

**KHANATE OF KALAT IN THE LIGHT OF IBN
KHALDUN'S CONCEPT OF *ASABBIYA*
(1731-1893)**

NAVEED RAZZAQ

Department of History, Quaid-I-Azam University,
Islamabad, Pakistan

Email: naveedbaloch100@yahoo.com

RABIA ISLAM

Department of History, Quaid-i-Azam University,
Islamabad, Pakistan

Email: rabiak843@gmail.com

Abstracts

Balochistan being a peripheral area of the Indian sub-continent had a society tribal in nature. This was also due to the resources of topography. Tribal societies guard their independence jealously, but there is a modicum of organization necessary for self-preservation, and the main contenders were the Khans of Kalat. Matters became complicated when the British extended their sway to Balochistan. Its ports changed masters and among the rulers it was only Naseer II who could invoke Asabiya, the sense of solidarity as theorized by Ibn Khaldun to confront the common enemy. Khudaidad Khan had a long rule but it became contentious ever since he sought the help of the British in establishing his rule, which simultaneously alienated the Baloch tribes. Baloch history before independence was unlike any other province of British India, and thus even after independence a tribal structure with the dominance of sardars continued to exist, complicating thus the political process of Pakistan.

Keywords: *Jhalawan, Gwador, Karachi, Mohabbat Khan, Sandeman*

The emergence of the Kalat Confederacy in 1410 brought new and unprecedented chapters in the history of Baloch and Balochistan when a tribal confederation comprised of Baloch tribes came into being for the first time under the first Khan of Kalat Ameer Miro Khan Mirwani Baloch in 1410. In its initial years, it was a loose tribal confederation based on small and weakened Brahui speaking Baloch tribes with a confined jurisdiction, but soon developed and spread wide with the dawn of the 1600s, when one of the most powerful rulers like Mir Ahmed Khan Qambarani in 1666 gathered all the remaining Baloch tribes of Sarawan (Upper parts of Balochistan) and Jahalawan (central Balochistan) under his suzerainty and established Kalat as his capital by making a powerful tribal army and this was the emergence of Kalat Khanate. Apart from the Qambarani (Ahmadzai) family, another powerful tribal confederation was also witnessed in the 15th and 16th centuries under the leadership of Chakar Khan Rind.¹ It was actually comprised of five main Balochi speaking tribes named as Rinds, Lasharis, Karois, Hoats and Jatios. The death of Chakar Khan of Sibbi provided a vacuum for Kalat rulers to get back their previous positions and the Khanate of Kalat once again reemerged on the map of Balochistan. Three tribal confederacies were counted as the main tribal entities in the post-Chakar period; The Khanate of Kalat, The Makran State and The Dodai Confederacy.²

Among all these three tribal confederacies, the region of Makran remained the most important for the foreign super powers, particularly for the ancient, Persians and British kingdoms.³ Kalat expanded through conquests and negotiations. Consequently, it easily surpassed its contemporaries like the Makran state and the Dodai tribal confederation.⁴ Kalat's geographical environment compelled the Kalat rulers to find pastoral lands outside Kalat for revenue generation. The existence of a short-ranged nomadic lifestyle resulted in the expansion of Kalat Khanate towards the fertile lands of western Balochistan along with eastern Punjab.⁵ Noori Naseer Khan 1749-1794, the most powerful ruler of Kalat, not only consolidated the confederation in the late 18th century but defined its borders for the first time on technical grounds using tribal solidarity.⁶ His famous agreement with the Durrani Empire of Afghanistan made him the supreme and sole ruler of his country as he now became unanswerable to any adjacent neighboring power. Article 1 of the agreement accepted Naseer Khan as the absolute ruler not liable for paying any tribute to Afghan Kingdom from Kalat side.⁷ Naseer perfectly sustained tribal solidarity unlike his predecessors. But the Khanate in its 545 years, apart from ascendancy and expansions, also witnessed civil wars, assassinations and brutal depositions of the rulers etc. The geographical confinement and the loose tribal structure with the

