

Short Story

Gold Coins and a Selfish Man

Sam was a greedy and a selfish man. He always desired to have lots and lots of money and never hesitated to cheat others to make money. Also, he never wished to share anything with others. He was so selfish that he would like to own everything for himself.

The selfish man used to calculate each and every small aspect. He paid very little amount of wages to his servants. Where ever he went, he calculated a lot to save money by deceiving others. He also told a lot of lies to protect his wealth. Simply, Sam was the antonym for the word; HONESTY.

However, he was taught a nice lesson by his own act. One day, he missed a small bag, which contained 50 gold coins. He was searching for the bag of gold coins, day and night. He sent his workers in search of the bag, but none could find it. He told his friends and neighbors that he had lost a bag of gold coins and requested them to inform him, if they found it. Sam was so sad that he had lost so many gold coins.

After a couple of days, a ten year old girl, who lived near Sam's house, told her father that she had found a small bag and that it had 50 gold coins. Her father worked in Sam's land and he told his daughter that the bag belonged to his master. He had lost it two days ago, and added that he would return the bag to his master.

They weren't very rich, and the father could have easily retained the gold coins, and hide the fact of finding the bag. He was so honest that he felt that he should return the valuable coins to his master, as he was the rightful owner.

He gave the bag back to his master Sam, and asked him to check whether the bag had 50 gold coins. Sam who was



literally happy to get the coins, decided to play a trick. He shouted at his worker, 'there were 75 gold coins in this bag and you gave me only 50! Where are the other coins? You have stolen them!'

The worker was shocked to hear this, and he pleaded to his master that he gave whatever his daughter had found. Selfish and greedy, Sam did not accept the worker's story, and decided to take the issue to court.

The judge heard both the sides. He questioned the daughter and the worker about the number of coins they had found in the bag, and they assured it was only 50.

He cross-examined Sam and Sam replied, 'Yes m'lord, I had 75 gold coins in my bag, and they gave me only 50. Hence, it is quite obvious that they have stolen the balance 25 coins!'

Judge then asked, 'Are you sure you that your bag had 75 coins?' and Sam nodded his head in acceptance.

The judge then made his judgment, 'Since Sam lost a bag of 75 gold coins and the bag found by the girl had only 50 coins, it is obvious that the bag found, didn't belong to Sam, and it was lost by someone else. In addition, if anyone found a bag of 75 gold coins, I will declare that it belongs to Sam. As there are no claims against the loss of 50 coins, I order the girl and his father to take those 50 coins as a token of appreciation for their honesty!'

Honesty will always be rewarded and greediness punished!

Sunday Quiz

1. Dry ice is a frozen form of which gas?
2. Who wrote the Sahitya Akademi Award winning novel 'Imasee Nurbaree'?
3. Which British Prime Minister was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature?
4. When was DM College founded?
5. Name the event associated with the codename 'Smiling Buddha'?

(5) Indian's first nuclear explosion in Pokhran (1974)
(2) B M Malashankar
(4) 6th August 1946
(3) Sir Winston Churchill
(1) Carbon Dioxide

Answers:

Compiled by - Dr. S Langpoklakpam.

WHENEVER YOU SEE CONSTRUCTION AND MINING EQUIPMENTS, JUST THINK OF US
A SOLUTION FOR EVERY CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT

BEML LIMITED

Automobile Engineering Works-1
BEML WORKSHOP
New Checkson Road, Purana Barbari
Imphal East.
Manipur - 795 001

ALL KINDS OF SPARE PARTS AVAILABLE

AFTER SALES SERVICE TO YOUR SATISFACTION

Authorised dealer BEML Limited
(A Government of India Mini Ratna Company under Ministry of Defence)

Letters, Feedback and Suggestions to 'Imphal Times' can be sent to our e-mail : imphaltimes@gmail.com.
For advertisement kindly contact : -
0385-2452159 (O)

Contd. from page 1

Problem of 1949 Annexation of Manipur

Table No. 1
Transformation of Manipur State

Period	Status of State	Order
Pre 1947*	International Protectorate	1
26 July 1947	Autonomous State (Constitution adopted)	2
11 August 1947	Associate state (sovereign within Indian Constitution)	3
15 August 1947	Sovereign state	4
18 October, 1948	Sovereign People's Republic (Assembly functions)	5
15 October 1949	Annexed state (Continuous state with suspended sovereignty)	6
January 21, 1972	Constituent state of India (Susp. Sovereignty)	7

