next day Mohan ordered cessation of the interrogation. Hari Shumsher recommended death sentence to Ganesh Man, Chalise and six others. The decision was forwarded to the prime minister's *Ijlas* (Court). Mohan wanted the King 'to place his seal, as per law and precedence.' Tribhuwan did not move till he took refuge ⁽⁴⁵⁾. The bond between the King and the people was maintained.

The last 100 pages of Sagar Rana's writing from the King's move to the Indian Embassy on November 6, 1950 to the return of the King Tribhuwan to Kathmandu on February 15, 1951 provide us many facts which have not been known widely.

The process of Prince Gyanendra being declared King by Mohan on November 7, 1950, the

move of Tribhuwan to Delhi by a special Indian plane ‘for the medical reasons’ on the 11th, the launch of the Nepali Congress into an armed operation on the next day and their capture of Birganj, the proposal of the Government of India for the interim government of Nepal under the King Tribhuwan on December 8, followed by the acceptance of the Memorandum by Mohan on January 8, 1951, and later by the King Tribhuwan who approved Mohan’s proclamation and also appealed the Nepali Congress to lay down the arms on the 10th, and finally, the participation of the Nepali Congress in the tripartite talks in Delhi reaching ‘Delhi settlement’ or ‘Delhi Compromise’ on February 7, have been a matter of controversy long among the political scientists and others who are concerned with this period ⁽⁴⁶⁾.

Before the King’s refuge in the Indian Embassy in Kathmandu, the Nepali Congress had already taken their decision to launch the armed revolution to dislodge the Rana regime at its first General Meeting at Bairagnia (presently located in Sitamarhi district, Bihar) in September 1950. They responded without any delay, and amazingly the airplanes of Himalayan Airways owned by Mahavir Shumsher dropped leaflets from the sky in Kathmandu, Biratnagar, Birgunj and other cities, declaring that the revolution would begin on November 12, and called upon the people and the Nepali Army to join the liberation struggle⁽⁴⁷⁾. The Nepali Democratic Radio started broadcasting from a station in Biratnagar ⁽⁴⁸⁾. These were also part of the revolution which utilized ‘all available means.’

In Birgunj, two prisoners inside the barracks who saw the reconnaissance flight by Matrika Koirala, ‘Dictator’ of the Mukti Sena, succeeded in persuading the army men to believe that ‘other planes would follow with powerful bombs’ and to show a white flag. The Nepali Congress at that time have now secured a great quantity of weapons and ammunition besides three and a half million Indian rupees in cash ⁽⁴⁹⁾.

The victory in Birgunj had an unexpected positive impact on the quest of the people of Nepal for change. Sagar Rana describes the exaltation of the people of Nepal in India. “It is said that Prime Minister Nehru was furious, but the rest of India rose in one to salute the stunning triumph of the revolutionaries,” and, encouraged by the newspaper reports, many young Nepalis from all walks of life living in India, ‘who had little or no contact with politics’, went to the Nepali Congress headquarters to join the Mukti Sena ⁽⁵⁰⁾.

On the other side, the new situation in Birgunj led to an unexpected humiliation which the top Nepali Congress leaders swallowed in Delhi. They were Matrika and B. P. Koiralas, their sister Vijayalakhshmi, and Subarna and Mahavir Shumshers who went to Delhi from Patna to meet the King with a booty of Indian rupees. But, they were detained by the security forces at the airport, and treated like a ‘band of thieves or criminals,’ and their cash to the King was confiscated after tiresome procedures. Sagar Rana continues ⁽⁵¹⁾.

Tired and furious the NC leaders were released before daybreak next morning. For two days they could not meet Nehru and eventually he ‘condescended’ to see the two brothers, separately. Matrika in particular had to face the brunt of Nehru’s fury. Nehru even threatened to lock them up. Eventually, as was his nature, he cooled down, and explained the delicate position of India in the international forum. But the trip had been humiliating and futile. They were not allowed to meet the King, and Nehru refused any material support for the revolution, though he did not ask them to withdraw it.