absence of a powerful “Assabiya” resulted in the Khanate’s failure in its transformation into a stable empire of the Turko-Mongolian design. Things became further problematic when Khan Mehrab Khan was killed in 1839 by the British army. The British deliberately inflamed differences and used the lack of tribal solidarity between the Khans and the Sardars for its colonial interest. Assabiya remained missing till the partition of 1947. Mehrab Khan, in his war against the British attack, had to fight on his own. Mir Nasir Khan II was poisoned and put to death becoming a victim of “The Palace Conspiracy” When Sardars had their secrets connections with the British authorities, Khan Khudaid Khan was dethroned twice when tribal chieftains started a mass mobilization against his rule with the support of Robert Sandeman.**. In this research study, case study methodology will be carried out in which the history of the Khanate of Kalat and the relationship between Khans and their chieftains will be discussed using a qualitative research process. Books, journals and research articles on the history of Kalat will be utilized.

The “Theory of Assabiya” given by Ibn Khaldun will be applied, which talks about tribal solidarity and its role in the development of any tribal confederation, Khanate and empire. The “Theory of Assabiya” believes that a socially construed group or a tribal section will only remain powerful until tribal solidarity in the shape of Assabiya will be present within that group. The rise and fall of civilizations, empires, states and tribes depended on the nature of *Assabiya*.

This research work will be significant in terms that it will shed light on the political history of the Khanate of Kalat together with the reasons behind its abrupt rise and deplorable fall by theoretically using Ibn Khaldun’s theory. A lot of work has been done on the history of the Khanate but limited sources are available on the relationship between the chieftains and Khan from 1731-1893. This work will also be significant in terms that it will try to explore the answers to some questions under the theoretical framework of Assabiya about how absence of solidarity within a particular group gives space to outsiders and foreign powers to disintegrate a political or a tribal confederation.

The land of Balochistan from the Greek invasion to the British ascendancy remained under the constant invasion of various powerful foreign invaders. Darius 1 (522-486 BC) conquered its, the south-western part for the first time, which was named Makran. Afterwards, Alexander the Great of Macedonia, on his way to his home country from India, passed through this area of Makran (Balochistan) and then named it *Gidroschia* for its hard, harsh and barren physical appearance. The

Persians were then followed by the Arabs, who conquered Balochistan at different periods of time.

The dawn of the 10th century was followed by the Turko-Mongolian influence in this region. The Ghaznavids, Ghuris and the Slave Dynasty sultans proved less enthusiastic about this region, but Turko-Mongolians, like Chingize Khan from 1130 to 1370 and then the Timurids conquered its most important and strategic trade routes like Bolan Pass for their revenue, aggrandizements.⁸ Balochistan witnessed its nominal and indirect control under the Safavids and the Mughals, but the 15th century witnessed another interesting development when the local Baloch tribal section in the area of Kalat laid down the foundation of Kalat Khanate under the leadership of Mir Miro Mirwani in 1410.⁹

The Kalat Khanate, in its early days, was a small loose tribal confederation, lacking a strong socio-political structure with an absence of economic sustainability. The constant Safavid, Afghan and 1 disruptions and attacks questioned Baloch survival on their mainland. Baloch tribal authorities realized the need for a strong regional political entity for their political survival. As a result, Mir Ahmed Khan I in 1666 reoriented the shaky Baloch confederation into a strong Khanate by developing a sense of a magnificent tribal solidarity with the tribal chieftains.¹⁰ The realization was collective in its nature both from the side of Sardars and Khan. The growth of tribal solidarity not only resulted in Khanate's unprecedented socio-economic development, but progress was also observed in the governance sector.

