



GLIMPSES OF INDIA'S FREEDOM STRUGGLE DEPICTED IN MAINSTREAM HISTORIOGRAPHY

ABHINAV TIWARI

Post Doctoral Fellow, Department of History, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi (U.P.)

SANJAY KUMAR

Principal, Govt Degree College, Satpuli, Pauri Garhwal, Uttarakhand

ABSTRACT

History as historiography becomes polyphonic, defies fundamentalist essentialism and enlarges the terrain in which to flourish. Historiography does not annul or relativise history, but constitutes it, - not as a preface or as so many incomplete versions, but as what historians do. It tells us that historical reconstructions are provisionally certain and hypothetically sure, although individual historians may in all sincerity or naiveté believe that they have done the job finally. It also keeps history alive by renewing it. (Rao, B. Surendra, 2010)

New sources and new methods of analysis can lead to historical readings different from previous ones. A comment frequently made is that since historical facts do not change, how can history change? This reflects a lack of awareness of the sources and methods currently being used in historical interpretation. The facts may not change although sometimes they do as a result of fresh information or new ways of analysing old information but the interpretation of these facts can change. History is not just a directory of information; it also involves analysing and interpreting this information. (Thapar, Romila, 2014)

Keywords: historiography, trends and schools of thought, freedom movement, chronological framework, thinker, historian, nationalism, marxist, subaltern.

INTRODUCTION

The enormity of sources available and accessible to historians and researchers to study nationalism and Indian National Movements have made the subject extremely fascinating and challenging both for obvious reasons. The journey of emergence and evolution of India as the largest and most vibrant democracies of the world begins on from 15 August 1947 onwards. India also reflects many of the forces which have created the world. For example, it was the first non-white nation to emerge from colonial control, and its independence from Britain in 1947 undermined the whole fabric of the British Empire which had dominated world affairs in the preceding decades (Judith M. Brown, 1985 p. 1). Since history is an essential component of nation-building, the question often discussed in recent times is whether a nation can have many versions of history. How an event is seen can vary according to the perspective of the viewer and the purpose for which it is being viewed. But historians do hold that every claim to history has to be vetted according to the methods now used to test the veracity of historical information.

On 15 August 1947 the British India directly ruled by the Crown was declared independent and 25th part of the land of the sub-continent was yet struggling for liberation and still ruled by princely

states. A case in point is Hyderabad. On 15 August the national flag was hoisted by Congress in different parts of Hyderabad state. The offenders were arrested and taken off to jail. On the other side the Razakars grew more truculent. They affirmed their support for the Nizam's declaration of independence, and printed and distributed handbills which proclaimed: 'Free Hyderabad for Hyderabadis' and 'No pact with the Indian Union'. (Ramchandra Guha, 2008, p. 53) Every year after 1930, Congress-minded Indians celebrated 26 January as Independence Day. However, when the British finally left the sub-continent, they chose to hand over power on 15 August 1947. This date was selected by the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten, as it was the second anniversary of the Japanese surrender to the Allied Forces in the Second World War. So freedom finally came on a day that resonated with imperial pride rather than nationalist sentiment. (ibid, p. 5) There were two Indian territories- Goa and Pondicherry ruled by the Portuguese and French respectively still waiting for independence from colonial yoke. This could be only possible in 1954 and 1961 when Pondicherry and Goa became independent respectively. So finally in 1961 India emerged out of its centuries-old bondage of colonialism. Surprisingly none of the monographs and text books on Indian freedom movement has taken note of these episodes.

History is minimally three things: What happened in the past, what people believe happened in the past, and what historians say happened in the past. Historiography is largely about the second and third of these definitions of history (Robin W. Winks, 1999). The Great Revolt of 1857 was an epoch-making and remarkable event in the annals of modern Indian history which later became an idea and symbol of mass anti-colonial struggle and patriotism. It remains a highly emotive date in the collective consciousness of Indian mind-set. The events of 1857 have been a subject matter of intense debate and controversy in the academic circles. The primary focus of the historiography has been to categorize the events with in the 'rubrics' ranging from 'mutiny', 'rebellion', 'uprising', 'revolution', and 'first war of Independence' etc. the preoccupation with the labelling has often gravitated the focus from the real 'theatre' of the events to that of 'polemical diatribes'. These highly polarized opinions representing different set of ideological 'comfort zones' have been marked by alienation from the ground 'politics', 'dynamics' and 'impact' of the 'event' on the psycho-social-cultural fabric of the society (Percival Spear, 28-30 December 2007, p.29). Its significance lies not only in investigation of complex genesis, multifaceted nature and far reaching consequences rather it became a landmark for historians of modern India and a considerable number of books have titles centring around 1857. (Sen, S. N. 1957 etc.)

