
Ex Libris
K.K.Venugopal

HISTORY
OF
THE BRITISH OCCUPATION OF INDIA

By
N. KASTURI, B.A.

Being a Summary of
Rise of the Christian Power in India

By
Major B. D. BASU, I. M. S. (Retired)

Vols. I to V

R. CHATTERJEE
CALCUTTA

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

India, unfortunately, does not possess a complete reliable history of her past or even of modern times. During the British period of her history, India has not produced anyone who would take the trouble of writing a true complete history of her past and present. To expect this from the English historians of India is undoubtedly an impossibility, for they are apt "to make expediency the test of truth." English authors have generally spread erroneous views and pretty half-truths, and so, Indians have to sift the truth from a mass of prejudiced descriptions. Again, the Indian question has "never passed out of politics", as Lord Rosebery said of the Irish question. The Spanish Catholics, probably in a confessing mood, have left a more or less true account of their conquest of America, but the English Protestants have left no record of their misdeeds. Such officers of the Company as dared to speak out, like Captain Cunningham and Major Evans Bell, were disgraced and dismissed. Christian missionaries had the mission of proving their co-religionists to be "paragons of virtue" in contrast with the black heathens of the land. Non-official Englishmen had, as a class, no sympathy for Indians. Sir George Trevelyan wrote in 1864, "However kind he might be to his native servants, however just to his native tenants, there is not a single non-official in India who would not consider the sentiment that we hold India for the benefit of the inhabitants a loathsome un-English piece of cant".[1] India was, to them, a land to be fleeced and ex-

ploited. Any attempt on the part of educated Indians to unravel the tangled web of Indian history during British supremacy is construed as creating disaffection to the British Government.

We have also to expose many falsehoods that have been wilfully spread as truth by English writers. Foremost among these is the one which represents that India was given over to anarchy until the British assumed its government. "India would never have existed but for England .... If left to herself, India would degenerate into a bear-garden"[2] and so on and so forth. Another is that India has been conquered by the sword. These falsehoods have to be thoroughly exposed by a consideration of the means employed and the policy pursued by the British.

The historian, like the scientist, has not only to classify but to generalise and explain by means of theories and hypotheses. This requires what Tyndall styles "scientific imagination" to discover the missing links. Of course, history should be based on the solid rock of original research among contemporary records; but for this purpose, Indians cannot get access to many unpublished public documents, whilst the published ones are not always trustworthy. Mr. James Mill writes of "the skill of the Court of Directors in suppressing such information as they wished not to appear", while Mr. Cunningham mentions "alterations in State Papers to suit the temporary views of political warfare" and "counterfeit documents which the ministerial stamp forces into currency".[3] We have to be cautious of these "chains of dangerous lies." Some importance has also to be attached to traditions, anecdotes and legends, though their handling requires great moderation. The treaties, apart from their equivocal language, are also of high importance. Contemporary records, written by Indians and

uninfluenced by foreigners, deserve more attention and credit than they have hitherto attracted.

Under these circumstances, a true history of British India is still a desideratum; but it will be sheer cowardice not to attempt writing it because the difficulties are great. The work may be incomplete or imperfect; but, just as "it is better to have loved and lost than never to have loved at all", so it is better to have attempted and failed in the task than never to have made the attempt at all.

———

HISTORY OF THE
BRITISH OCCUPATION OF INDIA

Struggles of Different European Nations for Supremacy in India

India has, from time immemorial, played a prominent part in the civilization of the nations of the earth. Their commercial instinct led the navigators of European nations to discover the sea-route to India. Golden India—the theme of poets, the wonderland of travellers, haunted them in their dreams and hence they set sail, unlike the Crusaders, to amass earthly riches. They preferred the sea-route, because it was less risky in those days of bloody wars upon the land and less expensive since no toll need be paid on the high-ways of the sea.

The sea-route to India was discovered when Vasco da Gama with a handful of daring followers braved the stormy passage round the Cape of Good Hope and landed at Calicut on the 22nd May, 1498. The Zamorin of Calicut extended to them the traditional Indian hospitality, not knowing that his guests would, in twelve years more, plunder his city and burn his palace! By the superior strength of their fire arms, the Portuguese won easy victories over the Indians, and within less than a century, their flag waved triumphantly over Mangalore, Cochin, Ceylon, Ormuz, Diu, Goa and Negapatam. Monopolising the profitable traffic of the Indian seas, they amassed colossal fortunes,

though the inhabitants of the Portuguese dominions groaned under their heavy yoke. In the words of Alfonzo de Souza (1545), "The Portuguese entered India with the sword in one hand and the crucifix in the other; finding much gold, they laid aside the crucifix to fill their pockets, and not being able to hold them up with one hand—they were grown so heavy,—they dropped the sword too; being found in this posture by those who came after, they were easily overcome."

The Dutch supplanted the Portuguese in the Eastern seas. A Dutchman who had escaped from a Portuguese prison was the first to electrify their phlegmatic temperament and direct their energies towards the wealth of the East. Eight vessels were soon equipped and despatched, four by the Cape route and four by the North-East passage. The former reached Java about 1598. The Dutch had established, by 1663, factories at Pulicat, Sadras, Agra, Patna, Surat and Ahmedabad. In 1675, they constructed a factory at Chinsurah. They prospered as long as they confined their energies to a steady prosecution of commerce; but, Meer Jaffar, the British puppet, resented the extent of their despotism and secretly encouraged the Dutch to import troops from Batavia. A fleet of seven ships with 1100 men arrived in due course, but Clive saw through the Dutch plans and destroyed their army before it reached Chinsurah. The Dutch power henceforward rapidly declined, and in 1805, they exchanged Chinsurah, Malacca and other possessions in India for Sumatra. Thus we have no relic in India of their imperialistic aspirations.

The pirates and adventurers of Bristol had long been jealous of the commercial importance of Lisbon and, as early as 1527, Robert Thorne had advised Henry VIII to open a route to India

by the North-West, but all attempts in that direction failed. In 1578, Sir Francis Drake captured a Portuguese vessel hailing from the East and came upon very valuable charts disclosing the desired route. In 1594, Lancaster reached Java by the Cape route and in 1600, the East India Company received its charter from the British Queen.

"The Society of Adventurers" constituted into the East India Company resolved on consultation "not to employ any gentleman in any place of charge"[4] lest a great number of adventurers might withdraw their contributions. It is necessary to note that 'adventurers', as a rule, do not observe any code of morality or show traits of good breeding.

The first Englishman to set foot on Indian soil was Captain Hawkins, who landed at Surat in 1608 with a letter from James I to the Great Moghul. The rivalry of Portuguese Jesuits compelled him to return to Surat. In 1612, Captain Best defeated the Portuguese squadron off Surat, where the English founded a factory. English factories soon began to multiply in various places, such as Hughli, where they secured a footing by means of an English doctor's success in curing the illnesses of Jehangir's daughter and one of Shah Shuja's wives.

As a trading corporation, the Company met with great success. Immense fortunes were made by every one connected with the Company in any capacity. They had as yet no ambition to rule India. Sir Thomas Roe, the English ambassador at the Moghul Court, advised them, "If you will profit, seek it at sea and in quiet trade." But, on the third day of April, 1661, the Company was authorised to make peace and war with "non-Christian" people and was thus invested with political powers.

The idea of acquiring supreme power in India

did not originate with the English. The French "first broke the spell which held the Europeans in subjection to the native powers". "The two important discoveries for conquering India, (1) the weakness of the native armies against European discipline and (2) the facility of imparting discipline to natives in the European Service, were made by the French."[5] Though Dupleix suffered at the hands of his own countrymen for trying to carry out this scheme, the East India Company adopted it with zeal and vigour.

The French "Compagnie des Indes" was started by Colbert in 1664 under very favourable auspices and within four years they secured a factory at Surat and founded Pondicherry in 1674 by the conciliatory policy of Francois Martin. Dr. Lenoir and M. Dumas, who succeeded him, took a world of pains to make Pondicherry agreeable to the Indian rulers like Dost Ali Khan, the Nawab of the Carnatic, who visited it. M. Dumas went to the length of supporting Dost Ali Khan and his son-in-law Chanda Saheb against the Marathas and, for this purpose, strengthened the fortifications of Pondicherry and formed the first Sepoy corps known. Dumas became so famous for ousting the Marathas that the effeminate representative of the house of Timur conferred on him the title of Nawab and the command of 2000 horse.

He was succeeded in 1741 by Dupleix—a remarkable leader of men like Napoleon and, as ambitious. But for want of support from home, his dream of establishing a European empire in India would have succeeded. Taking advantage of the European situation, he despatched La Bourdonnais to Madras, the principal seat of English commerce, on the plea that he wanted to restore it to the Nawab of the Carnatic. La Bourdonnais was bribed into ransoming the fort to the English

and so, the Nawab himself attacked Madras. Dupleix went to the length of dispersing his ally's soldiers by his own guns and drove him into the arms of the English, who attacked Pondicherry by sea. The attempt of the English failed and Dupleix sent messengers carrying the happy tidings to Arcot, Haiderabad and Delhi. While in this self-congratulatory mood, news of the Peace of Aachen arrived and Dupleix was obliged to surrender Madras.

The armies of the two Companies were not long idle. Chanda Sahib expelled Sahojee from the kingdom of Tanjore. The Marathas imprisoned the insolent Muslim and nominated Pertap Singh, a very popular ruler, for Tanjore. The English began to fulfil their agreement with Sahojee by capturing Devicottah and then entering into an alliance with Pertap Singh. It is only fair to add that they granted Sahojee a pension!

Not to be beaten in this game, Dupleix ransomed Chanda Sahib and helped him to defeat and kill Anwaruddin, the ally of the English and Chanda Sahib's rival to the Nawabship of Arcot, in the battle of Amboor in 1749. All the discontented princes of the Deccan now flocked to the French camp. On the strength of French alliance, Muzaffar Jung proclaimed himself Subedar of the Deccan, and Nazir Jung, his uncle, who came down to the south on a campaign of revenge, was assassinated. Mahomed Ali, son of Anwaruddin, was holding out in Trichinopoly assisted by Lawrence of the English Company. Trichinopoly was truly the rock upon which the ambition of Dupleix was wrecked. His attempt to capture it failed; a reinforcement of 700 men was drowned in the sea. The French Government considered his plans villainous and he was recalled in 1754. He was disgraced and died in poverty. His successor M.

Godehu concluded peace, by which "the two Companies agreed not to interfere in the differences that might arise among the princes of the country", an agreement honourably kept by the French only. The French Company came to an end in 1769. Pondicherry and Chandernagore are their only important possessions in India today. The French were not a great colonising nation, probably because they were too honest. Bishop Heber has recorded the extreme popularity of the French in India. They had "more conciliating and popular manners". Many of them adopted Indian dress and customs. They did not have "the foolish, surly, national pride"[6] of the Englishman.

The establishment of the British power in India has to be explained on the principle of survival of the fittest. They possessed the scheming and designing nature to a great extent. Sir John Malcolm wrote : "Force and power could not have approached the shores of India without meeting with resistance; but to the unpretending merchant every encouragement was offered."[7] The author of "Justice for India" writes that the Indian empire is "a creature of might, not of right". It is the object of this book to narrate the manner in which the British attained political power—how they took advantage of the simplicity, credibility and faithfulness of the Indian, "great qualities which formed alike the strength and weakness of those races, their strength after they had been conquered, their weakness during the struggle".[8] William Howitt writes : "The system which, for more than a century, was steadily at work to strip the native princes of their dominions and, that too, under the most sacred pleas of right and expediency, is a system of torture more exquisite than

regal or spiritual tyranny ever before discovered; such as the world has nothing similar to show."[9] Again, a writer in the *Calcutta Review* considers the comparison, made by the natives, of Englishmen with white ants as very apt and says that "in our early connection with India there was much, from the contemplation of which the moralist will shrink, and the Christian protest with abhorrence".[10] They broke treaties whenever convenient and acted on the principle "divide and conquer." According to Sir John Kaye, "If the violation of existing covenants ever involved ipso facto a loss of territory, the British Government in the East would not now possess a rood of land between the Burhampooter and the Indus." The entertainment of European officers by Indian princes was a fatal mistake. The planting of British Residents in their capitals was the cause of their ruin; for one of the duties of these officers was to foment dissensions.[11] The system of subsidiary alliance was designed to wipe out the independent existence of Indian States and, according to W. Russell, Resident at Hyderabad, it led inevitably to the destruction of the State which embraced it. Sir Thomas Munro informed the Marquess of Hastings that it destroyed every government which it undertook to protect.

———

The English in Bengal : Early History.

Dr. Wilson noted the fact that the British established their dominion from Bengal and not from Madras or Bombay as an unsolved riddle. This was because Bengal was more fertile and unprotected. There was also no navy in the East corresponding to the Maratha navy on the West. Their mask of sanctimoniousness and businesslike habits pleased the natives and they earned in Bengal a reputation better than that at Surat, where they were regarded as "a set of vile brutes fiercer than the mastiffs."[12]

The Company's supremacy in Bengal and India is inseparably connected with their treachery towards Sirajuddaula. His maternal grandfather—Ali Verdi Khan—knew the intriguing nature of the British only too well, for they were allying themselves with the disaffected 'Gentue Rajas and inhabitants' like the Raja of Burdwan, and Omy Chand. His informers and spies were also able to tell him much about the Company's designs on his own satrapy. He was, therefore, cautious in his dealings with them and his plan was "to oblige all the Europeans indifferently to have no forts." "'You are merchants', he often said to our (French) and the English vakeels, 'what need have you of a fortress? Being under my protection you have no enemies to fear.'"[13] The story goes that in his dying speech to his successor Siraj, he said: "Suffer them not, my son, to have fortifications or soldiers: if you do, the country is not yours."[14]

When the young Siraj ascended the throne, he did not find Bengal a bed of roses. The English "never addressed themselves to him, and

'avoided all communications with him."[15] They even refused him admission into their factories and countryhouses. They insulted him by not sending him the customary presents on his accession. The English had already begun intrigues with Shaukat Jung, a relative of Ali Verdi Khan, and to guarantee safety to all who sought their protection against the Nawab. They issued dustucks or passes to a large number of natives in order to trade customs-free, to the great prejudice of the Nawab's revenue. Worse than all, they began to levy duties on goods brought by the very government which permitted them to trade free. These measures, according to David Rannie, "caused eternal clamour and complaints against us at Court."[16] Setting at naught the Nawab's authority, the English began strengthening the fortifications at Calcutta on the plea of an imminent French war, though even if the plea was true, they should have obeyed the Court of Directors who ordered them "to engage the Nabob to give you his protection." The French at Chandernagore obeyed Siraj but the English sent his messengers back, and they seem to have sent an offensive reply that "the Ditch will be filled up with the heads of Moors." At about the same time, a gentleman called Raja Ballabh who, while Dewan at Dacca, had proved of great help to the English, fell into disfavour at Court and so, to save his property from confiscation, he sent his son Kissen Das with all his moveable wealth to Fort William. The Nawab demanded his surrender but met with a peremptory refusal. In an interview with Mr. Watts at Cossimbazar, Siraj warned him of the dangerous consequences of the policy pursued by his countrymen, but that officer never cared to communicate the conversation to Calcutta.

Insulted and treated with contempt by the

British traders at Calcutta, Sirajuddaula had now no other resource except making an effort to extirpate them from his dominions. So, he despatched troops against Cossimbazar, which was surrendered without a siege. He spared the English merchants there in the true spirit of a humane ruler. This unexpected success allowed him to march to Calcutta before the rains and, intrepid general as he was, he covered the distance of 160 miles in eleven days. On the way, he reduced the fort of Tannah after a very gallant fight against British cannonading from the river. Though advancing triumphantly towards Calcutta, Siraj was ready for a compromise on payment of a fine, the amount of which he left to the Company to propose. But the English were confident of their success, especially because the Portuguese gunners of the Nawab had been exhorted by priestly admonitions and curses to desert their master. Another mean decision of the English was to leave the native part of the city to its own resources, contenting themselves with burning a number of houses there to make a clear passage for opposing the attack.

The Nawab reached Calcutta on the 16th June, 1756, but he reserved the last attack for the 19th Ramjan, which fell on the 18th. Anticipating his attack, the English issued the brutal order that no quarter was to be given. They also kept Omy Chand and Kissen Das under confinement lest they might betray their plans. In the struggle that accompanied that inhospitable attack, Omy Chand's brother-in-law lost his arm and a faithful Jamadar saved the honour of his master's women by killing thirteen of them with his own hand. In spite of everything, the English were miserably beaten. A "criminal eagerness" was "manifested by some of the principal servants of the Company to

provide for their own safety at any sacrifice."[17] "Soldiers began to draw bayonets on their own officers." But "the Moors suspended their operations as soon as it was dark."[18] No resource was left but a disgraceful flight. The Company's servants considered it "as fatal and melancholy a catastrophe as ever the annals of any people suffered since the days of Adam"[19]; but the British were not expelled from their paradise for ever. Siraj was much too good and forgiving. Mr. S. C. Hill believes that this was due to the intercession of his grandmother and mother who carried on trade with the English in saltpetre—an article which the Sultan of Turkey had exhorted Aurangzeb not to sell to Christians, because "it was often burnt for the destruction of good Mahomedans."[20]

English historians have associated the capture of Calcutta with a tragedy designated by them as "The Black Hole." Though they have failed to prove Siraj's direct complicity, strong reasons exist for disbelieving the whole story. There is no mention of the incident in the Muslim chronicles of the time, where it must have found place, if true. Nor is it mentioned in the Proceedings Book of the English refugees at Fulta, or in the Reports of the Madras Council, or in the letters of either Clive or Watson to the Nawab or in the Treaty of Alinagar. Clive does not refer to it in his letter to the Directors explaining the reasons for Siraj's dethronement. Mr. Holwell, who first published the story, never mentioned it in the note he read before the Select Committee in 1760. On the other hand, Holwell was reputed to be a big liar. He spread certain false charges of murder against Meer Jaffar (from whom he had received one lakh of rupees) in order to place Meer Kasim on the throne (Meer Kasim gave him 3 lakhs). Many of

the persons alleged to have been murdered were alive when he wrote his report and the charges were repudiated as false by the Calcutta authorities! No wonder Holwell wanted to blacken the character of Siraj by other false inventions.[21] No compensation for the relatives of the alleged dead were extracted from Meer Jaffar, even when it could have been very easily done. Again, the versions do not all agree. If the room was 18 feet square, "Geometry contradicting arithmetic gives the lie to the story,"[22] as Dr. Bholanath Chunder observed in 1895. Captain Grant says there were 200 persons in a room 16 ft. square (!), while Dr. C. R. Wilson says it was 18 ft. by 14 ft. 10 inchs.[23] Only the names of 56 of the dead seem to have been traced. Why? Perhaps the number 123 is an exaggeration; even these 56 might be those left behind by the English when they took to flight. Or, as S. C. Hill says, it might be that "in the careless talk of Calcutta, the Black Hole and Fort William" were "often confounded."[24] All that we have said above induces us to believe that the Black Hole Tragedy was a myth invented by interested Europeans to serve their ulterior ends.

After appointing a Hindu governor over Calcutta and renaming it Alinagar, Siraj returned to his capital, leaving the English refugees at Fulta unmolested and even opening a market for their securing provisions until, according to their declared intentions, the weather permitted them to embark for Madras. But the ungrateful band of Englishmen sought to undermine Siraj's position by "a correspondence with some of the principal people of the country"[25] and, asking the Madras government for reinforcements, pleading at the same time for further extensions of the Nawab's mercy. 'To deceive the Nawab',[26] Major Killpatrick

was instructed to assure the Nawab of the good intentions of the British and to ask for a supply of provisions.

Meanwhile, a detachment of 800 Europeans and 1300 Sepoys under Admiral Watson and Colonel Clive arrived from Madras. As soon as he landed, Clive addressed a letter to the Nawab through Manick Chand, the Governor of Calcutta, but "finding in it many improper expressions", that officer returned it to the English suggesting some alterations, since "you write that you are desirous of peaceable measures."[27] But the Europeans, thirsting for blood, and with a force "sufficient to vindicate our claim", were not prepared to entreat his (Nawab's) favour. They despatched direct to the Nawab letters 'of an unmistakably threatening character.' Manick Chand was soon won over; "he made no stand at Calcutta but hastily betook himself to Hughli, whence he sent word to the Nawab at Murshidabad that the British he had now to deal with were very different kind of men from those he had defeated at Calcutta." Of course, Calcutta was easily recaptured by the Company; but the descendants of the old sea-king robbers and pirates attacked Hughli, plundered the granaries and stores, "pillaging the native houses."

In spite of all this, Siraj kept up his self-control and wrote a letter overpowering in its moderation. Probably, he knew too well the ravages of British intrigue in his Court and Camp. He wrote, "If the English who are settled in these provinces will behave like merchants, obey my orders and give me no offence, you may depend upon it I will take their loss into consideration and adjust matters to their satisfaction."[28] He promised to pay compensation for any pillage for which his army was responsible and appealed

to their Christian duty of 'accommodating a dispute.' But, 'the indispensable conditions of British alliance' included many preposterous demands which increased at every step in the negotiations.

Siraj had encamped near Calcutta to hasten peace negotiations, but Colonel Clive's two deputies had arrived in his camp not 'to propose an accommodation' but as spies. They escaped at night and early the next day, the English fell upon the the unsuspecting Nawab—a highly reprehensible act of treachery. Conscious of the 'unwillingness of his generals' and 'the appearance of disaffection in some of his principal officers',[29] Siraj concluded the Treaty of Alinagar on 9th February, 1757, by which all the old privileges of the English were reiterated and certain new ones, especially the rights of fortification and minting, were granted.

But the Treaty did not conclude the struggle. The English discovered loopholes and wove webs with consummate hypocrisy. Mr. Watts, their envoy at Murshidabad, like all his white ant brood, started his campaign by pressing many an extravagant claim on the Nawab's treasury, far beyond the terms of the Treaty. They remembered verbal promises to pay three lakhs of rupees for compensating private sufferers like Clive and Killpatrick. Again, Mr. Watts suggested a British attack on Chandernagore in the teeth of the Nawab's known opposition to such a step, for he had said that it was 'contrary to all rule and custom that you should bring your animosities and differences into my country."[30] The Nawab appealed to their faith in a Gospel and honesty to maintain the peace so lately and so solemnly concluded, but admiral Watson replied in a tone of injured innocence.

In order to test the bona fides of the British

he asked them to lend him their troops in order to meet the Imperial forces, promising a monthly payment of a lakh of rupees. This request involved him in his ruin, for it gave the English a pretext for moving their troops from Calcutta. The Nawab had betrayed himself. So, we find the Company insisting upon the fulfilment of the Treaty in *every* article, within ten days or, otherwise, 'answer for the consequences.' It is necessary to add that no time limit was fixed in the original treaty. The English diplomatically observed that they would be ready to march with the Nawab if they were allowed to make Calcutta secure by capturing Chandernagore! The French deputies, in their desire to avoid war, drew up a very advantageous treaty which Watson refused to accept. Even Clive objected to this bloodthirsty attitude, because 'he (the Nawab) and all the world will certainly think that we are men of a trifling insignificant disposition or that we are men without principles.'

When Watson refused to sign the Treaty, the French appealed to the Nawab for help and Rai Durlabh was despatched with a considerable force to protect Chandernagore. Another difficulty now arose. The Council at Fort William refused permission for the troops to march unless the Nawab permitted the war. So, Mr. Watts bought the help of the Nawab's secretariat and procured a forged letter which could be interpreted as permissive. A charge of entertaining deserters was discovered against the French and their fort itself fell after a week's siege by the treachery of an officer who, later on, died by his own hand. Nandkomar, the Governor of Hughli, was also bribed by Omichand for the English.

The Nawab was alarmed and enraged at the turn events had taken in his land. The English

had committed a gross breach of the law of nations. They had done wanton outrages on his subjects. They even demanded from him the surrender, not merely of French refugees, but even of all the French factories in his country ! Still, Siraj sent away M. Jean Law and others from his dominions in partial compliance with this audacious and insulting request. He even explained to the English that the French owed large sums to his subjects and so he could not hand over the French factories.

But, the intrigues and bribery of Mr. Watts and his right hand, Omichand, were fast undermining Siraj's power and influence. The principal conspirators were the Seths, Meer Jaffar, Manickchand, Nandcomar, Raja Ballabh and Durlabh Ram. Of these, Meer Jaffar was vigorously encouraged since he was an aspirant to the throne, while every effort was made 'to lull the weak prince into perfect security.' Omichand demanded for his services 5 per cent. on all the royal treasure that will be plundered later on and 30 lakhs in money besides. It is said that there is honour among thieves but those at Murshidabad deceived Omichand by the foulest means that ever disgraced human transactions. A treaty of 14 clauses on red paper in which Watson's signature was forged under Clive's orders was drawn up to satisfy the heathen Indian and another of 13 for all real purposes. Lord Clive, 'the Heaven-born general,' was not ashamed to inform Parliament "he thinks it (forgery) warrantable in such a case and would do it again a hundred times." ! Within 30 days of his declaration as Nawab, Meer Jaffar was to confer upon the company the Zemindari of the country south of Calcutta, to deliver all the French factories, to pay the Company one crore of rupees

for compensating recent losses, with further sums for the different sections of the inhabitants of Calcutta and the several British officers. This alliance was signed by Meer Jaffar at dead of night, Mr. Watts entering his house 'in a dooley', generally used only by women.

When the plot was ripe, Mr. Watts and other Europeans left the capital on pretext of "taking the air in their gardens."[31] Siraj suspected treachery and forced Meer Jaffar to swear fealty on the Koran. Of course, he did it most solemnly and informed the English that everything was ready. Clive marched towards Plassey, where the Nawab's army was encamped. On the 23rd June, 1757, the battle of Plassey was fought. The Nawab's army was demoralised and corrupted by the English. Mir Madan, his greatest general, died early in the day. His commander-in-chief Meer Jaffar deserted him in his hour of need. So, as Colonel Malleson says, "Plassey, though a decisive, can never be considered, a great battle."[32] Siraj fled to his capital and tried to rally his troops by lavish payments of gold. The soldiers received his bounty and deserted him. In despair, the Nawab left his capital disguised as a faqir.

Clive saluted Meer Jaffar as "Subah of the Three Provinces" and assured him that the English would most religiousiy perform their treaty while 'handing him to the musnad.' It was now time for these foreigners to fleece their creature and grow rich at his expense. Omichand was now undeceived. The news overpowered him 'like a blast of sulphur';[33] he "remained for many hours in stupid melancholy and began to show signs of insanity". Clive advised him (!) to make a pilgrimage and, according to British historians he died, in about a year and a half, in a state of imbecility. Meanwhile, Siraj was detect-

ed and captured at Rajmahal by Meer Jaffar's son. That very night, he was murdered in cold blood and his mangled body was paraded through the streets of Murshidabad. The Muslim author of Riyaz-us-Salateen writes that the murder was committed at the instigation of the English chiefs and Jagat Seth. Meer Jaffar, who was known as "Colonel Clive's Ass" must have got the permission of Clive for the act. The English never condemned the act. Thus ended the life of Sirajuddaula. His only fault seems to have been a lax private life, but who among his enemies was a paragon of virtue ? "Whatever may be his faults", says Col. Malleson, "Sirajuddaula neither betrayed his master, nor sold his country.....He was the only one of the principal actors in that tragic drama who did not attempt to deceive."[34]

Meer Jaffar and His Rule.

Meer Jaffar, like all traitors, was a miserable creature with no moral stamina. He had never handled the state machine. The policy inaugurated by Ali Verdi Khan and continued by Siraj was to gain the goodwill of the people by advancing proper persons without distinctions of caste or creed to positions of honour. Leaning for support on foreign bayonets, Meer Jaffar replaced Hindu functionaries by those of his own creed—not knowing that his supporters would throw him overboard whenever it paid them to do so.

Ram Narain, the Governor of Bihar, was the first Hindu official to suffer. He was so loyal to Ali Verdi Khan's family that he had encouraged M. Jean Law to proceed towards Plassey from Patna, but with the fall of Siraj, he proclaimed Meer Jaffar as Nawab. An expedition under Major Coote was sent in pursuit of M. Law but before it reached Patna, he had crossed over to Oude. Ram Narain apologised for his carelessness and informed Coote that he had sent 2000 troops in pursuit of the French. Interested partisans brought many allegations to Coote against Ram Narain and in a conference that was arranged, the Governor swore fealty and allegiance to Meer Jaffar and Coote returned leaving Ram Narain free, for the time being.

In a few months Ram Narain was charged with intrigues in conjuction with the Vizier of Oude. Clive joined "his ass" in this expedition but for a widely different purpose. Fearing an alliance between Oude and Behar, if extreme steps were taken, Clive appointed Meer Jaffar's

son, Meeran, as nominal Governor and Ram Narain as his Deputy—an arrangement by which Clive was able to pocket 7 lakhs of rupees! He did not also forget that he was the servant of a company of merchants. He forced the Nawab to grant the Company the monopoly of salt-petre, which was then available only in the country above Patna.

Ramram Singh, the Governor of Orissa, was summoned for settlement of accounts and when he wisely sent his cousin and nephew, they were imprisoned. Ramram Singh was not the man to take this tamely. He wrote that he had an army of 7000 to defend his rights but that he was prepared to compromise the situation by paying a nuzzerana of one lakh of rupees a year, if Clive would guarantee his safety. This he did most willingly. Ramram Singh interviewed Clive at Calcutta and his relatives were set free.

Ogulsingh, Governor of Purneah, took up arms when an attempt was made to displace him and Meer Jaffar sent an army under Coddum Hussein, the prospective governor, to coerce him. The rebels were dispirited at the sight of English troops and Ogulsingh was imprisoned.

The Nawab contemplated the ruin of Rai Durlabh also, but fortunately for the country a civil war was avoided by each swearing oblivion of former distrusts.

In spite of these, the Nawab was not a happy man. He had promised in his greed and his ignorance, large sums to the Company and to individual Englishmen. When the treasury was discovered to be most unexpectedly empty, the English Shylocks very generously "consented to receive half the moneys immediately and to accept the rest by three equal payments in three years."[25] His British friends were also the

direct cause of the decrease in his general revenues, since they began to trade in articles like salt which were hitherto yielding revenue. In vain did their poor puppet plead and protest and refer to the poverty of his people, the emptiness of the treasury, the arrears of salary for his army, the devastating nature of the English trade. The Nawab was helpless and he had to submit. The revenues of Burdwan, Nuddea and Hooghly were assigned over for payment of the balance of the bribe.