In fact, the Indian National Congress ‘succeeded’ in leading the people’s upheaval of the Quit India movement of 1942 into the ‘constitutional channel’ through 1946 provincial elections. The Constitution of India came into force on January 26, 1950. On February 25, the Preventive Detention Bill was introduced, passed and signed into law in one day⁽⁵²⁾. Now, keeping the Nepali King under the protection of the Indian Government, Nehru thought that he could engineer the process to the constitutional monarchy in Nepal without the intervention of the ‘adventurist’ Nepali Congress leaders. The Nepali Congress leaders were not well conscious about this aspect of Nehru’s policy. Indian socialists, Jaya Prakash Narayan and Ram Manohar Lohia who were the leaders of the Quit India movement and who also extended timely advice to the Nepali leaders already left the Indian National Congress.

The arrest of Ram Manohar Lohia in 1949 gives a hint to the coming age in India. Responding to B. P. Koirala’s hunger strike, Indian socialists held a public meeting demanding the release of political leaders in Nepal at Connaught Circus, New Delhi on May 25, 1949, but their demonstration proceeding toward the Nepali Embassy was blocked by the police, and their ‘sit-down’ protest on the road was removed by tear gas. In the evening, Lohia was arrested. Lohia was agitated and said, “The British government treated me very badly, but it was the independent Indian Government that shot tear gas grenade on me”⁽⁵³⁾.

Another socialist and later, Gandhian, J. P. Narayan, who listened to the complaint of the Nepali Congress leaders in November 1950, protested against the cold shoulder that Nehru showed to the Nepali leaders. But, Nehru refuted flatly, referring to “every kind of bungling being done by amateur politicians who know nothing about politics and less about insurrection”⁽⁵⁴⁾.

We shall see how the ‘adventurism’ was observed in the process of the ‘Revolution of 1950’.

In Palpa, the progress of the anti-Rana struggle took a unique turn. Kamal Raj Regmi, a young student leader, wanted to go to the warfront and not under the flag of the Nepali Congress. He worked under the flag of the Nepali National Congress, a communist organization. Their non-

violent protest demonstrations were unexpectedly allowed and even received cheers from the younger generation of Rudra's family. Next day the Nepali Congress followers also joined the movement. Sagar Rana describes the dramatic scene. "Around this crucial point of time, Rudra Shumsher and the state troops under his command moved to the side of the revolution. The psychological effect of this action was felt throughout the country. By daybreak on the third morning, the crowd on the streets of Tansen was massive. Hectic consultations between principal actors in Palpa and wireless contact with Kathmandu led General Prachanda Shumsher to hand over the weapons brought from Kathmandu to Rudra-an act of virtual surrender to the revolutionary forces"⁽⁵⁵⁾.

Kamal Raj and his men made cutting remarks about the transfer of the arms from one party of Rana to another, and finally the idea of People's Government was accepted by the Nepali Congress and the Nepali National Congress, though the latter was forced to become a minority in the government. Rudra Shumsher joined the government as military governor, and Regmi's group also joined it after some weeks.

Sagar Rana adds that General Prachanda Shumsher, Mohan's senior cousin, and Colonel Chhetra Bikram Rana, who had been sent by Mohan to keep Rudra and his family in virtual house arrest, judged coolly that their recourse to military action was meaningless when the fate of the Rana regime and future of the country was being decided in New Delhi. He concludes that the far sighted decision of a Rana General and his second in command led to 'the surrender without a bullet' ⁽⁵⁶⁾. It may be added that the presence of the unknown people contributed a lot to the achievement of unity among the anti-Rana forces.