FREEDOM MOVEMENT AND CHRONOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

It was James Mills who brought the convention to India, in an anterior form of Hindu, Muhammedan and British periods, with his *The History of British India*, first published in 1817. Mill's work had a long lasting influence on the writing of Indian history and his periodisation and tripartite division of Indian history remained the hegemonic construct. (Mukhia, Harvans, January-June, 1998 p. 100.) In the beginning of the 20th century, in 1903 to be precise, 'Ancient, Medieval and Modern' were first used by a British historian Stanley Lane-Poole. (Mukhia, Harvans, 2002, p. 179) The Indian national movement comes within the chronological framework of Modern India and a considerable number of books either monograph or popular text books have accepted titles revolving around 'Modern'. (Sumit Sarkar, 1983) But the books on Modern India follow varied chronological markers. Bipan Chandra's *Modern India*, one of the most popular and widely read text books, published in several versions and numerous editions begins at 18th century India and concludes on partition of India

whereas another master piece text by Sumit Sarkar covers the period 1885-1947. 1885 has become landmark as it was the year of foundation of Indian National Congress at Bombay. Majority of the works on Modern India concludes on 1947 without giving any valid reasons and historical justification on this premise. Bipan Chandra, who has authored considerable number of books on nationalism, colonialism, communalism, freedom struggle and many facets of it without advocating underlying logic, considers the years succeeding 1947 as contemporary India. (Chandra, Bipan, 2011) Ramchandra Guha raises this issue but remains unanswered. (Guha, Ramchandra, 2008, p. xxi)

One of the front leaders of Indian National Congress, Surendranath Banerjee (1848-1926) in his autobiographical work (Bose, Nemaï Sadhan, 1987) *India : A Nation in Making* disapproved India as a nation and even Aurbindo Ghosh was hesitant to accept nationhood of India. R.C. Majumdar, an assertive nationalist historian, comments, “There were Bengalis, Hindusthanis, Sikhs, Rajputs and Marathas but no Indian “and it was he who has strong reservations to claim the great revolt of 1857 either as national or first war of Independence. (Majumdar, R.C., 1965, pp. 624-25) The questioning on the significant issue of nation and nationalism changed the perception of anti-colonial revolts and movements and consequently the label or title 'national movement' (The Gazetteer of India: History and Culture, 1990, pp.551-586) disappeared from writing and it was replaced with more acceptable terminology 'freedom struggle' / 'freedom movement'. (Prasad, Bisheshwsar, 1971)

TRENDS AND SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT ON FREEDOM MOVEMENT:

There is a veritable flood of recent detailed studies particularly on the freedom movement. The recent debate on Indian nationalism and freedom movements can only be highlighted by studying the existing historiography on the subject which can roughly be grouped into four schools-Cambridge or Colonial, Nationalist, Marxist and Subaltern. Along with the dominant trends of historiography Post-colonial / Post-modernist's approach too has been taken into account. But they have been denied for their fractured modes of analysis and interpreting historical currents (Mukherjee, B. N., 2001). The Postmodernists have been seen as a different class of morticians of history, by denying its ontological status they are accused of reducing all history to textuality , 'telling it is you like it', as it were, legitimizing any promiscuous construction and without a standard value to meet or fulfil. They are accused of reducing all history to historiography (Rao, B. Surendra, 2010). In this age of identity formations new perspective of looking the India's struggle for freedom is emerging on the platform of historiography- Dalit perspective. Gradually this new emergent approach to analyse and situate the role of dalits in freedom struggle has been recognised duly in some way.

The Cambridge or Colonial School believes that the national movement was not a people's movement based on the basic contradiction between the interests of the Indian people and British Colonialism and that it was a product of the needs and interest of the elite groups who used it to serve their own narrow interests. Nationalism is seen primarily as a mere ideology which these elite groups used to legitimize their narrow ambitions and to mobilize public support. The thesis propounded by historians- Jack Gallagher, Ronald Robinson, Anil Seal, and Christopher Bayly and etc. were collectively founders of the infamous “Cambridge School “of Indian history. Among the Cambridge historians Bally's writing has lasting impact on Indian historiography (Mahmood Farooqui). The view propounded by Cambridge historians not only denies the existence of colonial exploitation and underdevelopment and the central contradiction but it also denies any intelligent or active role to the mass of workers, peasants, lower middle class and women in the anti-imperialist struggle. They are treated as dumb creatures who had no perception of their needs or interest (Prasad, Bisheswar, 1966).

