# Competing nationalisms in the contestations over Sikh role in 1857

(Draft, draft, draft…..)

Dr Pritam Singh

Senior Lecturer in Economics        Research Associate
Department of Economics and Strategy    Department of International Development
Business School                            Queen Elizabeth House
Oxford Brookes University,              University of Oxford
Oxford.                                 Oxford

Note: Though I believe in removing all possible restriction to dissemination of knowledge, I feel compelled to request, due to the incomplete nature of this article, that any one feeling the need to quote any part of this article should first consult me. psingh@brookes.ac.uk

# Competing nationalisms in the contestations over Sikh role in 1857

The British annexation of Punjab in 1849 and the 'Indian sepoy mutiny'/ 'war of independence' in 1857 are two historical events that are very close to each other in time but are imbued with vastly different meanings and degrees of significance in the imagination of Punjabi/Sikh nationalism and Indian nationalism. For Punjabi/Sikh nationalism, 1849 signifies the tragic end of 50 years of sovereign Punjabi/Sikh state, and in comparison with that, 1857 is a date of relatively minor significance. For Indian nationalism, on the contrary, 1849 is of relatively 'minor significance'- it is one date among many that signify the consolidation of British empire in 'India'. In comparison with that, 1857 for the Indian nationalists is a date of huge meaning and significance- it is first war of independence from British imperial rule.

The contestation over Sikh role in 1857 is linked with the contestation over Indian/Hindustani role in 1849. This article attempts to tie up multiple and tangled aspects of the relationship between Punjabi/Sikh nationalism and Indian nationalism with the aim of drawing up as clear a picture as possible of the Sikh role in 1857. I have three main aims: one, I will provide a brief historical overview of the rise of Sikhism and Punjabi nationalism with the aim of highlighting the significance of 1849 in Punjabi/Sikh imagination; two, I will attempt to provide some historical accounts of the Sikh role in 1857 and third, I will try to examine contesting interpretations of the Sikh role in 1857.

The rise of Sikh/Punjabi nationalism and the significance of 1849

It is indeed a debateable point to stretch in time the use of the term 'nationalism'. Some would argue that the term nationalism can be appropriately used in the context of the rise of modern capitalism though it might be further debateable whether modern capitalism has a history of two centuries or five centuries. In the case of Sikh/Punjabi nationalism, the founding of the Sikh faith by Guru Nanak (1469-1539) can be considered as the foundation stone in the building of Punjabi/Sikh nationalism.

Nanak was born in a village, Talwandi Rai Bhoe, now called Nankana Sahib, about forty miles from Lahore (Khushwant Singh 1999, pp. 29-30).[1] His was an upper caste Khatri Hindu family and his father an administrative official in the office of a local Muslim chieftain. Nanak showed signs of early childhood rebellion against religious orthodoxy, hypocrisy and the Hindu caste hierarchy. In his youth, he used the medium of music, poetry, song and speech to preach the love of God and to attack the politically oppressive policies of the Muslim Mughal regime and the socially oppressive practices of the orthodox Brahminical Hindu religion. He also attacked the wealthy for their greed and spoke in favour of an equitable social status for women (Nikky-Guninder Kaur Singh 1993). He used the language of the masses, the Punjabi language, to preach his ideas.

This practice was in sharp contrast with that of the Hindu priests and the Muslim clergy, who used Sanskrit and Arabic respectively. Sanskrit and Arabic were inaccessible to the mass of the population; the traditional priestly classes used the old classical languages to exercise their intellectual hegemony. They believed that by using a language the masses could not understand, they could display their superiority of learning and develop a mystique around them.

Guru Nanak seems to have made a conscious break with this tradition. Rejecting Sanskrit, which used to be called *dev bhasha* (the language of the gods), he used Punjabi (*lok bhasha*, people's language) to communicate his egalitarian teachings. He attracted a following among the lower castes, mainly Hindus but some converts to Islam.

[1] Instead of following the usual practice of using the initials of the authors cited, I have mentioned the full name of all the scholars with the Singh surname. This has been done to avoid confusion resulting from too many Singh entries in the Bibliography.