Another chance for fleecing the Nawab now cropped up. The Shah-Zada or heir apparent to the Moghul throne, who held the title of Soubedar of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, was marching with a large force to make good his claim. Meer Jaffar knew that his troops, long in arrears, could not be relied on, and so he turned to Clive for help. Ram Narain managed to stop the Prince at Patna by small presents and specious negotiations and, with his help, Clive and Meeran were able to drive off the Shah-Zada. "Unbounded was the gratitude of Meer Jaffer"[36] and Mill says that "he gave Clive the jaghire of the territory around Calcutta, amounting to £ 30,000 a year." For our own part, we are inclined to believe that the jaghir was extorted from Meer Jaffar by Clive.

This ruinous method of pleasing his foreign friends made the Nawab very unpopular with his taxpaying subjects. They "beheld with detestation the gold and silver of the capital ostentatiously carried away by foreigners."[37] "Meer Jaffar felt the restraints with abomination, which turned his head to notions of emancipating himself from the ascendance of the English"[38] and no wonder too! No succour could be got from the French, for there were practically none in Bengal. Under

these circumstances, it appeared plausible that he invited Dutch help. Anyhow, in 1759, a fleet of boats arrived from Batavia and was destroyed on its way to Chinsurah by Clive. From what Malcolm in his Life of Clive writes upon the subject, there is no reason to suspect the complicity of Meer Jaffar in the Dutch expedition. He writes that the Dutch were persistently refusing to recognise him as Nawab ; that "it required the continual good offices of Clive to preserve terms betwixt them."[39] Moreover, in the enquiry before the Parliamentary Committee in 1772, no convincing evidence was brought to substantiate the charge that the Nawab invited the Dutch to Bengal. What seems probable was that the Dutch were merely trying to strengthen Chinsurah, benefitting by the experience of the French who had been but recently rooted from Bengal. They could have had no hopes of Meer Jaffar helping them. In fact, the Nawab's troops joined the English in attacking and defeating the Dutch.

The English had now no more European rivals in Bengal. The Heaven-born General now sailed for England to display his illgotten wealth and outshine the aristocracy of his native land and pass for an Indian Nawab. Clive had also some plans for the complete subjugation of India to place before the ministers at home. He exhorted the English "to embrace the first opportunity of further aggrandising ourselves", for, "such an opportunity will soon occur ;" he wanted the Company "to take the sovereignty of Bengal upon themselves" for Meer Jaffar was old and his son "so cruel and worthless." He said that "a small force from home will be sufficient, as we always make sure of any number we please of black troops."(!)[40] But Pitt did not see his way to second these proposals.

On Clive's departure, his powers were divided because Mr. Holwell was made Governor till the arrival of Mr Vansittart from Madras and Colonel Calliaud was appointed to the supreme military command. A new danger broke out in the form of a rebellion against Meer Jaffar's weak rule led by the Shahzada, who was invited by the discontented chiefs. It was feared that Cuddam Hoossein, Governor of Purnea, would also join the rebels with 6000 troops. Meanwhile the Emperor was murdered and the Shahzada, proclaiming himself Emperor, advanced towards Patna. Ram Narain valiantly attacked the enemy, was repulsed with heavy losses, and was besieged in Patna. Colonel Calliaud and Captain Knox totally routed the enemy. Meeran unexpectedly died during the campaign. Whatever might be said regarding the legality of a Company of merchants fighting against the Emperor's deputy in 1759, there can be no justification for opposing him in 1760, for to "oppose him was undisguised rebellion." Again, the young Meeran had begun, on the evidence of Vansittart, to plan schemes to shake off the dependence on the English and to continually urge upon his father that until that was effected his government was a name only. So, his death was so advantageous to the English interests that the story of his being killed "by a flash of lightning while lying on his bed"[41] might really cover a dark and sinister assassination at the instigation of the English themselves.

The Second Revolution in Bengal

Every one of the terms of the Treaty that had been imposed upon Meer Jaffar had been faithfully executed by the traitor. The English could not with any show of decency expect any thing more from him. So they planned to kick him off and hoist some other puppet. Mr. Holwell was bent upon effecting a second revolution in Bengal, for it was a rather profitable game. He was intent on cutting the throat of his benefactor by vile intrigues. Colonel Calliaud was at first against the scheme, because "in such a case it is very possible we may raise a man to the dignity, just as unfit to govern, as little to be depended upon, and in short, as great a rogue, as our Nabob; but perhaps not so great a coward, nor so great a fool and, of consequence, much more difficult to manage".[42] Mr. Holwell perpetually found fault with Meer Jaffar and his measures. The situation of the Nawab was deplorable from the first—"with an exhausted treasury and an exhausted country and vast engagements to discharge, he was urged to the severest exactions."[43] "Bengal was bankrupt and was fast nearing anarchy".[44]

When Mr. Vansittart succeeded Holwell, conditions did not improve. Even Colonel Calliaud now fell in with the scheme. Several secret meetings were held to hatch the plot and in none of these could any charge be made against the Nawab except his weakness. The reasons for a change of Government were declared to be the necessity for a greater annual income, for funds to maintain the army, the widening of English influence, and the want of money for the operations on the coast,

the reduction of Pondicherry and for "loading home the next year's ships"! In a secret conclave on 15th Sep. 1760 'the great object' was said to be "the securing of a fund of money for the present and future exigencies of this settlement, as well as the other two presidencies, no money being expected from Europe".

Separate officers were deputed to intrigue with Cassim Ally, son-in-law of Meer Jaffer and Rai Durlabh and to report their fortunes to the Committee. Accordingly Mr. Vansittart reported that Cassim was ready to cede Burdwan, Midnapore and Chittagong, if his father-in law could be removed to make room for him and if "we could undertake to give him the general management of the country." Mr. Holwell reported that the Rai "received the overture with much satisfaction and approved in general of the plan."[45]

Now that their plans had matured, the English conspirators presented several charges against Meer Jaffar in three letters addressed to him, on the perusal of which he was much affected. The British "insisted on his coming to some determination for the immediate reform of his government," but the Nawab desired time to consult his friends, and named Cassim Ally as one "on whose true attachment and fidelity he might safely rely." Cassim, however, was extremely apprehensive and the English refused to send him to the Nawab until measures were taken for his security. Meer Jaffar, meanwhile, was consulting Keneram, Moonital and Checon—persons whom the English characterised as "his greatest enemies." So, the English conspirators determined to act, especially since the 19th October was a 'Gentue feast' when the principal men would be fatigued with their ceremonies. Colonel Calliaud with two companies of military and six of sepoys joined Cassim and amrched into

the courtyard of Meer Jaffar's palace. Several messages passed between the affrighted Nawab and his British 'friends'. At last, in his despair, he wrote to Cassim resigning his office and dignity and praying for a decent pension. These conditions being agreed to, "the old ally of Plassey was deposed by the Council and the new friend of the Company installed in his place."[46]

Surely, Cortez and Pizarro were not guilty of so base a treachery when they arrested Montezuma and the Inca Athahualpa, for they offered the Inca an opportunity of answering the charges preferred against him before a tribunal. Holwell and others cast cruel aspersions on the character of Meer Jaffar which, on their own statement, have not the least foundation. They tried to paint their victim in monstrous colours, according to the proverb, "Give a dog a bad name and then hang him."

By the second Revolution in Bengal the Company was richer by a cash payment of 20 lakhs of rupees, and money covers a multitude of sins. They got firmans for Burdwan, Chittagong and Midnapore "as well as for half of the chunam already produced at Sylhet."[47] Again, the new Nawab issued "a very severe order forbidding all the shrafs and merchants to refuse the Calcutta siccas or to ask any batta on them,"[48] and thus the Company could derive huge profits from the Calcutta mint. "A supply of money will be sent with the Colonel for the payment of the troops at Patna and we have even some hopes of obtaining 3 or 4 lacks besides to send down to Calcutta to help out the Company in their present occasions there and at Madras."[49] A paper was also got from Cassim promising 20 lakhs of rupees to Messrs. Vansittart, Calliaud, Holwell, Sumner and M'Gwire. Torrens in his "Empire in Asia" writes: "The inequity of this transaction finds few apologists even

among those who have taken upon themselves to dress and enamel Oriental deeds for European view."[50] The Court of Directors, however, appeared in sack cloth and ashes and directed its subordinates in India to observe faithfully all treaties and agreements, not knowing or, as is more probable, not desirous of expressing openly, that it was by utter disregard and flagrant violation of all tenets of morality and justice and distinct bad faith that the English succeeded in acquiring political supremacy in India.

———

forced the Emperor to accept his terms and brought him to Patna.

Meanwhile, an event took place in the first week of 1761 whose importance for British supremacy has not been sufficiently recognised—the Battle of Panipat. A revolution at Delhi had brought the Marathas to the north and Raghunath Rao, the brother-in-law of the Peshwa was invited by Ahmed Shah Abdali's governor at Lahore to help him. The expedition to the Punjab proved fatal. Ahmed Shah started in revenge and a writer in the *Calcutta Review* Vol. LI, proves that he forced upon Muslims in India the conviction that it was a life and death struggle between Muslim and Hindu. He wanted to save India from being reconverted into a Hindu kingdom. The Afghans and Marathas, both highlanders and skilled in guerilla warfare, met on 6th January, 1761, in the field of Panipat. The Marathas were led by Sadasheo Bhow; their infantry and artillery were trained on western lines and led by a follower of M. Bussy; they were joined by the troops of Bhurtpore, the Rajputs, the Holkar and Sindhia. But the Hindu army was too heavily encumbered and the Bhow displayed, according to Casi Raja Pundit, a contemporary chronicler and eye-witness, "a capricious and self-conceited conduct" that alienated the sympathies of his allies. In the battle, both parties suffered heavy losses and the Marathas were routed. It broke the backs of the two nations who were in the field for wresting the sceptre of India from the Moghul emperors. Sydney Owen writes, "with the Battle of Panipat, the native period of Indian history may be said to end. Henceforth the interest gathers round the progress of the merchant princes from the Far West."[51]

To return to our narrative.

The Emperor at Patna was anxious to be conducted to Delhi by the British, but as Mr. Vansittart wrote to the Court of Directors: "We find it impossible to spare a sufficient detachment for undertaking so distant and so important a service."[52] Meer Cassim took the opportunity to please the Emperor by a promise of 24 lakhs of rupees a year and so receive formal investiture at his hands. Then the Emperor left for his capital.

Tranquillity being thus restored in Bengal, Meer Cassim had now to deal with the problem of his European allies. Some members of the Committee of Fort William were never satisfied with the methods or results of the Second Revolution. In a stream of letters addressed to the Court of Directors they violently attacked Cassim's administration and the vagaries of the majority. They spoke of "extortions and cruelties and base murders." They spoke in angry measures of the treacherous policy of Mr. Vansittart in handing over Ram Narain to be imprisoned by the Nawab, in spite of the fact that Major Carnac and Colonel Coote had successively refused to do it and against the engagement of Lord Clive. According to Mill, this incident "extinguished among the natives of rank all confidence in English protection."[53]

The English had secured by firman exemption from transit duties but this did not extend to the private trade of the servants of the Company. But these latter applied the passport of the Company to protect their trade, "thus drying up one of the sources of public revenue,"[54] and when anybody opposed their procedure, "it was customary to send a party of sepoys to seize the offender and carry him prisoner to the nearest

(English) factory"! Many young writers, according to Verelst, were thus enabled to spend £1500 to £2000 per annum, while infinite oppressions were committed on the people.[55] The Court of Directors condemned this 'unwarrantable' trade as "a grand source of disputes, misunderstandings and difficulties" and wanted that "a final and effective end" should be put to it.[56] This order was never obeyed. The English flogged or confined all who refused to buy their goods or sell them theirs. They enforced a monopoly on many articles of trade. Mr. William Ellis, Provincial Chief at Patna, was typical of the English trade agents of the period. He had a violent and provocative temper and a firm faith in the use of force before everything else. In short, as Burke put it, "the miserable country was torn to pieces by the horrible rapaciousness of a double tyranny."

In order to discuss the pretensions of both parties and form preventive regulations, Messrs. Vansittart and Warren Hastings proceeded to the Nawab at Monghyr and a fortnight later, a Treaty was concluded by which Meer Cassim agreed that the English need pay a duty of only 9 per cent on all articles of inland trade such as salt, tobacco and betelnut, while, as Lord Clive said, "the Natives paid infinitely more." In spite of this the selfish English protested loudly against the Treaty of Monghyr and ignored its terms with impunity. Hence, the Nawab was obliged as a measure of justice to his own subjects, and to prevent breaches of the peace, to abolish all customs in his dominions for two years. He had every right and justification to do this. But the English, greatly offended, held various consultations at Fort William and during one of these Mr. Watts went to the length of saying, "The English E. I. Company

have an undoubted right to trade in any articles produced in the Indostan Empire, either for foreign or inland trade." Mr. Vansittart was censured, since, according to Major Carnac, "his concessions are so evidently shameful and disadvantageous to us" that he must have been bought over by the Nawab.[57]

The newly published "Calendar of Persian Correspondence" contains many letters between Meer Cassim and the Governor and so reveal many phases of the struggle. We know from it that "the Nazim had begun to suspect that the English were secretly negotiating with the Emperor to acquire the Divani of his dominions."[58] He wrote to the Governor in 1763 that it was evident to every one that the Europeans could not be trusted. Again and again, Meer Cassim complained of his officers being beaten and chastised and he wrote bitterly against Mr. Ellis, "the mischief monger." He had realised early enough that the game of the English was to hoist puppet after puppet on the musnud and provoke disturbances in order to have another Revolution to their advantage. Therefore he took a desperate line, calling the Councillors "servants" and "men of low character"[59] and justifying his appellations. He also wanted to know from the Governor "if he is an Amil, or a Wadahdar, a Zemindar or a Gumastah, or a Mutsaddi that he cannot issue orders about anything excepting the customs."[60] Still, since it was increasingly evident that the English did not desire for peace, Meer Cassim tried feverishly to settle all disputes amicably. He wrote sincere letters explaining his position and his willingness to allow everything that could be interpreted as having been won by firmans and treaties. After detailing all their iniquities, he wrote: "Judge therefore from these circumstances who is the oppressor and who the

oppressed." The Councillors, excepting Vansittart and Hastings, were indignant at his abolition of all customs and tolls and they began questioning his authority to do so. Two other members were therefore deputed for insisting, without any negotiation or discussion, that he should revoke his order and collect duties as before. The second Deputation presented eleven demands which no self-respecting prince could have acceded to—such as reimposition of duties, compensation for the loss suffered by English merchants, &c. The English knew this already and they had warned Mr. Ellis to be ready to attack Patna, to which place a supply of arms in a flotilla of boats was sent, The Nawab detained the boats. The Council wrote to him that his conduct amounted to a declaration of war. The Deputation was withdrawn and Mr. Ellis proceeded to assault Patna.

The Nawab was now a desperate man. Since his accession, "everything that had a tendency to increase his own efficiency was supposed to be designed against the English," though, as Elphinstone says, "he carried on no intrigues with European powers, made no overtures to the Marathas, and was less conciliating towards Shah Alam and Shuja-ud-daula than the British themselves desired. He made enemies of all his Zemindars and at the crisis of his dispute with the English he undertook the distant and dangerous expedition to Nepal."[61] "He conducted himself under innumerable provocations with temper and forbearance." But matters had now come to such a crisis that he had to send his troops to Patna. His brave Armenian general, Marcan, saved Patna and brought Mr. Ellis and others captives to Monghyr, Within a week, Meer Cassim was informed that he had been dethroned and Meer Jaffar once more placed upon the musnud, and a regular proclama-

tion of war was made by the Calcutta Council. Messrs. Warren Hastings and Verelst stood neutral regarding the war, thinking it to be unjust. Meer Cassim replied: "You gentlemen were wonderful friends. Having made a treaty to which you pledged the name of Jesus Christ you took from me a country to pay the expenses of your army with the condition that your troops should always attend me and promote my affairs. In effect, you kept up a force for my destruction."[62]

Meer Cassim knew that Jagat Seth and other Hindus had conspired against Siraj and so he had him removed to Monghyr along with his brother, despite unauthorised protests from the Company. It must be said to his credit that he bore his grievances with great patience. When Mr. Vansittart warned the Councillors that if an army was sent against the Nawab, he might execute the English prisoners under his custody, the Councillors indignantly retorted "that, were all the prisoners to a man killed by Meer Cassim, they would not for a moment recede from their proposed revenge or even come to terms of accommodation with it."[63] The English troops under Major Adams and the Nawab's under Taky Khan had many a fight and skirmish, during one of which Taky Khan was killed. Meer Cassim resolved to make a last determined stand at an almost impregnable fortification called Oodwah Nullah. Broome in his History of the Bengal Army mentions various steps taken by the Nawab to increase the efficiency of his troops. His Indian made muskets are praised by him as even superior to the English, for they were made of 'admirable metal' and with flints 'of excellent quality.'[64] So, in spite of a prolonged siege of one month, the Company could not make any impression on the Natives. At last, the Nawab's soldiers became negligent on account

of over-confidence; the officers gorged themselves with wine and spent their time with dancing-women. Treachery was also at work Hence, in spite of the inimitable sorties of Nujuf Khan, when an Englishman in the employ of the Nawab turned traitor and conducted the enemy along the ford right into the sleeping camp, the Nawab lost full 15000 men in the surprise and flight. The siege of Oodwah Nullah has been well described by the author of Seirul Mutaqherin.

Contemporary chroniclers mention several causes for the defeat of the Indian army. One Muslim traitor is mentioned by name Mirja Iraj Khan. Meer Cassim's employment of Armenians and Europeans is also severely criticised. Coja Petruse, a leading Calcutta merchant and an Armenian, induced his brother Coja Gregory and other fellow-countrymen such as Marcan and Arratoon to conspire against their employer. Many European artillerymen went over to the enemy and "were hailed by the English officers." Again, Meer Cassim was not present in Oodwah Nullah to encourage his soldiers and check licentiousness.

From Monghyr, Meer Cassim came to know of the treachery of his Christian servants. The author of the Seir writes of an attempt made by the English rebels under Mr. Ellis who were now prisoners making an attempt to procure muskets, and Meer Cassim's head spy one day surprised him with the news of a huge conspiracy to take his life hatched by the Christians in his camp—officers and prisoners. Meer Cassim now warned the English that "if you are resolved—to proceed on this business, know for a certainty that I will cut off the heads of Mr. Ellis and the rest of your chiefs and send them to you."[65] Of course, the English sent spirited but exasperating replies. So, at Patna (where he had taken shelter), Meer Cassim

ordered all the Christians in his service and under captivity to be executed. The task of execution was assigned to a German protestant who had won the nickname of Sombre or Somro, according to Indian authors, and the first head to fall was that of Coja Gregory or Gurgin Khan. Except Dr. Fullarton, no other English rebel was left alive. After this, Meer Cassim crossed into Oude. Thus was closed the Nawabship of a victim of the Company's greed, tyranny, injustice and corruption.

Restoration of Meer Jaffar.

The Calcutta Council had issued a proclamation on 7th July, 1763, declaring that Meer Cassim had wantonly begun the war and calling upon all "to repair to the standard of Mahommed Jaffer Cawn Bahadur, to assist him in defeating the designs of the said Cassim Allee Cawn and finally establishing himself in the Subahdaree." Hence, by restoring Meer Jaffar, the English in a way acknowledged the injustice done to him, but as Elphinstone writes, "they did not scruple to impose new and severe terms upon him. All the concessions made by Cassim Ali were retained, the whole of the commercial privileges claimed by the Company's servants were insisted on, the force to be kept up by the Nawab was limited to 6,000 horse and 12,000 foot, and he was to indemnify the Company and individuals for all the damage occasioned to them by the usurper whom their own agreement had set up to supplant him. By a separate agreement he was to grant a donation of 25 lakhs of rupees to the army and some gratification to the navy, which was not fixed at the time."[66] No wonder his complaints very soon became loud and long. Among a list of thirteen which he submitted to Calcutta in September, 1764, can be found, among others, the refusal of the merchants to pay customs "under cover of the protection of the English factories," the forcible capture of villages by their Gomasthas, the occupation by the English of serveral houses designed for the use of strangers 'so that I could not have them in case I should want them for myself, my family and dependants', the granting by the Company of protection to the

dependants of the Sircar, desolation of villages by the Company's sepoys &c.[67] As usual the Company did not take any notice of these real and substantial grievances.

Meanwhile, Meer Cassim had taken refuge with Shuja-ud-daulah, Ruler of Oude and Nawab Vizier of the Empire. The Emperor Shah Alam was still in Allahabad under Shah Shuja's protection. The Vizier took a solemn oath on the Koran that he would espouse Meer Cassim's cause, but, since he could not undertake a distant expedition before putting down the revolt of the Raja of Bundelkhand, Meer Cassim himself proceeded against him and compelled him to pay all arrears of tribute. Having thus won the admiration and gratitude of his allies, Meer Cassim proceeded with them towards Bengal on his campaign of revenge against the English. Shuja-ud-daulah in a letter to the Governor and Council at Calcutta accused them of establishing and turning out Nawabs at pleasure without Imperial consent, injuring the revenues of the Imperial Court and of entertaining "a wicked design of seizing the country for yourselves." He asked them to desist from improper desires and confine themselves to commercial affairs. No one can deny that right as well as law was on the side of the Emperor and his Vizier.

The English were really afraid of the combination of power and influence against them, and, raising the camp at Buxar, they retreated into Patna (Azimabad). From that safe position, they tried to create dissensions amongst the Muslim chiefs and nobles. The author of the Seir was perhaps a medium for conveying to the Emperor "the veneration of the English for the Imperial person."(!)[68] The Vizier's troops were also disorderly and heavily encumbered. Moreover, as

mentioned in the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Vol. VI, the Vizier was also ruined by the treachery of Maharaja Kalyan Singh, son of Raja Shitab Rai, who though in the Vizier's employ gave the English information regarding the number and movements of his troops. He was not ashamed to write to the English that "he was on the look out to find an opportunity to turn the tide in their favour." Gholam Hossein Khan, the author of the Seir, managed to put the English in possession of the fort of Rohtas, though, as the Governor of the fort later on complained, "not one of the stipulated conditions were observed"[69] by the English. The Vizier also alienated sympathy by oppressing the inhabitants and arresting Meer Cassim himself, for no clear reason. The English had also taken care to remove Nandkumar from Meer Jaffar, though according to Major Carnac, there was no suspicion of his being engaged in treachery. Major Carnac was also superseded by Major Munro from Bombay, since he encouraged Meer Jaffar to negotiate with the Emperor for a Royal Firman establishing his claim for Nawabship. The Calcutta Council ordered Meer Jaffar to return from the front to Calcutta—an order which the Nawab had to obey.

At last, the Battle of Buxar was fought on September 15, 1764 and the Vizier was defeated with great loss. The Emperor, hoping to get English help in making himself independent, separated from his Vizier and encamped near the British lines. Meer Cassim was fortunately liberated by Shuja and he fled in precipitation to Allahabad and thence to the Rohillas at Bareilly. The English demanded from Shah Shuja the surrender of Meer Cassim and Somro but both the birds had flown. So, the war was continued and the

fortress of Chunar besieged by English troops. Since the gallant defenders completely repulsed their attacks, the English raised the siege and marched on to Allahabad. Fortunately for them, Nujuf Khan of Oodwah Nullah fame joined their camp and, with his assistance, they succeeded in capturing Allahabad. Shuja also fled to the Rohillas and endeavoured to procure the help of Mulhar Rao Holkar. But after a few more skirmishes, he submitted to Major Carnac and through the mediation of Raja Shitab Rai, a peace was concluded by which Shah Shuja was compelled to pay the English 50 lakhs of rupees, to accept an Agent at his court and to cede the fair province of Ghazipur. The last clause was not approved by the Court of Directors, since the frontier of Ghazipur was surrounded by warlike people. Thus ended the war of Shuja with the English.

A traitor can never be a happy creature, for he can never command respect even from those for whose sake he commits treachery. Such was the case with Meer Jaffar. His last days were made miserable by the increasing and unauthorised demands of the Company upon his diminishing revenues. At last in January, 1765, his soul attained that final peace which no enemy or friend could ever disturb. Sir. W. W. Hunter writes : "His death is said to have been hastened by the unseemly importunity with which the English at Calcutta pressed upon him their private claims to restitution."[70] The man who gave him solace and comfort in his last days was neither a Muslim nor a Chirstian. It was Nandkumar, the faithful servant.

Events in Bengal after Meer Jaffar's Death

The Court of Directors appointed Lord Clive to reform Bengal affairs and so Mr. Vansittart resigned before Clive landed in India. It was during the term of office of Mr. Spencer that Meer Jaffar died. The treaty imposed on him made no mention of his successor and so the English got one further opportunity of improving their position. The Company's officers refused to recognise Najum-ud-daulah, son of Meer Jaffar, until he consented to create an office of Naib or Deputy for the management of all affairs and appointed Mohammed Reza Khan for the post. Moreover, all the principal offices in the Revenue Department had to be filled up after getting the sanction of the English. The payment of 5 lakhs of rupees to the Company for maintenance of troops was to be continued along with the restriction on the Nawab's troops. Of course, the English were to trade customs free. A small present of 20 lakhs of rupees was also extorted for the sake of the members of the Calcutta Government.

When these arrangements were well nigh complete, Lord Clive touched at Madras. He heard of the death of Meer Jaffer and nothing of what had happened later. So "he was delighted at the news" and planned to "set up a six-year old grandson of Meer Jaffer and rule in his name, the sovereignty of the English being hidden from the public eye.'[71] But when he reached Calcutta, he was enraged at the corruption of his coreligionists, forgetting that imitation is but the most sincere form of flattery. Clive did not succeed in making them disgorge their ill-gotten wealth; for

many resigned the service and, returning home, started an agitation against Clive himself.

Clive had been sent out to reform the abuses of which the servants of the Company were guilty in carrying on their private trade and to clean in his own words, "the Augean stable." So, soon after his arrival, he wrote to his employers about "the unwarrantable acquisition of riches," which had "introduced luxury in every shape and in its most pernicious excess." "There was nothing that bore the form of government." The army showed utter lack of discipline. "Riches, the bane of discipline, were daily promoting the ruin of our army." Soldiers were allowed to plunder and pocket the booty realised. He reported also the refined brutality which the English practised on the Indians through their numberless agents and subagents.

Clive's one great plan was to secure for the Company the Diwany of Bengal and rule with a puppet on the throne, like Dupliex, or the Peshwas or the Nawab Vizier. So, he proceeded to Allahabad to meet the Emperor, still living there under Shah Shuja's protection. On his way, he met Mohammed Reza Khan and won him over to his schemes. He joined General Carnac at Benares and, threatening Shah Shuja with renewal of hostilities, forced out of him Allahabad and Corah, along with a large sum for expenses incurred in the war. Shah Alam met Clive on the 9th August, 1765, and that was the occasion when he tolled the death-knell of his own Empire by signing the grant of the Dewany of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa to the East India Company. There is reason to suspect from the findings of the Parliamentary Committee of 1773 appointed to inquire into the incident that the grant was extorted from a helpless man. Elphinstone admits that "there are few transactions

in our Indian history more difficult to explain than this treaty." The author of the Seir says that the Emperor and the Vizier "were obliged to grant the request, although reluctantly."[72]

The Company became, therefore, Diwan. "The allowance for the support of the Nawab's dignity and power and the tribute to His Majesty must be regularly paid ; the remainder belongs to the Company",[73] and this without any responsibility to defend the country or maintain peace! Clive said: "there will still be a Nabob with an allowance suitable for his dignity and the territorrial jurisdiction will still be in the chiefs of the country"—like Shitab Rai and Mahomed Reza Khan—"acting under him and the Presidency in conjunction, though the revenues will belong to the Government." Clive's scheme was not to undertake the direct civil administration of the land, for native officers were cheaper and more honest and efficient. He feared also the disfavour of the people and of the French, Dutch and Danes. Moderation, as a policy, was also a necessity. This double system of government produced the worst possible results.

At about this time, Nawab Najim-ud-daulah died under very suspicious circumstances. While returning after a complimentary visit to Clive in company with Mohammed Reza Khan, "he was assaulted by some sharp pains in his bowels which finding no vent at all became so excruciating that the young Nawab on his alighting at his palace departed this life".[74] The general report charged Reza Khan strongly and Verelst mentions a rumour current in Calcutta that it was the result of foul play on the part of Clive.[75] Nor was Clive a friend of the young man. He had described him to the Directors as "a man with little abilities and less education," as "mean, weak and ignorant" and

as "the issue of a prostitute." The Company also benefited largely by his death, for the allowance made to maintain the military establishment of the Nawab was reduced from 55 lakhs to about 40. With the death of Najum-ud-daulah, the semblance of the Nawab's power disappears from the annals of Bengal. From henceforth, the history of Bengal is interwoven with the names of governors of the English race.

Either through incapacity or unpopularity, Clive did not do much to fulfil his mission. His countrymen looked upon him as a moral leper[76] and as unscrupulous and selfish. He did not abolish the notorious inland trade but made matters worse by granting the monopoly of the salt trade to the servants of the Company, allowing them to charge the exorbitant duty of 35 per cent—thus oppressing the Indians for the benefit of his own compatriots. With a curious notion of finance, he reduced the tax on such luxuries as betel and tobacco. All his reforms were calculated for "present applause" rather than for "permanent advantage."[77] After feathering his own nest and that of his countrymen, Lord Clive left India for good in 1767. His suicide was attributed by some to the prickings of his guilty conscience at the memory of his several crimes.

Mr. Verelst succeeded Clive but resigned after 2 years. Mr. Cartier, his successor, had to make room in 1772 to Warren Hastings. During these 5 years, no political event of any momentous consequence happened in India. Bengal was passing through a period of great misery under the double yoke imposed by Clive and the rapacity of English traders. The Company's factors were ruining Bengal industries in various reprehensible ways and when Bolts freely criticised their methods he was promptly deported from India. Wheeler

writes that "during three years, the exports of bullion from Bengal exceeded five millions sterling whilst the imports of bullion were little more than half a million."[78] The Governor, Verelst, complained: "It is in this situation the Court of Directors and the nation in general have been induced to expect prodigious remittances in species from a country which produces little gold and no silver." The author of the Seir writes: "Lacs piled upon lacs have therefore been drained out of the country."[79] An epidemic of small-pox also caused great mortality, without distinction of age, sex or creed. Unfortunately, at such a juncture, a drought also happened which would surely not have produced famine but for the misdeeds of the Company's agents, who stored up rice in order to make an unholy profit out of the miseries of the people. Thus, in Bengal, the change of masters was not fortunate for the land.