In Biratnagar, home town of B.P., main forces of the Mukti Sena were Rais and Limbus. B. P. who faced his last scene of the fierce battle, recalls, "I saw the governor, his wife and daughters, and some others in the courtyard trembling with fear. --- Yathumba (Mukti Sena commander) was beside himself shouting that the governor must be cut down.--- I pushed him away from there. In his fury, he hit a wooden pole with his khukuri (a short sword used in Nepal) and it got stuck and remained there, shaking. That is how agitated he was." B. P. insisted that whatever the provocation, once the enemy surrenders he must be protected ⁽⁵⁷⁾.

Restraint prevailed with B. P.'s agile judgement cultivated by his readiness to talk with the people from all walks of life. Political, non-violent and humanitarian solution to the problems was observed in the various scenes of the armed revolution. This is one of the reasons why it remained in the memory of the people.

The trajectory of two Rana intellectuals in Kathmandu told by Sagar Rana arouses our interest. When a few of the young C-class Ranas suggested to 'open negotiations with the rebels',

one A-class son of Juddha castigated them as ‘sons of slaves’. Then, a number of Ranas not in the Roll of Succession resigned from their respective official positions. The next day a few joined the agitators on the streets led by Balakrishna Sama, calling for the return of King Tribhuwan ⁽⁵⁸⁾.

Earlier, when Balakrishna Shumsher, a captain in the army, presented his play, *Dhruba*, to the Prime Minister Bhim Shumsher, he incurred the PM’s displeasure, and was degraded to a teacher in Tri Chandra College. However, Balakrishna had his fruitful days as a teacher, poet and playwright under the newly appointed Director General of Education, Mrigendra⁽⁵⁹⁾. Later, Balakrishna, the chief examiner, found a derogatory word, in reference to the Rana regime, in a paper of a student of Tri Chandra College ⁽⁶⁰⁾. Sagar Rana surmises that Balakrishna and Mrigendra decided for the student to stay in the same class for another one year, but they did not inform this to the Prime Minister. The matter was later leaked to Juddha. While the student died in jail, Mrigendra was relieved of his position until he was asked to return to the same post by Padma Shumsher. Balakrishna, who came under the close surveillance of the securities, later joined the revolutionary group, and took a new name, ‘Balakrishna Sama’. ‘Sama’ is a short version of Shumsher, but symbolizes his struggle for ‘equality’ (*samanta*) ⁽⁶¹⁾. This occurred in the world where even young proposers for the opening of a library were arrested as rebels who encouraged the anti-Rana activities ⁽⁶²⁾.

Dimon Shumsher Rana, a C-class Rana who chose Mohan Shumsher as a mentor for *chakari* (relations of lord and vassal), was a lieutenant in the army. He was drawn into English literature by a Bengali tutor, and soon moved to Nepali literature. When he wrote his first novel *Basanti*, he met Mrigendra to get the permission from the Department of Education. Mrigendra’s response was euphemistic, but considerate. Finding there was no chance of publication in Nepal, he moved to Banaras and got his work published there. It was well read there, but when he came back to Nepal, he was ostracized by his friends and relatives. There were no longer the relations of *chakari* to Mohan, now Prime Minister ⁽⁶³⁾.

One day in the end of November 1950, persuaded by Tulsi Lal Amatya, a teacher at a local school who had secretly met with King Tribhuwan, attended a meeting where a group was talking in Newari of which he did not understand except *juloos* (procession, Arabic origin). After the meeting, he was asked to lead the *juloos* in the next morning. He agreed. In the demonstration, he unexpectedly saw Balakrishna Sama at the head of a large group with a sprinkling of Rana cousins. “Suddenly, slogans of ‘Mohan be warned, Tribhuwan will come back,’ was heard. The anger locked up in thousands of hearts now erupted into a furious crescendo; a strange excitement I’d never felt before now seized me” ⁽⁶⁴⁾.

Dimon was arrested, and taken to Singha Durbar, a special treatment for a Rana, and later Samaji and others were brought in. They assured Dimon, saying “The Congress is winning. The

King is on our side and India is with us. Mohan cannot harm us. The Rana regime will pass into history”⁽⁶⁵⁾. We can confirm that, even at this stage there was no change in their trust in the ‘good will’ of India.