His followers came to be known as Sikhs. Sikh, a Punjabi word, means a learner or a disciple. It is a variant of the Sanskrit word s*hishya*, which means pupil (Harbans Singh 1994, p. 1). Some of his followers came from his own Khatri caste. The Khatris, though an upper caste, were one step lower than the highest Hindu caste, the Brahmins. The Khatris felt that in Sikhism they had found a religion in which they did not have to feel inferior to the Brahmins and, ironically, they had the satisfaction of feeling that they enjoyed the status of the highest caste in the new religion. The Khatris, therefore, felt that this was their own religion and this sense of ownership became a powerful source of attraction for them to become Sikhs. However, for the large mass of Punjabis who were attracted to Guru Nanak's teachings, it was the content of his teachings (equality), the medium of his communication (the Punjabi language) and the form of his communication (poetry, song and music), which attracted them to Sikhism. He can therefore be legitimately characterised as the founder and articulator of a truly Punjabi religion. Roger Ballard (1999), a Punjab studies scholar, in his attempt to conceptualise a Punjabi religion, pays particular attention to the Punjabi dimension of Nanak's teachings. He calls Punjab as "the home base of Guru Nanak" (p. 14) and imagines Nanak to be calling all Punjabis to rise above all religious divisions among them:

> After all if Nanak were still with us to comment on current developments, it is far from unreasonable to suggest that he would wish to add the phrase *koi na Sikh* [no one is a Sikh] to his celebrated epigram *koi na Hindu, koi na Musulman* [no one is a Hindu, no one is a Muslim](p. 16) (translation added).

Khushwant Singh (1999), the most celebrated scholar of Sikh history, interprets the emergence of Guru Nanak as a Punjabi nationalist response to the historical changes taking place in Punjab in the fifteenth century (pp. 13-16). He writes:

The Punjab, being the main gateway into India, was fated to be the perpetual field of battle and the first home of all the conquerors. Few invaders, if any, brought wives with them, and most of those who settled in their conquered domains acquired local women. Thus the blood of many conquering races came to mingle, and many alien languages-Arabic, Persian, Pushto, and Turkish-came to be spoken in the land. Thus, too, was the animism of the aboriginal subjected to the Vedantic, Jain, and Buddhist religions of the Aryans, and to the Islamic faith of the Arabs, Turks, Mongols, Persians, and Afghans. Out of this mixture of blood and speech were born the Punjabi people and their language. *There also grew a sense of expectancy that out of the many faiths of their ancestors would be born a new faith for the people of the Punjab.*

By the end of the 15th century, the different races that had come together in the Punjab had lost the nostalgic memories of the lands of their birth and begun to develop an attachment to the land of their adoption. *The chief factor in the growth of Punjabi consciousness was the evolution of one common tongue from a babel of languages.*

Although the Punjabis were sharply divided into Muslims and Hindus, attempts had been made to bring about a rapprochement between the two faiths and a certain desire to live and let live had grown among the people. *It was left to Guru Nanak and his nine successors to harness the spirit of tolerance and give it a positive content in the shape of Punjabi nationalism* (pp. 13-14, italics added).

After Guru Nanak, there were nine other Gurus who provided spiritual and political leadership to the Sikh community. The Sikh faith remained a deeply pacifist faith until the period of fifth Guru Arjan Dev (1563-1606). He compiled the Sikh holy book, the Adi Granth (later known as Guru Granth Sahib). In compiling the Adi Granth, Guru Arjan showed a remarkable commitment to pluralism. He included in the Adi Granth, not only the teachings and the writings of all the five Sikh Gurus but also the contributions made between twelfth and sixteenth centuries by many Hindu Bhaktas (devotees of God) and Muslim Sufi saints.[i] Guru Arjan's other major contribution to the consolidation of the self-identity among the Sikhs as a community was construction of the Harimandar Sahib (later known more popularly as Golden Temple) in Amritsar.[ii] To project the pluralism and the openness of the holiest Sikh shrine, Guru Arjan invited a revered Muslim *sufi* saint Mian Mir to lay the foundation stone of the Golden Temple.