The sense of Assabiya resulted in the formation of a powerful tribal force. Kalat's tribal forces allowed the Khan of Kalat, Ameer Abdullah Khan, to lead a military expedition to Kachhi. It was the most fertile region of the upper Sindh under the Kalhora rulers. Kaachi was the most fertile land near the Khanate and its incorporation was considered imperative for revenue production. Ameer Abdullah Khan Ahmadzai (1716-31), the Khan of Kalat, focused his main attention on Kachhi and led an expedition against the Kalhora chief, Noor Muhammad Kalhoro, but he was killed in a violent battle near the area of Sanni. Interestingly, Nader Shah Afshar, in the meantime, founded the famous Afsharid dynasty in Persia. The problem of the Kachhi acquisition was presented before Nader's court for settlement. In return for an allegiance from Khan of Kalat, Kachhi was given to Kalat once and for all in the blood compensation of Abdullah Khan on the orders of Nader Shah. The whole area was divided between the Khan and the *Sardar* (chief), which later

became the basis for tribal rivalry and the main reason for the downfall of tribal unity and *Assabiya*.

The first tribal civil war between Khan and his chieftains in the history of Kalat was witnessed during the period of Khan Mohabbat Khan Ahmadzai. The next tribal tension was witnessed during Mehrab Khan's period, which eventually ended in his unexpected killing during the first Anglo-Baloch War of 1839. This civil war between the Khan and the Sardars was so intense and complicated that the British found it the most appropriate time for its attack on Kalat in 1839.

The third and most forceful civil war between Khan and the chieftains (*Sardars*) was observed during the period of Ameer Khudaiad Khan (1857-93). It was the most disastrous one that resulted in the overall division and destruction of Baloch tribal solidarity. Robert Sandman, Agent to the Governor General of Balochistan, on the other hand, played a pivotal role in instigating *Sardars* and weakening *Assabiya* totally.

Naseer Khan I (1749-94) was the only Khan in the period from 1729-1893 who never gave a single chance of rebellion to his Sardars against his throne. His entire period was based on a kind of reign of terror" which he inflicted on his subjects to prolong his rule. It undoubtedly proved mainly successful. None of the Sardars of Jahalwan and Sarawan could raise his head against any of his verdicts.¹¹ Apart from having a successful rule, Naseer developed an organized administrative structure to further the imposition of his will and power over Sardars. He maintained the *Assabiya* through force. Administrative sections of Khanate were mainly identified by Henry Pottinger for the first time, where Wazir was in a higher position after Khan. Shahgasi, the Ministry of Law and Tribal Affairs were mainly designed to check the advancement of Tribal Sardars in their particular jurisdictions.¹²

Tribal solidarity is the sense of cooperation in a tribal group that empowers a tribe or a social faction to secure its survival on its land and confront external aggression. The concept of tribal solidarity exists among all the Afro-Asian and Turko-Mongolian tribes. Tribal solidarity develops through a close blood kinship procedure in its initial stage and then it gets developed into a group feeling and collective consciousness. *Assabiya*, the group or tribal solidarity, according to Ibn Khaldun, has always been the main tool in any social group that unites a group for a particular cause. The more *Assabiya* is stronger, the more a group will progress towards stronger socio-economic development. As a result, the sense of *Assabiya* or tribal solidarity helps the tribal confederation to further get ahead in the state formation process. Meanwhile, Ibn Khaldun

also stresses the importance of Assabiya a social group, but it also induces the sense or feeling of “Royal Power” in a group to attain this stage of its progress and ascendancy.¹³

Ibn Khaldun further argues that the feeling among members of any group that they share a common descent and sharing the same blood is the most important bounding factor for tribal and social unification. Assabiya becomes more powerful and dominant when a feeling of common descent exists among each member of any tribal society.

The sense of “Tribal Solidarity” or Assabiya in different social groups of the world in different time periods resulted in the formation of different tribal confederations, Khanates and powerful empires. It certainly was the sense of Assabiya that gathered Mongolian tribes under the powerful leadership of Chingize Khan and then he successfully established the famous Mongolian Empire. Tribal solidarity among the Turk tribes in the leadership of the Kai tribe resulted in the formation of the Ottoman Empire in Anatolia. Besides other reasons for their downfall, the absence of Assabiya within their tribal setup was the main reason for the downfall of these tribal Khanates and empires. This, according to Ibn Khaldun, is because when societies become more civilized and luxurious, they become lazier and more lethargic and then they leave the main principles of Assabiya that they once possessed.¹⁴

The problem of tribal solidarity in the Khanate of Kalat was witnessed in three different timeframes.

