A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO THE CHIN/ZO PEOPLE

I prepared this information paper (494 pages) with some of the most essential parts of my 960-page “paper”: *An Introduction to the Chin/Zo People of Bangladesh, Burma, and India – XXIII* by simply pasting them together to create a medium to introduce ourselves to the outside world. Even among our people, only a handful of academics know about many of these facts. In addition to the said parts, a few Youtube links will also give the reader a better picture of us. I intend to upload the full version on a Website in 2023. So, this paper shall only serve as a provisionalary medium until then. And the reader may certainly wonder why some items such as photos and links are repeatedly used in it. It was not a mistake on my part; it was in many cases a necessity. Many parts of it, therefore, are not identical to the full version.

About 20 years ago, a survey was conducted among our people, including academics, regarding papers and books on our history. The survey found that nearly all surveyed thought those papers and books were too dull to read. So, as the non-academics of our people are also one of this paper’s main target groups, I have highlighted some key information pieces profusely with blue and red colors and **characters in bold**. Hopefully, it is now a bit more interesting for them to read. I shall also use the same methods in the coming Updates until the final version is edited. I cannot afford to produce two versions now – one for academics and another for non-academics.

The following quotes are a few brief descriptions of the Chin/Zo people in some of the most prestigious, authoritative, and internationally recognized reference books, publications of academic institutes, and religious institutions, including British colonial records.

1.1 CHINS or KUKIS

**A tribe living in the mountainous region between Lower Bengal and Upper Burma.** They form a collection of tribes belonging to the Tibeto-Burman group of the Indo-Chinese race, and consist of three divisions: Northern Chins, who inhabit the Chin Hills and a small part of the country to the north of them; the Central Chins (known as Kamis, Kwemis, Mros, Chinboks and Chinbons) live in the Pakokku Chin Hills and the northern Arakan district; and the Southern Chins of the Arakan Yoma. **The Chins are, for the most part, a warlike race, divided strictly into clans over which their leaders and upper classes have almost despotic power and influence. They are unclean in habits, treacherous and given to intemperance.**

*(The Encyclopedia Americana, 1947)*

1.4 CHINS

**A group of tribes of Mongol origin, occupying the southernmost part of the mountain ranges separating Burma from India...** Chin villages, often of several hundred houses, were traditionally self-contained units, some ruled by council of elders, others by headmen. **There were also hereditary chiefs who exercised political control over large areas and received tribute from cultivators of the soils...** The Chins have much in common with the Kuki, Lushai, and Lakher people and speak related Tibeto-Burman
languages...Domestic animals, kept mainly for meat, are not milked or used for traction. Chief among them is the mithan, a domesticated breed of the Indian wild ox...Traditional religion comprises of a belief in numerous deities and spirits, which may be propitiated by offerings and sacrifices. Christian missions have made many converts..."

(\textit{The New Encyclopaedia Britannica}, 1986)

1.6 THE CHINS

The Chins, who dwell in the mountainous regions of West Burma and East India, are well-skilled in fishing, hunting and weaving fine textiles...(\textit{Burma: Weltmission heute Nr. 22/ Evangelisches Missionwerk in Deutschland}, 1996). \textit{Remark:} This 205-page book, prepared by the Evangelical Mission Work in Germany, under the title of \textit{Burma: World Mission Today No. 22}, devotes only twelve lines or six sentences on the Chins.

1.10 THE CHINS

... Numbering circa 220,000 - are of Tibeto-Burman origin, migrated to Central Burma through Chindwin Valley about 300 years ago; they were driven to the mountains in the west by later comers such as the Burmans and Shans...The Chins, with the exception of a few Buddhists and Christians who have had come into contact with the Burmans and Europeans, are primitive Animists... Andru describes that the standard of the Chins' moral is very low, and that of their cleanliness as well which is due to their reluctance to have a bath for the mountain wind is chilly and the water sources faraway..."  


1.11 CHIN-KUKI-LUSAIS

“People this region with dusky tribes, almost as numerous in dialect and designation as the villages in which they live, owning no central authority, possessing no written language, obeying but verbal mandates of their chiefs, hospital and affectionate in their homes, unsparing of age and sex while on the warpath, untutored as the remotest races in Central Africa, and yet endowed with an intelligence which enabled them to discover for themselves the manufacture of gun-powder.” (Reid, 1893. p. 2.)

1.12 LUSAIS

“In 1871 the Indian Government was involved in hostilities with the wild tribes on the south-east frontier of Bengal, known by the common name of Looshai, and Colonel Roberts’s services were again brought into requisition...The Looshais, says Colonel Roberts [later Field Marshal], are a family of the great Kokie tribe, who may be found in Independent, or Hill, Tipperah, which bounds the Looshai country on the west.. (Rathbone Low, p. 109)

.................................................................................
Some mysteries and important facts about the Chin/Zo people in brief:

- Their neighboring kingdoms – such as the Arakanese, Assamese, Burmese, and Manipuri – could never subjugate them because, perhaps, they were too wild. Their own hereditary chieftainships ruled them until the British conquered them with several minor and major military campaigns. Many of those British military campaigns were so fierce that four British officers received the most coveted medal – Victoria Cross (VC) – for gallantry for British troops in the British Empire: Major-General Donald Macintyre, VC., FRGS; Lt. Colonel Surgeon F.S. LeQuene, VC; Surgeon John Crimin, and another, whose identity I could not find yet until now (see Appendix O). There were no other similar incidents in the history of all other major races of Burma, who made an armed resistance against the British war efforts for years. Excluding, of course, is the Burmans, who fought three wars against the British: 1824-26, 1852-53, and 1885.

- Their territory was divided into two parts in 1937 – one was integrated into British India and the other into British Burma. Then, again, those in British India were divided into two parts when India and East Pakistan (now Bangladesh) were created in 1947.

- The Chin/Zo people inside British Burma signed a treaty known as the Panglong Agreement on February 12, 1947, with representatives of the Burmans, Kachins, Shans, and Kayahs (aka Karenni) on the principle of equal status to form a union under the name of UNION OF BURMA.

- The various Zo tribes in present-day Mizoram fought a 20-year-old armed struggle against the central Indian government from 1966 to 1986. They attained statehood in 1986, and all the Zo tribes agreed to abandon their tribal identities and adopt MIZO as their common nomenclature. The language, now known as the Mizo language, was originally the Hualngo/Lushei or Duhlilian dialect. MI stands for PERSON or HUMAN, and ZO is a geographical designation: a COLD PLACE. So scholars now simply interpret these words as HIGHLANDER. However, as a non-academic, I have a second thought about the word: ZO. With the mysterious events occurring within us and in our lands mentioned below, I am wondering if ZO could possibly be the corruption of the word JEW. And for outsiders, there is great confusion between MIZO and ZOMI, for there is also another Zo group that defines itself as ZOMI. The meaning of the two terminologies is the same. The only difference is those who use ZOMI speak the Tedim dialect (KAM HAU dialect in all British colonial records), spoken by the Tedims and its related tribes in northern Chin State.

- CHIN is believed to be initially a Burmese word, and KUKI to be a Bengali word. However, they initially call themselves ZO, CHO, ASHO, or LAI. The outside world knows them only in the following terminologies: CHIN or KUKI or CHIN-KUKI-MIZO or CHIN-KUKI-MIZO-ZOMI.

- The combined population of all Chin/Zo people inside India, Burma and Bangladesh is conservatively estimated to be 4 - 5 million. Chin State's population: 480,00 (36,000 km2); Chins in other parts of Burma: 1.5 to 2 million; Mizoram: 1.1 million (22,000 km2); 500,000 among
Manipur State's 2.9 million (22,000 km²); some 50,000 in the Chittagong Hill Tracts of Bangladesh; the rest in Assam, Nagaland, Tripura, and Meghalaya states in India.

- **Their various types of traditional songs are composed solely in poetic words.** A very special type of song is the autobiographical one composed by several remarkable people (see on p. 3 in the **Special Appendix** for some samples of the poetic words and my close relatives who had their own autobiographical songs).

- **Although they speak about one hundred different dialects, several tribes share these poetic words in composing their songs.** So, without enough pre-knowledge of these poetic words, a layman cannot interpret these songs. (I, as a non-academic, prefer to use “dialect” here instead of the academic term “language”. See Tables 20-A, 20-B and 20-C on pp. 55-56 for the **Matrix of lexicostatistic percentage in 21 Chin languages**

- **And although there are about one hundred tribes and sub-tribes, several of them belong to the same clans or sub-clans.** For example, about 80% of the Sizang tribe (written as SIYIN – or SEYIN - in all British colonial records) and at present numbering some 17,000 are the direct descendants of the six sons of SUANTAK – whom the 80% of the Sizangs are using as their main clan's name. But people who belong to the Suantak clan can also be found among at least twenty other tribes and sub-tribes, whereas some of the main clans of the remaining 20% of the Sizangs form the majority in some other tribes. An example of how the clan system in social intercourse functions: Whenever two persons make an acquaintance, they ask each other's clan names. So if they, for instance, belong to the same clan, they immediately feel close even though they may belong to different tribes and thus speak different dialects (See Tables 2, 2-A, 3, 3-A and for some of the main clans on pp. 152-159).

- **There are two Items in it: SPECIAL APPENDIX and APPENDIX O.** In the 61-page **Special Appendix**, I describe my search for the progenitor of the Sailo chiefs who ruled most parts of modern-day Mizoram for some centuries. He was **Seam Muang, the younger brother of Kim Le** (2), founder of my native village Lophei and the **Kim Le dynasty**, which lasted 12 generations. The dynasty ended with Suang Hau Thang, my father's eldest brother (see my own genealogical tree of 2-A, 5-A and 5-B on p. 153 and pp. 156-157). **Appendix O** (100 pages) deals with the various British military campaigns and the high-ranking personalities who had played crucial roles in conquering us.

- **Some Chin/Zo tribes had believed in the existence of a higher being called Pasian, Pathian, and Pathen from ancient times.** “Pa” stands for “Father”; “Sian”, “Thian” and “Then” stand for “Clean” or “Holy”. These terms come from the words “Siang” “Thiang”. (For a detailed explanation, see 18.1 ANCIENT RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OF THE CHIN/ZO PEOPLE and 18.2 ORIGIN OF THE DEFINITION OF THE SUPREME GOD IN CHIN, and **Map on p. 167**.)

- **Three US and European satellites (Landsat, Copernicus, and CNES/Airbus) photographed an exceptionally bright, long, and large light/figure on the 22nd of February 2017 in the heart of**
what the British called the “Siyin Country” or the “Siyin Tract” in northern Chin State, Burma. If the light is viewed from certain distances and perspectives, it transforms itself into a figure that looks like a smiling human being. The place where it appeared is only about 4 km away from my native village (see pp. 186–200 for the satellite photos).

- An illiterate person named Pau Cin Hau invented a well-functioning script around 1902, which he claimed to have been given to him personally by the biblical God in a vision. It has no similarities at all with any other existing scripts. The distance between Mualbem village, in which he lived for decades and finally was buried when he died in 1948 at the age of 80, and Lophei is only 12 km (see 18.3 THE RELIGION OF LAIPLAN PAU CIN HAU, Satellite Photo 3 on p. 193 for the two villages' locations, and p. 194 for his script).

- In 2004, the National DNA Analysis Center, Central Forensic Science Laboratory in India, confirmed the finding of Central Asian Jewish DNA among them. Until 2018, nearly 10,000 Chin/Zo returned to Israel under Israel’s “Law of Return” program. (See my Family Photo on pp. 303-304, in which I wore a cap that looks like the traditional Jewish skullcap. When my maternal uncle took the photo on May 12, 1949, I was only four years and three months old – being born on February 7, 1945.) There was not a single Jew in the whole region (present-day Chin State) where I was born. The nearest Jewish community of about 150 people was in Mandalay – at a distance of 400 air-kilometer away. Another Jewish community of some 2 500 people in Rangoon left for India when the Japanese advanced towards Burma at the beginning of WWII.

- The Lophei Baptist church building needed to be renewed and expanded, but as the villagers could not afford it, they resorted to prayers. So, to make the story short, money appeared in the church 38 times – mostly during daytime – even though the only entrance door was always well-locked. The money was thus used to buy new corrugated iron sheets for the roof and the building was expanded (see pp. 306-319).
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**THIS PAPER IS DEDICATED TO**

- Chief Khup Lian, my paternal grandfather, and the following fellow Siyin Chiefs
  
  https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Khup_Lian_inscription

- Chief Khup Pau of Khuaisak and his sons Chief Khai Kam and Mang Pum
  
  https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Khai_Kam

- Chief Thuk Kham of Lun Mun (Upper Thuklai)

- Chief Kam Lam of Sum Niang (Lower Thuklai)

- Chief Mang Lun of Lim Khai (Sagyiling)

- Chief Pau Khai of Buanman

The above Siyin Chiefs altogether led some of the fiercest battles against the British troops under the direct personal command of Gen. (later Field Marshal) Sir George White during the First Chin Expedition 1888-89 & Chin-Lushai Expedition 1889-90. He then fought once against the British with the above mentioned Siyin Chiefs and the following heroes of other tribes in the Siyin-Nwengal [Siyin-Gungal] Rebellion of 1892-93. Chief Khup Pau and Mang Pum were imprisoned for four years in Rangoon and Chief Khai Kam was banished for life on the notorious Andaman Islands in the Indian Ocean off Burma.

- Chief Thuan Thawng of Kaptel (a cousin of Hau Cin Khup, Chief of the Kam Hau tribe), and his son Pau Khai (both of them died in Kindat prison);

- Chief Pau Khan Hau of Helei and his son Pau Kho Thang

- Unknown heroines and heroes of the Chin/Zo people in their wars of resistance against foreigners – among them the victims of the Battle of Taitan (Siallum)

- My parents, my five sisters and brother

- Ma Mya Swe, my wife (also known as Nang Htwe Kham)

- Lt. Colonel Son Kho Pau (see PHOTO J for his brief biography)

- Lt. Colonel Thian Khaw Khai (see Appendix P), my mother's younger brother, who was imprisoned and then forced to resign for his political activities for the Chins (he is the father of Pu Thang Za Pau)

- Capt. K.A. Khup Za Thang: Compiler of the Genealogy of the Zo (Chin) Race of Burma (1st and 2nd Editions)

- My cousin brothers: the late Pu Hau Za Cin & Pu Thang Za Pau, who were killed in action in fighting against the Burmese armed forces.

---

"...The route to Chittagong was discussed, and enquiry was made whether the Chins would object to the advance of a column of British troops through their country; also whether, in the event of their having no objection to such an advance, they could supply transport coolies and guides..." (9.5.1 Negotiations With the Siyins)

"...An expedition against the Chins on a modified scale was now sanctioned. It was determined to deal first only with the Siyins and to inflict on them such a crushing blow as not only to cripple them for the future, but also to terrify the Tashons into giving up the rebel Shwe Gyo Byu, his followers, and the Shan captives...This brings the history of the Chin Hills up to the end of the season 1888-89. We had 67 casualties during the expedition and the state of affairs was that all the Siyin and 18 of the Kam Hau villages had been destroyed, and our troops now occupied the tract..." (9.6.3 Preparations for Operations against the Siyins)

"Sir George White, in a telegram to the Chief Commissioner of Burma, described the action on 27th January 1889 against the Chins as follows:- 1. Enemy in considerable numbers, using many rifles and ammunition. They fired at least 1,000 rounds, standing resolutely until actually charged, even trying to outflank us. Their loss probably about eight or ten, but they were carried down the khuds at once. Most difficult enemy to see or hit I ever fought...! " (9.6.6 Encounter with the Siyins)

---

**Note.** In these battles 400 Kam Haus (modern term: Tedim-dialect speaking Zos) and 30 Suktes also took part. Besides them were 1,200 Siyins from the five core Siyin villages and the Khuanos from neighboring villages such as Pimpi, Thangnuai, Suangpi, Phunom, Zung, and some Vaipheis. Altogether they numbered some 2,000 men.
A FEW WORDS ON THESE VIDEOS

(These Youtube videos from Mizoram and Manipur states in India (Mizoram: 1.2 m; 500 000 Chin-Kuki-Zo out of Manipur's 2.9 m population as of 2011 census) show our religious and daily way of life. It is unthinkable for the Chin/Zo inside Burma to make similar performances in public before a Buddhist Burmese audience in “Western dresses” because the ethnic Burmans, especially the authorities, hate any trace of Western culture and religious beliefs. They identify such things with colonialism or “moral decadence” - it's perhaps because of Christianity's 2,000 years of bloody history. Therefore, such performances are held only in closed halls.)

BESY Choir - He hideth my soul (6:06)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3ajY-xEw6ZU&list=RDf4BF1--fwrM&index=2

Kan Run Lo Mawi La - The Leprosy Mission Choir (4:32)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aHSjísFiXXc

Maruat - Engtia awm thei nge? (FAMILY WORSHIP -4)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G9aUVdBiSwY&list=RDAG15WJ1zcEQ&index=3

Aizawl | Silent City | Honking free city of India (4:22)
(With over 3.5 lakh people and about 1.3 lakh registered vehicles, Aizawl, the capital city of Mizoram, has become the first Indian city to adopt a no-honking policy, that too without any official help and legislation. It is also well-known throughout India for its cleanliness. It is done mainly by the people themselves on a voluntary basis.)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uoQk6FPh7Is

Exploring AIZAWL with Vloggers | Mizoram | Northeast India with @Swanderlust (12:27)
(This video shows the honesty of people in Mizoram: Car owners leave their car keys in the cars and the car windows are also left open in Parking Houses)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zLjcdnAqiqo

Armed Veng N Kohhran Zaipawl - Beramno/Amen (7:07)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XZqhceRXukA&list=RDf4BF1--fwrM&index=5

Mizoram- The Land of Blue Mountains | The most disciplined state (3:44)
(Also video shows the honesty of people in Mizoram)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XNGGJQjJTve&tl=134k

Fashion Velocity 2019 (2) – 6:09
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lZoX-O8iaTw&t=19s

Fashion Velocity 2019 (5) – 5:43
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZdsWymLyT3E

Kimkima-I zun ngaih lunglen @ VSE Fashion Show 2019
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=frGmoCw3Jl&tl=5s

Miss & Mr THADOU || TRADITIONAL SHOW || THADOU CULTURAL FESTIVAL (27:32)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0W6T9vHlXG0

(For strangers, only the first part: 01-9:35, and the second part: 16:30-27:32 – will be interesting. The Thadous are a major tribe (some 250,000 of what is known to the outside world as the Chin-Kuki-Mizo people. There are three competing groups among them for self-identification. One group prefers to identify themselves as THADOU, the second group favors THADOU-KUKI, and the third group is for KUKI. But all other Zo tribes have known them from ancient times as THADOU or KHONGSAI. (It is also often written simply as THADO.) Judging by this video, it is clear that the first group prevails. Izd)

(For many people, only the first 5 and the last 5 minutes could be interesting. Without a good background knowledge of our history, the rest would be difficult to understand.)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BhTgpECYoNA&t=341s

Genome Biology 2004, 6:P1 Deposited research article

Tracking the genetic imprints of lost Jewish tribes among the gene pool of Kuki-Chin-Mizo population of India


https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X_1zguZTyns

Bnei menashe aliyah 2018 march

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W5UmII8sHKo&t=10s

Bnei Menashe aliyah family reunions - #3

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z_3R9YJJRI
SOME SELECTED YOUTUBE THUMBNAILS ON CULTURAL, SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS EVENTS OF THE CHIN/ZO PEOPLE OF INDIA AND BURMA

THese photos are meant to serve as a visual medium to introduce them to the outside world and to show that they try to retain together their distinctive common identity culturally, religiously and socially wherever they are - be it in Asia, Australia, Europe, USA or Canada. (As of end of 2020 an estimated 200,000 of them from Burma are believed to be living outside their native land as refugees.)

(About 95% of a conservatively estimated combined population of 4.5 million (2.5 in Burma and 2.5 in India and Chittagong Hill tracts in Bangladesh) is Christian and the rest Animist and Buddhist.)

- Selected, created and prepared in this form by thangzadal. Hamburg, Germany. 12.2020.
Chief Khup Lian (right), my paternal grandfather, with Rev. Za Khup, father of Vum Ko Hau (Photo taken on July 14, 1960). Khup Lian was about 90 years old when this photo was taken. He died on December 3, 1962, at Lophei. Vung Hau, wife of Khup Lian, was from the chieftain clan of Thuklai. Her younger sister, Vum Cingh, was married to Maung Pum of Khaasak (a son of Chief Khup Pau and younger brother of Chief Khai Kan) - three of the most well-known heroes of the Siyin-Gungal rebellion. (9.14 THE SIYIN-SWENGAL REBELLION - 1892-93). Rev. Za Khup was married to Ciang Zam, a daughter of Chief Man Suang, paternal uncle of Khup Lian. As Khat Lian, brother of Ciang Zam and the only son of Chief Man Suang, was physically handicapped, the hereditary chieftainship of the clan was passed on to Khup Lian. He was the 11th generation from Chief Kim Le and also the 11th Chief in the Kim Le dynasty, which ended with Suang Hau Thang, the eldest son of Khup Lian, when the hereditary feudalism was abolished in Chinland in 1948 with the overwhelming desire of the masses. Together with the other Siyin chiefs, the Sizangs, the Sutkhes, the Kamhaus, the Vaipehis, and the Khuanos, Khup Lian fought some of the fiercest battles against the British in 1888-90. Gen Sir White, commander of the British expedition, made the following remark: "...the most difficult enemy to see or hit I’ve ever fought..." And once again he fought in the Siyin rebellion. - See APPENDICES A, A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4, E, F, EE ; TABLES 5/A & 5/B. 9.13.5 FORMAL SUBMISSION OF THE SIYINS and FOOTNOTE under it for more information on Khup Lian. The progenitor of the powerful Sialo chiefs who ruled most parts of present-day Mizoram for centuries was Seum Maung, the younger brother of Kim Le.

* See the SPECIAL APPENDIX in my 913-page “paper”: An Introduction to the Chin/Zu People of Bangladesh, Burma and India - (XXII).

---

NU CIANG ZAM, My Mother

My mother is the daughter of Chief Man Suang of Lophei. Chief Man Suang’s mother was Pi Tongdim Kimai [from the chieftain clan of Buamman]. My mother and wife are thus related. At one time after a war the Lophei Chief’s families resided with my grandparents at Lannum. Like my maternal great-grandfather, my maternal grandfather also received troubles just after the British annexation of the Chin Hills. The Chin Chief's register recorded: “The Chief Man Suang deported as a Political prisoner for using his villagers not to surrender unstamped guns, vide Criminal case No. 21 of 1898/99 dated 12 December 1898;” (Vum Ko Hau, p. 202)

The two verses below are from Khup Lian's 28-Stanza (56 verses) autobiographical song which are dedicated to his capture of a rifle in a hand-to-hand fighting during the British's First Chin Expedition (1888-89) under the direct command of Field Marshal Sir White, and the battles themselves. (Vum Ko Hau, p. 234).

A. Vang Khun Suan tu Leido vaimang, ni khat piñ beng the nge,
B. Al bang that ing Hautoi ing ei-ing Kienthuang tai bang la ing nge,
   Za lai ah Kansuung ing nge

- Enemy attempting to capture
- My Glorious Land
- I scattered like pebbles
- I swore that
- I am the son of a hibhorn, Noble
- And killed enemies like chickens
- Besides capturing an enemy gun
- I am excited among the hundreds [figuratively: the multitude]

- Photo credit: Vum Ko Hau (Illustrations 67)
- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. Updated in May 2021.
Field Marshal Sir George S. White, VC., GCB., OM, GCSI., GCIE., GCVO.
(6 July 1835 - 24 June 1912)

Adjusted from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Stuart_White &
http://www.britishempire.co.uk/forces/armycampaigns/africancampaigns/boerwar/stuartwhite.htm

Note: When he fought against the Chins in 1888-89 he was Commander of the Upper Burma Field Force with the rank of major-general.

1835 born 6th July in County Londonderry
1833 entered the 27th Inniskilling Regiment
1857 Indian Mutiny
1863 exchanged to 92nd as Captain
1874 married Miss Amelia Bayley, daughter of the archdeacon of Calcutta
1879-80 Afghan War. 2nd in command 92nd
1880-81 India. Military Secretary to the Viceroy
1881-85 Commanding Officer 2nd Battalion Gordon Highlanders
1884-85 Sudan Expedition
1885 Egypt. AA and QMG
1885 Madras. Brigadier-General
1885-86 Commanding Brigade in Burma Expedition
1886-89 In Command of Upper Burma Field Force
1889-93 Bengal. Major-General
1890 Zhob Field Force
1893-98 Commander-in-Chief India
1897-1912 Colonel of the Gordon Highlanders
1898-99 QMG HQ of Army
1899-1900 GOC Natal Field Force. Lieut-General
1900 28th Feb. Relief of Ladysmith
1900-04 Governor of Gibraltar
1903 Field Marshal
1912 died on 24th June.

- See APPENDIX 0 BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF BRITISH GENERALS AND ADMINISTRATORS...

-Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. 01/2019.
APPENDIX E

“Remarks. - Village: Koset [Khuasak] is inhabited by the Twuntak [Thuan Tak/Suantak] clan of the Siyin tribe. The past history of all the Siyin clans is found in the chapter dealing with the history of the Siyins. Lyin Yum [Lian Yum] governs his own village only and has nothing to say to other villages. Village was disarmed in 1891. Kuppow [Khup Pau], the ex-Chief, is in a jail in Burma and his son Kaikam [Khai Kam] is deported to the Andamans [the notorious islands off Burma’s coasts in the Indian Ocean on which both political prisoners and criminals serving life-sentence were banished from the British colonial time up to the 1970s] and should never be allowed to return to the hills. The present Chief spent some months in jail in Burma in 1894 for assisting his rebel relatives. The Twuntaks* fought stubbornly in 1888-89 and again in 1892-93. They should never be allowed to leave their present village-site. Village was destroyed in 1889 and rebuilt in 1895; it has no stockades and is easily attacked from all sides, except from the west. The notorious Aung Paw lives in this village and knows Burmese. Water is abundant in village and below village and there are several campaign-grounds.”

“Remarks. - Village: Lope [Lophei] is inhabited by the Kimlel [Kim Le] family, an offshoot of the Twuntak clan of the Siyin tribe (see chapter on the Siyin tribe). Khuplin [Khup Lian], the Chief, has visited Rangoon. There was no village at Lope when we first occupied the hills, though the site had previously been occupied by the Kimlels. After the rebellion of 1892 the Kimlels were disarmed and allowed to build a separate village so as to weaken the Twuntaks by splitting them into two independent villages [Khuasak and Lophei]. The village is easily approached by following the excellent mule-road from Fort White to within a mile and a half of old Fort White and then dropping down on to the village. Village is not stockaded and easily attacked from all sides. Excellent camp some 250 yards south-west of village. Water is abundant in streams.” Source: The Chin Hills, Vol. II, Part III, Gazetteer of Villages, iv 

........................................................................

“Lope village was founded by Somman [Sawm Mang] and destroyed by the Tashons when Lua Twam [Lua Thauam] Somman's son, was Chief. Lua Twam's grandson, Kuplien [Khup Lian], rebuilt the village after the Siyin-Nwengal rebellion. The people call themselves 'Kimlel’ te' to distinguish themselves from the Twuntaks of Tavak. Kimlel was an elder brother of Nyal [Nei Zal], from whom the Chiefs of the Siyin clan spring, and the Kimlels of Lope and Twuntaks are really one and the same branch of the Siyin tribe.” (Source: Footnote on Page 129 (Carey & Tuck, Vol. I)

........................................................................

Note 1: In fact, Lophei was founded by Chief Kiim Le, not Sawm Mang. Kiim Le was the 12th generation and Sawm Mang the 19th generation from Zo. - See Tables 2, 3, 5/A & 5/B and the Inscription on Khup Lian's Memorial Stone and text: APPENDIX F-1 &F-2.*

Note 2. When Lophei village was completely destroyed in a tribal war by the Falam or Tashons, the few survivors moved back to their mother village, Khuasak, in the early 1880s. Before Lophei was destroyed there were more than one hundred households in it. Khup Lian was allowed to rebuild his native village with 29 families.

Note 3. Twuntak was the progenitor of a major clan named after his name. The Sizangs called him THUAN TAK and the name of the clan which bears his name as THUAN TAK until one or two decades ago. But he and the clan which is named after him are better known as SUANTAK by all other Zo tribes and sub-tribes. However, nowadays, more and more Sizangs are also using SUANTAK. The Mizos call him SUANTAKA. This clan and its sub-clans are found among more than 20 Zo tribes and sub-tribes in northern parts of Chinland (Burma), Manipur, Mizoram, and Nagaland states in India. About 80% of the Sizangs, who number some 20,000 at present, are his direct descendants. He was the youngest brother of To Hin and Seak Tak from whom some other major clans also descended. (See TABLE 2-A, p. 85).

........................................................................

SOME MORE INFORMATION ON KHUASAK AND THE SIZANGS

“Khuasak was attacked for two times by the combined forces of Burmans, Tashons, Zahu, Khuangli and Hualngho [In ancient times the Sizangs very often simply collectively called the Tashons, Khuangli, Zahu and Hualngho “the Falans” after the seat of the chieftainship.] It was completely destroyed on the first attack and 150 people of the village were either taken away or killed. This event took place in B.E [Buddhist Era] 1220 (1859) according to Burmese chronicles. The Burmans who took part in this attack were 400 men. The Khuasak villagers then moved to Muitung (close to Thuklai or later Fort White) and lived with the Thuklais where the Tashons once again attacked with a big force. In this battle Lian Bawi, one of the most powerful Chiefs of the Tashons, an uncle of the historical Chief Con Bik, who had given sanctuary to the Prince Shwe Gyo Byu and his followers, was captured and killed by the Sizangs, and the Tashons withdrew immediately.” (Carey & Tuck, Vol. 1, p. 130)

……………………………………………..

“The Khuasaks then moved back to their old village. It was for the second time attacked again by the Tashons and Burmans from Kale State. - “The Burman version of this fight is as follows. In BE. 1228 (1867) the Kale Sawbwa [Prince] Maung Yit, at the request of the Tashons, sent an army into the hills to attack Kosek. Maung Yit was in command of the forces numbering 800 men, the Tashon force numbered 1,000. Kosek village was duly surrounded, but the Siyins fought so determinedly that the united forces could not take the village. Some Burmans managed to reach the village and set fire to a house, and the fire spreading, about half the village was destroyed. A parley then took place, and the Siyins promised a mithun and some grain to the Tashons, who then retired, and the Burmans considered it wise to accompany them and to return to Burma through Tashon territory. One Burman was killed in the attack and several Tashons. The fact of the Burmans retiring via Falam and leaving their rations inclines one to believe that the united forces were defeated and that No-man [Chief Ngo Mang of Khuasak] did not surrender.” (Carey & Tuck, Vol. I, Footnote 2. p. 131)


“The Burman version was given by Amat [high ranking official of Burma royal court] who accompanied the expedition is as follows: In Kashon 1239 B.E [1878] we set out to attack Kosek village. Our force was 1,500 strong, divided into two columns. The first was composed of men drawn from Mingin, Taungdwin, Kale, and Yaw, 1,000 strong, and commanded by Kampat Wun [high ranking executive officer of Kampat] Maung Pauk Tun. This column marched west from Kalemyo with its objective Kosek. The second column, 500 strong, was commanded by Maung Shwe Maung of Kendat, head clerk of Kalemyo; under Maung Shwe Maung were three Bos [military officers], Maung Min Gaung, Maung Tet Po, and Maung Shwe Bu. The force was drawn from the following centres: Tein Nyn 70, Legayaing 100, Kalewa 70, Yazagyo 160; besides these the Yan Aung Naing Wundok [township officer of Yan Aung Naing] sent 100 Yes Amuhdans [a sort of police] collected from the Chindwin who were commanded by the Legayaing Sitke [second-in-command of a military unit during the time of Burmese kings]. The column advanced from Nansoungpu up the Nataga stream to Tiddim, where it was met by the brothers of the Chief Kochim [Khun Cin], who guided the column south to Shwimpi [Suanpji], which village the Sokte declared was not under Koppow [Khup Pau] but under Kochim. Therefore it was not attacked. Shortly after the arrival at this village news was brought in that Koppow had routed the Kalemyo force, so the column at once retreated, the Bos considering that it was not sufficiently strong to move alone against Kosek. The northern column returned without fighting and made suitable gifts to the friendly Soktes. The Kalemyo column lost 27 killed and two or three were taken prisoners.” (Carey & Tuck, Vol. 1, p. 133)

................................................................

(Prepared by Thang Za Dal. June, 2014 – Updated in June 2021 for clarity)
Khup Lian's Memorial Stone - erected at the top of Lophei Village. The animals drawn on the memorial stone indicate his hunting trophies: a tiger, 3 bison (gaur), 2 leopard, 3 wild boars, several barking deers and 4 deers.

Certificate of Good Service

Presented to Khup Lian, Chief of Suangdaw and Lophei villages

Khup Lian has been Chief of Suangdaw and Lophei villages for about 30 years. He is one of the best and most influential of the Siyin Chiefs. He is highly respected and has always been of great assistance to the administration. In recognition of his long and loyal services, His Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor is pleased to present Khup Lian with a gun and this Certificate.

The 3rd June 1922

Sgd. R. H. Craddock
Lieutenant-Governor of Burma
Rangoon

Note. Suangdaw was founded in 1899 and Tuivial aka Akbutun and Tuisau villages were founded in 1923 and 1924 respectively. All the four villages consisted of about 250 households in the early 1950s with vast rain and pine forests.
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APPENDIX F-1

INSCRIPTION BY EX-CHIEF KHUP LIAN, LOPHEI

“I am the 15th generation down from the House of Thuan Tak who is the original progenitor of the Siyin Tribe. Being an orphan from childhood I exerted myself all alone in many enterprises by which I became a self-made man with many and various achievements. When the British in 1888 undertook their first expedition against us I attained the age of 20 years and I played an active part in the defence against them.

When the British troops marched up to the Signalling at No. 5 Stockade the united forces of the Siyins, Sukte and Kamhaus [modern term: the Tedims] made a good resistance to the British attack which was easily repulsed. On this occasion I personally captured one rifle. When the second expedition took place in 1889 the British, too well armed to be resisted against, carried the day: hence the annexation of the Chin Hills. I then rebuilt and settled in Lophei Village which was originally founded by Kim Le and was destroyed by the Tashons[also known as the Falams] in my grand-father Lua Thuam’s time. Henceforth, my hereditary chieftainship* of the Lophei clan was restored to me.

Moreover, I founded the three villages - Tuisau, Tuivial [aka Akbutun], and Suangdaw - all of which have ever since been in my jurisdiction. As I was advanced in age after my service of 40 years as Chief, my eldest son succeeded me to the chieftainship. Being highly satisfied with my meritorious and loyal services, His Honour., the Lieutenant- Governor of Burma in 1922 presented me a D.B.B.L. gun as a reward and a good service certificate. And to mention more I was given many good certificates by various Administrative officers of the Chin Hills. The Burmese text on the inscription may be translated as follows: The Sizang people who dwell in the villages of Lophei, Khuasak, Buanman, Thuklai, and Limkhai are the descendents of Thuan Tak. I belong to the fifteenth generation. The history of my lifetime has been recorded in Zo and English.” Source: Zo History by Dr. Vumson Suantak

* According to the Sizang tradition, the chieftainship was inherited by Manh Suang, the younger brother of Khup Lian's father, but as Manh Suang's only son, Khat Lian, was physically handicapped, it was passed on to Khup Lian.

Note 1. There were 100 households (85 native Lophei families, 9 slave families, and 6 families from outside that sought refuge in the village) at the time of the Tashons' attack, which should have most likely taken place sometime in the early 1800s. Only seven couples (husband/wife) and four men escaped the destruction unhurt and captivity. 180 Lophei were killed and 30 attackers (numbered about 600) also lost their life. The rest were taken away as captives and distributed among the Tashons to be slaves. Among the survivors were my paternal great, great grandparents, Lua Thuam and Tong Dim. Those survivors had to thank En Mang of the Mang Vum Sub-clan, one of Lophei's - and also of the entire Sizangs' - most famous warriors whom the Tashons were very much afraid of, for their survival - he came back on that day from a short journey to Mualbem, the seat of the Sukte chieftainship, at the invitation of the Sukte Chief. (It was never confirmed, but the Sizangs had always suspected that the Sukte Chief had invited him on that day at the request of the Tashons.) The Tashons immediately withdrew when they knew about his return. Lua Thuam was so arrogant that his fellow Sizangs, whose combined population was estimated to be about 3 000, did not come to his rescue when his village was attacked. About some 50 years before this event took place, nearly one-fourth of the village was totally destroyed by a landslide and several people lost their lives.

Note 2. My pregnant great, great grandmother was taken away in captivity and kept at the Chief's residence and they were (with her daughter, Za Ngiak, who was born in captivity) treated as his own family members; however, their freedom had to be bought at a very high price. Za Ngiak was first married to Vum Hau. When he died she married her late husband's nephew Thuk Kham of the Lummun Sub-clan (paternal grandfather of Vum Ko Hau). She herself died soon and he married Tuang Tin, also of the Lua Tawng Sub-clan (see Tables 8, 8/B, 8/C, Vum Ko Hau. pp. 207-8, 215, Nos. 9 & 10 on p. 217).

Note 3. Among the survivors of the raid were: Hang Suak of the Thuam Lam Sub-clan and his wife; Dong Hong of the same Sub-clan and his wife; Tawn Hang of the Hau Suang Sub-clan and his wife; Vum Suak of thesame Sub-clan and his wife; Kop Kam of the Lua Tawng Sub-clan and his wife; Han Thuk of the Ngo Suang Sub-clan and his wife; Lua Thuam, En Mang, Lam Kam, and Do Khai of the Nau Lak clan. Some 50 years before the Tashons' attack a landslide completely destroyed one fourth of the village and several people were killed.

Note 2. Khup Lian died on December 3, 1962 at Lophei.

(Thang Za Dal. January, 2015. Updated in December 2021.)
THE CRUCIAL ROLES OF CHIN/ZO SOLDIERS IN BURMA

THE BATTLE OF INSEIN NEVER REALLY ENDED *
by Aung Zaw

“...Although some foreign historians have depicted the Battle of Insein as a conflict between Burman troops and Karen rebels, Tun Tin noted that soldiers from different regions of Burma helped to defend Rangoon. They included Chin, Kayah, Shan, Gurkha and Kachin battalions (though some Kachin took up arms against the U Nu government). The most decisive role in defending Insein was played by the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Chin Rifles, fighting on what is regarded as the most strategic battle front of all. Some insurgents, including communists, reinforced Burmese forces before going back to the jungle to repel Burmese troops...”

(Monday, February 9, 2009)
Copyright © 2008 Irrawaddy Publishing Group | www.irrawaddy.org
Note: U Aung Zaw is from Myanmar/Burma and is the founder and Chief-Editor of The Irrawaddy, a magazine published in Chiang Mai, Thailand.
The Irrawaddy covers news and offers in-depth analysis of political and cultural affairs in Burma and Asia generally.
* See 15.8.2. The Outbreak of Civil War and the Crucial Roles of Chin Soldiers and Appendix DD for full text.

STATEMENT OF THE CHIN COMMUNITY (GERMANY) ON RUMORS ABOUT CHIN SOLDIERS SHOOTING AT DEMONSTRATORS IN BURMA (DATED OCTOBER 2007)*

“...Ever since the first massacres of the students in 1962, General Ne Win's Military Intelligence Service used to spread words about Chin soldiers shooting at demonstrators. The same thing happened during the “1974 Labour and U Thant Strikes” and again during the 1988-Uprisings after troops had mowed down thousands of demonstrators. This is part of Ne Win's stratagem to reduce public hatred towards him and his Burma Army and to instill ethnic hatred among the oppressed people. This stratagem proves to be successful as some of our Burman brothers and sisters believe those rumours and even spread the words further, unwittingly serving the interest of the military dictators. This is due to total ignorance of what happened inside the Burma Army under General Ne Win...”

* See APPENDIX S for full text!

WERE CHIN SOLDIERS MADE SCAPEGOATS?*
by Zaw Htwe Maung

“...Traditionally, Chins are warrior tribes and many Chins joined the Burma Rifles since Burma was under the British Rule. The bulk of the soldiers in the British-trained Army were of minority ethnic groups such as Chins, Kachins and Karens...Hence, many Chins were career soldiers and officers when Burma regained her independence and they had a very good reputation as 'Loyalists to the Union', 'Real Soldiers Defending Democracy' and so on, under U Nu's Regime...As mentioned earlier, Chins are traditionally warrior tribes and well known to be good and disciplined soldiers... Nowadays, in Burma if one sees a minority soldier who speaks Burmese with accent they just conclude that this is a Chin although they may be a Wa or Karen or Kachin or of other minorities, because the reputation of Chin soldiers was totally destroyed since Ne Win's Era...There is no doubt that the Chins were made Scapegoats by the Burmese Military for their propaganda purposes as well as for their further 'divide and rule policy' because all opposition groups, whether they are Burmese or ethnic minorities, have the same and single goal which is to topple down the Military Dictatorship in Burma and the Junta is afraid that they will be united...”

- Source: Chinland Guardian
November 22, 2007
* See APPENDIX T for full text!
- Mr. Zaw Htwe Maung is an Arakanese scholar.

Note: The above quotes are from my own 725-page history paper of the Chin people.
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PREFACE

Initially, I started writing this “paper” more than two decades ago under A Brief Introduction to the Traditional Songs and Folk Dances of the Chins. As I was not trained to write a complex paper or book on history, my first humble intention was to write a simple and compact information booklet on the Chins’ traditional songs, which I could distribute to interested parties. But then the circumstances that took place in 1988 in Burma - the bloody nationwide mass uprising against the 26-year old military dictatorship in which government troops mowed down more than 3,000 peaceful demonstrators - forced me to expand it further (see INTRODUCTION for more information about it). I realized then the urgent need to make ourselves – the Chin/Zo people – better known in the outside world. As a result, I changed its title to the present title from Update V upwards.

I have been writing this paper without the supervision or guidance of a single scholar until now. It still, therefore, is provisional, and I have edited it only perfunctorily. Only when I think I have collected enough information will the final editing be done. This paper shall therefore serve until then only as a source of raw information.

Although this work is not perfect, I know that I am the right person (“the right person who appears at the right timing”) to write many crucial parts of it, which nobody else could do. For instances, my search for the roots of the Sailos (Appendix A to Appendix A-4); my explanation of some deliberate manipulated historical facts in two books (Appendix EE (A) to Appendix EE (A) – 11 (Map 2); my explanation of the complex major and sub-clan systems; and the genealogical charts, diagrams, and tables; the creation of Appendix O, etc., to name a few.

Although this paper certainly is already too long to call a paper, I shall keep on calling it paper anyway, just for the sake of convenience. And those who have read it may undoubtedly wonder why I am using blue and red colors and bold profusely. I know that it could be very irritating for many readers. The simple reason behind it is that nowadays, very few young Chin/Zo are interested in their own people’s history; it was found out recently that they thought nearly all the books and academic papers on Chin/Zo history were too dull to read. So it is hoped that, by highlighting some critical information with different colors and bold in this lengthy paper, they, who also happen to be among the “main target groups” of this paper, may find it a bit more interesting to read. I shall, therefore, keep on using colors and bold until the final editing is made.

In May 2016, I got the following book as a present from Dr. Rodinga: HISTORY OF OPERATIONS IN NORTHERN ARAKAN AND THE YAWDWIN CHIN HILLS 1896-97 WITH A DESCRIPTION OF THE COUNTRY AND ITS RESOURCES, NOTES ON THE TRIBES, AND DIARY By CAPTAIN G.CC. RIGBY, Wilshire Regiment, Attache, Intelligence Branch, will be integrated. Although I have got several books on the Chin/Zo people, written by colonial officials and modern scholars, I have had never heard of its existence before. This book describes how the British conquered the Southern Chins by four military columns starting from Arakan.

Initially, I wanted to integrate many parts of this book into this Update. But, then I decided to include only its contents and some brief descriptions of three southern Chin tribes as an appendix (APPENDIX JJ) instead because of the lack of enough time for this task on my part these days. I shall perhaps integrate some of it in the future Updates, or if I could not do that, hopefully, some other scholars might do it in the future.

........................................
Abstract

Those who are known to the outside world in the following terms today - CHIN or CHIN-KUKI-ZO or CHIN-KUKI-MIZO-Z OMI or CHIN-KUKI-MIZO, etc., - belong to a single ethnic group of Mongoloid Stock. The term, CHIN, was originally a Burmese word and KUKI a Bengali. However, they had known themselves - and called themselves as well - from ancient times only in any of the following terms: ASHO, CHO, KHAMI/KHUMI, LAI, ZO, YAW (and later MIZO or ZOMI). There were originally around 100 tribes and sub-tribes, which have now been reduced down to some 70 tribes and sub-tribes since several of them have adopted the common nomenclature of MIZO when Mizoram attained statehood in 1986 after a 20-year old armed struggle against the central Indian government. Although all of them cannot yet agree upon a common nomenclature that encompasses them all, ZO or ZOFATE (descendants of ZO) have become more and more popular among several sectors of the society. Hence, this term - ZO - is interchangeably used with CHIN or CHIN/ZO throughout this paper.

And they do not have a common language yet until today, but the “Mizo language”, which is also known as the Duhlian or Lusei dialect, is spoken and understood by at least some 2 million Zos. Other major Zo dialects that are spoken or understood by more than tens of thousand are Asho, Dai, Haka/Thantlang (Lai), M’ro (Khumi/Khami), Falam or Laizo, Thado-Kuki, and Tedim (Fraser, p. 15). The Zo dialects belong to the Sino-Tibetan linguistic groups.

Their ancient country was divided into three parts, namely Bangladesh (formerly East Pakistan), Burma, and India by the British. They have now got two internationally recognized federal states: - Chin State in Burma and Mizoram State in India - with a combined population of 2.5 million. Another conservatively estimated 1 million Zos are living outside of these states. Mizoram State has an area of 21 000 sq. km and Chin State 37 000 sq. km. That means Chin State alone is nearly as large as Switzerland.

The Zos were originally adherents of their traditional religion, i.e., Animism. And their cultural heritages are the fruits of this ancient religious belief. Nowadays, the great majority of them are Christian of several denominations. However, approximately 10 percent of the Zo population inside Burma profess Buddhism and their traditional religion.

As they were warrior tribes, the British needed several decades to suppress and bring them under their complete control with numerous punitive and suppressive expeditions under the command of many outstanding generals; among them, five who would later became field marshals.

The first armed conflicts between them took place as early as 1824. The British made their first official military expedition against them in 1841-42 under the name of the Arakan Frontier Expedition, and several expeditions followed between 1871 and 1897. The British staged two more suppressive expeditions against two rebellions between 1917 and 1919. For the Lushai Expedition 1871-72, for instance, the British launched their campaign with two columns - the Cacher or left Column and the Chittagong Column. For the former column alone, 1,600 fighting men, 2800 coolies, and 153 elephants were deployed.

The Cachar, or left, column consisted of: - Half Peshawur Mountain Battery, Captain Blackwood, R.A.; one company Sappers and Miners, Lieutenant Harvey, R.E.; 500 men of the 22nd Panjaub Native Infantry, Colonel Stafford; 500 of the 42nd Assam Light Infantry, Colonel Rattray, C.B.; 500 44th Assam Light Infantry, Colonel Hicks; and 100 police, under Mr. Daly. There were 1,400 coolies, under
Lieutenant-Colonel Davidson of the Commissariat; also a Coolie Corps of 800 men for the carriage of the Sepoys’ baggage under Major Moore. In addition, 600 Coolies joined during the campaign to replace casualties. There were 121 elephants, and 32 others arrived later, of which 20 died in the campaign. The Staff Officers, besides Colonel Roberts, were Captain Thompson, Brigadier Major, and Captain Butler, Aide-de-Camp. Dr. Buckle, Inspector-General of Hospitals, was in medical charge, and Mr. Edgar was Political Officer of the Column, acting in subordination to the General. The Topographical Survey was under Captain Badgley and the telegraph under Mr. Pitman. (Rathbone Low, p. 113 – Footnote)

And for the Chin-Lushai Expedition 1889-90, the British deployed 7,300 fighting men in three columns under the command of two generals and a colonel. (One of them, the Chittagong Column, alone consisted of 3,780 men, 3,300 coolies, 2,200 mules, and 71 elephants as transport.)

The Mizos attained statehood only after fighting a 20-year old war (1966-86) against the central Indian government. The Chins inside today’s Burma agreed to voluntarily form up a federated union on equal terms and equal status with the Burmans, Kachins, Kayahs (Karennsis), and Shans by signing a well-known treaty called the Panglong Agreement on February 12, 1947, at Panglong in Southern Shan State. Without this treaty, the Union of Burma would have never come into existence at all.

Thousands of Chin soldiers in Burma played some of the most crucial roles in saving and maintaining the Union of Burma at its most critical moments during its more than 60 years of civil war which broke out since her independence from Britain in 1948. However, the successive Burmese governments have been completely neglecting the welfare of the Zo people from the very beginning of Burma’s independence. So human rights violations committed against them by the successive governments are rampant everywhere that tens of thousands of them have left and still are leaving the country and migrating to several countries around the world.

Although the Chin/Kuki/Zo people were made up of roughly nearly 100 tribes and sub-tribes and speak different dialects, the great majority of them are closely intertwined by several major clans and sub-clans. The PREFACE and INTRODUCTION in the two editions of the 287-page Genealogy of the Zo (Chin) Race of Burma by Capt. Khup Za Thang below will tell a part of the story. For example, my own main Clan, THUAN TAK or SUANTAK or SUANTAKA, was the 8th generation from ZO, who is believed to be the progenitor of several major clans. My sub-clan, LUA TAWNG (15th generation from ZO), begins with the great-grandson of KIIM LEL (12th generation from ZO). Kiim Lel was the founder and first chief of Lophei. My paternal grandfather KHUP LIAN was the 22nd generation from ZO, and 11th generation from Kiim Lel. The clan’s chieftainship ended with Khup Lian’s eldest son, Suang Hau Thang, when the Chins decided to end feudalism in 1948 (see TABLES 5A & 5B for my own genealogical trees - 5A is on my paternal side and 5B my maternal side). The powerful former Chiefs of the Sailo clan, who had ruled large parts of the Lushai Hills (present-day Mizoram) for centuries, for example, were the descendants of Seam Muang, the younger brother of Kiim Lel. He was captured by the Hualngo/Luseis in a tribal war (see TABLES 2, 2-A, 3, 3-A; APPENDICES A, A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4, E, F, Satellite Photo 5 and Photo 12.)

The Chin/Zo people owe the traditional religion - Animism, that is - that they have been adhering from time immemorial for many of their cultural heritage. The composition of various kinds of their traditional songs solely in poetic words and their ability to memorize their genealogies without a script, for example, are two among them.
PREFACE (FIRST EDITION - 1973) of the Genealogy of the Zo (Chin) Race of Burma

“Back in 1955, Pu Thawng Kho Hau [of Thuklai village, Chin State] had compiled a book called “Zo Khang Sim Na” (Zo Genealogy). Although some people complained at that time that there were some inaccuracies in the book, I think we should be very glad that he had compiled it because that book aroused many people’s interest in their own genealogical roots. And those whose genealogical trees were not included in it were very sad.

Although I had wished to compile a book on ZO genealogies since a long time ago, I could slowly start with my serious research only seven years ago, in 1965. When I started it, I thought that it would be quite a simple and easy undertaking, but it turned out to be three times more difficult than I had envisioned because some clans even had different versions within their own genealogies. So when I found out about this problem, I realized that I needed to request every clan to send me an approved version of their own.

And another big hurdle that made my work even more difficult was that we did not - and do not - use the female lines in our genealogies from our forefathers’ times to the present time. I, therefore, decided to include all the females that could still be recalled in this book, lest they would get lost forever. Such extra efforts had prolonged and complicated my undertakings.”

INTRODUCTION (SECOND EDITION - 2007) of the same book above

“When I retired from Pyi-Thu Council [People’s Council] in 1976, I started again for the task of compiling the Addendum by informing all those who could be interested in the project. After 12 years, in 1988, the 1st draft was finished. And then, the 2nd draft was prepared with data received in the meantime, and a fair copy was completed at the end of 1992. That means researches and data collection were made in 12 years (1976 - 1988), and then it took another four years (1988-1992) to prepare two drafts and a fair copy. So this Addendum was ready for printing only after 16 years of hard work. The first edition of Zo Genealogy was the fruit of 12-year hard work (1962-1974), and then the Addendum could be brought to completion only after 16 years (1976-1992). So, altogether I needed 28 years to bring the two works to a complete end. The Addendum was finally ready to be photostatted in 1993 - the year in which I reached 70 years of age:"

The following is Pu Vum Ko Hau’s Foreword for the 1973 Edition of the Genealogy of the Zo (Chin) Race of Burma

FOREWORD

by

Ambassador Vum Ko Hau, Ph.D. (Prague), F.R.A.I., F.R.G.S., former Member of Bogyoke Aung San’s interim Union Cabinet and Vice-President, Supreme Council of United Hills People As a Life Fellow of The Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and a Member of the historic Bogyoke Aung San’s first Union Provisional Cabinet at the creation of the Union of Burma in 1947, it is a pleasure for me to be invited to write a foreword to the compilation of the Genealogy of the Zo (Chin) Race of Burma by Captain K. A. Khup Za Thang.

An entry in the respectable Encyclopedia Britannica describes the Zo Chins in the following manner:
The respect for the birth and
the knowledge of pedigrees.  
the duty of revenge,  
the virtue of hospitality,  
the clannish feeling,  
the suddenness of their raids.

...On account of the difficult communications in the regions inhabited by the Zo race, contacts between communities were infrequent, and as a result, the formerly unified language spoken by a single race tended to split up into a variety of dialects. But in traditional songs and poetry, they still retain their original uniformity, and the meaning is generally understood by the hearer regardless of whether he comes from Tiddim, Tuikhiang, Assam, or Manipur states.

The means of preserving knowledge of one’s pedigree among the Zo race are mainly verbal. One instance of its use in everyday life when addressing one another. This is done with strict adherence to one’s standing in the genealogical table. One’s pedigree, in fact, takes precedence over one’s age. For example, I myself would be obliged to address Jemadar Suan Kam (K.P.M.) as Pu Suan Kam (Pu meaning grandfather), although he is only about the same age as my father. Many of my contemporaries, whose pedigrees are longer than my own, are obliged to address me as ‘Pa Hau’ (‘Father’ Hau) and even in some cases as ‘Pu Hau’. The same rule applies without exception to married couples; hence you would find husbands calling their wives ‘Ni’ (Auntie) and wives calling their husbands’ Pa’ according to their genealogical standing.

Another instance of the verbal preservation of genealogy is occasioned at the festive gathering of the Clan Chiefs and Elders in which the Chief Priests formally recite in full - without a single omission - the names of all of the forefathers of the Clans. It is also a tradition among the leaders to record their clans’ histories in ceremonial songs that are largely autobiographical in content. These songs recount of the dead and of the manner in which they met their misfortune...

One further particular fact might be mentioned. Although lacking in surnames properly speaking, there is a continuation in naming from grandfather to eldest grandson, as is usually the case, or as sometimes happens, from one grand-uncle, as in my own case. In effecting this, the last name of one’s godfather is inherited by the godson. Thus, there would be a continuing link between the last name and first name, as for example, with my own name: Tun Lun-Lun Vum-Vum Hau-Hau Vum - Vum Ko Hau.

The feat of putting down in print for the first time the genealogy of over twenty generations of an entire people whose span of life in terms of human chronology stretches to a thousand years is an accomplishment that deserves acknowledgment. Captain Khup Za Thang’s compilation which has brought together a good many (though by no means all) of the scattered Zo race into the pages of a single volume, should be appreciated by all members of the hereditary-conscious race...”

(Ambassador to France and Netherland; Indonesia, Cambodia, and Laos; Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Hungary)
SOME OLD AND NEW SPELLINGS OF TRIBAL NAMES

OLD SPELLINGS (used during British colonial period) and NEW SPELLINGS or TERMS used by local people with the same meaning.

CHIN NWE = CIIMNUAI - The oldest known settlement of the northern Chins since they arrived in the Chin Hills. It is located south of Tiddim (see Map 5)

HAKA = HALKHA, HAKA, HAKHA
KANHOW = KAM HAU -
KHWUNGLI = KHUANGLI
THANTLANG/KLUNG KLUNG* = THANTLANG
KOKIE = Kookie = Kuki
KWESHIN = KHUALSIM
KHUAPI = KHUAPI
LAWTU = LAUTU
LOOSHAI/LUSHEI = LUSEI
NWENGAL = GUNGAL - The west bank of Manipur River in Tiddim and Tonzang Townships
NWEITE = GUITE
NORN = NGAWN
SHENDU = LAKHER/MARA
SHINTHANG = SENTHANG
SHURKWA = SURKHUA
SIYIN = SIZANG
SOOTIE/SOKTE = SUKTE
TASHON = TLAISUN, TLASUN
THETTA = SAKTA
TIDDIM = TEDIM**
VAIPE = VAIPHEI
WHENOH = HUALNGO
YAHOW = ZAHAU
YO = ZO, ZOU
YOKWA = ZOKHUA
ZOPE = ZOPHEI
ZOTUN = ZOTUNG


** In all official documents and World Atlas this spelling TIDDIM is still used, although the local people are using now TEDIM, both for the town and for themselves as well. Author (tdz)

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FIELD MARSHALS, GENERALS, SENIOR OFFICERS AND ADMINISTRATORS WHO HAD EITHER TAKEN PART OR PLAYED SOME IMPORTANT ROLES IN CONQUERING THE CHIN/ZO PEOPLE INSIDE PRESENT-DAY BANGLADESH,
BURMA AND INDIA (1841-1919) WITH SEVERAL MAJOR AND MINOR MILITARY CAMPAIGNS

(Note: This list is from my 960-page paper - Update XXIII. The ranks in this Appendix were the ones that most of them reached in their lifetime, but many of them had already had these ranks when they took part in the various expeditions or campaigns mentioned below against the Chin/Zo people - from 1841 to 1894, and once again between 1917 and 1919. This Appendix alone contains 100 pages. I insert this list here just in order to give the reader a quick overview of the Appendix.)

01. Field Marshal Sir George Stuart White, VC., GCB., OM., GCSI., GCIE., GCVO*
02. Field Marshal Sir Frederick Sleigh Roberts, 1ST Earl Roberts, VC., KG., KP., GCB., OM., GCSI., GCIE., C.B., PC*
03. Field Marshal Philip Walhouse Chetwode, 1st Baron Chetwode, 7th Baronet of Oakley, GCB, OM., GCSI., KCMG., DSO*
04. Field Marshal The Lord Napier of Magdala, GCB., GCSI., CIE, FRS*
05. Field Marshal Sir Charles Henry Brownlow, C.B., K.C.B.*
06. General Sir George Benjamin Wolseley, GCB.*
07. General Sir James Willcocks, GCB., GCMG., KCSI., DSO. *
08. General Sir Arthur Power Palmer, GCB., GCIE.*
09. General Sir Richard Campbell Stewart, C.B., K.C.B.*
10. Lieutenant-General Sir Benj. Lumsden Gordon, RA., KCB*
12. Lieutenant-General Sir Richard Harte Keatinge, VC., C.S.I*
13. Lieutenant-General Sir Arthur Purves Phayre, GCMG., KCSI., CB*
14. Lieutenant-General Sir William Penn-Symons, KCB., CB*
16. Major-General Donald Macintyre, VC., F.R.G.S. (He was awarded the Victoria Cross, the highest and most prestigious award for gallantry in the face of the enemy that can be awarded to British and Commonwealth forces, for his action on 4 January 1872 during the Looshai [Lushai] Campaign, North-East India.)
17. Major-General Sir Vincent William Tregar, K.C.B.*
18. Major-General Henry Brooke Hagstromer Wright, CB., CMG*
19. Major-General Albert Fytche, C.S.I*
20. Major-General Sir James Johnstone
21. Major-General Sir Phillip Mainwaring Carnegy, CB., GOC*
22. Major-General John MacDonald
23. Major-General Nuthall
24. Major-General William Joseph Fitzmaurice Stafford, C.B.
25. Major-General Sir Theodore Fraser, KCB., CSI., CMG*
26. Major-General Montague Protheroe, C.B., C.S.I*
27. Major-General Michael Joseph Tighe, K.C., KOMG., D.S.O*
30. Major-General Edward Pemberton Leach, VC., CB.*
31. Major-General Sir Herbert Mullaly, C.B.C.S.I., K.C.M.G*
32. Major-General W. H. Birkbeck, C.B., C.M.G*  
*Order of the Rising Sun
The Order of the Rising Sun is a Japanese order established in 1875 by Emperor Meiji of Japan. The order was the first national decoration awarded by the Japanese Government, created on April 10, 1875 by decree of the Council of State. It is the second most prestigious Japanese decoration after the Order of the Chrysanthemum.
33. Major-General Clifton Edward Rawdon Grant Alban, CBE
34. Brigadier-General Gerald Edward Holland, C.B., C.M.G., C.I.E., D.S.O.**
35. Brigadier-General D.C.A. Andrew*
36. Brigadier-General Faunce, C.B.
37. Brigadier-General Bourchier, C.B., K.C.B.
38. Brigadier-General Graham
39. Brigadier-General Alexander Beamish Hamilton, C.B.*
40. Brigadier-General Herald Pemberton Leach, C.B., D.S.O.**
41. Brigadier-General Macquoid
42. Brigadier-General Alexander Cadell*
43. Brigadier-General Colin Robert Ballard, C.B., C.M.G.*
44. Brigadier-General C.H. Roe, C.M.G.,
45. Brigadier-General F.W. Towsey, C.M.G., C.B.E., D.S.O.
46. Brigadier-General F. A. Smith
47. Brigadier-General Elliot Philipse Johnson, C.B
(Winner of Nobel Prize for Medicine (1902) (The Burma and Chin-Lushai campaign medal awarded to Colonel Sir Ronald Mosquito" Ross, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., late Indian Medical Service, whose discovery of the mosquito cycle in malaria won him the Nobel Prize for Medicine and universal acclaim as one of the greatest benefactors of mankind.)
49. Colonel William Chase VC, CB
50. Lieutenant-Colonel Charles Mc Dowall Skene, D.S.O.** a brilliant military strategist and tactician
52. Colonel Frank Montagu Rundall, D.S.O.**
53. Colonel Edward Robert John Presgrave, D.S.O.**
54. Colonel Charles Herbert Shepherd, D.S.O.**
55. Colonel George John Skinner, D.S.O.**
56. Colonel Caulfield, Gordon Napier, DSO**
57. Colonel Joshua Arthur Nunn, D.S.O.**
58. Colonel Arthur Gentry Morris C.M.G., D.S.O.**
59. Colonel William John Hicks
60. Lieut.-Colonel Surgeon F.S. Lequesne, VC.  
(He was awarded the Victoria Cross for his action on May 4, 1889 at the battle of Taitian/Siallam during the First Chin Expedition 1888-89. The defenders were Siyins.)
"... The British adopted a punitive strategy; families of the village headmen were packed off to the secure territory of Lower Burma and their villages were burned, then new villages, led by strangers loyal to the British cause, were established. The guerrillas targeted these villages, and by 1890 more than 3000 British troops were involved in the battle to maintain order and suppress the rebels' activities...Action against the Chin rebels continued when 3500 men were sent to avenge raids in the Chin and Lushai areas [beginning] on the 15th November 1889, and eventually only the sheer weight of numbers brought the military struggle to an end. Two VCs were awarded during this campaign, One of the recipients was Irish, this being Surgeon John Crimin..."  
(http://www.irishregimentsandhistory.com/#/irish-vcs/4543061438)
62. Lieutenant-Colonel Henegan, John, DSO**
63. Lieutenant-Colonel Frederick Arthur Rogers, D.S.O.**
65. Lieutenant-Colonel H.Y. Beale, D.S.O**
66. Lieutenant-Colonel. East, Lionel William Pellew, DSO**
67. Surgeon Major William Reed Murphy, D.S.O.**
68. Lieutenant-Colonel Taylor, Hugh Neufville, DSO**
69. Major Edward James Lugard, D.S.O.**
70. Major Owen, Edward Roderic, DSO**

Note. For reason of space only those who had the rank of major and above are listed here.

NOTES ON THE RANKS AND HONOURS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL FROM THE ABOVE-LIST

Note 1. Field Marshal Sir Frederick Sleigh Roberts (No. 02): After serving with the British Army in the Umbeyla and Abyssinian campaigns of 1863 and 1867–1868 respectively, Roberts fought in the Lushai campaign (1871–1872), for which he was appointed Companion of the Order of the Bath (CB)... (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Frederick_Roberts,_1st_Earl_Roberts)

Note 2 Field Marshal Brownlow (No. 5) and Brigadier-General Bourchier (No. 37) received the K.C.B., for their services in Looshai.” (Source: Rathbone Low, Footnote on p. 126)

Note 3. General Sir Arthur Power Palmer, GCB GCIE (No. 8) received The Companion of the Order of the Bath for his excellent services in the suppressive campaign against the Siyin-Gungal Rebellion 1892-93.

Field Marshal Sir George Stuart White Collection: Photographic copies of sketches of the Chin Hills Campaign, Burma.

Photographers: Contents: Provenance: Unknown 19 prints Most approx. 175X125mm Galentin silver prints Deposited on permanent loan by Lady Napier.

Collection of 19 prints, guarded and filed. The collection comprises photographic copies of sketches made during the Chin Hills Campaign of 1892-93 and sent by General Sir Arthur Power Palmer.:

Description: Commander of the Expedition, to Sir George Stuart White, Commander-in-Chief in India. Most of the prints are briefly captioned by the artist, with more extensive notes, presumably by Palmer, written on the reverse. Among the subjects are: view of Fort White, a halt on the road to Fort White, Christmas dinner at Fort White, cantilever bridge erected by the Madras Sappers across the Manipur River, views on the Chindwin River, signalling station above Kaptial, Nwengal Column crossing the Manipur River, Howchinkoop (Chief of the KAM HAU Tribe, Kaptial burning, bivouac on plateau above left bank of Manipur River.
http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/indiaofficeselect/PhotoShowDescs.asp?CollID=2486

Note 4. General Sir R.C. Stewart, K.C.B., C.B.* (No. 9), had already reached the rank of major-general and was General Officer Commanding Burma/ Commander-in-Chief in Burma when he personally supervised the Chin-Lushai Expedition 1889-90 and also the Siyin-Gungal Rebellion.

“After fourteen hours! continuous march the column reached Botung, and the next day Captain Rose and I [Bertram Carey] proceeded to Mobingyi [Mualbem] and arrived the next afternoon (10th April 1892) at Fort White and had the good fortune to find there the General Officer Commanding Burma, General Stewart...” (The Expeditions of 1891-92: March to the Lushai Country. Carey & Tuck, pp. 70-71 and see also 9.11.5 The Siyin Rebellion)

“...With matters at this stage the General Officer Commanding [Brigadier-General Palmer] returned to Fort White to meet the Major-General Commanding Burma.” (ibid p. 88)

Note 6. Those who are marked with a single asterisk ( * ) are the ranks that they attained at the end of their careers.

Note 7. DSO (Companion of the Distinguished Service Order) marked with double asterisk ( ** ) were awarded during the Chin-Lushai 1889-90, or the Chin Hills 1892-93 expeditions. And all of them, except four, commanded troops during any of these expeditions. The Distinguished Service Order (DSO) is a military decoration of the United Kingdom, and formerly of other parts of the British Commonwealth and Empire, awarded for meritorious or distinguished service by officers of the armed forces during wartime, typically in actual combat.

SOME OF THE BRITISH ADMINISTRATORS WHO HAD ALSO PLAYED SOME IMPORTANT ROLES IN CONQUERING THE CHIN/ZO PEOPLE

- Sir Charles Crosthwaite (1835-1915): Chief Commissioner of Burma (March 1887 to December 1890)
- Sir Bertram Sausmarez Carey, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., C.I.E., V.D. Commissioner of Sagaing Division, Burma; Political Officer in Chin Hills and the first Superintendent (Deputy Commissioner) 1889-95
- Mr. H.N. Tuck, Extra Assistant Commissioner, Burma, and Assistant Political Officer, Chin Hills
- Lieut.-Colonel John Shakespear, C.M.G., C.I.E., D.S.O. Deputy Chief Commissioner of Assam, author of The Lushei Kuki Clans
- Captain Lewin, Superintendent of the Chittagong Hill Tracts
- Mr. Edgar, Deputy Commissioner of Cachar

HIGH RANKING BRITISH MILITARY COMMANDERS AND OFFICIALS WHO SEALED THE FATE OF THE CHIN/ PEOPLE ON 29TH JANUARY 1892 AT THE CHIN-LUSHAI CONFERENCE AT FORT WILLIAM, INDIA

- The Hon'ble Sir Charles Alfred Elliot, K.C.S.I., Lt. Governor General of Bengal
- His Excellency Lieutenant-General the Hon'ble
- Sir. J. C. Dormer, K.C.B., Commander-in-Chief, Madras
- Sir Alexander Mackenzie, K.C.S.I., Chief Commissioner of Burma
- W.E. Ward Esq, C.S.I., Chief Commissioner of Assam -
- Sir Henry Mortimer Durand, K.C.I.K., C.S.I., Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department
- Major-General E.H.H. Collin, C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department
- Major-General Sir James Browne, KCSI., C.B., R.E. Quarters-Master-General in India
1.0 INTRODUCTION

... Since we all cannot yet agree until today upon a single nomenclature covering all the tribes, “Chin-Kuki-Mizo” or sometimes “Chin-Kuki-Mizo-Zomi” are used by both outsiders and the ourselves. The two words: “ZOMI” and “MIZO”, always confuse outsiders. In fact, both of them have exactly the same meaning - that is, “ZO MAN” or “ZO PERSON” or “HIGH LANDER). Those who prefer to call themselves ZOMI insist that it’s grammatically more correct, and therefore this term should be used. But those who prefer MIZO to ZOMI insist that this term had already been used officially in a historical document called the “Mizo Memorandum”, dated April 26, 1947, which was submitted to the then British Government and the Government of India by the Mizo Union, on behalf of all the Chin-Kuki-Mizo tribes. (The Mizo Union was founded in Aizawl on April 9, 1946.) Actually, MIZO had already been used by Lt. Col. J. Shakespear as early as 1912 in the INTRODUCTION of his book. “Among the people themselves, the Lusheis are sometimes spoken as Dolian, at the derivation of which I will hazard no guess, and the general population of the hills is spoken of as Mizo.” So, they argue that it should be used. Interestingly, even those who prefer to call themselves ZOMI, for example, call an Indian “Mivom” which literally means “man dark”. However, its real meaning is supposed to be “dark/black man” and it’s the same with a European. He is called “Mikang” - literally “man white”. The term “Zomi” was officially used when the “Zomi Baptist Convention” was founded in 1953 by the more than thirty Baptist Associations in Chin State and Kale-Kabaw Valley in Sagaing Division as an umbrella organization.

These days two these terminologies are rapidly gaining popularity. Therefore, they are widely used among several Zo tribes, namely: ZOFATE and ZONAHTHAK - that is, “Children of Zo” or “Descendants of Zo”. Also, among those who prefer to call themselves ZOMI, the term: “ZO SUANTE” is equally getting very popular as well now. Zo Suante and Zofate have the same meaning. Since Mizo and Zomi have the same sense anyway, I shall simply mostly use either CHIN or CHIN-KUKI-MIZO or CHIN/ZO or sometimes ZO, and their land: CHINLAND or ZORAM interchangeably in this paper for the sake of convenience. In several Chin/Zo dialects, “Ram” stands for a country. Dr. Vumson Suantak first used the terms “East Zoram” for Chin State and “West Zoram” for Mizoram in his book Zo History. I shall also use these terms interchangeably in this paper.

The following quotes are a few brief descriptions of the Chin/Zo people from some of the most prestigious, authoritative, and internationally recognized reference books, publications of academic institutes, and religious institutions, including British colonial records.

1.1 CHINS or KUKIS

A tribe living in the mountainous region between Lower Bengal and Upper Burma. They form a collection of tribes belonging to the Tibeto-Buran group of the Indo-Chinese race, and consist of three divisions: Northern Chins, who inhabit the Chin Hills and a small part of the country to the north of them; the Central Chins (known as Kamis, Kwemis, Mros, Chinboks and Chinbons) live in the Pakokku Chin Hills and the northern Arakan district; and the Southern Chins of the Arakan Yoma. The Chins are, for the most part, a warlike race, divided strictly into clans over which their leaders and upper classes have almost despotic power and influence. They are uncleanly in habits, treacherous and given to intemperance.

(The Encyclopedia Americana, 1947)

1.2 KUKI

A name given to a group of tribes inhabiting both sides of the mountains dividing Assam and Bengal from
Burma, south of Namtaleik river... In the case of the Thado Kuki who followed them, the Lushai, who drove the Thado north from the district called Lushai hills, the Lakher, and the various tribes of the Chin hills in Burma -Haka, Siyin, Sukte, etc. - there is, inspite of divergences, so strong a similarity in general type and culture that they can be fairly treated as forming a single group, ruled by chiefs on a quasi-feudal system, exogamous patrilineal, attaching great importance to genealogy and descent... Clans claim descent from a common ancestor... Chiefs wield wide authority; their subjects are bound to them by service tenure, a man accepting a chief's protection assumes a vassalage which he cannot put off at will... All disease is ascribed to spirits and can be driven off by appropriate disinfectants or ceremonies, but a beneficient Creator is believed in, to whose abode souls go after death, having to pass a malignant demon on the way... The Kuki is generally an indefatigable hunter and snarer of game, warlike, bloodthirsty and destructive. His languages belong to the Tibeto-Burman family and his folklore savours of the Arabian Nights. \( \text{*(The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1959)*} \)

1.3 CHINS
A group of tribes of Mongol origin, occupying the southernmost part of the mountain ranges separating Burma from India... Chin villages, often of several hundred houses, were traditionally self-contained units, some ruled by council of elders, others by headmen. There were also hereditary chiefs who exercised political control over large areas and received tribute from cultivators of the soils... The Chins have much in common with the Kuki, Lushai, and Lakher people and speak related Tibeto-Burman languages... Domestic animals, kept mainly for meat, are not milked or used for traction. Chief among them is the mithan, a domesticated breed of the Indian wild ox...Traditional religion comprises of a belief in numerous deities and spirits, which may be propitiated by offerings and sacrifices. Christian missions have made many converts...” \( \text{*(The New Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1986)*} \)

1.4 MIZOS, also called LUSHAI, or LUZEI
Tibeto-Burman - speaking people numbering about 270,000... Like the Kuki tribes, with which they have affinities... Every village, though comprising members of several distinct clans, was an independent political unit ruled by a hereditary chief. The stratified Mizo society consisted originally of chiefs, commoners, serfs and slaves (war captives). The British suppressed feuding and head-hunting but administered the area through the indigenous chiefs...” \( \text{*(The New Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1986)*} \)

1.5 KUKI-CHIN-VÖLKER [Kuki-Chin-Peoples]
A collective name for a group of old Mongoloid peoples and tribes (population in 1985, 3. 5 million) in West Burma, East India and Bangladesh. It covers several other small tribes that are closely linked to the Kukis such as Chins, Mizo (Lushai) and the Meiteis or Manipuris in the Manipur plains... There was also head-hunting. The Meiteis have become Hindus and there are several Christians among the Mizos and Chins. \( \text{(Broekhaus Enzyklopädie, 1990)*} \)

1.6 THE CHINS*
The Chins, who dwell in the mountainous regions of West Burma and East India, are well-skilled in fishing, hunting and weaving fine textiles...(Burma: Weltmission heute Nr. 22/ Evangelisches Missionwerk in Deutschland, 1996). Remark: This 205-page book on Burma, prepared by the Evangelical Mission Work...
in Germany, under the title of *Burma: World Mission Today No. 22*, devouts only twelve lines or six sentences on the Chins.

1.7 THE TERM “CHIN” IS IMPRECISE

It is a Burmese word (*khyang*), not a Chin word... No single Chin word has explicit reference to all the peoples we customarily call Chin, but all - nearly all - of the peoples have a special word for themselves and those of their congeners with whom they are in regular contact. This word is almost always a variant form of a single root, which appears as zo, yo, ks u, s u, and the like. The word means, roughly, “unsophisticated”...[p. 3].

Another group of Kuki-Chin speakers are the Kuki (Shakespeare, 1912). *Kuki* appears to be a Manipuri term. (Manipuri, or Meitei, is the Kuki-Chin language of a long-Hinduized people who have for many centuries ruled the Manipur Valley.). Kuki peoples inhabit the relatively low hill country in Manipur, Cachar, Tripura (or Tiperah), and possibly the northern part of the Chittagong Hills Tracts. The so-called New Kuki, especially the Thado, are Northern Chin who were pushed out of the Chin Hills proper into Manipur and into the Naga Hills of Burma and Assam by Lushai in the middle of the nineteenth century. Some of the Old Kuki, such as the Vaiphei (see Carey and Tuck, 1896; Needham, 1959), consist of refugees from the Chin Hills who were forced out earlier by similar pressure at the end of the eighteenth century...[p. 5].

The 1931 *Census of India* reported about 345,000 persons speaking about forty-four distinct Chin and Chin-related dialects (*Census of India*, 1939, pp. 183-184, 189). Most of these dialects and languages are mutually unintelligible. Embree and Thomas, 1956 (p. 14) estimate that there were 350,000 Chin in all of Burma in 1943 and 554,842 Kuki and Chin peoples including those in Pakistan [Bangladesh] and India in 1931...[p. 6]. However, there is no absolute separation between the Kuki and some of the northernmost Chin of Burma. Even some of the old Kuki, like the Vaiphei, were not long ago “Tiddim-type” Chin...[p. 16]. For instance, some of the so-called “Old Kuki” Kuki of Manipur-Assam probably did not arrive there as recently as the rest of the Old and the New Kuki. The New Kuki were pushed out from the Chin-Lushai country by their near relatives, the Lushais, in the 1700’s and 1800’s. The Old Kuki seem first to have been mentioned in the Manipur chronicles about 1554 (Shakespeare, 1909, p. 373). The cultural and social organization of the Kuki, and especially of the “older” Old Kuki, resembles that of the Southern Chin in style and simplicity...[p. 25]. It is used in contrast to such terms as zo, the common Chin name for themselves, which expresses their view of being backward and uncultivated...[p. 30]. Chin are *zo mi* because they lack the civilization of the Burman, whose culture they envy, however still will not emulate...[p. 55]. (Lehman)

1.8 CHIN-HILL-TRIBAL PEOPLE

AREA: Around 351 miles from North to South and 80 miles from East to West and approximately 20,880.08 square miles.

POPULATION: 750,000 inhabitants, two thirds of the region is situated on the mountains and hilly ranges. **The majority of the inhabitants are Chin-hill-tribal people.**

RELIGION: Christian is the major religion of the Chins but 86 percent of Chins are belonged to the Protestant Denomination numbering about fifty sects, and there are few buddhists, animists and a few Islams.

(Source: *CATHOLIC CHURCH IN CHIN HILLS*. Myanmar Catholic Directory-2000: Official directory of
the Catholic Church in Myanmar)

1.9 CHINS**

Inhabiting the western hills of Burma as far north as the Somra Tract, and as far south as Sandoway and Thayetmyo, the Chins are divided into a great many tribes and speakers of different dialects. They use the destructive taungya type of shifting hillside cultivation described in chapter viii. Indirect rule, through native chiefs, has also been British practice in this area, and with equally satisfactory results from the standpoint of loyalty. In addition, the Chins have furnished many recruits for the armed forces, in peace and war. They are reputed to have low moral standards and also low standards of cleanliness, the urge to bathe being inhabited by the cold mountain air as well as by the distance to the nearest source of water. Stevenson describes their clothing as follows: The dress of the men can be said to dwindle from little in the north to still less in the south, and the sex exhibits a magnificent resistance to the wide climatic variations to which it is exposed. (H.N.C. Stevenson, The Hill Peoples of Burma, p. 7). Note. - *Italics is mine.*

1.10 THE CHINS*

-... Numbering circa 220,000 - are of Tibeto-Burman origin, migrated to Central Burma through Chindwin Valley about 300 years ago; they were driven to the mountains in the west by later comers such as the Burmans and Shan... The Chins, with the exception of a few Buddhists and Christians who have come into contact with the Burmans and Europeans, are primitive Animists... *Andru* describes that the standard of the Chins' moral is very low, and that of their cleanliness as well which is due to their reluctance to have a bath for the mountain wind is chilly and the water sources faraway..." (Burma: Land. Geschichte. *Wirtschaft*, 1967; Hans-Ulrich Storz/Schriften des Instituts für Asienkunde [Documents of the Institute of Asian Studies], Hamburg).

* Excerpts from books marked with an asterisk on previous and these pages are my own translations from the original German texts.

** Burmese *Economic Life*. p. 32. Standford University Press. USA. 1947. By J. Russel Andrus (Former Professor of Economics, University of Rangoon)

1.11 CHIN-KUKI-LUHSAIS

“People this region with dusky tribes, almost as numerous in dialect and designation as the villages in which they live, owning no central authority, possessing no written language, obeying but verbal mandates of their chiefs, hospital and affectionate in their homes, unsparing of age and sex while on the warpath, untutored as the remotest races in Central Africa, and yet endowed with an intelligence which enabled them to discover for themselves the manufacture of gun-powder.” (Reid, 1893. p. 2.)

1.12 LUSHAIS

“In 1871 the Indian Government was involved in hostilities with the wild tribes on the south-east frontier of Bengal, known by the common name of Looshai, and Colonel Roberts’s services were again brought into requisition... *The Looshais, says Colonel Roberts [later Field Marshal], are a family of the great Kokie tribe, who may be found in Independent, or Hill, Tipperah, which bounds the Looshai country on the west...*” (Rathbone Low, p. 109)
4. POPULATIONS

The Chin population in Chin State in 2001 was 480,673 (2001 Annual Statistics of Burma). Ninety-eight percent of this population is ethnic Chin. The rest is ethnic Burmans - most of them are government servants. More than 1,000,000 Chins are living in Sagaing, Magway (Magwe), Yangon (Rangoon), Bago (Pegu), and Ayeyawady (Irrawaddy) Divisions, Rakhine (Arakan) State, and Naga Hills in Burma. (Burma is made up of seven ethnic states and seven divisions in Burma Proper.) The Mizoram State has a current population of more than 1,100,000, according to the 2011 census. About 90 percent is ethnic Mizo. The Zo populations in Tripura, Assam, Manipur and Nagaland states in India are estimated at some 600,000. In Manipur State alone, there are 480,000 people out of the state’s 2.8 million. The population of Zo in the Chittagong Hill Tracts in Bangladesh is estimated to be about 30,000 - 45,000. So, altogether the total Zo population would be not less than some 3 million, excluding the Manipuris (Meiteis), who some anthropologists also regard to be Chin. Pu L. Keivom believes that the Zo population could even be as high as 5 million. See 17.9.3 for his article. (The population estimates above in India and Bangladesh were as of 1985.)

5. LANGUAGE

Despite the lack of a common language among them until today, the Zo people can communicate with each other in six or seven major dialects, which belong to the Sino-Tibetan linguistic groups. These six or seven major dialects are so closely related to each other that someone who speaks one of them needs only from six months to one year to understand and to be able to speak quite fluently any other of them, provided that he lives among those dialect-speaking people. From Burma's independence in 1948 up to 1988, the Chins were officially permitted to learn their language only up to the second grade. However, they could learn their dialects up to the 4th grade in schools unofficially thanks to an influential and far-sighted Chin education officer in Chin State. But since 1989, the government adopts several subtle tricks so that they can no more effectively learn their language in public schools.

Burmese and English are now compulsory subjects. In Chin State, the Laizo dialect, which is spoken in the Falam region has been used as semi-official Chin language for the 30-minute Chin Radio program, which is broadcast daily from Rangoon by the state-owned Burma Broadcasting Service. It was changed later to Myanmar Radio and Television (MRT). Contrary to this, the Mizos in India have complete freedom to promote and use the Hualngou/Lusei dialect as their common language. It has already been highly developed enough that it can be majored in India up to the master's degree level. This dialect is spoken by more than 1,200,000 people, and well-understood by another 300,000. (This dialect is also known as the Duhlai dialect.)

“Today, many Mizo varieties have been assimilated into a language identified as Mizo. Chhangte (1993: 1), a noted linguist among the Mizo says: Nowadays, the term Mizo refers not only to the Luseis but also to other tribes such as: Chawhte, Hmar, Hnamte, Khawhring, Khiantge, Ngente, Paihte, Paute, Rahte, Rawite, Renthei, Tlaupangcha and Zawngte...Modern spoken Mizo is more or less the same as the language of the Lusei tribe (also known as Lushai) and has been the lingua franca of the area for a century.” (Khoi Lam Thang, p. 38)

According to Khoi Lam Thang's master degree thesis, more than twenty major Chin dialects (Asha, Bualkhuwa, Dai, Falam, Hakha, Kaang, Khualsim, Khumi/Maru, Lautu-Hnaring, Lakher/Mara, Mizo, Matu, Senthang, Siyin, Taisun, Tedim, Thado/Kuki, Thantlang, Zanni and Zo) have 36% of lexicostatistic similarity. (See MAPs 3 & 4 of the Geographical Centers of Chin Dialectal Groups, and TABLES 20/A; 20/B & 20/C)

The dialects used on the above Tables, except that of the Mizo, are from inside Burma.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of similarity</th>
<th>Names of languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>Hakha, Thantlang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>Siyin, Tedim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>Buakhua, Zaniat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>Falam, Taisun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>Zo, Siyin, Tedim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>Hakha, Thantlang, Khualsim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>Thado, Zo, Siyin, Tedim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>Lakher, Mara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>Falam, Taisun, Hakha, Thantlang, Khualsim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>Mizo, Falam, Taisun, Hakha, Thantlang, Khualsim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>Buakhua, Zaniat, Mizo, Falam, Taisun, Hakha, Thantlang, Khualsim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Thado, Zo, Siyin, Tedim, Buakhua, Zaniat, Mizo, Falam, Taisun, Hakha, Thantlang, Khualsim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>Thado, Zo, Siyin, Tedim, Buakhua, Zaniat, Mizo, Falam, Taisun, Hakha, Thantlang, Khualsim, Senthang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>Kaang, Dai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>Lautu-Hnaring, Lakher, Mara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>Thado, Zo, Siyin, Tedim, Buakhua, Zaniat, Mizo, Falam, Taisun, Hakha, Thantlang, Khualsim, Senthang, Asho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>Thado, Zo, Siyin, Tedim, Buakhua, Zaniat, Mizo, Falam, Taisun, Hakha, Thantlang, Khualsim, Senthang, Asho, Matu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>Thado, Zo, Siyin, Tedim, Buakhua, Zaniat, Mizo, Falam, Taisun, Hakha, Thantlang, Khualsim, Senthang, Asho, Matu, Kaang, Dai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>Thado, Siyin, Tedim, Buakhua, Zaniat, Mizo, Falam, Taisun, Hakha, Thantlang, Khualsim, Senthang, Asho, Matu, Kaang, Dai, Khumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>Thado, Zo, Siyin, Tedim, Buakhua, Zaniat, Mizo, Falam, Taisun, Hakha, Thantlang, Khualsim, Senthang, Asho, Matu, Kaang, Dai, Khumi, Lautu-Hnaring, Lakher, Mara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Percentage of lexicostatistics similarity

(Khoi Lam Thang)

Note: “Falam” in this case stands for the LAIZO dialect, which is used as the common language (unofficial) of the Chins by the Burmese government in radio broadcasting programme.

TABLE 20-A
| Thado | Zo | Sino | Tedim | Bual | Zanniet | Mizo | Falam | Taisun | Hakha | Thantlang | Khualsim | Matu | Kaang | Dai | Asho | Lautu-H | Lakher | Mara | Khumi |
|-------|----|-----|-------|------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|------|------|-----|------|--------|--------|-----|-------|
| 82    | 318| 67  | 67    | 67   | 67     | 65   | 62    | 62    | 62    | 60    | 60     | 50    | 47   | 48   | 47  | 47   | 40     | 39     | 38  | 40    |
| 91    | 64 | 66  | 66    | 66   | 63     | 63   | 67    | 67    | 65    | 63    | 63     | 52    | 44   | 46   | 47  | 50   | 39     | 35     | 34  | 38    |
| 68    | 75 | 69  | 65    | 65   | 64     | 63   | 60    | 53    | 43    | 45    | 43     | 44    | 33   | 28   | 33  | 44   | 36     | 36     | 32  | 31    |
| 72    | 76 | 73  | 73    | 65   | 55     | 42   | 37    | 47    | 33    | 47    | 44     | 36    | 32   | 31  | 31  | 36   | 36     | 36     | 36  | 36    |
| 87    | 82 | 82  | 80    | 59   | 46     | 43   | 40    | 44    | 38    | 35    | 38     | 36    | 36   | 36  | 36  | 36   | 36     | 36     | 36  | 36    |
| 83    | 81 | 77  | 62    | 44   | 44     | 38   | 41    | 39    | 36    | 32    | 34     | 34    | 36   | 34  | 34  | 36   | 36     | 36     | 36  | 36    |
| 95    | 89 | 67  | 47    | 47   | 42     | 47    | 46    | 36    | 36    | 36    | 36     | 36    | 36   | 36  | 36  | 36   | 36     | 36     | 36  | 36    |
| 76    | 66 | 48  | 46    | 43    | 47     | 49    | 35    | 35    | 35    | 35    | 35     | 35    | 35   | 35  | 35  | 35   | 35     | 35     | 35  | 35    |
| 68    | 43 | 41  | 37    | 46    | 41     | 38    | 37    | 36    | 37    | 36    | 36     | 36    | 36   | 36  | 36  | 36   | 36     | 36     | 36  | 36    |
| 50    | 47 | 41  | 42    | 45    | 38     | 38    | 38    | 38    | 38    | 38    | 38     | 38    | 38   | 38  | 38  | 38   | 38     | 38     | 38  | 38    |
| 38    | 35 | 42  | 47    | 38    | 35     | 37    | 37    | 37    | 37    | 37    | 37     | 37    | 37   | 37  | 37  | 37   | 37     | 37     | 37  | 37    |
| 58    | 42 | 37  | 33    | 30    | 48     | 30    | 30    | 30    | 30    | 30    | 30     | 30    | 30   | 30  | 30  | 30   | 30     | 30     | 30  | 30    |
| 48    | 39 | 32  | 31    | 31    | 31     | 31    | 31    | 31    | 31    | 31    | 31     | 31    | 31   | 31  | 31  | 31   | 31     | 31     | 31  | 31    |
| 36    | 28 | 31  | 36    | 21    | 36     | 36    | 36    | 36    | 36    | 36    | 36     | 36    | 36   | 36  | 36  | 36   | 36     | 36     | 36  | 36    |
| 52    | 51 | 34  | 34    | 34    | 34     | 34    | 34    | 34    | 34    | 34    | 34     | 34    | 34   | 34  | 34  | 34   | 34     | 34     | 34  | 34    |
| 81    | 81 | 34  | 34    | 34    | 34     | 34    | 34    | 34    | 34    | 34    | 34     | 34    | 34   | 34  | 34  | 34   | 34     | 34     | 34  | 34    |

Table 3. Matrix of lexicostatistic percentages in 21 Chin language

(Khöi Lam Thang)

TABLE 20-B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tonzang</th>
<th>Tedim</th>
<th>Falam</th>
<th>Hakha</th>
<th>Thantlang</th>
<th>Matupi</th>
<th>Mindat</th>
<th>Kenpetlet</th>
<th>Paletwa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thado</td>
<td>Sizang</td>
<td>Falam</td>
<td>Hakha</td>
<td>Thantlang</td>
<td>Matupi</td>
<td>Mindat</td>
<td>Hnoktu</td>
<td>Chinpon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tedim</td>
<td>Ngawn</td>
<td>Zokhua</td>
<td>Zophei</td>
<td>Zopong</td>
<td>Muun</td>
<td>Daai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zo</td>
<td>Laizo</td>
<td>Mie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teizang</td>
<td>Zaniat</td>
<td>Senthang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hualingo (Mizo)</td>
<td>Thawr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dim</td>
<td>Khualsim</td>
<td>Amlai</td>
<td>Rawngtu</td>
<td>Rah</td>
<td>Myo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khuano</td>
<td>Zahu</td>
<td>Tamang</td>
<td>Wumtu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Khum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vangteh</td>
<td>Tapong</td>
<td>Wumung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Khuangsu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunte</td>
<td>Sim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val</td>
<td>Bualkha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saizang</td>
<td>Taisun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaileeng</td>
<td>Lente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Chin languages in the Chin State of Myanmar

(Khöi Lam Thang)

TABLE 20-C
9.6.6 ENCOUNTER WITH THE SIYINS  On 27th January [1889] the road-making party was again confronted by Chins. The working party was sent back to the stockade and the troops, now unencumbered, attacked the enemy, who retired slowly, making a stubborn resistance, till they reached formidable and skillfully placed stockades, where they made a stand. Sir George White, at our stockade, hearing heavy firing in front, joined the attacking party with a small enforcement of the 42nd Gurkhas, and at once ordered, and took prominent part in the charge, which was brilliantly led by Lieutenant-Colonel Skene, D.S.O. [He was later killed in action in Manipur. tzd] Sir George White, in a telegram* to the Chief Commissioner of Burma, described the action as follows:-

‘Enemy yesterday attacked our working party on road above this and held our covering party, 40 British and 100 Gurkha, from 9 till 2, when I arrived and ordered their positions to be charged. We carried all, driving them entirely away, getting off ourselves wonderfully cheaply. Only one Norfolk dangerously wounded. Enemy in considerable numbers, using many rifles and ammunition. They fired at least 1,000 rounds, standing resolutely until actually charged, even trying to outflank us. Their loss probably about eight or ten, but they were carried down the khuds at once. Most difficult enemy to see or hit I ever fought.’

The result of this action was a serious blow to the Siyins and they now realized that it was impossible to save their villages. The fight had taken place on one of their historic battle-fields,* for it was here that they had overthrown an army sent against them by the King of Burma in former days. On 22nd January after several skirmishes, in which we suffered loss, General Faunce proceeded to the summit of the Letha range and from an altitude of 8,200 feet looked down on the Siyin villages lying 3,000 feet below him. No. 4 stockade was established on 31st January and No. 5 three days later. Accompanied by Sir George White and Major Raike, General Faunce advanced on Koset (Siyin) on 4th February with a strong force.***

9.6.11 ACTION AT TARTAN** On 4th May the last action of the expedition was fought and it merits fully description. Some new huts had been noticed on the site of Tartan, and to destroy these a party was sent from Fort White on 4th May. The following account is taken almost verbatim from the report of Captain C.H. Westmoreland, 42nd Gurkha Light Infantry. The column, consisting of 65 rifles of the 2nd Battalion Norfolk Regiment and 60 rifles of the 42nd Gurkha Light Infantry, occupied the heights above New Tartan without opposition. The main body advanced with the intention of rushing the village, but encountered determined resistance from the Chins, who were strongly posted in two stockades.

The upper stockade consisted of a log-hut, the sides and roof of which were bullet-proof. It was connected with a ravine to the east by a trench about 3 feet wide, 5 feet deep, and 20 yards long. The trench was covered with logs and planks flush with the ground. The hut itself was surrounded at a distance of 5 or 6 yards with rows of sharp-pointed stakes about 3 feet high. The second stockade was in the bed of the ravine. It consisted of a hole about 6 or 9 feet square, from which a trench ran down the ravine. Both trench and hole were covered with logs and planks and were bullet-proof. In both stockades there were a few spaces between the logs through which the Chins fired, and the only way in which they could be carried was by pulling away some of the timber.

* & ** See Footnote on next page

At the lower stockade, early in the action, Second-Lieutenant Michel fell mortally wounded. The troops at first endeavoured to turn out the defenders of the upper stockade by firing through the openings between the logs.
Before long the covered trench was noticed and pulled open and the Chins in it were shot. After accomplishing this under fire from the Chins in the lower stockade and in the neighbouring jungle, the column retired, burning the villages as it went. The Chins, who had suffered heavily, did not follow, being deterred by the loss which they had sustained and kept in check by a small covering party on the height. In this action our loss was one officer killed and two (Captain Mayne and Surgeon Le Quesne) severely wounded and three men killed and eight wounded. Surgeon Le Quesne received the Victoria Cross for conspicuous coolness and gallantry displayed whilst dressing Lieutenant Michel's wound.

9.13.2 _THE BATTLE OF TARTAN [TAITAN or SIALLUM]_

(See also 9.6.11)

... The Chin leader [Vum Ko Hau] is heir to the ruling Lunman clan of the Siyin Chins. Some of his grand uncles fell in the action against General Sir George White's army at No. 3 Stockade and at Tartan in the Siyin Valley. At this latter place 60 out of 80 holders of the Fort fell on May 4, 1889. Lieut.-Colonel F.S. LeQuense won the Victoria Cross (Times April 18th 1950.) But his own dashing qualities of leadership and toughness in resisting Burma's enemies during the Second World War were natural qualities he breathed at his birthplace: Fort White. This very high post bears the name of Field Marshal Sir George White, V.C., O.M., G.C.B., G.C.S.I., G.C.M.I.E., G.C.I.E., G.C.V.O., L.L.D., who took three years to subdue the heroic Siyin Chins after the fall of Mandalay and the humiliation of King Thibaw.* (Diplomats in Outline: *Vum Ko Hau Siyin of Siyin Valley...* - THE DIPLOMATICS: The Review of the Diplomatic and Consular World. London. (Vum Ko Hau, p. 135.)

- Telegram from the District Staff Officer, Burma, to the Chief Secretary to the Chief Commissioner, Burma.- No. 1283, dated the 9th May 1889.

**GENERAL FAUNCE wires. Begins: 323 C.F., Fort White, May 5th 1889. A new Siyin village near site of Tartan, south-east of this, having been seen from Sagvilain by party referred to in my 320 C.F., I sent 65 Rifles, Norfolk, 60 Rifles, 42nd, under Major Shepherd, Norfolk, yesterday to destroy new Tartan which consisted of 15 houses. No opposition till after troops entered village, at bottom of which two very strong stockades, flanking each other and connected by covered way with plank-roof. Siyin Chins held their fire till troops were within 50 yards. They stood their ground and fought with great pluck, eight being killed with the bayonet. In the first stockade their loss was 30 killed and many wounded** I regret our loss was heavy...

- **YOUR No. 1283. Chief Commissioner (Sir Charles Crosthwaite, K.C.S.I.) will be glad to know whether it is to be understood that the attack was successful and that both stockades were taken and the village destroyed.**

- Telegram from Major F.D. Raikes, C.I.E., to the Chief Secretary to the Chief Commissioner, Burma - 163P, dated the 15th May 1889.

New village of Taitan was destroyed, but one stockade was not taken as Officer Commanding Force considered if there were further casualties column could not return to Fort White that night and no arrangements made for camping out. On 9th May 150 Rifles under General Symons went out and destroyed remaining stockade; place found deserted; General Symons relieved General Faunce on 6th May 1889.
• Telegram from the District Staff Officer, Burma; to the Chief Secy to the Chief Commissioner, Burma: - 1488, dated the 15th May 1889.

Following from General Officer Commanding Chin Field Force. Begins: May 10th. Party 150 Rifles, Norfolk, and 42nd Gurkhas, under Brigadier-General Symons visited TAITAN, scene of fight on 4th May, yesterday. Were unopposed though signal shots were fired. Found many graves and several bodies were buried in enemy’s trenches. Siyin Chins repaired stockade which was all completely destroyed and burnt. Ends.

Pau Thual, a heroic defender of the Taitan Fort, composed the following song: (Vum Ko Hau, p. 232, No. 39. See also APPENDIX L.)

Phung Sakluang leido sakluang
Tul Luang thing bang hong ki phom
Phung luang lum suang bang beal ing

- See PHOTO 1

“Early Tactics of the Chins: When we first advanced into the hills the Chins fought in the open and from behind stockades, but they soon learned that our quick-firing rifles were too much for them; and they could not stand against the charges of British and Gurkha troops. They then tried fighting from covered-in trenches as at Tartan in 1889. This fight, though considered but a drawn battle from our point of view, was regarded by the Chins as an overwhelming disaster to their arms; they frankly admitted that they were beaten and could never again stand face to face with British troops.” (Carey & Tuck, p. 231)

* See the 2nd page of APPENDIX E

** The Roll Call of Honour was:


---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

5. https://it.qwe.wiki/wiki/Siallum_Fort

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Note. Source of all telegrams: Vum Ko Hau, 169-170

Pu von min nam sial ing

Bodies of relatives and enemy

Were heaped like logs on one another
Bodies of relatives served as my fort
And called the heroic names of my clansmen
as I killed the enemy

The following poem was composed by the late Rev. T. Hau Go Sukte (see 18.3.2 RELIGION) in honour of the heroines and heroes of the Battle of Siallum. See Photo 30!

SIALLUM FORTRESS
(Battle of Siallum 4th May 1889)
Mark ye well this honoured spot,
Stained with blood of heroes slain;
They to keep our ancient lot,
Fought a horde from Great Britain.
Mark ye th’ historic date,
Eighteen eighty nine May fourth;
They their precious blood poured forth;
When for us who born of late,
They their precious blood poured forth;
Sowed the seed of liberty.

(Source: X-Sender: khoiksm@hotmail.com[Rev. Khoi Lam Thang]
To: suantak@us.net
Cc: zoni@yahoogroups.com, Zoni@onelist.com, ciimuai@yahoogroups.com,
Date: Thu, 24 May 2001 11:45:34 -0000
Subject: [ZONET] May ni 4 ni leh SIALLUM KULH

9.17 THE TASHON TRIBE

9.16.1 Legendary Origin of the Tashons The Thados, as has been remarked, claim their origin from the bowel of the earth, and the Tashons also believe that their original parents stepped, not out of a burrow like the Thados, but out of solid rock. At Shunkla there is a large rock and out of this the Tashons believe that a man and a woman came, who settling down close by became the parents of those who are now called the Shunkla tribe proper. The Tashons call themselves Shunkla after the name of the village which they believe their first parents started, building themselves the first house after emerging from the rock, and by this name they are known to all the southern tribes...(Carey & Tuck, 141-142)

Rise of the Power of the Tashons After the Shunklas (Tashon is the Burmese corruption of the word Shunkla) had founded Falam they gradually brought all their neighbours, both relations and aliens, under their control. When we occupied Chinland we found the Tashons numerically the most powerful in the hills... The Tashon tribesmen, unlike Siyins and Suktes, do not claim one common progenitor. They are a community composed of aliens, who have been collected under one family by conquest, or more correctly strategy. The esprit de corps in the tribe therefore falls far short of that displayed in the Siyin,
FORT SIALLUM or FORT TAITAN (FORT OF THE SIYIN/SIZANG)

Photo Courtesy: Tuangpu

- Lt. Col. Surgeon LeQuesne got his Victoria Cross for his action here on May 4, 1889.
- See 9.10.2 ACTIONS AT TARTAN (TAITAN or SIALLUM)
- Restoration of it was done by the Burmese Government, but not strictly according to the original structures.
- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. January 2016
LIEUTENANT-COLONEL F.S. LEQUESNE, VC.

Lieutenant-Colonel F.S. LeQuesne, V.C., who won the decoration in 1889 for conspicuous brevity while serving as a surgeon during the attack on the village of Tartan, Upper Burma, died on April 14, 1950 at the age of 86. Ferdinand Simeon LeQuesne, who was the third son of the late Lieutenant-Colonel Giffard N. LeQuesne, Royal Jersey Artillery, was born in Jersey on Christmas Day, 1863. After being at school in the Channel Islands he received his medical training at King’s College Hospital, London. Preferring a career in the service to that of a private practitioner, he joined the army medical service, and in 1889 was called upon to serve in the Burma Expedition.

On May 4 of that year he was with a column of the Chin Field Force attacking the village of Tartan. In the course of the operations Second Lieutenant Michel, of The Norfolk Regiment, was lying wounded within five yards of the loopholed stockade from which the enemy was maintaining a continuous fire. Surgeon LeQuesne, notwithstanding the fire, with perfect coolness and self-possession, went to the aid of Michel and remained with him for 10 minutes dressing his wounds. LeQuesne then turned his attention to other wounded and while attending to another officer was himself severely wounded. In addition to being awarded the Victoria Cross, which was gazetted on October 29, 1889. LeQuesne was mentioned in dispatches and received the medal and clasp for the campaign. He saw further service the next year with the Chin-Lushai Field Force and in 1891 with the Wuntho Field Force.

LeQuesne reached his majority in 1898, just before the outbreak of the South African War. He continued to serve and he was promoted to lieutenant-colonel in 1906. Lieutenant-Colonel LeQuesne, who retired in 1918, was in his younger days a fine shot and an able player at rackets and lawn tennis. He was unmarried. - Time. London. (Vum Ko Hau, p. 399)

NAVAL AND MILITARY MEDICAL SERVICES

THE VICTORIA CROSS.

“The Queen has been graciously pleased to signify her intention to confer the decoration of the Victoria Cross upon Surgeon Ferdinand Simeon LeQuesne (Medical Staff), whose claim has been submitted for Her Majesty’s approval for his conspicuous bravery during the attack on the village of Tartan, Upper Burma, by a column of the Chin Field Force on May 4th last. The act of courage for which he has been recommended is recorded as follows: - “Displayed conspicuous bravery and devotion to duty during the attack on the village of Tartan by a column of the Chin Field Force on May 4th last, in having remained for the space of about ten minutes in a very exposed position (within five yards of the loopholed stockade from which the enemy were firing), dressing with perfect coolness and self-possession the wounds from which Second Lieutenant Michel, Norfolk Regiment, shortly afterwards died. Surgeon LeQuesne was himself severely wounded later on whilst attending to the wounds of another officer.”

(Source: The British Medical Journal. Nov. 2, 1889. 1015)

Medal entitlement of:
Lieutenant Colonel Ferdinand LEQUESNE
Medical Staff ( Royal Army Medical Corps )

* Victoria Cross
* India General Service Medal ( 1854-95 )
  o 3 clasps:
  o "Burma 1887-89"
  o "Chin Lushai 1889-90" - "Burma 1889-92"
* Queen's South Africa Medal ( 1899-1902 )
  o 3 clasps:
  o "Cape Colony"
  o "South Africa 1901" - "South Africa 1902"
* 1914 Star
* British War Medal ( 1914-20 )
* Victory Medal ( 1914-19 )
* King George VI Coronation Medal ( 1937 )

http://www.victoriacross.org.uk/puleques.htm

Note: The following is my correspondence with Mr. Starling, Director of the Museum, concerning a misunderstanding on my part with regard to a sub-title in his article below.

from: museum <armymedicalmuseum@btinternet.com>
reply-to: museum <armymedicalmuseum@btinternet.com>
to: Thang Za Dal <thangzadal@googlemail.com>
date: Mon, Mar 19, 2012 at 10:09 AM
subject: Re: THE MEDICAL VICTORIA CROSS(F.C. LeQuesne)
signed-by: btinternet.com

Dear Sir

Thank you for your email. I feel you may have misread the paper because the Kachin Hills expedition refers to the 1893 expedition and then the paragraph goes on to refer to the many other 'minor troubles for some years'.

This leads into the Le Quesne and the Chin Hills expedition of May 1889.

I will access your paper.

Regards,

Pete Starling
Army Medical Services Museum
Keogh Barracks
Ash Vale
GU12 5RQ
01252 868612
THE MEDICAL VICTORIA CROSSES

WAR IN BURMA - THE AWARD OF THE VICTORIA CROSS TO FERDINAND SYMEON LEQUESNE

PH Starling

Director, Army Medical Services Museum, Keogh Barracks, Ash Vale, Aldershot

Introduction

Britain had been engaged in fighting in Burma on a small scale since the late 18th century but fighting intensified in the 19th century into what became known as the First, Second and Third Burmese Wars, after which Upper Burma was annexed by the British on 1st January 1886. The Third Burma War had taken a heavy toll on the combined British and Indian force, mainly from sickness with epidemics of malaria, dysentery and typhoid fever resulting in heavy wastage. The terrain dictated that the method of evacuation of the casualties was initially by hand but later by pony and elephant. Where possible rivers were used and large steamers were employed as floating hospitals [1]. The rate of admission for disease per 1000 strength in 1888 was 2,367.4% and a death rate of 48.49% the following year things were slightly better with 2,144.55 admissions per 1000 and 30.19 deaths [1]. After the Third Burma War there were further expeditions, conducted in the main to control the hill tribesmen, and it is one such expedition, the Kachin Hills Expedition of 1893, that is detailed here.

Kachin Hills Expedition

The Kachin Hills form a mountainous district of Upper Burma inhabited by the Kachin people who had been raiding columns and settlements for some years. Numerous small actions and two large expeditions were mounted against the Kachins to bring the major troubles to a halt, which happened in March 1893. There re-occurred some minor troubles for some years after, necessitating a strong police force remaining in the area for some years.

One such expedition was sent to destroy the village of Tartan which had been rebuilt by the rebels after its destruction in February 1889. The force consisted of 2nd Norfolk Regiment and sixty men of the 42nd Gurkha Light Infantry. The whole force was commanded by Capt. Otway Mayne, 2nd Norfolks with 25 year old Surgeon Captain Ferdinand LeQuesne as the medical officer [2].

Ferdinand Simeon LeQuesne

LeQuesne was born in Jersey on the 25th December 1863, the third son of Lieutenant Colonel Giffard N LeQuesne, a retired Royal Jersey Artillery officer and Auguste W LeQuesne, née Simeon. He was initially educated in the Channel Islands and later underwent medical training at Kings College Hospital. He qualified as a licentiate of the Society of Apothecaries in 1885; MRCS in 1886 and a Licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians, also in 1886. Commissioned as a Surgeon Captain on 28th July 1886 he was attached to the 2nd Norfolk's and proceeded with them to Burma [3].

LeQuesne's presence on the return to Tartan on the 4th May was regarded more as a morale booster than a necessity. The Chins were not expected to fight but to follow their practice of abandoning their village on the approach of the column. By 0930am the column was above what looked like the abandoned village and Captain Mayne deployed his forces and the final advance into the village began. When almost at the bottom of the hill the troops discovered two fortified stockades which immediately came to life as heavy fire poured from them. One of the first to fall was 2nd Lieutenant Michel, leading the main party forward. Forced to withdraw, the troops pulled back with Michel's body but he still remained exposed to the Chin fire. A Private Charles Crampton went and fetched LeQuesne to treat Michel's wounds. Here he dressed the wounds aided by Crampton and two Gurkhas, all the time under constant Chin fire (Figure 1). After about ten minutes LeQuesne and his helpers brought Michel's body under cover. Observing this brave act, from a position about thirty yards away was Captain Mayne, who himself was wounded. LeQuesne now dashed across the fire swept hillsides to Mayne's side and commenced dressing his wounds at which point he himself was wounded. Mayne's own statement testifies to the bravery of LeQuesne.

"...the splendid coolness and gallantry displayed by Surgeon LeQuesne in attending to the wounded, he himself being exposed during the whole time to a very hot fire, under which several men dropped; this was more especially the case while attending to 2nd Lieutenant Michel, owing to his extremely exposed position. I consider that Surgeon LeQuesne's conduct is deserving of the highest possible recognition."[4]

By now some eleven officers and men had been killed and with only two doolies, Captain Westmoreland, on whom command now rested, decided that withdrawal was the only option [5]. This, the force did, leaving Tartan burning once again. Some days later a force returned again to the scene of the action and destroyed the now unoccupied stockades.

On 29th October 1889 LeQuesne's name appeared in the London Gazette with notification of the award of the Victoria Cross.

"Displayed conspicuous bravery and devotion to duty during the attack on the village of Tartan, by a column of the Chin Field Force, on 4th May 1889, in having remained for the space of about ten minutes in a very exposed position (within five yards of the looped stockade from which the enemy was firing), dressing with perfect coolness and self-possession the wounds from which Second Lieutenant Michel, Norfolk Regiment, shortly afterwards died. Surgeon LeQuesne was himself severely wounded later on whilst attending to the wounds of another officer."[6]

The Victoria Cross was presented to him by General BL Gordon at Rangoon in December 1889.

[Private Crampton was recommended for the Victoria Cross for his actions but was awarded the Distinguished Conduct Medal (DCM). He was awarded a bar to the DCM during the Anglo Zulu War.]
LeQueune recovered from his wounds and took part in further actions in Burma including with the Chin Lushai Field Force in 1890, the Wuntho Field Force in 1891 and the Kaukwee Expedition. He was awarded the Indian General Service Medal 1854-95 with three clasps and was further ‘Mentioned in Despatches’. After a year in England from 1893 to 1894 India beckoned again and service in Bengal until 1900 and then the Punjab until 1901, during which time he was promoted to the rank of Major, in May 1898. In November 1901, with the Anglo Boer War almost three years old, LeQueune found himself in South Africa, where he served until 1902 and was awarded the Queens South Africa Medal with clasps for Cape Colony, 1901 and 1902 and was once again ‘Mentioned in Despatches’.

After a further two years in England he returned to Bengal until 1909, being promoted Lieutenant Colonel in 1906. With the outbreak of war in 1914 LeQueune joined the BEF, serving in the war until 1918, when he retired. On retirement he took up the post, amongst others, of Honorary Surgeon to the Metropolitan Hospital London. His recreations were shooting, racquets and lawn tennis; presumably he developed his love for the former whilst in India. He remained a bachelor throughout his life [6].

Ferdinand Simeon LeQueune died on 14th April 1950, aged 86 at 6 Victoria Square, Clifton, Bristol. He was buried at Canford Cemetery, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol, on 19th April 1950.
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MEMORIAL STONE AT SIALLUM FORT

PHOTO 30

Poem composed by Rev. S.T. Pu Hau Go in 1967
Photographer unknown

Note. On March 4, 1965 a proposal was made to the Ministry of Culture by Major Son Khaw Lian, Chairman of the Chin Affairs Council, and Chin Cultural Officier Pu Suak Khaw Khai for the restoration of the fort and the erection of this Memorial Stone. A news item about it appeared in Kyemon (The Mirror) on 14.9.1965. This Stone was erected on 16.3.1967.
- This information and photo were received by me from Pu David Hang Za Pome on 29.1.2016.
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Two Sizang Chiefs and Four Elders

Sitting (from left to right): Pu Kim Suang of Limkhai, Elder; Pu Thuk Ngo, Elder of Buanman.
Standing (from left to right): Chief Pu Pau Khai of Buanman (Mrs. Vum Ko Hau’s grandfather), Pu Kam Suan, Buanman Elder; Pu Mang Pau of Limkhai, Elder; Chief Pu Mang Lun of Limkhai (aka Sagyilain). These two Chiefs were among the five Sizang Chiefs who made peace with the British Government. See 9.13.3 FORMAL SUBMISSION OF THE SIYINS

Source of Photo: Vum Ko Hau, PV 39

Notes: Photographic copy of a portrait made in 1898, reproduced on the Chin Hills Battalion Christmas card for 1938. The accompanying note reads: ‘The famous Siyin fighting Chief, Mang Lon of Sagyilain [aka Limkhai], a Siyin hero of the Chin Hills of 1888-89-90 and who afterwards rendered great services to the Government of India during the Siyin-Nwengal Rising of 1892.’ [Gelatin silver print, 65x84mm].

Topics: Chin Hills Battalion; Chins (ethnic group);
Portraits: BURMA, Mang Lon, Sagyilain Chief
Places: Burma; Chin; Myanmar
http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/indiaofficeselect/PhotoEnqFull.asp?PrintID=110758
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PHOTOS 13 & 14

Photo 13 (above): Limkhai Zo-Ngal (background)
A section of the lower part of Thuklai (foreground)

Photo 14 (below): Khuasak (background)
A section of the top part of Thuklai (foreground)

Photos: Courtesy of Michael Suantak (Photos taken in 06/2009)
(tzd/12.2012)
Photo: Thang Cin Tual

**VOKLAK** - A historical village in connection with the Battle of Tartan (Sialhum). Northern Chinland.
Sukte and Thado tribes. The members of the Falam council are not looked up to as every man’s hereditary and lawful lord, as is the case with Chiefs in the north. They are *parvenus* and aliens, who cannot expect to be treated with the respect which high birth demands and secures in all Kuki tribes. The Tashon Chiefs themselves are well aware that their birth does not entitle them to the love and respect of their people. To maintain their position they keep their people constantly crushed under a yoke of taxation and fines, and should any village show signs of impatience or resistance it is promptly dealt with and crippled. The people of the Tashon tribe may be classed into five divisions - (1) The Shunkla (2) The Yahow (3) The Tawyan (4) The Kweshin (5) The Whenoh. These five divisions may be subdivided into - (1) Shunkla of Falam (2) Other Shunkla (3) The Yahow tribe proper (4) Other villages of Yahow origin (5) Kwungli [Khuangli] (6) The Norn [Ngawn] family (7) The Kweshin and Minledaung community (8) Tawyan (9) The Whenoh clan.

9.17.3 *Suzerainty of the Tashons and the Council of Chiefs* From the foregoing pages it will be gathered that the Shunklas of Falam rule a heterogeneous community composed of various aliens, who far outnumber the ruling tribe. The fact that they have acquired and maintained their rule over all these people speaks well for their power of administration. They hold their position, not so much through their prowess in the field as through the ingenuity which has enabled them to play off one sect against another and thus uphold their rule over the whole. The Falam tribe is administered by a council of five Chiefs, who are all chosen from the Shunkla and Falam villages. The post of councillor is attained, not by virtue of birth, but by the vote of the people. It is a most extraordinary circumstance to find a Kuki tribe disregard birth, and appointing to rule them five men who may be of plebeian origin and who have attained affluence by successful trade, proved their wisdom in diplomacy, or fought their way to fame in raids and wars. Amongst the Chins, as among the Kukis, it is the male issue which commands respect and demands rights, but amongst the Shunklas a plebeian like Sonpek [Con Bik] who is the greatest man in the tribe, can make himself Chief by right, through marrying into a family of Chiefs. Such a thing would not be possible amongst the Hakas and Suktes. The aristocratic family of the Shunklas is the “Kong Perr” [Cong Khar], to which the two old councilmen Karr Lyin [Khar Lian] and Man Hlror [Mang Hlur] belong. The other three are men whose position in the tribes is due either to their own efforts or to distinction gained by their fathers.” (Ibid, p. 149)

9.17.4 *March to Falam* General Graham now fixed the 10th March [1891] as the date on which the Haka-Falam column should start, and on that day a column of 300 rifles and two guns under the command of Colonel Mainwaring, accompanied by Mr. Ross and Lieutenant Macnabb, Political Officers, marched from Haka along the new mule-track, which was now finished as far as the Minkin hill. On the 13th, after a peaceful march, the column camped on the same spot as in 1890 on the north-west side of the capital, the Northern column, as already related, encamping near Pate. The reception of the columns was friendly, but the Tashons had gathered in force around their mother village, and both columns were very closely watched by Chin piquets...On the 16th the Haka column started on its return march, leaving Lieutenant Macnabb with the road-making party under Captain Steevens, who had not yet completed the mule-track. During the next four days the road was completed, and Lieutenant Macnabb, who had seen much of the Falam Chiefs during this time, had gained valuable information regarding the sentiments and customs of the Tashons...(Ibid, pp. 50-51)

9.17.5 *Meeting with the Tashon Chiefs and* In the afternoon of 11th March [1889] General W. Penn
Symons summoned the Falam Chiefs and read out the terms which had already been explained to them some three months previously by Major Raikes. The Chiefs, to our intense surprise, after permitting the columns to approach their capital unopposed, firmly and politely declined to acknowledge the supremacy of the British Government by paying tribute; and, without absolutely refusing, expressed their doubts at being able to pay any portion of the fine imposed on them by harbouring rebels and raiding in the plains.

The General dismissed the Chiefs with a solemn warning to carefully consider their final answer, which was to be given within two days. At this time the whole valley, in which formerly lay the original village of Falam, was full of armed Chins, numbering not less than 3,000 men, gathered from all sides; the host seemed to to settle itself in groups of from 10 to 100 men; they were quiet in demeanour, but held their heads high and seemed quite prepared for whatever might be the result of the negotiations. The crowd was a motley one, the Tashon Chiefs dressed in the gaudy tartan of the tribe, well armed with bright guns, vermilion and black parti-coloured da scabbards, and beautifully inlaid powder-horns.

The Whonhs were conspicuous by their chignons, which contrasted with the lofty head-dresse of their neighbours, the Yahows, who were present carrying the strange “Shendu” chopper-shaped da in basketwork scabbards. Scattered around in bunches were scowling Siyins, the half-breeds from Tawyan and Minleaudang, the semi-independent clique of Kwungli, and the trans-Nankathe tribesmen of Sukte and “Poi” origin. The congregation was armed with a variety of weapons; spears and flint-lock guns predominated, but bows and quivers of barbed arrows were carried by not a few. Each man bore his food-supply for a few days on his back.