In addition to it, Maulana Azad's *India wins Freedom*, D.R. Manekar's *Accession to Extinction*, H.M. Seervai's *Partition of India: Legend and Reality*, Wavell's *The Viceroy's Journal*, Bipan Chandra, et.al (ed)'s *India's Struggle for Independence*, Stanley Womper's *Jinnah of Pakistan*; and from the perspective of Manipur, British Reports, N Sanajaoba (ed)'s *Manipur: Past and Present* (Vol. I-III), Manipur University publications of contemporary times have been source materials. Let me discuss the issue of Manipur in entirety using the historical documents and various analytical tools. Inevitably, some foreign vocabularies and nomenclatures will be used as it is so as to avoid the controversy surrounding and arising out of the people.

First Issue

In between two world wars (Inter-war period, 1919-1945), the political status of the states was very dynamic and characterised by fluidity. Its stature and level changes and doesn't have a definable static character. To categorise the political status would be next to impossible. The state system that existed before the First World War does not match with the present times as the former was colonial times. A long historical past of imperialism and colonialism has made the matter more complicated and obscured.

British paramouncy is neither colony, it infringes upon the independence of the states under monarchy, terminology which is not recognised by the international law. Because of it, the unfeasibility and impracticability of appropriately categorising the states' status of sovereign and semi-sovereign occurred during the time of paramouncy.

Political status of states during the inter war period (1914-1945) and varied in the comity of nations. Categories altered

The political status of Manipur starting from pre-1947 to the year 1972 has been given above in the form of a chart. Firstly, the political status of Manipur in the pre-1947 was not included in the purview of colonialism. This has been treated as true by various colonial sources, Manipuri sources, and other independent sources. Phillips Ziegler in his work, *'Mounbatten: The Official Biography' (1985)* writes, 'As the boundaries of British India has gradually extended in the first half of the nineteenth century, an increasing number of princely states had entered into treaty arrangements with the new power, under which they accepted the presence of a British residents in their capitals and a degree of subordination to the Raj, but were not absorbed into the colonial bloc'.

James Crawford, while mentioning about the princely state stated that the native states in the Indian subcontinent are included in the purview of neither the protectorate state nor the colonial protectorate. Their status is same as international protectorate. I, myself, have earlier dealt sufficiently enough on the issues of Manipur during those days of paramouncy. When the paramouncy came to an end, the state can exercise the option of joining either of the two dominions or remaining independent under particular political arrangement.

Congress had persistently tried hard and made all possible efforts to substitute and replace the British paramouncy but the British have firmly taken the stance that it was beyond their jurisdiction. The issue that needs to be clarified at the first instant is the interpretation of the native state by the British did not match and synchronise with interpretation of the British. From the viewpoint of the Congress leadership, states of Moghul, Maratha, and Sikh were very often found to be mentioned as native states. Manipur was never a part of it. Manipur in its historical past and contemporary times also was not mentioned in the *'Blood relation'* state of Sardar Patel. It is viewed from the perspective of the Congress' native state. Manipur belongs to the same category of separate state like Burma, Ceylon (Sri Lanka). Congress has falsely deemed the Indian subcontinent as a continuous state.

Manipur had its own political constitution in the year 1947. By virtue of it, despite being under international protectorate, Manipur became an autonomous state. Since the said constitution was given neither by the British nor by the Congress, the Manipur constitution stands unique and independent outside their political authority. VP Menon himself writes that the status of the Manipur state was outside the purview of British India. And in August 1947 also, it was a part of neither India nor Pakistan.

On 11 August, 1947, Manipur after signing the Standstill and Accession Act which accordingly had agreed to hand over the three subjects to the (soon to be realised) Indian confederation remained as Associate State. Granville Austin, while

describing the status of the states writes, 'Somewhat later (sic) after the Cabinet Mission' most of them (states) became loosely attached to the union government in a relationship more closely resembling confederation than federalism although several threatened to remain independent'. In the case of independence of the associate state, there has been widespread agreement. James Crawford writes, 'even if foreign affairs, defence and other subjects are handed over to another state, associate state remained independent as it happened to Western Samoa. He further mentioned that associate state can cease to be so basing on the principle of self-determination exercised through the free and genuine expression of the will of the people. In the case of Manipur becoming a case of associate state, the free and genuine expression of the people were bypassed. And also Manipur cannot cease to be associate state, as no visible initiative is forthcoming from the metropolitan state (India) which would pave way for solutions of issues as Metropolitan state is day by day becoming more and more imperialist. eeping this aside, even after accession, the state doesn't lose its independence. It has been very categorically mentioned in the Clause 7 & 8 of Accession Treaty. Clause 7 of the Instrument of Accession states:

"Nothing in this instrument shall be deemed to commit me (Manipur King) in any way to acceptance of any future constitution of India or to fetter my discretion to enter into arrangements with government of India under any such future constitution".