Guru Arjan came into conflict with the Moghul emperor Jehangir in Delhi because the Guru gave blessings to a rebel of the Moghul court who had come to the Guru seeking his blessings. This was the first conflict in the subsequent long history of the Punjab-based Sikhs' conflict with the state power based in Delhi. This ended in tragedy. Guru Arjan was tortured to death in 1606 by the Moghul Emperor, thus becoming the first martyr of the Sikhs.[iii] His son Hargobind (1595-1644), who became the sixth Guru, broke the earlier pacificist tradition of the Sikh community and waged an armed war against the Moghul rulers. He also introduced the theory and practice of the marriage between religion and politics by wearing two swords, one symbolising spiritual power and the other temporal power, and by constructing the Akal Takhat (the throne of Timeless God) across the Harimandar. At the Akal Takhat, he sat on a throne like an emperor and held court.[iv]

The period of Guruship of the seventh guru, Har Rai (1630-1661), and that of the eighth guru, Har Krishan (1656-1664), was one of quiet organisation of the Sikh community. The ninth guru, Tegh Bahadur (1621-1675), came into conflict with the Moghul emperor because he defended the religious rights of the Brahmin Hindu community, which was being targeted for persecution by the Moghul ruler Aurangzeb. The Guru was tortured to death along with his three associates in Delhi on November 11, 1675.[v] His son, Gobind Singh (1666 – 1708), became the tenth and the last guru of the Sikhs.

Guru Gobind Singh made the most original and imaginative contribution in transforming the Sikh community into a community of 'Saint-Soldiers' i.e. a community of people who were inspired by a moral-religious vision of righteousness to take up arms against oppressive rulers. In the history of the evolution of the distinct identity of the Sikhs, the creation of the Khalsa (the community of the pure) in 1699 by Guru Gobind Singh remains the most defining moment in the history of the Sikhs. The Sikhs had acquired by then an almost complete package of their distinct identity – a holy book Guru Granth Sahib, a holy city Amritsar, a holy religious centre The Harimandar (The Golden Temple), a centre for taking political decisions i.e. the Akal Takhat at Amritsar and a distinctive physical appearance with uncut hair. The only element missing in this package was the control of state power, which they were to acquire through their armed might later in 1799 when a Sikh chieftain, Ranjit Singh,

became the ruler of Punjab. His death on June 27, 1839 resulted in a bloody succession war and eventually in 1849 in the British annexation of Punjab.

**The significance of 1849 in Sikh/Punjabi imagination**

In order to capture the significance of 1849 in the historical consciousness of the Sikhs/Punjabis, it is important to highlight the importance of 1799.
By the end of eighteenth century, the Sikhs had become virtual rulers of Punjab. The Sikh struggle of this period brought into prominence several men of remarkable competence who not only "built up the Khalsa Commonwealth but also won back the confidence of the Muslim peasantry" (Khushwant Singh 1999, p. 183). Sikh resistance against the Persian and Afghan invaders and their Mughal collaborators "built up (perhaps unconsciously) the notion that the Punjab would be better off if it were ruled by Punjabis rather than remain a part of the kingdom of Kabul or the Mughal Empire" (ibid.). An English traveller, George Forster, writing in 1783, observed:

> The discordant interests which agitate the Sicque [sic] nation, and the constitutional genius of the people, must incapacitate them, during the existence of these causes, from becoming a formidable offensive power … Should any future cause call forth the combined efforts of the Sicques [sic] to maintain the existence of empire and religion, we may see some ambitious chief led on by his genius and success, and absorbing the power of his associates, display, from the ruins of their Commonwealth, the standards of monarchy …" (Forster 1798 quoted by Gupta 1992, pp. 495-496).

This prophetic observation became true sixteen years later in 1799 when an 'ambitious chief' Maharaja Ranjit Singh 'led by his genius and success, and absorbing the power of his associates', occupied Lahore.

**The Sikh Empire (1799-1849)**

In 1799, Ranjit Singh (1780-1839) the chief of the Sukerchakia *misl* emerged as the supreme political and military leader among the competing *misls*, captured Lahore and became the first and only Sikh emperor of Punjab. Punjab existed as a sovereign state for fifty years (1799-1849) before it was annexed by the British in 1849 and merged with the rest of India under colonial rule. Though Ranjit Singh's Punjab was a Muslim-majority country and the administrators were chosen on merit not only from the main religious communities – Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs – but also from European Christian visitors, the fact that the ruler was a powerful Sikh maharaja remains embedded in the consciousness of both the Sikh elites and the masses that the Sikhs were once rulers of an independent sovereign state of Punjab.[2] The importance of this historical memory among the Sikhs can be gauged from the historical and literary narratives by the Sikhs which portray Maharaja Ranjit Singh as the most important Sikh so far after the ten gurus. He is referred to as the "Lion of the Punjab" (Khushwant Singh 1997).