1. The first one was observed during the rule of Ameer Mohabbat Khan Ahmadzai with his chieftains from 1740 to 1749.
2. The second phase was noticed during the rule of Ameer Mehrab Khan from 1830-39 which resulted in his execution by British forces.
3. The third and the longest absence of tribal solidarity was witnessed during the period of Khan Khudaidad Khan which lasted about 30 years.

Khan Abdullah Khan assumed power as a Baloch Khan in 1716 by replacing his predecessor, Khan Mehrab Khan. Abdullah Khan, unlike his ancestors, proved to be one of the most powerful Khans in the history of Balochistan, who not only expanded his jurisdiction to all his four surroundings but retained successfully the tribal solidarity within his tribal ranks. Historian Naseer Dashti says the following words about Abdullah Khan:

Mir Abdullah Khan entered Kech from Punjgur, and after an initial resistance, the ruler of Kech, Malik Dinar Gichki, agreed to pay tribute to the Khan, and Makuran became a dependency of the Khanate. After the Makuran campaigns in 1724, the Khanate forces under the command of Mir Feroz Raisani occupied Pishin, and the Gilzai governor of the area fled back to Kandahar. Another force under the command of Mir Sultan Shahwani occupied Shorawak and made it part of the Khanate.¹⁵

The expeditions towards Kachhi, Sindh and Afghanistan united the Afghans and Kalhoras against Abdullah Khan. He died while fighting with Mian Mehmood Khan Kalhora in 1731. Abdullah Khan was not only a great military strategist but was a sharp political leader who judiciously examined the value of tribal solidarity in a tribal setup. He never gave any single chance to his rivals and dependents to break their allegiance to him. He also used diplomatic manoeuvres to control his chieftains by providing them with territorial assets and financial incentives. Inyatullah Baloch, a modern writer on Baloch nationalism, praises Abdullah Khan on many grounds, particularly for his role in the aggrandizement of Baloch national identity by stating that Abdullah Khan judiciously managed tribes in different ways to be united under a single umbrella of the Baloch Khanate by more focusing on united agenda by minimizing the internal rifts.¹⁶ But his successor, Mohabbat Khan, failed to abide by the preceding ruling style because of the absence of tribal solidarity. A bloody tribal civil war started at the cost of many tribal lives.¹⁷

Khan Mohabbat Khan soon proved to be a weak ruler and the tribal chiefs acquired influence over Khan on his decisions in his court. Mohabbat was unable to take unilateral decisions on his own and his absolute dependency on his tribal chiefs weakened the position of the Khanate. The weak and lethargic nature of Khan was exploited by one of the most influential tribal chiefs, Mir Lashkari Raisani, who wanted to replace the Khan with his brother, Mir Altiaz Khan.

Raisani had a huge following at the Khan's court and, with the help of his supporters, he deposed Mohabbat Khan and replaced him with his brother Altiaz Khan. This absence of tribal and political harmony gave a formidable chance to Nadir Shah for the complete domination of the Baloch State. Iranian forces attacked Makran and Showrawak, where several Baloch fighters were killed.¹⁸ This lack of tribal solidarity along with the Iranian intrusions started weakening the Baloch state.

The newly installed Khan's decisions soon disgruntled the tribal chiefs when he ordered that his brother Mohabbat Khan should stay at court rather than living outside the capital.¹⁹ Lashkari Raisani and some other court members were totally against these decisions as Khan refused to play his cards on their recommendations. The tribal chiefs started taking independent decisions and Mir Altiaz, on the other hand, started fighting with them by spending all the revenue on battlefields. The problem of tribal solidarity within the tribal ranks also stopped the flow of territorial expansion that started during the period of Mir Ahmed. Taking the opportunity of all these civil wars and state of crisis, Mohabbat Khan, with the help of some support at home, took power once again at the court and returned to Kalat.

