


**Making *Anyatha* (Upper Lander) and *Auktha*
(Lower Lander):
Crossing the Introduction of the Colonial Boundary
System to British Burma (Myanmar)**



Myo Oo*

[Abstract]

In Myanmar studies, despite research on the categorization of ethnic nationalities are fairly much, research on the categorization of Myanmar people (ethnic Myanmar) is rarely exposed. People settled down in Central Myanmar had been categorized by regionalism into two groups as *Anyatha* (Upper Lander) and *Auktha* (Lower lander). It can be determined that the regionalism of Myanmar people existed and still exists. Previous scholarship in the colonial history of Myanmar has primarily referred to the documents recorded by the colonial officers and historical texts composed by the British authorities and scholars. The Catalogue of the Hluttaw Records is one of the rarest documents recorded in the Myanmar language on the affairs in the borderline drawn by the British after the Second Anglo-Myanmar War (1852-1853). Scrutinizing the Catalogue of the Hluttaw Records, it has been found that the text sheds light on the division of Central Myanmar into two regions in colonial Burma, later known as Lower Myanmar and Myanmar kingdom. These areas were known as Upper Myanmar between 1853 and 1885, and the categorization of

* Visiting Professor, Korea Institute for ASEAN Studies, Busan University of Foreign Studies, South Korea. myooo14@gmail.com.

the Myanmar king's subject, known as *Anyatha* (Upper Lander) and British colony citizen later known as *Auktha* (Lower Lander). This article traces back the relation of introducing the colonial boundary system and the division of Central Myanmar into two regions that allowed the emergence of regionalism among Myanmar people.

Keywords: Colonial boundary system, Lower Myanmar, Upper Myanmar, *Anyatha*, *Auktha*

I . Introduction

In the Myanmar language, two words categorize Myanmar people into two sections: they are *Anyatha* (Upper lander); and *Aauktha* (Lower lander). The former means the upper lander, born in Upper Myanmar, starts from Magway Division northwards, while the latter means the lower lander, born in Lower Myanmar, starts from the Pegu (Bago) Division southwards. According to the Myanmar-English Dictionary published by the Myanmar Language Department, *Anya* means the upriver region adjoining the upper reaches of the Ayeyarwaddy River (2019: 620) and *Auk* means the downriver area (2019: 690). These words are generally used in present-day Myanmar to refer to the upper and lower parts of Myanmar. *Anyatha* (Upper lander) and *Auktha* (Lower lander) are defined based on their birthplace. Since they descend from the same ethnicity, it is challenging to define via appearance. However, it is possible to determine whether a Myanmar person is an *Anyatha* or an *Auktha* listening to their vocabulary and pronunciation and when they speak out. *Anytha* pronounces the word *tawinpu*, the 16th number of the Myanmar alphabet, which has the pronunciation of *ta*, as *tha*, as well as the word *tha*, the 30th number of Myanmar alphabet, which is pronounced *ta*. On the other hand, while the *Anyatha* differentiate the usage of paternal uncle (lower) as *bagyi* and (younger) as *badwe*, that of maternal uncle (lower) as *ugi* and younger as *ulay*, *Auktha* never addresses every parent's siblings as *ulay* (uncle). Similar to the paternal uncles, different words signify maternal aunty. Upper landers address their aunty (lower) as *ayilay*

and aunty (upper) as *ayigyi*, while the Lower landers do not do that. Together with the fame of Mandalay, the last capital of Myanmar, as a cultural center of Myanmar, the term *Anytha* can be interpreted by the extended meaning as a people who are intimate with Myanmar language and culture. For example, *Ahet Myanma Pyi Saye-say-mya* literarily means here are Upper Lander writers publishing novels on traditional Myanmar culture and society in upper Myanmar. On the other hand, the term *Anyatha* has generally been used to address the children working in teashops in Yangon. Some upper landers regard that term as discriminatory against the people who migrated from upper to lower Myanmar for their living.

The modern administrative areas started to divide Central Myanmar during the colonial period. Dividing upper and lower Myanmar only happened to Central Myanmar and excluded Rakhine State located not in the central area, and Shan and Kayin State situated in the frontier areas. Myanmar kingdom has been divided into two countries immediately after the Second Anglo-Myanmar War (1852-1853) due to losing the war of the Myanmar kingdom. Upper Myanmar remained as the Myanmar Kingdom while the lower part became British colonial Burma (Myanmar). In this way, various administrations practiced in Upper and Lower Myanmar. Strikingly this period only last long 32 years, precisely from 1853 to 1885 when the British Army occupied Upper Myanmar after the Third Anglo-Myanmar War in 1885. Though these 32 years were not important enough to be mentioned in Myanmar's historical period, this period took an important role in categorizing modern Myanmar people into two categories.

Research on *Anyatha* and *Auktha* conducted from the linguistic approach has done to some extent, uncover the different usage and pronunciation of speakers from Upper that of speakers from Lower Myanmar (Patricia & Milner 1989; Kartz 1999). Analysis from a historical perspective: there is an article entitled "A Study on the Factors of Domestic Migration of the Ethnic Burman in the Burmese King's Age" (Myo Oo 2012). This article throws light on the push-pull factors of the ethnic Burman (Myanmar) migration in Central Myanmar during the Myanmar king's age. Though this article traces the organizational and economic characteristics of

ethnic Burma's migration from Myanmar kingdom (Upper Myanmar) to the British colony Burma (Lower Myanmar) in the Yadanabon period, the scope of this article does not reach the making of British colonial citizens in Lower Myanmar.

The article under study historically traces how the colonial boundary system demarcated Central Myanmar into two countries as the Myanmar Kingdom, later Upper Myanmar, and British Burma, later Lower Myanmar, and categorized the people in Central Myanmar into two groups such as Myanmar king subject, later *Anyatha*, and the British colonial citizen, later *Auktha*. To trace the categorization of two groups in Central Myanmar, this study will focus on how the colonial boundary system demarcated the Myanmar kingdom into two countries and categorized Myanmar king subjects in upper Myanmar and colonial citizens in lower Myanmar. To understand how both authorities, understand and took action to subjugate the Myanmar king's subjects and colonial citizens, this research scrutinizes the document entitled *The Catalogue of the Hluttaw Records* (2011).

Previous scholarships in the colonial history of Myanmar have mainly referred to the documents recorded by the colonial officers and historical texts composed by the British administrator-scholars. Scrutinizing the Catalogue of the Hluttaw Records, it has been found that the text sheds light on the historical accounts on the categorization of the British colonial citizens, which have been documented in a record recorded by the Myanmar king's officers. This document has revealed the account on the categorization of the British colonial citizen differentiating from its citizens from that of Upper Myanmar since the British authority had drawn a borderline between the Upper and Lower Myanmar immediately after the Second Anglo-Myanmar War (1852-1853). This document has also referenced the account on the categorization of the Asians in Upper Myanmar, such as Indians and Chinese and British colonial citizens. In sum, this document could help provide historical knowledge that introducing the new boundary, defined by the Western perspective, had categorized the British colonial citizen and the Myanmar King's subject.