6

The Nepali Congress declared ceasefire on January 16, 1951, and participated in the tripartite talks with the King and the Ranas in the first week of February 1951, with India as the ‘arbitrator’. Sagar Rana discloses that the meeting was far from ‘tripartite.’ The Nepali Congress leaders were only once taken to Hyderabad House where the King stayed for an audience. “The Ranas and the Nepali Congress leaders were never allowed to meet across a table”⁽⁶⁶⁾. B. P. could say only a few words to Vijay Shumsher, son of Mohan Shumsher, at a public function on the occasion of India’s Independence Day⁽⁶⁷⁾.

It was C. P. N. Singh who moved from one to the other, or invited the leader he chose, to meet him separately; B. P. considered to be an ‘impetuous and excitable’ man as compared to the more reasonable elder brother ‘who understands Nepal’s politics’, was often excluded and invited only in meetings called by Nehru. After a few weeks of such unsubtle diplomacy B. P. heard one day. ‘It had been done.’

The Rana-Nepali Congress coalition government, with the king presiding as the ‘constitutional’ head, was a non-starter from its very inception. The manner in which Delhi manipulated the deal rankled the sensibilities of King Tribhuwan and the Congress leaders, and the Rana rulers were of course the most aggrieved of the three --- India, thereon, was viewed as an interfering bully instead of a benevolent elder brother. It is such a pity, since the ardent and vocal support of the people of India and its media had hastened the emergence of Nepal out of the morass of an outdated family dictatorship⁽⁶⁸⁾.

Later, Nepal-India relations and the history of Nepal had to bear the pain of the deep scars that the ‘Delhi Talks’ left for long years. Sagar Rana wonders why Nepal had to be in a hurry for the end of the Rana regime when the revolution stampeded many Rana people, and Mohan and his team were already isolated.

Jawaharlal Nehru’s speech in the parliament on December 6, 1950 is often cited in this connection⁽⁶⁹⁾. Here I shall digest his main points in his own words.

First, as for the position of Nepal in the context of the situation in China, he said, “And now our interest in the internal conditions in Nepal became still more acute and personal, if I may say

so, because of the developments across our borders, because of the developments in China and Tibet, to be frank.”

Nehru continued, “Now we have had from immemorial times, a magnificent frontier, that is to say, the Himalayas. --- Now so far as the Himalayas are concerned, they lie on the other side of Nepal, mostly not on this side. Therefore, the principal barrier to India lies on the other side of Nepal and we are not going to tolerate any person coming over that barrier. Therefore, much as we appreciate the independence of Nepal, we cannot risk our own security by anything going wrong in Nepal which permits either that barrier to be crossed or otherwise weakens our frontier.”

Secondly, about the Rana regime, he confirmed, saying “In fact, if I may put in order of priority, our chief need – not only our need, but also the world’s need is peace and stability in Nepal at present. But having said that, I should also like to add that we are convinced that there can be no peace or stability in Nepal by going back to the old order completely.”

Thus, Nehru proposed ‘a middle way’ to the peace and stability in Nepal. “Therefore, we have tried, in so far as our advice is of any worth, to advise in a way so as to prevent any major upset there; we have tried to find a way, a middle way if you like which ensures the progress of Nepal, the introduction of or some advance in the ways of democracy in Nepal and at the same time, a way which does not uproot the old completely.”

While the main slogan of the Nepali Congress leaders in the ‘Revolution of 1950’ was a responsible government under the King without excluding the anti-regime Rana political leaders, the ‘middle way’ to the peace and stability promised that the leaders of the Rana regime would participate in the government.

Under the background of the unsparing criticism on Nehru’s China policy in the Parliament, Vallabhbai Patel, Deputy Prime Minister, sent a letter to Nehru dated November 7, 1950, proposing ‘a fundamental reappraisal of China policy’⁽⁷⁰⁾. It was also the day when Mohan Shumsher declared Gyanendra, who was only 4 years of age as the King of Nepal. Nehru’s reference to ‘our own security’ was expressed in this political climate. Patel passed away on December 15, 1950.