(Ibid, p. 39)

9.17.6 Position of the Tashons Doubtless it was the presence of this large force drawn from so many tribes and from the very borders of the Lushai country that induced the Tashon Chiefs to show a bold front, fully believing that with our small force we should be alarmed at the display of the Chin strength. The Chiefs when they informed General Symons that they would not pay tribute were quite sincere and intended to fight rather than pay, though they preferred to gain their end without fighting if possible. It must be remembered that the Tashons held a unique position in Chinland at this time. All the tribes from Manipur to Haka and from Burma to Lushai owed them nominal allegiance and the Tashons, realized that their prestige would be gone and the name of Falam lowered in the eyes of Chinland if they in common with the petty clans had to pay tribute and acknowledge the supremacy of the white men.” (Ibid, p. 39)

917.7 Decadence of the Tashon Power The Falam council recognizes that the tribal position is in a most critical state at the present time. They not only failed to keep us out of the Siyin country in 1889, but they also met with no success when they tried to prevent our visiting Falam in 1890 and again, two years later, when we placed a post at their village. Their position then became still more unstable. They had approved the Siyin-Nwengal rebellion, although they did not openly assist the rebels, and when we had finished dealing with the Northerners, we disarmed some Whonhs and Yahow tribesmen as well as some Norns subordinate to the Kwungli and tributary to Falam. The people thus saw what we already suspected, namely, that Falam was afraid to fight us for the guns of their subordinates. This year has seen the partial disarmament of the south, and now that the northern and southern tribes are disarmed, the Tashons recognize that their turn comes next, and they are very awkwardly placed. If they surrender their guns, their power will be diminished and their prestige lowered; if, on the other hand, they fight, they are certain to be beaten, their fine
capital will be at the mercy of the troops and Government as a punishment may split up the present Tashon possessions into two or three independent chieftainships, Falam retaining the Shunklas, Kweshins, Torrs, while the Yahows and Wennohs would be independent of the Tashons and directly subordinate to the Assistant Political Officer at Falam. (Ibid, p. 151)

9.17.8 Occupation of Falam  Marching from Haka on the 10th March [1892] the column was met on the 12th by a deputation of Falam Chiefs and arrived on the 13th at our old camp near Falam, where we were met by more Chiefs. The Falam Chiefs were now told for the first time that we intended to occupy their village. They strongly objected, having hoped that we would camp where we were as we had done the two previous years. However, we had not come out to bandy words with them, and so, keeping the principle Chiefs as a safeguard, the troops advanced with all military precautions, it being impossible to see the villages until quite close to it. No resistance was offered and the village was peacefully occupied... (Ibid, p. 65)

10.0  SYSTEMS OF GOVERNANCE IN ANCIENT CHIN/ZO SOCIETIES

INTRODUCTION

Hereditary chieftainship was common in central, northern and western regions of Chinland with the exception of the Tashon area in the central region as were already mentioned earlier. A number of those chiefs ruled over several villages stretching over vast areas and many of them had both political, military and judiciary powers over their subjects. And although some Chiefs may have had ruled just a few villages, their influence could reach far beyond their own jurisdiction. Here is an example. “The Siyin Chiefs and for that matter all the Chin Chiefs were never under foreign sovereignty and they all wielded the powers of kings and monarchs from time immemorial. They waged war any time they chose and kept any number of slaves in their own house or in other distant villages collecting feudal levies as the occasion demanded. These feudal allies or in a few cases slaves were acquired in various ways. Feudal allies were acquired in times when strangers requested for food or clothings from the richer feudal lords in times of war, defeated or oppressed persons came to the stronger lords for protection and alliance; the third category consisted of slaves who were actually prisoners of war but who were never redeemed...” (Vum Ko Hau, pp. 178-179) The following passages will reveal more about how the Chins were ruled in olden days.

10.1  THE POSITION OF CHIEFS

(Carey & Tuck, pp. 200-203)

10.1.1  The Kuki, Siyin and Sukte Chiefs

_ The Kuki race is characterized by its respect for birth, and, as the Chin are but a family of that race, we find in them a natural reverence for him who by right of birth is Chief of the tribe, or clan, or family. The Chief may be wanting in qualifications and there may be many of other families his superior in ability; but, unless he is physically or mentally quite unfit for his position, there is no danger of his being supplanted, and the usual course is for elders and advisers to assist him in his rule. The position of the Chin Chief in regard to the people is very similar to that of a feudal Baron. The Chief is lord of the soil and his freemen hold it as his tenants and pay him tithes, whilst they in common with the slaves are bound to carry arms against all his enemies. If a fugitive or an outcast takes refuge in a village, he pledges himself as vassal or slave of his protector._

We found that the Siyin and Sukte Chiefs in particular were in a familiar position to the Barons of old who
Member Chiefs of What the British called the Falam Democratic Council
(See 9.17 THE TASHON TRIBE)

- Photo courtesy: Pu Tawl (Obtained from Salai Van Cung Lian of UK. 2017)
- Note: Pu Con Bik was the famous Head Chief of the Council. Pu Van Naw, Chief of the Zahaus, was the grandfather of the late Pu Za Hre Lian, former Chin politician and Plenipotentiary Ambassador of Burma to France and the United States for several years.

ruled their tenants and were subordinate, both they and their tenants, to the King. The Sukte Chiefs ruled their tenants, received their tithes, and fought their own private quarrels, and at the same time they paid tax to the Tashons and obeyed their summons to collect their forces to fight in the Tashon interests.

10.1.2 Haka and Southern Chiefs

At Haka and in the south an intricate state of affairs exists, for the Chiefs of several clans, presumably for the sake of strengthening their position and controlling powerful dependents, in times gone by founded the village of Haka and peopled it with their several families and immediate followings. The position of the Haka and other Southern Chiefs in common with that of the Northern Chiefs is that of hereditary and lawful rulers, but as already shown in previous chapter, the Tashon custom is different.

In the Northern Hills a Chief, when he becomes too old to lead the clan on raids, naturally leaves these arduous duties to his sons, but he does not abdicate in his son's favour, and he continues to the end as the head of the clan. It is a custom for no man in the north to eat the liver of any animal whilst his father is alive as it is deemed disrespectful to do so. Amongst the Hakas the very marked respect of age, which is so noticeable in the north, is entirely wanting.

10.1.3 Falam Chiefs

The Falam Chiefs pretend that all on the council are hereditary Chiefs; such, however, is not the case, though it is possible for a man of common extract to become connected with the hereditary Chiefs by marriage; and this is how the Tashons promote a commoner to the rank of Chief. The Chiefs are elected to the council by the people, but as a general rule they belong to the old families, and only when a common man is particularly conspicuous as a soldier, a diplomatist, or as a rich merchant, is he promoted to the council. The Tashons say that a man must have slain another before he can attain to the council. If this is the fact, there must have been many cold-blooded murders committed as the Tashons are not warriors.”

10.1.4 Mizo Chieftainship*

“The people lived in villages, each of which was ruled by a Chief (Lal) who was entirely independent. The first known clan which introduced the Chieftainship was the Hnamte clan of the Lusei sub-tribe while they were in Khawrua and Tlangkhua in the Chin Hills of Burma. At that time the powers and position of a Chief were said to be trivial in nature. It was originally not hereditary one but voluntary to be a head of the clan. It is said that the people had adopted the Chief system so that they could be guided and governed in all activities of life. In course of time the eldest son of the former Chief became a Chief. In case there was no male issue in the family it was a custom for a younger brother of the former Chief to succeed.

In course of time the Mizo Chief became the real centre of authority in Mizoram. He may be best described as a Maharaja of a petty separate state. In times of war or in the Council the Chief was the head and his word carried


Footnote 2 (Carey & Tuck, p. 137): “Amongst the Siyins and Suktes the reverse is the rule [from that of the Thados]: The elder sons go out into the world and find their own villages, whilst the youngest stays at home with his father and helps him, and at his death the youngest son inherits almost all the father's property and the chieftainship of the tribe or clan, his elder brothers becoming subordinates to and paying him the tribute which is due to the head of the tribe.”
weight. Theoretically, all that in the village belonged to the Chief. He could call upon people to furnish him with everything that he needed. He administered the village as advised by the Council of Elders who were appointed by him from the common citizens of his village.

To assist him, each Chief appointed some elder men known as Upa (s) (Advisors or Elders). Furthermore, there was gradation among the Upas or Advisors. The regular government of the the Mizos consisted of a Lal or Chief, Khawnbawl Upa or Upamin (Chief Advisor), and Upas and the people. The basis of selection and appointment of Khawnbawl Upas or Upamin was believed to be the confidence and support people had in them. Once selected the appointment of the Upa became hereditary unless an exceptional case intervened…”

10.2 OTHER FORMS OF RULERSHIP

Among other tribes in southern parts of Chinland, which were called by the British as independent southern Chins, the status of rulership was determined by merits - that is, people elected their leaders every three years or more depending on the duration of the shifting cultivation practiced in the area. The candidate should either be wealthy (having abundant surplus of harvest, for instance), or a victorious warrior or a highly skilled hunter. In a way it was a democratic headman system.

The following are terminologies concerning different rulerships among the various Chin/Zo tribes. Among the Tedims, Sukte and Sizangs a hereditary chief is called “Ukpi” (Uk=Rule + Pi = main/Chief), meaning roughly “main/chief ruler”. Or, he is sometimes also called “Sia Kaai Hausa” (“headman who receives tributes”). And a simple headman is called “Hausa”. Among the Haka and related tribes a hereditary chief is called “Ram-uk Baw” (“he who rules a country”), and “Khua-bawi” (“village chief”) stands for a normal village headman. Among the Falam and related tribes “Bawi” or “Mi-uk” (“he who rules people”) are used for a hereditary chief. The Mizos terminologies for a hereditary chief is “Lal” (“lord”) and a village headman is “Khuatal” (“village lord”). Among all these rulerships the hereditary chief was at the top of the hierarchy. At the second level was the headman, and the “Upate” (“village elders”) were in the third position.

10.3 FEUDALISM AND ANCIENT CUSTOMARY LAWS

Most Zo tribes had their own customary laws - or some tribes may share some or a large part of their customary laws- and they were ruled according to these laws. Many chiefs in fact were just executing the customary laws that were practiced by their specific tribes with the help of village or community elders. Several of these customary laws were still in use until very recently in nearly the entire Chin State with the exception in matters of capital offences.

The following excerpts from Pu Lian Uk’s article will reveal how much the Chins put value on their ancient customary laws:

“...The Chins, whose religion was then animism, were ruled by their numerous Chieftains with their customary laws from the time immemorial of their long history...After the annexation of Paletwa area and many other Chin communities which fall today in the Burma proper by the British, the Chin customary law was first compiled by U Tet Pyo which was known as Maung Tet Pho ‘Customary Law of the Chin Tribe by John Jardine, 1884. A text translation and general note was later made by Dr. F. Forchammer, the then Professor of Pali and Archaeology, British Burma. When the whole of Chinland was eventually annexed after a long and stubborn resistance, a regulation known as the Chin Hills Regulation 1896 was enacted. In
this Regulation a provision was made to grant the use of the Customary Laws and the continuation of the system of their local administration. This Regulation was followed in the administration of both the Chin Hills and the Naga Hills throughout the occupation of the British.

When Burma was about to get independence and a Frontier Areas Commission of Enquiry was formed in May 1947, the Chin delegation agreed to amalgamate with the Union of Burma on the condition that the customary laws are retained and respected. The following dialogues between the Chin delegation and the chairman of the Enquiry Commission will illustrate the importance attached by the delegation to the retention of their customary laws:

*Chief U Thang Tin Lian:* “As we have said in our memorandum, we should like to go into Burma proper. Only as far as the preservation of the Chin customs is concerned we should like to deal with that matter ourselves.”

*Chief U Pun Za Mang:* “…If we could preserve our ancient customs we should like to join with Burma proper.”

*U Sein Lien:* “We want to control our internal affairs ourselves and for the rest we should like to join Burma proper.”

*Chairman:* “What internal affairs do you mean?”

*U Sein Lien:* “Ancient customs.”

*Kanpetlet Chin Representative:* “We suggest that the customary law be applied to all legal matters including criminal offences.”

*Chairman:* to U Lun Pu (Mro-Chin): “What do your people want?”

*U Lun Pu* (through interpreter U Tha Aung): “We want to amalgamate with Burma, but we want our people to be ruled according to our customary laws.”

*Chairman:* “What sort of guarantee do you want from the Government of Burma about the retention of your customs?”

*U Lun Pu:* (through U Tha Aung): “We want to decide all the cases by ourselves.”

…As a result of the presentation made by the Chin delegates mentioned above, the Chin Special Division Act 1948 was passed which guaranteed the use of the Chin Customary Laws in the Chin Special Division. Meanwhile, the use of the Chin Hill Regulation 1895 was continued in the Naga Hills until 1959...”*

.................................

**Note:** The following information on the Chin-Kuki-Mizo chieftainship (10.4 – 10.8) is taken directly from a Lecture Series on BA Political Science for Undergraduate Students based on Manipur University Syllabus. **Author’s (Lecturer) remark:** Information used in this lecture series are collected from various books, articles, and internet sources for educational purpose only. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7rB44GqtzFc](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7rB44GqtzFc)

### 10.4 Chieftainship: An Overview

- Chieftainship is a common traditional political institution among many of the tribes of Northeast India.
- Among the **Chin-Kuki-Mizo** groups and some tribes among the **Nagas** like **Semas** and **Konyaks**, the hereditary chief possessed executive, legislature and judicial powers in the village.
- There are two types of chieftainship: Hereditary and Elected/Selected.
- The chief appointed members of the Council of Elders to assist him in village
administration. Council of Elders was chosen from among the subjects who possessed tact and wisdom and were well-versed with the customary laws of the people.

10.5 **Chieftainship among the Chin-Kuki Tribes**

- Chieftainship is the most common traditional political institution among the Chin-Kuki communities.
- The chief decided both civil and criminal cases according to the customary law of the village [or tribe]. His decisions were final, and all matters.
- He was the traditional village head having the authority to enact laws and, at the same time, execute these laws at his discretion.
- Theoretically, all powers were vested in the hands of the chief, yet in practice, he would never try in any case without his council. A chief who governed strictly according to custom could do almost everything he liked without losing his followers. But a weak chief who tried petty tyrannies soon found himself without any subjects.
- The Chin-Kuki chiefs were well-known as strong, despotic, and hereditary chiefs who ruled over their people. The institution of their chieftainship is generally viewed as autocratic.
- The chief is patriarchal and feudal. He retained absolute authority over village land and the villagers.
- The relationship between him and the villagers was symmetrical to feudal relations between landlords and tenants. His words were law. Villagers could settle in the village so long as they pleased the chief.
- In short, villagers had no freedom. The chief decided their fate. This system is considered antithetical to the practice of democracy.
- However, in practice, each chief drew his power from the long-observed customs and traditions.

10.6 **Chieftainship among the Mizo society**

- When the British annexed the country of the Mizos, they were amazed to find that a large number of village units of administration - running independently and all headed by a chief of immense local standing.
- It is impossible to state clearly when and how this institution took concrete shape in the past.

10.7 **Position of the Lushei Chiefs**

*[Explanation: Lusei/Lushei was the name of a major Zo tribes inhabiting what was known as the Lushai Hills until it was officially named Mizoram State on **February 20, 1986**. This day has been recognized as the **Mizoram State Inauguration Day**. All the Zo tribes living in Mizoram State decided to abandon their tribal identities and accepted **MIZO** as their common nomenclature. The then Mizo leaders deliberately chose this auspicious day in line with the **Chin National Day of February 20, 1948**.]*

- The chief was usually called 'Lal', which means in Mizo 'lord'. He maintained his position more through his personal qualities than hereditary rights.
- The chief's position in the village was indeed that of a benevolent ruler. He looked after all those who lived in the village as his own children.
- He was bound to help them in their adversities, counsel them in their difficulties, reward them in their achievements, and punish them when they were found guilty of misdeeds or infringement of established
customs.

- The villagers, in their turn, were to obey his orders implicitly, carry out errands assigned to them individually and collectively and help the chief in all possible ways.
- The chiefs commanded respect for the administration they carried out over their subjects; the Sailo clans who established their chieftainship claimed they came out of the space between the moon and the sun.
- The killing of a Sailo chief was the most heinous crime in those days, and a Sailo captured in a raid shouldn’t be enslaved nor killed according to the convention.
- The chief exercised judicial powers, including the power of life and death.
- Being the protector and father of the subjects, he led the war party in wartime. He appointed important officials of the village like the Council of Elders (Lal Khawmbawl), Blacksmith (Thirdeng), Priests (Sadaw and Puithiam), and Village Crier (Tlanggau).

10.8 Rights and Privileges of Lushei Chiefs

- The chief, as the supreme authority of the Mizo society, enjoys rights and privileges, which may be summed up in the following way:
  1. He had the right to make all his trusted sons chiefs by dividing his land between his sons.
  2. He was the rightful owner of all lands within his jurisdiction.
  3. He was entitled to the free labor of the villagers and for the construction and repairing of his house.
  4. He was entitled to ‘Fathang’ (1-3 baskets paddy) from every household in the village at the end of each year.
  5. Different kinds of taxes known as ‘Chhiah’ were entitled to him, viz., Meat tax (Sa chhiah), Bee tax (Khuai chhiah), Sal tax (Chi chhiah), Fish tax (Sanga chhiah).
  6. He had the right to collect an additional quantity of paddy from Ramhual and Zalen (Those men of possession in the village who were exempted from the paddy tax).
  7. He was entitled to keep a special priest called Sadaw to perform religious functions for the subjects’ sake.
  8. He had the right to confiscate half of the paddy from the villagers who migrated without permission.

13.0 JAPANESE INVASION OF CHINLAND AND EAST INDIA

13.1 THE INVASION

Japan, under its dictator General Tojo, formed the Axis power with Italy under Mussolini and Germany under Hitler. Japan then declared war on the United States of America and attacked Pearl Harbor on 7th December 1941. By 1942 Japan had overrun China, French Indochina, British Singapore and Malaysia, Thailand and the U.S. possessions such as the Philippines, Guam etc. The Japanese crossed the Burma border in early 1942, took Pegu and Rangoon, and marched north toward Chinland.

* Source: Effect of the Customary Law and Its Importance Upon the Chins, by Pu Lian Uk, B.A., L.L.B (Rgn.). This article appeared in the Rangoon University Chin Students Literature and CulturalSub-Committee Magazine 1968-69, pp 131-133.

**Note 2.** The first compilation of the Chins' customary law was done by a Burman named Maung Thet Pyo, Assistant Commissioner of Myde, under the title of The Customary Law of the Chin Tribe, 1884. It was translated into English by Maung Shwe Eik, Myook
The advance On to New Delhi “Chalo Delhi” was launched in full scale by the Japanese in March 1944. The 15th Japanese Imperial Army under the command of Lt. General Renya Mutaguchi was assisted by the Indian National Army (I.N.A) commanded by Commander-in-Chief Subhas Chandras Bose. The main attack of India was launched through the Chin Hills and the Chindwin Valley (see Map 6).

By early 1942, having successfully driven the British into India, the Japanese occupied Burma, east of Chindwin River. In May 1942 the Governor of Burma fled to Simla in India and established a Burmese Government there. Vumthu Maung, a young Chin nationalist and several of his fellow activists were freed from Katha and other jails by the Japanese. As soon as the they were back in Chinland, after crossing the Dry Zone of Burma on foot, they organized the Chin freedom movement (see 14.1).

Japan wanted to win the favour of Asian people and to do so they propagated the Greater Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. In an attempt to win the trust of the Chin people the Japanese freed Chin soldiers of the Burma Army who had been captured by them. These Burma Army regulars and the Chin Hills Battalion later became the backbone of the Levies formed to defend Chinland from the advancing Japanese.

“The first fierce battle the Chin Hills Battalion and the Chin Levies fought against the Japanese Artillery Battalion was at No. 3 Stockade near Theizang village. A barrage of rifle fire and pangis of the Chins halted the first major Japanese advance from Burma reaching No. 3 stockade. In the fighting the majority of the advancing Japanese troops including their commanders were killed. Captain Sakamaki told us after their occupation of the Chin Hills that very few of them returned to Kalemyo alive.” (Vum Ko Hau, p. 25)

“To begin with the Japanese forces crushed the 17th Division[of the 14th British Army] in the Chin Hills area and pushed their drive in three directions - the west bank of the Chin River, the Tammu area, and midway between the Imphal-Kohima Road by way of Wukulu after crossing the Chindwin River. The focal objective of the Japanese forces was to beleaguer Imphal and to gain mastery over the Imphal Plains...

Then the Japanese forces, which had been in full readiness for an opportunity to strike, went into action and after a little more than a month of fighting established domination over the Imphal Plains. The Indian National Army under the command of Subhas Chandra Bose, head of the Provisional Government of Azad Hind, advanced into Indian territory for the liberation of their motherland.” (Ibid, pp. 44-45)

The 31st Division (Japanese 15th Army) of 20,000 men under Major General Kotoku Sato marched across the Chin-Naga Hills to attack Kohima on April 4, 1944. Kohima was defended by Chin and Naga soldiers of the 1st Assam Regiment. After a week of severe fighting, with assistance from the 2nd Indian Division, Kohima was held and the Japanese advance was stopped at Dimapur in Assam. Major General Tsumoru Yamamoto’s 33rd Division attacked Imphal from all sides over a period of four months but could not break through. General Mutaguchi ordered his men to “continue in the task till all of your ammunition is expended. If your hands are broken, fight with your feet. If your hands and feet are broken, use your teeth. If there’s no more teeth left in your body, fight with your
spirit. Lack of weapon is no excuse for defeat.” But the Japanese lacked not only arms. They were also madly driven by hunger and thirst.

“The Imphal-Kohima battle which now ended was the last and greatest of the series that had been fought continuously during the past ten months on all the Burma fronts. They have achieved substantial results; the Japanese Army had suffered the greatest defeat in its history. Five Japanese Divisions (15th, 18th, 31st, 33rd and 56th) had, at any rate temporarily, been destroyed as fighting formations, while two other divisions, an independent brigade, and many line-of-communication units had been badly mauled. Fifty thousand Japanese had been killed or died, and their bodies counted in the Arakan and Assam sectors.” (Slim, W., Field Marshal. Defeat into Victory. London. 1956)

The British troops were assisted by several thousands of local Chin Levies in their offensive campaigns against the Japanese.

13.2 JUSTICE UNDER THE JAPANESE OCCUPATION

In the early days of the Japanese occupation the Japanese soldiers behaved correctly and politely. There was not a single case of rape - in contrast to the British propaganda. But later their attitudes changed as their supplies grew thin, and herds of cattle belonging to the local people were slaughtered and grains confiscated by force. After some months in the Chin Hills the Japanese showed their methods of ruling an occupied country. Contrary to their propaganda the Japanese applied very cruel methods in ruling the Chin country.

“Every educated person who served with distinction with the British against the Japanese before their occupation of the Chin Hills was ‘invited’ from time to time to report to Tiddim. Most of the invitees expressed their unwillingness to serve in the new administration. When they got to Tiddim, the new divisional headquarters of the Japanese Army for north Burma and East India, they found that things were not moving as they expected. Some of the Chiefs who took active command of their clan Levies found themselves in chains; many people were slapped as they reported. Other Chiefs were required to reside near the Japanese camps; guns were requisitioned lest they would be used for revolt. Some suspected as spies for the British were slapped, boxed, and beaten to death in drawing rooms within the sight of their families.

All were required to bow low in front of Japanese officers. One had to announce one’s name every time one reported to the Japanese commissioner. Many a fat and haughty person during the British days became slim and cautious overnight. As soon as the Japanese reached the heart of the Chin Hills, they started killing people on the slightest suspicion. I believe that this was to frighten the people and to show who the real masters were for the fact that they would not win the love or respect of the place they occupied in the ordinary way. The worse form of sufferings by the people in the Japanese occupied zones were the requisitioning of food and labour.

On account of the war, no cultivation could be done and as such less food was produced, but the Japanese imperial troops came without rations and as such they had to requisition whatever food they could in the occupied territory. This was most difficult in a place like the Chin Hills through which they attempted to invade India. Almost all the ponies were requisitioned, also cattle and later mithuns. The 300-mile long motor road from Kalemyo-Chin Hills to Bishenpur-Imphal was to be maintained by the local requisitioned labour; this gave no time for the local people to cultivate; the Japanese troops depended on the people's food and they gave them no time to cultivate to produce food. This was impossible.” (Vum
Ko Hau, p. 31) “This kind of requisitioning of labour by force did not take place only in the Chin Hills. The same thing was done for the Burma-Siam railway line construction. This work was more familiarly known as the Death Railway line. Beside the European prisoners-of-war from Indonesia and Southeast Asia, many labourers from Indonesia, Thailand and south Burma were requisitioned. Some whole families were sent and never returned.” (Ibid, p. 52)

13.3 ARMED RESISTANCE MOVEMENTS AGAINST THE JAPANESE

As soon as the Japanese occupied the Chin Hills, a local army called the Chin Defence Army (C.D.A) was formed up by them. The first batch of officers were appointed from those whom the Japanese used as guides and intelligence officers on the invasion of the Chin Hills and Assam. The tasks of the CDA was to look after the Japanese occupied territories of the Chin Hills, while the Japanese forces and the INA were to invade India.

“By June 1944, however, many Japanese troops had begun to retreat towards the Chin Hills from the Imphal front. Tiddim was made the field hospital for Japanese troops. Every day my Levy Commander, Bo [“officer” in Burmese] Pau Za Kam, had to supply about seventy labourers to bury Japanese who died in the Tiddim (Lawibual) field hospital...All the local traitors’ reports about our impending rebellion reached my headquarters first and I could destroy them... Before we parted from the Japanese Headquarters at Tiddim, Bo [“officer” in Burmese] Thawng Cin Thang and I had vowed that I would look after our interests in the Japanese occupied areas and that he would take care of what went on in the British territories... I had the satisfaction of having looked after his brother who was reported adverse to the Japanese commissioners.

The fact was recorded by Bo Thawng Cin Thang in a written certificate. Together with Colonel Kelly, Bo Sein Lian and Bo Suang Lian left Saizang on the 13th March 1944 and hid themselves in the west bank area of the Manipur river although the locality was traversed by Japanese troops on one occasion when they marched up to cut off British troops at Singgial at M.S. 102. They formed the first staff officers of the resistance movements which were later known as the Sukte Independence Army and the Siyin Independence Army or in short S.I.A. The organisation of the Sukte Independence Army was initiated by Chief Bo Hau Za Lian of Suangzang, Bo Thawng Cin Thang and other headmen on the West bank of the Manipur river. Bo Thawng Cin Thang, Bo Hau Za Lian, Bo Sein Lian, Bo Suang Lian, B.G.M., and the other commanders and members of the S.I.A. crossed the Manipur river and made headquarters at Mualbem...

And in every part of the Chin Hills various resistance movements were secretly organized against the Japanese. A well-formed organization among them in the Northern Chin Hills was the Chin Leaders’ Freedom League, whose main aim was to look after the interests of the undefended local Chin people from the Japanese oppression. Some of its outstanding leaders were Vum Ko Hau (Thuklai), Gin Za Tuang (Tonzang), Vul Za Thang (Tonzang), Pau Za Kam (Khuasak), Khai Mun Mang (Thuklai), Sum Mang (Zahau area), Awn Ngin (Buanman), Zuk Tsio and Pi Don Khaw Cing…” (Ibid, pp. 31 & 55).

“The resistance movements quickly spread to Ngawn, Falam, Zahau and Haka areas, and in September 1944 an open rebellion was launched. After being suppressed for so long the Zo people were exploding for freedom, and an organization called ‘Free Chins’ was born. The Free Chins attacked the Japanese at Mualbem, Sualim, Suangaktuam and Sakhiang...The success of the Free Chins, or as it was then known as the Chin Independence Army, was enormous. Lt. General Shinichi Tanaka [Commander of the 18th
Division of the 15th Japanese Imperial Army in the Arakan war theatre was not satisfied with the intelligence reports collected by the Arakan, Indian and Burman agents on the movements of the British inside East India. He therefore gave orders to recruit the local Chins, too. The Japanese intelligence network under Captain Tanaka Seiokuro was very successful when Chin agents were employed.

At first the Masho and Khami Chin agents collected information on the movements of the West African Division as it moved south down the Kaladan Valley. As Chin settlements stretched from the Valleys of Kaladan to Bandurban and Chiranga, the Chins could easily infiltrate into Chittagong and head west in Bengal. However, the Japanese defeat in the beginning of 1945 changed the conditions. The Japanese intelligence network depended on getting their food supply from the local people, and in many instances the Japanese used brutal methods to obtain food. The local people therefore attacked the base of the intelligence unit and slaughtered all the Japanese.” (Vumson, pp. 177-178)

The Japanese were in several Asian countries heartily welcomed at the beginning of World War II as true liberators from the yoke of various Western colonial powers, but their cruelties soon became so loathsome that at the ending parts of the War uncountable Japanese lost their lives at the hands of the occupied peoples.

13.4 BATTLES IN CHINLAND: THE TURNING POINT FOR BOTH THE ALLIED FORCES AND THE JAPANESE

Since the fate of the Chin/Zo people are very closely intertwined with WW II and especially with the great battles that were fought between the British and Japanese in Chinland, I feel that a brief description of the background history of these battles need to be mentioned in this paper. However, as this paper is not mainly about WW II, the British and Japanese, I shall simply quote here some passages from one of the most authoritative books on the subject: Burma - The Turning Point so as to give the reader a rough picture about the important passive role that Chinland had played.

“I am delighted for a variety of reasons to write this Foreword to Major-General Ian Lyall Grant's well-researched and dramatic account of the “Turning Point” in the Burma campaign of the Second World War. Firstly, because the author, using fresh material including some Japanese sources, has been able to throw new light on a particularly bitter phase of the war against Japan. The enemy were extremely tough and brave and the staunch and tenacious resistance put up to them astride their main thrust line to Imphal, conducted in appalling conditions and invariably at very close quarters, reflected the greatest credit on the skill and courage of the British and Indian troops, particularly the Infantry. So it is high time that the exploits of the 'Forgotten Army' were known more generally.

Secondly, as I had the privilege of knowing and later serving one of the real heroes of the campaign, Major-General 'Punch' Cowan, the Commander of the 17th Indian (Black Cat) Division, I am delighted that the activities of his division feature so prominently in the book. 'Punch' Cowan commanded the

Dear Mr. Vum Khaw Hau,

Damm good show for the grand job of work you have done and been doing. We are extremely anxious to hear the outcome of SUAH LIM show. I think, the quicker we get your family and other important persons behind the screen, the better, as the
60 reported now at PHUNOM can divert anywhere they like.
(1) We shall greatly appreciate if Suang Hau Thang, Lian Thawng, Sumberd Thaum Cin and other notables can be called.
(2) O.C. will not object to Chiefs and families coming over to us voluntarily. This applies to important and Jap blacklisted persons as well. As for the mass of the people from the Valley, we can assure that it is only a question of a few days before our troops arrive. So, would it not be advisable if they hide food in the jungle and keep themselves out of the houses, if Jap punitive party attempts to come. Arrangements re: this FREE CHIN MOVEMENT, in all respects, sounds extremely O.K. Please extend my congratulations to MESSRS. SON NGUL and COMPANY for their impending appointments in the FREEDOM MOVEMENT. Chief Hau Za Lian will come to see his men on 21-9-44. He will tell you details.
Better times soon
P.S. V. Good news just received.
Yours sincerely,
Please ask Mr. Suak Pum.
Thawng Cin Thang
20-9-1944

Note 1. Author’s (tdz) explanation for page 84 marked with ‘”: I am inserting Vum Ko Hau’s letter above here to straighten out the records as to the existence of the two separate organizations (Siyin Independence Army and Sukte Independent Army), and the letter above is one of the three letters of Bo Thawng Cin Thang addressed to the author (Vum Ko Hau) in connection with their wartime activities in 1944. (It is an exact reproduction of the original text from his (VKH) book on page 60.) The letter shows the cordial relations, mutual-respect and trust between the top leaders of the two separate organizations. For further information on this subject see Vum Ko Hau’s book, pp. 55-62. (Some uninformed Suktes lately accused that some Sizangs had tried to replace the Sukte Independent Army with the Siyin Independance Army.)

Note 2. And there is a big confusion about the two names. Originally - and officially - it was Sukte Independent Army, NOT Sukte Independence Army. It was formed up in early 1944 whereas the Siyin Independence Army was formed up much later (the Sizins had used INDEPENDENCE). At the beginning, the short form of the Siyin Independence Army was written in the following way: SIA (Siyin) in order to avoid confusion between the two abbreviations. However, both words (independent and independence) have lately been interchangeably widely used in several papers. All the leading personalities of both armed organisations were intimate friends, or former classmates, or comrades and those who later fomend the Siyin Independence Army; they themselves had had actively participated earlier in the Sukte Independent Army, too. There were always very close cooperations between them to the end of WW II when the two armed units were dissolved. (Source: E. Pau Za Kam of Khueak, who himself was a founder of the Siyin Independence Army.) The main achievements of these two armed groups were the gathering of information on Japanese movements that were so vitally important for the Allied Forces.

Note 3. Those who have got Vum Ko Hau's book can see pp. 375-386 and the Biography of Major-General Tuang Za Khai (APPENDIX Z) of my paper: The Chin/Zo People of...for more information on the SIA, SIA (Siyin) and other related topics.

Note 4. Mr. Thawng Cin Thang later held the post of Chief Commissioner in several Divisions before he retired and passed away.
- See PHOTO 22 for leaders and officers of the Siyin Independance Army.

division from immediately after the Sittang disaster in early 1942 until the capture of Burma in 1945 and was undoubtedly one of the outstanding divisional commanders of the War. I had the greatest respect and admiration of him...”

(FOREWORD by Field Marshal The Lord Bramall, KG., GCB., OBE., MC. xiii)

“Burma was the western bastion of the empire or ‘co-prosperity sphere’ planned by the Japanese for South-East Asia. In 1942 they captured it with ease and held it with equal ease throughout 1943. In 1944 and 1945 they suffered the greatest land defeat in their history and lost all they had gained. This book describes the cause of this remarkable reversal.
On the Indo-Burmese frontier there were three major military ‘fronts’, separated from each other by hundreds of miles of forest-covered mountains. The Northern Front was American; its aim was to cover the construction of a road and pipeline across the northern tip of Burma to China. The Southern Front in the Arakan was British. It had the limited aim of capturing the small port of Akyab and establishing an air base there. The Central Front was also British. It covered the only practicable route into central Burma. It was on the fighting on this front that the fate of Burma depended.

The Japanese recognized the importance of this sector and decided to capture the Central Front’s forward base at Imphal in early 1944, thus preventing any British invasion. They planned to isolate Imphal by cutting its only supply line at Kohima and keeping the road there blocked.”

(INTRODUCTION, xvii)

“The great battle of Imphal/Kohima in March to July 1944 was the turning point of the war in Burma. It raged for four months over a huge area of forest-covered mountains and, although the forces involved were relatively small, the fighting was of an intensity and ferocity that have seldom been surpassed. The Japanese refusal to acknowledge defeat in the face of staggering losses led to a disaster from which they were never to recover.

A key part of this struggle was the series of battles on the Tiddim Road between the 17th Indian Division (17 Division) and the Japanese 33rd Infantry Division (33 Division). 33 Division was widely considered by the British to be the best of the Japanese divisions in Burma (Slim (1), p 357, Evans, p 59), 17 Division (like several other divisions) never doubted for one moment that it was the best of the British divisions; certainly it had more experience than any other of fighting the Japanese. These two divisions had clashed before in 1942 during the retreat from Burma. Then the hastily assembled 17 Division, inexperienced and only half-trained, had been the losers. Now this tough division had a new organisation, had trained hard for two years and had no doubt that it could avenge its earlier defeat. The two divisions were reinforced by other first-class formations during the battle but basically it was a fight to the death between the two of them. This book tells for the first time the full story of this epic struggle.”

(CHAPTER ONE - The Reason Why. p. 19)

“The turning point of the war in Burma in the Second World War was the Imphal/Kohima campaign of 1944. In March of that year the Japanese 15th Army advanced into India with the aim of capturing the vital British depots and airfields around Imphal. For four months there was intense and savage fighting in many places but heaviest fighting of all was along the road leading from Tiddim in Burma to Imphal. Here the Japanese were confronted by the same British/Indian division that they had so decisively defeated in 1942. They now first planned to encircle and destroy this division and then, ‘pouring like a torrent’ along this route, to burst into the Imphal plain and seize Imphal.

They failed in their first aim but, nothing deterred, General Mutaguchi, who commanded the Japanese 15th Army, decided to take personal command in this vital sector himself. He brought up all his available reserves, all his tanks and most of his heavy artillery and prepared a final all-out thrust for Imphal. However, General Scoones, who commanded the British 4th Corps, struck first. Ferocious fighting followed over a wide area. After three weeks the Japanese were not only defeated
but virtually annihilated and Mutaguchi admitted in his diary that the campaign was lost. The door to Burma was now wide open and undefended and General Slim's Fourteenth Army flooded through it to win the great victories of 1945.” (Text on the Jacket)

15.0 INDEPENDENCE OF THE UNION OF BURMA

15.1 BACKGROUND HISTORY IN BRIEF

The signing of the Panglong Agreement by the peoples' representatives of Burmans, Shans, Kachins and Chins on the 12th February 1947 at Panglong in Southern Shan State gave birth to the Union of Burma. If the Shans, Chins and Kachins had not signed this treaty, only “Burma Proper” or “Ministerial Burma” would have gained independence and there would never be a Union of Burma. The Kayahs or Karennis, who later joined the Union, did not sign this treaty. The four Karenni states, which were later made into Kayah State, were de jure independent sovereign states recognized in a treaty signed in 1875 by both the Burmese kings and the British.

The non-Burman peoples have always by tradition mistrusted the Burmans in general that it could even be said that the signing of the historic Panglong Agreement itself could be materialized solely on the grounds of General Aung San’s personal sincerity and honesty. As an attempt to prove this point and, the historical backgrounds that paved the way for the birth of the Union of Burma, I shall quote the following lengthy passages from Vum Ko Hau's book, since I, the author, do not have any other more reliable and detailed documents on this topic than this book on hand at the moment. Another important reason for quoting these passages is the fact that modern Burmese history, especially about the most critical hours at its birth, have so badly been manipulated by those in power that it is time to straighten at least some of the untruths out.

For the culmination of the last and final independence of Burma the following historical factors are the significant episodes:

1. The Aung San-Attlee Agreement
2. The Panglong Agreement
3. The Frontier Areas Commission of Enquiry**
4. The Provisional Cabinet of Bogyoke Aung San
5. The Provisional Cabinet of Thakin Nu
6. The Authors of the Constitution of the Union of Burma
7. The Nu-Attlee Agreement

The Aung San-Attlee Agreement paved the way for the Burmans and the Frontier peoples for free intercourse and for the frontier leaders to become the Governor’s executive counsellors. The Panglong Conference sealed the fate of the future of the Frontier peoples as well as the people of ministerial Burma. They decided to fight together for the independence of Burma. The Frontier Areas Commission of Enquiry composed of the leaders of the Frontier Areas who had been elected as Counsellors to the Governor of Burma to represent their respective races viz. the Shans, Chins and the Kachins. For the first time in the history of Burma three Frontier leaders elected by their own races sat as Members of the Executive Council of the Government of Burma. The names of the three frontier leaders were the Hon'ble Sao Sam Htun Counsellor for Shans; Hon'ble Vum Ko Hau Counsellor for Chins and Hon'ble Sinwa Naw Counsellor for Kachins. They took office in March 1947. They led their delegations earlier to the Panglong Conference where they were instrumental in the successful drafting of the Panglong Agreement. The
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LEADERS AND OFFICERS OF THE SIYIN INDEPENDENCE ARMY (1944-45)

1st Row - Sitting on ground (L to R): 2. Vum Zam (TL); 3.: Suak Pum (BM); 4. Ngam Thawng (BM); 5. Ngo Thawng (TL); 6. Sing Za Cin (VL); 7. Mang Thawng (TL); 10. Son Zam (VL):
2nd Row - Sitting on chairs (L to R): 1. Bo Za Suan; 2. Bo Mang Hau; 3. Bo Thuk On; 4. Bo Lam Khaw Mang (last Chief of Thuklai);
3rd Row - Standing (L to R): 1. Thuam Khaw Thang (VL); 2. Khai Khaw Pau (BM); 3. Pu Awn Zam (KS); 4. Vum Thawng (KS); 7. Ngo Hau (PV); 8. Tuang Tun (TL)
4th Row (L to R): 1. Sing Ngo (LK); 6. Hang Khaw Zam (TL); 7. Suang Za Ngin (LK); 10. Za Khup (TL); 8. Lian Khaw Pau (BM);
11. Ngul Khai (BM)
5th or Last Row (L to R): 4. Khai Khaw Pau (TL); 8. Vungh Khaw Thang (BM); 10. Thawng Cin Lian (LP)

Explanation: BM stands for Buanman Village; KS for Khuasak; LK for Limkhai; LP for Lophei; PV for Pumva; TL for Thuklai, and VL for Voklaak.

Source: Vum Ko Hau, PV 41.
Note by author (tzd): “Bo” is a Burmese word for “officer”. The names of several people in the photo can no more be recalled and whenever I get new ones I will add them here. The names listed above are the ones I have got until the date below.

(Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. November 2015)
drafters of the Panglong Agreement and other outstanding frontier leaders were...

15.2 THE PANGLONG AGREEMENT

Dated Panglong, the 12th February 1947

A conference having been held at Panglong, attended by certain Members of the Executive Council of the Governor of Burma, all Saohpas and representative of the Shan States, the Kachin Hills and the Chin Hills:

The Members of the conference, believing that freedom will be more speedily achieved by the Shans, the Kachins and the Chins by their immediate co-operation with the Interim Burmese Government:

1. A Representative of the Hill Peoples, selected by the Governor on the recommendation of representatives of the Supreme Council of the United Hill Peoples (SCOUHP), shall be appointed a Counsellor for Frontier Areas shall be given executive authority by similar means.

2. The said Counsellor shall also be appointed a Member of the Governor's Executive Council, without portfolio, and the subject of Frontier Areas brought within the purview of the Executive Council by Constitutional Convention as in the case of Defence and External Affairs. The Counsellor for Frontier Areas shall be given executive authority by similar means.

3. The said Counsellor shall be assisted by two Deputy Counsellors representing races of which he is not a member. While the two Deputy Counsellors should deal in the first instance with the affairs of their respective areas and the Counsellor with all the remaining parts of the Frontier Areas, they should by Constitutional Convention act on the principle of joint responsibility.

4. While the Counsellor, in his capacity of Member of the Executive Council, will be the only representative of the Frontier Areas on the Council, the Deputy Counsellors shall be entitled to attend meetings of the Council when subjects pertaining to the Frontier Areas are discussed.

5. Though the Governor's Executive Council will be augmented as agreed above, it will not operate in respect of the Frontier Areas in any manner which would deprive any portion of those Areas of the autonomy which it now enjoys in internal administration. Full autonomy in internal administration for the Frontier Areas is accepted in principle.

6. Though the question of demarcating and establishing a separated Kachin State within a Unified Burma is one which must be relegated for decision by the Constituent Assembly, it is agreed that such a State is desirable. As a first step towards this end, the Counsellor for Frontier Areas and the Deputy Counsellors shall be consulted in the
administration of such areas in the Myitkyina and the Bhamo Districts as are Part II Scheduled Areas under the Government of Burma Act of 1935.

7. Citizens of the Frontier Areas shall enjoy rights and privileges which are regarded as fundamental in democratic countries.

8. The arrangements accepted in this Agreement are without prejudice to the financial autonomy now vested in the Federated Shan States.

9. The arrangements accepted in this Agreement are without prejudice to the financial assistance which the Kachin Hills and the Union Hills are entitled to receive from the revenues of Burma, and the Executive Council will examine with the Frontier Areas Counsellor and Deputy Counsellors the feasibility of adopting for the Kachin Hills and the Chin Hills financial arrangement similar to those between Burma and the Federated Shan States.


(Signed) (Signed) (Signed)
Saohpalong of Tawngpeng State. (Sinwa Naw, Myitkyina) (Aung San)
(Signed) (Signed)
Saohpalong of Yawngewe State. (Zau Rip, Myitkyina)
(Signed) (Signed)
Saohpalong of North Hsenwi State. (Dinra Tang, Myitkyina)
(Signed) (Signed)
Saohpalong of Laihka State. (Zau La, Bhamo)
(Signed) (Signed)
Saohpalong of Mong Pawn State. (Zau Lawn, Bhamo)
(Signed) (Signed)
Saohpalong of Hsamonghkam State. (Labang Grong, Bhamo)
(Signed)
Representative of Hsahung Saohpalong.
(Hkun Pung) (Signed) Chin Committee
(U Tin E) (U Htun Myint) (Signed)
(Signed) (Signed) (Signed)
(U Kya Bu) (Hkun Saw) (U Thawng Za Khup, Tiddim)
15.3 THE FRONTIER AREAS ENQUIRY COMMISSION [aka REES-WILLIAMS COMMISSION]

In order to find out the wishes of the peoples of the Frontier areas, a Frontier Enquiry Commission was formed as authorised by the Aung San-Atlee Agreement. The following gentlemen were members of the Commission. Bogyoke Aung San did not sit personally on the Commission but relegated it to Thakin Nu [U Nu].

1. Mr. D.R. Rees-William (now Lord Ogmore), Chairman.
2. Thakin Nu, Vice President, AFPFL.
3. Hon’ble Sao Sam Htun, Shan Counsellor.
4. Hon’ble Sinwa Naw, Kachin Counsellor.
5. Hon’ble Vum Ko Hau, Chin Counsellor.
7. Bo Khin Maung Gale, AFPFL.
8. Saw Myint Thein (who replaced Hon’ble U Kyaw Nyein when the Commission moved to Maymyo)  Karen youth.
9. Saw Sankey, KNU

This Commission enquired and recommended the best method of associating the Frontier peoples with the working out of the new Constitution for Burma and made suggestions regarding the participation of the Frontier peoples as members of the Constituent Assembly. They reported the fact that the Frontier peoples really wanted to participate in the Constituent Assembly. (Ibid, p. 110)

15.8 THE CHIN/ZO PEOPLE IN POST-INDEPENDENCE BURMA

15.8.1 ABOLITION OF FEUDALISM IN CHINLAND AND MIZORAM AND THE BIRTH OF CHIN NATIONAL DAY AND MIZORAM STATE INAUGURATION DAY

5,000 Chin delegates from all regions of Chinland, including the former Lushai Hills which later became Mizoram, held a conference in Falam from February 10 to 22, 1948, and decided to abolish the centuries-old feudalism and to replace it with democratic systems of government. There were only 17 votes against the move. The voting for this decision took place on the 20th February. This date was later chosen by the then Chin Members of Parliament as the Chin National Day and it is celebrated ever since annually by every Chin community. However, in Burma those who want to celebrate it must ask for permission every year from local authorities. So whether permission will be given or not depends entirely on the whims of the authorities concerned. And successive Burmese governments have been trying in vain since 1974 to change it to Chin State Day - the year in which the Chin Special Division became a Union State. The Zo people in Mizoram also achieved their statehood on February 20, 1987, after 20 years of armed struggle. Hence, this day is also celebrated yearly in Mizoram as the Mizoram State Inauguration Day as well. (See APPENDICES I and N for more information and different opinions on the Chin National Day. (Please read ZOMI for CHIN in APPENDIX I.)

With regard to the abolition of Chieftainship* in Mizoram see the following passages:
and regional councils were established in 1952. Political life was democratised. Adult franchise was introduced. Women were politically emancipated. Chieflainship became unpopular. There was an agitation for its abolition. The chiefs of North Mizo District were abolished on 1st April 1955 and the village chiefs in South Mizoram were abolished on 15th April 1956. They were paid compensation by the Assam Government. In North Mizoram the Sailo chiefs formed a majority with 165 members and with few commoner clan chiefs. And in the South, the Mara (Lakher) chiefs were 20 and the Fanai (Pawi) chiefs were 17 in number along with other village headmen. With the abolition of chieftainship the village system came under the Mizo Hills District Council. In accordance with the Sixth Schedule of the Indian Constitution, the Lushai Hills was granted autonomy and, the Mizo Union, a regional political party formed the council...


15.8.2 THE OUTBREAK OF CIVIL WAR AND THE CRUCIAL ROLES OF CHIN SOLDIERS

When Burma and India gained their independence the Chins were, without their opinion being asked, automatically divided into two parts. (Actually, the demarcation of the boundary between the British India and British Burma had already been made by the British back in 1937.) And then when East Pakistan [now Bangladesh] seceded from India those in India were once again automatically partitioned into two parts.

Immediately following its independence on January 4, 1948, the country was torn apart by a ruthless civil war which is still raging until today. In fact, it was mainly the Chin, Gurkha, Kayah (Karen) and Kachin soldiers who had saved the Union of Burma from the Karens and the “multi-coloured insurgents” (it's a term used by successive Burmese regimes to denote all the armed movements of various ideological stripes that were fighting against the central government in Rangoon). Almost all the strategic towns in Central Burma were already in the hands of these armed organisations.

And the Karens had even taken Insein in 1949 - a satellite town located just some 9 miles from the center of Rangoon - that the Burmese government was already called “the Rangoon Government” in the literally sense. Most of the government soldiers of ethnic Burman themselves had joined either the Communist Party of Burma or other armed Burmese organizations. So it became the sole duty of non-Burman soldiers to fight on the government's side. Although other non-Burmese soldiers (a Kayah battalion, a Shan battalion, a Gurkha battalion, three Kachin battalions and three Karen battalions) had also played extremely crucial roles in the government's countrywide military campaigns, the most decisive role was played by the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Chin Rifles in defending Insein, the most strategic battle front of all.

“...Although some foreign historians have depicted the Battle of Insein as a conflict between Burman troops and Karen rebels, Tun Tin noted that soldiers from different regions of Burma helped to defend Rangoon. They included Chin, Kayah, Shan, Gurkha and Kachin battalions (though some Kachin took up arms against the U Nu government). The most decisive role in defending Insein was played by the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Chin Rifles, fighting on what is regarded as the most strategic battle front of all. Some insurgents, including communists, reinforced Burmese forces before going back to the jungle to repel Burmese troops.”*

Later one of the Kachin battalions and most of Karen soldiers from the three Karen battalions men-
tioned above joined their compatriots against the government. The Karens had to withdraw from Insein after a 112-day siege. All the military experts, who had had analysed these military campaigns, agreed that if Insein had fallen then, Rangoon also would have fallen automatically. Partly because of these bitter experiences on the Burmans' part all ethnicities were mixed up in Burma's armed forces starting from the early 1950s.

From 1949 up to 1953 U Nu, the Prime Minister of Burma from 1948-1958 and 1960-62, had always publicly

* The Battle of Insein Never Really Ended by AUNG ZAW. Monday, February 9, 2009

  • See APPENDIX DD for his article in full text.
  • See APPENDIX P for some lists of the recipients of these honours, and PHOTO J for a few biographical sketches of the late Col. Son Kho Pau, who commanded the 2nd Chin Rifles.)

acknowledged in his every speech on the occasions of the “Union Day” (12th February) and the “Martyrs' Day” (19th July) about the decisive roles that the said non-Burman soldiers had played and the sacrifices that made in saving the Union. (On 19th July 1947 General Aung San and the majority of his cabinet ministers were assassinated.) But nowadays not even a single Burman - not to mention the two alien ethnic communities - that is, the Chinese and Indians - knows anymore about the crucial roles that the non-Burman soldiers had played for the Union because these historical facts are not mentioned at all in Burmese history books. (See APPENDICES S and T for more information on this subject.)

The following are a few evidences to show how crucial the roles that the two Chin battalions had played in defending Rangoon against the Karens for Burma were: an officer received Burma's highest military award for gallantry - the Aung San Thuriya; the second highest award Thika Thuriya was conferred to another officer; Thura Tazeik, the third highest award was received by 16; the fourth highest award, “Thuyeagaung Hmat-Htan-Win Award” was conferred to 24 (Thuyeagaung in Burmese means hero); the fifth highest award, the Supreme Commander's Certificate of Gallantry Award (SCCOG) was conferred to 27; Certificate of Honour was conferred to 1. So, altogether 17 officers and 53 other ranks received various awards.*

### 16.O THE ZO PEOPLE IN POST-INDEPENDENCE INDIA

**INTRODUCTION**

As I intend to deal under this subject mainly only with the political history, I shall concentrate solely on affairs that are directly concerned with the attainment of statehood for Mizoram. And since I have got very few materials in my hands on this subject and I still am completely stranger to these affairs, I shall give briefly elaborate here only some very basic information on Mizoram. I shall perhaps later expand this chapter with events that are concerned with other Zo tribes living outside of Mizoram State such as Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland and Tripura states, etc.

#### 16.1 BACKGROUND HISTORY

When the British finally conquered the Lushai hills after two major and one minor expeditions, they created South Lushai Hills District and North Lushai Hills District. The former was administered from Bengal and the later from Assam. The two districts then were merged under the Lushai Hills District in 1898 and it became a part of Assam. It was once again changed in 1954 to the Mizo Hills District.

On the advice of the Simon Commission in 1935, the Lushai Hills District, the Naga Hills, and the North
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THE BATTLE OF INSEIN NEVER REALLY ENDED *
by Aung Zaw

“...Although some foreign historians have depicted the Battle of Insein as a conflict between Burman troops and Karen rebels, Tun Tin noted that soldiers from different regions of Burma helped to defend Rangoon. They included Chin, Kayah, Shan, Gurkha and Kachin battalions (though some Kachin took up arms against the U Nu government). The most decisive role in defending Insein was played by the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Chin Rifles, fighting on what is regarded as the most strategic battle front of all. Some insurgents, including communists, reinforced Burmese forces before going back to the jungle to repel Burmese troops...”

(Monday, February 9, 2009)
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Note: U Aung Zaw is from Myanmar/Burma and is the founder and Chief-Editor of The Irrawaddy, a magazine published in Chiang Mai, Thailand.
The Irrawaddy covers news and offers in-depth analysis of political and cultural affairs in Burma and Asia generally.
* See 15.8.2. The Outbreak of Civil War and the Crucial Roles of Chin Soldiers and Appendix DD for full text.

STATEMENT OF THE CHIN COMMUNITY (GERMANY) ON RUMORS ABOUT CHIN SOLDIERS SHOOTING AT DEMONSTRATORS IN BURMA (DATED OCTOBER 2007)*

“...Ever since the first massacres of the students in 1962, General Ne Win's Military Intelligence Service used to spread words about Chin soldiers shooting at demonstrators. The same thing happened during the “1974 Labour and U Thant Strikes” and again during the 1988-Uprisings after troops had mowed down thousands of demonstrators. This is part of Ne Win's stratagem to reduce public hatred towards him and his Burma Army and to instill ethnic hatred among the oppressed people. This stratagem proves to be successful as some of our Burman brothers and sisters believe those rumours and even spread the words further, unwittingly serving the interest of the military dictators. This is due to total ignorance of what happened inside the Burma Army under General Ne Win...”

* See APPENDIX S for full text!

WERE CHIN SOLDIERS MADE SCAPEGOATS?*
by Zaw Htwe Maung

“...Traditionally, Chins are warrior tribes and many Chins joined the Burma Rifles since Burma was under the British Rule. The bulk of the soldiers in the British-trained Army were of minority ethnic groups such as Chins, Kachins and Karens...Hence, many Chins were career soldiers and officers when Burma regained her independence and they had a very good reputation as 'Loyalists to the Union', 'Real Soldiers Defending Democracy' and so on, under U Nu's Regime...As mentioned earlier, Chins are traditionally warrior tribes and well known to be good and disciplined soldiers... Nowadays, in Burma if one sees a minority soldier who speaks Burmese with accent they just conclude that this is a Chin although they may be a Wa or Karen or Kachin or of other minorities, because the reputation of Chin soldiers was totally destroyed since Ne Win's Era...There is no doubt that the Chins were made Scapegoats by the Burmese Military for their propaganda purposes as well as for their further 'divide and rule policy' because all opposition groups, whether they are Burmese or ethnic minorities, have the same and single goal which is to topple down the Military Dictatorship in Burma and the Junta is afraid that they will be united...”

- Source: Chinland Guardian
November 22, 2007
* See APPENDIX T for full text!
- Mr. Zaw Htwe Maung is an Arakanese scholar.

Note: The above quotes are from my own 725-page history paper of the Chin people.
APPENDIX S

CHIN COMMUNITY (GERMANY)

STATEMENT ON RUMOURS ABOUT CHIN SOLDIERS SHOOTING AT DEMONSTRATORS IN BURMA

The Rumour
Ever since the first massacre of the students in 1962, General Ne Win’s Military Intelligence Service used to spread words about Chin soldiers shooting at demonstrators. The same thing happened during the 1974 Labor and U Thant Strikes and again during the 1988 uprisings after troops mowed down thousands of demonstrators. This is part of Ne Win’s stratagem to reduce public hatred towards him and his Burma Army and to instill ethnic hatreds among the oppressed peoples.

This stratagem proves to be successful as some of our Burman brothers believe those rumours and even spread the words further, unwittingly serving the interest of the military dictators. This is due to total ignorance of what happened inside Burma Army under General Ne Win.

The Reality
Ever since the Care-Taker Government period in 1958-1960 General Ne Win abolished the British-era ethnic based battalions and turned the Burma Army into mixed-ethnic battalions with the majority made up of ethnic Burmans. But Ne Win was careful enough not to eliminate the names of these battalions, so the names 1st, 2nd, 3rd [or 4th Chin Rifles] remain even though these battalions are no more made up of Chin soldiers. The majority of soldiers in any battalion is the Burman soldiers and the Chin soldiers if they ever exist are made up of 20 to 30 or even less in each of these battalions. It was Ne Win’s strategy to use soldiers bearing the badges and uniforms of Chin battalions to crack down whenever unrest occurred. So, many people who are not aware of the changes inside the Army easily believe the Chin soldiers are shooting.

The Chin Revolution
One important fact is, nowadays the ever increasingly racist SPDC regime no more promotes Christian Chin soldiers to higher ranks. And at the same time the Chin youths are very clever and intelligent and very much globalized. In response to the military regime’s persecution and hardships and sufferings imposed upon them the Chin youths are leaving behind their beloved land temporarily in the thousands to study political science, economics, theology etc. in western countries. At this very moment there are already about 500 Chin students in the universities in the western world and the number is increasing. This makes the racist military regime very nervous. If we are to expect the successive Burmese governments to grant us state scholarships to study abroad, less than 10 Chin students would have the chance to get it in ten years! So this is sort of an “unintended consequences” of the SPDC regime the mass Chin exodus is creating. This is part of our Chin revolution – knowledge revolution.

Our Vision
The pro-democracy political organizations like the Chin National Front, Chin National League for Democracy, Zomi National Congress etc have been fighting for the restoration of democracy and federalism in our country. Non political organizations like the Chin Forum and civil societies, including the Chin Community (Germany) are formed all over the world to promote democracy, freedom and federalism. Our aim is to bring back modernity and establish a peaceful and prosperous federal democratic Union so that our country could rejoin the civilized world. Successive Burman dominated central governments have been wasting the country’s precious natural and human resources by heightening racial hatreds among the peoples and there by unnecessarily ruined all the opportunities to build a united and prosperous Union.

We condemn all barbarous killings
Definitely all the Chin people strongly condemn the shootings and killings of peaceful demonstrators as uncivilized and barbarous acts. Whoever shoot the peaceful demonstrators must face justice along with their superiors who actually gave orders to do so.
October 2007

---------------------------------------
Donauwörther Str. 47
86154 Augsburg, Germany
Tel:+49–8271–420575
Email :info@ccgev.de

Note: See APPENDIX T for an Arakanese scholar’s comment on this statement.
APPENDIX DD

THE BATTLE OF INSEIN NEVER REALLY ENDED

By AUNG ZAW

Monday, February 9, 2009

Captain Tun Tin and his fellow officers of the 5th Burma Rifles were taking a break from ongoing battles with communists and Mujahedeen rebels in Arakan State. When off duty at their barracks, they usually tuned in to the radio for news and light entertainment. An announcer suddenly broke into the broadcast with the dramatic words: “The Union of Burma is now facing a great danger.” The message was repeated three times and then the radio went off the air.

Two radio operators, Karen officers named Arthur and George, approached hurriedly and handed an incoming wireless message to Tun Tin. It read: “Attention 5 Burif, repeat Attention 5 Burif. Abandon Arakan, Repeat Abandon Arakan. Troops Dispatch Forthwith, Troops Dispatch Forthwith. Dakota Planes awaiting Akyab Airfield. Ack receipt, repeat Ack receipt.”

Then came the news that rebel soldiers of the Karen National Democratic Organization had seized the Rangoon suburb of Insein. Tun Tin and soldiers immediately left for the Sittwe (Akyab) airfield and boarded the Dakotas, planes of Indonesia’s recently launched Garuda airline, provided by the Indonesian government at the request of the newly formed Burmese government led by President Sao Shwe Thaikhe and Prime Minister U Nu. Tun Tin’s commanding officer, Col Saw Myint, later recalled that it was the first time Burmese soldiers were airlifted to a battlefield—in this case, Rangoon. As soon as he landed at Rangoon airport, Tun Tin half-jokingly told senior officers who briefed him on the Insein emergency: “We’ll go shopping in Insein within four or five days.”

It was January 1949, barely one year after Burma won independence from Britain.

Hostilities between the Karen and Burmans had been escalating since 1948 as Burmese troops tried to disarm Karen soldiers who had fought alongside Britain against the Japanese in World War II. Karen and Burmans shared a history of distrust and the Karen soldiers who had supported the British war effort feared they would be vulnerable to attack by Burmese troops if they surrendered their weapons. When the Thirty Comrades led by Gen Aung San entered Burma with Japanese troops to liberate Burma from British rule, many Karen continued to support Britain, harassing the Japanese and providing intelligence to the British. In the Irrawaddy delta region, the Karen population also resisted the new administration backed by the Burma Independence Army (BIA). A rebellion in the delta was led by Shwe Htun Kya, who—according to Maj Kyaw Zaw, a member of the Thirty Comrades—commanded only about 100 armed men, who had refused to disarm and surrender their weapons. Retreating British officers left Shwe Htun Kya with arms and ammunition and reportedly told him: “We will be back soon. Keep up the resistance.”

Col Suzuki (aka Bo Moe Gyo), who helped train Aung San and the Thirty Comrades, traveled to Myaungmya to investigate the Karen rebellion. A Japanese colonel was killed during the mission and Suzuki ordered revenge. In Myaungmya alone, about 150 Karen, including former cabinet minister Saw Pe Tha, were executed by the BIA and Japanese troops.

The Karen retaliated by killing many Burmans.
In his autobiography, Kyaw Zaw acknowledged responsibility for much of the killing in the delta. Entering one town, Phyu, Kyaw Zaw found that 200 people had been killed by the Karen National Defense Organization (KNDO). The violence spread to Rangoon, where Insein was taken over by the KNDO. Ne Win, the country’s new army chief of staff, removed senior Karen officers from the War Office and called in forces from the north and south. Kyaw Zaw, a colonel and commander of the northern region, based in Maymyo, was among those recalled to the capital. He recalled that as soon as he entered the War Office, Ne Win threw down a military map and thundered: “You are now in charge ... go and fight the Insein battle.” Kya Zaw replaced Brig General Aung Thinn, who was “permitted to retire” by Ne Win, who was suspicious of the southern commander’s loyalty. Aung Tin fought with the British General Orde Wingate and was a close friend of the charismatic Karen leader Saw Ba U Gyi.

The Battle of Insein began, with the War Office issuing the order: “Not to retreat one inch from your position.”

All roads into Rangoon were blocked by Karen soldiers and only the air route was open for government reinforcements. The Karen rebels had earlier raided Mingaladon Air Force base and seized ammunition, although they did not take over the airport. If Karen forces had taken the airport, government reinforcements from Arakan would not have been able to land in Rangoon. They would have taken weeks to arrive by sea, and by then Rangoon would have been under Karen control.

In their books, Tun Tin, Kyaw Zaw and Saw Myint maintained that if Rangoon had been taken by the rebels Burma would again fall prey to imperialist slavery under colonialist rule. Kyaw Zaw and Tun Tin believed that Britain bore part of the blame for the fighting between Karen and Burman. The irony was that Tun Tin and his officers later traveled to London and studied there, learning the “four cuts” British warfare strategy which would later defeat Burma’s ethnic insurgents.

The Battle of Insein failed to have a serious effect on daily life in Rangoon. The city’s cinemas were still showing up to four programs a day and schools remained open. Movie stars and musicians performed for the troops on the Insein front line, where soldiers requested encores with the plea: “Before we die in the battle, could you please sing one more song!” Karen snipers commanding strategic positions gave government forces a hard time. Tun Tin recalled telling his men in the face of a fierce Karan attack: “We will never surrender, we will leave our bones here but we will never surrender.”

As Karen soldiers advanced and snipers took their toll, Tun Tin whipped up the morale of his men by climbing from the trenches and urging them on. Ne Win, an army commander at the time, recalled in the book “Burma and General Ne Win,” written by the scholar Dr Maung Maung, who was briefly president in 1988: “Once, a troop of men in front of Insein would not move on order to attack. They had grown weary and battle-shy. Tun Tin, their leader, jumped up from the trench and walked up and down with a little swagger telling the men that death would not come until one’s time is up.” Bullets whizzed round like him bees, but he remained untouched. The men then rose and marched forward to attack with Tun Tin leading them.”

Tun Tin was decorated and received the title of “Thura” for his bravery. Others who were awarded medals included Aung San Thuriya and Thiha Thuriya. Kyaw Zaw, who had previously known only guerrilla warfare, described the Battle of Insein as his “first military academy.” He lost many officers and men in the battle, describing Insein as a graveyard littered with corpses. On the battlefield, he met Col Kyi Maung, who later became a prominent leader of Aung San Suu Kyi’s National League for Democracy. Ceasefire talks between Karen leader Saw Ba U Gyi and Burmese commanders were mediated by Indian diplomats, but the truce broke
down after three days. It was a surrealistic break in the fighting—Karen soldiers were even allowed into Rangoon to watch movies.

The government used the pause to bring reinforcements from upper Burma aboard Garuda aircraft. The Karen found themselves short of ammunition and with no open lines for supplies or reinforcements. The fighting resumed. During breaks in the fighting, Tun Tin and his officers roamed Rangoon and spent time in a hotel in Fraser Street, now renamed Anawrahta Street. The former colonial-era student prayed at Shwedagon Pagoda for victory, pledging to save the union from disintegration and his motherland’s “fragile independence.”

Although some foreign historians have depicted the Battle of Insein as a conflict between Burman troops and Karen rebels, Tun Tin noted that soldiers from different regions of Burma helped to defend Rangoon. They included Chin, Kayah, Shan, Gurkha and Kachin battalions (though some Kachin took up arms against the U Nu government). The most decisive role in defending Insein was played by the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Chin Rifles, fighting on what is regarded as the most strategic battle front of all. Some insurgents, including communists, reinforced Burmese forces before going back to the jungle to repel Burmese troops.

The battle lasted 112 days, finally ending in May 1949. About 500 Karen soldiers and civilians died. Fifteen major actions were fought before the Karen began to withdraw from Insein at the end of April. Tun Tin observed the retreat through his binoculars and noted it was calm and impressive. He had to wait before fulfilling that ambition to go shopping in Insein, however. In a visit to Insein hospital, he saw Karen nurses led by Dr Saw Marcus Paw treating wounded Karen soldiers, singing as they worked. An Arakanese medic with the Burmese Army, Dr Htun Aung Kyaw, offered to help the Karen medical team. Tun Tin saw tears in the eyes of Karen nurses, surprised at the unexpected offer of aid from a former adversary.

The Battle of Insein was over, but the Karens’ fight for equal rights continued—and lingers on.

Karen soldiers were pushed through the Irrawaddy delta and later to the Thai-Burmese border. In 1950, Saw Ba U Gyi and senior Karen leaders were killed at the Thai-Burmese border. Tun Tin served as a “moderate force” in the Ne Win government, becoming deputy prime minister in the 1980s and frequently traveling abroad to seek development aid for Burma from the West. He was briefly Prime Minister, but resigned at the time of the 1988 uprising. He lives quietly now in Rangoon, meditating and writing. A recent book describes his army experience and contains a description of the Battle of Insein. Kyaw Zaw led a famous battle against invading Kuomintang forces in northern Burma but was sacked in 1957, accused of leaking information to the Communist Party of Burma (CPB). He and his family made clandestine journey to northern Burma and joined the CPB in 1976. In his book, Kyaw Zaw admitted that he was a faithful party member of CPB and that he had long maintained a line of communication with the party.

Karen soldiers and civilians recently celebrated in the jungle on the Thai-Burmese border the 60th anniversary of the founding of the Karen National Union, whose aim of justice and peace in Burma remains a distant dream. The Battle of Insein never truly ended.
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Readers’ Comments

Battle of Insein Revisited
Regarding the article, “The Battle of Insein Never Really Ended” [February 9, 2009; URL:
http://www.irrawaddy.org/article.php?art_id=15080]:

When Insein was occupied by the KNDO, they were confronted by: (1) hastily trained students from Myoma High School, the University of Rangoon, Faculty of Medicine; (2) Communist and PVO troops; (3) Burmese navy, Burmese Air Force with Oxford Trainers and fire extinguisher bombs. The Chin troops commanded by Brig Blake arrived a few days later and started the offensive against the KNDO. The Burmese Navy also shelled Insein from the Hlaing River. When the Burma Rifles arrived, the offensive was well on its way.

Pe Than Maung

The Irrawaddy’s Burman Bias

Regarding the article, “The Battle of Insein Never Really Ended” [February 9, 2009; URL:
http://www.irrawaddy.org/article.php?art_id=15080]:

The Irrawaddy—both in printed and electronic magazines—has been considered one of the best of the Burmese publications, both by the people of Burma and the international community. But reading the above article we have some reservations, not only for its journalistic ethics but also of the magazine’s mission. It chooses to highlight only a fraction of the true story where it narrows in on the heroism and sacrifices of the Burman, even though mention was made [about the Chin]: “The most decisive role in defending Insein was played by the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Chin Rifles, fighting on what is regarded as the most strategic battle front of all.”

It would be ridiculous to level the famed and honorable magazine, as harboring the “Mahar Bamar” attitude—even though it is dominated by Burmans and “farang” [Westerners]—when it mentioned that “Tun Tin noted that soldiers from different regions of Burma such as Kayah, Kachin and Gurkha helped to defend Rangoon.” But the fact that most of the ethnic nationalities armies rally behind the Burmese army is because they loved and believed in “Pyidaungsu” (the Union of Burma), the alternative being Communism or one major ethnic group lording over it. Ethnic nationalities still cherished the dream of Bogoyke Aung San who initiated the union spirit. The supreme sacrifices made by the Chin and the Kachin soldiers that fought tooth and nail in the Battle of Insein was so intense that U Nu’s daughter, who fell in with a young Chin captain, was promised marriage if Rangoon was saved, even though the promise was never kept.

Now all the ethnic armies are fighting against the Myanmar [Burman]-dominated tatmadaw [Burmese army]. Why? It was rather paradoxical to witness that the KNU was been belittled at its 60th anniversary. Instead we should concentrate on a Federal Democratic Union of Burma, where all the ethnic nationalities, including the Karen, have consented to live within the union since the 1970s. It would be more beneficial if one of The Irrawaddy’s aims would be to close the gap between the ethnic and the pro-democracy fighters.

Kanbawza win

Note. Mr. Aung Zaw is from Myanmar/Burma and is the editor of The Irrawaddy, a magazine published in Chiang Mai, Thailand. The Irrawaddy covers news and offers in-depth analysis of political and cultural affairs in Burma and Asia generally. Note 2. Passages are highlighted in blue and red colours by myself. Thang Za Dal. November 2012.
APPENDIX T

WERE CHIN SOLDIERS MADE SCAPEGOATS?

By Zaw Htwe Maung

Chinland Guardian November 22, 2007

The Chin Community (Germany) had issued a statement upon the above mentioned topic. They mentioned: "Ever since the first massacre of the students in 1962, General Ne Win's Military Intelligence Service used to spread words about Chin soldiers shooting at demonstrators. The same thing happened during the 1974 Labour and U Thant Strikes and again during the uprisings of 1988 after troops mowed down hundreds of demonstrators. This is part of Ne Win's stratagem to reduce public hatred towards him or his Burma Army and to instil ethnic hatreds among the oppressed peoples".

The present author is neither a Burmese [1] nor a Chin, but a Rakhaing or Arakanese, hence, also a member of another ethnic minority group of Burma. As a neutral person, I will attempt to meet the complaints raised by the Chins looking into all authentic historical facts of Burma and its people, and carefully scrutinize the roots of these rumours.

Traditionally, Chins are warrior tribes and many Chins joined the Burma Rifles since Burma was under the British Rule. The bulk of the soldiers in the British-trained Army were of minority ethnic groups such as Chins, Kachins and Karens. Most of them were Converted Christians from their natural beliefs. It cannot be ruled out that it was part of the 'Tactic and Strategy' or 'the Policy of Divide and Rule' of the Colonial Masters then. In any case, the British Rulers never trusted the majority Buddhists Population of Burma, especially the majority ethnic group, the Burmese. The Burmese were rarely accepted in the armed forces before the First World War. Some Colonial Rulers wrote: "Never arm the Burmese! If the Burmese have an army they will invade all weaker neighbours, bully other ethnic minorities and finally they will kill their own people who won't dance to their tune". Anyhow, the British did not accept the Burmese in the Burma Rifles at the beginning. They used only Chins, Kachins and Karens.

Hence, many Chins were career soldiers and officers when Burma regained her independence and they had a very good reputation as 'Loyalists to the Union', 'Real Soldiers Defending Democracy' and so on, under U Nu's Regime. Chins did not accept statehood although they were granted. They remained as a 'Special Division' inside the mainland. Only in 1974, according to the new constitution 'Chin Special Division' became Chin State, however, as everybody knew, the Socialist Republic of the Union of Burma and its 1974 constitution were sham ones. The 'States' were only 'Nominal States', incomparable to the States of the 1947 constitution. Since the Socialist Republic of the Union of Burma was a centralized Nation and a 'One Party State', the real power was only in the hands of an elite group in Rangoon, particularly in the hands of the Party Chairman and the Head of State then, Ne Win. In fact, the authorities and powers given to the 'State Councils' were much less than the authority and power of a Deputy Commissioner of a District under U Nu's regime. However, even under the BSPP Regime some persons of ethnic minority groups were appointed as high ranking officers in the Burma Armed Forces. As far as I remember, there were two Chins and one Kachin Brigadier-Generals in the Army, which was the second highest rank in the then army and the Chief of Burma Air force was an Arakanese (Rakhaing). Also some colonels were from some minority ethnic groups as well as from Muslims. [2] Only after 1988, the bulk of the high ranking officers are from "Burmese Buddhists".

The statement of the Chin Community: "Ever since the care-taker government period in 1958-1960 General Ne Win abolished the British-era ethnic based battalions and turned the Burma Army into mixed-ethnic battalions with the majority made up of ethnic Burmans. But Ne Win was careful enough not to eliminate the names of these battalions, so the names 1st, 2nd or 3rd Chin Rifles remain even though these battalions are no longer made up of Chin soldiers.
Burman soldiers made up the majority in any battalion and if there are any Chin soldiers they are only about 20 to 30 or even less in each of these battalions", is correct.

In fact, Ne Win did it even earlier than the Era of the Caretaker Government. Since he became army chief in 1949, he had this idea. He became Commander in Chief of Burma Army after the forced retirement of the Karen, General Smith Dun, because some Karen Army units and one company from a Kachin Battalion went underground and fought against the central government. Let Ya, who was the Second in Command under Aung San, at the same time, the Defence Minister and Deputy Prime Minister then, was totally against the forced retirement of General Smith Dun, a Karen. And even when the majority of the cabinet ministers wanted to pension Smith Dun he recommended another Karen, Brigadier Saw Kya Doe, to be given the post of Army Chief. His efforts were all in vain because eventually Ne Win became the Army Chief.

Ne Win and his protégés did not trust the battalions of the ethnic minorities, especially the Karens and the Kachins. There were lots of conflict between the Defence Minister Let Ya and the Commander-in-Chief Ne Win due to Let Ya's plan to send military officers for further studies in the Military Academies Sand Hurst (England) and West Point (USA). Ne Win never trusted the officers either trained by the military academies of the western countries or the officers of ethnic minorities, who at that time became the majority of the general staff of the Burma Armed Forces. He wanted to dismiss all of them except Brigadier Saw Kya Doe, who had joined the Japanese-trained Burmese Army during the Japanese Era. Let Ya was against that plan, but Ba Swe, Kyaw Nyein and all the socialists, who were the majority in U Nu's government, backed Ne Win firmly. Let Ya became fed up with politics and resigned from both his political and military posts. These were given to Ne Win, who became Deputy Prime Minister as well as Defence and Home Minister. He thus could manipulate all Armed Forces in Burma as he wished and as soon as he took office he removed almost all British-trained persons from their posts, regardless of whether they were of Burmese or ethnic-minority descent. The only Sand Hurst-trained Karen, Brigadier Saw Kya Doe, mentioned above as Let Ya's preferred successor to Smith-Dun, was allowed to remain in the Burma Army for one or two years, not only because he and his battalion joined the Burmese Armies during the Japanese Era but also because he fought against the Karen and other rebels. Later even Saw Kya Doe became fed up with war and he resigned from the army.

Since that time, Ne Win shuffled the ethnic battalions of the Burma Army into mixed-ethnic battalions with the majority made up of ethnic Burmese slowly by slowly. He used two methods. The first method was the immediate replacement of the commander and the bulk of the officers of those battalions with Burmese. The second method was replacing the soldiers, non commissioned officers and many officers of that battalion with Burmese and also from other ethnic groups, if the commander was still from that ethnic group. In that way, all battalions of Burma army became mixed-ethnic battalions with the majority made up of ethnic Burmese. However, Ne Win was cunning enough not to eliminate the names of these battalions, hence; they remained as Chin, Kachin, Shan, Karen, Gurkha, Kayah Battalions, and so on. Some of the commanders were of that ethnic group and some were Burmese. The final reshuffling was made during the Era of the Care Taker Government.

In the case of the shootings at the university campus on the 7th July 1962, the commander of that battalion was Lt. Col. Sein Lwin who was later well known as the 'Butcher Sein Lwin' in 1988. The bulk of the soldiers were Burmese and not Chins. Colonel Sein Lwin was not a well educated man; he did not even finish his high school. That's why he regarded university students with jaundiced eyes. About more than a year ago, in 1960 still under U Nu's regime, Sein Lwin had problems with university students. Sein Lwin drove his new Chevrolet Bel Air Sedan recklessly on Prome Road near the University and some students were slightly hit. Instead of stopping to apologize to the students, he and a fellow army officer speeded up the car and tried to escape. The students followed his car. Just near the 'Windermere Ministers Village' Sein Lwin could not control the speed and the car hit the round-about and stopped. He and the other
officer ran into the 'Ministers Village' and took refuge there. One minister came out and consoled the students telling them that he came out to apologize on behalf of the driver and his companion so that the students could forgive the driver and the other. The angry students did not chase the driver anymore but they set fire to Sein Lwin's car. Since that time he was very angry with the university students and waited for a chance to give a Vendetta. On the 7th July 1962 when his troops surrounded the campus, the students jokingly asked him whether he wanted to see how the university campus and class rooms looked like because they knew exactly that he had never been inside there in his whole life, he felt insulted. It was the best time for him to revenge, hence, he sent Ne Win through radio the false information that the situation could not be controlled by peaceful means and therefore he had to request for shooting orders. Ne Win who was drunk at that time, wanted to show his power and authority to the challengers, permitted the firing orders. However, later Ne Win pushed all blame to Aung Gyi, his deputy then, which was vehemently rejected by Aung Gyi in his 'Open Letter' in July 1988.

As mentioned earlier, Chins are traditionally warrior tribes and well known to be good and disciplined soldiers. In fact, since the BSPP Era many Chins did not join the army as they did under U Nu's Era because there were many shortages in Burma due to the mismanagement of the economy. Many people had to think for their 'Existence Minimum' and had to carry out 'cross border trading' with the neighbouring countries in their nearest border. Those traders, though officially paying tax to the government, were named 'smugglers' and the markets selling these goods were called 'Black Markets'. Many Chins, too, were involved in this kind of trading with their nearest border, India. Hence, there were not many Chin soldiers inside the Burma Army. However, since the Ne Win Era the name Chin Battalions remained although in truth, the bulk of the soldiers of those battalions were pure Burmese Buddhists. And since the Chins are well known to be good soldiers who obey the commands of their Army chiefs, the various Burmese Military Governments usually stated that it was the Chin Battalion who did the shooting. Since most of the Chins are Christians and the majority populace of Burma are Buddhists, this also serves as a good tool to confuse the Burmese populace and 'divide and rule' the country between the Chins and the Buddhists majority similar to the way the Colonial Masters did earlier.

Here I would like to point out that the descendents of the People of the Subcontinent had to bear the burden of the 'Divide and Rule Policy' of the British Colonial Masters. Until the present time, they are neither cordially accepted nor showed affinity by the Burmese people. A similar situation can be found in many former British Colonies in Africa.

During the Colonial Era, the British preferred Indians for public sector jobs. Most of the policemen and officers, postmen, railways and other transport workers, prison guards and officers, doctors, nurses and hospital workers, clerks, armed forces personnel and even menial workers were Indians. Here I would like to cite Ton That Tien [3] who wrote: "That in some form of occupation half of those engaged, and that in other forms of employment over 40%, should be aliens, would be a remarkable situation in any country".

On the whole the British were too distrustful of the loyalty of their Buddhist subjects (the Burmese and other ethnic groups like Mons, Shans and Arakanese) to become familiar with modern science, technology and warfare. All independence struggles, rebellions, boycotts and so on, were brutally crushed by the British-Indian Army, Para-Military Police and Burma Police which were mainly filled up with Indians.

Thus there began to rise in Burma an antagonism against Indians in addition to anti-British feelings. Many Burmese did have ill-feelings towards the Indians during the colonial era. These feelings are now slowly decreasing, especially among the new generation who were born in the post-independence era. However, until the present time, Indians are neither cordially accepted nor showed affinity by the Burmese people.

Aping the Colonial Masters, the various Military Governments have been using the same divide and rule tactics with
a big difference. Indians were aliens brought by the British to Burma and the whole battalion is filled only with Indian soldiers. Chins are indigenous minorities of Burma and the battalions are not filled with Chin soldiers but with Burmese Buddhists and are named Chin battalions. This shows that the various Military Governments are more crooked than the Colonial Masters.

Nowadays, in Burma if one sees a minority soldier who speaks Burmese with accent they just conclude that this is a Chin although they may be a Wa or Karen or Kachin or of other minorities, because the reputation of Chin soldiers was totally destroyed since Ne Win’s Era. There were rumours that these soldiers who shot the monks in Rangoon in September 2007 were taken from the Thai-Burmese Border. It cannot be ruled out that some soldiers are from the ‘ceased fire groups’ of some other ethnic minorities or the Pocket Army of the Opium Warlords, who are for the time being allies of this military regime. When we saw the pictures of some soldiers in 'Stern Magazine'[an influential German weekly magazine] their features were with 'Chinky Eyes' and they looked more like other ethnic minorities from the Chinese Border rather than a Chin. Hence, no wonder, they talked in a much accented Burmese as some monks claimed.

However, one cannot deny the fact that the majority soldiers in the division stationed in Rangoon, which crushed the demonstrators in September 2007, were Burmese Buddhists. In any case, these soldiers were recruited from some minorities as well as from the Burmese. Many young boys from their childhood were taken or bought from their poor parents and trained to become soldiers. According to the latest surveys, there are about 70,000 'Child Soldiers' in the Burmese Army, the highest in the world. They were taught or better say 'brain washed' to be faithful and loyal to the Burmese Military and their leaders only. They were taught they had no parents anymore, only the Burma Army was their parents and because of the Burmese Military and their leaders, they could survive and therefore they had to respect 'their parents' had to listen to them and obey their orders. It is very similar to the way the Japanese Imperial Army trained Koreans and Manchus about 25 years before the Second World War. Most 'Japanese soldiers' stationed in South East Asia were the so-called "Manchukos". Only officers were Japanese. One cannot neglect the fact that, Ne Win, the so-called 'Second Father of the Modern Burmese Army' was a Japanese-trained soldier who turned down the plan to send military officers to go for further studies in the Military Academies Sand Hurst (England) and West Point (USA). Hence, there is no doubt that many ideologies of the modern Burmese Army were influenced by the Mentalities and Ideas of the Second World War's Imperialist Japanese Army!

Sometimes the Burmese are too ethno-centric. They had and have an illusion that pure Burmese Buddhists soldiers won’t shoot and kill their own people, especially the monks even if they are ordered by their officers. They would rather become renegades and so on. In fact, since the time of the Burmese Royal Army; all Burmese soldiers did kill, loot, rape, and destroy everything which their 'He who must be obeyed' commanded. The past history of Ayuddiya (Siam) and Mrauk U (Arakan), then the present history of U Thant's funeral riots in 1974, then again in 1988 had proven that Burmese soldiers did not respect the clergy and the religion they supposed to practice. There is no doubt that these Burmese soldiers did kill monks, loot monasteries, temples, destroyed Buddha statues and even loot the Buddha statues as booty to take home during the crushing of these demonstrations in September 2007.

The history of the Holy Maha Muni Image in Mandalay has proven it! The Burmese Royal Armies looted this colossal statue from the Arakan City or Mrauk U after the Burmese conquest of the Rakhain Kingdom in the late 19th Century. They used the Arakanese prisoners of war, about thirty thousand including the last King of Arakan, as slave labour to carry that colossal image across the mountain range and for other slavery works. Till now some Arakanese from Sittwe call the Burmese as "Robbers and Thugs of the Holy Image, Maha Muni". I am sure; Thais must have been naming the Burmese some similar names. There were rumours in Thailand that the Burmese king Hsinphyu Shin of the Konbaung Dynasty had robbed the gold from Ayuddiya and donated that gold to the (former) umbrella [4] of the Shwe
Dagon Pagoda in Rangoon.

After 1988 many Chins left the country because of economic, social, political and other problems. It can even be called as the 'Chin Exodus' and therefore, nowadays there are very few Chin soldiers in the Burma Army. Aside from that, almost all ethnic minorities in Burma are bilingual speakers. Apart of their mother tongue, they also have to speak and learn Burmese which is the Lingua Franca of the whole Union of Burma. As Christians the Chins learned the English language from the Christian Missionaries. That's why; generally their command of the English language is much superior to many Burmese who start learning this only from the 5th grade where their teachers are also not native speakers but Burmese. After the nationalization of all schools in Burma in 1965, Burmese replaced English as the official language used in the schools. Teaching the minority languages such as Shan, Karen, Mon and so forth was also forbidden. Only in the early 80s, when Ne Win's favourite daughter Khin Sandar Win failed the entrance examination in Singapore, did English once again become an official language. It was rather too late because there was then a shortage of experienced teachers able to teach the required subjects in English. Many experienced teachers and scientists who had been trained under U Nu's government began to leave Burma and settle abroad. The Burmese people have had to suffer under this burden until the present. Hence, if a normal Burmese goes abroad he/she has language difficulty but many Chins speak English fluently and rarely face language difficulty.

As the way, the Chin Community claims: “The Chin youth are very clever and intelligent and very much globalized. In response to the military regime's persecution and hardships and sufferings imposed upon them, the Chin youth are temporarily leaving behind their beloved land in the thousands to study political science, economics, and theology and so on in the western countries. At this very moment there are already about 500 Chin students in the universities in the western world and the number is increasing. This makes the racist military regime very nervous”. According to population ratio, the Burmese and Chins are 40:1, however, based on this population ratio, nowadays there are comparatively more Chins studying abroad than Burmese.

As a conclusion, I would like to say that I share the view of the Chin Community. There is no doubt that the Chins were made Scapegoats by the Burmese Military for their propaganda purposes as well as for their further 'divide and rule policy' because all opposition groups, whether they are Burmese or ethnic minorities, have the same and single goal which is to topple down the Military Dictatorship in Burma and the Junta is afraid that they will be united. Hence, the Junta instead of admitting their mismanagement, tried to divert by pushing blames on Chin soldiers thereby 'shooting two birds simultaneously with one stone'. So for those in the opposition camp inside or outside Burma, and especially the Burmese media in exile, should think twice before they write or speak so as not to unwittingly echo the junta's words but rather scrutinize the reality inside the Burma Army and avoid becoming a mouthpiece of the enemy they claim to fight against.

[1] The word Burmese or Burman is also only for the Bamas, the biggest ethnic group in Burma and not for the citizens of Burma, because if one asks a Karen or a Shan or even a Tavoyian who speaks a dialect of the Burmese Language, "Are you a Burmese or a Burman" his answer will no doubt be, "I'm neither Burmese nor Burman, instead I am a Tavoyan, Chin, Shan and so forth." The word Arakanese or Rakhine/Rakhaing is also only for the majority ethnic group in the Rakhine State, the people who are called Yakhines by Burmese, and not for the other groups living in Rakhine State such as Mro, Dainet, Kamans, Kamwee, Myedu, early Bengali settlers who came after the British occupation and the group who named themselves "Rohingyas". I used the word Indian in this paper to represent not just the people of India, but rather the people from the Subcontinent, which means Indians, Pakistanis and Bangladeshis who are called Kalas by the Burmese.
Muslim is a religion. Regardless of any ethnic group, every body could be Muslim if they believe in this religion. Hence, what I meant was not only the Buddhists who are majorities but also the believers of the minority religion could also get higher positions.


[4] The present Umbrella of Shwe Dagon Pagoda was donated by King Mindon in the second half of the 19th century. The Umbrella donated by King Hsinphyu Shin is kept in the Pagoda Museum since that time. King Hsinphyu Shin donated that umbrella due to his body weight one or two years after the Burmese conquest of Siam. That's why, the modern Thais suspected it to be made of the gold taken as booty from Siam. About 90 years later, at the second half of the 19th century, his great grand nephew, King Mindon, replaced that umbrella with the new one due to his body weight again. Since Hsinphyu Shin was a warrior and Mindon was a fat man, it is sure that Mindon was heavier than his great grand uncle. Apart from that, Mindon was the king only of Upper Burma. Lower Burma had already become a British Colony and King Mindon had to ask permission from the British Government for his donation. When even the king of the half of Burma could donate more gold to the new umbrella than the first one; it must be taken for granted that the ruler of the entire Burmese empire then, Hsinphyu Shin, could easily donate such gold amount without using the gold from Siam taken as booty, though there was a very unfortunate incident. The present author has seen that umbrella many times in the museum. The names of other donors from the Ava City were written on the gold banyan leaves and small gold bells attached to that umbrella, though the king was formally known as the main donor.
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* Format changed once again in July 2022 by myself. tzd
Some of the Most Prominent Chin/Zo Leaders of the Second Generation Inside Burma
(Chin/Zo Leaders of the First Generation Were the Chiefs and Elders Who Led Campaigns Against the British)

Front Row Sitting L - R: Lt. Col. Lian Cin Zam (CO., Chin Hills Bn); Mr. R. Thuang Hmung, W.K.H., B.A (Hons) - Deputy Commissioner, Falam; Col. Dal Za Kam (Comd No. 2. Lt Inf Bde); Mr. Thawng Cin Thang, T.P.C (Secretary, Chin Ministry); Lt. Col. Son Kho Pau (CO., 2nd Bn, Chin Rifles).

Standing L - R: Lt. Col. Do Kung (CO., 3rd (E) Chin Bn); Mr. Za Hre Lian (Deputy Commissioner, Kampetlet); Sithu Mr. Vum Ko Hau (Deputy Secretary, Foreign Office); Mr. Sa Vut, W.K.H./Asst. Secretary, Chin Ministry; Major (later Colonel) Van Kulh, BGM & Bar (Ollg. Comd, 1st Chin Rifles)

The information below concerning Cols. LCZ and DZK were obtained from Salai Van Cung Lian (UK), October 2019.

- At the peak of the Karen Uprising from early 1948 to mid 1949 a number of Chin battalion commanders, among them Lt. Col. Lian Cin Zam, tried to remain neutral between the Karens and Burmans. U Nu, the then Prime Minister, was forced to fly to Pegu to personally plead Col. Lian Cin Zam to side with the government. The Burmese politicians and military top brass could never forget and forgive this humiliation. When he suddenly died in a military hospital under very unusual circumstances in 1957, the government refused to transport his remains and family to Kalaymyo by a Burma Air Force plane. So, his body and family were flown to Kalaymyo by a company aeroplane of the Burmah Oil Company. (See PHOTO 32 for a concrete evidence to prove this fact). Its top managers were former intimate friends of the late colonel. -

Col. Dal Za Kam was forced to resign without pension because he also opposed to fight against the Karens, according to a confidential War Office report, under the title of A Paper of the Chin Affairs in the Army (Sheet 1):

“...At this conference, the authorities at War Office had their first insight into Col. Dal Za Kam’s unmilitary character and reactionary mental attitude when he refused to recognize the country-wide uprisings as an insurrection against the legally constituted Government but chose instead to regard them as a racial affair between the Burmans and the Karens in which Chin soldiers should not participate...”

- Mr. Thuang Hmung later became a minister of Chin Affairs for a legislative period under the U Nu government.
- Mr. Thawng Cin Thang became Chief Commissioner of several Divisions.
- Lt. Colonel Son Kho Pau attained this rank at the age of 27! He was a hero of the Battle of Insein, commanding the 2nd Chin Rifles. Several soldiers from his battalion were bestowed with outstanding awards (see Appendices P & DD). Born on July 1, 1920, at Thuklai, and after having passed 9th standard from Government Anglo-Vernacular High School in Falam, he joined the 2nd Burma Rifles in 1939 and participated in the famous General Wingate Expedition. He attained the rank of Major in 1945. He became CO of the 2nd Chin Rifles with the rank of Lt. Col. on Jan. 4, 1948 (Burma's Independence Day). He attended Burma Army Staff College for one year run by the British and passed it with flying colours; he stood 1st in the class. Late in 1951 he was forced to resign without pay because of his disobedience to his superior, Brigadier Kyaw Zaw, who later took refuge in the People's Republic of China where he died in mid 2012. Col. Son Kho Pau went underground in mid 1964 and went to East Pakistan (now Bangladesh) with 150 men, where he got promises of military hardwares support for an armed force from the then Pakistan government. He and his bodyguards were ambushed and captured by the 7th Assam Rifles inside Nagaland in 1965 on their way back from East Pakistan. They were handed later over to the Burmese government. He was imprisoned in Mandalay for ten years without trial before being released under a general amnesty.

- Mr. Za Hre Lian later became a minister of Chin Affairs for one or two legislative periods and then served as Burma’s ambassador to Nepal, Egypt, France, Spain and the Netherlands. He died in 1997 in the US at the age of 74.
- Major (later Colonel) Van Kulh became a Minister of Housing for some years in the General Ne Win government.

Photo Courtesy - Dr. Huat Za Mang, M.B.B.S., F.R.C.S. (Thuklai, Chinland/Texas, USA) - 2012
Photo taken in Rangoon, Burma, 1950.

* Prepared in this form by Thang Za Dal. October 2019.
The Burma Oil Company Ltd.'s (BOC) acknowledgment of receipt of the payment of Aviation Spirit by the Chin Affairs Ministry on behalf of Lt. Col. Lian Cin Zam's family for the transport of his own remains and his family from Rangoon to Kalaymyo by a BOC company airplane. From there they were further to be brought to their native village: Mualbem in Chin State. When he died in a military hospital in Rangoon under unusual circumstances, the Burmese government refused to transport his remains and family by a Burma Air Force plane. So the managers of the BOC, who were former intimate friends of the colonel, asked the government to allow them to transport his remains by a company airplane. Col. Lian Cin Zam, CO of the 3rd Chin Rifles, refused to fight against the Karens in 1949 by arguing that the Karen Uprising was the result of racial conflict between the Burmans and Karens, but not the whole country's problem. So the top Burmese politicians and military brass could not forget and forgive him. This Photo is to be viewed together with PHOTO J in order to be able to understand its full background history. tzd.

- The above document was obtained from Salai Van Cung Lian (UK)
The Commanding Officers of the 1st and 2nd Chin Rifles - Lt. Colonel Hrang Thio (left) and Lt. Colonel Son Khaw Pau.

Lt. Colonel Son Khaw Pau was also a veteran of the First and Second Chindit operations, 1943 and 1944.

Photo courtesy of Salai Van Cung Lian (UK). Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. December 2019
- He was the immediate younger brother of my mother. He was imprisoned for 2 years for his activities for the Chins and then was forced to resign. His eldest son was also killed in action against Burmes troops in 1974. Statistics for APPENDIX P are taken from his memoir: IN COMMEMORATION OF THE DIAMOND JUBILEE. He had also authored The Biography of Lt. Colonel Son Kho Pau. See PHOTO J.
After I arrived at my parent Unit, I applied for Burma Commission Officer in Burma Army. In the Unit Selection Boards out of 32 applicants for Burma Commission Officers in Burma Army only 16 applicants were selected.

In the Central Selection Board out of 16 applicants from Burma Army Signals, appeared only three applicants were selected.

As such on 9.6.1947 I was commissioned as 2nd Lieutenant in Burma Army Signals with Burma Commission No. BC 3964.

In the month of September 1947 I was posted to 2nd Battalion, The Chin Rifles Mingaladon as Regimental Signal Officer from Burma Army Signals Maymyo.

On 2.11.1948 I was promoted to Captain and was appointed as Battalion Adjutant of 2nd Battalion, The Chin Rifles, Mingaladon.

Towards the end of 1948, the adherents of the KNDO's in Thaton and Amherst Districts of Tenasserim Division became intransigent, openly carrying arms and threatening to take over the Administration from the Union Government Authorities. The situation became worse as communal tension mounted.

2nd Battalion, the Kachin Rifles, under the command of commanding officer Lieut. Col. Thing Nan was sent to Moulmein in the later part of December 1948, as the activity of the KNDO insurgents was tense.

At that critical juncture, the Prime Minister U Nu who was then handling the affairs of the Defence Ministry felt that the Chins as a minority racial group voluntarily adhere to the Union.

Therefore in the second week of January 1949, 2nd Battalion, The Chin Rifles under the command of Commanding Officer Lieutenant Colonel Son Kho Pau was sent to Moulmein by ship.

As soon as Lieut. Col. Son Pau's arrival at Moulmein, he got down to work building up a safety zone around Moulmein and sending out some companies on peace preservation duties to the outlying areas.

The swiftness firmness and tact with which he handled the explosive situation had a deterrent effect on Karens and a calming one on the populace.
Thus, through the combined military operations against the KNDO and MNDO Insurgents by 2nd Kachin Rifles and 2nd Chin Rifles, Amherst district was totally recaptured and re-occupied by Union Government troops.

2nd Chin Rifles handed over the security and Administration needs of Amherst District to 2nd Kachin Rifles prior to further military operations against the KNDO and MNDO Insurgents in Thaton District.

2nd Chin Rifles under the able and tactful command of Commanding Officer Lieut. Col. Son Kho Pau started military operation against the KNDO and MNDO Insurgents from Martaban to Thaton town in Thaton District.

Thaton District was recaptured and re-occupied by 2nd Chin Rifles and captured large quantity of arms and ammunitions in addition to great numbers of surrendered arms and ammunitions.

2nd Chin Rifles handed over the Security and Administration duties to SITWUNTHAN prior to 2nd Chin Rifles being recalled to Rangoon for assignment of operational duties at Insein Battle Fronts.

When Amherst and Thaton District in Tenasserim Division were recaptured by Government troops, I was performing the duty of Battalion Adjutant of 2nd Chin Rifles.

The photo of officers and men of 2nd Chin Rifle, who took part in the military operation against the KNDO and MNDO Insurgent in Thaton District with their captured and surrendered arms and ammunitions from the KNDO and MNDO Insurgents was attached as Appendix "C".

No sooner had Lieut. Col. Son Kho Pau and his Battalion captured Thaton District and received large quantity of captured and surrendered arms and ammunitions from the KNDO Insurgents, he was urgently recalled to Rangoon with his Battalion to join in the fighting against The KNDO Insurgents with 1st Chin Rifles which was fully engaged in battle with the KNDO Insurgents at Thamaing Battle Front.

In the second week of March 1949, the whole Battalion of 2nd Chin Rifles was airlifted to Mingaladon Airport from Moulmein in full battle order dress by four chartered aircrafts within 3 days.
On landing at Mingaladon Airport, 2nd Chin Rifles under the command of Commanding Officer Lieut. Col. Son Kho Pau opened Insein second front by attacking the KNDO Insurgents at Sawbwayigone Battle Front, thereby some of the KNDO Insurgents who fought against 1st Chin Rifles at Thamaing Battle Front on their way to capture the capital city of Burma, Rangoon, had divert some of the KNDO's fighting troops to fight against 2nd Chin Rifles at Sawbwayigone Battle Front.

As such there was less likelihood of the KNDO Insurgents capturing the capital city of Burma, Rangoon, by splitting their fighting force due to 2nd Chin Rifles opening the Insein second Battle Front.

The KNDO Insurgent entrenched themselves in strong defensive bunkers in depth in Sawbwayigone, Kyugon, Thamaing and North Insein areas.

To recapture one foot of the KNDO Insurgents infested areas of Insein battle front, 2 or 3 of our officers and men had to sacrifice their lives in hand to hand fighting in frontal assault of sometimes by snipers shooting.

From the second week of March 1949 to the end of May 1949 2nd Chin Rifles under the tactful command of Commanding Officer Lieut. Col. Son Kho Pau and Battalion Second in Command Major Thual Khup attacked the KNDO Insurgents at Sawbwayigone, U Set Kya Kyaung, Vest Factory and Duck Egg Hill battles with valour and ferocity and sometimes hand to hand fighting without regard for their lives.

On 10.4.1949 alone 1st Chin Rifles under the command of Commanding Officer Lieut. Col. Harang Thio (B.G.M), and Battalion Second in Command Major Van Kulh and 2nd Chin Rifles under the command of Commanding Officer Lieut. Col. Son Kho Pau and Battalion Second in Command Major Thual Khup attacked and captured Duck Egg Hill which was the last stronghold of KNDO Insurgents in the whole of Insein area.

In the Duck Egg Hill battle, 15 officers and men were killed in action and 36 men were wounded in respect of 1st Chin Rifles and 5 men were killed in action and 15 officers and men were wounded in respect of 2nd Chin Rifles.

During the whole Insein military operations against the KNDO Insurgents, The Commanding Officer of 1st Chin Rifles Lieut. Col. Hrang Thio (BGM) was a veteran of the world famous 1st and 2nd General Wingate's long range
expedition in World War II and also a veteran of the Union of Burma Government's campaign against the multi-coloured Insurgents in Independent Burma.

The photo of Lieutenant Colonel Hrang Thio (BGM) who was directing 1st Chin Rifles Battalion assault against the well-dug in KNDO Insurgents at Duck Egg Hill by Radio Telephone on 10.4.1949 was attached as Appendix "D".

1st Chin Rifles - Honours and Awards

Honours and Awards conferred to the officers of 1st Chin Rifles, by the then Government of the Union of Burma during the whole Insein Military Operations against the KNDO Insurgents in 1949, in recognition of their gallantry, loyalty and faithful service they rendered to the Union of Burma and her Government in time of National Crisis is mentioned below.

Aungsan Thuriya

Lieutenant Tai Chawn

Thiha Thuriya

Lieutenant Ca Thuan

Thura Tazeik

Lieutenant Hniar Tseo
Lieutenant Thang Sui
Lieutenant Ngun Nawl
Lieutenant Run Ling

2nd Chin Rifles - Honors Awards Certificate of Gallantry and Certificate of Honor

During the whole Insein Military Operations against the KNDO Insurgent in 1949, Command Officer of 2nd Chin Rifles was Lieutenant Colonel Son Kho Pau who was a veteran of the World Famous 1st and 2nd General Wingate's
long range expedition in World War II and also a veteran of the Union of Burma Government's campaign against the multi-coloured Insurgents in Independent Burma.

The photo of Lieutenant Colonel Son Kho Pau, Commanding Officer of 2nd Chin Rifles who directed all The Military Operations against the KNDO Insurgent at all Insein Battle Fronts in 1949 was attached as Appendix "E".

The then Government of the Union of Burma conferred Honours Awards, Supreme Commander's Certificate of Gallantry and Certificate of Honours to the undermentioned 64 officers and men of 2nd Chin Rifles under the command of Commanding Officer Lieutenant Colonel Son Kho Pau for various acts of heroism and gallantry in actions at Insein Battle Fronts during the whole Insein Military Operations against the KNDO Insurgents in 1949.

**Thura Taziek Award**

The undermentioned Recipients of Thura Tazeik awards were published in Special War office Council order No. 32/S/50 and 34/S/50 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SR No.</th>
<th>Regimental No.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>96022</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Kai Khan Dal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>96109</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Cin Za En</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>96141</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Thang Cin Zam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>96173</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Khen Piang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>96496</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Mang Khan Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>01666</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Ge Sheing</td>
<td>Posthumous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>01683</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Hang Bu</td>
<td>Posthumous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>01687</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Mang Tam</td>
<td>Posthumous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>01708</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Ling Khui Om</td>
<td>Posthumous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>80126</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Thawng Zang</td>
<td>Posthumous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>96471</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Neng Kho Vung</td>
<td>Posthumous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>96551</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Gin Khan Thang</td>
<td>Posthumous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five survivors and seven Posthumous award = 12 other ranks.
Thuyeegaung Hmat-Htan-Win Award

The under-mentioned Recipients of Thuyeegaung Hmat-Htan-Win Awards were published in Special war office Council order No. 19/S/49 and 34/S/50 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Regimental No.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>BC- 3783</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Thual Khup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>BC- 3867</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Tual Khen Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>BC- 4050</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Kai Za Dal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>BC- 4051</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Ngun Hei Thang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>BC- 4084</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>H. Ngo Zam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>BC- 4079</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Ngul Za Thang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>BC- 5421S</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Gin Za That</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>68843</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Hau Za Kam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>96163</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Kam Za Cin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>50843</td>
<td>Lance/Sergeant</td>
<td>Thang Khaw Gin</td>
<td>Lai Cin Zam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>62738</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Luan Za Kap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>96108</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Du hop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Lance Corporal</td>
<td>Neng Za Gin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>96129</td>
<td>Lance Corporal</td>
<td>Phung Za Kap</td>
<td>Thang Khaw Zam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>96380</td>
<td>Lance Corporal</td>
<td>Khai Khaw Zam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>96274</td>
<td>Lance Corporal</td>
<td>Gin Za Kham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>96564</td>
<td>Lance Corporal</td>
<td>Neng Khan Thang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>96715</td>
<td>Lance Corporal</td>
<td>En Khaw Lian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>96008</td>
<td>Lance Corporal</td>
<td>Thang Lian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>96040</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>On Khaw Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>96253</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Kham Khan Thang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>96456</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Gen Za Lang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>96709</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>00165</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Officers and 17 other Ranks = 24 Officers and men.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Regimental No.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>BC- 3772</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Sawi Thanga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>BC- 3878</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Neng Za Suan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>BC- 3984</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Mang Vum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>BC- 4084</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>H. Ngo Zam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>68218</td>
<td>Coy Quartermaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>68263</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Thuam Khan Thang</td>
<td>Killed in action at Hmawbi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>68344</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Khual Khaw Zam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>96187</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Hang Pum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>96090</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Gin Do Cin</td>
<td>Killed in action at Insein SWOCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>68819</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Mang Za Kap</td>
<td>4/S/51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Khup Khan Dal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>75070</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Kam Za Nang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>96224</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Do Dal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>96234</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Thang Za Kap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>96331</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Gin Za Nang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>96113</td>
<td>Lance Corporal</td>
<td>Neng Do Thang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>96185</td>
<td>Lance Corporal</td>
<td>Min Khaw Zan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>96513</td>
<td>Lance Corporal</td>
<td>Gin Kho Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>96600</td>
<td>Lance Corporal</td>
<td>Hen Go</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>96567</td>
<td>Lance Corporal</td>
<td>Hau Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>01709</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Shwe Uu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>80099</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Sheing Ki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>96065</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Dai Kho Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>96258</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Vung Khaw Nang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>96315</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Phung Za Nang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>96384</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Khan Suan Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial No.</td>
<td>Regimental No.</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Names</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>96770</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Zam Do Lian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>96818</td>
<td>Rifleman</td>
<td>Let Kho Cin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 officers and 23 other ranks = 27 officers and men

Certificate of Honour

96662 WO II/ ORQMS Maung Bo

The Union government troops including the officers and men of 1st Chin Rifles under the command of Commanding Officer Lieutenant Colonel Hrang Thio BGM and officers and men of 2nd Chin Rifles under the command of Commanding Officer Lieutenant Colonel Son Kho Pau saved the Union of Myanmar and her Government by recapturing and re-occupying the whole Insein areas from the KNDO Insurgents at the end of May 1949.

The Government of the Union of Burma conferred Honours, Awards-Supreme Commander's Certificate of Gallantry and Certificate of Honour for various acts of heroism and gallantry in action to officers and men of the Chin Rifles during the whole Insein Military Operations against the KNDO Insurgents proved their gallantry, loyalty and faithful services they rendered to safeguard the Independence of the Union of Myanmar in time of national crisis.

The fiercest and costly battles I had ever seen, fought and experienced in World War Two and the Union of Burma Government's campaign against the multi colored Insurgents was at Insein Battle Fronts because we fought against the Army trained, seasoned and experienced Ex. Karen Rifles Battalions, most of them were World War II veterans.

300 officers and men of Chin Rifles shed their life blood and sacrificed their lives for the Union of Burma and her people at Insein Battle Fronts.

To replace the dead and wounded soldiers of 2nd Chin Rifles at Insein Battle Fronts 250 Chin Recruits were brought down to Mingaladon from Kalemyo by special chartered planes as all riverline and road communications were disrupted by the Internal Insurgents.
Those 250 recruits were given intensive Recruit Training especially in the handling of all kinds of small arms and actual firing at the firing range in different positions, firing at moving targets and snipe shooting and tactical movements within three months to keep us with the momentum of fighting the Insurgents.

20 officers and men of Chin Rifles were killed in action at Duck Egg Hill on 10.4.1949 and the funeral service in respect of those who were killed was to be carried out at Mingaladon cemetery on 12.4.1949.

The photo of loading one dead body of our comrades in arms into each separate truck at the mortuary of Defence Services General Hospital Mingaladon just before the funeral procession was leaving for Mingaladon cemetry on 12.4.1949 was attached as Appendix "F".

The photo of Battalion Bands of Bag Pipes and Silverline bugles of 1st and 2nd Chin Rifles leading the funeral procession from Defence Services General Hospital Mingaladon to Mingaladon cemetry on 12.4.1949 was attached as Appendix "G".

The photo of Senior Officers of Chin Rifles who followed the funeral procession in single file formation giving honour and paid last respects to our dead heroes on 12.4.1949 was attached as Appendix "H".

The Senior Officers of the Chin Rifles who followed the funeral procession in single file formation from front to rear was as mentioned below:— (See Appendix "H"

- Capt. Kep Lo
- Lieut. Gin Za That
- Capt. Ngun Hnok
- Lieut. Ngun Nei Thang
- Capt. Thian Khaw Khai
- Capt. Kham Cin Pau
- Lieut. Col. Hrang Thio BGM
- Lieut. Col. Son Kho Pau

I preformed the duty of Battalion Adjutant of 2nd Chin Rifles during the whole Insein Military Operations against the KNDO Insurgents in 1949.
The remains of our dead Comrades-in-arms who were killed in action at Insein Battle Fronts with their family members and personal effects in respect of 2nd Chin Rifles were flown by twelve planes to Kalemyo from Mingaladon with Capt. Tual Khen Pau and Lieut. Gin Za That to look after them on their homeward bound.

I felt a great gratitude to all responsible officers and men who helped me in the arduous task of looking after the bereaved family members in sending them back to their home town from Mingaladon to Kalemyo being the nearest Airport.

I composed the undermentioned two pieces of songs in commemoration of the Insein Military Operations against the KNDO Insurgents to encourage our dear comrades-in-arms who were fighting at the Insein Battle Fronts side by side with other Government troops till victory was achieved.

1. (a) Zaang tawi ngam kuam, khuai bang suan tu, do taa pial vaa laam bang ze.

   (b) Ngam kuam an bang in it man ah, zo suan han lung ciam ve vuah.

2. (a) Zaang tawi lun teng, neem zo taa ee, zaang ngam kuam suan vak cih nge.

   (b) Zaang kuam lum bang ih sun nah te, Thian mang zing vai hawm hih ze.

In the later part of the month of June 1949, 2nd Chin Rifles and No. 16 Union Military Police Battalion under the command of Major Son Kho Lian (2nd Chin Rifles) re-captured and re-occupied Delta towns such as Twante, Twentewa, Yandoon, Maubin and Yalay galay from the dominion of the KNDO Insurgents after the liberation of the whole Insein areas by Government troops at the end of May 1949.

During the height and heat of Insein Battle between the Government troops and KNDO Insurgents, the loyal officers and men of 1st and 3rd Burma Rifles was being formed as 1st Burma Regiment under the command of Commanding Officer Lieut. Col. Sein Win and Captain Bani as Adjutant of the Battalion at Mingaladon.
2nd Chin Rifles under the command of Commanding Officer Lieut. Col. Son Kho Pau and 1st Burma Regiment under the command of Commanding Officer Lieut. Col. Sein Win attacked the KNDO Insurgents at Phonggyi and Daabein towns and re-captured the two towns after the liberation of some Delta towns.

To support the Ground Forces of Government troops attacking the KNDO Insurgents at the two towns, Burma Airforce fighters took part to strafe the Insurgents.

Incidentally one Burma Airforce fighter was lost in the engagement with the Insurgents.

In the later part of 1949, 2nd Chin Rifles under the command of Commanding Officer Lieut. Col. Son Kho Pau attacked 1st and 3rd Burma Rifles deserters at Hmawbi, Wanetchaung, Taikhyi towns and Red Flag Communists at Letpadan and re-captured and re-occupied the said towns.

Sergeant Hang Pum of 2nd Chin Rifles was killed in action at Hmawbi Battle Front.

In the early part of 1950, 2nd Chin Rifles under the command of Commanding Officer Lieut. Col. Son Kho Pau and Battalion Second in Command Major Thual Khup moved to Prome from Mingaladon by road and rail.

The PVO's and the Red Flag Communists offered their utmost resistance to the in-coming Government troops.

2nd Battalion the Chin Rifles attacked the White and Red Flag Communists in Prome District and re-captured and re-occupied Prome District except Paukkaung and Padaung townships.

In Prome District the leading Rebel Groups - the White and Red Flag Communists and the PVO's made way for the incoming 2nd Battalion. The Chin Rifles, later on and the triumvirate administration of the Insurgents along the Irrawaddy valley upto Prome crumbled away.

After the liberation of Prome District (except Paukkaung and Padaung townships) 2nd Battalion, the Chin Rifles moved on to Thayetmyo town by
land route and liberated Thayetmyo District (except Mindon township) from the domination of the Red Flag Communists.

The Thayetmyo township hospital was recovered intact and the Township Medical Officer Dr. Bakhet was recommended for honour and award on the next Independence day to the then Government of the Union of Burma.

After having handed over the security and administration needs of Thayetmyo District to 1st Battalion the Shan Rifles, 2nd Battalion the Chin Rifles returned to its original assignment, Prome District to clear of the remaining Red Flag Communists in Paukkaung and Padaung townships and to tend into the security and administrative needs of the District.

During the liberation of Prome and Thayetmyo Districts from the tricoloured insurgents, I performed the duty of Battalion Adjutant of 2nd Battalion the Chin Rifles.

In the month of February 1951, I handed over the duty of Adjutant 2nd Chin Rifles to Capt. Kai Za Dal and returned to Company duties as I was very interested in fighting than office staff duties.

I was performing the duty of Company Commander, 'A' Company 2nd Chin Rifles from the month of March 1951.

From the month of April to May 1951, as Force Commander of 'A' Company 2nd Chin Rifles and 'B' Company of 1st Shan Rifles, I attacked the Red Flag Communist under Bo Naga at Okshitpin Battle front in Padaung Township and liberated the township from the domination of the Red Flag Communists.

At Okshitpin Battle front the following Pounder Guns were captured:

(a) One 25" Pounder Gun (nick named Mohein).
(b) One 2½" Pounder Gun (nick named Warazein).

The 25" Pounder Gun was nick named as "Mohein" and the 2½ Pounder Gun was nick named as "Warazein" with which the Red Flag Communists leader Bo Naga and his men pounded and harassed the innocent steamer passengers travelling on double deckers, playing along Irrawaddy River from Yangon to Mandalay in Upper Burma and back.
After having captured 25" and 2½" Pounder Guns from the Red Flag Communists under Bo Naga, the passengers travelling on double deckers along the Irrawaddy River from Yangon to Mandalay in Upper Burma and back, could travel freely with peace of mind and without any more hindrance from the Red Flag Communists.

The photo of officers and men of 2nd Chin Rifles and 1st Shan Rifles who took part in the military operations against the Red Flag Communists under Bo Naga in Padaung township with their captured 25" and 2½" Pounder Guns was attached as Appendix "I".

From the month of June to the month of August 1951 as Force Commander of 'A' and 'D' Companies of 2nd Chin Rifles I attacked the Red Communists in Paukkaung township and recaptured and re-occupied the township from the hand of the Red Flag Communists.

After having recaptured and re-occupied Padaung and Paukkaung townships in Prome District I handed over the duty of Company Commander of 'A' Company 2nd Chin Rifles Paukkaung to my Company 2nd-in-Commander Capt. San Uk.

On 19.9.1951 I left Burma for United Kingdom by BOAC aircraft to attend three Military Training Courses.

On 20.9.1951 at 5:30 P.M. I arrived at London Airport safely.

After having completed and passed the under mentioned three Military Training Courses in the United Kingdom, I arrived back to Burma by Staffordshire ship on 16.4.1952.

(a) Technical and Chemical Warfare
Course No 11 (Officers)
Joint School of Chemical Warfare
Winterbourne Gunner
Salisbury Wiltshire
United Kingdom.
70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHIN NATIONAL DAY
(20TH FEBRUARY 2018)

Brief history of the Chin National Day. From 18th to 22nd February 1948, 5 000 delegates from every corner of Chinland gathered together in Falam, the then capital of the land, to discuss several topics concerning the future destiny of the Chin people. So, the overwhelming majority of the delegates (only 17 were against it) voted on the 20th February for the abolition of the age-old Chin feudalism. Then on 9th October 1950, MPs from various Chin political parties in the Ministry of Chin Affairs decided to recognize this day as the Chin National Day. However, the Chins were not allowed to celebrate it officially nationwide until February 20, 2013. It was the 65th anniversary.

Special Note: The Mizos in the then Lushai Hills waged a 20-year-old (1966-1986) armed struggle against the central Indian government for independence. However, they later agreed to accept statehood. They then chose the 20th February as the Mizoram Inauguration Day to symbolize the unity of all the Chin/Zo people. Since then several Chin/Zo communities from both sides often celebrate THIS DAY together wherever they are.

* Originally created in this form by Thang Za Dal. May 2018.

* I added the Special Note in July 2022.
Israel's 70th birthday celebrations

A round-up of Independence Day festivities around the country gives you plenty of options to pick from.

By Yocheved Lauren Laufer
April 14, 2018 21:27

If you haven’t heard or seen the signs plastered all over the country, Israel is celebrating 70 years of independence on Wednesday evening April 18 and Thursday, April 19. All the usual Independence Day festivities will be bigger and more extravagant for the state’s momentous anniversary, with every Israeli organization and establishment marking the occasion even better than they did last year. The Jerusalem Post compiled a list of events going on all over the country so wherever you and your family are stationed, you can find endless activities and events to choose from. All events are free unless otherwise noted.

APPENDIX N

Chin Resource Lailun Foundation

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CHIN NATIONAL DAY

(perhaps the most trenchant single postmortem of our much acclaimed day: have we ever made an in-depth study?)

October 6, 2005

By No Than Kap

INTRODUCTION:

On the 9th of October 1950, the then Chin Affairs Council proclaimed the 20th of February 1948, Chin National Day. From that time onward, February 20th of every year became the National Day of the Chin People. Thus, February 20th is not only regarded as a memorable day, it is promulgated as the national day. This kind of proclamation calls for in-depth study and thorough analysis of the case. It is an affair of the whole nation and a challenge to every Chin. So let us examine the matter exhaustively.

(The italics here in INTRODUCTION is mine. tzd)

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE ISSUE

About Chin National Day, some argue that it's not only the 20th of February 1948, that is so important, but also the 20th of February 1918 and 1940. For on those two days, certain memorable events for the uplift of the Chin people took place, too. Even without the 20th of February 1948, February 20th could still be a landmark in Chin history.

Among those who hold this view, the statement of Mindat Zuzin (alias Ke Khui Sing) might be most explicit. In Chin National Day Golden Jubilee Magazine, he writes: "... On the 20th of February 1918, the Chin Education Uplift Society was formed at Maymyo (now Pyn-Oo-Lwin), and groundwork for the Chin people started.... On the 20th of February 1940, British rulers (Mcracken, the Commissioner of Magwe Division; Naylor, the Deputy Commissioner of Falam; and Poo Nyo, the Superintendent of Kanpetlet) attended a mass meeting at Kanpetlet. When those British officials turned down the demand of the people, the Chin Hills Union Organization, led by Vawntu Mawng, and the masses numbering about 1,000 reacted in outrage, and the three officials fled in terror..." (Chin National Day: Golden Jubilee Commemorative Magazine, p. 70. Translated from Burmese by the author).

In that same Magazine, Robert Siang Lian wrote an article on the Chin National Day, but did not mention the 20th of February, 1918 at all. It might be that he did not deem it worth mentioning, or did not accept it as one of the days which brought about the Chin National Day. Also, unlike Mindat Zuzin, who put the year of the episode at Kanpetlet 1940, Robert Siang Lian recorded it as 1938, not 1940. Moreover, according to Siang Lian, the number of the members who attended the meeting was "about 300 members of the Chin Hills Union Organization, ...and about 300 government servants ...altogether about 600)," and not 1,000 (cf. Chin National Day: op. cit, English Section, p. 24). Note that according to Siang Lian, there was no ordinary working class, i.e., the masses who attended the meeting, but in Zuzin's record the masses numbered about 1,000.
Contact was made with both of them by phone on the 17th of February 2004 to find out the reasons for the discrepancies between the two versions of the affair. Both of them affirmed that they have written evidences to document their respective claims. After three days, (that is, on the 20th of February 2004), Mindat Zuzin included the two events of February 20, 1918 and 1940, in his Chin National Day speech, emphasizing their importance once again.