Ranjit Singh's legacy remains a contested terrain. On one hand, he represents the realisation of the Sikh dream of statehood and political sovereignty, and, on the other, he is a symbol of composite Punjabi identity and is celebrated as a secular Punjabi ruler.[3]

---

[2] Khushwant Singh (1999) provides the details of high offices held by Muslims and Hindus (p. 294) and by several Europeans in his chapter "Europeanisation of the Army" (pp. 258-67).

[3] Tahir (1999), analysing the work of a Punjabi Muslim poet, Qadiryar (b. 1802) "who ranks amongst the foremost Punjabi poets" (p. 55), argues that the poet celebrated in one of his works, the *Var* (Ballad), the military victories of Hari Singh Nalwa over the Pathans and Afghans. Hari Singh Nalwa was one of the most distinguished Sikh generals in Ranjit Singh's army. Tahir argues, "If the *Var* is examined, nowhere does the poet mention the Muslim or Islam. It is the Pathan and the Afghan against the Punjabi. He composed the *Var* neither as a Muslim nor as a Sikh, but as a Punjabi. Hari Singh is written of as a Punjabi battling against the Afghans and the Pathans. *The provincial feeling may have been prompted by the political situation prevailing in Ranjit Singh's Punjab*" (p. 64, italics added). Darshan Singh (1999) analyses the work of another eminent Punjabi Muslim poet, Shah Muhammad,

His death on June 27, 1839 resulted in a bloody succession war and eventually in the British annexation of Punjab after the almost leaderless Sikh army was defeated in two bitterly fought Anglo-Sikh wars (Hasrat 1992a and 1992b). Ranjit Singh's last surviving son, Dalip Singh (1838-1893) was converted to Christianity in 1853, and brought to England in 1854 where he was given a feudal estate at Elvelden to afford the luxury lifestyle of a prince. When he grew up, he reconverted to Sikhism but was not allowed to go to Punjab for fear of becoming a rallying point for the Sikhs to demand the return of their lost kingdom. Bitter, disappointed and lonely, he died in a humble hotel room in Paris on October 22, 1893 (Wylam 1992).

The British annexation of Punjab in 1849 after the defeat of the Sikh army had three significant consequences. First, the conquering British generals, impressed by the bravery of the defeated Sikh soldiers and generals, decided to incorporate them with honour into the British army in India. This resulted in a strategic success, though temporary, in turning the Sikhs into allies of the British rule in India. Second, the defeated Sikhs nurtured a grievance against the Indians who had enlisted themselves in the British army that had defeated the Sikhs. Third, the British used this Sikh grievance against the Indians in enlisting Sikh support against the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857 in India (Omissi 1994). A combination of all these three consequences resulted in a long-term troubled relationship of distrust between the Punjabi Sikhs and the rest of India, especially the Hindi 'heartland'.[4]

---

who in his war-ballad written in 1849, bemoans the defeat of the Sikh army in the first Anglo-Sikh war as a defeat of the Punjabi kingdom of Ranjit Singh and refers to the war as "a war between Punjab and Hind (Hindustan)" (p. 73). Hindustan is one of the Hindi words used for India.

[4] See Kudasiya (2006) for a useful deployment of the concept of Hindustani/Hindi heartland. Chatterjee (2007) is a good use of the concept of Hindustani heartland in arguing for a case of the

The people of Punjab in general and the Sikhs in particular identified themselves with Ranjit Singh's Punjab as their sovereign homeland. This is true of Punjabi/Sikhs even in those territories which were not under Ranjit Singh's direct control. One indicator of an average Punjabi/Sikh's identification with Ranjit Singh is that many of them fought against British annexation of Punjab without ever having been in the employment of his army. Here I would like to narrate a personal story.