The record which has been noted accounts mentioned above is *The Catalogue of the Hluttaw Records*, Vol. I and II (Yangon: Yapyi Printing Press, 2011) recorded the official letters during the Yadanabon Period (1853-1885). The first publication, *The Catalogue of the Hluttaw Records (CHR)* Pat I and II, had been published in two volumes in 1909 by the Government Printing Press. However, due to having the first publication published in 1909, it is challenging to reach these books, the second publication of the *CHR*, of which two volumes were published in a book in this publication, has been scrutinized. The records in the book are primary documents that are full of historical data recorded in the official letters dispatched by the Hluttaw of the Myanmar king's court during the Yadanabon Period (1853-1878). In this book, Dr. Kyaw Win, the Secretary of the Myanmar Historical Commission and a part-time professor of Yangon University has given a review in the "Preface" of the *CHR* as follows.

... The account on foreign relations, that of Irrawaddy Flotilla Company, that of the state scholars of Myanmar, and that of Bombay-Burma Timber Company, has been recorded in the *CHR*. This book has recorded precious historical documents. It is a primary source for Myanmar history. In addition, since the events recorded in the book have been noted in official writing, the record is entirely accurate. I firmly believed that the *CHR* is a helpful handbook for scholars in the fields of Myanmar literary and Myanmar history, and they can rely on this book for their studies... (Kyaw Win 2011: 9).

The *CHR* is full of historical values. The letters, dispatched by the Myanmar king's court and the British authorities since 1826, copied from the *parabikes* (a writing material of coarse paper made from mulberry pulp and applied before the colonial period in Myanmar from no. 1 to 25, has been printed in the first part, and other documents on the account from 1874 to 1885, noted from the *parabike* no. 159 to 419, in the second part. The record, the *CHR*, has opened with the account of the 3rd waning day of *Dabaung* 1187 (23 February 1826) and recorded the affairs of King Mindon and his son King Thibaw.

One of the purposes of this research is to investigate a historical document recorded by the Myanmar king's officials, which would also help conduct further examinations on the colonial history of Myanmar. This research could reveal new historical facts on the categorization of the Myanmar king's subject and British colonial citizen to more foreign researchers who want to use documents recorded from the Myanmar side. This study would also help to understand the colonial formation of the British colonial, which continued to 1885 when the Upper Myanmar was annexed by the British Annexation Army after the Third Anglo-Myanmar War (1885).

In this research, a socio-linguistic approach will be adopted to decipher the newly categorized people and locations defined by the new territorial outlook noted in the record. This article has been divided into five sections. The following section briefly introduces the historical context of pre-modern Southeast Asia when Western imperialism entered there. The discussion on the relationship between the establishment of the colonial boundary system and the categorization of the British colonial citizen in Lower Myanmar will be in the third section. The final section is a summary of the discussions in the article.

II. When Western Imperialism and Pre-Modern Southeast Asia Meet

The adventure of Western powers to Southeast Asia made the emergence of modern Southeast Asian nations, and these nations owe their present boundary alignments to colonial action. Southeast Asian areas, both mainland and archipelago, were incorporated into the Western colonies from the late 18th century. The Western powers were mapping their possessions and defining colonial jurisdictions during the 19th century (Owen 2005: 79). While mapping and representing jurisdictions in the colonies, the authorities were confronted with political instability. To respond to the instability, the powers tried to provide sovereignty to the residents in the totality of the colonial territory. For this purpose,

Western powers incorporated Western territorial outlooks into their colonies, defined in territorial terms, and maps and treaties set the borders (Solomon 1969: v). With the incorporation of the Western territorial perspective by the Western powers to Southeast Asia during the colonial period, modern boundaries came into existence in the region. The colonial boundary system, which was incorporated into Southeast Asia, gave way for categorizing the colonial citizens in the respective countries.

It is common in Southeast Asia that the past kingdoms were defined by natural boundaries such as streams, rivers, and mountain ranges. These boundaries could not develop an effective administrative apparatus in the remote areas. The nature of borders in traditional Southeast Asia can be seen in Solomon's research memorandum entitled *Boundary Concepts and Practices in Southeast Asia* (California: The Rand Corporation, 1969). In his work, he has illustrated the relation of the sovereignty and boundary in Southeast Asia as follows:

In Southeast Asia, order and surveillance were not easily maintained in remote areas. Sovereignty was not defined in a strict territorial sense. Marginal territorial concessions were a legitimate instrument of national policy and were not viewed as fatal to the kingdom. A shifting frontier based on transitory power relationships was a means of gauging and aligning the international equilibrium. Sovereignty was as crucial to Southeast Asian principalities as it was the oldest nations of Europe, but the content was different: in Southeast Asia, the preservation of sovereignty was less dependent upon the maintenance of absolute territorial integrity (Solomon 1969: vi).

Subsequently, the borders of the conventional main lands of Southeast Asian nations were distinguished by independent administrations, which could be interpreted without treaties or articles from another country, multiple barriers that an edge, unconnected, but which were adaptable, and autonomy and borders were not coincident. For provincial civilizations, they were accustomed to calling upon their families on both sides of the border, and some emigrated from one side to the other at various times (Thongchai 1994: 76-78). Accordingly, only the civilized

regions or the borders respected the limits, were conserved by regional sentries. Thus, a guardhouse was also an indication of the extremity of autonomous authority over a specific realm. Incredibly since Bangkok discerned no perimeter, the stance of a guardhouse and the extent the patrol post distinguished the breadth of the domain under the hegemony of Bangkok. On the other hand, in contemporary periods, the extent of sovereign territory marked by a boundary line delimits the space of a border guard's sovereignty. Each quantity of this barrier was stipulated unassisted by the regional council. It may or may not reach another piece of a perimeter. Hence, the perimeter of a commonwealth was sporadic, and, consequently, the kingdom was not officially bound (Thongchai 1994: 76).

2.1. The Western Notion on the Boundary

By referring to the term as suggested by Solomon, the Western notion of the boundary will be reported in this small section. The Western state is defined in territorial terms and focused on the sovereignty in its national territory. In Western territorial outlooks, borderlines are well-defined by maps and treaties. During the colonization in Southeast Asia, Europeans were confronted with political instability. Thus, they responded by defining borders within colonizers agreeing on boundaries that became more urgent for the more intense competition in colonization. According to Solomon, the colonial boundary system was designed to stabilize spheres of influence and provided border security assurance against invasion or large-scale territorial encroachment (Solomon 1969: v).

The Western boundary concept, incorporated into Southeast Asia, is a common assumption of a modern state. Referring to previous scholarship on the characteristic of boundary, Solomon has summarized the modern western boundary concept as follows. A modern nation-state necessitates and is desirable to achieve the establishment of boundaries, which can be represent by lines on maps. In addition, they should consider the issues of authority and organization (Solomon 1969: 1). Moreover, a state should have territory, and there can exist one entire sovereign state only. In other words, a state is defined as a territory, and state sovereignty

resides within the totality of the national territory (Solomon 1969: 2). The colonial boundary system was designed to stabilize spheres of influence without significant commitments of resources (Solomon 1969: v).

In the past, streams, rivers, and mountain ranges were selected as natural boundaries, often in disregard of the cultural unity of the river valley and upland civilizations (Solomon 1969: v-vi). In traditional Southeast Asia, order and surveillance were not easily maintained in remote areas. Sovereignty was not defined in a strict territorial sense. Marginal territorial concessions were a legitimate instrument of national policy and were not viewed as fatal to the kingdom. A shifting frontier was a means of gauging and aligning the international equilibrium based on transitory power relationships (Solomon 1969: vi).