That same night, Mindat Zuzin was asked if he had written documents to prove that the Chin Education Uplift Society was formed on the 20th of February 1918 at Maymyo. His answer was negative, but he did mention the fact that on that day the Chin Education Uplift Society (one of the leaders was Vawmtu Mawng) made a protest against the decision of the British authorities to rescind the teaching of Burmese language in Chinland.

In light of the above ambiguous and somewhat contradicting assertions, it became clear that regarding the origin of Chin National Day, the statement of Vawmtu Mawng, the vice chairman of the Chin Education Uplift Society which was founded in February 1918, and the chairman of the Chin Hills Union Organization that had direct confrontation with the British authorities in 1940, is most reliable and authentic. Moreover, it may not be wrong to say that Vawmtu Mawng was a key figure who championed the promulgation of the Chin National Day.

On the 20th of February 1951, at 10:00 am, Vawmtu Mawng delivered a speech on Chin National Day at Mindat. In his message he mentioned briefly the years 1918 and 1940 in connection with their resistance against the English, but did not elaborate on the incidents of February 20, 1918 and 1940, nor include them in the factors that brought about Chin National Day. Below is a short excerpt from his message:

"The Southern Chins, in particular, had always been joining hands with the Burmese revolutionaries and fighting against the British rulers over the education system in 1918, over religion in 1927, and over administration in 1935" (Chin National Day: op. cit, Burmese Section, p. 60. Translated from Burmese by the author)

As seen above, Vawmtu Mawng did not even mention on which date or month of 1918 the Chin Education Uplift was formed. Neither did he mention the year 1940. However, in that same message, he did declare in the clearest terms that the event on 20th February 1948 was the true cause for the birth of Chin National Day:

"A general meeting was held in Falam and was attended by about 5,000 representatives of the Chin people. Among several proposals, proposal number four, which was put forward on the 20th of February 1948 was the main factor that gave birth to Chin National Day (Chin National Day: op. cit, Burmese Section, p. 65.)" Therefore, only Vawmtu Mawng's statement, which was that the decision made on the 20th February 1948, was the primary and sole cause of the founding of the Chin National Day, is reasonable and acceptable. It is, quite obvious that the statement of Vawmtu Mawng is most definite and worth analyzing with regard to how Chin National Day came into being.

On the other hand, the claims of others that both February 20th of 1918 and of 1940 needs to be taken into account for the birth of Chin National Day appears to be just an attempt to vindicate the designation of February 20th as Chin National Day.

In fact, if one gives much importance to the incident at Kanpetlet on the 20th of February 1940, in which the interests of Vawmtu Mawng's group and the British's collided, the rebellion of the Sim tribe and the Hakas in 1917 against the British, as well as the resistances of the Siyin, Kamhau, and Tlausun, etc., during the invasion of Chinland by the British troops count, too. Ignoring these incidents while emphasizing the activities of Vawmtu
Mawng and party to the extent of making it the foundation of Chin National Day is tantamount to doing injustice to history. It also means groping for pretexts that the 20th of February 1948, is not the only day that bred Chin National Day. Moreover, the protest made in 1918 was to say "no" to the decision of the Bristish government to replace the teaching of Burmese in Chinland with the teaching of the Chin language. That means Vawmtu Mawng's Chin Education Uplift Society prefers teaching Burmese to Chin language in Chinland. So, can we, the Chins, praise the protest which was made to deny the teaching of Chin language in the Chin schools? May it never be!

There are two reasons that February 20, 1948, is regarded as a glorious day for the Chins. One is that on that day the first congress of the representatives of the entire Chin Hills was successfully held. Concerning this Robert Siang Lian writes:

"[20th February, 1948] is a landmark in the history of Chin Hills because it was the first time that all the Chins were able to hold the general meeting and achieved national unity among themselves. So, 20th February is an historic and meaningful day for the Chins, because all the Chins were able to achieve national solidarity on this very day." (Robert Siang Lian, Chin National Day and National Unity, CND, GJC Magazine, p. 26). The date inside the brackets is the author's addition.

When Siang Lian said, "It is a landmark in the history of Chin Hills because it was the first time that all the Chins were able to hold the general meeting and achieve national unity among themselves," he seems to emphasize the unity they achieved more than the reason they achieved that unity, or the purpose of having that unity. This view of Siang Lian is shared by many others, too. If one glorifies the 20th of February 1948, on the grounds that the first Chin congress was held and national unity was achieved on that day, and overlooks or ignores the cause of such event, it is disagreeable because it could suggest that any unity attained even for a mean purpose could be glorified. This is unacceptable simply because when people unite to do something wrong, that unity, in itself, is already wrong. The act of unifying to do wrong things cannot be appreciated or valued. So, in the final analysis, without knowing the reason for achieving unity on February 20th, one cannot conclude that this day is either glorious or honorable. It is, indeed, a landmark in Chin history, but this fact does not necessarily qualify it as honorable or glorious.

In other words, if we honor February 20th just because it is the day that national unity was attained, we may be taking the matter too lightly. However, if we commemorate February 20th because unity was achieved for an honorable cause, the day deserves hailing. The reason it happened is more important than what happened and how it happened. Another motive for holding February 20, 1948, in great esteem is that "the rule of the hereditary chiefs" ended on that day. This aspect puts greater emphasis on the reason, and can be clearly seen in the message of Chin Affairs minister Vawmtu Mawng:

" On the 9th of October 1950, the Chin Affairs Council declared the 20th of February 1948, the Chin National Day not only because the Chins were freed from the yokes of blood-sucking hereditary chiefs who obstruct the development of the Chin people, but also because the rule by the elected Councilors was introduced on that day."

(Chin National Day: op. cit, Burmese Section, p. 66. Translated from Burmese by the author).

Here Vawmtu Mawng stated clearly the reason for attaining solidarity among the Chins. According to him, the reason for designating February 20th as a glorious day is that on that day (1) the system of hereditary chieftaincy was ended and (2) a new government system (the rule by the elected Councilors) was introduced.
Which country in the world has ever marked the day on which their old governing system changed as their national day? If an independence day is named 'national day', that is a different story. In that case we would call the day we attained independence from an alien nation our national day. After that we would be under no other nation’s rule. Only then should we celebrate that day as our national day. The Singaporeans call their independence day (August 9) their national day. And it is reasonable and acceptable because they were governed by no other nation from that day forward. We, the Chins, did not call the day we attained independence from the British our national day. Because we do not now live freely, as our forefathers did at one time, the day cannot qualify as our "National Day."

Some may argue that our national day is not the day on which our forefathers' administrative system ended, but the day the British era chiefs ceased. The bottom line is that the Chin chiefs under the British ruled their subjects mostly in the same manner our forefathers ruled their ancient land. So, dismissing the British era chiefs soon after independence is tantamount to rejecting the governing system of our forefathers. Therefore, the day the British era chiefs ended was the day the administrative system of our forefathers (the invaluable part of our culture) became null and void.

In short, the day of ending the governing system of a nation is not the same as the day of gaining independence by that nation. They are two separate things that have different significances. Therefore, February 20th, the day on which our forefathers' governing system was changed and discarded, is not worth calling "Chin National Day"; and naming it "the birthday of the Chins (Lai Phun Suah Ni)," is meaningless; nay, it is ridiculous. Even if we recognize the 20th of February 1948, as the day the Chin people achieved national unity for the first time, we would rather call it "Chin Union Day" than national day.

It is usual that when a governing system of a country becomes obsolete, the populace or the government substitute it with a better system. Thus, if the day the governing system is changed is called the national day or the founding day of a nation, some countries would have more than ten nation founding days, for the longer the history of a nation, the more likely it is that that nation has had different kinds of governing systems.

Vawmtu Mawng elucidated why he called the chiefs blood suckers and hinderers of the development of the Chin people, as shown below:

**Grain tribute:** Each house had to pay half a bushel of maize, millet, etc., to the chief annually.

**Labour:** One member of each house had to work one to three days a year in the fields of the chief.

**Meat tribute:** Whenever a villager bagged an animal he had to give some specified portions to the chief.

To free them from those *sufferings*, 5,000 men who attended the February 20, 1948, conference at Falam voted in favor of eliminating the hereditary chieftaincy in the Chin Hills, and only 17 objected to the proposal." (Chin National Day: op. cit, p. 65. *Italic is the author's*).

If one compares what Vawmtu Mawng enumerated as the sufferings of the Chins under their chiefs with the sufferings of other nations under their suppressive rulers, the sufferings of the Chins are not at all worse or more severe. Therefore, it is not proper or fair to call our chiefs blood suckers or obstructers of development. About development in those days, history tells us that the ignorance of the people as a whole and their isolation from the outside world for centuries, coupled with the British's unwillingness to educate them, are the main factors that hinder development.
To enable us to judge rightly how severely we suffered under our chiefs, we need to study the sufferings of others under their own rulers. We will not need to look at different peoples. Just a glimpse at God’s chosen people, the Israelites, will be enough for us to see things in a proper perspective. Setting aside the sufferings of the Israelites under alien kings, the hardships they endured under their own kings was not at all lighter than what the Chins suffered under their chiefs. Let us examine how Israelites should suffer under their kings, namely Saul, David, Solomon, etc., as foretold by the LORD. "He (your king) will take your sons and appoint them for his own chariots and to be his horsemen, and some will run before his chariots. He will appoint captains over his thousands and captains over his fifties, will set some to plow his ground and reap his harvest, and some to make his weapons of war and equipment for chariots. He will take your daughters to be perfumers, cooks and bakers. And he will take the best of your fields, your vineyards, and your olive groves, and give them to his servants. He will take a tenth of your grain and of your vintage, and give it to his officers and servants. And he will take your menservants and your maidservants and your finest young men and your donkeys, and put them to his work. He will take a tenth of your sheep. And you will be his servants." (1 Sam 8:10-17).

And so the Israelites had their own kings for hundreds of years and endured untold hardships without grudging. They knew that to have their own land with their own kings was the way in which they could show the world that they were a sovereign, independent nation.

To make the contrast more clear, let us compare the sufferings of the Israelites under their own kings to the sufferings of the Chins under our own rulers.

*Did we do as much works for our chiefs as the Israelites did for their kings?*
No. We work for our chiefs just one or two days in a year.

*Did our chiefs ever use some of our daughters as their cooks and perfumers?*
Far from it. Our chiefs were never lustful. They kept a very high moral standard and they led exemplary lives.

*Did our chiefs ever confiscate our best fields and gardens and give them to their servants just as the kings of Israel did?*
Not at all. Everyone had his own fields which could be passed on to his descendents.

*Did our rulers ever force our sons to forge the arsenal for the warriors?*
Never. Every village had its own blacksmith who earned his living justly by working in his smithy.

*Did our chiefs ever demand one tenth of our grain?*
Nay. Only half a bushel a year was demanded.

*Did our chiefs ever take away our best domestic animals?*
Never.

*Did our chiefs ever take our best servants?*
Never. They had their own servants who came to them voluntarily to become servants, and those who were captured for slaves.

*Did our chiefs use their subjects like slaves?*
No. When a man did a wrong thing he was judged fairly, according to the law of the land. The punishment was meted out fairly, in proportion to his wrongdoing. Moreover, whenever a man was judged, the chiefs never did it alone; he was always assisted by his councilors. Even the slaves were treated humanly and very leniently. Slaves were permitted to mix freely with members of their host family, as if they were legitimate members of the family. A slave could even marry his master's daughter and became his heir.

If this is true, why are we, the Chins, so resentful about having our own chiefs? Why can we not take pride in the days when we were under our own chiefs with quite a perfect governing system and quite a rich culture? As a matter of fact, the rejection of our own rulers shows that our magnificence has worn down, our noble-mindedness has frayed, and we are on our way to becoming a people of no status.

If we look at the history of Israel further, we see that they had no kings for more than 300 years, i.e., during the time the apostasy and oppression covered the whole land. As recorded in Judges 21:25, "In those days there was no king in Israel: every one did what was right in his own eyes." That period is called min-meh-naing-ngan [lawless country] in Burmese. In min-meh-naing-ngan people usually behave like beasts; there are no taboos of any sort. How fortunate we were to have chiefs (rulers) in the days of our forefathers so that our Chinland was never in the category of min-meh-naing-ngan.

Every governing system in the world has its advantage and disadvantage. Even so-called democracy has its advantages and disadvantages. So, to point out only the weaknesses of any governing system, including the chieftainship of the Chin people, to the extent of making it a dark age without considering its advantages is tantamount to doing injustice to the history of mankind. It also shows that we are vengeful people with ignoble mentality. We might regard our olden-day rulers as harsh and pitiless when, in fact, they carried disciplined judgment in one hand and mercy in the other. Therefore, they can be classed as expert rulers (chiefs) of their day.

Our neighbors such as the Arakans, Indians, and Burmese had kings. We can read from history books that those kings, too, had shortcomings. The sufferings of the people under their kings might not be lighter than that of the Israelites, but those nations never celebrate the fall of their kings and the end of their kingdoms. For instance, the Burmese do not mark the day on which their last king was taken prisoner as their national day. On the contrary, even today they long for their days of kuh-min-kuh-chin, kuh-`thi-kuh-nan[one's own kingdom]. They are not ashamed of their kings and rulers.

We, Chins, ought to be like them. We ought to follow their way of thinking in this regard. Even if the way of living and the system of government of our forefathers were not so advanced, they deserve our recognition and esteem. If we are ashamed of our parents, our ancestors and their lifestyle, and see only the weaknesses of our past rulers, and celebrate the day their rule ends as the founding day of our nation, there will not be a more degenerate and despicable people on earth than we are.

Lamentably, we often teach our young people to be happy when they ought not be happy, and inculcate in them a keenness to take pride in things for which they should not be proud. We instill in them hatred and contempt for our old chiefs as if they were despots. Thus, we create a complex situation in which it is difficult for our young people to differentiate between what is right and what is wrong, what is white and what is black. Some of our learned men are very fond of preaching and writing in condemnation of our old chiefs, but dare not utter a word or jot a line in despise for the alien rulers. Can we call such a deed gallantry? No. Can we call such writers men of
insight? Nay. Can we call such people patriots? Not at all. They are just the bearers of pointed spears of grudge and hatred.

Truly speaking, the day on which the rule of the chiefs ended is the day the Chin governing system, which our forefathers had adopted for centuries, came to an end. Every clean-hearted man with deep insight will say that the old governing system of our forefathers is an invaluable part of our Chin culture.

Are we to say, then, that the system of hereditary chieftaincy should be continued up to this day? No. Are we to say that the wish of the majority on the 20th of February 1948, is to be relegated? Nay. Even today the wish of the Chin majority is to abolish the system of chieftaincy. If this is so, shall we disregard the wish of the majority? Not at all. There is no better thing than to introduce a new administrative system, according to the needs of the day, which will benefit the people. But the day on which the administrative system changed is not the national day of the country concerned. However good the new governing system may be, the day on which it is adopted should not, nay, cannot be called the national day of any country. One simple reason for this is that we have changed our governing systems not less than three times after 1948 (in 1962, 1974, and 1988). That would give us more than three national days already. It is absurd.

The uneasiness for the loss of our administration system does not mean, though, that it should be re-introduced; it only means that it ought not be condemned too utterly.

Some would argue that even if February 20th is not called "Laiphun Suah Ni (the birthday/founding day of the Chins" it is still "Chin Phunpi Ni (great race day/national day)". To call it "Chin Phunpi Ni" would not be sensible for, we did not become a great race, or superior race, on that day; we were already a great race long before that fateful day. Some may say that we should continue to celebrate this February 20th since we, Chins, do not have other days for gathering together in unity. But celebrating February 20th will not enhance the forging of the Chin unity, for the concept of its use is already wrong. It is important to note that we can have unity without February 20th. There is no tangible benefit for celebrating February 20th. The drawback of commemorating February 20th far outweighs the benefit. It is sad if the 20th of February celebration is the only way for the young Chins to meet one another and to renew their spirit of unity, for to celebrate with merriment the day on which one part of our invaluable culture is buried implies that we are still politically naïve and immature in our judgments.

CONCLUSION

It is good for the Chins to have a day which is worthy of celebration but if there is no such day, let it be. It is not proper to keep February 20th as our national day just for the sake of having a national day. If we are so inclined and determined to have such a national day, why don't we find a day in 1921 on which the decision to replace Burmese language with Chin language in the Chin Hills schools was made? If we decline to call the day on which the decision to teach Chin language in Chin schools our National Day, we have no other day, so far, that is fit to be called our national day.

On the other hand, the proposal made by some Chin leaders that December 4th should be the Chin National Day seems to be unconvincing and unacceptable. We were not told that any event deserving to be called a landmark in the history of Chins ever took place on that day. The other suggestion that the term Chin National Day should be changed to "Chin Special Division Day" or "Chin State Day" is also not reasonable and fitting, because gaining a political status of a Special Division or State is not worth hailing, in the first place, for a nation that had been living freely and under no foreign rule for centuries.
The fondest dream is to call our independence day "National Day." Nevertheless, we have not had such a day since the British came and conquered our land. Therefore,

1. If we still wish to mark February 20th as a memorable day, it might be more appropriate and meaningful to call it "Chin Union Day" instead of "Chin National Day".

2. The prudent study of the Chin history leads us to conclude that, so far, the day that deserves to be called "Chin National Day" is the day the decision was made to replace the teaching of alien languages in schools in Chinland with national (Chin) language.

EPILOGUE

There are some Chins who think that the Kawlte (Burmeses) have always opposed our having National Day, and had attempted to abolish it by changing the term National to Union or People, etc. Moreover, they see as a stooge and henchman of the Kawlte any Chin who dares to question the worthiness of celebrating our National day on February 20, 1948. To the best of my knowledge, the Kawlte never tried to change National with Union or People. However, they tried to change Chin National Day with Chin Special Division Day in 1966.

This is what I know about the Kawlte's involvement:

The security committee of Chin Hills (the chairman being Kawl) had a meeting on the 6th of January 1966 at Tedim High School. At that meeting the committee decided to change the term Chin National Day to Chin Special Division Day. This decision was reaffirmed at the meeting held on the 31st of January 1966 at No.1 Kaleymyo High School, and was endorsed by Party Supervisor Chairman Maj. Mynt Thein on the 19th of February 1966.

However, this decision was turned down by the Revolutionary Council at Yangon (by the same Kawl leaders). The statement issued by the Revolutionary Council at Yangon on the 25th of November 1966 says, "Chin National Day is Chin National day (Chin Amyotha Nih di Chin Amyotha Nih ta hlin phit di)," and thus reaffirms the term Chin National Day. In other words, though some lower rank Kawlte tried to change Chin National Day with Chin Special Division Day, the higher authorities did not want to change it.

So, it is inaccurate to classify as a stooge or henchman of the Kawlte anyone who opposes the term Chin National Day, or the use of February 20th as the assigned date of commemoration. For instance, in 1956, Pu Za Hre Lian, the former Chin Affairs Minister, proposed to celebrate Chin National Day on the 4th of December instead of the 20th of February for his own reasons. But we know that he neither did it just to please the Kawlte nor was asked to do it.

Note: I am including this article in this Paper of mine in the hope that the opinions expressed herein by the author (Pu No Than Kap) could give both strangers and the Zo people themselves alike a different perspective in looking back at the Zo/Chin history (see also APPENDIX 1). Pu No Than Kap (in his mid 40s) is a former Chin politician and now living in Burma. I myself have marked some key information pieces in blue color to highlight them.

Thang Za Dal. November, 2009

See 15.8.1 ABOLITION OF FEUDALISM IN CHINLAND AND MIZORAM AND THE BIRTH OF

CHIN NATIONAL DAY AND MIZORAM STATE INAUGURATION DAY
Cachar Hills were declared “Backward Tracts” or “Backward Areas”. On 1 April 1937, these districts were given Excluded Area status within Assam, and as a result, they were administered directly by the Governor of Assam.

To sum up the overall political and social developments in western Zoram there were eight major factors that had played crucial roles in shaping the present destiny of the people therein.

- The arrival and conquer of the British.
- The introduction and imposition of the Inner Line Regulation of 1873 by the then British Government which is till in existence until today. This Regulation prevents people from other parts of India to freely enter and settle in Mizoram.
- The Chin-Lushai Conference held in 1892. This conference sealed the fate of the entire Zo people forever.
- The arrival of Christian missionaries from the West and the creation and introduction of script.
- The First World War. More than 2,000 young men from the former Lushai Hills had volunteered to join the Labour Corps during this war in Europe. They saw how big the world was and modern technical advances in the outside world. This experience opened their eyes and motivated them to strive for education and for better life.
- World War II. The Second World War reached their homeland and this paved the way for national and political consciousnesses for the first time.
- The founding of the Mizo Commoners' Union in 1946, which was later changed to the Mizo Union (MU), and the United Mizo Freedom Organisation (UMFO) in 1947. The MU's two most distinguished achievements were the successful abolition of the centuries-old feudalism in the Mizo society, and its submission of the MIZO MEMORANDUM in 1947 to the Government of British India. The two political parties had undertaken political activities for the future political destiny of the Zo people.
- The Mautam Famine and the founding of the Mizo National Front

16.2 **MAUTAM AND THE BIRTH OF THE MIZO NATIONAL FRONT (MNF)**

(The two quotes below are from *Vumson*, pp. 265-67)

Every 48 years, a cyclic ecological phenomenon called Mautam leads to widespread famine in this region. When such a famine started in 1959, the Mizos were disappointed by the Assam Government's handling of the situation.
**Explanation for previous page:**

**“Formerly there was unrestricted intercourse between British subjects in the plains of Assam and the wild tribes living across the frontier. But there broke out frequent quarrels and, sometimes, serious disturbances between the former and the latter. This was particularly the case in connection with the traffic in rubber brought down by the tribes, for which there was great competition. The extension of tea gardens, as mentioned earlier, beyond the border line also frequently involved the Government in troublesome disputes with the hillmen. To obviate friction Government of India decided that certain special rules should be laid down by taking up special powers. Accordingly, in 1872, the provisions of Act XXXII Vict., Cap. 3, Section 1, was made applicable with effect from the 1st January 1873 in Cachar and the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Subsequently the Bengal Eastern Frontier Regulation 1 of 1873 was passed for the frontier districts. This Regulation had given power to the Lieutenant Governor to prescribe a line to be called the “Inner Line” in each of the tribal areas beyond which no British subjects or those of specified classes could pass without a licence. Accordingly Inner Line started on the southern frontier to the District of Cachar, from the site of the outposts established during the Lushai Expedition of 1871-72…” (Lalrimawia, p. 75)

“...Needless to say, the Lushai Hills Inner Line had been an effective instrument in checking large scale immigration of undesirable foreigners into the district. Had not been this Regulation introduced, the district might have been completely infiltrated, like those of Tripura and Assam and in a lesser degree, Meghalaya and Manipur. Fortunately, the Hills had been safeguarded and foreigner’s problem has not been a serious issue like most of the North-Eastern states, but the Chakmas of Chittagong Hill Tracts have been in the habit of immigrating into Chakma District in the Southern Mizoram, the number of which has suddenly been increasing during the past 8 years (1977-85)...With an attempt to free themselves from the hands of Bangladesh’s soldiers and escape cruel punishment, a large number of Chakmas have been entering within Mizoram. If this is not checked effectively, there is every possibility of their out-numbering the Mizo population in the next few decades within their own territory. Since the issue of permit for entry and residential passes had been restricted, there were only a few Bengali families of shopkeepers who had been in possession of residential houses of their own within the district. Nonetheless, there exists a number of Nepalese who had been settling and acquiring land in different parts of the district. Even this is not a serious problem. The material result of all this is that, not like Assam, Meghalaya and Tripura, most of the rich people and big contractors belong to the Mizo community themselves.” (Ibid, pp. 80-81)

.................................................................

The introduction of Assamese as the official language of the state in 1960, without any consideration for the Mizo language, led to further discontent and protests.

16.3 **THE MIZO NATIONAL FRONT SET UP AN UNDERGROUND GOVERNMENT**

“The leaders of the MU, who were pro-Assam and pro-India, were in control of the district administration since independence. However, in 1963 they realized that they had failed to bring the district forward economically and that they had lost their popularity among the people. To regain their popularity and to counter the MNF’s campaign for independence, they took a more nationalistic approach. The MNF was split in 1962 into two factions on the ground of strategies and tactics to be used for the achievement of its goal of independendence.

Laldenga, Lalnummawia and Sainghaka secretly went to East Pakistan in the first week of December 1963 for secret talks with Pakistani agents. They were promised arms and financial support in their struggle for independence. However, when they came back to Mizoram they were arrested by the Assam police and jailed for one month. As soon as they were released, the MNF secretly formed up an underground Mizo Government with the following personalities holding various portfolios: Laldenga (President); Lalnummawia (Vice-President); Lalkhawliana (Finance Secretary); R. Zamawia (Defence Secretary); Sainghaka (Home Secretary); and J.F. Manliana (Chief Justice). Rao describes the MNF government as follows:

The MNF set up its own Government. It had a President and a Council of Ministers in charge of Home,
Defence, Foreign, Finance, and Public Information. There was also a Parliament with Speaker and members who were all selected by an Executive Committee. The whole of Mizoram was divided into four administrative divisions, each under a Chief Commissioner. Each division was divided into four subdivisions and each sub-division under a Deputy Commissioner. There was a national judiciary headed by the Chief Justice. In each administrative area there were judges for the administration of justice. There was also a Mizo National Army under a Chief of Staff who was assisted by others. The pay of all officers was Rs. 15 per month - equal pay for unequal work. (Ibid, p. 277)

The underground Mizo Government then sent a number of young men to Pakistan to work out the army deal. At the beginning of 1965 a shipment of arms arrived in Mizoram. It was the first outfit for the Mizo National Volunteers (MNV), who made up the Vanapa or V Battalion. In late 1965 and early 1966 the MNF was in frantic but secret preparation for the taking-over of the military, and civil administration of Mizoram. The MNF’s military wing, which was 20,000-manstrong, was put under the command of General Sawmvela and it was divided into four commands, namely the Eastern, Western, Southern and Northern. The leading commanders of the Mizo forces were Charlie Lalkhawliana, Lalthmimgthanga, Thangzuula, Sawmvela, Biakchhunga, Bualhranga, Vanlalngaia and Ngurchhina.

16.4 THE ARMED UPRISING AND ITS CONSEQUENCES


...The extremist section within MNF advocated the use of violence to seek independence from India. A special armed wing called the Mizo National Army (MNA) was created for the purpose. The MNA consisted of eight infantry "battalions" organised on the pattern of the Indian Army. One of the battalions was named after Joshua, while the rest were named after the legendary Mizo heroes: Chawngbawia, Khuangchera, Lalvunga, Saizahawla, Taitesena, Vnapa and Zampui Manga. The Lion Brigade (Chawngbawia, Khuangchera, Saizahawla and Taitesena battalions) operated in the northern half of the district, while the Dagger Brigade (Joshua, Lalvunga, Vnapa and Zampui Manga) operated in its southern half. MNA consisted of around 2000 men, supported by another group called the Mizo National Volunteers (MNV), which comprised of an equal number of irregulars.

In the early 1960s, the MNF leaders, including Laldenga, visited East Pakistan (now Bangladesh), where the Government of Pakistan offered them supplies of military hardware and training. Laldenga and his lieutenant Lahnunmawia were arrested by the Government of Assam on the charge of conspiring against the nation, but were released in February 1964 after an undertaking of good conduct by Laldenga. However, shortly after their release, MNF intensified its secessionist activities. The MNF members forcibly collected donations from the Mizos, recruited volunteers and trained them with arms supplied by Pakistan. By the end of 1965, the MNF weapon cache consisted of the plastic explosives stolen from the Border Roads Organisation, rifles and ammunition obtained from the 1st Assam Rifles (AR) headquartered at Aizawl, crude bombs and stenguns.

The March 1966 Mizo National Front uprising was a revolt against the Government of India, aimed at establishing a sovereign state for the Mizos. On 1 March 1966, the MNF made a declaration of independence, after launching coordinated attacks on the Government offices and security forces posts in different parts of the Mizo Hills District. The Government suppressed the uprising and recaptured all the places seized by the MNF by 25 March 1966, although the MNF continued its rebellion with less intense attacks over the next few years. The Indian armed forces, fresh from the Sino-Indian War of 1962 and the Indo-Pakistani War of 1965, were focused on the Indo-Pakistan and Indo-China borders. The extremist MNF leaders wanted to take advantage of this situation by starting an armed rebellion to establish an independent Mizo nation. The rehabilitation of the pro-Government Chakma refugees from East Pakistan in the Mizo district further instigated them.

During the Government’s operations to suppress the rebellion, the Indian Air Force carried out airstrikes in Aizawl. The security forces stationed in the Mizo district included the 1st Assam Rifles (AR) headquartered at Aizawl, the 5th Border Security Force (BSF) and the local police. On the night of 28 February/1 March 1966, the MNF launched a series of simultaneous attacks on the 1st AR garrisons at Aizawl, Lunglei and Champhai and the 5th BSF posts at Chawngte, Demagiri, Hnahlan, Marpara, Tipaimukh, Tuipang, Tuipuibari, Vaphai and Vaseitlang.

16.6 THE MIZO NATIONAL FRONT DECLARED INDEPENDENCE ON MARCH 1, 1966

The following is the original declaration in full text:

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE BY THE MIZO NATIONAL FRONT

In the course of human history it becomes invariably necessary for mankind to assume their social, economic and political status to which the law of nature and Nature's God entitles them. We hold this truth to be self-evident that all men are created equal, and that they are endowed with inalienable fundamental human rights and dignity of human person; and to secure these rights Governments are instituted among men deriving their just power from the consent of the government and whatever any form of Government become destructive to this end, it is the right of the people to alter, change, modify and abolish it and to institute a new government and laying its foundation on such principles and organization its power in such forms as to them shall see most likely to effect their rights and dignity. The Mizo, created and molded into a nation and nurtured as such, by Nature's God have been intolerably dominated by the people of India in contravention of the Law of nature.

The leaders of Mizo nation had, many a time, verbally and in writing, put forward to the government of India, their desire of self-determination for creation of free and independent Mizoram for bringing about protection of Human rights and dignity, which the Mizo, by nature, ought to have, but the Government of India, violating the Charter of the United Nations and its Universal Declaration of Human rights re-affirmed in the Principles of Bandung Conference, have ignored the voice of the Mizo people and are determined to continue domination and colonization ruling over us with tyranny and despotism by instituting self designed administrative machinery with which they endeavour to mislead the world to win their confidence.

Our people are despised, prosecuted, tortured, manhandled and murdered without displaying justice while they preach and proclaim before us and before the world that they have instituted for us a separate administrative set up in conformity with the principles of democracy. To conceal their evil and selfish
design of religious assimilation and Hindu indoctrination they preach that have established which we cannot accept as it leads to suppression of Christianity.

To prove this, let facts be submitted:

1. They have instituted Government to rule over us in our own country without any respect for Human Rights and dignity even in the fact of the present candid world which committed to these rights and dignity.
2. They have been pursuing a policy of exploitative measures in their attempt to wipe out Christianity, sole religion, and no consideration has ever been paid to our national way of life.
3. They have been preaching throughout the world as if they have instituted separate administrative machine in conformity with the principles of Democracy to conceal their policy of degeneration of our national morality and of assimilation while that had been instituted for us is a pattern of colonial administration.
4. They refuse not only to procure supply of food and arrange other forms of assistance in times of famine, but also prohibited us from seeking and receiving assistance from friendly countries which resulted in the death of many people.
5. They have established a multitude of offices and sent hitherto swarms of Indian officers, who had an immoral life cruelly oppressing our womenfolk to commit immorality by taking advantage of their official capacity and of the position they occupy in the administrative machinery.
6. Taking the advantage of economic frustration of the people they subject us to economic slavery and force us to enter into the door of poverty.
7. Curbing freedom of expression, our patriots are arrested and kept in jails without displaying any form of justice.
8. The export facilities which we used to enjoy during the pre-Indian domination, has been totally closed.
9. Without exploring our country's economic resources in agriculture, industries and mining and giving no consideration for their development, they maintain suppressive measures against our economic right.
10. Realizing the importance of our country to India in its defense strategy, the Government of India is establishing military basis throughout our country and thereby creating an atmosphere of cold war while nothing is done for its economic and social development.
11. In spite of our repeated appeal for peaceful settlement of our rightful and legitimate demand for full self- determination, the Government of India is bringing exploitive and suppressive measures employing their military might and waging war against us as done in the case of the Nagas and the Kashmiris.
12. Owing to absence of medical facilities in our countries our people died without having medical treatment and attention.

For these and all other innumerable causes, we declare to the candid world that India is unworthy and unfit to rule over the civilized Mizo people who are created as such and endowed with territorial integrity by nature and Nature's God.

We, therefore, the representatives of Mizo people, meeting on this day, the first of March, in the year of our Lord, nineteen sixty six appealing to the supreme judge of the world for the rectitude of our intention so, in the name and by the authority of the good people of this country solemnly publish and declare, that the Mizoram is, and of rights ought to be free and independent, that they are absolved from all political
connections between them and to Government of India is and ought to be resolved and that as free and independent state, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce and to do all other Acts and Things which independent state may right do. And for the support of this declaration, we appeal to all freedom loving nations and individuals to uphold Human Rights and dignity and to extend help to the Mizo people for realization of our rightful and legitimate demand for self-determination. We appeal to also independent countries to give recognition to the independence of Mizoram.

LALDENGAL
(Source: Pu Lalamlien)

16.7 MIZO ARMED TROOPS CAPTURED TWO TOWNS IN EAST ZORAM (CHIN STATE)
At midnight on 1 May 1966 military posts and police stations in Falam and Teddim towns in Eastern Zoram (Chin State) were overrun by the MNA troops simultaneously, and more than 300 rifles and other small arms and about K. 600,000 fell into their hands. The 800-man troops that captured Falam was commanded by Lieutenant-Colonel Lianhunna; and the troops that captured Teddim were from the Taiteesena or T Battalion under the command of Lieutenant-Colonel Zachuala.

The MNA troops were heartily welcomed and assisted in every possible way by the local people in East Zoram. The Burmese government was in a panic and it immediately dispatched the 24th Burma Rifles and the 42nd Burma Regiment to attack the MNA. The 24th Burma Rifles was commanded by Colonel Ngo Zam, a native of Thuklai village, East Zoram. The MNA troops had underestimated the efficiency of battle-hardened Burmese soldiers, so they withdrew towards Mizoram very recklessly. Colonel Ngo Zam later confided to a few trusted friends that had he wanted to, he could have easily inflicted great losses to the Mizo troops. But he delayed his march intentionally in order to let them escape with as few casualties as possible. Even then the T Battalion still suffered a number of casualties in a few armed clashes.

16.10 ATTAINMENT OF THE UNION TERRITORY STATUS

Despite all the great suffering and losses in terms of human life and materials the MNF was still popular with the people. MNF leaders became respected politicians and civil servants, and the Mizoram government was operating in the shadow of the MNF. At the end of 1981, Laldenga was in New Delhi for negotiations with Mrs. Indira Ghandi. The Indian Government initially agreed to grant the Zo people statehood, and Laldenga accepted it. The negotiations came to a deadlock, however, because of four demands put forward by Laldenga.

They were:

1. Extermination of the power of the Governor in Mizoram. (The real administrator of the Union Territory
of Mizoram was the Lieutenant Governor. The Chief Minister of the State, was only implementing what the Lt. Governor ordered him to do. When Mizoram became a state within India, Laldenga did not want the status quo. He wanted as much self-determination as possible.)

2. Natural resources of the state should belong to the state and the state should have all the rights to exploit and market them.

3. Separate election laws should be created for Mizoram.

4. The Forest Department, which at that time was situated in Silchar, was controlling the state forests in Mizoram. Laldenga wanted the forest department to be under the Mizoram Government.

Laldenga also demanded a separate flag for Mizoram State, but the Indian government rejected the demand as unnegotiable.

There had been several talks between the Indian Government and the Mizo National Front leaders. However, both sides did not give in easily to each other’s demands. Thus negotiations for peace settlement dragged on and on. The main obstacle was Art. 371A of India Govt. Act, which gives the Naga Government the power to control land and its natural resources but refuses the control of law and order.

Laldenga demanded the power over land and its natural resources and also the control of law and order to be under the jurisdiction of the Mizoram Chief Minister, similar to all other Indian states. Another hindernis was Laldenga’s demand of immediately assuming the responsibilities of the Chief Minister of Mizoram, which was unconstitutional as he had not been elected, although Lalthanhawla, the then Chief Minister, announced that he would step down and leave his post vacant in search of peace. In 1971, the Indian Parliament had passed the Twenty-Seventh Amendment Act, and on 21 January 1972, Mrs. Indira Gandhi went to Aizawl and inaugurated the Union Territory of Mizoram. The Mizo Hills District became the Mizoram Union Territory, and Zo leaders now had direct access to the Indian Government without going through the Assam of Assam.

Unlike a District Council, a Union Territory has a Legislative Assembly and a Council of Ministers. The Legislative Assembly of a Union Territory has the authority to make laws in respect of the matters given in the State List and Concurrent List. However, the Assembly of the Union Territory of Delhi was not given control over Public Order, Police, Municipal Committee, Improvement Trust, etc. The ministers were to be responsible to the legislature, and the Chief Commissioner was to preside over their meetings. The President of India was given authority to set up a Council of Advisors. After West Zoram became a Union Territory, the first Mizoram Assembly election was held in March 1972.

16.11 THE BIRTH OF THE MIZORAM STATE

“Rajiv Gandhi's assumption of power following his mother's death signaled the beginning of a new era in Indian politics. Laldenga met the Prime Minister on 15th February 1985. Some contentious issues, which could not be resolved, during previous talks referred to him for his advice. New Delhi felt that Mizo problem had been dragging on for a long time, while the MNF was convinced that bidding farewell to arms to live as respectable Indian Citizens was the only ways of achieving peace and development. Statehood was a prerequisite to the implementing of the accord [Mizoram Accord, 1986] signed between the MNF and the Union Government on 30 June 1986. The document was signed by Laldenga on behalf of MNF, and the Union Home Secretary RD Pradhan on behalf of the Indian Government. Lalkhama, Chief Secretary of Mizoram, also signed the Agreement. While the MNF kept its part of the bargain, the Centre [Central Government] initiated efforts to raise the status of Mizoram to a full fledged State. A Constitution
Amendment Bill and another to confer statehood on Mizoram was passed in the Lok Sabha on 5 August 1986. The formalization of Mizoram State took place on 20th February, 1987. Chief Secretary Lalkhama read out the proclamation of statehood at a public meeting organised at Aizawl's Parade Ground. Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi flew in to Aizawl to inaugurate the new state. Hiteshwar Saikia was appointed as Governor of Mizoram.” (Source: http://mizoram.nic.in/about/history.htm#INSURGENCY)

The Mizoram Accord, officially entitled MIZORAM ACCORD, 1986, MEMORANDUM OF SETTLEMENT* (see APPENDIX BB for full text) was the landmark that restored peace and harmony in the state. Its core points are as follows:

- Handing over of all arms, ammunition, and equipments to the Central Government.
- Preparation for settlement and rehabilitation of underground personnel.
- Conferment of Statehood on the Union Territory of Mizoram.
- The State will be at liberty to adopt any one or more languages for official purposes
- Establishment of a separate university for the state.
- The State to have a High Court of its own.

(*Note: This 28-minute documentary of the Mizo Uprising is richly informative. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7NjY9tK70. I have not yet obtained until the time of this writing reliable statistics on total losses in terms of human life and material during the 20-year war on both sides. tzd)

17.0 PEOPLE

17.1.1 ORIGIN OF THE CHINS

( Colonialists' View - I )

(Carey & Tuck, pp. 2-3)

Origin of the Chins: Our closer connection with the Chins and Lushais during the last five years does not appear to have taught us anything more than we knew twenty years ago of the ethnology of the tribes. Yule in 1855 described the Chins and Lushais as ‘of Indo-Chinese kindred known as Kukis, Nagas, Khynes, and by many more specific names.’ Colonel Hanny identified the Chins with the Nagas of Assam mountains and states that they must be closely allied to the Kukis. In 1866 Colonel Phayre [later Lt-General] classified the Chins living on the north of Arakan as Indo-Chinese. Mr. Taw Sein Kho, Burmese Lecturer at Cambridge, in a pamphlet on the Chins and Kachins bordering on Burma, wrote:

“Ethnically these tribes belong to that vaguely defined and yet little understood stock, the Turanians, which includes among others the Chinese, Tibetans, Manchus, Japanese, Annamese, Siamese, Burmese and the Turks. The evidence of language, so far as it has been studied, leaves little doubt that ages ago China exercised much influence on these Turanian races, whose habitat, it is said, included the whole of at least Northern India before its conquest by the Aryans.”

Mr. MacCabe of the Assam Commission, whose service has been spent among the Nagas, Lushais, and the other hill tribes of the province of Assam, designates the Chin-Lushai family as Indo-Chinese. Captain Forbes calls the race Tibeto-Burman. Mr. B. Houghton of the Burma Commission, in an essay on the language of the Southern (Sandoway) Chins [in present Rakhine State] and its affinities in 1891, writes -
‘As a mere conjecture of the original habitat, & c., of these races the following may be hazarded. At first the stocks may have lived together in Tibet or perhaps a good distance to the West of it...After the departure of the Chinese smaller hordes from time to time poured into India, the largest being the Burman one, which, perhaps by the pressure of the newly arrived Aryans, was forced into Burma. The hillmen of Arakan I would regard as rather later immigrations.’

In the Burma Census Report of 1891 Chin ethnology is dismissed with the remark that the Chins or Kyins are a group of hill tribes, all talking various dialects of the same Tibeto-Burman speech and calling themselves by various names. Without pretending to speak with authority on the subject, we think we may reasonably accept the theory that the Kukis of Manipur, the Lushais of Bengal and Assam, and the Chins originally lived in what we now know as Thibet and are of one and the same stock; their form of government, method of cultivation, manners and customs, beliefs and traditions all point to one origin. As far as the Chins are concerned, we know from our own experience, as well as from the records of Manipur, that the drift of migration has changed and is now towards the north. The Nwite, Vaipei, and Yo Chins, who within the memory of man resided in the Northern Chin Hills, have now almost entirely recrossed the northern border, either into the hills belonging to Manipur or to the south of Cachar, and their old village sites are now being occupied by the Kam Hau clan of Sukte Chins, which also is steadily moving northwards...

Those of the Kuki tribes which we designate as ‘Chins’ do not recognize that name, which is said to be a Burmese corruption of the Chinese ‘Jin’, or ‘Yen’, meaning ‘man’. The Northern Chins call themselves Yo, the Tashons, Haka, and more southern tribes Lai, while the Chins of Lower Burma give their name as Shu...The Chins subordinate to Burma are not contained in the tracts administered from Falam, for besides the Chinbokes, Chinbons, and Chimmes administered from Yawdwin, and the political charge of the Arakan Hill Tracts, the Deputy Commissioner of Minbu, Thayetmyo, Kyaukpyu, and Sandoway all have dealings with Chins who reside in their districts…”

17.1.2 ORIGIN OF THE CHIN
(Colonialists’ View - 2)

_“I believe some people are of the opinion that they were the aboriginal tribes of Upper Burma, and were gradually forced back into the hills, driving back in turn the Lushais, who dwelt in the hills now occupied by the Chins; the Lushais retreating across the Manipur River still further into the hills. After our subjugation and occupation of Upper Burma the Chins began to be a thorn in our side, just as they had been to the King Thibaw, and his predecessors. Thibaw tried sending an army to invade their country; but it was ignominiously defeated, and the troops retired after doing more harm than good to the prestige of the Burmese army.” (The Siyin Chins by F. M. Rundall, Political Officer, Northern Chin Hills.)

17.1.3 ORIGIN OF THE CHINS
(Colonialists’ View - 3)

Geographical and Ethnological
(Reids, pp. 1-5)

“Prior to 1889, the interior of the tract of country known as the Chin-Lushai Hills, was a terra incognita, and, even now, there are probably many members of the general public included in the class of well-
educated to whom the title conveys but little meaning, and in whom it arouses still less interest. Considering of parallel mountain ranges rising to heights of over 9,000 feet, this, the most recent acquisition to Her Majesty’s dominions, embraces every variety of physical feature and climate, from the dense and deadly jungles below, through the tangled mazes of which the ponderous elephant and rhinoceros push their way, to the invigorating summits, crowned with pines, where the sheen of the pheasant’s wing catches the eye, as, with lightning speed, he skims down the mountain side.

People this region with dusky tribes, almost as numerous in dialect and designation as the villages in which they live, owning no central authority, possessing no written language, obeying but the verbal mandates of their chiefs, hospital and affectionate in their homes, usparring of age and sex while on the warpath, untutored as the remotest races in Central Africa, and yet endowed with an intelligence which has enabled them to discover for themselves the manufacture of gun-power. Such in general outline is the Chin-Lushai country, and such were its inhabitants until some years ago they were touched by the transforming wand of civilization...

Considerable confusion arises from the various names under which the inhabitants of the Chin-Lushai Hills have been described. Previous to the Expedition of 1871-72, the wild tribes which had been in the habit of raiding our North-Eastern Frontier, were generally spoken of as “Kukis” - a Bengali word meaning hill-men or highlanders. Since that event, however, the term “Lushai” has come into more common use; and although originally applied to the tribe or tribes occupying the tract immediately to the south of Cachar, is now employed, in a comprehensive sense, to indicate all those living to the west of the Kaladyne river, while those to the east are designated Shendus. On the other side, to any one approaching them from the Burma side, the Shendus would be known as Chins, and divide the people with whom I am going to deal in the following pages into the two broad classes of Lushais and Chins, the course of the Kaladyne river forming the line of demarcation...I believe the Lushais call themselves 'Zao'. 'Chin' is a Burmese term, and on the authority of Colonel Woodthorpe, synonymous with Khyen (pronounced 'Chin').”

17.3.3 PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT

“Physically the Chin is a fine man, taller and stouter than his neighbours in the plains on both the north and east, and although he fell short of the build of the Pathans, his measurements compare more than favourably with those of the Gurkha. It is no uncommon occurrence to find men 5 feet 10 inches and 5 feet 11 inches in height with chest measurement of 39 inches and with a calf measurement of the abnormal size of 16 inches. Individual tall men are found in the Kuki villages immediately south of Manipur and among the Sukte, but the finest built men in the Hills are the Siyins, Hakas and independent southerners.

The Siyins, though small in stature, are splendidly limbed and are the most evenly built tribe in the hills, though the Hakas and independent southerners are as a whole taller and produce the finest individual men. The late Lyenwa of Kotarr and Lalwe of Thangtlang are perfectly proportioned giants with a magnificent development of muscle. The worst built and puniest men in the hills are found amongst the Tashons, who are as a whole distinctly inferior to other tribes in physique and carrying capability...

The carrying capacity of the Chin equals that of the Bhutia and is superior to that of the Gurkha as inasmuch as he is faster. It is not uncommon to find a man carrying 180 lbs. for a 12 mile stage, and a load as 60 lbs. appears hardly to affect the ordinary pace of the carrier, who will march 20 miles in the day. The Chins and the southern Kukis of Manipur being the same race, living in the same class of country and under the same conditions, are, as to be expected, equally good carriers; but for short distances neither
are as fast as the most satisfactory of all the foreign coolies who have worked in the Chin Hills, the Tunkal...” (Carey & Tuck, pp. 165-166)

17.3.4 APPEARANCE AND PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

“All the Lushai Kuki clans resemble each other very closely in appearance and the Mongolian type of countenance prevails. One meets, however, many exceptions, which may be due to the foreign blood introduced by many captives taken from the plains and from neighbouring tribes; but these are not worth considering, and the description of the Kuki written by Lt. Stewart close on 80 years ago cannot be improved on. The Kukis are a short, sturdy race of men with a goodly development of muscle. Their legs are, generally speaking, short in comparison with the length of their bodies, and their arms long. The face is nearly as broad as it is long and is generally round or square, the cheek bones high, broad and prominent, eyes small and almond-shaped, the nose short and flat, with wide nostrils. The women appear more squat than the men even, but are strong and ‘lusty’. In Lushai clans both sexes are as a rule rather slighter made than among the Thado and cognate clans, whom Lt. Stewart was describing. Adopting the scale given in the handbook of the Anthropological Institute, the colour of the skin varies between dark yellow-brown, dark olive, copper coloured and yellow olive...Both men and women are good walkers and hill-climbers, which is only natural, but for a race which lives exclusively on the hilltops the number of good swimmers is very large. Most men are not afraid of the water, and manage rafts very skilfully, making long journeys on them in the rains...” (J. Shakespear, pp. 1-2)

17.4 THE GENERIC NAMES “CHIN”, “KUKI” AND “ZO” AND THEIR ANCIENT HOMELANDS

“The term ZO or JO was mentioned as the name of a people in a few historical publications of the Indo-Burman peoples. Fanch'ot, a diplomat of the Tang dynasty of China, mentioned in 862 A.D. a kingdom in the Chindwin valley, whose princes and chiefs were called ‘Zo'. In 1783 Father Sangermo** mentioned “the petty nation called ‘JO’ G. A. Grierson*** recorded in 1904: ‘The name is not used by the tribes themselves, who used titles such as ZO or YO or SHO.' However, because of the Zo people's frequent contacts with many different peoples at their borders the available literature is often confused about which people should be designated as ZO or other names. When the British took possession of Bengal and had their contact with Zo people, the Bengalis told them that the Zo were Kuki, a Bengali word which means something like savage or wild hill people. But when the British came in close contact with the Lusei, they realized that they did not call themselves Kuki. Initially the British used the term ‘Loosye'. The British, however, later adopted ‘LUSHAI’ as the official designation for Zo people living in the western part of the

---

** Father Sangermo: A Description of the Burmese Empire, Rome, Parbury, Allen and Co. MDCCXXXIII

...The rise of the Tang dynasty (618-906) brought contact between early Zo people in the Chin-dwin and the Tang Chinese. The Tang, as widely traveled traders, recorded the existence of three kingdoms in Burma - the Pyu, the Pegus (Mon), and the Sak. The Sak kingdom may have been the Zo of Upper Burma. (Ibid, 33)
“The actual translation of zo in the Zo common language may be termed as follows: Zo people divide a mountainous region into two climatic zones. The higher part of the region is characterized by cold, wet, and damp climatic conditions, where potatoes, maize and sulfur beans may be grown. These areas are covered with rain clouds in the monsoon rainy season. The sun is rarely to be seen. Such a place or area is denoted by the term ‘Zo’ in distinction from the ‘shim’ of ‘chhim’, which is generally lower in elevation and with a warmer and drier climate, where bamboo thrives and hill-side rice may be grown. The generic name ‘Zo’ has no relation with the geographical-climate term ‘zo’. Zo people have a tradition of naming their clans [tribes] after the head of each clan. Hualngo are descendants of a man named Hualngo, and the Zahau, Kamhau and [some] other Zo clans [tribes] each carries the name of their founder. It must have been the same with Zo, too. Zo or a very similar sounding name must have been the name of the Zo's originator. The ‘Genealogy of Zo (Chin) Race of Burma’ by Khup Za Thang shares this interpretation and postulates a man named ‘Zo’ as the founder of the Zo people.

The author chooses Zo as the designation of all Zo people, because it appears to him that Zo is the most widely used name, whether it be Zo, Yo, Jo, Cho, Sho, Khxou, or Yaw. The author does not insist that ‘Zo’ is the proper or right designation. However, he believes that names such as Kuki and Chin which originated as abused names should not be adopted as the designation of a people. Such names could hinder understanding between the abuser and the abused. It will be in the interest of all Zo people to be known by a common name, most possibly Zo.” (Ibid, p. 6) See TABLE 4.

“In the absence of written documents, and because the Zo had limited contact with neighbouring peoples, it is extremely difficult to trace Zo history. However, through historical linguistics, archaeological findings, and ethnic relationships, it is now accepted that Zo belong to the group of people identified as Tibeto-Burman. The oral genealogy of Zo claims that a man named Zo was the originator of all Zo people...Estimates based on oral history account for approximately twenty-seven generations of Zo people. Assuming a generation to last twenty-five years, Zo people have been in existence for only seven hundred years. Zo legend asserts that the Zo were originally from a cave called CHINNLUNG, which is given different locations by different tribes. The legend cannot therefore be accepted as a fact, because it is contradictory to known facts of how man originated. The physical features of Zo people, yellowish or brownish skin, brown eyes, black hair, slanted eyes, prominent cheekbone, wide nose, and flat face suggest their relation to the Indonesian-Malay subrace of the Mongoloid Race. By analysing Zo language and comparing it with other languages anthropologists concluded that Zo language is related to the Tibeto-Chinese languages and therefore their cultural affiliations with them...” (Ibid, pp. 26-27)

“This term Kuki, like Naga, Chin, Shendu, and many others, is not recognized by the people to whom we apply it, and I will not attempt to give its derivation, but it has come to have a fairly definite meaning, and we now understand it by it certain closely allied clans, with well marked characteristics, belonging to the Tibeto-Burman stock. On the Chittagong border the term is loosely applied to most of the inhabitants of the interior hills beyond the Chittagong Hill Tracts...In the Lushai Hills nowadays the term is hardly employed, having superseded by Lushai. In the Chin Hills and generally on the Burma border all these clans are called Chins...The term Lushais as we understand it, covers a great many clans...The Lusheis, however, did not eject all the clans they came in contact with, many of them they absorbed, and these now form the bulk of the subjects of the Thangur chiefs. In this monograph Lushai is used in this wider sense, Lushei being used only for the clan of that name. Among the people themselves the Lusheis are sometimes spoken as Duhlian, at the derivation of which I will hazard no guess, and the general population of the hills is spoken
of as Mizo”. (J. Shakespear: INTRODUCTION)

The origin of the term “Chin” itself is not yet known for sure as there are several contradicting and controversial theories. Among them are also that of Sakhong’s. He tries to prove in several ways in his book (In Search of Chin Identity: A Study in Religion, Politics and Identity in Burma, 2002) that the word “Chin” is the original term used by various Chin tribes from ancient times. But his theories are far from convincing. According to Lehman it is a Burmese word: “The earliest mention of the Chin in Burman inscriptions of the Pagan kingdom dates from the thirteenth century A.D. and refers to the Chins as “allies” or “comrades” - that being the meaning of the term “Chin” - in the lower valley of the Chindwin (literally “the hole of Chin”)* (Lehman, p. 20)

Lehman believes Kuki to be a Manipuri term [Lehman, 5]. But according to Mr. Edgar (p. 92 above) this term apparently is a Bengali word. And with regard to this term “Kuki”, the following few lines will simply clarify the confusions that surround it from the point of view of the Zo people themselves. Those who are currently known - and call themselves as well - as “Kuki” were always known among the Zo people as “Thado” or “Khuangsai”. While some of them nowadays prefer the term “Kuki”, some others prefer to call themselves either “Thado” or “Khuangsai”. However, a new term called “Thado-Kuki” is getting popular among them these days. The word KUKI itself does not mean anything at all in any Zo dialects. Actually, Thado is the name of both the tribe and the clan (see Table 4).

And the original homelands of the Chins are also still shrouded in mystery. But it is now generally agreed among scholars that they might have had migrated from the Tibetan Plateaus or South-West China towards the Chindwin valleys and the plains and hills west of Irrawaddy river around A.D. 800 and that they migrated further to their present homelands around the 14th century. “Chin history begins after A.D. 750, with the development of Burman civilization and of Chin interaction with it.” (Lehman, p. 22). See Migratory Routes: MAP 2.

The postulations of those who are deemed to be experts on the Chins and Burma as a whole themselves are still full of contradictions on the topics in question. The following are some examples:

“The places mentioned in old Burmese and the modern place names in the Chindwin Valley, however suggest to Luce (1959b) that the Chin were left to themselves in the Upper Chindwin. No places above Monywa are mentioned in the inscriptions. By twelfth century the Burmans had occupied the Yaw and

- **Author's (tdz) Note:** So far as I know, all scholars - both foreign and native alike - have translated Chindwin exactly as Lehman has done. Actually, “dwin” in Burmese has five meanings: hole, in, inside, within and during. For examples: Hole like in Ye-dwin (water well, or water hole); Taw-dwin (in or inside forest); Ein-dwin (in or inside house); Psy-dwin (in or inside country); Moe-dwin (during raining season). Therefore, Chindwin can also be translated literally as “in or Inside Chin”. But since it still doesn’t really make any sense it could perhaps make more sense to translate it figuratively as “inside Chin country”, or something like that. “The hole of Chin” does not have any sense at all in this context. I have just lately found another completely new definition of Chindwin. “That officer [Woodthorpe] states that when surveying the Chindwin river, he was informed that it was so called from the fact that its forming the eastern limit of Chin raids in Burmese territory.” (Reids, pp. 5-6). I find this newly found definition to be very interesting and deem to be plausible to some extent. However, new theories still must be sought after, if there’s any.

17. 5 **DEFINITION OF THE CHIN/ZO TRIBES AND SUB-TRIBES**

**Special Note:** Non-Chin/Zo readers are baffled by some tribal names, namely Zo, Zou, Thado, Thadou, Thadou-Kuki, Kuki, Mizo and Zomi. The word ZO covers all the Chin/Zo people and Zou covers only a tribe by the name of Zou. In
olden days the name of this tribe was written as “ZO”, but it was so confusing for people that this tribe added “U” in order to differentiate the two similar sounding words. The second confusion with the words: THADO, THADOU, THADOU-KUKI and KUKI. These are, in fact, the names of a single tribe. There are three competing groups among them: one group prefers THADO while the second group prefers THADOU-KUKI, and the third group uses KUKI alone. KUKI is a Bengali word and the British used it in all their documents. All the ZO tribes have known them from ancient times only as THADO or KHONGSAI. It is also very often simply written as THADO. The next confusion is about MIZO and ZOMI. Actually, they have the same meaning: HIGH LANDER. Those who identify themselves as MIZO use the Duhlian/Lusei dialect, which is now widely known as the Mizo dialect, and those who prefer ZOMI use the Tedim dialect.

The Zos are a Mongolid people. The society is patriarchal and monogamous and made up of several tribes and sub-tribes. Vumson and Sakhong make two great mistakes by grouping 64 Zo tribes into six major tribal groups, namely Asho, Cho (Sho), Khumi, Lai, Mizo and Zomi in their book and dissertation respectively (see TABLE 1). This diagram was originally made by Vumson. And Zakhong uses it again in his dissertation with a major change in it: He replaces the word TIBETO-CHINESE with MONGOLIAN (Zakhong, p. 83), as the main root of Man, Karen, Tibeto-Burman and Tai-Chinese.

Actually, the so-called major tribal groups are not tribal groups at all. If any Zo from these “major tribal groups” uses any of these terminologies he means the entire Chin-Kuki-Mizo, and not a single tribe. If a Sizang, for example, wants to say something about his own tribe, he uses the word “Sizang”, but if he uses “Zomi”, he means all the Chin-Kuki-Mizo people. It is exactly the same with all other people from the six groups.

Another vivid example with regard to this issue is: Under “ZOMI” (TABLE 1) are listed 13 tribes. But so far as I know most of the dialects of these so-called tribes are just very slightly different. So I wonder if they all could really be defined as separate tribes. With the exception of the Thado, Baite and Sizang dialects, the “dialects” of the rest 10 tribes listed cannot at all be defined as separate dialects. The dialects of the Thados and Baite are almost exactly the same and the “dialects” of the rest differ from each other only in accents. So, without extra efforts these 10 “tribes” can communicate each other very easily in their “own dialects”. I would rather therefore define them as Tedim sub-tribes - the main tribe being Tedim. Even the Sizang dialect itself has, according to Khoi Lam Thang, about 90 percent of similarities with the Tedim and its other related-dialects (see TABLES 8/A; 8/B & 8/C). However, nearly all the other native Tedim-related dialects speakers have great difficulty in understanding - and learning to speak it (the Sizang dialect) fluently.

It is due to three big barriers:

- The three varying tones of it which differ from the varying tones of the other dialects;
- The rest of the words - that is the 10 percent of words that are not to be found in any other Zo dialects;
- Its several thousands of adverbs that have no similarities with the adverbs of the other Zo tribes, and the Sizangs profusely use these adverbs in everyday life. So far as this author knows even Burmese and English languages do not have adverbs that are similar to that of the Sizangs. All these adverbs are made

---

About Harvey’s book: “Since its first publication in 1925 this work has been recognized as an important contribution to the history of the East. The first serious attempt to write the history of Burma after that of Phayre. The author based his book on a mass of original sources, Burmese inscriptions and chronicles, together with English, Dutch and Portuguese sources and translated Chinese chronicles form the basis of the material from which he constructed an astonishingly interesting book which no student of Indo-Chinese can afford to ignore...” (Comment of The Times Literary Supplement on Harvey’s book. December 1925)
hils-hel; king-kung; lil-lul; mil-mel; niak-nuak; zil-zul, etc. Everybody who has ever come into close contact with the Sizang dialect will confirm this fact.

And there was a very interesting incident which worthy a mention here with regard to the dialects in Tedim area. Even Rev. Dr. J.H. Cope, the American Baptist missionary to the Chin people at the turn of the 20th century, had made a great mistake with regard to the Sizang and other dialects in the Tiddim Subdivision. This author still wonders how Dr. Cope, who is said to have had mastered the Sizang dialect, could make this great mistake in the first place (see APPENDICES M, M-1 and M-2).

Although some tribes in Northeast India have re-identified themselves recently as Zo, many tribes that had been classified as Kuki-Chin by British scholars and colonial officials during the British rule have not re-identified themselves yet as Zo.

17.5.1 LIST OF CHIN/ZO TRIBES AND SUB-TRIBES


The following are the various Zo tribes and sub-tribes and their native inhabitats in Eastern Zoram: Tiddim and Tonzag Townships: Tedim, Zo, Teizang, Sukte, Hualngo, Kuano, Guite, Val, Thado-Kuki, Sizang; Falam Township: Falam, Ngawn, Laizo, Zanit, Hualngo (Mizo), Khualsim, Zabau, Tapong, Sim, Buakhua, Thaisun and Lente; Haka Township: Haka, Zokhua, Mi Ei, Senthang, Thawr and Khalsim; Thantlang Township: Thantlang, Zophei, Lautu and Mara/Lakher (the Mara/Lakher are also found in considerable numbers in the “Pawi-Lakher Autonomous Region” of Mizoram); Matupi Township: Matu, Zrotung, Daai, Lautu, Mara/Lakher, Amlai, Tamang and Wumthu; Mindat Township: Mindat, Muun, Daai, Cho, Kaang (M’kaang) and Rawngtu; Kapanetlet Township: Knoktu, Chinpon, Daai, Cho, Kaang and Rah; Paletwa Township: Khami/Khumi, Chinpon, Daai, Khamui, Myo, Asho and Khuangs. The Plains Chins are mainly concentrated in Rakhine State, Ayeyawady, Magway and Bago Divisions. The tribes that are living in the Chittagong Hill Tracts are as follows: Khyeng/Khyang, Bawm or Bawmzo, Thadou or Thadou-Kuki, Mizo, Masho (M’to) and Panku; The Zos in Manipur State in India are mostly Paite, Thadou-Kuki, Zou, Mizo, Baite, Hmar, Vaiphei, etc. Zos in Nagaland (India) are mainly Thadou-Kuki; and the tribes of Zo in Tripura State, India, are Mizo, Hmar, Thadou-Kuki and some other smaller ones. The Zos in Sagaing and Magway Divisions are a mixture of several Zo tribes and sub-tribes (see MAPS 3 & 4). Since several Zo tribes and sub-tribes listed here in Mizoram have had abandoned their separate tribal identities and already identified themselves commonly as MIZO, it is no more possible to describe their specific former native regions.
17.6 THE SOUTHERN CHINS

(Part IV: Anthropological Notes. Rigby pp. 128-137)

The following notes apply to the inhabitants of the tract of country known as the Chin Hills. Yawdwin subdivision, bounded on the north by the Baungshe country or Haka Chin Hills, on the south by the Minbu and Kyaukpyu districts, on the east by the plains of Burma, and on the west by the Arakan Hill Tracts.

These people have been divided into different sections, known by different names, mostly of Burmese origin and supposed to be distinct tribes, but further investigation has disclosed the fact that they differ but little from one another in language or customs, and do not themselves acknowledge to belong to different tribes. Some of the names have, however, been in use too long to be dropped, and are perhaps the most convenient designation to distinguish the Chins inhabiting certain localities. It should, however, be borne in mind that these names will not be recognized by the natives themselves. In entering the country from the Arakan side much confusion was caused, and a good deal of time was spent, in trying to find out the whereabouts of the “Tribes” of “Yindus” and “Gweyas”, names which perhaps a more intimate knowledge of the Burmese language would have led us to suspect to be of that origin.... (pp. 128-137)

Names used in this report. For descriptive perposes I have divided the Chins of the Southern Chin Hills as follows:

1. The Chinboks.
2. The Yindus or Chins of the Arakan Yomas south of Zang-im-nu village, who women tattoo the face in spots. A small number of these are also to be found east of the Mon river in the Ding and Kaw and Knav valleys (the Paukadu-Piedaw group) and the Salin valley.
3. The Cane-belly Chins, inhabiting the country east and west of the Yomas, west of the Mon river and north of Zang-im-nu. This section had never previously been visited, and before this year nothing was known concerning them. The most distinctive feature about them is their custom of wearing coils of red came round the waist...

HABITS AND CUSTOMS

Chinboks, Yindu, and Cane-belly Chins

History

It seems probable that the Southern Chins originally came from the north. The ruddy blush sometimes seen through the dark skin of a Chin woman or child, if it happens to be clean enough, seems to point to a Tartar* origin. They differ from the Northern

[*A member of the Mongolian people of central Asia. tzd]
(Source: The Oxford Dictionaries. www.onelook.com)

Chins completely in language and in some customs, as in the method of disposing the dead (the Northern Chins bury, the Southern Chins burn, a dead body)...

Chinboks

(Appearance, dress &c. -Mon) The Chinboks men are, as a rule, small and puny but quick and active on their native hills. Always abominably dirty, their faces are often smeared with soot from sleeping with the head on a burnt log or on the fireplace as a pillow. The only thing a Chinbok
takes a pride in is his hair, which is done in a high knot on the crown of the head, bound round tightly with red cloth and strings of cowrie shells. Through this, from the back, is stuck a long brash pin fasterned by a string from its end to the top-knot, and with a pendant of beads or red goat's hair. Into the top of the knot he stick as many feathers as he can acquire, sometimes the whole of the tail of a cock tied to a stick...A wrist-guard made of leather or plaited cane covered with lace is always worn to protect the wrist from the bow-stering when shooting...

Women

The women seem, as a rule, to be bigger made than the men, and some of the younger girls are fairly good-looking. They are also several shades less dirty than the men. The face is tattooed on reaching the age of puberty in a pattern of lines and semi-circles, which does not have quite the same beauty-marriage effect as the spot pattern affected by the Yindus and Can-belly Chin women. The hair is worn in a low knot or “bun” on the crown of the head, sometimes bound round with a strip of cloth and fasterned with the brass skewer-like hair-pin...

Yindus.

The men differ little from the Chinboks, but are on the whole perhaps rather bigger. The hair is worn in a small knot rather forward on the head, usually bound with strings of small beads, boar's tusks and teeth, or a narrow strip of cloth and often ornamented with feathers...The wrist-guard is nearly always made of thin rope wound round to a breadth of 4 or 5 inches. Unlike the Chinboks, they do not, as a rule, carry their weapons about with them unless on a journey...

Women

The women are decidedly smaller than the Chinbok women, more dirty and untidy. The hair is parted in the middle and done up in a rough knot at the back of the head, but always has a dishevelled, mop-like appearance. The face is closely tattooed in indigo blue spots, without any attempt at pattern...

Cane-belly Chins

The men are far superior in physique to any of the other Southern Chins. They average about 5 feet 7 inches to 5 feet 8 inches in height, and are broad, powerful-looking men. They are also cleaner than the Chinboks, and in fact a superior race in every respect, as well as being, as far as our experience went, a more truthful and altogether pleasant lot to deal with...The wrist-guard is made of thin rope, like the Yindus. Except the headmen, who usually turned up with a spear, they do not, as a rule, carry their weapons...I should say they are as fine and strike-looking a lot of savages as it would be possible to find anywhere out of Africa....

Women

The women appear to be much inferior in physique to the men, and differ little in appearance from the Yindu women described above. The same hideous method of tattooing if followed, and the same huge gourd-hearings worn...

17.7 CLANS AND SUB-CLANS

A large part of the Chin/Zo society is made up of several major clans and sub-clans, which are patrilineal - that is, they are related through the male line. So, although they may speak different dialects and are thus identified as different tribes or sub-tribes, they are so closely intertwined by these clan and sub-clan systems. The following are
some examples: My main clan is called Suantak – he was the 8th generation from our oldest known progenitor ZO (he was most likely a fictive person) – see **TABLE 2-A**. Then my sub-clan began with Lua Tawng; he was the 15th from ZO and the 8th generations from Suantak. I am the 24th from ZO, the 15th from Suantak and the 8th generations from Lua Tawng (see **TABLE 5-A**). The Sailo chiefs, who had ruled most parts of present-day Mizoram in India, for some centuries descended from Seam Muang, the younger brother of Kim Lel, founder of Lophei, my native village (see **TABLE 3-A** and **SPECIAL APPENDIX 1**). The Suantak clan can be found among at least 20 Zo tribes and sub-tribes (about 80% of the Sizangs – some 20,000 - are Suantak's direct descendants). And the main clans of the Thadous (250,000) descended from his two brothers: To Hin and Seak Tak (see **TABLE 2-A**). For example: And although both of them – Sizang and Thadou – are identified as two separate tribes, 81% of their dialects are similar (see **TABLE 20-B**).

**A short note**: The vowel “a” is added to every name in **TABLE 3-A**. It is done according to the Mizo way of writing their names. As Mizo human names are unisex, “a” is added to male names and “i” to female names in order to differentiate them.

There were - and still are - many contradictions among the genealogies of several clans and sub-clans that it was almost hopeless to correct and standardize them in the past. One of the main reasons of such contradictions was that we did not have a script of our own until the Christian missionaries created it for us in the early 1900s. However, the late Capt. Khup Za Thang of Buanman had at least succeeded in correcting and standardizing the genealogies of several main clans and sub-clans in his lifetime (1923-1993) after 28 years of thorough and meticulous research. So, as a result, at least the genealogies among the Sizangs have fully been corrected or standardized. Just have a look at the following **TABLES: 2, 3, and 4** and compare them with the information left behind by the British as some examples to get an idea of how confusing these genealogies indeed are:

“Neyan [Nei Zal] of Chin Nwe [Cimmuai] is the father of the Siyin tribe; he lived 13 generations ago and he had three sons, Ne Nu [Ngu Ngu], Vamlok [Vang Lok], and Daitong; these three together left the nursery of the Northern Chins, migrated some 12 miles to the east, and founded the two villages of Limkai [Lim Khai] and Twantak [below present-day Khuasak village]. Vamlok is the progenitor of the three communities which we classify as the Limkais [Limkhai], Toklaing [Thuklai], and Bwenman [Buanman] clans, and Ne Nu is the progenitor of the clan we designate as the Siyin clan of the Siyin tribe, though it would be more correctly named if we called this family the Twantak clan. Vamlok had three sons, Hansook [Hang Sawk], Toklaing and Limkai. Hansook founded Tavak village, Toklaing founded Vumyang [Vumzang] village, whilst Limkai remained in the original village of that name. Ne Nu had one son named Lamtam, who lived in Twantak [Thuan Tak] the village founded by his father Ne Nu and his uncle Daitong. Lamtam's youngest son Neyal [Nei Zal] moved from Twantak and founded Koset village, which nine generations later was destroyed by the Siyins [themselves] when attacked by **General Faunce** in 1889. Four generations ago Koset emigrants founded Tannwe [Thangnuai] village...

Besides these villages there was one called Twiyan [Theizang] near the site of our No. 3 Stockgate, inhabited by the last remnants of the Vaipei tribe. **General Faunce** and **Major Raikes** destroyed every village in the Siyin Tract. **During the next two years the tribe surrendered and settled down as follows.** The Limkai clan settled in Sagyiain [Sakhiling]; the Toklaing clan lived in the three villages of Pumba [Pumva], Shark, and Yo; the Bwenman clan lived in Vokla [Voklak] and Narlpi; while the Twantak family (Siyin clan) was scattered in the six villages of Koset [Khuasak], Nashwin, Tannwe, Laibung, Pimpi, and Montok, and several families settled with the Suktes in You, Phunom, and Kholai. At the close of the Siyin-Nwengal rebellion the Siyins were collected into families and settled down in five large
villages: the Limkais remained in Limkai or Sagyilain and the Bwenmans were collected into one village at Vokla; the Toklaings were all settled on the original village-site of Mwiton (Toklaing); and the Twantak family were collected and settled down in Koseit and Lope [Lophei]. The (Siyn Clan) Twantak family is descended from Ne Nu, and the Limkai, Toklaing, and Bweman families are all the descendants of Ne Nu's younger brother, Vanlok, and thus the whole tribe is merely one family. When we occupied the country we found the inhabitants divided into four clans: of Limkai, Bweman, Toklaing and Twantak (Siyn), each controlled by its own Chief and each Chief independent the other. We have recognized the custom and have appointed or recognized the Chiefs of the four clans according to the customs of the tribe.” (Carey & Tuck, pp. 127-129)

Main Clans among several ZO tribes in Northern Chin State, Manipur and Mizoram States


(Source: ZO People and Their Culture by Sing Khaw Khai, Published by Khampa Hatzaw, Churachanpur, Manipur, India.)

Special Note: For those who do not have any idea about what a clan or sub-clan is: According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary: A group of people tracing descent from a common ancestor – like the MacDonald clan in Scotland. There are only two ethnic peoples out of more than 15 in Burma who have this system – the Kachins and the Chins. But the Kachins do not have generation counts like the Chins. Four and half pages in the main text above are left for reason of space.

17.10  CHIN-KUKI-MIZO: A LOST TRIBE OF ISRAEL?

Introduction

The reader may surely find the following information about the finding of Jewish DNA in a number of Zo tribes
GENEALOGICAL TREE OF THE ZO RACE
(ZO KHANG ZUNGPI)

1. ZO

2. (Kip Mang le Ciin Hil)

3. (Naw Phut le Lei Mang)

4. (Naw Song, Phu Song, Suang Kop)

5. (Song Thu le Ngai Te)

6. (Song Mang le Han Em)

7. (Song Kip, Song Za, Za Khai, Za Hong, Za Niang)

8. (Za Mang, Hual Than, Hual Nam) Taw Tak (To Hin, Seak Tak, Thuan Tak/Suantak)

9. (Tha Do, Tha Lun, Tong Luai, Hang Sing) (Nge Ngu, Nei Lut, Hin Nung, Nun Zong, Dai Tawng, Vang Lok)

10. (Bok Lu-a, Lam Tam, Khua Kuan, Tung Nung, Nan Tal, Phu Cil) Gen Zo, Hau Nam, Tau Kon (Nam Zo, Hau Nung) (Thuklai, Hang Sawk, Liim Khai)

11. (Rai Na-a, Bat Kai, Neih Zal, Liim Tuang, Suante, Hin Nam)

12. Chuah Loma (Kiim Lel, Seam Muang) (That Lang, That Mun) (Khan Siing, Mang Son, Tuang Thang)

Note 1: This diagram is prepared by myself from the original 2007 Edition for use in Internet transmission. The great majority of the genealogical trees in this book are mainly from the Sizang region (Siyin Region) and a few other adjoining areas of it. Among the Sizangs the names of several people are still missing in this edition because their names arrived too late at the time of printing.

Note 2: Genealogical lines marked in red colour are that of mine - my main clan starts from Suantak/Thuan Tak. For the rest of my genealogical tree see TABLES 5/A to 5/D.

- Thang Za Dal/June, 2014

TABLE 2-A
## Genealogical Tree of Mizo (Table 3)

### Explanation on discrepancies and usages in Tables 2 & 3

Discrepancies between the two genealogical charts (Tables 2 & 3) are marked in red. It is very possible that there indeed were several generation gaps between ZO and his alleged two sons, Kip Mang and Ciin Hil (Kipmanga and Chinihilha). These discrepancies are due partly to the lack of written records in the past on this subject. (The first known compilation of genealogies of the Thuan Tak/Suantak clan and sub-clans among the Sizangs inside Burma was done in 1956 by Pu Thawng Kho Hau, Thalkei village.) And there is a great difficulty in standardizing all the different genealogies for although a great majority of clans and sub-clans memorize their own lineages rather correctly, their memorization of other clans' genealogies were in many cases contradictory. For example, originally all the Suantat's sub-clans among the Sizangs memorized only the four sons of Thuan Tak/Suantak - namely, Nge Ngu, Nei Lut, Dai Tawng and Sang Lok - and believed that Hin Nung and Nun Zong were the sons of Dai Tawng. But after seven years of intensive research K.A. Khup Za Thang found out that Hin Nung and Nun Zong were in fact Dai Tawng's brothers, not his sons, and so on! And originally the Sizangs could only recall the five sons of Nge Ngu, namely Lam Tam, Khuai Kuan, Tung Nung, Nan Tal and Phu Cil. However, the Sailo and its related clans could trace their roots back to a Bok Lua (Boklua), also a son of Nge Ngu/Ngekguna. Furthermore, according to many clans and sub-clans Naw Song had only two sons, namely Song Thu and Ngaitha, but according to several other clans and sub-clans he must have had two other sons as well: Zinthlao and Luahpuia (Table 3). The said discrepancies between different genealogies in the past certainly were due to the fact that communications between different tribes were almost non-existent until the British arrival for there were always inter-tribal wars, and even in modern times when close human contacts between them had been well established there were no qualified scholars in this specific field to undertake the task of ironing out these discrepancies. There are plans to set up research groups sometime in the future to clarify all these discrepancies not only within Chin State, but also inside India, and also to expand the research to cover other Zo clans and sub-clans as well, although it may surely prove to be a daunting and frustrating task to do so for the memories of several clans were contradicting. However, the "Genealogy of the Zo (Chin) Race of Burma" has slowly become a standard work now - at least among many clans and sub-clans inside northern Chin State, because it is using genealogies that are commonly accepted by several clans.

As for the differences in the way names are written: Until today there are no standardized forms of writing names among the Zo people. Those in India, especially in Mizoram or those who have already abandoned their former tribal identities and now collectively identify themselves as Mizo, write their names together and "i" and "u" are added at the end of male and female names respectively in order to differentiate the genders because several Mizo names are, unlike that of other Zo names, unisexual. However, it has already become a tradition these days among them that the two vowels are still used anyway even when the genders of the names are clearly distinguishable without these vowels. And names are spelled according to the pronunciations of tribal dialects. (This diagram - which is 100 % identical with the original, is reproduced in this form by myself. And for the purpose of explanation names are marked in red. Thang Za Dal. Hamburg. June 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ZO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kipmanga, Chinihilha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nawphula, Leimangja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nawchawnga, Phuchawnga, Suangjawpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Zinthlao, Chongthua, Luahpuia, Ngaitea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Chumnga, Hanema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chawngkipa, Chawngzaa, Zhakaia, Zawhanga, Zanianga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Zamanga, Hualthana, Hualnana, Tawtaka, (Tohina, Seaktaka, Thuantaka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Thadoa, Thaluna, Chawngluai, Hangsinga, Ngekqua, Neilata, Hinunng, Nunzong, Daitawa, Namzlo, Hangunng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Siizanga, (Batkala, Neihzala, Liimtuanga)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ralnaa, (Kilmele, Seammunga, Thalfla, Thatmuna, Thangso, Mangson, Tuangthang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Chhuahlawma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Zamuaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. (Zadenga, Paliana, Thangluaha, Thangura, Rivunga, Rokhuma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Thangmanga, Chawngluia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Sailoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Vanglakw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Thuklai, Hangsawk, Limkhai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Lunmun, Suumniang, Tuanam, Zamang, Zangkaii, Tonsung (Sitzam, Tunmang, Nqotha, Tunseal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chawngkunga, 1996
GENEALOGICAL TREE OF THE ZO PEOPLE

[1] ZO
  (Generation Gaps)

[2] (Kipmanga, Chinhilha)

[3] (Nawphuta, Leimanga)

[4] (Nawchawnga, Phuchawnga, Suangkawpa)

[5] (Zinghioa, Chonghua, Luahpuia, Ngaita)

[6] (Chungmanga, Hanema)

[7] (Chawngkipa, Chawngzaa, Zaakhia, Zahawng, Zanianga)

[8] (Zamanga, Hualthana, Hualnama, Tawtaka, Tohina, Seaktaka, Thuantaka)

[9] (Thadoa, Thaluna, Chawngluai, Hangsinga) (Ngeknkua, Neilutta, Hinlung, Nunzong, Daitawng, Vanglawk)

[10] (Boklua, Lamtama, Khawkuana, Chungnunqa, Nantala, Phuchila) Genzo, Haunam, Tawkawn, Namzo, Haunung

[11] (Batkaia, Neihzala, Liitmuanga)

[12] (Kimiela, Seammuana/Ral Na-a/Sihzanga/Zehmuaka) (Thalana, Thutmuna) (Khansinga, Mangson, Tuangthang)

[13] Chhuahlawma

[14] Zahmuaka

[15] (Zadenga, Palina, Thanluatha, Thangura, Rivunqa, Rokhuma)

[16] Thangmanga, Chawngula

[17] Sailing

-------------------------------

[9] Vanglawk

[10] Thuklai, Hangsawk, Liikhau


-------------------------------


(Diagram created for this purpose by Thang Za Dal. June 2014)

* Note: Zamuaka [12] and Zamuaka [14] must be two separate persons. See the Appendices given above for explanation.

TABLE 3-A
TABLE 5-A

KIIM LEL KHANG "TON KAAL SUANH NGIAK HANG TUU LUA TAWNG TE

12 Kiim Lel, Seen Muang
   Thun Lian ✓
   Z/i M
   Z/i N
   Ton Kaal

13 Hau Suang ✓
   Tun Suang ✓
   Nga Suang ✓
   Ngaik Haas

14 Hau Suang ✓
   Tun Suang ✓
   Nga Suang ✓
   Ngaik Haas

15 Hau Suang, Mung Vun
16 Hau Teng
17 Hau Teng, Mung Vun
   Tun Vunh ✓
   Lao Tsen
   Hau Teng

18 Hau Suang, Mung Vun
   Tun Vunh ✓
   Lao Tsen

19 Hau Suang, Mung Vun
   Tun Vunh ✓
   Lao Tsen

20 Hau Suang, Mung Vun
   Tun Vunh ✓
   Lao Tsen

21 Hau Suang, Mung Vun
   Tun Vunh ✓
   Lao Tsen

22 Hau Suang, Mung Vun
   Tun Vunh ✓
   Lao Tsen

23 Hau Suang, Mung Vun
   Tun Vunh ✓
   Lao Tsen

24 Hau Suang, Mung Vun
   Tun Vunh ✓
   Lao Tsen

25 Hau Suang, Mung Vun
   Tun Vunh ✓
   Lao Tsen

26 Hau Suang, Mung Vun
   Tun Vunh ✓
   Lao Tsen

- (Khup Za Thang/2007)
- Genealogical Tree of the Lua Tawng Sub-clan of Suangkay Clan (my own Sub-clan): See 17.6 Clans and Sub-clans
- Note: The heading of this chart should in fact be written in this way: Kiim Lel Khan, "Ton Kaal" Suangkay Haas, Hau Suang Tuu, Lua Tawng Te
- See Table 5/B for the names of women who are married into my sub-clan from other sub-clans and the Lua Tawng women who are married into other sub-clans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numei Tum</th>
<th>Numei Zaam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nga Paut</td>
<td>Khan Giang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ltu Tung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phat Hong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wng Tua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swn Mng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tua Vnght</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tua Hng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lus Knn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ltn Thmn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn Thmn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mng Khup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrn Son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swn Vnm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan Khph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thzm Khly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khph Lnn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sng Hau Tng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vnr Thang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mng Hkly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fv Tsul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thng Vl Nng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thng Za Knp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fv Khml</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thng Za Dll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numei Zaam</th>
<th>Psl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan Giang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ltu Khnt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vng Giang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vng Dn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cng Awi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lng Nlkd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hng Dm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lng Cnght</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mng Cn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn Nlkd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fv Cn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thzm Cngt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnn Cngt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chng Kq Vng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khlp Cnght</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nhng Hk Nk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pw Khng Cng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khlt Zhngt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khng Khn Mnn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vng Nq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chng Khn Mnn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fng Kq Mng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hn Zh Dm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngk Kq Mnn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vng Mng Cng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chng Khn Hk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nhng Khn Cng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chng Lnh Hu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thng Dll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Khlp Zhngl 2007)

- Female Lines in the Ltu Tawng Sub-clan (See 17.6 Clans and Sub-clans)
- This Chart shows women who are married into the Ltu Tawng Sub-clan and the Ltu Tawng women who married into other sub-clans.
- Numei Tum: Women from other sub-clans who are married into this sub-clan
- Numei Zaam: Women of this sub-clan who are married into other sub-clans
- Psl: husband
- 18, 19, 20... Generation counts from Zo
- (57/24) = Refers to my mother’s genealogical tree (p. 57 in this book; 24th generation from Zo)

(6/04 2010)

**TABLE 5/B**
BOOK COVER - GENEALOGY OF THE ZO (CHIN) RACE OF BURMA

ZO SUANH KHANG SIMNA LAI BU
 зр (чунь) сиинхунгул
GENEALOGY OF THE ZO (CHIN) RACE OF BURMA

by
CAPTAIN K.A.KHUP ZA THANG

Prepared in this form by Thang Za Dal. Hamburg. May 2022
BOOK COVER – GENEALOGICAL TREE OF MIZO

Prepared in this form by Thang Za Dal. May 2022.
interesting. However, more independent DNA tests may need to be conducted among various isolated Zo tribes, who have not yet been mixed up with non-Zo blood, in the future to prove or disprove this finding. Furthermore, curiously, there are also a number of similarities in tradition and religious belief between both ethnic groups. Among them, for example, are the naming of newborn children (17.8 Chin/Zo Names); (19.0 Culture: Marriage Custom); the belief in a supreme being among some Zo tribes and the appearance of Prophet Pau Cin Hau among the Chins (18.1 Ancient Religious Beliefs of the Chin); (18.2 The Religion of Laipian Pau Cin Hau), etc. Considering such facts, I (author of this paper – tzd) sometimes even wonder if the word “ZO” could probably be the corruption of JEW.

17.10.1 Amishav Organization: Lost Tribe Returns to Israel

THE ISRAEL REPORT January/February 2000 37 Descendants of the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel Due to Arrive at Ben-Gurion Airport on Friday/After Centuries of Exile, Bnei Menashe Return to Zion Jerusalem - An emotional scene is expected at Ben-Gurion airport early Friday as 37 descendants of the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel are set to arrive at 6:50 a.m. on EL AL flight #0076 out of Bombay. The new arrivals, members of the Bnei Menashe, are coming to Israel under the auspices of the Jerusalem-based Amishav organization, which is dedicated to locating descendants of the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel and returning them to the Jewish people. They join an additional 450 Bnei Menashe (children of the Tribe of Manasseh) already residing in the country.

Sources: http://www.cdn-friends-icej.ca/isreport/janfeb00/lost.html

17.10.2 Lost Tribe of Israel

TIME Magazine/February 28, 2000 Mizos living in the remote hills of northeastern India claim they're from Jewish stock By Michael Fathers, Aizawl

In a bare room in an unfinished concrete building on the fringes of the Golden Triangle where the hill tribesmen were once headhunters, man puts on a prayer shawl and begins chanting in Hebrew. A small number of followers join in the responses.

Afterward he says: “I was a corps cadet in the Salvation Army 10 years ago, but now I am a Jew.” This is Yeshurun Ngaihte, 50, the chazan, or elder, of the year-old Sephardic synagogue in Aizawl, capital of India's Mizoram state on the border with Burma... The forested hills of northeastern India must rank among the last places on the planet where you would expect to find a synagogue, let alone two. But the Jews of this remote region believe they are descendants of a legendary lost tribe of Israel that, according to the Old Testament, disappeared almost 3,000 years ago.

“When I read the Old Testament, I realized Mizos were very similar to the Jews,” says Sela, “so I prayed to God to tell me if we were Jewish.”... According to local legend, the Mizos’ Jewish connection goes back more than 1,000 years to a remote cave in China where the scattered remnants of the lost Jewish tribe of Menashe were holed up. They called themselves Chhinlung, after the cave, and over the years they made their way south through Thailand, settling for good in a pocket of hills astride what is today Burma, India and Bangladesh... The relative, Zaithanchhungi, an insurance saleswoman and former teacher, went to Israel in 1983. There she met Eliyahu Avichayil, an Orthodox rabbi whose Amishav organization searches the world for descendants of the lost tribes. He showed immediate interest in her story, saying Jews had been scattered as far as China. He urged her to return to India to catalogue Mizo history. She came up with a list of apparent similarities, including the building of
altars, the sacrifice of animals, burial customs, marriage and divorce procedures, a belief in an all-powerful deity and the symbolic presence of the number seven in many festivities. Zaithanchnhuni saw other links in musical instruments and household practices. “I was a non-believer, but after my search I now believe very firmly that the Mizos are of Jewish descent.” Yet she herself remains a Presbyterian. Why? “Because I believe in Jesus Christ. For many people it is difficult to go back to the thoughts of our ancestors”.

... But for Mizoram's chief minister Zoramthanga, former deputy commander of the guerrilla force that battled the Indian army, identity is not a problem. “There is a possibility that the Mizos are one of the lost tribes of Israel. There are certain practices and customs which suggest this. But I should add that only when we reach heaven will we have the proof,” he says, roaring with laughter. (With reporting by Subir Bhaumik/Aizawl and Eric Silver/Jerusalem)

17.10.3 **Menashe in Myanmar**

Ha'aretz/ By Yair Sheleg/September 21, 2002

Three journeys to the Kuki-Chin-Mizo people on the Indochinese border convinced Hillel Halkin that they are descendants of the Children of Israel. Some of the elders of the Kuki-Chin-Mizo people, who live on the border between India and Myanmar (Burma), still remember that some time during the 20th century, before they became totally Christian, they marked "the memory of ritual circumcision... And then the two came to Mizoram, one of the Indian republican states, which is located on the eastern border of India with Myanmar, the home of the Kuki-Chin-Mizo people.

The three names derive from the fact that these people live in three different areas: They are the dominant population in the state of Mizoram; they are also a considerable part of the population of the Indian state of Manipur (also on the border with Myanmar); and they form a significant percentage of the population of the Chin region of Burma (where Halkin could not go because the Myanmar authorities have prohibited entry into the region)... One obvious difference between the testimonies of the Kuki and other groups Avichail spoke to is that while the Chiang and the Karen were linked only by external factors to the 10 tribes, among the Kuki this was an internal tradition... During the visit to Mizoram, Avichail and Halkin began to get more and more evidence of the historical connection between the members of the group and the Jewish people... (Source: BN News September 21-22, 2002/ Subject: [chinland] Menashe in Myanmar: Three journeys to the Kuki-Chin-Mizo people on the Indochines

17.10.4 **ISRAEL Lost and Found?**

Newsweek, October 28, 2002, pp. 72-73 By Dan Ephron

When the veteran Israeli journalist Hillel Halkin began hunting for the lost tribes of Israel four years ago, he though the claim that a community of Indians on the Burmese border was descended from one of the tribes was either a fantasy or a hoax... But on his third trip to the Indian states of Manipur and Mizoram, Halkin was shown texts that convinced him that the community, which calls itself Bneis Menashe, has roots in the lost tribe of Menashe. The documents included a will and words to a song about the Red Sea. The argument, made in his new book, “Across the Sabbath River” (*Houghton Mifflin*), is not just academic... As founder of the organization Amishave (My People Return), Eliyahu Avichail trots the globe in search of lost Jews, in order to bring them back to their religion through conversion and direct them to Israel... The group has already brought 700 of the Bnei Menashe to Israel and believes thousands more are eager to come. Most have been put up in settlements in the West Bank and Gaza Strip - the main arena of Israel - 142 Palestinian fighting...
FROM INDIA TO ZION

Arutz Sheva June 2, 2003

A special ceremony will be held tomorrow morning, Tuesday, June 3, 2003, at 8:15 am at the Western Wall in Jerusalem to welcome home some 50 members of the Bnei Menashe (children of Manasseh), a group claiming descent from a lost tribe of Israel. After arriving on EL AL flight 072 from Bombay, they will be brought from the airport straight to Jerusalem to say a prayer of thanksgiving at the Wall. Members of the group, all of whom hail from the northeastern Indian state of Mizoram, are making aliyah under the auspices of the Amishav organization, which is dedicated to assisting "lost Jews" who wish to return to the Jewish people... On hand to greet them will be: Rabbi Eliyahu Ben-Dahan, the Director-General of Israel's Ministry of Religious Affairs; Rabbi Eliyahu Avichail, the chairman and founder of Amishav; and Michael Freund, Amishav's Director and a former Deputy Communications Director in the Prime Minister's Office...

For the lastest news from Jerusalem, Israel and the Jewish World visit www.OurJerusalem.com Note: Courtesy: Our Jerusalem, Jewish Press Agency For the lastest news from Jerusalem, Israel and the Jewish World visit www.OurJerusalem.com To: Myanmar; sizang@yahoogroups.com ; thiansawmpiang@yahoo.com.au Sent: Saturday, June 14, 2003 7:54 AM

MORE NEBI Menashe ARRIVE ISRAEL

Fifty members of the Bnei Menashe of northeastern India, a tribe claiming descent from the "lost tribe" of Menashe, have arrived in Israel Tuesday. They join 700 Bnei Menashe already in the country, most of whom live in in Kiryat Arba, Gush Katif, and Beit El. There are approximately another 5,000 Bnei Menashe still living in India and observing a fully Jewish lifestyle. ... As part of their ongoing work with the Bnei Menashe, Amishav released the first Hebrew- Mizo dictionary last year. Mizo is one of the main languages spoken by the Bnei Menashe. Michael Freund, Director of Amishav said at the time, "We hope it will facilitate the study of Hebrew by the Bnei Menashe and ease their absorption in Israel." (Source: Jerusalem Post, Arutz-7, Ha'aretz, AP, IMRA, MENL, ou.org, Media Line] X-Apparently-To: chinland@yahoogroups.com Date: Sun, 15 Jun 2003 14:28:39 +0200

Israeli 'Lost Tribes' Living in W. Bank

Wed Dec 24, 5:24 AM ET By GAVIN RABINOWITZ, Associated Press Writer Middle East - AP

SHAVEI SHOMRON, West Bank - Some 2,700 years ago, 10 of the 12 biblical tribes of Israel were driven from the Holy Land into exile and the mists of history. Now, a group claiming descent from one of the lost tribes can be found sitting in a bomb shelter in a West Bank Jewish settlement, learning Hebrew... Members of the group from northeastern India call themselves the "Bnei Menashe," or children of Menashe, and believe they are descendants of the Israelite tribe of Manasseh. The return of the "lost tribes" to their ancient homeland is viewed by some as the fulfillment of biblical prophecy and a herald of the Messiah. Others see the return as an opportunity to boost the numbers of Jews living in Israel in what they see as a demographic war with the Palestinians ...

Living in the northeastern Indian states of Mizoram and Manipur, the Bnei Menashe, who number about 6,000, were originally animists who were converted to Christianity by British missionaries in the 19th century. In 1953, a tribal leader named Manchala had a dream in which his people would return to Israel, which led the tribe to adopt Jewish tradition.

DNA tests prove that Mizo people are descendants of a lost Israeli tribe
By Tathagata Bhattacharya/Aizawl Exclusive
It has been a long-standing contention of a section of Mizos that the people of Mizoram are descendants of the
Menashe, one of the lost tribes of Israel. But the claims were quashed several times by Israel where, by the law of
return, anyone with proof of Jewish roots can go and settle. However, a recent DNA study has validated the claim.
Bhaswar Maity, a research scholar at the Central Forensic Science Laboratory, Kolkata, had begun the DNA
typing of samples (100 male and 80 female) taken from the Mizos in March 2002. "Studies on the Y chromosome
[male] did not return the Cohen modal haplotype, which is present in most Jewish males around the world," says
Dr V.K. Kashyap, director of the laboratory. (Tracing the male chromosome is difficult because most Mizo men,
who migrated from elsewhere, wed women along the way and the Y chromosome is lost every time a female child
is created.) "But of the mitochondria DNA [female samples], a few Kuki samples returned the unique haplotype
[genetic sequence code] found in the Jewish community in Uzbekistan."
This is a clear indication that there was a Jewish female founder effect in the Kuki community. "It is
scientifically impossible to have the same genetic sequence in two populations living so far apart if they did not
originate from a common stock who historically inhabited a common space," says Maity. He also found a specific
mutation in some Lusei and Kuki samples that is also present in Indian Jews.
This puts the Indian government on a sticky wicket as the United Nations has said that a country cannot rule
over people other than its own. The government has more reason to be worried because the Aizawl-based
Chhinlung Israel People's Convention, an organisation of 2.5 lakh members who believe they are descendants of
the Menashe, has begun preparations for realising their dream of a "New Jerusalem". This correspondent even
stumbled upon a new flag for the "country of the Menashe people" as Lalchhanhima Sailo, the chairman of the
convention, put it. The organisation had submitted a memorandum to the UN in 1998 to recognise the Chhinlung
people as a lost tribe of Israel. "We are now awaiting Israeli recognition," says Sailo. "Once it comes through, we
will have an independent country in the northeast of India." Sailo feels this is a very real possibility because there
are Chhins in parts of Manipur, Burma, Bangladesh and Assam.
It is difficult to ignore the similarities that exist between the lives of the Jews in Israel and those of the Mizos.
According to Zaithanchhungi, there are anthropological perspectives. The Mizo burial ritual is similar to that of
the Jews. Secondly, though the Mizos migrated to Mizoram through lands where Buddhism was the dominant
faith, it left no influence on them. Even in the first half of the 20th century, they sacrificed animals to Pathian
(Jehova). "They had the sacrificial altar on a hillock and a cross similar to that of David was drawn on the altar,"
she says. "Only men were allowed to witness the sacrifice. This is more than sheer resemblance." Another
resemblance is between the Mizo ritual of Cawngpuisial and the Jewish Sabbath. Sabbath starts when the stars
appear on a Friday evening and ends with the same on a Saturday evening. In Mizoram, during the Cawngpuisial,
villagers are restricted from going out of the village (and strangers from entering it) after the stars appear on a
Friday. The curfew is lifted on Saturday after the stars appear. Shaina, a student from Raanana near Tel-Aviv, who
recently visited the Amishav Hebrew Center in Aizawl—an Israeli government agency tracing lost Jewish tribes
—found the "similarities between the people of Israel and Mizoram simply too stark to be neglected".
Allenby Sela, principal of Amishav, was one of 900 Mizos who converted to Judaism to settle down in the
Gaza Strip. He returned to Mizoram to make the people aware of their history. "We should know who we are,


where we came from, what our roots are," he says. "Faith can't be recognised by blood tests. It's a spiritual thing. Our history is oral and there is no clinching evidence. But this is not enough for Israel to accept." Israel recognised the Black Jews of Ethiopia and the Fallasahs of South Africa as lost tribes without any tests.

(Source: The Week/12 September 2004/Malayala Manorama Publications Kochi, Kerala, India) http://www.theweek.com/24sep12/currentevents_article1.htm Return-Path: <senito-7355252-42-1095092834-Subject: [linking to bros] DNA tests prove that Mizo people are descendants of a lost Israeli tribe

17.10.9 Israel's Chief Rabbinate Recognizes Mizos As An Israeli Lost Tribe

SANGZUALA HMAR, TNN - Times of India AIZAWL, SEPT. 21, 2004:

It's as good as Gospel truth that 10 of the Semitic tribes that Moses had led across the Red Sea from slavery to freedom in the Promised Land about four millennia ago have since been lost. But for those who thought the Biblical tale of the '10 lost tribes of Israel' was but a myth, there is an interesting claim by a branch of Christians from Mizoram.

Armed with the results of what he calls a conclusive DNA test, the chief of the Chhinlung Israel People's Convention (CIPC), Lalchhanhima Sailo, is reiterating a decades-old claim that a section of Mizos are descended from the Bnei Menashe clan, one of the legendary lost tribes. The latest test he has cited to substantiate his claim was conducted by the Central Forensic Science Laboratory in Kolkata on 180 blood samples collected randomly from Mizo people in March 2002. The report says the mitochondrial configuration of the DNA of some of the blood samples drawn from women match the unique "haplotype" — a genetic sequence code found in Jews of Uzbekistan. A specific cellular mutation that is sometimes found in Indian Jews was also noticed in some of the samples. Significantly though, studies on the Y- chromosome (for males) did not match the Cohen modal haplotype that is common to most Jewish males around the world, the tests revealed. Incidentally, about 800 Jews from Mizoram have in recent years emigrated to Israel and are settled in different Jewish 'kibbutzes' in the Gaza Strip. When contacted by Times of India, an Israeli embassy spokesperson said though Mizo Christians had in the past made claims about their Jewish ancestry, they had not approached the Israeli government following the latest DNA test. As and when the fresh evidence was placed before the Israeli authorities, their claim would be considered.

The myth of the lost tribes traces its origin to the times of the "wise king" Solomon, the third king of Israel. When Solomon died, Israel or Judaea was divided into two, according to the Bible. The tribes inhabiting this Promised Land too, split along territorial and political lines — while Judah and Benjamin were loyal to the Davidic house in the south, the remaining 10 tribes aligned themselves to a litany of monarchies from the north. While most modern Jews trace their roots to this southern kingdom, the famous "10 tribes" were believed lost for centuries.

Jews all over the world kept their faith in the words of Prophet Ezekiel: "Behold, I will take the children of Israel... and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their land. And they shall be divided into two kingdoms no more." There have been, over the years, many apocryphal claims about the existence of these tribes, including the unproven belief that some of them could be found in Kashmir and Mizoram. Though the CIPC has always claimed that Mizos are descendants of the Menashe, the theory had never gained much currency. Even the majority of Mizos, who concur on their theological links with Israel, dismissed claims of ancestral or other
umbilical connection... Sailo now plans to take the matter up with the Israeli government and even harbours latent visions of founding a movement for what he calls "New Jerusalem" which would encompass Jews of Assam, Manipur, northern Bangladesh and Myanmar. (http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/articleshow/859025.cms).

17.10.10 Deposited research article: Tracking the genetic imprints of lost Jewish tribes among the gene pool of Kuki-Chin-Mizo population of India

Bhaswar Maity, T Sitalaximi, R Trivedi and VK Kashyap
National DNA Analysis Center, Central Forensic Science Laboratory, 30 Gorachand Road, Kolkata - 700014, India

This was the first version of this article to be made available publicly.

Subject areas: Genome studies, Evolution
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Outline

Background

The Kuki-Chin-Mizo population comprising traditionally endogamous tribal groups residing in the state of Mizoram, India claim their descent from the ten lost tribes of Israel that were exiled by the Assyrians. To ascertain their oral history, we analysed DNA markers comprising 15 autosomal microsatellite markers, 5 biallelic and 20 microsatellite markers on Y-chromosome and the maternally inherited mitochondrial DNA sequence variations on 414 individuals belonging to 5 tribal communities from Mizoram (Hmar, Kuki, Mara, Lai and Lusei). The genetic profiles obtained were compared either with populations sharing Jewish ancestry or with local populations along the probable route of migration of the Jewish ancestry claimant Mizoram tribes.

Results

Y-STR analyses showed absence of the Cohen Modal Haplotype, the genetic signature of Cohanim origin. Y-chromosomal biallelic marker analyses revealed the presence of East and Southeast Asian-specific lineages and absence of haplogroup J predominant among Jewish populations. The mitochondrial DNA sequence analyses however revealed traces of genetic relatedness between the Jewish ancestry claimant Mizoram tribes and Near Eastern lineages. Autosomal analyses showed moderate degree of genetic differentiation among the different Mizoram tribes.

Conclusions

Migration of the lost tribes through China resulting in subsequent genetic admixture over a long period of time has probably diluted the extant gene pool of the Kuki-Chin-Mizo population. Although their paternal lineages do not exhibit any trace of Jewish ancestry, incidence of maternal Near Eastern lineages among the Mizoram tribals suggests their claim to Jewish ancestry cannot be excluded.
18.0 RELIGION

18.1 ANCIENT RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OF THE CHIN/ZO PEOPLE

Belief in a Supreme Being

“The Chin is often described as a devil-worshipper. This is incorrect for he worships neither god nor devil. The northerners believe that there is no Supreme Being and, although the southern Chins admit that there is a Supreme God or ‘Kozin’ [Khuazing] to whom they sacrifice, they do not worship him and never look to him for any grace or mercy, except that of withholding the plagues and misfortunes which he is capable of invoking on any in this world who offend him. The Hakas and southerners believe that there is a God, who lives in the heavens. He is not capable of showering blessing on them, but as he is able to trouble them in every conceivable manner they propitiate him with sacrifices. The Siyins say that there is no Supreme God and no other world save this, which is full of evil spirits who inhabit the fields, infest the houses, and haunt the jungles. These spirits must be propitiated or bribed to refrain from doing the particular harm of which each is capable, for one can destroy crops, another can make women barren, and a third cause a lizard to enter the stomach and devour the bowels.” (Carey & Tuck, pp. 195-196)

“Colonel Hanny identifies the Khyens [Chins] with the Nagas of Assam mountains. They must also be closely allied to the Kookis. In Trant's account of the Khyens, on the Aeng pass [a pass in the Arakan Yoma or mountain ranges in present-day Rakhine State], he mentions their worship of a divinity called Passine (Pasian); and Lieutenant Stewart, in his notice of the 'new Kookis' of nothern Kachar [Cachar in North-East India], says that they recognize one all-powerful God as the author of the universe, whom they term 'Pathen' (Pasian/Pathian).” (Trant's Two Years in Ava and Jour. Asiatic Society Be. 1855 p. 628. Vum Ko Hau, p. 301)

“Well only one trace of supreme authority still exists among the Kieaans [Khyen/Chin], and this in the person of Passine, or head of their religion. This position was formerly held by a man who resided on a mountain called the Poijou, near the source of the Mob river, and united in his person the two offices of soothsayer and priests, which are now held by his descendants in the male and female line. Writing and books being unknown to the Kieans, the mandates of the Passines are verbal, but irrevocable; to them every dispute of importance is referred for arbitration, and in cases of marriage or sickness they are consulted. The tenets of the Kieaan faith are most simple, and of the supreme Deity they appear to have conception; for to my question on the subject, my informer answered, that 'they were the offspring of the mountains, and of nature;' and nature alone appears to have any claims on their feelings.” (Trant. 1827, p. 433. I recommend those who have got this book to read p. 432, too. On this page, there is a description why Chin women in southern Chinland started tatooing their faces.)
18.2 ORIGIN OF THE DEFINITION OF THE SUPREME GOD IN CHIN

Although this is not a theological paper and I myself have no knowledge at all about theologies, I feel that first of all a brief explanation is needed to clarify how the Chins had chosen this term or terms for the Supreme God whom some tribes are recorded to have believed in. In nearly all Chin dialects he is called in the following terms: Pathian, Pathen, Pasian or Passine as it is spelled above in Trant’s book. No matter how these words are spelled or pronounced, they all have the same meaning - that is, Pa (“father”) and Thian/Sian/Then (“holy”) - literally, “Father Holy”. All “thian”, “then” or “sian” come from the words “thiang” or “then” or “siang” which mean “clean” or “clear” or “holy”.

However, the origin of this term is controversial. I do not know what the western missionaries’ version on this term is, but even nearly all Chin scholars on Christianity believe that it was an invention or selection of Christian missionaries. The following quotation is one example:

“This paper is about the Chins’ God, Pathian. The Chins call their Christian God with the divine name of Pathian. When Protestant missionaries first arrived at hilly villages of the Chins during the last year of the nineteenth century, they had three options to transliterate the divine name of the Christian God for the Chins: Pathian, Zimmang and Khuazing. The missionaries’ selection was Pathian as the Universal Supreme Being i.e., the Christian God and their choice has turned out to be an appropriate one. We would like to investigate this transliteration process from missiological perspectives. Was the missionaries’ selection a good one? If so, why was it good? What are the religious connotations of Pathian, Zimmang and Khuazing anyway? What was the role of the native peoples in the process of semantic reconfiguration of the term, from the traditional (Laipian) Pathian to the Christian God, Pathian? What is the missionary role of the Pau Cin Hau Movement for the new rendering of the divine term, Pathian? To explicate this process, we would like to begin with the ethnic background of the Chins.”*


I (tzd - author of this paper), see it quite differently. The fact that the (Asho) Chins in the Aen (Aan in modern spelling) area had already been using the term “Passine” in 1824-26, when Thomas Abercomby Trant made his finding (between May 1824 and May 1826), is a very strong evidence that the word Pasian/Pathian must have been an ancient usage for a deity who the Chins were familiar with from ancient times. So it could not be a term invented or chosen by Christian missionaries.

The Aan pass area in northern Arakan Yoma is remotely located. The Roman Catholic Church arrived together with the Portugese seafarers in the early 1500s in the coastal regions of Burma, but this Church had great difficulty spreading its missionary works to other parts of Burma. And Carey and Tuck had already made their findings with regard to the religious beliefs of the various tribes of the northern Chin Hills in 1889-94 before any Christian missionary had started his mission work in the hills (The Chin Hills had already been printed in mid-1895). The first Baptist Christian missionaries arrived in northern Chin hills only in 1899. The chaplains who accompanied British colonial troops made no religious activities among their newly conquered tribes. The first
among the Asho Chins in Lower Burma was converted only in 1834, according to the American Baptist Mission records. That was some ten years after Trant's sojourn in that region. The first missionaries to West Zoram (present day Mizoram) first began their work in 1891 (see 18.5 CHRISTIANIZATION OF WEST ZORAM AND MANIPUR).

What is most interesting here with regard to the term, Passine, is that it's almost identical with the term used by Tedim (Chin State) and Paite and Zou tribes in Manipur State in India: Pasian. The Mizos, Sizangs, Falams, Hakas, Thantlangs, and several other tribes, who are living in the regions adjoining the Tedims' territory, call him Pathian. And the Thadou-Kukis, another tribe who are also living very close to the Tedims, call him Pathen.

There were absolutely no social intercourses between the Asho and northern Chins until the British rule began in the early 20th century. Until the British made their first military campaigns against the northern Chins starting from December 1888, the Kale-Kabaw and Gangaw valleys were the raiding grounds of the northern Chins for slaves and cattle. So it was absolutely impossible for a northern Chin to travel to the Asho regions by passing through these valleys. And the Matrix of lexicostatistic percentage of the Tedim and Asho dialects is only some 46% (see TABLE 20/A and 20/B). Besides, the regions in which the Ashos and Tedims are living are separated by a distance of some 400 km and high mountains and thick forests and there was no infrastructure at all between them. I personally would therefore assume that these terms - Passine, Pasian, Pathian or Pathen - must have had an ancient origin and that it could be interpreted as a strong indication that some tribes' belief in the existence of a higher being is plausible. (See Map showing the locations of Tedim and Aan)

18.3 THE RELIGION OF LAIPIAN PAU CIN HAU

A social and religious movement among the Chins sometime in the 1890s and the early 1900s was popularly known as the Pau Cin Hau Movement after the name of the founder and leader, Pau Cin Hau. He was also called Laipianpa, which literally means “he who gave birth to writing” because he invented a script which he claimed to have learned in one of his visions.

In ancient times the Chins spent most of their times in fighting and hunting, they vied one another to excel in these activities. Life was hard and precarious. There were constant wars between tribes. Femines, epidemics, diseases and misfortunes were common. All these were believed to be caused by evil spirits called dawi. These dawis were believed to dwell at different parts of a man's dwellings, springs, treks, rocks, rivers, lakes, mountains and so on. If any misfortune, such as illness, ominous dreams, etc. occurred the affected person offered animals ranging from a chicken to a mithun or a buffalo to appropriate the dawi or dawis. While people lived such a hard and hazardous life filled with fear of war and evil spirit, there appeared in Chinland during the last decade of the 19th century three important events, namely the Pau Cin Hau Movement, the British invasion, and the arrival of Christianity.

Pau Cin Hau was of the Sukte tribe/clan and was one of the eight sons (and two daughters) of Khan Lian and Ciang Zam. The following are some excerpts from an article by Mr. S. Ngin Suanh:

Pau Cin Hau was born in 1859 at Khan Lian's residence which was situated at the east end of the Military Football Field of modern Tiddim/Tedim [see Map 5 and Satellite Photo Light 1&2]. Pau Cin Hau was brought up as an ordinary normal child according to the traditional patterns of life. He tended his father's mythuns and goats in the grazing of Tiddim/Tedim, namely at Vansangdim, Lawibual, Mualtuk and sometimes farther away at Thuammual and Thangmual [Kennedy Peak
and the long mountain range between Fort White and Kennedy Peak along the Kalaymyo-Tiddim/Tedim motor car road, see Map 5 and Satellite Photo 3. He freely associated with his boyhood friends such as Cin Kam, Hau Cin Khup who later became Chief of the Kam Hau tribe... When he was old enough, he was sent to Mualbem [see MAP 5 and Satellite Photos 2 and 3] by his parents, according to the practice of those days, to learn the tactics of war and to be able to speak the language of Teizang; in those days the enemies did not dare to kill a captive who spoke the royal language of Teizang. When he returned from Mualbem he helped his father in the common and normal occupation of all people, that is cultivation...When he was living a normal and healthy life he was involved in a prophecy concerning the destruction of Tiddim, which was at the Zenith of its power. Pasian (God) commanded him to speak out, but nobody believed him, and he composed the following song:

\[Thang va zal Sian za mang aw,\]
\[Tongdam khaak heem in za’ng e.\]
\[Pupa’ pat lo khua van nuai-ah,\]
\[Sian tong dam sin thu hi e.\]
\[(Thou God of gods, reigning on height,\]
\[I heard a hint-Thy word.\]
\[Unheard, unknown in days of yore,\]
\[God’s word prevails through all the land.)\]

Sometime later the British began their campaigns to annex the Chin Hills. The Chins made a brave stand against the invaders, but had to give into superior force. They advanced into the Chin Hills, and captured and burned Tiddim. Its population scattered in all directions. Khan Lian and his family fled to Lailui about six miles north of Tiddim (see MAP 5 and Satellite Photos 1&2). At Lailui Pau Cin Hau continued to receive revelations from Pasian, but as nobody believed him, he became ill and remained invalid for fifteen years. During his long illness he had communications from Pasian in the form of visions and dreams. Pau Cin Hau had many visions, of which the following are some selected samplings:

**Vision of Heaven**

On a plains were gathered a multitude of people, rich and poor, great and small. I went to the place where these people gathered, and I saw a rope hanging down from heaven above the multitude. Many people competed to climb up the hanging rope but no one was able to do so. When many people had failed, I prayed to Pasian and climbed up the rope, and I was ble to climb it. As I climbed up the rope, I found there were thirty layers of heaven, and I saw the abode of Pasian. Then I climbed down again to my startingplace. Again I saw a rope hanging down to the underworld. I climbed down the rope and there were forty layers of the world. I then climbed up the rope to my starting place. Then I wound up the rope and coiled it beside me, and the coil was twice my height. Concerning this vision Pau Cin Hau composed this song:

\[Zan ciang zal mang thangvan tuang va tung veang e,\]
\[Za lu’n sum tual lum sang e.\]
\[Banzal lim sun, sei no gual aw,\]
Meelmuh pian in dang sang e.
(To heaven I went in vision clear,
And saw God's home, how glorious!
With hands I shade my eyes from dazzling light:
The sight, oh friends, how wonderful!)

Vision of Pasian's Command

On a very wide plain there gathered a huge multitude of people. Then Pasian appeared from above in a dazzling rainbow-haloed light. He was riding about wherever He pleased on something shining and sparkling like the sun. Then I cried to the multitude, “Behold Pasian, Let us all follow His command.” However, no one dared to look up at Him but looked down at the ground with down-cast eyes. Then Pasian called to me: “Pau Cin Hau, the life of you, human beings, is not even comparable to that of the worm. But if you follow My holy commands you will be able to fly. Unless you obey My commands, heaven and earth will convulse you into two or three lumps. Those who disobey me, I will punish.” After these words He ordered: “Worship me!”. “How should we worship Thee?” I asked, and He replied:

‘Worship me saying this:

Pasian, the Creator of heaven and earth, sun and moon;
Pasian, the Creator of men and animals;
Pasian, the Healer of the sick.”

Pau Cin Hau composed this song:
Tung thangvan ah, a sang sawn ah,
Sian zua pa meel in mu’ng e.
Sim lei leh thangvan kal ah e,
A bawl lo mi om lo e.
(I saw in heav’n, in highest heav’n,
The face of Father Pasian.
Between heaven and earth below,
There’s none he had not made.)

Vision of Pasian's Command to abolish dawi sacrifices

Once in a vision Pasian appeared to me and commanded: “Pau Cin Hau, starting from now until eight years are completed, abstain from taking the life of living things from the smallest ants and flies, rats and birds, to the biggest beasts.” As Pasian commanded I scrupulously abstained from taking the life of any living thing for eight years. When the eight years were completed Pasian again commanded me: “Pau Cin hau, we have now completely fulfilled our promise with the dawis, and we have overcome them; for during these eight years we have successfully abstained from taking life, whereas they have been persecuting and killing human beings. Therefore, from this day on which I command you, you must cease to sacrifice meat and drinks [the Chins' alcoholic traditional rice-beer] to the dawis.”

From that day on, sacrifices of meat and drinks to the dawis (ancestral spirits) and to the lesser dawis, were abolished.
Sian mang in tongdam hong khak e,
Zin tawh na khen in ci e.
Pupa khan a lung a gimna,
Sian in leen puan bang paai e.

(Almighty Pasian, He sent me the word,
“Be set apart from dawi!”
The bane of man from ancient times,
Pasian now casts off like rag.)

INVENTION OF WRITING

During my fifteen years of illness at Lailui village [see Map 5 and Satellite Photo 1 just above Teddim/ Tedim], I once had a vision of Pasian coming down from heaven and commanded me: “Pau Cin Hau, learn lai- (i.e. reading and writing)!” And Pasian held a book in his hand. Pasian then took some pebbles, and He put them together and separated them again in turn, in a certain fashion. Pasian then asked me, “Can you do like this?” and I answered, “I can”. Then I did as He had done, and I was able to do so. When I could do as He had done, He gave me a book. After this vision there arose in my mind a great desire to learn how to write. This desire occupied my mind day and night, and I was contemplating about it continually. Finally, a system of sounds spontaneously flowed, as if it were, out of my mind, and I formed a symbol to represent each sound as I thought fit. And thus my writing came into being.

There are 1,051 basic characters, each representing a sound. To each basic character may be added two to five additional marks to represent long and short, ascending and descending sounds. These additional marks are called “dawng tawi na”. In this way, he symbolized all the sounds and words of the language, and people learned them easily and well. All these sounds were arranged into mnemonic poetic lines. These lines were in turn grouped into six divisions called books or grades. A student could write anything and everything in the language when he had learned all the lines in the six grades, namely

1. I Bu (168 words)
2. Min Bu (171 words)
3. Donglen Bu (156 words)
4. Lunsia Bu (246 words)
5. Thatuk Bu (146 words)
6. Thuamzong Bu (164 words)

Many people liked this invention and they quickly and easily learned it. Pau Cin Hau himself used it to record his visions, dreams and teachings. He used it widely for exorcism. Whereas people before used to record their achievements on monuments in basrelief, now they used Pau Cin Hau's writing on their monuments. This system of writing was good enough for those earlier days but later his son Sian Khaw Cin, and nephews Thang Cin Kham, Cin Khaw Gin and Pau Za Dong improved it in 1930 and reduced the whole system to 37-alphabetical characters in order to facilitate typewriting and printing. This revised system, though not so widely used as the original, was a great advance on the old one. The system of spelling was very easy as the longest word could be spellt with only four letters. (See APPENDICES H-1 & H-2)
His Public Ministry

During this fifteen-year of illness, he was first treated according to the old religion. The whole series of sacrifices were offered to all known dawis. But he could not regain his health. Finally he renounced the old religion and resorted to prayer as Pasian commanded, and he was healed at once. People were greatly surprised at his sudden healing. Other invalids asked him how he got well. For these other invalids he prayed as he did for himself, and they also became well again, namely Khai Za Deng, Vum Khaw Thang, Hen Dam and Lian Zuan. And they became his first followers. They were very zealous about Pau Cin Hau’s teaching as Pasian commanded him, and they also eagerly learned the newly invented writing. All these happened at Lailui...His renouncing and departure from the age-old fear of and sacrifices to dawis was so uniquely new that people at first laughed and scorned at him and ridiculed his doctrine. Inspite of these he refused to give up his new religion. People, including his own relatives, persecuted him. “He abolished the practice of sacrifices to dawis which was the main cause of poverty among the Chins in olden days. His followers were freed from fear of evil spirits. He abolished the old-time practice of the postponement of funerals for several days, even months and years. He also abolished other extravagant festivals. However, he did neither abolish nor condemn all the traditional customs and practices. He retained and preserved, or modified some cultural festivals, songs and dances.

His following crossed the barriers of tribe and territory, and spread outside Chin Hills to as far as the Lushai Hills and Manipur at the beginning of this century. The number of his followers at one time was estimated to be around 150,000. He died on December 28, 1948 at Mualbem.
2 Background

The Pau Cin Hau script is the ecclesiastical script of the Laipian religious tradition, which developed in the Chin Hills region at the turn of the 20th century. The script is named after Pau Cin Hau (1859–1948), a ‘Sukte’ (Tedin) Chin, who founded the Laipian tradition and developed the script in order to convey his teachings. In an account given by J. J. Bennison in the 1931 *Census of India* report for Burma, Pau Cin Hau stated that the characters of his script were revealed to him in a dream in 1902.¹ Pau Cin Hau revised his script twice and developed the third and final form in 1931.