**The story my grandfather told me**

My grandfather Sardar Sandhura Singh Gill (1890-1972) narrated to me a story about the participation of his great grandfather in one of the Anglo-Sikh wars. This story fascinated me then and has continued to fascinate the historian with in me ever after. The reasons for my fascination have, however, changed over time. He told me that one day his great grandfather was working in the fields (it was 1840s after Ranjit Singh's death) that he received a message sent by Maharani Jindan ( the youngest and the last queen of Ranjit Singh, and the mother of Dalip Singh- the youngest son of Ranjit Singh who was exiled to Britain) to the general population of Punjab that their Raj was under threat from the advancing British army and they should come with whatever weapon they can get hold off to fight and save their Raj. My great great grandfather was furious with anger on learning about this threat to their Raj. He immediately stopped working in the fields and walked towards the battle field front as per the information given by the messenger sent by Rani Jindan. He was physically so powerful, my grandfather told me, that when he was walking furiously towards the battlefield and found at one point that his path was obstructed by a tree, he uprooted the tree single-handedly.

---

emergence of 'a new identity of the Sikhs of Punjab' in opposition to Hindustani heartland in the context of 1857 conflict.

There are several aspects of this story: I was a young kid when my grandfather told me this story in the late 1950s and I did not ask him any questions I should have and could have had I been older. I did not ask about in which one of the three main Anglo-Sikh wars my great great grandfather fought, what happened to him (did he die?), did my grandfather meet his great grandfather or did he hear this story from his parents or grand parents..  The aspect of the story which fascinated me most at that time was about the physical prowess of my great great grandfather in uprooting a tree single-handedly. As I grew older, I started feeling pride in belonging to a family whose ancestors had resisted British imperialism though the environmentalist in me now feels awkward about the uprooting of the tree!

From a historical point of view, several other aspects of this oral historical narrative are very valuable. One, my ancestors lived in an area under the jurisdiction of the princely state of Faridkot (not under Ranjit Singh's jurisdiction). This tells us about the widespread and deep identification of the Punjabis in general and Sikhs in particular with Ranjit Singh's regime. Second, ordinary people, and not only salaried soldiers of Ranjit Singh's army, participated in the battles to defend his regime. Third, in the historical consciousness of ordinary Sikhs (my grandfather was well-off but not a rich landowner); the final down fall of the Punjabi kingdom of Ranjit Singh in 1849 was an event of great and tragic significance. Fourth, 1857 was not a part of the historical memory of the Punjabis and Sikhs at least in the twentieth century. My grandfather never mentioned 1857 to me. I came to know about 1857 only from the Indian nationalist history as taught at school though I knew about Anglo-Sikh wars and 1849 as part of growing up in a Sikh household.


**The role of Hindustanis/Poorbias in annexing Punjab**

The participation of the Hindustanis as a part of the British army in the annexation of Punjab created the first major fault-line in the relations between Punjabi/Sikh nationalism and Indian nationalism. Punjabis hated the Hindustanis, whom they called Poorbias, for being a part of the conquering army. It is reasonable to say that the Punjabis viewed themselves as a different nation from the Poorbias before the Anglo-Sikh Wars but there were no feelings of animosity towards the Poorbias. However, after the Anglo-Sikhs Wars which Shah Mohammed called 'Jang Hind-Punjab', the Punjabis hated the Poorbias as much as they hated the British for annexing Punjab.

After 1857, the Sikhs' relationship with the colonial rulers reflected two conflicting moods in the community. One was a mood of anger and revenge against the Raj for having annexed their kingdom, the other of demoralization, resignation and adaptation to the historic reality of the power of the British empire. A section of the religious minded Sikhs and ex-soldiers of Ranjit Singh's army gave expression to the mood of revenge by indulging in acts of violent and non-violent defiance of British rule. Large numbers of Sikh peasants and soldiers sympathised silently with these acts of defiance but were also tempted by the lure of a career in the British army. The colonial rulers dealt very harshly with the small defiant section of the community and offered generous and seemingly honourable opportunities to the accomodationist section. A large number of Sikhs were recruited into the British army and their religious practices were respected with great care (Omissi 1994). The respect shown to the religious practices of the Sikh soldiers seemed to be the result of two considerations: first, it was an attempt at correcting the damage the British rulers had suffered in 1857 as a result of the real and rumoured disrespect shown to the religious practices of the Hindu and Muslim soldiers; second, the British had understood that Sikh soldiers true

to the Saint-Soldier tradition of Guru Gobind Singh were likely to be a better and more motivated fighting force than the non-*Khalsa* tradition (Omissi 1994).