Cambridge school stands as a calumny on the achievements of the Indian national movement.

Nationalist historians see the national movement as a movement of the people, a result of the spread and realization of the idea or spirit of nationalism or liberty. The movement is seen as a creation of a few great leaders who saw the interest of Indians opposed to alien domination and only a charismatic leader was lacking to awaken the masses. The major weakness of nationalist historians is that they tend to ignore or, at least underplay the inner contradictions of Indian society both in terms of class and caste (Singh, Lata, p. 100). Nationalist historiography comprises the writing of prominent leaders and freedom fighters that were doing crucial works of writing about movements. They were the front leaders of India's freedom movement, namely, Lala Lajpat Roy, Surendra Nath Banerjee, R. G. Pradhan, Patabhi Sitaramayya, C. F. Andrews, Girija Mukherjee and etc. After independence some professional historians carried the task of writing on freedom movement of India and this led to the considerable output of some remarkable and comprehensive works within nationalist framework. Notable historians of this school were R. C. Majumdar, Tara Chand, Bisheswar Prasad and B. R. Nanda. But they failed to provide analytical rigour in their interpretation (Chandra, Bipan, 2012, p.185).

MARXIST HISTORIOGRAPHY

Deeply influenced by the Marxist tools of analysis based on dialectical materialism and historical materialism Marxist historians analysed the national movement with perspective of class and class struggle. Since R. P. Dutt's *India Today* there has been considerable writing on the Indian national movement by Marxists. E. M. S. Namboodripad's *A History of India's Freedom Struggle* and A. R. Desai's *Social Background of Indian Nationalism* are representative works in Marxist framework. Marxist historians clearly see the primary contradiction with the British, as well as the process of the nation in the making, and unlike the nationalists they take full note of the inner contradictions of Indian society. It is, of course, important to review many harsh criticisms of the leaders of the national movement, which can be found in the documents of the communist movement till before the Dutt-Bradely thesis of 1936 and occasionally later. The correction of this attitude need not, however, mean that the communists or the other left groups were incorrect all the basic positions they took, for example in 1942. An overwhelming preoccupation with the 'errors' of the left, as in the volume edited by Bipan Chandra, is unfortunate, since by this very preoccupation, it belittles the achievements of the left during the national movement and its contribution to it (Habib, Irfan, 2001, p.10).

SUBALTERN HISTORIOGRAPHY

A series called, Subaltern Studies, appearing in the last two decades of the twentieth century, has introduced an almost new genre of history writing on modern India (Kumar, Sanjay, 2015, p. 90). The Subaltern Studies are collections of monographs on diverse unconnected topics and have brought about a major shift in recent years in the historiography of Indian national movement. This school, initiated by Ranjit Guha, was based on the observation that in a land of great social and cultural diversity the voice of the people on the fringes were not heard. It dismisses all previous writings including those based on the Marxist perspective as elite historiography which sees mass political awareness and mobilization as the exclusive handiwork of elite achievements. According to Subaltern School, in colonial and neo-colonial historiographies these achievements were credited to British colonial rulers, administrators, policies, institutions and culture, in the nationalist and neo-colonialist writings, to Indian elite personalities, institutions, activities and idols ; and, in the Marxist writings, to

party programmes and organisation (Singh, Lata, p. 101). Dipesh Chakravarty observes modernity is so deeply ingrained in political, social and academic circles that it is almost impossible to write professional history without the prescriptions rooted in Western thought structures. It is essential to recognise that the firmly closed problematic of modernity has been irrevocably opened up from the singular to plurality and from certitudes to ambiguities in the context of the globalization of the economy, culture and above all of knowledge (Mukhia, Harvans, 2013, p. 31).