The script was designed to represent Tedim ([ctdl]), a northern language of the Kuki-Chin group of the Tibeto-Burman family, which is spoken in Chin State, Myanmar. It is known traditionally as *pau cin hau lai* “script of Pau Cin Hau”. The Tedim word *lai* means “writing” and Pau Cin Hau himself is referred to as *laipianpa* “script creator”.² The name is also romanized as ‘Pau Chiu Hau’ and is known in one source as ‘Bow-chinhwa’.³

There appear to be logographic and alphasyllabic forms of Pau Cin Hau. The logographic form is believed to be the original script revealed to Pau Cin Hau (see Figure 6). It is reported that the logographic script consisted of 1,050 characters, which were reduced to a repertoire consisting of 57 characters.⁴ This 57-character repertoire belongs to the alphasyllabic script described in this document. The transformation of the logographic script into an alphasyllabic form was the final revision made by Pau Cin Hau in 1931. Some characters of both the logographic and alphasyllabic scripts resemble those found in Burmese, Latin, and other writing systems, but these occurrences are coincidental. Neither form has a genetic relationship with any other script.

The alphasyllabic script formalized in 1931 was used for writing and printing Laipian and Christian literature. A primer for the script was printed for the purpose of teaching the script (see Figure 3). Books of Laipian ritual songs were written in the script and it is believed that some of these were also printed.⁵ In 1931, the Baptist and Foreign Bible Society printed the “Sermon on the Mount” from the book of St. Matthew in


See APPENDIX H-2 for the following research papers of Dr. Anhuman Pandey on the Pau Cin Hau Script:

- Preliminary Proposal to Encode the Pau Cin Hau Script ISO/IEC 10646 (N3781 L2/10-080)
- Defining Properties for Tone Marks of the Pau Cin Hau Script (N3784 L2/10-092)
- Introducing the Logographic Script of Pau Cin Hau (N3961 L2/10-438), Dr. Pandey has also produced the following papers on Pau Cin Hau’s Script. See APPENDIX H-5 for more information on Dr. Pandey himself. One can download all of his papers listed here in pdf from the link below.
- Pau Cin Hau Alphabet - Allocating the Pau Cin Hau Script in the Unicode Roadmap (N3865 L2/10-073)
- Preliminary Proposal to Encode the Pau Cin Hau Alphabet in ISO/IEC 10646 (N3960 L2/10- 437)
- Proposal to Encode the Pau Cin Hau Alphabet in ISO/IEC 10646 (N4017 L2/11-104R)
Proposal to Change the Names for Some Pau Cin Hau Characters (N4129 L2/11-287)
Pau Cin Hau Syllabary - Preliminary Code Chart for the Pau Cin Hau Sallabary (N4412)
(Source: http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/~pandey/)

Note: There were and still are rumors and speculations among several of those who have ever heard of Pau Cin Hau’s invention (even many educated Chins among them) that he might have had learned some basic knowledge in either Manipuri or Burmese - the two scripts that are closest to the region where Pau Cin Hau spent his entire life. These two speculations are groundless for the following reasons. His birthplace Tiddim - or Tedim as it is known today - was conquered and completely destroyed by the British on March 11-12, 1890, under the command of General Faunce, who had marched from the Burma side. And the Kingdom of Manipur had also just been annexed and conquered by the British from the Indian and Bengal sides. So there was no security to travel between the Chin Hills and Manipur when he began his invention around 1902. If Pau Cin Hau had wanted to learn Manipuri, he would have to travel at least seven days to reach the nearest Manipuri villages where he could learn it. And it would also take him at least two days to reach the nearest Burmese villages where he could learn Burmese. There was no possibility at all that he could have learned some basic knowledge of western writing from the Baptist missionaries either as the first Baptist missionary arrived in the northern Chin Hills in 1899 in Haka – some 150 km from Tiddim.

The first conversion of four persons to Christianity in the entire Chin Hills took place only in 1904 at Khuasak, some 30 km away from Tiddim, where he lived. The first batch of Chins learned Burmese at some Buddhist monasteries in Kalaymyo sometime in 1907-8. So, there are absolutely no similarities between his and the other two scripts. As mentioned in the first quote above, even for translating parts of St. Matthew into his script from Burmese in 1932, he had to be helped by a vernacular school teacher named Thang Cin Kham, who knew Burmese. Compare APPENDICES H-1 and H-2 with H-3 & H-4.

“The transformation of the logographic script into an alphasyllabic form was the final revision made by Pau Cin Hau in 1931. Some characters of both the logographic and alphasyllabic scripts resemble those found in Burmese, Latin, and other writing systems, but these occurrences are coincidental. Neither form has a genetic relationship with any other script.” (Source: Preliminary Proposal to Endcode the Pau Cin Hau Script in ISO/IEC 10646. p. 1. See APPENDIX H-2)

18.3.4 THE LAIPIAN HIERARCHY

1. Laipian (Script Creator): “Laipian” is a unique position held by Pu Tg. Pau Cin Hau, not to be taken up by any other person.

2. Laimang (Script King = Professor): “Laimang” is the second-highest rank in the Laipian hierarchy. Only one person can hold this Laimang position at a time. He is the vicarious leader of the Laipian Religion. Pu Tg. Lian Vungh (Mualbeem), second son of Pu Tg. Pau Cin Hau held that position. I do not know who the present Laimang is.

3. Laito (Script Lord = Script Master): This is the third-ranking position held by Pu Tg. Vum Khaw Thang (Lailui), a contemporary of Pu Tg. Pau Cin Hau, and later left vacant after his death. Recently Pu Tg. Ngin Suanh (Suangpi), a very faithful and diligent Lai-at for many years, was promoted to this office. There is only one Laito at present, although I assume that there can be more than one.

4. Lai-at (Script Writer): Pu Tg. Ngin Suanh held the fourth-ranking position for many years. I do not know if somebody had been appointed to this post after he was promoted to Laito.


6. Laisang (Script Receiver = Pastor): This is the lowest rank in the hierarchy. A Laisang leads a local congregation, called Sang (School), in a village or a quarter of a town.
18.3.1 HOW THE CHRISTIAN MISSIONARIES SEE PAU CIN HAU AND HIS RELIGION

The Pau Cin Hau Religion or Movement was one of the most important parts of the Chin people's history, no matter if one believes in his claims of communicating with God or not. So, I believe that it is very important to learn what the outsiders, especially the British colonial officials and pioneer Christian missionaries who had known him personally or who were closely familiar with his life and his religion had thought about him and his religion. What I have got in hand are an article reproduced by the late Rev. Khup Za Go under the title of The Pau Cin Hau Movement in the Chin Hills in his book (see BIBLIOGRAPHY) and the late Rev. Dr. Robert G. Johnson’s book (see BIBLIOGRAPHY). Interestingly, both sources cite the same source, but some of the texts are different. Since I do not have access to the original materials being cited by them, I shall briefly reproduce below a few crucial parts from these books. (I am trying to get the original materials these days and when and if I succeed, this section will be rewritten anew.) I assume that the views that Johnson expresses in his book with regard to Pau Cin Hau and his religion may probably more or less reflect the opinions not only of other American Baptist missionaries who came to Chinland before him, but also that of many Christian missionaries and religious leaders of other Churches from the West as well that have followers among the Chins. Dr. Johnson was based in Haka, the present capital of Chin State, from 1946 to 1966. The quote below is from Khup Za Go's book, pp. 109-110:

“...Unfortunately, when the census was taken, the Cencus Superintendent was not aware of the existence of this movement and the followers of Pau Cin Hau were all recorded in the enumeration schedules as Animists. The Deputy Commissioner of the Chin Hills district has estimated the number of followers in his district at 35,700 (26,000 in Tiddim sub-division and 9,700 in Falam sub-division) but there are also followers on the other side of the frontier [the Burma/Indian border].

A copy of the script mentioned by Pau Cin Hau will be found in Chapter X.

The Pau Cin Hau Script.- In paragraph 135 of Chapter XI an account is given of the Pau Cin Hau Movement in the Chin Hills. Reference is made there to to certain Chin characters which were revealed to Pau Cin Hau in one of his dreams. Copies of the original characters are not available but apparently they were very numerous. The characters were revised, the third and last revision being carried out in 1931. The new alphabet consists of 21 consonants.

The first page of the Spelling Book together with the corresponding Roman version is printed on page 195. It will be noticed that the Chin sounds can be properly represented in these new characters but not in Roman character. 'The Sermon on the Mount' in St. Matthew has already been printed in this character. In this work of translation Pau Cin Hau is helped by a vernacular school teacher named Thang Ccin Kham who lives in Tonzang village near Tiddim. and who knows Burmese. The whole of St. Matthew is being translated and in May 1932 the first eight chapters had already been completed. For the purpose of translation, the Burmese version of St. Matthew is used and also a Chin version (in the Roman character),
which was done by Mr. Cope, the American Missionary in the Chin Hills. This version in the Roman character is also given in the ‘Sermon on the Mount' referred to above. No information is available as to the number of persons who can read the script.” (Cited sources: Census of India 1931, Burma, Part I, p. 194, pp. 217-218)

The quotes below are from Johnson's book.

THE PAU CIN HAU SCRIPT (pp. 399-401)

“Pau Cin Hau devised a script in accordance, he said, with a revelation from God. Evidently there were about 1050 characters in the script originally so that each and every sound in the Chin languages could be written correctly. This proved cumbersome and Pau Cin Hau worked diligently at simplifying it, ending up in the 1930s with an alphabet of 21 consonants and 7 vowels plus tonal signs.

Because of this script, which many people diligently studied, the Pau Cin Hau religion was also called “Laipian” (“script-creation” or “birth of writing”). It is still known by this name in areas where it exists. There is no reason why the various Chin languages cannot be written in the roman characters used in English. [1] True, various persons have thought diacritical markings are necessary to render Chin properly in the Western alphabet that English uses, but for the most part even this has not proven necessary. So there was really not a need for special alphabet such as Pau Cin Hau invented -- and certainly not one invented by an illiterate person. The script has died out and exists now only as a curiosity or museum piece. All the northern Chin languages use the common roman alphabet; an exception is the Asho (Southern) Chin which uses Burmese script.” (See the quote below in Footnote to get a general picture about this script. For more information on this subject, see APPENDIX H-2 and also other related papers by Pandey that are listed in Footnotes on page 163. He is undoubtedly the most authoritative scholar on this subject.)

**Impact of “Laipian” on the Churches**

[2] Pau Cin Hau claimed to have received his religion by direct command of God through visions and revelations. He did not acknowledge any prior knowledge of Christianity. But it is probable that he had learned something of Christianity from the Lushai people of India, many of whom had become Christians in the late nineteenth century. Lushais came over the border to sell medicines and other goods. Perhaps they brought some knowledge of God, which Pau Cin Hau received in imperfect form, for he seemed to know nothing of Jesus Christ. This cannot be proved but seems a reasonable guess.

From Dr. Hjalmar East [one of Johnson’s predecessors] we learn that the Karen preacher and teacher, Po Ku, who was stationed in the little mission school at Tonzang, was asked by the missionary to visit Pau Cin Hau as often as possible and explain the New Testament to him. It is unclear where Pau Cin Hau was living at this time. We know that he lived for some years at Lai-lui, also at Tiddim/Tedim, and that in 1932 he was living at Mualbem. He died in 1948. Without doubt, Po Ku and other Christian teachers made a conscious effort to reach this man for Christ. [3] But there is no indication that this prophet ever came to the Christian faith. There is nothing in his doctrine about the Bible, Jesus Christ or [4] the
fullness of Christian ethical and moral teaching.

There is some evidence that Dr. East and Dr. Cope [another predecessor of Johnson] believed that the Pau Cin Hau religion, by its emphasis on one God and its rejection of belief in and sacrifice to the evil spirits, would help break down barriers to the Chins' acceptance of Christianity, that it would be a forerunner of the Faith, that it would be a sort of John the Baptist preparing the way for the Lord.

“A Promising Movement”?

An optimistic view of the movement is contained in a report of the British and Foreign Bible Society (Burma Agency) for 1932 in which the writer said:

“Amongst the so-called ‘backward’ races there are distinct signs of movement away from their ancestral animism towards higher and purer faiths. The most promising of these among the people of the Chin Hills where a religious reformer has arisen who by his condemnation of the drunkenness and restriction of animal sacrifices and his worship of one Creator God seems to be drawing near to genuine Christian ideals. His followers, numbering thousands, are found among almost all the clans of the Chin race and there can be little doubt that with sympathetic and wise leadership this indigenous and spontaneous quest after higher things can be turned into a definite movement towards Christianity. (Ibid pp. 400 - 401)

Author's (tzd) Note: The passages underlined (by myself) below are the ones that are missing in the above quote from Johnson's book.

“Amongst the so-called ‘backward’ races there are distinct signs of movement away from their ancestral animism towards higher and purer faiths. The most promising of these among the people of the Chin Hills where a religious reformer has arisen who by his condemnation of the drunkenness and restriction of animal sacrifices and his worship of one Creator God seems to be drawing near to genuine Christian ideals. His followers, numbering thousands, are found among almost all the clans of the Chin race and there can be little doubt that with sympathetic and wise leadership this indigenous and spontaneous quest after higher things can be turned into a definite movement towards Christianity. At the urgent request of the leader, the Bible Society has published a small edition of the “Sermon on the Mountain” in a character (somewhat modified after consultation with the Agency) which he claims to have received in a dream by Divine Revelation and which, it is stated, exactly “fits” the pronunciation of all the Chin dialects.

(Original source: Thirty-third Annual Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society (Burma Agency), 1932, under the title of “Religious Movements” pp. 8-9)

The Laipian Movement Today

According to Mr. S. Ngin Snunh, who is presently the paid secretary of the Pau Cin Hau group and lives in Tiddim, there are about 150,000 people practicing this religion. Undoubtedly, this is highly inflated. For one thing, there are only 77,000 people in the whole Tiddim subdivision, where it is strongest. I doubt if there are even 25,000 who could be termed followers of Pau Cin Hau. The movement has produced no scriptures, no well-known leaders, and has nothing to offer that Christianity cannot match and exceed in wholesome teachings.
[5] What has prevented the followers of Pau Cin Hau from coming en masse to the fullness of the Christian faith? Very probably it is the strong prohibition of drinking alcoholic beverages in any shape or for that is the barrier. Too many of this a difficulty and are unwilling to give up their liquor...

[6] We therefore come to the conclusion that the Pau Cin Hau prophet movement has not had a lasting impact on the Baptist churches of the Chin Hills... Had it never existed, in all probability the history of the expansion of Christianity in the Chin Hills would not have been much different.

(End of quotes from Johnson's book)

18.3.2 MY COMMENTS ON THE ABOVE QUOTES

I am not familiar with the Pau Cin Hau religion, and I have never studied any Christian theologies during my entire lifetime. Still, I would like to make my comments on the numbered facts from the above quotations (I numbered them myself for this purpose):

[1] I disagree with Dr. Johnson’s argument that the Chin languages (I, as a non-academic, prefer dialects, actually) can be written in the Roman alphabet and that Pau Cin Hau's invention is unnecessary. True, all the Chin dialects, except that of the Asho, are written in the Roman alphabet nowadays. But since there are no tonal signs in all of them, one has first to be a native speaker to correctly read and understand them because the meaning of words differs depending on the tones. Johnson remarks that it’s a script invented by an illiterate. But it could even be said the other way around that the very fact that an illiterate, who had never had any knowledge of writing before, could invent a functioning script with tonal signs itself be taken as a great miracle already. Whether one believes it to be the product of either God or just that of a genius is absolutely another matter. Until now, there are already several hundred - or maybe even a few thousands - of highly educated Chins around the world. But not even a single “highly educated” Chin has ever attempted yet to improve any existing single Chin dialect by inventing and introducing tonal signs to it. In fact, if he had not invented this script, his claim of communicating with God would most likely be just a hollow claim. His invention is flourishing nowadays, instead of becoming just a museum piece, at least among his followers who number some 40,000 at present (see Footnote below).

(“In the past several years, I happened to meet a couple of fanatic, highly educated Chin Christian church leaders who believed that Pau Cin Hau’s invention could even be the work of Satan and that what Pau Cin Hau thought to be God could also be Satan and that what he called visions and dreams also might be just hallucinations. So, on every occasion, I told them that if Satan is so powerful enough even to enable Pau Cin Hau to invent a functioning script, why don’t they or any other people who are holding doctorates in theologies ask God to give them also the ability to invent one, too. A better one in that case. But until today, nobody could do that.”

[2] Johnson writes, “…But he had probably learned something of Christianity from the Lushai people of India, many of whom had become Christians in the late nineteenth century. Lushais came over the border to sell medicines and other goods. Perhaps they brought some knowledge of God, which Pau Cin Hau received in imperfect form, for he seemed to know nothing of Jesus Christ. This cannot be proved but seems a reasonable guess.”

I disagree with Johnson’s above speculations on the following simple grounds: 1. The first Christian missionaries arrived in the Lushai hills only in 1891 and 1894 (see 18.5 THE CHRISTIANIZATION OF
WEST ZORAM AND MANIPUR), but Pau Cin Hau had already created his script around 1902, and he had even prophesied the destruction of Tiddim (Tedim) by the British on March 11-12, 1890 under the command of General Faunce, which he claimed to have had foreseen in a vision, for instance (see on p. 156-157); 2. Had he gotten some knowledge of God from either the Lushai traders as Johnson speculates or British troops or Baptist missionaries who came to the hills from Burma side in the late 1890s, he would undoubtedly have had taken at least some parts of Christianity, especially about Jesus and his teachings, and integrated them into his teaching? But he did not do that. See the following point.

[3] As I have just mentioned above, the fact that Pau Cin Hau did not come to the Christian faith or there was nothing about Jesus Christ, I think, could even ironically be interpreted as the authenticity of his “calling”; if there were something about Jesus in his teaching, there would surely be some people who would like to accuse him of imitating the Christian faith - or even as a fraud. If I understand the Bible correctly, even the great majority of Israelites or Jews, who the Bible itself has mentioned several times as God’s own Chosen People, themselves have not yet accepted Jesus as either the son of their God - or as the Messiah whom they have been waiting for for millennia - until now. So far as I know, the concept of the son of God begins only when a historical person named Jesus appeared on earth 2,000 years ago. The only nearest biblical verses that could probably be interpreted as an indication of the existence of Jesus or a powerful heavenly being beside God in the Old Testament are to be found only in some verses in Proverbs, Psalm, and Isaiah (my biblical references are from Holy Bible - New International Version).

[4] Christians everywhere are proudly - and very carelessly as well - talking all the time about these words: “The fullness of Christian ethical and moral teaching”. But some serious freethinkers may surely see these words very critically. They may probably not want to question the values of Jesus’ ethical and moral teachings themselves, which can be summed up in five words: Love, Forgiveness, Compassion, Peace, and Humility, because these moral teaching are so invaluable for any human relationship if one could observe any or all of them, no matter whether one believes in his main message of salvation or eternal life or not. But they would instead want to question how these noble values could have been so badly abused by the very people who claim to be the best believers and observers of these morals. Between his appearance on this earth 2,000 years ago and the present time, uncountable innocent human beings have had lost their precious lives in countless sectarian conflicts and wars that the Christians fought against each other in the very names of the two deities whom they claim to be worshipping. According to Wikipedia in 2015, they were divided into more than 41,000 denominations around the world. (According to an article in the US-based Newsweek magazine in the early 1980s, about 1200 new churches were founded every week worldwide.)

I do not believe that Christian moral teachings are necessarily superior to that of other major religions. The main factor that differentiates Christianity from any other religion is its core message - the existence of eternal life. That’s its “uniqueness”, provided of course, that the biblical God and Jesus do really exist somewhere in the universe. So, perhaps, the only consolation for the individual believer is that he may probably get eternal life - or salvation as the Christians say - by observing only Jesus’ original teachings in the Gospels, but not any moral that was made in his name by man.

[5] In Chin/Zo: Zu or Zo Zu, fermented rice-beer has been an indispensable part of the Chin/Zo people’s everyday life and culture from time immemorial. They did not and do not drink this rice beer just to get drunk. So, at the beginning of the Baptist missionaries’ efforts to convert them to Christianity, it was indeed a great barrier for the
Chins. But later, a great majority of them managed to give it up entirely. The Roman Catholic Church exploited
this barrier by allowing them to keep on consuming and using it as in the past to gain a great number of followers
who could not live without it. (See 18.4 THE CHRISTIANIZATION OF EAST ZORAM OR CHIN STATE and
19.O CULTURE)

[6] The Pau Cin Hau Movement may certainly mean nothing from the Christian theological point of view, as Dr.
Johnson has pointed out above, but for the primitive Chins, it was at least two great leaps forward, not counting
his invention of writing. First, he had successfully managed to take away the Chins’ fear of evil spirits, and he
abolished all the costly animal sacrifices to appease those spirits. Second, as the members of his religion are still
using the ancient Chin traditional songs solely composed in poetic words, this religion is preserving one of their
priceless cultural heritages. And it is nowadays generally agreed among the Chins that, if Christianity had not
come, Pau Cin Hau’s religion might have even most likely become Chinland’s main religion and that his
invention would also have become the land’s script. Another crucial fact is that, despite many of its negative
sides, the Chins owe the Animism that they have been practicing for generations for a large part of their
cultural heritage. (It is still being practiced in some parts of Chinland.)

-----------------------------------------------

Christians have been accusing each other of being either Satan-incarnates or Antichrists. And every Church
claims to be the only true Church. Until now, I have never heard that any living human being has ever seen either
Satan or his evil spirits with his own eyes. But when the communists appeared everywhere in the world, they were
branded by all Christians as Satan-incarnates who must be wiped out of the face of the earth at all costs. However,
although communists have nearly wholly disappeared around the world since the Soviet Union was falling apart
and the Chinese communists have long adopted capitalism and thus they pose no more threat to humanity,
Christians are still as divisive as ever before. Mutual hatred is still rampant among them. Chin Christians inside
Burma alone, for instance, who may number about 2 million, belong to some 30 rival denominations. The Bible
says that God expelled Satan and his followers from heaven because of their rebellion against him. So, as a
layman in theology, I cannot imagine how God and Jesus would let the souls of those who persecuted and killed
each other in their names into their realm.

In my life, I would have read the Bible from the beginning to the end at least ten times, but I have had never
come across even a single verse that says ’You shall make wars against Satan and his fallen angels on our behalf’.
God and Jesus only plead us to love each other. If they have to make wars against Satan and his fallen angels one
day, they will do it in their own way. It is absolutely not the duty of we human beings. We cannot even see our
own souls or we do not know for sure if we have souls at all. We get this idea only from the Bible.

The Chin Animists had believed - and still believe - that those imaginary evil spirits could only cause all kinds
of illness. Nothing more than that. Unlike Christians, the Chin Animists had never made wars or killed each other
even in the names of those imaginary evil spirits, for instance. I believe that a great majority of Christians may
probably not realize that the uneasy truce between rival denominations since a couple of centuries ago is not
because the leading members of these Churches have become holier, but simply because the rule of law and
reason has got the upper hand. Otherwise, bloody conflicts would most likely still go on endlessly until today. It is
interesting to note here that Chin Animists were - and are not - necessarily more evil than Christians. And it could
also be a good idea for those who believe in the superiority of Christian moral teachings to ponder seriously upon
why countless non-Christians are also as good as they are, or in other words, why they are not necessarily more
evil than the average Christians.
There is another very crucial theological point that has been troubling me personally so much for my whole adult life. Although theologians and leaders of those Churches are already powerful enough to promise their followers salvation and eternal life in the names of God and Jesus, and at the same time threatening them with eternal damnation at a place called “hell” for committing what they call such “sins” as using condoms and other contraceptive devices or practicing various kinds of sexual activity or consuming pork, etc., they still keep studying theologies and even endlessly debating about the very existence or non-existence of those deities! In my opinion, nobody has the sole right to monopolize the interpretation of its contents, for everybody can buy the Bible in book shops. However, if someone prefers to believe in another person’s interpretations of those contents, that should also, of course, be his own right and business.

So, in my opinion, as a theological layman, the easiest way for all the Christian churches to overcome their theological differences would be to let their powerless and poverty-stricken followers directly worship the God who would forgive the wrongdoings of the rich and the powerful and give them eternal lives in his kingdom.

Since the leaders of those Churches themselves are even already thus theoretically above the biblical God anyway, I do not see any reason why they could not do it, if they sincerely wish to do so. Even the biblical God himself is said to have sent his only Son to this world to save humankind from mutual self-destruction and eternal damnation. However, suppose I am to admit honestly and bluntly. In that case, I do not believe that Christians would ever be able to solve their theological differences alone unless Jesus comes back on the clouds accompanied by millions of angels, as some verses in the Book of Revelation describe. But if he would come back incognito like a thief, as some verses also describe, his worshippers may most likely accuse him of being a fraud and crucify him again.

And here naturally arises a great theological question: Would Christians still get salvation or eternal life if they cannot worship together in a single Church? I would say that they would still get it on the conditions that they do not condemn each other as false Churches and justify their evil deeds in the names of God and Jesus. And they must preach only about love. Since even ancient Israelites could not worship God uniformly, although they had witnessed his powers and great miracles in various forms uncountable times during several centuries, it is no wonder that Christians nowadays are divided into tens of thousands of rival Churches; the only sources of their belief in God are the thousands-year-old Bibles.

Another theological problem for me, when I closely observe how most Christians worship their God, is that they seem to believe that they would first become sinless and holy only when he is in heaven first. Jesus may not have needed to preach the virtues of Love, Forgiveness, Compassion, Peace, and Humility at the risk of his own life.

And if I understand some Churches’ doctrines correctly, they only emphasize the importance of faith in Jesus to attain eternal life, or one does not need to be sinless and holy. Of course, I fully understand and accept that it would not be easy for human beings with blood and flesh to be completely sinless or holy, but according to my understanding of the core Christian ethics taught personally by Jesus, to be sinless or holy means one must not cause to shed the tear or blood of an innocent person and justify his evil deeds in the names of God and Jesus. As simple as that. The following are a few more words on Satan and his fallen angels as I see them:

- The Israelites had always disbelieved God’s laws for centuries. Still, God had never had directly blamed Satan and his fallen angels for the Israelis’ sins and rebellions, even though there are some mentions and prophecies about the existence and final downfall of an evil and powerful entity in the Old Testament -
symbolized as Babylon – which some biblical scholars may want to interpret as Satan. The warning of Satan’s possible mischievous deeds is mentioned only in the Gospels and some prophecies in the Book of Revelation, which many theologians interpret as his downfall. So, we will have to wait and see whether these prophecies someday become fulfilled or not.

- There is no mention of the number of angels God expelled from heaven in the Bible. And there is also no mention in it whether they also reproduce like us humans and whether they work round-the-clock or not to tempt humans to commit evil acts. So, to mislead human beings worldwide to commit evil deeds round the clock, for instance, there must at least be three times more fallen angels than the total human population at any time. Suppose Church leaders and theologians could not find out the number of those fallen angels – or if they all are still alive or not - or the number of angels who would monitor human beings’ everyday activities around the world. In that case, they still should explain to their followers how their sins would be registered in the Book of Life. My conversation with an illiterate paternal aunt of mine mentioned below could be interesting for some people in this regard. And I suppose it would not be a bad idea for Christians if they would seriously think about this question: Why do Satan and evil spirits not play an equal fatal role for humankind in other major religions such as Buddhism, Confucianism, Hinduism, and Taoism?

Speaking about evil spirits, I would like to share with you the conversation that I had had with one of my illiterate paternal aunts, who was about 70 years old at that time, back at my native village in the mid-1960s. The Chins were Animists from ancient times (there are still some thousands in various parts of Chin State, especially in the south). They did not and do not worship evil spirits, as many outsiders used to believe. Only they believe that those evil spirits could cause all kinds of illness, so those Animists killed various types of animals and offered them to appease those imaginary evil spirits to heal their sicknesses, as Carey and Tuck rightly had written on pp.195-196 of their book. (According to the belief of the northern Chin Animists alone, for instance, there were about 68 kinds of “evil spirits”. However, not a single evil spirit is said ever to have appeared to them in human form and tortured or killed them with weapons as countless Christians have been doing to each other for centuries.

At first glance, this conversation may probably sound just hilarious or even crazy, but it may likely contain some enlightening elements from the Christian theological point of view. Although she was illiterate, she was very intelligent and had a hunger for general knowledge. She got a lot of knowledge in various fields from many young men in the village who were studying at the Rangoon and Mandalay universities at that time. I cannot recall the contents of our conversation in detail, but the following is the nearest reconstruction.

**I:** Before we became Christian, we were very much afraid of evil spirits. But their presence is no more to be felt since we became Christian. Why is that? Do you think they’re hiding now in some other places because they’re afraid of the Christian God, Jesus, and angels?

**She:** I think they had run away from our land.

**I:** You think they had run away from our country? Where could they be now?

**She:** I think they are all back in paradise since long ago.

**I:** In paradise? Do you mean in heaven where the biblical God is said to live?

**She:** No, in England and other wealthy Christian countries in the West.

**I:** Why should they run to these countries in the first place?
**She:** They must have run away to these countries not because they were afraid of the biblical God, Jesus, and angels, but rather because of the guns of the English angels.

**1. The guns of the English angels? What do you mean by that?**

**She:** The English soldiers who had conquered us with their guns.

**1. You mean the English soldiers were angels?**

**She:** Yes. Look, we had never even seen any evil spirits whom we had been offering animals for generations, and they had never killed us with guns, nor had they ever imprisoned us for years as the English soldiers had done nor had they ever put us in jails even for decades – or exiled some people for life on isolated islands. So, they must, in reality, be mighty angels.

**I: How would you prove that they were angels?**

**She:** They were Christian and powerful priests accompanied and blessed them wherever they went and whatever they did. Our pastors tell us all the time about the Ten Commandments, and one of them is, “You shall not murder!” My two sons [they were studying at the Rangoon Arts and Science University at that time] used to tell me that English soldiers conquered many nations around the world with guns. So they must have gotten God’s permission to kill countless innocent people.

**I: Okay, then. But how could those evil spirits arrive in those countries? Could it be that they flew with their wings?**

**She:** I don’t think they had their wings anymore.

**I: When they were still angels, they were supposed to have wings. But why do you think that they didn’t have wings anymore?**

**She:** God must have had destroyed their wings when he drove them out of heaven. Otherwise, they might fly up to heaven again someday. And if even they still had wings, they might not be able to fly non-stop to those countries. Thousands of men from our people, who were conscripted to serve as laborers in France during World War I, told us that the oceans were so vast that they needed more than one month to reach France.

**I: Okay, let’s say they had no wings anymore. But how could they have reached countries in the West?**

**She:** They sailed with the ships that transported English soldiers back and forth between England and our country. And when there were airplanes, they flew by air.

**I: Okay. Let’s say they are already there. How could they survive then?**

**She:** Look! Even when they were in our country, we never heard that evil spirits died from hunger or diseases. And we had never seen them cultivating food plants.

**I: Don’t you think they might have had difficulty entering those countries? I suppose the local angels over there might not have welcomed them with open arms.**

**She:** I don’t think they would have had any problems. They would have simply intermarried with the local angels.

**I: Intermarrying with the local angels? Where did you get this bizarre idea?**

**She:** Last Sunday, our pastor preached in the church that humans were so attractive that angels transformed themselves into humans and married them in ancient times. This act made God very angry with those
angels/humans. So, if that story is true, some or many of us may even be the descendants of angels, too.

I: If they were married to each other, what kind of skin colors could they probably have?
She: Like we human beings, angels also must have different colors of skin: white, yellow, brown, and black.

I: So, do you believe there are no more evil spirits in our land?
She: Yes. Why should they want to stay here? They had to live in forests or caves or on mountains or trees without clothes or blankets or umbrellas when they were here. And they had to eat what we ate, like maize, millet, rice, sweet potatoes, and so on, and what we offered them. And they had to walk from one place to another on foot. But in Western countries, they can live in palaces, castles, big houses, and travel by air, train, ship, car, etc. There is plenty of delicious food there. And there are are more than enough beautiful clothes to cover their bodies. When they were still in our land, they had to drink only one kind of alcohol – our traditionally fermented rice beer -, but in the West, they can enjoy thousands of different types of alcohol, like rum and whisky and beer, and so on. So if I myself were an evil spirit, I’d never want to come back to this horrible place.

I: Where did you get the idea that they were naked?
She: Do you think they also had tailors like us? And they also planted cotton for their clothes? Or from where would they get the materials for their clothes?

I: But all Christians are still afraid of them.
She: In that case, why don’t they ask God to show them these evil spirits and kill them all with their guns? The West’s Christians have mighty armies and tanks, warships, airplanes, and powerful bombs. They should drop some of the kind of bombs that the Americans had dropped in Japan on those spirits’ places. Why can’t they do that? I’m an old, frail woman, but I’m not afraid of them.

I: Why do you regularly go to church on Sundays then?
She: Yes, I go to church every Sunday, not because I’m afraid of evil spirits, but because I want to see God when I die. Since evil spirits are no longer in our country, why should I fear them?

I: Do you think they can make human beings evil, as Christians believe?
She: Look! Before we became Christian, we offered them all kinds of animals to heal our ailments, but when the white people from the West came and brought modern medicines with them, these medicines were more powerful than evil spirits. So, if they’re not even as powerful as the simple medicines that we can buy cheaply in the markets, why should they be powerful to make us evil? Listen, my sons told me that Buddhists, for example, are more peaceful than Christians. So what or who makes them peaceful? Why should evil spirits make only the Christians, not Buddhists, commit bad things? And why were there so many good people among the Animists?

I: How sure are you that there are no more evil spirits in our land?
She: For now, I’m pretty sure about that since there’s no sign that they have ever come back. But if our land becomes highly developed and wealthy someday and we have all kinds of delicious food and alcohol, good houses, good cars, trains, airplanes, and so on, then they will probably come back to the land of their ancestors. So long as we’re so poor, they won’t want to come back to go on foot and be naked and to eat our primitive food again. Don’t you think so?
PHOTO - LIGHT 1

VIEWED FROM THE HEIGHT OF 40 KM

- The light can be seen as a yellowish spot exactly at the junction of N 24°14' & E 93° 46'
(Actually, it can already be spotted clearly from the height of 60 km.)

- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal, June 19, 2017.
- Seen from 15.79 km
- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal, June 19, 2017.
A MYSTERIOUS LIGHT/FIGURE

Three US and European satellites (Landsat, Copernicus, and CNES/Airbus) photographed an extremely bright, long, and large light on the 22nd of February 2017 in the heart of what the British called the “Siyin Country” or the “Siyin Tract” in Chin State, Burma. I first saw it on the 12th of June 2017 when I visited Google Earth. It could be clearly seen already from the height of 60 km as a yellowish spot. What is astounding is: If the light is looked at from different angles - or different distances – there seems to be a figure in the form of a “smiling human being”. I made hundreds of screenshots of it from different angles and distances. (The light/figure was visible only until mid-2018; since then, the area in which it appeared and its immediate surrounding areas had been replaced with newer satellite photos.)

Note. There are ten villages near the place where the light’s appearance took place; the combined population of these villages was about two thousand. Therefore, theoretically, at least a couple of people should have seen it, but nobody noticed it. In addition to this, there must have been a few hundreds of middle and high school students at the Thuklai State High School for it was a Wednesday and the school summer holiday had not yet started. The school is situated only about 3-4 air-kilometer away in the direct opposition of the site, but none of them had seen it. And there are two motor car roads close to the site in question – one road connects Kalaymyo and Tedim, the other connects Kalaymyo and Falam/Haka (see the roads in Photo–Figure 9). On any given day during this period (January-May), some hundreds to a few thousand passengers pass through the site’s vicinity. But not a single person of these people had seen it.

Furthermore, I surfed several times over other parts of Chinland, and Mizoram and Manipur states in India in search of similar appearances on Google Earth thoroughly but I found none. These states are adjoining Chinland and a couple of millions of the Chin/Zo people are also living there.

1. Residents of Chin State in Burma, Mizoram, and some parts of Manipur states in India belong to what is known to the outside world as the Chin-Kuki-Mizo ethnic group. Traces of Near Eastern DNA were found in several tribes of this group back in 2004. Hence, the Chief Rabbinate of Israel recognized them as a lost Israeli tribe. See a separate paper of mine “CHIN-KUKI-MIZO: A LOST TRIBE OF ISRAEL?” for more information on it.

2. An illiterate prophet by the name of Pau Cin Hau (1859-1948), who was born in Tedim, invented a well-functioning script called the Pau Cin Hau script out of his visions with the biblical God. And he founded a religion known as the Religion of Laipian [Script creator] Pau Cin Hau. He spent most of his adult life and finally passed away and buried at Mualbem village, which is located close to Daakdungh Buan in Satellite Photos 1 & 10, but as it's not written on the photo, only the site can be seen. The distance between Mualbem and my native village, Lophei, is just about 12 km. For more information about him, see my papers, “Ancient Religious Beliefs of the Chin/Zo People”.

3. If the date (day, month, and year) are added together they make up the mystical number of SEVEN! Numbers 7, 12, 40, 49, and 70 had played several crucial roles in the Jewish people's history in ancient times. Number 7 is mentioned 735 times in the Bible, so we can say that it is the most frequently mentioned number in this book. The ordinal number 7th is used 119 times in the Bible, while the word “sevenfold” is used 6 times. If we take all this into account, we have the result of 735 + 119 + 6 is 860, which means the number 7 is mentioned 860 times in the Bible. Number 40 is mentioned 146 times and Number 12 - 187 times.

\[22.2.2017 = (22+2+2+1+7) = 34 \ (3+4) = 7, \ or \ 2+2+2+2+1+7 = 16 \ (1+6) = 7.\]
- Seen from 2.60 km

- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal, June 19, 2017.
- Seen from 2.08 km
- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal, June 19, 2017.
- From Lailui village to Mualbem village (sign of a village beneath Dakdungh): A view from the West toward the East. The Manipur River in the photo flows rightward.

- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. July 2017. The valley seen above is called the Kalay-Kabaw Valley.
- **Satellite Photo Light 2**

- Satellite Photo Light 1 - viewed from a different perspective - from the north toward the south.
Photo taken by a CNES/Airbus satellite on February 22, 2017 - Seen from the height of 11.60 km. (A part of what is seen in this photo is generally known as the “Siin Vallay” or a large part of the “Siin Region”.) The summit at bottom/left side of Photo (meeting point of six mountain ranges) is the well-known Kennedy Peak (2,703 m). It's the second highest summit in Chinland and is called in Chin Thuammal. (The highest summit, Mt. Victoria (3,053 m) is located in southern Chinland.) It was on the grazing meadows around this summit and mountain ranges that Prophet Pau Cin Hau, who invented a script, which he claimed to have been given to him by the biblical God in visions around 1900, tended his father's mythuns and goats when he was still young for many years. Such historical site - Fort White (2305 m) - and villages - Lophei, Khuasak and Thuklai - can be seen here. Mualbem village, where he lived for several years and was buried, is located close to Daakdung Buan village at far right of photo. (The distance between Mualbem and Lophei is about 12 km.) A number of other villages that are also located within the site of this Photo are invisible here. Several great battles were fought between the British and Japanese during WW II around this summit, Fort White and also in several other parts of northern Chinland. The mountain range between Kennedy Peak and Fort White and beyond is sometimes called “The Great Letha Range”. It’s well-known since the British annexation in 1889-89. The river on top right of the photo is called Manipur River. (For more information on Pau Cin Hau, see my other paper: The Chin/Zo People and Their Religions.)

“The visit which made the biggest impact, however, was that of the Supreme Allied Commander of the newly established South East Asia Command, Lord Mountbatten himself, who visited the [17] division on the 11th of February [1945]. He enjoyed the trip and noted that “the scenery is indescribably beautiful...He recorded the view from Kennedy Peak beggars description...” (Major-General I.L. Grant, p. 50)

PHOTO 27

( PORTRAIT OF PAU CIN HAU AND HIS SCRIPT )

- Source: blogs.slv.vic.gov.au/?attachment_id=16395

Rev. Thuam Hang, Pastor Pau Suan and their wives from Khuasak village were the first converts to Christianity (in this case the American Baptist Church) in CHINLAND, which was known as the Chin Hills until the country's independence in 1948. (Its population then was estimated to be somewhere around 4-600,000.) They were baptized on 4 May 1904 by Rev. Dr. East, an American Baptist missionary, in a stream called Lui Pi down below the village - it's the stream that flows between Khuasak on one side and Lophei and Thuklai on the other side. Thousands of the Plains or Asho Chins who are living in the plains of what was then known as Burma proper (Magwe, Pago, and Irrawaddy Divisions) had already converted to Christianity in the late 1800s.

* See Note 3: under Author's (tgd) Notes in 18.4 The Christianization of East Zoram (Chin State)!

---

PHOTO - FIGURE 1

The valley seen above is the Kalay-Kabaw Valley.
FIGURE 5

FIGURE 16

- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. Hamburg, June 2017.
Lophei, my native village, is visible on top of the photo. (Mualbem is the marked village beneath - or foreground - of Daakdungh Buan (red point) . This photo was taken by three US and European satellites (Lansat, Copernicus, and CNEF/Airbus) on 22.2.2017. The scenes in this region have been replaced with photos taken in mid-2018 so that the mysterious light/figure is no more visible since then.

* Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. Hamburg. December 2018. FORT WHITE on top of the Light/figure is the new Fort White.
INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, about 98 percent of the Chin State’s population is Chin and of which circa 80 percent is Christian who belongs to the following Churches: Anglican Church, Assemblies of God, Baptist Church, Christian Baptist Church, Christian Mission Alliance, Christian Church of Myanmar, Christian Reformed Church, Church of Jesus Christ, Church of Christ Jesus, Church of God, Church on the Rock, Elim Independent Church of Myanmar, Evangelical Baptist Church, Evangelical Presbyterian Church, Evangelical Free Church of Burma, Four Square Gospel Church, Full Gospel Assembly, Full Gospel Church, Fundamental Baptist Church, Gospel Baptist Church, Independent Church of Burma, Jehovah's Witnesses, Methodist Church, Presbyterian Church, Reformed Presbyterian Church, Roman Catholic Church, Seventh Day Adventists, Seventh Day Baptist Church, United Pentecostal Church, United Reformed Church, United Wesleyan Church. etc., and a few “home-grown” Churches as well.

And the rest - approximately 20 percent is - Animist and Laipian (see below) and Buddhist. About 95 percent of the Chin/Zos in India are also Christian of several denominations. (The percentages given here concerning religions in both Chin State and India are the nearest average estimates based on various sources.) I shall quote here a few lines from the article of Mr. Stevenson that shows how various rival Christian denominations divided their spheres of influence in Burma in the early 1900s (see marked passages on page 29 of APPENDIX V for more information on this subject):

“...When the province of Burma was divided into spheres of influence for various missions, the central Chin Hills were allotted to the American Baptists, a body who have resolutely set their face against the production or consumption of alcohol in any form or circumstance whatsoever. Immediately, there arose the paradoxical situation of a group of prohibitionist Christians trying to convert a people who welcome Christianity but cannot stomach prohibition because their entire system of reciprocities is built upon the procedure at feasts of which the drinking and supply of liquor is an integral and inseparable part...”

The great majority of Christian Chins take great pride in being Christian because, for them, Christianity means civilization and Animism primitiveness or backwardness. Therefore, they often exaggerate the number of Christians in Chin State to hide their inferiority complex. And although all Christian are solemnly preaching about the virtues of love and forgiveness, the Christian Chin society is, like all other Christian societies everywhere globally, irreconcilably divided into fragments by their mother churches’ sectarian rivalries. There were - and still are - more love and harmony among the Animists than among Christians - that is, from the beginning of the British rule up to even the present time. The following is some brief information on the three major Christian denominations, Roman Catholic Church, Baptist Church, and Anglican Church, that play many important roles in the Christian Chins’ daily life in Burma.

18.4.1 ADOPTION OF THE NAME “ZOMI BAPTIST CONVENTION”

“There had never been any formally constituted organization of the Christian churches in the Chin Hills. When I returned from the USA arriving at Rangoon on 18th September 1950, I was invited to speak at the annual meeting of the American Baptist Missionary Fellowship in October. In my speech I attempted to express what I thought to be most essential for the growth of Christianity among our people. I explained that the Chin Hills had been the
most neglected and the least developed area in Burma. To remedy this, I made the following two proposals:

(1) In order to strengthen the Christian churches, the village churches should be formed into properly constituted local associations and there should be an overall organization embracing all the organizations.

(2) A well-experienced missionary should come and make a survey of all the Chin Hills and give us advice on various projects of development. The Missionary Fellowship approved both proposals. Accordingly, Mission Secretary E. E. Sowards visited the Chin Hills during February and March 1952. By that time both the Tedim and Hakha missionaries had left on furlough. So I myself had to accompany him throughout his survey tour. At the conclusion of his survey tour he advised me as follows:

(a) The government in recent months changed its policy on mission work in Burma. Under this new policy our days of missionaries in Burma were numbered. And we might be asked to leave the country any day. What you proposed in October 1950 must be proceeded forthwith. You just start forming properly constituted Christian bodies – local associations and an overall convention, as speedily as you could. This properly Christian bodies must be ready to take over missionary work whenever the missionaries had to leave.

(b) And when this convention was formed it should be a purely national organization, bearing the national name, and run by national personnel. No foreign missionaries should hold any official position and should not be a member of any committee, but should work in an advisory capacity. According to his advice, I began forming the Tedim, Falam, and Hakha Associations during 1952. Then in order to constitute an overall convention, I asked the three Associations to select ten leaders each from the three Associations to form a Constitution Drafting Committee. This Constitution Drafting Committee met at Falam Baptist Church during the last week of October and the first week of November 1952. I acted as Chairman of the Constitution Drafting Committee.

(c) Having explained to the Committee that we are forming a purely national organization, I proposed that the name of our organization should bear our own national name. I said, "Outsiders call us Chin, but we never call ourselves by that name. So I believe you all agree to reject Chin to be the name of our organization," and all the members of the Committee agreed by acclamation.

(3) Then I proposed that we should take ZOMI as our name as this is our correct historical name. And we should call our organization Zomi Baptist Convention.

(4) A man sprang to his feet and rejected the name ZOMI outright saying, "Saya, in Hakha we apply this word Zo to the most backward and the most despicable people. So we do not want this name for our big Christian organization."

(5) "In that case what name do you like?" I asked and he replied, "LAIMI". Then I explained, "I propose ZOMI because I believe it is the correct original historical name of our people, from the Naga Hills to the Bay of Bengal. To the north of Tedim, the Thados and other tribes call themselves YO, in Falam, LAIZO. The Tedim people call themselves ZO, the Lushais, MIZO, in Hakha, ZOTUNG, ZOPHEI, ZOKHUA. In Gangaw area ZO is pronounced YAW, in Mindat JO or CHO, and in Paletwa KHOMI. In Prome, Sandoway, and Bassein areas they call themselves A-SHO. So I am convinced that in spite of slight variations this ZO is our original historical national name."

(6) After this explanation the Rev. Sang Ling who was the most senior and revered pastor from Hakha
stood up and said, "What Saya Hau Go has just said is correct. In our younger days we were told that we were born at YOTLANG. And ZO is our true original name. The word LAI is not our national name. LAI was first used by denizens of Hakha. It means our village people, our own local people, as distinct from outsiders. It is not our national name." Saying this, he waved to Rev. Sang Fen who also was the second eldest and most respected pastor and asked, "What is your opinion on this, Saya?"

(7) Then Saya Sang Fen stood up and briefly said, "I agree. I believe ZO is our national name and I myself am the pastor of ZOKHUA".

(8) After the two most senior and revered pastors of the Hakha area arose and spoke in support of my proposal, not a single voice of dissent was heard and the name Zomi Baptist Convention was unanimously approved.

(9) What the Constitution Drafting Committee had approved at the Falam meeting was officially and universally adopted by the General Meeting at Saikah, March 5-7, 1953. The lone dissenting voice seemed to be more an idiosyncrasy or at best a limited local usage without any sound historical basis, because not a single member of the Constitution Drafting Committee voiced any support at Falam.

The General Meeting held on March 5-7, 1953 at Saikah village in the now Thantlang township of Hakha area was attended by 3,000 Christians. Of these about two hundred were from the Falam area and less than ten from the Tedim area, because Saikah was 7-9 days' foot journey from Tedim area. Even there, where by far the vast majority of delegates were from the Hakha area there was not a single voice of support for LAIMI, but the name Zomi Baptist Convention was born, named and based on the foundation of historical truth, confirmed by the General Meeting at Saikah with the most remarkable spirit of Christian harmony and unity never experienced before or since.

I was asked, out of necessity, to serve temporarily for one year as General Secretary, pending the arrival of the Rev. David Van Bik who was earmarked to relieve me on arrival from the USA the following year.”

Signed T. Hau Go Sukte
Rangoon 1st December 1988

-------------------------------
(Source: ZONET/Date: Sun, 23 Mar 2003) Note: The late Mr. T. Hau Go Sukte was the first Chin graduate with a M.R.E degree from the U.S. Author

-------------------------------
(Source: ZONET/Date: Sun, 23 Mar 2003) Note: The late Mr. T. Hau Go Sukte was the first Chin graduate with a M.R.E degree from the U.S. Author (tzd)
18.4.3  “CHINS FOR CHRIST IN ONE CENTURY” (CCOC)

There was a major project called the “Chins for Christ in One Century” or (CCOC), which was implemented between 1983 and 1999 under the guidance of the ZBC. Its main aim was to convert as many Animist Chins as possible to Christianity before the end of the second Millenium. There were 1,894 volunteers (all were laymen) who carried out the mission. The project areas were in Central and Southern Chin State. Altogether 20,051 people were converted. During this period, seven people died of disease. And the total expenses were: Kyats 54,922,245. That sum would be the equivalent of about US $ 150,000 at the then black market exchange rates. (Sources: CCOC records)

18.4.4  BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE CHIN HILLS

The blue mountains on the Western side of Chindwin river was always in the mind of the French Priests of Paris Foreign Mission Society. They are known for their missionary zeal and holiness. They attempted to enter the Chin Hills even in 1864. In that year, Bishop Bigandet sent Fr. Lecomte MEP. His mission to reach the Chin Hills was not successful as his movement was restricted. The King’s soldiers escorted him, and he was not allowed to go beyond the Catholic village.

Twenty years later, in 1884, Fr. Laurent MEP, who worked some years among the Kachins, previously came to Kalaymyo. There he met some Chins. He found that the Chins did not speak Burmese much, but they were kind and simple. In 1888, Fr. Antonin Usse came up to Mindat near Mawlaik from Chaung U by English steamer. As he looked attracted his eyes. He wrote to Bishop Simon of Mandalay: “Further in the west are the Chins, a people of straightforward and brave warriors, who are defending their independence against the ambition of the English. I would be proud to be their apostle.” He came back to visit the Catholics in the English military camps. This time, on 22nd September 1889, he reached Fort White near Thuklai. As he looked down from there, he saw the nearby villages abandoned by the villagers who hid themselves in the jungle due to the war with the British soldiers. In his letter to the bishop dated October 15, 1998., he said, “Once I climbed to the top of the mountain and contemplated the villages far away. How I wished to go there with my crucifix and my breviary ... It would be useless to go now... The country will open itself. Some day it will be necessary to send a caravan of missionaries in that part of the Vineyard. They might die even then, victims of their zeal.”

He was the first Catholic priest to visit northern Chin State. In 1890, the Vicar Apostolic of Mandalay, Mgr Simon, sent one of his best priests, Fr. Laurent MEP, and Fr. Verstraeten to Chin Hills, 250 miles away. They went towards Northern Chin Hills and settled at Balet, south of Mawlaik, on the western side of the Chindwin, but after one year there, they saw that they were still far from the real Chins. The next year, Fr. Laurent went with Fr. Jarre to try to enter Chin Hills in the south from Pakokku; through Pauk and Tilin they arrived at the big village of Shon-Shi, near the Myitha river. Although it was at the foot of the hills, they had met real Chin people, and they started to study the language. At the end of 1891, after the retreat, a third missionary, Fr. Accarion, joined them. With the collaboration of Chin traders who had come down to the plains, the two young ones made the project of climbing to Haka to settle there, in the center of Chin State, the English officer who was a protestant and hostile to the Catholics, obliged them to leave and go back down to the plains, saying that the Chins were not yet tamed and the life of the priests would be in danger. The Fathers had no choice but to go back to Gangaw.
In 1898, the American Baptist missionaries came to Hakha. The same officers who refused to give permission to work in the Hills welcomed them with open arms. The coming of the Baptist Mission was a blessing in disguise for the Catholic Mission. For more than forty years, they invented the written language for Hakha, Falam, and Tiddim with English alphabets. They translated the New Testament. They abolished the sacrifices to devil, which is too expensive. The Chins opened their eyes to the world. They wanted to become Baptists but their strict prohibition to drink “Zu” (Chin beer) is too demanding for the Chin people as Zu is for them a kind of food and also the only consolation for them after a day’s hard work. Many people began [to] ask for a kind of Christians who would allow to drink Zu. But many wanted to be free from worshipping the evil spirit. By all means, the first attempts of Catholic missionaries to Chin Hills were not successful.

18.4.4.1 EVANGELIZATION OF SOUTHERN CHIN STATE

The second attempt was made this time in 1934, under Bishop A. Faliere, 50 years later than the protestants. Bishop A Faliere, Fr. Audrain MEP, and Fr. Alexis U Ba Din, A diocesan priest with four catechists, arrived at Kampetlet, the capital of Southern Chin State, on 17th December 1933. Looking for better prospects, the pioneers

Author’s (tzd) Notes

Note 1: The Chin Baptists in Chin State and its neighboring regions inside Burma Proper are organized in more than 30 associations - nearly all of them are organized more on tribal rather than on regional basis - which in turn are run under the umbrella of the Zomi Baptist Convention.

Note 2: Sakhong does not elaborate at all on the founding history and existence of the ZBC in his dissertation, although he mentions the events that took place as late as 1999. Even when briefly mentioned (just four times on pages 9, 213, 226 & 254), he used the term “Chin Baptist Convention”, instead of the official term: Zomi Baptist Convention. (He comes from the Haka region and is widely known as a strong opponent of the word “Zo” in any form although he himself belongs to the ZOPHEI tribe.)

Note 3: The first conversions in the Chin Hills took place at a village in 1904, 150 miles away from Haka, where the first American Baptist missionaries made their base. That was four years after they arrived in Haka in 1899. “The First Baptisms, May 11, 1905: The first baptism of Northern Chins took place near Khuasak in the Siyin valley, near Fort White in Tiddim Sub-division. A small stream called by East the ‘Pok boy River’, although it is merely a small creek, was dammed up for the occasion, and on May 11, 1905, in the presence of a large number of curious villagers, Pu Pau Suan and his wife Pi Kham Ciang, and Pu Thuam Hang and his wife Pi Dim Khaw Cing, were baptized by Dr. East. East wrote: These are the first fruits in the Chin Hills, and from the depths of our hearts, we praise God and take courage. We have four more candidates in that district and hope to baptize them this year. This will give us a constituency for the organization of a church.” (East ltr., 11/3/05/ Robert J. Johnson: History of American Baptist Chin Mission, Vol.1, p. 128.) “After the events of the second baptism, Dr. East remained in Khuasak village for about a week. He then moved eastward to Theizaung village for more preaching and medical treatment, returning to Khuasak for an important event for the formation of a little church among the new Christians. On February 17, 1906, a Sunday morning was a red-letter day in the history of Christianity among northern Chins. On that day, Dr. East organized the first Christian Church in the Chin Hills, the first of any denomination, at Khuasak among the Siyin people. This Khuasak Baptist Church was established by the following persons [1 pastor, 2 deacons and 9 laypersons] and dedicated by Dr. East.” (Johnson, Vol. 1, p. 130). The first convert in Haka itself was Shia Khaw, and the conversion took place on January 1, 1906.

Note 4: The “Chin Christian Centenary (1904-2004)” was held from March 17 to 21, 2004, at Khuasak to commemorate the 100th Year of Christianity among the Chin people. More than 6,000 people from all over Chin State and Burma took part in the ceremony. Another ceremony was held in Haka in 1999, where the missionaries arrived and made their base to commemorate the arrival of the first Christian missionaries in the Chin Hills. Several thousands of people from all parts of Chin State and Burma took part in it, too.
proceeded to Mindat, 32 miles northeast of Kanpelet on 31st December 1933, first Mass was offered on 1st January, 1934. With the streamous efforts of two pioneers: Fr. Audrian and Fr. Alexis, the good seed of the Word of God was sown in Mindat area of Southern Chin State to grow into a big tree in time.

18.4.4.2 EVANGELIZATION OF NORTHERN CHIN STATE

In 1938, Bishop Faliere came to meet Colonel Burne at Mague to settle some problems connected with Mindat hospital. Colonel Burne was the highest authority in the Chin Special Division. When they met each other, the Colonel had just come back from his official visit to the northern Chin Hills. He told the Bishop that he met some Chins in Falam who asked him if they could be Christians and still be allowed to use moderately alcoholic drinks. He asked the Bishop to go and start Catholic Mission in the Northern Chin Hills. The Bishop was very happy, and he himself came to the north the next year in 1939. When the Bishop and his companions came to Tiddim at the house of Mr. Kelly, the Assistant Superintendent in Tiddim, a Catholic, the Superintendent from Falam came to meet them. He told the Bishop that the coming of the Catholic Mission in the Chin Hills was contrary to the agreement signed in 1898 with the Baptist Missionaries. He wanted them to go back as they did to Fr. Jarre and Fr. Accarion. Bishop smilingly told him that he came here with the permission of the highest authority, Colonel Burne at Mague. He continued his missionary tour without fear.

The American Baptist Missionaries did not keep silent. They wrote to the British Governor to Burma, reminding him of the agreement made with them in 1839. The coming of the Catholic Church in the Chin Hills would be breaking that agreement. They wanted to prevent the presence of the Catholic Church in the Chin Hills by hook or by crook. The Governor kindly thanked them for their good works among the Chins, but he ended his letter saying that he did not see any reason to forbid the coming of the Catholics there." As in the rest of Burma,"," he added, "the simultaneous presence of Baptists and Catholics created an emulation quite beneficial to the population, so would the presence of Catholics alongside the Baptists on the hills be of benefit to all people." With this, the Catholics won a landslide victory.

The real beginning of the Catholic Church in the Northern Chin Hills started with the coming of Fr. Mainier, Fr. Blivet, fr. Aloysius U Ba Khin and four catechists: Maung Tun Yin, Fridolinus Mg Ba Maung, Saya Aung Min, Fr. Frank Reuben to Tonzaung. Fr. Moses took up his residence at Tonzang, while Fr. Blivet took up at Lailui village. Established: Hakha Diocese was recently part of Mandalay Diocese. Pope John Paul II established the new diocese of Hakha on December 21, 1992, and the enthronement was celebrated on 21st of March 1993.

Townships: The diocese comprises townships of Chin State except for Paletwa and adjacent regions: Tamu, Kalay, Kalewa, Paukgbyin, Mawlaik, and Homalin of Sagaing Division.

Area: Around 351 miles from North to South and 80 miles from East to West and approximately 20,880.08 square miles.

Population: 50,000 inhabitants, two-thirds of the region is situated on the mountains and hilly ranges.

The majority of the inhabitants are Chin-hill-tribal people.

Religion: Christian is the Chins' major religion, but 86 percent of Chins belong to the Protestant Denomination, numbering about fifty sects, and there are few Buddhists, animists, and a few Islams. Catholic population: about 67, 427 Suffragan of Mandalay Archdiocese.

18.4.4.3 ZONES AND PARISHES

Zones: According to civil data, it is divided into four zones: Hakha zone, Tiddim zone, Kalay zone, and Mindat zone. Under Hakha zone, there are 7 parishes: Hakha, Falam, Lumbang, Thantlang, Hnaring, Rezua and Surkhwa.
Under Tiddim Zone, there are 5 parishes, such as Tiddim, Tongzang, Laitui, Waibula, and Cikha.
Under Kalay Zone, there are 5 parishes, such as Kalay, Tahan, Tamu, Khampat, and Kalewa. Under the Mindat zone, there are 6 parishes such as Mindat, Lukse, Khanpetlet, Ro, M’Kui Im nu, and Matupi.

18.4.4.4  French Priest-Missionaries in Chinland (East Zoram)
French Priests of the Foreign Missions of Paris who had been assigned in Chin State

01. Rev. Fr. Audrain (1934-died on 8th of May, 1940 at Mindat)
02. Rev. Fr. Fourmel (1934-died on 30th of May, 1968 in Mind
05. Rev. Fr. Louis Garrot (1956-61, Mindat)
06. Rev Fr. Antonie Kelbert (1953-66, Tonzang)

Source: This shortened article CATHOLIC CHURCH IN CHIN HILLS is taken from the Myanmar Catholic Directory. It is an official directory of the Catholic Church in Myanmar. Joshua Gin Shoute [ZONET] From: Salai.Kipp@t-online.de (Salai Kipp Kho Lian) Date: Mon, 23 Jul 2001 12:58:11 +0200

18.4.5  KHUMI-CHIN ANGLICANS
By Revd. Canon E.W. Francis & Mrs. Francis

[An overview of the development of the Khumi-Chin Anglican Church, based in Paletwa, Chin State. The Revd. (now Canon) E.W. FRANCIS went to Burma from England in 1932 with the Bible Churchman’s Missionary Society, now known as “Crosslinks”]

He began in the western part of the country while learning Bengali in order to work amongst the Bengali-speaking community around Buthidaung. However, the Missionary Society had a request for encouragement from 10 Lushai evangelists who were working amongst the KHUMI-CHIN of the Upper Kaladan River area. They had travelled from the Lushai Hills as missionaries, and as requested, Francis and another missionary, S. Short, were sent for one year to give them some fellowship and training. In those days, there were only about 100 Christians in the area. This “one year” for Revd. Francis turned into over 30 years! He got married in 1938, and he and his wife worked among the Khumis until 1965 (except for a brief period of time during the Second World War). They were based in PALETWA, and had a wonderfully fulfilling Christian life there. As well as spreading the Gospel amongst the Khumis, Revd. Francis also helped improve the Khumi-Chin oral tradition to writing, translated the New Testament and hymns and prayers into Khumi. Many are literate in their first language today.

The Anglican Church that Revd. Francis founded amongst the Khumis is thriving and is growing in 1999. As of 1998, there are 2 Khumi Bishops, 28 ordained Priests, and 158 Catechists/Evangelists. The SITTWE DIOCESE is covered by these two Bishops and there are 17 Townships in Rakhaine State and 4 Townships in Chin State (Paletwa, Matupi, Mindat, Khanpetlet). The population is over 2,634,310. Amongst an estimated 92,000 Christians in the area, 13,114 are Anglicans. These Anglicans have 15 Youth Branches, 18 Mother’s Union Branches, 18
Religious Education Departments, 32 Men’s Societies, and Sunday schools attached to each congregation. Some of the parishes are carrying out long-term development projects such as planting Orange, Banana, Mango groves and growing Sesame and Chillies. There is a Bible School in Paletwa... (Source: *Centennial Highlights of Christianity in Chin Hills: 1899 - 1999*; published and printed in the U.S., March 1999)

18.5 THE CHRISTIANIZATION OF WEST ZORAM (PRESENT-DAY MIZORAM) AND MANIPUR

As I do not have many materials on this subject, I shall simply quote a few passages directly from *Zo History* by Vumson Suantak and Professor Lal Dena’s dissertation to briefly show how West Zoram was Christianized and how a few denominations had rivaled each other for new followers there.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONARIES

Soon after the British invasion, Christian missionaries came to Zo country. The missionaries had worked in India and Burma, where they had had little success in converting the Indians and Burmans who were Hindu, Muslim, and Buddhist. They had more success with the hill peoples because they were ignorant of the teachings of major religions. In 1834 the American Baptist Mission recorded the first convert of an Asho Chin in lower Burma. They soon went to the hill regions bordering Burma, India, and China, and they arrived in Zo country in the latter part of the nineteenth century. The first missionary, who came to the southwest of West Zoram in the latter part of the 1880s, was Rev. W. Williams of the Welsh Calvinistic Church. In 1893 R. Arthington of the Arthington Aborigines Mission financed two missionaries to Aizawl [the then capital of Lushai Hills], F. W. Savidge and J. H. Lorraine.

In 1894 they went to southwest Zoram. They did not see success in their first years, but they learned the Zo language [Lusei or Duhlial dialect], and within two years, they introduced the writing of the Zo language using the Roman script. They also translated some portions of the Bible and prepared the first and only Lusei-English dictionary. Even today, the sizable book is the only available dictionary of the Zo language. Lorraine and Savidge taught the people how to read and write, and afterward, they opened mission schools. Only in their fourth year, however, did the two missionaries start to see signs of success. In 1898 they were recalled to England because Arthington believed that those missionaries’ job was to teach a few people to read so that those individuals might teach and evangelize other individuals or tribes.

In 1898 a Welsh Presbyterian missionary, Rev. D. E. Jones, arrived in the northern part of West Zoram. He had easier work than Lorraine and Savidge, as, by 1899, he had visited almost all important villages and had twenty converts. The British administration completely ignored education for their subjects, so that educating the people was wholly in the hands of the missionaries. They used this to their advantage by teaching the Lusei/Duhlial dialect in schools, although the official language was Bengali. The schools included courses in Evangelism so that the missionaries had Christians trained as teachers, evangelists, and pastors in a short time.

To yield even more success, the missionaries introduced to medicine and hygiene. These new methods could cure more sick people than the Zo traditional methods of sacrifice, and many families converted to Christianity to cure their sick ones. As a result, Christianity spread with increasing speed, and in the 1940s, there were villages in which all the people were Christian. There were even some villages founded where only Christians were allowed to dwell.

In the 1951 census of India, 91% or 178,000 of 196,000 Mizos were Christian. 56,000 or 29% of Mizos could read and write. One of the reasons for the success of the missionaries in the Lushai Hills was the church organization. The Baptist missionaries in the southern Lushai Hills combined with the Welsh Mission in northern
Lushai Hills, and the church was organized in the same manner...” (Suantak, pp. 142-43)

The following passages are from LaL Dena’s book. For those who are interested especially in the sectarian rivalries between various denominations in Northeast India, this book could be very informative and valuable. See Footnotes for its PREFACE and CONTENTS on the next and over next pages (175-176).

“The first missionary who went to Manipur with full patronage from a British official (Mr. A. Porteous, the activating Political Agent) was Mr. William Pettigrew, from the Arthington Aborigines Mission Society, named after Robert Arthington, a millionaire at Leeds near London...Even prior to the founding of the mission society, Arthington wrote to the Assam Baptist Mission on 15 September 1885, stating his desire to open work among any unevangelised tribes in and around Assam or elsewhere in India.

Arthington’s interest in Assam hill tribes had been kindled by the reports of St. John Dalmas, a missionary in Bengal, who had spoken when on furlough about the “untamed “hillmen of Assam who were not yet reached by the Gospel. John Dalmas, later on, became a key intermediary in Arthington’s private mission, issuing instructions, forwarding money, and receiving reports on Arthington’s behalf. Of about thirteen missionaries whom Arthington commissioned in 1890, William Pettigrew proceeded to Manipur and J. H. Lorrain and F. W. Savidge to Lushai hills in 1894...” [p-3] When the Lushai hills gradually came under the firm grip of British control, William Williams, a Welsh missionary who had been working in Khasi hills, took it as the “fulness of time” to proclaim the message of the Gospel among the Lushais and rushed to Aizawl on March 1891...” (ibid. p. 43)

PREFACE

The study is an attempt to examine and evaluate the missionary movement in Manipur and Lushai hills during the latter part of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century from the colonial perspective. The missionary movement followed closely on the heels of colonial expansion into the two hill countries that succumbed to British imperialism’s onslaught in 1891. Strangely enough, it was the British officer, Mr. A. Porteous, who, as an acting political agent in Manipur for some time and later on as superintendent in Lushai hills, initiated the missionary entry into both territories in 1894. It was again the same Arthington Aborigines Foreign Mission Society (a private mission society named after Mr. Robert Arthington at Leeds) which, after having laid the enduring foundation of Christian presence in both Manipur and Lushai hills simultaneously, withdrew later on after handing over the two fields to other missions. The Welsh Calvinistic Methodists’ Foreign Mission Society (WCMFMS), with its headquarters at Liverpool, stepped into the North Lushai hills; the Baptist Missionary Society (BMS), in collaboration with the London Missionary Society (LMS), took over the South Lushai Hills, while the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society (ABFMS), occupied the Manipur field. Later on, an independent and undenominational Welsh missionary who had then made Aizawl, the capital of North Lushai hills, as the base of his operation, had made an inroad into the South-West of Manipur hills having boundary with Lushai hills, with the help of new converts from Lushai hills and established the North East India General Mission with its headquarters at London and branch office at Philadelphia. For historical reasons, the missionary movements in these two regions were thus closely interlinked. It is for this reason that this study covers the two regions...
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18.6 RESEARCH PAPERS THAT HELPED THE CREATION OF VARIOUS CHIN/ZO SCRIPTS

The Chin/Zo people have to thank the following personalities for their various research papers on the following
dialects which helped later for the creation of scripts. (Source: Rev. Arthur Carson's records - see the list of
American Baptist missionaries).
1. Siyin Dialect: Captain Rundall (1891)
2. Mizo (Lusei/Duhlisan); Lt. Colonel Herbert (1874)
3. Lakher (Mara): Captain S. R. Tickell (1852)
4. Kuki: C. A. Soppit (1874)
5. Haka (Lai): Surgeon Major Newland, IMS (1894)
6. Tedim and Falam: Rev. Dr. Joseph Herbert Cope (1924)
8. Asho Chin: Maung Copany, a Karen Baptist evanglists of the Bassein Pwo Karen Association (1866)

18.7 A MYSTERY IN THE LOPHEI BAPTIST CHURCH THAT CANNOT YET BE SOLVED
UNTIL TODAY
The heading above is one of the sub-headings in the *HISTORY OF LOPHEI VILLAGE AND ITS BAPTIST CHURCH*. This 77-page history booklet was published in 2008 by a committee made up a few leading villagers. The sub-heading in the Sizang (Siyin) dialect on page 47 reads *D. TUNI DONG A KITEL ZONGAWL THU*. It can also be translated as “AN UNSOLVED MYSTERY UNTIL NOW”. See pages 47 and 48.

Back in 1957, the Lophei village church, where my conversion to Baptist Christianity from the Religion of Prophet Laipian Pau Cin Hau and my baptism took place, needed to be expanded and renovated. *(My conversion took place in 1952 at my age of seven, and I was baptized at this village on August 16, 1960 - a Tuesday. I have been an independent Christian since 60 years ago.)* But as the villagers could not afford it, they resorted to prayers. So, to everyone’s surprise, some money was found in the church’s offering bag on March 3, 1957, between the morning and evening services; it was a Sunday. At first, people thought that the treasurers might have forgotten to collect the offerings from the morning service, but when the treasurers checked carefully, they found everything to be in order. From then on, money was found in the offering bag from time to time, mainly during the daytime and on different weekdays. Some people were assigned nearly every day to watch the church’s only entrance door every day, which were well-locked, but they found nothing unusual. Thus, money kept on appearing 38 times - the last time on March 9, 1957. The total amount was Kyat 1160.70 (the equivalent of some USD 160.00 at that time).

The villagers did not dare to use the money; they thought God might have returned offerings that were made unwillingly. Therefore, the matter was brought by Rev. Mang Khaw Pau of Khuaasak village to the attention of the *Zomi Baptist Convention* (ZBC) - the umbrella organization of all Baptist Associations in Chin State. He was the General Secretary of ZBC from 1957 to 1962. But as the ZBC also did not dare to permit its use as its leading members agreed with the Lophei villagers, he further brought the matter to the attention of the *Burma Baptist Convention* (BBC) in Rangoon. Finally, it was decided that the money could have been a gift of God Himself for the church’s renovation and expansion and thus the villagers were allowed to spend it. So, they replaced the old corrugated iron sheets with new ones and expanded the building. This church was replaced with a new building (see the new church on the cover of the booklet) in 2000-2001.

Back in 2017, I requested Rev. Khoi Lam Thang, B.Th., B.A., M.Div., M.A., M.Th., General Secretary of the Bible Society of Myanmar, to search in the archives of the *Chin Baptist Convention* (the word "Zomi" was replaced with "Chin" in 2013) and *Myanmar Baptist Convention* (formerly BBC) if there were any records on this matter. But there were none. Then I contacted Mr. David Hang Za Pome, a son of the late Rev. Mang Khaw Pau, now living in Perth, Australia, and asked his opinion on this matter. He believed that his father might have brought this case to the then ZBC and later to the BBC verbally, but not in a written form. All the office-bearers of the period in question had passed away long ago.

Suppose anybody would like to know more about the meaning of the booklet’s contents. There are a number of Siyin dialect-speaking Chins in Perth and Melbourne in Australia and Maryland State in the United States, or the *Siyin Region Baptist Association* in Yangon would be happy to provide a qualified one for the task. *(See Appendix KK for more information)*
18.8 INTRODUCTION OF BUDDHISM INTO NORTHERN ZORAM (NORTHERN CHIN STATE)

With the sole aim of spreading Buddhism among non-Burmese Animists and Christians in Burma, the successive Burmese governments under the then Prime Minister U Nu and the Buddhist Sangha of Burma formed up a missionary society called - loosely translated: Buddhist Hills Missionary Society (in Burmese: Buddha Bata Taungtan Sasana Pyoke Aphywak) and dispatched several Burmese Buddhist monks to Chin State to do missionary works among the local people in the 1950s and ’60s. However, in the late 1960s, almost all of them had already left the monkhood and became laymen and married Chin women. Its original aim thus proved to be a complete failure. In the past two decades, several pagodas were constructed in Chin State with the forced labor of local Christian population. And several crosses erected by the locals on the top of high mountains throughout Chin State were destroyed by Burmese soldiers.

19.0 CULTURE

MARRIAGE CUSTOM

“At Tiwalam, Win Karr, the headman, told Mr. Ross that General Tregear had arrested Vantura, Howsata’s brother, but that another brother, Do Kwe, had run away; also that Vantura was a cousin of Ya Hwit of Tantin, and that Howsata was married to Win Karr’s sister, by name Ngwin Daung. According to Chin custom when a man dies the next unmarried brother takes his widow to wife. For a similar Jewish custom see Genesis, Chap. XXXVIII.” (Reid p. 149)

19.1 SUMMARY OF THE CHIN/ZO CULTURE

The Chin/Zo culture can be briefly summed up in the following ways:

19.1.1 Mithan/Mithun - Their National Animal: Their raising of partly domesticated, partly wild mithan/mithun.

19.1.2 The Great Hornbill - Their National Bird: They regard Hornbill as their national bird and uses its as their national symbol occasions; it has therefore even been used as their national emblem since several decades ago.

19.1.3 The Rhododendron - Their National Flower

In modern times - starting from around the 1950s - this flower has also been widely regarded and used by them as their national flower. Both the red and white Rhododendron plants are abundant throughout the land.

19.1.4 The composition of all traditional songs poetical words - be they autobiographical, love, social or religious - in poetical words.

19.1.5 Folk dances, Head-hunting and other special feasts

19.1.6 The consumption of fermented rice-beer called Zu in nearly all Zo dialects (or)

RITUALS AND ROLES OF MEAT AND ZU

19.1.7 Their complex social structures and kinship

19.1.8 Their complex clan systems

19.1.9 Their customary laws and marriage customs

19.1.10 The facial tattooing of women in southern parts of Chinland

19.1.11 Their sophisticated traditional textiles.
19.1.12 Their several colorful traditional tribal costumes of the Zo women.

The Zo national identity without Za the national drink, Mithan the national animal, Hornbill the national bird, and Rhododendron the national flower is therefore nowadays almost unthinkable. The Chin/Zo actually owe the Animism that they have been practising for ages for nearly all their cultural heritages.

19.2.1 MITHAN/MITHUN* (Bos gaurus frontalis) - THEIR NATIONAL ANIMAL

As mentioned above the Zos and their culture are distinguished from other ethnic peoples in their neighbour regions in many ways. The roles that the Mithan/Mithun - “Sial” in several Zo dialects - play are some among them. Mithan, which looks like a gaur but slightly smaller than a gaur, used to play such an important role in the Zo society for meat, social, culture and religion throughout their known history that some Westerners had even mistakenly called the Zo culture as a “mithan-oriented culture”. Since ancient times the Chins have been keeping them as domestic animals while a great number of herds are also freely roaming in the wilderness. But all these freely roaming herds also have owners and those owners go into the wilderness occasionally to count the population of their herds.

As herds do not mix each other and every herd remains in its chosen area there’s no problem in counting their populations. The quantity of mithan one possesses was and still is used partly in many regions to measure a man’s wealth. Although tens of thousands of these animals are freely roaming in the wilderness the whole year round they are rarely stolen or secretly killed despite the fact that hunting guns are abundant in Chin State and hunting is a pastime for most men during their free times - that is, mostly in the evening. (See Photos 17 and 18, and 20.5 HUNTING AND FISHING)

19.2.2 GREAT INDIAN HORNBILL (Buceros bicornis) - THEIR NATIONAL BIRD

The Hornbill has always also been playing a very important role in the history and culture of the Chin/Zo people from time immemorial. So I am quoting here a short information piece why and how much the Hornbill means for them (Sing Khaw Khai, p.194).

“They are noble because they live the beautiful life characterized by love and faithfulness. Thus, hornbills are much respected and honoured by the Zos. According to tradition marriage is regarded as a kind of contract tied with love and loyalty. Thus a marriage is considered to be ‘unbreakable’ or ‘inseparable’ except by the event of death. A wife cannot be divorced so long as she remains faithful to her husband. The idea of a faithful life expressed in the married life of the hornbill is taken as a symbolic expression of the love for one’s wife who is likened and referred to as a hornbill. Zo people proudly put on hornbill feathers on all important ceremonial occasions in self-identification with the dignity and honour that the hornbill exemplifies. J. Suan Za Dong once described the cultural beauty of the hornbill in identification with Zomi and their nation as thus:

“Two hornbills stately and dignified,
For loyalty and honour so proudly pose
Symbolising ZOMI in culture rich and sound
Splendours of our State: fresh like a rose
Scenic beauties and flowers in our land abound.”
19.2.4 THE COMPOSITION OF TRADITIONAL SONGS IN POETIC WORDS

MUSICS AND DANCES (Colonialists' View)

“This brings up the question as to why the early missionaries did not adapt native music to the Christian worship. I suppose that the idea never really occurred to them. Being familiar with hymns from childhood and wishing the Chins to be the inheritors of the rich treasure of Christian music, it no doubt seemed right and proper to give them the advantage of this store of devotion. Furthermore, Chin songs were generally love songs, war songs, and songs of the feast, many of them with lewd words and connotations.” (Johnson, Vol. 1, p. 370)

(Note. I am going to present here in this section only traditional songs that belong mainly to the Sukte, Sizang, Paite, Tedim and Zou tribes from the Tedim and Tonzang townships in northern Chin State, Burma, and Manipur State in India. The simple reason is that I am only familiar with these traditions. So far as I know there are no lewd words in the traditional songs of these tribes. Dr. Johnson apparently had no ideas at all about these traditions. He was stationed in Haka during his entire sojourn in Chinland.)

* Mithan/Mithun

** Gayal

Scientific classification
Kingdom: Animalia
Phylum: Chordata
Class: Mammalia
Order: Artiodactyla
Family: Bovidae
Subfamily: Bovinae
Genus: Bos
Species: B. gaurus frontalis

Gayal or mithun (Bos gaurus frontalis or Bos frontalis) is the domesticated gaur, probably a gaur-cattle hybrid breed.

** Taxonomy

The wild group and the domesticated group are sometimes considered separate species, with the wild gaur called Bibos gaurus or Bos gaurus, and the domesticated gayal called Bos frontalis Lambert, 1804. When wild Bos gaurus and the domestic Bos frontalis are considered to belong to the same species the older name Bos frontalis is used, according to the rules of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN). However, in 2003, the ICZN "conserved the usage of 17 specific names based on wild species, which are pre-dated by or contemporary with those based on domestic forms", confirming Bos gaurus for the Gaur.[1] The gaur, or mithun as it is commonly known in the North East region of India, is the state animal of Arunachal Pradesh and Nagaland.

* Note: The total mithan population in Chin State as of October 31, 1999 was 35,000. In Matupi Township: 8,990; Mindat TS: 8,540; Falam TS: 4,410; Than Tlang TS: 2,820; Ton Zang TS: 2,556; Kanpetlet TS: 2,060; Paletwa TS: 1,843; Tiddim TS: 1,676 and Haka TS: 1,340.

(Source: State Veterinary Department, Haka, Chin State. October 31, 1999.) Other habitats of mithan in the region are Naga Hills (Burma), Nagaland (India), Chittagong Hill Tracts (Bangladesh), Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram states. (From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia)

- See PHOTOS 17 & 18

** See Footnote on next page for more information

There are several types of traditional songs: Lapi, Laphei, Latung, Ailawng La, Autobiographical, Biographical, Love, Social, Lamenting, Funeral, Zola, Danthian La, and so on. Traditionally, every song - be it autobiographical or biographical or love or social - was and still is composed in poetic words. Some types of songs maybe solely sung and some others maybe sung and danced with as well. Lamenting songs are only sung and not danced with - at funerals. But funeral songs are sung and danced with. Ailawng La or “Ailawng Song” of the Sizangs, for instance, is purely of braggart nature and is composed and sung spontaneously among intimate friends. One may compose and sing such a song spontaneously about what he thinks of himself - he may brag about his family’s or his own achievements, or of his high birth, for instance. But everyone present
in the round will also respond by spontaneously composing some verses of either praise or derision - what he personally thinks of the braggard.

Scientific Name: Buceros bicornis
Other Names: Great Indian hornbill, Great pied hornbill
Range: Burma, India, Indonesia, Malay Peninsula and Sumatra
Habitat: Primarily evergreen and moist, deciduous forests along the Himalayan foothills and lowland plains

Size:
Male: Length: 37.5 to 41.5 in.
Weight: 6.6 lbs.
Female:
Length: 37.5 to 41.5 in.
Weight: 5.7 lbs.
Lifespan: Estimated at 35-40 years
Diet: In the wild: Primarily fruit, but also small mammals, lizards, snakes and insects In the zoo: Monkey biscuits, fruits and vegetables
Incubation: 38 - 40 days
Nesting cycle: 113 - 140 days
Clutch Size: 1 - 2 eggs

Behavior
Great hornbills have a very loud, distinctive call heard particularly at the start of breeding season or when birds return to the roost. This honking call is repeated at regular intervals. Great hornbills can be found in pairs, small family groups or flocks of up to 40 birds. Although they can cover a large area during daily feedings, they may spend a whole day at particular fruiting trees. Great hornbills may leave the forests to feed on isolated figs or bamboo but prefer to stay in the forest. They use communal roosts regularly with three to four birds per tree and arrive via the same route each sunset.

Reproduction and Breeding:
Great hornbills form monogamous, territorial pairs. Mass courtships involving 20 or more birds have been documented. The nests are made in natural tree holes, trunks of dead trees, or in primary limbs of living trees, and the birds will defend a 100 meter territory surrounding the nest. When the female is ready to lay her eggs, she will seal herself into the nest using feces, wood, bark and food debris, leaving a small slit for the male to pass food through to her. The male makes roughly five feeding visits per day, regurgitating food for the female and her young. When the chicks begin to grow and the nest gets too crowded, the female will leave and reseal the nest. The parents continue to feed the chicks in the nest cavity until their casque begins to develop at roughly four to five months. At this time, the family may form into a small flock that ranges widely in search of food.

Amazing Facts
The casque of the great hornbill can be seven and one-half inches long! Their wingspan measures up to 62 inches! Their "whooshing" wingbeats can be heard over a half mile away!
Source: The Sacramento Zoological Society
3930 West Land Park Dr., Sacramento, CA 95822
T: 916-264-5888 F: 916-264-7385 E: info@saczoo.com www.saczoo.com
- See PHOTO 19

The braggard maybe praised in the beginning parts with his positive or strong points, but his weaknesses would be exposed in the concluding parts. One can therefore loosely define this song as a song meant for debate or some kind of light entertainment among friends and is therefore not taken as offense by the participants after the occasion is over. This song is not used for dance.

In olden days - and still also at present time - many men and women of a number of Zo tribes composed autobiographical songs. A typical and complete autobiographical song of the Sizangs is, unlike all the other types of songs mentioned above, basically divided into four parts which are called, “A Kai” or “La Kai”, “A Naw” or “La Naw”, “La Ngui” or “A Ngui” and “A Thip Na”. In “La Kai” the owner of the song mentions about his family’s roots, and in “La Naw” he describes the events that have taken or still are taking place within his
PHOTOS 17 & 18

MITHAN/MYTHUN - THE NATIONAL ANIMAL OF THE CHINS

- MITHANS IN CHINLAND (SIAL in most Chin dialects)
- See 19.2. MITHAN/MYTHUN (Bos gaurus frontalis) - The National Animal of the Zo People

- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. April 2016.
PHOTO 19

HORNBILL - THE NATIONAL BIRD OF THE CHINS

Source of Photo: Ginpu Guite (ZogamOnline)

GREAT HORNBILL (*Buceros bicornis*)

- See 19.3 GREAT HORNBILL (*Buceros bicornis*) - THE NATIONAL BIRD

(Created in this form by Thang Za Dal/10.2015)
Rhododendron - National Flower of the Chin/Zo People

- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal, January 2021
A TYPICAL LANDSCAPE IN CHINLAND WITH PLENTY OF RED AND WHITE RHODODENDRON TREES

Photographer: An Unknown Chin National Front fighter.
Photo Courtesy of Salai Naing Hung
Obtained from Ms. Edith Mirante
https://twitter.com/EdithMirante/status/1501826832735215616
http://www.projectmaje.org
WHITE RHODODENDRON - ANOTHER TYPICAL LANDSCAPE IN CHINLAND

own family. Then in “La Ngui” he composes verses describing about his relations with his friends or his relatives and foes alike, who are important for him in some way - and also about the important events in his lifetime that directly affect him personally or his family, etc. Vum Ko Hau translated “A Kai” as “Slow” and “A Naw” as “Fast” or “Normal Fast”, and “A Thip Na” as “Epilogue” in his book. He had apparently made the first three definitions simply on the grounds of the different rhythms of them. Due to the nature of the contents of these parts, I shall, however, very loosely use the following definitions instead: Prelude I, Prelude II, Main Part and Epilogue. But not every autobiographical song contains “A Kai” or “Prelude I”. These two components are mostly used in the songs of those who are outstanding in the society and contain several stanzas. An autobiographical song can be sung only in the above-mentioned order - that is, it must be begun with either Akai or A Naw and then A Ngui and at the end A Thip Na. Autobiographical orbiographical songs and a number of traditional songs can be sung only by a group of men and women, and not singly. The reason is that these songs are sung with two different melodies - male and female. Although these are different, according to ethnological song experts, they are in total harmony with each other. And in some autobiographical songs a part called “La Thal Kai” is also included. (See APPENDIX G as an example of an autobiographical song; it’s the autobiographical song of the late K.A. Khup Za Thang with English translation.)

Every part consists of a few to several stanzas. The part which contains most pf the stanzas is the “La Ngui”. A stanza is made up of two sub-stanzas or verses. Each sub-stanza contains about 30 words. These two sub-stanzas are called in the Sizang dialect: “A Kung” and “A Dawn” - loosely translated: “Beginning” and “Ending”. These two sub-stanzas are simply written as “A” & “B” in modern usage. Or the second sub-stanza is written as “X” in some books.

The late Colonel Khai Mun Mang, for example, composed his autobiographical song, which contains 60 stanzas, nearly solely in poetic words that I, author of this paper, understand only about 30 percent of their meanings, although I myself have been using the Sizang dialect for my whole life.

On any singing occasion those who sing such an autobiographical song will be automatically divided into two groups. The drummer, who is always only a man, and half of the party sings “Part A” and the other half “Part B”. Each stanza will be repeatedly sung at least four or five times before the next stanza is sung. The duration of a stanza being sung depends on the drummer. However, unlike other parts such as “A Ngui” and “La Thal Kai” and “A Thip Na” the stanzas in “A Kai” sung only once without repetition. Each of these parts is sung with different melodies or cadences and different dances are also used as well.

The autobiographical song of Chief Khup Lian, my paternal grandfather, contains 28 Stanzas and the two stanzas below are among the most famous ones. The first stanza is dedicated to the war against the British and his down-heartedness when the Suktes and Kamhaus (Tedims) decided to give up the resistance war during 1888-1890. Zangsí is the poetic word for the Sizangs, Suktui lun the Suktes, and Lantui mang the Kamhaus.

A. Zangsí sial lum kan sang a pal bang nang a,
Suktui lun leh Lantui mang hong neam ta e.
B. Sial lum kawi ciang meal mang ta ka ci kom a.
Do nen nuai a tong dam pat bang neam ing nge.

The verses below are dedicated to his capture of a rifle in a hand-to-hand fighting in this war (Vum Ko Hau, p. 234):

A. Vang Khua Suan tu Leido vaimang, ni khat pil bang the nge,
B. Al bang that ing Haitoi ing ci-ing Kawltiang tui bang la ing nge,  
Za lai ah Kansaang ing nge
Enemy attempting to capture
My Glorious Land
I scattered like pebbles
I swore that
I am the son of a highborn Noble
And killed enemies like chickens
Besides capturing an enemy gun
I am exalted among the hundreds [figuratively: the multitude]

And when someone dies, woman mourners will sit around the dead and recall their relationship with the deceased himself or his immediate family in poetic words spontaneously composed on the spot and “sing” them like songs while they are crying. If a woman is well-familiar with the histories of her own family and that of the dead, she would start her lamenting song from several generations back. She would recall all the historical facts generation by generation. So some lamenting songs can even take several hours. If and when she is tired she will take a long rest and then continues again until she's finished with what she wants to say which she cannot say in plain words. Lamenting songs are called “Kaa Laa” - literally, “crying song” in Sizang and Tedim dialects. And when a woman composes and “sings” such songs the words “Kaa mal lo” (literally, “citing crying words”) are used instead of “sa” for singing. However, the melodies of lamenting songs are completely different from that of all other types of traditional songs. The mourners may even “debate” in such a way, if they think someone’s recollections are unfair, or if the recollections of a woman are not complete, some other women may come to help her - of course, also by composing in poetic words as lamenting songs. People therefore carefully listen to mourning songs at funerals. But nobody verbally intervenes in such a debate.

During the duration of a funeral service, which may take from two to seven days, all the autobiographical songs that belong to the deceased himself or his forefathers/mothers will be sung. And particular dances and songs that are meant for such an occasion are performed. It happened very often although the songs may have been composed several generations ago. But if the dead does not have autobiographical song of his own, then the songs of his forefathers or that of his next nearest relatives will be sung. Besides, except the Sizang every clan in other Tedim-related tribes and sub-tribes has its own mourning songs and these songs cannot be used by any other clans. The dead can be taken out of his compound for burial only after all his clan’s songs have been fully sung. Among the Sizangs, the dead could be taken out of the house only after the Thang Ho leh Lian Do songs had been sung.

Young men and women use every joyous festival or feast for courting by composing love songs in poetic words and singing them on the spot or they may use the already existing uncountable love songs if they cannot compose themselves. A great number of poetic words are commonly shared by some tribes despite the differences in their spoken dialects.

Note 1: Here are some of my immediate relatives, who have got autobiographical songs: Chief Kim Lel (founder of my paternal line chieftainship 13 generations ago from me) - 8 Stanzas; Chief Sawm Mang (my great, great, great grandfather) – 13 Stanzas; Chief Lua Thuam (my great, great, grandfather: – 14 Stanzas; Pi Tong Dim (wife of Lua Thuam) - 32; Chief Man Suang (paternal uncle of Khup Lian) - 28; Chief Khup Lian (my grandfather) - 28 (wife of Khup Lian did not have a song of her own); Chief Suang Hau Thang (eldest son of Khup Lian and the last Chief of the Kim Lel dynasty) did not have a song of his own; Suang Thang (my
maternal grandfather) - 114; Ciang Hau (my maternal grandmother) - 10; my mother - 8 (my father did not have a song); Vum Ko Hau - 26; Vumson Suantak - 16; Lt. Col. Thian Khaw Khai (one of my mother’s three younger brothers) - 42; and other relatives such as Chief Ngo Mang of Khuasak (father of Khup Pau) - 58; Chief Khup Pau (father of Khai Kam and Mang Pum) - 28; Chief Khai Kam - 10; Mang Pum (brother of Khai Kam) - 47; Capt. K.A. Khup Za Thang (compiler of Zo Genealogy) - 35, etc. Kim Le’s song is the oldest known among the Sizangs. See his song and its English translation in APPENDICES A-2, A-3 & A-4.

* Every Stanza contains two verses.

See also TABLES S/A to S/D and APPENDICES E, F and L for some of the personalities mentioned here.

Note 2: Since the traditional Zo songs of the Sizangs and other Tedim-related tribes are complex and therefore should better be explained by someone who is really well-versed in them, the information mentioned above should serve only to give the reader some sketchy ideas about these songs. I myself am not qualified enough to elaborate further on this subject. For instance, “La Thal Kai” was traditionally composed and sung only by women as a medium to express freely what they thought and observed about in their own families or communities which they could not spell out verbally. When “La Thal Kai” songs were sung only specific amount of musical instruments were used and sung by not less than seven or eight women. However, nowadays these songs are simply integrated into autobiographical or biographical songs. Furthermore, not all autobiographical songs automatically contain “A Naw” and “A Kai”.

Note 3. A very important and interesting fact about poetic words: Despite differences in spoken words, a great number of Chin tribes (Falam, Hakha, Mizo, Paite, Sizang, Tedim, Thado-Kuki, Zou, etc.) share many of their poetic words. I have not yet studied the poetic words of other Chin tribes in central and southern Chinland.

Here are some examples of normal and poetic words of the Sizangs and some of their neighbouring tribes, such as PaiteTedim, Sukte, Zou, etc.

1. Aal bang da (poetic word) = he/khua ngai (spoken word) = sad
2. Ang kawi (poetic) = pasal/zi (spoken) = husband or wife
3. Ang lai vontawi (poetic) = la te (spoken) = one’s own children (sons and daughters)
4. Buan bang nil (poetic) = vawk (spoken) = throw away/abandon
5. Ciin leh tawi (poetic) = u leh nau (spoken) = brothers and sisters
6. Dral lum (poetic) = lum (spoken) = shield
7. Dimtai (poetic) = Tedim (spoken) = Tedim tribe/town
8. Hau ta (poetic) = ngual te/ngual dang te (spoken) = strangers
9. Hau tawi (poetic) = Ulki, Kumpi (spoken) = Chief/King/Noble
10. Phetrai (poetic) = Lophei (spoken) = Lophei village
11. Soltha, Tung Soltha (poetic) = Tha (spoken) = Moon
12. Sukta (poetic) = Sukte (spoken) = Sukte tribe
13. Thian Mang (poetic) = Pathian (spoken) = God
14. Twa nu (poetic) = nu (spoken) = mother
15. Va bang leang (poetic) = khualhaw (spoken) = travel
16. Vangkhu (poetic) = khua, ngam (spoken) = village, town, city, country
17. Zaa pa (poetic) = pa (spoken) = father
18. Zatta (poetic) = mpir/mihopnpi (spoken) = mass, public, crowd
19. Zang ni (poetic) = ni (spoken) = sun
20. Zaan thiam (poetic) = vaht thiam, thin neam, thu neam (spoken) = kind, skilled
21. Zang khen kawil ciang (poetic) = thau (spoken) = gun

The Chin/Zo traditional musical instruments are gongs of different sizes, bamboo flutes (three to six holes), mouth-organs made of gourd and bamboo, gaur/buffalo horns, cymbals, five-piece (five tunes) wooden xylophones, etc. The typical traditional drum of the northern Chins is made of manually-hollowed wood about 35 cm in circumference and 45 cm in length which is covered on both sides with hide. The mouth-organ which called rothem consists of a gourd into which seven to nine reeds are inserted, one to serve as a mouthpiece, and the others that are of various lengths on which small holes are bored. (For more information on this subject visit Wikipedia under Music of Mizoram.)

Most Chin musical instruments are used only mainly to orchestrate the rhythm of songs and dances rather than as the accompaniment of the songs’ melodies. There are only a few different melodies in their songs.
As mentioned above, originally the Zos must have had several dances before they were Christianized. It is believed that at least about 100 original dances from various regions still survive today - without counting the number of variations that some of them have. For example, the “Pa Lam” of the Sizangs has two different variations - a seven-step version and a three-step version - for different occasions, yet it has only a single name. The name of the dance itself means “Dance of Men” or “Male Dance”. It is danced solely by men and only on the occasions of funeral and feast celebrating the killing of big wild animals. At important funerals (of important persons) and feasts celebrating the killing of big wild animals the seven-step version was used and at ordinary funerals and feasts celebrating the killing of less important animals the three-step version was used.

The Sizangs classify wild animals into two categories: “Sa-pi” or “Sa-mang” and “Sa-no”. Sa-pi or Sa-mang roughly literally means “great animal”, and Sa-no means “small animal”. Those that are classified as Sa pi/Sa-mang are elephant, rhinoceros (Sumatrensis), rhinoceros (Sondaicus), tiger, panther, leopard and gaur. Bear, wild boar and deer are included in the Sa-no category. Normally, only hunters who had really killed any of the animals mentioned above could celebrate these feasts. Only wild animals killed with a gun - a bow in ancient times - were celebrated, but not trapped ones. (When the British arrived there were still quite a number of both kinds of Rhinoceros in Chinland. But they were soon extinct along with some other rare animals such as Malayan sun bear at the turn of the 20th century (see APPENDIX J).

In Mizoram there are about eight major dances. But out of these dances the “Chai Lam” has four versions and the “Tlang Lam” has several variations. Another example is “Sar Lam”. It is a warrior dance and has several variations, too. It is danced in many regions in central Chin State, Chittagong Hill Tracts in Bangladesh and two districts of Mizoram.

And several tribes have different versions of bamboo dance. For some tribes Bamboo dances are not performed only on joyous occasions, but they were also parts of religious rituals as well. The Maras, for instance, performed in olden days a special version of it to send the souls of the dead to the worlds beyond at funerals.

Several dances and customs and traditions got lost as a result of Christianization, because the Zos owe the Animism that they had professed or still are professing in many regions for a large part of their cultural heritages. That’s one major reason why so many Christian Chins cannot distinguish religion from culture and are therefore even ashamed of their cultural heritages. And several denominations even forbid their members to perform folk dances, because folk dances used to be parts of religious rituals as well in Animism. Their religious leaders from the West have never taught them about the importance of culture for a people’s identity and survival.

Different dances were used for different occasions or feasts. There were about 24 important occasions or feasts among those in the Tiddim and Tonzang townships and Manipur State in India which were of social, religious and economic nature. The most common occasions were the new year, the attainment of certain level of wealth, harvest, funeral, the killing of one or more remarkable wild animals mentioned above. (For the four major feasts of the Zahas see marked passages on pages 15, 18 & 24 of APPENDIX V.)

Since there is no sex segregation among Zo society men and women dance tightly together - that is, each dancer stretches out his hands beneath the arms of the two dancers on his left and right sides and put them around their waists or hold the hands of the dancers next to his immediate neighbours. At any dancing occasion everybody is free to choose a place in the row. Zo folk dances are mostly collective or group dances in which
men and women and young and old alike can take part regardless of social status.

Although some of these collective dances do not need special training, there are a number of dances that demand long hours of training and experience. The bamboo dance is one example. Since several of the Zo dances are collective dances all dancers sing collectively while they are dancing arm-in-arm. Dances are led solely by the drummer.

By the way, Burmese dances are staged performances rather than social dancing. The two sexes are strictly segregated in the Burman society. A man could be sued by a woman if he touches any part of her body without any concrete reasons or her permission. It is absolutely a tabu.

“Head-hunting”: - It used to be considered that all inhabitants of these Hills were head-hunters. In fact, so great an authority as Colonel Lewin derives the name “Lushai” from “lu”, a head and “sha”, “to cut”. This, of course, is a mistake, as the name of the clan is not Lushai, but Lushe, and though “sha” does mean “to cut”, it does not mean “to cut off”, and could not be used of cutting a man's head; but that such a mistake should have been possible show how firmly rooted was the belief that head-hunting was one of the peculiarities of the population of these Hills. I believe that as far as the Lushais and their kindred clans are concerned, head-hunting was not indulged in. By this I mean that parties did not go out simply to get heads. Of course, a man who had killed his man was thought more highly of than one who had not, and, therefore, when a man did kill a person and he brought the head home to show that he was speaking the truth; but the raids were not made to get heads, but for loot and slaves. The killing and taking of heads were merely incidents in the raid, not the cause of it...” (Shakespear, pp. 59-60)

The “traditions of head-hunting” were apparently different from tribe to tribe. The Sizangs and Tedim-related tribes for instance, cut only the heads of those they had killed in war. They did not hunt down innocent human beings - even among hostile tribes - and cut their heads just in order to make these heads as trophies nor did they deliberately kill and cut the heads of captured enemy. A captured enemy was usually kept and used as slave instead. Even then his family or relatives or tribe could still buy for his freedom. A most vivid example was the case of the pregnant Pi Tong Dim, wife of Chief Lua Thuam, my paternal great, great grandfather. She gave birth to a daughter in captivity. When a combined force of Tashons, Zahaus and Hualno/Lusei completely destroyed Lophei in Chief Lua Thuam's time, more than 200 people, including Tong Dim, were taken away as captives and all of them, except Tong Dim and her daughter, were distributed among the captors to be slaves. Tong Dim and her daughter themseles were kept as family members by the ruling Chief of Tashons at his residence. However, a very high price had to be paid for their freedom. Slavery was widely practiced among all Zo tribes until the British annexation, as it had also been widely practised in other countless parts of the world, including some Western Christian societies as well as late as one or two centuries ago.

A very special occasion among the many feasts of the Zo people was the making of a victory ceremony with special rituals and dances over one's enemy at which the enemy's skull (s) was (were) displayed. This feast is called “Ngal Ai” in Sizang, “Gal Ai” in Tedim dialects. And “Ral Ai” in Mizo and many other Chin dialects. Traditionally, among the Sizangs and other Tedim-related tribes mostly only warriors and powerful chiefs made this ceremony because of some reasons: First, the Chins used to believe that one must be spiritually superior and more powerful in worldly terms as well than the dead enemy if one wanted to celebrate this special ceremony, otherwise the spirit of the dead would bring him and his family misfortunes; second, it was very costly to celebrate such a feast. However, not every warrior or powerful chief made this ceremony even though they may not have lacked self-confidence and the necessary material means. One example was my paternal
grandfather. He was both a chief and a warrior. He led some of the fiercest battles against General Sir White’s British troops during the Anglo-Chin War (1888-89), and fought against the British once again during the Siyin-Nwengal Rebellion (1892-93). However, he did not cut even a single enemy’s head nor did he make the said ceremony. He had only once made the feast for the killing of gaur.

Unlike all the other ceremonies this ceremony was a very rare occasion - at least among the Sizangs. The celebration of this feast in fact was both an act of revenge and sorrow at the same time, rather than a joyous occasion. The rituals and dances with which this feast was made were different from tribe to tribe, but the main essence of it was generally the same among several tribes. Another reason why only those who were true warriors dared to make this feast in olden days was that if one celebrated this ceremony without having ever really fought in a war or killed an enemy he could easily become an object of contempt, or a laughing stock.

However, it became somewhat fashionable lately in the mid 1950s and ‘60s among the Sizangs to make this ceremony without having ever really fought in a battle or having ever killed an enemy that only five out of the twenty-two people who had made this ceremony during the 20th century could be taken seriously. In ancient times those - especially young warriors - who had killed enemies in a battle cut the heads of the enemies whom they killed and took them home in order to prove their bravery. Brave people were admired and respected. A brave man had had a better chance than a coward to get a woman of his choice, for instance.

And here are a few statistics among the Sizangs who had made various celebrations in the 20th century: Twenty men made the “Saai Aai” feast - for the killing of one or more elephants; 68 men made the “Sial Aai” feast for the killing of one or more gaur; six celebrated both feasts: “Saai Aai” and “Sial Aai”; seven made the “Sahang Aai” feast for the killing of one or more tigers; three made both feasts: “Saai Aai” and “Sahang Aai”. (See Appendix CC)

Among the feasts mentioned above the “Sahang Aai” is also a very special one, like the “Ral Ai”, because, unlike other feasts, it was a tradition among several tribes that someone who had killed a tiger must compulsorily make this celebration. Among the Tedims, for example, if he could not afford to make it himself, even his Chief was obliged to defray the expenses of the ceremony. And among some tribes only those who had had self-confidence and brave enough dared to make it. It was believed that if someone is not really superior to the “spirit” of the tiger that he had killed and then made this ceremony, when he died not only his remains, but also even that of his wife’s, would be exhumed and lacerated into pieces by tigers. And this really had happened for a number of times. Therefore, it was celebrated with very special rituals. One among them was the hunter being disguised himself as a woman by dressing woman dresses, for instance, so that tigers would not “recognize” him!

People therefore used to say, when someone who had made this “Sahang Ai” died, “Let’s wait and see who is superior”. They meant either the hunter or the tiger which he killed. Burials were always made in the evening and if nothing happened to his grave during the first burial night, then people said the next day that the hunter was indeed superior to the “spirit” of the tiger. See Footnote below as one example of these feasts.

Sai Aina Thu (The Account of The Elephant Celebration)

Posted on May 4, 2015 by Win Hein

This text is my reverse transcription into the Sizang community script of one text collected by Theodore Stern in the 1950’s and printed in: 1984. Sizang (Siyin) Chin texts. Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area 8(1). 43–58. (http://stedt.berkeley.edu/ltba/cumtocs.html)

Sai Aina Thu
Ni dang lai in, kapu kapa te nuntak lai in, sai a ka ciangin, a lu pua aa khua mual pan mual suak aa, thau tam mama kap aa a sai a ai hi.
Tua a aina aa, nu taw pa taw khuang tum aa, siel ki taw daak tal thua in, sun taw zan taw a lam hi.
A sai ai ni in khua mual aa a lam phot hi.
A sai lu siia mihing li in zawng aa a sai ai pa sai lu tungah to sak hi.
A khua mual pan in inn dong pua aa, lap pui hi.
Tua a sai aina in siel klawng khui khawng ngo hi.
A thi ciangin a sai ai a ki tep te na in diel khai hi.
Siel ai te in a vom khai hi.
Sahang ai te in a san khai hi.
Tua a ai pa thi zok ciangin, a innkuanpui te in tua diel khai thei nawn ngawl hi.

In ancient times, when my forefathers killed an elephant, they cut its head and carried it to the village. They fired several shots at the top of or at the main entrance of the village before entering it. On the day of the celebration of what is called the “Sai Ai” [victory over elephant] feast, it was first celebrated at the top of or at the main entrance of the village by dancing and singing [songs that were composed especially for such a festival and also the autobiographic songs of the hunter, if he had had already composed them before]. At this celebration women and men danced days and nights by beating and playing all kinds of musical instruments. [The celebration could last three to seven days]. On this occasion the head of the elephant and the man who killed it were carried by men on bamboos from where the celebration first took place - that is, either at the top of or at the main entrance of the village - and brought them into the village. At the feast mithuns and cows were slaughtered. And a long white flag was raised at his house on a high bamboo tree. When someone celebrated the “Sial Ai” [victory over gaur] feast, long, black flag was raised at his house and at the house of someone who celebrated the “Sahang Ai” feast [victory over tiger], long, red flag was raised. When those who celebrated such feasts died, the flags were no more raised.

Note by author (tzd): Theodore Stern is an American Linguist. The English translation above has been done by myself. It's a free translation. Source: https://sizangkam.wordpress.com/2015/05/04/sai-aina-thu-the-account-of-the-elephant-celebration/https://sizangkam.wordpress.com/research/

19.2.7 RITUALS AND ROLES OF MEAT AND ZU

Meat of different animals and Zu play so many crucial roles among several Zoe tribes that their explanation would fill several pages. When someone dies in a village, every household will bring a pot or several pots of rice-beer of different sizes to be consumed at the dead’s house, depending on the nature of its kindship with the dead's family or its economic condition. And on other important occasions as well, like the various ceremonies and feasts mentioned above, every household will also bring just the same amount to the place where the event will take place. On such important occasions, for example, Zu is not drunk just in order to get drunk, but as a social function that cements a community or communities.

The rituals of consuming Zu at formal events are very strict - at least at the beginning or until people get drunk. The drinking will be initiated by the high priest, if it is a religious event, or someone who has the highest social status or the most elderly man or woman in the society, if it’s a social event. In olden days when only dried gourd was still used as cup each would drink the quantity of a small gourd and when he had consumed his share, he would then invite another man or woman who also had some social status or who was most advanced in age,
and so on. If there was a guest or stranger at the scenes, he would also be given equal priority no matter what his social status was. And it is deemed very rude for someone to start drinking from any pot without being invited by someone who has just consumed his own share.

One's first own share is usually just a cup. The measurement is done at the beginning by marking inside the beer pot with a small piece of bamboo and when the water level reaches that marking by drinking it will be filled up again with water. When all those who are present have already drunk their shares in the first round, then everybody is free to drink from any pot he likes. Rituals for the drinking of Zu among many other Zo tribes are also equally strict. For the feasts and rituals among the Zahau tribe, see marked passages on pages 23 & 27 of APPENDIX V.

There are only three other nationalities in Burma - the Karens, Kayahs/Karennis and Nagas - that have this kind of rice-beer. So far this author knows, however, in those three societies, unlike that of the Zo society, the consumption of rice-beer does not play any crucial role.

“Chin Liquor: “Yu” or “zu” is the name given to the liquor of the country; it is made from rice, various millets, or Indian-corn, according to the staple crop of the neighbourhood. Only among the Hakas, on the immediate south of Manipur and on the Lushai border, is rice liquor found; elsewhere liquor is always made of millet and very occasionally of Indian-corn. The method of preparing this liquor is simple: a quantity of millet is placed in an elongated jar and is damped with water, thus causing it to ferment. Fermentation is usually assisted by the introduction of ferment, which kept from each brew to assist the next. It is left in this condition until required, and a pot of liquor which has fermented for 30 days and more is superior to that which has only fermented for a week. When the liquor is required the pot is brought forth and the mouth is closed with leaves, a hollow reed is passed through the millet almost to the bottom and water is poured into the jar. The liquor is now ready and is either drunk by being sucked out of the jar through the reed or run off into a receptacle by means of a second reed, which connected with the upright one in the jar by an inverted V-shaped joint of beewax or metal and which acts, when sucked with the lips until the stream commences to flow, as a syphon.

Lieutenant Macnabb in a pamphlet on the Chins thus correctly describes the Chins' extraordinary taste for liquor:-

“The great universal vice amongst the Chins is drunkenness: men, women, and even babies at their mothers’ breasts all drink, and a state of intoxication is considered as creditable as it is pleasant. No event is complete without liquor, and nothing is offence when committed under the influence of liquor. Not to provide a visitor with liquor is considered the height of discourtesy, and the warmth of a man's reception is guaged by the number of pots of liquor broached for him.

The liquor varies in taste as well as in strength, and because one has drunk a quart of one’s liquor without feeling the effects, it does not necessarily follow that a quart of another man's liquor will not go to the head, and the first cupful drawn from the pot is stronger than the last. The taste is not unlike cider. It is a most refreshing drink after a hot march, and though it is unwise to drink whilst actually marching, it certainly pulls one together more quickly than any other stimulant in times of great fatigue...It speaks well for the quality of the liquor that the Chin, although an habitual drunkard from his early childhood, lives to a good old age. A child and its great-grandfather may often be seen drinking together at the feasts...” (Carey & Tuck, pp. 183-184)

Equally crucial are the roles that meat of various animals also play among several tribes. I shall mention
briefly here only about the traditions of the Sizangs. Traditionally the Sizangs classify domestic animals in three categories: 1. Mithan, water buffalo and cow; 2. goat; 3. pig. There are two different rituals of cutting the throats of these animals depending on the occasion, or the purpose of the event - marriage ceremony, funeral service (during and after), a feast made in honour of a relative on one’s mother's side, etc. And the meat is also prepared differently depending on the occasions. For general occasions 14 portions, and for marriage ceremonies only 3 portions are prepared from specific different parts of the animal killed, and these portions are distributed among relatives according to the six major and two minor categories of relationship. Although the portions are of course small and only symbolic, they are deemed very important for such traditions cement kindships and social ties.

The meat of an animal which is slaughtered for the sole purpose of consumption without any specific purpose is prepared without any rituals. And it is a very common practice for people to slaughter any of the above-mentioned animals for someone as a gesture of gratitude for some past favour.

Although this tradition of meat division may vary from tribe to tribe, I think the Zahau tradition could be used as a model for the vast majority of Zo tribes. For the Zahau tradition of meat division and kinship see marked passages on pages 15-23 and 28 of APPENDIX V. It is a 20-page article titled: FEASTING AND MEAT DIVISION AMONG THE ZAHAU CHINS OF BURMA: A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS by Mr. H.N.S. Stevenson. But I am using only the 18 pages of text from it; the other two pages contain photos which are blurred anyway. (URL for the original article here: www.arakanmusic.com/BOOKS/zahau_chins_of_burma.pdf)

Several other Zo tribes also are still widely practising this tradition of meat division of their own even though they have already been professing the Christian faith for three, four generations. Not only because of the traditions and customs mentioned above, but also because of many of the codes of social relationship and kinship were and still are rather complex, the traditional Zo society as a whole could be defined as very conservative. (“The Northern Chin proper are those of Tiddim Subdivision. The Tiddim social and cultural system is basically complex, and so, despite important structural distinctions, belongs with that of the Central Chin rather than with the Southern Chin...The structure of Chin society as a whole will be better understood, however, only when research has been done on the Tiddim Chin.” Lehman, p. 17)

• ZU AND LUNG ‘BEER AND STONE’ CULTURE OF KCHO

Here is another article dealing with the very important role that the rice-beer plays in Mindat area of Southern Chin State. I am using the entire article here.

“When one visits Kcho land, he will find conglomerations of mysterious monolithic tables everywhere like outdoor cultural museums. Kcho people have been practicing this unique culture of constructing stone monuments for centuries. No one knows how and when this lithic culture began among Kcho people. A documentary television program of ‘Kcho Lung Zu’ broadcasted in 2002 by the NHK, a Japanese TV channel, briefly mentions that there were people also in India, China, and Japan who had similar culture of erecting stones in the same way as the Kcho people do. Of course, there were some more societies in other parts of the world where such cultures related to stones can be seen, like South America, the British Island and so on. Some Kcho consider that Kcho people came from Pyu, one of the earliest settlers of Burma (the history of Chin tribes 2000: Kcho or Chin tribes of Mindat and Kanpetlet). They proposed that the Kcho stone culture is handed down from the Pyu culture, where the dead were cremated, the bones were then put in an earthen urchern and placed under the stones. Kcho people also used to, some still do, cremate the dead and put the bones in an earthen jar called guh k’am ‘bone pot’, which
they place under the stone-tables. Authors of ‘A brief history of Kcho Chin’ speculate that Kcho people came from Sak or Htet, who were mentioned in stone inscriptions as ‘htet-my-an-chin’ of the west. The Htet of the west were recorded in the Burmese stone inscriptions along with the Pyus and other major known groups of the time.

It will be almost impossible to verify the above two claims that Kcho people were Pyu or Htet. But, it is highly possible that Kcho people had significant contact with whoever had those cultures of erecting stone monuments, if it were not the original Kcho culture. Another speculation of the authors in ‘A brief history of Kcho Chin: 1997’ is that Kcho people might have been part of or influenced by the social-culture group, who practiced a kind of Buddhism, before the forceful introduction of Thei-ra-wa-da Buddhism by the Burmese monarch, in which stones played a part in the belief system called Htei-la-kyawk-pya kookwe hmuh ‘the worship of giant stone slabs’. The Kcho oral history of migration, which says that Kcho people lived in Pagan area, seems to support the hypothesis that Kcho people had significant contact with other culture(s), many of which they absorbed. The fact that some villages are still called Chin-ywa ‘Chin village’ and some stone monuments similar to Kcho stone tables are said to be still standing today in the vicinity of Mt. Pukpa, also seems to be supporting the Kcho oral history.

Whatever was the origin of Kcho people and the stone culture, we will mainly concern ourselves with examining what these stones tell us about Kcho people.

The stone tables are associated with the Zu ‘local-brewed millet beer’ feast, which Lehman (1963: 177ff) calls ‘Feast of Merit’. One cannot construct this stone monument at will, but only at the occasion of Zu Hlak/sak ‘Zu/Beer Feast’. There are a hierarchy of the ‘Zu’ feasts, and only the level of Lung Zu ‘stone beer’ and above in the hierarchy sanctions one to erect lung m’soon ‘a stone table’.

1. K’phlai zu ‘Inaugural Zu Feast’
2. Me zu ‘Goat Zu Feast’
3. Gha zu ‘Ten Zu Feast’
4. M’ku zu ‘Twenty-Zu Feast’
5. Lung zu ‘Stone Zu Feast’
6. Maang zu ‘Lordship Zu Feast’

Six feasts combining level 1 to 4, any level of the feasts more than once except level one or the K’phlai Zu ‘Inaugural Beer Feast’, sanctions one to give the level 5 feast called Lung Zu ‘Stone Beer Feast’ and construct a Lung M’soon ‘stone table’ outside the village called Ng’zuung Lung ‘stone table outside the village and on the higher ground or ridge as opposed to valley’. One can begin to erect a stone table in front of his house called Du “u”ma Lung ‘stone in front of the house’ after 6 Ng’zuung Lung or stone tables outside the village.

Finally, the highest level of Zu feast called Maang Zu ‘Lord Beer Feast’ presupposes six Du”u”ma Lung ‘stone in front of the house’. A man who can give this feast can build Maang Im ‘the Lordly Mansion’, and also can have Maang K’tung ‘Master pole or a pole showing his a achievement’. They also eat Maang ei ‘royal banquet?’ separately from the commoners during festive occasions. Very few people are said to have been able to have this feast in their life time; among them are –

1. Ng’ghon Om M’lu”p, or Om M’Lu”p from Ng’ghon village, celebrated a Maang Zu using 100 mithans.
2. M’Kyai Ghung Kyu”i, Ghung Kyu”i from M’kyai village, used 60 mithans during his Maang Zu.
3. There were many Maangs or lords who had this feast using 30, 20, 12, and 6 mithan
4. K’Hngi Long Maang Ng’Thang, Maang Ng’Thang from K’Hngi Long village, also was famous for his wealth. He had so many K’hngais ‘ear-rings’ that he had to sun them out on a mat.
SPECIAL NOTE: The following three Factors (19.1.7; 19.1.8 and 19.1.9) are not dealt with in this paper for they will take up several hundred pages. However, the complexity of 19.1.8. could be to some extent understood through 17.7 CLANS AND SUB-CLANS.

5. Vok Kyuk Kho Ghung, Kho Ghung from Vok Kyuk village, too was well known for his bravery. As he could kill six elephants with his spear on a single day, he was revered equally with the Maangs.

19.2.7 THE FACIAL TATTOOING OF WOMEN IN SOUTHERN PARTS OF CHINLAND

A very special and interesting part of the Chin culture is what is now known as the Chin facial tattoo tradition. It is mostly practiced among women in the southern parts of Chin State. There are a variety of Chin facial tattoos in terms of forms and styles. However, it is a gradually vanishing tradition. Mr. Shwekey Hoipang, a Chin Christian pastor, has widely elaborated on this subject in his interview with the Chinland Guardian. See APPENDIX GG for his interview.

19.2.8 TRADITIONAL CHIN/ZO TEXTILES AND TRIBAL COSTUMES

Women of almost all the Zo tribes have their own costumes - a shirt, a garment or sarong and a shawl. The shawls' average sizes are roughly 2 by 1 metres. These costumes are worn by women at every festive gathering (see PHOTOS 11-A & 11/B1 & B2). The men's dresses are less spectacular. And since 30 years ago the traditional Chin textiles have great demand among those who value ethnological cultural heritages.

A few passages quoted from Mantles of Merit and The Irrawaddy Magazine will give the reader some insights into the various traditional textiles of the Zo people:

“...As art objects, Chin textiles deserve to be much better known for their beauty and technical virtuosity than they are. As cultural objects, they deserve to be understood for their integral role in the core Chin effort to achieve merit in this life and the next. We under-took the research for Mantles of Merit in an attempt to accomplish these two goals. We use “mantle” as the generic for Chin textiles in ligt of its meaning as “something that enfolds, enwraps and encloses” and the near-total absence of tailoring in traditional Chin textiles...The focus of the book is on culturally important textiles, so not all textiles get equal weight. The great majority of textiles discussed are woven on back-tension loom and used in culturally important circumstances, particularly feasts and rites of passage.

Major textiles, including blankets and tunics, are strongly represented. Bags receive what may seem surprisingly little attention, but bags are heavily traded, as are their weaving elements, so they tend to be relatively less reliable documents of the culture in which they are found...In both western and Chin writings about Chin culture, however, an area not yet fully described is their rich textile heritage. This omission is particularly unfortunate in light of the complexity of the weaving, the diversity of style and the enormous traditional importance of textiles in Chin life. Further, this extraordinary materail culture is
Author's (tzd) Note 1. Information concerning traditional songs, folk dances and head-hunting ceremonies mentioned above are that of various tribes from Tedim and Tonzang townships in Burma and a part of Manipur State in India. Even among these tribes there are a number of variations in these fields. But since it's not possible to describe these variations in detail, I've simply generalized them all. I know only in general that several other Zo tribes also made or still make similar festivals or feasts, but I do not have detailed information about them.

Note 2. Traditions that are still in existence and practised among some tribes somewhere in Zoram are explained in present tense, and the ones that exist no more in past tense.

Note 3. Mr. H.N.S. Stevenson was a trained anthropologist and British colonial administrator. He was also the Superintendent of the Chin Hills Division and author of The Economics of the Central Chin Tribes (1943) and The Hill Peoples of Burma (1944), etc.

