

The Distortion of British Colonial and Diplomatic Archives in Ronan Lee's recently published Book "Myanmar's Rohingya Genocide" - I B Tauris 2021

A Memorandum by Derek Tonkin (British Diplomatic Service retired) - Revised on 25 March 2021

[Note: This critique relates exclusively to the historical presentation in Chapter 2 on "British Colonial Rule and Rohingya Identity". My observations in no sense seek to diminish the terrible catastrophe which has been inflicted by the Tatmadaw on the Rohingya people. The author presents their testimony with compassion, sensitivity and acute political insight. Nonetheless there is a fundamental fault-line running through the Rohingya narrative of their history and identity which the author accepts uncritically and which is it important to resolve if there is ever to be reconciliation between Buddhist and Muslim ethnic groups in Rakhine State and elsewhere in Myanmar.]

The author notes in Chapter 2 that the research findings of the surgeon, botanist and gazetteer Francis Buchanan "form the cornerstone of Rohingya assertions about the group's history in Myanmar". His manner of presentation however inclines me today to place even less importance than I did previously on what Buchanan wrote about "Rooinga", either in his published works or unpublished writings. Apart from very brief references to "Rooinga" in Buchanan's 1799 Article in Asiatic Researches and in his manuscript diary, all Buchanan tells us about the Rooinga in these references is that they are Muslims who say their name means they are "natives of Arakan", or as we would say today "Arakaners". All that I accept. But more than this is pure speculation.

Limited Value and Significance of Francis Buchanan's Isolated References to "Rooinga"

Buchanan does not give the sources of his information about "Rooinga", either in his article or in his diary (and assuredly in no other of his voluminous writings). The only quotation given in the diary and reproduced by the author is that of a Brahmin priest and his attendants who told Buchanan "that the Bengala [Bengali/Bangla] word for Arakan is Rooinga". This is not a first-hand source. We have no way of knowing whether Buchanan actually met any Muslims from Arakan in Amarapura at all. If he did, he leaves it only to our supposition. It is not to be excluded that Buchanan composed his Rooinga vocabulary mainly from discussions with the Muslim interpreters he brought with him and whom the author describes dismissively as "servants" who nonetheless informed Buchanan, according to the author, of "his [Buchanan's] understanding and description of Rooinga as a discrete language". These interpreters who would have been fluent in both Hindi and Rakhine Burmese, as would have been the Brahmin priest and his attendants.

The author seems unaware of the archive of works published contemporaneously by Buchanan while in service recording his travels in Bengal and beyond, as well as the series of articles published later during his retirement in publications such as the Edinburgh Philosophical Journal and the Edinburgh Journal of Science between 1820 and 1826. In none of these articles is there any hint of a reference to “Rooina”. Instead, Buchanan’s isolated references in two works in the late 18th Century are treated as some Holy Grail and accorded a status akin to the Tablets of Moses. Buchanan contrasts “the Mohammedans [who] have been long settled in Arakan” with “the proper natives of Arakan [who] call themselves Yakain” and who call the Rooina, Muslims and Hindus, “*Kulaw Yakain or stranger Arakan*”; that is long settled but possibly not indigenous as the term is understood today. They are mostly held to be descendants of Muslim and Hindu communities captured by the Portuguese in Bengal during the 16th and 17th Centuries and sold on to the Arakanese and even colonial buyers like the Dutch East India Company (VOC), speaking a quaint patois interlarded with Arabic, Portuguese, Arakanese and Bengali barely understood by the Bengali-speaking migrants to Arakan during British rule. ¹