Later, Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting was held in London in January 2-12, 1951. S. Gopal, the biographer of Nehru, mentions that Nehru informed the British Government that he could not attend the meeting if they recognized Gyanendra⁽⁷¹⁾. Nehru succeeded. Their main issue in the meeting was the Korean War, and they needed the leading role of Nehru.

This episode needs to be understood in the context of the demonstration of ‘a seething mass of excitable people’ who surrounded the airfield in Kathmandu, demanding the return of Tribhuwan and ‘British mission go back!’ which Sagar Rana described without missing the importance of their action⁽⁷²⁾. In this demonstration in the end of November or in the beginning

of December 1950, women took leading role and blocked the British evaluation team. Easter Denning, head of the team, promised them that he would accurately report the facts to the government, and then was allowed to proceed to the British Embassy.

Already in the election campaign in 1946, Nehru envisaged India in future as a strong modern state that would adopt the socialist way of economic reconstruction ‘with the goodwill and agreement’ of the people⁽⁷³⁾. Swami Sahajanand Saraswati, a peasant leader, who left the Indian National Congress in December 1948, said that the August Revolution of 1942 released the ‘People’s Power’ (*Jan Shakti*), but, much more strengthened the ‘Constitutional Power’ (*Vaidhanik Shakti*)⁽⁷⁴⁾. Nehru’s approach of ‘middle way’ to progress without uprooting the old system was applied in the world scale. Final decision on India’s will to remain in the Commonwealth was approved in its Heads of Government meeting in April 1949, and the Colombo Plan for Co-operative Economic Development in South and South-East Asia was started in January 1950⁽⁷⁵⁾. However, it was not easy for Nehru to set forward his Commonwealth policy while facing the situation in China which sent her army to Korea in October 1950. He could no longer afford to understand the delicate situation facing the people of Nepal who even called a slogan, “British Mission go back!” It was true that Britain was ‘longtime friends of the Ranas’⁽⁷⁶⁾. It was in this connection that what Sagar’s *didi* said on the day of India’s independence had relevance. But, Nepal was ‘a sovereign independent state,’ and was not a member of the Commonwealth, though she joined the Consultative Committee for the Colombo Plan in March 1952⁽⁷⁷⁾.

After India’s independence, the King, Rana rulers and the Nepali Congress leaders had expected good relations with India from their respective stances, but in India in 1950-51 there was less room for the cool analysis to judge who represented the interests of the people in the long term perspective. The maneuver played by his team member was far from persuading the Nepali people. The tragedy was the fact that ‘our own security’ strode in the meeting room without any appreciation of the ‘Revolution of 1950’ in which the possibility of the anti-Rana movement was expressed delicately in the various scenes beyond the ‘adventurism’ of the Nepali Congress leaders which Nehru labelled. The ‘adventurism’ actually appeared in the Quit India movement of 1942 too. Moreover, as Kiran Mishra wrote, B. P. and many Nepali people in India had joined India’s struggle for freedom inclusive of the Quit India movement. B. P. Koirala had learnt the difference between the British rule in India and the Rana regime in Nepal through his jail experiences in both countries.

The coalition government with the Ranas and the Nepali Congress under the King Tribhuvan in the first half of the 1950s satisfied no one, and did not work in the direction of what Nehru wanted, that is, Nepal free from infighting. Its result was the King’s coup by Mahendra, the son of Tribhuvan, in 1960.

Jung Bahadur Rana, who founded the Rana regime after the 'Kot massacre' in 1846, visited England and France in 1850 and even exchanged witty words with Queen Victoria. But, the body of law which he built up in Nepal after his return had important role in the maintenance of the Rana regime. The cruelty and even the tortures of the people proceeded on the basis of the evidence under the 'Rule of Law' ⁽⁷⁸⁾.