The work of the Subaltern Studies group, still largely based on the written word rather fieldwork and open to serious questions on empirical as well methodological grounds, is nonetheless one of the several exploratory efforts in this direction (Idem, 1988, p. 62). Owing to the nature of the sources available Subaltern historians have focussed on narrower approach of history-modern and notably addressed the issue of anti-colonial protests, rebellions and revolt of marginalised groups. Despite all the limitations Subaltern historians through their multi-volume ambitious project has established their academic presence by addressing many ignored issues using non-consumed sources, mainly folksongs, proverbs and other folk material (Kumar, Sanjay, 2015, p. 90).

Subaltern studies, by contrast, had a very different aetiology. It was developed by mostly Indian social historians rather than cultural critics, and before 1988 remained influential, but only relatively so, and within a small orbit. By reading between the lines of official documents, or extrapolating from new archival discoveries, they sought to provide a portrait of the intelligence and improvisational skill of peasant insurgents. By 1986 the focus of the Subaltern group was beginning to shift away from the spontaneous consciousness of peasant rebellion. In place of anecdotal accounts of local struggles, one was more likely to find a sweeping interrogation of 'modernity'. As one of the original members Sumit Sarkar himself lamented, the presence of subalterns in their work waned, replaced by a stress on historical ruptures, the dangers of universalism, and the 'fragment'-an open-ended ahistorical datum offering itself up to hermeneutical improvisation while resisting incorporation into a theory of the social whole (Brennan, Timothy, 2014, p. 70).

Modern Indian History as a discipline has seen a lot of prolific scholarship and historians who have used various frameworks of analysis, S. N. Sen, Amba Prasad, Sardar K. M. Pannikar, Tara Chand, Bisheshwar Prasad among the early generations, and Sarvepalli Gopal, Sushobhan Sarkar, Bipan Chandra, Barun Dey, B. Sheikh Ali, K. N. Pannikar and Sabyasachi Bhattacharya amongst others studied aspects of the Indian National Movement, and the colonial and post-independence periods. From biographies to print culture to archival sources to visual media to oral testimonies, every kind of primary source has been explored. The challenge for the historians at the Indian History Congress, which is the largest organisation of professional historians of India, has been to counter the colonial mindset and establish an independent line of thinking. It is the historians of Modern Indian history who have worked tirelessly to highlight the oppressive colonial legacies of the personal laws, the policies of divide and rule, communalism and other problems that the post-Independence Indian polity inherited (Siddiqui, Rushdai, 2014). Textbooks on modern India in general and freedom movement in particular have many inbuilt lacking and this is serious academic flaws. Dilip M. Menon has drawn our attention towards some major issues and rightly alleged that the ideologies of Ambedkar, Jinnah and V. D. Sawarkar have been ignored. There is territorial bias too found in even most popular and authoritative writings. Hardly one finds even patchy description of freedom

movements in north-east India, princely states and the regions where Indian National Congress was not politically dominant one.

DALIT PERSPECTIVE OF THE INDIAN FREEDOM MOVEMENT

Anti-colonialism nationalism produced a history that largely referred to the past of groups that had been active in the national movement and were therefore thought to constitute the nation. Mainstream historical writing has been duly criticised for negating the role played by dalits in various events of anti-colonial struggle (Kumar, Sanjay, 2012, p. 206). The Dalit narrative of the first freedom struggle is filled with stories about brave women martyr, belonging to the oppressed communities, including Jhalkaribai, Avantibai, Pannadhai, Udadevi and Mahaviridevi. Matadin Bhangi emerges as the source of inspiration for the first spark of the Revolt and has been claimed to be the father of the 1857 rebellion (Nath, S. R. Sajeevan, 1998). The role of low caste people has never been an issue to be addressed in elitist historiography and even subaltern who claims to be the advocate of marginalised and oppressed has not admitted a single Dalit among the charmed circle of bhadrakalok researchers (Kumar, Sanjay, 2015, p. 93).

Dalits of Bundelkhand region highly revere the memory of Jhalkaribai who fought alongside Rani Lakshmi Bai of Jhansi while Udadevi, who was the companion of Begum Hazrat Mahal, is worshipped as a 'hero' in central U.P. It is true that the stories of these dalit heroes are linked with those of queens like Rani Lakshmi Bai and Begum Hazrat Mahal, but it is nonetheless imperative to evaluate in the right historical context the roles of these brave Dalit warriors at a time when most of the kings and landlords were joining the company forces to show their unquestioned loyalty (Dass, Mohan, 2010, pp. 19-45). There is no dearth of Dalit rebels in the revolt of 1857 but there is visible absence of Dalit heroes and their patriotic activities, no less than others in academic history writing and their best portrayal is found in oral tradition and folk culture (Singh, Dinesh Kumar, 2014, p. 39).