Capricious Misinterpretation of British Colonial Archives 1826-1948

Set against the massive archive of British colonial and immediate post-independence diplomatic records, the presentation of quasi-indigenous and British-era migrant communities in Chapter 2 “British Colonial Rule and Rohingya Identity” is largely a work of fiction. The only quotation the author uses from these records is an inaccurate and misleading summary in the Main Report by a colonial official in the 1872 Census of Arakan, which leads the author to conclude that: “All of Arakan’s Muslims were identified in the 1872 Census as indigenous.....”. This conclusion is without justification. While the extract quoted indeed notes that: “There are some 64,000 of them [Muslims] in Arakan, differing from the Arakanese but little except in their religion ² and social customs which their religion directs”, the detailed analysis of Arakan Division in Appendix 1 is more authoritative. It records: “There are between 24,000 and 25,000 Mahomedans in the country who differ from the others in little besides their religion” ³ while observing with respect to the remaining 30-31,000 that: “The natives of India are immigrants and call for no remark”. Appendix 1 records the total number of Muslims enumerated at 64,315 of whom it is clear that only 24-25,000 were quasi-indigenous while the rest (30-31,000) were migrants: a ratio of roughly 4 descendants of indigenous Muslim communities [Rooina, Kaman, Myedu] to every 6 migrants or descendants of migrants from India during British rule. It requires no great level of academic insight to see where the official who

¹ See my 2019 analysis at: [Migration from Bengal to Arakan during British Rule 1826–1948 \(toaep.org\)](http://toaep.org)

² My underlining, for sake of comparison

³ Ditto

prepared the Main Report went wrong in drafting his summary analysis. It is also highly significant that, even before Chittagonian migration to Arakan took off in earnest and at least a decade before Britain took complete control over Burma in 1886, migrant Chittagonians and their descendants under British rule already exceeded the number of descendants of indigenous Muslim ethnicities in Arakan.

Unsupported Claims of Uninterrupted Indigeneity for the Entire Rohingya Community

Generally, this chapter exhibits all the characteristics of denialism. The author ignores the extensive data and records of the important and detailed 1921 and 1931 Census Reports in which a team of anthropologists under Leslie Taylor of the Indian Educational Service, appointed as Deputy Superintendent of Census Operations, reviewed and analysed both “Indo-Burman” quasi-indigenous Muslim communities in Arakan and the much greater migration of Indian communities classified as “Indian”. While Buchanan may have met informants in Amarapura one day in 1795, Leslie Taylor and his team were anthropologists specially appointed to analyse the racial composition of Burma. His presentation on indigenous and migrant Muslim communities in Arakan carried out on the ground over weeks if not months is infinitely more authoritative than Buchanan, while in no way contradicting what Buchanan had written about the “Kulaw Yakhain” now described as “Yakaing-kala” in Burmese and “Arakan-Mahomedan” in English. Yet the author totally ignores the 1921 and 1931 Censuses. Could this be because these Censuses record the Yakaing-kala as only one of four indigenous Muslim minorities, numerically far exceeded by the majority of Bengali (and other) migrants during British rule, mostly from the Chittagong region? This would have unwelcome implications for ideologues and their acolytes with respect to the composition of today’s “Rohingya” community.

The author misrepresents the 1941 Report by Financial Secretary James Baxter which is only concerned with British-era Indian immigration. He ignores in particular Chapter VII devoted exclusively to Arakan, which analyses Indian migration into Arakan Division and which details migrant ethnicities in the Division. He claims that the Report “clearly identified the indigenous nature of Arakan’s Muslims”. It does no such thing. The Report is by a Commission of Inquiry established “to examine the question of Indian immigration into Burma” during British rule.

The author alleges that: “The report made numerous references to ‘indigenous Mahomedans in the Arakan Division’ ”. The fact is that, apart from the reference quoted by the author from Page 4 of the Report, the only other reference in the entire 192-page Report to quasi-indigenous Muslims in Arakan is taken from Page 7 of the report where James Baxter noted in passing that the minority of “indigenous Mahomedans in the Arakan Division numbered 25,955 at the 1921 Census”; a number

which rose to 56,963 in the 1931 Census, including Kaman (2,670) and Myedu (2,681).⁴ The Baxter Report assesses the number of British-era majority Chittagonian migrants to Northern Arakan and their descendants alone at 186,327, not counting many hundreds of migrants from further afield. The author avoids all reference to actual numbers of indigenous and non-indigenous Arakan Muslims contained in the narrative and tables of British reports, the only possible point of departure for any serious analysis as there are no other statistics. British data show a ratio of only one descendant of the early quasi-indigenous settlers to every four British-era migrants and their descendants.