The Administration of Warren Hastings

No period of British Indian history is so well-known as the 13 years during which Warren Hastings presided over Indian affairs; but this is an indirect result of his Impeachment, which revealed many shady transactions. Had he brought any territory under the jurisdiction of England, it is highly probable even Burke might not have taken such pains to attack him; for he eloquently asked: "Has he enlarged the boundary of our Government? No; there are but too strong proofs of his lessening it."[80] But Warren Hastings did the great work of consolidating the Empire which Clive had formed by forgery and fraud.

Hastings's first task in Bengal was to destroy every trace of the Native government. Reducing the Nawab into a mere puppet, Clive had vested all power in two Naibs at Murshidabad and Patna, Mahomed Reza Khan and Shitab Rai. Though these two creatures of the English were systematically loyal and "wholly occupied" in "thoughts of keeping the individuals of that nation in good humour,"[81] Warren Hastings arrested them on trumped up charges and, after receiving large sums of money, acquitted them. Reza Khan was not reinstated, while Shitab Roy died soon of a broken heart. No successor was appointed to the Naibship. Maharaja Nandkumar, who was Hastings's tool in accusing the Naibs, was disappointed and disgraced. Thus by one stone, Hastings killed many birds—dissolved the double system of Government, damaged Nandkumar's reputation, got

rid of the two Naibs and enriched himself with 'ten lakhs' and even more. Again, Hastings removed the Civil and Criminal Courts to Calcutta. He reduced the allowance to the Nawab and cancelled the tribute to Shah Alam on his removal to Delhi in 1771. He wrested Allahabad and Corah from Shah Alam for the Vizier, though, as Mill writes, generosity and justice spoke on the side of the forlorn Emperor. But "the calls of want and the heavy attraction of gold"[82] turned the balance.

Hastings turned his attention to foreign affairs. He entered into a contract with the Vizier, for a consideration of 40 lakhs, to exterminate the Rohillas. According to J. H. Clarke, "there is no other instance of a civilised power entering into a war with the avowed object of destroying a people with which it had no quarrel."[83]

Next year, Warren Hastings was made Governor-General and he was to be assisted by a Council of five. The most praiseworthy of these Councillors was Sir Philip Francis, than whom India has had no truer friend among the British race. He had for some time the majority of the Council with him and, realising the rottenness of the administration, he encouraged all to bring to light the corrupt practices of Hastings. Maharaja Nandkumar's letter, charging Hastings with bribery, was placed on the Council table, but the Governor-General indignantly denied the authority of his Council and brought a counter-charge of forgery against his accuser in the Supreme Court at Calcutta presided over by his school-fellow and bosom friend Sir Elijah Impey. The Maharaja was tried, convicted and hanged—though the Court itself had been created 3 years after the date of the alleged crime and though, by no twisting of the law, could Nandkumar be proved to have ever

become subject to the English law which punished forgery with death. Shades of Lord Clive!

Hastings could now breathe freely—thanks to Sir Elijah. It is not necessary to enumerate here all his misdoings, since they are found in most books and since subsequent chapters will reveal some. That he was griping and goldthirsty has been admitted by many British authors like Talboys Wheeler. Colebrooke writes of the unbounded misery of the people under his rule. He refers to his 'crooked politics' and 'shameless breach of faith'—his deposition of Zemindars, plundering of Begums, extermination of innocent tribesmen—"the stretching of the land rents to the utmost sum they can produce." No wonder Colebrooke was forced to exclaim that Warren Hastings's yoke was "the heaviest that ever conquerors put upon the necks of conquered nations." The best account of his rule is that by Mr. Torrens in his "Empire in Asia—how we came by it. A Book of Confessions"—a cheap reprint of which is now available.

———

The Rise of the Marathas and the First Maratha War

The Marathas were a great nation since the remotest periods of history. Huien Tsang speaks of their sleepless revenge and their over-powering sympathy when face to face with distress. The Muslim conquest and rule had beneficent effects upon the Hindus, since high posts were always open to merit and intelligence. The Muslims were never as bad rulers as the European historians have painted them. According to Ibn Batuta, the Marathas were very cultured and skilled in the arts, medicine and astrology. The Muslim rulers of the Deccan had to propitiate them in sheer self-defence.

Shivaji was the founder of the Maratha Empire. Though illiterate, he was neither a freebooter nor a plunderer. He had the enthusiasm and idealism of Mazzini, the military genius of Garibaldi and the statesmanship of Cavour, while the noble qualities which he displayed as king of the Marathas have hardly been surpassed by any monarch either before or after him. He is regarded as an incarnation of God, since he was instrumental in checking the Moghul advance into the Deccan. He united the Marathas 'for a higher purpose.' Above all, he was intensely religious, being a very fervent disciple of Saint Rama Das. Tenderness and humanity ennobled all his wars, while honour towards women distinguished his whole life. Mr. Ranade has given a very illuminating account of his life in his "Rise of the Maratha Power."

Shivaji's Board of Administration consisted of

eight members—the Peshwa or the Prime Minister, the Senapati or Commander-in-chief, the Amatya, Sachiv, Mantri or Foreign Secretary, the Pandit Rao, in charge of the ecclesiastical department and the Nyayadhish or chief Justice—and was therefore called the Ashtapradhan. This system has its counterpart in the present constitution of the Government of India. Another great reform of Shivaji was the refusal to bestow jaghirs for civil or military service. Everyone was directed to draw his fixed salary in kind or money from the public treasury or granaries. Shivaji's idea of demanding Chauth and Sardesmukhi has been condemned by European writers and compared to the levying of blackmail by the robber chiefs of Scotland. But, since the Marathas undertook to protect those who paid them against foreign aggression by maintaining troops for that purpose, Ranade points out that their levy resembles more the subsidiary system of Wellesley.

Shivaji's son was barbarously tortured and executed by Aurangazeb, while his grandson Shivaji, nicknamed Sahoo, was rendered idiotic and weak, probably by the administration of *pousta* (described by Bernier as a slow poision administered by the Emperor to refractory nobles and dangerous subjects). Sahoo had also become loose in morals and so his ministers thought it proper to limit his authority to Satara alone, conferring the powers of Government on the Peshwa Balaji Vishwanath. Thus the Peshwas were saviours rather than confiscators of the Maratha Empire, and under them, its dominions were extended from sea to sea and from the Himalayas to the Cape.

While the valour of Shivaji laid the foundations of the Maratha Empire, the imprudence and intrigue of Raghoonath Rao or Raghoba precipitated its

downfall. He was the brother of Balaji Baji Rao, the greatest of the Peshwas, and showed remarkable abilities as a soldier. He subdued the Moghuls, entered Delhi and Lahore and marched in triumph as far as Attock in the North. Thus by his rash expedition, he drew upon his nation the wrath of Ahmed Shah Abdali. On the fatal field of Panipat the Maratha confederacy was broken into pieces.

Raghoba's character found full scope in his dealings with the English. His brother died a few weeks after the disastrous news reached him and, during the minority of his nephew, Raghoba became the Regent. In order to stop a threatened invasion of the Nizam, Raghoba cast covetous eyes on European troops and arms and was prepared to sacrifice Salsette and Bassein for them ; but, fortunately, the attack did not take place. But he concluded a treaty of perpetual friendship with the Company and placed the Seedee of Janjira, an Abyssinian pirate, under British protection. Freed from control, the Seedee commenced plundering Maratha villages.

When Madhoo Row came of age, his relations with his uncle grew strained and Raghoba was kept in confinement. "This excellent prince"[84] died at the age of 28, leaving no children but nominating his brother as his successor and his uncle as guardian. Raghoba got Narain Row, his ward, assassinated on 30th August, 1773. Mr. Mostyn, the British envoy at Poona, who was very probably at the bottom of the entire plot, reported to Bombay that Raghoba had proclaimed himself Peshwa. But several Maratha statesmen,—Nana Fadnavis, foremost among them all—realised the national danger and rallied round the posthumous son of their murdered lord.

Balaji Janardan Bhanu alias Nana Fadnavis was a high class nobleman. While yet in his

teens, he had accompanied Sadashes Row Bhow to Panipat as one of his secretaries with the idea of making a pilgrimage to the holy places of the North after the battle. He lost his mother and wife in the route and travelled to Poona on foot and in disguise. Panipat made such a terrible impression on his mind that he devoted his life to the consolidation of the Maratha nation. He took service in Poona as a secretary and rose to be the Prime Minister. He shrank from 'the political embrace' of the English and was steadily against their offers of armed assistance.

Finding Poona too hot, Raghoba fled to the Gaekwar. The Bombay Government, on the strength of Mr. Mostyn's representations, disputed the authenticity of the birth of the posthumous son and so Raghoba formed a hybrid alliance at Surat with the Bombay Council by which he promised them the two islands of Salsette and Bassein and a portion of Surat province on his installation on the Musnud. The Directors of the Company had written to Bombay as early as 1768: "We recommend to you, in the strongest manner, to use your endeavours upon every occasion that may offer to obtain these places (the two islands) which we should esteem a valuable acquisition."[85] Mr. Mostyn arrived from England in 1772 with special instructions to secure 'the coveted spots' by "fomenting domestic dissensions"[86] at the Maratha capital.

The Treaty of Surat led to the First Maratha War. Lt. Colonel Keating was sent "for the assistance of Raghoba against all his enemies." The Poona army under Hari Pant Phurkay met Raghoba and his allies near Arras in an indecisive battle. The coming of the monsoon and the defection of the Gaekwar compelled Hari Pant to recross the Nerbuddah and retreat towards Poona.

The Gaekwars were valiant commanders of the

Maratha Army who had established themselves in and around Baroda. After Panipat, they declared themselves freed of allegiance to the Raja of Satara. A prolonged war of succession between four brothers was ruining the land when Raghoba fled to Guzerat and so Colonel Keating attempted to fish in the troubled waters. He sent an officer to the camp of Futih Sing, one of the rivals; the envoy was luckily insulted and thus an opportunity was afforded for reprisals. The Bombay Government now took up the matter in earnest and sent Mr. Mostyn, of worthy memory, to Baroda, since he was a past master in the art of duplicity alias diplomacy. Of course, Mostyn succeeded in putting the idiotic Sayajee Rao on the throne with Futih Sing as Regent, getting for the Company in return for its troubles "the government and revenue" of three purgunnahs around Surat and Broach.

The Government of Bombay had waged war and concluded treaties without the knowledge and consent of the Governor-General at Calcutta. Sir Philip Francis, the redoubtable champion of the Indians, knew the character of Raghoba and Mostyn only too well and so, having the majority of the Council on his side, he called for an account of the affairs in Bombay. After a delay of 24 days, a meagre and vague reply was sent; but it was enough to prove the iniquity of their transactions. So, the Supreme Council asked that the troops be withdrawn, the treaty rescinded and all negotiations suspended. On the 18th July, 1775, they sent Colonel Upton as their own agent to Poona.

Upton arrived at Purandhar, where the Poona ministers were staying, but, when conversations began, he too insisted on Salsette and Bassein. His mission was therefore vehemently resented, since the request was highly inconsistent. Warren Hastings

had now regained power and he began preparations for a large war. For some inexplicable reasons, in June, 1776, Nana Fadnavis and others agreed to most of the proposals of the Supreme Committee. They agreed to cede Salsette and make ample provision for Raghoba. The Bombay Government felt insulted at this Treaty of Purandhar and appealed to the Court of Directors, who, with the true business instinct, supported the more profitable treaty of Surat. So, Mr. Mostyn was once more selected for Poona, in spite of the opposition of many of the ministers.

It was not long before Mr. Mostyn discovered that the French were influencing affairs at Poona! A certain M. St. Lubin had arrived there and, sure enough, proposed to bring 25,000 Europeans to support the ministry and to train 10,000 sepoys! Nana was reputed to be jealous of all Europeans and never to trust any of them; but yet this rumour was exaggerated into a huge bogey. Mr. Mostyn also succeeded in fomenting dissensions between the ministers Sakharam Bapoo, Nana Fadnavis and his cousin Moroba. Through his machinations, Moroba became chief minister in the place of Nana and immediately requested the English to reinstate Raghoba in Poona. Warren Hastings was overjoyed at the turn of events and in spite of the opposition of Francis and Colonel Upton, he gave orders that Colonel Leslie should march to Bombay traversing the dominions of independent princes.

Hastings had another motive also in mind, equally sinister and selfish. The Raja of Satara died leaving no issue and so, Hastings incited Moodajee Bhonslay, the Regent of Berar, who was descended from a branch of the House of Shivaji, to claim the throne. Meanwhile, the wheel of Poona politics had undergone another revolution.

Affairs were once more in the hands of Nana of whom Mr. J. Sullivan wrote: "give us Nana Fadnavis and such like. What poor pygmies we are as Indian administrators when compared with natives of that stamp!"

Nana Fadnavis realised that the Bengal force, though ostensibly directed against "French designs on the West Coast", were aimed at the Maratha power. So, he drove away St. Lubin from Poona and prepared to meet the gathering storm. Mr. Mostyn died about this time, entitled to the everlasting gratitude of his countrymen but with no biography or bust or statue to immortalise his glorious name in the annals of his country's history—though Clive and Hastings, whose work was not more brilliant, have been honoured in many ways.

Before the arrival of the Bengal Army, the Bombay Government despatched troops under Colonel Egerton with Raghoba to Poona. The Maratha forces were arrayed at Tallygaon, 18 miles from Poona, under their able and tried leaders the Holkar and the Sindhia. At the sight of these sturdy highlanders the British officers became panic-stricken and though they had provisions for more than a fortnight, resolved upon a precipitate retreat to Bombay itself! The Marathas cut off their retreat and captured their guns and baggage. Hence, the members of the Field Committee agreed to deliver Raghoba and surrender all recent cessions but, as Mr. Carnac said, "under a mental reservation"! They were also to send an order countermanding the advance of the Bengal troops, but as soon as they returned to Bombay, they took care to cancel the order. Admirable honesty! Raghoba along with the two English hostages were kept in the custody of the Sindhia.

Col. Leslie was opposed in his march by the independent princes of Bundelkhand and, since his progress was slow, his impatient master appointed Col. Goddard in his stead. Fortunately, he did not survive to receive the intelligence of his disgrace. Col. Goddard gained over the Nawab of Bhopal and was given a free passage through Berar. On receipt of intelligence regarding the disaster to the Bombay troops, he marched to Surat and, authorised by the Supreme Government to press for a renewal of the Treaty of Purandar with an additional clause regarding the French, began negotiations with Poona. Warren Hastings too tried to create dissensions among the Maratha confederates, especially the Sindhia and the Holkar.

It is necessary to digress a little and trace the growth of these two principalities. When at the beginning of the 18th century, Asaf-Jah, the Governor of Malwa, invaded the Deccan, the Emperor appointed a Hindu governor for the province. Balaji Vishawnath seized the opportunity and parcelled out the province into two military fiefs for his faithful followers, Ranoji Scindia and Malharjee Holkar. Ranoji was a private trooper in his service whose duty was to take care of his master's slippers. It is related that on one occasion when the Peshwa had a long interview with the Raja, Ranoji became weary and fell asleep but even in his sleep he held the slippers in both hands clasped to his breast. The Peshwa was of course much pleased with his conduct and raised him to the Governorship of the Northern half of Malwa. When Ranoji died without legitimate issue, the bastard Madhava Rao got possession of his father's fief. The English extol Madhoji as a great soldier and statesman but this is only because he played into

English hands and paved the way for the establishment of their supremacy. H. G. Keene writes that his illegitimacy "caused him to conceive a prejudice against his countrymen and to show a strong preference to foreigners."[87] Warren Hastings did not find any favour with the Holkar's State where Ahalya Bai was striving for the independence and welfare of her dominions with greater strenuousness even than her contemporary, Catherine of Russia.

On a promise of the district of Broach and forty-one thousand rupees, Sindhia connived at the escape of Raghoba and the two English hostages from his custody. The fact was, he had already begun to grow jealous of Nana's power and had a private scheme of his own—Raghoba to retire towards Jhansi, leaving Poona under the joint control of his young son and the Sindhia. To his immense mortification, these selfish proposals were rejected by Goddard, who went to the length of even attacking the Sindhia's camp and driving his men in hot pursuit. Warren Hastings induced the Rana of Gohud to join Col. Popham in capturing Gwalior, which fell before their combined attack in 1780. Col. Carnac invaded his territory and ravaged it from end to end. The humiliation of the traitor was now complete.

Nana was thoroughly disgusted with the perfidious character of the English. He sent a message to Goddard that the surrender of Salsette and the person of Raghoba were essential preliminaries to any treaty negotiations. So, Goddard, with the advice of the Bombay Government, put his army in a state of readiness to take the offensive. Nana Fadnavis tried to unite the different princes of India against English aggression. He invited the Nizam, Hyder Ali, the Nawab of Arcot and even the Emperor of Delhi. He told the latter,

"The ways of the Europeans are unfair and wily. It is their custom at first to ingratiate themselves with the Indian princes, show them the advantages of their alliance and then put the prince himself into prison and seize his kingdom...You should therefore put down the Europeans, which course alone will preserve the dignity of the princes of this country. Otherwise, the European foreigners will seize the kingdoms on land and occupy the whole country." This attempt at a great coalition of powers along with the defeat of the Madras forces by Hyder and another failure to capture Poona, the heart of the Empire,—this time by Goddard, greatly disheartened the English.

Moodajee Bhonsle refused to mediate for terms but, in order to save himself from utter ruin, Madhoji offered his services. After prolonged negotiations, the Treaty of Salbye was concluded in 1782 and ratified by Nana Fadnavis on hearing of the death of Hyder. All territories captured by the British after the Treaty of Purandhar were surrendered; Raghoba was given a pension of 25,000 rupees; Gwalior was restored to Madhoji Sindhia. Thus ended the First Maratha War in which Nana had eclipsed the statesmanship of Hastings. It was a glorious triumph for the Marathas and had Nana's advice been followed by the chieftains of the Maharashtra, the Empire founded by Shivaji the Great, would have been established on a more secure and permanent basis.

Hyder Ali

In establishing their Empire in India, the English had to fight all their important battles with the Hindus—Marathas, Jats, Gurkhas, Sikhs. But there is one great exception to this general rule, Hyder Ali. Hyder's greatgrandfather was a Fakir settled at Gulbarga and his younger son migrated to Kolar in Mysore and died in 1678, leaving four sons, the youngest of whom was the celebrated Ruler of Mysore. Hyder's father had entered the Mysore army and had risen to the rank of a Faujdar, receiving a jagir for his loyal services. The Mysore Rajas in those days had resigned all their power to ministers like Deoraj and Nanjeraj who supported the French in their struggle with the English. Mysore troops helped the French in Trinchinopoly and Hyderabad. As a soldier, Hyder took part in plundering the Nizam and paid a visit to Pondicherry, where he admired the discipline of the French troops and the skill of their engineers. In 1755, Nanjeraj appointed him as the Faujdar or military governor of Dindigul. He constructed at Dindigul a great factory to prepare cannon and ammunition with the aid of French workmen.

Since he was totally illiterate, Hyder employed a Maratha Brahmin named Khande Rao as his Secretary. Through his instrumentality, the Queen mother tried to induce Hyder to liberate her son from the control of the ministers. Hyder eagerly snatched at the opportunity but, for the Raja, it was only an exchange of King Log for King Stork. The disappointed Khande Rao invited the Marathas

to punish the treason but, bofore long, the Maratha forces were called away to Poona as a result of the Panipat disaster. Hence, Hyder captured Khande Rao and kept him in an iron cage. Henceforth, the Raja was a non-entity in Mysore politics and Hyder became the virtual ruler of Mysore. Hyder strengthened his position by taking advantage of a dispute between two rivals for the Raja-ship of Bednur. He supported one claimant, captured Bednur and made himself master of the kingdom.

From 1767 till his death in 1782, Hyder was engaged in several actions with the English and he proved the most formidable enemy whom they had ever encountered in India. The brilliancy of his achievements dazzled his enemies. The English were the aggressors ; for, in 1767 they invaded his territory Baramahal, after inducing the Nizam and the Nawab of Arcot to desert him. Hyder's Commander, Fazl-ulla-khan easily recaptured the few forts taken by the English. The Madras Government became alarmed and sent Cap. Brooke to offer terms of peace. But Hyder replied : "I am coming to the gates of Madras and I will there listen to the propositions the Governor and Council may have to make." In three days and a half he covered the distance of 130 miles—a wonderful feat of military skill and leadership—and appeared suddenly on St. Thomas' Mount, five miles from Madras. The English were struck with consternation. With great magnanimity and generosity Hyder refrained from capturing the city but allowed the English to conclude a treaty by which a mutual restitution of conquests was made and an alliance in defensive wars concluded. The British, in order to widen the breach between Hyder and the Nawab of Arcot, granted Hyder the district of Karur, which belonged to Arcot. The

British never intended to fulfil the terms of the treaty when they concluded it. The Court of Directors condemned the Madras Government for courting disaster and making the East India stock fall 60 per cent.

An occasion soon arrived to test the faith of the English. Hyder was engaged in wars with the Marathas in none of which he was able to vanquish the sturdy highlanders of the Daccan. So when they invaded his dominion for the fourth time in 1772 he demanded, under the treaty, help from Madras. He even went to the length of revealing to the foreigners Nana Fadnavis's plan of a great combination of powers against them, but the English refused assistance. Hyder exhibited his want of statesmanship in not entering into an alliance with Nana Fadnavis even though the Marathas agreed to reduce the chauth paid to the Peshwa's government and to allow him to keep certain districts that had been pledged to them. He had not the large vision, foresight and imagination of a real statesman.

Since the English violated their solemn agreement, Hyder turned his attention to them, after his return from a conquering expedition to Coorg. He dismissed with insults the missionary Schwartz and the English envoy Mr. Gray. Then in July, 1780, he swooped down upon the Carnatic. Wherever he went he was hailed as a deliverer because the people had been extremely oppressed and their minds completely alienated by the sort of government that had been established in that country by the Nawab with the help of the English. The Madras Government roused themselves from their torpor and directed Col. Harper from Guntur and Col. Braithwaite from Pondicherry to proceed towards Madras. With his large force and superior tactics and the able generalship, not

of himself only, but of distinguished French officers like M. Lally, he could have succeeded in driving out the English from Southern India.

But such was not the will of providence. And so it happened that Hyder committed a mistake which enabled Braithwaite to reach Madras. Warren Hastings purchased the alliance of the Nizam by a promise of the district of Guntur and made him jealous of Hyder's success by a false rumour that the Emperor had promised to make Hyder the viceroy of the Daccan !

Meanwhile, Hyder utterly routed the Guntur force, capturing Sir David Baird and Col. Baillie as prisoners and killing about 700 Englishmen. This disaster was the most fatal that had ever overtaken the English in India. Hastings immediately sent 15 lakhs of rupees and a large force under Sir Eyre Coote to Madras. He also put an end to the Maratha War. Sir Eyre Coote "drew a picture in the darkest colours, not only of the weak and disastrous condition into which the country was brought, but of the negligence and incapacity, if not the corruption and guilt, of those servants of the Company under whose mismanagement such misfortunes had arrived." So, a quarrel naturally ensued between Coote and the Madras Government and Sir Eyre left for Bengal. Hyder had not yet been vanquished. He was in the zenith of his fame when, fortunately for the British, he died on the 7th December, 1782.

The death of Hyder was a great loss to the Mysoreans as well as the Marathas. The treaty of Salbye was not notified by Nana Fadnavis until he lost all hopes by Hyder's success. Though an illiterate Muslim and a great soldier, he was altogether free from fanaticism. He appointed Hindus like Purnea and Krishna Rao to the high posts in the administration and he had never any

cause to regret his choice. He was a born soldier an excellent rider and skilful alike with his sword and his gun. As a soldier, Hyder in his lifetime was without any equal in India and without many in the world. He was the only Indian prince of his time who organised and maintained a navy for the defence of his coast-line.

But no greater mistake can be committed than that of comparing Hyder to Shivaji or Nana Fadnavis. His statesmanship was not of a high order. He was an upstart and a usurper who tried to impose his will upon others and depended on outside help. He also committed a great mistake in not joining Nana Fadnavis and fighting the foreign danger. Again, he placed confidence in unfaithful Frenchmen, to whom he gave offices of trust and responsibility in his army. Even during his life, he had every reason to be dissatisfied with their conduct. He rose from the rank of a private soldier to that of a general and then an independent sovereign whose name inspired terror and respect in the minds of the English.

Rise of the Nizam's Dynasty

The Nizam was the first servant of the Moghul Emperor to deal the death-blow at his master's supremacy. He was a traitor to his sovereign and his country and his rise was due to treachery, intrigue and cunning. After the death of Aurangzeb, the Said brothers became king-makers, sincerely desirous, like Cromwell, to save the Empire from impending ruin. A Turani nobleman, called Chin-Kilich Khan (the Nizam-ul-mulk), was the Governor of Moradabad when the brothers were guiding the ship of state in the name of the Emperor Ferokh Siar. For some crime, Chin-Kilich Khan was deprived of his office and so he conspired against the ascendancy of the Saids. On account of the power of Hussain Ali Khan, the Viceroy of the Deccan—the younger Said—the conspirators failed and the elder brother became Vizier or Protector of the Empire. The Said Vizier showed remarkable statesmanship by abolishing the poll-tax renewed by Aurangzeb. He also appointed Chin-Kilich Khan, who had been won over by him, as Governor of Malwa, in 1720.

As soon as he became Viceroy in Malwa, "he turned his attention towards increasing the number of his troops, filling his magazines, exercising his officers and soldiers and making new acquisitions in the district of Chanderi"[88] and began intrigues in the Imperial Court. Therefore, it was proposed to transfer him to Multan, Khandesh or Allahabad. At this he "resolved to display openly the standard of revolt"[89] and in the war that ensued,

Hussain Ali Khan was slain and the Vizier imprisoned. Nizam-ul-mulk became thus the Viceroy of the Deccan also. He proceeded in 1722 towards Delhi in triumph and the helpless Emperor created him Vizier and gave him the Viceroyalty of Guzerat also. Though now the greatest man in the Empire, he was singularly devoid of statesmanlike qualities. He was a consummate hypocrite and so was very unpopular all round. Hence, he resigned his office of Vizier and proceeded towards the Deccan. The Emperor, while accepting his resignation, gave him the office of Vakil-i-Muttak and the title Asaf Jah.

He repaid all these acts of kindness by black ingratitude. He asked the Governor of Guzerat to ravage imperial territories with the help of the Maratha leaders Sillaji and Kantaji, so, Guzerat and Malwa were taken away from him and granted to Hindu nobles. Asaf Jah invited Baji Rao Peshwa to attack these provinces. The Hindu governors of these provinces, in significant contrast with the disloyal Muslim Viceroys, tried their utmost to repel the invasions. The author of the Seir says: "Raja Giridhar (Viceroy of Malwa) would not suffer his country to be ravaged ; and being an officer of character, he engaged Baji Rao several times, after having in vain requested assistance from the capital. His repeated representations to the throne and to the ministers availed nothing, and that brave man, having wasted his small force in endless skirmishes, at last fell himself in one of them."[90] Here is a lesson for the rulers of India who should follow the policy of the ancient Romans and of the Moghuls and repose confidence in the Indians by entrusting them with all the high offices of the State, for that is the only way to safeguard the Empire.

Nizam-ul-mulk is also suspected of having instigated Nadir Shah to invade Hindustan, through his relative the Viceroy of Cabul. When Nadir's troops were ravaging the North, he did not go to the assistance of the Emperor and his loyal nobles like Saadat Khan. As soon as Nadir Shah returned to his country, he declared his independence, transferred his capital from Aurangabad to Hyderabad and was busy in strengthening his power in the Deccan. At last in 1748, death put an end to his treacheries at the reputed age of 104. He was succeeded by Nasir Jung and it was this succession which brought about the first conflict between the French and the English in India.

The Rise of the Oude Principality

The history of Oude can well be compared to the rising and disappearance of a great and ominous comet. It rose and became independent of the paramount Moghul power by means of treachery and never did any good either to the Indian people or to the Moghul Emperor. On the contrary, it materially contributed to the growth of the British power in India not only by means of intrigues but by furnishing assistance in money and men. Sir Henry Lawrence says that it was "periodically used as a wet-nurse to relieve the difficulties of the East India Company's finances."[91] Again, Oude supplied "the best disciplined infantry in India. Three fourths of the Bengal Native Infantry come from Oude and recruiting parties from Bombay are sometimes seen to the East of the Ganges."[92] So the debt of the English to Oude can never be estimated.

Saadat Khan, the founder of the Principality, was a native of Persia who came into prominence during the tangled conspiracies against the Said brothers at Delhi. The Emperor, freed from the brothers, gave him the Viceroyalty of Oude. He was a capable administrator and so, he soon reduced the refractory spirits in Oude and greatly increased the revenue. The aggrandisement of his own family was his one supreme object in life. Sir Henry Lawrence believes that he had also joined in the invitation to Nadir Shah but the Seir-ul-Mutakhareen does not impute any treachery to him. When Nadir Shah actually invaded Hindustan, Saadat Khan went out to

fight with him. Saadat Khan died comparatively young at the age of 50 leaving only a daughter. His two nephews Sher Jung and Sufder Jung contested the principality, and Nadir Shah, who was then in Delhi, chose Sufder Jung mainly because he had paid him a nuzzer of two millions sterling. When Nizam-ul-mulk resigned the office of Vizier, Sufder Jung was made Nawab Vizier and he sustained for some time the tottering authority of the King of Delhi. Sufder died in 1754 and was succeeded by his son Shuja-ud-daula, whom we have already met many times in connection with the growth of the British power in Bengal.