To conclude this part, the loss of the Sikh empire in 1849 was for Sikh/Punjabi nationalism, the end of a dream. The British rulers understood this feeling among the Punjabis/Sikhs and made systematic efforts to heal the wounds they had inflicted on Punjabi/Sikh consciousness. On the other hand, the Hindustanis did not realise in 1849 or the following years before 1857 that they had incurred the wrath of the Punjabis for participating in the British wars to snatch their (Punjabis') independence. The cost the Hindustanis paid for this insensitivity to Punjabi/Sikh sentiments was that they could not win any sympathy from the Sikhs in 1857. Punjabis/Sikhs looked upon 1857 as a double opportunity: to inflict injury on the Hindustanis and to win the favour of the British who had been attempting strenuously to mend ways with the Punjabis/Sikhs.

**The Sikh role in 1857**

There is irrefutable evidence that the Sikhs were the allies of the British against the Hindustani mutineers in 1857 (See Khushwant Singh 1963/2006, Dalrymple 2006). It will be a travesty of historical evidence if this Sikh alliance with the British is seen out of Punjab context. If the Punjab context is taken into account, we would notice that it is not only the Sikhs but also Punjabi Muslims and Hindus who had no sympathy with the Hindustani mutineers. According to Khushwant Singh (1963/2006), except a few incidents, 'the Punjab was not affected by the rebellion which convulsed the rest of northern India. Punjabi Mussalmans turned a deaf ear to their Hindustani co-religionists' exhortation to jihad against the pig-eating despoilers of Islam. Punjabi Hindus and, with greater reason, the Sikhs refused to listen to the belated appeal to save Hindu dharma from beef-eating foreigners who used cow fat to

grease their cartridges. This was not surprising because those, who in the summer of 1857 claimed to be crusaders for freedom, were the very people who eight years earlier had been the feringhees's instruments in reducing the Punjabis to servitude' (p 109). What united the Punjabi Muslims, Hindus and the Sikhs was the spirit of Punjabi nationalism against the Hindustanis. Countless Punjabi Hindus (most eminent Diwan Mool Raj) and Punjabi Muslims along with the Sikhs had given their lives fighting against the Hindustanis in defending the sovereign state of Punjab during the Anglo-Sikh wars. It would be more appropriate to call these wars as Anglo-Punjab wars. That is, in fact, how Shah Mohammed, the celebrated Punjabi poet, had characterised these wars as 'Jang Hind-Punjab'. It is interesting to note in this context that a few Sikhs who sympathised with the mutineers were the ones whose spirit of Punjabi nationalism, it seems, had been diluted by being located outside Punjab and in the Hindustani territory: 'There were stray cases of Sikhs joining the mutineers. In Benares, a battalion of 'Ludhiana Sikhs' of the 37th native infantry mutinied on 3 June 1857. Many were killed or hanged. This triggered off a mutiny at Jewanpur, 70 miles from Benares. The Sikhs guarding the courthouse and treasury at Benares remained loyal' (Hilton 1957 cited by Khushwant Singh 2006, p109).

By way of conclusion, it can be said though the Punjabis including the Sikhs were angry with both the Hindustanis and the British for usurping their Punjab, when it came to choosing between the two when these two were at war with each other in 1857, the British were successful in winning over the Punjabis/Sikhs to their side because of four main reasons: one, the British showed utmost care in respecting the religious sensibilities of the Sikhs while the upper caste segments of the Hindustanis Hindus had shown disrespect towards the Sikhs ; two, the British offered economic

incentives mainly in the form of attractive employment opportunities in the army to ordinary Sikhs and extended territorial jurisdiction to the Sikh rajas; third, the Sikhs saw 1857 as an opportunity to take revenge on the hated Hindustani/Poorbias, and fourth, the Sikhs feared the return of the Moghul rule if the British were defeated.