In an attempt to show an alleged all-embracing continuity of indigeneity in the Arakan Muslim community, the author states: “Contemporary Rohingya leaders have contended that the bulk of these settlers [British-era migrants] were descendants of Arakan natives that fled the Burmese conquest, and so indigenous,” a theme which he repeats on other pages. The era of mass migration from Bengal started only a century after the Burmese invasion of 1795 in the wake of the Third Anglo-Burmese War of 1886, and while I am quite prepared to accept that some migrants may well have a record in their family history of an ancestor of at least four generations previously who had once lived in Arakan, I do not see how this could possibly make the majority of such migrants “indigenous”. Indeed, it is preposterous to pretend, as reportedly does prominent Rohingya Abu Tahay [page 142] that: “These people return [a century later] to their old homes they had fled in 1794”. For other people in Myanmar, especially, Rakhine Buddhists, this interpretation would seem to confirm their worst nightmare: the fear of being swamped by Muslim migrants claiming a right to settle as an indigenous community. The author seems unaware of the likely impact of his repetition of such statements. They are manifestly untrue and only increase tensions between the Buddhist and Muslim communities. This narrative is in any case totally unacceptable to Burmese Buddhists throughout the country.

The Council of Scholars of North Arakan went so far in a petition dated 25 October 1948 to Prime Minister U Nu as to attempt to de-Indianise the Muslim population of Arakan completely: “We are dejected to mention that in this country we have wrongly been taken as part of the race generally known as Chittagonians. We humbly submit that we are not. We have a history of our own distinct from that of Chittagonians. We have a culture of our own. Historically we are a race by ourselves”. This is effectively a denial of their origins, despite the voluminous and irrefutable evidence of Chittagonian migration into Arakan contained in over 120 years of British-era archives. It is only

⁴ Attached at Annex are extracts from the 1921 and 1931 Censuses, including the 1931 Table of “Indo-Burman Races” and “Indian Races” whose descendants in Rakhine State today comprise the Rohingya community.

another step to argue that most of the more than 30 million inhabitants of Chittagong Division in present-day Bangladesh could claim indigenous rights in Arakan because in the past one of their ancestors may have been resident there.

Cherry-picking facts is another sure indication of denialism. The author notes that British Sub-Commissioner Charles Paton estimated Arakan's population at around 100,000 in 1826, with "Mugs [Rakhine Buddhists] six-tenths, Muslims three-tenths, Burmese one-tenth," and that: "This figure is close to the proportion of Muslims estimated to be living in Rakhine State when the 2014 Census was undertaken, almost 200 years later". So, allegedly, nothing has changed. But Paton's estimate was little more than guesswork, recorded in a single sentence. It has little authority since it completely ignores the many other ethnicities living in Arakan at the time.

Annual censuses in the form of capitation taxes and household registration started in 1829 and have continued uninterrupted, except during the period of the Second World War, to this day. By the Census of 1842, by which time most Muslims and Buddhists who had fled to Chittagong in 1785 had returned home, the Rev Comstock, an American missionary, quoting the 1842 Census, noted that: "The population of Arakan at the present time (1842) is estimated at about 250,000. Of these, about 167,000 are Mugs, 40,000 are Burmese, 20,000 are Mussulmans, 10,000 are Kyens, 5,000 are Bengalese ⁵, 3,000 are Tounghmaroos, 2,000 are Kemees, 1,259 are Karens and the remainder are of various races, in smaller numbers." He later breaks down these numbers into districts. This indicates a Buddhist population in 1842 in Arakan of 207,000 against 25,000 Muslims or a ratio not of 7:3 (Paton 1826), but of 8:1 (1842 Census). Subsequent annual and decennial censuses record the gradual reduction of this 8:1 ratio to 2:1 by 2014 as the proportion of the Muslim population grew as a result of immigration and, though to a lesser extent, of natural increase.