Sir John Macpherson

After this account of the rise of Hyder Ali, the Nizam and the Nawab of Oude—necessary for a clear understanding of the history of the relations of the British with them—, we can resume our narrative. Sir John Macpherson, who officiated as Governor-General of India on the departure of Warren Hastings, was first employed as Secretary to the Nawab of Arcot. Flattered and cajoled by the English from George III downwards, the Nawab took every opportunity to please them with costly presents and grants of land. Lord Macartney, for example, was once offered £30,000 as a present during a ceremonial visit.[93] At last, Macpherson was asked by the Nawab to plead his cause in England, supported by liberal bribes to Directors and Cabinet ministers. Nothing came, however, of his attempts except an appointment for him as a writer in Madras. He was dismissed in 1776 but he created such an agitation over his dismissal that the Company promoted him to the rank of Member of the Supreme Council at Calcutta ![94] Thus on the departure of Hastings, he was enabled to become the Governor-General. But, he was not made Governor-General for long, because, as Lord Cornwallis wrote, he was notorious for "ill-earned money", "flimsy cunning," "shameless falsehoods," "mean jobbing and peculation" "duplicity and low intrigues."[95] Even after his retirement, his election to parliament was cancelled on the ground of bribery. "Between 50 and 60 of his supporters had been convicted of that offence and 82 actions had been brought against him which he avoided by going abroad" ! At last, he was found guilty of bribery and fined £3000.[96] Such was the character of one of the Governors-General of India.

Lord Cornwallis.

1786—1793.

Lord Cornwallis was offered the Governor-Generalship of India as early as 1782 but he declined it because he wanted to be an autocrat independent of his Council. After the defeat of the Coalition Ministry, on the question of Fox's India Bill, Pitt came to power and his Bill of 1784 established a Board of Control to superintend the affairs of the Company. Even this new Act did not satisfy Cornwallis. So another law (26 Geo. III c.26) was passed by which the Governor-General could act without the consent of his Council and even against its opinion.

He was an Irishman and came to India to retrieve a blasted reputation. He had surrendered at Yorktown to Washington and lost the American colonies. He was not a great man and had no strong principles. He was a reputed drunkard[97] and his character was not above suspicion. The ministers at home wanted to establish an Empire in the East to compensate for the loss of that in the West, and so he was given 'a chance'.

He was unsympathetic to Native princes from the very beginning. When Madhava Rao Sindhia, as guardian of the Delhi Emperor, demanded the customary tribute, he had the sense of justice and honour to refuse it. The Nawab of Oudh had been burdened by Hastings with British troops whose services he did not require. According to contract, he wanted that these should be withdrawn, but Cornwallis turned a deaf ear to his entreaties.

He was instructed by the Court of Directors to demand from the Nizam the surrender of the circar of Guntur. Cornwallis did not do this in a straightforward manner but "conveyed a body of troops to the neighbourhood of the Circar"[98] and sent Captain Kennaway to Hyderabad. Of course, Guntur was given back without a show of resistance.

But the greatest ambition of Cornwallis was to cross blades with Tipu. The English had suffered much at the hands of Hyder and his son and they were so terrified at Tipu that "English mothers scared their naughty children with his name."[99] The Governor-General was waiting for some convenient pretext to crop up. He deliberately violated the treaty concluded with Tipu in 1784 and in a treaty with the Nizam went to the length of omitting Tipu's name significantly in a list of the Company's allies! Colonel Wilks calls this treaty "a very intelligible offensive alliance."[100] Since by the Treaty of Mangalore Tipu was recognised as an ally of the Company, Cornwallis was guilty of bad faith and disobedience of Acts of Parliament. Moreover, he made friends with the Peshwa and the Bhonsla—who were enemies of the Mysore rulers. He made elaborate preparations for war and circulated wild stories regarding Tipu's barbarities, though they pale into insignificance in comparison with the cruelties of Europeans.

The immediate cause which led to the war was the allegation that Tipu was meditating an attack on the Raja of Travancore, an ally of the Company. Cornwallis would have suffered the swallowing up of Travancore and he would not have raised his little finger to save his ally had he not considered that defeating Tipu would retrieve his reputation and had he not also been promised assistance by the Marathas and the Nizam. Mr. Fox called this alliance "a plundering confederacy for the

extirpation of a lawful prince," for his allies were each promised a share in the booty.

Col. Wilks writes that Tipu was "unprepared for war" and Mr. Holland, ex-Governor of Madras, that "he had no intention to break with the Company." Tipu himself assured the English that he had no idea of invading Travancore and requested an amicable settlement by exchange of envoys. But Cornwallis was for taking advantage of the rare opportunity when the French were powerless to help Tipu and when a coalition had been laboriously prepared against him. General Meadows provoked Tipu by an insulting reply and commenced operations. But Tipu soon proved more than a match for him.

So, Cornwallis himself took the field. Bangalore was captured by assault and "a deplorable carnage"[101] of its inmates perpetrated. Tipu's letters for peace and agents were insultingly disregarded and the Governor-General proceeded to his capital, Seringapatam. Tipu sent him a present of fruit, which was returned untouched. The fact was, as Mill writes. the feelings of the English resembled more the rage and fury of savages than of civilised beings.[102] Plunder, promotion and glory could not be acquired by the paths of peace. A number of Europeans, especially Frenchmen, deserted Tipu. "Among them was a man named Blevette whose departure was a serious loss to the Sultan, as he possessed considerable skill in fortification."[103] Seringapatam was besieged and was very nearly fallen.

Just then, Nana Fadnavis and other Marathas put pressure upon the Governor-General to conclude peace. This was very fortunate for the Rajas of Mysore, under whom Mysore has to-day become a model State, for had Cornwallis destroyed Tipu, he would never have troubled himself

about the rightful sovereign of the state. By the Treaty of Seringapatam, 23d February, 1792, Tipu was forced to cede half his dominion, pay three crores of rupees and deliver two of his sons as hostages.

Cornwallis could now boast that for the first time, the British obtained some territory by conquest and not merely by fraud, diplomacy or intrigue. His war was very popular in England, where a loan of £500,000 was subscribed for its expenses, though it was against the Act of Parliament of 1784. He treated the Act "with uninterrupted contempt and received applause for every successful violation of it."[104]

His policy was to have India, not for Indians but for England. He excluded the children of the soil from all high offices in the government of the country. While the Indian princes were appointing European soldiers and officers, the English Company excluded Indians from all high appointments. The European civil servants of India were corrupt and incompetent and a disgrace to any government. So, Cornwallis enhanced their salary in order to improve them. As a result of this, Indians became mere "hewers of wood and drawers of water." "They continued in a state of dreary stagnation,"[105] for none but the lowest offices were bestowed upon the natives His so-called judicial reforms made the people more litigious and poor, for they rendered justice "unintelligible, tedious and expensive."[106] Perjury and forgery increased to an awful extent. The law courts became hot-beds of corruption. Curiously enough, the Government was not bound by any law.

Nor was he able to maintain law and order. Dacoities were prevalent with murders, burnings and excessive cruelties. "Volumes might be filled

with the atrocities of the dacoits, every line of which would make the blood run cold with horror."[107] There was no protection for person or property.

Lord Cornwallis is not entitled to any credit for enforcing measures of Permanent Revenue Settlement. "He was not, in any way, the author or originator of it."[108] The idea first originated with Sir Philip Francis and his "plan of finance was adopted with blind enthusiasm, with a sort of mechanical and irresistible impulse."[109] When he established the system, the assessments were very heavy and there was widespread default and sale of estates, so that within ten years "a complete revolution took place in the constitution and ownership of the estates."[110]

Thus in seven years, Cornwallis had retrieved his honour and become a Marquis; he was able to create so much faith in his powers that he was sent out for a second time to India. He confirmed the usurpation of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa; he conquered territories for his masters and expelled the French from India; he debased the natives and created anarchy by his judicial reforms. To call Cornwallis a man of "stern rectitude" or of "high principles' or of 'pacific intentions' is one of those falsehoods which unfortunately abound in the pages of Indian history written by the English.

Sir John Shore

In 1793, the Company's charter was renewed for twenty years. Since England was fighting the French Revolution, she wanted to show the world her pacific intentions; and so a new clause was inserted in the charter by the exertions of Sir Philip Francis that "to pursue schemes of conquest and extension of dominion in India are measures repugnant to the wish, the honour and the policy of this nation," etc. Yet, an agitation was started by the manufacturers of Manchester and Glasgow to ruin the cotton industry of India. Sir John Shore had the reputation of being sanctimonious in appearance and a lover of peace. So, he was chosen to succeed Cornwallis.

But really speaking, he was no lover of peace. He was the President of the Board of Revenue under Warren Hastings and one of his greatest friends. Edmund Burke strongly objected to his appointment and sent letters to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Company as well as to Mr. Dundas.[111]

At first, Sir John turned his attention to the improvement of Calcutta, its police, "its internal management, also for cleaning the streets, controlling sale of spirituous liquors, and other matters which contributed to the welfare of the community."[112] But Maratha affairs soon engaged his attention. Ahalya Bai had died, leaving the throne to the young and profligate Tookajee Holkar. He listened to the machinations of Mr. Malet, the envoy of the Company at Poona, and ravaged the territories of Madhoji Sindhia when he went on a visit to the

Peshwa. Mr. Malet, true to the principles of his predecessor Mr. Mostyn, wanted to "foment domestic dissensions" in order to get rid of the two tall poppies in the Maharashtra—Nana Fadnavis and the Scindhia. Of these, Madhoji was weakened by the Holkar's attacks and, at last, was waylaid by an armed gang employed for the purpose by Nana, as some versions relate, but more probably by Mr. Malet himself. Madhoji's death greatly gladdened the minds of all Englishmen, from Lord Cornwallis downwards.

Charles Malet wrote: "As long as Nana remained supreme at the Poona Court, they (the British) should never dream of obtaining a firm footing in the Mahratta kingdom." But, Nana could be removed only by his death, imprisonment or disgrace or by a change in the Peshwaship. On the 25th October, 1795, it is stated the Peshwa Madhoo Rao committed suicide by throwing himself down from the terrace of his palace, fracturing two of his limbs and surviving but for two days. Grant Duff writes that, though the Peshwa conducted the Dusserah festival with great eclat only three days earlier, "a fixed melancholy seized on his mind,"[113] but this is very improbable. Again, it is said that the Peshwa was "overwhelmed with anger, disappointment and grief," because Nana Fadnavis had kept his cousin Baji Rao, son of Raghoba, in too close confinement ! This reason will scarcely hold water, since Nana had been given full power and since the Peshwa himself many times insisted on his exercising such discretion. Moreover, Baji Rao deserved the punishment as a traitor. Again, those who deliberately commit suicide will generally choose only painless methods of death. So, if it is not due to accident, it must have been designed by Mr. Malet; for, ever since his birth, Madhoo Rao was the enemy

of the English standing in the way of Raghoba. The Bombay Government disputed his legitimacy and tacitly supported Baji Rao, son of Raghoba.

When Baji Rao became Peshwa, Nana's power declined. He tried to be at the helm of affairs by asking the widow of the late Peshwa to adopt a son, but this was revealed to Baji Rao by the Company's envoy and so, Nana had to run away from Poona and spend some years in captivity. Thus English influence became supreme among the Marathas.

Madhoji died in February, 1794 and was succeeded by Daulat Rao, who was very ambitious to combine the Marathas against the Nizam for paying off many old scores and to realise arrears of chauth amounting to over two crores. The Nizam was helpless; he shut himself up in Kurdla and had to surrender to the confederacy. The Nizan naturally resented the treachery of the English, who did not come to his help, and so he encouraged French officers like M. Raymond to train his troops. The protests of the Governor-General, the President and Governor of Bombay fell flat on the Nizam. So the English began to apprehend danger from that corner and they induced the Nizam's son Ali Jah to rebel against his father, The Nizam was compelled to ask for English help to put down his son and thus they forced him to accept all the measures proposed them. "Sir John Shore encouraged a set of English adventurers to go to Hyderabad and offer their services to the Nizam... and the corps they attempted to discipline remained but as an awkward sqad compared with the battalions the frenchmen had trained."[114]

Muhammad Ali, Nawab of Arcot, was very useful for the English because he assigned them territories yielding four and a half lakhs of pagodas

for their services in putting him upon the throne. Moreover, he showered gold and silver upon them on a lavish scale. A number of English adventurers like Paul Benfield and others gave him loans on high rates of compound interest for these purposes, and so when he died at the age of 79 in 1795, the amount of his liabilities was simply astounding. Lord Hobart, the Governor of Madras, tried to force upon his son Omdut-ul-Omrah a treaty by which the Company should get all the districts mortgaged for the payment of the instalments as well as some forts and the sovereignty over the Polygars. The Governor-General and his Council did not approve of this plunder and so nothing was done for the present.

The manner in which Sir John Shore dealt with Oudh was even more atrocious than that of Warren Hastings. He considered Oudh to be a "dependency on the English," "a gift from the Company," 'whatever its relations under treaties may be"! The subsidy of fifty lakhs was paid by the Vizier punctually and without complaint, but Sir John Shore compelled him by threats administered in person at Lucknow to add to this the expense of maintaining one European and one native regiment of cavalry, thus shamefully violating the engagement of Cornwallis not to increase the subsidy. They removed his minister Maharajah Jhaso Lall and, although guiltless of any crime, kept him as a state prisoner. Asaf-ud-daula took these so much to heart that he fell ill and refused medicine, exclaiming "There is no cure for a broken heart," leaving the Company "to improve the incident of a fresh succession."[115]

Vizier Ali, a natural son of Asaf succeeded to the musnud and was recognised by the Governor-

General and Resident. But shortly afterwards, Sir John Shore discovered in Benares a brother of the late Vizier, called Saadat Ali, who was "a more promising sponge to squeeze."[116] "Sir John now figured more in the light of an auctioneer"[117] for "the people seemed as it were sold to the highest bidder." Of course, Saadat Ali "cheerfully consented" to pay up all arears, to give up the forts of Allahabad and Futty Gurh with eleven lakhs of rupees for the cost of repairing them, to increase the annual subsidy from fifty-six to seventy-six lakhs, to pay all expenses of moving the Company's troops, besides a cash payment of twelve lakhs, and to banish from Oudh all Europeans, except the servants of the Company (!) so that the injustice might not get wind abroad. For all these services, the British Governor-General was given the title of Baron Teignmouth in 1797. Sir Henry Lawrence wrote in the *Calcutta Review* for January, 1845:—"Much as we admire Lord Teignmouth's domestic character, we are obliged entirely to condemn the whole tenor of Oudh negotiations. Historians have hitherto let him down slightly, but his Lordship may be judged by the same standard as other public officers; by the right or by the wrong that he committed, and not by his supposed motives or his private character."

The Marquess of Wellesley.

Richard Colley Wellesley, Earl of Mornington, better known as the Marquess of Wellesley, was born in Ireland in 1760. As a member of the Irish Parliament, he was a great admirer and friend of Grattan. In 1784, he came over to England and entered the House of Commons as a Liberal but, with the progress of the French Revolution, he became an enemy to all reform and his opinions became biassed. In 1793, he became a member of the Board of Control and studied Indian conditions with great energy and care. According to Mr. Hutton, his biographer, he had "the advantage of an intimate acquaintance with Lord Cornwallis". When Lord Teignmouth resigned, Pitt was not inclined to bestow the office on Lord Hobart, since he wanted a stronger and more daring officer. He selected Cornwallis again; but the rebellion which Pitt had provoked in Ireland and the hell he had let loose upon that land required Cornwallis's services. So, his choice fell on Lord Mornington, who had once been offerered the Governorship of Madras and who was one of his few intimate friends. "After a week at Holwood with Pitt, spent in anxious discussions of the needs and prospects of our Indian possessions Mornington was definitely appointed Governor-General of India." Lord Mornington's private life was marked by a rather half-hearted respect for the seventh commandment. He kept a French concubine for some time whom he afterwards made his wife and had children by her but she did not care much for him and probably, this disappointment

in love made him the victim of morbid Frankophobia. He brought out his brother Henry as his political secretary, while another brother Arthur had already preceded him to India. The policy of the triumvirate is clearly expressed in the following extract from a letter to a friend written by the Governor-General two years after his arrival:—"I will heap kingdoms upon kingdoms, victory upon victory, revenue upon revenue ; I will accumulate glory and wealth and power, until the ambition and avarice even of my masters shall cry for mercy."

Mr. Dundas had instructed the Earl to attend with the utmost vigilance to the system of retaining, in Native States, European officers under whom their troops are trained. During his short stay at the Cape of Good Hope, he interviewed two Indian officers—David Baird, who had been forced as a prisoner to play the monkey for Tipu's pleasure, and Major Kirkpatrick, former Resident at Gwalior, Envoy to Nepal and Resident at Hyderabad. These two poisoned his mind against Tipu, the Nizam and the French and described to him the deranged condition of the Native States. So, the Earl of Mornington meant to follow a spirited foreign policy from the very first.

As soon as he landed, however, he took certain measures, like the prohibition of the publication of newspapers on Sundays, calculated to impress on the heathens that the Company's Government was a Christian government. The college at Fort William was established in order to help "in furthering the evangelisation of India"[118] and the chief work done there was the translation of the Christian Scriptures, into the Oriental tongues. His biographer, Revd. W. H. Hutton, a minister of the Christian faith, considers him "the first ruler of India to stand forth decisively as a Christian."

Wellesley and the Nizam

We shall first examine his relations with the Nizam. In a letter from the Cape, he had congratulated Mr. Dundas on the deranged condition of the Native States, especially the Marathas, Mysore and Hyderabad. The position of the Nizam after Kurdlah was the most pitiable. The Resident at his Court was the redoubtable Major Kirkpatrick's brother, Colonel James Kirkpatrick. He had reconciled himself so much that he married a Muhammadan Courtier's daughter, but many Hyderabad Nobles accused him of bribery, corruption and even murder. His assistant was Captain John Malcolm, who was packed off to India as a tender cadet at 12, since he was bold enough to reply to a query before the Court of Directors that if he met Hyder Ali, he would out with his sword and cut off his head. He had taken part with Cornwallis in the Mysore campaign and, having a great ambition to join the Diplomatic Service, had studied Persian and many country languages. At last, he realised his ambition and during a long career played many parts with credit to himself and benefit to his compatriots. Against such a combination of intriguing skill, Hyderabad could oppose not even a third rate statesman. So, Lord Mornigton wanted to try his diplomatic snare, called the "subsidiary alliance," in Hyderabad first. It was the thin end of the wedge introduced for destroying the independence of the Native powers of India. It was a mere delusion to deceive the Home Government, which wanted the Company to abstain from aggres-

sion. "Countries were not ostensibly conquered; the sovereign was allowed to remain on his throne, with all the trappings of royalty; but substantial power was transferred from him to the person of a political agent. British conscience was, therefore, soothed."[119]

Lord Mornington wrote to Colonel Kirkpatrick a letter, dated 8th July, 1798, marked "Secret," instructing him to displace the Nizam's Corps officered by the French with the Company's troops, because the Nizam's French officers might join Tipu in the event of a war with Mysore. This was a preposterous and gratuitious presumption, for according to the Triple Alliance of 1792, the Nizam, the Peshwa and the Company were to support each other against the aggressions of Tipu. The Colonel was not to propose the arrangement to the Nizam but only to his minister, Azim-ul-Omrah, who was already in the pay of the Company. Arthur Wellesley wrote to Major Shawe in 1803, "You will have observed from my letters to Col. Close, that I have urged him to pay the minister in order to have accurate information of what passes." So, there is every probability that Azim was also paid to betray his master. Of course, he received the proposal with satisfaction and, according to the Earl's plan for a *coup de main*, General Harris was ordered to "march towards Hyderabad from the Guntoo Circar with the utmost promptitude and caution." So, the helpless Nizam was compelled to dismiss his French troops, which he did, not without some difficulty and great reluctance, since they had served him long and loyally. He was to receive a subsidiary force of 6000 sepoys with artillery officered by the British and "to pay for the men who kept him a prisoner," as Mrs. Graham wrote of Baji Rao Peshwa.[120] The Nizam signed

the death-warrant of his independence on the 1st September, 1798. The very preamble of the treaty is a falsehood, since it says that the Nizam "expressed a desire for an increase of the detachment of the Hon'ble Company's troops at present serving His Highness."

Mr. Dundas and the Court of Directors were highly satisfied at the transaction, "completed in so masterly and effectual a manner" and very advantageous to the Company both positively and negatively. The noble Earl 'who stood forth decisively as a Christian' was awarded an annuity of £5000 for twenty years beginning from the date of the Treaty. Colonel Kirkpatrick was given the remarkable distinction of the Honorary Aide-de-Camp to the Governor-General and Captain Malcolm—a man after the Earl's own heart—became his Political Assistant.

The war with Tipu

The Earl of Mornington now launched upon the second war with Tipu. If the first war was unjust, this was certainly a crime ; for there was no *causus belli* except in the Governor-General's imagination. As a matter of fact, he had made up his mind to wage war with Tipu long before he set his foot on Indian soil and for some years he was merely watching Mysore as the cat watches a rat. Mornington began to plot the ruin of Tipu from the commencement of his rule. After "an honourable and unusually punctual discharge[121]" of the large sum due to the English, Tipu exerted all his activity to repair the ravages of war. "He began to add to the fortifications of his capital,—to remount his cavalry and discipline his infantry—to punish his refractory tributaries—and to encourage the cultivation of his country, which was soon restored to its former prosperity[122]." He had no intention of violating the Treaty of 1792. In his letters to Sir John Shore and the Earl he spoke of the firm foundations of friendship and harmony between the two powers. Lord Mornington played his part of duplicity extremely well. In June, 1798, when he received an application from Tipu for the restitution of Wynaad he appointed a commission and on its recommendation, restored it to him.

The allegation against Tipu was that he conspired with the French against the English. Even if this was true, he had every right to join the French, and that by itself, without open declaration of hostilities, can never be a cause for

war that can be justified. In June 1798, Lord Mornington sent General Harris in Madras a document said to have been published at Mauritius and implicating Tipu in such a conspiracy. The Governor-General was not quite sure that it might not turn into an exaggeration or misrepresentation and what he then wanted was that it should become "a matter of serious discussion." But yet, we find him writing ten days afterwards:—"It is my positive resolution to assemble the army upon the coast." He had already reduced the Nizam to the position of a prisoner and, though his attempt to induce the Peshwa to enter into a subsidiary alliance failed, he left the Peshwa to the tender mercies of the Scindia. General Harris was for an amicable settlement of the question "on account of our great want of cash", while the secretary to the Government of Madras considered it as uncalled for. The French fleet had been destroyed by Nelson in the Battle of the Nile and so there was no chance of their helping Tipu in any way. With profound hypocrisy the Governor-General wrote on 4th November, 1798, to Tipu of this victory: "Confident from the union and attachment subsisting between us that this intelligence will afford you sincere satisfaction, I could not deny myself the pleasure of communicating it." Yet, four days later, he assumed an insolent tone and talked of sending Major Doveton to ask for the cession of certain districts in the interests of peace! The Earl ordered the Navy to be ready to swoop down on the coasts and also prepared the troops. He himself arrived in Madras on the 31st December, 1798.

On his arrival, he found a letter from Tipu explaining the Mauritius incident as an exaggerated report of his employment of certain French adventurers and expressed surprise at his sugges-

tion of "war" and "measures of self-defence."[123] He swore that he had no hostile intentions against the British. But the British Governor-General was not to be so glibly cheated of his war. After a delay of nine days, he wrote a reply demanding an answer in 24 hours, adding,—"Dangerous consequences result from the delay of arduous affairs."[124]

The proud spirit of Tipu would not yield to the coercion of the English. He did not reply within the stipulated period and so the British marched on his territories on the 3rd February, 1799. Poor Tipu was quite unprepared to resist this unjust war; he was surrounded by sea and land; the French, the Nizam, the Marathas—none came to his help. So, he appealed for peace on the 13th February and sanctioned Major Doveton's mission. But peace was insulting to the might and majesty of the British power, as interpreted by the Earl. General Harris proceeded on to Seringapatam; he also seduced many of the tributaries, principal officers and subjects of the Sultan to desert him; by means of the services of Tremal Row an alliance was also negotiated with the old Queen of Mysore. General Harris was determined to capture Seringapatam, since it was reported that it contained enormous treasure. On the 4th May, 1799, Seringapatam fell and Tipu met the glorious death of a soldier. The city was plundered by the greedy soldiers and many excesses were committed on the helpless inhabitants of the place.

Tipu's death rendered the British empire permanent and secure in India. The victory was commemorated by the British by thanks-offerings in their churches. The Governor-General was created Marquess of Wellesley and given the appointment of Captain-General and Commander-in-chief of all the forces in the East Indies.

General Harris, "the penniless son of a humble clergyman", was made General Lord Harris of Seringapatam. Tipu's dominions were partitioned; the English got the lion's share; the Nizam got a slice; a small portion was allotted for the descendent of the old Raja as a reward for help rendered in betraying Tipu. The astute Hindu minister, Purniya, (resembling Talleyrand in many respects), who had served both Hyder and Tipu, was made the Diwan.

Mr. James Mill[125] has thoroughly exposed all the fallacious arguments used to support the Franko-phobia of the Governor-General. He has also pronounced certain correspondence said to have been discovered in Seringapatam as innocent in nature, but they may very likely be forgeries after all. In 1799, Tipu had only 120 Frenchmen in his employ, for he had already realised in 1792 that they were "of a crooked disposition, faithless and enemies of mankind." So to charge him with a conspiracy with France was preposterous nonsense.

Thus ended the last war with the dynasty of Hyder Ali in Mysore. In its origin, progress and termination, it fills one of the darkest pages in the history of India.

Wellesley and Oude

The Marquess of Wellesley's relations with Oude were even more blameworthy. He removed Mr. Lumsden from Lucknow and appointed a more pliable tool, Colonel Scott, as Resident. Then he began what he called his "reform"—which meant the disbandment of a large portion of the Nawab's regular army and the substitution of an increased number of the Company's regiments of infantry and cavalry. The object was to extinguish the Nawab's military power. The additional troops were actually ordered into Oude without allowing any time for the Nawab to draw up a remonstrance, for, since the Company had undertaken during the time of Sir John Shore to defend the Vizier's possessions, the Company was considered to have the power of augmenting British forces in Oude at their own pleasure and compelling the Nawab to pay for their maintenance, since they were intended for his defence.[126] The Nawab protested desparately against the degradation of his authority and the apparent injustice of the measure, but the Governor-General charged him with levity and disrespect. His remarks were interpreted as an impeachment of the Company's honour and justice—"a guilt which hardly any punishment can expiate." "If the party injured submits without a word, his consent is alleged. If he complains, he is treated as impeaching the honour and justice of his superior."[127]

Arguing on this line, the Governor-General peremptorily required Saadat Ali either to resign his princely authority and retire on a pension or

cede half his territory by way of indemnity for the expenses of the troops. The Company, in short, wanted, besides the 76 lakhs subsidy, territory yielding an annual income of 59 lakhs of rupees. The Vizier remonstrated that the demand was in violation of an existing treaty, but the Governor-General instructed the Resident to take forcible possession of the districts, thus instigating him to an act of dacoity. The Marquess's grand object was "the sole administration of the civil and military government of all the territories and dependencies of the state of Oude together with the full and entire right and title to the revenues thereof; but for some reason or other, he left her half the prey to the grasp of future spoilers." The Vizier cried, "Let me speedily be permitted to depart on my travels and pilgrimage, for I shall consider it a disgrace to show my face to the people here."[128] "But this intention was too hopeless and despairing for adoption, and eventually the Vizier consented to sign the treaty placed before him, after discussion and expostulation had proved to be in vain." The Treaty was signed on the 14th November, 1801, by which the Company "took away half his possessions because they had exhausted his purse and in token of their "friendship and union" they made him bound to them—by a halter." The Marquess appointed his brother Henry as Lieutenant-Governor of the Ceded Provinces, but since he was not a servant of the Company, the Directors opposed the appointment and he was removed.

Sir Philip Francis, the vigilant supporter of India's cause, was yet in Parliament. As Mr. Howarth said: "From year to year, as the mischiefs (of the Company) increased, his speeches kept pace with them. From year to year, I might

almost say from day to day, his talents and his industry were employed in exposing the fatal folly of that distinctive system which has been adopted by your government in India and encouraged and protected in England and the ruinous consequences which would result from it." He helped Mr. Paull from Oude to frame a charge for impeachment against the Marquess and to call for the publication of papers. On the 28th May, 1806 the charge was read before the House and later on Lord Teignmouth and Sir Alured Clarke were examined by the promoters before the House. Meanwhile, a General Election unseated both Mr. Paull and Sir Philip Francis, and so, it was only in 1808 that Lord Folkestone took the matter up. His eloquent pleading for justice to a non-Christian prince fell flat upon the ears of the Christians of England. Mr. R. Thornton referred to the Treaty of 1801 with the Vizier and said it was "really a sort of Gallic Hug, in which the noble Marquis had squeezed the Nabob to death. One might as well call a robbery committed by a foot-pad on a traveller on Hanslaw-Heath, a Treaty!" The Marquess's greatest supporters were his two brothers Arthur and Henry, who were in Parliament, and the ex-Chief Justice of Bengal, Sir John Anstruther, who opposed the resolution by mystifying and open-handed liberality to all the members. They compared the Nabob's position as "analogous to that of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland"! and even pleaded the authority of the Court of Directors for the acts of Wellesley. But as Sir Thomas Turton said: "How then, Sir, must the House have been astonished to find, that not one letter, not one scrap of paper, not one expression in any one letter, which can be tortured into an instruction to the Marquis Wellesley...has been produced or read."

Logic and rhetoric were of no avail. The so-called Mother of Parliaments rejected the Resolutions and passed, instead, a vote of thanks for the Marquis, which Mr. Sheridan considered scarcely justifiable. The ex-Chief Justice of Bengal was the mover of this astounding proposition.

Mr. Paull exposed before Parliament another reprehensible transaction of the noble Marquis in 1806, viz., the annexation of Farrukhabad This small principality was governed by Muslim princes of Afghan descent as tributaries of the Nawab Vizier of Oude, paying annually a tribute of 4 lakhs of rupees. In 1787 Cornwallis concluded a treaty with the King of Oude by which "the English resident at Furrukhabad should be recalled and that no other should afterwards be appointed." Yet, in November, 1801, Wellesley introduced his brother Henry there and instructed him to bribe the members of the young Nawab's family and his friends in order to prevail upon him to abandon his principality and retire on a pension of a lakh of rupees per year. Henry succeeded in his plans and was rewarded with the charge of Furrukhabad.