Note 4. In all Tedim-related tribes and sub-tribes it is called Zu Zu (Zo Rice-beer). The main ingredients of rice-beer are maize, rice, or sticky rice, sorghum and millets, or the combination of them all. These are cooked first and then fermented with self-made yeast. It can be consumed after four or five days. Among the southern Chins, it's very common to consume fermented Zu after several months.

Note 5. A Zu pot is filled with the ingredients mentioned above to the full and water is then poured in until it is full. It can be consumed after two hours. Zu is normally drunk directly from the pot through one or two bamboo pipes.

Note 6. Zu pots are made of clay and a kind of resin and the shapes of them are completely different from that of pots used for cooking food. The sizes shapes are also varying from region to region throughout Chinland. Hierarchy of Zu Hlok or Beer Feast

evolving quickly as the Chin become more integrated into neighboring majority cultures, abandoning some of their traditional ways... Accordingly, this book describes the Chin textile culture particularly as it existed in the late 19th century through the mid-20th century, at the end of the era when the Chin had a cultural tradition that was fairly distinct from that of the surrounding area...” (pp. 7-11).

“...Many of the earliest known Chin textiles were simple in their construction, with or without thin warp stripes and little or no other decoration. Indeed, remnants of this early simplicity can still be found in selected conservative quarters, most notably in the indigo-dyed cotton and flax textiles of the Southern Chin (Figures 279 and 281). But other early textiles were strikingly sophisticated in their weaving structures. These culturally deep structures include twill, weft-twined tapestry, 2-faced supplementary weft patterning and false embroidery... Perhaps the single textile motif that most connotes high status among the Chin is the white warp band that is patterned on only the obverse by use of supplementary wefts. This is found on a wide range of Northern Chin blankets, most prominent in the vai puan (Figure 125) and some Chin skirts and head wrappers in Tiddim and Manipur (Figure 238) and is closely approximated in the traditional skirts of the Bawm (Figure 236). Many of the high status skirts in Falam have a remarkable lack of field decoration (Figures 219-221), sharply contrasting with the animated supplementary weft decoration of other Falam textiles. Just as among the Ashõ where high status textiles are often highly conservative (e.g. Figures 426 and 462), and in Haka, where conservative leaders prefer the can lo puan to the cong-nak puan, these Falam skirts may harken back to an earlier time when supplementary weft decoration was minimal...

The Nagas have made warp-faced, 4-panel blankets and lower body wraps in which the dark lateral panels have dark wefts and the light-colored central panels have white wefts. This distinctive method for creating dense color saturation closely resembles the contraction of the 3-panel Mizo/Hualngo puan laisen (Figure 160) and the Siyin dap zal (Figure 145), just to the south of the Naga. The Naga pieces, collected in 1912-13, are as early as any of the Mizo/Hualngo or Siyin pieces that we have examined and so could be
the source of this weaving idea for Chin weavers. Moreover, many old Naga textiles use laid-in wefts, singly or in bands, to provide subtle color or textural patterning to warp-faced textiles. This element is evocative of the Mizo/Hualngu ngo te kherh puan (e.g., Figure 165), an old traditional blanket, as well as of many Ashō textiles (e.g., Figure 540).” (pp. 273-75)

“... It’s a long way from the ethnic Chin villages of southern Rakhine State to museums and private collections around the world, but somehow, the traditional weaving of the Sone-Tu has made that journey—and it has done so almost by accident.

‘It came out of frustration,’ explains Mai Ni Ni Aung, the director of Sone-Tu Backstrap Weavings, a project that has won international recognition for its efforts to preserve the traditional weaving techniques and patterns of the Sone-Tu, a Chin sub-group famed for its indigenous textiles. So the first priority was to hire highly skilled weavers as teachers. Because the Sone-Tu don’t have a written language, the sole repository of traditional weaving skills is the “muscle memory” of long-time practitioners of the fine art of back-strap loom weaving, the distinctive technique employed by the Chin. Using a back-tension, or backstrap, loom with cotton or silk is an extremely time-consuming process, taking even an experienced weaver two to three weeks, at six hours a day, to produce just one 80-by-20-inch single-pattern shawl. The results, however, are often quite stunning in their beauty.

According to David W. Fraser, co-author with his partner Barbara Fraser of “Mantles of Merit: Chin Textiles from Myanmar, India and Bangladesh,” the traditional textiles of the Chin are remarkable for their variety, quality and importance to their traditional culture as emblems of status. “Some of the Chin groups are particularly adept at using supplementary wefts to create remarkably intricate patterning,” Mr. Fraser explained recently via e-mail. “Because warps are generally very closely packed in Chin textiles, in many cases the supplementary weft patterning is visible only on the front face of the textile.” The patterns on Chin textiles differ greatly from one piece to the next, but all are characterized by a highly evolved aesthetic sensibility and executed with a rare virtuosity. As Dr. Khosrow Sobhe of Textile Museum Associates of Southern California puts it, the patterns vary “from minimalist statements evocative of a Mar Rothko painting to exquisitely intricate supplementary yarn patterning, in some cases using weaving structures mastered exceptionally by the Chin.”

The project has achieved its success—which last year earned it a grant from the National Geographic Society—by increasing international recognition of the artistry of Sone-Tu weaving. It has done this largely through word of mouth, winning Sone-Tu textiles a dedicated following among private collectors and a place in such prestigious venues as Singapore’s Asian Civilization Museum, the Textile Museum in Washington and England’s Brighton Museum & Art Gallery, among others...”

For more information on this topic see APPENDIX ii or the original text under: http://www.irrawaddy.org/burma/magazine-lifestyle/weaving-future-sone-tu-textiles.html

Source: Weaving a Future for Sone-Tu Textiles
By KYAW PHYO THA / THE IRRAWADDY On Saturday, October 12, 2013 @ 11:24 am
- For more information on this topic see:Article printed from The Irrawaddy Magazine: http://www.irrawaddy.org
Copyright © 2012 The Irrawaddy Magazine. All rights reserved.

-
A Young Chin/Zo Girl from the Chittagong Hill Tracts in Bangladesh drinking the traditional Zo Zu ("zo rice beer"). (I'm using this photo without the authors' prior permission. tzd. January 2014)

PHOTO 40

TRADITIONAL RICE BEER POTS AND CEREMONIAL POSTS

- Photographer unknown
- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. December 2016.
- Traditionally tattooed women from southern Chinland
- Photographer(s) unknown

- Photos selected and created in this form by Thang Za Dal. Hamburg. 04.2016.
- A SPINNING KUMI CHIN GIRL FROM SOUTHERN CHINLAND AND RAKHINE STATE
(Photographer unknown)

- Photo selected and created in this form by Thang Za Dal. May 2016.
- 3 Young Khumi Girls in their traditional dresses in Paletwa, southern Chinland.
- Photographer unknown

- Some Chin couples in their traditional tribal costumes (Photo taken on Chin National Day 2015 in Norway)

Among the Traditional Dresses Seen Here Are (alphabetically): Cho, Haka, Matu, Mizo, Tedim and Thantlang

(Photos directly taken and prepared from the 60th CND Concert DVD by tzd. 06.2011)
Some Young Asho (Plains) Chins in their traditional dresses

- Photo selected and prepared in this form by Thang Za Dal. Germany. October 2016
SOME CHIN/ZOS IN THEIR TRADITIONAL TRIBAL COSTUMES (FEBRUARY 20, 2016. USA)
- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal, Hamburg, January 2021
- A Portion of Chins living in Singapore (4,000) are, unlike most of other Chins living abroad, not refugees. They are professionals and their families.
21.0 PRESENT PLIGHT OF THE CHIN/ZO PEOPLE IN BURMA

21.1 TELEVISION AND RADIO BROADCASTING PROGRAMME

(Note. This part may need to be updated in the near future. tzd. June 2022)

Since the Chin State, which is just slightly smaller than Switzerland, has only about 1200 km of motor roads and most of them are dry-season-only roads (see MAP 8). And since there are only a few thousand television sets in its nine townships and sub-township, it's almost impossible for the great majority of its people to travel to its other regions to study or observe the traditions and ways of life of their fellow folk. Even those who have TV sets themselves cannot see TV programs full-time since they do not get electricity sufficiently and regularly.

Despite the great sacrifices that they have had made for Burma, which were mentioned earlier in this paper, there were until very recently a number of Chins who could not even afford the cheapest rubber sandals and some equal numbers had to rely solely on kerosene lamps before solar energy lamps were donated by some foreign donors when the Aungsan Suu Kyi government came to power. Even their attempts for self-improvement have always been in one way or another sabotaged by Burmese authorities. (See 20.3 PROFESSOR DR. SALAI TUN THAN below; it is just an example out of several incidents.) Instead of being grateful for what the Chins have done for the country during the past 70 years, the successive Burmese governments have always even spreaded rumors among the Burmese populace whenever a massacre was committed by government troops against civilians in the country that it was the Chin soldiers who had committed the massacre. The following quotation is from the Chin Community (Germany)'s Statement:

“Ever since the first massacre of the students in 1962, General Ne Win's Military Intelligence Service used to spread words about Chin soldiers shooting at demonstrators. The same thing happened during the 1974 Labour and U Thant Strikes and again during the 1988 uprisings after troops mowed down hundreds of demonstrators. This is part of Ne Win's stratagem to reduce public hatred towards him and his Burma Army and to instill ethnic hatreds among the oppressed peoples...”

The Chin Community's Statement (APPENDIX S) above and an Arakanese scholar's comment on the said statement (APPENDIX T) vividly reveal the agony of the Chins and that of all other ethnic minorities as well in Burma. In fact, only a single Chin had ever been promoted to the rank of major-general** until today, even though tens of thousands of Chins have served and still are serving in Burma's various armed forces until today. The next highest rank held by another Chin national is Brigadier-General. He is Hung Ngai from Mindat Township. Although he is a Buddhist from childhood, the promotion to his present rank is said to have nothing to do with his religion, but his own qualifications. According to reliable sources he has never been given the task of commanding troops that were involved in the various massacres against peacefuldemonstrators in the land.

And if the reader carefully looks at the two photos of Haka (PHOTOS 2 and 3), he will perhaps see only one or two motor cars in them. This is a very clear indication of the Chins' economic hardship. All the other so-called “indigenous peoples” or “national races” are also meeting the same fate. (“Indigenous peoples” or “national races” are the ruling ethnic Burman politicians' favourite terms to denote all the native peoples living in the country, excluding the two alien ethnic groups: Chinese and Indians.)

In contrary to this, the economic and commercial fruits of the land are overwhelmingly enjoyed only by these two mainly urban-dwelling alien nationals together with the corrupt native elites. These two alien nationals have
had almost never shed blood and tears in the ruthless 60-year old civil war. Of course, a number of half-caste of both Chinese and Indian ancestry also have had equally suffered with their host nationals and lost their lives in the decades-long internal political conflicts. While several tens of thousands of women and girls of the “indigenous peoples” and ethnic Burmese women as well in politically disturbed areas have not only been raped but also bestially murdered by government soldiers, none or very few of the women and girls of the two alien ethnic groups are known to have met the same fate. While millions of those indigenous peoples are uprooted from their birthplaces, and their homes and properties confiscated and destroyed, none or only a very few of those alien nationals are reported to have suffered similarly. (I've also prepared another separate paper called Burma's 60 - Year Old Civil War (1948-2008): A Brief Chronology. This paper deals chronologically mainly with Burma's internal affairs during the past 60 years. It contains 119 pages until end of June 2022.)

As the human rights situation is extremely bad and the successive governments do not make any economic developments in Chin State, life for the great majority of the Chin people is very hard. Therefore, more than 170,000 Chins have left and still are leaving their country and are now living in several countries as refugees or illegals under extremely hard conditions. The following statistics are just some rough estimates as of 2019: Australia (3000); Germany (500); India (35,000); Malaysia (55,000); Singapore (4,000 – they are professionals and their family members, not refugees); Thailand (7,000); USA & Canada (80,000); Netherlands (150); Swizerland (37); Scandinavian countries (3,500); New Zealand (1500); UK (150); South Korea (300); Japan (200); and about 7,000 elsewhere. The uprooted, who are called the IDPS (Internally Displaced Persons) and those who are living in several refugee camps inside Thailand and Bangladesh of various non-Burman native ethnic groups number about one million. They are Arakanese (Rakhines), Arakan Muslims, Chins, Kachins, Karens, Karenns, Mons, Shans, etc. Not a single pure Indian or Chinese is mong them.

And throughout Chin State, names of roads, villages, towns, and government offices are written only in Burmese since a four decades ago.

21.2 THE MARCH 31, 2004 ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROJECT MAJE

Project Maje, an independent information project on Burma's human rights and environmental issues, has released a new report, "Mithuns Sacrificed to Greed: The Forest Ox of Burma's Chins." The report contains information about the little-known mithun, a large domesticated ox traditionally used for ceremonial purposes by the Chin and Naga tribes of Western Burma and Northeast India. Mithuns stand five feet tall at the shoulder and are related to the forest-dwelling gaur. An essential element of indigenous culture, these docile bovines are now the subject of commercial meat-trade schemes by Burma's regime, and there have been reports of confiscation of mithuns from Chin villagers. These developments pose a threat to Chin culture, and possibly to the future survival of the mithun, which is the least in number of all the large mammals domesticated by humans. The report is available at Project Maje's website: www.projectmaje.org

-----Ursprüngliche Nachricht-----
References: Edith Mirante [mailto:maje@hevanet.com] Gesendet: Sonntag, 4. April 2004 00:42

21.3 PROFESSOR DR. SALAI TUN THAN

"... It was only after a desperate search of two weeks that the family finally learned that Dr. Tun Than was being held in Rangoon's notorious Insein prison...Sources told a reporter of the Irrawaddy On-line News last week that the former rector of Yezin Agricultural University had been arrested near the city hall in
Rangoon while distributing leaflets calling for free elections in the country... His family has been able to send him medicine through the International Committee of the Red Cross. Dr Salai Tun Than, a retired agronomist, had devoted himself to rural development in Ngaphe township of Magwe division since his retirement a dozen years ago. In 1993, he established the Myanmar Integrated Rural Development Association (MIRDA) with the assistance of the Myanmar Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches. The group assisted since his retirement a dozen years ago.

The group assisted villagers with the cultivation of oranges, coffee and tea in the area in which it operated its project in Ngaphe. But the military government did not permit MIRDA to function officially as an NGO. The group faced continual disturbances from the regime and donors were prohibited from visiting MIRDA sites. The regime at one point destroyed over half of MIRDA's orchards. Dr Salai himself was also prohibited from conducting agriculture-training workshops, according to a source familiar with the MIRDA. A Christian and a member of the Chin ethnic group, Dr. Salai Tun Than earned a Ph.D. in Agronomy from the University of Wisconsin and had served as rector at the Yezin University of Agriculture in Pyinmana until 1990. The Hong Kong-based Asian Human Rights Commission made an urgent appeal this week for increased international response to the doctor's arrest.” (Burma Courier No. 306; Chin Human Rights Organisation's report & Irrawady Online News/January 30, 2002)

Even the late Mr. Khun Sa, the world’s most famous drug warlord and the number one on the U.S.’s wanted list as drug trafficker, and Lo Hsing-han and Wei Hsueh-kang, who are also internationally well-known drug traffickers, are living in Rangoon and enjoying special privileges under the present government. They are investing hundreds of millions of dollar of their drug money in all kinds of lucrative business enterprises such as banking, transports, constructions, real estates, tourism, hotels, etc. Mr. Khun Sa and his 10,000-man private army surrendered in 1996 and lived in Rangoon until his death in 2007. Lo Shing Han and Wei Hsueh-kang are pure Chinese. Khun Sa is half-Shan and half-Chinese. Several senior military officer' involvement in drug business is an open secret in Burma since the 1960s. See the following news item:

“... It is an open secret that the 2 banks (Asia Wealth Bank & Mayflower Bank) mentioned above have links with the drug lords. A long time ago, Interpol issued a warrant for the arrest of Khun Sa and the junta refused to hand him over. But the two banks in question extensively deal with black money and army officers are share holders not only of these banks, but of money enterprises run illegally... The drug lords run domestic airlines, some railways lines, road transport, departmental stores and many other economic activities where army officers are dormant co-partners...” (Source: Money Laundering: A Dilemma for Burma's Junta - By B. K. Sen (Senior Advocate): Mizzima News (www.mizzima.com) January 2, 2004.)

(Author's (tzd) Note: Dr. Salai Tun Than, an ethnic Chin, was released from prison after the International Red Cross intervened and was allowed to fly to the United States. He attempted to go back to Burma via Thailand in 2004. However, he was not allowed by the Burmese government to enter Burma. Since then he has been living in the United States as an exile. This news item is still included in this paper anyway, as a proof of the continuing persecution under which his people, the Chins, and the entire population of Burma as a whole are still suffering.)
21.4 CHIN STATE'S UNEASY COHABITATION WITH THE REGIME

REF: RANGOON 0082

¶1. (U) Summary. Burma's ethnic minority Chin population, long victims of the Burmese regime's "Myanmarization" program, has reached a stage of uneasy but peaceful cohabitation with ruling authorities in its home state. In underdeveloped Chin State along Burma's western border with India, ethnic Chins have garnered some measures of greater religious tolerance at the expense of inclusion in local governance. After years of pressure to convert the Christian Chin community to Buddhism through threats and missionary efforts, GOB authorities seem to have given up. The Chin remain resilient in practicing their faith loudly and publicly. Trade with a rapidly growing India remains a dream just beyond their borders, and the UNDP serves as the only available catalyst for rural advancement. End Summary.

A Land That Time Forgot

¶2. (U) On a recent trip to conduct visa fraud investigations, Conoff traveled by car from southern Sagaing Division deep into the hinterlands of Chin State. Lying on Burma's western border with India, Chin State may be the least developed of all of Burma's ethnic states. It is the only state without any paved roads. Of the half-million inhabitants in Chin State, an estimated 85% live in isolated villages perched upon steep hillsides. Many of these 500 villages are accessible only by foot or horseback; about one quarter still have yet to establish a source of running water; and only a handful have any access to electricity. The economy depends on slash and burn subsistence agriculture of millet and beans.

¶3. (U) Chin State's economic stagnation and lack of development is in large part due to its isolation, both culturally and physically, from the rest of the country. Only three dirt roads connect Chin State with the rest of Burma. They are regularly under patchwork construction, and summer monsoons routinely disable them for days. No commercial airport exists in the state, and Conoff saw only one gas station during a seven day trip through two of the three largest population centers. Upon leaving the Chin State, it is another 10 to 15 hours by car (or boat during monsoons) to reach the nearest substantial market, Mandalay.

¶4. (U) With so few economic opportunities, the favorite pastime of young Chin men and, increasingly, Chin women, seems to be migrating in search of employment elsewhere. After the mechanization of jade mining in northern Burma, only three prime job markets remain attractive: the Indian border province of Mizoram, northern Malaysia, and the United States. Seasonal migrant laborers in Mizoram earn about $100 to $200 for three to four months toil, while Malaysian factory laborers earn $200 a month.

¶5. (SBU) Meanwhile, the Chin connection to the United States grows ever stronger and more politically active. Many Chin were converted to Christianity by American Baptist missionaries so they feel a special bond with the United States. Strong Chin exile and expatriate communities in Michigan and the Washington DC area support the homeland through donations to churches and through encouragement to seek travel to the U.S. Locals enthusiastically point out villages that have strong ties to America. As Conoff passed through one such village, he encountered a Chin-American couple, naturalized decades ago, who return annually to support a local orphanage. They proudly displayed a letter from their Congressman requesting consular support as they visited refugee communities in Malaysia and various contacts in Burma. The push to emigrate to the U.S. is supported strongly by a pull from Burmese already there, and the combined effort results some in far-fetched schemes: Chin asylee
follow-to-join visa applications in Burma have an egregiously high fraud rate.

C. Trade and Glimmers of Development

¶8. (U) Many people in the Chin region recognize the growing opportunities from trade with India, particularly since the Burmese prefer Indian products to cheap in imports from China. Chin engage in border trade with India; however, the primary trade route, a paved road from Tamu, India, to Kalay, Sagaing Division, does not enter the Chin State. Goods traveling this route flow from Kalay directly to Mandalay, leaving most of Chin State entirely out of the equation. Border trade directly between Chin State and India does exist, but it is limited to goods carried over the border by hand or packed on horse carts.

¶9. (U) Virtually the only stories of successful rural development in Chin State come from the UNDP's decade-long grassroots intervention with local villages. The UNDP has introduced running water to roughly 75% of local villages through village tap stands. School houses in many villages were built through villager and UNDP collaboration, proudly displayed on signboards. Its most significant project, however, is the ongoing Self Reliance Group (SRG), a microcredit program managed by a village-appointed committee. This "teach a man to fish" approach has succeeded in educating locals on the value of saving and investment. Villagers optimistically talk about making the leap from slash and burn agriculture to pig or chicken farming, and more ambitiously, to building modest hydroelectric generators.

D. Uneasy Cohabitation

¶12. (SBU) The cost for modest progress in religious tolerance is apparently a loss in political access: fewer and fewer Chin find opportunities at any level of government service, even within their own state. Five years ago, Chin ethnics were present in District and, sometimes, State-level civil service jobs. Now, few Chin hold government jobs, even at the Township level. The only government positions still open to Chin are schoolteachers and nurses, likely because they must live in rural villages. The result is a segregated society with divisions between disadvantaged Christian Chins and the ruling Buddhist Burmans easy to see.

¶13. (SBU) Comment: Chin State's ongoing marginalization in part results from its economic and cultural isolation, but that isolation also results from years of neglect by the GOB. The marginalization of the Chin parallels the situation we observed in Kachin State (refel) with power increasingly concentrated in ethnic Burman hands. Maintaining three dirt roads is the extent of the GOB's commitment to support Chin State. Chin people today do not aggressively seek more autonomy or appear willing to risk conflict. Rather, they seek to maintain peaceful cohabitation and the limited space for religious practice it offers. Even a state of peaceful cohabitation, however, will not attract development support from the GOB. So the Chin are now learning to help themselves with UNDP support. End Comment.

Source:
Viewing cable 06RANGOON370, CHIN STATE'S UNEASY COHABITATION WITH THE REGIME
To understand the justification used for the classification of each cable, please use this WikiSource article as reference.
containing the reference ID e.g. #06RANGOON370.
Reference ID Created Released Classification Origin
06RANGOON370 2006-03-20 08:54 2011-08-30 01:44
UNCLASSIFIED/FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY Embassy Rangoon
This record is a partial extract of the original cable. The full text of the original cable is not available.
UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 03 RANGOON 000370
21.5 INSTITUTIONALIZED DISCRIMINATION IN CHIN STATE

44. During his latest visit, the Special Rapporteur went to Chin State to look into allegations of discrimination against Christian communities. He welcomed the open and frank discussion that he had with state government officials and township elders. He visited Baptist churches in Mindat and Kanpae and met clergy and members of the congregations. While the Special Rapporteur appreciates that people of different faiths and beliefs generally live peacefully and harmoniously together in Chin State, he is nevertheless concerned about a degree of institutionalized discrimination against Christians in Chin State in state government structures and administrative procedures.

   This includes discrimination in access to jobs, especially senior positions, within the civil service. Only 14 per cent of department head positions and 25 per cent of township administrative officer positions are held by Christians, notwithstanding the fact that 87 per cent of people in Chin State are Christian (with 11 per cent Buddhist and 2 per cent animist). Other areas of concern include local planning regulations and administrative requirements that render it more difficult for Christians to secure permission to build and renovate structures for religious worship, as well as to buy property and change residence.

Source: United Nations
A/68/397
General Assembly Distr.: General
23 September 2013 / Original: English
13-48420 (E) 141013
*1348420*
Sixty-eighth session/ Agenda item 69 (c)

21.6 UN RIGHTS ENVOY AWESTRUCK BY LEVELS OF POVERTY IN CHIN STATE

* Thursday, 22 August 2013 13:40
* Written by Van Biak Thang (vanbiakthang@chinlandguardian.com)

22 August 2013:

The level of poverty in Chin State has alarmed Tomás Ojea Quintana, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in Burma who made his first ever trip to one of the most isolated regions in Burma. Mr. Quintana said in his statement yesterday that the Chin communities have suffered from neglect from the central government over the years.

"With the country opening up, development will come, but it is important that this process occurs in a participatory, transparent, accountable and equal manner," he said. "The process of development and the exploitation of natural resources there should benefit the Chin communities," added the UN expert who had just returned from his first trip to Chin State. Over 70 percent of the population in Chin State live under the poverty line, making it the poorest state in the whole of Burma. During his 8th trip to Burma, Mr. Quintana travelled to Mindat and Kanpetlet towns in southern Chin State, also visiting Christian churches and government-controlled Na Ta La schools. The Na Ta La residential schools,
run under military-dominated Ministry for Border Affairs, has been accused of taking coercive measures to convert Chin Christian students to Buddhism.

Salai Za Uk Ling, Program Director of the Chin Human Rights Organization (CHRO), said: "Graduates of the Na Ta La schools have guaranteed government positions, but only if they are Buddhists. This is a clear reflection that discrimination on the ground of religious identity is entrenched within the Na Ta La school system."

"This is why we have been calling for the abolition of these schools and to instead properly finance the state education system where everyone can enjoy equal access to good education."

The UN Special Rapporteur made a two-day trip to Chin State. He also visited other ethnic States of Rakhine, Shan and Kachin as well as Meikhtila in Mandalay region. During his ten-day visit, Mr. Quinta was denied permission to visit Kachin State's Laiza, the headquarters of the Kachin Independence Organization (KIO).


21.7 DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST BURMA-CHINA NICKEL PROJECT IN CHIN STATE
* Monday, 12 August 2013 08:38
* Written by Khai Pi
Published in Chin News

12 August 2013: Hundreds of demonstrators, mainly from the Zomi groups in exile, have protested against the Gullu Mual nickel project in Tedim Township of Chin State, Burma. The events call for an immediate stop to the nickel mining project, a joint venture between Burma's government and mining companies from China. A statement released by the World Zomi Congress (WZC) said the groups condemned the partnership that would only exploit the natural resources of the indigenous people in Chin State. Four nickel deposit areas in Mwe Hill, Webula Hill, Hakhalay and Nat Hill and four chromites areas in Mwe Hill, Webula Hill, Hakhalay, Nat Hill, Bopibun, Muwelut, Maungtaw-Hnamataw and Falam were found, according to the New Light of Myanmar on 27 September 2011.

The government-run newspaper said the record states that there would be 110.57 million tons of nickel ore and 38,100 million tons of chromites ore in Chin State. Several other Chin civil society groups including the Chin Student Union in Kalay and the Kuki Women's Human Rights Organization (KWHRO) also raised their concerns over development projects in Chin State, the least developed state in the country. The New Light of Myanmar in 2011 said North Mining Investment Co Ltd of China, China Nonferrous Metal Industry’s Foreign Engineering & Construction Co Ltd and Guiling Research Institute of Geology for Mineral Resources held discussions on exploration and production of the deposit.

A 2008 report by the Earthrights International said Kingbao (Jinbao) Mining Co. signed agreements with the Ministry of Mining No. 3 in Burma to conduct exploration and feasibility studies at the Mwetaung nickel deposit in Chin State that contains proven nickel reserves in excess of 10 million tons. Kingbao (Jinbao) Mining Co. is a joint subsidiary of Gold Mountain (Hong Kong) International Mining Co. and Wanbao Mining Co., both of which control 50% of the company. Gold Mountain (Hong Kong) International Mining Co. is itself a wholly-owned subsidiary of Zijing Mining Co., while Wanbao Mining Co. is a wholly-owned subsidiary of China North Industries (NORINCO).

"The entry of large, foreign-dominated mining companies goes beyond environmental issues. It is primarily a glaring face of land grabbing," added the Kuki Women's Human Rights Organization (KWHRO). In recent months, the anti-Gullu nickel project demonstrations took place in front of Burmese embassies in India, Australia and USA, with more protests being organized in other foreign countries.
The combined length of all motor roads in Chin State (36,019 sq km) - nearly as large as Switzerland - is only about 1,200 km. And most of them are dry-season-only and jeepable!

- See 21.1 TELEVISION AND RADIO BROADCASTING PROGRAMME
Thang Za Dal (Mr)
Grindelallee 141
20146 Hamburg
Germany

Updated from XXII in June 2022

PHOTO AND MAP CREDITS
Map 1  Courtesy: Mr. and Mrs. Frasers
Photo 11:  (Mr.:Bergbewohner im Grenzgebiet von Bangladesh, by Claus-Dieter Brauns & Lorence G.

GL0SSARY
(See also 17.8  ZO NAMES, and DIAGRAMS 1 & 2: HOW THE NORTHERN ZOS GET THEIR NAMES)

Terms of Kinship and other Prefixes

Lia  a poetic word used to designate the status of an unmarried woman.
Mak pa  son-in-law (term used by parents and relatives of a married woman towards her husband
Mak te  address form used by parents and relatives of a married woman towards her husband’s relatives
Mo  address form used by female relatives of a married man towards his wife
Ngang  father’s sister’s husband; seniors are addressed by last name with prefix only.
Ni  father’s sister
Ni  address form toward an elderly domestic female slave; for male slave  is Pa - these two usages,
that is, the  address forms for  female and male slaves, are confined to the Sizangs alone
Nu  mother; mother’s sister, mother’s cousin sister; address form of respect for a middle-aged
woman; wife of paternal uncle. An example: The wife of my father’s younger brother is
called Hang Za Cing. So I address her as Nu Cing. The name of my mother’s elder sister was
Ciang Ko Cing. So I addressed her as Nu Cing.
Nu neau  daughter of maternal uncle. An example: The nickname of one of the daughters of my
maternal uncle is called Dimno. So my brother, my sisters and I myself address her as
Nuneau Dimno. But she simply addresses me as U Dal.
Nu phal  address form used by a married man towards the husband of his wife’s sister
Pu no  son of maternal uncle. An example: the children of my paternal uncles’ sisters and
cousin sisters as well call me Pu no Thang Za Dal or Pu Dal Thang Za Dal or Pu Dal
- using only the last word of my name.
The nickname of the first son of my maternal uncle(immediate younger brother of my
mother, Thian Khaw Khai) is Pau no. So my brother, I and my sisters call him Pu no
Pauno. But he simply calls us either U Dal, as I am older than him. He calls my sisters
who are younger than he himself simply by their nicknames.
Pi  grandma; father’s mother; mother’s mother; lady; wife of maternal uncle. An example:
The name of my eldest maternal uncle was Suan Neam. So I addressed her as Pi Neam, or Pipui (great aunt). The name of her husband was Khup Ko Thang. I addressed him as Pu Thang or Pu Pui. But both paternal and maternal grandfathers and paternal and maternal grandmothers are simply addressed as Pu and Pi respectively. Also an address of respect regardless of age or kinship

Pa  father; father’s younger or elder brother; address form of respect for a middle-aged man
Pu  grandpa. father’s father; mother’s father; mother’s brother, mother’s cousin brother, overlord. Also an address form of respect regardless of one’s age or kinship

Tang or Taang  A poetic word used to designate the status of an unmarried young man.
Sungh pa  address form of a married man towards his father-in-law
Sungh nu  address form used by a married man towards his mother-in-law
Sungh te  address form used by a married man towards all relatives of his wife’s
To pasal  father-in-law(address form used by a married woman towards her husband’s father
To nupi  mother-in-law(address form used by a married woman towards her husband’s mother
U  elder(brother or sister); also an address form of respect towards an elder man/woman
U nu  address form used by a man towards the wife of his elder brother

BRIEF BIOGRAPHIES OF THREE ZO SCHOLARS: PU VUM KO HAU, REV. KHUP ZA GO AND DR. VUMSON SUANTAK

DR. VUM KO HAU, AUTHOR OF THE PROFILE OF A BURMA FRONTIER MAN
By Carey Suante

ZOGAM.COM :: Bridging The Zomis
Parentage: Rev Za Khup & Pi Ciang Zam of Thuklai
Date of Birth: 17th March 1917 (10:00 pm)

A prominent member/leader of the Chin Defence Army during Second World War. He worked as a stenographer at the Deputy Commissioner Office at Falam after the Second World War. He served as a translator during the Pinlong Conference in 1947 and was also among the seven Zomis who were part of the Constituent Assembly 1947 - 48.

In the Interim Government after Independence he was appointed as the Deputy Councillor of Frontier Areas (Chin Affairs). Thus in this capacity he was amongst the five delegates of signatories at the Nu-Atlee Agreement in London on 17th October 1947. He was also a member of the 17 leaders who wrote the Burmese Constitution and selected the National Anthem.

Offices held:
1948 - Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Foriegn Affairs
1955-59 - Ambassador to France and Netherland
A Pastor and Zo Leader Passes Away – Rev. Khup Za Go
by Kham Khan Suan, Sanjoy Hazarika
Wednesday, 14. February 2007

Khup Za Go, a pastor of the Zo people, who lived in Manipur and Mizoram, died in a road accident in New Delhi last week. He was accorded an emotional farewell and buried at Churachandpur in Manipur. Born and brought up in Murlen, Champhai district (now in Mizoram) Rev Go completed his Masters in Political Science from Guwahati University in 1971. Since then he committed himself to a full time church ministry despite other opportunities. An incumbent pastor at Zomi Christian Fellowship, Delhi, the Rev Go had served the Chin Baptist Association (1971-1977) as executive secretary and in various other capacities. In between, he worked as assistant director and thereafter as director of the Christian Literature Centre of CBCNEI (Council of Baptist Churches in North East India) in Guwahati (1981-87).

He was elected vice-president of CBCNEI in 1991-92. The Rev Go completed his theological studies from Serampore College (1980-81); Oxford and Union Theological College, Bangalore (1993-95). A Baptist church leader, he participated in various international Christian events in Indonesia, the USA, Frankfurt, Myanmar and Thailand. The Zo leader published more than 15 books; the latest being Leivui Panin (Out of the Dust) in the Tiddim Chin language — a collection of 86 published journal articles — released by his friend Dr HT Sangliana, MP and IPS (retd.) in February. An ecumenical preacher, he ardently championed the cause of Zo unity and solidarity. In his death, the Zo people have lost a tall church leader, visionary and prolific writer.

This obituary can be viewed at The Statesman website as well.

Carey Suante
2007-05-17

_________________________________________

BRIEF BIOGRAPHY OF DR. VUMSON SUANTAK

Written by thalmlual.com Thursday, 14 May 2009 08:00

Date of Birth : November 9, 1937
Place of Birth: Tamdeang*, Tedim Township, Chin State, Burma.
Date of Deceased: September 19, 2005, Laurel Hospital, Maryland, US

Educational Background
1957 - Matriculated from Tedim State High School, Tedim Township
1969 - Ph. D (Doctor of Natural Science) Bergacademie, Freiburg - Germany

Publications

1970 - Geochemical Exploration of Trace Elements (in German version)
1986 - Author of Zo History (in English)

* Foundation for Democracy in Burma /member and for five years served as its President
* Member of Committee for Restoration of Democracy in Burma
* Founder of Chin National Council and Chin Freedom Coalition (Washington) and Chin Forum (Ottawa)
* Founder, Former Chairman, and Advisor of Zomi Innkuan Washington D.C (USA) since 2001. Zomi Innkuan D.C Chairman 2001 from 2004
* Member of the Board of Consultants of the Political Affairs Committee of Chinland,
* Human Rights Activist since 1987
* Founding member of Zomi Literature Institute (ZOLITE)
* Member of the Zo Re-Unification Organization (ZORO) since 1995 and served as coordinator, USA branch ZORO President
* Member of Advisory Board of the Chin National Community – Japan
* Lecturer in Non-Violence Actions, Human Rights and Minority Rights
* Represented Chin Forum in Constitution drafting federal and state in various Burma related seminars
* Worked together with the NCGUB from 1991 to 1999 and other organizations
* Promoted Peace and Democracy in Burma and encouraged armed groups for peace negotiations
* His political activities involved, among other works, lobbying Congress and the US Government for the cause of bringing democracy to Burma and giving interviews to the media such as the BBC, Voice of America, and the Radio Free Asia etc...

Note. *Tamdeang (Suangdaw), Tuivial aka Akbutun and Tuisau villages were founded by Chief Khup Lian of Lophei with the Lopheis and Khuano people. See APPENDIX F.
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MANTLES OF MERIT: Chin Textiles from Myanmar, India and Bangladesh.
By David & Barbara Fraser; River Books Co., Ltd. 2005 (ISBN 974 9863 01 1)

- Prepared in this form by thangzadal. hamburg/06.2014
Mantles of Merit: Chin Textiles from Myanmar, India and Bangladesh

by

David W. Fraser,
Barbara G. Fraser

Rating details · 7 ratings · 3 reviews

"Mantles of Merit - Chin Textiles from Myanmar, India and Bangladesh is the product of many years of research on the history, culture and textiles of the Chin, a heterogeneous group of people, hitherto inadequately studied. Their rich textile culture emphasizes grand blankets and intricate tunics, made of homespun cotton, flax, hemp and silk, dyed with indigo and lac, and woven on a back-tension loom. In considering Chin textiles as art and cultural objects, the authors describe both their beauty and technical virtuosity and their integral role in the Chin effort to achieve merit in this life and the next. The inter-relationships between the complex subdivisions on the Chin and their neighbours are also discussed." Research involved visits to Chin villages, interviews with weavers and Chin elders, examination of many textile collections, review of the anthropological, missionary and colonial literature and private papers, consultation with other scholars and the assembly of a body of Chin textiles for analysis. Over 650 illustrations with 613 in colour, included detailed drawings of textile structures, photographs taken by early missionaries and scholars, photographs from Chin family albums, as well as close-ups and studio photographs of the world's great collections of Chin textiles.


Project
20 January 2015

Shwe Natural Gas Project

Shwe natural gas project is a multi-field integrated development, consisting of the Shwe, Shwe Phyu and Mya offshore gas fields located offshore Rakhine State in blocks A-1 and A-3 of the Bay of Bengal, Myanmar.

Shwe natural gas project is a multi-field integrated development, consisting of the Shwe, Shwe Phyu and Mya offshore gas fields located offshore Rakhine State in blocks A-1 and A-3 of the Bay of Bengal, Myanmar.

The project is being developed in a three-phase scheme by a consortium of six companies, led by POSCO subsidiary Daewoo International. The consortium includes POSCO Daewoo International (51%, operator), Oil and Natural Gas Corporation (ONGC) Videsh (17%), Myanmar Oil and Gas Enterprise (MOGE: 15%), Gas Authority of India (GAIL: 8.5%), and Korean Gas Corporation (KOGAS: 8.5%).

Shwe natural gas project reserves

The combined natural gas reserves of the three gas fields are estimated at 4.53 trillion cubic feet. The Shwe gas field, discovered in 2004, has the largest gas reserves among the three fields.

Shwe natural gas project controversies and concerns

The Shwe natural gas project faced a lot of criticism, with its environmental impact assessment (EIA) not released prior to the start of construction. It was also criticised for not allocating sufficient gas for domestic use in Myanmar.

Critics alleged that the project’s pipelines pass through ecologically sensitive and residential areas, including rainforests, parks, rivers, marines and sanctuaries.

Area: 261,220 sq.mi (676,560 km²)

Official Landmass of Non-Burman “indigenous national races”: Chin State (36,019 sq. km or 5.32 %); Kachin State (89,012 sq. km or 13.16 %); Kayin State (30,383 sq. km or 4.5 %); Kayah State (11,670 sq. km or 1.72 %); Mon State (12,155 sq. km or 1.8 %); Rakhaing/Rakhine State (36,780 sq. km or 5.44 %); Shan State (155,800 sq. km or 23.02 %). These territories altogether make up about 55.14 % of the entire area of Burma. (Prepared in this form, except the map, by Thang Za Dal. 12/2014)
PHOTOS 2 & 3

Photo 2 (above): A Section of Haka, Capital of Chin State
Photo 3 (below): Sport Stadium and Panoramic View of Haka
Photographer unknown (These photos were circulated first around 2007).

- created in this form by thangzadal/06.2014
- Photo (above): Phatzang aka No. 2 Stockade (distant summit), where the first battles between the British and Chins took place in 1888-89. It was also one of the most well-known battle grounds between the British and Japanese in WW II in the Chin Hills War Theatre. The distant valley is the Kale-Kabaw Valley.
- Photo (below): Vangteh village - One of the well-known villages during the Chin-Lushai Expedition 1889-90. See 9.6.6 Encounter with the Siyins; 12.4 Surrendered Guns

- Photographer unknown. These were first circulated around in 2007.
- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal, January 2014
ABOUT ME

This part is divided into six sections: A, B, C, D, E and F

• Section A: A brief description of my novel
• Section B: It contains a few corrections in a paragraph from the book itself.

• Section C deals with an explanation concerning why Jennifer, the daughter of an American Black and a Belgian, called her mother “Mama”. A posting in Quara solves this question under “Why do African Americans call their mothers Momma/Mama?” The reason for my making this explanation is: to my great surprise, several people asked me why I let Jennifer call her mother “Mama”.


• Section E contains my comments (Letters to Editor) on 16 political articles on Burma that appeared in various Online Newspapers.

NOTE: I am publicizing the following numbered Items in this Section only now for the first time.

4. Clarifying Myanmar’s complex ethnic makeup
5. Death rattle for Myanmar democracy
6. Jailing of journalists hides mass graves in Myanmar
7. Myanmar slipping on several fronts
8. Rakhine killings inflame Myanmar’s powder keg
10. India takes fight to China via SEAsia
11. Where Suu Kyi stands the most to lose
12. Mad rush to repatriate Rohingya refugees
13. Genocide bad for business in Myanmar

• Section F: WHY DID THE PEACE-BUILDING PROCESS (2015-2016) IN BURMA FAIL? It is about my comments (Letters to Editor) – on 15 articles in two influential Online Newspapers in Burma. I distributed it to a few thousand recipients on September 10, 2022.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Thang Za Dal

September 30, 2022.
(SECTION A)

ABOUT MY NOVEL

I have written a 412-page historical romance novel in English under the title of “Why Are You Crying, Mama?”. A German publisher (www.tredition.de), based in Hamburg, Germany, publishes it. It is available on several online bookshops since March 31, 2021, in three versions: Hardcover, Paperback, and E-Book.

“This is Jane's autobiographical novel. John, a black American, rescued Jane, a wealthy Belgian (her mother was a Flander and her father a Wallon), at the last moment from a fatal auto accident in 1926. They marry later and have a daughter named Jennifer. Jennifer disappears without a trace when she is eleven years old at the beginning of WWII. At that point Jane begins her search for the meaning of human existence on this earth, its possible existence in other forms beyond this world, the world's great mysteries, happiness, compassion, soul, consciousness, reincarnation, eternal life, and peace of mind, etc., through Christianity and Buddhism through discussions with a senior Buddhist monk from Ceylon (Sri Lanka). The monk is well-versed in various main Christian Churches' doctrines and leading Buddhist schools' different concepts. The timespan covers between 1926 and 1975.”

Author Profile [from the book]

Thang Za Dal was born in 1947 in Burma. He began his political activities against the successive military dictatorships in 1964. He and his wife sought political asylum in Germany in 1978, and they have got two daughters and four grandchildren. His wife passed away in 2015 from heart complications. He has authored more than forty political and history papers on Burma during the last few decades.

The following are among them.

- Grand Strategy for Burma/Myanmar (I - VIII)
- An Open Personal Supplication to the Present and Future Rulers of Burma/Myanmar (I - VII)
- Open Supplication to the Ethnic Burmans of Burma (I - VI)
- Open Appeal to Institutions and Individuals That May Have Stakes or Interest in One Way or Another in Burma (I - IV)
- To Whom It May Concern (I - VIII)
- Some Strategic Concepts for the Rebuilding of Burma/Myanmar (I - III)
- The Chin/Zo People of Bangladesh, Burma, and India - An Introduction

Remark: My profile mentioned above is visible only on my publisher's Website (see the Link below), but not in the book itself. Therefore, I have requested my publisher to integrate it into future prints. April 17, 2021.

https://tredition.com/authors/thang-za-dal-11006/why-are-you-crying-mama-paperback-3045/
(SECTION B)

A special request to those who have access to this novel concerning a correction on p. 174:
“...a single sura...” should be replaced with “... a few verses in a single sura...”, as follows:

“What do you think of Islam?”

“I’m sorry, I haven’t had enough time to read the Qur’an. And even if I did, I probably wouldn’t study it. The reason is that, like Christianity and Judaism, Islam has several different branches, and I wouldn’t know which branch’s doctrine I should study. I’ve got enough problems with the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament. And as the various branches of Judaism have problems among themselves, all the Christian Churches also have more than enough irreconcilable theological differences. So concerning Islam, I can only tell you an interesting true story. One of my best friends, a lifelong Muslim, and some of his Muslim friends surprised me a few months ago by suddenly converting to Christianity just because of a few verses in a single sura that they read in the newly published Qur’an in English. The author was Abdullah Yusuf Ali, an Indian Islamic scholar born in 1872. It has rapidly become one of the most widely known translations used in the English-speaking world since its publication in 1938 by Sheikh Muhammad Ashraf in Lahore, Pakistan.”

“How can someone, you know, be Muslim and Christian?”

“I won’t tell you, although I know it. It’s in the beginning parts of the Qur’an.”

“Why don’t you want to tell me?”

“Since I don’t have any ideas about all the remaining suras, I don’t want to cause a controversy unnecessarily by naming it. Some Muslims might think I want to promote Christianity. So if it’s so important for you to know it, why don’t you ask some Islamic theologians which sura it is and how the various branches of Islam interpret it?”

“Okay. To which Church did your Muslim friend convert?”

“I’m sorry, Jane. I can’t tell you that.”

“Do you know anything else about him – I mean Abdullah Yusuf Ali?”

“Yes, a little. I’ll read just a few lines about him from his book: Abdullah Yusuf Ali, CBE, MA, LLM, FRSA, FRSL, was born on 14th April 1872 in Bombay, British India, and died in London on 10th December 1953. He studied English literature and studied at several European universities; he spoke both Arabic and English fluently. He could even recite the entire Qur’an from memory ...”
Why do African Americans call their mothers Momma/Mama?

10 Answers

Maggie McFee, Mad scientist, artist, sysadmin, maker, skeptic, robotics dabbler, backup fetish

Answered 6 years ago · Author has 610 answers and 2.3M answer views

The same reason I (and pretty much every person I grew up with regardless of race) do. It's what I learned in the region/culture I grew up in. As for US rappers, you'll also find some say "moms" or "ma". But Southern rap influences are very strong in rap, and a lot of Southerners say "momma". So there is undoubtedly some imitation/adoption by non-Southern rappers. *

"Momma! Just killed a man. Put a gun against his head, pulled my trigger now he's dead." - Whoops! That's not a rap lyric! That's from a 1975 song by UK band Queen. So it's certainly not just an African-American thing. In this case it's meant to denote an Italian speaker who would likely also use the word "momma".

Mum, mumma, ma, mama, mummy, mom, momma, mucm, maman, etc. They're all just regional, lingual and cultural variations of the same earlier word.

And that earlier word, you may be surprised to find, is... "momma" (Latin, also spelled "mama", or "mamme" for the Greeks).

Also surprisingly, the word we often consider the proper version, "mother", is actually a newer Germanic-derived word. (which was, in turn, derived from the proto-Indo-European "māter").
(SECTION D)

A LIST OF THE POLITICAL AND HISTORY PAPERS THAT I HAVE SO FAR PRODUCED BETWEEN 2010 AND THE END OF 2020. THERE ARE AT LEAST 5 MORE PAPERS THAT I HAVEN'T LISTED HERE BECAUSE THEY ARE UNRELATED TO THE MAIN TOPICS OF THE PAPERS ON THIS LIST.

(Thang Za Dal. Hamburg, Germany. September, 2022)

Note: I distributed these papers, except the history paper on my people (see No. 43 below), to more than 250 addresses (individuals, institutions, diplomatic missions, human rights organizations, and news media) on the given dates. Although many papers contained only a few pages, they were full of Links for critical information that are crucial for the fates of all the NATIVE ETHNIC PEOPLES OF BURMA. Most of the Links were for articles and Youtube videos that appeared in several local and international news media such as The Irrawaddy, Mizzima, RFA, BBC, VOA, and DVB, etc.

1. TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN (I) - 1
   (March 23, 2019) = 6 pages

2. TO WHO IT MAY CONCERN (II)
   (October 12, 2019) = 4

3. TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN (III)
   (November 1, 2019) = 5

4. TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN (IV)
   (December 1, 2019) = 4

5. TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN (V)
   (December 6, 2019) = 3

6. TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN (VI)
   (December 28, 2019) = 7

7. TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN (VII)
   (January 4, 2021) = 25

8. TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN (VII)
   (1st modification) = 25 (January 10, 2021)

9. GRAND STRATEGY FOR BURMA/MYANMAR
   (April 27, 2012) = 6

10. GRAND STRATEGY FOR BURMA/MYANMAR (II)
    (September 14, 2012) = 10
11. GRAND STRATEGY FOR BURMA/MYANMAR (III)  
   (October 19, 2012) = 12

12. GRAND STRATEGY FOR BURMA/MYANMAR (IV)  
   (December 25, 2012) = 61

13. GRAND STRATEGY FOR BURMA/MYANMAR (V)  
   (February 6, 2013) = 112

14. GRAND STRATEGY FOR BURMA/MYANMAR (VI)  
   (February 19, 2013) = 117

15. GRAND STRATEGY FOR BURMA/MYANMAR (VI)  
   (First modification) (February 19, 2013) = 132

16. GRAND STRATEGY FOR BURMA/MYANMAR (VII)  
   (October 30, 2013) = 92

17. GRAND STRATEGY FOR BURMA/MYANMAR (VII)  
   (2nd modification) (October 30, 2013) = 185

18. GRAND STRATEGY FOR BURMA/MYANMAR (VII)  
   (3rd modification) (July 10, 2015) = 275

19. GRAND STRATEGY FOR BURMA/MYANMAR (VIII)  
   (May 2016) = 186

20. SOME STRATEGIC CONCEPTS FOR THE REBUILDING OF BURMA/MYANMAR  
   (First Posting) April 10, 2010 = 8

21. SOME STRATEGIC CONCEPTS FOR THE REBUILDING OF BURMA/MYANMAR  
   (3rd modification) (October 2013) = 15

22. SOME STRATEGIC CONCEPTS FOR THE REBUILDING OF BURMA/MYANMAR  
   (4th modification: July 24, 2015) = 38

23. AN OPEN PERSONAL SUPPLICATION TO THE PRESENT AND FUTURE RULERS OF BURMA/MYANMAR  
   (Second Modification) (February 7, 2015) = 19

24. AN OPEN PERSONAL SUPPLICATION TO THE PRESENT AND FUTURE RULERS OF BURMA/MYANMAR  
   (Third Modification) (August 24, 2015) = 33
25. AN OPEN PERSONAL SUPPLICATION TO THE PRESENT AND FUTURE RULERS OF BURMA/MY ANMAR

(Fourth Modification) (December 17, 2015) = 31

26. AN OPEN PERSONAL SUPPLICATION TO THE PRESENT AND FUTURE RULERS OF BURMA/MY ANMAR

(Fifth Modification) (February 25, 2016) = 40

27. AN OPEN PERSONAL SUPPLICATION TO THE PRESENT AND FUTURE RULERS OF BURMA/MY ANMAR

(Sixth Modification) (June 17, 2016) = 76

28. AN OPEN PERSONAL SUPPLICATION TO THE PRESENT AND FUTURE RULERS OF BURMA/MY ANMAR

(Seventh Modification) (August 24, 2016) = 45

29. FIRST OPEN SUPPLICATION TO THE ETHNIC BURMANS OF BURMA

(December 25, 2016) = 51

30. SECOND OPEN SUPPLICATION TO THE ETHNIC BURMANS OF BURMA

(February 12, 2017) = 102

31. THIRD OPEN SUPPLICATION TO THE ETHNIC BURMANS OF BURMA

(April 5, 2017) = 78

32. FOURTH OPEN SUPPLICATION TO THE ETHNIC BURMANS OF BURMA

(September 1, 2017) = 14

33. FOURTH OPEN SUPPLICATION TO THE ETHNIC BURMANS OF BURMA

(1st modification) (September 6, 2017) = 14

34. FIFTH OPEN SUPPLICATION TO THE ETHNIC BURMANS OF BURMA

(November 13, 2017) = 50

35. SIXTH OPEN SUPPLICATION TO THE ETHNIC BURMANS OF BURMA

(February 12, 2018) = 73

36. OPEN APPEAL TO INSTITUTIONS AND INDIVIDUALS THAT MAY HAVE STAKES OR INTEREST IN ONE WAY OR ANOTHER IN BURMA

(February 28, 2018) = 12

37. SECOND OPEN APPEAL TO INSTITUTIONS AND INDIVIDUALS THAT MAY HAVE STAKES OR INTEREST IN ONE WAY OR ANOTHER IN BURMA
38. THIRD OPEN APPEAL TO INSTITUTIONS AND INDIVIDUALS THAT MAY HAVE STAKES OR INTEREST IN ONE WAY OR ANOTHER IN BURMA

(April 30, 2018) = 24

39. FOURTH OPEN APPEAL TO INSTITUTIONS AND INDIVIDUALS THAT MAY HAVE STAKES OR AN INTEREST IN ONE WAY OR ANOTHER IN BURMA

(December 12, 2018) = 8

40. BURMA'S 60-YEAR OLD CIVIL WAR (1948-2008) – A BRIEF CHRONOLOGY

(Last modified in January, 2021) = 116

41. OPEN LETTER TO THE RULERS OF BURMA (in Burmese)

(January 24, 2012) = 26

42. CHIN STATE & MIZORAM

(November 2019) = 110

43. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE CHIN/ZO PEOPLE OF BANGLADESH, BURMA AND INDIA - UPDATE 23rd (This 960-page paper will be uploaded on a Website in 2022 or 2023.)

44. WHY ARE YOU CRYING, MAMA? It's a historical romance novel in English (412 pages in 37 chapters), published by the tredition publishing house in Hamburg, Germany, and available in three different versions (Hardcover, Paperback, and E-Book) on several online bookshops since March 31, 2021. Most of the major events take place in the French-speaking parts of Belgium between 1926 and 1975. An experienced American editor commented: “unputdownable”; a British editor remarked: “a monumental work”.

(January 24, 2012) = 26

45. A Collection of 21 newspaper Articles on Burma's Ongoing Peace-building Process + My Comments on them

(November 8, 2016)

(SECTION E)

The following are a few examples of my comments on those articles:

01. Burma: Project Maje: Hornbills and Powder Horns: Chin State...

OCTOBER 2021 REPORT


Thang Za Dal political analyst. Q: What are the main types of difficulties in Chin State because of the Feb. 1
coup? A: As you know so well for decades, Chin State always has so many difficulties...

Thang Za Dal, political analyst

Q: What are the main types of difficulties in Chin State because of the Feb. 1 coup?
A: As you know so well for decades, Chin State always has so many difficulties in all sectors for decades that I cannot even name them.

Q: Why do you think Chin State is strongly resisting the coup forces?
A: The main reason why the Chins strongly oppose could be that we are more and more aware of the injustices under which we've been suffering since Burma's independence.

Q: Do you think there is a new unity among groups in Chin State?
A: I think there's already a new kind of unity among different groups now in Chin State. The only problem would be how long it'd last and whether there'd be some far-sighted, visionary leaders among the Chins. But the Chins' unity or their unity with all the other resistance movements throughout Burma alone may not be enough to build long-lasting peace without the goodwill and assistance of the regional and global powers.

02. Hans-Bernd Zöllner: "Democracy is just a fantasy". The junta in Burma is firmly in the saddle. Moreover, the uprising has no political perspective. If it does succeed, Hans-Bernd Zöllner fears that even more violence could follow.

29.9.2007

https://taz.de/Hans-Bernd-Zoellner/15194205/

HANS-BERND ZÖLLNER (65) teaches languages and cultures of mainland Southeast Asia at the Asia-Africa Institute of the University of Hamburg. In 2000 he published "Burma zwischen Unabhängigkeit zuerst, Unabhängigkeit zuletzt" (Burma between Independence First and Independence Last) at Lit Verlag Münster. Until 2002 he worked as a pastor in Hamburg. In 1987, he was awarded the Federal Cross of Merit for the care of German-speaking prisoners in Thailand.

taz: Mr. Zöllner, in Burma the military has taken brutal action against demonstrating monks. Is the conflict escalating?
Hans-Bernd Zöllner: I don't think the junta is interested in using more force than is absolutely necessary. It would deprive itself of its legitimacy. But it is possible that there are hotheads among the military or the monks who do not keep their agreements. Then the situation could escalate.

taz: Why would the military deprive themselves of their legitimacy by using more force?
Monks and those in power form a symbiotic community. I call this a kind of "Burmese knot" of monks, people and government. It is held together by spiritual leadership and state power and is concretized in the begging bowl: The monks receive food from the laity, including the military. In return, they give their blessing. According to the teachings of Buddhism, only those who support the monks can achieve prosperity
and prestige. This knot holds the society together. It is now being challenged by the monks.

taz: How do the monks untie this knot?

When the monks stop accepting donations, they excommunicate the donor, so to speak. Even now, there is talk of this form of spiritual boycott, although it is only being applied in rudimentary form so far. In Burma, political and religious strikes are inseparable. The military needs the seemingly powerless monks. The spiritual opposition denies the rulers spiritual support and thus the basis of their existence. This is a threat much greater than a popular uprising. Should soldiers or monks violently break the "Burmese knot," it will be quite bad, I fear.

taz: How likely is that?

There's no way to tell. The only predictable thing in Burma is unpredictability. All the overthrows have been unexpected: The 1962 coup came out of the blue; no one suspected in 1988 that people would take to the streets under the leadership of the students. Two years later, everyone was surprised that the election was not recognized. That makes predictions difficult. In my estimation, belief in miracles is one reason for this unpredictability. Not only the rulers believe in the stars. The whole nation trusts astrology.

taz: Could the 1988 massacre happen again?

I don't think so, because the civilian population hardly takes part in the protest. In 1988, the protesters were led by students, civilians. The monks only joined in. Today, the protest is led by the monks. Moreover, there was a power vacuum at the time after General Ne Win resigned. Incidentally, he is the only Burmese ruler in 2,000 years who voluntarily relinquished power. Politicians, generals and student leaders tried to fill this void. The military fired on the demonstrators out of desperation, and the soldiers knew no other way to help themselves.

taz: And today, the soldiers know how to respond?

Today there is a military junta that has ruled unsuccessfully but with a strong hand for 20 years. The generals have their troops, reasonable command structures, a government. They have even adopted a constitution. And the military has built political structures and the mass organization USDA. This is a very different situation.

taz: What would happen if the monks were successful and ousted the junta?

How would that happen? People don't have guns. Now, some exiled Burmese are hoping that military men who happen to have drunk a "democracy serum" will secede from the army and lead Burma to democracy by military means. This is a pretty fantasy.

taz: The idea of oppositionists is supposed to be a fantasy?

A democratic government could only be established if all military leaders voluntarily resigned. But why should they? The military has a completely overblown sense of self-importance. Incidentally, this is also a result of the boycott policy against the country.

taz: Are there any democratic politicians who could take power?
Aung San Suu Kyi would be suitable as president because, as a heroine of the Burmese resistance, she is a figure of integration. But there are no political figures besides her, not even abroad. And the student movement has long since been crushed. The monks themselves have no political program. If the junta is indeed overthrown, a brutal power struggle could begin.

INTERVIEW: PETRA KILIAN


-------------------------------

Guest 12.10.2007, 11:59 Dear taz readers!

Although I do not agree with the majority of Dr. Zöllner's points of view, I find the overall context very thought-provoking. And the other reader comments are also quite insightful and informative. As I myself remain a concerned citizen of Burma, I would like to share my opinion with your readers at this point. However, my concerns are entirely different.

I agree with Dr. Zöllner that there is no political figure of the caliber of Aung San Suu Kyi, even among the Burmese in exile, who could play a significant role in unifying and resolving the current problems. This is also the reason why the opposition movement is in such a precarious situation.

The opposition movement as a whole is very scattered and relies solely on Suu Kyi. They don't have the right strategies, or perhaps no strategies at all, to put it bluntly. Therefore, it is quite likely that the opposition movement would not be able to bring its effort to a successful end should something happen to it.

The opposition movement currently derives its cohesion from only 4 common grounds, namely

(a) their common hatred of the military regime

(b) their desire for freedom

(c) their love and respect for Ms. Aung San Suu Kyi

(d) their shared desire to escape poverty and misery.

Since I do not know Aung San Suu Kyi personally and have not yet read or heard anything about her methodology for addressing political problems, my concerns are these:

If Aung San Suu Kyi ever has the opportunity in the near future to once again play such a decisive role as she did nearly 10? years ago, will she be skillful enough to outmaneuver the generals? Will there be enough qualified and far-sighted and, in addition, selfless visionaries around her to give her the right advice, and will she herself ultimately be receptive enough to such advice? Or is she herself visionary enough? And will she be strong and capable enough to make crucial decisions on her own?

If we look back at what happened to her and Burma when she enjoyed some degree of freedom to influence important decisions, we see that she was surrounded by former military officers who were themselves part of the military establishment. Therefore, there were no new ideas to solve the problems that affected her and the entire country. For example, they and their advisors had apparently underestimated the cunning intentions of the generals and overestimated the influence of the masses. Thus, she missed several great
opportunities to put the generals on the defensive. Just one example: She could have put the generals on the defensive by presenting her own economic master plan that both the generals and foreign investors could not have rejected, instead of continually calling on the world community to impose trade embargoes.

At present, it looks as if she may indeed get another chance to play a decisive role again. But since her own political party, the NLD, has been severely decimated by the military, she will need a great deal of courage, mindfulness, flexibility, patience, good counsel and international support, along with vision, to overcome all the hurdles that lie ahead.

Yours sincerely

Thang Za Dal

Remark by Thang Za Dal: The taz (“Tageszeitung”) – The Daily Newspaper – is a left-liberal newspaper based in Berlin. 03/2022

ASIA TIMES

03. Rohingya insurgency declares ‘open war’ in Myanmar

In an exclusive interview with Asia Times, the Arakan Rohingya Salvation Army said its August 25 attacks were staged in ‘self-defense’ and would continue until Rohingya rights are restored

by Mike Winchester
August 28, 2017
https://asiatimes.com/2017/08/rohingya-insurgency-declares-open-war-myanmar/

Thang Za Dal: August 29, 2017 at 9:24 AM

My main concern is something else. The successive governments in the country have tried to solve the country’s non-Bamar peoples’ demand for equal rights by means of force instead of using political means since 1948 with money borrowed from outside. That’s one major reason why the country has been branded a "Least-Developed- Country" or LDC by the UN in 1988. Now I wonder how the present government and military will get the necessary money to expand their extremely costly military campaigns against all non-Bamar armed forces.

Thang Za Dal: August 29, 2017 at 10:10 AM

...and the whole world knows already how poor the people of Burma are. Corruption is a major problem. The forests have long become barren. And the country can no more rely for its main revenues on the sales of natural gas and oil since a couple of years ago because the prices of these commodities are plummeting on the international markets...
04. Clarifying Myanmar’s complex ethnic makeup

By Sai Wansai December 7, 2017


Thang Za Dal: December 7, 2017 at 1:19 PM
An overdue article indeed! According to Mr. Khoi Lam Thang’s thesis for Master of Arts degree (from Payab University, Chiangmai, Thailand, published in October 2001: A Phonological Reconstruction of Proto Chin, pp 24-25): Percentage of lexicostatistics similarity of the languages of (I as a non-academic prefer the term "dialects") 21 major Chin tribes was 36.1%. (The tribes listed were as follows: Thado-Kuki, Zo, Siyin, Tedin, Buakhua, Zanit, Mizo, Falam, Taisun, Haka, Thantlang, Khualsim, Sentlang, Asho, Matu, Kaang, Dai, Khumi, Lauwu-Naring, Lakh, Mara.) In another research paper done by another linguistic scholar (I could not find this source anymore at the moment, unfortunately), the lexicostatistics similarity between the Burmese language and average Chin dialects was below 1%.

Thang Za Dal: December 8, 2017 at 1:21 PM
I’m sorry I forgot to mention that Mr. Khoi Lam Thang’s thesis is for Master of Arts degree was for linguistics.

Asia Times

05. Death rattle for Myanmar democracy

by David Scott Mathieson
December 29, 2017

The Rohingya crisis has crystalized a military pathology that if not acknowledged and reversed could terminate elected governance

http://www.asiatimes.com/article/death-rattle-myanmar-democracy/

Thang Za Dal: December 29, 2017 at 2:08 PM
A very fair and insightful analysis indeed. However, let us all be honestly blunt and frank: There are no – and there will never be – satisfactory solutions for all the problems that the country has been facing for decades, especially since the Rakhine crisis has emerged. And there will never be the so-called peace and national reconciliation as long as it exists as a sovereign state. The very simple reason is that there are too many powerful major players – military, political, economic, and financial blocs – that are competing each other ruthlessly for their own interests. Period.

..........................
Asia Times

06. Jailing of journalists hides mass graves in Myanmar

The detention of two Reuters reporters likely aims to intimidate other media against reporting on emerging evidence of massive military atrocities
by Lee Short January 5, 2018
http://www.asiatimes.com/article/jailed-journalists-hide-mass-graves-myanmar/

Thang Za Dal: January 5, 2018 at 3:09 PM

I have been deeply involved in Burma’s politics from my very young age, say since 1963 (I’m now 72), but not as a political activist, rather as an independent observer. As far as my experiences are concerned, almost all the problems that the country has been confronted with since 1948, the main culprits are only the political and military elite of the ethnic Burmans. The great majority of the ordinary ethnic Burmans are peaceful, generous, kind and not racist. That’s why all the different ethnic peoples in the country at grassroots level have been living peacefully and harmoniously together for even centuries despite the ruling classes’ (both political and military) inhumane treatments against all non-Burman peoples. Those non-Burman ethnic peoples, therefore, have to rely solely on the mercy of those ethnic Burmans in authority for their everyday survival. The only long-term solution for this vicious circle would be to build up strong and fair institutions in the country. Until or unless there are no such institutions, the suffering of those ethnic peoples will have no endings.

Thang Za Dal: January 5, 2018 at 7:27 PM

I suppose there may be some people who are curious about my own ethnicity: I’m an ethnic Chin (100%) from Chinland.

Asia Times

07. Myanmar slipping on several fronts

Elected government is stuck in a state of paralysis as the Rohingya refugee crisis impacts business confidence, tourism and peace prospects
by Andray Abrahamian
January 8, 2018
http://www.asiatimes.com/article/myanmar-slipping-several-fronts/?utm_source=The+Daily+Report&utm_campaign=53d8c54a47-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2018_01_08&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_1f8bca137f-53d8c54a47-31525577

Thang Za Dal: January 8, 2018 at 3:51 PM

What I’m going to tell you now may probably not directly or indirectly relavent to this article, but I’d like to share it with you anyway. Along my long political journey I used to speak with a number of seasoned and experienced ethnic Burman political activists over the future of the country. What I found out was rather
interesting – at least for me personally: Nearly all of them believed that Burma could only be unified and successfully ruled in the long run by some dictatorial or strong personalities because of the nature of the ethnic Burmans’ national mentality. But what they all agreed upon was that those personalities must be visionary and completely void of corruption. I would not make any judgment on these thoughts, but the main problem in my opinion is where and how to find such personalities.

Asia Times

08. Rakhine killings inflame Myanmar’s powder keg

Fatal police shooting of at least seven ethnic Rakhine protestors at on January 16 at Mrauk U plays into rising Arakan Army insurgency’s hands

by Lee Short
January 19, 2018
http://www.asiatimes.com/article/rakhine-killings-add-fuel-myanmar-powder-keg/?utm_source=The+Daily+Report&utm_campaign=08de00e1ca-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2018_01_19&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_1f8bca137f-08de00e1ca-31525577

Thang Za Dal: January 19, 2018 at 2:59 PM

If we thoroughly analyse all the problems that have arisen starting from U Thein Sein’s government until now and how the authorities in power (both the government and the military) have been handling them, we can very easily come to the conclusion that there’s no more a central authority governing the land and that they do not have any short-term or long-term visions and strategies for the country’s future destiny.

………………………………………………

ASIA TIMES

09. Spurned by West, Myanmar's Kachin look to China - Asia Times

Kachin leader N Ban La tells Asia Times that his army’s ties with China have improved markedly since joining a Beijing-backed alliance of ethnic insurgents

by Bertil Lintner
January 24, 2018

Thang Za Dal: January 24, 2018 at 12:08 PM

The West (Australia, Canada, EU, Switzerland, US, etc.) has never been seriously interested in peace-building process in Burma. What all they have been doing especially since a few years ago is aimed at reaping some short-term financial benefits by keeping their relations with it. If one carefully looks at their "strategies" in this regard, one easily gets the impression that these strategies must have been drawn and made by some second or third-level state institutions, and not by the highest institutions. Anybody who is well-versed in various types of strategy (political, military, economic, etc) can easily see that the strategies
they are deploying and implementing are very superficial and rudimentary. Since the West’s annual trade volumes amount to hundreds of billions of dollar and they are rising rapidly anyway, why should they need to care about a poverty-and problem-stricken country like Burma? China’s main worry – or its main rivalry – is no more the West, but India.

Thang Za Dal: January 24, 2018 at 12:13 PM

Sorry for my shodiness: I wanted to say "Since the West’s annual trade volumes with China..."

Thang Za Dal: January 24, 2018 at 2:25 PM

Yes, I’m also of the same opinion with B. Lintner’s view: “…But it is still far from certain that China is interested in any ‘final solution’ to Myanmar’s ethnic conflicts through the establishment of the federal union many ethnic groups envisage…The Chinese can enhance those interests by playing the “ethnic card” to show the Myanmar government and military that only they, and no other outsiders, can handle and influence the long-running armed conflict’s various non-state actors…” A problem- ridden, yet natural resource-rich country like Burma in its immediate neighborhood is a great blessing in disguise for China.

Thang Za Dal: January 25, 2018 at 8:35 AM

Burma has got, unlike the ex. Yugoslavia, for instance, a very uniqueness. As I’ve already once written as a comment on an Asia Times article, the main culprits of nearly all the problems are the elite of the ethnic Bamar (both political and military). The large part of the ordinary ethnic Bamar are peaceful, generous and not racist. That’s why all ethnic peoples have been living peacefully even for centuries in what is now known as Burma. There are of course minor ethnic conflicts here and there on daily basis, but that’s very natural wherever different ethnic groups are living together. So, the main problem is that until now there’s not yet even a single Bamar who is visionary and as strong enough as Gen. Aung San. I once asked a seasoned and well-balance Bamar political activist why it is so. His simple answer was: It’s due to our (the Bamar’s) national mentality and Karma. So, there’s absolutely no chance to change it.

Thang Za Dal: January 25, 2018 at 10:05 AM

I feel I need to add a few important points more, otherwise it’d not be fair. The West alone cannot be blamed for its lack of interest in the peace-building process, since the leading Bamar politicians and military brass themselves were not interested at all in it from the very beginning: While the military alone is getting US$ 3 billion yearly (that is, about 14% of the country’s total budget) and squandering this hard-earned money by making extremely costly offensives against the armed forces of the so-called indigenous national races, the government is begging around in the international community for the expenses of peace-building process. And a large part of the few millions (some $ 100 million?) of the first batch of outside donors’ money simply disappeared through corruption without a trace.

............................................................................................................................................
Asia Times

10. India takes fight to China via SEAsia

Association of Southeast Asian Nations and India’s newly announced ‘Delhi Declaration’ puts maritime security at the forefront of relations

by Richard Javad Heydarian

January 29, 2018

http://www.asiatimes.com/article/india-takes-fight-china-via-seasia/

Thang Za Dal: January 29, 2018 at 2:29 PM

I’m just very curious about the role that the problem-ridden Burma would play in this game.

Thang Za Dal: January 29, 2018 at 4:45 PM

As Syed Abbas has rightly pointed out India has got enough problems even within its own territory – I mainly mean the whole North-East India – where several armed organizations are fighting against the central government for decades. In other words, nearly its entire NE territories are – strategically speaking – extremely vulnerable. So, in a broader sense, the "false line" in fact runs along southwest China, western Burma and NE India. So, if I were influential Indian politicians, I’d try to solve the problems in the NE before I begin laying and implementing a Grand Strategy for the country before expanding its reach into the Far East. Its NE territories’ long-term stability is very precarious in my opinion. So far as I know the successive Indian central governments have been handling peoples in these areas very unfairly and with cunning tricks only for short-term gains.

Thang Za Dal: January 29, 2018 at 5:09 PM

You’re welcome. Sorry, I wanted to say the "fault line".

Thang Za Dal: January 29, 2018 at 9:33 PM

Let us compare the strengths and weaknesses of China, India and Japan. The Chinese and Japanese are homogenous (I mean in the case of China, the majority Han Chinese), whereas the Indians are not. The strengths of the Chinese are that they’re extremely resilient that they can integrate themselves very easily into all kinds of alien societies whereas the Indians and Japanese are not; the Chinese’ are religiously not as dogmatic as the Indians; the Indians’ only strengths are their ability to maintain and live on democratic principles and their nuclear weapons; the Japanese’ only strengths are their technological achievements and economic power, but their most dangerous weakness is their feeling of being superior to any other non-European peoples – so, their powerbase is built everywherely only among the elite of the countries in which they commercially engage, which is totally opposite to the Chinese – let’s say among the Oversea Chinese, for example, and so on. The main danger for China could come from within and not from outside. With the word "within", I mean corruption among the ruling class and the ever-widening disparities of living standards between the very rich and the extremely poor (the hundreds of millions of rural population and the wandering working class). So, I think, to some extent we can already foresee what will happen within the next few coming decades in Asia (South Asia, South East Asia, and Far East Asia).
Asia Times

11. Where Suu Kyi stands the most to lose
Ethnic-based parties which stumbled at the polls in 2015 are uniting in their home states to beat her ruling NLD in 2020
by Sai Wansai
30 January 2018
http://www.asiaticmes.com/article/suu-kyi-stands-lose/?utm_source=The+Daily+Report&utm_campaign=c3bba92059-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2018_01_30&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_1f8bca137f-c3bba92059-31525577

Thang Za Dal: January 30, 2018 at 2:10 PM
I’d say it’s a very well-balanced and insightful analysis.

Asia Times

12. Mad rush to repatriate Rohingya refugees
There is no indication the situation in Myanmar’s Rakhine State is stable or secure enough to begin a resettlement process
by Angshuman Choudhury
February 2, 2018

Thang Za Dal: February 2, 2018 at 11:20 PM
I’m not so sure whether this 24-minute TV interview given by Prof. Dr. Neginpao Kipgen (an ethnic Chin from Burma) of the Centre for South-East Asian Studies on 7th December, 2017 with the ANC/ABS-CBN News could help us to see the current situation from a different perspective. The subject of the interview was: Understanding the Rohingya Crisis.

https://www.facebook.com/ANCearlyedition/videos/379335672521021/

Thang Za Dal: February 7, 2018 at 11:10 PM
A few words for Ro Anwar Arkani: I fully understand your feelings for you youself surely are most likely a Rohingya or a sympathizer. But judging by the standard of your writing, I’m quite sure that you’re a highly educated person. So, I think, you have to understand his position as an academic, and not as a political activist. I wonder if you’ve ever read or heard about how Burma’s so-called indigenous peoples have been suffering for 70 under the successive rulers of Burma. I myself am an ethnic Chin. Chin State is nearly as large as Switzerland. We were one of the founding peoples of the so-called Union of Burma. But what have we gained? Until 2011, we had only 1,200 kilometer length of motor cars – and most parts of it were only jeepable or dry-season-only. And tens of thousands of us have served in the armed forces in defending the
country? But what have we gained? Chin State is the poorest state in the whole country and there are more than 200 000 Chins living in various countries as refugees. If you want to know more about us, I’ll be more than pleased to give you some links!

**Thang Za Dal: February 7, 2018 at 11:33 PM.**
A few words for Ro Anwar Arkani – again: The Chin State’s official population a few years ago was – if I’m to be exact, 480 000 people (only 2% of it was non-Chin). So, imagine how many percentage do the 200 000 refugees make out of the total population!

**Thang Za Dal: February 8, 2018 at 3:58 PM.**

Chin State is allocated yearly a mere 1% of the Union budget and although very large deposits of Nickel and Chromite had been foun in Chin State several decades ago, the Chins don’t have any power at all to decide what to do with them.
At present time there are about 200,000 Chins living as refugees in Australia, Canada, Denmark, England, Finland, Germany, India, Japan, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, and the USA. (See also attached Photo 28!)
The majority of those who are listed below are mainly refugees from Burma in the listed countries as of 2015. The numbers in bracket are that of the Chins – some of them partly roughly estimated.)

Australia 28,916 (2,000)
Austria 128 (0)
Canada 8,967 (2,000)
Czech Republic 253 (30)
Denmark 1,736 (1,500)
Finland 1,499 (100)
France 472 (0)
Germany 3,136 (500)
India 50,587 (45,000)
Ireland 64 (0)
Italy 441(0)
Japan NA (circa 200)
Korea (South) 11,514 (400)
Malaysia 252,292 (50,000)
New Zealand 2,200 (100)
Netherlands 1,104 (50)
Norway 3,136 (1,500)
Russia 626 (0)
Singapore NA (4,000)*
Sweden 1,499 (500)
Switzerland 253 (35)
Thailand 1,978,348** (5,000)
UK 13,064 (128)
USA 103,291 (60,000)***

Note 1. The statistics above are citizens of Burma, including the Chins, who are living in the given countries according to Global Migration Flow Map as of end of 2015. The great majority of them are refugees. https://www.iom.int/world-migration

Note 2.*. All those Chins who are residing in Singapore are professionals, not refugees.

Note 3.** Nearly 90% of those in Thailand are migrant workers who are living there legally or illegally. Circa 100,000 non-Bamar ethnic people who are living in several refugee camps are not counted.

Note 4.*** As of 2017, there were altogether 169,949 refugees in the US from Burma: Arakan/Rakhine (2,531); Bamar (5,878); Chin (59,679); Kachin (3,916); Karen (71,353); Karen/Kayah (12,490); Mon (2,261); Shan (1,121); Others – Chinese, Rohingya, Tamil, etc. – (10,629).

Source: Dr. Rodina – BACI- Burmese American Community Institute, 2017.
(Main source: My upcoming "6th Open Supplication to the Ethnic Burmans"

Asia Times

13. Genocide bad for business in Myanmar

Will the Rohingya refugee crisis spur Aung San Suu Kyi’s beleaguered government into economic action?

by Kyaw Lynn and Peter Janssen

February 5, 2018

http://www.asiatimes.com/article/genocide-bad-business-myanmar/?utm_source=The+Daily+Report&utm_campaign=43d9a88e1e-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2018_02_05&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_1f8bca137f-43d9a88e1e-31525577

Thang Za Dal: February 7, 2018 at 12:14 AM

Just read these two articles and you’ll know how "healthy" Burma’s economy right now is and you’ll be able to foresee what the consequences of it will be in a few years to come.

A few words for Mr. Michael Begala: The main weakness of Buddhism is that it’s too peaceful and philosophical. I was for some decades a Christian, but I did study Buddhism (nearly all schools of it) very deeply. Buddhism, in my opinion, is for great minds and those who truly yearn for internal peace. But, unfortunately, ordinary people need illusions and many non-Buddhist religions very well provide these illusions. Now you surely may be interested in what I’m believing: I do believe, of course, in something but I’d not disclose here what it is.

Fuel imports valued at over $2 billion in 10 months of this fiscal year
Submitted by Eleven on Wed, 01/31/2018 – 16:50

http://www.elevenmyanmar.com/business/13318

Trade deficit hits over $3.6bn in 10 months
Submitted by Eleven on Wed, 01/31/2018 – 16:00

http://www.elevenmyanmar.com/business/13313

Thang Za Dal: February 7, 2018 at 10:22 AM

I would like to make a short explanation with regard to "Illusions" otherwise some major religions might
feel being insulted. So far as I know every religion claims to possess the "the only truth". But in my opinion one’s illusions may be another person’s truths or realities, or the other way around. So I feel that everybody has the right to believe in anything he likes – religiously speaking. But if he causes suffering – or even death – to some innocent human beings in the name of his religion, then that is very bad. Not necessarily his religion, but he himself as the believer.

.................................................................

ASIA TIMES

14. North Korea, Myanmar in a sanctions-busting embrace

Confidential UN report says Myanmar continues to take delivery of North Korean weapons in violation of UN sanctions and amid consistent official denials

by Bertil Lintner
February 8, 2018

Thang Za Dal: February 9, 2018 at 8:10 AM

CONSIDER THE ARMAMENT MAKER

To give arms to all men who offer an honest price for them without respect of persons or principles; to aristocrats and republicans, to Nihilist and Czar, to Capitalist and Socialist, to Protestant and Catholic, to burglar and policeman, to black man, white man and yellow man, to all sorts and conditions, all nationalities, all faiths, all follies, all causes, and all crimes. – Creed of UNDERSHAFT, the arms maker, in Shaw’s *Major Barbara.*

"I appreciate the fact that the manufacturers of arms and ammunition are not standing very high in the estimation of the public generally." – Samuel S. Stone, President of Colt’s Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co. (Source: *Merchants of Death – A Study of the International Armament Industry* by H. C. Engelbrecht and F. C. Hanigen, London. 1934. *Chapter I, p. 1*)

.................................................................

ASIA TIMES

15. How the West won and lost Myanmar

Aung San Suu Kyi shuns erstwhile Western allies to embrace China, Russia and others unperturbed by her regime’s rampant rights abuses

by David Scott Mathieson
March 29, 2018
https://asiatimes.com/2018/03/west-won-lost-myanmar/

Thang Za Dal: March 30, 2018 at 1:32 PM
What I’m going to say would sound cynical and therefore many won’t like it. Actually, the Rohingya/Bengali crisis is a great, great blessing in disguise not only for all the so-called indigenous national races of Burma, but even for the ethnic Bamar themselves. The simple reason is that during the past 60 years (since the military rule began in 1962) the entire population of the country has been ruled by successive military dictatorships ruthlessly, but which country from the West has ever cared about it? A couple of wealthy and powerful countries of them with a couple of wealthy Asian countries have even been generously supplying them with weapons and finance. If the Rohingya/Bengali crisis were not there, no one would know and care how ruthless and corrupt the military and political elite are.

Thang Za Dal: (March 31, 2018 at 9:20 PM)

Answer to Winnie XiPooh: From 1962 to 1988 (the time the nationwide uprising took place) Japanese loan to Burma was more than USD 6 billion. From then on Burma has been heavily relying on China for both military hardwares and finance (in the form of investment). If you want more details, I’ll be quite happy to supply you.

ASIA TIMES

16. European businesses lose confidence in Myanmar

European Chamber of Commerce in Myanmar says 81% of the firms there were not satisfied with the country’s business environment

by Bertil Lintner
December 13, 2018

Thang Za Dal: December 13, 2018 at 11:04 PM

I’m not an economist, but one should not and cannot ignore two crucial factors in looking at Burma’s economy: Burma’s stand on the International Corruption Index for 2017 was 130! out of 175 countries. And if I understand it correctly, its GDP growth of 5.9% was in large part based on the revenues that it gained from the sales of its natural resources on the international commodity markets. As everybody in this world knows, commodity prices are subject to fluctuations and there will come a time when natural resources alone cannot be relied forever upon by a country for its long-term survival.

Thang Za Dal: December 14, 2018 at 9:51 AM

It’s not a secret that the main culprits of corruption in the country are high-ranking military personnel. But U Aung Kyi, director of the newly formed Anti-Corruption Commission, himself had admitted in a Radio Free Asia interview on September 30, 2018, that his commission doesn’t have jurisdiction over corruption cases committed by the military personnel. The following two links are written and visual reports on his interview. Unfortunately, they are in Burmese.

WHY DID THE PEACE-BUILDING PROCESS (2015-2016) IN BURMA FAIL?

The LINKS below for 18 articles of THE IRRAWADDY ONLINE NEWS and 3 articles of the MYANMAR TIMES dealt with the PEACE-BUILDING PROCESS in Burma between June 2015 and November 2016. This short period was the most critical moment for the country's more than 70-year-old (1948 - ) civil war history!

I also made some contributions in my own way to the Peace-building process by commenting on two of the land's most influential news media organs, namely The Irrawaddy and the Myanmar Times. (Several other people also made excellent comments in the same media, but because of space, I cannot afford to include them here.) So by carefully reading these articles and my comments, one will see the persons and reasons responsible for this process's failure.

Fortunately, I had saved my comments on The Irrawaddy's 15 articles in time, as you will see below; my other comments on the remaining articles appeared no more since The Irrawaddy changed its Internet portal in the ending part of 2016.

To prove that the comments you will see below were the original ones, I have made an additional list of them as screenshots and pasted them together, which I am attaching with this paper.

TIP for those unfamiliar with Links on PDF documents: You will get direct access to the data by clicking on the links if your computer has access to the internet. You do not need to enter the links manually.

Thang Za Dal (Mr)
Grindelallee 141
20146 Hamburg
Germany
September 10, 2022
Email: ssuantak07@gmail.com
thuantak07@gmail.com

NB: The section was sent to over one thousand email addresses on the above given date.
6. Thang Za Dal (Mr) Wednesday, June 17, 2015 - 4:20 am

I am the author of some political papers on Burma. The latest one (266-page) was published early this year and called: Grand Strategy for Burma VII. Since I don’t have first-hand information on the negotiations, I can only say the following few words on this latest development: 1. Both the government (+ military) and ethnic armed forces have strong and weak points of their own, but they all failed to use their strong points in the right way. Therefore, the outcome was already foreseeable from the very beginning of the negotiations. 2. Because of the negative open comments made by the various former negotiators of the ethnic armed forces on the new development, the media, the new negotiators will surely have to use new negotiating strategy and some new tactics. If I were they, I would try to make as a condition for the final signing of the agreement, the sincere willingness of the government (+ military) to radically reform all major sectors of the whole country. It’s just an example!

8. Thang Za Dal (Mr) Wednesday, June 17, 2015 - 7:03 pm

I feel that I need to elaborate briefly more on the strong points of the government plus military and the ethnic armed forces that I have in mind, otherwise the readers may probably not get my points clearly. Two of the strong points of the government and military are: abundant facilities such as finance and armed forces are in their hands, and powerful and wealthy nations and external institutions are willing to help implementing the peace process in every possible way (although the intention of many of them may not necessarily be selfless). So if the government and military were sincerely willing, they are in a very strong position to materialize it. But until now it seems that they failed to do so. Two of the ethnic armed forces’ strong points are: the great majority of ethnic Burmans have already realized since a long time ago that their own fate is closely intertwined with that of all non-Burman indigenous ethnic nationalities, which in turn means that without a lasting peace in the country, there could never be a real prosperity, and second point is the whole world is already aware of their decades-long plight – or in other words, their plight has already been internationalized. But these armed forces seem until now not to be able to “exploit” these golden chances.

So, when I said in my recent postings, “If I were they, I would try to make as a condition for the final signing of the agreement, the sincere willingness of the government (+ military) to radically reform all major sectors of the whole country,”, I did not mean it to be either a cheap trick or a bargaining chip. The simple logic behind it is that even if a nation-wide cease-fire agreement were signed and the guns fell silent, there could never be a long-lasting guarantee for peace and prosperity unless major sectors of the country are also radically reformed. Financial resources that may be saved as the result of a cease-fire may most likely simply disappear into some unknown channels.
The IRRAWADDY

Burma

02. Where Next in Latest Ceasefire Deadlock?
By Nyein Nyein 24 June 2015

3. Thang Za Dal (Mr) Wednesday, June 24, 2015 - 6:23 pm

Let me quote a few passages from my paper: Grand Strategy for Burma VII*

° How can one believe that the government is sincerely willing to build up peace since its so-called peace-making delegation is travelling around and negotiating with various armed movements, the military has even been intensifying its ruthless military campaigns against these armed movements, despite the fact that the President is said to have ordered it three times until February 2013 to stop its offensives?

° How can one believe the sincerity of the government if it has allotted the military $2.4 billion for this fiscal year (2013/2014), yet the government itself is still begging around in the international community to defray the cost of the peace-building process? ° How can one believe the sincerity of the government if it’s begging around in the international community for the cost of its peace-making efforts without spending the country’s own billions of dollar of financial resources – and the military is squandering hundreds of millions of dollars for its military campaigns against ethnic armed movements? [p. 51]

I, therefore, see only one solution for the UNFC to overcome this great hurdle: They should simply deploy a completely new Strategy! Their new Strategy should be like this: Simply wait patiently – without pushing on with their newly drafted constitution – until the coming 2015 general election has finally been held without trying to influence the process of the election in order to find out if the election was fair and correct enough and if the winning parties and the would-be newly formed government are powerful enough to bring the military under their control. Since the present government’s term in office is running out very soon anyway – and the military had even openly and defiantly defied the President’s orders for three times to stop its brutal offensives against the KIO/KIA and a number of other cease-fire signatory armed organizations – it’s simply senseless for the UNFC to either present their new constitution draft now, or to go on negotiating or to sign a treaty with it (the present government). This point has been confirmed by U Aung Min’s statement to the KNPP (Karenni National Progressive Party) negotiating team which is still right now negotiating with the government in Loikaw, Kayah State. He told them that the draft treaty (the government’s national ceasefire accord draft) had yet to be approved by Burma’s National Defense and Security Council. This statement clearly shows where the real power lies! (See Where Is Ethnic Reconciliation Going? under EXTRA INFORMATION ITEMS HEREWITH ATTACHED) [p. 56]

..................................................
03. Dealing with Defeat: Where it All Went Wrong for the USDP
The depths of its unpopularity now clear, the ruling party will need to embark on some serious soul-searching if it wishes to retain political relevance.

https://www.irrawaddy.com/election/opinion/dealing-with-defeat-where-it-all-went-wrong-for-the-usdp
by AUNG ZAW / THE IRRAWADDY | 27 Nov 2015

Thang Za Dal (Mr)
November 28, 2015

Even the most political naive layman on the street knew before the general election that the NLD would win and the USDP would lose – provided of course that the election would be fair. Only nobody, including the most talented political analysts, could not figure out the dimension of the final outcomes. In my paper of Grand Strategy for Burma VII, I did even outline a number of moves that the USDP/Military might make in time to enable them to secure their rule for sometime to come. But to my great surprise, none of these moves was deployed at all. So, my simple conclusion is that the USDP/Military top leaders must have had lived in a totally illusioned world until the very last moment. But then I also realized that it's no wonder that it happened like this. Every well-informed person in world affairs knows that throughout human history all dictatorships, regardless of time, place, ideology, ethnicity, etc., met the same fate because they all refused to accept the realities around them before it's too late.

Thang Za Dal (Mr)
November 28, 2015

Correction: A sentence above could probably be interpreted as if I had given the USDP/Military some advices so that they may be able to stay in power. What I wanted to say was the moves that they may most likely make that would enable to them to secure their rule...

The Myanmar Times

04. ‘Nationwide’ pact turns into disaster
By Fiona Macgregor, Friday, 19 February 2016

The IRRAWADDY
Burma

05. The Price of Peace

By SAW YAN NAING / THE IRRAWADDY | Thursday, March 17, 2016 |
Myanmar Times

06. Govt dissolves MPC, transfer assets
25 March 2016
https://www.pressreader.com/myanmar/the-myanmar-times-weekend/20160325/281513635280744

Myanmar Times

07. The price of peace: Western governments pledge millions
By Guy Dinmore - Monday, 28 March 2016

The IRAWADDY

Burma

08. Bertil Lintner: ‘It’s High Time the MPC Be Investigated for Corruption’
By Aung Zaw 29 March 2016

The IRAWADDY

09. Where Has Burma’s Peace Money Gone?
By Saw Yan Naing 1 April 2016

8. thang za dal – Monday, April 4, 2016 – 5:38 am
The MPC’s inglorious end was already clearly foreseeable from its very inception. Only those who were illusioned or who saw a great chance of financial benefits for themselves made great fanfare about it. Actually, Burma did not and does not need at all fundings from outside and the self-styled “peace experts” from either inside or outside of the country. If the Bamar military and political elites were truly and sincerely willing to make peace with non-Bamar armed forces, they would only need to sit down together in a shabby hut and there would be peace country-wide. They wouldn’t need to jet around in chartered jets and stay in five-star hotels in. It’s a great shame that two-digit billions of dollar are hidden abroad, but begging around in the international community for a couple of millions for the expense of the peace process.
10. Embattled Ethnic Armed Groups Cast Doubt on Suu Kyi’s Peace Drive

https://www.irrawaddy.com/opinion/commentary/embattled-ethnic-armed-groups-embattled-ethnic-armed-groups-peace-drive.html

By Lawi Weng 25 May 2016

3. thang za dal - May 26, 2016 – 3:51pm

The concept of the “21st Century Panglong Conference” is – and will remain – just a pipe dream of the NLD and Daw Aung San Suu Kyi. The very simple reason is that every sign until now shows that the new
government cannot bring the military under its complete control yet and that the military still keeps on
trying to achieve a peace of its own version by pursuing its own strategy. You will never be able to
successfully hold such a fateful conference that could and would seal the destiny of the entire PEOPLES of
Burma forever with two conflicting strategies!

The IRRAWADDY

11. KIO Vice Chairman Gen Gun Maw: ‘We Hope to Gain an Equal Status in the Political Dialogue’

https://www.irrawaddy.com/in-person/interview/kio-vice-chairman-gen-gun-maw-we-hope-to-gain-an-
equal-status-in-the-political-dialogue.html

By NYEIN NYEIN /

1. thang za dal Wednesday, June 8, 2016 - 2:39 pm

“Aung San Suu Kyi has said that the peace conference will be based on the inclusive spirit of the first
Panglong conference convened by her father Gen Aung San in 1947, and urged ethnic groups to think about
what they can concede rather than what they can gain.”

I think Daw Aung San Suu Kyi has borrowed the last few words “...and urged ethnic groups to think about
what they can concede rather than what they can gain.” from one of President John F. Kennedy’s
presidential campaign speeches. I noticed that she has used such similarly sounding words at least a couple
of times already.

Actually, these words are not appropriate at all in the present context. The simple reason is that the non-
Bamar PEOPLES have nothing to concede. What they have been demanding and fighting for for 70 years is
to regain their birthrights within their own legal territories. Countless innocent people have been tortured
and murdered, countless women have been raped and mutilated and countless properties have been robbed
by the so-called “Union Armed Forces“ or Bamar Tatmadaw during these decades! So, if the elite Bamar politicians and high-ranking militarymen would sit down together and decide to give these PEOPLES their birthrights back in full, the conference which is now under preparation would not even need to take place. THAT WOULD BE THE REAL PANGLONG SPIRIT!

She and the leading members of her party should read the following few lines from REPORT OF THE FRONTIER AREAS COMMITTEE OF ENQUIRY, 1947

CHAPTER I

2. Terms of Reference The terms of reference of the Committee were those quoted above. They have, of course, to be considered in the light of the statement of the agreed objective of His Majesty’s Government and the Government of Burma with which paragraph 8 of the Conclusions opens:- “To achieve the early unification of the Frontier Areas and Ministerial Burma with the free consent of the inhabitants of those areas.” (p. 1)

CHAPTER II PART III.

5. Right of Secession The majority of the witnesses who favoured a federation of Burma asked for the right of secession by the states at any time. Few federal constitutions contain provision for the secession of states. It seems to us that, if any such right is to be contained in the federal constitution for Burma, it will have to be carefully limited and regulated. (p. 20)

..........................................................

The IRRAWADDY

12. Aung Kyi to Head Govt-Linked Peace Think Tank


By Kyaw Kha 15 July 2016

1. thang za dal – Saturday – July 16, 2016 – 4:56 am

Actually, what the country badly needs is not new think-tanks, but courageous, sincere, honest and visionary leaders on the ethnic Bamar part. There are already more than enough qualified people who have got excellent ideas and concepts for the restoration of peace, righteousness, equality, etc. Even the average ordinary man on the street has got enough good ideas for such purposes. And I’m wondering what kind of new and good ideas could come out of those who have been leading members of the political and military establishments of the country for so long.

..........................................................
By Thuta 3 August 2016

1. thang za dal - Wednesday, August 3, 2016 - 9:12 pm
What a beautiful story – the right story at the right time at the right place under the right circumstances for the right people! Reading the story, one is tempted to speculate that the creative marriage broker is also allowed to open a (numbered?) bank account at the Swiss bank in question and deposit his own commissions from both the billionaire and the Swiss bank. The beauty of the story is richly further enhanced by the fact that Switzerland itself also happens in real life to be one of the most generous supporters – financially and morally – of the “arranged marriage”.

…………………………………………

Burma
14. Who Is The Head Of The Country?
By Lawi Weng 12 August 2016

4. thang za dal – Monday – August 15,2016 – 3:32 pm
Both are the heads of the country!

…………………………………………

The IRRAWADDY
Interview
15. Ye Htut: ‘Policymakers Need to Be More in Touch With International Norms’
By Kyaw Hsu Mon 7 September 2016

2. thang za dal – Wednesday – September 7, 2016 – 6:38pm
It’s really encouraging for the country to know that such a former bureaucrat could become an enlightened being. His candidness and newly gained perspectives truly deserve respect and admiration. Actually, I was rather often disappointed by his performances as the information minister even though I could understand them to some extent which one could only expect from someone from his surroundings. But the big question
which arises now from this interview is: How could thousands of bureaucrats in the country in key positions be made as enlightened as he himself?

.........................

The IRRAWADDY

16. Armed Forces Chief to Kofi Annan: Solutions Must Win Arakanese Approval


By KYAW PHYO THA / THE IRRAWADDY|

Friday, September 9, 2016

3. thang za dal – Saturday – September 10, 2016 – 12:09 am
Let’s be bluntly honest and frank! All of those who’ve got at least some knowledge on the background history and the present situation of the Arakan/Muslim/Rohingya/Bengali issue know very well that there’s really no solution to this extremely sensitive problem in the near or long distant future. One of the main and simple reasons is that there are quite a number of powerful circles both inside and outside of the country that are tremendously profiting from this conflict. That means even if there were some excellent solutions, those powerful circles would try to sabotage them at all costs. As simple as that! These circles are only pretending not to know about this reality. There’s a popular Burmese proverb: It’s easier to wake somebody up who is really sleeping than someone who pretends to be sleeping.

.........................

The IRRAWADDY
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17. ‘There is a New Cold War in Asia’: Bertil Lintner

https://www.irrawaddy.com/in-person/interview/there-is-a-new-cold-war-in-asia-bertil-lintner.html/#comment-998310

By The Irrawaddy 12 September 2016

4. thang za dal – Wednesday September 14, 2016 – 5:19 pm
I fully agree with one of Mr. Aung Mya Naing’s points that: “…Like big nations seeking and putting national interest as their first priority, the small countries also need to navigate the political waters in a way that would protect their national interest at best. Of course, on how to achieve this is a matter that each individual country has to ponder by itself. “ However, in order to be able to protect its national interest, every country – big or small, rich or poor – first of all needs internal peace and the minimization of corruption, just to name two basic crucial essentials. But these two factors are entirely absent in our country. So how could we protect our national interest?
The IRRAWADDY

18. US Training of Burma’s Military Could Help Democratization: David Steinberg

By The Irrawaddy 13 September 2016

8. thang za dal – Thursday – September 15, 2016 – 4:21pm
By reading this interview I’ve got the impression that The Irrawaddy has missed – either intentionally or unconsciously – to ask Mr. Steinberg, who happens to be one of the most well-known Burma experts, a crucially important question how he sees the ongoing “peace–building process” or the so-called 21st Century Panglong Conference. What he personally would have to say about it could be very interesting, even though those who know his academic records could have already rightly imagined what he would say. As to the title of the interview, I personally do not believe that even the best trainings that the world could offer would change the military’s present image which is beyond repair until or unless the leadership and the structure of the Tamadaw are completely reformed.

9. thang za dal – Saturday – September 17, 2016 – 6:11pm
Please kindly allow me to add a few more points to my recent comment on the same topic above: I’ve rather quite often been disappointed by the concepts of a number of Burma experts, including Prof. Dr. Steinberg, and policy makers in the West for the solution of the decades-long human rights violations in Burma. What is really needed is changing the mindset of the top brass which has apparently been influenced by some hidden ideology and personal interests. But who is interested in changing their mindset? Nobody – really! The simple logic for both political, military and business communities from outside of the country is that it’s easier to deal directly with such authoritarian personalities in leading positions.

The IRRAWADDY

19. Military Officials, Cronies Released from US Blacklist

By Kyaw Phyo Tha 8 October 2016

2. thang za dal – Sunday – October 9, 2016 – 2:34 am
The US has finally lost its remaining moral authority not only among the Burmese people but even throughout the whole world by uplifting its sanctions against the corrupt elites of Burma for financial and geostrategical interests. So far as I could observe the main problem with the US in the past was that it just imposed sanctions, but did not seem to have any visible far-reaching strategy at all for the achievement of
some long-lasting results for the entire people of Burma. In fact, there could have been some better strategies to achieve what the US now intends to achieve without sacrificing its moral authority entirely. And another major problem with the West in the broader sense is that they see Burma just as a small pawn in their regional grand strategy – that is, the Asia Pacific Region. It can be seen by their perfunctorily deploying strategies that are not really in line with the present and the soon-to-come circumstances in this region. They do not seem to foresee that the Burma issue could and would sooner or later even become a decisive factor for many reasons in their global grand strategy. Many politicians and strategists in the West may surely not agree with this point of view, but it’s the reality as I personally see it even though it would be too general to blame the whole West for such shortcomings since every Western country is also deploying its own strategy to secure its national interests in different sectors in the region in question.

The IRRAWADDY
Commentary

20. Burma’s Misguided Peace Process Needs a Fresh Start
https://www.irrawaddy.com/opinion/commentary/burmas-misguided-peace-process-needs-a-fresh-start.html
By Bertil Lintner 11 October 2016

6. thang za dal – Wednesday, October 12, 2016 – 8:21 pm
When I read this article and saw Mr. Jonathan Powell’s name in it, it reminds me of the following news items. These news items seem to clearly tell us that it’s really of no use for us to blame each other for what has been happening in the country for decades: None of us, even including all the generals and politicians, are in fact masters of our destiny even in our own country!

[South China Morning Post – Friday, 06 September, 2013,
OBAMA’S PLAN TO RESTORE MILITARY TIES WITH MYANMAR ‘TOO SOON’ FOR SOME US LAWMAKERS

Obama administration wants to re-establish defence training for Myanmar’s military, but some Republican lawmakers say it’s too early. The Obama administration wants to restart US defence training for Myanmar that was cut 25 years ago after a bloody crackdown on protesters.

BBC NEWS – UK FORCES CHIEF IN BURMA TO BUILD TIES WITH MILITARY

General Sir David Richards met political leaders and his military counterpart. The head of the UK’s armed forces, General Sir David Richards, is visiting Burma to try to build ties with the country’s powerful military.
3 June 2013 Last updated at 09:04 ET

DVB NEWS – NORWAY UPS BURMA OIL INVESTMENTS
By FRANCIS WADE
Published: 24 March 2011
Figures released last week by the Norwegian government show that investments in oil and gas companies operating in Burma stand at close to $US 5 billion, despite heavy opposition from rights groups.

---------------------

Burma Campaign UK

TONY BLAIR’S SECRET INVOLVEMENT WITH BURMA’S GOVERNMENT

May 15, 2014

Burma Campaign UK is calling on Tony Blair to disclose what his involvement is with President Thein Sein of Burma. Tony Blair has visited Burma on around three occasions, and is believed to be providing some kind of advisory role to the President... Burma Campaign UK has written to Tony Blair’s office 11 times in the past year, asking him to clarify what his involvement in Burma is. He has refused to disclose this information.

---------------------

TONY BLAIR QUERIED, AGAIN, OVER NATURE OF BURMA DEALINGS

By SAW YAN NAING / THE IRRAWADDY|

Friday, January 22, 2016 |

Former British prime minister Tony Blair was back in Burma earlier this month for at least his fifth visit since a quasi-civilian government assumed power under President Thein Sein.

---------------------

Daily Telegraph

11 June 2015 • 9:30pm

REVEALED: THE TRUE SCALE OF TONY BLAIR’S GLOBAL BUSINESS EMPIRE

---------------------

The Guardian (UK)

TONY BLAIR UNEPENTANT AS CHILCOT GIVES CRUSHING IRAQ WAR VERDICT

Chilcot report: ‘A devastating critique of Blair and the British government’

Wednesday 6 July 2016

---------------------

The Guardian

MPS DELIVER DAMNING VERDICT ON DAVID CAMERON’S LIBYA INTERVENTION

Foreign affairs committee says ex-PM was responsible for failures that helped create failed state on the verge of civil war

Patrick Wintour and Jessica Elgot

Wednesday 14 September 2016 09.08BST

---------------------

BBC

CAMERON OFFERS BURMA MORE MILITARY CO-OPERATION

15 July 2013

From the section UK

---------------------

Daily Telegraph

Blair heads for gold-rush Burma: Former Prime Minister opens new front to his personal empire after the junta relaxes its grip

Tony Blair has been busy building a fortune of $20?million

Blair went on a visit in October to boost ‘bilateral ties with Britain’

He now has permission to expand his personal influence into Burma
By Simon Walters for The Mail on Sunday
Published: 31 March 2013

UK GOVERNMENT TO STRENGTHEN GAS SECTOR IN MYANMAR
By Mizzima
On Tuesday, 11 October 2016

The Independent
UK DEFENCE FIRMS EARN $60BN FROM PENTAGON MILITARY CONTRACTS DURING OBAMA PRESIDENCY
Crofton Black, Ted Jeory
Wednesday 5 October 2016

The Independent
BRITAIN IS NOW THE SECOND BIGGEST ARMS DEALER IN THE WORLD
Exclusive: Two-thirds of UK weapons have been been sold to Middle Eastern countries since 2010
Monday 05 September 2016

The IRRAWADDY
In Person

21. Dateline Irrawaddy: ‘We have seen a certain degree of deadlock in the peace process.’


By The Irrawaddy 5 November 2016
SOME MORE INFORMATION ABOUT ME

PHOTO 1

This photo was taken on 12th May 1949 at about 8 a.m. in front of our house at Lophei by Edward Ngaw Cin Pau, the youngest of my mother’s three younger brothers. He dropped by at our house to say goodbye on his way back to Rangoon, where he was studying. He asked my elder brother and me (we were playing on the terrace in front of our house when he arrived) if we wanted to be photographed. As we said, yes, the “photo session” was hastily arranged, for he was in a hurry to catch a car for Kalaymyo, which is located some 30 km away in the present-day Sagaing Division. (He still had to walk 9 km from our village to Fort White to get a car which ran between Tiddim and Kalaymyo.)

On my left side in the first photo was my elder sister, and on the lap of my mother was my immediate younger sister. On my right side was my elder brother. My uncle made a notice on the back of the photo and signed it.

“Taken on the 12th May ’49. Printing, developing and enlargement with different colors are made at Royal Photo Studio, Rangoon. (Signed) 28.5. ’49.”

I was then only four years and three months old - born on 7th February 1945. (When I finished the 2nd grade at the Thuklai High School in Chin State, my family moved to Kalaymyo, and I enrolled in the 3rd grade at the No. 1 Primary School (there were three more primary schools in the town). So when my Burmese class teacher converted the Gregorian calendar into the Buddhist Era (BE) calendar, he made a mistake – instead of making it 1306, he made 1308. (This calendar is used only in Burma.) From that time on, I have been using this birthday in all my official documents until now.

My father, chief of the township police in Kalaymyo, was on duty in that town at the time. The present-day Chin State (36,000 km2), where I was born and lived until I was ten years old, is located in one of Burma’s remotest and most mountainous parts of Burma. Perhaps only half of its population of some 500,000 people in 1949 (the year in which this photo was taken), were Christian, and the rest either Animist or a non-Animist religion called the “Religion of Laipian Pau Cin Hau”. Pau Cin Hau invented a unique script in 1902, which he claimed to have been given to him by the biblical God.

He was illiterate when he invented this well-functioning script. It has no similarities at all with any existing scripts, including the Burmese. My parents and half of the people in the village, some 50 families with 270 people) were either Animists or adherents of the Religion of Pau Cin Hau. Among the village’s devoted Christians were my maternal grandparents, my mother’s four brothers, and her only sister. They all converted to Baptist Christianity in September 1936.

Note. The Mualbem village, where Prophet Pau Cin Hau had lived most of his lifetime and then died and was buried in 1948 at the age of 85, is only about 12 km away from Lophei. He abolished Animism among northern Chins.

PHOTO 2

This photo was taken 15 years later, on 10th July 1964, at the Myoma Photo Studio in Rangoon. In it were my mother, my brother, me and my younger sister. My elder sister, who was on my left side in the first photo, had died a few days before on 2nd May 1964 in Rangoon from stomach complications. My mother also died in Rangoon on 22nd September 1964 (about 72 days after this photo was taken) from blood and uterus cancer at the age of 49. (She was born on 23rd June 1915.) My father died in July 1964 in Shan State on a journey from overdoses of Quinine, an antimalaria medicine.

PHOTO 3 (MY PORTRAIT)

It was taken in Hamburg by Ms. Silvia Grigat, a family friend. My wife, an ethnic Shan national from Northeast Shan State, Burma, and I were fully involved in political activities against the Rangoon regimes from mid-1960 until we left the country for Germany in mid-1978. We have been living in Germany since then with two daughters and four grandchildren. My wife passed away on 21st December 2015 at the Hamburg University Hospital from heart failure at the age of 76 (she was born on June 1, 1940) after 49 days of hospitalization.

December 2021
MY PARENTS AND ELDER SISTER

Photo taken in Kalaymyo on December 10, 1941.
(He was Deputy Chief of the Township Police then. He later became its Chief.)

- Present-day Lophei Village (foreground): About 2/3 of it are invisible.
- (The old village site was down below the present village – invisible.)
- Ararrowed in red is the site of the Village Church. Its roof was renewed and the building expanded with money found 38 times in the offering collection bag in the church between March and September 1957. The church was replaced once again with a new one in 1996-98. Details about them are recorded under the sub-title of “A Great Mystery That Cannot Yet Be Solved Until Today” in the 77-page History of Lophei and Its Baptist Church (see the cover photo of the booklet). The booklet was published in 2008 by a committee of the villagers which was formed up for this task. I have made a special separate paper (82 pages) on this mystery under the title of A GREAT MYSTERY THAT CANNOT YET BE SOLVED UNTIL TODAY. The small cabin beside the church was store room.
- Circled was our house in which we lived until I was 10 years old. We then moved to Kalaymyo.
- The village in background is Thuklai - the original site of “Fort White”. Many parts of it are invisible here.
- Other Siyin villages are not visible here. PHOTO by Kenneth Vai Do Pau of Lophei. Created in this form by TZD. 02.2022.
The first church building (built in 1949-50) was renovated and expanded in 1960-61 with money found in the offering collecting bag in the church between 3/3/1957 and 5/9/1957 for 38 times. The final total amount found was Kyat 1160,95 (= USD 160). Then the new Church building in this photo once again replaced the old building in 1996-1998.

Created in this form by Thang Za Dal, Hamburg. April 2022.
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Lophei Khua le Lophei Tuiphum Pawlpi Tangthu Bu vawt tusia ngaisut zawk khuangeizo ahiahg tudong ki tangtung zongawl lai hi. Banghangziam ci le Tangthubu vawttu ci ngaisutna a omzawk ciang Committee zong kiphuan hi. Ahiahg nuntak natu zonkul ahiman pawlkhat nuntak natu zongin ki pusuak a, pawlkhat in hong thi sasan ahiman in tudong a kizom theingawl suak hi.

Kum 2006 kumciang in committee te hanciamkik in a mate mu, batzawk taciang kaikhawm in hongvawt Tangthubu ahi hi.

Hi Tangthubu asim te theampo in Lophei Khua pianthei na thu ahizong, Pu le Pa te ih a nopsak bun le ngim athuak nate heak natu le tulaitak Lophei Khuami khua a ngaak te nuntak zia telpui natu deina ahi hi.

Kam Za Nang
Chairman
Lophei Baptist Church
THU PATNA

Lopheikhua le Lophei Tuiphum Pawlpi a pianthei na Tangthu bu vawt tu ngaisutzawk ngeizo a, Committee zong kikoi zo ahihang, Leitung haksat na tatuam hu in ki tangtun zawk zongawl hi.

Ahihang 2008 kumciang in Yangon a om Lophei mi Taangthu bu Committee te hanciam nataw kivawt thei ahiman ki lungdam hi.

Hi tangthubu a kivawt ciangin Khang masa Ih Pu ih pi te ii haksatna a thuak nate, a hanciam nate khangkik te in tel a, citak na le hanciam thei natu deina ahi hi.

Lophei mite Pathian in thupha hongpiak nataw mun tatuam ah teangtek ahihang, a tenna muntek pan in a thisa Pu le pi te khawni zui-in makngil ngawl natu deina hi.

Rev. E. Ngin Khai
Pastor
Lophei Baptist Church
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“D. TUNI DONG A KITEL ZONGAWL THU”
“A MYSTERY THAT CANNOT YET BE SOLVED UNTIL TODAY”
(p. 47)

“1957 Kum sung in Lophei Tuiphum Biakinn sumbung sungah sumveu ki koi a, a kidok uhang kuama in a koisia hengawl hi. Lampaite in enku kale zong kuama in mu ngeingawl hi. Hi sumteng taw in Thikkang athak ilei a, Biakinn thikkang luiteng lai na in kizangh hi.”

“During 1957, money was found several times in the offering collecting bag in the Lophei Baptist Church. The villagers were asked who they thought could have done it, but nobody had any idea. And even though village elders and church leaders often secretly observed it (the church), they found nothing unusual. So with the found money, new corrugated iron sheets were bought and the old ones replaced.”

NOTES BY TZD

• Money was found 38 times and the final amount was Kyat 1160.95 (= USD 160). A strong worker earned only Kyat 2.00 per 10-hour day at the time. See another sheet of paper below under the heading of: DATES & WEEKDAYS ON WHICH MONEY WAS FOUND IN THE LOPHEI BAPTIST CHURCH

• Although the entrance door was always locked with a key, money was found mostly during day time and on weekdays.

• The villagers at first suspected that God might have returned offerings that were made unwillingly. So, they did not dare to use it. The case was brought to the attention of the Zomi Baptist Convention (ZBC) in Falam, the then capital of Chin State. (The ZBC, founded in 1953, was the umbrella organization of 30 Baptist Associations in Chin State and the Sagaing Region. It was changed to Chin Baptist Convention in 2013.) It further brought the case to the Burma Baptist Convention (BBC). Finally, the church leaders believed that it could be a gift of God for the renovation and expansion of the church building for which the villagers had prayed. So they were allowed to spend it as they had wished.

• I converted to Baptist Christianity in 1952 from Laipian Pau Cin Hau's religion in the first village church which was built in 1949. And I was baptized in this village in 1961 at the age of 16.

• The 77-page historical booklet is written in the Siyin/Sizang dialect.
(4) Niangtui teng ........................................ Ks. 12,000/-
(5) Video .......................................................... Ks. 11,000/-
(6) A tatuum ........................................................ Ks. 5,000/-
Zakna vek pi ......................................................... Ks. 113,000/-

(iii) Biakinn Huang
Sya Khup Khaw Thang te inn thanghuan Biakinn ih nisua nasang innmun khat K-8000/- (Tul liat) taw lei a, asauna Pi 165, azaina Pi 60 zai hi. Tua innmun sung ah tuikhuk khat kivawt hi. Pawlpi te in Christmas le New Year ciangin tua innmun sung tengah anneak tuidawn tu vawtna in zangh hi.

Sya Khup Khaw Thang ih a taka, a tanu te in a Pa innmunbup Pathian a itna le Pawlpi a itna taw in Lophei Tuiphum Pawlpi te man ngenngawl athong in 21-4-2005 ni in pia hi. A mate unau tungah Pawlpi in lungdam na lian mama kinei hi.

Tua innmun sungah tulaitak in Khangnote in paakhuan vawt a, maiyang ah Pawlpi zum limci mama khat saktu in tupna le sawnna kinei hi.

C. Pu Suangh Thang Shield Thu
Pu Suangh Thang ih a tate in a pa a phawna tu in Siyiin Christian Endeavour Union (S.C.E.U) te shield khat pia hi. Siyiin C.E Union te in la kidem natu phuan a, a masa phitbel kidem natu mun Lophei khua ah 7th December 1960 ni-in 'Rock Of Ages' Songs & Solo 1189 nasung kidemna in zangh hi. Tuakum in Khuasa C.E te in a khatna nga hi.

Siyin C.E Union (S.C.E.U) thu khensatna sungah, Pu Suangh Thang Shield sia kum3 anga masa po in tangsuk tu hi ci-in thu khensatna nei ahikom in kum Sung Buanman te in 3 vei nga ahikom Pu Suangh Tang shield sia Buanman Pawlpi te in tangsuk hi.

D. Tuni Dong a Kitek Zongawl Thu
1957 Kum sung in Lophei Tuiphum Biakinn sumbung sungah sumveu ki koi a, a kidok uhhang kuama in a koisia hengawl hi. Lampu in enku kale zong kuama in mu ngeingawl hi. Hi sumteng taw in Thikkang athak kilei a, Biakinn thikkang lut teng lai na ih kizangh hi.
### Biakinn sungah sum kikoi tepte na sazian:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/3/1957</td>
<td>K. 117.00/-</td>
<td>18/6/1957</td>
<td>K. 8.00/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/1957</td>
<td>K. 102.00/-</td>
<td>19/6/1957</td>
<td>K. 10.00/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/3/1957</td>
<td>K. 40.00/-</td>
<td>27/6/1957</td>
<td>K. 5.00/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/3/1957</td>
<td>K. 10.95/-</td>
<td>30/6/1957</td>
<td>K. 11.25/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/3/1957</td>
<td>K. 170.00/-</td>
<td>10/7/1957</td>
<td>K. 18.70/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/3/1957</td>
<td>K. 20.00/-</td>
<td>14/7/1957</td>
<td>K. 6.00/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/3/1957</td>
<td>K. 80.00/-</td>
<td>17/7/1957</td>
<td>K. 10.00/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/3/1957</td>
<td>K. 160.00/-</td>
<td>21/7/1957</td>
<td>K. 7.00/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/3/1957</td>
<td>K. 40.00/-</td>
<td>23/7/1957</td>
<td>K. 6.00/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4/1957</td>
<td>K. 50.00/-</td>
<td>28/7/1957</td>
<td>K. 6.25/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/1957</td>
<td>K. 50.00/-</td>
<td>5/8/1957</td>
<td>K. 16.95/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/4/1957</td>
<td>K. 36.00/-</td>
<td>8/8/1957</td>
<td>K. 8.30/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/4/1957</td>
<td>K. 5.00/-</td>
<td>10/8/1957</td>
<td>K. 2.00/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/1957</td>
<td>K. 15.00/-</td>
<td>16/8/1957</td>
<td>K. 7.00/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5/1957</td>
<td>K. 7.00/-</td>
<td>17/8/1957</td>
<td>K. 6.00/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/5/1957</td>
<td>K. 10.00/-</td>
<td>29/8/1957</td>
<td>K. 15.00/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/5/1957</td>
<td>K. 5.00/-</td>
<td>2/9/1957</td>
<td>K. 5.00/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/6/1957</td>
<td>K. 20.00/-</td>
<td>5/9/1957</td>
<td>K. 5.00/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**E. C.C.O.C NASEPNA**

C.C.O.C nasep na ah, Lophei Tuithum Pawlpi pan in 1984-85 kum in Mr. Thang Khaw Kang Paletwa ngam ah pai hi.
**DATES & WEEKDAYS ON WHICH MONEY WAS FOUND IN THE LOPHEI BAPTIST CHURCH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/3/1957</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>K. 63.10</td>
<td>09/6/1957</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>K. 6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/1957</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>K. 117.00</td>
<td>18/6/1957</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>K. 8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/1957</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>K. 102.00</td>
<td>19/6/1957</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>K. 10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/3/1957</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>K. 40.00</td>
<td>27/6/1957</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>K. 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/3/1957</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>K. 170.00</td>
<td>10/7/1957</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>K. 18.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/3/1957</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>K. 20.00</td>
<td>14/7/1957</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>K. 6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/3/1957</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>K. 80.00</td>
<td>17/7/1957</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>K. 10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/3/1957</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>K. 160.00</td>
<td>21/7/1957</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>K. 7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/3/1957</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>K. 40.00</td>
<td>23/7/1957</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>K. 6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/4/1957</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>K. 50.00</td>
<td>28/7/1957</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>K. 6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/4/1977</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>K. 50.00</td>
<td>05/8/1957</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>K. 16.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/4/1957</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>K. 36.00</td>
<td>08/8/1957</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>K. 8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/4/1957</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>K. 5.00</td>
<td>10/8/1957</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>K. 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/5/1957</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>K. 15.00</td>
<td>16/8/1957</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>K. 7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/1957</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>K. 7.00</td>
<td>17/7/1957</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>K. 6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/5/1957</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>K. 10.00</td>
<td>29/8/1957</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>K. 15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/5/1957</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>K. 5.00</td>
<td>02/9/1957</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>K. 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/6/1957</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>K. 20.00</td>
<td>05/9/1957</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>K. 5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4x Monday  
4x Tuesday  
4x Wednesday  
6x Thursday  
4x Friday  
6x Saturday  
10x Sunday  

..................  

38  

**Remark:** A man earned only Kyat. 2.00 per 10-hour hard-working day at that time. And as the money appeared mostly only during day time and the only main entrance door was well-locked, it was absolutely impossible for someone to secretly deposit it in the church. The official exchange rate then was K. 7.25 to one USD.  