British Diplomatic Archives in the Immediate Post-Independence Period Ignored

There is finally the absence of any reference by the author to British diplomatic archives during the first decade of independence after 1948 when the descendants of quasi-indigenous Arakan Muslims in Central Arakan - assuredly the Rooinga/Kulaw Yakain of Buchanan - let it be known that they wished henceforth to be called "Rwangya", to distinguish them from the very much larger community of Chittagonians who had migrated during British rule to Northern Arakan, notably into the area around Maungdaw and Buthidaung. This was at a time when the Chittagonians also made it clear that they wished to be known as Arakan Muslims or Burmese Muslims.

⁵ Page 228: "Within the past few years, many Bengalee Mussulmans have immigrated to Arakan, to get higher wages and better living, than they could procure in Chittagong: these constitute the five thousand Bengalees mentioned in enumerating the population of the province."

It was not until the early 1960s that the process of coalescing all Arakan Muslims, whatever their varied origins, under the “Rohingya” label took off and gained momentum, under the guidance and influence of a determined group of ideologues for whom historical fact was less important than aiming forlornly to achieve, by banding them together, the security and protection of the Arakan Muslim community against the discrimination and victimisation which they suffered in post-Independence Burma.

Most independent scholars see the Rohingya identity as a political construction initiated in the early 1960s when the rich historical kaleidoscopic heritage of quasi-indigenous and British-era Muslim migrant ethnicities, described in detail in the 1921 and 1931 British Burma Census Reports, coalesced into the monolithic, juggernaut Rohingya community as it is today internationally recognised. The new ethnicity is now a reality, but it did not exist prior to 1960; there is no historical evidence of the existence of any such homogenous community.

I have great sympathy with the ambitions of the Rohingya community in Rakhine State to be accepted and to qualify as a *taingyintha* or national race. But the 1982 Citizenship Law is discriminatory and capriciously enforced and is frankly not a worthy aspiration for the Rohingya. I have long thought that they should concentrate their efforts on securing the recognition and restoration of their citizenship rights guaranteed under the 1948 Acts, not on the hopeless task of seeking to secure the recognition by their fellow citizens that they too have an unbroken indigeneity stretching back many centuries. The majority of Rohingya qualified by statutory right as Burmese citizens either as quasi-indigenous descendants of the early settlers (Article 4(1) of the 1948 Union Citizenship Act) or by reason of the fact that they are third generation born in Myanmar (Article 4(2) of the Act). In both cases citizenship was *de jure* by birth and granted automatically. It is inalienable. It was only requests for naturalisation or options for nationality, affecting only small numbers of Arakan Muslims, that required any formal application under the 1948 Acts, and then only for full citizenship. The Rohingya should concentrate on what is theirs by right, not on seeking to conform unconvincingly to an unacceptably racist and outdated concept of citizenship.

Annex

The reports, censuses and other documents to which I make reference in this memorandum may all be found by scrolling up and down <http://www.networkmyanmar.org/Arakania.html> .

I include in this Annex transcribed extracts from the 1921 and 1931 British Censuses of Burma relating to indigenous Muslim ethnicities in Arakan as well as the 1931 list of “Indo-Burman” and “Indian” ethnicities, many of which are Muslim and have descendants in today’s Rakhine State. Buchanan’s “Rooinga” are designated “Yakaing-kala” (in Burmese - Kulaw Yakain in Buchanan)) and “Arakan Muslims/Mohamedans” (in English).