There are plenty of archival sources in form of administrative documents, despatches, proclamations, pamphlets, and letters etc. which will explore and uncover many hidden aspects of the Revolution including the unnoticed voice of many unsung heroes- Rampati, Udham Singh, Nathu Dhobi, Puran Singh, Makka Pasi, Narayan Singh, Matadeen, Ranjit Ram, Tulsidas, Asha Devi and many others to be surfaced in folktales (Shishir, Karmendu, 2008, pp. 34-35). Many researchers and scholars are looking for abundant folktales, folksongs and other undocumented materials spread in different regions and various dialects for reconstructing the history of the great Revolt as well as searching for their own role and identity in contemporary political framework of vibrant democracy. The laymen are more aware than ever before that they are living and making history (Strayer, Joseph R., 1954).

The studies on national movement, peasant struggles and even Communist movements in India have neglected the role of dalits or the disadvantaged sections of the society in these movements. Kancha Ilaiah is quite categorical in his opinion that the "mainstream historiography has done nothing to incorporate the Dalitbahujan perspective in the writing of Indian history. Subaltern studies are no exception to this (Satyanarayana, Adapa, 2004, p. 8). There is a new trend that is emerging rapidly in the historiography of nationalism inspired by the ideology of Jyotirao Govind Phule, B. R. Ambedkar and Periyar and is making impressive presence within a new category of dalitbahujan historiography (Ilaiah, Kancha, 1990). There is a marked tendency in mainstream history writing which practices intellectual untouchability and this is well reflected in deliberate silence on the role of Dalit freedom

fighters and Dalit ideologues in Indian nationalism and national movements. And a 21-year-old project that goes under the ironic label Subaltern Studies is yet to admit a single Dalit into its charmed circle of bhadrakok researchers (Nanda, Meera, 2007, p. 59). Despite all constraints and intellectual antipathy dalitbahujan historiography is echoing its sound presence in academia and is being accepted even in serious historical discourse (Thapar, Romila, 2014, pp. 36-37).

Historians today simply are not engaged in discovering new sources or analysing dominant notions of historical currents rather many fresh perspectives and new paradigms are emerging and thus making 'history' a more lively and vibrant discipline in social sciences. Historians of modern Indian history in order to portray the holistic picture of freedom movement are engaging and making dialogues with other disciplines and transforming the whole discourse as a subject of multi-disciplinary study. Oral sources are recognised as potential instruments of historical understanding of national movement and disastrous partition of India. All facts of a past are not historical facts; just all past is not history (Verma, Lal Bahadur, 1995 & 1996, p. 161).

Yet the more history we write the more we worry about the value and nature of history. The increase in the number of books on historiography and historical methodology is proportionally far greater than the increase in the number of historians (Strayer, Joseph R., 1963).

WORKS CITED

- Bisheshwar, Prasad. *Bondage and Freedom: A History of Modern India (1707-1947)*. New Delhi, 1971
- Bisheswar, Prasad. *Changing Modes of Indian National Movement*. New Delhi, 1966.
- Bose, Nemaï Sadhan. *The Indian National Movement: An Outline*. Calcutta, 1987, 3rd revised and enlarged edition.
- Brennan, Timothy. 'Subaltern Stakes' in *New Left Review*, 89 Sept/oct 2014.
- Chand, Tara. *History of Freedom Movement in India*, 1971.
- Chandra, Bipan. *Samkaleen Bharat*. New Delhi, 2011.
- Chandra, Bipan. 'Bharatiya Rastriya Andolan ki Rastravadi Itihaskaro Dvara Vyakhya' in Prabhat Kumar Shukla. ed., *Itihas Lekhan ki Vibhinna Dristiyan*, New Delhi, 2012.
- Chandra, Bipan. *India's Struggle for Independence 1857-1947*. New Delhi, 1989.
- Cited in Adapa Satyanarayana, 'Nation, Caste, and the Past; Articulation of Dalitbahujan Identity, Consciousness and Ideology, *Presidential Address*, Section iii: Modern India, Indian History Congress, 2004.
- Cited in Harvans Mukhia, *Time, Religion and History in India*, Taiwan, 2002,
- Cited in Ramchandra Guha, *India after Gandhi; the History of the World's Largest Democracy*, London, 2008.
- Farooqui, Mahmood. 'Lighting up a century' in editpage@expressindia.com. Farooqui is a historian, translator and dastangoi performer and Bayly was his M.Phil supervisor at Cambridge.
- Guha, A. C. *India's Struggle Quarter of a Century*. Delhi, 1982.