Wellesley and the Carnatic

The Marquess wanted to annihilate the independent existence of the Carnatic also. As early as his Mysore Campaign, he had written from Madras to the Nawab of Arcot, about the treaty of 1792, by which the Company was to possess full authority over the Carnatic during any war with Tipu and about the irregularities in the payment of subsidies and in mortgaging and assigning districts to his creditors. He referred to the 66 lakhs of pagodas which the Nawab owed to the Company and hesitated about the direct control of all Carnatic affairs by the Company itself. The Nawab did not tamely submit to this direction. He denied the charge that he had assigned the districts set apart by the Treaty of 1792 and appealed for a just consideration of his claims on the booty after the war with Tipu, since he paid nine lakhs of pagodas annually for the troops employed therein.

Dundas had also instructed Lord Mornington to "wait for favourable opportunities" to destroy the double system of Government in the Carnatic, but the Governor-General said that only the death of Omdut-ul-Omrah and the certain complications as regards succession which it must bring about would afford the chance for English aggression.

The Governor-General soon discovered that the late Nawab with the collaboration of his son Omdut-ul-Omrah intrigued with the two vakeels Gholam Ali and Ali Reza who had gone to Madras with the two sons of Tipu to be delivered up as hostages.

Major Evans Bell calls this tale "extravagantly improbable," since it appears absurd to think that the Nawab will "conspire against his friends of half a century and league with his enemies of thirty-years," "with their discomfited foe against their triumphant friends and allies"![129] The commission of inquiry collected only frivolous evidence, which, but for the strong bias of the Governor-General, would have gone into the waste-paper basket. The Governor-General, however, considered them "the most authentic and indisputable evidence."

Omdut-ul-Omrah luckily fell ill about the 5th July, 1801, and a series of disgraceful transactions ensued which ended in the annexation of that state. For ten days before his death, the palace at Chepauk was surrounded by British troops under Colonel MacNeil, and when the Nawab died on the 15th July, his heir, like the lamb in Æsop's Fables, was "called upon to answer certain interrogatories on a charge of treachery" preferred against his father and grandfather ! He was told of the Governor-General's resolution "that his future situation would be that of a private person considered as hostile to the British interests." The Company then quietly passed over two of the next in succession and fished up Azum-ut-Dowlah, who accepted all the terms dictated to him and was placed on the Musnad on the 28th July 1801.

Wellesley was charged with misdemeanour in his relations with the Carnatic by Sir Thomas Turton in the House of Commons in 1808, but his formidable logic and eloquence were of no avail. Some partisan of Wellesley quoted Domat's "Compendium of Civil and Public Law" to prove that a prince was bound not only by the engagements of his predecessor but to repair the damage created

by his predecessor's crimes. Mr. Sheridan retorted that it had been said "that Ally Hussain had forfeited his right to the throne in as much as he inherited the treason of his father. He could never have been a party to a treason which had not been communicated to him and with which the father had not been charged in his life-time. He never knew a more monstrous attempt than this to impose on the credulity of the public." Sir Samuel Romilly asked the House to do nothing that would disgrace them before posterity. Mr. Windham condemned the policy of the Company as that of a highwayman. He said: "The principle by which we were to be guided was that the natives of India had no rights, that we had no duties, and that all was to depend upon the decision of our majesties." Of course, the majority of the House were not for doing justice to a non-Christian prince. They passed a resolution approving Wellesley's conduct.

We shall now turn to the affairs of Tanjore. This small Maratha principality was established by Shivaji's father, Shahji, and his half-brother Venkoji. Shivaji left Venkoji to himself and by his cutting off this settlement from its proper place in the united Maratha kingdom, "Tanjore suffered grievously."[130] In 1742, Pratap Singh became the Raja of Tanjore and he was acknowledged by the English East India Company for more than seven years. Then, the exiled Raja Sahujee solicited their aid, promising to pay all expenses and grant them the fort of Devikottah. The English accepted the offer. "They determined, however," as Malcolm says, "that the capture of Devikottah, not the restoration of Sahujee, should be their first object"; but no sooner was the fort captured than they formed an alliance with Pratap Singh![131]

"Throughout the Carnatic wars, the Tanjore

army under Mankoji played an important part on the side of the English against the French."[132] Mahomed Ali, Nawab of Arcot, was eager for capturing it and when he invaded it in 1762, the English intervened and arranged that Tanjore should be a tributary to the Nawab paying 4 lakhs a year. When his greedy creditors pressed for money, he pointed to the treasures of Tanjore and in 1771 the Madras Government helped him to plunder Tulsaji, son of Pratap Singh. Further acts of spoliation were committed with English help in 1773. When Tulsaji died, the adoption of Sarboji was declared invalid and his half-brother Raja Amar Singh became the ruler. In 1793, a new treaty was concluded with him by which a large sum of money was paid to the Company for the defence of his country.

"In the year 1798 a convenient discovery was made that Amar Singh was not the legal heir to the musnad of Tanjore."[133] The British began intrigues with Sarboji through his guardian, Rev. Mr. Swartz. Amar Singh was accused of cruelly treating Sarboji, who was removed to Madras. The resident at Tanjore gave Amar Singh enormous trouble and Col. Baird, who was sympathetic to the ruler, was transferred to the Cape of Good Hope. Col. Baird saw Lord Mornington on his way to India and pleaded the cause of Tanjore, but the Governor-General was not long in India before an appeal was made by Sarboji against the decision invalidating his adoption. Learned Pandits from Benares were given suitable presents in order to declare it valid, in spite of a previous disallowance after careful investigation. So Raja Amar Singh was deposed and condemned unheard. An unknown foundling was placed on the Raja's throne upon condition that he would cede the revenue of his country to the Company and

become their pensioner for the rest of his precarious life.[134] The fertile province of Tanjore excited the cupidity of the Christian merchant "adventurers" so much that they did not scruple to adopt any means to get possession of it.

Affairs in Surat

The Nawab of Surat was also another victim of British diplomacy and intrigue. The Company had established its factory there by bribing the Sidhi officers "to arrange that no resistance should be made to the English on their attack on the Castle"[135]. The Muslim governor of Surat was merely a puppet [136] in English hands and a double system of government was established there. The English continually wrung concessions from him in order to make both ends meet. He was asked to disband his troops and pay for some battalions of the Company's troops. At last, he was so greatly pressed by the Christians that he consented to pay them a lakh of rupees annually besides certain concessions amounting to about 30,000 rupees per year. Before the Treaty was signed, the Nawab died in 1799. His infant son died a month afterwards. So, Nasir-ud-din, his brother, claimed the government of Surat. The new Nawab consented to pay a lakh of rupees per year "but perseveringly insisted that beyond that sum the revenues of that place would not enable him to go."[137] Mr. Seton, the Chief at Surat, wrote to Bombay, "I have left nothing undone ; and pressed him to the utmost. I am convinced he has not the means, or, I believe, he would really pay more," but the Governor-General wrote to the Governor of Bombay that he was resolved "not to confirm Nuseer-uddeen in the Station of Nabob, until he shall have agreed to transfer the whole civil and military administration and revenues of the city into the hands of the Company, reserving to himself an

annual stipend sufficient for the maintenance of himself and his family, to be paid by the Company from the revenues of Surat." [138] The reasons of the Governor-General to pension the Nawab were that, "Wheresoever not bound by specific treaties, the English were at liberty to dethrone any sovereign whom they pleased" [139] and that it was the duty as well as the right of the Company to take upon itself the entire civil and military government of the city, because its security and good government could be attained by such a step. As a writer in the *Calcutta Review* for June, 1848, says: "Any impartial person who will take the trouble to investigate this affair will find that the helpless Nawab had reason on his side, the English force and sophistry."

Wellesley and the Peshwa

The genius of Lord Mornington shone forth in its splendour in his dealings with the Marathas, especially in the methods he took to ensnare the Peshwa. When he landed, Baji Rao, the last of the Peshwas, was ruling in Poona with the help and support of Dowlat Rao Sindhia. Nana Fadnavis was spending his days in captivity and Lieutenant-Colonel Palmer had replaced Mr. Malet. The noble Earl did not press the Peshwa or the Marathas to join in the Mysore war, because he was reluctant to enhance their power by assigning them any share in the booty. He tried to keep the Marathas neutral by instructing the Resident to din into the ears of the Peshwa that the Sindhia was "keeping him a prisoner" and that he was a dangerous ally since he kept French officers who were sure to attract English resentment. Fortunately, these plans were checked by the restoration of Nana to liberty and power by the Sindhia. Rumours of a concerted plan to attack the Nizam began to disturb the minds of the British but nothing more was done by the Marathas.

Hence, Mornington was anxious that the Sindhia should retire from Poona into Hindustan, at the time when Tipu was attacked. For this purpose. he sedulously circulated rumours of a threatened invasion of India by Zemaun Shah, king of Cabul.[140] Since these threats had no effect on the Sindhia, it was necessary to foment dissensions in Gwalior itself and Colonel Collins was despatched to Hindustan. Probably this Christian officer was at the bottom of "the dissensions and disaffections

which prevail among his (Sindhia's) commanders and the unsettled and precarious state of his authority in Hindustan." [141] Lord Mornington also made a sudden but important discovery that a certain Ambaji, a commander under the Sindhia, had written a letter to the Vizier Ali containing a proposal to place him on the musnad of Oude—"a flagrant act of treachery." The Residents at Poona and Hyderabad then made many collateral discoveries tending to implicate the Sindhia as well as Baji Rao Peshwa. Intrigues were also carried on with the Raja of Berar by Colebrooke, the great Orientalist. A large force under the command of Sir James Craig was kept facing the frontiers of Sindhia's dominions. It would indeed be a wonder if, inspite of all these efforts, the Sindhia continued in Poona. He returned to Hindustan.

Under the guidance of Nana Fadnavis, the Peshwa prepared a contingent to co-operate with the Company's troops in the campaign against Tipu, but almost at the eleventh hour, the Governor-General declined the offer. In order to keep the Marathas quiet, Lord Mornington wrote to Colonel Palmer just before the war that, "notwithstanding the perverse and forbidden policy of the Court of Poonah, I shall not fail to secure for the Peshwa an equal participation with the other allies in any cessions which may be enforced from Tipu Sultan. I authorise you to make this declaration, in the most unequivocal terms, to the Peshwa and to Nana. If even this declaration shall fail to excite the Peshwa to employ every practicable effort to fulfil his defensive engagements with the Company, I trust, it will, at least, serve to prove the disinterested attachment of the British Government to every branch of the triple alliance." This promise was never kept. A pretext was discovered that

the Peshwa was entertaining a treacherous design against the English and conditions were imposed upon the fulfilment of the promise. Nana would have combined the Marathas, but a formidable disturbance was created, most probably by the Mysore Commission under Arthur Wellesley, by the Jagheerdars of the South, who rebelled against the Peshwa. Nana sent a force under Pureshram Bhow, but before order and tranquillity could be restored, death overtook the great Maratha statesman on the 13th February, 1800. With him perished the last dream of the Marathas to regain their supremacy in India.

But the English could not yet breathe freely, for Daulat Rao Scindhia was still alive. Long before the Mysore War, Mornington had determined on a war with the Sindhia. His embassy to Berar was for forming a defensive alliance against Tipu and Sindhia. He had instructed Sir Alured Clarke in 1799 to "keep in view the probability of early offensive operations against the dominions of Scindhia" and "to excite the Rajpoots and other tributaries." He also advised him to soothe Sindhia with lies.

Meanwhile, Baji Rao's mind was being slowly poisoned against Daulat Rao Sindhiah, whom he considered as more and more hostile. The Sindhia became very indignant when, without his knowledge, the Peshwa granted permission to Arthur Wellesley to purse Dhoondia Waugh into Maratha territory. Wellesley slew Dhoondia Waugh but did much more. He espied out the strategical positions and weaknesses of the dominions of the Marathas. After his return, he wrote a "Memorandum upon the operations of the Maratha territory", the opening words of which were, "As, before long, we may look to war with the Marathas, it is proper to consider the means of

carrying it on." It was also very generally expected that at the time when Colonel Wellesley was inside the Maratha dominions, Col. Palmer might be able to bring about a critical state of affairs in Poona necessitating or inviting British interference. In the opinion of the Governor-General and his brother, Col. Palmer was much to blame, and so he was replaced by Colonel Kirkpatrick from Hyderabad. When ill-health obliged him to leave India very soon, Colonel Barry Close, Wellesley's right-hand man at Mysore, was chosen. In his last official despatch to the Governor-General, Colonel Palmer had written: "I apprehend that nothing short of imminent and certain destruction will induce him (the Peshwa) to make concessions, which militate with his deep-rooted jealousy and prejudices." Fortunately for the British, a new cause of distractions was found in Sindiah's defeat of the Holkars, of whom Yeswant Rao fled to Nagpore. Mr. Colebrooke at Berar was not the man to let the opportunity slip, for we find the Holkar raising an army in a short time and levying contributions on Sindhia's subjects, probably financed by the English themselves. It is not necessary to refer to all the battles fought between Sindhia and Holkar in Malwa. Fortune sometimes favoured the one, sometimes the other. Meanwhile, since Sindhia was absent, Poona was the scene of wild disorder. Withojee Holkar, brother of Yeswant, revolted against the Peshwa from Kolapore but was captured and executed. Yeswant Rao vowed vengeance and marched towards Poona. "This crisis of affairs," wrote Lord Wellesley to the Court of Directors, "appeared to me to afford the most favourable opportunity for the complete establishment of the interests of the British Empire without the hazard of involving us in a contest with any party." No attempt was made to support

the Peshwa or check the Holkar. Nay, Colonel Kirkpatrick was specially instructed "to preclude every risk of hostilities between the British troops and Yeswant Rao Holkar." If Tipu could be attacked for contemplating war on an ally, Travancore, why could not the British help the Peshwa when the Holkar invaded and occupied the capital of their ally? A battle was fought by the Holkar with the troops of the Sindhia at Poona and the Holkar succeeded in completely routing his enemies. Probably the treachery of Captain Fidele Filose had something to do with the Sindhia's defeat. "Imminent and certain destruction" now stared the Peshwa in the face. He remembered a promise made by the Governor-General years ago that he would always be granted an asylum in Bombay. Fleeing before the Holkar's troops, he at last embarked in an English ship provided for his reception and proceeded to Bassein, where he landed on the 6th December, 1802.

After all, the Governor-General had succeeded in ensnaring the Peshwa. At Bassein, Baji Rao agreed to those very terms which he had been made to decline year after year and month after month, by the great Nana Fadnavis and Daulat Rao Sindhia. He put on his own neck the yoke of the subsidiary alliance on the 31st December, 1802. This treaty sealed the doom of the independence of the Marathas, those whom the genius of Sivaji had evolved as a great nation. Nana Fadnavis's prophecy came to be fulfilled, for he had opposed the accession of Raghoba's son on account of "the danger to be apprehended from the connection between his family and the English."

The Treaty of Bassein.

The Treaty of Bassein was the thin end of the wedge that finally destroyed the Maratha confederacy. As the Marquis of Wellesley believed, those who accepted the British alliance became dependent on the English Government, while those who did not, became dependent, for want of it![142] When the Holkar compelled Baji Rao to be an exile and nominated his own tool for the Peshwaship, the British waited a suspiciously long time before they took steps for reinstating him, since they wanted to extort more concessions from him. The British had every reason to know that Baji Rao was unpopular. The Governor-General himself had written but five years back of "the imbecility of his Councils, the instability and treachery of his disposition and the prevalence of internal discord."[143] Elaborate preparations had therefore to be made, in placing the wrong man upon the throne. Lieutenant-General Stuart asked Lord Clive from Madras to send a considerable proportion of the Madras army 'to encourage Mahratha jagirdars to cooperate"! The Marquis himself approached Poona to be near the principal scene of negotiation. The Commander-in-Chief—General Lake, "a truculent ruffian" [144] according to W. T. Stead, who had helped Pitt to put down Ireland's struggle against the Union—was ready in the North-Western provinces. The Governor-General's real plan was "to present a most powerful and menacing aspect to every branch of the Mahratta empire"[145], though ostensibly to restore Baji Rao. Colonel Close brought the Nizam's subsidiary force

to a position on the frontier. Major General Wellesley had begun his march towards Poona from the South "to encourage the Southern Jagirdars to declare in favour of the Peshwa's cause" and "to establish in Poona an order of things favourable to the return of the Peshwa." Amrut Rao, the puppet appointed by the Holker, fled from the city and Baji Rao was restored. The whole was an ignominious and disgraceful affair.

Now begins one of the blackest chapters in the history of India. The English had now deprived the Peshwa of his independence by reducing him into a subsidiary ally, but they had the further task of provoking the Marathas into war. When this policy failed, we will find that they became aggressors themselves.

One singular circumstance is that the English never tried to pursue or finish the Holkar even though Aurangabad in the Nizam's territories lay on his way to the North. Compare this with their action when Tipu invaded Travancore. This strange conduct can be accounted for only on one hypothesis—that the Holkar was a catspaw of the English who created distractions and helped them to ensnare the Peshwa. Justice and policy demanded a war against the Holkar : the Peshwa asked for it ; the Nizam would have been glad over it ; and even Sindhia and Bhonsle might have cooperated with the British, but the English were not prepared to estrange so pliable a tool.

Daulat Rao Sindhia was thoroughly alarmed at the turn of events. His troops had been defeated at Poona by the Holkar; the Treaty of Salbye which his ancestor Madhoji Sindhia had arranged with "unpretending merchants" had now been replaced and the Peshwa was in the pythonic embrace of the English. The mustering of troops on the entire Maratha frontier alarmed him consider-

ably. In spite of everything, his statesmanship directed him to be neutral. Nor did the Raja of Berar take up arms despite all his aversion at British interference in Maratha affairs. The Governor-General himself recognised the sincerity of their pacific intentions, while his brother did not believe that the Sindhia would venture to cross the Godavery.

Yet, Sindhia moved towards the Deccan. Two explanations were furnished by the British themselves. One was that Sindhia tried to join Holkar and Bhonsle and form a confederacy as a purely defensive measure against the menacing attitude of the British. The other was that the Peshwa invited him to Poona, since the Governor-General had assured him that he would not be compelled to adhere to the faith of his engagements at the hazard of involving the Company in a war with the combined Maratha States. But whichever theory was correct, the Governor General seized upon the event for launching a war, since he had decided even in 1799 on "a policy of reducing the power of Sindhia whenever the opportunity shall appear advantageous." Colonel Collins, the Resident at Sindhia's court, provoked him into anger by an insistent demand for divulging the policy about to be discussed with Bhonsle and Holkar. It seems the Sindhia remarked that after consulting his confederates he would tell him whether it was peace or war. This surely does not "amount to a positive aggression upon every received principle of the law of nations"—which the Governor-General chose to find in it, as if his mustering of troops on the frontiers of every Maratha State without any provocation was neither 'insulting' nor 'hostile' ! What right had the British to prevent independent sovereigns from meeting and discussing measures calculated to secure their own welfare ? Colonel

Collins and Major General Wellesley knew that the Peshwa had really invited Sindhia to Poona and he and Bhonsle were only obeying their legitimate sovereign whom the Christians themselves had reinstated as the executive head of the Maratha empire. Every "principle of the law of nations" demanded that the British should punish their own tool for inviting them to Poona. Instead of this, when Sindhia began to move, Col. Collins was directed to leave the Court as soon as Arthur Wellesley was ready with boats and provisions. Then, the latter wrote to Sindhia and Bhonsle not to proceed to Poona, threatening them with hostilities if they disobeyed his order. Colonel Collins left Gwalior with every mark of disrespect.

Sindhia wrote a letter to the Governor-General promising him not to subvert the Treaty of Bassein on condition that no design existed to ruin the old relations between the Peshwa and other Maratha chiefs. The Marquess never condescended to take notice of this very sane letter and never forwarded it to the Secret Committee in England. On the other hand, contrary to "all principles of law" (according to Messrs R. Ryder and W. Adam)[146] he delegated to his brother the power to declare war or conclude peace as circumstances and his military position would dictate. The Governor-General had to be playing the hypocrite in letters to the Court of Directors, since wars were very unpopular there and a vast load of debt had already accumulated. He pretended to suffer from an attack of Frankophobia at the eleventh hour, the hypocrisy of which has been thoroughly exposed by James Mill. General Lake was also supplied with numerous Machiavellian methods for corrupting the subordinate Chiefs of the Sindhia. Sir George Barlow strengthened the hands of the Marquis by a

minute in which he said, "that no native state should be left to exist in India which is not upheld by the British power or the political conduct of which is not under its absolute control."[147]

The Marathas had made no preparations for war. Colonel Collins himself says that there were not 50,000 troops in the camp of the Maharaja and that the prices of grain and grass were prohibitively high. Though Sindhia and Bhonsle made "friendly professions" to him during an interview, the blood-thirsty Resident interpreted them as insincere. An amicable letter was addressed by them on the 1st August, 1803, to General Wellesley, but war was declared on them on the 6th. Madhoji Sindhia and Moodajee Bhonsle had helped the foreigners when they were struggling hard to gain a footing on Indian soil, and this was the result. In the words of Sir Philip Francis in Parliament, "Commerce produced factories, factories produced garrisons, garrisons produced armies, armies produced conquests." The pretext for this Second Mahratta War struck him as "absurd and indefensible in the highest degree."

The Campaign of Intrigues

Of the five great Maratha chiefs, the Guicowar was the first to join the British, the Peshwa was already in their hands ; the Holkar needed vigilant watching. Smooth promises were now held out to him "to continue in peace with the Company," as Wellesley wrote to him in 1803. Moreover, the Nizam was induced to negotiate with Ameer Khan, a Pathan officer of the Holkar, for his defection, under the belief that the British would defray the cost of hiring him and his troops. Although the scheme fell through, "at least the Holkar's confidence in the chief" was shaken, as Wellesley believed. It is more than probable that Ameer Khan was in the pay of the English, since he was at last rewarded with the principality of Tonk in 1818.

Intrigues were also begun to ruin the Sindhia. The Governor-General mentioned in a secret letter to General Lake the princes and chiefs whom the Commander-in-chief should bribe. He also dilated upon an imaginary French State formed on the banks of the Jumna—a fact which never as yet formed any ground for negotiations. General Lake was also supplied an expert Machiavellian—Mr. Graeme Mercer—and the Collectors of Allahabad, Cawnpore and Etawah were directed to honour his drafts on the Governor-General for such sums of money as he might require.

The Marquis of Wellesley wanted to possess the person of the Moghul Emperor, who was, since Warren Hastings betrayed him into the hands of the Sindhia, well taken care of by the Marathas.

The Governor-General now raised false hopes in his breast and offered Shah Alum "an asylum from the oppressive control of injustice, rapacity and inhumanity." Since the same letter contained many references to "the injuries and indignities to which your illustrious family have been exposed," Shah Alum must have thought that he would be restored to power by British bayonets in at least a small portion of his former empire. The example of the British rewarding the Mysore Rajas for coming forward against Tipu strengthened his hopes. Again, a gross breach of faith was committed by the Christians because the "ikrarnamah" or written agreement, containing certain pledges submitted by Lord Lake to the Emperor, was never filed in the Company's records. The lands of the Mogul were thus "improperly alienated," according to Mr. Sullivan, the Chairman of the East India Company in 1848. Thus the Delhi Emperor was deceived by Wellesley and his vile instrument by specious promises.[148]

General Lake was also instructed to intrigue with Zeboo Nissa Begum (Sumroo's Begum), a remarkable woman who had carved out a principality for herself at Sardanha. She was to recall her battalions serving under the Sindhia and to influence the zemindars of the Doab to assist British arms. The Marquess gave elaborate instructions to General Lake and his expert adviser "on the degree and nature of the encouragement to be given to traitors from Sindhia's lands, on the advisability of treating with the Goojurs, etc." Conspiracies were set on foot in Sindhia's army. We have seen how, acting under Warren Hastings's advice, Madhoji had entertained European officers to train his men. This was a most suicidal policy and his successor had to pay the penalty for the folly. Mr. Perron had

succeeded De Boigne as Commander-in-chief of the Sindhia's forces and there were many another foreign mercenary. The Governor-General held out pecuniary rewards for all European deserters, and he succeeded even beyond his own expectations; for these traitors considered gold as their God. Again, one Bamboo Khan had been deprived of the Saharanpur District, by the Sindhia and he supplied to the Collector of Moradabad, a few days after the declaration of hostilities, translations of a letter alleged to have been written by the Sindhia to prove his warlike intentions. Bamboo Khan was to be promised "any pecuniary reward calculated to stimulate his exertions" ![149]

The Governor-general feared trouble from another quarter, the Punjaub, where Ranjit Singh had established his independence from the Kabul monarchy and was hammering the Sikhs into a martial race. Sikh chieftains like the Raja of Patiala were influenced by Lake to favour the cause of British arms. Political considerations prevented him from accepting the proposals of George Thomas to conquer and annex the Land of the Sikhs.[150] Desertion from enemy armies was encouraged by proclamation.

The War against Sindhia and Bhonsle

Six armies were brought into the field against Sindhia and the Bhonsle—Lieutenant General Smart on the Mysore frontier overawing the Southern Jaghirdars, Col. Stevenson at the head of Nizam's subsidiary forces proceeding to Aurangabad, the main army of N. India under General Lake, General Wellesley proceeding from Poona towards the north, the northern division of the Madras Presidency ready to pounce upon Cuttack, and the Gaekwar's subsidiary force engaged in reducing Broach.

General Wellesley proceeded towards Ahmednagar and by bribing[151] the native officers captured the fort. He appointed on his own authority Col. Graham to manage the territories depending upon that fort. The Peshwa was to be kept quiet by false promises. On the 13th August, Wellesley wrote to Colonel Close, resident at Poona, of "a proportion of the revenue to be given to the Peshwa", but on the 14th, he hastened to write that "it would be better not to hold out any promise or prospect." On the 17th, he wrote : "If the Peshwa should be satisfied with a general assurance that the conquered territory is to be applied to the benefit of the allies, it will be most convenient, as that assurance leaves the question open for future discussion and for a decision according to the circumstances of the war." In order to satisfy the Peshwa, the General urged Colonel Close "to pay the ministers" "upon a large scale."

After capturing Ahmednagar, Wellesley proceeded to the north to make a junction with

Stevenson. On his way he heard that Sindhia's infantry and artillery lay encamped at Assaye, and that Sindhia himself had proceeded forwards towards the Nizam's territories at the head of his cavalry. The Battle of Assaye was therefore in favour of the English. The reasons for the failure of the Marathas were very significant. Sindhia had given up the traditional but formidable methods of Maratha warfare and adopted European tactics. He had also employed perfidious European officers of whom not one was either killed or wounded at Assaye. On the other hand, despatches mention "sixteen of their European officers and sergeants coming over" and General Wellesley felt satisfied on finding "at all events, their European officers have left them." Each of these must have got the 'pay' mentioned in His Excellency's proclamation of the 29th August, 1803. Begum Sumroo's battalion was present at Assaye, and we can very strongly suspect that they must have played into the hands of General Wellesley.

After the battle of Assaye, Colonel Stevenson was ordered to pursue Sindhia's forces. But Mr. Mill says : "The enemy had been so little broken or dispersed by their defeat that they had little to dread from the pursuit of Col. Stevenson." [152] Still the Sindhia authorised Baloo Koonjer to open negotiations for peace, but General Wellesley, who was anxious for war, did not lend any ear to his proposals. He charged him with being a traitor and abused him. Stevenson, meanwhile, captured Burhampoor and Assergurh, mostly as a result of the treachery of European officers. General Wellesly wrote: "Sixteen of the European officers, sergeants, &c., had come in.... on the terms of the proclamation, among whom were Colonel Dupont, Captain Mercier and Captain Mann."

The Maratha chiefs had separated their armies

and were insisting upon peace. The British tried to take advantage of this chance by sending Stevenson to watch the movements of the Sindhia and Wellesely against the Raja of Berar. Since both these expeditions failed, Wellesley expressed his desire to receive envoys for peace. As a result of prolonged negotiations, an armistice was concluded with the Sindhia. In order to play off the two leaders of the Confederacy, no armistice was concluded with the Bhonsle. As General Wellesley himself said, "The Raja of Berar's troops are not included in it and consequently there becomes a division of interest between these two chiefs. All confidence in Scindhia, if it ever existed, must be at an end and the confederacy is, *ipso facto*, dissolved." The real purpose of the armistice, however, was to lull the Sindhia into a false sense of security and to get some time for making further military preparations. This is evident from a letter from the General to his brother, written on the day next after the conclusion of the armistice, in which he says, "I have the power of putting an end to it when I please and... supposing I am obliged to put an end to it on the day after I shall receive its ratification, I shall at least have gained so much time everywhere for my operations and shall have succeded in dividing the enemy entirely."

Six days later, when everything was ready, the British General fabricated pretexts for a battle. He said that the Treaty had not yet been ratified (though a space of ten days had been given by the concluding article), that its stipulations had not been performed and that "the interval of twenty coss between the British and allied armies" which had to be kept up had not been maintained, though in the last case Wellesley made compliance impossible by following the Sindhia's army! In vain did

the vakeels protest against the wanton attack on their master. The Battle of Argaum was fought and, as was only natural, the British troops won the day. The Governor-General was highly pleased at the victory, though he confessed he could not understand why the armistice was violated, for according to him, "Qua cinque via, a battle is a profit with the Native Powers." Thus ended the campaign of Wellesley in the Deccan. After this peace was concluded with the Sindhia as well as Bhonsle.

We must now devote some attention to the minor operations of the war against the possessions of the confederates. We shall first choose the campaign in Guzerat. Guzerat was conquered by Akbar the Great and Nizam-ul-mulk encouraged the Marathas to capture it. The Gaekwars established their supremacy over Baroda and the surrounding districts. Madhav Rao Sindhia was rewarded by the British for acting as a mediator at Salbye with a small district around Broach. This portion of Guzerat had therefore to be captured. Col. Murray, the officer in charge, was not to suffer "these operations to be interupted or delayed by any negotiations whatever." The Gaekwar felt some scruples of conscience to help the British in their unjust war, but Wellesley pointed out that "although it is not immediately specified , it can never have been intended that the Company should protect the Guickwar State, unless the Guickwar shoud also assist the Company with its forces against the enemies of the British Government." So, the Gaekwar's objections were of no avail. Intrigues were carried on with the Bheels. At last Broach fell and a district yielding an annual revenue of eleven lakhs of rupees was secured by the Company. The Gaekwar received no portion of the booty. Lt. Col. Woodington also made

the garrison at Powanghur capitulate, and thus the British deprived the Sindhia of all the possessions in Guzerat which had been held out as a bait to Madhav Rao Sindhia for his helping them out of their difficulties and concluding the Treaty of Salbye.