Transcribed Extract from the 1921 British Census of Burma - Report Part 1

140. Appointment of Mr. Taylor - *On account of the special desire of Government to obtain an improved linguistic and ethnological record Mr. L. F. Taylor, B.A., I.E.S., who had collated the reports received in the Preliminary Stage of the Linguistic Survey and prepared the grammars and gramophone records mentioned in Article 136 above, was appointed Deputy Superintendent of Census Operations to assist me.*

159. Arakan-Mahomedans - *The Arakan-Mahomedans are practically confined to the Akyab District [present-day Sittwe, Mrauk-U and Maungdaw Districts combined] and are properly the descendants of Arakanese women who have married Chittagonian Mahomedans. It is said that the descendants of a Chittagonian who has permanently settled in Akyab District always refuse to be called Chittagonians and desire to be called Arakan-Mahomedans; but as permanent settlement seems to imply marriage to an Arakanese woman this is quite in accordance with the description given. Although so closely connected to Chittagonians racially the Arakan-Mahomedans do not associate with them at all; they consequently marry almost solely among themselves and have become recognised locally as a distinct race. The Arakanese Buddhists in Akyab asked the Deputy Commissioner there not to let the Arakan-Mahomedans be included under Arakanese in the census. The instruction issued to enumerators with reference to Arakan-Mahomedans was that this race-name (in Burmese Yakaing-kala) should be recorded for those Mahomedans who were domiciled in Burma and had adopted a certain mode of dress which is neither Arakanese nor Indian and who call themselves and are generally called by others Yakaing-kala. ⁶*

The number of Arakan-Mahomedans tabulated in 1921 was nearly 24,000. The numbers tabulated at previous census as Mahomedan Arakanese have been as in Marginal Table 8. Such differences of numbers as are shown here indicate enumeration of the Arakan-Mahomedans at previous censuses under other descriptions; in the census table of 1901 it is impossible to identify them. Probably they have been entered as Sheikh or possibly under Other Mahomedan Tribes in all three earlier censuses mentioned in the table. The defect of females is possibly due to some women who marry Indian Mahomedans describing themselves as of the same race as their husbands.

⁶ Yakaing-kala recorded in British Censuses is indeed identical to Buchanan’s “Kulaw Yakain” by which the Rooinga were known.

Transcribed Extracts from the 1931 British Census of Burma - Report Part 1

16.....During the last decade [in Arakan] the Indians increased from 201,387 to 210,990, i.e., by 9,603 or just under 5 per cent, while Indo-Burman races increased from 24,856 to 49,745, i.e., by 24,889 or by 100 per cent. The Deputy Commissioner Akyab says this is due to the fact that at the last census some Arakan Mahomedans returned themselves as Indians; and he considers the 1931 figures to be correct in view of the fact that Indians and Indo-Burmans were more minutely questioned about their race in 1931. If the figures for Indians and Indo-Burman races are combined the increase is 34,492 or about 15 per cent.....

141.....In paragraph 16 of Chapter 1 it is pointed out that many Arakan Mahomedans in the Akyab district returned themselves as Indians at the 1921 census. The number may be roughly estimated at between 10,000 and 15,000, in which case the increase in the Indian population would be in the neighbourhood of 17 per cent.

143.....The Indo-Burman races include the Zerbadis, the Arakan Mahomedans, the Arakan Kamans and the Myedus. The number of persons belonging to these races has increased by 56,904 or 45 per cent. It is pointed out in paragraph 141 that in 1921 a number of Arakan Mahomedans in the Akyab district - estimated at between 10,000 and 15,000 - returned themselves as Indians. The increase is therefore reduced to between 30 and 35 per cent. The Arakan Mahomedans are mostly found in the Akyab district; the only other districts containing an appreciable number are Kyaukpyu (1,597) and Sandoway (1,658). They are properly the descendants of Arakanese women who have married Chittagonian Muslims. In Burma they are called ရှိခိုင်ကုလား (Yakaing-kala). They are recognised locally as a distinct race and they dress differently from the Arakanese and Chittagonians. The number recorded in 1931 was 51,615, which is more than double the number in 1921, namely 23,775. The reason for the large increase has been explained above.