* Prepared by Thang Za Dal. Hamburg. April 2022
THE “WHO IS WHO” AMONG THE VILLAGERS OF LOPHEI AND TAMDEANG/SUANGDAW VILLAGES
(see pp. 21-24 of Lophei & 44-45 of SUANGDAW)

*Tamdeang” was founded by Chief Khup Lian with a number of Lophei villagers in 1899. It was later changed to “Suangdaw”. Two other villages, namely Akbutun aka Tuivial and Tuisau were also under his jurisdiction. See Appendix F


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOPHEI VILLAGE (CS)*</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T AMDEANG/SUANGDAW (CS)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THINGUNAU (SR)**</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAHAN (SR)**</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KALAYMYO (/SR)**</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YANGON CITY</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEDIM (CS)*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAUNGYI (SS)***</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRALIA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* CS (CHIN STATE)
**SR (SAGAING REGION)
*** SS (SHAN STATE)

Remark: The names of my father and Suang Khaw Lian are missing in the list. My father was Chief of the Township Police in Tamu and Kalaymyo before he retired in 1949. Suang Khaw Lian was Assistant Township Health Officer. These and some other mistakes will be corrected in the coming second edition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Pa Min</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pa Ngaw Cin Pau</td>
<td>B.Sc, Ph.G</td>
<td>U Suang Thang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pa Hang Za Nang</td>
<td>B.Sc (Forestry)</td>
<td>U Khup Ngin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dr. Mang Cin Pau</td>
<td>M.B.B.S</td>
<td>Bo Khup Cin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Capt. Lian Pau</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>U Pau Thawng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pa Do Cin Zam</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>U Pau Thawng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pa Hang Cin Dal</td>
<td>B.Ag</td>
<td>U Pau Thawng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Capt. Thawng Mang</td>
<td>B.A, B.L</td>
<td>U Kip Lian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pa Kam Cin Thawng</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>U Kip Lian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dr. Zam Za Cin</td>
<td>M.B.B.S</td>
<td>U Suang Cin Thang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pa Lian Khan Khai</td>
<td>B.Sc (Geology)</td>
<td>U Khai Ko Hau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dr. Cin Lamh Mang</td>
<td>B.V.S</td>
<td>U Khai Ko Hau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pa Kip Kho Lian</td>
<td>B.E (Arch)</td>
<td>U Khai Ko Hau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pa Thang Cin Nang</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>U Khai Ko Hau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nu Cing Kho Man</td>
<td>B.A (Hist)</td>
<td>U Khai Ko Hau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pa Pau Do Thawng</td>
<td>B.Sc. (Zool)</td>
<td>U Ngaw Cin Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ms Dim Dal Cing</td>
<td>B.A (Geography)</td>
<td>U Ngaw Cin Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nu Hau Cinh Huai</td>
<td>B.A (Geography)</td>
<td>U Ngaw Cin Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ms. Dim Thian Vung</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>U Zam Za Cin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ms. Ciang Khan Ncam Khai</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td></td>
<td>U Zam Za Cin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Dr. Mang Dim</td>
<td>M.B.B.S</td>
<td>U Kam Cin Thawng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mr. Lian Tung</td>
<td>B.A (Law), LL.B</td>
<td>U Kam Cin Thawng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ms Niang Khan Cing</td>
<td>M.Sc</td>
<td>U Kam Cin Thawng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ms Lian Ciang</td>
<td>M.Sc</td>
<td>U Kam Cin Thawng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ms Thang Niang</td>
<td>M.Sc</td>
<td>U Kam Cin Thawng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mr. Hau Pum Khual</td>
<td>B.A (Eng)</td>
<td>U Lian Khan Khai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ms. Cing Khan Huai</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>U Lian Khan Khai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ms. Kam Nuam Cing</td>
<td>B.A (Law)</td>
<td>U Lian Khan Khai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ms. Ciang San Kim</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>U Lian Khan Khai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ms. Cing Pum Vung</td>
<td>Dip. (I.T)</td>
<td>U Cin Lamh Mang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mr. Hau Khan Cin</td>
<td>Dip. (I.T)</td>
<td>U Cin Lamh Mang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ms. Kiu San Thiam</td>
<td>Dip. (Insurance)</td>
<td>U Cin Lamh Mang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ms. Zam San Ctin</td>
<td>B.A (Hons) (Anthropology)</td>
<td>U Cin Lamh Mang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mr. Hau Khan</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>U Thang Cin Nang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mr. Thang Khan Mung</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>U Hang Za Nang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ms. Cin Khan Ncam</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>U Hang Za Nang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Pa Thawng Cin Tual</td>
<td>B.Sc (Maths)</td>
<td>U Lian Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Ms. Cing Pum Ncam</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>U Lian Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Ms Cing Dim Huai</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>U Thang Kang Thawng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Ms. Neam Kang</td>
<td>B.A (Bur)</td>
<td>U Ngui Ko Mang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ms. Cing Neam Ciang</td>
<td>LL.B</td>
<td>U Ngjin Do Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Pa min</td>
<td>Remark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Ms. Niang Thian Dim</td>
<td>LL.B</td>
<td>U Ngin Do Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Mr. Ngo Khan Kim</td>
<td>LL.B</td>
<td>U Ngin Do Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ms. Cingh Kang Niang</td>
<td>B.Sc (Phys)</td>
<td>U Cin Do Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Mr. Nang Pum Mung</td>
<td>B.Sc (phys), EGT(EP)</td>
<td>U Cin Do Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Nu Dim Khat Pum</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>U Thawng Za Cin Hau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Dr. Hau Cingh Mang</td>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>U Thian Ko Khai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ms. Hau Khan Dim</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>U Thian Ko Khai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Pa Suangh Za Dal</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>U Hau Suan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Mr. Thawng Cin Pau</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>U Zam Kim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pa Hau Ko Kam</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>U Hang Cm Lian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Pa Thang Khat Pau</td>
<td>B.E (Civ)</td>
<td>Lt.Col. Son Za Thang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Mr. Thawng Pau</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>Lt.Col. Son Za Thang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Nu Cing Neam Pau</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>Lt.Col. Son Za Thang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Mr. Tun Za Pau</td>
<td>B.E (Textile)</td>
<td>Capt. Suang Piang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Ms. Pau Khan Vung</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>U Vum Cin Mang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mr. Khai Khan Kien</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>U Thawng Vai Nang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Nu Neam Khan Cing</td>
<td>B.Eco</td>
<td>U Pau Tual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Nu Cingh Ko Hau</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>U Pau Tual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Ms. Cing Neam Khai</td>
<td>M.A(Eng)</td>
<td>Major. Hang Cm Dal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Ms. Thawng Suam Dim</td>
<td>M.E (Civil)</td>
<td>Major. Hang Cm Dal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Ms. Cing Dal</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>Major Hang Cm Dal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Ms. Cing Lun Dim</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>Rev. Thawng Ko Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Ms. Cing Khan Vung</td>
<td>B.Sc (Maths)</td>
<td>U Lian Za Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Ms. Pau Khan Dim</td>
<td>B.Sc (Phys)</td>
<td>U Lian Za Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Ms. Man Thian Uap</td>
<td>B.A (Eng)</td>
<td>U Lian Za Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Ms. Vung Cingh Mang</td>
<td>B.Sc (Maths)</td>
<td>U Lian Za Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Ms. Niang Za Lian</td>
<td>B.Sc (Chem)</td>
<td>U Son Za Hau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Ms. Sing Thian Vung</td>
<td>B.A (Eco)</td>
<td>U Kim Cin Khai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Ms. Cing Lamh Niang</td>
<td>B.A (Eng)</td>
<td>U Kim Cin Khai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Ms. Cin Muun Khai</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>Dr. Mang Cin Pau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Ms. Lian Kho Neam</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>Capt. Sawm Hang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Ms. Suangh Cingh Mang</td>
<td>B.Sc (Zool)</td>
<td>Capt. Sawm Hang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Ms. Thawng Cingh Neam</td>
<td>B.Sc (Chem)</td>
<td>Capt. Sawm Hang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Nu Man Za Huai</td>
<td>Dip.(Nursing)</td>
<td>Capt. Sawm Hang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Mr. Zam Cin Pau</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>Capt. Sawm Hang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Nu Hau Pum Cing</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>U Thawng Nang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Mr. Hau Kim</td>
<td>B.A (Psy)</td>
<td>U Lian Khan Khup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Mr. Hau Khan Lian</td>
<td>B.Sc (Chem)</td>
<td>U Lian Khan Khup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Ms. Pau Khan Lamh Cing</td>
<td>B.Sc (Chem)</td>
<td>Rev. Thawng Za Kap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Ms. Dim Za Ciang</td>
<td>B.Sc (Phys)</td>
<td>U Kam Ko Kang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Pa min</td>
<td>Remark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Mr. Cin Suan Mang</td>
<td>B.Sc (Zool)</td>
<td>U Kam Ko Kang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Ms. Thang Dim</td>
<td>BCSc</td>
<td>U Kam Ko Kang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Mr. Mang Mun Khai</td>
<td>B.Sc (Zool)</td>
<td>U Thian Langh Thang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Mr. Zam Nang</td>
<td>B.Sc (Zool)</td>
<td>U Thian Langh Thang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Mr. Lian Khan Thang</td>
<td>B.Sc (Phys)</td>
<td>U Ngin Ko Thang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Mr. Thang Kang Pau</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>U Pau Za Lian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Ms. Dim Suanh Cing</td>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>U Pau Za Lian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Ms. Man Thian Cing</td>
<td>B.A (Bur)</td>
<td>U Cin Za Mung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. GAZETTED OFFICER NGA TENG:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Zaa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>U Ngaw Cin Pau</td>
<td>Chief Geologist – Department of Mining Exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dr. Zam Za Cin</td>
<td>Township Health Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dr. Mang Cin Pau</td>
<td>Township Medical Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dr. Mang Dim</td>
<td>Township Medical Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dr. Hau Cingh Mang</td>
<td>Associate Professor - Education Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>U Lian Khan Khai</td>
<td>Assistant Director – Custom Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>U Hang Za Nang</td>
<td>Assistant General Manager - Timber Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>U Kam Cin Thawng</td>
<td>Manager – Trade Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>U Hang Cin Dal</td>
<td>Police Major – Peoples Police Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ms. Niang Khan Cing</td>
<td>Township Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ms. Lian Niang</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer - Education Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ms. Thang Niang</td>
<td>Lecturer – Technology University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Daw Thawng Cingh Neam</td>
<td>Police Officer (C.I.D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>U Suang Za Dal</td>
<td>Police Officer - Peoples Police Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Daw Cingh Kang Niang</td>
<td>Township Officer – Information Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ms. Lian Khaw Neam</td>
<td>District Agricultist – Agriculture Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R. ARMY OFFICER NGA TENG:
1. Lt.Col. Thian Ko Khai
2. Lt.Col. Son Za Thang
3. Major Khai Ko Hau
4. Capt. Thawng Za Cin Hau
5. Capt. Suang Za Khai
6. Capt. Suang Piang
7. Capt. Thang Ko Thawng
8. Capt. Thang Ngo
9. Capt. Thawng Mang
10. Capt. Sawm Hang
11. Capt. Lian Pau
12. Subedar Khup Cin
13. Police Major Hang Cin Dal
14. Police Officer Zam Thawng
15. Police Officer Thawng Cinh Neam

S. LOPHEI MI INN PHAZA

1. Lophei khua ah a teang lai Inn 42
2. Tamdeang ah a teang Inn 43
3. Thingunau ah a teang Inn 11
4. Tahan ah a teang Inn 27
5. Kalaymyo ah a teang Inn 28
6. Yangon ah a teang Inn 20
7. Tedin ah a teang Inn 4
8. Taungyi ah a teang Inn 1
9. America ah a teang Inn 10
10. Germany ah a teang Inn 2
11. Australia ah a teang Inn 1
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SUANGDAW KHUA TAANG THU
1899-1999
SUANGDAW CENTENNIAL RECORD

KUM 100 CIN POAI VAWT NI = 9-11 APRIL 1999
THEME : TOPA IN EITE HONG HU HI (EBENEZER)
I SAMUEL 7:12
### GENERAL WORKER SEAM NGEI TENG


Lai Sin Sang: { Appendix I, Photo No. 6 } ma en vun.

### SUANGDAW KHUAMI PILNA DEGREE NGATENG

A SIN KAI TENG LE NASEPNA (1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>MIN</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>NASEPNA</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Lam Za Tinh</td>
<td>B.A; Ed, B.Ed</td>
<td>S.E.O Chin State</td>
<td>Retd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Lian Za Thang</td>
<td>B.Sc (Forest)</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Lian Pau</td>
<td>B.A, Ed</td>
<td>Middle Head</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Dr. Vum Son</td>
<td>B.Sc (Geology) M.Sc</td>
<td>Ph.d (Germany)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>On Za Vungh</td>
<td>I.A</td>
<td>Joint Secretary</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Suak Ko Khai</td>
<td>I.Sc</td>
<td>State Cultural Officer</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Lian Kop Cin</td>
<td>B.E (Civil)</td>
<td>A.E, (M.E.P.E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ngo Cin Thawng</td>
<td>B.Sc (Maths) E.T.E.C</td>
<td>Secy Township Coop, Tedim</td>
<td>Retd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Kip Thian Pau</td>
<td>B.A (Geo) B.R.E Associate Director</td>
<td>Printing &amp; Press (M.B.C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Mang Hen Dal</td>
<td>B.Sc(Zoo) H.G.P Assist: Director, Ministry of Agriculture &amp; Forests</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Tuang Khan Dal</td>
<td>B.A, E.T.E.C</td>
<td>M.O.T 2nd Class Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Mang Cin Thang</td>
<td>Dip, Agri</td>
<td>Assist: Township Agriculturist</td>
<td>Retd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Extracted from: School Recordbook - S.P.S - Suangdaw.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dr. Huai Khan Ciang</td>
<td>MBBS,M.D(U.S.A)</td>
<td>d/o L.ZT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dr. Zam Lian Vung</td>
<td>B.Sc,M.Sc,Ph.D(Ger)</td>
<td>d/o VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mang Khan Cing</td>
<td>B.Sc, M.Sc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nu Ciang Pau</td>
<td>B.Sc(Zoo)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Miss Lian Kang Cing</td>
<td>I.R (3rd Year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Miss Cingh Zam Huai</td>
<td>B.A, (Hist)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nu Vung Za Vai</td>
<td>B.A (Psy) B.Th</td>
<td>J.A.T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Nu Nuam Man Cing</td>
<td>B.A(Geog)</td>
<td>J.A.T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Nu Tual Khan Dim</td>
<td>B.A(Hist)</td>
<td>Township Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pa Cin Za Pum</td>
<td>L.L.B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mr. Zam Thian Khup</td>
<td>G.T.I (Civil)</td>
<td>Army (G.E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mr. Zam Khan Kha</td>
<td>B.Sc, (Chern)</td>
<td>S/o L.ZT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Rev. Thawng Khan Khai</td>
<td>B.Th, B.A(Phy)</td>
<td>C.E, K.V.B.A III Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>S/m Cingh Dim</td>
<td>B.A (Hist)</td>
<td>P.A.T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>S/m Neam Kang</td>
<td>B.A (Geo)</td>
<td>L.D.C, B.E.H 82 IMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>S/m Dim Neam Huai</td>
<td>B.A (Geo)</td>
<td>I.M.F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>S/m Thang Hnai</td>
<td>B.A (Hist) (---yr)</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mr. Cin Do Khup</td>
<td>B.A (Psy) (---yr)</td>
<td>Sailor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mr. Dal Lam Cin Mung</td>
<td>B.Sc(Chem)(---yr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mr. Zam Min Thang</td>
<td>B.Sc(Chem)(---yr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Lai Thangtho Sang Pan Degree Nga Sate Le Aka Lai Te Kiehl Nawn Ngaw Hii.
A PART (1/5) OF LOPHEI VILLAGE

- Photo courtesy of Sam Khuasak
- Photo taken on October 1, 2017 at 8:30 am

- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. Germany. October 21, 2017.
LOPHEI AND THUKLAI VILLAGES SEEN FROM NORTHERN (THEY ARE ON TOP OF THE MOUNTAIN RANGE ON THE RIGHT SIDE)

Photo courtesy: Suangmung (Buanman)

Photo taken on October 1, 2017.

See: https://www.facebook.com/photo.php?fbid=1567756569930022&set=gm.1689185977805442&type=3&theater

- Top of Thuklai Village. The original FORT WHITE and the British War Cemetery were located here (see APPENDIX EE (p. 3), under TOKLAING OR MWITUN [THUKLAI OR MUITUNG]. In this cemetery 12 soldiers of the Norfolk and Cheshire Regiments; Major Gordon-Cumming, Cheshire Regiment; Major Stevens, 42nd Gurka Rifles; and Second Lieutenant Mitchell, Norfolk Regiment, were buried. (The Chin Hills, Vol. II, Part III, Gazetteer of Villages, p. v). The buried here were the ones who were killed in action in battles with the Sizangs (villagers of Buanman, Khuasak, Liimkhai, Lophei, Phumon, Pimpi, Pumva, Suangpi, Thangnuai, Thuklai, Voklaak, Zung, and the Vaiheis), the Kam Haus and Suktes. The fort was later moved to the present site, about 9 km away eastward, and there is also another war cemetery at the new site (see Satellite Photos 2 & 3 and Photos 15 & 16). The long and white buildings are the Thuklai State High School. Mualbem village is located on the top and other side of the distant mountain range seen above left and Vangeth village is located on the other side of the distant mountain range seen above right.

“Having learnt from Major Raikes, C.I.E., that it had been determined to leave a post in these hills for the rest of the year, and having on consultation with him come to the conclusion that our several reconnaissances north, south and west showed this to be the most central position, I select a site some 400 feet above and to the south-west of Tokhaing (4,800 feet), which occupied not only so much ground as to make it necessary to have a large number of men on duty, but was also commanded on three sides, notably from the site where the present post is, which with the permission of Major-General Gordon, C.B., and the concurrence of the Chief Commissioner, I have called “Fort White.” (Brigadier-General E. Faunce, C.B., Commanding Officer, Chin Field Force [First Chin Hills Expedition, 1888-89]. Source: Vum Ko Hau, p. x).

- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. September 2020.
Two Scenes around the famous Fort White (The original Fort White was located at Thuklai. See Photos 24 & 25.)

* Seen in the top picture is the 92-km Kalaymyo-Tedim motor car road. Fort White is located exactly at halfway between the two towns. The road in the foreground leads to Tedim. The Fort White garrison was located in the middle of the upper photo and the war cemetry about 150 meters below the road - also in the upper photo.

Photos: Michael Suantak. (Photos taken in 06/2009)

- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal/06.2015.
In this cemetery British soldiers who were killed in action during the various military campaigns against the northern Chins between 1888-90 and 1892-93 were buried. There was also another British war cemetery at Thuklai village (the site of old or original Fort White) until the owner of the land demolished it and constructed a large house and a garden on it in the early 1960s. All the wooden crosses and stoned tombs at the site in this photo still remained almost intact up to the early 1960s. They later became the victim of vandalism and were thus destroyed. (See Photos 24&25 for the upper parts of Thuklai where the first fort and cemetery were located.)

Note. In both cemeteries only British soldiers, and not who were called the “natives“ (non-Christian Indians and Gurkhas) were buried.

- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. February 2016.
SPECIAL APPENDIX

A brief explanation

Since a few centuries ago, the Luseis (also written as Lushai or Lushei by the British) had claimed that the powerful Sailo Chiefs, who had ruled many parts of the modern-day Mizoram, descended from a Boklua, the son of Nge Ngu (he is known as Ngeghuka by the Mizos). And they also claimed that Boklua was a Sizang - or Siyin as all the British records use this term – a Zo tribe. Nge Ngu was one of the six sons of Thuan Tak or Suan Tak (the Sizangs call him Thuan Tak, but other Zo tribes call him Suan Tak and the Mizos call him Suantaka). More and more Sizangs also use the term, Suan Tak or Suantak nowadays). Nearly 80% of all the Sizangs are the direct descendants of his six sons. (Note: As the Mizo names are unisex, the vowels “a” is added to male names and “i” to female names in order to differentiate the names of the two genders.)

However, since there was not a person named Boklua among the Sizang genealogies, the Sizangs did not take the Luseis’ claim seriously. But then, I posted in the Chinland@yahoogroups.com - in the ending parts of 2004 under the heading of “ARE THE MIZOS CHINS?”. I was surprised by the feedbacks of the Mizos in a positive sense. (Several Zo tribes and sub-tribes, including the Luseis, agreed to abandon their tribal identities and adopt MIZO as their common nomenclature when Mizoram attained statehood in 1986 after a 20-year-old armed struggle against the central Indian government. And by the way, what is known as the Mizo language today is the Hualngo/Lusei or Duhlian dialect. It has also become the lingua franca of several Chin/Zo tribes and sub-tribes outside of Mizoram.)

Those feedbacks induced me to start with my search first for the identity of Boklua. Suppose Boklua was a historical person and the son of Nge Ngu. In that case, he could only have been a villager of either Khuasak or Lophei because the people of Khuasak and Lophei villages are the direct descendants of Nge Ngu. What came into my mind next was the fate of Seam Muang, the younger brother of Kim Lel. Kim Lel was the founder and first chief of Lophei and the Kim Lel dynasty. There were three different versions about Seam Muang’s fate: the first version was that he had no issues, the second version was he had different opinions with his brother and left the village and disappeared, and the third version was that he fell madly in love with a slave girl, but as his elder brother was vehemently against their marriage, he fled the village with her and disappeared.

So, my next move was to find out if Kim Lel had made any hints about Seam Muang’s fate in his 8-Stanza (16 verses) autobiographical song. Fortunately, I found a copy of it in my father’s Notebook from 1940, which I keep here in Hamburg. Still, as I have no knowledge of our traditional songs, which are solely composed in poetic words, I asked a relative of mine back in Chinland to translate it into plain words, and he did.

To my great surprise and joy, there were some clues to Seam Muang’s fate. Kim Lel mentioned that his enemy captured his mother, and he could revenge him for the murder of his mother and that he lost his father to evil spirits, against whom he was helpless. But he did not mention at all his brother’s fate. That is a great mystery.

Thus began my reconstruction of the root of the Sailos’.
Special Note: I first prepared this Appendix in 2014 and last updated it in late 2021. But then, I recently got a 77-page history booklet of Lophei village: “The History of Lophei and Its Baptist Church”. The 4th version of Seam Muang’s fate mentioned in it is relatively different from the other three versions I mentioned in the existing Appendix. This 4th version seems more plausible because it is said to be based on the history of Seipui village itself, according to Rev. C. Thanzama, AG Church, who is a villager of this (Hualngo/Lusei) village. According to this version, Hual Than, the village Chief, and Seam Muang first met on the bank of the Manipur River perchance on one of the Chief’s hunting tours with some men. The Chief then took Seam Muang to his village. For the time being, I am releasing the 2021-updated version. However, I will prepare a new Special Appendix with the newly found version in the coming months (see the five pages below in which Seam Muang's fate is described in the Siyin dialect.)

(The main problem with such historical discrepancies is due to our lack of a written script until the Christian missionaries created it for us in the early 20th century. Therefore, we have to rely almost solely on oral history and a number of autobiographical songs of remarkable personalities as in the case of Kim Le'l's and Seam Muang's fates, as an example. See below for some samples of the poetic words used in composing our traditional songs and some of my immediate relatives who had composed their own autobiographical songs.)

Thang Za Dal

September 2022.

A Few words on Seipui village and the Chapchar Kut cheraw dance, Mizoram, 2014

Oral traditions say Chapchar Kut was first celebrated in Seipui village in adjoining Myanmar that has a sizeable population of Mizos [Hualngo/Lusei and some other Zo tribes] and their ethnic cousins.

Chapchar Kut used to be celebrated to thank the gods for saving the people from harm during the clearing of forest on hill slopes for jhum cultivation at the beginning of a year. The festival used to be observed with a lot of drinking [of fermented rice beer – only Chins, Kachins, Karens, Karennis, and Nagas in Burma have it] and eating. On the first night the young men and women would dance all night. The women would come dressed wearing a Vakiria. Chai dance has its origins in this festival.[6]

LOPHEI KHUA THU
Le
LOPHEI TUIPHUM PAWLPI
TANGTHU
a thatang zong pha mama ahiman, a paina khuate in Hausa seamtu in zol a, a zi tuzong zonsak hi. Ama sia athet na ngampan in Boklu-a, kici in a tapa sia Sailo kici hi.

B. PU SEAM MUANG THU

Falam ngamsung (Lusei/mizo) te ii, omna, "Seipui" khua Hausapa Hual Than le pasal ngalhang pawlkhat in, Meitei ngun dung ah, Zaangsiel le Sai vai in kuan hon uh hi.


Tua Tangvalpa in, ngalkhat pan in hongpai khi hi. Kapa sia Sizang mi a hi hi. Kapa in, innmun longam, khua le tui ka suapuipia piasiat ahiman in, ka khua ngaia a, teen natu mun khua zong in kong pai hi ci-in zokik hi. Seipui khua Hausa pa Hual Than lawm te in namin "Ngalna" hihen ci-in, Lusei pau in "Ralna" phuak hi.

Seipui Hausapa in, hi mipa sia, "Thaau te mi (Sizang) a kici te ahi hi. Kuama in bangma law theingawl tu nu hi ci-in, Seipui khua ah ciapui hi. Seipui khua a thetciang in, tua Tangval pa (Seam Muang) sia, a meal pha peuma in, ngaibaang mama ahiman, khuasung mi theampo te in, munuam tek mama a, a en tu in, khuasung mi thempo hong pai kheukho uhu hi. Seipui Hausapa ii, Leitual dim in en uhu hi ci hi.

Tua Tangvalpa tangthu te son in, Seipui Hausa pa in, hi Tangvalpa sia, Thaau te mi "Sizang" akici te ahi hi. A teen natu khua zongtu in, hongpai khia ahi hi. Tuni in ih khuasung hong theng a, ka leitual, tuikuang sungpan, tuidawn zo ahiman in, ih tuineak puipa hongsukh hi. Ama tung peuma, kuama in siatna vawt thathong theingawl tu nu hi ci hi.

Tua ahikom in ama sia, tuni in a dawn/ amuak mihing tam mama pha ih hikom in ama minsia "Za Hmuak" hi taken ci-in amin a phuasak hi.

"Za Hmuak" ci sia, Lusei kam hi a, "hmuak" aci sia, Sizangkam in zong "muak" ma hi a, 'vaimuak' ci na hi.

Tuaazawk ciang in, Seipuiikhua Hausapa in Za Hmuak sia, zu le sa ne sak in an le tui pia a, a tha ahaul hi. Seipui Hausapa in Za Hmuak awng, nang sia ngunngal ateang Sampheak mi Thaau te, Sizang mi nahikom ngun ngaldoi le kodoai kibang ngawl thong hi. Tua ahiman in nazi tu ih vai hawm tu kisamh hi. Zi nanei kultu a, inn na tuanngawl phamaw tuhi ci hi. Tua ahikom in Za Hmuak zi tu in, "Hmar", minam ahi Lawitlaang khuami, "Lawiler" akici, ngaknu mealpha khat
ma laksak uh hi. Lawitlangkhua sia, Seipui khua pan in, Tai (8) khualah hi.

Za Huamak le Lawiler hongh ki teang uh a, Seipui Hausapa innpan in, inntuant khia uh hi. A inntuan namun zong, Seipuipan in Lawitlang paina Seipui khuahui lamnuai ah, teangsak hi.

Tapa khat hongnei uh a, a innsia ngual in suangtaw deangthei tawn tung ahiman, a tapa min "Zadeanga" ci-in phuakpai hi. Za Huamak in Tapa 7 le tanu 3 a kingawm ta 10 nei hi. Za Huamak sia a ngalpal, ngalhang, sa man thei, thikseak thiam mkhath ah kom in, Seipui khua ah Thikseak in kizangh hi. Ngalhang ahikom in, nag le sa sungpan in, Seipui khua mite a huu zo le a hon khia zo pa asuak hi. Seipuikhua Hausa pa in, longam pha mama pia ahikom in, mimza, tangza tho in, Ton le aih, luup le ngaw niang mama in, poaikham in, laam tawntung in, nuamsa mama in nungta hi.

Zankhath ciangin, alamdang mama mangkhat a manh hi. Zingsang khuavak ciang in, azi tung ah, a mangmat teng son hi. "Kazang namtaw ka at tan a, phel 7 kasua a, tateng vantung ah kalot to le mual 7 tungah tu a, tungtuun 7 in apo hi." ci hi. Azi in "Zanmang khawng a, zang mangmat nahi le, manghohi hi bavak, phel 7 sua a, mual 7 tungah lawn na hi le, tapa 7 ih neiteng thisiat tu hivak" ci in thinngim uh hi.

Tuazawk nipikhat khawngciang in, azi Lawirel in mang lamdang khat man leleau hi. Azi in "ka mang sung ah phuitong kung puikhat kasauk a, ka paakthiam mama hi", ci-in apasal tung ah son hi. Ih zanmang sia lamdang ma ma a, zangphel 7 sua in, mual 7 tungah thethang in, tungtuun 7 suak cibang ih mang te hoingawl a, ih tate teng thi siat tu po ahile ih damlai in ih neisa teng nene lel leang ci-in a khui, a vok, a sial a neiteng ngo in nuamsa in om uh hi.

Tuahun laitak in Seipuikhua pan tai 7 bang a khuala na ah Tlangkhua kici khuakhat om hi. Tua Tlangkhua ah ateang te "Hnam" kici mite hi a, a ukpipa Pu San Pial thi hi. Pu San Pial thi zawkciang in Hnam mite a uk tu om nawnngawl ahiman Seipuikhua a om Lusei/ Hualngo mite Hausa asep sak tu in a cial uh hi. Lusei/ Hualngo te in no Hnam mite Theinga bek ne a, a nungta te kungah Theinga bek netu in Hausa seamzo buavak ung. Inn kuan tam mama apha Za Huamak te innkuan nacial tavun ci hi.

Hnam mite zong, Za Huamak kung ah pai in a vaiteng ason uh hi. Za Huamak in zong Seipui Hausapa kung ah a thu teng a sonciang in Seipui Hau sap a in, "Za Huamak awng, Hnam mite Hausa seamtu in hongcial bang in zui in seam in. Nang le kei ih thizawk ciang, ih tuu
ih tate ki-it kingai nawnngawltu ahi ciang, hehuai kasa hi. Pathian zong thu kim vak, sanu le sapa zong thukim vak, kasuan kapaal te le nasuan napaal te nguntui a le luankik ciang le, suangtat te a te hongpo a, a paak hongpaak ciang bek in, ngal le sa in kinei pheang tu hi hing, ci-in zu lup saban in kiciamna vawt uh hi. Sizangpa Pu Za Hmuak zong thukim in, Tlangkhua Hnam mite zui in, mual tung ngam 7 sungteng ah Hausa seam in, 'Sia' na kai hi. Za Hmuak tapa 7 teng ih min teng sia;

1. Za Deenga
2. Thang Ruaha
3. Paa Liana
4. Thang Ngura
5. Ri Vungha
6. Ro Khuma
7. Sailova te ahi hi.

Pu Za Hmuak mangsung ah, Zang phel 7 suak a, mualtung 7 tung tu in, tungtuun 7 suak te, Azi mangsung ah, Phuitong kung suak a, a pakthiam ma ma aciteng a tantun na ahi hi. A tapa te zong mualtung ngam khattek ah Hausa a seam uh hi.

Tua mualtung ngam 7 teng sia;
1. Za Deenga in, Tlangkhua ah khang 6 sung Hausa seam hi. Khang 7 na ciangin, Zawngte khua ah seamto in, Zawngte khua pan in Tio ngalzuan in a taai hi.
3. Paa Liana in Khiangrawn khua ah Hausa seam in, tua ngam pan in Tio ngal ah taai to hi.
4. Thang Ngura in Lawitlang khua ah Hausa seam hi. Lawitlang pan in Haka ngam Khuahring mual sang ah teang in tuakpan Tio ngal ah taai to hi.
5. Ri Vungha in Tuilum khua ah Hausa seam in, Tuilum pan in Tio ngalma zuan in taai to hi.
6. Ro Khuma in Khuaruah ah Hausa seam hi. (Khuaruah sia Khuang lung khua hui hi a, tulaitak in lecial ki nasia vawt mama na mun ahi hi.) Khuaruah pan in Haka ngam Khuaring mual ah, tuakpan in Tio ngalzuan in Mizo ngam a theng hi.

Sailova sia a unau sungpan a no bel hi a, innlua hi. Ama te unau sung pan apil bel ahi hi. Tio ngal athet uh ciang in Sailo-Lusei (or) Mizo nam a suak uh hi. Sailova suante in Kumpi nasep na sung ahizong, leitung sang ahizong, India ngamsung ah ama dawk tam ma ma om hi.
Sailo minamte athi uhciang, Tuang dung tungah, kibual se uh hi. Numei te athi ma asam pheapngawl te zong a thi uhciang in, a sampheap sak ham tang lai uh hi. A thciang a kivui na uh sia, Sizang ngeina vuidan taw kibang linlian hi. Tu in Tapidaw suaksiat zo ahiman kitele nawnngawlh hi. A khang ih etsuk ciang, Sizang sungah Lophei mitawh kinai bel hi.

Tuciang in pawlkhawt Kawlingam hong thengsuk kik om a, Tahan, Myo-hla, Kawlp, Tamu lamdung tengah nateang kakawi uh hi.

\textit{Note: Rev. Dongh Cin; Senior Pastor; A.G Church; Lophei in Rev. C. Thanzama; AG Church, Thaantapin Village: Tamu Township tung a dok hi.}

\section*{C. TUIZAANG KHUA AH TEN NA}

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzcd}
Thuam Lam \\
\arrow{r}{Siasong (Zima)} \\
\arrow{r}{Kimkhup (Zinu)}
\end{tikzcd}
\end{center}

Thuam Lam tuu Siasong (Khoaik kik) in a sunghpa Man Pau tawh ki ciam in Theizang khuataw ah khuasat phot hi. Tuakpan in, Tuizang khua satphei kik a, a sunghpa Man Pau tawh ngamkhen hi. Tuikai le Tuidak kilak lawteng Man Pau in tang hi. Dakpho lui pan, Kuai sun, Tuakpan Sakolmuah ah Sannamluai ah paito Thikhuan vum dong Khoaikik in tang hi.

A ngamsung tengah Dolthing sui te tungpan, Dol laamkhat ciang, pheap \textit{(dal)} khat, cialkhat ciang laamkhat veo Pu Khoaikik in "Sia" kai hi. Sa vum ah anga, thau le thal tawh amat tungpan a tel tongkhawt veo la hi.

Tomu le Lu Vung in a ten natu in, Kop Son le Son Tuang munah ngen hi. Anget bangin apiakciang, Tomu te inn 32 teangsak a, kumsim in innkhaw in taang seaukhat tek "Sia" in pia hi. Haikon khua lociing khat, Tomu te inn khat in neituam hi. Hilo zong Son Tuang le Kop Son in Tuizang ngam sung suak ahiciang ci-in Sal luankhat (\textit{amin Zui Awi a ci khat}) pia in a lei lai hi.
Note 1: Here are some of my immediate relatives, who have got autobiographical songs: Chief Kim Lel (founder of my paternal line chieftainship 13 generations ago from me) - 8 Stanzas; Chief Lua Tung (my great, great, great, great grandfather) – 10 Stanzas; Sawm Mang (my great, great, great granduncle – a son of Chief Lua Tung) – 13 Stanzas; Chief Lua Thuam (my great, great, grandfather: – 14 Stanzas; Tong Dim (wife of Lua Thuam) - 32; Chief Man Suang (paternal uncle of Khup Lian) - 28; Chief Khup Lian (my grandfather) – 28; Vung Hau (wife of Khup Lian did not have a song); Chief Suang Hau Thang (eldest son of Khup Lian and the last Chief of the Kim Lel dynasty) did not have a song; Pu Suang Thang (my maternal grandfather) - 114; Ciang Hau (my maternal grandmother) - 10; my mother - 8 (my father did not have a song); Vum Ko Hau - 26; Dr. Vumson Suantak - 16; Lt. Col. Thian Khaw Khai (one of my mother’s three younger brothers ) - 42; and other relatives such as Chief Ngo Mang of Khuasak (father of Chief Khup Pau) - 58; Chief Khup Pau (father of Chief Khai Kam and Mang Pum) - 28; Chief Khai Kam - 10; Mang Pum (brother of Khai Kam) - 47; Capt. K.A. Khup Za Thang (compiler of Zo Genealogy) - 35, etc. Kim Lel’s song is the oldest known among the Sizangs. See his song and its English translation in APPENDICES A-2, A-3 & A-4.

* Every Stanza contains two verses. On paper, the first verse is written is “a” and the second verse as “b”.


  Here are some examples of normal and poetic words of the Sizangs and some of their neighboring tribes, such as Paite, Tedim, Sukte, Zou, etc.

1. Aal bang da (poetic word) = he/khua ngai (spoken word) = sad
2. Ang kawi (poetic) = pasal/zi (spoken) = husband or wife
3. Ang lai vontawi (poetic) = ta te (spoken) = one’s biological children (sons and daughters)
4. buan bang niil (poetic) = vawk (spoken) = throw away/abandon
5. ciin leh tuai (poetic) = u leh nau (spoken) = brothers and sisters
6. Daal lum (poetic) = lum (spoken) = shield
7. Dimtui (poetic) = Tedim (spoken) = Tedim tribe/town
8. Hau ta (poetic) = ngual te/ngual dang te (spoken) = strangers
9. Hau tawi (poetic) = Ukip, Kumpi (spoken) = Chief/King/Noble
10. Pheitui (poetic) = Lophei (spoken) = Lophei village
11. Soltha, Tung Soltha (poetic) = Tha (spoken) = Moon
12. Suktui (poetic) = Sukte (spoken) = Sukte tribe
13. Thian Mang (poetic) = Pathian (spoken) = God
14. Tuan nu (poetic) = nu (spoken) = mother
15. Va bang leang (poetic) = khualhaw (spoken) = travel
16. Vangkhua (poetic) = khua, ngam (spoken) = village, town, city, country
17. Zua pa (poetic) = pa (spoken) = father
18. Zaata (poetic) = mipi/mihonpi (spoken) = mass, public, crowd
19. Zaang ni (poetic) = ni (spoken) = sun
20. Zuan thiam (poetic) = vawt thiam, thin neam, thu neam (spoken) = kind, skilled
21. Zang khen kawl ciang (poetic) = thau (spoken) = gun
SPECIAL APPENDIX

MY CORRESPONDENCE WITH PU J. THANG LIAN PAU ON THE PROGENITOR OF THE POWERFUL SAILO CHIEFS OF MIZORAM AND MY PERSONAL SEARCH FOR HIM

About this brief information paper

In 2010, Pu J. Thang Lian Pau, resident of Aizawl, Mizoram State, India, posted an article in the Zonet group questioning the connection between the Sizangs and the powerful Sailo Chiefs, who had ruled many parts of present-day Mizoram State for a few centuries. This information paper is about the questions that he raised – and the comments that he made - in his article, and my answers to those questions and comments, based on the results of my personal search for the origin of the Sailos.

I started my serious search around 2014-15 for the progenitor of the Sailo chiefs, which was shrouded in mystery. The results of my investigation are recorded in the following Appendices (A, A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4), Tables (2, 2-A, 3, 3-A), and Map 5. In addition to these Appendices and Tables, the information contained in Appendices E, F, F-1, and Tables 5A & 5B are also used as evidence to substantiate my postulations further. I am now combining all these Appendices, Tables, and Map into this brief information paper under SPECIAL APPENDIX-1 and make it a part of my history “paper”: An Introduction to the Chin/Zo People of Bangladesh, Burma and India

Since the contents of this brief information paper certainly would one day become of historical value, I shall try to translate Pu J. Thang Lian Pau’s questions and my comments and answers into English as accurately as possible.

Note 1. Our correspondence was in Tedim/Kamhau dialect. Note 2. Pu J. Thang Lian Pau is the one who had created and prepared the semi-professional quality map herewith attached under the title of Champhai District, Lamka District, Chandel District, Tedim & Tonzang Township, Kalay & Kabaw Valley Map. Note 3. He belongs to the Paite (also written sometimes as Paihite) tribe (a Zo tribe very close to the Tedim tribe). Note 4. I belong to the Sizang (Siyin) tribe, also a Zo tribe. The Sizangs call themselves Sizang, but all other Zo tribes call them Sihazang. Some Mizo dialect-speakers call them Sihazang Paite. In all the British historical records, it’s written as SIYIN or in some places also as SEYIN.

Explanations for non-Chin/Zo readers

Note 1. “Pu” is used by nearly all Chin/Zo tribes. Its equivalents are: Mr or Uncle or Grandfather – or an address form of respect even when someone is still middle-aged young if he is an important person. “Pi” is used as an address form for women; its equivalents are: Madam or Auntie or Grandmother.

Note 2. I am using the word “Lusei” in this correspondence. Lusei is also a prominent Zo tribe. When the Mizoram State gained statehood in 1986 after 20 years of armed struggle against the central India government, several Zo tribes, including the Luseis, abandoned their tribal identities and accepted “Mizo” as their common nomenclature. What is known today as the Mizo language was formerly the Hualngo/Lusei or Duhljan dialect.
Note 3. There is great confusion between the terms Mizo and Zomi, among outsiders. They are exactly the same. Mizo was already used in 1912 when Lt. Colonel J. Shakespear’s book, The Lushei Kuki Clans was published. Zomi was first officially used in 1953 when the Zomi Baptist Convention, an umbrella organization of some 30 Baptist Associations in Chin State and Sagaing Division, was founded. This convention was changed into Chin Baptist Convention in 2013.

Note 4: In Mizo dialect, human names are written together like Suantaka or Thuantaka. And as the Mizo names are, unlike all other Zo names, unisex, vowel “a” is added to male names and “i” to female names to differentiate them.

Note 5. I am using blue and red colors and bold profusely in this paper. The simple reason is that there are very few people among the Chin/Zo people interested in reading papers and books on our history. So, by using these colors, it is hoped that people would find it more interesting to read it.

Special Note. I would very much appreciate it if anyone could correct more precisely any part of my English translations below if in case they do deviate from Pu J. TLP’s original questions and my answers. Until today, nobody has ever attempted yet to make any similar postulations. And even if someone wanted to, without the knowledge and materials that I have in hand, he would never be able to do it. With “the materials that I have in hand”, I want to say that the Feedbacks of the Mizos, too, especially the invaluable material that Dr. Rodinga had later provided me, to my posting in the Chinland@yahoogroups.com under “ARE THE MIZOS CHINS?” back in the ending part of 2004. Without the materials mentioned above, even I would not be able to make those postulations. I would be more than happy and thankful if anybody could prove that my postulations are wrong in the near or distant future!

This brief information paper was first prepared with English translation by myself in December 2017. Then it was updated again for the third time for more accuracy and clarity by myself. September 30, 2021.

Thang Za Dal. Hamburg, Germany.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Friday, February 5, 2010
Sizang leh Sailo (Sizang and Sailo)
Dear All,
Zonet sung aa Pu. J. Thang Lian Pau ih laiaat Sailo leh Sizaang thu pen Germany aa om Pa Dal, Thang Za Dal ih thuk kiik na na sim leu cin, a nuai ah...

[Dear All,
Please read the following text about Pu Thang Za Dal’s response to Pu J. Thang Lian Pau’s article on the Sailos and the Sizangs? Pu Thang Za Dal lives in Germany. Zonet moderator’s remark.]

Pu J. TLP’s Question:

[1] Guai...
Capt K.A. Khup Za Thang in Zotate Khanggui (Genealogy) laibu hong bawl masapen a, tua pen deih bang zo kei; puah ding hon khat om kici kawmkawmpii mahin, Pu Vum Son Suantak, Pu C. Chawngkunga le midang ten hong siksan toto hi. Sihzang kineisak lam ten Sailote pen (thupi uh ahii man hiam) kosuan hi ci (nuam) uh a, up belin kinei (kha) suak ciat tawh kibang hi.
J. TLP: Capt. K.A. Khup Za Thang compiled the first book of Zo Genealogy [first published in 1973 and the 2nd edition was published in 2007 under the full title of Genealogy of the Zo (Chin) Race of Burma]. Although it was generally agreed that the book was not yet satisfactory and still needed to be improved, Pu Vum SonSuantak [author of Zo History, self-published in Aizawl, Mizoram in 1986], Pu C. Chawngkunga [compiler of the Genealogical Tree of Mizo, published in 1996, Aizawl, Mizoram], and some others used it as a reference. It seems that especially the Sihzangs want [try] to claim that the Sailos are (is it because the Sailos are important?) their own descendants.

My Answer:

Keima theih bang...

Sihzang lam pan pen Sailo tee Sihzang te suan hi ki ci masa zaw lo in Lusei lam pan hong kici ma sa in ka neih hi. Bo KZT in Zo Khangsimna Bu 1st Edition a bawl na ding khangthu thei khanghaamte a dot kawi kawi ciang in Sailo lam pan a mau Nge Ngu ii tapa Bok Lua pan a pian khiat na thu laikung, laiteh tawh hong ki puak ciang in Bo Khup Za Thang in a laibu bawl sungah amau ii khangsim na na khum sak pan hi. Tua hun mapek hun sawt pi lai in zong a kam uh tawh Lusei lam pan a gen kiza ngei den a hih hang in Bok Lua pen Sihzang te khang ciaptiek na sung ah om kha lo a hih man in a thupi tak in ki lak sak lo hih tuak hi. A hih hang, hih thu Bo KZT leh mi dang pawlkhat ii hoih tak a a kat uh teh Lusei te ciaptex na maan thei mah in teh a ki ci pan hi.

As far as I know...

It was not the Sizangs, but the Luseis instead, who first said that. When Bo KZT [Capt. KZT] decided to compile the first edition of Zo Genealogy, he sent out several letters of inquiry to those he believed to be well-versed in Zo genealogies to supply him with what they knew. The Sailos then proved in written form that they descended from Boklua, the son of Nge Ngu. Only then that Capt. KZT did include their genealogies in his book. Although the Sailos' version was generally known among the Sizangs since a long, long time before a number of the Sailo genealogies were sent to him by the Sailos, it was not taken seriously by the the Sizangs because Boklua's name was no more remembered among the Sizangs' genealogies. But when some intensive inquiries were made [by Capt. KZT and a few others], the Sailos' version was found to be plausible.

1. Bok Lua pen Nge Ngu ii tapa hi a cih ciang Sihzang kampau a tam pen (80 % bang) Suan Tak/Thuanc Tak ii tapa 6 sung pan Nge Ngu leh Yang Lok suan teng na hi a Nge Ngu ii asuah lian teng belh Khuasak khua leh Lophei khua mi te a hi hi. Yang Lok ii a suan lian teng pen Thuklai, Limkhai leh Buanman (tanghun lai in) khua mi teng na hi uh hi.

1. Eighty percent of those who speak the Sizang dialect are the descendants of Nge Ngu and Yang Lok. The direct descendants of Nge Ngu are those who originally lived at Khuasak and Lophei villages, and the direct descendants of Yang Lok are those who originally lived at Thuklai, Limkhai and Buanman villages (in ancient times).

(Later – around the 1910s – many people of Khuasak founded Theizang and Siyin Ywa villages; in the
early 1920s, several Lophei villagers also founded Suangdaw village – and Chief Khup Lian personally founded Tuivial and Tuisa villages with the Khuano people. At about the same time, some Thuklai villagers also founded Pumva and Dolluang villages.)

**Remark 1:** The Khuasak and Lophei people lived together at Khuasak until the Lopheis founded their village. When nearly all the Lopheis were wiped out in a tribal war by the combined forces of Tashons, Hualingo and Zahu tribes, the Lophei survivors moved back to Khuasak, their mother village.

2. Lophei khua a sat pa leh hausa masa pa Pu Kim Lel na hi a a ma'n Seam Muang a ki cii nau khat na neih hi. Tua Seam Muang pen a u pa mah bangin galhang mah mah khat hi na pi in Kim Lel ii a Lagui 8 aphuaksung ah a nu leh a pa a sih na thu gen ahih hang Seam Muang sii hiam, nung hiam na na phuak lo hi. A lagui kipat na lam ah agui massaa 2 bel a nau pa a phuak hi. Lophei khuami khempeuh pen Pu Kim Lel ii suanh ahi hi.

2. It was Kim Lel who founded the Lophei village and became its first chief. He had a younger brother named Seam Muang, and Seam Muang was also a warrior like his elder brother. Strangely, Kim Lel did not mention the final fate of his younger brother in any of his 8-Stanza (16 verses) autobiographical song, although he mentioned the fates of his mother and father. He dedicated two verses (Stanzas 2 (a) & 5(a) his song to his brother (see Appendix 3-A). All the Lophei people are Kim Lel's direct descendants.

**Remark 2:** Dear Pu TLP, to prove that Kim Lel's song was not newly composed to substantiate my explanation on Sailos' lineage, please see APPENDICES A-3& A-4. These will prove that his song had existed already long before the Sailos' claim of being descendants of Nge Ngu was known among the Sizangs.

3. Tua hi in, Lusei te ii gal sung ah a mat pa pen Seam Muang a hi thei kha diam a ki ci hi bek hi. (Kim Lel la zong hih laai atawp na ah hong khum ing. Ei Ciimmuai suanh teng beth ih lakammal ki bang khinh phial a hih teh tangla siam te'n a khiatnaa thei in teh.) Hih laai tawp naa ah Lusei lam pan a ciaptih na uh zong hong aat ing. Kim Lel laa pen Sihzang tanglatee lah ah a haam pen/ a sawtpen hi a a mah pen Zo pan khang 12 na hi, kei bel khang 24 na hi ing.

3. Therefore, we had only speculated if the one whom the Hualngo/Lusei captured in a tribal war could be Seam Muang. (Kim Lel's autobiographical song is attached at the end of this paper. Since we (several Zo tribes) share plenty of our poetic words, I hope you'll understand them.) And I include here also the Hualngo/Luseis' version at the end of this paper. Kim Lel's song is the oldest among all the Sizang traditional songs. He was the 12th and I am the 24th generation from ZO.


The Guite clan [in Churachenpur, Manipur State, India] also produced a genealogical book where Sailo (Duhlian)'s descent from the Guite clan is firmly recorded.
My Answer:

Keima theih bang...

Guite te'n khat leh khat a kibang het lo Khangsimna 2 na na nei uh hi. Version khat pen ah Thuan Tak (Suantak) ii Sanggam pa Seaktak pan in pai khia aa, Guite pen tua Seaktak khang pan simhsuk khang 4 pan (Zo pan khang 11) kipan sak pan hi. A hih hang in version dang khat ah Guite beh pen GUITE pan mah in kipansak pah giat in, ZO cih te khawng om lo hi. Guite pan aa a pat khang 8 na ah Bawk Lu (Bok Lua hi lo) na hi sak aa, Bawkluii tapa pen Ngek Nguk (Sihzang te'n Nge Ngu cii uh) na hi sak uh hii. Hih khangsimna 2 te bel a mau Guite sungthu a hih man in ke'n banga mah comment ka piak thei na diing om kei - koi pen man zaw diam, man lo zaw diam cih te pawl.

As far as I know...

The Guite clan has two completely different genealogical trees. In one version, Guite descended from Seaktak, one of Suantak/Thuantak’s two brothers, and he (Guite) is the 4th generation from Seaktak or the 11th generation from Zo. But according to the other version, there is no mention of Zo; it directly starts with Guite, and Bawk Lu (not Bok Lua) is placed in the 8th generation from Guite. And Ngek Nguk (the Sizangs call him Nge Ngu) is the son of Bawk Lu. Since these completely different versions are the concern of the Guites themselves, I have no right to make any comment on this matter – which version could be correct or false.

Pu TLP’s Comment:


In fact, the Sailos don’t claim that they are the descendants of either the Guites or the Sizangs; they only claim that they are the descendants of the ‘Paite (Paihte).

My Answer:

Keima thei bang...

Lt. Colonel J. Shakespear ii gelh laaibuu: The Lushei Kuki Clans sung ah a nuai bang in na na gelh hi.

As far as I know...

Lt. Colonel J. Shakespear writes as the following in his book The Lushei Kuki Clans (pp. 2-3)

“The existing Lushei Chiefs all claim descent from a certain Thangura, who is sometimes said to have sprung from the union of a Burman with a Paihte woman, but, according to the Paihtes, the Lusheis are descended from Boklua, an illegitimate son of the Paihte Chief Ngeguk...From Thangura the pedigree of the living chiefs is fairly accurately established. The Lusheis, in common with the Thados and other Kuki tribes, attach importance to their genealogies; and pedigree, given at an interval of many years, and by persons living far apart, have been found to agree in a wonderful manner. From comparison of these genealogies and from careful enquiries lasting over many years, I estimate that Thangura must have lived early in the eighteenth century. His first village is said to have been at Tlangkua, north of Falam. From him
sprang six lines of Thangur chiefs: 1. Rokhum, 2. Zadeng, 3. Thangluah, 4. Palian, 5. Rivung, and 6. Sailo. To the north the country was occupied by the Sukte, Paihte, and Thado clans. These appear to have been firmly established under regular chiefs.”

My Remark: Until very recently, many of the Mizo dialect-speaking Zos called nearly all the Tedim dialect-related dialects-speaking Zo tribes and sub-tribes as Tedim Paite, Sihzang Paite, etc.

Pu TLP's Comment:


In my opinion, although our history/genealogies [of all the tribes] had not yet thoroughly been researched, those who write our history try to take advantage by making their own history [of their tribes or clans] more important than the rest. Our history can be divided into three parts: the Ciimmnaui period [the first known settlement in present-day Tiddim township in Chin State]; the Ciimmnaui-British period, and the British-rule period. Actually, even the period between the Ciimmnaui and British periods is shrouded partly in darkness.

My Answer:

Keima thei bang...

Na gen te a man mun zong om thei kha mah ding hi. A hih hang in mun khempeuh ah man khin khol lo ding hi. Ih tangthu leh ih khang sim na te, a ki cing leh a man thei zah zah ih at thei na ding in field study a bawl zong ki om nai lo a, tua bang bawl thei na ding a ki sam pil na leh siam na te a sin, a nei zong ki om nai lo in Mikang khawng te hong gelh sak teng bek mah leh eima minam (tribes) sung ah a ki gen kam tawh ciaptah tangthu (oral history) khawng bek lai at peuh in ki zangh lai a hih man in tua bang a laibu bawl te zong mawk sak hin ding zong hi sa keng.

Na cih mah bang in ih taang hun a ih khangsimmna te a tam zaw reliable lo mah hi. Sihzang sung zong ah ka cih nop na hi. Gentehna No. 1: Sizang sung beh pawl khat sung bang zong a ciaptah na uh ki bang lo lai hi. Tua ahih man in beh sial sung ah kikup na nei sak in a khang sim na uh a ma kiang ah a puak ciang in “Approved by...” ci in gelh sak hi. Gentehna No. 2: Pu Vum Ko Hau laibu (Profile of A Burma Frontier Man, laimai 214) sung ah Suan Tak in tapa 4 bek nei sak hi – Nge Ngu, Nei Lut, Dai Tong leh Vang Lok. Pu Vum Ko Hau laibu sungah, Hin Nung leh Nun Zong pen Dai Tawng ih tapa ci in na ciamteh hi. Ahih hang in Bo Khup Za Thang in kum sawt pi a kat ciang in Suan Tak in tapa 6 a neih lam phawk khia hi. Nge Ngu, Nei Lut, Hin Nung, Nun Zong, Dai Tawng leh Vang Lok te ahi hi. Hih hang in Bo Khup Za Thang in kum 28 sung sinsen nakpitah in a thu na kan in a hih thei tawp a na na standardize hi. Sihzang kual pua lam – gentehna, Guite khang ciaptehna cih te pawl - belh a kat man hun ding zong om lo a hih man in a ki puak bang bang na na khum sak hi.

As far as I know...

Some parts of what you said could be true, but I don’t think everything would be true. The problem is that those
who wrote our history did not do any field study, and they did not have the necessary knowledge to do such thorough research. They, therefore, have to rely heavily on what the British colonialists or foreign scholars have written or the oral histories of their respective tribes. So it would not be fair to blame them for their weaknesses.

As you said, it’s true to some extent that our history and our genealogies, in general, were not reliable, including that of the Sizangs. Example No. 1. He [Capt. Khup Za Thang] found out that there were conflicts or slightly differences even within some sub-clans among the Sizangs. So, he demanded that every sub-clan must discuss among themselves first and send him only an approved version. Example No. 2: In the “Profile of A Burma Frontier Man”, p. 214, Suan Tak had only four sons namely, Nge Ngu, Nei Lut, Dai Tong leh Vang Lok. But after 28 years of thorough research, Capt. Khup Za Thang found out that Suan Tak had six sons, namely Nge Ngu, Nei Lut, Hin Nung, Nun Zong, Dai Tawng and Vang Lok. In Pu Vum Ko Hau’s book, Nun Zong and Hin Nung were the sons of Dai Tawng. Capt. Khup Za Thang thus tried to standardize the Sizangs’ genealogies as far as he could. However, he did not have the time to do researches on other clans outside of the Sizangs. The Guite genealogy, for instance, is an example. So he put them [clans from other areas] in his book as he received them.

Explanation for Clan and Sub-clan for non-Zo readers: For instance, my main Clan is Thuan Tak or Suan Tak or Suantak or Suantaka (see TABLE 2-A) my Sub-clan is LUA TAWNG (see my genealogical tree - No. 15 on TABLE 5-A).

Pu TLP’s Comment:

In brief, we (all Zo tribes) departed from each other only as late as during the Ciimnuai period [approximately around the late 1500s]. So it is not pleasant to hear some people claiming to be the Sailos or the Galte/Ralte [another clan/tribe] or the Sizangs. We should better simply call ourselves “WE”.

My Answer:
Keima theih bang...
Ciimnuai community sunghah ih om ciat lai zong in dialect tuamtuam pen na zangh zo thei kha in ka tuat hi. Bang hang hiam cih leh Kim Lel pen Nge Ngu ii tuusialawn (great grandson) na hi in a la pen Sizang kamal na zangh ta hi: “Sizang ka khan ngual sunghah kei hong dem zo ding om kei...” na ci a hih man in dialects belh a tuam na nei ciat khin hi thei kha ding in um ing.

As far as I know...
It is possible that even when we were living together at Ciimnuai, our forefathers could have already used different dialects. The reason is that Kim Lel, who was the great-grandson of Nge Ngu, had composed his autobiographical song in the Sizang poetic words: “There is none among my contemporary Sizangs who can rival me.”
Note for Non-Zo Readers: I do not translate the following passages into English because they are not relevant to the main topic in this paper. But as they could be interesting for the Zo people, I include them here anyway.


Dawn na: Kei muh dan...

Hih mun ah bel nang tawh ka ngaihsutna kibang lian hi hang. Kawl, Vai, Mikang pan a kipan midang tee tawh ih kiban lo na hih mun lian hi. Dialect tuamtauam pau ih hih hang in a beh, ih phung tawh a kizom khin ih hih man in Sen (Chinese), Indian te bang khawng in Mipi lungsim neih mi, piicing minam te hi le’ng ei kan kan aa a ki iit thei diing minam dang om lo mah hi. A hih hang in minam neu te - pii cing lo mi te - ih hih man in ih paunak (proverb) dung zui in “Simh zawng (monkey) in Zo zawng kawk” ih cih lian tee hi hang. Zawng pen Simh ah om ta leh, Zo ah om taleh kibang a, a nek adawn uh zong kibang a hih hang khat leh khat ki en neu, kisim mawh uh hi.

[7] Politik thu-ah zong i tup (goal) autonomous district (kum bangzah hong khawsuahpih tam?) ciang khawng bek hi kei hen la, Kawl le Vai kawmkal, Hindu-Muslim- Buddhist kawmkal ah om i hih manin tuate lak pan i khawsuah suak (kum bang tan ading, malam kum 100 maw, kum 500...?) theih nading pen Zotate khempeuh i kipumkhatna bek ah kinga ding hi. Sente leh Vaite ii economic & culture kidona ding battle field pen i Zogam hong hi ding ahih manin, malam kum 100 sung beek i khawsuah theih lai nang i pankhop kul hi.

Dawn na: Kei muh dan...

Hih mun ah zong nang ma ii muh bang lian in muu ing. En ih phawk kha kei a hi ven, Kawlgam sung bang ah sum leh pai, neihsa lam sa leh, pilna, siam na teng Sen leh Vai te khutsung bek om ta uh e!

[8] I beh bek, I khua bek, I pawlpi bek, I awkaihpithe bek I cihcih, I kikhop tuamtauam hun nawnlo hi..

Dawnna: Kei muh dan

Hih mun ah zong nang ma ii muh bang lian in muu ing. En ih phawk kha kei a hi ven, Kawlgam sung bang ah sum leh pai, neihsa lam sa leh, pilna, siam na teng Sen leh Vai te khutsung bek om ta uh e!

Thang Za Dal. September 30, 2021
APPENDIX A

The origin of the powerful Sailo Chiefs, who had ruled most of the Lushai Hills (Mizoram State in India) for a couple of centuries, was and still is shrouded in great mystery. The contents of APPENDICES A to A-4 are about my personal search for their root since the ending parts of 2004.

CORRESPONDENCES ON THE ROOT OF THE SAILO CHIEFS OF MIZORAM

The following correspondences were reactions to my own posting in the Chinland@yahoogroups.com in late 2004 under the heading of ARE THE MIZOS CHINS?

From: Son Suantak <vssuantak@yahoo.com>
Reply-To: chinland@yahoogroups.com
To: chinland@yahoogroups.com
Subject: Re: [chinland] Are the Mizos Chins?
Date: Wed, 10 Nov 2004 14:44:37 -0800 (PST)

The originator of the Sailo was the younger brother of our chief of Lophei village.

vumson

--------------------------

— Original Message —
From: Pualva Z <pualvaz@hotmail.com>
Date: Thursday, November 11, 2004 3:05 pm
Subject: Re: [chinland] Are the Mizos Chins?

Dear Pu Vum,

Yours is a very wonderful story. I have never heard of it. In those days those who were adopted by the chiefs were called slaves. If Sailo was a slave he would not have a chance to marry a chief’s daughter and he would not be chosen for their chief by the people.

I think that Sailo’s father and mother fell in love and Sailo was born but there would have been difficulties for the two to get married because they were Sizang and Lusei. However, his grandfather could adopt Sailo as his own nephew then he could have the chances to marry a chief’s daughter as well as to become a chief. If it was so, Sailo would not be a Sizang any more but a Lusei. It was also very strange that how and why Sailo’s parents allowed the Lusei chief to adopt their own son, Sailo.

Pualva

--------------------------
Pu Van Hmung:

The treatment of slaves and adopted sons differ from one clan [tribe] to another. For example, the strength of the Tlasun chiefs was due to their acceptance of slaves and adopted [conquered] people as their own. The Tlasun or Falam Democratic Council included these people who had not been Tlasun. Because of these they had the trust and the respect of new comers to the Tlasun society. Similarly, the Lusei or Chhakchhuak were more tolerant to the slaves and adopted [conquered] people. They have a law that says “Those who drink the same water from the same stream could not be treated as enemies.” The slave and owner relationship may be true in the Haka and Haka-Zo areas [as you’ve said in your previous posting], but it is not true everywhere. In the Sizang area also there was a chief who could not sire children but he asked his slave to sire children for him. The children were accepted as his own and later they inherit the chieftainship, although it was known to every one.

vumson

Note: Remarks above in parentheses [ ] are of my own. tzd/June 2009

Pualva Z <pualvaz@hotmail.com> wrote:

Dear Pu Thara,

I am glad to read your mail. However, I am not happy because I think my previous posting touched some of our Mizo brothers. This time I have no choice, so I have to tell you the truth. I heard that Sailos have two stories - a normal one and a bad one. The normal one is just like what you said and the bad one is that Sailo was a lakfa/sawn of a Sizang. Sailos and Mizos hate that bad story very much. I have no idea, which one would be the right one...

With best Regards,

Pualva

roding@vsnl.com wrote:

Dear U Van Hmung,

All the Lusei tribes [clans] have well recorded (by songs, poems, stone inscriptions; By written these days) history
or family tree. I have some of these books. Here I want to let you know the facts about Sailo clan.

1. Lusei tribes (mainly Chhakchhuak group, Hualngo, Hualhang, Lunkhua, Baichi) lived in Seipui village and its surrounding areas in (1400-1500 A.D). They captured Ralnaa (Galna, Son of Boklua of Suantak tribe [clan]) near Run river and took him back to Seipui.

2. The Lusei (Chhakchhuak) never treated Ralnaa as 'slave' but adopted him as their son. Ralnaa changed his 'religion' and worshiped what Luseis worshiped. That means he was not treated as a slave but 'adopted'. Lusei chiefs married Ralnaa to Lawleri, daughter of Lawitlang clan.

3. Ralnaa’s (Galna) name was changed as ‘Zahmuaka’ as he was welcomed by many people when he was taken to Seipui. [“Zahmuaka” literally means “welcomed by hundreds” because he was welcomed by hundreds of people on his arrival at the Seipui village. tzd]

4. Ralnaa (Now Zahmuaka) and Lawleri had 6 sons, Zadenga, Thangluaha, Paliana, Rivunga, Rokhuma, Thangura.

5. Sons of Ralnaa (Zahmuaka) went to western side of Tio river (now Mizoram) before other Lusei clans went there. Lusei clans were invited by 'Hnante' tribes to lead them but other Lusei clans denied it and sent Zahmuaka’s sons. Zahmuaka’s sons [therefore] became chieftains of Mizoram first.


7. They worshiped "Muchhip Pathian" even from Mizoram. With Sailo (clan), Lusei tribe is devided into 12 clans today.

Mang tha

Dinga

-----------------------------------------------
From: Son Suantak <ssuantak@yahoo.com>
Reply-To: chinland@yahoogroups.com
To: chinland@yahoogroups.com
Subject: Re: [chinland] Are the Mizos Chins?

Many greetings to you all. I fully agree with all of your postings, Pu Ro Dinga. You have left out whose son Sailo was. So here it is: Thangura was one of the six sons of Zahmuaka. Thangura had two sons: Chawngluela and Thawngmanga. Sailo was the son of Thawngmanga.

vumson

-----------------------------------------------
From: stanley Kunga
Reply-To: chinland@yahoogroups.com
To: chinland@yahoogroups.com
Subject: Re: [chinland] Are the Mizos Chins?
Date: Thu, 11 Nov 2004 01:08:50 -0800 (PST)

Dear Pualva,
Thanks for your explanation. I visited almost Zophei villages in Chin State and had interviewed some of the elders ten years ago. Villagers in Zophei area asked me "Can you speak Leiri (if I am not mistaken leiri- refering to
Halkha thlantlang/Thantlang dialect). Of course, I could speak and write well in Laiholh [Haka dialect]. Contrary to what you have written, it seems to me that those whom I met did not identify themselves as Lai. My friends from Zophei region communicate each other in Zophei hohl.

Let me explain how I got Zo as my (first) name. Duhlian speaking people, especially those who worshipped Pathian, the Supreme Being who manifested at Mt. Muchhip, called themselves as "Zo fate (the sons/ descendants of Zo)". That was why my parents gave me Zo as my name. My full name is Zo Sai Kunga. The middle word "Sai" was derived from "Sailo" as I am his 12th descendant. Sailoa was my great grand father from my mother’s side.

Like many young Chins (clifford, victor, henry, benjamin, edward, stoney, patrick, noel, nelson...), I got my English name "Stanley" from [my] English class. I used Stanley Kunga in [the] prodemocracy movement as there could be repercussions from the MIS [Burma’s most feared and hated Military Intelligence Service] by using my full name.

Thanks,

Kunga

From: "Lal Thanga" <Lal_thanga@hotmail.com>
X-Originating-IP: [198.81.26.71]
Date: Mon, 08 Nov 2004 15:18:26 -0800
Subject: [chinland] Mizo Vs Lusei/Lushai

Dear all,

I would make it clear that who Lusei/Lushai hnam are. Lusei has 12 clans. (I had argued that not to write Lusei as Lushai.) Those are: Hualngo, Hualhnam/Gualnam, Hual Hang, Hnamte, Chhantge, Chhawngte, Pa Chuau, Chuau Ngo, Chuau Hang, Lunkhua, Sailo/Thangur ...

Lusei is just a family name, not a political name at all. Most of the migrants to Tahan and Kale valley from Mizoram do not belong to the Lusei family. In Mizoram, they don't even proclaim as Lusei, no more. Hualngo, Hualhang become Chhakchhuak in Mizoram. ZNP president Pu Lalduhoma is Hualhang and Chhakchhuak. Let’s say Captain Vuta (father of Rev. Zothannawia/English Methodist-Rgn) can proclaim himself as Lusei because he is Chhantge clan of Lusei.

Lusei itself does not belong to Duhlian dialect at the first place because Rate, Chawngthu (I may point Lt Col Lalmuana (late) was the one), Ngente, Kawnli, Tlangkhu, Saihmun and others speak Duhlian in locality, around Rih Lake in Chin State. If someone campaigns as Lusei hnam for political or linguistic gains please ask if he/she belongs to one of these 12 clans. Well! migrants, due to drought, from Mizoram may say they are Mizos. It is fair enough.

The name Mizo started in the 1950’s, three decades before Mizoram Statehood. Remember Mizoram Day, adopted by Pu Laldenga, is fallen on February 20, the day we celebrate as Chin National Day since 1948. Pu Keivoma said "Hnam ah kan chiang tur a ni" then we can move on.

LMA

Note: Although this posting by LMA (Lal Lawm Thanga) is not directly relevant to the other correspondences mentioned above, I include it as an extra item for those who are not familiar with the tribal and clan names and some generalhistorical backgrounds concerning them. tzd
About the Correspondents above:

1. vumson was Dr. Vumson Suantak, author of tZo History. He was living in the U.S.A. He had passed away on 19th September, 2005.
2. Dinga is Dr. Rodinga. He was for several years the resident representative in India of the National League for Democracy – Daw Aung San Suu Kyi’s political party. He is living now in the U.S.A with his family.
3. Kunga is Mr. Sai Kunga (Falam, Chin State, Burma), 31. B.A in Theology, Zomi Theological College, Falam, Chin State (1997); M. Div, Alliance Biblical Seminary, Manila, the Philippine (2003). He lives now in the U.S.
4. Pualva is Mr. Van Mung alias Pualva and was a school teacher in Chin State and is now residing in Sweden.
5. Dr. Lal Lawm Thanga (LMA) is a dentist. He is now living in Los Angeles, USA

Thang Za Dal. June 2015

The following four quotations are from four books: Zo History by Dr. Vumson Suantak; The Lushei Kuki Clans by Col. J. Shakespear; The Chin Hills by Carey & Tuck, Volume I, and A Handbook of the Chin Language (Siyin Dialect) by Taylor, L.B (see Bibliography). These quotes are either directly or indirectly relevant to the main topic here.

THEORIES ON THE PROGENITOR OF THE SAILO CLAN

1. “As noted, the Lusei did not reject other people who came into contact with them, and many were absorbed and now form the bulk of the West Zoram or Mizoram population. Even the Thangura and Sailo chiefs, who had been the dominant Lusei leaders for some generations, were not direct descendants of the Lusei clan. The forefather of the Sailo chiefs, Boklua, was the grandson of the Sizang Ralna. (See 4 and 5). Lal Biak Thanga explains, “When the Luseis were at Seipui khua, their neighbouring village invited them to offer a chief. One house after another was approached, but all refused saying, “Invite Zahmuaka, who has many sons. The birth of Zahmuaka was as follows: The first Lusei settlers at Seipui khua [Seipui village] were of the Chhakchhuak clan. This clan was at war with the Paihtes, who were then living on right bank of the Chindwin [River]. In the fight one Chhuahlawma, the son of a Paihte warrior called Ralna, was captured by the Chhakchhuak people and carried off as a slave. He was adopted by them as a son. When he grew up and got married, his first son was named Zahmuaka by his wife. Zahmuaka had six sons. They were Zadenga, Paliana, Thangluaha, Thangura, Rivunga, and Rokhuma. Thangura was the grandfather of Sailoa, whose descendants ruled Lusei and other Zo clans who occupied the Lushai or Mizo Hills. Lal Biak Thanga continues, “...Zahmuaka traced his descent from one Sisanga and his wife Sesingi. Thus the most powerful chiefs of Lusei were descendants of Boklua, who was remembered as Sisanga because his clan was Sizang. Boklua was the son of Ngengu, or Nenua, who was the progenitor of the the Sizang. Zahmuaka, who was persuaded by the hnamte (common people) to become their chief, accepted leadership of the group, and his six sons, Rokhuma, Zadenga, Paliana, Rivunga, Thangura, and Thangluaha prospered. From them sprang six lines of Lusei chiefs. The descendants of Thangura, the Sailos, became the most powerful chiefs in the Lushei Hills...”
2. “The existing Lushei Chiefs all claim descent from a certain Thangura, who is sometimes said to have sprung from the union of a Burman with a Paihite woman, but, according to the Paihite, the Lusheis are descended from Boklua, an illegitimate son of the Paihite Chief Ngehguka. The Thados say that some hunters tracking a serao noticed the foot-marks of a child following those of the animal, and on surrounding the serao they found it suckling a child who became the great Chief Thangura, or, as they call him, 'Thangui'. From Thangura the pedigree of the living chiefs is fairly accurately established. The Lusheis, in common with the Thados and other Kuki tribes, attach importance to their genealogies; and pedigree, given at interval of many years, and by persons living far apart, have been found to agree in a wonderful manner. From comparison of these genealogies and from careful enquiries lasting over many years, I estimate that Thangura must have lived early in the eighteenth century. His first village is said to have been at Tlangkua, north of Falam. From him sprang six lines of Thangur chiefs: 1. Rokhum, 2. Zadeng, 3. Thangluah, 4. Palian, 5. Rivung, and 6. Sailo. To the north the country was occupied by the Sukte, Paihite, and Thado clans. These appear to have been firmly established under regular chiefs.” (J. Shakespear, pp. 2-3)

3. “...From the five men: Nge Ngu, Vanglok, Daitong, Hinnung and Nong Zong [Nun Zong], all the Siyin people descended. Part of the Koset [Khuasak] and Lope [Lophei] people are descended from Nge Ngu. Vanglok's descendants are the Tolkling [Thuklai], Bwenman [Buanman] and Limkhai people. Hinnung's descendants are the Hualngams [Hualnams]. Nong Zong's are the Taukan [Taukon] people. Daitong's descendants have died out.” (Naylor. p 45)

4. “...Neyal [Nei Zal] of Chin Nwe [Ciimmuai] is the father of the Siyin tribe; he lived 13 generations ago and he had three sons, Ne Nu [Nge Ngu], Vamlok [Vang Lok], and Daitong; these three together left the nursery of the Northern Chins, migrated some 12 miles to the east, and founded the two villages of Limkai and Twantak [below present - day Khuasak village]. Vamlok is the progenitor of the three communities which we classify as the Limkais, Tolkling, and Bwenman clans, and Ne Nu is the progenitor of the clan we designate as the Siyin clan of the Siyin tribe, though it would be more correctly named if we called this family the Twantak clan. Vamlok had three sons, Hansook [Hang Sawk], Tolkling and Limkai. Hansook founded Tavak [Thavak] village, Tolkling founded Vumyang village, whilst Limkai remained in the original village of that name. Ne Nu had one son named Lamtam, who lived in Twantak, the village founded by his father Ne Nu and his uncle Daitong. Lamtam's youngest son Neyal moved from Twantak and founded Koset village, which nine generations later was destroyed by the Siyins [themselves] when attacked by General Faunce in 1889. Four generations ago Koset emigrants founded Tannwe [Thangnuai] village...”

(Carey & Tuck, Vol. 1, pp. 127-28)
A brief explanation

The following postulations are the ones that I made on the progenitor of the Sailo Chiefs after a complicated and daunting personal search since the ending parts of 2004.

I only knew that the people of Lophei have two versions about Seam Muang (see below). But about two years ago I contacted a 90-year old paternal uncle of mine and asked him how much he knew about Seam Muang in the hope that he might know more than me about him for he had had spent when he was young a great deal of his times with my paternal grandfather and other elders in the village. (When my grandfather died in 1962 at about 90-95 years of age, I was still only 17 years old and my uncle in question was already nearly 40 years old.) He indeed knows a third version about Seam Muang: This third version was that Seam Muang felt madly in love with a female slave and that his elder brother was absolutely against it. It’s no wonder that his brother had opposed it, because even nowadays it’s still a taboo even for an “ordinary commoner” to get married with either a female or male slave in many Chin communities. But my uncle does not know to which tribe the slave had belonged. It is very possible that the slave was a Hualngo woman and that both of them simply secretly returned to her native village, Seipui. The facts that he did not return to Lophei in his lifetime and that he was warmly welcomed by the villagers of Seipui strongly suggest that he was most likely not a war captive as the legends have it. If he really were a war captive, he could have escaped from his captivity and returned to his native village sometime in his lifetime, since the distance between Seipui (see village marked in orange - bottom - on Map 5) and Lophei (see village marked in green on Map 5) is only some 2 or 3-days’ walk. But if he really were a war captive, the reason for his receiving a well treatment by his captors must in large part due to his special features that were still remembered by the Lophei elders: He is said to be, unlike his brother, well-built and extremely handsome. However, it is no more important here whether or not he was a war captive or he went there voluntarily, but rather whether he could be Ralma-a/Zahmuaka/Sizanga. By taking all the information that are available until today into consideration, one can with almost absolute certainty conclude that Ralma-a, Zahmuaka and Sihzanga must in reality have been Seam Muang.

Note. I believe that I am well-qualified enough - and the only right person as well - to solve this mystery from the Sizangs’ side. Besides me, there would be nobody else anymore among the Sizangs who could do better than me in this particular case. As genealogy has always been one of my flaming interests from my young age, I personally had even contributed K. 32,000 (circa USD 900 in 1990-91 when a dollar was still worth around K. 30-35) for Pu Khup Za Thang’s research and work on Zo genealogy. (See the compiler’s scanned handwritten record under CONCLUSION attached at the end of this Appendix.)

- Mr. T. Z.Dal (53/24). T.Z.Dal. stands for Thang Za Dal and 53 for the page on which my name can be found in the Genealogy book and 24 for my generation count from ZO. See my genealogical tree in TABLES 5/A & 5/B.
Now I shall try to make a picture out of a mosaic of different information that I have collected recently (see APPENDICES A-2, A-3 & A-4). When I made my previous speculations, which were used in previous Updates, I could not present any evidence to prove my points. Then I discovered Kim Lei’s autobiographical song, which is the oldest surviving autobiographical song among the Sizangs, in my father’s Note Book, written back in 1940 (see APPENDIX A-3) and also in another book called Sizang Labu (Sizang Song Book), compiled by the late Captain Mun Kho Pau of Khuasak, published in 1954 (see APPENDIX A-4) on my bookshelves here in Hamburg. But since I do not understand traditional Zo songs composed in poetic words (see 19.6 TRADITIONAL SONGS), I requested Pu Ngo Za Lian of Khuasak village to translate this autobiographical song for me into plain words in the hope that there might be some hints that could support my theses (I based my previous theses on speculations circulated among my relatives alone without knowing exactly the contents of the song in detail). And there indeed are a couple of Stanzas and verses in it that I think could support my theses.

In fact, there should be no mystery at all with regard to the root of the Sailo clan, if -

- The Sailos had simply remembered that their progenitor was called Boklua and that he was a Sizang and that he was the son of either Yang Lok or any of his brothers, except Nge Ngu, or
- Kim Lei’s autobiographical song were not so mysterious with regard to Seam Muang’s fate, or
- There were no Hualngo legends about the capture of a Ra1 Na-a or a Sihzanga in a tribal war. But that was not the case. See the following new postulations:

**NGE NGU, BOKLUA, KIM LEI, SEAM MUANG, RALNA-A, ZAHMUAKA, SIHZANGA**

The possibility that there’s some truth in Quotation NO. 2 in APPENDIX A-1 - that Boklua was the son of Paite Chief Nge Ngu - is very high due to the following reasons:

- Shakespeare and those who had told him the story - that, Boklua was the son of Nge Ngu - could not have known when he prepared his book that Nge Ngu’s and his five brothers’ direct descendants were originally Sizangs. All of them founded first the Thuantak village and then Nge Ngu’s direct sons founded and settled at Khuasak, not far from Thuantak - and later Kiim Lei founded and settled at Lophei. Therefore, since he (Boklua) is said to be the son of Nge Ngu, he must have lived either at Khuasak or Lophei. Yang Lok’s and his four brothers’ sons and founded and settled at Buanman, Limkhai, Thavak, Vomzang and Thuklai villages. *(Those in Tables 9, 10, 11 and 12 are some of the direct descendants of the said four brothers, Nei Lut, Hin Nung, Nun Zong and Dai Tawng who remained in the Sizang region until today.) Later the great majorities of families of these four brothers moved out of the Sizang region for it apparently was too small to accomodate them all. (Duhlhan dialect-speakers call all those who speak dialects that are related to the Tedim dialect: Paite. For instance, the Sizangs are called “Sihzanga Paite”.)

- Although the Sizangs could no more recall a person named Boklua as one of Nge Ngu’s sons this claim doesn’t lose its creditability because, as one can see in the last paragraph of my previous speculations above, even those who had moved out of the core Sizang region only three or four generations ago and settled in its immediate vicinity and speak the Sizang dialect no more have
simply been forgotten by the Sizangs in the core Sizang region.

* If he (Boklua) really were Ral Na-a, who was captured by the Luseis, and the son of Boklua, then Boklua must have had only a single son (among the Sizangs daughters were not counted in genealogies before the 15th generation from ZO - see some of the Sizang genealogical trees included in this paper - from Tables 5/A to 5/D and 8 to 12/A) and thus ended his lineage abruptly. And he himself must have died young.

Now let us have a look at some interesting verses from Kiim Leel’s song (see APPENDIX A-2):

* In 2 (a) and 5 (a) Kiim Leel dedicated his younger brother, but very interestingly in 8 (a+b) he said that he had no brother of his own (pianpu laizom = brothers/sisters born out of a single father and a single mother).

* If Seam Muang had died while Kiim Leel was still alive, he surely would have mentioned about it in one or two verses, because he had also mentioned about the death of his parents (6-a+b) - his mother at the hands of his enemy and for which he had managed to revenge, and his father at the hands of evil spirits for which he felt helpless.

* But if Seam Muang was still alive when he composed verses 3 (a & b), he would not have composed that he was without a brother/sister of his own. (Kiim Leel is said to have lived a very long life.)

* The Lopheis had had two different versions with regard to the fate of Seam Muang: one version was that he left the village because of differences of opinion with his elder brother and headed for Mualbem village, which later became the seat of the Sukte chieftainship, and was seen there for the last time; and the other version was that he left no issues of his own. But as Kiim Leel had expressed in several verses that he and his brother themselves had defeated and successfully defended against several enemies, the first version is not plausible. If Seam Muang really had had differences of opinion with his brother, he could have simply moved to any other Sizang village or he could have simply founded a new village. And the second version is also not plausible because, if that were really the case, Kiim Leel would not have needed to compose that he had no brother of his own.

CONCLUSION

By taking all the factors mentioned above into consideration, I personally believe that the one who the Hualngo had captured in an inter-tribal war could most likely be Seam Muang. (Even until some few years before the British arrived at the scenes there were still some tribal wars between the Sizangs and the combined forces of Tashon, Zahau, Khuangli and Hualngo as mentioned earlier above.) But if Seam Muang really were the captive, then a few questions shall need to be answered or solved, namely

Question 1. Why didn’t he simply admit to his captors that he was Seam Muang, the younger brother of Kiim Leel, Chief of Lophei?

Answer: Since the two brothers - and the Lopheis - are said to have fought and even defeated several enemies, the Hualngo also could surely be among the enemies that they had fought against. So,
if he had told his captors the truth, he would certainly be tortured or killed. Or his elder brother would most likely be forced to buy for his freedom, and that would be extremely costly. There were several such examples and one of the most vivid cases was the fate of my great, great, grandmother (see APPENDIX F).

Question 2. If the captive in question really were Seam Muang, then who was Boklua or what happened to him?
Answer: As I have already mentioned above he (Boklua) himself must have had died early or he did not have any issue of his own, or he had only a son but his son died in his young age. So Seam Muang might have had simply claimed that he was the son of his great uncle Boklua.

Question 3. Had Seam Muang been captured by their enemy, why didn’t Kim Le simply admit it and compose one or two verses dedicating to his brother’ fate?
Answer: Since Kim Le boasted in many verses that he and his brother were powerful warriors, it must have been a great shame for Kim Le to admit by composing a verse that his brother was captured by his enemy for which he could not revenge, or that he had simply disappeared without a trace. So, it is possible that after some generations had passed the truth was manipulated by my forefathers - that is, that Seam Muang had had no issues or he simply left the village because of differences of opinion with his elder brother - in order to hide the shamefulness of Seam Muang’s inglorious fate. (Note: Many of my forefathers also left several autobiographical songs and when they have been translated into plain texts sometime in the near future and if there are some new clues to this topic in those songs, then I shall have to write this section anew.)

Question 4. If Seam Muang really were the captive, why didn’t he try sometime in his lifetime to contact his relatives again?
Answer: In absolute contrast to the Sizangs, the Luseis have been absorbing even total strangers into their community and make them feel at home. So it's very possible that Seam Muang immediately felt at home among his newly found relatives. And there were only very limited social intercourses or communications between hostile tribes in olden days.

Question 5. How about the different names: Ral Na-a, Zahmuaka and Sizhanga that are mentioned in the Hualngo legends (APPENDIX A)?
Answer: It is most likely that his captors had simply affectionately given Seam Muang/Ralna-a these nicknames: Zahmuaka (the one being welcomed by the hundreds), and Sizhanga (after the name of his tribe). In short, Seam Muang, Ral Na-a, Zahmuaka and Sizhanga all must simply be a single person. If the three names - Ralna-a, Zahmuaka and Sizhanga - are made into a single person, it fits neatly in the existing genealogical lineages. (See 17.8 CHIN/ZO NAMES)

The above postulations are from our side. It's now up to the Sailos to decide if they deem these theses plausible or not. For this purpose I have created an alternative genealogical tree for the Sailo lineage (TABLE 3-A).

What I am going to write here is neither scientific nor academic, so it may even sound arrogant or naive. No matter whether the discrepancies of the Sailo genealogies and that of the Sizangs could be bridged or not, there was a strikingly similarity of mentality between the former Sailo chiefs and the Sizangs during their wars against the British: That was their extra-ordinary stubbornness. All other Zo tribes also had fought against the British equally bravely, but this obstinacy among the Sailo chiefs and the Sizangs was worth an extra mention by the British. So I, as a layman, suppose that there could probably be some truth in the theses that I have postulated above.

"The last two years’ work in the Siyin tract has been to thoroughly subdue and disarm the inhabitants, a task which has been prolonged owing to the extraordinary obstinate nature
of these tribesmen.”

(See 9.10.4 THE SIYINS and also Footnotes on the Sailo Chiefs by Shakespear on p. 121 of this paper).

Note 1. Since the generation differences between Kiim Leel and Seam Muang and me are 12, they must have lived about 300 years ago (for one generation is equal roughly to 25 years), or around A.D. 1600. I shall attempt to prove the reliability of the genealogies among the Sizangs used in this paper in some coming Updates.

Note 2. Judging by the autobiographical song of Kiim Leel, the Sizangs must have had already used the term “Sizang” as the name of their tribe in ancient times, although they were recorded as “Tautes or Tauktes” [Thau telemetry - meaning the “fatty ones”] in Manipuri Chronicles. Carey & Tuck, Vol. 1, p. 4).

Note 3. The reader may surely be interested to know more about Suantak, the progenitor of several clans and sub-clans, so see 17.7 CLANS AND SUB-CLANS

Special Notes:

1. Suantak or Suantaka or Thuan Tak, the progenitor of a great number of families, is said to have lived at and was Chief of Ciimnui (see MAP 5), the first known settlement of the northern Zo people in the Chin Hills when they migrated from the Kale-Kabaw Valleys in the Chindwin region around 1400 A.D. As he was too demanding from whom he collected tributes, a man of the Gangte tribe/ clan (another Zo tribe) lost his patience and knocked him three times with the hinleg of a deer which he brought along with him as a tribute, so Suantak died immediately on the spot. His children then left the village sometime later and founded other villages (see TABLE 2). Since the generation difference between Suantak and me is 17, he must have had lived sometime around the late 1400s or early 1500s (1945-425 = 1520). (Source for Suantak’s headmanship/chieftainship at Ciimnui: Zomi Encyclopedia, Vol. 5. pp. 54-55. This is a 21-Volume Encyclopedia which will be published in the near future. Each volume contains about 500 pages.)

2. Explanation about the words, Hualngo and Lusei. Actually, originally these were clan names - Hualngo being the great, great, great.. son of Lusei (see Dr. Ro Dinga’s genealogy on next page). With times gone by, they became tribal names as well (see Note 3).* And, in fact, those who belong to these two clans and tribes speak exactly the same dialect, which is known as either Hualngo or Lusei or Duhlian or now Mizo dialect. (This dialect has now become the official language of Mizoram State.) Although Dr. Ro Dinga himself has mainly used LUSEI in his correspondences (see Appendix A), I am simply using only Hualngo in this Appendix. The British formed up the Chin Hills Battalion in 1894 initially with five Chin tribes (each tribe being allotted a company), namely Haka [Hakhas], Seyins [Siin or Sizang], Konsais [Khuangsai or better known now as Thadou-Kuki], Whellos [Hualngo] and Zahous [Zahau]. (http://www.burmaster.org.uk/hyde.htm)

Thus, they were and are known more as Hualngo in Burma, and as Lusei or Lushai - and now Mizo - in India. I am reproducing below his genealogy and explanation from one of our very recent correspondences on this subject for those who are not familiar with these terminologies.

“I want to share you my family tree so that you will know better about LUSEI/Hualngo. (Name within bracket are sibling/s of relative name)

LUSEI-a
Sumpia
Lamira or Hamlira (Sunhauva)
Seipua
Lianmua
Tlatea (Khirhte)
Huallthana (Neihrima)
HUALNGOA (Hualhanga, Hualhnama/or Gualnam**)
Bochunga (Cherruta, Chalthlenga, Khupnoa)
Zathanga (Lalvura)
HUALNGO is my 11th ancestor while LUSEI is my 18th ancestor.
There are 10 LUSEI clans (or Lusei’s descendants)
They are:
Pachuau;
Chuauhang;
Chuango;
Tochhawng;
Vanchhawng;
Huahnar;
Hrahsel;
Chhangte;
CHHAKCHHUAK (Hualngo, Hualhang, Hualtham/or Gualnam**)
Sailo

Some mentioned as 12 or 13 LUSEI clans, deviding CHHAKCHHUAK as different Clans "Hualngo;
Hualhang; Hualtham; and Lunkhua". Whenever I mention the whole Lusei tribe, I use LUSEI. I
use HUALNGO when I mention Duhlian Speaking people in Burma."

3*. A similar case is with the Thadou clan/tribe. It was originally a clan name, but later it became a tribal name as well.
Those who speak this Za dialect are nowadays better known as Thadou-Kuki. They are also known as Khuangsai.

4. Hualhnam:* * In the Sizang dialect this clan is spelled as Hual Nam and there are two sub-clans (Kual Vial and
Hang Man) of this clan among the Sizangs numbering about 50 families in two villages, namely Khuasak and Voklaak.
See also generation counts 7 & 8 in TABLE 2. One may surely notice that there are some discrepancies between the
genealogy above - with regard to Hualhnam/ or Gualnam - and the one in TABLE 2. See 17.7 CLANS AND
SUB-CLANS for explanation for such discrepancies.

Thang Za Dal. June 2015
APPENDIX A-2

LOPHEI KHUA UKPI PU KIM LEL LA (AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL SONG OF CHIEF KIM LEL OF LOPHEI)

A KAIH*

1 (a)  Kim awng nge na khan tang bang pha e, nang in la thaang vang in nei, Lal von ni thum khum bang ka do hi e.
1 (b)  Tung soltha pui le, kiim pan va lai nei ta, lim bang la lian zu ve te, khua mual panh lawi bang nong thang hi ve.

Akhiak na (Meaning)

1 (a)  Kim awng na khan pha ma ma, zo ma ma a; ngal leh sa a thuap a thuap ah do zo nangh zo pa na hi hi.
       - Oh, Kim! Yours is a fulfilled life with glories; you’ve successfully fought against a great number of enemies and also defended against them.
1 (b)  Vantung pan thaa - pui ih vang nei bang ma, Kim Lel zong vang nei a, ih khuamual ah a min hong thang tawnung hi.
       - Literal translation: Like the light of the moon that shines in the sky, Kim Lel has also light and his fame is well-known at the top of our village.
       Figurative translation: Like the light of the moon that shines in the sky, Kim Lel is powerful and his fame is well-known in the whole region.

* Vang or Awang = Light, power, influence

Examples of usage
1. Pu X sia vang nei hi. = Mr. X has power/influence.
2. Pu X sia avang lian hi. = Mr. X is powerful/influential.
3. Pu X ih avang lian hi. = Mr. X’s power/influence is great.

...........................................................

2 (a)  Seam awng nge na khan tang bang pha e, nang in la thaang vang in nei, khua Ki’im a mi-in lengsial hong hawl e.
2 (b)  Namtem ziatsang a ka tawi lam a, lalmi ka tha, khua mual hawal suang za’a in hong ki phom e.

A Khiaik na:-

2 (a)  Seam awng, na khan na zaw la lawm manh, khua kíim khua paam in sial sia hong pia ah hong hawl tek hi.
       - Oh, Seam [Muang], since your life is so successful, people in neighbouring villages give us myths as tributes.
2 (b)  Hiam le naam tawi ah ngal ka tha sia, khumual ah suangtum lungtum om za ah, ki phom liang hi.
       - The enemies that I killed with knife and weapons are piling up like the stones at the village gate.

...........................................................

A NAW*

3 (a)  Tang lungtup ma bang tunh tangh, Mulu le Seam ka sak luang tul li vum a tuang ing nge.
3 (b)  Ka lal paw hang ve ci, maung va bang a man, tangh khuaw vaw nge tual sung ah thang ing nge.

A Khiaik na:

3 (a)  Pasal ah ka pian buang, ka tup theampo tunh siat in, ngal le sa ka mat, ka tha te, a sang
Being a real man, I’ve fulfilled all my wishes, and I have absolutely defeated my enemies.

Those enemies of mine who think they’re brave, I captured them like birds with mawngnai and in shackels, and my fame is spread throughout the land.

(Explanation: mawngnai, is a small species of banyan tree which grows on trees, by using the trees as its hosts; if their tiny fruits are chewed in the mouth for a while, a sticky substance like rubber is gained and then it is used as a rubber trap for catching birds.)

Ngual in kei ka hang zia ci, pau tang sua e, vang khua lai a, mi lian hang kei hing nge,
Ngual in lwm nuai thak ka le, ka sial lwm phu limthing nuai a, suang bang ka po hi ze.

A Khiaj na:
Ngual a pau theampo in na a ma te veo hang a ki sak tek hang khua thingbup a a lian belsia kei ma hi bek khi hi.
- Although everybody who can speak boasts that he is the brave one, only I’m the greatest in the whole village.

Ngual in a lwm tawi khia ka le, Kei ka beal cin tenh a, suangtum bang in ka om tin tunh hi.
- When others dropped their shields, I held my shield steadfastly and remained unmoved like a stone.

Seam in muvan lai tha tuanh, sabuaivom le sing khuang thua e kamkei sial in aai.
A lu pungh lam a ka khaih, ah lam ah lengsial ka hawl pui te, tha le dam nung na ze.

A Khiaj na:
Seam in ai thei theampo ai a Muvanlai tha tuanh ah khuang le dak thua in vompui le Sahang te Sial ngo ah ai hi.
- Adorning himself with the feathers of the great eagle (Muvanlai) Seam [Muang] celebrates everything that can be celebrated - among them bears and tigers - by slaughtering mithans.

Ngal lu ka pangh ah khai kawm ah, lampi ah pua ah, sial ka hawl pui te a thi a bo le om a nung ta lai le om lai hi.
- Among those who - like me - carried the heads of enemy on both of their sides and tending mithans on the way at the same time, there are some who are already dead and some who are still alive (figuratively: among my brave contemporaries with whom I have defeated our enemies, some are already dead but some are still alive).

Kial ngil na e, va thang mual tawm ta’ng nuai zin na sawmsial e, zuk salian suang bang ka zaung hi ze.

Na tun thaaamna vangkhua suanh ta’ng Pazua thaam na e, nuai zin la meel a mu nuam ingh.

A Khiaj na:
Ngilkial manh po mual dunq ka zui leh, Dawi te khawi sa, Sazuk, Sakhi hon khat ka man ah, cia pui in ka zaung uh hi.
- Trekking along the mountain range, I found and killed deers and barking deers that were raised by the Dawite (“evil Spirits” according to traditional belief) and we carried them home.
6 (b) Ka Nu hong mat sak te khua suanh ah, ka Nu phu la zo lei ka leng Ka Pa dawi ah thi ahi manh ka ci ka law ka he bua hi. Dawite meal mu nuam bek ingh.

- I conquered the village of those who had captured my mother and revenged them, but I feel helpless against the Dawis at whose hands my father lost his life. I only want to see the faces of those Dawis.

7 (a) Taang sak taang aw ci tangh, sak taang lengh, taang thang taang aw ci,
7 (b) Taang sak ka taan le taang sak nuai kei-tangh mau ngi ngei e.

A Khiak na:
7 (a) Sa pangh tu sia, a sak sang panh pang leng, a thang sang a sa om tu muang maw zaw.
- I took a position in the north [during hunting], but I suspected that the beast might appear in the south.
7 (b) A sak sang pan ka panh le, ka panh na nuai ah, sahang mau ngi ngei.
- I took a position in the north and the tiger was roaring beneath me.

8 (a) Laizom sel in taang sak na taang aw ci e, tangsak nuai a, kei-tangh mau ngi ngei ce...
8 (b) Laizom sel ta nong cia zang kei sa awng Zangsi ka ngual ka tong el zo om ngawl.

A Khiak na:
8 (a) Pianpui laizom nei ngawl a, a sak sang panh ma ka panh, leh a thang sang na ka nuai panh ma sahang om in hong mau ngi ngei va ve hi.
- Without a brother/sister of my own I took position in the north, but the tiger appeared in the south and was roaring beneath me.
8 (b) Laizom pianpui nei ngawl nong ci, sahang awng, Sizang ka ngualtam kei pau kei kam hong el zo kua ma om ngawl hi.
- **Literal translation:** Oh, You Tiger! Although you said [to me] you don’t have a brother of your own, there is none among my contemporary fellow Sizangs who dares to oppose my words. **Figurative translation:** He claimed that there was none among his contemporary fellow Sizangs who could rival him in village/state affairs. (Or, in other words, he wanted to say that he was the most influential or powerful among the Sizangs of his time.

Laizom pianpui = brothers/sisters who are born out of a single father and a single mother
Zangsi = Sizang

NOTES

1. - See 19.6 TRADITIONAL SONGS and PREFACE in APPENDIX G for the meanings of AKAIH or LA KAIH & ANAW or LA NAW and about traditional songs.

2. Since it’s not possible to translate many verses into English literally, the Zos’ traditional ways of expressing historical facts in bio - and - autobiographical songs may surely sound very strange to those who are not familiar with Zo traditions.

3. According to the History of Lophei,** the two verses in Stanza 1 (a+b) were composed by Seam Muang himself in dedication to his elder brother and that later these were integrated into Kiim Le’s autobiographical song. This is a common practice. However, in modern times, in nearly every autobiographical
song the names of those who compose such verses in dedication to the owner of the autobiographical song are mentioned in plain text at the end of every verse. So, if Kiim Lel and Seam Muang were still alive and composed these verses today, for instance, at the end of the two verses in Stanza # 1, it would be written in plain text like this: “Verses 1 & 2 were composed by Seam Muang as a dedication to Kiim Lel.” This can be clearly seen in the English translation of Khup Za Thang’s autobiographical song into English by myself. See APPENDIX G. When an autobiographical song is sung by a group of men and women (Verse A is sung by men and Verse B by women in two different tunes), if the owner of the song himself is present, he would tell the rest whom he dedicates with which verse (or verses). But if the owner of the song is absent, then someone who knows the song owner personally or about the background history of the song will explain about the song to those who are present.

4. Stanza 2 (a) and Stanza 5 (a) were Kim Lel’s own compositions dedicating his younger brother; Pau Tual’s own remarks can be seen on pages 194 & 195: Kim Lel i Seam Muang a phua

5. This is the oldest surviving autobiographical song among the Sizangs.

6. Translated from poetic words into plain words by Pu K.T. Ngo Za Lian of Khuasak and the English translation has been done by myself. Thang Za Dal, Hamburg. 25.12.2009.

** Source: Zomi Encyclopedia, Vol. 3. pp. 164 -193 (This is a 20-Volume Encyclopedia which will be published sometime in the near future. Each volume contains approximately 500 pages.)
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Ah Khumpa (Recorder): PAU TWEL [Pau Tual], Lophei, 1940

“This book contains historical records on the origin of the Sizangs - starting from Thuan Tak, and the affairs of Lophei village, as they are remembered by Pa Khup Lian [Chief Khup Lian] and some others who are familiar with history. Although some people say that some of the events recorded herein are not accurate, nobody else in the village knows these matters better than Pa Khup Lian...I would like to request those who read and use this book to keep it safely and with care.”

My Note: A number of new generation Sizangs spell their names in the English way: For instance, Cope for Khup; Howe for Hau; Lyan for Lian; Pome for Pum; Twel for Tual, etc.

Translated from Sizang into English and prepared and converted these pages into pdfs by Thang Za Dal, Hamburg, Germany/June, 2014.
A. GFEATURES vi-CHI CHÀM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Lam Ham - Khru a. at Gám 169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Lam Pau - Khau a. at Gám 174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Khu Cà Khu a. at Gám 174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Sơ Luông - Khau a. at Gám 176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Khu Luông - Khau a. at Gám</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Nước Lô Ngoi - Đông Pthreads 184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Port - Công Hồng Sê dê 186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Suong V. Kim Lô - Th Aluminium 187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Suong V. và Lâp Lâm Khau 189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Le Kim Lo - Hoà To 194*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Le Le Lô Lùng Lo - Rài 196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. ĐỊA CHỈ VIỆT NAM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Suon mang</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Khuu ng</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Luu Quan Lam</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Nguyen Quang Lam</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Khuu Danh</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Dao Thong</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Dao Thong</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Dao Thong</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Nguyen Quang Lam</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Tran Ngoc Lan</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. a. Kim dùng xe tải vận chuyển hàng phở bằng máy. Tha hàng ra xe tải, sau đó xe tải chở hàng phở vào
    b. Sử dụng xe tải vận chuyển hàng phở bằng máy. Tha hàng ra xe tải, sau đó xe tải chở hàng phở vào
2. a. Kim dùng xe tải vận chuyển hàng phở bằng máy. Tha hàng ra xe tải, sau đó xe tải chở hàng phở vào
    b. Sử dụng xe tải vận chuyển hàng phở bằng máy. Tha hàng ra xe tải, sau đó xe tải chở hàng phở vào
3. a. Đang làm việc trong ngày là làm hàng phở. Tha hàng ra xe tải, sau đó xe tải chở hàng phở vào
    b. Sử dụng xe tải vận chuyển hàng phở bằng máy. Tha hàng ra xe tải, sau đó xe tải chở hàng phở vào
4. a. Người làm việc trong ngày là làm hàng phở. Tha hàng ra xe tải, sau đó xe tải chở hàng phở vào
    b. Sử dụng xe tải vận chuyển hàng phở bằng máy. Tha hàng ra xe tải, sau đó xe tải chở hàng phở vào

D. 16
5. Tà lâm rai và hối lê quàn sa
làn vòng le sùng khung thung ngò
kàn ke sidin ask
B. Díi phăng làm a kah khía lam
a dung sú pha baw và téc bò la
kàn räng rúh
C. Ké a giót 0 da thăng quan con
tăng rai và ràn bia saom và la
giřu bia lê suăng báng kháu báu ngòh
B. Mă lêm tham nhúa hê. Dăng khía
súng làm phá tia rúh tham nhúa và
măn di có cải và mưu nhân ngòh

7. Tăng sáp làng và ñi làng sá làng
lêng làng khéng làng xã ñi
B. Tăng sáp kap làm le làng sá mà
xị kẹi êk màu vêng ngòh
8. Lài sáp dêc làm làng xã a làng xã
ñi ñi làng sá mà kẹi êk màu
ngòh uê
Lài sáp dêc làm và a làng xã
sá què làng khéng màu ngòh
kẹi êk làng và bò om ngòh
SIZANG LABU

[Siyin Traditional Song Book]

Avawt Pa: Capt. Mun Kho Pau (Khuasak). 1954

(Compiler: Capt. Mun Kho Pau)
been in print was in the Casel and of Upper Blanca.

The only piece of China some that I have read cultural and historical books.

offered to the left behind in the compilation of such

has reached a stage at which she can no longer

ago as 17th October 1947 in London and Dublin

The Treaty for our independence was signed at Long

of the past and to create some more for posterity.

standish Gladstone to our industry and if therefore

the gap in the library self for such books is a

The death of each book is a

propers where few such books have so far appeared.

resulted in culture and history. It is hardships to con-

In the HILLS within carrying the plan

language in the HILLS which amount the plan

complile the Sino's book for lack of writing

that China can now begin to

I am delayed this instead of the fractional

By Shih Na, Chou, formerly R.O.C. N.P.

FORWARD

6. Mrs. Tho Hang Kho Chun
5. Si Tho Hang Kho Chun
4. Mr. Kho Chun Han
3. Mr. Hang Chun Pan
2. Mr. Lai Chun Han
1. Captain Tho Hang Kho Chun Han

neel ba li hli.

hong lo na la dang khi lang dam na la bo

ned same as sinque ka pe daj lan lai ba huai lan a

A null a lang ei chung khe lama kom bok sing
other language.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>26. PE Trans On La</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>25. Thru to the Pool Tp L 91.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>24. Broom Man Tmp Pll 47.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23. Thru to the Pool Tp L 38.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>22. Thru to the Pool Tp L 37.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21. Kitchen King L 36.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20. PE Pool Tp L 35.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>19. Hotel Clerk L 34.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18. PE Pool L 33.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17. VA Lk Tp L 32.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>16. Hotel Neg L 31.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15. Thru to the Pool Tp L 30.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14. Hotel Shirt L 29.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13. Hotel Towel L 28.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12. Hotel Om L 27.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11. PE Pool Tp L 26.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10. PE Pool Tp L 25.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9. Thru to the Pool Tp L 24.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8. Thru to the Pool Tp L 23.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7. Thru to the Pool Tp L 22.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6. Hotel Om L 21.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5. Hotel Shirt L 20.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4. Hotel Towel L 19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3. Hotel Shirt L 18.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2. Hotel Towel L 17.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1. Chrmn, Chrmn, Chrmn, Chrmn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**After Council**

Secretary

SEL LUN FUK
Chief Khup Lian (right), my paternal grandfather, with Rev. Za Khup, father of Vum Ko Hau (Photo taken on July 14, 1960). Khup Lian was about 90 years old when this photo was taken. He died on December 3, 1962, at Lophei. Vung Hau, the wife of Khup Lian, was from the chieftain clan of Thuklai. Her younger sister, Vum Cingh, was married to Mang Pum of Khuasak (a son of Chief Khup Pau and younger brother of Chief Khai Kam) - three of the most well-known heroes of the Siyin-Gungal rebellion (9.14 THE SIYIN-NWENGAL REBELLION - 1892-93). Rev. Za Khup was married to Giang Zam, a daughter of Chief Man Suang, paternal uncle of Khup Lian. As Khat Lian, brother of Giang Zam and the only son of Chief Man Suang, was physically disabled, the clan’s hereditary chieftainship was passed on to Khup Lian. He was the 11th generation from Chief Kim Le and also the 11th Chief in the Kim Le dynasty, which ended with Suang Hau Thang, the eldest son of Khup Lian, when the hereditary feudalism was abolished in Chinland in 1948 with the overwhelming desire of the masses. Together with other Siyin chiefs, and the Sizangs, Suktes, Kamhaus, Vaipheis, and Khuanos, Khup Lian fought some of the fiercest battles against the British in 1888-90. Gen Sir White, commander of the British expedition, made the following remark: "...the most difficult enemy to see or hit I’ve ever fought..." And once again, he fought in the Siyin rebellion. - See APPENDICES A, A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4, E, F, EE; TABLES 5/A & 5/B; 9.13.3 FORMAL SUBMISSION OF THE SIYINS and FOOTNOTE under it for more information on Khup Lian. The progenitor of the powerful Saiio chiefs who ruled most parts of present-day Mizoram for centuries was Seam Muang, the younger brother of Kim Le. See APPENDICES A to A/4; TABLES 2, 2/A, 3, 3/A, and 17.7 CLANS AND SUB-CLANS in my 804-page "paper": The Chin/ći People of Bangladesh, Burma and India: An Introduction (XXI).

NU CIANG ZAM, My Mother

My mother is the daughter of Chief Man Suang of Lophei. Chief Man Suang’s mother was Pü Tongdim Kimlai (from the chieftain clan of Bumman). My mother and wife are thus related. At one time after a war the Lophei Chief’s families resided with my grandparents at Laxman. Like my paternal grandfather, my maternal grandfather also received troubles just after the British annexation of the Chin Hills. The Chin Chief’s register recorded: “The Chief Man Suang deported as a political prisoner for urging his villagers not to surrender unstamped guns. vide Criminal case No. 21 of 1898/99 dated 12 December 1898.” (Vum Ko Hau, p. 202)

The two verses below are from Khup Lian’s 28-Stanza (56 verses) autobiographical song which are dedicated to his capture of a rifle in a hand-to-hand fighting during the British’s First Chin Expedition (1888-89), and the battles themselves, under the direct command of Gen. [later Field Marshal] Sir White. (Vum Ko Hau, p. 234).

A. Vang khua Sun tu Leido voiming, ni khat pil bang the nge,
B. At bang that ing Hauoi ing ci-ing Kawltingk tai bang la ing nge,
-Za tai ah Kansuang ing nge

Enemy attempting to capture
My Glorious Land
I scattered like pebbles
I swore that
I am the son of a highborn Noble
And killed enemies like chickens
Besides capturing an enemy gun
I am exalted among the hundreds [figuratively: the multitude]

- Photo credit: Vum Ko Hau (Illustrations 67)
- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. Updated in June 2021.
Khup Lian's Memorial Stone - erected at the top of Lophei Village. The animals drawn on the memorial stone indicate his hunting trophies: a tiger, 3 bisons (gaur), 2 leopards, 3 wild boars, several barking deers and 4 deers.

Certificate of Good Service

Presented to Khup Lian, Chief of Suangdaw and Lophei villages

Khup Lian has been Chief of Suangdaw and Lophei villages for about 30 years. He is one of the best and most influential of the Siyin Chiefs. He is highly respected and has always been of great assistance to the administration. In recognition of his long and loyal services, His Honourable the Lieutenat-Governor is pleased to present Khup Lian with a gun and this Certificate.

The 3rd June 1922

Sd. R. H. Craddock
Lieutenant-Governor of Burma
Rangoon

Note. Suangdaw was founded in 1899 and Tuivial aka Akbatum and Tuisau villages were founded in 1923 and 1924 respectively. All the four villages consisted of about 250 households in the early 1950s with vast rain and pine forests.

- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. January 2013
APPENDIX E

“Remarks. - Village [Koset = Khuasak] is inhabited by the Twuntak [Thuan Tak/Suantak] clan of the Siyin tribe. The past history of all the Siyin clans is found in the chapter dealing with the history of the Siyins. Lyin Vum [Lian Vum] governs his own village only and has nothing to say to other villages. Village was disarmed in 1891. Kuppow [Khup Pau], the ex-Chief, is in a jail in Burma and his son Kaikam [Khat Kam] is deported to the Andamans [the notorious islands off Burma's coasts in the Indian Ocean on which both political prisoners and criminals serving life-sentence were banished from the British colonial time up to the 1970s] and should never be allowed to return to the hills. The present Chief spent some months in jail in Burma in 1894 for assisting his rebel relatives. **The Twuntaks fought stubbornly in 1888-89 and again in 1892-93. They should never be allowed to leave their present village-site.** Village was destroyed in 1889 and rebuilt in 1895; it has no stockades and is easily attacked from all sides, except from the west. The notorious Aung Paw lives in this village and knows Burmese. Water is abundant in village and below village and there are several campaign-grounds.”

“Remarks. - Village [Lope = Lophei] is inhabited by the Kimlel [Kim Lel] family, an offshoot of the Twuntak clan of the Siyin tribe (see chapter on the Siyin tribe). Khuplin [Khup Lian], the Chief, has visited Rangoon. There was no village at Lope when we first occupied the hills, though the site had previously been occupied by the Kimlels. After the rebellion of 1892 the Kimlels were disarmed and allowed to build a separate village so as to weaken the Twuntaks by splitting them into two independent villages [Khuasak and Lophei]. The village is easily approached by following the excellent mule-road from Fort White to within a mile and a half of old Fort White and then dropping down on to the village. Village is not stockaded and easily attacked from all sides. Excellent camp some 250 yards south-west of village. Water is abundant in streams.” Source: The Chin Hills, Vol. II, Part III, Gazetteer of Villages, iv

---

“Lope village was founded by Somman [Sawm Mang] and destroyed by the Tashons when Lua Twam [Lua Thum] Somman's son, was Chief. Lua Twam's grandson, Kuplien [Khup Lian], rebuilt the village after the Siyin-Nwengal rebellion. The people call themselves 'Kimlel’te' to distinguish themselves from the Twuntaks of Tavak. Kimlel was an elder brother of Neyal [Nei Zal], from whom the Chiefs of the Siyin clan spring, and the Kimlels of Lope and Twuntaks are really one and the same branch of the Siyin tribe.”

Footnote on Page 129 (Carey & Tuck, Vol. I)

---

**Note 1:** In fact, Lophei was founded by Chief Kim Lel, not Sawm Mang. Kim Lel was the 4th generation and Sawm Mang the 11th generation from Suan Tak (from whom our main Clan started). Or Kiim Lel was the 3rd generation and Sawm Mang the 10th generation from Nge Ngu. And Sawm Mang was the 7th generation from Kim Lel. It has been a great puzzle for us how Carey and Tuck could have made such a fatal mistake.


* Note 2. When Lophei village was completely destroyed in a tribal war by the Falam or Tashons, the few survivors moved back to their mother village, Khuasak, in the early 1880s. Before Lophei was destroyed there were 100 households in it. Khup Lian was allowed to rebuild his native village with 29 families.

---

APPENDIX F-1

INSCRIPTION BY EX-CHIEF KHUP LIAN, LOPHEI

“I am the 15th generation down from the House of Thuan Tak who is the original progenitor of the Siyin Tribe. Being an orphan from childhood I exerted myself all alone in many enterprises by which I becamea self-made man with many and various achievements. When the British in 1888 undertook their first expedition against us I attained the age of 20 years and I played an active part in the defence against them.

When the British troops marched up to the Signalling at No. 5 Stockade the united forces of the Siyins, Sukte and Kamhau[modern term: the Tedims] made a good resistance to the British attack which was easily repulsed. On this occasion I personally captured one rifle. When the second expedition took place in 1889 the British, too well armed to be resisted against, carried the day: hence the annexation of the Chin Hills. I then rebuilt and settled in Lophei Village which was originally founded by Kim Le and was destroyed by the Tashons[also known as the Falams] in my grand-father Lua Thuam’s time. Henceforth, my hereditary chieftainship* of the Lophei clan was restored to me.

Moreover, I founded the three villages - Tuisau, Tuivil (aka Akubutun), and Suangdaw - all of which have ever since been in my jurisdiction. As I was advanced in age after my service of 40 years as Chief, my eldest son succeeded me to the chieftainship. Being highly satisfied with my meritorious and loyal services, His Honour., the Lieutenant- Governor of Burma in 1922 presented me a D.B.B.L. gun as a reward and a good service certificate. And to mention more I was given many good certificates by various Administrative officers of the Chin Hills. The Burmese text on the inscription may be translated as follows: The Sizang people who dwell in the villages of Lophei, Khuasak, Buanman, Thuklai, and Limkhai are the descendants of Thuan Tak. I belong to the fifteenth generation. The history of my lifetime has been recorded in Zo and English.” Source: Zo History by Dr. Vumson Suantak

* According to the Sizang tradition, the chieftainship was inherited by Manh Suang, the younger brother of Khup Lian's father, but as Manh Suang's only son, Khat Lian, was physically handicapped, it was passed on to Khup Lian.

Note 1. There were 100 households (85 native Lophei families, 9 slave families, and 6 families from outside that sought refuge in the village) at the time of the Tashons' attack, which should have most likely taken place sometime in the early 1800s. Only seven couples (husband/wife) and four men escaped the destruction unhurt and captivity. 180 Lopheis were killed and 30 attackers (numbered about 600) also lost their life. The rest were taken away as captives and distributed among the Tashons to be slaves. Among the survivors were my paternal great, great grandparents, Lua Thuam and Tong Dim. Those survivors had to thank En Mang of the Mang Vum Sub-clan, one of Lophei's - and also of the entire Sizangs - most famous warriors whom the Tashons were very much afraid of, for their survival - he came back on that day from a short journey to Mualbem, the seat of the Sukte chieftainship, at the invitation of the Sukte Chief. (It was never confirmed, but the Sizangs had always suspected that the Sukte Chief had invited him on that day at the request of the Tashons.) The Tashons immediately withdrew when they knew about his return. Lua Thuam was so arrogant that his fellow Sizangs did not come to his rescue when his village was attacked.

Note 2. My pregnant great, great grandmother was taken away in captivity and kept at the Chief's residence and they were (with her daughter, Za Ngiaj, who was born in captivity) treated as his own family members; however, their freedom had to be bought at a very high price. Za Ngiaj was first married to Vum Hau. When he died she married her late husband's nephew Thuk Kham of the Lumnun Sub-clan (paternal grandfather of Vum Ko Hau). She herself died soon and he married Tuang Tiin, also of the Lua Tawng Sub-clan (see Tables 8, 8/B, 8/C, Vum Ko Hau. pp. 207-8, 215, Nos. 9 & 10 on p. 217).

Note 3. Among the survivors of the raid were: Hang Suak of the Thuam Lam Sub-clan and his wife; Dong Hong of the same Sub-clan and his wife; Tawn Hang of the Hau Suang Sub-clan and his wife; Vum Suak of the same Sub-clan and his wife; Kop Kam of the Lua Tawng Sub-clan and his wife; Han Thuk of the Ngo Suang Sub-clan and his wife; Lua Thuam, En Mang, Lam Kam, and Do Khai of the Nau Lahk clan. Some 50 years before the Tashons' attack a landslide completely destroyed 17 houses of the village and several people were killed.

Note 2. Khup Lian died on December 3, 1962 at Lophei.

**SOME MORE INFORMATION ON KHUASAK AND THE SIZANGS**

**“Khuasak was attacked for two times by the combined forces of Burmans, Tashons, Zahau, Khuangli and Hualnngo [In ancient times the Sizangs very often simply collectively called the Tashons, Khuangli, Zahau and Hualnngo “the Falams” after the seat of the chieftainship.] It was completely destroyed on the first attack and 150 people of the village were either taken away or killed. This event took place in B.E [Buddhist Era] 1220 (1859) according to Burmese chronicles. The Burmans who took part in this attack were 400 men. The Khuasak villagers then moved to Muitung (close to Thuklai or later Fort White) and lived with the Thuklais where the Tashons once again attacked with a big force. In this battle Lian Bawi, one of the most powerful Chiefs of the Tashons, an uncle of the historical Chief Con Bik, who had given sanctuary to the Prince Shwe Gyo Byu and his followers, was captured and killed by the Sizangs, and the Tashons withdrew immediately.” (Carey & Tuck, Vol. 1, p. 130)**

“The Khuasaks then moved back to their old village. It was for the second time attacked again by the Tashons and Burmans from Kale State. - “The Burman version of this fight is as follows. In BE. 1228 (1867) the Kale Sawbwa [Prince] Maung Yit, at the request of the Tashons, sent an army into the hills to attack Koset. Maung Yit was in command of the forces numbering 800 men, the Tashon force numbered 1,000. Koset village was duly surrounded, but the Siyins fought so determinedly that the united forces could not take the village. Some Burmans managed to reach the village and set fire to a house, and the fire spreading, about half the village was destroyed. A parley then took place, and the Siyins promised a mithun and some grain to the Tashons, who then retired, and the Burmans considered it wise to accompany them and to return to Burma through Tashon territory. One Burman was killed in the attack and several Tashons. The fact of the Burmans retiring via Falam and leaving their rations inclines one to believe that the united forces were defeated and that No-man [Chief Ngo Mang of Khuasak] did not surrender.” (Carey & Tuck, Vol. I, Footnote 2. p. 131)


“The Burman version was given by Amat [high ranking official of Burma royal court] who accompanied the expedition is as follows: In Kashon 1239 B.E [1878] we set out to attack Koset village. Our force was 1,500 strong, divided into two columns. The first was composed of men drawn from Mingin, Taungdwin, Kale, and Yaw, 1,000 strong, and commanded by Kampat Wun [high ranking executive officer of Kampat] Maung Pauk Tun. This column marched west from Kalemyo with its objective Koset. The second column, 500 strong, was commanded by Maung Shwe Maung of Kendat, head clerk of Kalemyo; under Maung Shwe Maung were three Bos [military officers], Maung Min Gaung, Maung Tet Po, and Maung Shwe Bu. The force was drawn from the following centres: Tein Nyin 70, Legayaing 100, Kalewa 70, Yazagyo 160; besides these the Yan Aung Naing Wundok [township officer of Yan Aung Naing] sent 100 Yes Amuhdans[a sort of police] collected from the Chindwin who were commanded by the Legayaing Sitke [second-in-command of a military unit during the time of Burmese kings]. The column advanced from Nansoungpu up the Nataga stream to Tiddim, where it was met by the brothers of the Chief Kochim[Khua Cin], who guided the column south to Shwimp [Suanppi], which village the Sokte declared was not under Koppow[Khup Pau] but under Kochim. Therefore it was not attacked. Shortly after the arrival at this village news was brought in that Koppow had routed the Kalemyo force, so the column at once retreated, the Bos considering that it was not sufficiently strong to move alone against Koset. The northern column returned without fighting and made suitable gifts to the friendly Soktes. The Kalemyo column lost 27 killed and two or three were taken prisoners.”