Campaigns were also conducted in Orissa. Clive obtained the Diwani of Northern Orissa while the rest of the country was ruled by the Marathas under Bhonsle. During the Maratha conquest of Orissa, the English merchants, who had many factories and trading posts, suffered some loss in their trade and an expedition was suggested, only to be given up very soon. When they were granted the Diwani, the Company agreed to pay, after negotiations with the Bhonsle's agent Udopuri Gosain, to pay arrears of chouth amounting to about 13 lakhs of rupees. Under the Maratha administration, a seer of rice was sold for 15 gandas or about 70 seers to the rupee.... opium cost a *pan* of cowries per masha, salt 14 karas per seer," but with the appearance of the British upon the scene Cuttack now begins to be noticeable, as it is at frequent intervals throughout the early years of British rule, as a place in constant want of supplies and always on the verge of famine."[153] The Governor General directed the military officers in Orissa to intrigue with the Oriya chiefs of the Hills. He wrote: "With other chieftains who may possess means of embarrassing your progress it may be advisable to negotiate engagements on terms favourable to their interests, without requiring for their absolute submission to the British authority." Harcourt captured Balasore very easily and, after taking possession of Juggernaut, occupied Cuttack. Spies were sent into Mohorbhanj and Nilgiri and the Rani of the former place with the heir-apparent became friends of the Company. The

acquisition of Orissa can hardly be called 'a conquest'.

The English captured Bundelkhand by the Treaty of Bassein, but the province could not be taken possession of without expelling certain chieftains, who, though tributary to the Peshwa, were averse to place themselves under the British yoke. A detachment was sent under Colonel Powell to join with a traitor and a soldier of fortune named Gosain Himmat Bahadoor. There was no difficulty, therefore, in reducing the petty chieftains and their forts.

The operations against the Sindhia in the north, were under General Lake. Under the nominal authority of the Moghul Emperor, the Sindhia was administering the Doab by means of French officers like De Boigne and M. Perron. On the 29th August, 1803, Lake occupied Coel on the frontier of the Sindhia's dominions. There was many a dastardly traitor in the Sindhia's Camp. General Lake wrote to Wellesley on the 29th itself, "Six officers of Perron's second brigade are just come in, having resigned the service even before they knew of the proclamation." Lake next proposed to capture Alighur; "my object is to get the troops out of the fort by bribery, which I flatter myself will be done," for "the place is extremely strong and, if regularly besieged, will take a month at least." But bribery was of no avail. Treachery, however, came to their help. Mr. Lucan, "a native of Great Britain who lately quitted the service of Sindhia", "undertook to lead Colonel Manson to the gate and point out the road through the fort", and so, the fort was easily reduced. M. Perron also left the service of Sindhia, for the "treachery and ingratitude of his European officers convinced him that further resistance to the British arms was useless."

Lake marched on to Kaunga and chuckled to the Governor-General on 8th September, 1803 : "I think when you hear the SECRET manner in which things have been conducted you will be much pleased, it is quite a new work in the army and has succeeded hitherto wonderfully well. I think to be very near Delhi in three more marches." Lake's plan was, not to capture Gwalior as the Governor-General desired, but to move on to Delhi in order to receive help from the Moghul Emperor. He fought a battle with the Sindhia's troops under M. Louis Borguin and defeated him, probably as a result of Shah Alum's steps to corrupt the troops of his enemies. Lake now entered Delhi and went to pay his respects to the titular Emperor on the 16th September, 1803, who was induced formally to make over the Empire of his ancestors to the English. Lake now proceeded to Agra, where two thousand five hundred men from the Sindhia's army transferred their services to the English commander on account of "the secret manner" in which things were conducted by General Lake. One other memorable battle had to be fought at Laswari. He wrote to Marquess Wellesley : "I made a general attack upon the enemy's position, the result of which I have the satisfaction of informing your Excellency has been a complete, though I sincerely lament to add, dear bought victory." He added, "These felons fought like devils or rather heroes and had we not made a disposition for attack in a style that we should have done against the most formidable army we could have been opposed to, I verily believe, from the position they had taken, we might have failed." Sindhia's troops were beaten because they had been deserted in a critical hour by their leaders; for General Lake wrote, "If they had been commanded by French officers, the event would have been, I fear, extremely doubtful.

I never was in so severe a business in my life or anything like it and pray to God I never may be in such a situation again." Colonel Malleson calls the Battle of Laswari one of the decisive battles of India. General Lake did not proceed to Gwalior, for he wished to bring the Princes of Rajputana to terms. The Indians suffered in 1803 from a severe famine and so they were not able to stand against the British army. The Natives looked upon the British victories with superstitious dread and Lake adds: "I do most sincerely agree with them, as our successes have been beyond parallel, and must have had the assistance of an invisible hand."[154]

In spite of Laswari, the English were now as much anxious for peace as the Maratha confederates themselves. Bhonsle's ministers signed the Treaty on behalf of their master in December, 1803. The ambassadors of the Sindhia also did the same in the same month. The greedy servants of the Company amputated, not like surgeons, but more like butchers. Both the confederates were robbed of all their fertile provinces and compelled to place the yoke of dependence on the British on their necks. Though it was understood by the ministers that Gwalior would belong to the Sindhia, and though this was the view of General Wellesley and Major Malcolm, Gwalior and Gohud were not returned. General Wellesley wrote: "I would sacrifice Gwalior or every frontier of India, ten times over, in order to preserve our credit for "scrupulous good faith" and "I declare that I am dispirited and disgusted with this transaction beyond measure". But the Governor-General persisted in his policy because, as he wrote, "We have got such a hold in his Durbar, by the treaty of peace, that if ever he goes to war with the Company, one half of his chiefs and of his army will be on our side"! So, he knew that

the Sindhia was surrounded by traitors. See how boldly he wrote to Major Malcolm in April 1804, "In this expectation (expecting Gowalior and Gohud), Scindhia's advisers and friends will be disappointed; they will not move me as easily as they have shaken Major Malcolm. I am perfectly ready to renew the war to-morrow, if I find that the peace is not secure!" The Sindhia was also once more induced to employ foreigners in his army like Jean Baptiste Filose. No wonder, therefore, that "Dowlut Rao Scindhia (has) formally renounced all claim to the district of Gohud and to the fortress of Gwalior."

The War with the Holkar

Jeswant Rao Holkar did not join the confederates against the British, because General Wellesley's letters beginning from the one sent on the 16th July, 1803, held out hopes of an ample reward for neutrality. Six months after the declaration of war, we find the same General writing to the Governor-General, "Therefore unless we make war upon Holkar and deprive the Peishwah of his territories, we shall not succeed in driving out the Mahrattas entirely from these countries although Scindhia should cede his rights." The Marquess was also anxious to crush the Holkar. General Lake knew the value of Holkar's neutrality, for he confessed, "If he (Holkar) had intended hostile measures against the British Government, he might have annoyed me most seriously."

As soon as the war was over, the Holkar whose mind was fed with false hopes, began to claim many privileges through his vakeels sent to General Lake. He asked for permission to collect Chouth according to ancient custom, the cession of certain districts formerly held by his family and a formal guarantee of his territories. The Governor-General now began to talk of 'right' and 'justice' and discovered a flaw in the claim of the Holkar to the throne. He talked of "adopting measures under the sanction of His Highness the Peishwah's authority" "for the restoration of Kashi Rao Holkar's rights either by force or compromise." The Governor-General sounded a distinct note of war for, according to his point of view, "the enterprising spirit, military character and ambitious views of Jeswant Rao Holkar render the

reduction of his power a desirable object with reference to the complete establishment of tranquillity in India."

The Holkar too played into English hands. He executed three British servants in his employ—Captains Vickars, Todd and Ryan—for carrying on intrigues and conspiracies against him lest they might betray him during any campaign of war. General Lake now began to assume a threatening attitude; for he wrote to the Marquess: "I never was so plagued as I am with this devil." Suddenly, as if by God-send, some criminal correspondence alleged to have been written under the Holkar's instructions was discovered! The letters were most probably forgeries. They called upon the Hindus to take "vengeance upon the ungrateful multitude" and the Muslims to "extirpate the profligate infidels." The Marquess now did not hesitate to declare war upon the Holkar in spite of a request from the Raja to be acquainted with the means by which the British prepared to settle all disputes and establish mutual friendship.

On April 16th, 1804, the Governor-General communicated his "determination to commence hostilities against Jeswant Rao Holkar at the earliest practicable period of time" and also directed that steps be taken to induce the Sindhia "to act in concert with the British forces." General Wellesley was also given instructions to proceed from the south; but he desisted from the campaign for various reasons. He was indignant at his brother's haggling over Gwalior in spite of his special pleading for a sympathetic interpretation of the peace. He was discontented at not being confirmed in his Staff Appointment by the authorities at home. Again he was requisitioned by his brother, in a short time, near Calcutta, for drawing up reports and memoranda.

Nevertheless, Sindhia was easily won over. The Governor-General tried to apply balsam to the wound he had inflicted. He held out promises to the Sindhia of ceding to him many fertile provinces from the Holkar, if he would help the British.[155] Nolens volens, the order had to be obeyed. Forces were despatched under Bapu Sindhia and Jean Baptiste Filose to carry fire and sword into the Holkar's dominions. But unaided by Wellesley, General Lake was not able to get any advantage over the Holkar by invading the south quitting Hindustan. Nor was there great chance for intrigue, since Holkar had already got rid of his foreign officers, though Meer Khan was a likely catch. The enthusiasm of the Commander-in-Chief and the Marquess had gone down to such a level that the latter wrote on 12th May, 1804, "It is unnecessary and unadvisable that any part of the British army should attempt, in the present season, to advance further into the central and southern parts of Hindustan." There was also a great necessity to relieve the "finances of India from the burthen of maintaining the subsisting military establishment in the field."

Meanwhile, on the 22nd, events had taken place which seriously compromised the prestige of the English in India. About 5,000 'vagrant banditti' surrounded four battalions of sepoys and 450 Europeans in a Bundelkhand village and carried away "50 European artillery, two 12-pounders, two howitzers, and one 6-pounder," inflicting heavy losses on the men. The humiliation and disgrace which "this unfortunate business" inflicted on the English were to be wiped out at any cost. The Governor-General also wrote, "It was impossible to anticipate the flagrant misconduct by which the honour of the British arms has been disgraced

and the interests of the British Government hazarded, by an officer, furnished with such ample means of maintaining both." Lieutenant-Colonel Fawcett, the officer in charge, was arrested and tried by court-martial. The Marquess also directed that the arrangements he had previously ordered be postponed and "every possible effort and exertion must be made to reduce Jeswant Rao Holkar and the predatory chiefs connected with him." Accordingly war was undertaken in right earnest. Three armies took the field—General Lake in Hindustan, Lieutenant-Colonel Wallace in the Deccan and Colonel Murray in Guzerat. Besides these, fraud and intrigues.

The war began with the signal success of Colonel Don at Rampoora, but the disaster at Bundelkhand was an earnest of many more that were yet to come. Brigadier-General Monson, in whose ability and skill General Lake reposed the fullest confidence, was chosen to pursue the Holkar with a large army and with every other facility for rapid marches and effective attacks. But when Monson found Jeswunt Rao Holkar occupying a strong position near the Mucundra pass with an army "stated to consist of a large body of cavalry, a corps of regular infantry and a large train of artillery," the Governor-General desired Lake to reinforce Monson's detachment in order that a decisive blow against Holkar's power and resources might be struck. He also wanted the Commander-in-Chief to take the field in person.

But the Marquess had hardly finished writing these notes when he received intelligence of the disaster that had overtaken Colonel Monson. Lieutenant-Colonel Monson was "the younger son of a peer" and was, therefore, a favoured child of patronage. Lake's plan was to unite the two forces under Monson and Murray before a decisive

blow was struck. On such a union, the command of the troops would have naturally devolved upon Colonel Murray, but the noble Lord wrote, "the Commander-in-Chief may probably consider the command of the united detachments to be too extensive for an officer of the rank of Colonel Murray", and so, Monson was promoted to the temporary rank of a Brigadier-General, in supersession of Murray's claims. It was a flagrant act of nepotism. On the 1st of July, Monson entered Holkar's dominions through the Mucundra pass and captured the fort of Hinglais-Ghur by escalade. He proceeded 50 miles inland in seven days, when news was brought to him of Holkar's crossing the river. He wanted to attack him before he could recover from the confusion of crossing. Imagine his chagrin when he was suddenly informed that Col. Murray intended to fall back upon Guzerat and that he had only two days' grain in camp. Afraid of the helplessness of his situation, he proposed to retreat with his five battalions of sepoys and artillery and irregular horse under Lt. Lucan and Bapujee Sindhia. The irregular cavalry was dispersed by the Holkar as soon as the retreat began, and Lucan, the traitor, was imprisoned. Amir Khan, in his memoirs written after the grant to him by the British of the principality of Tonk, accuses Bapujee of treachery in suggesting flight to Monson and exaggerating the enemy's strength, but Monson must have used his judgment before taking the fatal step.

With the Holkar's horse in hot pursuit, Monson reached Mucundra pass on the 9th and, passing through Kotah and the ford across the Chumbal at Ganmuch, he reached Rampoora on the 29th July. Grant Duff describes very graphically the miseries of Monson and his men during the

disastrous and precipitate retreat.[156] Guns sank deep in the mud and had to be spiked and abandoned ; rivers were swollen and could be crossed only with great delay and greater privations ; grain was exhausted in the adjoining villages ; they had to repulse several persevering attacks of the Holkar's cavalry ; many men were drowned ; women and children had to be left on the opposite banks to be massacred by Bheels from the hills. In short, there was so much mismanagement and neglect of ordinary precautions that had Monson not been a protege of the higher authorities, he would have been court-martialled. Fortunately for the British, the Holkar was not able to take full advantage of the retreat, because his cavalry was severely handicapped by rain and floods and because his troops were not really so numerous as Monson foolishly feared.

The humiliation of the British army caused grave alarm on all sides. But General Lake wrote from Cawnpore, "Rest assured, my dear Lord, nothing shall be wanting on my part to prevent the glory of our late campaign being tarnished by any advantage that can be gained by this freebooter. He certainly has not at present one man of power or consequence attached to him and, I think it will be in my power to prevent any one from joining him." But the cup was not yet full. Monson committed "the fatal mistake" of remaining at Rampoora till 22nd August, on which date he proceeded to Kooshalgurh to meet Sindhia's troops. Holkar's cavalry now came up when Monson was attempting to cross the Bannas and nearly annihilated his force. Monson fled on to Agra, leaving his baggage and wounded to the mercy of the enemy. There was so much discontent in the Doab under British rule that the Holkar was joined by many men of consequence.

Again, Sindhia's officers were so disgusted with the policy of the British that they refrained from actual co-operation with Monson. Monson's own troops were very much dispirited and disaffected. Grant Duff says, "Monson did not know the sepoys, they had no cofidence in him, nor he in them"!

The position of the Brittsh at this moment was most critical. Lake called the retreat, "this disgraceful and disastrous event". In his opinion, "a finer detachment never marched", and he laments: "I have lost 5 battalions and six companies, the flower of the army, and how they are to be replaced at this day, God only knows." But yet, no enquiry was made into the causes of the retreat. The Governor-General wrote to Lake: "I fear my poor friend Monson is gone... I will endeavour to shield his character from obloquy, nor will I attempt the mean purpose of sacrificing his reputation to save mine. His former services and zeal entitle him to indulgence, and however I may lament or suffer for his errors, I will not reproach his memory, if he be lost, or his character, if he survive." General Lake replied, "Your sentiments respecting Monson are noble and are worthy of the great mind you possess", and later, "I certainly become the responsible person in the first instance and shall, upon every occasion, declare publicly and privately, both here and at home, that you had nothing to do with the march of that detachment and that all censure for that measure must be attributed to me and me alone."

The energies of the British were now directed to retrieve their reputation, for as the Marquess wrote: "Every hour that shall be left to this plunderer will be marked by some calamity; we must expect a general defection of the allies and even confusion in our territories, unles we can attack Holkar's main force immediately with decisive

success," Monson discovered a secret correspondence between the Holkar and the Jat Raja Runjeet Singh of Bhurtpore, an ally of the English. The intercepted letters and communications proved, according to the Marquess, only that the Raja and his son were merely the instruments of "the mean, profligate and indigent contrivers of the original plot", and three months later, he asked Lake to proceed against the Raja "if his treachery should be proved." The real cause of the projected campaign was that the British desired to retrieve their fame by beating some one and they chose Bhurtpore because "the power or resources of Raja Ranjit Singh cannot reasonably give any cause of alarm for the result." Even assuming the letters to be genuine, the correspondence discloses nothing but the discontent and disaffection of all the allies and subjects of the Company. The Holkar, at the worst, was merely flattering the British by imitating their tactics! The British had made themselves obnoxious in the Doab by their enhancement of the land revenue their "cow-killing propensities," oppressive administration of the salt department [157] and an attempt to introduce the English system of courts. They also wanted the surrender of all those suspected by them of conspiracy.

Again, the Sindhia was getting more and more sullen and discontented. He protested, in a long letter dated 18th October, 1804, against many a serious injury and insult. He asked for "pecuniary assistance to the extent which might be requisite to prosecute the war" in consideration of "the embarrassed state of his finances," in the shape at least of a loan without interest, the amount to be deducted from the annual sum of twenty lacs fifty thousand rupees due to him from

the Company. He protested against the unwarranted assumption of the Governor-General and others that he had 'renounced' all claims to Gwalior and Gohud. He complained of the connivance of the English Resident at the disorders in his dominions, not knowing that, in the words of the Hon'ble Mr. F. J. Shore, Residents are "maintained for the express purpose of promoting misgovernment and confusion in the different principalities so as to afford plausible excuses for our taking possession of them."[158] "If I propose", he wrote "to Mr. Webbe, that I should despatch troops from hence to those pergunnahs, he will not consent, nor will he himself apply a remedy." He challenged the Governor-General to show cause why no assistance or protection was given him by Col. Murray when the Holkar captured Mundasoor and Amir Khan invested Bhilsa. He explained Monson's retreat as due solely to his cowardice and not to any defection of the Sindhia's troops, as was suggested, [159] for, while Monson with the infantry remained behind, Bapujee Sindhia advanced and encountered the enemy, losing 700 men in the struggle. Monson's treachery along with financial difficulties, he said, induced Bapujee to seek protection with the Holkar. In the concluding part of the letter, he said that he was collecting his troops and moving from Burhanpore, as a result of the "delay and evasions in every point" and many violations of treaty stipulations. The Sindhia was so exasperated at the policy of Mr. Jenkins, who succeeded Webbe on his death, that he incarcerated him—an act, which, in spite of extenuating circumstances, was against every received principle of the Law of Nations. Thus, wherever the English looked around, the prospect appeared gloomy for them; their state of affairs in India was extremely critical. The Raja of

Berar was also suspected of meditating war on the English. How they managed to get out of this mesh which they had themselves woven can now be studied.

The Marquess of Wellesley handled the situation very cleverly. He tried to conciliate the Raja of Bhurtpore in spite of all Lake's blood-thirsty eagerness to wipe that principality from the map of India. He proposed to assure him of "the determination of the British government to discharge all the obligations of the existing treaty with him." He suggested to General Lake many openings for intrigues against the Holkar. His army, it was noted, was composed of Pathans and Muslims. "You will also take every step", advised the Christian Lord, "... for encouraging desertion from Holkar by renewing the proclamation of last year ; or by other encouragements." Of course, Lake was a past master in that art and so he replied, "Some of them (Holkar's troops) are again making proposals to come over; they shall be received if they come...Anything like disaffection among them has its weight and may be of use ; therefore it shall be encouraged." Intrigues were also carried on with Sindhia's Christian Commander Jean Baptiste. Lake wrote, "Jean Baptiste would join him (Col. Murray) but cannot move from his present situation for want of subsistence for his troops. He is desirous of coming to me, but requires a lac and a half of rupees to pay his troops.....if he does anything worth notice, it will be time enough to pay him then." Sikh chieftains like Dolcha Singh and others were also subsidised to protect the Doab. After elaborating this huge Machiavellian plan, the Marquess made preparations for defending Agra, Delhi and other places and drew a net of five armies around the Holkar from Guzerat, Malwa, Cawnpore, Bundlekhand and Delhi.

Though the Holkar out-generalled the English and captured Muttra in the north, his possessions south of the Taptee river were all easily captured, especially since the Raja of Berar was compelled to yield on pain of war many provinces as a result of a charge of conspiracy. Colonel Wallace with the Peshwa's contingent captured Chandore. Colonel Murray proceeded to Ujjain, and Indore fell *without any resistance*—a clear proof that the British intrigues had succeeded only too well. So the Holkar sent vakeels to Poona to mediate for peace, but General Lake was determined to crush the plunderer. Hence, Holkar fell back upon Delhi, then under the command of Ochterlony, who had screwed himself into popularity by keeping a harem and studying the languages and manners of the people. Holkar retreated for Delhi also and sought refuge with the Raja of Bhurtpore. General Fraser, Monson and Lake went in hot pursuit. The first two officers won a dearly bought victory at Deeg and secured Holkar's ordnance. "The great and glorious victory gained at Deeg" appeared to Lake "to surpass anything that has hitherto been done in India". "The rapidity of my march" (23 miles a day!) "has astonished all the natives beyond imagination and made them think there is nothing we are not equal to". The Governor-General reciprocated these pompous and pleasing sentiments. "No greater display has been made of our power, valour or skill", said he.

But all these mutual congratulations of the two self-sufficient persons were premature, for the Holkar had escaped and "until his person be either destroyed or imprisoned, we shall have no rest." After ten days of siege, Deeg fell. General Lake, who had been empowered to decide for the conclusion of peace or the continuation of war, underrated the power of his enemy and planned their

utter annihilation. The Governor-General was also elated at the turn of the tide. He wrote, "The entire reduction of the power and resources of the Raja of Bhurtpore, however, is now become indispensably necessary, and I accordingly authorise and direct Your Excellency to adopt immediate arrangements for the attainment of that desirable object and for the annexation to the British power, ...of all the forts, territories and possessions belonging to the Raja of Bhurtpore".

The Holkar had taken refuge in the Bhurtpore fort itself and so its siege was begun. The town of Bhurtpore was eight square miles in extent and was surrounded by a mud-wall of great thickness and height and a very wide and deep ditch filled with water. The whole force of the Raja with many of the inhabitants of the surrounding country, together with the shattered battalions of Holkar's infantry, were thrown into the place. General Lake arrived before its walls on the 3rd January, 1805; batteries were opened on the 7th; a breach in the wall was reported practicable on the 9th and storming was determined upon. But "obstacles of an insurmountable nature" compelled the column to retire with heavy loss. "Circumstances of an unexpected and unfortunate nature occurred which their utmost efforts could not surmount." But Lake did not lose hope. "I hope, in a very few days, their excellent conduct will be rewarded by the possession of the place." A second attempt was made on the 21st January, but General Lake wrote, "I am sorry to add that the ditch was found so broad and deep that every attempt to pass it proved unsuccessful and the party was obliged to return to the trenches without effecting their object". After elaborate preparations for about a month, another attempt was made on the 20th February. "The Europeans,

however, of His Majesty's 75th and 76th who were at the head of the column refused to advance.....The entreaties and expostulations of their officers failing to produce any effect, two regiments of Native Infantry, the 12th and the 15th, were summoned to the fort and gallantly advanced to the storm", says Horace Hayman Wilson. It was the much-abused Indian who preserved the English from utter ruin.

It is very difficult to discover the causes of the failure of the English, because the commander-in-chief's reports are 'laconic', as Mill says, and unreliable. "As general causes, he (Lake) alleges the extent of the place, the number of its defenders, the strength of its works and lastly, the incapacity of his engineers; as if a commander-in-chief were fit for his office who is not himself an engineer;" but the greatest cause was that there was no British officer or soldier in the employ of the enemy inside the fort. On the failure of three formidable attempts, the Governor-General became much depressed and concerned. He wrote, "I fear that we have despised the place and enemy so much as to render both formidable." Therefore, intrigues were begun with the Raja of Bhurtpore to detach him from the Holkar. Lake had meanwhile been raised to the peerage, and he was asked by the Marquess to inform Runjeet Singh that his only certainty of escape from British wrath lay in throwing himself upon the clemency of the British Government and renouncing Holkar, in which case "he will be admitted to pardon and restored to his possessions." According to Lake's report, the correspondence was hopeful. Amir Khan was also promised jaghirs and funds to desert the Holkar, while the Sindhia was made powerless by the defection of Jean Baptiste Filose.

The negotiations which Lord Lake had opened with the Raja, terminated in the Treaty of April, 1805. It is highly creditable to the Raja of Bhurtpore that he did not curry favour with the English by surrendering the person of the Holkar. In order to show the world that the Raja had been sufficiently punished for his alleged treachery, it was laid down on paper that the Raja should pay twenty lakhs of rupees and be deprived of Deeg and the country granted to him the previous year. But, the Raja actually paid only three lakhs of rupees and the fortress of Deeg was restored to him very soon.

The Holkar should be looked upon as the saviour of India at this critical juncture. For had he been subdued, the British would have annexed not only his dominions but they would have gone to war with the other native princes of India and deprived them of their possessions. The supremacy of the English in India in the time of Wellesly would have been attended with consequences fatal to the very existence of Indians. Half a century later, during the time of Lord Dalhousie, the natives of India had come to know the character of the newcomers, their language, literature and science, and so they set in operation forces which saved India from utter annihilation, but brought her under the Crown and Parliament of England.

The Last Days of Wellesley in India

We have noted how, when his grievances were not listened to, the Sindhia moved out towards Bhurtpore and how as a result of treachery in his army, he was made ineffective as an enemy. The Sindhia assumed, therefore, a conciliatory tone and he was promised funds provided he would return and apologise for his conduct towards the Resident. Some time later, the Holkar joined him for the purpose of mediating a peace, as the Sindhia explained. The Governor-General too was not for pursuing him, especially since the Holkar had already proceeded towards Ajmere. He thought it only necessary to canton the troops in such a manner as would be easily available for renewing the war at any moment.

Had Wellesley remained in India till August, 1805, he would have renewed the war in right earnest in order to wipe out the disgrace at Bhurtpore, but he had to leave India for good very soon. The Directors were alarmed at the huge debt created by his wars. Dividends began to disappear. Regarding the war with the Holkar, Mr. Pitt was decidedly of opinion "that he had acted most imprudently and illegally and that he could not be suffered to remain in the Government." Cornwallis pointed out another cause for dissatisfaction in the fact that he did not secure the concurrence of his Council before the commencement of hostilities. The Court of Directors severely and adversely criticised the Indian policy of the Governor-General. It has to be remembered that the noble Lord had intimated his intention of

resigning the service of the Company and of embarking for England in the month of January 1803. But the confusion and disorder which he succeeded in creating in the Maratha polity by his machinations, made him change his mind and ask the permission of the Court of Directors to stay on in India and to improve the interests of the British in India. Wellesley submitted on the 18th May, 1805, his explanations in reply to the Court's attacks, and added: "The present state of affairs in India appearing to admit of my early resignation of the office of Governor-General and my health being extremely precarious, I propose to embark for England", etc. But already on January 18th, Lord Castlereagh had sent a letter to India appointing Lord Cornwallis as Governor-General. Cornwallis was supposed to be a lover of peace, but he had evinced great satisfaction at "the important and glorious achievements" of Lake and Wellesley and of the statesmen and generals "entrusted with the preservation of our Asiastic Empire." Cornwallis arrived in Calcutta on the 30th July and Wellesley left it on the 15th August. He was the greatest follower of Machiavelli whom England ever sent out to India.

After his return to England an attempt was made to impeach him. His greatest crime was, Mr. Paull said, that his administration deprived England of an annual sum of not less than one million pounds sterling, which had to be remitted home under the Act of 1793. "Since 1798, no sum whatever has been applied to commercial purposes and the law has been violated in this single instance to a sum exceeding 8 millions. To this extent, and to this amount has this commercial nation been deprived of such an import from our colonies, which the law enjoined and ordered."

Lord Cornwallis's Second Administration

When Lord Cornwallis landed in India, he found the affairs of the Company terribly disorganised. The Treasury was empty. "Lake's army, the pay of which amounts to about 5 lakhs per month, is above five months in arrears. An army of irregulars composed chiefly of deserters from the enemy, which, with the approbation of Government, the General assembled by proclamation and which costs about 6 lakhs per month, is likewise somewhat in arrear." "Lord William Bentinck has borrowed twenty lakhs from the Vizir and has written to press him for ten more. Our credit has, I believe, been tried to the utmost at Benares and other places." Cornwallis hit on the expedient of taking the bullion out of the ships at Madras which was destined for China and also to reduce the number of troops; for, as he satisfied the Court of Directors, "such is the astonishing increase of the exports from India, especially in the articles of opium and cotton from this place within these few years," that there can not be a doubt of the amplest supplies being tendered for the acceptance of the bills on Bengal drawn by Chinese agents of the Company.

Cornwallis proceeded by river to the Upper Provinces, in order to endeavour for peace, which was essential for these conditions. He deprecated in a letter to Malet, the "universal frenzy, which has seized even some of the heads which I thought the soundest in the country, for conquest and victory, as opposed to the interests as it is to the laws of our country." In a very

long letter, he unfolded to him his plan for terminating disputes and bringing about peace with the Maratha States. He wanted to restore all conquests to the Holkar, to give back Gwalior to Sindhia on certain conditions and, while terminating all connections with the Rana of Gohud, to ensure that the Rana was ensured a pension of about 3 lakhs of rupees per year. He wanted also to promulgate the general principles of policy towards all the States of India with a view to "restore to the Native States that confidence in the justice and moderation of the British government, which past events have considerably impaired and which appears to me to be essential to the security and tranquillity of the Company's dominions."