Mohabbat Khan's throne now became dependent on the will of Nader Shah, who played a pivotal role in his installation as the "Khan" for the second term. Kachhi, the most fertile region of Sindh, was given to Balochistan by the orders of Nader Shah in the blood compensation of Khan Abdullah Khan. The lands of the fertile Kachhi plains were further divided between the warrior tribes and the crown.²⁰ Again, another problem was waiting for the Khan over the revenue income distribution of Kachhi.

The entire reign of Mohabbat Khan was spent making deals with his chieftains over the distribution of wealth.²¹ Some of the tribal chiefs had indirect contact with Nader Shah. Nader Shah never wanted Mohabbat Khan to be independent in his decisions and expansions, especially in the Makran and the Chaghi areas which were close to the Persian borders. Moreover, Mohabbat was unable to take any decision on his own as the favor that was done by Nader Shah over Kachhi land to Khanate never allowed him to utter any word against his rule and influence over Kalat.

Naseer Dashti writes the following words for Mohabbat Khan and the condition of tribal solidarity in his period in these words: "Mir Mahabat Khan as the Khan was a mere puppet of those tribal chiefs who helped him to seek the assistance of Nader Shah Afshar in regaining the throne. His popularity was non-existent as he was brought back on the throne with the help of Iranian forces."²²

The rivalry between Khan and tribal chiefs for power weakened the Khanate institution. Mohabbat's dethronement became a precedent for subsequent revolts of Sardars against their *khans*.

The death of Mohabbat Khan with the rise of Naseer Khan I, changed the entire scenario of Baloch history when Naseer, the most powerful ruler, not only laid down the foundations of an immensely powerful Khanate along with developing a powerful army, but he sharply eradicated Persian and Afghan influence from Balochistan. The treaty between Ahmed Shah Abdali Ameer of Afghanistan and Naseer Khan was a clear manifestation of his power.

Naseer Khan I, with his vision, bravery and diplomacy, dismantled the growing ascendancy of the tribal chiefs and broke the chances of their exploitation at the hands of outsiders. Makran, Lasbella and Kharan all became parts of his ruling. Other than positive features in his character, Naseer was a highly powered, ambitious Khan and did everything to secure his Khanate and his ruling. He did not even spare his Baloch fellows in Sindh. Naseer Dashti writes,

He assisted the Afghan aggressions against his fellow Baloch Talpur tribes of Sindh. Though his gifting of Gwadar was in line with traditional Baloch values of showing hospitality, yet failing to regain the territory was the beginning of foreign rule on the vast region of southern Balochistan in subsequent years. The killing of his brother Mir Altaz Khan and suspected involvement in the killing of his other brother, Mir Mahabat Khan, shows major weaknesses in his personal character.

Naseer Khan's death and his replacement with Khan Mehmood Khan started another chapter of the problem in tribal solidarity.

Khan Mehmood Khan, unlike his father Naseer Khan, proved to be an extremely weak ruler as he was truly unable to control the newly incorporated areas within the Khanate. The Ghichki rulers of Makran broke off their allegiance and started ruling the western part of Balochistan according to their own way of governance. Prime Minister Akhund Fateh Muhammad was given a free hand to control the political upheavals of the state. Mahmud Khan's biggest blunder of all time was his invitation to Afghan King Shah Zaman to interfere in the political affairs of Khanate.²³ Tribal chiefs did not like a non-Baloch personality in the higher sector of governance, like Akhund Fateh Muhammad. The *Sardars* soon started a pervasive rebellion against Mehmood Khan.²⁴ The civil war between the tribal chiefs and Khan became so drastic and disastrous that following losses came up to the surface for the Khanate from 1800 to 1839.

1. The Loss of Karachi:

Karachi fell into the hands of the Talpur rulers of Sind in 1795, who were continuously waiting for a plausible civil war among the Baloch tribal people and a chance to get Karachi back to their throne because of its highly important geo-strategic position.