However, Chandra Shumsher, a workaholic with his simple life and his knowledge of English and the norms of British rule and diplomacy which he learnt in Calcutta, was not interested in the spread of school education in Nepal beyond the 'accepted level' ⁽⁷⁹⁾. Also, perturbed by the infighting on the Roll of Succession to the Prime Minister among the Rana family, he devised a scheme of the classification of A, B, and C-class Ranas according to the legitimacy of marriages and women's castes ⁽⁸⁰⁾. Later, Bhim Shumsher, who was a father of many C-class sons except Padma, gave key posts in governance to C-class Ranas ⁽⁸¹⁾, and then, Juddha Shumsher purged an able C-class Rana, Rudra Shumsher to Palpa. The norms inside the Palaces made the rift between A and C-class Ranas irreparable, and hastened the end of the Rana regime from inside. Now we also want to know how the women inside the palaces observed this family hierarchy of the Ranas and their own status in the society. A few words uttered by a *didi* in the book are predictive.

Outside the palaces, Sahana Pradhan demanded women's right to education, Divya Koirala faced Mohan Shumsher who sent her son to dungeon inside the Singha Durbar ⁽⁸²⁾ and Shanta Shreshta blocked the British evaluation team ⁽⁸³⁾.

Sagar Rana's description of the trajectory and revolt of some C-class and other Rana intellectuals carved out a new sphere in the cultural history of Nepal. We can also remind here that, B. P. Koirala was also encouraged by Munshi Prem Chand, an Indian writer, in his young days in Banaras, and published his first story in *Hans*, a literary journal Prem Chand edited ⁽⁸⁴⁾. B. P.'s interest in literary work cultivated his eyes to appraise the disposition of the people from all walks of life.

Mrigendra as the Director General of Education was interested in the qualitative improvement and spread of school education and the encouragement of literary activities which successive Rana prime ministers had neglected or limited to a 'showcase' ⁽⁸⁵⁾. When he was sent to India by Padma to study the education in India, he recommended Gandhian model of 'Basic Education' after his return ⁽⁸⁶⁾. His plan faced opposition from teachers and educated middle class, but it attests where his main concern was and has contemporary relevance in the South Asian setting.

We are overwhelmed by Sagar Rana's power of expression which succeeded in describing vividly the words, decision and action of political leaders, intellectuals and the common people. In the movement against the Rana regime, he tried to read the thought of the unknown people who moved history.

The sensibility of the author to the words uttered by the people made the characters in history and the people of Nepal closer to a reader who had only limited knowledge so far. When Dimon Shumsher Rana, a lieutenant in the army, brought his first novel to get the permission of publication from the Department of Education, Mrigendra showed one novel in manuscript without telling the name of its author, and said, "Go read this and come back to me after a week. I will consider your request in the meantime." Dimon read this novel eagerly. Later, Mrigendra asked him, "Tell me, can that be published in Nepal?" After many vicissitudes, both books were published in Nepal after the overthrow of the Rana regime⁽⁸⁷⁾. The 'unidentified' author of the book in manuscript was Mrigendra himself. This episode shows how the people both inside and outside the palaces lived unwaveringly at bottom and resisted the oligarchy in Nepal.

Sagar Rana traces forcefully how the words uttered at critical moments so often decided the personal destiny and the course of the country. The book, which is written with human touch and lucid analysis, is a stimulating introduction to the history of the rise and fall of the Rana Regime as well as the history of the people of Nepal.