The Arakan Kamans have increased from 2,180 to 2,686 and are practically confined to the Akyab and Kyaukpyu districts. According to paragraph 160 of the 1921 Census Report "they are descendants of the followers of Shah Shuja, son of Aurungzebe, who fled to Arakan in 1660 A.D. after the failure of his attempt to seize the Moghul throne. After the death of Shah Shula they were formed into a royal bodyguard of archers, and hence received their name. Their features are Indian, but their language, dress and manners are Arakanese".

The Myedus are descendants of Indian Muslims who came over to Burma from northern India in the time of Alaungpaya (see paragraph 158 of the 1921 Census Report). They have increased from 4,991 to 5,160 since 1921 and are practically confined to the Shwebo district.

The Zerbadis have increased from 94,316 in 1921 to 122,705 in 1931, i.e. by 28,389 or 30 per cent. In 1891, 1901 and 1911, the tribal designations were recorded in the enumeration schedules for Muslims and not the race, as at the 1921 and 1931 censuses. The figures for Zerbadis for the 1911 and previous censuses are therefore not reliable. According to the 1921 Census Report Zerbadi was a newish word in 1891, at which census only 24 Zerbadis were recorded; in 1901 the number recorded

was 20,423 and this was raised to 59,729 in 1911. The word Zerbadi is applied to the offspring of marriages between Indian Muslims and Burmese women. Objection has often been raised against the use of the word Zerbadi, but no satisfactory substitute has been suggested. The majority of the Zerbadis are Muslims and the Zerbadi Muslims prefer to be known as Burma Moslems. The term Burma Moslem is not, however, a satisfactory substitute for Zerbadi since some of the Zerbadis are Buddhists or Christians.

The following extract reproduces Page 245 from Part 2 of the 1931 British Burma Census. Group S includes the 4 “Indo-Burman races” and Group X the 38 “Indian Races”, 15 of which include Muslims. Those mostly resident in Rakhine State today were of British-era migrant Chittagonian and Bengali [from outside the Chittagong Region] descent, but Muslims from other communities also settled there in small numbers.

PTO

Census of British Burma 1931 Part 2

245

IMPERIAL TABLE XVII—Race. PART I.—Provincial Totals of Races by Religion—concl'd.