Sovereignty was as crucial to Southeast Asian principalities as it was the oldest nations of Europe, but the content was different: in Southeast Asia, the preservation of sovereignty was less dependent upon the maintenance of absolute territorial integrity (Solomon 1969: vi). A new border defined by the western perception appeared in central Myanmar after the Second Anglo-Myanmar War (1852-1853). Immediately after the war, administrative interactions between Upper and Lower Myanmar had initiated, and legal offices such as custom houses, immigration offices and mixed-courts were established. From the Western territorial outlook, the British authority defined the sovereignty of Lower Myanmar. The attempt led to the categorization of two different citizens in Upper and Lower Myanmar.

As mentioned in the previous small section, the rationalistic European view of modern international relations was different from the indigenous tributary relationship. Studying the case of Thailand, Thongchai said that the exclusive sovereignty of the supreme king over the lesser kings meant to expand the realm of the modern nation-state Siam under the regime of the new geographical concept over the indigenous ambiguous space. The confrontation occurred among these Siam and European powers and between different realms of geographical knowledge (Thongchai 1994: 104, 107).

2.2. Colonial Boundary System

The colonial boundary system is a system practiced by Western colonial powers in Mainland Southeast Asia. Solomon has pointed out the system in his book (1969), studying the case of Vietnam. When the European powers ventured into Southeast Asia, the authorities were confronted with highly dynamic political instability, delimited or demarcated boundaries. At that time, there were no legal and cartographic instruments of border definition. When they were embroiled in disputes in Southeast Asia, they realized the absence of the boundary system there.

Solomon has explained the aims of the European powers in Southeast Asia that the original purpose was to develop trade, and the acquisition was of only secondary interest. They changed their ambition because it was more challenging to control than to conquer new territory (Solomon 1969: 5).

According to Solomon, the interest in power became a steadily growing one stimulated by economic and security reasons (Solomon 1969: 5). The financial incentive for expansion in the quest for stable and profitable resources was matched by a territorial drive spurred by competition among the colonizers. The competing colonizers rushed toward each other's frontiers in their efforts to secure their possessions and deny other prizes to their traditional rivals, and the competition tended to be self-limiting (Solomon 1969: 6).

The imperial powers wished to avoid disastrous armed conflict with each other and had enough experience with misunderstandings and minor skirmishes to appreciate the real danger of imperial confrontation. Restraint was an essential element of the colonial boundary system (Solomon 1969: 7). Solomon concludes the colonial boundary system that political-economic factors led the colonial powers to enlarge their dominions and then strive for a definition and codification of the limits of their sovereignty. Many of the colonial boundaries bore a superficial resemblance to the broad outlines of earlier indigenous states (Solomon 1969: 8).

While Westerners were interested in borderlines, not Southeast Asian authorities; it is possible to see an example in Thongchai's

seminal work entitled *Siam Mapped*. The territorial delimitation of Siam was much more complicated because a clear boundary did not exist, but a frontier town was regarded as standard to more than one kingdom (Thongchai 1994: 81). According to Thongchai, to designate a boundary was not an exciting job for the king of Chiang Mai; if the British wanted to do it, they could have done it themselves with the help of local people who earned their living by collecting honey or hunting elephants (Thongchai 1994: 75).

The *khetdaen* (เขตแดน) of each town was determined primarily by the extent of the surrounding area it could protect. A town may or may not have a common border connecting it to another town, let alone a line dividing the realms of two towns or countries. As a conglomeration of towns, a kingdom was composed of political-territorial patches with much blank space in between (Thongchai 1994: 75). The *khetdaen* of an empire expanded to the edge/end of these outlying villages and the regions over which their sovereignty could be practiced. Farther than these thresholds, many woodlands and mountains comprise a path between the two realms (Thongchai 1994: 75). It was a boundary without a borderline. Or one could say that it was a wide section with a considerably straight breadth. It was not the entire perimeter, which was considered the region under one's autonomy and supervision (Thongchai 1994: 75).

In *Siam Mapped*, Thongchai analyzes the line as the barrier by trees or poles or stone markings between Burma and Siam as noted in many ancient records. Two well-known selections are the Three Pagoda Pass and the *Singkhon* Pass, which are also the *khetdaen* of this kind. The three pagodas were not, in fact, pagodas but enormous heaps of rocks purposely established. They were marking the limit (Thongchai 1994: 76). A bull track ritually depicted a boundary between Chiang Mai and a Kayah state at the crest of a ridge (Thongchai 1994: 76).

Accordingly, only the inhabited areas or the corridors, regarded as limits, were maintained by local wardens. Therefore, a guardhouse was also a reminder of the extremity of supreme authority over a specific sphere. Any part of this threshold was designated independently by the regional leadership. It might or

might not contact another area or perimeter. Thus the “boundaries” of dominion were unsteady and, therefore, the territory was non-bound (Thongchai 1994: 76).

The colonial boundary system, which represented the boundary, replaced the border area of the traditional mainland Southeast Asia boundary. Thongchai has pointed out that the British incorporated a concept of boundary; into Thai, whose qualification was different from that of *khetdaen*. In this way, the conception of *khetdaen* held by Siam had been replaced by the concept of boundary imposed itself as an alternative of signification (Thongchai 1994: 79).

III. Incorporation of Western Boundary into Myanmar

The boundary drawn in Central Myanmar was not the first boundary defined by the Western perception for Myanmar. With the defeat of the Myanmar king's army in the First Anglo-Myanmar War (1824-1826), Assam, Manipur, Cachar and Jaintia were put under total British control, and Arakan (Rakhine) and Tenasserim (Tanintharyi) were occupied (Htin Aung 1967: 214-215).

The Second Anglo-Myanmar War started on 5 April and ended on 20 December 1852. In December 1851, the Myanmar king's governor of Rangoon fined the captains and two crews 1,000 rupees for reported customs violations. Dissatisfied of the judgment, the Indian Governor-General Lord Dalhousie dispatched two vessels of the Royal Navy with an ultimatum that the Myanmar government rescind the fine and the governor should be immediately removed. Due to King Pagan and his minister being fully aware of the consequences of a new war, the Myanmar government accepted the terms. The British naval commander, Commodore Lambert, went ahead and blocked the coastline on 6 January 1852 (Cobden 1853: 21-22). On 18 February 1852, Dalhousie sent a new ultimatum, demanding four items, including one million rupees, to cover the costs of preparing for war (Banerjee 1947: 13). Without waiting for a reply from Myanmar, joint British naval and ground forces seized Yangon on 5 April, Patheingyi on 14 April and Mottama on 19 May

(Banerjee 1947: 14). Bago was taken in November despite spirited resistance (Thein 1967: 151). In December, Rangoon (Yangon), Pegu (Bago) and Prome (Pyi) were declared as newly occupied territory, and it became a new province of British Burma, a.k.a Lower Myanmar. On 18 February 1853, there was a rebellion in the Myanmar king's palace, and the war came to an end. Because a half-brother of King Bagan, King Mindon, led a peace party, enthroned, the Myanmar forces retreated to Upper Myanmar (Thant Myint-U 2004: 23).