(Carey & Tuck, Vol. 1, p. 133)

(Prepared by Thang Za Dal. June, 2014 – Updated in June 2020 for clarity)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribal Group</th>
<th>Subgroup 1</th>
<th>Subgroup 2</th>
<th>Subgroup 3</th>
<th>Subgroup 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naga</td>
<td>Sak</td>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>Zo/Meitei</td>
<td>Jingphaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1.** Tribes in *italic* are my own additions in accordance with *Zo History*, pp. 32-33

*(updated 04/2010)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2A</th>
<th>6/3/2007 D.</th>
<th>12/1900</th>
<th>7/1900</th>
<th>2/1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Loan, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name, Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
<td>Name, Name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: The table is a genealogical tree of the Zo Race. The numbers correspond to specific entries in the table.)
GENEALOGICAL TREE OF MIZO (TABLE 3)

(Thang Za Dal. Hamburg. June 2014)
TABLE 3-A


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZA</th>
<th>111</th>
<th>110</th>
<th>109</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zamuaka</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chintiema</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thangza Dal</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thangza</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepole</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelema</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fikemenka</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emenkana</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabhunana</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chintiema</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamuaka</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thangza Dal</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thangza</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepole</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelema</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fikemenka</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emenkana</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabhunana</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chintiema</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamuaka</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thangza Dal</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thangza</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepole</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Zamuaka [111] and Zamuaka [110] must be two separate persons. See the Appendices given above for explanation.

(Diagram created for this purpose by Thang Za Dal June 2019)
BOOK COVER - GENEALOGY OF THE ZO (CHIN) RACE OF BURMA

Prepared in this form by Thang Za Dal. Hamburg. May 2022
END OF SPECIAL APPENDIX
APPENDIX O

SOME OF THE BRITISH FIELD-MARSHALS, GENERALS, SENIOR OFFICERS AND ADMINISTRATORS WHO HAD PARTICIPATED OR PLAYED SOME IMPORTANT ROLES IN CONQUERING THE CHIN/ZO PEOPLE INSIDE PRESENT-DAY BANGLADESH, BURMA AND INDIA (1841 – 1919)

INDIA GENERAL SERVICE MEDAL 1854 95

“... The remaining clasps were issued for services during expeditions to nearby countries — Persia, Malaya and Burma... In addition, most of the expeditions were undertaken in very difficult terrain against determined and often fanatical resistance from tribesmen. Whilst some of the clasps are quite common, others are very scarce and some rare. The three rarest clasps in the series are "Kachin Hills 1892-93", "Hunza 1891" and "Chin Hills 1892-93". The medals were issued in silver to British and Indian troops, although from 1885 onwards bronze awards were issued to native transport personnel and followers. Medals with three or more clasps are very scarce.” Source: http://www.lightinfantry.org.uk/graphix/medals/india_general_service_medal_1854-1895.htm

MILITARY HONOURS WON DEFENDING THE RAJ

Posted in Bravery, Historical articles, History, War on Wednesday, 17 August 2011
This edited article about military honours in the Raj originally appeared in Look and Learn issue number 1024 published on 24 October 1981.

For over a century a force of 75,000 British soldiers and 150,000 Indian troops commanded by British officers governed India for the British. This was no mean achievement. India was a sub-continent with a population of some 400 million. During the whole of the British imperial influence in India, there were no really large wars, merely hundreds of tiny uprisings and punitive expeditions. Yet, for the typical British man in the ranks doing his duty under the most arduous conditions, soldiering was hard. Most men served the minimum of ten years in the country, and many their complete military service, perhaps as long as 30 years. Thousands died there, their neglected, lonely graves occupying the Christian plots in cemeteries all over India.

In recognition of each man’s service, a General Service Medal for India was struck. There were four different issues of this medal, each one covering a particular phase in the history of Britain’s relationship with India. The original purpose of the medal was to commemorate the successful campaign which took place in Burma between March 1852 and June 1852, but during the life of the medal, 23 campaign clasps were awarded.

Here they fought against the Pathans, one of the fiercest warrior races on Earth. There were also the Afridis, the Ghilzais, Baluchis, Waziris, Chitrals and Kafirs, all formidable adversaries – ruthless, courageous and cunning. The 23 clasps are as follows:- Pegu, Persia, North-West Frontier, Umbeyla, Bhootan, Looshai, Perak, Jowaki 1877-8; Naga 1879-80; Burma 1885-7; Sikkim 1888; Hazara 1888; Burma 1887-89;*, Chin-Lushai 1889-90; Samana 1891; Hazara 1891; N.E. Frontier 1891; Hunza 1891; Burma 1889-92; Lushai 1889-92; Chin Hills 1892-93; Kachin Hills 1892-93; Waziristan 1894-95.

The rarest of these clasps are, Kachin Hills, Hunza 1891, and Chin Hills 1892-93. There were no British
regiments present in the Hunza campaign: only a few soldiers from the Yorkshire Regiment served in the expedition to the Kachin Hills; and about 200 men from the 1st Battalion, Norfolk Regiment received the Chin Hills clasp. (http://www.lookandlearn.com/blog/12392/military-honours-won-defending-the-raj/)

**Note:** It's an excerpted version. tzd

----------------------------------------

**BURMA, 1889-92**

During the years 1889-90-1-2 a series of expeditions was organised to put down disturbances in Burma and Lushai; for the services rendered by the various forces the India Medal 1854, with bars for BURMA 1889-92 and LUSHAI 1889-92, were issued to the troops who took part in the following expeditions: The Pokhau expedition from April 16th to May 16th 1889; Touhon Expedition from September 17th 1889, to April 1890; Chinbok Column, January 1st to 20th, 1890; Thetta Column, January 1st to 4th 1891; Moneik Column, January 27th to March 28th 1891; Wuntho Field Force, February 18th to May 7th 1891; Tlang-Tlang[Klang-Klang] Column, March 29th to April 3rd 1891; Baungshe Column, December 25th 1891, to February 29th 1892; Irrawaddy Column, December 15th 1891, to April 18th 1892; North-East Column, December 15th 1891, to April 7th 1892.

Source: WAR MEDALS AND THEIR HISTORY
by W. Augustins Steward

* Note: Columns marked in red were against the Chins. tzd

http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=350244648956

----------------------------------------

**LUSHAI 1889-92**

**LUSHAI, 1889-92.** - The medal with bar LUSHAI 1889-92 was awarded to the officers and men campaigning the Lushai Expeditionary Force from January 11th to May 5th 1889; the relieving force under Lieutenants Swinton, Cole, and Watson, which went to the assistance of the forts Ayal and Changsil when attacked by the Lushais, September 9th to December 9th 1890; the expedition under Captain Hutchison against the Jacopa Village to avenge the attack on Mr. Murray, February 20th to March 3rd, 1891; the expedition under Captain Lock from March 1st to June 1892, necessitated by the general rising of the Eastern Lushais, and the attack at Lalbura upon a force under Mr. M. Cabe; also the force under Captain Shakespear, which advanced into the South Lushai hills between March 16th and May 13th, 1892. All dates are inclusive. Two divisions took part in this campaign, and European troops participated only with the Burma section. 1st King’s Own Scottish Borderers, and detachments of 1st Batt. Cheshire and Norfolk Regiments. The native troops were: 2nd Batt. 4th and the 42nd Goorkas; twocompanies of the Queen’s Own Madras Sappers and Miners. The troops engaged with the Chittagong column were: 2nd Goorkas, 3rd and 9th Bengal Infantry; 28th Bombay Pioneers, and a company of Bengal Sappers and Miners.

(pp. 224-225)

WAR MEDALS AND THEIR HISTORY
by W. Augustins Steward

“Chin Lushai 1889-90. Again, this bar was for punitive expeditions. Two expeditions were mounted, one against the Chins and the other against the Lushais. Few soldiers who took part in the actions remembered them with pleasure - they were fighting in the thick, uncharted jungle most of the time.”
Cambridge, p. 61
................................................................................................................................

THE CHIN FIELD FORCE (1889-90) AND THE KARENNI EXPEDITION 1888-89

Following the British victory in the Third Anglo-Burmese war, many native Burmese refused to accept the authority of the British army of occupation and resorted to guerrilla action. The guerrillas were mainly led by former officers of the disbanded Burmese royal army, village headmen and even royal princes. To the British they were not patriots but rebels and bandits, and the measures to suppress the rebels were severe and ruthless. Even those who aided the rebels were punished and British troops were responsible for many atrocities, including mass executions.

The British adopted a punitive strategy; families of the village headmen were packed off to the secure territory of Lower Burma and their villages were burned, then new villages, led by strangers loyal to the British cause, were established. The guerrillas targeted these villages, and by 1890 more than 3000 British troops were involved in the battle to maintain order and suppress the rebels' activities. Action against the Chin rebels continued when 3500 men were sent to avenge raids in the Chin and Lushai areas [beginning] on the 15th November 1889, and eventually only the sheer weight of numbers brought the military struggle to an end. Two VCs were awarded during this campaign. One of the recipients was Irish, this being Surgeon John Crimin.
http://www.irishregimentsandhistory.com/#!/irish-vcs/4543061438
................................................................................................................................

The Distinguished Service Order (DSO) is a military decoration of the United Kingdom, and formerly of other parts of the British Commonwealth and Empire, awarded for meritorious or distinguished service by officers of the armed forces during wartime, typically in actual combat.

Instituted on 6 September 1886 by Queen Victoria in a Royal Warrant published in the London Gazette on 9 November,[3] the first DSOs awarded were dated 25 November 1886.[4] It is typically awarded to officers ranked Major (or its equivalent) or higher, but the honour has sometimes been awarded to especially valorous junior officers. 8,981 DSOs were awarded during the First World War, each award being announced in the London Gazette. The order was established for rewarding individual instances of meritorious or distinguished service in war. It was a military order, until recently for officers only, and normally given for service under fire or under conditions equivalent to service in actual combat with the enemy, although it was awarded between 1914 and 1916 under circumstances which could not be regarded as under fire (often to staff officers, which caused resentment among front-line officers).

After 1 January 1917, commanders in the field were instructed to recommend this award only for those
serving under fire. Prior to 1943, the order could be given only to someone Mentioned in Despatches. The order is generally given to officers in command, above the rank of Captain. A number of more junior officers were awarded the DSO, and this was often regarded as an acknowledgement that the officer had only just missed out on the award of the Victoria Cross.[5] In 1942, the award of the DSO was extended to officers of the Merchant Navy who had performed acts of gallantry while under enemy attack.[6]
Since 1993, its award has been restricted solely to distinguished service (i.e. leadership and command by any rank), with the Conspicuous Gallantry Cross being introduced as the second highest award for gallantry. It has, however, thus far only been awarded to senior officers as before.[7]

Recipients of the order are officially known as Companions of the Distinguished Service Order. They are entitled to use the post-nominal letters "DSO". A gold bar ornamented by the Crown may be issued to DSO holders performing a further act of such leadership which would have merited award of the DSO.[7]

( http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Distinguished_Service_Order )

FIELD MARSHAL SIR GEORGE STUART WHITE

Field Marshal Sir George Stuart White (4 July 1835-24 June 1912) VC., GCB., OM, GCSI., GCIE., GCVO., was an officer of the British Army and recipient of the Victoria Cross, the highest and most prestigious award for gallantry in the face of the enemy that can be awarded to British and Commonwealth forces.

The Victoria Cross

He was 44 years old when the following deed took place for which he was awarded the VC. On 6th October 1879 at Charasiah, Afghanistan, Major White led an attack on a strongly fortified hill where the enemy force outnumbered the major’s by about eight to one. When his men became exhausted and immediate action seemed necessary, he took a rifle and, running forward alone, shot the enemy leader. This decided the issue and the enemy fled. Again, at the battle of Kandahar Major White led the final charge and personally captured one of the two guns held by the enemy, immediately after which the latter retired…”

“Educated at Sandhurst, entered the Army in 1853; served in the Indian Mutiny with the 27th Inniskilling, Fusiliers, and in the Afghan War of 1879-80 with the 92nd Gordon Highlanders...From 1886-1889, he commanded the forces in Upper Burma, his operations against the armies of dacoits and banditti and his expeditions into the Hill recesses of the Frontier tribes did much to secure the pacification of the province. On the 8th of April 1893, he succeeded Lord Roberts as Commander-in-Chief in India, a post he held until his return to England in 1897, when he was appointed Quartermaster-General of the Forces in England. In 1899 he was selected to command the British forces in Natal, South Africa. His name is especially associated with the defence of Ladysmith [The British lost 850 killed and wounded and another 800 as prisoners in this battle]...In 1885 war broke out with Burma, and White was appointed to the command of the Madras army detailed for service in the region. The capture of Mandalay was easily effected by the troops under the command of General Prendergast, and at the conclusion of the war White was placed in command of the forces left for the protection of the province...Heartily co-operating with the civil authorities, he organized a system of movable columns which gave the enemy no rest, and at the close of the first two years the
country was sufficiently pacified to allow the substitution of an organized police and military troops in the maintenance of internal order. White then directed his attention to the Frontier Tribes in the north and east and south, and was able by a series of well-planned expeditions to bring under the settled influence of British rule a tract compri-sing 50,000 square miles - a territory, that is to say, almost as large as England. “The success of these operations”, said the Government despatch, “which has involved great hardship and labour on the troops, and the satisfactory progress made towards the pacification of the country must be ascribed in a very large measure to the skill, judgment, and ability of Sir George White…”

Sir George White, after having conquered the Sizangs and some Kamhaus villages in the immediate vicinity of the Sizang region, and built up a base at Thuklai village called FORT WHITE, returned to Mandalay in mid February 1889. The base was later moved to what the Chins call “Thangmuai”, about 9 km east of Thuklai on the Letha Range. See MAPs 6, 15 & 15 for its location. tzd).

“Having learnt from Major Raikes, C.I.E., that it had been determined to leave a post in these hills for the rest of the year, and having on consultation with him come to the conclusion that our several reconnaissances north, south and west showed this to be the most central position, I select a site some 400 feet above and to the south-west of Tokhlaing (4,800 feet), which occupied not only so much ground as to make it necessary to have a large number of men on duty, but was also commanded on three sides, notably from the site where the present post is, which with the permission of Major-General Gordon, C.B., and the concurrence of the Chief Commissioner, I have called “Fort White…”

-Brigadier-General E. Faunce, C.B., Commanding Officer, Chin Field Force [First Chin Hills Expedition, 1888-89]. Source: Vum Ko Hau, p. x)

...Sir George White, in a telegram[3] to the Chief Commissioner of Burma, described the action as follows:- “Enemy yesterday attacked our working party on road above this and held our our covering party, 40 British and 100 Gurkhas, from 9 till 2, when I arrived and ordered their positions to be charged...They fired at least 1,000 rounds, standing resolutely until actually charged, even trying to outflank us...Most difficult enemy to see or hit I ever fought.”
The result of this action was a serious blow to the Siyins and they now realized that it was impossible to save their villages. The fight had taken place on one of their historic battle-fields, for it was here that they had overthrown an army sent against them by the King of Burma in former days. On 22nd January after several skirmishes, in which we suffered loss, General Faunce proceeded to the summit of the Letha range and from an altitude of 8,200 feet looked down on Siyin villages lying 3,000 feet below him. (The Chin Hills, By Carey & Tuck. p.28. See the scanned page herewith attached.)
Field Marshal Sir George S. White, VC., GCB., OM, GCSI., GCIE., GCVO.
(6 July 1835 - 24 June 1912)

Note: When he fought against the Chins in 1888-89 he was Commander of the Upper Burma Field Force with the rank of major-general. 

- 1833 born 6th July in County Londonderry
- 1833 entered the 27th Inniskilling Regiment
- 1837 Indian Mutiny
- 1863 exchanged to 92nd as Captain
- 1874 married Miss Amelia Bayley, daughter of the archdeacon of Calcutta
- 1879-80 Afghan War. 2nd in command 92nd
- 1880-81 India. Military Secretary to the Viceroy
- 1881-85 Commanding Officer 2nd Battalion Gordon Highlanders
- 1884-85 Sudan Expedition
- 1885 Egypt. AA and QMG
- 1885 Madras. Brigadier-General
- 1885-86 Commanding Brigade in Burma Expedition
- 1886-89 In Command of Upper Burma Field Force
- 1889-93 Bengal. Major-General
- 1890 Zhob Field Force
- 1893-98 Commander-in-Chief India
- 1897-1912 Colonel of the Gordon Highlanders
- 1898-99 QMG HQ of Army
- 1899-1900 GOC Natal Field Force. Lieut-General
- 1900 28th Feb. Relief of Ladysmith
- 1900-04 Governor of Gibraltar
- 1903 Field Marshal
- 1912 died on 24th June.

- See APPENDIX 0 BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF BRITISH GENERALS AND ADMINISTRATORS...

-Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. 01/2015.
and many wounded. Captain Westmoreland had sent another party under Lieutenant James to Kundu, but the Chins fled before he could come in contact with them. The pursuit was continued nearly to the foot of the hills some 7 miles off, but the enemy could not be overtaken, though many evidences of the execution done on them were visible. The detachment suffered no casualty. On its return, the villagers all turned out, cheering the men and giving expression to their satisfaction at the defeat of the Chins. On the same date Indin, the Sawbwa’s capital (10 miles south of Kalemyo), was fired into from across the river by the Siyins, while the Soktes and Kanhows attacked the military police post at Kangyi, some 20 miles north of Kalemyo, but were repulsed and pursued, our loss being one sepoy wounded.1

On the 30th December Sir George White arrived at Kambale and accompanied the force, which continued steadily advancing up the hills, the Sappers assisted by coolies making a road in their track, along which were constructed rough stockades, in which the troops slept and rations were stored. The troops found their route always heavily stockaded and the stockades generally held by the enemy, who never ceased to ambush when opportunity occurred, both day and night.

On 27th January the road-making party was again confronted by Chins. The working party was sent back to the stockade and the troops, now unencumbered, attacked the enemy, who retired slowly, making a stubborn resistance, till they reached some formidable and skilfully placed stockades, where they made a stand. Sir George White, at our stockade, hearing heavy firing in front, joined the attacking party with a small reinforcement of the 42nd Gurkhas, and at once ordered, and took prominent part in, the charge, which was “brilliantly led by Lieutenant-Colonel Skene, D.S.O.”2 Sir George White, in a telegram3 to the Chief Commissioner of Burma, described the action as follows:

“Enemy yesterday attacked our working party on road above this and held our covering party, 40 British and 100 Gurkhas, from 9 till 2, when I arrived and ordered their positions to be charged. We carried all, driving them entirely away, getting off ourselves wonderfully cheaply. Only one Norfolk dangerously wounded. Enemy in considerable numbers, using many rifles and plenty ammunition. They fired at least 1,000 rounds, standing resolutely until actually charged, even trying to outflank us. Their loss probably about eight or ten, but they were carried down the khuds at once. Most difficult enemy to see or hit I ever fought.”

The result of this action was a serious blow to the Siyins and they now realized that it was impossible to save their villages. The fight had taken place on one of their historic battle-fields, for it was here that they had overthrown an army sent against them by the King of Burma in former days. On 22nd January after several skirmishes, in which we suffered loss, General Faunce proceeded to the summit of the Letha range and from an altitude of 8,200 feet looked down on the Siyin villages lying 3,000 feet below him.

1 Brigadier-General Faunce’s report, No. 305C., dated the 23rd April 1889.
2 Captain Raikes’ diaries.
3 Telegram No. 53, dated the 28th January 1889.
- Top of Thuklai Village. The original FORT WHITE and the British War Cemetery were located here (see APPENDIX EE (p. 3), under TOLKAIING OR MWITUN [THUKLAI OR MUTUNG]. In this cemetery 12 prisoners of the Norfolk and Cheshire Regiments; Major Gordon-Cumming, Cheshire Regiment; Major Stevens, 42nd Gurka Rifles; and Second Lieutenant Mitchell, Norfolk Regiment, were buried. (The Chin Hills, Vol. II, Part III, Gazetteer of Villages, p. v). The buried here were the ones who were killed in action at Tartan (Taitan or Sialum) and also in other battles with the Sizangs (villagers of Buanman, Khussak, Lamkhai, Lophei, Phumon, Pumpi, Punva, Thangnaui, Thuklai, Voklaak, Zung, and the Vaipheis), the Kam Haus and Suites. The fort was later moved to the present site, about 9 km away eastward, and there is also another war cemetery at the new site (see Satellite Photos 2 & 3 and Photos 15 & 16). The long and white buildings are the Thuklai State High School. Mualbem village is located on the top and other side of the distant mountain range seen above left and Vangtch village is located on the other side of the distant mountain range seen above right.

"Having learnt from Major Raikes, C.I.E., that it had been determined to leave a post in these hills for the rest of the year, and having on consultation with him come to the conclusion that our several reconnaissances north, south and west showed this to be the most central position, I select a site some 400 feet above and to the south-west of Tokhlaing (4,800 feet), which occupied not only so much ground as to make it necessary to have a large number of men on duty, but was also commanded on three sides, notably from the site where the present post is, which with the permission of Major-General Gordon, C.B., and the concurrence of the Chief Commissioner, I have called "Fort White" (Brigadier-General E. Faunce, C.B., Commanding Officer, Chin Field Force [First Chin Hills Expedition, 1888-89]. Source: Vum Ko Hau, p. x)."
PHOTO 29
BRITISH WAR CEMETERY AT “NEW” FORT WHITE

In this cemetery British soldiers who were killed in action during the various military campaigns against the northern Chins between 1888-90 and 1892-93 were buried. There was also another British war cemetery at Thuklai village (the site of old or original Fort White) until the owner of the land demolished it and constructed a large house and a garden on it in the early 1960s. All the wooden crosses and stoned tombs at the site in this photo still remained almost intact up to the early 1960s. They later became the victim of vandalism and were thus destroyed. (See Photos 24&25 for the upper parts of Thuklai where the first fort and cemetery were located.)

Note. In both cemeteries only British soldiers, and not who were called the “natives“ (non-Christian Indians and Gurkhas) were buried.

- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. February 2016.
IN
LOVING MEMORY
OF
MAJOR H.F. STEVENS
42ND GOORKHAS
WHO DIED AT FORT WHITE, BURMA,
ON 28TH SEPTEMBER 1889
AGED 30
ERECTED BY HIS MOTHER, BROTHER
AND SISTER
THE LORD IS THEY KEEPER

(He was killed in a battle by Pu Kam Suak of Buanman village. Photographer: Unknown. Received from Pu David Hang Za Pome. Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. Hamburg. October 2016.)
Two Scenes around the famous Fort White (The original Fort White was located at Thuklai. See Photos 24 & 25.)

* Seen in the top picture is the 92-km Kalaymyo-Tedim motor car road. Fort White is located exactly at halfway between the two towns. The road in the foreground leads to Tedim. The Fort White garrison was located in the middle of the upper photo and the war cemetery about 150 meters below the road - also in the upper photo.

Photos: Michael Suantak. (Photos taken in 06/2009)

- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal/06.2015.
Photo taken by a CNES/Airbus satellite on February 22, 2017 - Seen from the height of 11.60 km. (A part of what is seen in this photo is generally known as the “Siyin Vallay” or a large part of the “Siyin Region”;.) The summit at bottom/left side of Photo (meeting point of six mountain ranges) is the well-known Kennedy Peak (2,703 m). It's the second highest summit in Chinland and is called in Chin Thumna. (The highest summit, Mt. Victoria (3,053 m) is located in southern Chinland.) It was on the grazing meadows around this summit and mountain ranges that Prophet Pau Cian Hau, who invented a script, which he claimed to have been given to him by the biblical God in visions around 1900, tended his father's mythuns and goats when he was still young for many years. Such historical site - Fort White (2305 m) - and villages - Lophei, Khuasak and Thuklai - can be seen here. (Mualbem village, where he lived for several years and was buried, is located close to Daakdung Buan village at far right of photo. (The distance between Mualbem and Lophei is about 12 km.) A number of other villages that are also located within the site of this Photo are invisible here. Several great battles were fought between the British and Japanese during WW II around this summit, Fort White and also in several other parts of northern Chinland. The mountain range between Kennedy Peak and Fort White and beyond is sometimes called “The Great Letha Range”. It’s well-known since the British annexation in 1889-89. The river on top right of the photo is called Manipur River. (For more information on Pau Cian Hau, see my other paper: The Chin/Zo People and Their Religions)

“The visit which made the biggest impact, however, was that of the Supreme Allied Commander of the newly established South East Asia Command, Lord Mountbatten himself, who visited the [17] division on the 11th of February [1945]. He enjoyed the trip and noted that ‘the scenery is indescribably beautiful...He recorded the view from Kennedy Peak beggars description...’” (Major-General I.L. Grant, p. 50)

Lophei, my native village, is visible on top of the photo. (Mualbem is the marked village beneath - or foreground - of Daakdungh Buan (red point). This photo was taken by three US and European satellites (Lansat, Copernicus, and CNEF/Arbus) on 22.2.2017. The scenes in this region have been replaced with photos taken in mid-2018 so that the mysterious light-figure is no more visible since then.

* Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. Hamburg. December 2019. FORT WHITE on top of the Light/figure is the new Fort White.
FIELD MARSHAL THE LORD NAPIER OF MAGDALA; GCB; GCSI; CIE, FRS.

Napier was the son of Major Charles Frederick Napier, who was wounded at the storming of Meester Cornelis (now Jatinegara) in Java on (26 August 1810) and died some months later. Robert was born in Ceylon on 6 December 1810.[1] He was educated at Addiscombe Military Academy from which he joined the Bengal Engineers at North-West Frontier...

Napier was appointed military secretary and adjutant-general to Sir James Outram, whose forces took part in the actions leading to the first relief of Lucknow on 25 September 1857. He then took charge of Lucknow's defence until the second relief, when he was badly wounded while crossing an exposed space with Outram and Sir Henry Havelock to meet with Sir Colin Campbell.[1]...In January 1860 during the Second Anglo-Chinese War, Napier assumed command of the 2nd division of the expeditionary force under Sir James Hope Grant. Napier took part in the action at Sinho, the storming of the Taku (Peiho) Forts, and the entry to Peking. For his services he received the thanks of parliament, and was promoted major-general for distinguished service in the field.[1]...

He achieved his greatest fame as an army officer when he led the expedition of 1868 against Emperor Tewodros II of Ethiopia. The Ethiopian ruler was holding a number of Protestant missionaries hostage, in his mountain capital of Magdala, as well as two British diplomats who had unsuccessfully attempted to free them... After the Ethiopian campaign, Napier received many honors. The Royal Society of London for the Improvement of Natural Knowledge inducted him as a member in 1869.[6] He received a parliamentary pension, was made Grand Commander of the Order of the Bath and a Freeman of the City of London and by way of victory title was given a hereditary peerage, Baron Napier of Magdala.[1]

Napier became Commander-in-Chief in India (1870-1876), being promoted to general in 1874. From 1876 to 1883 he served as Governor of Gibraltar. In 1877, during a tense period in European politics, he was appointed commander-in-chief of a proposed force which was to be dispatched to Constantinople.[1] On 1 January 1883 Napier was promoted to Field Marshal, and in January 1887 appointed Constable of the Tower of London.[1]

He died in London on 14 January 1890, receiving a state funeral and being buried in St. Paul's Cathedral. His eldest son, Robert William Napier (born 1845) succeeded to his barony.[1]

Note. He was Commander-in-Chief in India with the rank of lieutenant-general when he personally laid down the military strategy for the Looshai Expedition 1871-72 and supervised it.

Field Marshal The Lord Napier of Magdala

(6 December 1810 - 14 January 1890)

Place of birth: Ceylon

Place of death: London

Allegiance: United Kingdom

Service/branch: British Indian Army

Years of service: 1828 - 1890

Rank: Field Marshal

Commands held: Commander-in-Chief in India

Battles/wars: First Anglo-Sikh War

Second Anglo-Sikh War

Indian Mutiny

Second Anglo-Chinese War

1868 Expedition to Abyssinia

Awards: GCB, GCSI, CIE, FRS

Other work: Governor of Gibraltar

Constable of the Tower

*Note: During the Lucknow Expedition (1871-72) he had the rank of lieutenant-general and was already the Commander-in-Chief in India. He personally laid down the military strategy for the expedition.*

*See APPENDIX 0 BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF BRITISH GENERALS AND ADMINISTRATORS...*

Field Marshal Frederick Sleigh Roberts, 1st Earl Roberts, VC, KG, KP, GCB, OM, GCSI, GCIE, PC (30 September 1832 – 14 November 1914) was a distinguished British soldier and one of the most successful commanders of the Victorian era. He was affectionately known as 'Bobs' by the troops he commanded. Born at Cawnpore, India on 30 September 1832, Roberts was the second son of General Sir Abraham Roberts a member of the famous Waterford city family that contributed so much to the city. At the time, Sir Abraham was commanding the 1st Bengal European Regiment. Roberts was named Sleigh in honour of the garrison commander, Major General William Sleigh. His mother was Isabella, daughter of Abraham Bunbury of Kilfeacle, County Tipperary.

He was educated at Eton, Sandhurst and Addiscombe before entering the British Indian Army as a Second Lieutenant with the Bengal Artillery. He fought in the Indian rebellion, seeing action during the siege and capture of Delhi, and was present at the relief of Lucknow. In January 1858, at Khudaganj, he won the Victoria Cross...After serving with the British Army in the Umbeyla and Abyssinian campaigns of 1863 and 1867–1868 respectively, Roberts fought in the Lushai campaign (1871–1872)[in many colonial-era documents it is also spelled as Looshai] for which he was appointed Companion of the Order of the Bath (CB).... After a very short interval as Governor of Natal and Commander-in-Chief of British forces in South Africa, Roberts (having been promoted to Lieutenant-General in 1883) was appointed Commander-in-Chief in Madras, a post he held for four years. In 1885 he succeeded this appointment as Commander-in-Chief throughout the whole of India, and two years later was appointed Knight Grand Commander of the Order of the Indian Empire (GCIE). This was subsequently followed by his promotion to General in 1890, and in 1892 he was created Baron Roberts, of Kandahar in Afghanistan and of the City of Waterford.

After relinquishing his Indian command and becoming Knight Grand Commander of the Star of India in 1893, Lord Roberts two years later returned to his homeland as Commander-in-Chief of British forces in Ireland, becoming Field Marshal in 1895 and receiving the Order of St Patrick in 1897... Lord Roberts served as the last Commander-in-Chief of the British Army for three years before the post was abolished in 1904, and for the last ten years of his life was showered with yet more honours, including numerous honorary degrees and the Colonely of the National Reserve. He was a keen advocate of introducing conscription to Britain in order to prepare for a Great European War. He died of pneumonia at St Omer, France, while visiting Indian troops fighting in the First World War. After lying in state in Westminster Hall (one of two non-Royals to do so in the 20th century, the second being Winston Churchill in 1965), he was buried in St Paul's Cathedral, London...

( http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Frederick_Roberts,_1st_Earl_Roberts )
(Source: Rathbone Low, pp. iii-iv)
Field Marshal Sir Frederick S. Roberts

(30 September 1832 – 14 November 1914)

Place of birth: Cawnpore, India
Place of death: St Omer, France
Resting place: St Paul's Cathedral, London
Allegiance: United Kingdom
Service/branch: Flag of the British Army.svg British Army
Years of service: 1851 - 1904
Rank: Field Marshal
Unit: Royal Artillery

Commands held
Kuram field force
Kabul and Kandahar field forces
Governor of Natal
Commander-in-Chief of British forces in South Africa
Commander-in-Chief in Madras
Commander-in-Chief, India
Commander-in-Chief, Ireland
Command of British troops in Second Boer War
Commander-in-Chief of the Forces

Battles/wars
Umhleyla Campaign (1863)
Abyssinian Campaign (1867–1868)
Lushai campaign (1871–1872)
Second Afghan War
Battle of Kandahar (1880)
Second Boer War (1899-1902)

Awards
Victoria Cross
Knight of the Order of the Garter
Knight of the Order of St Patrick
Knight Grand Cross of the Order of the Bath
Order of Merit
Knight Grand Cross of the Order of the Star of India

"...Roberts also fought in the Lushai campaign of 1871–1872.[1]"

See APPENDIX 0 BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF BRITISH GENERALS AND ADMINISTRATORS...

FIELD MARSHAL PHILIP WALHOUSE CHETWODE, 1st Baron Chetwode, 7th Baronet of Oakley, GCB, OM, GCSI,

KCMG, DSO (21 September 1869 – 6 July 1950) was a British cavalry officer who became Commander in Chief in India. Chetwode was the son of Sir George Chetwode, 6th Baronet, and Alice Jane Bass daughter of Michael Thomas Bass the brewer. He was educated at Eton, where he was an athlete of some distinction, and entered the army through the Militia with his first commission being in the 3rd battalion the Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire Light Infantry. He then received a regular commission with the 19th Hussars in 1889,[1] giving him early acquaintance with both light infantry and cavalry.

Field Marshal Chetwood first saw active service in the Chin Hills expedition in Burma from 1892 to 1893[1] and later in the Second Boer War[1] where he took part in the defence of Ladysmith. In 1906, he became assistant military secretary to Sir John French and in 1908 was given command of a regiment in a cavalry brigade under the command of Edmund Allenby. In World War I, he served on the Western Front in smaller cavalry commands with little distinction. His 5th Cavalry brigade[1] helped cover the retreat from the frontier, and checked the pursuing Germans at Cerisy.

Later in the First Battle of the Marne, Chetwode's Brigade joined with Sir Hubert Gough to become the 2nd Cavalry division.[1] Gough had been behind the Curragh incident of March 1914 and Chetwode's willingness replace him on his temporary resignation had caused some ill feeling... With the war in Europe become bogged down in trench warfare, Chetwode was lucky to be transferred to the near East in December 1916 commanding the Desert Column[1] in the Egyptian Expeditionary Force under Sir Archibald Murray. In 1917 he commanded a Cavalry Division at the First Battle of Gaza and the Second Battle of Gaza. He married Hester (Star) Alice Camilla Stapleton Cotton and had a son and daughter. Their daughter, Penelope married John Betjeman the poet (later Poet Laureate) and had a son Paul and daughter Candida Lycett Green. Chetwode's sister Florence was married to General Birch. British

* Knight Grand Cross of the Order of the Bath (1929)
* Member of the Order of Merit (1936)
* Knight Grand Commander of the Order of the Star of India (1930)
* Commander of the Order of St Michael and St George (1917)
* Knight Commander Order of the Bath (1918)
* Distinguished Service Order (1900)
* Honorary DCL from Oxford University

Foreign
* Croix de guerre 1914–1918 (France)
* Order of the Nile, 2nd class (Egypt)
* Silver Cross of the Virtuti Militari (Poland, 15 February 1942)
* Order of the Sacred Treasure, 1st class (Japan)
  * Commander of the Legion of Honour (France)
FIELD MARSHAL PHILIP WALHOUSE CHETWODE, GCB., OM., GCSI., KCMG., DSO.

Born 21 September 1869
Westminster, London, England
Died 6 July 1950 (aged 80)
Marylebone, London, England
Allegiance United Kingdom
Service/branch British Army
Years of service 1889–1935
Commands held Commander-in-Chief, India
Chief of General Staff in India

**Battles/wars**
Second Boer War
* Siege of Ladysmith

World War I
* Western Front
* First Battle of the Marne
* First Battle of the Aisne
* Second Battle of Ypres
* First Battle of Gaza
* Second Battle of Gaza
* Third Battle of Gaza
* Battle of Jerusalem
* Battle of Megiddo

*Chetwode first saw active service in the Chin Hills Expedition in Burma from 1892 to 1893.*

- Adjusted from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philip_Chetwode,_1st_Baron_Chetwode](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philip_Chetwode,_1st_Baron_Chetwode)
- See [APPENDIX](#) for his brief biography
- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal.06/2014
critical table for the correction \( m \) to be applied to the latitudes of the end points of the loxodrome. He also discusses the errors introduced by the use of Meridional Parls as published in standard collections of navigation tables, when the further correction to the latitudes is omitted, and shows that they may in certain cases, exceed the error that would arise from treating the earth as a sphere. He evinces a somewhat uncritical preference for Hayford's Figure of 1910 over Clarke's Figure of 1880 on which most of the published tables are based; though there is certainly something to be said for using a figure that is now accepted as international.

As an aid to the graphical measurement of loxodromic distances in air navigation, the author suggests that the meridians on Mertcator charts should be divided in nautical miles rather than in degrees and minutes, both to avoid the mental arithmetic that the conversion entails and to eliminate the small differences in the lengths of degrees in different latitudes.  

F. G.

---

OBITUARY


By the death of Field-Marshal Lord Chetwode the Society has lost a valued friend and supporter. In India the late Field-Marshal had a most distinguished career, beginning with active service in the Chin Hills as a subaltern in 1892–93, Chief of the General Staff 1928–30, and ending his active Indian career as Commander-in-Chief of the Army 1930–35. In the South African war he attained his majority. He served with great distinction in the First World War, not only on the Continent but also in Egypt, Palestine and Syria. He became a full General in 1926 and Field-Marshal in 1933.

But to a later generation he became equally well-known in the arts of peace and particularly for his Chairmanship of the Executive Committee of the Red Cross and St. John Joint War Organization during eight difficult years, 1940–47. Throughout his career, his breadth of vision, his courtesy and unfailing kindnesses, won him many friends.

As Sir Philip Chetwode he succeeded Professor Balfour as President of the Royal Geographical Society in 1938. His first year of office was somewhat interrupted by absence abroad on Government business connected with the exchange of Spanish Civil War prisoners, but this was not allowed to lessen his close attention to the affairs of the Society. He was always anxious that young travellers and scientists should be encouraged and adequately supported, and it was on his initiative that the Expedition Fund was re-established.

Discussion of the best way in which the Society could adapt itself to changing times led to the setting up of a Committee on the future of the Society, which made a number of recommendations since carried out. During that year, 1938, the approach of war was increasingly apparent. As he eloquently expressed it in his speech at the Annual Dinner of 1939, he found the struggle between two opposed ways of life tremendously stimulating, and when war eventually broke out, he was determined that the Society should play its part worthily. In this spirit it was resolved that the Society's work should be maintained in London; only the more valuable books and maps were evacuated to the country, and at

The regiment was created as part of efforts by John Lawrence, Governor of the Punjab, to recruit men from the province he governed for service against rebels during the Indian Mutiny in 1857. The 20th were formed from elements of the 4th Punjabis and 5th Punjabis as the 8th Regiment of Punjab Infantry. It was formed in Nowshera by Charles Henry Brownlow, who became the regiment's first commanding officer (CO). He remained associated with the regiment into the 20th Century and became a Field Marshal in 1908.

The regiment's first overseas service came during the Second Opium War against China. After landing it was present at the successful assault on the Taku Forts on 21 August 1860. The regiment advanced with the rest of the British/Indian force, arrived at Beijing (Peking) in late September which was captured on 6 October. In 1861 it was brought into the Bengal Army line as the 24th Regiment of Bengal Native Infantry, replacing the previous 24th which had mutinied in 1857. It was renumbered the 20th later in the year.

The 20th Punjabis last overseas service before World War I came during the Boxer Rebellion. The regiment, along with many other Indian units, took part in the Allied intervention in China during the Boxer Rebellion in 1900. Its title was shortened to the 20th Duke of Cambridge's Own Punjab Infantry the following year. In 1904, the regiment was retitled in honour of Field Marshal Charles Henry Brownlow becoming the honorary colonel of the regiment, becoming the 20th Duke of Cambridge's Own Infantry (Brownlow's Punjabis).

(Source: Wikipedia)

"Sir Charles Brownlow was born in 1831, a son of Colonel George A. Brownlow. He served in the Punjab campaigns in 1848, the Hazara campaign in 1852-53, the expedition against the Momund tribes the following year, in which he was badly wounded; the Bozdar, Eusoal expeditions, the China war, the Ambeyla campaign, and commanded a column in the Looshai expedition in 1871. He was decorated several times and was aid-de-camp to the Queen from 1860 to 1861, and Assistant Military Secretary at Horse Guards from 1879 to 1889. He was knighted in 1887 and appointed a Field Marshal in 1908." (The New York Times. April 6, 1916)


GENERAL SIR ARTHUR POWER PALMER, GCB., GCIE.

Photographs Album details for shelfmark MSS Eur F108/50
Field Marshal Sir George Stuart White Collection: Photographic copies of sketches of the Chin Hills Campaign, Burma.
Photographers: Unknown
Contents: 19 prints Most approx. 175x125mm Gelatin silver prints
Provenance: Deposited on permanent loan by Lady Napier.
Description: Collection of 19 prints, guarded and filed. The collection comprises photographic copies of
sketches made during the Chin Hills Campaign of 1892-93 and sent by General Sir Arthur Power Palmer, Commander of the Expedition, to Sir George Stuart White, Commander-in-Chief in India. Most of the prints are briefly captioned by the artist, with more extensive notes, presumably by Palmer, written on the reverse. Among the subjects are: view of Fort White, a halt on the road to Fort White, Christmas dinner at Fort White, cantilever bridge erected by the Madras Sappers across the Manipur River, views on the Chindwin River, signalling station above Kaptial, Nwengal Column crossing the Manipur River, Howchinkoop (Chief of the Kanhow Tribe), Kaptial burning, bivouac on plateau above left bank of Manipur River.

http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/indiaofficeselect/PhotoShowDescs.asp?CollID=2486

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

A P Palmer joined Hodson's Horse in 1858 and took part in the actions at Nawbganj, Barabanki and in the Oudh campaign. As adjutant with the 10th regiment he went to Abyssinia.

In 1880 Palmer was appointed Assistant Adjutant-General but in Feb 1885 the regiment was ordered to Egypt so he immediately relinquished his staff job to command the 9th on this expedition which brought them the battle honour of Suakin. He was to be their CO until 1888. Afterwards his career went from strength to strength until he was appointed Commander-in-Chief in India.

25th June 1840 Born at Karnal
20th Feb 1857 Entered Bengal army
1857-9 Ensign 5th European Regiment (Indian Mutiny medal)
1858 Joined Hodson's Horse
1858 2nd Regiment of Hodson's Horse
Aug 1862 - Mar 1869 Adjutant 10th Bengal Cavalry
1869 transferred to 9th Bengal Cavalry
1885-1888 Commandant of 9th Bengal Lancers
1885 Suakin ( Medal with clasp, Kdiv'e's Star, dispatches, and CB)
Extra-Regimental duties
1874-5 Dafla expedition
1876-7 Dutch war in Achin (Dutch cross with 2 clasps)
1878-80 Afghan War - Peiwar Kotal, Khost Valley
1879 QMG with Kuram Field Force (Medal with clasp)
1880-5 Assistant Adjutant-General, Bengal
1892-3 Commanded force in North Chin Hills, Burma
8th May 1894 KCB
1897-8 Tirah Expedition (Medal with 2 clasps)
1898-1900 Commanded Punjab FF
27th June 1899 Promoted to General
Mar 1900 - Dec 1902 Commander-in-Chief in India
9th Nov 1901 GCIE (Order of the Indian Empire)
26th June 1903 GCB
28th Feb 1904 Died in London

http://www.britishempire.co.uk/forces/armyunits/indiancavalry/9thblpalmer.htm
General Palmer as Commander-in-Chief in India from 1900 -1902. He is in General's dress uniform and wears the robes of a Knight Grand Cross of the Bath.

Extra-Regimental duties
1874-5 Dulla expedition
1876-7 Dutch war in Achin (Dutch cross with 2 clasps)
1878-80 Afghan War - Peiwar Kotal, Khost Valley
1879 QMG with Kuiram Field Force (Medal with clasp)
1880-5 Assistant Adjutant-General, Bengal
1892-3 Commanded force in North Chin Hills, Burma
8th May 1894 KCB
1897-8 Tirah Expedition (Medal with 2 clasps)
1898-1900 Commanded Punjab FF
27th June 1899 Promoted to General
Mar 1900 - Dec 1902 Commander-in-Chief in India
9th Nov 1901 GCIE (Order of the Indian Empire)
26th June 1903 GCB
28th Feb 1904 Died in London

http://www.britishempire.co.uk/forces/armvunits/indiancavalry/9thbnpalmer.htm

"During the campaign in Burma in 1892-3 Palmer was once more in action, commanding the force operating in the Northern Chin Hills. He received the thanks of the government of India; he was mentioned in despatches and government orders, and was nominated K.C.B. on 8 May 1894."

- URLs obtained from Salai Van Cung Lian (UK)
  (Created in this form by thangzadal. hamburg. 01.2015)
GENERAL PALMER CONFIRMED IN THE OFFICE.

[PRESS ASSOCIATION.]

(Received March 22, 9.8 a.m.)

LONDON, 21st March.

King Edward has confirmed the appointment of General Sir Arthur Power Palmer as Commander-in-Chief in India.

[General Palmer has been provisionally in command of the Indian Army for some time past—since the death of General Sir William Lockhart. He entered the Indian Army in 1857, and served in the Mutiny campaign with Hodson’s Horse; also on the North-west Frontier in 1863; in the Abyssinian War in 1867-68; in the Duffla Expedition of 1894-95; in the Dutch War at Acheen, 1876-77; the Afghān War, 1878-9; the Soudan War, 1885; commanded the Chin Hills Expedition, Burmah, in 1892-93; and also took part in the Tirah campaign of 1897-8, where he commanded first the line of communications, and then the second division of the expeditionary force. He attained the rank of Major-General in 1895, and Lieut.-General in India in 1898, and finally became full General.]
GENERAL SIR GEORGE BENJAMIN WOLSELEY, GCB. (1907); KCB (1891); CB

Born 11 July 1839; son of Major Garnet J Wolseley, and brother of Field Marshal Viscount Wolseley, KP., GCB., GCMG., D.C.I., LL.D.; educated privately...Major-General by selection 1892; served with 84th Foot in Indian Mutiny (medal); Asst. Adj. Gen in Afghan campaign (medal and Brevet Lieut-Col)...Brigadier-General in Burma campaign, held the first Durbar in the Chin Hills for the formal submission of the following Siyin Chiefs: Chief Khup Pau of Khuasak; Chief Thuk Kham of Lunmun; Chief Kam Lam of Sumniang; Chief Pau Khai of Buanman, and Chief Mang Lun of Sakhiling [Lim Khai]. “On the 1st September 1890, at a Durbar held by Brigadier-General Wolseley, who was on inspection duty in the Chin Hills, the Siyin Chiefs formally took the oath of submission and friendship to the British Government and accepted Captain Rundall’s terms, which included the surrender of all slaves and a promise to cease raiding on the plains and cutting telegraph wires...”(Vum Ko Hau, p. 400).

- See also 9.13.3 FORMAL SUBMISSION OF THE SIYINS, and Footnote.

GENERAL SIR JAMES WILCOCKS, GCB., GCMG., KCSI., DSO

(1 April 1857–18 December 1926) was a British Army officer. Wilcocks was born in Baraut, Meerut District, United Provinces, India, the son of an officer in the East India Company's army. He was educated in England and passed out from the Royal Military College, Sandhurst in January 1878 (having only got in on the third attempt), being commissioned into the 100th Foot in the Punjab.[1]...

In 1884 he was seconded to the newly-formed Army Transport Department and posted to Assam...In 1889 he served as an intelligence officer in the Chin-Lushai expedition and in 1891 in the Manipur expedition... In June 1897 he was appointed assistant adjutant-general of the Baluchistan field force and in November 1897 second-in-command of the new West African Frontier Force as a Temporary Lieutenant-Colonel.[6] He was appointed Companion of the Order of St Michael and St George (CMG) in the 1899 New Year Honours.[7] In November 1899 he was promoted substantive Lieutenant-Colonel[8] (having received his Brevet in May[9]) and became Colonel-Commandant of the Frontier Force, being granted the local rank of Colonel in January 1900.[10] For his relief of Kumasi during the Ashanti War of 1900 he was appointed Knight Commander of the Order of St Michael and St George (KCMG) and promoted to Brevet Colonel.[11]...

After briefly serving in the South African War in 1902, he returned to India. He was promoted substantive Colonel in March 1902, although at this time he was serving as a Brigadier-General.[12] He was promoted Major-General and given a brigade in 1906[13], commanded the Bazar Valley Field Force in February and March 1908, was given command a division in March 1908[14] and promoted Lieutenant-General for distinguished service in the field following his command of the Mohmand Field Force in July 1908.[15] He was appointed Companion of the Order of the Bath (CB) in the 1907 Birthday Honours.[16] In
1910 he was appointed to the command of the Northern Army.[17] In the 1913 New Year Honours he was appointed Knight Commander of the Order of the Star of India (KCSI).[18] He was appointed Knight Commander of the Order of the Bath (KCB) in 1914.

In 1914 he was given command of the Indian Corps in France. He was appointed Knight Grand Cross of the Order of St Michael and St George (GCMG) in the 1915 Birthday Honours[19] and was promoted General in May 1915,[20] but resigned in September 1915 after friction with Sir Douglas Haig, who commanded the First Army...


* This page was last modified on 16 June 2009 at 11:30.

..............................................................

The University of Texas at AustinUniversity of Texas Libraries, Collection Travel at the Turn of the Century
Work Identifier urn:utlo:travel.1627206
Title From Kabul to Kumassi
Item Identifier urn:utlo:travel.1627206_main
Item URL http://www.lib.utexas.edu/books/travel/1627206

LEUTENANT-GENERAL SIR RICHARD HARTE KEATINGE, VC., CSI

Richard Harte Keatinge VC CSI (17 June 1825 – 25 May 1904) was an Irish recipient of the Victoria Cross, the highest and most prestigious award for gallantry in the face of the enemy that can be awarded to British and Commonwealth forces.

Keatinge was born in Dublin. He was 32 years old, and a major in the Bombay Artillery (Bombay Army), Indian Army during the Indian Mutiny when the following deed took place for which he was awarded the VC.

On 17 March 1858 at the assault of Chundaree, India, Major Keatinge voluntarily led the column through the breach which was protected by heavy cross-fire. He was one of the first to enter and was severely wounded, but the column was saved from serious loss which would probably have resulted but for the major's knowledge of the area. Having cleared the breach, he led the column into the fort where he was again wounded.
In 1868, he founded Rajkumar College, Rajkot, which opened its doors as a school for boys in 1870. From 1871 to 1873 he was Chief Commissioner of Ajmer-Merwara, and from 1874 to 1878 was Chief Commissioner of Assam. He played a crucial role in pacifying the newly conquered Lushais [modern-day Mizos]. He later achieved the rank of lieutenant general. In retirement, he settled at Horsham, Sussex, where he died in 1904.


**LIEUTENANT-GENERAL SIR BENJ. LUMSDEN GORDON, RA., KCB.**

GORDON, Lt Gen Sir Benj. Lumsden RA KCB, third son of late Capt James Gordon of Ivybank, Nairnshire
Born at Revack 08 July 1833 bap. Jul. 31, at Abernethy, Moray; Educated at Edinburgh and Addiscombe; nominated for "Honourable East India Company Service", by W. J. Eastwick on recommendation of his mother.

**MILITARY SERVICE**

Sir Benjamin Lumsden Gordon
1852, Jun. 12, 2nd Lt., H.E.I.C.S. (Madras Art.)
1857-8, Hoprse Artillery in the Indian Mutiny, present at relief of Lucknow, including operations at the Martinere and Dilkosha, Dec. 6, action and defeat of Gwalior Contingent at Cawnpore, and pursuit (Medal with clasp).
1858, Apr. 27, sen 2nd Lt to 1st Lt. : source Bombay Times
1860, Feb 02 Married Laura S, daughter of R R Caton, of Binbrook, co Lincoln
1863, Jun. 5, 2nd Capt., R.A.
1868, May 28, Capt.
1872, Jul. 5, Maj.
1875, Apr. 1, Lt. Col.
1880, Apr. 1, Bt. Col.
1879-80, served in Afghan war, battle of Charasiah, and operations round Kabul (Medal, two clasps).
Commander R.A. in Sir Roberts' advance on Kabul
1881, Feb. 22, C.B.
1883, Mar. 31, Col.
1884, Mar. 31 Brig. Gen. (temp.), Madras; Jun. 10, -sep 13 reward for distinguished services; Sep. 14
1886-7, served in Burmese Expedition, cmd. in Lower Burma Div.; thanked by Govt. of India (Despatches, Medal with clasps) (L.G.,1887, Sep. 3).
http://www.jccglass.me.uk/lines/caton-info9a.html

LIEUTENANT-GENERAL SIR HENRY D'URBAN KEARY, KCB., KCIE., DSO.

(28 April 1857-12 August 1937) was a British Indian Army officer, who served in a number of colonial conflicts before commanding an Indian division during the First World War.

Early life Henry D'Urban Keary was born on 28 April 1857, the fourth son of William Keary, the manager and agent of the Holkham Hall estate in Norfolk, and his wife Anna (née Anna D'Urban Rodwell). [1] He was educated at Marlborough College before attending the Royal Military Academy, Sandhurst; on passing out from Sandhurst in 1876, he was commissioned into the 2nd Battalion of the Suffolk Regiment as a second lieutenant. Later the same year, he was transferred to the Staff Corps and posted to India, where he took up a commission in the 1st Madras Native Infantry. Indian service Keary was promoted to Lieutenant shortly after his arrival, in 1877, and served with his regiment in the Second Anglo-Afghan War in 1879-8 and the Third Anglo-Burmese War in 1885.

From 1887 to 1892, with a promotion to Captain, he raised and then commanded a battalion of military police in Burma, as part of the operations to secure British control in the newly annexed country. During this time, he was involved in the operations against Wuntho in 1891, where he was awarded the Distinguished Service Order as well as being mentioned in despatches. In 1892, he was given a brevet promotion to Major and appointed to command the 31st Madras Light Infantry, which was involved in suppressing a rebellion in the northern Chin Hills in 1892-93. It later served in China (renamed the 31st Burma Light Infantry) as part of the Western relief force during the Boxer Rebellion, where Kearney was again mentioned in despatches.

His brevet promotion was confirmed in 1897, and he was subsequently promoted to Lieutenant-Colonel in 1903 and Colonel in 1906. He relinquished command of the regiment (now named as the 91st Punjabis) in 1909, when he was appointed to command the 2nd Infantry Brigade of the 9th (Secunderabad) Division; in 1910, he transferred to the Garhwal Brigade of 7th (Meerut) Division. From 1907 to 1912 he served as an aide-de-camp to the King, and in 1911, he was promoted to Major-General and made a Companion of the Bath.  
GENERAL Sir R. C. STEWART, K.C.B., C.B.

He had already reached the rank of major-general and was General Officer Commanding Burma/Commander-in-Chief in Burma when he personally supervised the Chin-Lushai Expedition 1889-90 and also the Siyin-Gungal Rebellion 1892-93.

“After fourteen hours! continuous march the column reached Botung, and the next day Captain Rose and I [Bertram Carey] proceeded to Mobingyi [Mualbem] and arrived the next afternoon (10th April [1892]) at Fort White and had the good fortune to find there the General Officer Commanding Burma, General Stewart. (The Expeditions of 1891-92: March to the Lushai Country. The Chin Hills by Carey & Tuck, pp. 70-71 and see also 9.11.5 The Siyin Rebellion)

“...With matters at this stage the General Officer Commanding [Brigadier-General Palmer] returned to Fort White to meet the Major-General Commanding Burma.” (ibid p. 88)

LIEUTENANT-GENERAL SIR WILLIAM PENN-SYMONS, KCB., CB.

Born July 17, 1843; son of William Symons: educated privately; joined 24th Regt. 1863); served in the Kafir and Zulu wars 1878-79; to India 1880; AAG for musketry, Madras 1882; DAQMG in the Burmese expedition 1885-86; commanded mounted infantry; Brigadier-General in the Chin Field Force; commanded the Burma Column in Chin-Lushai Expedition 1889; C.B. 1890; AAG for musketry, Bengal, 1893; commanded as Brigadier in the Panjab 1895; a Brigade in Waziristan 1894; Tochi 1898; and a Division in Tirah 1897-98; commanded the forces in Natal 1899; died October 23, 1899 of his wounds at assault of Talana Hill. (Vum Ko Hau, p. 401)

“The Battle of Talana Hill”, also known as the Battle of Glencoe, was the first major clash of the Second Boer War. A frontal attack by British infantry supported by artillery drove Boers from a hilltop position, but the British suffered heavy casualties in the process, including their commanding general Sir William Penn-Symons.

Reinforcements sent to Natal by Britain immediately before the outbreak of war had moved into the northern path of the province of Natal, but not far enough forward to occupy the passes of the Drakensberg mountains. As a result, the Boers could invade Natal from three sides. Lieutenant-General Sir George White in command of forces in Natal requested that forces at Glencoe (Dundee) be withdrawn to concentrate his forces at Ladysmith where he held the bulk of the British garrison. The Governor of Natal considered it necessary to hold the position for political and economic reasons, so he dispatched Lieutenant-General Sir William Penn-Symons to take control of the troops at Glencoe. War was declared at 5pm on 11 October with the Boers invading on the 12 October.”


...1889/90 nahm er als Führer der Burma-Kolonne an der Chin-Lushai-Expedition teil, wofür er am 14. November 1890 zum Companion (CB) des Order of the Bath ernannt wurde...”

(The above German text is translated into English by Thang Za Dal: “In 1889/90 he took part in the Chin-Lushai-Expedition as the Commander of the Burma Column for which he was appointed Companion of the
General Symons, whose skill won for the British the battle at Glencoe, and who our cables this morning report has died from the effects of his wound, has had a fine record. He was created K.C.B last year. He was born in Cornwall in 1843, being the eldest son of the late William Symons, of Hatt. He was educated privately, and entered the army in 1863. Deceased became a colonel in 1887. He served against the Galekas in 1877-78, and in the Zulu war the following year, for which he received the medal and clasp; Burmese Expedition, 1885-89; Brigadier-General Chin Field Force (medal with clasp); Chin Lushai Expedition, 1889-90 (C.B.); commanded a brigade, Waziristan Field Force, 1894-95 (clasp); commanded the 2nd brigade in the Tochi Field Force, and the First Division of the Tirah Expeditionary Force, 1897-98, being decorated for his services in the latter campaign, and appointed commander of the Sirhind District, Punjab. The loss of such a great soldier will cast a gloom not only on the British forces at present in South Africa, but the news will be received with the deepest sorrow throughout the Empire.
SIR ALEXANDER MACKENZIE. K.C.S.I

Death of Sir Alexander MacKenzie
The Scotsman
12th November 1902, pg. 11

The “Birmingham Daily Post” of yesterday says: Much regret will be felt in Birmingham at the announcement of the death of Sir Alexander Mackenzie K.C.S.I. who though not born within the borders of the city and for many years absent from it is still remembered as one of the brilliant band who have made King Edward’s School famous throughout the land... Sir Alexander was born at Dumfries in 1842 but he came to Birmingham at an early age on his father the Rev. J.R. Mackenzie M.A., D.D., accepting the pastorate of the Presbyterian Church, Broad Street...

His school career was distinguished, the Lea, Chance, and Keary prizes falling to him, and in 1859 he secured a founder’s exhibition, with which he entered Trinity College, Cambridge...He determined to enter the Indian Civil Service and at the examination in June 1851, he obtained second place, and probably would have been first but for an attack of illness during the examination. His B.A. degree was taken in 1862, and in the same term he also carried off one of the Hooper Silver Goblets for English declamation.

He landed in India in December 1862, and was soon after selected to work in the legislative and home departments of the Secretariat of the Government of India. While thus engaged Sir Alexander studied the native languages, and won large rewards for passing in Hindustani and Bengali within four months of his arrival, and subsequently for high proficiency in Bengali. He was thereupon selected by Sir Henry Harrington, legislative member for Bengal, to act as his private secretary, and assist in the revision of the great code of civil procedure.

Later – February 1865 – he was appointed Under Secretary to the Bengal Government, and a year or so later Junior Secretary...In September 1881, he was appointed by Lord Ripon to be Home Secretary to the Government of India, and in 1884 Lord Ripon offered him the Chief Commissionership of Assam in view of the fact that he had in the Bengal Office made the frontier affairs of that province a special study. His “History of the North-east Frontier” is, indeed, the standard official work on the subject...

He continued to fill the post of Home Secretary under Lord Dufferin, and in 1885 was selected by that Viceroy to be the next Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces. In January 1886 he accompanied Lord Dufferin to Mandalay to assist in the task of organising the newly-conquered territory of Upper Burma, whence he left for England on a year’s furlough. In May 1886 Queen Victoria pinned on his breast the jewel of a Companion of the Star of India... In November 1890 he was chosen by Lord Landsdowne to succeed Sir Charles Crosthwaite in the government of Burma...In January 1891 he was created a Knight Commander of the Star of India. He returned to his Indian work, and in 1895 became Chief Commissioner in Burma.

URL: www.brebner.com/obituaries/alex_mackenzie_obit.pdf
(Assistant Commissioner, Burma, and Political Officer, Chin Hills)

Person Sheet
Name Bertram Sausmarez Carey
Birth 21 Jan 1864
Death 14 Jul 1919 Age: 55
Ref Number Hh11
Father Alfred Henry Carey (1831-1880)
Mother Emily Ellen Hunt (1834+)
Spouses: Mary Harriet Chepmell
Birth 12 Nov 1865
Ref Number Hh11a
Father Dr Isaac Dobree Chepmell
Mother Isabella Morrison
Marriage 6 Jun 1895
Children: Bertram Chepmell (1897-1918)
Mary Judith De Beauvoir (1900-1901)
Rupert Sausmarez (1904-1981)
Notes for Bertram Sausmarez Carey
Educated at Bedford Grammar School, went out to Burma as Inspector of Police in 1886, promoted in 1887 to the Burma Commission for good work in connection with Dacoit hunting. Political Officer in the Chin hills from 1889-1895; twice officiated as Superintendent Political officer in the Southern States; went to Delhi, as attaché for Burma, at the Coronation Durbar, 1902-3; was Deputy Commissioner at Myingyan, Mogok (Ruby Mines) and Rangoon; Commissioner in Mandalay, Akyab and Sagaing.

War Services: Burma Expedition, 1885-7, Frontier Medal and clasp; ditto, 1887-9, clasp; Chin Lushai Expedition, 1889-90, clasp; Lushai Expedition, 1889-92, clasp; Chin Hills, 1892-3, clasp; took part in the march to Manipur, 1891, and later to Lushai to relieve Captain Shakespeare, who was invested; mentioned in despatches many times, and received the congratulations of the Government of Burma, and thanks of Governments of India, Bengal and Assam. He served in the Upper Burma volunteers, from 1889 to 1913, commanding the regiment in 1913, when he retired as Major on account of his ill heath. he gained the Volunteer Officer's Decoration, 1908. Invalided home in 1910, and at one time his life was despaired of, but he recovered at last sufficiently to return to Burma in 1911, and put in nine years of good work.

During the Great War he worked hard at recruiting Labour Corps for service in France, consisting of 1000 Burmans and the same number of Chins, thereby releasing 2000 Europeans for the fighting line. He was again seriously ill in 1917, but he continued in harness until Aug 1918, when his doctor insisted on his retirement. As it was still war-time, he could not return to England at once, but went to the Hills at Maymyo where, in Sep, he heard of the death in France of his soldier son. He returned to England in Feb 1919, and died at Worthing in July of the same year. For the services he was thanked by the Government of India,
receiving in addition the following Medal honours:

**SPECIAL NOTE BY THANG ZA DAL:** He and Mr. H.N. Tuck, Extra Assistant Commissioner, Burma, and Assistant Political Officer, Chin Hills, had authored one of the most authoritative books on the Chins:

*THE CHIN HILLS – A History of the People, Our Dealings With Them, Their Customs and Manners, and a Gazetteer of Their Country.*

Last Modified 3 Mar 2002 Created 14 Aug 2008 by Paul Dobree - Carey
http://www.careyroots.com/PS03/PS03_491.htm
http://www.careyroots.com/medals.html#India1852
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**LIEUTENANT-GENERAL SIR ARTHUR PURVES PHAYRE, GCMG, KCSI, CB**

(7 May 1812 - 14 December 1885) was a career British Indian Army officer who was the first Commissioner of British Burma, 1862-1867, Governor of Mauritius, 1874-1878, and author.

Phayre was born in Shrewsbury and educated at Shrewsbury School. He joined the Indian Army in 1828. In 1846 he was appointed assistant to the commissioner of the province of Tenasserim, Burma, and in 1849 he was made commissioner of Arakan. After the Second Anglo-Burmese War (1852), he became commissioner of Pegu. He was made a Brevet Captain in 1854 and in 1862 he was promoted to Lieutenant-Colonel.

In 1862 Phayre was made commissioner for the entire province of British Burma. He left Burma in 1867. He served as 12th Governor of Mauritius from 21 Sep 1874 to 31 Dec 1878.[1] He was appointed a CB in 1864, promoted to Colonel in 1866 and was knighted with the KCSI in 1867. In 1871, he was promoted to Major-General and was promoted to Lieutenant-General in 1873. He retired to Bray in Ireland and was appointed a GCMG in 1878.

http://www.worldstatesmen.org/Myanmar.htm

---


Royal Artillery, later Commander-in-Chief in Mesopotamia and Quarter-Master General in India
(a) Distinguished Service Order, V.R., silver-gilt and enamels, complete with top suspension brooch
(b) India General Service 1854-94, 2 clasps, Burma 1889-92, Chin Hills 1892-93 (Lieut. G. F. Macmunn, No. 6 Bo. Mt. By.)
(c) India General Service 1895-1902, 3 clasps, Punjab Frontier 1897-98, Samana 1897, Tirah 1897-98 (Lieut. G. F. MacMunn, No. 1 Kashmir Mn. By.)
(d) Queen’s South Africa 1899-1902, 3 clasps, Cape Colony, Orange Free State, Transvaal (Major G. F. MacMunn, D.S.O. R.F.A.)
(e) King’s South Africa 1901-02, 2 clasps, South Africa 1901, South Africa 1902 (Major G. F. MacMunn,
D.S.O.R.F.A.)

(f) 1914-15 Star (Bt. Col. G. F. Macmunn, D.S.O.)

(g) British War and Victory Medals, with M.I.D. oak leaf (Maj. Gen. Sir G. F. MacMunn)

(h) General Service 1918-62, 1 clasp, Kurdistan (Maj. Gen. Sir G. F. MacMunn)

(i) Defence Medal 1939-45, unnamed as issued

(j) Delhi Durbar 1911, unnamed as issued

(k) Jubilee 1935, unnamed as issued

(l) Legion of Honour, Officer’s breast badge, gold and enamels

(m) Royal Artillery Institution, silver prize medal, 47mm (Lieut. G. F. MacMunn, D.S.O., R.A.)

(n) The King’s Medal, Royal Society of Arts, Manufacture and Commerce, G.V.R., silver, 55mm (Lieut-General Sir G. F. MacMunn, K.C.B., K.C.S.I., D.S.O., for the Sir George Birdwood memorial Lecture “The Romance of the Martial Races of India”. Session 1931-32) contained in its fitted presentation case, the first thirteen on original ‘Court’ mounting as worn, some minor enamel chipping but generally very fine or better

Footnote

George Fletcher MacMunn, the eldest son of Surgeon J. A. MacMunn, P.M.O., Chelsea Hospital, and Charlotte, daughter of the Rev. George Mathias, Chaplain Royal, was born on 14 August 1869, and brought up at the Royal Hospital, ‘in the heart of all the glory and pathos of Army tradition’. His nurse was the widow of a Sergeant in the 32nd Light Infantry and had been through the Defence of the Lucknow Residency; and his childhood companions men who had served from Waterloo to Lucknow - ‘old James McKay of the ‘Forty-Twa’, John Irby who had lost a leg in the Quarries at Inkerman, Johnnie Green of the Rifle Brigade, all scars and wounds from the Mutiny ... and so forth’. Educated at Kensington Grammar School and ‘The Shop’, he was commissioned.

He was twelve times mentioned in despatches, and given the Brevet of Colonel on 1 April 1915. He became Major-General and a C.B. in 1916; a K.C.B. in 1917; a C.S.I. in 1918; and a K.C.S.I. in 1919. In the latter year he was appointed General Officer Commanding-in-Chief in Mesopotamia. In 1921 he returned to India as Quartermaster-General with ultimate responsibility for all movements and quarterings, supply and transport, and the holding and distribution of all war stores, and remounts. He retired in 1925 and from 1932-38 held command of the Royal Hospital, Chelsea. He served with the Home Guard during 1940-42. Sir George MacMunn was the author of several well known books on Indian and military subjects, most notably The Armies of India published in 1911, Martial Races of India (1933), and History of the Sikhs Pioneers (1936). Lieutenant-General Sir George MacMunn died on 23 August 1952, aged 83.

...............................

Refs: The Distinguished Service Order 1886-1923 (Creagh); Behind the Scenes in Many Wars (MacMunn).

Dix Noonan Webb

Email: auctions@dnw.co.uk

http://www.dnw.co.uk/medals/auctionarchive/viewspecialcollections/itemdetail.lasso?itemid=42168
MAJOR-GENERAL SIR RICHARD WESTMACOTT, K.C.B., D.S.O.

MILITARY MEDALS, GROUPS AND SINGLE DECORATIONS FOR GALLANTRY AND DISTINGUISHED SERVICE, A very good Victorian General Officer's Chin-Lushai D.S.O. group of 9 to 11 to Major-General Sir Richard Westmacott, K.C.B., Indian Army, comprising: The Most Honourable Order of the Bath (K. C.B.), Military Division, Knight Commander's neck badge, in silver-gilt and enamel, and breast star, in silver, with gold and enamel appliqu' centre, in Garrard's fitted case of issue; Distinguished Service Order, Vic., in silver-gilt and enamel; Diamond Jubilee, 1897, silver; Delhi Durbar, 1903 (both unnamed); Afghanistan, 1878, no clasp (Maj., Tran. Ser.); Egypt & Sudan, 1882, rev undated, 2 clasps, Suakin 1885, Tofrek (Lt. Col., 28th Bombay Infry.); India General Service, 1854, 1 clasp, Chin-Lushai 1889-90 (Colonel, 28th Bo. Inffy.); India General Service, 1895, 2 clasps, Punjab Frontier 1897-98, Tirah 1897-98 (Brigdr. Gl. Sir, K.C.B., D.S.O., I.S.C.); Khedive's Star for 1884-6, the group courtmounted for wearing in order as listed, a few contact marks but generally extremely fine and contained in an old case. (9) D.S.O. London Gazette: 14 November 1890. Richard Westmacott, Lieut.-Colonel and Colonel, India Staff Corps. "For services in the Chin-Lushai Expedition." Major-General Richard Westmacott, K.C.B., D.S.O. (1841-1925) was educated at Rossall and entered the Bombay Army on 19th March 1859. In 1860, he was in action against rebel Bheels in Gujarat and in 1868 took part in the operations against the rebel Naikras, including the action at Warak, for which he received the commendation of the Government of India (G.P.O. 161, 1868).

During the Afghan War of 1878-1880, he was appointed Road Commandant in command of troops on the vital Lines of Communication between Quetta and Kandahar, took part in the frequent engagements in the Khozak Pass and was also present at the relief of Kandahar (M.I.D.). He then served in the Sudan in 1885, participating in the operations at Suakin, Hasheen and Tofrek, also taking part in various attacks on convoys and in the advance on Tamaai (M.I.D. London Gazette: 25 August 1885). Made Lieut. Colonel in 1885 and Colonel in 1889, Westmacott served with the Chin-Lushai Expedition of 1889-1890 commanding an advance column on Haka for which he was again M.I.D. and also awarded the D.S.O. Created a Companion of the Bath in 1891, he commanded the 28th Bombay Pioneers, 1889-1895, and the 1st Brigade of the Mohmand Field Force in the action at Bedmanai amongst others on the North West Frontier.

Served with the Tirah Expedition in 1897-1898, commanding the 4th Brigade at both actions at Dargai and many other locations, all of which combined to bring a well-deserved K.C.B. when the campaign ended as well as further M.I.D.'s. Promoted Major-General in 1899, he commanded a First Class District at Mhow, 1900-1903, after which he retired from active service. Despite the authors' statement that Westmacott received a Mutiny medal it seems probable that this was simply an assumption on their part as there is neither evidence nor confirmation that he was entitled to that award and the group offered in this catalogue is just as the recipient wore it until his death. £4000-6000

http://www.artfact.com/auction-lot/military-medals,-groups-and-single-decorations-fo-1-c-1ec0g8xcgr
MAJOR-GENERAL ALBERT FYTCHE, C.S.I.

General Fytche, later Chief Commissioner of British Burma, was born in 1823 and educated at Rugby and Addiscombe. At the age of sixteen he obtained his commission in the Bengal army, and (like many distinguished men) commenced work in earnest at an early age. Before he was twenty, while serving as a lieutenant in the Arakan Local Battalion, he did credit to Rugby and Addiscombe while gaining his first laurels (1841) by routing out and punishing a wild hill-tribe known as the Walleng (Whualngo Lushai Chin) who had committed several raids on the British frontier. It was a difficult service. The position to be attacked was on a precipitous mountain, 4,000 feet high, with sides so steep that the inhabitants of the place could only ascend it by ladders. In the face of strong opposition Lieutenant Fytche dislodged the enemy, and for this gallant attack received the thanks of the British Government. In 1845 he joined the Commission of Arakan...The tribes on the Arakan frontier and region beyond - wild, savage people, of a very primitive type - occupied General Fytche's attention...” (Vum Ko Hau, p. 404)

MAJOR-GENERAL DONALD MACINTYRE, VC., F.R.G.S.

Born 1832; educated at Addiscombe; entered the army 1850; with the 66th Gurkhas in the Peshwar frontier expedition: 1852-64; with the Gurkhas in the Lushai-Chin expedition 1871-72; gained the V.C., climbed over a stockade 8 to 9 feet high under heavy fire; Brevet Lieut-Colonel; in the Afghan war 1878-79 commanded 2nd Gurkhas in the Khyber and in the Bazar valley; retired as Major-General 1880; F.R.G.S., wrote Wanderings and Wild Sports on and beyond the Himalaya Himalaya; died April 15, 1903. (Vum Ko Hau, p. 401)

Donald Macintyre VC (12 September 1831-15 April 1903) was a Scottish recipient of the Victoria Cross, the highest and most prestigious award for gallantry in the face of the enemy that can be awarded to British and Commonwealth forces. He was 40 years old, and a major in the Bengal Staff Corps, Indian Army, and 2nd Gurkha Rifles, Indian Army during the Looshai Expedition, India when the following deed took place for which he was awarded the VC.

On 4 January 1872 during the Looshai[Lushai] Campaign, North-East India, Major Macintyre led the assault on the stockaded village of Lalghoora[Lalngura]. He was the first to reach the stockade, at that time about 9 feet high, and successfully stormed it under heavy fire from the enemy.[1]


Major Donald Macintyre, 2nd Gurkha Rifles, India - 4th January 1872

"For his gallant conduct at the storming of the stockaded village of Lalghoora (in Looshai) on the 4th January, 1872.

Colonel MacPherson C.B., V.C. Commanding the 2nd Goorkha Regiment, in which Lieutenant-Colonel Macintyre was serving at the time as second in command, reports that this Officer, who led the assault, was the first to reach the stockade (on this side from 8 to 9 feet high); and that to climb over and disappear among
the flames and smoke of the burning village, was the work of a very short time. The stockade, he adds, was successfully stormd by this Officer under fire, the heaviest the Looshais delivered that day”.
London Gazette 27 September 1872
http://www.army.mod.uk/gurkhas/14281.aspx

MAJOR-GENERAL SIR THEODORE FRASER, KCB,CSI, CMG
15 June 1865(1865-06-15) – 22 May 1953 (aged 87)

Major-General Sir Theodore Fraser KCB,CSI, CMG was a British soldier of the Royal Engineers, serving for most of his career with the Indian Army. He was born on 15 June 1865 in Inverness, Scotland to parents Rev. Donald Fraser D.D. and Theresa Eliza Isabella Gordon, the fourth daughter of Major-General Alexander Gordon of the Royal Engineers. Education and career From University College School he went to Clare College, Cambridge,[1] obtaining his commission direct into the Royal Engineers in February 1886. Indian service soon brought him experience of frontier warfare. He was in the Chin-Lushai expedition of 1889-90 and the Hazara expedition in 1891. In May, 1916, Colonel Fraser was appointed the administrative role of General Staff Officer Grade 1 (G.S.O.1) of the newly-formed 15th (Indian) Division, stationing on the Euphrates front until October of that same year where he was again transferred to the III Corps as Brigadier-General General Staff.

He led the Corps through the Battle of Kut, and the manumaneuvre leading to the occupation of Baghdad, and then the operations on the Adhaim in April, 1917...He assumed the command of the 15th Division in September 1918, the 18th Division in the following March, and promoting to Major-General in June 1919. He was engaged in the Kurdistan operations of 1919-20, and relinquished command in October, 1921, From March to November, 1922, he commanded the forces in Iraq, but was not again employed until May 1924, when he was appointed General Officer Commanding (GOC) Malaya. He performed his tour of duty in Singapore for the next three years until his retirement on 9 June 1927, with Major-General C.C. Van Straubenzee, KBE, CB, CMG (1867-1956) replacing him as the next GOC Malaya on 16 June, 1927.

National Library Singapore
NLB I National Library I Public Libraries
(The Singapore Free Press and Mercantile Advertiser (1884-1942), 12 May 1924, page 6)
Major-General Sir Evan Theodore Fraser, K.C.B., C.S.I., C.M.G, who has been appointed to the command of the troops in Malaya, is a distinguished officer who passed his service in the Royal Engineers. He was commissioned in the Royal Engineers in 1886, reached the rank of colonel in 1916, and major-general in June, 1919. His first active service in the Chin-Lushai Expedition, 1889-90 (medal with clasp); followed by the Hazara Expedition, 1891 (clasp); North-West Frontier Expedition, 1897-1900 (mentioned in despatches, brevet majority, Queen's medal with three clasps); and the Great War. He was in India when the war opened, and at first officiated as Embarkation Officer, after which he took the duties of Assistant Adjutant and
Quartermaster-General of the Lahore Division, leaving Bombay for Egypt in charge of the advance party for the disembarkation of the Indian troops for France. In succession he was a brigadier-general and divisional commander in Mesopotamia. Mentioned several times in despatches, 1914 Star, K.C.B., C.S.I., and C.M.G., and promoted colonel and major-general.

http://newspapers.nl.sg/Digitised/Article/singfreepressb19240512.2.29.aspx
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MAJOR-GENERAL SIR PHILLIP MAINWARING CARNEGY, C.B., GOC

Infantry Brigade (1858-1927) Dollar Academy, Cheltenham College, RMC Sandhurst Indian Army
Phillip Mainwaring Carnegy was the son of Major-General P A Carnegy. He was commissioned in the 67th Foot[later 2nd Battalion Hampshire Regiment] on 30 January 1878, but transferred to the Indian Army in 1884. He saw a great deal of active service in the brush fire wars of the Indian Empire, including Afghanistan (1878-80), Burma (1885-6 and 1889), the Chin Lushai Expedition (1888-90), Manipur (1891), Chitral (1895), the Tirah Expedition (1897-8) and China (1900) and was twice wounded. By the time the European War broke out he had advanced to major-general and was commanding the 8th (Jullundur) Brigade, part of the 3rd (Lahore) Division. He was 53. Carnegy deployed to France with his brigade in September 1914. Indian troops were used piecemeal in the desperate fighting round Ypres and suffered grievously in the wet winter of 1914-15. Carnegy was replaced in January 1915 by a British officer, Peter Strickland. He retired from the army in 1919 and was knighted in 1921.

http://www.firstworldwar.bham.ac.uk/donkey/carnegy.htm

---

MAJOR-GENERAL WILSON-WRIGHT OF COOLCARRIGAN, CB., CMG.

In 1649 Cromwell's army landed in Dublin. Among these was a 34-year-old soldier from Royston in Yorkshire, a captain in the army, by name of James Wright (1615 - 1700). Nothing is known of his father John; his mother Margaret Wright was a daughter of Richard Ratcliffe, also of Royston, Yorkshire.

At the time of the Cromwellian invasion, Captain Wright had a small son, William, but his first wife Jane Owen had died in 1641, shortly after their marriage. On 1st July 1661, Captain Wright was granted lands at Golagh in Co. Monaghan. However, his connection with Monaghan seems to have run considerably further back for in 1650 he took as his second wife Mary Slacke, daughter of John Slacke of Slacke's Grove in County Monaghan... The Rev. Wright's third son was Sir Charles Theodore Hagberg Wright (1862 - 1940), KBE, CB, FRS, Secretary adn Librarian to the London Library and Assistant Librarian at the National Library of Ireland. He had been educated privately in Russia, France and Germany before returning to Ireland where he married Constance Lewis but died without issue.

The fourth brother was Major General Henry Brooke Hagstromer Wright, CB, CMG, a veteran of Burma (1886-89), the Chin-Lushai Expedition (1889-90), the North West Frontier (1897-98), South Africa (1899-1902) and World War One. He married Helen, daughter of Sir John Kirk, GCMG, lived at Seaton
Down House in Devon, and died in 1948, leaving two daughters...”

http://boards.ancestry.co.uk/surnames.wilson/12433/mb.ashx?pnt=1

British Awards for Gallantry

**MAJOR-GENERAL MONTAGUE PROtheroe, C.B., C.S.I.**

Fine Group of Seven, display mounted: The Most Honourable Order of The Bath, Companion’s breast badge, C.B., in Gold and enamels, hallmarked 1887, with gold suspension and ribbon clasp, nearly extremely fine; Companion of the Star of India, in Gold and Diamonds, with finely carved cameo and Brooch Bar) (1881); Jubilee 1897 (Silver Un-named), good very fine; Abyssinia Medal (Embossed: Lieut M PROtheroe. MADRAS SAPPs & MINRS), very fine; Afghanistan 1878-1880: Clasp: Kandahar (officially engraved: MAJOR M PROtheroe. MAD:S.C., nearly extremely fine; Kandahar Star: (Impressed: MAJOR M. PROtheroe. MADRAS S.C.). India General Service Medal 1854-1895: Clasps Burma 1885-7, Burma 1887-89 and Chin-Lushai 1889-90 (Script Engraved: Colonel M. Protheroe M. S.C.).

Montague Protheroe was born in Pancras, London on 25 Jan 1841, the son of Evan Protheroe, a wine merchant of Haverstock-Hill and Henrietta Foote Protheroe (nee Smith). He attended Blackheath Preparatory School before entering the Honourable East India Company’s Academy at Addiscombe in 1857. Upon graduation, his first unit was the 45th Madras Native Infantry Regiment, where he was appointed 2nd Lieutenant on Jan 1858... During the Afghan War, he served as ADC to Lieutenant-General Sir Donald Stewart, Commanding Kandahar Field Force and took part in operations in the Kama District and Besud. He accompanied Sir Frederick Roberts in the march from Kabul to Kandahar.

He took part in the battle for Kandahar, for which he was mentioned in despatches, and subsequently appointed a Companion of the Order of the Star of India (CSI) in 1881. He received the decoration personally from Queen Victoria on 24 Mar 1881. He was promoted to Lieutenant-Colonel on 4 Jan 1884 and took part in the Burma expedition of 1885-87, for which he was again mentioned in despatches and promoted to Colonel on 17 May 1886, in recognition of his service in Burma.

Major-General Sir George White VC commended Protheroe’s service in the Upper Burma Field Force during 1887. Sir George wrote: “Colonel M. Protheroe, CSI has been Assistant Adjutant and Quartermaster-General of Force during the time I commanded it. His zeal, ability and untiring powers of work are well known to all the officers of high rank who have commanded in Upper Burma, and have been invaluable to me and to the force at large. I hope that his excellent service may receive some further mark of approval.” He was subsequently appointed a Companion of the Order of the Bath (CB) in 1887. Colonel Protheroe took part in the Chin-Lushai expedition of 1889-90.

As Brigadier-General, he commanded the Haiderabad contingent from 1890-1895. Returning to London from India, he was served as Aide De Camp to Queen Victoria from 1894-1897, receiving the Jubilee medal. Following this appointment he was promoted to Major-General on 30 Apr 1897, and appointed Assistant Military Secretary for Indian Affairs. He returned to India at the end of 1898, and was appointed Commander of Burma District on 4 Jan 1899, an appointment he held until 1903. He retired in Feb
1903, and returned to London. In retirement he was involved with the Royal United Service Institute. He was appointed Honorary Colonel of the 94th Infantry Regiment (Russell’s Infantry) on 13 May 1904. Major-General Protheroe never married, and died on 2 Jul 1905, aged 64...”

http://www.emedals.ca/catalog.asp?item=BAG194

MAJOR-GENERAL SIR HERBERT MULLALY, C.S.I., C.B., K.C.M.G.

Major General Herbert Mullaly in The Times
Saturday 15 August 1908 (Honours)
Indian Frontier Operations
The King has been pleased to make the following promotions in and appointments to the Orders of the Star in India and the Indian Empire in connexion with the recent operations against the Zakka Khel and Mohmands:- C.S.I.
Colonel (Brigadier-General) Herbert Mullaly, C.B.
Wednesday 01 May 1918 (Court Circular)

On arrival Their Majesties were received by the Mayor and the Town Clerk of Chatham, the Mayor and Town Clerk of Gillingham, Admiral Sir Doveton Sturdee, Bt. (Commander-in-Chief at the Nore), and Staff, and Major-General Sir Herbert Mullaly and Staff.

Friday 01 December 1922

Major General Sir Herbert Mullaly, surveying the vital Eastern problem, begs Greater Britain to live up to its faith in peace and good will, especially with the Turks and our Moslem fellow-subjects, and to refrain from offending them and their religious principles.

Monday 13 June 1932

Obituaries

Major General Sir Herbert Mullaly, late R.E., died at La Tour de Peilz, Switzerland, on June 9, at the age of 72. The son of Mr. John Mullaly, of the Honourable East India Company’s Service, he was educated privately, and joined the Royal Engineers from Woolwich in 1878. His first active service was as field engineer with the Chin-Lushai Expedition, 1889-90, when he was mentioned in dispatches. In 1895 he was officiating assistant secretary of the Military Department, India, D.A.A.G. for R.E., and secretary of the Defence Committee, India, and in 1896 he was appointed D.A.Q.M.G. for Mobilization, India. In the South African War, 1899-1900, he served as D.A.A.G., being present at Lombard’s Kop, the defence of Ladysmith, and other operations. He was severely wounded and mentioned four times, and received his brevet of lieutenant-colonel and four clasps.

After his return to India he was in 1902-3 officiating deputy secretary, Military Department, India, and was then D.Q.M.G., and in charge of mobilization, India, till 1906, when he was appointed Director of Military Operations in India, a post which he held till 1910. He was made C.B. in 1905. In 1908 he officiated as Chief of Staff with the Bazar Valley field Force and the Zakka Khel Expedition, and was again mentioned and created C.S.I. He commanded a brigade from 1910 to 1913. In the Great War he commanded a division
and the East coast Defences, and was mentioned twice and created K.C.M.G. in 1917. He retired on an Indian pension in 1920. Sir Herbert Mullaly married, in 1883, Mabel, daughter of the late Mr. Hastings Read, I.C.S.; she died in 1924.

Source: http://www.kenthistoryforum.co.uk/index.php?topic=1811.30

---

MAJOR-GENERAL R. G. WOODTHORPE. CB., K.C.I.E., R.E.

By Colonel Sir Thomas Hungerford Holdich, R.E., K.C.I.E., C.B. Robert Gosset Woodthorpe, second son of Captain John Bolton Woodthorpe, R.N., was born at Purfleet, in Essex, on September 22, 1844, and was educated at Mr. John Taylor's school at Woolwich, preparatory to entering the Royal Military Academy as a cadet. He obtained his commission in the Royal Engineers on June 22, 1865, and very early in his career he elected for service in India. He “heard the East a-calling” as others have done, and he responded to that call with the service of a lifetime, finishing his career as Deputy Survey-General at Calcutta, and taking his last long leave on May 26.

Nature intended Robert Woodthorpe to be one of the world’s explorers. He was gifted with a short, square figure and sturdy frame, immense capacity for endurance, and a courage that no combination of difficulties and dangers could depress. Thus, when the Indian Survey Department pointed the way to geographical distinction, he accepted the chance with alacrity, and he speedily drafted off to some of the wildest and most inaccessible districts of the Indian borderland on survey duty.

His first surveys were carried through the Khasia and Naga highlands, and it was here that he found himself face to face with a people so exceptional in their physical characteristics, and so entirely aboriginal in their manners and customs, that he at once fell into the habit, which never after left him, of illustrating his wanderings with his pencil... In 1871-72 he was called to accompany the Lushai expedition, which was carried through districts much akin to those of the Khasia community...

Source: JSTOR: The Geographical Journal, Vol. 12, No. 2 (August 1898)
http://www.jstor.org/pss/1774471

Note by TZD): He is the author of The Lushai Expedition 1871-1872.

---

MAJOR-GENERAL MICHAEL JOSEPH TIGHE, C.B., COMB., D.S.O.

Lieutenant, was born 21 May 1864, at Trincomalee, Ceylon, eldest son of Major Michael Joseph Tighe, 70th Regiment. He was educated at a private school, and at Sandhurst, and joined the 1st Battalion The Leinster Regiment 25 August 1883, and the Indian Staff Corps 27 June 1885. He served in the Burmese War, 1886-89, with the Mounted Infantry (Menial with clasp); with the Red Karen Expedition in 1889; served with the Mounted Infantry; was mentioned in Despatches 15 November 1889, and received a clasp, and was created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 12 November 1889]: "In recognition of services during operations in Burma. Michael Joseph Tighe, Lieutenant, Bombay Staff Corps". The DSO was awarded for personal gallantry at the action of Niza Kaing 1 June 1889, when in command of the MI of
the AG to Sir N Collet's Force (Field operations, Burma, General Orders, No 17, 6 May 1889): "In this action the MI, under Lieutenant Tighe, attacked and destroyed the Karen Force at Niza Kaing; this officer himself killed eight of the enemy in the hand-to-hand fighting".

He served with the Chin-Lushai Expedition in 1890 (clasp); Chin Hills Expedition, 1890-92, as Political Officer (two clasps). He became Captain 25 August 1894. He served in East Africa, 1895-96; operations against the Mazrin Arabs, also with the Naval Brigade in operation on the coast (Medal and Brilliant Star of Zanzibar awarded for distinguished service before the enemy); Ufunda, 1897-99; operations against the Wa Zeita; operations against the Soudanese Mutineers (Despatches, Medal and clasp, Brevet Major, 4 October 1899); Mikron Expedition and operations in East Persia in 1901; storm and capture of Wadisfort, in command; Brevet of Lieutenant Colonel. In 1902 he accompanied the Indian Contingent at King Edward's Coronation (Medal); in 1911 commanded Indian Contingent at Coronation of King George V (CIS and Medal); in 1911 awarded CB; in European War, 1914, commanded Composite Brigade, British East Africa; commanded Expeditionary Force, BEF, in operations against the Germans up to 1 April 1918. He was promoted Major General for Distinguished Service in the Field 3 June 1915; awarded KCMG 28 March 1916. He married in London, 14 June 1900, Katherine Helen Mackay, daughter of Mackay Hugh Bailie Scott, and they had one son, Valentine Michael Vincent, born 14 February 1904.

Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book) Bombay Staff Corps

**MAJOR-GENERAL W. H. BIRKBECK, C.B., CMG., Order of the Rising Sun**

Colonel W. H. Birkbeck, C.B., C.M.G., who has been promoted to be Major- General, was born in 1863, youngest son of the late Mr. Joseph Birkbeck, of Set- tle, Yorkshire, and obtained his commission in the King's Dragoon Guards when he was 20 years of age. His first service was in India, where he acted as assistant superintendent of signalling during the Hazara expedition of 1888, receiving mention in despatches; and again obtaining a similar honour in the Chin-Lushai expedition, 1889-90. In October, 1899, on the outbreak of the South African war, Colonel Birkbeck was selected to go to the front as assistant inspector of remounts, his services being twice mentioned in despatches, and rewarded with a brevet lieutenant-coloneley and the C.B. He remained in South Africa until May, 1903, and two years later was attached to the Japanese army in Manchuria, when he was decorated with the Order of the Rising Sun and the C.M.G. Subsequently he became Commandant of the Cavalry School, and last year was ap- pointed. Director of Remounts at the War Office.


**Note:** The Order of the Rising Sun (れえあずきょうくうじゅうしゅのメジリ) is a Japanese order established in 1875 by Emperor Meiji of Japan. The order was the first national decoration awarded by the Japanese Government, created on April 10, 1875 by decree of the Council of State. It is the second most prestigious Japanese decoration after the Order of the Chrysanthemum.

MAJOR-GENERAL EDWARD PEMBERTON LEACH, VC., C.B.

Rank: Lieutenant, 17-4-1866; Captain, 31-12-1878; Major, 17-4-1886; Lieutenant Colonel, 5-12-1892. Army Rank: Major, 22-11-1879; Lieutenant Colonel, 2-3-1881; Colonel, 2-3-1885; Major General, 1-10-1897. War Service: Looshai, 1871-72; Afghanistan, 1879-80; Sudan, 1885.

REFERENCE:
1. CONNOLLY, T.W.J. Roll of Officers of the Corps of Royal Engineers From 1660 to 1898. Royal Engineers Institute, Chatham, 1898.
2. The Royal Engineers Monthly List, April 1910.
http://www.reubique.com/officers.htm

MAJOR-GENERAL WILLIAM JOSEPH FITZMAURICE STAFFORD, C.B, Bengal Army

1871-72 Looshai expedition CB Medal Group

William Joseph Fitzmaurice Stafford was born at Winscombe, Somerset on 18 April 1819, the son of Colonel John Stafford and his wife Frances Maria Stafford. He received a classical and mathematical education at La Flèche College, France. He was nominated as a Cadet for the East India Company's Bengal Infantry by E.I.C. Director John Thornhill, at the recommendation of his father, then a Major-General. Stafford passed the Military Committee at East India House, London on 29 July 1840 and embarked for India on the Vernon on 31 July 1840.

Ranked as an Ensign in September 1840 and posted to the 36th Bengal Native Infantry in February 1841, he qualified as an interpreter in December 1843. Served as Brigade Major with the Hurriana Field Force under General H. C. van Cortlandt, C.B. and was selected to command a detachment sent to cooperate with Brigadier Showers against Khajjar, at the surrender of which place he was present in October 1857. For his services he was mentioned in despatches and thanked by Sir John Lawrence. Commanded the 22nd Punjab Infantry in the affair at Kukrowlie and at the taking of Bareilly - for which he was mentioned in Lord Clyde's despatch, G.O. 8 May 1858.

For his services in the suppression of the Indian Mutiny he was granted the brevet of Major and awarded the medal with clasp. He then served in China in command of the 11th (later 22nd) Punjab Infantry, operating in the vicinity of Shanghai and capturing a number of stockaded villages. He also commanded a mixed force at the relief of Tsinpoo. For his services he was awarded the medal without clasp.
Stafford was promoted to Major in February 1861 and to Lieutenant-Colonel in March 1866. Served in the Looshai expedition, 1871-72, in command of the 22nd Regiment Native Infantry. For his services he received the thanks of the Government of India, was awarded the medal with clasp and was created a C.B. Stafford was then placed in command of the Eastern Frontier District for five years from October 1872, commanding the Duffla expedition, 1874-75 for which he received the thanks of the Government of India. Stafford retired as a Major-General on 10 March 1878 and died on 29 August 1887.


MAJOR-GENERAL JOHN MACDONALD

Bengal Staff Corps, head of survey operations on the Looshai Expedition Punjab 1848-49, no clasp (Ensign, 18th Bengal N.I.); India General Service 1854-95, 1 clasp, Looshai (Major, Bengal Staff Corps)

Footnote

John MacDonald was born in India on 11 March 1829 and entered the East India Company Service in the season of 1846. He served with the Army of the Punjab in 1848-49 as an Ensign with the 18th Regiment Native Infantry. He was twice employed on special duty in the Looshai Country in 1869-70 and 1870-71, and in the Looshai Expedition of 1871-72, when he served as head of the survey operations. He received the thanks of Government in G.G.O.s 1227 of 1870 and 480 of 1872, and in Government Resolution 562 of 1872, in recognition of his professional work in the Looshai Expedition 1871-72. Promoted to Lieutenant-Colonel in December 1872, he became Colonel in December 1877, and retired as Major-General in December 1880. He died in England on 16 February 1892.

http://www.dnw.co.uk/medals/auctionarchive/searchcataloguearchive/itemdetail.lasso?itemid=25507

MAJOR-GENERAL SIR VINCENT WILLIAM TREGEAR, K.C.B., (1909)

b. 1842; s. of late Vincent Tregear, of the Indian Educational Department; educ: privately; entered Bengal Army, 1859; Commanded the 9th Bengal Infantry; Colonel on the Staff at Multan, 1895-97; served in the Afghan War, 1879-80; Lushai Expedition, 1889; Chin Lushai Expedition, 1889-90; became Major-General, 1897; retired, same year; m. Jane Charlotte (died 1899), d. of William Oswald Bell, 1867. Address: c/o H. S. King and Co., 9, Pall Mall, S.W. Club: Royal Albert Yacht.


Tregears in India

By George Maxwell June 26, 2008 at 05:17:56

I am interested in contacting any descendants of Major General Sir Vincent William Tregear CB who was born on 25th June 1842 in Juanpore, West Bengal, India and died September 1925 in Portsmouth, Hampshire. He married Jane Charlotte Bell who was born in 1848 in Benares, India and died 1899 in Portsea Island, Hampshire and they had issue;
1. Vincent Francis William Tregear, born on 1st Jan 1870 in Kurseony, West Bengal, India, sometime Major 98th Infantry Regiment Indian Army
2. Frederick Charles Tregear, born on 2nd May 1871 in Purneah, West Bengal, India, sometime Major 16th Rajaputana Rifle, Indian Army
3. Arthur Templeton Tregear, born on 24th Nov 1874 in Lucknow, West Bengal, India
4. Grace Isobel Tregear, born on 24th Feb 1876 in Bengal, India
5. Florence G Tregear, born in 1877 in Lucknow, West Bengal, India and married a Mr Condon and had a daughter Florence born in India in 1899.
Also any descendants of John Richard Tregear who was married in Bengal, India, in 1880 to Mary Stuart Bell, sister of the above Jane Charlotte Bell. They had at least one child, a daughter, Mildred Bell Tregear born in 1881 in Jessopore, Rajasthan, India.

https://www.genealogy.com/forum/surnames/topics/tregear/16/

MAJOR-GENERAL SIR GEORGE BOURCHIER, K.C.B. (23 August 1821 – 15 March 1898) was a British officer who served in the Bengal Army, one of three armies that made up the British Indian Army.

Biography
Bourchier was the son of the Rev. Edward Bourchier and Harriet Jenner. He was educated at the Addiscombe Military Seminary. He entered the Bengal Artillery in 1838 and took part in the Gwalior Campaign 1843–1844. He was stationed at Punniar. During the Indian Mutiny he commanded a battery at Trimmu Ghat and was present at the sieg and capture of Delhi. He was at Bulandshahr, Alighar, and Agra with Sir Colin Campbell for the relief of Lucknow and at Cawnpur.

He was commissioned a Brevet Colonel and C.B. From 1864 to 1866. he commanded the Royal Artillery in Bhutan. In 1871, he commanded the East Frontier District, and in 1871 to 1872 he commanded the Cachar column in the Lushai Expedition. He was awarded the K.C.B. in 1852 and promoted to Major-General. He died on 15 March 1898.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Bourchier_(Indian_Army_officer)

BRIGADIER-GENERAL F.W. TOWSEY, C.M.G., C.B.E., D.S.O.

when he took charge in December, 1898. He has worked hand in hand with the commanding officers at Fort White and in the Kail Valley, and has been most successful, under my instructions, in bringing about the surrender and submission of the proud and obstinate Northern chiefs. My special thanks are also due to Mr. A. S. Fleming, Chief Commissioner of Patkúkú, for his assistance in supplying transport and accommodation for the troops along the lower line of communication.

63. The campaign has not been one in which regimental officers have had many opportunities of especially distinguishing themselves. Its character has been incessant hard work. In this and in seeing after their men, the officers as a body have entirely satisfied me. The brunt of the work and responsibility has been borne by the staff and departmental officers.

64. I beg to submit the names of the following officers who have rendered specially valuable services to the Burma columns of the Expeditionary Forces:

1. Colonel T. G. Skene, D.S.O., commanding 42nd Gorkha Light Infantry, the Chin Hills, and the Northern Column, has well sustained a reputation previously gained for command.

2. Major G. Haney, Royal Engineers. This officer, as my Commanding Royal Engineer, and for some time second-in-command, has rendered me most valuable assistance. I cannot speak too highly of the ability and devotion with which he has thrown himself into his work. I commend his services for special recognition.

3. Lieutenant E. J. Lugard, 42nd Gorkha Light Infantry, served with distinction in the Chin Expedition of 1888-89, and has displayed conspicuous gallantry and intelligence in leading his men on several occasions during the operations of this season.

4. First-Grade Office G. E. Holland, Her Majesty's Indian Marine Service, to whose skilful applied exertions are entirely due, the placing of 600 tons of rations in Rann by water,—a most arduous undertaking, successfully carried out.

5. Captain A. H. Clark-Kennedy, Madras Staff Corps, has very nobly fulfilled the responsible duties of Chief Commissariat Officer.

6. Lieutenant A. H. Morris, Royal Irish Regiment, Transport Officer with the Southern Column, has done particularly good service in his department. I consider him the best ammunition sergeant I have ever met. His services are especially worthy of record and reward.

7. Brigade-Surgeon E. C. Mansky, Medical Staff, as my Principal Medical Officer, has had responsible duties. I commend him for his administrative abilities.

From amongst the thirty medical officers who have served with the force on the Burma side, it is difficult, where all did well, to single individuals for special mention but:

8. Surgeon-Major G. D. Bourke, Medical Staff.

9. Surgeon F. A. Rogers, 42nd Gorkha Light Infantry, senior medical officer with the Northern Column, and

10. Surgeon W. H. Beaumont, Medical Staff, having displayed skill, zeal, and energy in their duties, have fallen prominently under my notice.

The following officers have also deservedly earned mention in this despatch for their good services:

Colonel J. K. Cuthbert, commanding the 2nd Madras Infantry and lines of communication.

Major G. G. Stonor, 1st Battalion King's Own Scottish Borderers, who commanded the detachment of his regiment, and was second in command of the Southern Column for some time before involved.

Captain E. D. Pickard-Cambridge, Bedfordshire Regiment, Superintendent of Army Signalling.

Captain J. G. Hunter, 10th Bengal Infantry; Lieutenant T. F. B. Head-Tabiyar, K.C., Survey Officer; Lieutenant E. W. M. Norie, Middlesex Regiment, Field Intelligence Officer; Lieutenant D. B. Thomas, 1st Battalion CheshIRE Regiment, for distinguished leading; Lieutenant W. H. Hilditch, 27th Bengal Infantry, Hill-Cooly Transport Officer; Lieutenant F. H. S. Thomas, Madras Staff Corps, Assistant Commissariat Officer, Northern Column; and

Veterinary-Surgeon G. H. Evans, Army Veterinary Department.

The name of Major Gordon-Cumming, 1st Battalion CheshIRE Regiment, would have been added to those mentioned for good services, but he was killed in action.

It remains only for me to bring to prominent notice the names and services of my personal Staff:

Major H. W. Bradshaw, Royal Artillery, has been my Chief Staff Officer. The ability with which he has supported me has won my warm regard. His advancement would be a distinct gain to the service.

Captain W. W. Burton, Madras Staff Corps, Junior Staff Officer, has ably assisted Major Bradshaw, and worked hard for the success of the expedition.

Lieutenant J. M. Stewart, 5th Gorkha Regiment, acted as my orderly officer, and gave me loyal assistance. I consider him a young officer of great promise, one whose military career is well worthy of watching and encouragement.

65. The campaign was officially closed on the 8th April, 1899.

From Brigadier-General W. W. Trogan, Commanding the Chittagong Column, Chin-Lushai Expedition, to the Adjutant General in India, —(No. 47th, dated Calcutta, the 1st May, 1899).

THE operations of the Chittagong Column, Chin-Lushai Expedition, having been brought to a conclusion, I have the honour to submit the following report for the information of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief:

2. Composition of Force.—The force under my command was composed of the following troops:

Corps. Total Strength in Officers and Men.

No. 2 Company, Bengal Sappers and Miners.

3rd Bengal Infantry ... 891

Detachment 8th Bengal Infantry 301

2-2 (P. W. O.) Gorkha Regiment 779

Half Battalion, 24th Gurkha Regiment 369

26th Bombay Infantry (Pioneers) 731

Detachment, Chittagong Frontier Police 252

Total ... 3,830

Cashar Column.—Four hundred men of the Cashar Military Police.

The transport consisted of—

2,611 Punjabi coolies,

782 local

2,196 miles,

71 elephants.
BRIGADIER-GENERAL ALEXANDER BEAMISH HAMILTON, C.B.

The Great War C.B. Group of Nine to Brigadier A.B. Hamilton, King’s Own Scottish Borderers, a Veteran of the Chin-Lushai Expedition, and was Mentioned in Despatches. During the Sudanese Campaign 1896-98 as One of Only Two K.O.S.B. Officers Present
a) The Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Military Division, Companion’s (C.B.) breast Badge, silver-gilt and enamel, with integral silver-gilt ribbon buckle
b) India General Service 1854-95, one clasp, Chin-Lushai 1889-90 (Capt. A.B. Hamilton 1st. Bn. K.O. Sco. Bord)
c) Queen’s Sudan 1896-98 (Cpt A.B. Hamilton. 2/K.O.S.Bds.)
d) 1914-15 Star (Brig: Gen: A.B. Hamilton. C.B.)
e) British War and Victory Medals (Brig. Gen. A.B. Hamilton.)
f) Hong Kong Coronation 1902, bronze, unnamed as issued
g) Belgium, Kingdom, Order of the Crown, Commander’s neck Badge, 72mm including wreath suspension x 55mm, silver-gilt and enamel
h) Khedive’s Sudan 1896-1908, one clasp, Khartoum, this clasp a contemporary tailor’s copy, unnamed as issued, lacquered, generally nearly extremely fine, with recipient’s Great War Bronze Memorial Plaque ‘Alexander Beamish Hamilton’ (9)
C.B. London Gazette 3.6.1915 Colonel (temporary Brigadier-General) Alexander Beamish Hamilton. Belgium, Order of the Crown, Commander London Gazette 24.9.1917 Colonel (temporary Brigadier-General) Alexander Beamish Hamilton, C.B., late Embarkation Commandant ‘For distinguished services rendered during the course of the campaign.’ Brigadier Alexander Beamish Hamilton, C.B., born December 1860, the son of Lieutenant-Colonel Samuel Beamish Hamilton, King’s Own Scottish Borderers; Commissioned Second Lieutenant, King’s Own Scottish Borderers, January 1881; Lieutenant, July 1881; served in the Chin-Lushai Expedition as part of the Burma Column under Brigadier W.P. Symons, November 1889 - April 1890; Captain, December 1889; Appointed Adjutant, March 1890-December 1893; Deputy Assistant Adjutant General, Egypt, December 1893 - December 1898, with the Garrison at Alexandria; Served in the Nile Expedition 1898 (Mentioned in Despatches, London Gazette 30.9.1898)
... died in a nursing home in Weymouth, whilst still on Active Service during the Great War, 30.12.1918, and is buried in Affpuddle (St. Lawrence) Churchyard, Wiltshire.
site at www.spink.com

BRIGADIER-GENERAL COLIN ROBERT BALLARD, C.B., C.M.G

The Great War C.B., C.M.G. Group of Ten to Brigadier C.R. Ballard, Norfolk Regiment, Who Commanded Various Three Infantry Brigades on the Western Front 1914-17; a Veteran of the Burma Campaign 1891-92, the North West Frontier, South Africa, and Somaliland; Mentioned in Despatches on Seven Occasions
a) The Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Military Division, Companion’s (C.B.) neck Badge, silver-gilt
b) The Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, Companion’s (C.M.G.) neck Badge, silver-
c) India General Service 1854-95, one clasp, Burma 1889-92 (Lieut. C.R. Ballard 1st. Norfolk Regt.)
Brigadier Colin Robert Ballard, C.B., C.M.G., born Lasswade, Scotland, July 1868, the second son of
General J.A. Ballard, C.B., Royal Engineers; educated at United Service College, Westward Ho;
Commissioned Second Lieutenant, Norfolk Regiment, February 1888; Lieutenant, April 1890; served in
Burma as part of the Baungshe Column as Intelligence Officer under Major R.H. Gunning, 25.12.1891-
29.2.1892; served during Operations in Chitral with the Relief Force, March to August 1895, and subsequent
Operations on the North West Frontier of India in the action against the Khel Waziris, and with the Tirah
Expeditionary Force as Transportation Officer under the command of General Sir W.S.A. Lockhart, K.C.B.,
K.C.S.I. (Mentioned in Despatches, London Gazette 7.6.1898); Captain, May 1898... Brigadier
Brigadier Commanding, 57th Infantry Brigade, British Armies in France, 31.12. 1916-6.4.1917 (Four times
Mentioned in Despatches, London Gazettes 19.10.1914, 17.2.1915, 15.6.1916, 6.7. 1918; Brevet of Colonel,
18.2.1915); Colonel, 12.1.1917; Served as Military Attaché, Romania, 6.5.1917-16.9.1919 (Appointed
Knight Commander, Order of the Star of Romania, Military Division; and Commander, Order of Carol I);
General Officer Commanding, Lowland Area, Scottish Command, 10.10.1919-10.2.1920; President, Allied
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BRIGADIER-GENERAL GERALD EDWARD HOLLAND, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O.

The Exceptional Great War Military Operations, C.B., C.M.G., Unique Boer War C.I.E., Indian Marine
Chin-Lushai Operations D.S.O. Group of Eleven to Commander G.E. Holland, Royal Indian Marine, Captain
of the Ill-Fated Warren Hastings and Latterly a Brigadier-General in the Royal Engineers
(a) The Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Companion's (C.B.), Military Division, neck Badge, silver-gilt
and enamel
(b) The Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, Companion's (C.M.G.), breast Badge,
silver-gilt and enamel, with usual swivel-ring suspension and ribbon buckle
(c) The Most Eminent Order of the Indian Empire, Companion's (C.I.E.), breast Badge, gold and enamel,
complete with upper suspension brooch
(d) Distinguished Service Order, V.R., silver-gilt and enamel
(e) India General Service 1854-95, three clasps, Burma 1885-7, Burma 1887-89, Chin Lushai 1889-90 (1st
Gde. Officer, H.M.I.M.S.)
(f) Queen's South Africa, one clasp, Natal (Commnr., Rl. Ind. Mar.)
(g) 1914-15 Star (Lt. Col., C.I.E., D.S.O., R.E.)
(h) British War and Victory Medals (Brig. Gen.), officially re-impressed
(i) Belgium, Order of Leopold I, Military Division, Officer's breast Badge, silver-gilt and enamel
(j) Belgium, Croix de Guerre
(k) Italy, Order of St. Maurice and St. Lazarus, Knight's breast Badge, gold and enamel, enamel work
chipped in places, otherwise generally good very fine (11)
Lot Notes C.B. London Gazette 4.6.1917
C.M.G. London Gazette 14.1.1916
C.I.E. London Gazette 25.7.1901
D.S.O. London Gazette 14.11.1890 'In recognition of services during the late Chin-Lushai Expedition.'

Brigadier-General Gerald Edward Holland, C.B., C.M.G., C.I.E., D.S.O., served on the Naval Transport Staff at Durban 1899-1900, while a Commander in the Royal Indian Marine. His appointment as the Disembarkation Officer during the heady days of the arrival of first White's and then Buller's force was rewarded with three Mentions and a unique Boer War award of the C.I.E. Holland was also responsible for the preparation of the Hospital Ships. White mentioned him in his Despatch dated 2.11.1899 and Buller twice recording in his of 30.3.1900: 'Commander G.E. Holland, D.S.O., Indian Marine, has also been employed at Durban throughout. His genius for organisation, and his knowledge of transport requirements is, I should say, unrivalled. He undertook the alteration of the transports which were fitted at Durban as hospital ships, and the result of his work has been universally admitted to have been a conspicuous success. I strongly recommend him to your consideration' (London Gazette 8.2.1901 refers).

Holland had been created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order for the Chin-Lushai Expedition but was probably better known as the Captain of the ill-fated Warren Hastings (see below). He was Court-Martialed for her loss but received only a simple reprimand and this simultaneously with receiving a commendatory order containing warm praise issued by the Viceroy and Governor-General in Council of India for his fine conduct and saving of life.

At the outbreak of the Great War, Holland (who had retired from the Royal Indian Marine in 1905) became a Lieutenant-Colonel, Royal Engineers and Assistant Director of Inland Water Transport. He was appointed its Director in 1916, a Brigadier-General in 1917, created a Companion of the Order of the Bath and the Order of St. Michael and St. George, two Foreign Orders and Mentioned in Despatches thrice. He died of sickness contracted in France while on leave in England in 1917.

http://www.christies.com/lotfinder/LotDetailsPrintable.aspx?intObjectID=1550623

---

**BRIGADIER-GENERAL HERALD PEMBERTON LEACH. C.B., D.S.O.**

Major and Brevet Lieutenant Colonel, late RE, 4th son of Lieutenant Colonel Sir George Archibald Leach, KGB, RE; born 1851; first commission 1871; promoted Colonel by Brevet in 1894; retired in 1908 and became Honorary Brigadier General in 1912. Served with 1st Division Khyber Field Force in command of Company, Bengal Sappers and Miners, 1878-79; was present at capture of Ali Musjid, action at Deh Savak and the operation in the Bazar Valley (Despatches). Subsequently in the Kurram Valley, 1879-80, when he took part in Zaimuckt Expedition, including the taking of Zowa (Despatches, thanks of Government of India, Medal with clasp). Lent to Home Government for service with Camel Transport during the Nile Expedition, 1884-85; present at the actions of Abu Klea and Gubat; Senior Transport Officer on withdrawal of Force from Metemmeh (Medal with two clasps; Bronze Star; Brevet of Major).

Senior RE with Lushai Expedition 1888-89 (honourably mentioned; Medal with clasp). CRE with
Chin-Lushai Expedition.1889-90 (Despatches, clasp, Brevet of Lieutenant Colonel); Created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 30 May 1891]: "Harold Pemberton Leach, Major and Brevet Lieutenant Colonel, Royal Engineers". CRE (Colonel on the Staff) with Chitral Relief Force, 1895. Present at taking of Malakand and action on Panjkora River (Despatches, Medal with clasp; CB). Commandant Bombay Sappers, 1890-91. Military Secretary to C-in-C Bombay, 1891-93. Commandant Bengal Sappers, 1893-1900; Brigadier General commanding Presidency District, 1900-05 (thanks of Government of India for despatch of China Expedition from Calcutta); also officiated in command of Peshawar District in 1896, and again in 1898; Lahore District in 1901 and as DQMG Army Headquarters, India, in 1898. During the Great War commanded the 89th Brigade, 4th Army (subsequently turned into 1st Training Reserve Brigade), 1914-1917 (Secretary of State's List, CBE). Subsequently served as Group Commander, Surrey Volunteers. Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book)

**BRIGADIER-GENERAL ALEXANDER CADELL**

A Fine Campaign Group of Four to Brigadier-General A. Cadell, 38th Bengal Infantry, Late 26th Punjab Infantry India General Service 1854-95, two clasps, Chin-Lushai 1889-90, Waziristan 1894-5 (Lieu.t. A. Cadell 38th Bl. Iny); Queen's Sudan 1896-98 (Capt. A. Cadell. 26th/Pun: Iny.), suspension claw re-affixed ; India General Service 1895-1902, one clasp, Punjab Frontier 1897-98 (Brevet Major A. Cadell. 38th Bl. Iny.); Khedive's Sudan 1896-1908, no clasp (Captain A. Cadell. 38th Bl. Iny.).

Brigadier-General Alexander Cadell, born 1867; Lieutenant 38th Bengal Infantry, 1885; Captain 1896; served with the Indian Contingent at Suakin during the Dongola Expedition under Sir H. Kitchener 1896 (Brevet Major); served in the campaign of the North West Frontier of India under Sir W. Lockhart (1897-98) with the Malakand Field Force, including the night attack at Markhanai, the operations against the Mamunds and the engagements at Agrah and Gut (Mentioned in Despatches 22.4.1898); Lieutenant-Colonel and Commandant 38th Dogras, 1910; Colonel 1.1.1914; Deputy Adjutant-General in India, Headquarters Staff, from 1.3.1915; Brigadier-General 27.12.1916; served during the Great War in operations in Mesopotamia, February-August 1917; General Officer Commanding 41st Infantry Brigade (M.I.D. London Gazette 28.7.1919); retired 21.1.1921.

http://www.invaluable.com/auction-lot/a-fine-campaign-group-of-four-to-brigadier-genera-1-c-u5r9spgs8h

**BRIGADIER-GENERAL D.C.A. ANDREW**

Brigadier-General David Claphon Adrian Andrew (1866-1942), Commissioned Second Lieutenant, Royal Warwickshire Regiment, January 1886; transferred Indian Army, April 1887, and posted 21st Bengal (Punjab) Infantry; Appointed Assistant Commandant, Burma Military Police Battalion, Mandalay, November 1890; served with the Momeik Column in operations against the Kachins, January-March 1891; saw action at Thanga and Montok in operations against the Chins, November 1892; Captain, January 1897; present at the defence of Malakand, and the actions at Landakai, Utman Khel, Buner, and Tanga Pass, 1897-98; Appointed Second in Command, 21st Punjabis, December 1902; Major, 30.1.1904; Company
Commander, 55th (Cokes) Rifles, January 1907, and saw action with them in the North West Frontier, 1908; Lieutenant-Colonel, 22.10.1911; Commandant 55th (Coles) Rifles, 22.10.1911-21.10.1916; Brigade Commander, Bannu, 1.6.1914; Brigadiere-General, 14.3.1917. Brigadier-General Andrew retired 3.4.1920.


**BRIGADIER-GENERAL C.H. ROE**, Royal Engineers,

The Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, Companion's (C.M.G.)
A Great War C.M.G., C.I.E. Group of Seven to Brigadier-General C.H. Roe, Royal Engineers, The Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, Companion's (C.M.G.) neck Badge, silver-gilt and enamel; the Most Eminent Order of the Indian Empire, Companion's (C.I.E.) neck Badge, gold and enamel; Kaiser-i-Hind, V.R., silver; India General Service 1854-95, three clasps, Chin Hills 1892-93, Burma 1887-89, Burma 1885-7 [In this order] (Lieutt., R.E.); British War and Victory Medals (Brig. Gen.); Delhi Durbars 1911, the fourth with edge bruising and contact wear, otherwise good very fine or better (7)

Brigadier-General Cyril Harcourt Roe, C.M.G., C.I.E., was born in Dorchester in October 1864 and gazetted to the Royal Engineers as a Lieutenant in February 1884. Arriving in India in March 1886, he participated in the operations in Burma until the following year, being employed in 3rd Brigade, under General Anderson. Advanced to Captain in August 1892, he next served as a Company Commander in the Sappers and Miners during the Chin Hills Expedition, when he was employed in building new forts in the North. By the outbreak of hostilities in August 1914, Roe had risen to the rank of Colonel, and two months later was granted the rank of Temporary Brigadier-General, his subsequent 1914-18 services incorporating the Mesopotamia operations and resulting in two 'Mentions' (London Gazettes 21.1.1919 and 5.6.1919 refer) and the award of a C.M.G. and C.I.E. He retired to Worcestershire and died in November 1928.

www.christies.com
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**BRIGADIER-GENERAL F. A. SMITH**, Indian Army, latterly commanding the 2nd Rajputs

INDIA GENERAL SERVICE 1854-95, 1 clasp, Chin-Lushai 1889-90 (Lieut. F. A. Smith, 3d Bl. Infy.);
INDIA GENERAL SERVICE 1895-1902, 3 clasps, Punjab Frontier 1897-98, Samana 1897, Tirah 1897-98 (Capt'n., 2d Bl. Lt. Infy.) unofficial connections between clasps; CHINA 1900, no clasp (Capt'n., 2d Rajput Lt. Infy.); NAVAL GENERAL SERVICE 1915-62, 1 clasp, Persian Gulf 1909-14 (Lt. Col., 2nd Rajputs, H.M.S. Pelorus) Frederick Alexander Smith was born on 18 March 1864. First commissioned in the Yorkshire Light Infantry on 7 February 1885. Appointed to the Bengal Staff Corps, Indian Army, in March 1888. Posted to the 2nd Rajput Light Infantry as a Wing Officer in September 1888.

Served on the N.E. Frontier of India, Chin-Lushai 1889-90 (medal with clasp). Appointed Adjutant in 1894 and Captain in February 1896. Served on the N.W. Frontier of India 1897-8, with the Kohat Kurrum
force and in Tirah, 1897-98, including the actions of Chagru Kotal and Dargai (medal with 3 clasps). Appointed a Couble Company Commander in May 1900 and was present with the 2nd Rajputs in the campaign in China, 1900 (medal). Smith was promoted to Major in February 1903, was ranked as 2 i/c/ of the 2nd Rajputs in August 1907 and became a Lieutenant-Colonel and their commander in February 1910. Smith qualified for the Naval General Service medal as Commanding Officer of the detachment of 2nd Rajputs, borne for duty on H.M.S. Pelorus in June 1913 for services during the punitive operations against the Tangistani.