Race-group and Race.		Religion.	Males.	Females.	Race-group and Race.		Religion.	Males.	Females.				
R2	Cantonese ...	Total ...	24,303	9,687	X16	Jat	273	11				
		Animist ...	12,110	4,153	X17	Kachi	539	193				
		Confucian ...	6,204	2,568	X18	Kaka (Moplah) ...	Total ...	9,039	402				
		Buddhist ...	5,530	2,749		Muslim	8,949	392				
		Christian ...	282	143		Others	90	10				
		Others ...	177	74	X19	Kanarese	151	89				
R3	Fukienese ...	Total ...	33,057	16,981	X20	Kashmiri	38	6				
		Animist ...	15,670	6,856	X21	Khoja	208	159				
		Buddhist ...	12,261	7,369	X22	Konkani	75	...				
		Confucian ...	4,783	2,567	X23	Kumaoni	2,010	319				
		Christian ...	304	174	X24	Mahratta	437	162				
		Others ...	39	15	X25	Maimon ...	Total ...	3,097	758				
R4	Other and un-specified Chinese.	Total ...	29,001	12,874		Muslim	3,097	747				
		Animist ...	18,243	7,359		Others	11				
		Buddhist ...	9,047	4,839	X26	Malabari ...	Total ...	2,645	560				
		Confucian ...	1,174	460		Hindu	1,931	445				
		Muslim ...	227	94		Muslim	542	29				
		Christian ...	291	122		Christian	137	69				
		Others ...	19	...		Others	35	17				
S	Indo-Burman Races.	...	90,307	91,859	X27	Marwari	1,480	823				
S1	Arakan-Mahomedan	Total ...	26,153	25,462	X28	Moghul	348	239				
		Muslim ...	26,150	25,462	X29	Nursapuri ...	Total ...	3,361	1,688				
		Buddhist ...	3	...		Muslim	2,865	1,419				
S2	Zerbadi ...	Total ...	60,413	62,292		Christian	438	231				
		Muslim ...	57,415	59,736		Others	58	38				
		Buddhist ...	2,637	2,180	X30	Oriya ...	Total ...	58,905	3,680				
		Christian ...	220	135		Hindu	56,016	3,110				
		Others ...	141	241		Muslim	910	231				
S3	Arakan-Kaman ...	Total ...	1,296	1,390		Buddhist	1,427	157				
		Muslim ...	1,287	1,383		Christian	501	173				
		Buddhist ...	9	7		Others	51	9				
S4	Myedu ...	Total ...	2,445	2,715	X31	Parsi	307	191				
		Muslim ...	2,240	2,441	X32	Pathan ...	Total ...	3,501	971				
		Buddhist ...	205	274		Muslim	3,439	937				
					Others	62	34					
X	Indian Races	...	733,911	283,914	X33	Punjabi ...	Total ...	21,345	7,445				
X1	Assamese ...	Total ...	891	435		Hindu	7,269	2,673				
		Hindu ...	772	413		Muslim	5,866	1,634				
		Others ...	119	22		Sikh	7,792	2,969				
X2	Baluchi ...	Total ...	53	11		Arya and Brahma.	73	83				
		Muslim ...	53	11		Others	343	84				
X3	Bengali ...	Total ...	48,682	16,529	X34	Rajput	416	67				
		Muslim ...	28,781	10,750	X35	Sindhi	270	56				
		Hindu ...	18,160	5,360	X36	Sorati ...	Total ...	3,937	2,195				
		Buddhist ...	1,491	309		Muslim	3,783	2,170				
		Christian ...	228	90		Others	154	25				
		Others ...	22	20	X37	Tamil ...	Total ...	93,435	56,453				
X4	Bhotia ...	Total ...	1	...		Hindu	78,135	45,304				
		Hindu ...	1	...		Christian	12,082	9,705				
X5	Bihari ...	Muslim ...	508	31		Muslim	1,504	748				
X6	Borah ...	Total ...	112	48		Buddhist	1,584	658				
		Muslim ...	112	48		Others	130	38				
X7	Chittagonian ...	Total ...	163,912	88,240	X38	Telegu ...	Total ...	123,940	35,819				
		Muslim ...	157,155	86,749		Hindu	118,696	33,883				
		Hindu ...	4,891	873		Christian	3,184	1,285				
		Buddhist ...	1,826	617		Muslim	1,086	373				
		Others ...	40	1		Buddhist	881	263				
X8	Chulla ...	Total ...	23,269	8,723		Others	93	15				
		Muslim ...	23,108	8,656	Y	European, etc.	...	17,769	13,082				
		Others ...	161	67		European and allied Races, including Armenians. Anglo-Indians	7,885	3,766				
X9	Deccani ...	Total ...	817	373	Z	Other Races	1,836	1,203				
		Muslim ...	817	373						Arab	61	18
X10	Dogra	146	10						Egyptian	9	...
X11	Garhwali	961	263						Goa-Portuguese	40	16
X12	Goanese	651	150						Japanese	448	187
X13	Gujarati	4,622	1,847						Jew	643	618
X14	Gurkha ...	Total ...	26,689	12,843						Mauritian	3	4
		Hindu ...	25,745	12,447						Negro	5	...
		Buddhist ...	655	292						Persian	370	327
		Others ...	289	114						Philippino	67	11
						Singhalese	179	21				
X15	Hindustani ...	Total ...	132,842	42,125	Turk	11	1					
		Hindu ...	103,591	32,445									
		Muslim ...	27,328	9,020									
		Buddhist ...	1,273	383									
		Christian ...	460	227									
		Others ...	190	50									