Though the new king, King Mindon (1853-1878), did not ratify or acknowledge any treaty with the British regarding the annexation of Lower Myanmar after 1852, the boundary between the Lower and Upper Myanmar had been demarcated. The borderline was marked by stone pillars throughout the border drawn by the British one-sidedly. The initiation of the modern administrative apparatus in Myanmar also helped categorize different citizenship within the same ethnicity.

Along with introducing the new boundary, responding to the British administrative apparatus, new administrative offices had been established throughout the Irrawaddy River in Upper Myanmar. The official ports such as Dagonmaw Port, Minhla Port and Shwemyodaw Port also came into existence (*CHE* 2001: 517). Other new offices that emerged in Upper Myanmar were the custom-house. The names of the custom-houses were Minde-Dewun Custom House, Bamaw Custom House, Yadanabon Custom House, Minhla Kindaw Custom House and Myingyan Custom House (*CHE* 2001: 109, 131, 200, 206, 207, 234, 240, 245).

In traditional Myanmar, a frontier was expected, and it was regarded as a zone of less contact and hence of less definition. After the Second Anglo-Myanmar War, a boundary that divided Upper and Lower Myanmar had been drawn, and Lower Myanmar included all of the territory of British colonial Myanmar, composed of Bago, Pyi, Rakhine and Taninthayi. Drawing a boundary was an attempt to define the British colonial Myanmar territory and state sovereignty residents within the territory. This attempt differentiated indigenous people into two categories: the citizen of the British

colonial Myanmar who lived in Lower Myanmar; and Myanmar's king's subject who lived in Upper Myanmar. In other words, the inhabitants in Lower Myanmar were categorized as British colonial citizens, excluding the Myanmar who share the same ethnicity with them and who lived in Upper Myanmar. As Leach has explained that a boundary violently divides ethnic peoples into different nations, new citizens appear in both countries (1960: 49-51).

The emergence of the new administrative institutions paid the way for introducing new terms of the new institutions as follows. This section will attempt to determine the initiation of new administrative apparatus on the categorization of the British colonial citizens, referring to new terms used after the boundary had been drawn.

3.1. New Boundary and New Territorial Concept in Myanmar

The terms for a new territorial administration encountered in the records happen to be new terms created and modified. Immediately after the occupation of the areas in Lower Myanmar where the British authority had one-sidedly drawn a boundary that defined British colonial Myanmar. The British administration had erected stone pillars throughout the border without codifying the treaties with the Myanmar king.

After the boundary had been drawn between Upper and Lower Myanmar, new administrative terms became official languages; the term *kyauktaing* and related terms. It is possible to trace two names of some stone pillars established in the borderline in the CHR as follows. They were *Thanbaya-gaing Kyauntaing* (*Thanbaya-gaing* stone pillar) and *Lu-kyauk Kyauktaing* (*Luu-kyauk* stone pillar) (CHE 2001: 562). Initially, the term *kyauktaing* was a stone pillar. The term was revived and applied to a stone pillar, and it was used by the Myanmar officials and retained its use in the CHR. In many cases, *kyauktaing* had been used throughout the CHR. *Kyauktaing*, it means stone pillar in literature. Thus, the word for setting up stone pillars to mark boundary had been represented as *kyauktaing sitehmat* in the record (CHE 2001: 64).

It did not mean that marking a stone in the border area by the

British authority was not the first one. There were two places that limited and marked the passages between Thailand and Myanmar. The two well-known passages were the Three Pagoda Pass and the *Singkhon* Pass. Explaining the meaning of a boundary in Thai, Thongchai informed us of the marks between Thailand (Siam) and Myanmar (Burma). According to him, the three pagodas were not, in fact, pagodas but massive stone pillars that had intentionally been constructed to mark the passage in the border area between Myanmar and Thailand. In addition, these pillars maintained the limit of the two kingdoms. The *Singkhon* Pass was a boundary between Chiang Mai and a Kayah state, ritually marked by a bull track at the top of a hill (Thongchai 1994: 76).

As mentioned above, the *kyauktaing* is a limit for Myanmar in the indigenous territorial conception, but it marked the boundary between Upper and Lower Myanmar for the British. The colonial boundary concept was unfamiliar to the Myanmar king's officials, and to stipulate such conditions might have seemed to them to be interpreted as what they had seen. In another ward, the notion on the boundary associated with the laws and customs associated had paid the invention of new terms combining the term *kyauktaing*. Another term that had often come up in the record is *Kyauktaing-myau-bak*. The term *Kyauktaing-myau-bak* had also been used to express the areas located in the northern region of the boundary (CHE 2001: 56, 57, 58, 65, 69, 71, 81, 99, 106, 133, 134, 140, 141, 146, 161, 167, 168, 176, 184).

Regarding the border area, the officials used the term *kyauktinag*, *necha* and *nesat* interchangeably (CHE 2001: 66, 93). Generally, the terms *necha* and *nesat* are frontier areas. In this sense, they had been used as a boundary. The term *Hnit-nainggan-ne-asat* or *Hnit-nainggan-asat* (frontier area between two countries) (CHE 2001: 184), meaning a border between two countries, has also been used with an alternative. Myanmar officials seem to be muddled in understanding the newly introduced territorial concept, and they synonymously used the terms mentioned in this paragraph, with a boundary in the record.

In short, the British fixed a boundary in central Myanmar after

the Second Anglo-Myanmar War. The term *kyauktaing* is denoted in traditional Myanmar as a mark that limited the area which confronted two countries: Upper Myanmar Kingdom and British colonial Myanmar (Lower Myanmar). In this way, the realms of geographical knowledge seem to have changed at this time.

3.2. *Nainggan* or State in Colonial Boundary System

Myanmar officials revived the terms such as *nainggan* or *naingandaw* to mean the Myanmar kingdom in Upper Myanmar. Initially, the term *nainggan*, which has been used since the Bagan period, had denoted the kingdom of Myanmar. *Nainggan* is a compound word of *naing* and *gan*. According to Than Tun, the most famous historian in pre-modern Myanmar history, the term *naing* had referred to an area occupied by the military power; and *gan* was an area of a tiny state which became a tributary taking protection (2005: 7). *Naingandaw*, in modern Myanmar literary, means the state in the contemporary political definition; the term *Myanma nainggan* is today a popular political term in Myanmar. In the CHR, the term *nainggan* has often been recorded (CHE 2001: 49, 58, 94, 102, 120, 156, 157, 158, 159, 187, 308). The term *naingandaw* was first found in the *Dhamayazaka* Stone Inscription of the Bagan Period (Nyein Maung 1972: 65-69).

Continuously, the terms prefixed to *naingan* can be seen in the same record. In this context, the term *naingandaw* may refer to the space of Upper Myanmar (CHR 2001: 299). Because the term *naingandaw-ne-ludo* here relates to the people who lived in the state (CHR 2001: 70, 81), and the term *naingandaw-bet-ne* means the areas in the state (CHR 2001: 81). It, thus, can be said that the term *nainggan*, which has been used to refer to the kingdom since the Pagan period, has been used with the meaning which denotes not only the territory but human and territory, too. Though the term's meaning is ambiguous on the spatial concept, it might be included in a modern sense to some extent.