2. Uprisings of Jahalwan:

The Brahui-speaking tribes of Jahalawan also started fighting with one another. Pro-Khan tribes were fewer in number, while those who were against the Khan killed many of their famous allies of Khan in the Jahalawan. Jahalawan became the center of uprisings. The day-to-day political and tribal problems destabilized Khan at his own court. In 1789, a fierce battle was fought between the tribes of Jahalwan and Kalat. The head of the Bizanjo tribe who was the main factor behind the scene was eventually submitted to Kalat again at the cost of innumerable tribal lives.

3. The Problem of Gwadar:

Gwadar was given to Muscat by Naseer Khan I in 1758. However, the Jams of Labella were totally against this decision²⁵. When the civil war was at its peak, the Jams attacked the forces of Muscat and deposed the governor. Muscat, on the other hand, attacked the Baloch forces in the coastal belt. Gwadar once again fell to Muscat at the cost of numerous Baloch tribal soldiers.

4. Baloch Areas in Punjab fell to Ranjit Singh:

A major portion of southern Punjab remained under the domination of the Khanate since the period of Chakar Khan in the 16th century. During the medieval period, Afghanistan had a dominant role in the Chakar confederacy. Afghan atrocities forced a number of Rind Baloch tribal people to migrate to different parts of Punjab. These Baloch tribes settled and were then ruled by Kalat.²⁶ Later, the Khans of Kalat successfully ruled all those areas which were considered a huge incentive for Kalat's economic survival. Sikhs under the leadership of Ranjit Singh started conquering all the important geo-strategic southern parts of Punjab. The Baloch tribes were forcibly evacuated from their homes by the Sikhs.²⁷ Kalat, could not secure its possessions in Punjab both in Mahmood Khan's and Mehrab Khan's periods. The tribal chieftains were unwilling to help both the Khans to regain their territorial legacy in Punjab because of the lack of tribal harmony.

The British observers from 1810 to 1820 were closely watching all the political and tribal developments in Khanate. The contemporary geo-political situation in Asia and Europe and the growing Russian expansion towards the Persian Gulf threatened the British government regarding their rule in the Indian subcontinent. Serious efforts had to be taken to stop Russian expansion and to control the peripheries. Khan Mehrab Khan was having problems with his chieftains over the revenue of fertile possessions. He wanted to regain the glory of Naseer Khan as an absolute ruler. The chieftains, on the other hand, were waiting for foreign aggression. The development of British interests in the political affairs of Khan became an option for Sardars to depose Mehrab once and for all.

In the first Anglo-Afghan war of 1839, while getting back to Bombay through Sindh and Balochistan, the British army on their way attacked Kalat fort. Mehrab Khan, along with his court army, was killed and his brother was installed by the British on the condition of full support to the British. Mehrab Khan was instructed by the British side to intervene in the Afghan problem and to support the British in the installation of Shah Shuja against Dost Muhammad, which was totally rejected by Mehrab according to the treaty of 1758 between Nasir Khan and Ahmed Shah Abdali.²⁸ No tribe from any part of Balochistan came for the help of Khan, despite Khan's continuous mercy except Zagar Mengals of Nushki. The Kalat state was given an ultimatum to not take any foreign policy decision without the approval of the British government. Indeed, things would have been changed if tribal solidarity were there on the eve of the British advent. Besides the other reasons for Kalat's fall, the main and the most important reason was the lack of sharp tribal solidarity. Marri and Bugti tribes were not in the command of Khan and they went for a fierce attack on Indus army on their way to Afghanistan as a part of tribal disunity. This gives eventually British the basic ground to attack Kalat.²⁹ A. W Hughes of the Bombay Civil Service out rightly supported British heroism against Marri and Bugtis.³⁰

The British later accepted that Khan Mehrab Khan was killed on wrong information as he was not entirely against British influence. However, the Pro- British Wazir in Khan's court, Mulla Muhammad Khan, was convicted for providing wrong information. Major General Willshire was not even accused.³¹