Only 17 army officers received the Naval medal for the Persian Gulf operations. During the Great War he was promoted to Colonel (Hon. Brigadier-General in February 1915 and was appointed Brigadier-General & Commandant of the Secunderbad Infantry Brigade in June 1916. Smith served in Egypt between 15 November 1914 and 12 February 1916, for which he was mentioned in despatches (London Gazette 21 June 1916) awarded the brevet of Colonel and awarded the Serbian Order of St. Sava, 5th Class. Additionally awarded the 1914-15 Star trio. Smith retired on 1 March 1921 but was Colonel of the 1/7th Rajput Regiment (late 2nd Rajputs) from August 1921 until his death on 12 August 1945. (Source: www.dnw.co.uk. 11 May 2011)

**COLONEL R.M.RAINEY-ROBINSON, C.B., WORC.R.**

1914/15 Star
British War Medal COL. R.M.RAINEY-ROBINSON
Victory Medal MID COL. R.M.RAINEY-ROBINSON


1903 married Alice Hildebrand. CB 14 June 1912. Retired 14 February 1913. September 1914 he raised the 11th Worcesters. His Adjutant wrote, "Many years before the war he had raised two Indian units, we greatly benefitted from his immense experience. He was an excellent instructor and his natural wit made him a popular CO. Although well over 50 and on the retired list, he at once volunteered for active service." Arrived in France 22 September 1915 and at the end of the year took the battalion to Salonika. MID 6 December 1916, 11 July 1919. CMG 1917. 1928 appointed Colonel of 1/1st Punjab Regiment. He died 20 February 1932. Funeral took place at Upwey, Weymouth.

[http://www.qcmilitaria.com/medalsBritArmy1b.htm](http://www.qcmilitaria.com/medalsBritArmy1b.htm)
LIEUTENANT-COLONEL F.S. LEQUESNE, VC.

Lieutenant-Colonel F.S. LeQuesne, V.C., who won the decoration in 1889 for conspicuous brevity while serving as a surgeon during the attack on the village of Tartan, Upper Burma, died on April 14, 1950 at the age of 86. Ferdinand Simeon LeQuesne, who was the third son of the late Lieutenant-Colonel Giffard N. LeQuesne, Royal Jersey Artillery, was born in Jersey on Christmas Day, 1863. After being at school in the Channel Islands he received his medical training at King’s College Hospital, London. Preferring a career in the service to that of a private practitioner, he joined the army medical service, and in 1889 was called upon to serve in the Burma Expedition.

On May 4 of that year he was with a column of the Chin Field Force attacking the village of Tartan. In the course of the operations Second Lieutenant Michel, of The Norfolk Regiment, was lying wounded within five yards of the loopholed stockade from which the enemy was maintaining a continuous fire. Surgeon LeQuesne, notwithstanding the fire, with perfect coolness and self-possession, went to the aid of Michel and remained with him for 10 minutes dressing his wounds. LeQuesne then turned his attention to other wounded and while attending to another officer was himself severely wounded. In addition to being awarded the Victoria Cross, which was gazetted on October 29, 1889. LeQuesne was mentioned in dispatches and received the medal and clasp for the campaign. He saw further service the next year with the Chin-Lushai Field Force and in 1891 with the Wuntho Field Force.

LeQuesne reached his majority in 1898, just before the outbreak of the South African War. He continued to serve and he was promoted to lieutenant-colonel in 1906. Lieutenant-Colonel LeQuesne, who retired in 1918, was in his younger days a fine shot and an able player at rackets and lawn tennis. He was unmarried. - Time. London. (Vum Ko Hau, p. 399)

NAVAL AND MILITARY MEDICAL SERVICES

THE VICTORIA CROSS.

“The Queen has been graciously pleased to signify her intention to confer the decoration of the Victoria Cross upon Surgeon Ferdinand Simeon LeQuesne (Medical Staff), whose claim has been submitted for Her Majesty’s approval for his conspicuous bravery during the attack on the village of Tartan, Upper Burma, by a column of the Chin Field Force on May 4th last. The act of courage for which he has been recommended is recorded as follows: - “Displayed conspicuous bravery and devotion to duty during the attack on the village of Tartan by a column of the Chin Field Force on May 4th last, in having remained for the space of about ten minutes in a very exposed position (within five yards of the loopholed stockade from which the enemy were firing), dressing with perfect coolness and self-possession the wounds from which Second Lieutenant Michel, Norfolk Regiment, shortly afterwards died. Surgeon LeQuesne was himself severely wounded later on whilst attending to the wounds of another officer.”

(Source: The British Medical Journal. Nov. 2, 1889. 1015)

Medal entitlement of:
Lieutenant Colonel Ferdinand LEQUESNE
Medical Staff ( Royal Army Medical Corps )
* Victoria Cross
* India General Service Medal ( 1854-95 )
o 3 clasps:
o "Burma 1887-89"
o "Chin Lushai 1889-90" - "Burma 1889-92"
* Queen's South Africa Medal ( 1899-1902 )
o 3 clasps:
o "Cape Colony"
o "South Africa 1901" - "South Africa 1902"
* 1914 Star
* British War Medal ( 1914-20 )
* Victory Medal ( 1914-19 )
* King George VI Coronation Medal ( 1937 )
http://www.victoriacross.org.uk/puleques.htm

Note: The following is my correspondence with Mr. Starling, Director of the Museum, concerning a misunderstanding on my part with regard to a sub-title in his article below.

from: museum <armymedicalmuseum@btinternet.com>
reply-to: museum <armymedicalmuseum@btinternet.com>
to: Thang Za Dal <thangzadal@googlemail.com>
date: Mon, Mar 19, 2012 at 10:09 AM
subject: Re: THE MEDICAL VICTORIA CROSS(F.C. LeQuesne)
signed-by: btinternet.com

Dear Sir

Thank you for your email. I feel you may have misread the paper because the Kachin Hills expedition refers to the 1893 expedition and then the paragraph goes on to refer to the many other 'minor troubles for some years'.

This leads into the Le Quesne and the Chin Hills expedition of May 1889.

I will access your paper.

Regards,
Pete Starling
Army Medical Services Museum
Keogh Barracks
Ash Vale
GU12 5RQ
01252 868612
WAR IN BURMA - THE AWARD OF THE VICTORIA CROSS TO FERDINAND SIMEON LEQUESNE

PH Starling

Introduction

Britain had been engaged in fighting in Burma on a small scale since the late 18th century but fighting intensified in the 19th century into what became known as the First, Second and Third Burmese Wars, after which Upper Burma was annexed by the British on 1st January 1886. The Third Burmese War had taken a heavy toll on the combined British and Indian force, mainly from sickness with epidemics of malaria, dysentery and typhoid fever resulting in heavy wastage. The terrain dictated that the method of evacuation of the casualties was initially by hand but later by pony and elephant. Where possible rivers were used and large steamers were employed as floating hospitals [1]. The rate of admission for disease per 1000 strength in 1888 was 2367.45 and a death rate of 48.49; the following year things were slightly better with 2144.55 admissions per 1000 and 30.19 deaths [1]. After the Third Burma War there were further expeditions, conducted in the main to control the hill tribesmen, and it is one such expedition, the Kachin Hills Expedition of 1893, that is detailed here.

Kachin Hills Expedition

The Kachin Hills form a mountainous district of Upper Burma inhabited by the Kachin people who had been raiding columns and settlements for some years. Numerous small actions and two large expeditions were mounted against the Kachins to bring the major troubles to a halt, which happened in March 1893. There re-occurred some minor troubles for some years after, necessitating a strong police force remaining in the area for some years.

One such expedition was sent to destroy the village of Tartan which had been rebuilt by the rebels after its destruction in February 1889. The force consisted of 2nd Norfolk Regiment and sixty men of the 42nd Gurkha Light Infantry. The whole force was commanded by Captain Otway Mayne, 2nd Norfolk’s with 25 year old Surgeon Captain Ferdinand LeQuesne as the medical officer [2].

Ferdinand Simeon LeQuesne

LeQuesne was born in Jersey on the 25th December 1863, the third son of Lieutenant Colonel Giffard N LeQuesne, a retired Royal Jersey Artillery officer and Augusta W LeQuesne, née Simeon. He was initially educated in the Channel Islands and later underwent medical training at Kings College Hospital. He qualified as a licentiate of the Society of Apothecaries in 1885; MRCS in 1886 and a Licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians, also in 1886. Commissioned as a Surgeon Captain on 28th July 1886 he was attached to the 2nd Norfolk’s and proceeded with them to Burma [3].

LeQuesne’s presence on the return to Tartan on the 4th May was regarded more as a morale booster than a necessity. The Chins were not expected to fight but to follow their practice of abandoning their village on the approach of the column. By 0930am the column was above what looked like the abandoned village and Captain Mayne deployed his forces and the final advance into the village began. When almost at the bottom of the hill the troops discovered two fortified stockades which immediately came to life as heavy fire poured from them. One of the first to fall was 2nd Lieutenant Michel, leading the main party forward. Forced to withdraw, the troops pulled back with Michèl’s body but he still remained exposed to the Chin fire. A Private Charles Crampion went and fetched LeQuesne to treat Michèl’s wounds’. Here he dressed the wounds aided by Crampion and two Gurkhas, all the time under constant Chin fire (Figure 1). After about ten minutes LeQuesne and his helpers brought Michèl’s body under cover. Observing this brave act, from a position about thirty yards away, was Captain Mayne, who himself was wounded. LeQuesne now dashed across the fire swept hillside to Mayne’s side and commenced dressing his wounds at which point he himself was wounded. Mayne’s own statement testifies to the bravery of LeQuesne.

“…the splendid coolness and gallantry displayed by Surgeon LeQuesne in attending to the wounded, he himself being exposed during the whole time to a very hot fire, under which several men dropped; this was more especially the case while attending to 2nd Lieutenant Michel, owing to his extremely exposed position. I consider that Surgeon LeQuesne’s conduct is deserving of the highest possible recognition” [4]

By now some eleven officers and men had been killed and with only two doolies, Captain Westmoreland, on whom command now rested, decided that withdrawal was the only option [5]. This, the force did, leaving Tartan burning once again. Some days later a force returned again to the scene of the action and destroyed the now unoccupied stockades.

On 29th October 1889 LeQuesne’s name appeared in the London Gazette with notification of the award of the Victoria Cross.

‘Displayed conspicuous bravery and devotion to duty during the attack on the village of Tartan, by a column of the Chin Field Force, on 4th May 1889, in having remained for the space of about ten minutes in a very exposed position (within five yards of the loopholed stockade from which the enemy was firing), dressing with perfect coolness and self-possession the wounds from which Second Lieut. Michel, Norfolk Regiment, shortly afterwards died. Surgeon LeQuesne was himself severely wounded later on whilst attending to the wounds of another officer’.

The Victoria Cross was presented to him by General BL Gordon at Rangoon in December 1889.

‘Private Crampion was recommended for the Victoria Cross for his actions but was awarded the Distinguished Conduct Medal (DCM). He was awarded a bar to the DCM during the Anglo Boer War.’
LeQuesne recovered from his wounds and took part in further actions in Burma including with the Chin Lushai Field Force in 1890, the Wuntho Field Force in 1891 and the Kaukoo Expedition. He was awarded the Indian General Service Medal 1854-95 with three clasps and was further ‘Mentioned in Despatches’. After a year in England from 1893 to 1894 India beckoned again and service in Bengal until 1900 and then the Punjab until 1901, during which time he was promoted to the rank of Major, in May 1898. In November 1901, with the Anglo Boer War almost three years old, LeQuesne found himself in South Africa, where he served until 1902 and was awarded the Queens South Africa Medal with clasps for Cape Colony, 1901 and 1902 and was once again ‘Mentioned in Despatches’.

After a further two years in England he returned to Bengal until 1909, being promoted Lieutenant Colonel in 1906. With the outbreak of war in 1914 LeQuesne joined the BEF, serving in the war until 1918, when he retired. On retirement he took up the post, amongst others, of Honorary Surgeon to the Metropolitan Hospital London. His recreations were shooting, racquets and lawn tennis; presumably he developed his love for the former whilst in India. He remained a bachelor throughout his life [6].

Ferdinand Simeon LeQuesne died on 14th April 1950, aged 86 at 6 Victoria Square, Clifton, Bristol. He was buried at Canford Cemetery, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol, on 19th April 1950.

References
4. Statement by Captain O Mayne 2nd Norfolk Regiment regarding operations on 4th May 1889. The National Archives, WO32/7404
5. Copy of the report by Captain CH Westmoreland, 42nd Goorkha Light Infantry, Fort White, dated 5 May 1889 to District Staff Officer Chin Field Force. The National Archives, WO32/7404
6. LeQuesne VC File, Army Medical Services Museum
9.6.11 Action At Tartan

On 4th May the last action of the expedition was fought and it merits fully description. Some new huts had been noticed on the site of Tartan, and to destroy these a party was sent from Fort White on 4th May. The following account is taken almost verbatim from the report of Captain C.H. Westmoreland, 42nd Gurkha Light Infantry. The column, consisting of 65 rifles of the 2nd Battalion Norfolk Regiment and 60 rifles of the 42nd Gurkha Light Infantry, occupied the heights above New Tartan without opposition.

The main body advanced with the intention of rushing the village, but encountered determined resistance from the Chins, who were strongly posted in two stockades. The upper stockade consisted of a log-hut, the sides and roof of which were bullet-proof. It was connected with a ravine to the east by a trench about 3 feet wide, 5 feet deep, and 20 yards long. The trench was covered with logs and planks flush with the ground. The hut itself was surrounded at a distance of 5 or 6 yards with rows of sharp-pointed stakes about 3 feet high. The second stockade was in the bed of the ravine. It consisted of a hole about 6 or 9 feet square, from which a trench ran down the ravine. Both trench and hole were covered with logs and planks and were bullet-proof. In both stockades there were a few spaces between the logs through which the Chins fired, and the only way in which they could be carried was by pulling away some of the timber.

At the lower stockade, early in the action, Second-Lieutenant Michel fell mortally wounded. The troops at first endeavoured to turn out the defenders of the upper stockade by firing through the openings between the logs. Before long the covered trench was noticed and pulled open and the Chins in it were shot. After accomplishing this under fire from the Chins in the lower stockade and in a the neighbouring jungle, the column retired, burning the village as it went. The Chins, who had suffered heavily, did not follow, being deterred by the loss which they had sustained and kept in check by a small covering party on the heights. In this action our loss was one officer killed and two (Captain Mayne and Surgeon LeQuesne) severely wounded and three men killed and eight wounded. Surgeon LeQuesne received the Victoria Cross for conspicuous coolness and gallantry displayed whilst dressing Lieutenant Michel's wound. (Carey & Tuck, p. 30)

* As the British practised the tactic of burning down every village, which showed any sign of resistance, and taking away or destroying the domestic animals and grains anyway, the Chins themselves burned down several of their own villages and destroyed their grains before the British could do it.

Footnote 2 on page 30. “The village called by us 'New Tartan' is known to the Chins as Shullum, and they give the following account of the fight. Shullum was a settlement in which about 100 persons of the Bwenman clan lived. They had built block-houses in case of surprise by the troops, who actually did not surprise them, the first intimation they received of their approach was seeing a fox-terrier which was in advance of the troops. The Chins, men, women, and children, all crowded into the block-houses, approximately 80 in numbers; they had time to get well into their positions as the troops marched past the village before they saw it. The troops then turned and attacked the block-houses. Twenty-nine Chins were killed and 11 wounded. Lyn Kam, the Bwenman Chief, was killed. There were 40 untouched persons left in the block-houses when troops retired. The Tartan Chief's (Dolyn) youngest brother killed and Tan Chim, another brother, wounded. Dolyn came out of it all right, but five years later died in the Myangyan jail.”
9.13.2 _ THE BATTLE OF TARTAN [TAITAN or SIALLUM]
(See also 9.6.11)

... The Chin leader [Vum Ko Hau] is heir to the ruling Lunman clan of the Siyin Chins. Some of his grand uncles fell in action against General Sir George White’s army at No. 3 Stockade and at Tartan in the Siyin Valley. At this latter place 60 out of 80 holders of the Fort fell on May 4, 1889. Lieut.-Colonel F.S. LeQuense won the Victoria Cross (Times April 18th 1950.) But his own dashing qualities of leadership and toughness in resisting Burma's enemies during the Second World War were natural qualities he breathed at his birthplace: Fort White. This very high post bears the name of Field Marshal Sir George White, V.C., O.M., G.C.B., G.C.S.I., G.C.M.I.E., G.C.I.E., G.C.V.O., L.L.D., who took three years to subdue the heroic Siyin Chins after the fall of Mandalay and the humiliation of King Thibaw.* (Diplomats in Outline: _Vum Ko Hau Siyin of Siyin Valley..._ - “THE DIPLOMATIS” The Review of the Diplomatic and Consular World. London. (Vum Ko Hau, p. 135.))

Telegram from the District Staff Officer, Burma, to the Chief Secretary to the Chief Commissioner, Burma.- No. 1283, dated the 9th May 1889.

- GENERAL FAUNCE wires. Begins: 323 C.F., _Fort White, May 5th 1889. A new Siyin village near site of Tartan, south-east of this, having been seen from Sagylain by party referred to in my 320 C.F., I sent 65 Rifles, Norfolk, 60 Rifles, 42nd, under Major Shepherd, Norfolk, yesterday to destroy new Tartan which consisted of 15 houses. No opposition till after troops entered village, at bottom of which two very strong stockades, flanking each other and connected by covered way with plank-roof. Siyin Chins held their fire till troops were within 50 yards. They stood their ground and fought with great pluck, eight being killed with the bayonet. In the first stockade their loss was 30 killed and many wounded** I regret our loss was heavy..."

- See PHOTO 1

“Early Tactics of the Chins: When we first advanced into the hills the Chins fought in the open and from behind stockades, but they soon learned that our quick-firing rifles were too much for them; and they could not stand against the charges of British and Gurkha troops. They then tried fighting from covered-in trenches as at Tartan in 1889. This fight, though considered but a drawn battle from our point of view, was regarded by the Chins as an overwhelming disaster to their arms; they frankly admitted that they were beaten and could never again stand face to face with British troops.”
(Carey & Tuck, p. 231)

* See APPENDIX E

The above list will be added later with the names of the wounded.

Source of all telegrams: _Vum Ko Hau_, 169-170
• YOUR No. 1283. Chief Commissioner (Sir Charles Crosthwaite, K.C.S.I.) will be glad to know whether it is to be understood that the attack was successful and that both stockades were taken and the village destroyed.

• Telegram from Major F.D. Raikes, C.I.E., to the Chief Secretary to the Chief Commissioner, Burma – 163P, dated the 15th May 1889.

New village of Taitan was destroyed, but one stockade was not taken as Officer Commanding Force considered if there were further casualties column could not return to Fort White that night and no arrangements made for camping out. On 9th May 150 Rifles under General Symons went out and destroyed remaining stockade; place found deserted; General Symons relieved General Faunce on 6th May 1889.

• Telegram from the District Staff Officer, Burma; to the Chief Secy to the Chief Commissioner, Burma: - 1488, dated the 15th May 1889. Following from General Officer Commanding Chin Field Force. Begins:

May 10th. Party 150 Rifles, Norfolk, and 42nd Gurkhas, under Brigadier-General Symons visited TAITAN, scene of fight on 4th May, yesterday. Were unopposed though signal shots were fired. Found many graves and several bodies were buried in enemy's trenches. Siyin Chins repaired stockade which was all completely destroyed and burnt. Ends.

Pau Thual, a heroic defender of the Taitan Fort, composed the following song: (Vum Ko Hau, p. 232, No. 39. See also APPENDIX L.)

Phung Sakluang leh leido sakluang
Tul Luang thing bang hong ki phom
Phung luang lumsuang bang heal ing
Pu von min nam sial ing
Bodies of relatives and enemy
Were heaped like logs on one another
Bodies of relatives served as my fort
And called the heroic names of my clansmen
as I killed the enemy

The following poem was composed by the late Rev. T. Hau Go Sukte (see 18.3.2 RELIGION) in honour of the heroines and heroes of the Battle of Siallum.

SIALLUM FORTRESS
(Battle of Siallum 4th May 1889)
Mark ye well this honoured spot,
Stained with blood of heroes slain;
They to keep our ancient lot,
Fought a horde from Great Britain.
Mark ye th' historic date,
Eighteen eighty nine May fourth;
They their precious blood poured forth;
When for us who born of late,
They their precious blood poured forth;
Sowed the seed of liberty.

(Source: X-Sender: khoiksm@hotmail.com[Rev. Khoi Lam Thang]
To: suantak@us.net
Cc: zomi@yahooogroups.com, Zoni@onelist.com, ciimmuai@yahooogroups.com,
Date: Thu, 24 May 2001 11:45:34 -0000
Subject: [ZONET] May ni 4 ni leh SIALLUM KULH)
Pictures of Lt. Col. Simeon le QUESNE, his VC medal, painting showing him at the Battle of Taitan, and his grave at the Canford Cemetery, City of Bristol.

Source: URL obtained from Salai Van Cung Lian (UK)

- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. Hamburg. 2015
MEMORIAL STONE AT SIALLUM FORT

Poem composed by Rev. S.T. Pu Hau Go in 1967
Photographer unknown

Note. On March 4, 1965 a proposal was made to the Ministry of Culture by Major Son Khaw Lian, Chairman of the Chin Affairs Council, and Chin Cultural Officer Pu Suak Khaw Khai for the restoration of the fort and the erection of this Memorial Stone. A news item about it appeared in Kyenone (The Mirror) on 14.9.1965. This Stone was erected on 16.3.1967.
- This information and photo were received by me from Pu David Hang Za Pome on 29.1.2016.

Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. Germany. March 2016.
FORT SIALLUM or FORT TAITAN (FORT OF THE SIYIN/SIZANG)

Photo Courtesy: Tuangpu

- Lt. Col. Surgeon LeQuesne got his Victoria Cross for his action here on May 4, 1889.
- See 9.10.2 ACTIONS AT TARTAN (TAITAN or SIALLUM)
- Restoration of it was done by the Burmese Government, but not strictly according to the original structures.
- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. January 2016
India General Service 1854-95, one bar, Chin Hills 1892-93 (SURG. CAPT. J. P. DOYLE, 10TH MADRAS INFY.). Very fine. (1)

Fußnoten

This scarce bar of which few survive was authorised on 9 January 1903 and issued to about 2,600 men. It was awarded for service in the Northern Chin Hills during the Siyin-Nwegal uprising, when the Chins rose in rebellion against British proposals to disarm the tribes.

- Obtained from Salai Vun Cung Lian (UK)
- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. October 2015.
BRIGADIER-GENERAL ELLIOT PHILIPSE JOHNSON, C.B.

b. 21 November 1866, d. 26 November 1925
Elliot Philipse Johnson was born on 21 November 1866.1 He was the son of Charles Cooper Johnson and Jemima Anne Frances Martin. He married Mary Inkson, daughter of Surgn-Maj-Gen James Inkson, on 4 July 1892. He died on 26 November 1925 at age 59. He was Companion, Order of the Bath (C.B.) in 1918.1 He was Colonel RE, Honour Brigadier-General (ret), served in Chin-Lushai Expdn 1889–90 (medal), NW Frontier India 1897 (despatches twice, medal), Somaliland 1903–04 (medal), WW I 1914 on staff in Mesopotamia (despatches three times, Commander Star of Roman in 1920. (http://thepeerage.com/p48883.htm)

THE COMMANDANT

COLONEL ARTHUR HENRY MORRIS C.M.G., D.S.O.

MORRIS, ARTHUR HENRY, Lieutenant, was born 3 January 1861, at Ryde, Isle of Wight, eldest son of Reverend Henry Morris and Eliza Jemima Morris (nee Broughton). He was educated at Canterbury, and joined the Royal Irish Regiment 27 January 1883, from the Yorkshire Artillery Militia; took part in the Soudan Expedition, 1884-85 (Medal with clasp, and Bronze Star); served in the Burma Campaign and Expedition against the Red Karens, 1885-87 (Despatches; Medal with two clasps); was Chief Transport Officer to Chin-Lushai Expedition (Despatches; clasp; thanked by the Government of India, and created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 14 November 1890]: "Arthur Henry Morris, Lieutenant, The Royal Irish Regiment. In recognition of services during the Chin-Lushai Expedition".

He became Captain in 1891, commanded two expeditions against tribes in the Northern Territories of the Gold Coast, 1900; (Despatches twice); West Africa, 1900; operations in Ashanti, commanded column which forced its way into Kumasi from the north (severely wounded); defence of Kumasi, commanded garrison, and later on commanded the column which cut its way out of Kumasi (Medal with clasp; Brevet of Lieutenant Colonel; Despatches); commanded Expedition against the Tiansis, 1902 (Despatches); Chief Commissioner, Northern Territories, Gold Coast, 1899-1904; created a CMG, 1904. Lieutenant Colonel Morris married, in 1902, Dorothy Mary Wilkie, niece and adopted daughter of Walter Laverton, of Manchester, and they had one son, John Henry Morris (born 4 October 1908). He commanded the Duke of York's Royal Military School, 1908-13; became Colonel, 23 November 1908, and retired in July 1913. He was Commandant of an internment camp from 1915. His favourite recreations were hunting and shooting.

Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book)Royal Irish Regiment
The Burma and Chin-Lushai campaign medal awarded to Colonel Sir Ronald ‘Mosquito’ Ross, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., late Indian Medical Service, whose discovery of the mosquito cycle in malaria won him the Nobel Prize for Medicine and universal acclaim as one of the greatest benefactors of mankind.

India General Service 1854-95, 2 clasps, Burma 1885-7, *Chin-Lushai 1889-90* (Surgeon R. Ross, 9th Madras Infy.)

Ronald Ross was born at Almora, a hill station in the Nort-Western provinces of India, on 13 May 1857, the eldest child in the family of ten of General Sir Campbell Claye Grant Ross, of the Indian Army. At the age of seven he was sent to England to begin his education, initially in Ryde and then at Springhill, near Southampton. He became fond of nature studies as well as of drawing, music, writing verses and mathematics.

In 1874 he became a medical student at St Bartholomew’s Hospital in London. The extraordinary thing about Ross was that he never really wanted to be a doctor. His real ambition was to be an artist, and he had given evidence of his ability when he came first in the Oxford and Cambridge Local Examination in Drawing. But his father wanted him to go into the Indian Medical Service, so he obeyed. He failed his first examination and, to save his father money, he went to sea as a ship’s doctor until the next examination. He eventually passed and entered the Indian Medical Service, arriving at Bombay in October 1881. For the next several years he held temporary appointments either attached to various Madras regiments or doing duty at station hospitals. Some six months were spent at Vizianagram, and a short time at Pallaveram, both in the Madras Presidency.

From September 1882 to August 1884 he was at Madras itself. In September 1884 he brought a detachment of Madras Pioneers from Quetta to Madras, and in January 1885 spent a week in Burma taking a regiment to Thyetmyoo. On two occasions he was with detachments of Indian troops at Port Blair in the Andamans. From May 1885 to May 1886 he was at Moulmein during the operations in Burma, and later took part in the Chin-Lushai operations of 1889-90, for which he received the India medal with two clasps. During a visit on leave to England in 1894, Ross was introduced to Patrick Manson, the famous tropical diseases doctor, who had made the discovery that a mosquito carried the parasite which caused elephantiasis in man. Manson suggested to Ross that the mosquito could also be the carrier of the malaria parasite, which the Frenchman, Laveran, had recently discovered in the blood of people suffering from malaria. However, no one had any idea yet how the parasite got there and Ross determined to find out. He began his search as soon as he got back to India. Two years and four months later, on 20 August 1897, he saw the first significant sign of success in the discovery of the pigmented oocysts of the malaria parasite in an unusual kind of mosquito, Ross’s ‘dapplewinged mosquito’, now well known as the anophelines mosquito.

It was not until the following year, however, that the discovery that malaria was an infectious disease transmitted from man to man by the mosquito was fully and for all time established. On 28 July 1898, when Manson announced Ross’s results at the Edinburgh meeting of the British Medical Association, the whole astounding cycle of development had been demonstrated for bird malaria and hence by very obvious probability for malaria in man. In February 1899, Ross left India to take up the position of lecturer at the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, and in July of the same year he retired from the Indian Medical
Service.

His mind was now turned almost wholly to the application of his discovery to the eradication of malaria by the destruction of the anopheles mosquito. Success was not at first so great as had been anticipated, for although the method was clearly logical enough, difficulties in carrying it out were at first underestimated. Ross, nevertheless, lived to see his methods applied with increasing success all over the world and, as organization and experience increased, universally recognized as the way in which man might eventually rid himself of this most deadly of all diseases of the tropics which, even today, is reckoned to claim some three million lives every year. Within a few years of his discovery honours of every kind were conferred upon Ross by scientific institutions of many countries. **In 1901 he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society, which awarded him a Royal medal in 1909. In 1902 he was awarded the prestigious Nobel prize for medicine.** He was appointed a Commander of the Bath in 1902, a Knight Commander of the Bath in 1911, and received honorary degrees from several universities.

Whilst in Liverpool, Ross organized and led expeditions to Sierra Leone (1899-1900), West Africa (1901-02), Mauritius (1907-08), Spain, Cyprus and Greece (1912), his chief concern being the prevention of malaria. During 1912 he moved to London and became physician for tropical diseases at King’s College Hospital. In 1908, Ross received a commission as Major in the R.A.M.C., Territorial Force, became Lieutenant-Colonel in 1913, and Consulting Physician for tropical diseases to the Base Hospitals for Indian Troops in England in December 1914. In 1915, he was sent to Alexandria to investigate dysentery prevailing in the Dardanelles. He became Consultant for Malaria to the War Office and in 1917 was sent to Salonika on a malaria survey. The ship he was on was torpedoed “in a landlocked bay close to the Leucadian Rock (where Sappho is supposed to have drowned herself)” - Ross gives a dramatic account of the incident in his ‘Memoirs.’ In 1918 he became temporary Colonel in the R.A.M.C., and in June of that year was appointed a Knight Commander of St Michael and St George.

In 1925 he became Consultant in Malaria to the Ministry of Pensions, and when, in 1926, the Ross Institute and Hospital for Tropical Diseases at Putney Heath was founded in his honour, he became its first director-in-chief. Sir Ronald Ross died on 16 September 1932, at the Ross Institute after a long illness. The medal is accompanied by a substantial quantity of additional research and six related books, including Ross’s Memoirs (London 1923) which contains an autographed letter of thanks from Ross to James Tait Black for the memorial prize won by Ross for this same book.

--------------------

CIVILIAN AWARDS (John Tamplin Collection)
Collection: CIVILIAN AWARDS (John Tamplin Collection)
Category: SINGLE CAMPAIGN MEDALS
Note: Highlighting in blue colour has been done by myself. tzd
(Source: http://www.dnw.co.uk/medals/auctionarchive/viewspecialcollections/itemdetail.lasso?itemid=36374)
Colonel Sir Ronald ‘Mosquito’ Ross, K.C.B., K.C.M.G

“The Burma and Chin-Lushai campaign medal awarded to Colonel Sir Ronald ‘Mosquito’ Ross, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., late Indian Medical Service, whose discovery of the mosquito cycle in malaria won him the Nobel Prize for Medicine and universal acclaim as one of the greatest benefactors of mankind."

(http://www.dnw.co.uk/medals/auctionarchive/viewspecialcollections/itemdetail.lasso?itemid=36374)

- See APPENDIX 0  BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF BRITISH GENERALS AND ADMINISTRATORS...

- Created in this form by Thang Za Dal. June/2014.
COLONEL FRANK MONTAGU RUNDALL, D.S.O.

He was born 18 May 1851, son of General F H Rundall, RE, CSI. He was educated at Marlborough, and was gazetted to the 49th Foot, as Sub-Lieutenant, 9 March 1872, becoming Lieutenant, 20 November 1874, and Captain, Indian Staff Corps, 9 March 1884. He served in the 49th (Royal Berkshire Regiment), 4th Bengal Infantry, 9th Bengal Infantry, 3rd Gurkha Rifles, and 4th Gurkha Rifles. Captain Rundall was on the Staff of General Sir William Lockhart, in the Upper Burma Campaign, 28 September 1888 to 2 February 1887, and received the Medal and clasp. In 1889-90 he served in the Chin-Lushai Expedition, receiving a clasp. He became Officer Commanding the Chin Hills, and Political Officer, Fort White, and conducted operations against Kanbaw, China, in 1891; received a clasp, and was created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 19 November 1891]: "Frank Montagu Rundall, Captain, Indian Staff Corps. For services in the Chin Hills".

The Insignia were presented by the Queen at Osborne 10 January 1893. He was promoted to Major 9 March 1892. In 1891 he served in the Manipur Expedition, commanding in the action of Bapam. He was mentioned in Despatches [London Gazette, 14 August 1891], and received a clasp. He again saw active service in the Waziristan Expedition, 1894-95, and received a clasp. Captain Rundall was promoted to Lieutenant Colonel 9 March 1898. He served with the China Field Force, 1900-01 (Medal). He was created a CB 1901; became Colonel, and was put on the Supernumerary Employed List, Indian Army. He commanded Group A, City of London Volunteer Regiment.

Colonel Rundall has published a Manual of the Chin Language. He married, in 1876, Emily Rosa, daughter of the Right Reverend E H Bickersteth and they had two sons and two daughters.

(Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book)
(http://www.dnw.co.uk/medals/auctionarchive/viewspecialcollections/itemdetail.lasso?itemid=36374)

COLONEL JOSHUA ARTHUR NUNN, D.S.O.

NUNN, JOSHUA ARTHUR, 1st Class Veterinary Surgeon, AVD, was born 10 May 1853, eldest son of Edward W Nunn, JP, DL, of Hill Castle, County Wicklow, Ireland. He was educated at Wimbledon School, and at the Royal Veterinary College, London, and became a Barrister-at-Law, Lincoln's Inn, and Advocate, Supreme Court, Transvaal.

He was a Fellow of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons; an FRCS, FRS Edinburgh; passed through the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons with Honours; received the Royal Agricultural Society's Prize in 1876; was Lieutenant, Royal Monmouthshire Engineer Militia, from 1871-77; Veterinary Surgeon, RA, 1877. He served with the RA in the Afghan War, 1878-80 (Medal); was Veterinary Surgeon to the Punjab Government, 1880-85; on special duty with the Natal and Cape Governments, investigating South African horse sickness, 1886-88. He served in the Chin-Lushai Expedition, as Principal Veterinary Officer, 1889-90, on the Indian Frontier (Medal and clasp; Despatches); served in the Zulu Rebellion in 1888; was present at the surrender of the chief Somkeli at St Lucia Lagoon; was Principal, Punjab Veterinary College, 1890-96; Deputy Inspector-General, AVD, 1901-4; PVO, Eastern Command, 1904-5; PVO, South Africa,
1905-6; Examiner in Hygiene, Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons; and in Toxicology at Liverpool University.

He was created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 12 December 1890]: "Joshua Arthur Nunn, Army Veterinary Department. In recognition of services in the Chin-Lushai Expedition". He was created a CIE for services in Lahore Veterinary College. Colonel Nunn married, in 1907, Gertrude Anne, widow of W Chamberlain, and widow of E Kellner, CIE. He wrote 'Stable Management in India'; 'Lectures on Saddlery and Harness'; a 'Report on the South African Horse Sickness'; a 'Report on South African Horses'; 'Diseases of the Mammary Gland in Domestic Animals'; 'Veterinary Toxicology' and many articles in the various professional publications on veterinary medicine and surgery. He was Editor of the 'Veterinary Journal'. This distinguished officer died 23 February 1908. Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book) Army Veterinary Department

COLONEL GEORGE JOHN SKINNER, DSO.

Colonel, was born 16 June 1841, son of James Skinner, JP, and of Mrs Skinner. He was educated at the Scottish Naval and Military Academy, Edinburgh; entered the 100th Regiment 16 September 1859; 38th Regiment, 1860, and BSC, 1865; became Captain, 1871; Major, 1879, and Lieutenant Colonel, 1885. He served during the Afghan Campaign of 1879-80 with 3rd Bengal Infantry (mentioned in Despatches; Medal). He became Colonel 16 September 1889. For his services in the Chin-Lushai Expedition, 1889 and 1890, he received the thanks of the Government of India; the Medal with clasp; and was created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 14 November 1890]: "George John Skinner, Lieutenant Colonel, and Colonel, Indian Army". Colonel Skinner was placed on the Unemployed List 16 June 1908. He married (1) Robina Agnes (who died in 1876), daughter of Reverend W Asher, DD, and (2) Katherine Fox, daughter of Lieutenant Colonel A Baird. Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book)

COLONEL CHARLES HERBERT SHEPHERD, D.S.O.

Major SHEPHERD, was born 4 April 1846, second son of Thomas Shepherd, of Beverley, Yorkshire; was educated at Rugby; gazetted Ensign, 9th Foot, 2 May 1865; Lieutenant 15 February 1871; served in the Afghan War, 1879-80: as Transport Officer, Khyber Line, at Bosawal and Jellalabad (Medal); Captain, 1 September 1880; Adjutant, Auxiliary Forces, 28 November 1881; Major, 10 January 1883; served in Burmese Expedition, 1887-89; operations in the Chin Hills; officiated as Deputy Judge Advocate (Despatches, 22 June 1886, and 2 September 1887; Medal with two clasps); created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 12 November 1889]: "In recognition of services during the late operations in Burma. Charles Herbert Shepherd, Major, The Norfolk Regiment". Insignia presented by the Queen 1 August 1890. He served in Chin-Lushai Expedition, 1889-90 (clasp); became Colonel 28 October 1898; retired 4 April 1903. Colonel Shepherd was married. Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book) Norfolk Regiment
COLONEL GEORGE WILLIAM ROGERS, D.S.O.

Colonel ROGERS was born 11 September 1843. He became Lieutenant, RA, 1 September 1852: Lieutenant, Bengal Staff Corps, 22 December 1868. He served in the Lushai Expedition, 1871-72 (Medal with clasp). He again saw active service in the Afghan War, 1879-81, taking part in the action of Ali Khel; operations around Kabul and Sherpur, March from Kabul to the Relief of Kandahar, and battle of 1 September (Despatches [London Gazette, 4 May and 3 December 1880]; Medal with two clasps; Bronze Star; Brevet of Major, 1 September 1882).

He was DAAG (Musketry), Bengal, 24 July 1884 to 17 February 1886. He served in the Sikkim Expedition, 1888, and was created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 12 April 1889]: "In recognition of services during the operations at Sikkim. George William Rogers, Lieutenant Colonel, Bengal Staff Corps". He became Lieutenant Colonel 1 September 1888; Brevet Colonel, 19 September 1902, and retired on 19 September 1902, with the rank of Colonel. Colonel Rogers married in 1892, Jane Isabella, daughter of Major General J S Rawlins. He died 27 April 1917.

Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book) Bengal Staff Corps.

---

COLONEL EDWARD ROBERT JOHN PRESGRAVE, D.S.O.

PRESGRAVE, EDWARD ROBERT JOHN, Captain, and Brevet Major, was born in London, 29 June 1855, only son of Lieutenant Edward Presgrave, HEICS, and of Margaret Crane. He was educated at Wellington College, and was gazetted to the 21st Regiment, the Royal Scots Fusiliers 11 February 1875, becoming Lieutenant 11 February 1875. On 19 December 1878, he was admitted to the Madras Staff Corps. He was employed in the Rumpa Rebellion in 1879; served in the Afghan Campaign, 1879-80 (Medal); was Adjutant, 15th Madras Infantry, 1882-86; became Captain 11 February 1886; served in the Burma Campaign, 1886-7-9 (Medal and two clasps).

He was Second-in-Command, 12th Regiment 2nd Burma Battalion Mounted Infantry, 1890-93. He served in the Expedition to Manipur, 1891 (Despatches [London Gazette, 14 August 1891], clasp). He again saw active service in Burma, 1892-93-94, with the Tashon Column and in the operations in the Northern Chin Hills. He was mentioned in Despatches, GGO 733 of 1893; was given the Brevet of Major 29 December 1893, received a clasp, and was created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 12 February 1895]: "Edward Robert John Presgrave, Captain and Brevet Major, Indian Staff Corps. In recognition of services during the operations carried on in Burma and the Northern Chin Hills in 1892-93 and 1893-94".

The Warrant, Statutes and Insignia were sent to India 25 April 1895. He was Commandant, 10th Gurkha Rifles, 1893-1902; became Major and temporary Lieutenant Colonel 11 February 1895. He was AAG India 20 July 1900 to 24 July 1901, and 3 January 1902 to 31 August 1906; was given the Brevet of Colonel in 1904, and became Colonel 11 February 1904. Colonel Presgrave was put on the Unemployed
Supernumerary List 29 June 1912. He was given a special appointment, Military Intelligence, in 1914; became GSO, 2nd Grade, in 1917, and was mentioned for services rendered [London Gazette, 13 March 1918]. Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book)

**COLONEL CAULFIELD, GORDON NAPIER, DSO**

Captain, was born 27 Jan. 1862, son of the late Colonel Robert Caulfield and Anne Lovell Bury. He entered the Army on 22 Jan. 1881, as Second Lieutenant, 50th Foot; was transferred to the 24th Foot 1 July, 1 1; became Lieutenant, outh Wales Borderers 1 July, 1 1, and Indian Staff Corps 23 April, 1883. He served with the Burma Expedition, 1885-87, and 1887-89, and received the Medal and two clasps; in the Wuntho Expedition in 1891 (clasp), and in the operations in the Northern Chin Hills, 1892-93; received a clasp; was mentioned in Despatch, G.G.O. 733 of '93, and was created a Companion of the Distinguished service Order [London Gazette, 2 Jan. 1894]: *· Gordon Napier Caulfield, Capt., Indian Staff Corps. In recognition of services during the operations in Burma and in the Northern Chin Hills." The Insignia, etc., were sent to India and presented 13 Nov. 1894. He had been promoted to Captain, Indian Army, 22 Jan. 1892, and became Major 22 April, 1901; Lieutenant-Colonel 1 June, ] 890-1 ; Brevet Colonel 11 ), 1907, and retired a Colonel, Indian Army, 1 Feb. 1913. Colonel Caulfield commanded the 17th (Reserve) Battn. Durham Light Infantry from 1914. He married, in 1902, Mildred, youngest daughter of Philip O'Reilly, D.L., and they have two daughters.

**COLONEL TAYLOR, HUGH NEUFVILLE, DSO**

Capt., was born 20 Dec. 1 59, at Blackheath, Kent, on of the late Capt. J. H. Tarlor, )laster Attendant, Madras Presidency, and of ~lr. J. H. Taylor. He was educated at Carshalton House, Carhalton, Surrey, and joined the 1st Bedford hire Regt. 29 Feb. 1 2; became Lieutenant, Indian taff Corps, 2 May, 1883, and 'apt. 2 Jan. 1893. He served in Burma, 1887-89, and 1889-92 (1 Medal with two clasp ; Dipatche); in Burma, 1892-93. Operation in the • 'Northern Chin Hills, in command of a detachment of the 90th Punjabis. He was mentioned in Diplatches, G.G.O. 733 of '93; received a clasp, amd was created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 2 Jan. 1 94]: "Hugh Neufville Taylor, Capt., Indian Staff Corp. In recognition of service during the operations in Burma and the Northern Chin Hills." He became Major 10 July, 1901, and Lieutenant–Colonel 1 June, 1004, and commanded the 20th Punjabis from 1897 to 1905. He was Deputy Inspector-General, Military Police, Burma, and retired 1 Feb. 1914. He has the Delhi Durbar Medal. He married, 17 Dec. 1907, at Colombo, Cicely–lay, daughter of W. R.

p. 602 PUBLIC HEALTH. [MARCH 9, 1907

**COLONEL WiICKLOW, C.B., K.O.B.**

February 18th.He joined the Madras Medical Department as an Assistant-Surgeon, July 3rd, 1856; became
Deputy-Surgeon-General, April 5th, 1885; and retired from the service in 1890. He had charge of the Medical Department in the Burmese expedition in 1885-6, was twice mentioned in dispatches, and received the thanks of the Government of India. He was also with the Chin-Lushai expedition in 1889-90, being again mentioned in dispatches. Presumably he had received the Frontier medal with two clasps for these services, but the Army Lists do not credit him with these honours. He was made C.B. in November, 1896, and K.O.B. in June, 1906.

(www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/.../pdf/brmedj08003-0062b.pdf)

THE DEATH OF COLONEL WRIGHT

It came as a shock to the foreign community to hear of the death on July 27 at Shanhaikuan, through drowning, of Col. E.G. Wright, CO, of the Indian Infantry, says the P and T. Times. Colonel Wright came to Tientsin in command of the above regiment and was very popular in this port. He leaves a widow and a son at home. Colonel Wright was born on June 20, 1865, and received his first appointment as lieutenant in the Bedford Regiment in 1885, going to the L.S.C next year. He received his captaincy in 1896, his majority in 1908, being made Lieut.- Colonel in 1911. He saw service in the Burmese expedition of 1886-89, the Chin-Lushai expedition of 1889-90, and the Tibetan expedition of 1908-04.

- The Straits Time, 18 August 1919, p. 10

COLONEL E. P. MAINWARING

(a) India General Service 1854-94, 3 clasps, North West Frontier, Looshai, Burma 1889-92 (Capt'n. E. P. Mainwaring, 4th Goorkha Regt.)
(b) Afghanistan 1878-80, 3 clasps, Ali Musjid, Kabul, Kandahar ( Maj. E. P. Mainwaring, 4th Goorkha)
(c) Kabul to Kandahar Star 1880 (Major E. P. Mainwaring, 4th Goorkha Regt.) the reverse centre also faintly scratched ‘Won Sept 1880 - Rec’d Dec 1883’

Footnote

... Between 1868 and 1887, he served with the 4th Gurkha Rifles, being made Captain on 29th June 1869. He took part in the Hazara expedition of 1868 on the North West Frontier, and in the Looshai operations of 1871-72, on the North East Frontier, for which he received the India medal and two clasps. In 1878 Mainwaring took part in the capture of Ali Musjid. He rejoined the regiment from sick leave in January 1879 and served with it during the remainder of the Second Afghan War, taking part in the advance to the Sherpore cantonment at Kabul, the fighting at Jagdalak, the action of Shekabad, the Kabul to Kandahar march under General Sir Frederick Roberts, the battle of Kandahar, and the operations against the Maris under General Sir Charles MacGregor...

In 1885 he became Lieutenant-Colonel, the same year Roberts was appointed Commander-in-Chief in India and the decision was taken to raise a second battalion to each of the first five Gurkha regiments..
1891 his participation in the operations in Burma that year gained him a third clasp to his Indian medal.

Mainwaring retired to England in 1893 with his wife, whose own family, in the best traditions of the British ruling caste, had long associations with the sub-continent. She was the granddaughter of none other than Florentia Sale. Colonel Mainwaring died in Cheltenham on 13th July 1922.

- Ref: Burke’s Landed Gentry; Particulars of the Life of Colonel Edward Mainwaring; A Journal of the Disasters in Affghanistan, 1841-42 (Lady Sale); The Afghan Campaign of 1878-1880 (Shadbolt); History of the 3rd Queen Alexandria’s Own Gurkha Rifles, 1815-1927 (Woodyatt).

http://www.dnw.co.uk/medals/auctionarchive/viewspecialcollections/itemdetail.lasso?itemid=42152

Dix Noonan Webb
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Category: SINGLE CAMPAIGN MEDALS

The Looshai campaign medal awarded to District Superintendent Jack Patch, Bengal Police

MR. JACK PATCH

India General Service 1854-95, 1 clasp, Looshai (J. Patch, Dist. Supt. Police)

Jack Patch joined the Bengal Police Department on 17 May 1863, as an Assistant Superintendent of Police. He transferred to Assam in January 1869, was promoted to District Superintendent of Police in September 1870, and took part in the Looshai expedition of 1871-72. He continued to serve in Assam until July 1884, when he returned to Bengal, and subsequently served at Cuttack, Lohardugga, Hazaribagh, Hooghly, and finally at Hazaribagh again, by which time he had risen to become a District Superintendent 1st Grade. Patch retired in April 1894 and is last recorded in the India Office List of 1913.

MR. T.D. BERRINGTON

The Chin-Lushai campaign medal awarded to Mr T. D. Berrington, Assistant Superintendent, later Director-General, in the Telegraph Department(India General Service 1854-95, 1 clasp, Chin-Lushai 1889-90 (Asst. Supdt. T. D. Berrington, Tel. Dep)

Trevor Douglas Davies Berrington was born on 5 December 1856, and educated at Clifton College from 1867 to 1874. He then served in the Telegraph Department in India for many years, having received his training as a student at the Royal Indian Engineering College for the Telegraph Department at Cooper’s Hill in 1878.

He was posted to the Burma Division and to Rangoon, and subsequently served at Rawulpindi, in the Punjab, in Assam, and at Dacca. During 1889-90 he took part in the Chin-Lushai expedition for which he received the medal with clasp. By 1894 he was Superintendent in charge of the Bellary Division at Belgaum, and was then employed in the Director-General’s office. Around 1900 he became Chief Superintendent of
the Postal Department in the Punjab, and in August 1901 he was appointed Chief Superintendent in the Telegraph Department, of which he became Deputy Director in March 1903. He was appointed Director of the Traffic branch in July 1904, and was a Member of a deputation to China from February to July 1905, for the renewal of the Chinese Telegraph Convention of 1894/1904. He was finally appointed Director-General of the Telegraph Department in 1907, and continued as such until he retired on 5 December 1911.

---

**MR. S.V. TAYLER**

The Chin-Lushai campaign medal awarded to Mr S. V. Tayler, Assistant District Superintendent of Police in Bengal India General Service 1854-95, 1 clasp, Chin-Lushai 1889-90 (Mr. S. V. Tayler, Asst. Dist. Supt. of Police)

Mr S. V. Tayler was appointed Assistant Superintendent, 3rd Grade, in the Bengal Police, sometime before January 1886, when he is shown as serving at Burdwan. He later served at Backergunge and at Midnapore, and by January 1889 had been appointed to the 2nd Grade, serving at Chittagong Hill Tracts. He took part in the Chin- Lushai expedition of 1889-90, and after a period of furlough, then served in the South Lushai Hills. He is last mentioned in the Indian Army List of July 1892.

---

**MR. R.B. McCABE**

The Lushai campaign medal awarded to Mr R. B. McCabe, Political Officer in the North Lushai Hills India General Service 1854-95, 1 clasp, Lushai 1889-92 (Mr. R. B. McCabe, Pol. Officer North Lushai Hills)

Robert Blair McCabe was born in about 1854, and educated at Victoria College in Jersey. He entered the Indian Civil Service after an open competitive examination in 1874, arrived in India in November 1876, and was posted to Assam. He moved to the sunder station at Dibrugarh in December 1876, and was appointed Assistant Commissioner, 3rd Grade, in January 1877, and as Sub-Registrar of the sunder Sub-Division of Lakhimpore in the following June.

McCabe was in charge of the Sub-Division of Jaipore in Lakhimpore from March 1878, was shortly afterwards appointed a J.P., and also officiated as an Assistant Commissioner, 2nd Grade. He became Assistant Inspector of Immigrants at Lakhimpore in December 1878. In 1884 he was promoted Deputy Commissioner, 4th Grade; in about 1891 he became 3rd Grade, and 2nd Grade a year later. Finally he was appointed Deputy Commissioner, 1st Grade, in 1896. Also in that year he became Inspector-General of the Police Department, Commissioner of Excise, Superintendent of Stamps, and Inspector-General of Registration. Shortly after his arrival in India, McCabe was sent to take charge of the savage tribes of the Naga Hills, and he arrived in Kohima immediately after the murder of his predecessor. The Chief Commissioner, who visited the Naga Hills some years later, said that the work which McCabe had done ‘in civilising the Angami Nagas and spreading among them a spirit of loyalty and content is unprecedented’. On a number of occasions when an outbreak occurred, McCabe was responsible for restoring order
again; notably at the forts of Aijal[Aizawl] and Changsil when they were attacked by the Lushais, and the Political Officer, Captain Ulick Browne, was killed... In ‘the difficulties with the Lushais’ he showed great bravery and judgement. This was in connection with the expedition under Captain G. H. Lock, from March to June 1892, necessitated by the general rising of the Eastern Lushais and the attack at Lulbura upon a force under McCabe. For his services here, McCabe received the India medal with clasp ‘Lushai 1889-92’...

Deputy Commissioner McCabe was killed in the earthquake at Shillong on 12 June 1897, when his house collapsed. He was 43 years of age. In the London Gazette of 29 June 1897, the following notice appeared: ‘It had been the Queen’s intention to confer a Companionship of the Most Exalted Order of the Star of India on the late Mr Robert Blair McCabe, Indian Civil Service, in recognition of his services in Assam, and of his work of exceptional merit among the wild tribes of the North-East Frontier of India.’ Two memorials were raised to his memory. One in Shillong Cemetery, and the other a memorial drinking fountain at Kohima.

(http://www.british-medals.co.uk/british-medals/campaign-medal-groups-pre-wwi/igs-1854-bar-chin-lushai-1889-1890-capt-kosb-qsa-3-bars)

**COLONEL William St. Lucian Chase, VC, CB**

Born July 2, 1856 in St Lucia, British West Indies  
Son of Richard H. Chase and Susan I. Buhot  
Brother of Alice H. Chase, Richard H. Chase, Ethel A. Chase, Ernest E. Chase, Lionel B. Chase and Frederick A. Chase  
Husband of Dorothy Steele ? married 1901 [location unknown]  
[children unknown]  
Died June 24, 1908 in Quetta, Baluchistan, India (now North West Pakistan)  
Categories: Royal Military Academy Sandhurst | 15th Regiment of Foot | Victoria Cross.  
Biography  

Chase, William St Lucien (1856–1908), army officer, eldest son of Captain Richard Henry Chase of the control department of the War Office, was born in St Lucia, West Indies, on 21 August 1856. He was educated at the Royal Military College, Sandhurst, and commissioned sub-lieutenant in the 15th foot on 10 September 1875, the unit then being in India. Promoted Lieutenant he transferred to the Bombay staff corps[1] on 31 May 1878, at that time part of the Bombay Army. He served in the Second Anglo-Afghan War, taking part in the defence of Kandahar. During the sortie from Kandahar on 16 August 1880 against the village of Deh Khoja, he and Private T. E. Ashford (Royal Fusiliers) rescued a wounded soldier, carrying him over 200 yards under fire. For this they both were awarded the Victoria Cross (4 October 1881) and were mentioned in dispatches.

The citation for the Victoria Cross reads - "For conspicuous gallantry on the occasion of a sortie from Kandahar, on the 16th August, 1880, against the village of Deh Khoja, in having rescued and carried for a distance of over 200 yards, under the fire of the enemy, a wounded soldier Private Massey, of the Royal Fusiliers, who had taken shelter in a blockhouse. Several times they were compelled to rest, but they
persevered in bring him to a place of safety. Private James Ashford (also of the Royal Fusiliers and likely with Massey at the blockhouse and awarded the VC) rendered Lieutenant Chase every assistance, and remained with him throughout."

Chase served with the Zhob valley expedition in 1884 as deputy assistant quartermaster-general, and was again mentioned in dispatches. From 1 November 1882 to 10 December 1887 he was deputy assistant adjutant-general, Bombay. Promoted captain on 10 September 1886, he was appointed on 28 August 1889 wing commander of the 28th Bombay native infantry (Pioneers). He took part in the Chin-Lushai expedition in 1889–90, and was mentioned in dispatches. Promoted major on 10 September 1895, he served on the north-west frontier in 1897–8 against the Mohmands, and in the Tirah campaign of 1897–8, taking part in the capture of the Samphaga Pass, in the operations at and around Datoi, in the action of 24 November 1897, and in the operations in the Bara valley, 7–11 December 1897.

On 10 June 1899 Chase became commander of the 28th Bombay native infantry, with the temporary rank of lieutenant-colonel. In 1901 he married Dorothy, daughter of Charles Edward Steele, district magistrate of Hyderabad. He was nominated CB in 1903. Later he became assistant adjutant-general, Quetta division, and was on leave when promoted to command the Fyzabad brigade. He returned to Quetta, where he died of brain disease on 30 June 1908. Medal entitlement of Colonel William St Lucien Chase - 28th Bombay Native Infantry •Victoria Cross •Companion, The Most Honourable Order of the Bath ( CB ) •Afghanistan Medal ( 1878-80 ) ?1 clasp: ?"Kandahar" •India General Service Medal ( 1854-95 ) ? 1 clasp: ?"Chin Lushai" •India Medal ( 1895-1902 ) ?2 clasps: ?"Punjab Frontier 1897-98" - "Tirah 1897-98" William Chase was invested with his Victoria Cross by the GOC Bombay at Poona, India, on 23rd January 1882. He is buried at English Cemetery, Quetta Cemetery, Pakistan. His Victoria Cross is held by the Army Museum of Western Australia, Fremantle, Australia.


LIEUTENANT-COLONEL JOHN SHAKESPEAR, CMG., D.S.O.

SHAKESPEAR, JOHN, was born at Indore 1 September 1861, youngest son of Colonel Sir Richmond C Shakespear, CB, Bengal Artillery, and Marion Sophia Thompson. He was educated at Wellington College, and the RMC, Sandhurst, and gazetted to the 100th Regiment 22 January 1881; became Adjutant, 1885; served as Intelligence Officer with the Lushai Expeditionary Force, 1888, and with the Chin-Lushai Expedition, 1889 (Medal), and created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette 14 November 1890]: "John Shakespear, Captain, The Prince of Wales's Leinster Regiment. In recognition of services during Chin-Lushai Expedition".

He was Assistant Police Officer, 1890; Superintendent, South Lushai Hills, 1891-96. He married, in 1892, Charlotte F B, daughter of Arthur Disney Dunne. He became Major, 1895; admitted to ISC, 1896; Assistant Commissioner, Assam Commission, 1896; Deputy Commissioner, 1897; Police Officer, North
Lushai Hills, 1897; First Superintendent, Lushai Hills, 1898; was transferred to Supernumerary List, 1 May 1900, after ten years' permanent civil employment; became Lieutenant Colonel 22 January 1907; became Deputy Commissioner, Assam, and Political Agent in Manipur in 1905. Lieutenant Colonel Shakespear wrote 'The Lushais and the Land They Live In' (Silver Medal of the Society of Arts), 1894, and 'The Lushai Kuki Clans', 1912. He commanded the 18th Battalion Northumberland Fusiliers at the time of the European War, and was created a CMG in 1917.

Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book)

Prince of Wales's Leinster Regiment (Royal Canadia)

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL CHARLES McDOWALL SKENE, D.S.O.

Lieutenant Colonel Skene was born about 1844, son of W A Skene, Lethenty, Aberdeenshire, and a kinsman of the Duke of Fife; was educated at Addiscombe, and joined the 43rd Gurkha Rifles (then the 43rd Assam Light Infantry), Indian Army. He served in the North-West Frontier Campaign in 1863. He married, 24 June 1870, atRyde, Isle of Wight, Rosalie Purnell George, eldest daughter of Mr James Thorne-George, and had four children: Charles George; Madeleine; Alice Beatrice, and John Gordon. He was present at the Forcing of the Ambala Pass in the Duffla Expedition in 1874; the Akka Expedition, 1873-74; the Burmese Expedition, 1886-89, when he took the Ruby Mines; was mentioned in Despatches, and created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 25 November 1887]: "Charles McDowall Skene, Lieutenant Colonel, Bengal Infantry. For operations in Burma". He commanded the Northern Column in the Chin-Lushai Expedition, and was repeatedly mentioned in Despatches from the Government of India.

Colonel Skene was killed in action at Manipur in March 1891, aged 47, having been transferred to 42nd Gurkha Rifles as Commanding Officer just previously.

Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book)

(http://www.dnw.co.uk/medals/auctionarchive/viewspecialcollections/itemdetail.lasso?itemid=36374)

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL HENEGAN, JOHN, DSO

Lieutenant, was born 29 Jan. 1865, and entered the South Wales Borderers 6 Feb. 1884; became Captain, Indian Staff Corps, 30 Dec. 1885; served in Burma, 186-9 (Medal with clasp), and in the Chin-Lushai Expedition in 1892, (clasp). He served in the Northern Chin Hills, 1892-93, when he was mentioned in Despatches, G.G.O. 733 of '93; received a clasp, and was created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 2 Jan. 1894]: "John Henegan, Lieut., Indian Staff Corps. In recognition of services during the operations in Burma and the Northern Chin Hills." He again served in Burma in 1895-96. He became Major, Indian Army, 6 Feb. 1902; Lieutenant-Colonel, Indian Army, 3 J an. 1909, and is Commandant, 10th Gurkha Rifles. London Gazette, 26 May, 1894.-" War Office, 26 May, 1894. The Queen has been graciously pleased to give orders for the following appointments to the Distinguished Service Order, in recognition of the services of the undermentioned Officers in the recent operations against Fodey Silah, in Combo, on the Gambia. To be Companions of the Distinguished Service Order."
LIEUTENANT-COLONEL M.B. ROBERTS

- An Unusual Great War ‘Civil’ O.B.E., ‘Chin Hills 1892-93’ Group of Three to Lieutenant-Colonel M.B. Roberts, 39th Garhwal Rifles
a) The Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, 1st type, Civil Division, Officer’s (O.B.E.)
b) India General Service 1854-95, one clasp, Chin Hills 1892-93 (Lieutt. M.B. Roberts 39th Garhwalis), officially renamed
c) India General Service 1895-1902, V.R., two clasps, Punjab Frontier 1897-98, Tirah 1897-98 (Capt'n M.B. Roberts 39th Bl. Infy.), light contact marks, otherwise very fine or better, scarce to European Officers, mounted for wear (3)...Lieutenant-Colonel Montgomery Browne Roberts, O.B.E. (1863-1924); commissioned Lieutenant (from Militia) Leinster Regiment, 1885; transferred Indian Army the following year and was posted to 2/3 Goorkhas (three years later to become the 39th Garhwal Regiment of Bengal Infantry), 1887, ‘towards the end of 1889 the Battalion furnished a detachment, under Lieutenants A.H. Battye and M.B. Roberts, which took part in this reconnaissance (also known as the Niti Expedition). The force was composed of 209 men of the two battalions of the 3rd Gurkhas, with six British officers (Major C. Pulley in command), and had for its object the dislodging of a party of Tibetans who had established themselves within our frontier at Barahoti, and were levying tolls, etc. At Tapuban the column was divided...The detachment of the Battalion returned to Kaludanda on December 21st, after an absence of just under two months.

The troops engaged were accorded the approval of H.E. the Commander-in-Chief for hard work well carried out’ (Regimental History refers); served with the regiment in the Northern Chin Hills during the Siyin - Nwengal uprising, 1892-93...Thanked by the Lieutenant-Governor United States Provinces (as President of the United Provinces War Board) for his services; in later life he provided the “Introductory” for the Historical Record of the 39th Royal Garhwal Rifles; died in Malaga, Spain.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL A.H. BATTYE

- A Fine Indian Campaigns Group of Three to Lieutenant-Colonel A.H. Battye, Part of the Famous ‘Family of Soldiers’, After A Distinguished Career With the Gurkhas, He Raised and Commanded the 14th (Reserve) Battalion Royal Scots During the Great War. India General Service 1854-95, three clasps, Burma 1885-7, Chin-Lushai 1889-90, N.E. Frontier 1891 (Lieutt. A.H. Battye 2nd Bn. 3rd Gurkha Regt.), letter ‘r’ of ‘Regt’ officially corrected; India General Service 1895-1902, V.R., three clasps, Relief of Chitral 1895, Punjab Frontier 1897-98, Tirah 1897-98, with usual private clasp carriage fitment to accommodate later clasps awards (Lieutt A.H. Battye. 2nd Bn. 4th Gurkhas.); China 1900, no clasp (Captain A.H. Battye. 4th Gurkha Rif.), impressed, light contact marks overall, therefore very fine or better, with an original calling card for ‘Lt. Colonel & Mrs. Arthur H. Battye’ (3)
LIEUTENANT- COLONEL F.E. CARLETON

The India General Service 1854-95 Medal to Lieutenant-Colonel F.E. Carleton, King’s Own Scottish Borderers, who Commanded the 1st Battalion During the Chin-Lushai Expedition, 1889-90 India General Service 1854-95, one clasp, Chin-Lushai 1889-90. (Lieut. Coln. F.E. Carleton K.O. Sco. Bord.), suspension slack, partially officially corrected, Lieutenant-Colonel Francis Edmund Carleton (1844-1900), commissioned Ensign 24th Foot, 1861; transferred Lieutenant King’s Own Scottish Borderers, 1864; served with the Regiment as part of the Peshawar Valley Field Force during the Second Afghan War, 1878-80, and took part in the Lughman Valley expedition, the expedition against the Wazir Kugianis, and the expedition into the Hissarak Valley (medal); advanced Major 1881; Lieutenant-Colonel 1889; Officer Commanding 1st Battalion King’s Own Scottish Borderers during the Chin-Lushai Expedition, 1889-90; during this campaign 21 men of the regiment died of sickness and six officers and 273 men had to be invalided, this amounted to over half the battalion strength at the time; Carleton, and his Second in Command Major G.O. Stoney, were both invalided home, with the latter dying that year; Carleton was forced to retire due to poor health 1893; he lived for another eight years before dying in Plymouth.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL H.Y. BEALE, D.S.O.

- The Rare ‘Chin Hills’ India General Service Medal to Captain, Later Lieutenant-Colonel, H.Y. Beale[D.S.O.], 2nd Battalion Norfolk Regiment; He Commanded the 3rd Battalion of His Regiment, 1901-02 India General Service 1854-95, one clasp, Chin Hills 1892-93 (Capt. H.Y. Beale, 2d Bn. Norf. R.), D.S.O. London Gazette 31.10.1902 Henry Yelverton Beale, Captain and Adjutant Norfolk Regiment ‘In recognition of services during the operations in South Africa’. Lieutenant-Colonel Henry Yelverton Beale, D.S.O. (1860-1939); educated as Wellington College and Sandhurst; commissioned Second Lieutenant 9th Foot, 1881; Captain 2nd Battalion 9th Foot, 1888; served attached 1st Battalion (as he appears on the medal roll) for the operations in the Northern Chin Hills, 1892-93 (Brevet Major; Mentioned in Despatches G.G.O. of 1893); Adjutant 3rd (Militia) Battalion, 1897; Major 1899; served during the Boer War as a Station Staff Officer; Officer Commanding 3rd Battalion, 20.6.1901-20.3.1902 (D.S.O.; M.I.D. London Gazette 10.9.1901 and 29.7.1902); retired 15.8.1903; reengaged for service during the Great War as Major, Depot, Norfolk Regiment, 5.8.1914; Temporary Lieutenant-Colonel, Officer Commanding, Depot, Norfolk Regiment, December 1916-17.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL JAMES KIERO WATSON, CMG, CVO, CBE, DSO, IGS

WATSON, JAMES KIERO, Captain, was born 19 June 1855, son of Major General James Watson (late 60th Rifles) and Mrs James Watson. He was educated at Clifton College and Sandhurst, and was gazetted to the King's Royal Rifle Corps 25 April 1885. In 1891 and 1892 he served in Burma, taking part in the operations
in the Chin Hills. He was attached to the Egyptian Army, 1894-99, and served in the Expedition to Dongola in 1896 as ADC to the Sirdar, being present at the operations of 7 June and 19 September. He was mentioned in Despatches [London Gazette, 3 November 1896], received the Egyptian Medal with clasp, and was created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 17 November 1896]: "James Kiero Watson, Captain, King's Royal Rifle Corps. In recognition of services during the recent operations in the Sudan".

Lieutenant Colonel J K Watson served in the European War from 1914; was Military Attache, Egypt, from 1916; was mentioned in Despatches, given the Legion of Honour, and created a CBE in 1919. He married, in 1902, Katherine Emelia, daughter of H C Nisbet, of The Old House, Wimbledon, and they had one son. He died in 1942. CMG, CVO, CBE, DSO, IGS 1854 (1) Burma 1889-92, Queen's Sudan, QSA (3) RotK Pair Joh, 1914-15 Star, BWM, VM, 1911 Coronation, Turkey Order of Osmanieh, Turkey Order of Medjdie, France Legion of Honour 5th Class, Romania Order of the Crown 1st type 5th Class with swords, Egypt Order of the Nile 4th Class, Belgium Order of Leopold II 3rd Class with rosette on ribbon, Khedive's Sudan (7) Firket, Hafir, Sudan 1897, The Atbara, Khartoum, Sudan 1899, Gedid. Miniatures only DNW Apr 03 £650.

Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book)

OCT. 8, 1927 MEMORANDA The British Medical Journal 637

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL WILLIAM REED MURPHY, D.S.O.

Bengal Medical Service (ret.), died in London on August 7th, aged 77. He was educated at Clongoweswood College, co. Kildare, at Trinity College, Dublin, and at the Meath Hospital, where he won many prizes. After taking the L.R.C.S.I. in 1871, and the L.K.Q.C.P.I. in 1872, he entered the I.M.S. as assistant surgeon in March, 1872, passing into the service second out of a very large batch (40). As the first man, the late Lieut.-Colonel Alexander Crombie, C.B., had already gone through the Netley course as a candidate for the Army Medical Department, in 1871, he went straight out to India, and Murphy headed the Netley list and gained the Herbert prize.

He attained the rank of brigade surgeon lieutenant-colonel in October, 1896, and retired in July, 1899. His whole cairer was passed in military employment, and he had a very fine war record...His first active service was in the secoild Afghanwar of 1878-80, when he took part in the action at Saifudin, the occupation of Kandahar, the actions of Ahmed Khel, Arzu, and Patkao Shama, was mentioned in dispatches in 1878, and received the Afghan medal with a clasp. He subsequently served in many frontier campaigns; the Hazara expedition of 1888, was mentioned in dispatches, and received the frontier medal with clasp; the Lushai campaign of 1889 (clasp); in the Chin-Lushai campaign (1889-90) he was prinincipal medical officer, was mentioned in dispatches, and was awarded the D.S.O. and another clasp.- He was in the Chitral campaign of 1895, with the relief force (medal with clasp); the Tirah campaign of 1897-98, with the Kurram-Kohat force, and as principal medical officer of theKurram movable column; he was -twice mentioned in dispatches. Nearly twenty years after his retirement he was granted a good service pension, on July 6th, 1918.
LIEUTENANT-COLONEL W. J. “LINGER” LONG

A Great War C.M.G, group of eight awarded to Lieutenant-Colonel W. J. “Linger” Long, King’s Royal Rifle Corps The Order of St. Michael and St. George, C.M.G., neck badge, silver-gilt and enamels; India General Service 1854-95, 1 clasp, Lushai 1889-92 (2d. Lieut., 4th Bn. K.Rl. Rif. Corps); Queen’s South Africa 1899-1902, 6 clasps, Tugela Heights, Relief of Ladysmith, Laing’s Nek, Belfast, Orange Free State, Cape Colony (Captain, K.R.R.C.) clasps mounted in order as listed; King’s South Africa, 2 clasps (Capt., K.R.R.C.); 1914-15 Star (Major, K.R.Rif.C.); British War and Victory Medals, with M.I.D. oak leaf (Lt.Col.); Delhi Durbar 1911.


Wilfred James Long was born in 1871, son of Rear-Admiral Samuel Long, and educated at Winchester College. He was commissioned into the King’s Royal Rifle Corps in 1889 and served in the operations in the Chin Hills 1891-92, with the Lushai Column (Medal with clasp). As a Captain he served with the regiment throughout the War in South Africa 1899-1902 (Queen’s medal with six clasps, King’s medal with two clasps). At the outbreak of the Great War, “Linger” Long was serving with the 3rd Battalion in India until January 1915, when the battalion went to France, with Long as second-in-command. In the autumn of 1915 when the 80th Brigade of Rifles left France, Long took the 3rd battalion to Salonika where his wide experience on the inhospitable veldt of South Africa stood the battalion in good stead. During the Great War he was wounded twice, Mentioned in Despatches twice, awarded the C.M.G. and a Brevet Lieutenant-Colonelcy. “Linger” Long died on 24 May 1954, aged 82.

http://www.dnw.co.uk/medals/auctionarchive/searchcataloguearchive/itemdetail.lasso?itemid=18274

258 JULY 29, 1939 OBITUARY - THE BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL DEATHS IN THE SERVICES
LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FREDERICK JOSEPH DEWES, I.M.S. (ret.),

Died in a nursing home at Blackheath on July 13, aged 78. He was born on January 3, 1861, the son of Mr. Henry Dewes, was educated at St. Thomas's Hospital, and took the M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P. in 1886. He entered the Indian Medical Service as surgeon on October 1, 1887, became lieutenant-colonel after twenty years' service, and retired on September 12, 1921. He served in Burma in 1884-8, receiving the frontier medal with a "clasp; in the Chin Lushai campaign on the North-East Frontier of India in 1889-90, clasp to the frontier medal; in the campaign on the North-West "Frontier in 1897-8, -in the Mohmand expedition, receiving the medal with a clasp; and in Tirah, another clasp. He received the Kaisari-Hind Medal on January 1, 1909. He had been a member of the British Medical Association for forty-nine years.

1078 JUNE 7, 1930. MEDICAL NEWS)
HONORARY SURGEONS TO THE KING.
LIEUTENANT-COLONEL ARTHUR JAMES STURMER, Madras Medical Service(ret.),

Died at Clifton on May 11th, aged 79. He was born on February 1st, 1851, the son of Arthur James Sturmer of the Auditor-General's Office, Calcutta, was educated at Bart's, and took the M.R.C.S. and L.R.C.P. Lond. In 1874. Entering the I.M.S.as surgeon on MAarchl 31st, 1875, he became surgeon lieutenant-colonel after twenty years' service, was placed on the selected list for promotion on March 31st, 1901, and retired, with an extra compensation pension, on April 12th, 1905. He served in the Afghan war of 1879--80, and received the medal; and on the North-East -Frontier of India in the Chin-Hills expedition of 1892-93, gaining the frontier medal with a clasp. For some years before his retirement he held the posts of superintendent of the Government Maternity Hospital, Madras, and professor of midwifery in the Madras 'Medical College.

www.nebi.nlm.nih.gov PMC/articles/PMC2313456 ...brmedj07495-0048.pdf

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL ROBERT HENRY GUNNING
(Commanding the 1st Battalion King's Royal Rifle Corps)

He was killed in action at the Battle of Talana Hill October 20th 1899. He was the eldest son of Sir George William Gunning, 5th baronet, of Little Horton House, Northampton, was born in 1852, and educated at Eton. He entered the 68th Foot in 1873, was transferred to the 60th Foot 1874, and was promoted Captain 1883, Major 1890, and Lieutenant Colonel 1898. He served with the 60th Rifles in the Zulu War, 1879, was present at the action of Ginginhlovo and Relief of Etshowe, and afterwards served as adjutant of the battalion throughout the operations of "Clarke's Column", receiving the medal with clasp. In the Burmese Expedition 1891-92, he was in command of the Baungshe Column during the operations in the Chin Hills, receiving the medal with clasp. At Talana, Lieutenant Colonel Gunning fell while leading his battalion in the attack. Sir A Conan Doyle in writing of this battle states "It was here between the wall and the summit that Colonel Gunning of the Rifles and many other brave men met their end, some by our own bullets and some by those of the enemy" and again “among the killed were many that the army could ill spare. The gallant but optimistic Symons, Gunning of the Rifles, Sherston, Connor, Hambro, and many other brave men died that day”. Lieutenant Colonel Gunning was mentioned in despatches by Lieutenant General Sir G White, December 2nd, 1899 (LG February 8th 1901). He was buried in the cemetery just below Talana Hill close to where he fell. http://www.angloboerwar.com/Casualties/casualties_g.htm

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL E.M. JACKSON

Indian Army, and quite possibly unique, basis presence of the ‘Chin Hills’ clasp together with battle clasps on the Khedives Sudan Medal, this latter medal almost invariably a no clasp issue named to Indian units.

Ernest Montague Jackson was born 3 November 1863. Commissioned Lieutenant in the Royal Scots in August 1884, ad subsequently transferred to the Madras Staff Corps of the Indian Army in January 1887. In January 1887 Jackson was posted as Wing Officer to the 28th Madras Infantry. Six months later he had been posted to the 17th Madras Infantry and saw action during the Burma Campaign 1887-89. Returning to his parent regiment, Jackson next saw service during the Chin Hills expedition of 1892-93. During the Dongola Expedition of 1896, Jackson was seconded to the Egyptian Army and served with the 11th Sudanese Infantry Battalion, taking part in the operations of 7th June and 19th September 1896, as a “Special Service Officer” for which he was was Mentioned-in-Despatches in the London Gazette of 3 November 1896...

However, his service in India was short-lived as his regiment was detailed as one of 4 x Madras Infantry regiments to serve overseas in the suppression of the Boxer Rebellion in China. He served in China as Second-in-Command of the 28th Madras Infantry. He was promoted Lieutenant Colonel in August 1910 and assumed the command of the 88th Carnatic Infantry (late 28th Madras Infantry) in the following month. Lieutenant Colonel Jackson retired from the Army in October 1913, a month before his 50th Birthday.


---

**LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FREDERICK ARTHUR ROGERS, D.S.O.**

Surgeon ROGERS, FREDERICK ARTHUR, was born 7 September 1861, son of Moses Rogers, Deputy Inspector-General of Hospitals, Madras, and Caroline Rogers. He entered the Indian Medical Service, and served in the Burmese War of 1885-89 (twice mentioned in Despatches), and received the Medal with two clasps), and with the Chin-Lushai Expedition, 1890 (Despatches, and created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 14 November 1890]: "Frederick Arthur Rogers, Surgeon, Indian Medical Service". His DSO was awarded "In recognition of services during Chin Lushai Expedition". The Letter and Insignia were handed to Mr Rogers by Mr Hobert, Secretary and Registrar, 3 March 1891. He married, 1892, Janet Felicia, daughter of John Churchill, of Wimbledon. Lieutenant Colonel Rogers retired in 1905, and died 2 November 1912.

Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book)

---

**LIEUTENANT-COLONEL, EAST, LIONEL WILLIAM PELLEW, DSO**

He was born 27 July, 1866, son of Rear-Admiral J. W. East, R.N., and of Ruth East (nee Cunningham). He was educated at the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich; entered the Royal Artillery 16 Sept. 1885; became Captain 18 Dec. 1895; served in the Hazara Expedition, 1891, and in the Second Miranzai Expedition, 1891; was mentioned in Despatches [London Gazette, 15 Sept. 1891], and was created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 12 Feb. 1895]: "Lionel William Pellew East, Lieut., Royal Artillery. In recognition of services during the operations carried out in the Northern Chin Hills in 1892-3
and 1893-4." The Insignia were presented on 2 March, 1895. He served on the North-West Frontier of Assam, 1894, and in the Abor Expedition, and was severely wounded. He became Major 18 May, 1904. He was D.A.A.G., India, 12 Sept. 1904, to 11 Sept. 1908, and G.S.0.2, Welsh Division, Western Command, 29 Sept. 1909, to 28 Sept. 1913, and was promoted to Lieutenant-Colonel 15 April, 1914.

Lieut.-Colonel East served in the European War, and was four times mentioned in Despatches; was given temporary rank as Brigadier-General, 1916, and given the Brevet of Colonel, 1917, and created a C.M.G. 1916. He was killed in action in France in Sept. 1918. He was a member of the Russian Order of St. Stanislas. He married, in 1897, Margaret, daughter of Colonel A. Stephen, I.M.S. (retired), and they have one son, James Arthur Cumming,, born on 21 Oct. 1915, and three daughters, Ruth, Margaret and Elizabeth. London Gazette, 16 July, 1895.-" The Queen has been graciously pleased to give orders for the following appointments to the Distinguished Service Order, in recognition of the services of the undermentioned Officers during the recent operations in Chitral."

______________

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL ROBERT BALMAIN LOW, D.S.O.

LOW, ROBERT BALMAIN, Lieutenant, was born 7 October 1804, son of General Sir Robert Culiniffe Low, GCB, and Constance (who died in 1900), daughter of Captain Taylor; became Lieutenant, Royal Irish Regiment, 7 February 1885; joined the Indian Staff Corps 12 October 1885; served in the Lushai Expedition, 1889 (clasp); in the Hazara Expedition, 1891 (Medal and clasp). He was ADC to Major General, Bengal, 1 April 1892 to 2 November 1895; was ADC to the GOC, Chitral Relief Expedition, 24 March 1895 to 28 August 1895. For his services in this campaign he was mentioned in Despatches 15 November 1895; received the Medal with clasp, and was created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 21 January 1890]: "Robert Balmain Low, Lieutenant, Indian Staff Corps, ADC to Major General Sir K C Low, KCB, Commanding a First-Class District in India.

In recognition of services during the operations of the Chitral Relief Force". The Insignia were presented by Her Majesty 24 February 1890. He became Captain 19 February 1896; served in the Tirah Expedition, 1897-98, taking part in the operations in the Bara Valley 7-14 December 1897 (two clasps); was ADC to Lieutenant General, India, 29 October 1898 to 28 June 1905 Commandant, Headquarters Camp, and Provost Marshal, China Expedition, 31 July 1900 to 30 June 1902, and was present at the relief of Pekin and at the action of Peitsang and Yangtsun (Despatches [London Gazette, 14 May 1901]; Medal with clasp; Brevet Majority, 29 November 1900). He became Major, Indian Army, 7 February 1903; was DAAG, India, 17 September 1905 to 16 September 1909; was promoted to Lieutenant Colonel, Hodson's Horse, Indian Army, 7 February 1911. On 18 May 1915, Lieutenant Colonel R B Low was given a special appointment (graded DAAG). He married, in 1899, Mabel Violet, daughter of Major General O'Grady Haly, CB (Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book)
SURGEON-LIEUTENANT-COLONEL W. M. CouRTNEY

Bengal Establishment He is permitted to retire from the service from December 7th. He was appointed Assistant-Surgeon, October 1st, 1889, and became Surgeon Lieutenant-Colonel, October 1st, 1889. He served with the Duffa expedition in 1873-74; with the Burmese expedition in 1886-87 in medical charge of No. 18 Field Hospital with the 4th Brigade Upper Burmah Field Force (medal with clasp); and with the Chin-Lushai Force, under Brigadier-General Symons, in 1889-90 as Senior Medical Officer in charge of the General Hospital (clasp).
(Source: Nov. 9, 1895. NAVAL AND MILITARY. [The British Medical Journals, 1201])

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL HAMILTON GEORGE MAXWELL, INDIA ARMY

India General Service Medal 1854-1895, 2 clasps, Samana 1891, Chin Hills 1892-93 (Lt. 19th Bl. Lers.) clasps soldered togethered; India General Service Medal 1895-1902, 1 clasp, Punjab Frontier 1897-98 (Lieut., 16th Bl. Cavy.); China War Medal 1900 no clasp, Capt'n., 16th Bl. Lers.); 1914-15 Star (Lt. Col., Remount Serv.); British War Medal (Lt. Col.); Victory Medal (Lt. Col.); Delhi Durba Medal 1911 in silver (30, 000); Croix de Guerre 1914-1915 with bronze palm; U.S. Military Order of the Dragon (Capt. Hamilton G. Maxwell, 16th Cavalry No. 167), lacking pagoda top ribbon bar, first seven and last two medals mounted together court styles as worn(9) Hamilton George Maxwell was born 7 July 1863, grandson of the late General Sir Abraham Roberts, G.C.B. Of the Palace Hampton Court and the son of Colonel Hamilton Maxwell, late Bengal Staff Corps. After serving briefly in the ranks, he was commissioned a 2nd Lieutenant in the Connaught Rangers on 7 May 1887. Dixon-Gazette  www.dixonsmedals.co.uk

DEATHS IN THE SERVICES

LIEUTENANT.-COL. JOHN CHARLES LAMONT, C.I.E., I.M.S., died on June 19 in Edinburgh at the ripe age of 80. He was educated at the Liverpool College and Edinburgh University, where he graduated M.B., C.M. in 1885 with first class honours. In 1886-7 he was demonstrator of anatomy in the University, an appointment which determined his life’s work. In 1887 he entered the Bengal Medical Service and saw active service with the Chin-Lushai Expedition of 1889-90 and the Manipur Expedition in 1891, receiving the Frontier medal with clasp. Three years later he was appointed professor of anatomy in the Punjab University at Lahore, a post that he occupied with distinction until 1906, when he went on leave preparatory to retiring in 1908 from the Indian Medical Service. He immediately took up the post of lecturer on anatomy, University College, Dundee, which he filled from 1906 to 1914, and for three years he was examiner in anatomy at the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh. He published a number of papers in the Journal of Anatomy, and was elected to F.R.S.Ed, in 1920. In 1914 he volunteered for military service, was re-employed by the Government of India, and was awarded the C.I.E. in 1919. His recreations were fishing and golf, and he was one of the five original members of council of the Clan Lamont Society, founded in 1895... (Source: British Medical Journal, July 7, 1945, p. 32)
LIEUTENANT-COLONEL W.B. PLGOTT

Commandant, 1st Battalion, Royal Warwickshire Regiment; served in the Chin Lushai Expedition, 1889-90; served with the Tirah Expeditionary Force, 1897-98; won a medal with 2 clasps, served in the South African War and took part in the actions at...


OFFICERS DIED: SOUTH AFRICA 1899 - 1902
( http://glosters.tripod.com/BoerD.htm )

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL LOUIS EUGENE-Du MOULIN

Du MOULIN - Lieutenant-Colonel Louis Eugene - 1/Royal Sussex Regt.
Killed in action at Abraham's Kraal, near Koffyfontein. 28th Jan. 1902. Aged 42. Born October 1859. Served in Hazara 1885 (medal & clasp, MID), Chin-Lushai 1889-90 (clasp, MID), Manipur 1891 (clasp), Tirah 1897-8 (medal & 2 claps), and QSA (4 clasps).

______________________________

PREFACE.__

_Louis Eugène du Moulin_ was of French descent. By birth he was a New Zealander. He passed through Sandhurst and entered the army in 1879, joining the 107th Regiment–now the Second Battalion of the Royal Sussex Regiment. With this battalion all his service was spent, until his promotion in 1899 as second in command of the First Battalion Royal Sussex Regiment (the old 35th).__

He served in the Black Mountain Campaign of 1888, in the Chin-Lushai and Manipur expeditions of 1889-91, and in the Tirah Campaign of 1897-98. Alike among the dark pine woods of the Himalayas, in the dense jungle of Manipur, or on the bleak, stony ridges of the Hazara country the name of du Moulin became a byword in the Regiment, and far beyond the Regiment, for restless energy, never-failing resource and cool daring. He became known all over India as a musketry expert. Many of his ideas were adopted, and are in universal use by those who may never have heard his name.__


______________________________

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL B. A. JOHNSTONE. O.B.E.

Family group: A Great War O.B.E. group of seven awarded to Lieutenant-Colonel B. A. Johnstone, West Riding Regiment, late Indian Army Medals ] Family group: A Great War O.B.E. group of seven awarded to Lieutenant-Colonel B. A. Johnstone, West Riding Regiment, late Indian Army. The Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, O.B.E. (Military) Officer's 1st type, silver-gilt, hallmarks for London 1919; India General Service 1854-95, 1 clasp, Chin Hills 1892-93 (Capt'n., 21st Madras Pioneers); China 1900, 1 clasp, Relief of Pekin (Major, 1st Mad. Pioneers); 1914-15 Star (Major, W. Rid. R.); British War and Victory Medals,
M.I.D. oak leaf (Lt. Col.); Delhi Durbar 1903, together with a set of related miniature dress medals (7), these mounted as worn, the second with officially re-engraved naming and the sixth officially re-impressed, contact marks and edge bruising, generally very fine Five: Captain R. A. Johnstone 1939-45 Star; Africa Star, clasp, 8th Army; Italy Star; Defence and War Medals, contained in original addressed card forwarding box, extremely fine (19) E600- 700 O.B.E. London Gazette 3 June 1919.

Beresford Asheton Johnstone, who was born in March 1861, the eldest son of Captain (later Major-General) George Nassau Johnstone, was originally commissioned into the Hampshire Regiment as a 2nd Lieutenant in April 1881. Advanced to Lieutenant in April 1883, he was appointed to the Indian Army in the following year, when he joined the 21st Madras Pioneers as a Wing Officer. Active service followed in the Chin Hills 1892-93, after which he transferred to the 1st Madras Infantry as a Double Company Commander, and, in 1900, was present with the regiment at the relief of Pekin. He was also present at the Delhi Durbar of 1903, when he acted as A.D.C. to General Wolfe Murray, but in April 1905, as a result of contracting malaria, he was invalided out in the rank of Major. The outbreak of hostilities in August 1914 found him quickly recalled to the British Army, when he was appointed second in command of the 9th The Duke of Wellington's Regiment, which he eventually commanded in the Ypres salient, being twice mentioned in despatches. He was invalided home with a strained heart, but without resting continued to train troops' (Times obituary refers). Johnstone, who also commanded battalions of the York and Lancaster and South Staffordshire Regiments, ended the War back in India, as a depot C.O. at Kirkee and Poona, and was awarded the O.B.E. for this latter work in 1919. The Colonel, who retired to Tenterden in Kent, died in January 1930. Sold with a small quantity of original documentation, including M.I.D. certificate, dated 11 June 1920 and original Indian Army Officer's Record of Services. Also see Lot 434 for further family awards. http://www.bbc.co.uk/.../thread=6507153

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL J. M. CAMILLERI

13th Bengal Infantry, late Royal Malta Fencible Artillery and East Yorkshire Regiment

John Mary Camilleri was born on 26 June 1865, and was first commissioned on 14 January 1885, in the Royal Malta Fencible Artillery. He was appointed Second Lieutenant in the East Yorkshire Regiment in July 1887 and transferred to the Bengal Staff Corps in November 1888, being attached to the 13th (Shekhwatii) Bengal Infantry. He took part in the expedition to Manipur in 1891 (Medal with clasp); in Burma 1892-93, operations in the Northern Chin Hills (Despatches G.G.O. 733 of 1893, clasp); on the N.E. Frontier of Assam in 1894, Abor Expedition; on the N.W. Frontier of India in 1897-98, Malakand, as Brigade Transport Officer to 1st Brigade, 2 August-October 1897, including the action at Landakai (Despatches London Gazette 5 November 1897); Operations to Bajaur and in the Mamund country, Buner,
including attack and capture of the Tanga Pass (Despatches London Gazette 22 April 1898, medal with clasp); in Tirah in 1897-98 (Clasp). Appointed Second in Command, 13th Rajputs, 8 June 1908, he was promoted to Lieutenant-Colonel and Commandant of the regiment on 13 November 1910. Lieutenant-Colonel Camilleri died in India on 20 September 1912. (www.dnw.co.uk)

A RARE CHIN HILLS PAIR AWARDED TO LIEUTENANT-COLONEL A. B. DRUMMOND, 39TH GARHWALIS

INDIA GENERAL SERVICE 1854-95, 1 clasp, Chin Hills 1892-93 (Lieutt. A. B. Drummond, 39th Garhwalis) old erasure between name and unit; Afghanistan, GOLD MEDAL OF THE ORDER OF IZZAT-I-AFGHANI, dated AH 1320 [1901], Arthur Berkeley Drummond was born on 27 November 1869, son of the Rev. Arthur Hislop Drummond. He was first commissioned into the Northumberland Fusiliers on 18 June 1890, and shortly afterwards transferred to the Indian Army. In June 1898 he was appointed Political Assistant in Baluchistan, later becoming assistant to the Resident at Mewar in April 1900, and assistant to the Political Agent at Kalat in October 1903. Promoted to Political Agent in Rajputana, March 1905, he later became Resident in Mewar, September 1906 and Political Agent at Haraoti and Tonk, April 1908. In September 1912 he was appointed Boundary Commissioner in Bhopawar, moving shortly afterwards to the Political Office, Deoli, in January 1913 and becoming Political Agent at Bundi, May 1913. Drummond was the Assistant Agent to the Governor-General in Central India, October 1913, and in November 1914 was posted on special duties to the Governor-General in Rajputana. Assistant Resident at Mewar in February 1915, his final posting was as Political Agent, Kotah and Jhalawar in March 1916. 548 www.dnw.co.uk, 18 May 2011

OFFICERS OF THE ROYAL ENGINEERS
(Listed Alphabetically)

Lieutenant Colonel Edward De Santis Edward Henry de Vere Atkinson. Lieutenant, 16-9-1885; Captain, 29-3-1895. War Service: Lushai, 1889; Chin-Lushai, 1889-90; Zhob Valley, 1890.
- Theodore Fraser. Lieutenant, 18-2-1886; Captain, 13-8-1896. War Service: Chin Lushai, 1889-90; Hazara, 1891; North West Frontier, 1897-8; South Africa, 1900.
- William Albert Harrison. Regimental Ranks: 2nd Lieutenant, 16-3-1887; Lieutenant, 16-3-1890; Captain, 19-12-1897. War Service: Chin Lushai, 1889-1890; China, 1900-1901.
- Robert Maxwell Hyslop. Regimental Ranks: Lieutenant, 15-7-1868; Captain, 11-5-1881; Major, 1-10-1887; Lieutenant Colonel, 7-7-1894. Army Ranks: Colonel, 7-7-1898. War Service: Looshai, 1871-2; Egypt, 1882.
- Edward Pemberton Leach, VC, CB. Regimental Rank: Lieutenant, 17-4-1866; Captain, 31-12-1878; Major, 17-4-1886; Lieutenant Colonel, 5-12-1892. Army Rank: Major, 22-11-1879; Lieutenant Colonel, 2-3-1881; Colonel, 2-3-1885; Major General, 1-10-1897. War Service: Looshai, 1871-72; Afghanistan, 1879-80; Sudan, 1885.
- **Ricardo Dartnell Petrie.** Lieutenant, 23-2-1881; Captain, 17-12-1889; Major, 10-5-1899. War Service: Zhob Valley, 1884; Burma, 1886-8; Chin-Lushai, 1889-90; China, 1900-01.

- **Walter Hungerford Pollen.** Lieutenant, 6-4-1879. War Service: Egypt, 1882; Looshai, 1889. Died at Chittagong, 26-3-1889.

**REFERENCE:**

1. CONNOLLY, T.W.J. Roll of Officers of the Corps of Royal Engineers From 1660 to 1898. Royal Engineers Institute, Chatham, 1898.
2. The Royal Engineers Monthly List, April 1910.

---

**LIEUTENANT-COLONEL H. ROSS-JOHNSON**

[ Medal ] Five: **Lieutenant-Colonel H. Ross-Johnson**, Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry, late Liverpool Regiment India General Service 1854-95, 2 clasps, Burma 1885-7, Chin-Lushai 1889-90 (Lieutt. 2d L'pool. R.); 1914-15 Star (Lt. Col., L'pool. R.); British War and Victory Medals (Lt. Col.); Khedive's Sudan 1896-1908, 1 clasp, Sudan 1899, unnamed as issued, together with a mounted set of five miniature dress medals, very fine and better (10) E450-500 Hastings Ross-Johnson was commissioned into the King's Liverpool Regiment in May 1885 and served in the Burma expedition of 1885-87 and in the Chin-Lushai Expeditionary Force in 1889-90. He was promoted Captain in 1891 and served in the Nile Expedition of 1899 and took part in the first advance against the Khalifa. In December 1900 he was promoted Major. During the Great War he was Major, Temporary Lieutenant-Colonel in command of the 7th (Service) Battalion of the Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry.

[link to image]

**ROYAL ARMY MEDICAL CORPS AND OTHER MEDICAL UNITS (Colonel David Riddick Collection)**

**ASST.-SURGN. C. J. W. MEADOWS**, PESHAWUR MOUNTN.

India General Service 1854-95, 1 clasp, Looshai, recipient’s initials engraved, otherwise extremely fine

**Footnote**

Charles John Walford Meadows was born on 14 January 1844. Training at Guy’s and Westminster Hospitals, he took the L.S.A. in 1866, M.R.C.S. in 1867 and S.S.C. Cantab. in 1882. Appointed an Assistant Surgeon with the Bengal Medical Establishment on 1 October 1869, Surgeon on 1 July 1873 and Surgeon-Major on 1 October 1881, he attained the rank of Brigade Surgeon Lieutenant-Colonel on 1 April 1895. He served in the Looshai Expedition of 1871-72 and was mentioned in despatches. Lieutenant-Colonel Meadows died at Norwood on 2 August 1899, from the effects of an accident when he was knocked down by a bicycle.

[link to image]
MAJOR/LIEUTENANT-COLONEL ROSS ACHESON SMYTH

Major, 18th Royal Irish Regiment and Lieutenant Colonel, 10th Battalion Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers.
Regimental Number ---- Born: ---- Died: 1917-09-27 Aged: 55 Enlisted: ------
Name commemorated on Glendemott Parish Church World War 1 Memorial. Name also listed on the
Diamond War Memorial.
Husband of Mrs Smyth, Ardmore, Londonderry.

Major Smyth was born in 1862. He was the eldest son of Mr John Acheson Smyth, Larchmount, and
grandson of Mr Ross T. Smyth, well known in connection with the corn trade in Liverpool. He entered the
Royal Irish Regiment in 1885, retiring after eighteen years’ service with the rank of brevet major. He served
in the Chin Lushai Expedition in 1889-90, in India, and the Boer War, in which he was wounded and
mentioned in despatches. He was married in 1892 to a daughter of Mr Thomas Malcolmson, of Minella,
Clonmel, and they had two sons and a daughter. One of his sons died in infancy, and the other son, Second
Lieutenant John Ross Smyth, Royal Irish Regiment, was killed in action early in the Great War. Major Ross
Smyth was a Deputy Lieutenant for the county of Derry, a member of Londonderry Board of Guardians and
No. 1 District Council, and belonged to a family which had resided at Ardmore for over five generations.

After retiring from the Regular Army, he took an active part in the Unionist campaign against Home
Rule, and was greatly admired in political circles for his frankness and outspokenness. When the Great War
broke out, he placed his services at the disposal of the Army authorities, and to him in a great measure was
due the formation of the 10th Battalion of the Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers (Derry Volunteers), Ulster
Division, his magnetic personality being responsible for drawing many recruits in this regiment. He had the
honour of being appointed commanding officer of the battalion, with the rank of lieutenant colonel. The
battalion served under his command at Finner, Randalstown, Bramshott, and Seaforf from September 1914
to September 1915, when he accompanied them to France... Messrs. Vincent Ward & Son, sculptors, John
Street, Londonderry, erected the tablet. (http://www.diamondwarmemorial.com/soldiers/view/1091

LIEUT. COLONEL EDWARD GYLES VAUGHAN, DSO served with the forces in Chin Lushai
1889-90, at Malakand in 1897-8, Uganda 1898-9, the NW frontier of India 1908, Abor 1912 (DSO).
www.britishcolonialafrica.com/

SENIOR BRITISH OFFICERS AND MEDICAL STAFF OF THE CHITTAGONG COLUMN,
CHIN-LUSHAI EXPEDITION 1889-90, UNDER THE COMMAND OF BRIGADIER-GENERAL V.
W. TREGEAR

1. Colonel C. McD. Skene, D.S.O., commanding the 42nd Gurkha Light Infantry, the Chin Hills, and the
Northern Column, has well sustained a reputation previously gained for command.
2. Colonel J. K. Clubley, commanding the 42nd Madras Infantry and lines of communication.
3. Major G. O. Stoney, 1st Battalion King’s Own Scottish Borderers, who commanded the detachment of
his regiment, and was second-in-command of the Southern Column for some time before invalidated.
5. Major H. W. W. Burton, Royal Artillery, has been my senior Staff Officer. The ability with which he has supported me has won my warm regard. His advancement would be a distinct gain to the service.
6. Major G. Henry, Royal Engineers. This officer, as my Commanding Royal Engineer, and for some time, second-in-command, has rendered me most valuable assistance. I cannot speak too highly of the ability and devotion with which he has thrown himself into his work. I commend his services for special recognition.
7. Brigade-Surgeon E. C. Markey, Medical Staff, as my Principal Medical Officer, has had responsible duties. I commend him for his administrative abilities.
8. Surgeon Major G.D. Burke, Medical Staff.
10. Surgeon W. H. Bean, Medical Staff.

- Source: THE LONDON GAZETTE, SEPTEMBER 12, 1890; See APPENDIX FF of my paper: The Chin/Zo People of Bangladesh, Burma and India for more information.
(Note: Taken word-by-word directly from the Gazette. TZD)

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL W. H. HILDEBRAND

Born 6-7-1865. Lieu - 29-8-1885. Capt. - 29-8-1896. Major - 29-8-1903. Lt. Colonel - 29-8-1911. Retired
17-2-1912. War Service - Burma 1887-89 - Kalewa Column in the operations on the Western Frontier.
N.W. Frontier of India 1897-98 - Operations during August and September 1897, operations of the Flying Column in the Kurrum Valley under Colonel Richardson 20th Aug to 1st Oct. 1897.
http://www.military-medals.co.uk/groups.html

MAJOR EDWARD JAMES LUGARD, D.S.O.

LUGARD, EDWARD JAMES, Lieutenant, was born at Worcester, 23 March 1865, youngest son of the Reverend F G Lugard, MA, and Mary Jane, daughter of the Reverend Garton Howard. He passed first in the military competitive examination from the Militia into the Line; was farming in Manitoba and NWT, Canada, 1883-84; joined the 3rd Worcestershire Regiment, 1885; joined Northumberland Fusiliers 10 November 1886; was transferred to the Bengal Staff Corps (now Indian Army), 1888; served in Burmese Expedition, 1888-89, under Brigadier General Faunce (Medal with clasp); Chin-Lushai Expedition, 1889-90, with the 42nd Gurkha Light Infantry (Despatches; clasp, and created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 14 November 1890]: "Edward James Lugard, Lieutenant, Bengal Staff Corps. In recognition of services during Chin-Lushai Expedition". Extract from Despatch of Brigadier General W P Symons, dated 1 May 1890: "I beg to submit the names of the following officers, who have
rendered specially valuable services: Lieutenant E J Lugard served with distinction in the Chin Expedition of 1888-89, and has displayed conspicuous gallantry and intelligence in leading his men on several occasions during the operations of this season" [London Gazette, 12 September 1890].

He served in the Manipur Expedition, 1891 (slightly wounded; clasp). He served as Second-in-Command with the British West Charterland Company's Expedition to Ngamiland, South Central Africa, and in command of the Expedition, 1897-99; served as a Special Service Officer in South African War, 1899-1900 (Medal with three clasps).

Promoted Major 10 November 1904; retired from the Army 10 November 1906; was Political Assistant to the High Commissioner of Northern Nigeria, 1903-6; Secretary to Imperial Institute, 1908-12; Political Secretary to the Governor of Northern and Southern Nigeria, 1912-13, and to the Governor-General of Nigeria, 1914-15; served with Machine Gun Corps, 1915-16, and in Naval Intelligence Department, 1916-18; created OBE, 1918. Major Lugard's favourite recreations were shooting and travel. He married, 1893, Charlotte Eleanor, elder daughter of the Reverend G B Howard, and had one son.

Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book) Bengal Staff Corps

SURGEON MAJOR WILLIAM REED MURPHY, D.S.O.

Surgeon Major Murphy was born 23 October 1849, son of John Doyle Murphy and Rebecca Reed; educated at Clongowes Wood College, County Kildare; Trinity College, Dublin, and Royal College of Surgeons, Ireland. Took all prizes there during student course, and all at Meath Hospital. Took first place and First Herbert Prize at Netley on entering Indian Medical Service on 30 March 1872; served with the Indian Contingent, Malta and Cyprus 1878; in the Afghanistan Campaign of 1878-80 (Despatches; Medal and clasp; received the 'Special thanks of the Brigadier General Commanding the Cavalry Brigade', when with his regiment, 19th Bengal Lancers at the cavalry action of Pat Kao Shana, for conduct in action "at great personal risk" [London Gazette, 22 October 1880]); Hazara Campaign of 1888 (Despatches; Indian Medal and clasp); Lushai Campaign of 1888-89 (clasp). PMO Lushai Column, Chin-Lushai Field Force, 1889-90 (Despatches; Mentioned by the Government of India; clasp). Created Companion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 14 November 1890]: "William Reed Murphy, Surgeon Major, Indian Medical Service, Bengal". His DSO was awarded "In recognition of services during Chin-Lushai Expedition". Chitral Relief Force, 1895 (Medal and clasp). PMO Kurram Kohat Force, 1897 (Despatches an 1 two clasps). PMO Kurram Movable Column, Tirah Field Force, 1897-98 (Despatches and clasp). was a Member of the Royal Institution of Great Britain. Promoted Surgeon Major in 1884, and Lieutenant Colonel in 1892. Retired in 1899. / Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book) Indian Medical Service

MAJOR OWEN, EDWARD RODERIC, DSO

He was born on 4 May, 1856, at The Hewletts, Prestbury, Gloucestershire, where his father then resided, son of Hugh Darby Owen, Esq., of Bettws Hall, Montgomeryshire, North Wales, and of Mrs. Hugh Owen. "Roddy" Owen was educated at a private school at Malvern, and at Eton (1869-73), and for a year with a
tutor, during which time he began his riding career by winning the Duke of Beaufort's Blue Coat Race at Dauntsey on the late Mr. E. Chaplin's Holland. He entered the Army through the Militia, receiving on the 3rd March, 1875, a commission in the 2nd Battn.

South Devon Infantry Militia (11th Foot). On the 11th Sept. 1876, he was transferred to the 1st Battn. of the 20th (East Devonshire) Regt., which, in 1881, became known as the Lancashire Fusiliers. He joined his new regiment at Halifax, Nova Scotia. He shot in the Rocky Mountains; came Edward Roderic OweD. home on leave in 1878; kept a few horses (which were trained by his elder brother Hugh at Cirencester), and rode some races. In 1879 his regiment was stationed at Malta, and in 1881 Roddy hunted to his heart's content, and won many important races. In 1883 he was stationed at Mhow in India, and in March, 1884, was attached to the Staff of the Viceroy, Lord Ripon, as Extra A.D.C. He became well known on all the race-courses in Bengal. In A.–. 1 84, at the age of 2, he was promoted to Captain, and returned to Ireland, where he migrated from the staff of Lord Ripon to that of Lord Spencer, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. He won the great Sandown Steeple–chase in 1 84, and in two successive years he rode the winning mount in the Sandown Grand Prize.

Twice he won the great Sandown Steeple-chase on the same horse, Kilworth. In 1899 he had the highest average of wins among gentlemen riders for the year. In 1889 and 1900 he was A.D.C. to 'General Sir Evelyn Wood at Alder hot. In 1891 he was selected for the Mounted Infantry Regt. At Aldershot, which had been raised and was then commanded by Colonel Hutton. In 1892 he steered Father O'Flynn to victory in the Grand National, and directly after the race he took the train to London, applied at the War Office for active service, and served as Chief of the Staff to General Sir Francis Scott, Inspector-General of the Gold Coast Constabulary; commanded the expedition against Zebus in West Africa, and left England for Lagos. In 1892 he served with Sir Gerald Portal's fission in Uganda.

He was cho en as Commandant of the Equatorial Provinces of Torn and Unyoro, 1893-94, during which time he quelled ingle-handed a Moslem revolt of a critical nature. He was then entrusted with the important mission of planting the British flag under circumstances of extreme difficulty at Wadelai, thus safeguarding the upper reaches of the ile for Great Britain. He received the African Medal, 1892, the Brilliant tar of Zanzibar, and was created a Comr.anion of the Distinguished Service Order [London Gazette, 4 Jan. 1895]: 'In recognition of ervic against the Zebus in 1892, and during the recent operations in Central Africa, Edward Roderic Owen, Captain and Brevet Major, The Lancashire Fusiliers." The Insignia were presented 3 Sept. 1895. In the summer of 1894 he was home on leave, and in Jan. 1905, sailed for India to join his regiment at Quetta.

He became Official Correspondent of the "Westminster Gazette" during the North-West Frontier Campaign, and being attached to the King's Own Scottish Borderers, took part in their wellknown charge. He and Colonel Sir Younghusband were the first to enter the Fort of Chitral, after a forty–mile ride in a hostile country, in advance of the Relief Force. Major Owen travelled in the Palnirs; joined the Sudan Expedition, receiving the Medal and the Firket Medal. In the endeavour to stamp out cholera at Ambigol Wells, where he was Commandant, be contracted illness and died there. The Arabs, who loved him, placed circles of white stones round his grave. A Memoir of him has been written by his sister, Lady Owen-Mackenzie. London Gazette, 12 Feb. 1895.-"
Service Order, in recognition of the services of the undermentioned Officers during the operations carried out in the Chin Hills in 1892-3 and 1893-4.

__________________________

MAJOR BEVERLY WILLIAM REID USSHER (b. 4 April 1853, d. 1916)

Major Beverly William Reid Ussher was born on 4 April 1853. He was the son of Maj.-Gen. John Theophilus Ussher and Annabella Ross. He married Eliza Mary D'Arcy, daughter of Matthew Peter D'Arcy and Christina Margaret Daly, on 9 May 1887. He died in 1916. Major Beverly William Reid Ussher gained the rank of Captain in the service of the 7th Dragoon Guards. He fought in the Ulundi Expedition in 1879. He gained the rank of Lieutenant in 1879 in the service of the 80th (South Staffordshire) Regiment. He fought in the Sudan Expedition between 1884 and 1885. He gained the rank of Lieutenant in 1890 in the service of the 7th Dragoon Guards. He fought in the Chin-Lushai Expedition in 1890, where he was mentioned in despatches. He gained the rank of Major in the service of the Durham Light Infantry.

http://thepeerage.com/p33276.htm#i332759

__________________________

MAJOR R.W. JOHNSTON


MAJOR DAVID SIMPTON

MAJOR DAVID SIMPSON, of the Indian Medical Service (Madras Establishment), Superintendent of the Government Maternity Hospital, and Professor of Midwifery at the Medical College, died at Madras on March 19th, at the age of 46; of abscess of the liver. He entered the service as Surgeon on March 31st, 1887, and attained the rank of Major on March 31st, 1899. He took part in the Chin Lushai Expedition, 1889-90 (medal with clasp), and in that to Manipur in 1891 (clasp).

__________________________

SURGEON MAJOR S.F. BIGGER, M.B.

INDIA GENERAL SERVICE 1854-95, one clasp, Waziristan 1894-5 (Surgeon Major S.F. Bigger, M.B., 3rd Punjab Cav.)
Lot Notes

Surgeon Lieutenant-Colonel Samuel Ferguson Bigger was born in October 1854 and completed his education at University College, London. Awarded the Diploma of the Royal College of Surgeons in November 1875 and appointed a Licentiate of the Society of Apothecaries in November 1877, he joined the Indian Medical Department as a Surgeon in the following year. A member of the Zaimukht Expedition in Afghanistan between 1879-80, where he was present at the action of Zawa and won entitlement to the Afghanistan Medal, Bigger was also present in the Chin-Lushai operations of 1889-90, being Mentioned in Despatches. 'Surgeon Major S.F. Bigger, at Medagiri, had the heaviest work of the Campaign in dealing with the sickness of the followers, and ensuring their satisfactory transit when invalided to the base. His duties were discharged in a most able and admirable manner, and reflect the highest credit on his judgment and ability' (Governor-General's Order 677 refers).

Promoted to Surgeon-Major in March 1890, he went on to witness further active service in the Waziristan operations of 1894-95 and the Tirah operations of 1897-98, the latter including the action of Dargai and another Mention in Despatches (Governor-General's Order 244 refers). Bigger was advanced to Lieutenant-Colonel in March 1898 and placed on the Retired List in September 1903.

( http://www.christies.com/LotFinder/LotDetailsPrintable.aspx?intObjectID=1757270 )

MAJOR ALGERNON M. CAULFE, D.S.O., D.C.M


MAJOR W. H. WARDELL, 39th Garhwal Rifles

Seven: Major W. H. Wardell, 39th Garhwal Rifles, a veteran of the Chin Hills 1892-93 expedition, for which he was recommended for a D.S.O., subsequently killed in action at Festubert, 24 November 1914. India General Service 1854-95, 1 clasp, Chin Hills 1892-93 (Lieutt., 39th Garhwalis) officially re-engraved naming, as often found with this clasp; India General Service 1895-1902, 2 clasps, Punjab Frontier 1897-98, Tirah 1897-98 (Lieutt., 39th Bl. Infy.); Queen’s South Africa 1899-1902, 2 clasps, Transvaal, South Africa 1902 (Capt., Garhwal Rif.); 1914 Star, with clasp (Major, 1/39 Garhwal R.); British War and Victory Medals
Footnote

Warren Henry Wardell was born on 30 August 1866, and educated at King’s School, Canterbury, Kent; and Pembroke College, Oxford. He obtained his first commission through the Militia on 21 December 1889, in the King’s Liverpool Regiment; before entering the Indian Army, being appointed to the 39th Garhwal Rifles in July 1891. Most of his service was passed with the 1st Battalion, of which he was Adjutant. He was for nearly six and a half years a Double-Company Commander in the 2nd Battalion, but returned to the 1st Battalion on 21 December 1912.

His first period of active service took him on the Chin Hills Expedition of 1892-93. Here he was recommended for a D.S.O., and mentioned in despatches ‘... for his unceasing activity against some of the most troublesome of the Syin tribe, which resulted in their being the first to surrender their firearms and submit to our terms.’ Afterwards served with the Malakand Field Force in the operations in Bajaur, including the night attack by the enemy on the perimeter camp at Nawagai, and subsequently with the Mohmand Field Force in the attack on the Bedmanai Pass, and in the operations in the Mittaian and Suran Valleys, and on the line of communications Tirah Expeditionary Force. He served in the South African War with the Mounted Infantry from December 1901 to August 1902, ‘being one of only fifteen Indian Army officers asked for by Lord Kitchener.’ (Dix Noonan Webb. Lot No. 1141/Collection: OFFICER CASUALTIES OF THE TWO WORLD WARS (27 June 2002). Category: CAMPAIGN GROUPS AND PAIRS

MAJOR G. M. HUTTON, D.S.O., R.E.

The death is reported by cable of Major Gilbert Montgomerie Hutton, as the result of an accident. Major Hutton was born in Dublin on June 18th, 1865, being the eldest son of the late Captain F. W. Hutton, F.R.S. He was educated at the High School, Dunedin, and Christ’s College, graduated B.A. of New Zealand University, 1885, was nominated for a commission and gazetted lieutenant in February, 1886. He served in the Chin-Lushai expedition, 1889-90, and throughout General Buller’s Natal campaign, being present at the Tugeln, Spionkop, and at all the actions previous to the relief of Ladysmith. After the relief he was appointed Staff-Officer R.E. Natal Army, attached to Sir A. Buller’s Headquarters’ Staff, with his Colonel, C. K. Wood. When General Buller returned to England, deceased volunteered for further active service, and commanded the 9th C.R.E. at Rustenburg, where they were virtually besieged for four months...

(Press, Róráhi LXVII, Putanga 13180, 21 Whiringa-a-nuku 1911, page 9)


SURGEON MAJOR I. P. DOYLE, I.M.S. Indian Medical Services

A rare ‘Burma 1887-89’ D.S.O. group of three to Major I. P. Doyle, Indian Medical Services
Distinguished Service Order, V.R., silver-gilt and enamel, complete with brooch bar; India General Service 1854-954 clasps, Burma 1887-89, Chin-Lushai 1889-90, Chin Hills 1892-93, Lushai 1889-92 (Surgeon, I.M.S.); Africa General Service 1902-56, 1 clasp, Somaliland 1902-04 (Major, D.S.O., Somaliland F.F.).
Ignatius Purcell Doyle was born in India on 1 June 1863, the son of Surgeon-Major William Doyle. Educated at the French College, Blackrock, Co. Dublin and the School of Physic, Trinity College Dublin, he gained the L.R.C.S.I. and L.K.Q.C.P. in 1884. He joined the Army as a Surgeon on 30 September 1886 and served in Burma, 1888-89, was twice wounded, was mentioned in despatches (London Gazette 15 November 1889) and created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order. He then served in the Chin-Lushai expedition, 1889-90, in the Chin Hills, 1891-93, the Lushai expedition, 1892 and in the Somaliland Field Force in 1903, having been promoted to Major (Surgeon) in September 1898. Major Doyle retired on 31 December 1903 and died in Dublin on 22 October 1923.

http://www.dnw.co.uk/medals/auctionarchive/viewspecialcollections/itemdetail.lasso?itemid=54142

-------------------------------

MAJOR ERNEST HENRY SAMUEL MTWYFORD, DSO

MTWYFORD, ERNEST HENRY SAMUEL, Major, was born 28 October 1863. He joined the Scottish Rifles 5 December 1883, as Lieutenant, from the Militia, and was Adjutant, Scottish Rifles, 20 November 1887 to 19 November 1891. He served in the Chin-Lushai Expedition in 1889, as Transport Officer. He became Captain, Scottish Rifles, 7 March 1894, and Major 3 April 1899. Major Twyford served in the South African War, and was created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order, 29 November 1900, and the decoration was gazetted 19 April 1901: "Ernest Henry Samuel Twyford, Major, Scottish Rifles. In recognition of services during the recent operations in South Africa". Major Twyford was killed 13 April 1901, in the Badfontein Valley, on his way to join the Royal Scots, into which regiment he had been promoted to Second-in-Command for good service in Natal. DSO, IGS 1854 Chin Lushai 1889-90 (Lt 2/Scot Rifles), QSA (6) CC T-H OFS RofL Trans SA 01 (Maj, DSO, Scot Rifles.

Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book) (Cameronians) Scottish Rifles)
I.M.S.); Africa General Service 1902-56, 1 clasp, Somaliland 1902-04 (Major, D.S.O., Somaliland F.F.).
D.S.O. London Gazette 12 November 1889; citation London Gazette 15 November 1889 ‘Surgeon I. P. Doyle, I.M.D. (Madras), distinguished himself much by personal courage and care of the sick. On the 9th December, 1888, he was twice wounded. On the 1st January, 1889, during the withdrawal from Kan to Gangaw, he again distinguished himself; and it is greatly in consequence of his courage and bearing that the wounded got safely into Gangaw. I commend this officer very specially to the consideration of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief’.

Ignatius Purcell Doyle was born in India on 1 June 1863, the son of Surgeon-Major William Doyle. Educated at the French College, Blackrock, Co. Dublin and the School of Physic, Trinity College Dublin, he gained the L.R.C.S.I. and L.K.Q.C.P. in 1884. He joined the Army as a Surgeon on 30 September 1886 and served in Burma, 1888-89, was twice wounded, was mentioned in despatches (London Gazette 15 November 1889) and created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order. He then served in the Chin-Lushai expedition, 1889-90, in the Chin Hills, 1891-93, the Lushai expedition, 1892 and in the Somaliland Field Force in 1903, having been promoted to Major (Surgeon) in September 1898. Major Doyle retired on 31 December 1903 and died in Dublin on 22 October 1923.

http://www.dnw.co.uk/medals/auctionarchive/viewspecialcollections/itemdetail.lasso?itemid=54142

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

MAJOR ERNEST HENRY SAMUEL MTWYFORD, DSO

MTWYFORD, ERNEST HENRY SAMUEL, Major, was born 28 October 1863. He joined the Scottish Rifles 5 December 1883, as Lieutenant, from the Militia, and was Adjutant, Scottish Rifles, 20 November 1887 to 19 November 1891. He served in the Chin-Lushai Expedition in 1889, as Transport Officer. He became Captain, Scottish Rifles, 7 March 1894, and Major 3 April 1899. Major Twyford served in the South African War, and was created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order, 29 November 1900, and the decoration was gazetted oil 19 April 1901: "Ernest Henry Samuel Twyford, Major, Scottish Rifles. In recognition of services during the recent operations in South Africa". Major Twyford was killed 13 April 1901, in the Badfontein Valley, on his way to join the Royal Scots, into which regiment he had been promoted to Second-in-Command for good service in Natal. DSO, IGS 1854 Chin Lushai 1889-90 (Lt 2/Scot Rifles), QSA (6) CC T-H OFS RofL Trans SA 01 (Maj, DSO, Scot Rifles).

Source: DSO recipients (VC and DSO Book) (Cameronians) Scottish Rifles)
Author's Notes

Note 1. The Appendix O is a part of my 725-page paper: The Chin/Zo People of Bangladesh, Burma, and India: An Introduction. I am using red and blue colours profusely in this Appendix to highlight some key information. The simple reason behind my using these two colours is that even the majority of educated Chin/Zo people find books and papers on their people's history too boring to read. So, by using these colours it is hoped that they may find a bit more interesting to read this Appendix and the whole paper as well. First prepared in 2015 and last updated in December 2020 by myself. thangzadal@gmail.com

Note 2. When and if I get the biographies of other senior British military officers such as Major-General Nuthall, Major-General R.C. Stuart, Brigadier-General Faunce, C.B, etc., in the future I will add them in this Appendix.

Note 3. Only those with the rank of major upwards and a couple of high-ranking civil administrators/political officers are listed in this Appendix for reason of space. Note 4. K.P.M is an acronym or abbreviation for: The KING'S POLICE MEDAL FOR GALLANTRY, and I.D.S.M stands for INDIAN DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL. Note 5. All the British troops who had taken part in the numerous expeditions against the Chin/Zo people were very proud of their participation. It was a milestone for their lives.

Note 6. The Links below are for the Battle of Siallum in eleven languages: Czech, Dutch, French, German, Italian, Norwegian, Polish, Portugues, Russian and Turkish. I do not know how good or bad these versions are, but the German version, for instance, needs to be polished.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siallum_Fort
https://de.qwe.wiki/wiki/Siallum_Fort
https://cs.qwe.wiki/wiki/Siallum_Fort
https://fr.qwe.wiki/wiki/Siallum_Fort
https://it.qwe.wiki/wiki/Siallum_Fort
https://nl.qwe.wiki/wiki/Siallum_Fort
https://pl.qwe.wiki/wiki/Siallum_Fort
https://pt.qwe.wiki/wiki/Siallum_Fort
https://ru.qwe.wiki/wiki/Siallum_Fort
https://tr.qwe.wiki/wiki/Siallum_Fort
https://no.qwe.wiki/wiki/Siallum_Fort
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