In the text, the other term, the territory of Myanmar is *Myanma-ne* (CHR 2001: 56, 144, 115, 117, 120, 158, 170, 179) and *Myanmar Naingandaw-atwin* (CHR 2001: 158). While the term

Myanma-ne means the territory of the Myanmar kingdom in Upper Myanmar, the term Myanmar *nainggandaw-atwin* means a particular place in the territory of the Myanmar kingdom. In this context, the meaning of the terms might have been gradually modified by a modern territorial outlook, defined by the western perception.

The Myanmar officials had adopted *Myanmar-min-paing-ne* and *ingalte-min-paing-ne* to refer to areas on both sides. These two terms have contained the territorial concept of the sovereignty of the rulers. The term *Myanmar-min-paing-ne* is the way it has been spelled in the Myanmar realm (CHR 2001: 150). As expressed in the word itself, the term's meaning has been associated with the territorial concept of the sovereignty of the Myanmar king. As will be discussed later, the territorial concept of sovereignty took a crucial role in categorizing the Myanmar king's subject. With its intrinsic meaning, *ingalte-min-paing-ne* is equivalent of a British territory. The term referred to Lower Myanmar, which had been established as British colonial Myanmar at the time. It, however, is clear that the word was added to an exceptional concept of sovereignty in this context.

The other term used in the sense of sovereignty with the Lower Myanmar was *ingalate-paing* (CHR 2001: 176). The term indicates the territory which the British colonial government had ruled. Continuously, the terms *ingalate-pine-myitsin* (CHR 2001: 169) and *ingalate-ne-nay* (CHR 2001: 171) have also been used to refer to the territory under the sovereignty of the British government. The former means the river valley ruled by the British government, and the latter indicate a particular man or woman directly, and the British colonial citizen indirectly. The term above mentioned was referring to the territory of the British, but there is also a term called *ingalate-nesat* (CHR 2001: 65). The term reflects the meaning of the areas on the border, which are located in the side of Lower Myanmar that had been ruled by the British.

The term *ingalate-ne* has also been used synonymously with Lower Myanmar (CHR 2001: 95, 97, 117, 150, 166, 170). In contrast to the term *ingalte-min-paing-ne*, the term *ingalate-ne* here simply

indicates the British territory (*CHR* 2001: 116, 150, 153, 154). On the other hand, there is a term that refers Lower Myanmar. It is *auk-myo-kyeywa*, which is located in the towns and cities in Lower Myanmar (*CHR* 2001: 55, 63, 307). This term has still been used in the local dialect of the uplands.

To sum up, the terms used to refer to the territories of the Myanmar kingdom and British colonial Myanmar had been revived and modified. They might have seemed to be influenced by the new territorial outlook, which had been added eventually. The introduction of new administrative terms would help to understand the categorizing of the British colonial citizen and the Myanmar king's subject in the following small section.

IV. Making Myanmar King's Subject and the British Colonial Citizen

Since the introduction of new administrative terms, which are based on the colonial boundary system, the expression of Myanmar ethnic had been divided into two categories: the British colonial citizen and Myanmar king's subject. The differentiation of the British citizens and Myanmar king's subject can be seen in cases recorded in the *CHR*, such as the robberies in border areas, reported illegal smuggling of cows, buffaloes and horses, and in cases that had been judged in joint-courts. Studying these cases recorded in the *CHR*, it is possible to see the categorization of two citizens.

Regarding the categorization of the British colonial citizens, there are six terms: *kyauktaing-taung-bak-ne-lumya*, *ingalate-min-kyun*, *ingalate-min-kyun* (repetitive), *kuauk-taung-taung-bak-ka-lu*, *ingalate-kyun-myo* and *Myanma-ne-kula-thu*. The Myanmar king's officials use *kyauktaing-taung-bak-ne-lumya* to mean the British colonial citizens. The term directly refers to the people who lived in the boundary's southern territory, indirectly referring to the people in Lower Myanmar or British colonial Burma (Myanmar) (*CHR* 2001: 106). Another term that denotes the British colonial citizens is *inglate-min-kyun*. The term *kyun* generally means a slave; however, in this context, it means a subject. The term directly expresses the

British colonial citizen in the Myanmar context (*CHR* 2001: 80, 98, 141, 153). The other word that refers to the British colonial citizens is *ingalate-kyundaw-myo* (*CHR* 2001: 157, 173, 182, 193, 204, 205, 207, 208, 209, 213, 216, 218, 220, 225, 226, 234, 235, 237, 259, 260, 261, 269, 304, 305, 315, 336, 337, 338, 343).

And another term is *ingalate-kyun* (*CHR* 2001: 199, 427, 437, 486). The term, *ingalate-kyun*, which referred to the British colonial citizen, can be seen as violating a criminal law that prohibited the export of animals used in farms. The export of animals such as cows, buffalos and horses, was a crime in the Myanmar kingdom (*CHR* 2001: 292). In the *CHR*, the letters dispatched between the British and Myanmar officers on exporting animals have also been printed on some pages. In his letter to the British officer who resided in Mandalay dated 11 April 1874, the Kinwun Mingyi, the chief minister of the Myanmar king's court, had explained the Myanmar law, which prohibited the export of the animals above mentioned (*CHR* 2001: 257). The term *ingalate-kyun* has been used in robbery (*CHE* 2001: 193), criminal cases (*CHR* 2001: 215, 266, 533), and civil lawsuit cases to refer the British colonial citizens (*CHR* 2001: 227, 269, 335, 337, 338, 505).

Ingalate-Kyun-myo, meaning the British's repetitive, can be seen in a criminal case charged for the Myanmar government's timber abuse (*CHR* 2001: 327). Continuously, the term *ingalate-Kyun-daw-ma* (the British subject) has also been recorded in civil lawsuit cases (*CHR* 2001: 227, 260). In exporting animals, the term *ingalate-kyun* (*CHR* 2001: 256-257) and the terms such as *inglate-kyun-daw-myo* (*CHE* 2001: 292, 450, 451, 549, 584, 598) and *kyauk-taing-taung-bak-ne nwa-we-thu*, which means the man who came to buy a cow from south of the boundary, have been referred to (*CHR* 2001: 364). The Myanmar king's officials, in addition, contained the term *kuauk-taing-taung-bak-ka-lu* to mean a British colonial. *Kuauk-taing-Taung-bak-ka-lu* can be interpreted as a man who came from the southern part of the boundary (*CHR* 2001: 56). Similarly, the term *Myanma-ne-kula-thu* was also used to refer to British colonial citizens (*CHR* 2001: 56).

To refer to the Myanmar king's subject, the Myanmar king's

officials have used expressions such as *Myanmar-min-Kyun*, *Myanmar-kyundaw-myo*, *Myanmar-Kyun*, *Myanmar-min-Kyun*, *Nainggan-bak-ka-lu*, *Myanma-ne-ga-lu*, and *Myanmar-Kyun-daw-myo*.