The third and the longest civil war between the Khan and Sardars was witnessed when Khan Khaudaid Khan assumed power in 1857. The

support for the tribal heads on direct connections was a part of British Forward Policy coined by Sandeman.³² His predecessor and half-brother, Naseer Khan II (1841-1857) gave a tough time to the British forces.³³ It is worthwhile to say here that it was again the Assabiya or the “tribal solidarity” that allowed Naseer Khan to confront the British forces on several occasions. Almost all the tribes of Sarawan and Jahalawan were hand in hand with Khan against the British malicious ascendancy on Baloch land. Naseer Khan along with his Sardars dragged out General Rose from Kalat, but things changed when Khudaidad Khan assumed power with the help of the British. Tribal chieftains soon became rebels against Khudaidad as they started considering him as a puppet in the hands of British officers. Tribal chieftains in the reign of Khan Khudaidad Khan were divided two times. At first, they supported his cousin Sher Dil Khan and deposed Khudaidad in 1863 and then they again supported Khudaidad in 1864 against Sher Dil Khan. Tribal sections and chiefs like Mulla Muhammad Khan Raisani, Sardar Habib Khan Rustamzai, Sardar Mir Jehangir Khan Lehdi, Mir Mubarak Shahwani, Mengal chief Sardar Noordin Mengal and Mir Gauhar Khan Zarakzai all started rebellions against Khan at different times. Numbers of them were supported by the British government and the British officers were also playing arbitrary roles between the Khanate and the chieftains. The inter-civil war was in the interest of British authorities for their colonial interests. Forward policy from the British side further enhanced tribal rivalries and it was a success from Sandeman’s side. The tribal solidarity and Assabiya was in its worst form during Khan Khudaidad Khan’s period and this third civil war eventually weakened the basis of the Khanate and it ultimately ended 52 years after the death of Khan Khudaidad Khan and on the eve of partition on August 14, 1947.

Conclusion

The history of the Khanate of Kalat mainly revolves around inter-tribal wars, jealousy and unfavorable prejudice on both sides of tribal chieftains and Khans. The lust of power on both sides destabilized the Khanate in many ways. It remained powerful and stabilized when Assabiya or tribal solidarity was present in its pure form. Tribal solidarity weakened on many occasions. Sometimes owing to internal conflicts, while on some points it was deliberately given flame by the foreign powers, particularly by the Persians under the leadership of Nader Shah and the British under Robert Sandeman. Ibn Khaldun’s theory of Assabiya totally gets applied to the rise and downfall of Kalat. It reached its peak under the headship of Noori Naseer Khan when tribal solidarity developed unprecedentedly in its practical shape. The Khanate expanded

on territorial grounds rapidly together with socio-economic growth. However, it soon experienced a surprising downfall with the collapse of solidarity. The more Assabiya exists, according to Ibn Khaldun, the more the tribal confederation will be powerful and the more Assabiya gets weak, the more the tribal confederation leads to its disintegration. The Khanate of Kalat faced ample problems in its political structure during the periods of Khan Mohabbat Khan, Khan Mehrab Khan and Khan Khudaidad Khan when tribal solidarity collapsed in its all forms and manifestations.

Notes and References:

- ¹ Baloch, M S K, *The Great Baluch*, (Quetta, Balochi Academy, 1976), p. 136-147.
- ² Baloch, Innayatullah, *The Problem of Balochistan*, (Stuttgurt, GMBH, 1987), p. 97.
- ³ Baloch, Hameed, *Makran, Ehdai Jadeed Sa Ehdai Qadeem Tk*, (Karachi: Hashmi Reference Library, year), p.12.
- ⁴ Khan, Jahanzeb. "Tribal Structure and State Formation in Colonial Balochistan," Unpublished PhD diss., (Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad, 2022) p. 86.
- ⁵ Sholz, Fred. *Nomadism and Colonialism; A Hundred Years of Baluchistan; 1872-1972*, (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2009), p.108.
- ⁶ Khan, Ahmed Yar. *Inside Balochistan* (Karachi: Royal Book Company, 1975)p.9
- ⁷ Buller, Hughes. *The Gazetteer of Balochistan (Sarawan)* P. 46
- * The Palace Conspiracy exerts a great importance in the history of Kalat. Sardars of Sarawan and Jahlawan were openly instigated against Naseer Khan 2 by the British authorities. With the help of Sardars of and court officials Naseer Khan II was poisoned and replaced his young son Khudaidad Khan. Sardars became unhappy over Naseer Khan's developing relations with Afghan Amir Shah Shuja.
- ** Robert Groves Sandeman was a colonial administrator known for his administrative and tribal reforms in Colonial Balochistan. He was the founder of British Balochistan which lasted from 1877 to 1947.
- ⁸ Martin Auxman. *The Khanate of Kalat and the Genesis of Baloch Nationalism 1935-1955*, (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2008), p.18.
- ⁹ Farooq, Baloch. *Baloch or Unka Watan*, (Lahore: Fiction House, 2012), p. 24.
- ¹⁰ Swindler. Nina "The Political Structure of a Tribal Federation: The Brahui of Balochistan" PhD diss., (Columbia University, 1969), p.166.
- ¹¹ Ibid p.174.
- ¹² Pottinger, Henry. *Travel in Baloochistan and Sinde; Accompanied by a Geographical and Historical Account of those Countries*, (London: Longman, 1816), p. 282-83.
- ¹³ Khaldun, Ibn. "The Muqaddimah" Translated By Franz Rosenthal (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, 1967), p. 99-106.
- ¹⁴ Ali, White, *An Islamic Approach to Studying History: Reflections on Ibn Khaldun's Deterministic Historical Approach*, Intellectual Discourse, 2009), p. 4.
- ¹⁵ Dashti, Naseer. *The Baloch and Balochistan A historical account from Beginning to the Fall of Baloch State*, (USA: Trafford Publishing, 2012), p. 163-164.
- ¹⁶ Innayatullah Baloch. *The Problem of Greater Balochistan*, (Stuttgart: Steiner-Verlag-Wiesbaden-GmbH),p.103
- ¹⁷ Naseer, Gul Khan. *Tarikh-e-Balochistan*, (Quetta: Kalat Publishers, 2005), p. 43-44.

¹⁸ Ahmedzai, Naseer Khan. *Tarikh e Baloch o Balochistan*, (Quetta: United Printers, 1994), p. 126.

¹⁹ Auxman, Martin *the Khanate of Kalat and the Genesis of Baloch Nationalism 19??-1955*, (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 118.

²⁰ Hathoram, Rai, *Tarikh –e- Balochistan* (Karachi: Hashmi Reference Library, 2018), p. 212

²¹ Muhammad Saeed Dehwar, *Tarikh-e- Balochistan*, (Quetta: Balochi Academy, 2007), p. 139-140

²² Dashti, Naseer. *The Baloch and Balochistan A historical account from Beginning to the Fall of Baloch State*, (USA: Trafford Publishing, 2012), p. 117.

²³ Leech, Major Robert. "A Brief History of Kalat brought down to the deposition and Death of Mehrab Khan" *Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal*. 11, no. 38 (1843): 473-512.

²⁴ Ibid p.191.

²⁵ Ibid p.192.

²⁶ Dames, L.W, *Literary History of Baluchistan*, (Calcutta: Indian Printing Press, 1907), p.15.

²⁷ Ibid p.193.

²⁸ Khan, Mir Ahmed Yar . *Mukhtasir Tarikh Qaum-e-e Baloch o Khwanain-e- Baloch* (Karachi 1973)

²⁹ Dutta, Simanti. *Imperial Mappings Savage Spaces: Baluchistan and British India* (Delhi: B.R Publishing Corporation, 2002) p. 23

³⁰ Huges, A. W, *The Country of Baluchistan* (London, 1877) p. 24

³¹ Leech, Major Robert. "A Brief History of Kalat brought down to the deposition and Death of Mehrab Khan" *Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal*. 11, no. 38 (1843): 488.

³² Thornton, Thomas Henry. *Colonel Sir Robert Sandeman: His life and works of on our Indian Frontiers* (London: John Morley, 1985) P.35

³³ Naseer Khan. *Tarikh e Baloch o Balochistan*, (Quetta: United Printers, 1994), p. 208.