- Idem. 'The Teaching of History in Indian Universities: How Much of it has Changed?' in *The Indian Journal of Social Science*, Vol. 1. No. 1, 1988.
- Ilaiah, Kancha. *Why I am Not a Hindu: A Sudra critique of Hindutva Philosophy*. Calcutta, 1990.
- Irfan Habib, *Essays in Indian History: Towards a Marxist Perception*. New Delhi, 2001, 4th reprint, p.10.
- Judith M. Brown, *Modern India: The Origins of an Asian Democracy*. Delhi: 1985, 2nd impression, p.1.
- Kumar, Sanjay. 'Light on the Recent Perspectives of Indian Historiography' in Bishwa Mohan Pandey, ed., *Reinterpreting History: Reconstructing History in Changing Socio-Cultural Scenario*, Nainital, 2015.
- Majumdar, R. C. *British Paramountcy and Indian Renaissance*, Part 1, Bombay, 1965.
- Menon, Dilip M. ed., *Adhunik Bharat Ka Sanskritik Itihas*, New Delhi.
- Mukherjee, B. N. 'Reflections on Trends in Indian Historiography', Presidential Address, Indian History Congress, Calcutta, 2001 ; Vijay Kumar Thakur, 'Myth as History: Indian Historiography at Cross-roads, Presidential Address, Historiography section, Andhra Pradesh History Congress, 2001.
- Mukhia, Harvans. 'Medieval India: An Alien Conceptual Hegemony?' in *The Medieval History Journal*, Vol. 1 Number 1, January-June, 1998.
- Mukhia, Harvans. 'Subjective Modernities' in *Pakistan Perspectives*, Karachi, Volume 18, Number 1, January-June 2013.
- Namishray, Mohan Dass. *Dalit Freedom Fighters*. Delhi, 2010.
- Nanda, Meera. *Postmodernism and Religious Fundamentalism: A Scientific Rebuttal to Hindu Science*. Pondicherry, 2007.
- Nath, S. R. Sajeewan. *1857 Kee Kranti Ka Janak: Nagvanshi Bhangi Matadin Hela*. Allahabad, 1998.
- Rao, B. Surendra. *History as Historiography*. Lecture Series Publication-5, Indian Council of Historical Research, Bangalore, 2010.
- Shishir, Karmendu. *1857 Ke Rajkranti: Vichar aur Visleshan*, New Delhi, 2008.
- Shukla, R. L. *Adhunik Bharat ka Itihas*. New Delhi, 1998.
- Siddiqui, Rushda. 'Historians and the Indian History Congress' in *Souvenir*, Indian History Congress Platinum Jubilee Session, Jawaharlal Nehru University, 2014.
- Singh, Dinesh Kumar. '1857 Ki Jankranti Aur Jhansi' in Sanjay Swarnkar, Ed., *Madhya Bharat Mein Swatantra Andolan Ka Itihas*, New Delhi, 2014.
- Singh, Lata. 'Subaltern Historiographic Critique of Colonialist and Nationalist Discourses' in *The Indian Historical Review*, Volume xxi Number 1-2 (July 1994-January 1995).
- Spear, Percival. 'The Mutiny in India', in souvenir, Delhi through the Ages, *Indian History Congress, Sixty-eighth Session, University of Delhi, 28-30 December 2007*.



- Strayer, Joseph R. 'Introduction' in Marc Bloch. *The Historians Craft*, Manchester, 1954.
- Thapar, Romila. *The Past as Present: Forging Contemporary Identities through History*. New Delhi, 2014.
- The Gazetteer of India: History and Culture*, Volume 2, Publications Division, Government of India, Delhi, 1990, third edition, pp.551-586.
- Verma, Lal Bahadur. 'Why and How of Oral History: Transforming of Past into History' in *The Indian Historical Review*, Volume xxii , Numbers 1-2 (1995 & 1996), p.161.
- Verma, Lal Bahadur. *Itihas ke Baare Mein*. Sahitya Upakrama, 2010.
- Winks, Robin W. (ed.), *Historiography*. Oxford University Press, 1999.

PURVA MIMAANSA