The term *Myanmar-min-kyun* (CHR 2001: 153) has been used with the intrinsic meaning of the term *ingalate-min-kyun*. In the same context, Myanmar officials recorded the terms *Myanmar-kyundaw-myo* (CHR 2001: 261, 392, 400, 444) and *Myanmar-Kyun* (CHR 2001: 198) to refer to the Myanmar king's subject. These terms should be appropriately interpreted as the Myanmar king's subject. However, the term *Myanmar-min-Kyun* has added a sense of citizenship, which indicates the preposition of the Myanmar King's subject. On the other hand, *Myanmar-Kyun-daw-myo*, meaning Myanmar king's subject, has been used in civil lawsuit cases (CHR 2001: 331, 338, 341, 343, 347, 505) and criminal cases (CHR 2001: 519, 548). Though *Myanmar-Kyun* and *Myanmar-Kyun-daw-myo* directly mean a slave of Myanmar, there is not much distinction in using the terms mentioned above.

The other term which refers to the Myanmar king's subject is *nainggan-bak-ka-lu* (CHR 2001: 81). It expresses the meaning of a man from Myanmar territory. In addition to these terms, there is one more term, which is *Myanma-ne-ga-lu* (CHR 2001: 90), which means a man who came from the Myanmar territory. This term has been used synonymously with *nainggan-bak-ka-lu*. All of these terms were mainly used to refer to the Myanmar king's subject.

Along with the bureaucratic reformation in Lower Myanmar, there had been a case that Myanmar had also been given a chance to choose its citizenship repeatedly. In the case of Myanmar, it is vividly informed as follows. A Myanmar had generally been born in Myanmar and had been regarded as a Myanmar king's subject, based on their birthplace (CHR 2001: 423, 533, 549, 562). One, however, could change his citizenship, moving out of the motherland. Again, he had gotten a chance to apply for his citizenship where he wanted to be. If a Myanmar king's subject who had moved out to Pyay, Lower Myanmar, in 1867; he would have obtained his citizenship in Upper Myanmar by requesting it to the authorities (CHR 2001: 339).

Thongchai has explained the indigenous Southeast Asian tradition on an individual subject and his king in his book.

In indigenous Southeast Asian tradition, a subject was bound first and foremost to his lord rather than a state. People who lived in one area might not necessarily belong to the ruler of that area, although they might still have to pay tax or rent to the lord of that land. As the surveyor James McCarthy noted with puzzlement, it was a peculiar custom in which the power over individuals and land was separated. As a modern western man, he did not realize that this custom was quite common in the region and throughout Asia (Thongchai 1994: 164).

In Myanmar, this kind of relationship changed immediately after incorporating Lower Myanmar into the British Empire. The British authority attempted to define the territory of Lower Myanmar and the sovereignty residents within British colonial Burma (Myanmar). This attempt paved the way for cancelling the binary relationship between an individual and his king in British colonial Myanmar. In this way, the British colonial authority categorized the British colonial citizens, excluding the Myanmar king's subjects in Upper Myanmar.

4.1. Including, Excluding and Making British Colonial Citizens

In British colonial Myanmar, people were categorized into two citizenships as the Myanmar king's subject and the British colonial citizen. Regarding the method of categorization, the term, *sayin-cha* was applied (CHR 2001: 269). By *sayin-cha* means a man listed as a British colonial citizen or a Myanmar king's subject. As reflected on its meaning, the term proves that both citizens had already been listed on both sides.

In this section, the relation of the categorization of the Myanmar king's subject and the registration of Asians as British colonial citizens will be explored. The British authority in Lower Myanmar tried an attempt to get the registration of the Asians, who migrated to Myanmar as British colonial citizens. This attempt included the Asians in the category of British colonial citizens. In addition, the British authority in Lower Myanmar showed their concern for the Europeans who visited Upper Myanmar. Their

endeavor had let them take the role as representatives of the European. In doing so, the Europeans had been placed on the other sides of the Myanmar category. In this way, the others became the Myanmar king's subject. The term *ingalate-kyun-daw-myo sayin-cha-lu* here means the man who had been listed as a British colonial citizen (*CHR* 2001: 270).

4.2. Including Asians into the Category of the British Colonial Citizen

In Yadanabon Period, it is well known that some Asians, Indians and Chinese migrated and settled down in both Myanmar territories: Upper and Lower Myanmar. Some of the Asians performed as complainants or defendants in the cases of criminal and civil lawsuits. To judge the circumstances that occurred between two citizens, the mixed court had been initiated. The Mixed Court Law had been enacted in 1869, and it had been recorded in the *parabike* no. 116 by the agreement of the officials in both countries, in a letter dated 21 July 1869 (*CHR* 2001: 129). The British Deputy Commissioner asked for one head and six assistants to be appointed in the mixed court for the British officer in his letter to Upper Myanmar dated 28 July 1869 (*CHR* 2001: 130). According to the letter from the Pakhan Mingyi to the British Deputy Commissioner dated 10 August 1869, the cases in the mixed court had been judged by a British officer and the Kala Wun Myintinsa Maha Thiriguna Kyawthu (*CHR* 2001: 130). According to the letter dated 11 August 1870, the first judge assigned in the mixed court from the Myanmar side was Ala Zeyathein, in a city near present-day Nay Pyi Taw. When he moved out, the Kala Wun was appointed in his place (*CHR* 2001: 139); then he was replaced by Phan Chet Wun. Finally, a new judge, who had not been mentioned his name in his record, was assigned (*CHR* 2001: 137).

The different categorizations had been made between indigenous Myanmar and the Asians who migrated to Myanmar. To clarify the various categories of Asians, such as the British colonial citizens and Myanmar king's subject, the term refers to the categories discussed in the latter part of this section.

According to the record of the CHR, on 5 Aril 1869, the British

representative had issued an announcement in a board in Zegyo Market, locates in the center of Mandalay, stating that one, regardless of ethnicity, who wanted to claim British colonial citizenship, should come and register in the mixed court (*CHE* 2001: 109).

Firstly, the category of the British colonial citizen of Indian decent will be introduced. The term *sayin-cha*---meaning one who had been listed as a British colonial citizen or as a Myanmar king's subject---was often found in the case of Asians in the record (*CHR* 2001: 304, 350). The term *sayin-cha* can be found in Sul Man, an Indian who served in the Myanmar king's royal artillery and claimed that he was a British colonial citizen himself. The case of Sul Man was that he refused it, saying that he was a British citizen when he had been assigned to military service, though he was working as a soldier getting 80 rupees from his officer, U Yang Naing, was under contract (*CHR* 2001: 373). The term *ingalate-Kyun* referred to the Indians can be seen in civil lawsuit cases and criminal cases (*CHR* 2001: 182); the term *ingalate-kyun-daw-myo* (*CHR* 2001: 199) was in civil lawsuit cases (*CHR* 2001: 199, 208, 216, 218, 260, 261, 261, 266, 336, 337, 391, 505) and criminal cases (*CHR* 2001: 204, 205, 208, 213, 234, 243, 350, 351, 378, 519).

The same term has also been referred to with the Chinese. The cases in which the same term for the ethnic Chinese were disagreements of tax collection (*CHE* 2001: 205, 304, 305), reported cases of violation of the tax law (*CHE* 2001: 220, 237), and civil lawsuit cases (*CHE* 2001: 497). In addition to the Asians, some Europeans were also addressed as *ingalate-kyun* in a civil lawsuit case (*CHE* 2001: 182, 523, 534). On the other hand, the opposite of the term *ingalate-kyun-daw-myo*, *Myanmar-kyun-daw-myo* can be found in the civil lawsuit case of Caliba, an Indian (*CHE* 2001: 189, 199).