Notes

- (1) Lt. General Daman Shumsher Jang Bahadur Rana, *Nepal-Rule and Misrule*, New Delhi: Rajesh Publications, 1978, p. vi.
- (2) Sagar S. J. B. Rana, *Singha Durbar: Rise and Fall of the Rana Regime of Nepal*, New Delhi: Rupa Publications India, 2017, p. 74.
- (3) Sugauli is a village in India, now located at Purba Champaran District, Bihar.
- (4) Sagar Rana, op. cit., p. 131.
- (5) Ibid., p. 132.
- (6) Ibid., p. 133.
- (7) Ibid., p. 147.
- (8) Rishikesh Shaha, *Modern Nepal: A Political History 1769-1955, Vol. 2, 1885-1955*, New Delhi: Manohar, 1990, p. 128. As for Rishikesh Shaha's contact with Mrigendra and Subarna Shumsher, see Sagar Rana, op. cit., p. 127 and p. 246.
- (9) Sagar Rana, op. cit., p. 150.
- (10) Ibid., p. 151.

- (11) Ibid., p. 153.
- (12) Ibid., pp. 104-5.
- (13) Prem Uprety, *Nepal: A Small Nation in the Vortex of International Conflicts*, Kathmandu: Pugo Mi, 1984, pp. 201-2.
- (14) Ibid., p. 207.
- (15) Ibid., p. 200.
- (16) Sagar Rana, op. cit., pp. 283-4 and pp. 287-8.
Baber was Jungi Laath (literally, military lord), Controller of the military and security wing (Ibid., p. 263).
- (17) Ibid., pp. 273-5.
- (18) Ibid., pp. 276-82.
- (19) Kiran Mishra, *B P Koirala: Life and Times*, New Delhi: Wishwa Prakashan, 1994, pp. 115-6.
- (20) Sagar Rana, op. cit., pp. 278-9.
- (21) Ibid., pp. 285-8.
- (22) As for how the Japanese bombing in Rangoon devastated the life of the Tamils in Burma, see S. Nagarajan, "Tamils of Burma and the Second World War," *Osaka University of Foreign Studies: Bulletin of Asian Studies*, Vol. 4, 1994, pp. 85-96.
- (23) Sagar Rana, op. cit., p. 288.
- (24) Ibid., pp. 289-90.
- (25) Ibid., pp. 307-9.
- (26) Ibid., pp. 320-5.
Mishra writes that a letter written by B. P. in jail with the help of the Gurung guard and taken by Krishna Prasad Bhattarai and Balchander Sharma, moved Nehru to pressure Mohan into the release of B. P. Koirala. See, Kiran Mishra, op. cit., p. 23 and pp. 27-28.
- (27) Sagar Rana, op. cit., p. 325.
- (28) Ibid., p. 322.
- (29) Ibid., pp. 325-7.
- (30) Ibid., p. 333.
- (31) Ibid., p. 301.
- (32) Ibid., p. 302.
- (33) Ibid., p. 306.
- (34) Ibid., pp. pp. 306-7.
- (35) Byron Farwell, *The Gurkha: A History of the finest infantry men in the world*,

Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1985, p. 250.

- (36) Uprety, op. cit., pp. 285-297.
- (37) Sagar Rana, op. cit., p. 312.
- (38) Ibid., pp. 30-32 and p. 343.
- (39) Ibid., p. 165.
- (40) Ibid., p. 82, pp. 98-101, and, pp. 182-3.
- (41) Ibid., p. 101.
- (42) Ibid., p. 337.
- (43) Ibid., p. 341.
- (44) Ibid.
- (45) Ibid., p. 343.
- (46) The Association of Asian Studies, Osaka University of Foreign Studies, *The Chronology of Asia in the 1940s*, 1995, p. 286. The chronology is mainly written in Japanese, but this part in is English.
- (47) Sagar Rana, op. cit., pp. 351-2.
- (48) Ibid., p. 352.
- (49) Ibid., pp. 362-3.
- (50) Ibid., pp. 363-4.
- (51) Ibid., p. 382.
- (52) David H. Bayley, *Preventive Detention in India: A Case Study in Democratic Social Control*, Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1962, p. 11.
- (53) Onkar Sharad, *Lohia* (in Hindi), Allahabad: Lok Bharati Prakashan, 1969, p. 184.
- (54) Sarvepalli Gopal, *Jawaharlal Nehru-A Biography, Vol. 2*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1979, p. 69. Gopal cites Nehru's letter to Jaya Prakash Narayan dated November 20, 1950 in answer to JP's letter to Nehru dated November 17. This means that Nepali Congress leaders proceeded to Delhi immediately after the victory at Birgunj.
- (55) Sagar Rana, op. cit., p. 379.
- (56) *ibid.*, p. 380.
- (57) *Ibid.*, p. 369. Gyan Bahadur Yathumba joined the Nepal Democratic Congress, and later assumed office as the IGP (Inspector General of Police) of Nepal.
In this connection, Shri Krishna Sinha in p. 367 is Chief Minister of Bihar.
- (58) *Ibid.*, p. 358.
- (59) *Ibid.*, p. 91 and pp. 126-7.
- (60) *Ibid.*, pp. 152-3.