Lord Cornwallis had some experience of Lake's activities in Ireland at the time of the Irish Rebellion and Union, and since he had come to India in the dual capacity of Governor-General and Commander-in-Chief, dissensions broke out between them. On the 25th July, the Governor-General in Council, Marquess Wellesley, had ordered him to "be prepared to commence active operations" and to "transmit a plan of operations for the eventual prosecution of hostilities" "at the earliest practicable period of time." But five days later, on the 29th, Cornwallis wrote to him "not to engage in any act of aggression unless it might be necessary in order to secure your own army from *serious* danger." No wonder, this was felt by Lake as a bolt from the blue. The disappointed Commander-in-Chief began to remonstrate with his superior, whom he accused of usurping his authority. Lord Cornwallis firmly told him that he should obey his commands. The aged lord's last letter was one of "regret and concern" at the attitude taken by that "truculent ruffian", "especially after the full persuasion I had been impressed with

of the thorough cordiality with which you had contemplated my arrival in India in the stations of of Governor-General and Commander-in-Chief". Lord Lake intended to resign his command and return to England. His uncompromising attitude preyed on the mind of his old master and hastened his death. He died at Ghazipur in October, 1805 —not able either to effect any reform or commit any mischief in the administration of India.

———

Sir George Barlow (1805-1807)

The death of Cornwallis was welcomed by Lord Lake, for the Commander-in-Chief abandoned his intention of returning to England. Sir George Barlow, the senior member of the Council, acted as Governor-General. Though he was an apt pupil of the Marquess of Wellesley, he could not carry on the traditions of his master. War was opposed by the public and by the authorities at home and was positively disallowed by the empty treasury. Nevertheless, Sir George adopted a dishonest and mean policy towards the Native States. He wanted to separate the Sindhia and Holkar. The former was made to understand, through a very pliable agent called Munshi Kavel Nyne, that all his possessions which had been captured by Wellesley would be returned to him if he separated from the Holkar. Therefore, the Holkar had to find an asylum somewhere else. He directed his steps to the Punjab from Ajmere, expecting assistance from the King of Kabul and the Sikh chieftains. Meanwhile a treaty was concluded with Sindhia on 23rd November, 1805. Several items of the Treaty of Surji-Arjengaon were modified. There was no longer to be any defensive or subsidiary alliance between the English and Sindhia. Gwalior and the province of Gohud were likewise ceded to him. Ranjit Singh, because he counted on British help, did not help the Holkar, and Lord Lake pursued him into the Punjab. How does the character of the Jat Prince Ranjit Singh of Bhurtpore compare with that of the Sikh chief Ranjit Singh of the Punjab? The autobiography of Amir Khan

relates [160] the method by which Lord Lake sent "an intelligent and skilful negotiator" to the Holkar's camp in order to induce him to sue for peace. On the 24th December, 1805, a treaty was signed on the terms which Lord Cornwallis had proposed. Thus ended the Second Maratha war. With the exception of the Peshwa no other Maratha state was drawn into the abominable subsidiary or so-called defensive alliance. But all the Maratha Princes, the Peshwa, Sindhia, the Raja of Berar, Holkar, were most unjustly deprived of some of their most fertile provinces.

Sir George Barlow followed a policy of obtaining power by playing one Raja against another. He withdrew from the defensive alliance concluded with the Rajput Princes by Wellesley and Lake. According to Malcolm,[161] his policy was "a policy, which declaredly looks to the disputes and wars of its neighbours as one of the chief sources of its security ; and which, if it does not directly excite such wars, shapes its political relations with inferior States in a manner calculated to create and continue them" Metcalfe wrote that Sir George contemplated in the discord of the native powers an additional source of strength and "if I am not mistaken, some of his plans go directly and are designed to foment discord among those States."[162]

The Vellore Mutiny broke out during Barlow's term of office. Wellesley was the pioneer among the Company's officers to launch on a scheme of evangelising India, and in Madras, where Christianity had found a warm welcome from the earliest times, the religion was thriving very well and vigorously.[163] There were many zealots among the Christian officers. In the beginning of the nineteenth century., Lord William Bentinck was the Governor of Madras and Sir John Craddock, the

Commander-in-Chief, and both these rode rough-shod over the religious and social scruples of the people. Without consulting the native officers, certain changes were made in the dress and social usages of the Madras Sepoy. The Sepoy was ordered "not to mark his face to denote his caste, or wear ear-rings, when dressed in his uniform; and it is further directed that, at all parades and upon all duties, every soldier of the battalion shall be clean shaved on the chin. It is directed also that uniformity shall be preserved in regard to the quantity and shape of the hair upon the upper lip, as far as may be practicable."

About 2 A. M. on the 10th July, the native troops appointed to guard Tipu's sons at Vellore awakened the commanding officer with a loud firing, and in the disturbance, he was mortally wounded. The mutiny was easily suppressed and a mixed Commission was set up to inquire into the incident. The civilians attributed it to the absurd and foolish military measures; while the military officers regarded it as a conspiracy in favour of the sons of Tipu, who were therefore removed to Bengal. The Governor-General, however, was satisfied of the good conduct and innocence of the hostages.

It should be remembered that the authorities were then trying to convert the heathens of India. Reverend Sydney Smith, in an article published in the *Edinburgh Review* for 1807, wrote that Government was very willing to forward the missionaries' views and to supply them with passports. He says that the plan and objects of their mission were printed free of expense at the Government Press. He refers to the "determined and fearless interposition" of the Residents in their favour.

Sir George Barlow was not confirmed. He was greatly disappointed at the appointment of

Lord Minto for the place. However, as a solatium, Sir George Barlow was made Governor of Madras, in the place of Lord William Bentinck, who was recalled.

Lord Minto

When Lord Minto arrived, the finances of the Company were tottering under the burden of the late war; internal rebellion and external invasion had both to be guarded against. Effective steps had not been taken to discourage or suppress the dacoities in Bengal, which increased "to a degree surpassing what was ever witnessed in any country in which law and government could with any degree of propriety be said to exist."[164] The Governor-General explained away this fact by the venality of Indian police officials and the temptation of superior wealth in the hands of an emasculated race.[165] It is really surprising how soon the Sir Gilbert Elliott of the impeachment had become an Anglo-Indian bureaucrat. There is no evidence of the superior wealth of Bengal; the weakness of the subject race is a damaging confession; while, of the venality, the Native States employing Indian officers were peculiarly free from the infamy. The fact was that the British rulers never cared for the welfare or prosperity of their subjects.

The danger of a Maratha combination to avenge the late war was fortunately averted by the insanity of the Holkar in 1808 as a result of continued disappointments. His dominions were administered by a regency, nominally under Tulsi Bai, the favourite mistress of Jeswant Rao, but really controlled by Ameer Khan. The Holkar's dominions alternately swayed between two factions—the Maratha and the Pathan, and Ameer Khan, anxious to be in the good graces

of the Christian Government, served as its catspaw and kept up the anarchy and disorder. The other Maratha powers, however, seemed formidable enough. But the finances of the Company did not allow them to keep large armies on the frontiers and so they resorted to the policy of creating distractions by encouraging the Pindaris to plunder the dominions of the Sindhia and the Holkar—a policy pursued by the Iron Duke himself in 1803.[166] It appears highly probable that the English, in their anxiety to induce the Rajah of Berar to enter into the subsidiary alliance, indirectly invited Ameer Khan through their puppet, the Nizam, to invade Berar; and then, exhibited its disinterestedness in coming to Berar's rescue, suggesting at the same time the subsidiary alliance as a panacea for all his ills.

Since Lord Minto's regime is noted for his foreign policy, it deserves greater attention, though he gave effect to what had been already initiated by the Marquess of Wellesley. During the latter's regime, the N. W. Frontier assumed dangerous prominence for the first time and then, the Marquess had embassies sent to Persia and opened intrigues in Sindh and the Punjab. Captain Malcolm had been sent to Persia in 1799 in order to tempt the King to betray a prince of his creed with an annual bribe of three lakhs of rupees. He had also to intrigue with the exiled brothers of the Amir living under the Shah's protection. These purposes, hidden under the cloak of a commercial embassy, succeeded only too well; since, within 2 years, the Amir was blinded and imprisoned by his half-brother, who was in his turn, dethroned hy his brother Shah Shuja. Malcolm had also instructions to engage the Shah in his favour so as to check the French, but this Frankophobia had, during the time of Minto, given

place to Russophobia. The Peace of Tilsit upset the plans of English statesmen and they began to fear a combined Russian and French attack upon India.[167]

So, after some bickerings with the Home Government to set aside technical objections,[168] Sir John Malcolm was once more chosen for his campaign of "deceit, falsehood and intrigue". But by his injudicious haste and "ill-timed arrogance" in asking the Shah to send away the French embassy, the mission from which so much was expected, ended in miserable failure.

Lord Minto despatched a mission to the Amirs of Sindh ostensibly against a French invasion but in reality against their Afghan sovereign. Wellesley's idea was to cultivate the friendship of the Sikhs and raise them into a buffer State against the Afghans and the Marathas. Ranjit Singh adhered to a policy of strict neutrality and even offered to hand over the Cis-Sutlej chieftainships to the British, "on condition of mutual defence against their respective enemies." As this did not suit the British, Ranjit sought to bring the territories more closely under his control. The Sikh States appealed for British help and Mr. Metcalfe, a confirmed Jingoist, was sent to Lahore, the Commander-in-chief receiving private orders to be prepared for an advance.[169] Metcalfe endeavoured to instil confidence into Ranjit's mind, but since he could give no answer to the question of Ranjit's control over the Cis-Sutlej tracts, the Sikh Raja invaded the States. The British had spied out the land and noted the military weaknesses of the Sikhs and hence, they declared the Sutlej as the boundary of Ranjit's dominions and asked for a military outpost on the left bank of the river to prevent future encroachments ! No wonder Ranjit had "serious thoughts of appealing to the sword,"

but, at last, for various reasons, a treaty was concluded in April, 1809, by which the Cis-Sutlej States were retained by the British. The unstatesmanlike Ranjit felt amply conpensated when he was given a free hand over the dominions North and West of the Sutlej. Little did he recognise that this very freedom served an ulterior purpose of the British to render the Punjaub a buffer State.

It was on this account that an embassy to Shah Shuja sent under Elphinstone did not conclude any definite treaty. The Afghan mission was regarded, from the very first, with strong prejudice and distrust. Shah Shuja's best advice to the English was "to go home as fast as they could, unless they were inclined to help him against his enemies"—enemies created partly by British diplomacy in Persia. Moreover, the English desired to compensate Ranjit Singh and so they did not desire to restrict his ambitions, fully realising that it would be very difficult for such a heterogeneous empire to outlive the Lion of the Punjaub.

The British apprehended danger from the sea also. Hence the isle of France, Bourbon and Rodriguez in the Indian Ocean and the Dutch possessions in the Eastern Archipelago were annexed in 1810 at great cost to the Indian tax-payer.

It is but fair to remark that great credit is due to Lord Minto for doing much to discourage the invasion of India by Christian missionaries. He placed the Serampore Mission under strict control in regard to preaching propaganda and the publication of vernacular pamphlets and books.

Another incident, though small, has to be noted, since it reveals one important aspect of Christian rule in India. In order to relieve an acute financial crisis, Sir George Barlow, the Governor of

Madras, abolished in 1808 a monthly allowance for camp equipage, called "Tent Contract," given to commanders of Native Troops. This induced the British officers to rise in mutiny at Masulipatam, Seringapatam and Hyderabad. Blood was shed[170] in Mysore in a free fight between a loyal regiment from Chitaldrug marching towards Seringapatam and the mutineers. M. Victor Jacquemont writes that "the Government had the weakness not to shoot a single officer."[171] The most distinguished political officers, like Colonel Barry Close, Malcolm, Hon'ble Arthur Cole and even Lord Minto, hurried to the scenes of mutiny to pacify the officers. No Christian officer was hanged or blown from the mouth of a cannon.

The Marquess of Hastings

Lord Minto's greatest fault was that he did not have earth-hunger. Moreover, he had to make room for a personal friend of the Prince Regent. So, the Marquess of Hastings was appointed in order to win the applause of the British by more conquests and exploitation. Sir George Birdwood has said that it was the Company's possession of India which enabled England successfully to resist the power of Napoleon I. It was by bleeding India and flooding her markets with cotton goods and ruining her industries that England secured enough money to intrigue with other European powers against France. Hence, Lord Hastings came to India with a free hand in the double capacity of Governor-General and Commander-in-chief. He must also have had a desire to win military glory to wipe out his disgrace at Yorktown.

The renewal of the Company's charter was effected during his voyage to India in 1813. The "shop-keeper" rule of the British dates from this year, since after it the Company became a deliberate destroyer of Indian industries. The new charter degraded the plain-living Indians and flooded the Indian market with needless luxuries and dangerous drinks.[172] Moreover, while in 1793, the exertions of Sir Philip Francis had inserted a clause in the charter disavowing any desire for extension of dominion, the charter of 1813 was significantly silent on this crucial point of policy. Again, the charter very unfairly saddled India with the cost of the Clerical Establishment of the Company. It also encouraged settlements of

Europeans in India. All these indefensible measures were sought to be justified by motives of philanthropy and altruism. In fact, the sum and substance of the charter was that India was not for Indians but for Englishmen.

The Marquess of Hastings declared war with Nepal soon after he landed in India. The disputes which brought about this war were caused by some frontier claims. The Gurkhas are admitted to have been open to reason and even prepared to make reparation.[173] The usual method of dealing with such disputes was by appointing representative commissioners and one such, under Mr. Bradshaw, was actually sitting when the Marquess appeared on the scene. Then suddenly, Mr. Bradshaw began using improper language, the Magistrate of Gorakhpur was empowered to order an advance of troops into Nepal, and the Gurkhas were asked to evacuate the disputed lands within twenty-five days ! The Governor-General proceeded to Lucknow to shake the pagoda-tree and succeeded so far that the Nawab Vizir "out of gratitude" advanced him a loan of 12½ crores of rupees.[174] The Gurkhas remembered this till 1857, when they carried fire and sword through Oude in their campaign of revenge.

The Nepalese had to guard a large frontier against an enemy who possessed superior forces and the subtler weapons of intrigue and corruption. Still they deliberately and boldly took up the challenge. Against 30,000 troops and 60 guns marching in 5 divisions from the Sutlej down to the Koosee in the East, they could collect only 12,000 ill-armed and ill-disciplined men. But yet, according to Shishir Kumar Ghose, the English found in Nepal "what the Hindus were like in early days, not demoralised by defeat and disorder." General Gillespie died, in the heroic

seige of a very weak position taken up by the brave Balabhadra Singh[175] and 300 of his men, exhorting with his last breath his cowardly[176] British regiment to follow him. Balabhadra is an even greater hero than Leonidas of Greece.

So, it was found necessary to supplement the sword by fraudulent intrigues with discontented hill-tribes and dispossessed Royal families in Nepalese Territory. Dr. Rutherford, a trade agent, supplied very useful information derived through his system of spies. General Ochterlony, who kept a harem himself and lived in the super-oriental style, persuaded the Rajas of Hindur and Bilaspore to join the British and marched towards Amar Singh, the Gurkha leader at the head of 700 troops.[177] With less than half the number, Amar Singh inflicted heavy defeats on the British, but in their hour of triumph the Gurkhas did not fail to show that generosity to the vanguished for which the Hindus alone of all nations of the earth are noted. A British officer, who had deserted the Holkar's service and married a Muslim lady, won over the Raja of Sikkim, the chief of Kumaon and the people of Garhwal into neutrality. Thus, the failure of British arms all along the frontier of Nepal was counteracted to a certain extent.

As the war continued, the English learnt the peculiar Gurkha methods of warfare, and "so the issue was placed in the power of continuance, that is, in the length of the purse." The Raja of Nepal realised this early enough and he sent his family priest to Mr. Bradshaw, the political agent, in spite of the warnings of Amar Singh.[178] In the true Shylock spirit, the Christians required the perpetual cession of all the hill country captured by them and of the Terai ; the relinquishment of Nagree and Nagarkot to Sikkim ; the acceptance of a Resident and a stipulation not to entertain

Europeans in service. Shades of Tipu's fate hovered over the Raja of Nepal, and all patriotic Gurkhas like Amar Singh desired to keep the English out of Nepal, at all costs.

Recurrence of hostilities was, therefore, inevitable and a sharper and shorter campaign began in 1816. It ended in March and a very advantageous treaty was concluded. The Gurkhas were crushed never to rise again. The British became the masters of the pleasant Himalayan heights and valleys, which, they thought, they could in time colonise.

Lord Hastings extended British influence in another quarter by concluding a treaty with Cutch promising to protect its ruler. He must be given credit for being foresighted enough to declare that the British Empire should not be pushed to the river Indus and the countries beyond. He could have easily conquered Sindh, without enhancing the reputation of the British for bad faith, had he been so inclined. But Lord Hastings said : "Few things would be more impolitic than a war with Sindh, as its successful prosecution would not only be unprofitable but an evil. The country was not worth possessing and its occupation would involve us in all the intrigues and wars, and incalculable embarrassments of the countries beyond the Indus."[179] How devoutly one could have wished that these views had prevailed in the Councils of his successors like Bentinck, Auckland, Ellenborough or Dalhousie!

The Pindari War and the Last of the Peshwas

The Pindaris were a sort of unpaid militia whose services had long been requisitioned by the Maratha princes but who, in times of peace, were peaceful and loyal cultivators.[180] Since they were the auxiliaries of the regular Maratha forces, the British entertained ill-feeling towards them. Of course, too much credence should not be placed in British accounts of Pindari ferocity. Even Sir John Malcolm is compelled to admit their humanity to prisoners[181]. The Pindari leaders were mostly Afghan military adventurers. Thus Nusroo and his son Chekun were Jemadars under Sivaji and Ghaziuddin, the son of the latter died fighting for the Peshwa. His son Gurdee Khan took service under Mulhar Rao Holkar and under him the number and importance of the Pindaris developed greatly. Amir Khan, Tukoo and Bahadur Khan were known as Holkar Shahee (adherents of Holkar). The Sindhia engaged the younger son of Ghaziuddin, whose descendant Wasil made some incursions into British territory. Sindhia had also given titles and jagirs to Cheetoo, a Jat of very romantic antecedents, and Karim Khan, a Pathan soldier of rare courage and excellence. The vaious Maratha princes had to engage more and more free-booters as a result of the confusion created by Barlow's Machiavellian policy towards the Native States.

The Pindaris respected the British possessions for a long time on the testimony of no less a personage than Grant Duff. Amir Khan was even

patronised by them and no steps were taken to punish them when, between 1808 and 1812, they committed sundry dacoities in Guzrat, Mirzapur and Shahabad. But in 1815, a party of Pindaris were routed by Major Fraser on the plea that they were meditating an incursion into the Southern Provinces. Mr. Prinsep naturally attributes the Pindari plan to the instigation of the Marathas, though no evidence is or can be adduced. This provoked them to a plundering progress through British territories all along the Kistna river. The British preparations for war, without any consultation of the princes, were so largely out of proportion to the object against which they were presumably directed that the Marathas were naturally alarmed. Nor was this 'a baseless suspicion', since prospects of a huge war with the Marathas were talked of with delight in every English camp.

The ulterior motive of the Pindari War was to destroy Maratha power for which effort the British were now better equipped than ever before. Central India was for many years a terra incognita to them, but thanks to the meritorious services of Colonel James Tod, his map of Central India and Rajputna, presented to Hastings in 1815, "was of vast utility to the Government, being made one of the foundations of Lord Hastings' plan of operations in the year 1817."[182] Colonel Tod fanned the flames of hatred between the Rajputs on the one hand and the Marathas and the Muslims on the other.[183] He did not even spare one of the greatest, best and noblest of all the monarchs in India—Akbar the Great—in this disgraceful campaign of fomenting dissensions. Thus armed with an accurate map and confident of Rajput neutrality, if not help, Hastings entered upon his extensive war.

The Sindhia was first dealt with. A former treaty with him by which the Company had undertaken not to correspond with the Rajputs, was declared annulled "on proof of his hostile practices", and "emancipated from this injurious shackle", the Governor-General received all the Rajputs as feudatory to the British, taking consolation in the hope that "their reciprocal estrangements will prevent their ever forming any union." The Sindhia was forced to accept this new treaty as a result of some skilful military manoeuvres. So the Governor-General in a proclamation to the army consoled it "for the diminished prospect of serious exertion." Sir John Kaye observes with reference to this statment : "It proves how little he desired to conceal the fact that the army was longing for a war with the Maratha States."[184]

It was not so easy for the Governor-General to deal with the Jat princes of the Doab. He did not consider it expedient to court another disaster at Bhurtpur; but for "refusing to let any of the Company's servants to go into the fort"[185] (constructed on the model of Bhurtpur), Daya Ram, Raja of Hattras, was wantonly attacked and the place was captured after a protracted seige. On this the Raja of Moorsan surrendered without any resistance.

The Peshwa was the main link of the chain which held together the Maratha confederacy, and so it had to be struck out first. Though "a prisoner in the hands of the English", in the words of Lady Caldecott, Baji Rao was never tired of expressing his gratitude to the Company. Lord Valentia had three interviews with him at Poona and he was satisfied that he valued the British alliance very highly. Sir James Mackintosh, the Chief Justice of Bombay, considered him superior to George III and even Napoleon. Sir Barry

Close, the British Resident at Poona, in spite of the persistent campaign of General Wellesley and his school of Machiavalllians to misrepresent the Peshwa, believed in his sincere gratitude. But with the appointment of Mountstuart Elphinstone as Resident at Poona, troubles began. Elphinstone was in the diplomatic service during those eventful years when the Peshwa was persuaded to place the yoke of subsidiary alliance on his neck. Throughout the second Maratha War, he served on the staff of Sir Arthur Wellesley and later for 4 years as Resident at Nagpur when, he confessed, he became "dreadfully coarse and unfeeling." In 1809, he went on an abortive mission to Afghanistan and suggested the capture of Sind. With such a glorious record of double-dealing and diplomacy, he became Resident at Poona. His first public act was to dismiss Jamsedji Modi, a very shrewd Parsi agent through whom Sir Barry had managed all his dealings with the Peshwa with success—a change not very welcome to the Peshwa himself.

Again, the Peshwa had certain claims of arrears of tribute amounting to a crore of rupees from the Gaekwar, along with the lease of the Ahmedabad farm to continue or renew. Elphinstone, after much delay, approved of the appointment by the Gaekwar of a most undesirable and irritating Brahmin named Gangadhara Sastri---who was reputed throughout the Deccan for his sneaking services to the British and who, in the words of Elphinstone himself, called "the Peshwa and his ministers---old fools and damned rascals, or rather dam rascals."[186] The Sastri had many enemies, since he betrayed the Hindu cause and received liberal allowances from the Company,[187] and Elphinstone had to issue a guarantee for his safety before he could set foot in the Deccan.

As soon as Gangadhar arrived in Poona, he

advised the externment of Modi[188]; but before Modi left for the North, he was found dead in Poona itself. It was certainly not a case of suicide; it is very absurd to allege that the Peshwa had a hand in murdering his most faithful officer; it is very probable that he was poisoned by some emissaries of the Resident and the Sastri.

The lease of the Ahmedabad farm was of great interest to the English, for it touched the Bombay district on many points; but Baji Rao granted it to Trimbuckji Danglia, a great and loyal minister. The Peshwa also made great efforts to win over the Sastri by offering him a ministership (which was refused) and by proposing a marriage alliance, which was first accepted and then refused in a very insulting manner. The Sastri prevented his wife from visiting the palace. Meanwhile, his final arrangement to cede to the Peshwa estates worth 7 lakhs for payment of all arrears was not sanctioned by the Gaekwar and so the Sastri found himself in a very awkward position.

While matters had come to such a pass Gangadhar Sastri was murdered at Pandharpur while in the Peshwa's camp. The Peshwa had gone there on one of his pilgrimages to expiate for his father's murder of Narayana Rao. It is, therefore, unlikely that in such a holy place, while engaged in such a mission, Baji Rao would have committed a deed both dastardly and abhorrent to Hindu religion and custom. Trimbuckjee Danglia, from whom a confession seems to have been exported by methods too patent had also no motive for the crime. The truth seems to be that the deed was done by certain of the Sastri's Baroda enemies who had come to Pandharpur and from whom the Sastri had received letters threatening personal injury and even loss of life.[189]

Elphinstone knew how to make capital out of this murder and pose as the avengers of a martyred Brahman. Political instinct told him to connect the Peshwa and his favorite, Trimbuckjee, with the murder. He, therefore, demanded the surrender of Trimbuckjee forgetting that even if he were the true criminal, the Peshwa was the proper person to deal with him. So, as in honour bound, the Peshwa resisted the demand but Elephinstone was inexorable. He surrounded Poona with troops and poor Baji Rao surrendered his minister to be incarcerated in the Thana fort. Thus the Peshwa was deprived of his second great minister.

Another source of trouble was the exact relationship between the Peshwa and the Gaekwar. The Company maintained that by the Treaty of Bassein the Peshwa had lost all powers except the formal one of recognising the Gaekwar while the Peshwa held that the Gaekwar was still but a feudatory. No definite steps were taken by the Christians to settle this since peace and amity were not to their interest and, already in April 1817, they were holding themselves in readiness "to seize the Peshwa's portion of Guzerat and the Northern portion of the Konkan". We find Elphinstone already writing on 6th April 1817, "I think a quarrel with the Peshwa desirable".

Trimbuckjee escaped from British custody and the Peshwa was forced to cede the three hill forts of Singhad, Purandhar, and Raigad as a pledge that he would be surrendered on discovery. In January 1817, he entered into a new Treaty by which he ceded his share of the revenues of Guzerat in compensation for the murder of the Sastri. The Peshwa was so much disgusted at the turn of events that he left for Mahuli, a sacred place of pilgrimage. Here he interviewed Sir John Malcolm and told him his desire for friendship

with the British, though he did not know then how much their espionage system had revealed even the dishes of his meals. Malcolm advised him to make a gesture by sending a contingent to help the British against the Pindaris but this advice only increased the suspicions of the Peshwa and his Commander-in-Chief Bapu Gokhla.

If Baji Rao "had been much exasperated by the recent transactions", the people were disgusted at "the grasping police of the British" and they clamoured for war. Elphinstone at Poona was liberally supplied with exaggerated reports of the Peshwa's doings by the former's miscreant agents Balajee Pant Natoo and Yasvantrao Ghorpade. The Resident asked for General Smith and Colonel Burr to come to his assistance and withdrew his troops to a position four miles from the city—an act which everybody understood as a preparation for war. The Peshwa and Bapu Gokhla had never contemplated seriously to go to war with the British and so they were easily defeated by the Company at Kirkee. This battle is memorable since Bapu Gokhla displayed such judgment and valour that the author of "Fifteen Years in India" who took part in the action writes, "the Muse of History will encircle his name with a laurel for fidelity and devotion in his country's cause." [190] The Peshwa left Poona a fugitive, Bapu Gokhla died very soon.

Elphinstone's diplomacy had secured for the Christians a valuable trump card—the Raja of Satara—the undoubted sovereign of all the Marathas. Through Balajee Pant Natoo, he had induced this prince to desert into the English camp and publish a proclamation calling upon all to disown the Peshwa and side with the English. Hence Baji Rao was driven to seek a second interview with Sir John Malcolm, though he had

about 6000 good horses and 5000 infantry" and the fort of Assergarh and hosts of faithful followers". Sir John Malcolm considered the opportunity 'providential' and agreed to grant him a pension of eight lakhs of rupees per year. [191] Baji Rao was sent to Bithoor on the Ganges where he died in 1850 after a protected life of enforced idleness. English historians found fault with his debauchery not remembering their own contemporary Georges. But his administration was indeed skilful since Poona is described by Mr. Richards who saw it in 1801 as "displaying symptoms of comfort and happiness, of business and industry not to be exceeded in any of our commercial towns" [192].

The War with the Bhonsle.

Another Maratha Prince ruined by British diplomacy was the Raja of Nagpur. During Elphinstone's period of intrigues at his court, the Raja held out resolutely and would not enter into a subsidiary alliance. But, the Raja died in 1816 leaving an idiotic son Bala Saheb, enabling the Company "to effect that which has been fruitlessly laboured at for the last 12 years." A Council of Regency was formed under Appa Saheb, Mr. Jenkins, the Resident, entered into a labyrinth of intrigues; "dexterity has been requisite and money has removed obstructions" and on the night of the 24th April 1816, the nefarious business, unpopular to the nobles and people, was transacted. The conditions of the treaty were "Somewhat Severe", the whole charge of the subsidy and contingent being a third of the revenue! [193] Ministers had to be approved by the British and Appa Saheb's correspondence with the Peshwa was regarded with suspicion. He was perpetually critisised for maintaining his contingent at a lower standard. Despite all this harshness, Appa Saheb, who was according to Sir John Malcolm sincere in his prosfessions, called Mr. Jenkins "his brother" and said that "his Lordship the Governor-General stood in the relation of a father."

In January 1817 during the absence of Appa Saheb the idiotic Raja was found dead in his bed apparently as a result of violence. Mr. Jenkins took no notice of this and did not even refer to it in his correspondence with the Governor-General. No investigation was made by him

at the time but two years later it occurred to him to charge Appa Saheb with the crime. Like "a crowd of crows pecking a vulture to death", proofs could then be easily fabricated against a man whom everybody knew the British wanted to ruin. We can, therefore, suspect the English also, since the murder served their purposes and plans most.

In November 1817, the Peshwa with the knowledge and approval of Mr. Elphinstone, the kindred spirit of Jenkins at Poona, sent a Khillut to Appa Saheb and a ceremonial durbar was, according to custom, to be held in honour of the event. In reply to the Raja's invitation, Mr. Jenkins went to the length of positively prohibiting the ceremonies since the subsequent relations of the British with the Peshwa had become strained. However, the Raja received the khillut in public durbar and reviewed his troops "with uncommon demonstrations of pomp and show."

Ever since his accession, Appa Saheb was pressing for a modified treaty especially as regards the equipment of the contingent, the remission of duties on corn intended for the British army, the excess of troops maintained by the Company in his kingdom, and his own heavy debts consequent in the harsh terms of the treaty. Mr. Jenkins looked upon any public mention of these grievances as "a full admission of an hostile purpose" [194] in spite of continued professions and protestations of goodwill and friendship on the part of the Raja. Undoubtedly, the Raja "had some grounds for complaining of the costliness of his new friends."