4.3. Excluding Europeans

To know the preposition of the European, the terms referred to respective ethnicities will be discussed in this small section. The ethnicity of the Europeans had been clearly defined in the CHR, and

the essence of the term *Ingalate-kyun* was different from the terms *Ingalate* and *acha-lumyo* (other European) (*CHE* 2001: 80). In the record, the British have been named *Ingalate-lu-myo* (*CHE* 2001: 80,89,90, 230, 236,324, 354, 357) while the British officers were addressed as *Ingalate-ayashi* (*CHE* 2001: 91, 93, 101, 102, 320, 326, 355, 365). On the one hand, the term *Ingalate-than*, which refers to the British diplomat going on a trip to China in 1874 (*CHE* 2001: 276-283), has been found.

On the other hand, the Europeans were titled *thosaung* (European) (*CHE* 2001: 440). As a limitation for foreigners, the Myanmar authority enacted a law for the Europeans and foreign citizenships and a regulation for the British officer who would travel around Upper Myanmar (*CHE* 2001: 80).

M. Yegar in his book, *Muslim of Burma, A Study of a Minority Group*, Wiesbaden, 1972, states *Kala* roughly means overseas person-somebody from South Asia, West Asia and Europe and Beyond. The root of this name is believed to be *ku la* meaning either "to cross over (the Bay of Bengal)" (1972: 29, 30, 32, 36-37, 111). In this record, *kala* (Than Tun 1990: 23) has special meaning for people who migrated from the Indian continent, and *kala-phyu* is for the Europeans. The term *kala-phyu* was found on page no. 129. *Kala-lumyo* is on page no. 213, 288 and 472 of the CHR. The other terms which referred to Indians are *Hindu-lumyo* (*CHE* 2001: 186) and *India-tai-tha Pathi* (*CHE* 2001: 294).

Regarding Westerners in Upper Myanmar, the British authorities performed different actions. The British administration showed their concern on the affairs of Westerners who had been in Upper Myanmar. In doing so, they tried to place the European position on the other side of the Myanmar king's subject. The authority showed their concern in the affairs of Westerners, asking permission of the traveler in Upper Myanmar. The first record that the British authority asked for from the Myanmar authority was administrative, which allowed two American mission members to travel in the Shan State in December 1876 (*CHE* 2001: 102). In 1868, the British officer in Mandalay had asked for a permit granted to the American Mission led by Rev. Cushion, which would go to the Shan

State accompanied by ten youths and bring five guns and five swords (*CHE* 2001: 117, 131, 138). In 1871, the British authority asked for permission for the American Mission to the Shan State again (*CHE* 2001: 162).

As has been seen in this section, the attempts of the British authority to let the Asians be British colonial citizens placed the Europeans on the other side of the Myanmar king's subject. In this way, the remained people formed the Myanmar king's subject in Upper Myanmar.

4.4. The Alternative Way: Migration

Another way that increased the scope of the British colonial citizen was the migration of the Myanmar king's subjects to the south in the late Konbaung Period. Through King Thibaw (1878-1885), Myanmar officials charged steep taxes, especially *Sassamedha-kun*, to the subjects because of increasing tax on canals, land and products. Apart from heavy taxes by the Myanmar king, there might have been other factors such as drought and famine (Adas 1974: 45-46). These facts became essential push factors for the domestic migration in Upper Myanmar, as reflected in a survey. For example, the farmers from Kyaukse, a main agricultural area of Upper Myanmar, migrated to Lower Myanmar (Maung Maung Tin 1965: 128-129).

After the Second Anglo-Myanmar War, some Myanmar kings' subjects moved in hordes to Lower Burma. Most of the immigrants were farmers, merchants and slaves (Kyan 1969: 3), and it can be regarded that the migration was ascribed to the differences in the socio-economic conditions between Lower and Upper Myanmar.

The stability and the economic development of Lower Myanmar triggered the migration of the Myanmar king's subjects looking for a better life. After the Second Anglo-Myanmar War, agriculture was developed in British colonial Burma (Myanmar), especially in the plain areas, owing to the economic policy of the British colonial government and the growing need for workers on farms in this part. The tenants from Upper Myanmar and India were permitted to come to Lower Myanmar in the harvesting season for

labor requirements (Kyan 1978: 131). While some of them went back to their native lands, others settled down in Lower Myanmar. According to historical records, the number of immigrants from Upper Myanmar amounted from 311,000 in 1881 to 411,000 in 1885 (Adas 1974: 44).

The British authority tried to persuade the immigrants on the pretext of economic development of Lower Myanmar. The colonial government probably aimed then to generate the landowner class rather than the farm-hands class. For this purpose, the British government legitimized the 1876 Land Owning Act, and according to this act, if a farmer worked on the same farm for 12 years continuously, he would be entitled to own the farm (Ohno Toru 1975: 325; *The Burma Code* 1910).

In addition to the economic condition, the social state of Lower Myanmar caused the migration of the Myanmar king's subject to the south. Compared to the other feudal societies, though it was not severe and absolute feudalism was the administrative system in the Myanmar kingdom. While the farm slave system was practiced in Upper Myanmar, the British government enacted the Slavery Abolition Act in 1833 (Hayward 1985: v), and the British government legitimized the abolition of the farm slave system in all its colonies in 1843, including Lower Myanmar (*Achepya* 1977: 372).

The dramatic demographic changes in Upper Myanmar were happening in the time of King Thibaw. A British diplomatic who visited Mandalay recorded the demography of Upper Myanmar in his records. In 1855, three years after the Second Anglo-Myanmar War, Henry Yule arrived at Amarapura, an old capital near Mandalay, and recorded the population of Upper Myanmar. According to Yule's record, the population was no more than 3,600,000, among whom about 1,200,000 people were in the capital (Yule 1968: 289). Demographic changes can be seen in some documents as well. Although King Badon (1782-1819), the most flourishing era of the Konbaung Period, 40,000 families lived in Amarapura, 20,000 families were listed when the royal capital moved from Amarapura to Mandalay in 1855 (Maung Maung Tin 1965:

127). Given the population of Upper Myanmar during the King Mindon reign after the Second Anglo-Myanmar War, it came to be known that 400,000 families lived in Upper Myanmar except for the Shan plateau, but only 200,000 remained at the time of King Thibaw (Maung Maung Tin 1965: 127).

To sum up, the administrative and socio-economic condition in Lower Myanmar, set up by the British authority, persuaded the migrants from Upper Myanmar who had been seeking a better life. In this way, giving an alternative way to the migrants from Upper Myanmar led to citizenship in British colonial Myanmar.

V. Conclusion

The purpose of this article is to deepen the discourse of the colonial boundary system categorizing Myanmar people into two sections as *Anytha* and *Auktha*. This article deals with the study of the Catalogue of the Hluttaw Records, the primary document that recorded the Supreme Court's official letters during the Yadanabon Period (1853-1885), paying attention to the influence of Western notions of boundary on the creation of the Myanmar king's subject. In studying the creation of the Myanmar king's subject, the socio-linguistic approach was adopted. Before the Second Anglo-Myanmar War, no boundary defined by the western perception was traceable in the Myanmar realm.