- (61) Ibid., p. 153.
- (62) Ibid., p. 92.
- (63) Ibid., pp. 136-8.
- (64) Ibid., pp. 358-9.
- (65) Ibid. p. 359.
- (66) Ibid., p. 388.
- (67) Ibid.
- (68) pp. 388-9.
- (69) A. S. Bhasin (ed.), *Documents on Nepal's Relations with India and China, 1949-66*, Bombay and New Delhi: Academic Books, 1970, pp. 25-26.
- (70) Neville Maxwell, *India's China War*, Dehradun: Natraj Publishers, 1997 (first published in 1970), pp. 72-73. Also see Yamguchi Hiroichi, *The Legacy of Jawaharlal Nehru-A Japanese View*, New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company Pvt. Ltd., 2019, pp. 76-77.
- (71) Gopal, op. cit., p. 70. Also, see Mishra, op. cit., p. 123. As for India's decision to remain in the Commonwealth and her role in the Colombo Plan, see Shigeru Akita, *Teikoku kara Kaihatsu Enjyo e-Sengo Azia kokusai Chitsujyo to Kogyouka* (in Japanese, *From Empires to Development Aid-International Economic Order of Asia in the 1950s-60s*), Nagoya: University of Nagoya Press, 2017, pp. 20-40.
- (72) Sagar Rana, op. cit., pp. 357-8. The correct date of the arrival of the British evaluation team at Kathmandu is expected to be clarified later.
- (73) Sho Kuwajima, *Muslims, Nationalism and the Partition-1946 Provincial Elections in India*, New Delhi: Manohar, 1998 (Reprint, 2020), p. 133
- (74) Swami Sahajanand Saraswati, *Maharudra ka Mahatandva* (in Hindi), Bihta: Shri Sitaramashram, n. d., p. 7.
- (75) Akita, op. cit., pp. 23-24.
- (76) Sagar Rana, op. cit., p. 384.
- (77) Akita, op. cit., pp. 42-43.
- (78) Sagar Rana, op. cit., p. 109.
- (79) Ibid., pp. 62-63 and p. 71.
- (80) Ibid., pp. 82-83.
- (81) Ibid., pp. 90-91.
- (82) Ibid., p. 67. "Singha Durbar was owned by the state and occupied by succeeding prime ministers."
- (83) Ibid., p. 358.

- (84) Mishra, op. cit., pp. 70-71. Also, see Sagar Rana, op. cit., 212-222.
(85) Sagar Rana, op. cit., pp. 120-7.
(86) Ibid., pp. 265-7.
(87) Ibid., pp. 137-8.

P. S. I would like to express my thanks to Mr. Komal Chitracar with whom I shared a room at the International Student House, Timar Pur, Delhi for 6 months in 1963. After we parted at Kathmandu in December 1988, we met again at Osaka in May 2018 when he came for a conference. He kindly brought a book for me. That was *Singha Durbar*. Mr. Chitracar is a public accountant in Kathmandu, and translated Bertholt Brecht, *Setzan* from German into Nepali.