Clause 8 states: "Nothing in this instrument affects the continuance of my sovereignty in and over this state, or save as provided by or under this instrument, the exercise of any powers, authority and rights now enjoyed by me as ruler of this state".

On 15 August 1947, the political status of was elevated with Manipur becoming a sovereign status. Manipur in actuality became a sovereign peoples' republic when its assembly with its members elected through adult franchise had its session on 18 October 1948. When an independent Manipur became a part of India, there was a harsh change in the political status of Manipur. India annexed Manipur. The said annexation had been denounced and opposed altogether by the duly elected government of that contemporary time, hills and valley brethren, different parties, leftist movement. Today, it is being continued by organisations spearheading the liberation movement through resistance. During that time, only a fragment of Congressman pleaded for merger of Manipur.

Second Issue

Whether the annexation of Manipur is right or wrong in the benchmark and practices of universally accepted jurisprudence has become a very crucial issue. Instrument of accession, Standstill Agreement,

Indian Independence Bill, 1947 did not infringe upon the independence and sovereignty of the state. The Indian Independence Bill 1947 neither prohibited the state from accession to either of the dominion nor issued any mandate for accession. Instrument of accession also neither leads to devolution or suspension of state continuity. Viceroy Mounbatten took great responsibility in facilitating the accession-it is cited below. Firstly E.W.F. Lumby writes that the people of London took the acts of Mounbatten concerning accession as very arbitrary and excessive. H.V. Hodson writes that Mounbatten illegally bypasses the Secretary of state and seeks Plenipotentiary Powers. In fact, Mounbatten never gave consideration to the interest of the state.

Secondly, as per laws and norms, when the political department worked for the sovereignty of the state, Mounbatten worked for the accession. As per Sir Conrad Corfield's arrangement, a treaty relation between the state and as the paramouncy is very clear. So, accession before the end of paramouncy was considered as a 'Breach of Faith'. It is because of this reason that Sir Conrad Corfield, who holds the Charge of Political Department left his department and fled on 23 July without attending a meeting of kings he called on 25 July 1947.

Thirdly, concerted effort by Mounbatten to chart out a strategy to thwart and obstruct Communist movement, and to bring in India to the Commonwealth. The strategic importance of Indian ocean charted out by Clement Atlee and the determined effort to fill the void created out of Pakistan with the state's territory. In short, he left no stones unturned and tried his level best for accession so as to serve the long term British interest. In addition to it, Mounbatten had the personal ambition of becoming the first Sec. Lord or Governor General of Dominion of India. In fact, it can be said that the personal ambition nursed by Mounbatten falls in the Nehru-Patel-Gandhi's trap of abolishing the independence of the states. Altogether about 20 states deserve to continue its existence as independent states, remaining others were of miniscule village size only.

All the attempted annexation by India were not given consent and sanction by the United Nations. The Security Council of the United Nations after accepting the complaints on the invasion of Hyderabad put forward by Nizam on September 1948 was no longer pursued after the Nizam accepted defeat. India's relation with Bhutan, as per Treaty of Friendship signed on 8th August 1949, India gave guidance to Bhutan's relation with other countries. Why the dispute is still continuing today - the instruction by the Security Council to conduct Plebiscite could not be conducted by India. Article 2A and 10th Schedule were incorporated by the 35th Constitution Amendment regarding Sikkim which accordingly took over the Defence, Communications, External Affairs and Social Welfare. The 35th Amendment says, 'Sikkim will not be a part of territory of India, but an associate state. But in the 36th amendment Sikkim was annexed by India. The Indian empire is expanding exactly the same like the British did in earlier times- this imperial expansion is likely to doom one day.hough, the complaint regarding the annexation of Manipur was not put up to the UN Security Council. UN had in very categorically made it known from the above mentioned that annexation is illegal. Though the dispute comes to a standstill as there was no longer alteration, in Manipur, there is a history of continued resistance in various forms by the people. Next, what can be contemplated is whether the Maharaja of Manipur has the power to integrate or merge Manipur to its neighbouring state.

(To be contd.....)