The boundary that had been viewed from the western perception had been incorporated into Myanmar after the Second Anglo-Myanmar War. Regarding the western boundary concept, Solomon has noted that the concepts were essentially legalistic, and the colonial boundary system was designed to stabilize spheres of influence without a significant commitment of resources, as mentioned above. After the Second Anglo-Myanmar War, the British authority had drawn a borderline between Upper and Lower Myanmar. Defining the sovereignty residents in Lower Myanmar, the British authority categorized Myanmar in Lower Myanmar as the British colonial citizen, differentiating them from Myanmar in Upper Myanmar. In Upper Myanmar, giving a chance to the Asians, such

as Chinese and Indians who migrated to Myanmar, to apply for their citizenship as British citizens, the British authority made them British colonial citizens. In addition, the British authority had taken the role of representation of the Europeans who visited Upper Myanmar, showing their concern on the respective cases with visitors. Moreover, the British administration had persuaded the tenants who had migrated at harvest time from Upper to Lower Myanmar, offering wild land for settlement in Lower Myanmar.

In the discussion so far, it has been found that the colonial boundary system created the Myanmar King's subject in Upper Myanmar, excluding them from the category of British colonial citizenship. Thirty-two years later, the Third Anglo-Myanmar War (1885) broke out, and Upper Myanmar was incorporated into British Myanmar. However, since Lower and Upper Myanmar are divided by land and the categorization of the people in Central Myanmar came into existence, the extended meaning of the terms distinguished the people in modern time.

References

- Achepya Myanma Nainnganye Thamine* (Fundamentals of Burmese Political History), Volume 2, Part 2. Yangon: Myanma Soshelit Lanzinpati Bahohtanachou. 1977.
- Adas, Michael. 1974. *The Burma Dela: Economic Development and Social Change on an Asian Rice Frontier, 1852-1941*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Banerjee, C. C. 1947. *British Relations with Burma, 1826-86*. Bombay: The National Information and Ltd.,
- Burma Act II, 1876-The Burma Land and Revenue Act, 1876. *The Burma Code*. 1910. Rangoon: Government Printing Press. 4th Edition.
- https://www.burmalibrary.org/en/burma-act-ii-1876-the-burma-land-and-revenue-act1876?_cf_chl_jschl_tk_=36830d289ae2e635e7a4391bc8a0b40cd0c340c3-1626152563-0-AUiL2XnmfsJsteLxxKBIxlTIV6JM8dU9u25uLnxSJ-Dc4E2EmPT14ShtP9xXTmLdQSe0oJpитеAoc9lGXxi_NpsJm-Nthl3kGvb6h4

MSGfhXyhfv3A2OwUNoavVcIDcRrdC3LONfPmtB6fhwuHq
 QBDRLPXOijshA27fUup5XC9naJpbfqjIWK2vy6DBi0l2gdgP
 -L_cLlEmt_nSOaSYHwllc017LoBNvcycWPOoN_vvFTHew1e
 4yMJDASODZK1RDOcnemWjUERRXxHfKqjSzrhXMP74C7
 DhNnlFeHFpzRzlitT0xhFfaDSapl4J_z0iVCeLQbFsC479SPrx
 w4gawX7f-ou3aGHw0-hHWPKW41kdH72NL9-YP_Kk_pFwu
 Nto77Du_eeFvaY-f29x-k9g4VJn1bseBnnDtstowIDZuU3AiF
 ensbRrFQ2gPbyV080op03qumt1f-KhgO_mm6nDI.
 (Accessed July 12, 2021).

- Cobden, Richard. 1853. *How Wars are got up in India: The Origin of the Burmese War*. London: William and Frederick G. Cash.
- Hayward, Jack. 1985. *Out of Slavery: Abolition and After*. London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd.,
- Hluttaw Parabike Ahmatatha Atokauk Hmatpon* (The Catalogue of the Hluttaw Records) Volume i & ii. Combined and Second edition. Yangon: Yapyi Saoketai. 2011.
- Htin Aung, Maung. 1967. *A History of Burma*. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.
- Kartz, Ernst Ulrich ed. 1996. *Southeast Asian Languages and Literatures: A Bibliographical Guide to Burmese, Cambodia, Javanese, Malay, Minangkabau, Thai and Vietnamese*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris.
- Kyan, Daw. 1969. Thibawmin Padawmuchaingna Britisha Myanmar Naingthu Naiganthado i Achean (The General Condition of the People of British Burma at the time of the Deposition of King Thibaw). *Burma Journal of Literary and Social Sciences*, 2(2): 1-24.
- _____. 1978. *Myanmar Nainngan Ache-ane (1885-1886) (The General Condition of Burma (1885-86))*. Yangon: Nainngan-thamine Thutethana Uzihtana.
- Leach, Edmund. 1960. The Frontier of Burma. *Comparative Study in Society and History*, 3(1): 49-68.
- Maung Tin, Maung. 1989. *Kaunbaungset Mahayazawindawgyi* (The Great Chronicle of Konbaung Dynasty) Volume 1. Yangon: Sgawa Sarpay.
- Myo Oo. 2012. A Study on the Factors of Domestic Migration of the Ethnic Burman in Burmese King's Age. *The Journal of*

- Asian Studies* (Korean Association of Asian Studies). 15(1): 23-41.
- Nyein Maung, U. 1972. *Shehaung Myanma Kyauksa-mya (474-600)* (Ancient Myanmar Stone Inscriptions) Volume 1. Yangon: Ministry of Trade.
- Ohn Kyi. 2004. Twebat-yone Hmukhin-mya (Cases Appeared in Mixed Court). *Selected Writing of Daw Ohn Kyi*. 46-86. Yangon: Myanmar Historical Commission.
- Ohno Toru (Trans). 1975. *Japan Sit Ouchoyehkit Myanmar Nainngan* (Burma under Japanese Military Administration). Yangon: Pagan Saoutai.
- Patricia Herbert and Anthony Milner, eds. 1989. *Southeast Asian Language and Literatures: A Select Guide*. Hawaii: Hawaii University Press.
- Solomon, Robert L. 1969. *Boundary Concepts and Practices in Southeast Asia*. California: The Rand Corporation. Research Memorandum.
- Than Tun, ed. 1990. *Royal Order of Burma, A.D. 1598-1885, Part X, Epilogue, Glossary and Index*. Kyoto: The Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University.
- _____. 2005. *Pagan-khit Nainggan-ye Thamine* (Political History (of Myanmar) in Pagan Period). Yangon: Konthaya.
- Thant Myint-U. 2004. *The Making of Modern Burma*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thein, Mawbi Saya. 1967. *Myanma Wungyi Hmugyi-mya Akyauung* (Myanmar Ministers and Noblemen). Yangon.
- Tongchai Winichakul. 1994. *Siam Mapped: A History of the Geo-Body of a Nation*. Hawaii: Hawaii University Press.
- Yule, Henry. 1968. *A Narrative of the Mission to the Court of the Ava in 1855*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Received: Feb. 24, 2021; Reviewed: Jun. 21, 2021; Accepted: Jun 25, 2021