---

[i] For full details on these contributors, see K. Brown (ed.), *Sikh Art and Literature* (London: Routledge 1999), 198-199.

[ii] Ian Kerr, 'Harimandar', in Harbans Singh (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Sikhism Vol.2* (Patiala: Punjabi University 2001).

[iii] For details, see R.N. Vohra, 'Martyrdom of Guru Arjan Dev' in S. S. Bal (ed.), *Proceedings of the Punjab History Conference Twelfth Session, March 17-19, 1978* (Patiala: Punjabi University 1979), N. Smart, *The World's Religions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1992), 99, J.S. Grewal, *The Sikhs of the Punjab* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1998), 42 and Pashaura Singh, 'Understanding the Martyrdom of Guru Arjan', *Journal of Punjab Studies*, 12(1), Spring 2005, 29-62.

[iv] Khushwant Singh, *A History of Sikhs Vol. 1: 1469-1839* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press 1999), p 63. Hugh McLeod attributes the emergence of violence in Sikh political practice to the large scale entry of the Jat farming community into Sikhism. Though he makes a probing analysis of the Jat dimension in the evolution of the Sikh community from the period of the third Guru to the Sixth Guru, he unnecessarily succumbs to an element of essentialism in characterising the Jats as prone to violence: 'The death of Guru Arjan may have persuaded Guru Hargobind of the need for tighter organisation, but we find it difficult to envisage a large number of unarmed Jats suddenly becoming commanded to take up weapons. *The Jats will have remained Jats*' (italics added). H. McLeod, *The Evolution of the Sikh Community* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999), 12. This essentialist characterisation is contrary to McLeod's own general method of historical-evolutionary analysis of the changes in the development of the Sikh community. I have had a very fruitful and friendly private correspondence with Hugh McLeod regarding this comment of mine after the publication of my paper 'The Political Economy of the Cycles of Violence and Non-violence in the Sikh Struggle for Identity and Political Power: implications for Indian federalism', *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No.3, April 2007, pp 555-570. I have depended upon that paper for this section of the present article.

[v] Khushwant Singh, A *History of Sikhs*, 73-74 & J.S. Grewal, *The Sikhs of the Punjab* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1998), 72.

For a modern human rights interpretation of Guru Tegh Bahadur's martyrdom, see Pritam Singh, in M.R. Anderson & S. Guha (eds.), *Changing Concepts of Rights and Justice in South Asia* (Delhi: Oxford University Press 1998). This interpretation was a key input into Amnesty International's decision to declare Guru Tegh Bahadur as one of the five eminent men of the seventeenth century whose ideas and actions were decisive in the struggle for human rights in the seventeenth century. The other four selected by AI are: John Lilburne (1617-1657), John Locke (1632-1704), William Pen (1644-1718) and Voltaire (1694-1778). Amnesty International brought out a publication on this subject to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Amnesty International 1998).

Explores whether contemporary transformations in society can be understood as negotiating nationalism. Provides a critical comparison of the European Union and Canada with regard to the relationship between nationalism and multiculturalism. Attempts to establish a clearer understanding of contemporary nationalism through the topics of transnational nationalism, cosmopolitanism, and nationalist reactions. Vertical role contestation was the result of the domestic public's awareness-and dislike-of Russia's role as a sending country. Role Dissonance in Foreign Policy: Russia, Power, and Intercountry Adoption. Article. In the context of intersubjectivity between rivals, there is no requirement to achieve role relations, however. Role theory, which considers the role's source and the intersubjective making of the role, has not attended to intersubjective construction between the role taker and its imagined audience [9,15,51]. Current role theory, which explains rivalry embedded in the European tradition of natural law, sometimes makes no sense to a weiqi rival, who can avoid entering into rivalry, or make moves that do not make any apparent contribution to one's position in said rivalry. Nationalism is an ideology and movement that promotes interest of a particular nation (as in a group of people) especially with the aim of gaining and maintaining the nation's sovereignty (self-governance) over its homeland and uniting the different ethnicities of the nation. Nationalism holds that each nation should govern itself, free from outside interference (self-determination), that a nation is a natural and ideal basis for a polity, and that the nation is the only rightful source of political