But worse was yet to come. When Appa Saheb pressed for a revision of the treaty, his "brother" called in troops to Nagpur in order to procure nothing short of the Raja's entire

submission and full security for the future, "which can be a work I conceive, neither of time nor of difficulty." Naturally, the Raja's troops were provoked and got out of control. An attack on the Residency was repulsed. The Raja regretted the incident, and declared his readiness to abide by such terms as his Christian "brother" proposed. Mr. Jenkins also required some time "to get expected reinforcements" and "to relieve the harassed condition of the troops." So, he asked Appa Saheb to withdraw his forces into Nagpur and see that not a single shot was fired on pain of immediate and total ruin. A few days later, a catalogue of most humiliating conditions was offered for Appa Saheb's acceptance—a confession of his guilt, an appeal for mercy, surrender of all ordinance and ammunition stores, disbandment of Arab troops, evacuation of Nagpur for the British soldiers, and the entry of the Raja into the Residency! After a desperate attempt to display his self-respect, the Raja was intimidated into submission but his troops were not to be so easily coerced. The Arab troops inflicted heavy losses on the British and after a disorderly but prolonged struggle, Nagpur was occupied by the Christians.

Mr. Jenkins now committed a flagrant breach of faith with his helpless prisoner. The Raja had been made to understand that no considerable portion of territory would be taken from him except for the payment of the subsidy and the maintenance of the contingent as fixed by the former treaty. But a new engagement was now made by which the Raja was forced to cede all his territories North of the Nerbudda and all his rights in Berar Gwaligarh and Singoojah; to cede Sitabaldi Hill and any other fort which British might demand to appoint only such ministers as have the

confidence of the Company ; to pay all arrears of the subsidy and to remain in his palace at Nagpur "under the protection of British troops." Thus Appa Saheb, shorn of most of his territory and power, became a prisoner in his own capital.

His "father" however had a "determination to remove him from power" and his "brother" was only too glad to please the Governor-General by trumping up charges which Appa Saheb had no longer the power to be guilty of. The treaty which was promised in lieu of the engagement referred to above, was never concluded. Appa Saheb's proposal to cede his principality and retire on pension was not acceded to, since it would not have paid the British. Mr. Jenkins went on assiduously discovering treasonable designs. The resistance of certain khilledars in handing over their forts was attributed to the Raja's insinuations ; treasonable correspondence with the Peshwa was suspected ; he attributed to the Raja a desire to escape from Nagpur. At last, the murder of Bala Saheb was sprung upon him and the miserable Raja was suddenly conveyed to the Residency for, according to the Governor-General, "the circumstances did not amount to such proof as would justify so decisive a course of proceeding." The Resident had not even the shadow of a jurisdiction to try the Raja who was an ally ; but even apart from this, the Raja was never given an opportunity to know the nature of the charges and the evidence by which they were to be substantiated. He was about to be condemned unheard on manufactured evidence procured after the loss of his prestige and his arrest. The khilledars now professed secret orders from Appa Saheb, to propitiate British greed. At last, it was decided by his "brother" and "one who stood in the relation of father to him" that he should be

kept a state-prisoner in Allahabad and that the infant grandson of Raghujee Bhonsle be placed on the throne. The infant promised a long period of minority and plenty of happy years to the Resident at Nagpur. On the whole, 28 lakhs worth of land was ceded to the British out of a total revenue of 60 lakhs! No wonder Appa Saheb proposed the cede the whole estate and live on a pension.

The subsequent history of Appa Saheb reads like a novel. He eluded the vigilance of his escort and escaped in the dress of a sepoy to his loyal Gonds in the Mahadeo Hills with whose help he captured Chouragarh fort. By negotiations with Sir John Malcolm he assured himself that the Company was prepared to pay him on surrender an annual pension of a lakh of rupees. A combined irruption of several detatchments into the hills of was made in order to arrest him and when, at last surrounded in Aseergarh, he fled in the guise of a Fakir to Lahore where he received a scanty allowance from Ranjit Singh. From there he fled beyond the first range of the Himalayas to the Raja of Mundi and, after many years, returned to the plains. He took sanctuary in the temple of Mahamandira in Jodhpur and, when the Christians compelled the Raja to give him up, he nobly pleaded his inability to infringe upon the privileges of the temple. The demand was urged no further. Thus Benke's statement made in 1783 that "there is not a single prince or state who ever put any trust in the Company who is not utterly ruined" came true in his case also.

———

The War with the Holkar

The Holkar was another prince to be handled. Jaswant Rao Holkar died insane and in the confusion that ensued, the British carried on intrigues with Ameer Khan and other Pathan officers [195]. Nawab Abdul Gaffoor Khan, in the Battle of Mahidpur in December, 1817, "played the part of a traitor to his master and deserted the field of battle with the forces under his command."[196] The British later assigned to him the district of Jaora. The Treaty of Mundisoor negotiated by Sir John Malcolm reduced the Holkar to the position of a feudatory and henceforth he never appears in the pages of Indian history as a menace to British power.

As regards the Pindaris, how the Grand Army commanded by Lord Hastings and 34,000 strong marched from Northern India in three detatchments and the army of the Deccan, 57,000 strong advanced "like one of Timour's or Chengiz Khan's gigantic hunts" has been described in several words on Indian history. Those Pindari leaders who submitted or betrayed their comrades were rewarded with costly jagirs. Chetoo alone held out and at last met a tragic fate, being devoured by a Tiger.

During the war the impregnable hill fortresses of India---- Rajdeir, Trimbuck, Talneir, Aseergarh,--- fell into British hands through treachery or pusillanimity. "Thirty fortresses" in the words of Lake "each of which with a Seevajee as master would have defied the whole Anglo-Indian army fell unresistingly in a few weeks and this vast

Maratha empire which had overshadowed the East and before which the star of the Mogul had become pale, was destined to furnish in its own from another great example of the vicissitudes of future." [197]

Other Measures of Hastings

To the warlike policy of Lord Hastings, Oude was an exception, to all appearences. For even though the Vizier was allowed to assume the title of King in order to insult the Emperor,[198] and was awarded the lands got from the Gurkhas (yielding one-sixth of the proper interest on his loan of one crore of rupees), the Governor-General had no love for him. His life was made miserable by a Resident called Major Bailie who with imperious domination and "magisterial tone," "fixed his creatures upon his Excellency with large salaries" and "dictated to him in the merest trifles."[199]

The Marquess of Hastings drew up in his Private Journal an elaborate scheme of an Indian Confederacy bound by two feudal duties (i) support for the Paramount Power with all forces in any call and (2) appeal to the Paramount Power in all cases of mutual difference. But he actually accomplished something very different. He added to the Company's territory 50,000 square miles and won for himself £ 60,000 for the purchase of a private estate. Nor did he help the dumb millions whose lives were entrusted to his care. Mr. Ludlow says, "The manufactures of India were deliberately ruined by a general lowering or total abolition of import duties on articles the produce or manufacture of Great Britain without any reciprocal advantages being given to Indian produce or manufacture when brought home." India's interests were thus sacrificed to enrich England. Hastings also sanctioned the Ryotwari system in

Madras which has done more than anything else to "abase" the people of that Presidency.[201] Of course, the Court of Directors have also to share part of the blame but Hastings should have protested or resigned rather than be an instrument in destroying millions of people. Lord Hastings was also notorious for his dishonest dealings as can be found, for example, from a study of his relations with Palmer and Co., of Hyderabad.[202]

Lord Amherst

Lord Amherst landed in India seven months after the departure of Hastings and during the interim, Mr. Adams, the officiating Governor-General, had just enough time to gain notoriety by shipping off Mr. J. B. Buckingham, for publishing in the 'Calcutta Journal' some remarks on a clergyman friend of his.

Lord Amherst had been a few months only in India when he declared war against Burma. The problem of Anglo-Burman relations had become acute as early as the time of Lord Minto when Kingberring and his Mugs carried on their periodical raids into Burma from the British territory of Chittagong. The Burmans believed that the invasions were instigated and encouraged by the British and demanded the surrender of the insurgents and of Dr. M'Rae, the Civil Surgoen of Chittagong. Lord Minto, while admitting to the Court of Directors "that the State of Ava had sustained a deep injury at the hands of men who were under our authority and protection," sent an envoy to Ava "to undeceive the Burmese Government" of their reasonable suspicions. Another complaint of Burma was the grants of land made by the British to refugees from Aracan. It is on record that in 1797-1798, 30 to 40 thousand persons were thus tempted away from their land into Bengal.

Captain Cunning, the Christian envoy chosen by Lord Minto, had a shrewd eye for military weaknesses and hence he suggested to his masters 'Conquest.' "Should it enter into the views of

Government to obtain a preponderating influence in the Burmese dominions, the present was certainly the most favourable moment, as the weakness of the Government and general discontent of the people would put the whole country at the disposal of a very small British force"! Lord Minto added, while writing to the Court of Directors, "of our complete and speedy success in the war, little doubt could be entertained."

Kingberring died in 1815 but the British declined to deliver up his followers. Therefore, "the ignorant, arrogant and barbarous government" of Burma began to negotiate with Indian powers like the Marathas for a joint effort at destroying British power. They obtained control of the Upper Brahmaputra valley by the military occupation of Assam. They carried on an indiscriminate capture of the Company's elephant-hunters and of boatmen on the Naf river. Sir Edward Paget, the newly arrived Commander-in-Chief was eager for war—the royal road to fortune, honour and glory. His plan was to keep the operations on the Assam frontier purely defensive while an attack was to be made on Rangoon by sea. Sir Thomas Munro advised the diametrically opposite plan but Paget's plan prevailed. The Madras sepoy, not so scrupulous about caste as his Bengali brother, was sent to Rangoon in even larger numbers than Amherst wanted. The Bengal and Madras troops met at the rendezvous and on the 10th May 1824, anchored off Rangoon. The city was easily captured for it was entirely deserted. It was like Napoleon before Moscow. The Burmese relied more upon guerilla warfare. They constructed stockades in the most difficult and inaccessible recesses of the jungle and carried on nightly attacks on the enemy. The state of affairs on the Assam and Aracan frontier was no better. The British under Captain

Norton were defeated with heavy losses by the famous Burmese warrior, Maha Meng Bundoola and there was, for some time, a real panic in Calcutta expecting an invasion ! The rains and the rise of the rivers prevented further catastrophes.

The chief ground for the declaration of hostilities had been the incidents on another field—Shahpuri at the mouth of the Nap river. The Burmese had captured Mr. Chew, the commander of a pilot vessel stationed there and held him as a hostage for the Mug insurgents. The war was not very successful even here. Failure, thus stared at Government in all directions. Bundoola was hastening to Rangoon. So the British began to create discontent among the Burmese garrisons or foster any that existed. They induced the Siamese to make "military demonstrations." They persuaded the Guroo of the Raja to induce a peace treaty to be drafted whose clauses were so unfavourable that the king refused to accept them. Meanwhile, Maha Bundoola himself was killed in 1825 by the bursting of a shell. The British now marched straight on Ava and the king, feeling his powerlessness, and hearing of the fall of Bhurtpore concluded peace at Gandaboo, within 4 days' march of Ava. Thus ended a war which benefitted the Governor-General more than anybody else. The war inflicted very heavy financial expenditure and awful loss of life on India and Burma lost some of its most precious possessions. "The history of this war," says Major Archer, "is divested of all honourable characteristics."

We have to note one dark episode that stained the annals of Lord Amherst's career in India—the Barrackpore Massacre. The swarthy sepoy has been praised as "simple and easily manageable" by Sir Jasper Nicolls Commander-in-Chief, as "patient, obedient and efficient" by Major General

Sir Thomas Reynell and both these placed him in orderliness and amenability to discipline. But yet they were not free from ill-treatment of every kind. The Bengal troops were, as regards pay and allowances, worse off than their comrades of Bombay or Madras. Again, as a class, they were worse treated than the European section of the army. The insults of the alien officers and soldiery and the depression of the natives to the lowest offices created deep discontent. The European troops were being pampered with and they did nothing except "overawing the native army."

During the Burmese War, the 47th Regiment stationed at Barrackpore was ordered to march, though nobody cared to supply carriage cattle for the heavy loads of the regiment. The sepoys had to pay for their transport whenever they were ordered to move[203]. But, at that time, "no bullocks could be provided, none could be hired; and they could only be purchased at an extravagant price." The Commissariat Department refused to consider an application for help. The regiment refused, again, to travel by sea for fear of losing their caste. They also demanded double batta because prices were reputed to be high in Burma. Instead of some sweet and persuasive words of reconciliation which would have brought them round, Sir Edward Paget surrounded the regiment with 2 battalions--- "The signal for slaughter was given.... There was no attempt at battle. None had been contemplated. The muskets (of the sepoys) with which the ground was strewn were found to be unloaded."[204] The brutal Commander-in-chief courtmartialled many survivors and the regiment was struck out of the army list.

During the time of Lord Amherst, the reputation of British arms was retrieved by the

capture of Bharatpore by Lord Combermere, the Commander-in-Chief. General Lake's failure to capture it by repeated assaults was being thrown into the teeth of the English by the natives and so, Sir Charles Metcalfe drew up an elaborate report regarding the question, advising interference in some succession dispute and winning a glorious victory. An opportunity cropped up in 1825; the Company supported one Rana Bulwant Singh; and despatched the Commander-in-Chief with 25,000 men and a large artillery. Bribery was very probably used among the beleagured army. Superstition too created a panic since a story was current that when an alligator from the sea besieges the fort, it must fall and since the Commander-in-Chief's name was usually pronounced "Kumbhir" meaning alligator! After a month of siege operations, the fort was mined and the British committed many atrocities and cruelties upon the people.

To meet the expenses of these campaigns, Lord Amherst obtained large loans from Native Princes and even pensioners. According to Mr. T. M. Ludlow, the Nawab of Oude lent £ 1,000,000, the Sindhia £800,000, the Raja of Naghpur£ 50,000, the Raja of Benares £20,000 and even the unfortunate ex-Peshwa Baji Rao refunded "a very considerable sum" out of the savings from his pension? [206]

In 1827, Lord Amherst proceeded to Delhi and unnecessarily humiliated the Moghul Emperor by sitting at right angles to His Majesty in a State Chair in front of the thone on the right. He did not pay any nuzzar and "set aside the ceremonials and forms of address." His conduct was considered so derogatory to His Majesty that he sent Raja Ram Mohon Roy to England to plead his whole case before the British

authorities. After degrading the Emperor, [207]
Amherst spent the summer in Simla where he received a friendly missson from Ranjit Singh. In March 1828, he left India.

Lord William Bentinck

Lord William Bentink was recalled from India when he was the Governor of Madras, in connection with the mutiny at Vellore and since "he wished that the country which had been the scene of his undeserved humiliation should also be the scene of his administrative triumphs,"[208] he applied for the post of Governor-General on the retirement of Lord Amherst. "He had devoted his active mind with great ardour to the study of Indian politics and discovered that "in many respects, the Muhammadans surpassed our rule" and that "our policy, on the contrary, has been the reverse of this—cold, selfish and unfeeling." It was easy for him to diagnose the disease but he did not propose to apply the remedy.

Indian historians consider him a peace-loving Governor-General but this was only because the finances of the company were so precarious that he could not indulge in the costly luxury of war. On the other hand, he had to carry out retrenchments by reducing the salaries of civil and military officers in spite of the hatred of his own co-religionists. But enough number of events took place in his time to indicate that he was as much a Jingoist as any other Governor-General. Take for example Coorg—a place long coveted by Anglo-Indians as a veritable paradise on earth. During the Mysore wars, a Treaty had been concluded with its princes in 1790 by which its independence was guaranteed. But during Bentinck's time, the Raja's sister Demmaji and her husband sought protection against the exaggerated cruelties of the brother

with the Resident at Mysore. War was declared; the Raja hoping that a reconciliation might yet be possible, "sent orders prohibiting the Coorgs from encountering the troops of the Company"! [209] Of course, the Raja was easily dethroned and sent to Benares. Later on, he went to England to complain personally to the authorities about his unjust dethronement and ill-treatment. Bentinck, without inquiring into the claims of the sister, annexed the fertile and beautiful province on the plea that the Coorgs unanimously desired to be placed under the protection of the Company. "The inhabitants are hereby assured that they shall not again be subjected to native rule, that their civil and religious usages will be respected and that the greatest desire will invariably be shown by the British Government to augment their security, comfort and happiness," declared Bentinck in a proclamation. But this promise was not kept up. Cash payment of revenue was insisted on, instead of kind, and an insurrection broke out.

The distribution of the Prize money on the capture of Coorg was made, according to the Asiatic Journal, May, 1836 in the following manner :—

	Rs.
Colonels	25,000 each
Lieutenant Colonels	15,000 „
Majors	10,000 „
Captains	5,000 „
Subalterns	2,500 „

No wonder the inhabitants "unanimously" desired to place themselves under British power.

Bentinck deprived the Raja of Mysore of all power of managing the affairs of his principality in 1831 and further gave him no opportunity to answer the allegations against him. He summarily substituted direct British management—a step condemned as unjust and impolitic by Major Evans

Bell. He interfered in the internal affairs of Joypore and his appointment of Jootha Ram as minister "was ascribed to a desire on the part of the British Government to annex the country on account of the certain ensuing anarchy." He also took possession of the Sambhar District and a share of the Salt Lake as security for the tribute due from Jodhpore—an act which "gave great offence to both prince and people," leading to an attack on the Resident and the death of his Assistant. Govinda Chandra, the ruler of Kachar, was assassinated in 1830 and since he had no male heir, the 'Benevolent' Bentinck annexed it under a doctrine that became notorious under Dalhousie. He also confiscated part of the possessions of the Raja of Jynteah on the ground of the infraction of some treaty.

Bentinck visited Oudh in 1831 and threatened the king with "the direct assumption of the management of Oudh territories by the British Government" if a decided reform in administration was not effected. This threat alarmed the vizier and so he sent Colonel Du Bois and a native gentleman[211] to proceed to England and represent his case to the authorities. The Governor-General trumped up a charge of conspiracy against the Company upon the Colonel so that he could be of no use to the king on landing in England. The native gentleman was thus left alone "in a helpless condition, friendless and in a strange country where he knew not a word of the language" and so was obliged to return. He died on his way to Lucknow at Poona. Bentinck also gave much trouble to Raja Ram Mohan Ray, the envoy of the Moghul Emperor. When he passed by Delhi, he studiedly insulted the Emperor by not visiting him. These incidents rankled in the minds of the king and his loyal subjects and were

probably the reasons that contributed to the Indian mutiny of 1857.

Bentinck was also the author of a plot to annex Gwalior. The Resident was directed to ask the Maharaja whether in view of the troubles encircling him (created by the Company itself), he would like to retire on a pension assigning Gwalior to the Company. Mr. Cavendish, the Resident, declined the delicate job and so was reprimanded thus, "You have thus allowed a favourable chance to escape of connecting the Agra to the Bombay Presidency." He was also removed in a few months and a certain Major Sutherland was appointed. Before leaving for Gwalior, he waited upon the Governor-General to know his policy at Gwalior : was it to be intervention or non-intervention ? "Lord Bentinck, whose disposition like that of Lord Palmerston loved a joke, quickly replied : Look here, Major, and his lordship threw back his head, opened wide his mouth and placed his thumb and finger together like a boy about to swallow a sugar-plum. Then turning to the astonishing Major he said, "If the Gwalior State *will* fall down your throat, you are not to shut your mouth, as Mr. Cavendish did, but swallow it, that is *my* policy."[212] Again, Bentinck nominated, without any inquiry into an alleged adoption, the deceased Raja's uncle to the throne of Jhansi, a circumstance which served Dalhousie as a precedent in 1853.

The Afghanistan imbroglio and disasters of 1839-42, the subsequent unjustifiable wars with Sind and the Punjab and also the annexation of the two provinces were in no small measure due to the part Bentinck played in the scheme, euphemistically styled, "the navigation of the Indus." It was Moorcroft, the traveller, who first suggested it[213] but Sir John Malcolm adopted it as his own

pet scheme. He suggested that the capture of Sind was easy and profitable beyond measure. The plan caught Bentinck's fancy and it was to be ostensibly undertaken for the purpose of conveying to Ranjit Singh King William's present of a coach and horses ! Sir Charles Metcalfe condemned the survey, "The scheme of surveying the Indus under the pretence of sending a present to Raja Runjeet Singh seems to me highly objectionable. It is a trick, in my opinion, unworthy of our Government which cannot fail when detected, as most probably it will be, to excite the jealousy and indignation of the powers on whom we ply it."[214] But all protests were vain, the British took their boats and troops upon the Indus and completed the survey. "The survey of the Indus and the Commercial Agency were the prolegomena, so to speak, of the great epic of the Afghan War." Even the plan of supporting Shah Shooja seems to have been settled at an interview between Ranjit Singh and Bentinck at Roopur in 1831[215] and the idea of extending the British boundary to the Indus and even to the mountains beyond was entertained by many responsible officers including probably the Governor-General himself. As Commander-in-Chief, Bentinck, proved to be very incompetent for ill-discipline and discontent were rampant among the ranks.[216]

In the administration of domestic affairs, Bentinck did little to promote the interests of the natives of India. He combined the executive and judicial functions—a measure that has been a great curse to the people of Hindustan. He resumed rent-free lands,[217] after cruelly repealing an old regulation requiring before every resumption a judicial investigation and a final decree by the Supreme Court. The collector of each district was authorised to dispossess holders on his own authority

and thus "many families that were in comparative affluence" were "hurled into the depths of poverty"; "hundreds and thousands who considered themselves beyond the reach of adversity" were "cast upon the world to seek their bread." Since Bentinck did not want the existence of an Indian aristocracy, he resumed also estates and jaghirs on failure of male issue in spite of the vehement protests of Sir John Malcolm, the Governor of Bombay.[218]

In order to anglicise and denationalise the natives of India, he selected Macaulay to decide the controversy between the occidentalists and the orientalists and to fix upon English as the medium of instruction in India. Bentinck encouraged Christian missionaries to convert the heathens of India and Macaulay's measure was also taken in furtherance of the same purpose of undermining the religious and social life of India.[219] Bentinck is also considered a great philanthropist because he passed an Act abolishing Suttee, but the credit really belongs to Raja Ram Mohan Ray,[220] who educated public opinion on the matter by exposing the cruelty and injustice of the practice in spite of the ridicule and abuse of his co-religionists. Again, he is considered as a great friend of India because he employed natives in the service of the State but we see no reason for thanking him, since all the appointments in the public service belong of right to the tax-payers and the sons of the soil. Moreover, Bentinck was forced to employ natives on account of financial necessity and the orders of the Court of Directors. He was also no friend of higher education for Indians. Bentinck is also given credit for granting liberty to the Press but he duped the Press with the shadow only. While in Madras he had once said, "It is necessary in my opinion, for the public safety, that the Press

in India should be kept *under the most rigid control.*[221] It matters not from what pen the dangerous matter may issue, the higher the authority, the greater the mischief." That Bentinck's seven years' rule from 1828-1835 was on the whole beneficial to the natives of the country is a myth. His foreign policy was aggressive and his domestic policy was destructive of the best interests of the children of the soil.

The Renewal of the Charter, 1833

During the Governor-Generalship of Lord William Bentinck, the Company's charter was renewed in 1833 for a further period of twenty years. The Reforming Era of England did not augur any good for India, no notion can be more mistaken than that of Mr. R. C. Dutt who wrote that "the administration of India is determined by the current opinions of England" and that "English history and Indian history have run in parallel streams." "Avarice," said Sir John Malcolm "avarice, the most obstinate and hardened passion of the human mind, being the first principle of commerce, was the original bond of their (the Company's) union and humanity, justice and even policy gave way to the prospect or love of gain."[222] Therefore, the charter of 1833 was more advantageous to the English than to the people of India. It imposed heavy financial burdens on India; it amplified and extended the provisions of the Charter Act of 1813; it intensified the exploitation of India. Again, in a secret conclave of Whig ministers and magnates at Lord Lansdowne's place, Bowood, "it was decided that we should avail ourselves of all opportunities for adding to our territories and revenues at the expense of our allies and of stipendiary princes like the Rajah of Tanjore and the Nawabs of the Carnatic and Bengal."[222]

The India Reform Society established in 1853 published a tract entitled "The Government of India since 1834" to prove that the Company did not deserve to have its charter renewed any more.

This pamphlet will repay careful study. It is said that during the 20 years since 1834, the Company was engaged in wars that were not necessary for the safety of the country for 15 long years. These wars "have retarded the improvement, and diminished the happiness of the natives of India, whilst they have exhausted the resources of the Government; but they were the natural result of the system established in 1833." The military expenditure was increased during the period from eight to twelve millions sterling and so, the Government had little to spend on public works of permanent utility. The pamphlet describes the moral debasement of the people and says "To India it is ruin and destruction; to England it is danger and disgrace." The progress of justice was hampered by cumbrous legal forms and legal tax. "Judges," as Mr. Campbell confesses, "were a scandal to the British name." The Police, according to a petition of more than a thousand Christian inhabitants of Calcutta sent to the House of Commons, "not only failed to effect the prevention of crimes, the apprehension of offenders and the protection of life and property; it has become the engine of oppression and a great cause of the corruption of the people." Out of 22 millions of people, the Indian Government in 1853 educated one hundred and sixty, "whereas in Hindu times every village community had its school." Every post of profit, of trust, of value had been transferred at enormous addition to the cost of Government—to Englishman. The division between covenanted and uncovenanted servants was kept up in order to exclude the natives, however educated, able and competent, from all high and lucrative employments, though the Charter Act of 1833 enacted that none should be excluded from any office by reason of religion, place of birth, descent or colour. Dr.

Chuckerbutty who "carried off several medical prizes at University College and received the diploma of M. D" was refused a Commission as Surgeon in a Native Regiment, in spite of repeated applications to individual Directors and to the Court which included some of the most eminent of the retired public servants of India. Thus the Indians were condemned to inferiority. Salt, 'the only condiment for their tasteless rice', was a Government Monopoly. Not only were they taxed for their shops in towns and for stalls and sheds on road-sides, "but for each tool and implement, of their trades; nay for their very knives, 'the cost of which is frequently exceeded six times over by the Moturpha (tax) under which the use of them is permitted." The people of India complained that "the Government is forcing drunkenness on them", in order to raise revenue from ardent spirits.

Of course, much cant was delivered in noble vein by Lord Macaulay and others, who, in the words of Digby, said much "of the tongue merely and not of the heart." Macaulay was a needy adventurer who came out to India to shake the pagoda tree. The post of Law Member that he acquired though "unfamiliar with the law or the practice of Indian courts and recommended by no remarkable forensic qualifications"[224] carried a salary of £10,000 a year. "I may, therefore, hope to return to England," he wrote to his sister, "at only thirty-nine, in the full vigour of life with a fortune of thirty thousand pounds. A larger fortune I never desired." Besides, his post as Law Commissioner brought him an additional £5000 a year. His only qualification was supreme contempt for everything Indian. "Lord Macaulay's triumph over the Oriential School headed by Dr. Wilson was really the triumph of a deliberate intention to undermine the religious and social life of India." One

of his duties as Law Member was to make laws for the natives of India and accordingly he drew up the Indian Penal Code. When one reads it, one is reminded of Burke's description of the Irish Penal Code as "a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment and degradation of a people and the debasement in them of human nature itself as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man." Mr. Theobold, a Calcutta Barrister, informed a Parliamentary Committee of 1858 that the Code "establishes an irresponsibility upon the part of all persons having powers of any kind by law". The punishments laid down are very severe and unsympathetic. The principle underlying the law is—once a jail-bird, always a jail-bird. The Law Commission set up in 1833 spent nearly 35 lakhs of rupees from Indian revenues till 1853 and at last the Penal Code was the result.

Lord Auckland (1836-1841)

For twelve months after the departure of Bentinck, Sir Charles Metcalfe acted as the Governor-General of India. Had he been made permanent, he would have followed the footsteps of his political Guru—the Marquess of Wellesley. He condemned the policy of Sir George Barlow. "There is a loud cry that we are in danger from extended dominion. For my part, I can contemplate universal dominion in India without much fear." But the authorities were displeased with him, it is alleged, for his liberating the Indian Press. The Peel Ministry of 1831-1853 chose Mr. Monstuart Elphinstone to succeed him but he declined the offer because "the chance of great events occurring is not considerable" and he had no visible scope for his ambition. According to Lord Ellenborough, the state of his health prevented him from accepting that position. Therefore, Peel's choice fell upon Lord Heytesbury but the Melbourne Ministry did not like him because of his Pro-Russian proclivities[225] and his disapproval of the policy then in vogue to annex Indian States on every possible occasion. So, Sir John Hobhouse cancelled his appointment and, on Bentinck's advice, Lord Auckland was chosen as the Governor-General.

Lord Auckland's administration is an important landmark in the history of British India because the problem of a "scientfic frontier" assumed importance in his time. Afghanistan, the Switzerland of Asia, was then ruled by Dost Muhammad who had driven Shah Shuja to live upon the bounty of the Company and Runjit Singh at

Ludhiana. As early as 1832, an exploring expedition under Lieutenant Burnes, who had presented the coach and horses to Runjit Singh, traversed Afghanistan and Central Asia, being received hospitably by every man of rank and importance, including Dost Muhammad. Burnes returned to England in 1833 and he was "killed with honours and kindness." [226] He interviewed the king and the ministers and talked of "the designs of Russia, her treaties, intrigues, agencies, ambassadors, commerce, &c., the facilities, the obstacles regarding the advance of armies" &c. Lord Auckland sent Burnes on a "commercial mission to Kabul"; Kaye wrote "Commerce in the vocabulary of the East is only another name for conquest." The mission was received in Kabul with great pomp and splendour. Its main object was to induce Dost Muhammad to throw in his lot with the English against Russia and Burnes nearly succeeded in his task. He wrote "yet, in all that has passed or is daily transpiring, the chief of Kabul declares that he prefers the sympathy and friendly offices of the British to all these offers (Russian and Persian) however alluring they may seem from Persia or from the Emperor." But these reports of Burnes were "emasculated and mutilated" by the "unsparing hand of the state-anatomist." "The character of Dost Mahomed had been lied away; the character of Burus has been lied away; both, by the mutilation of the correspondence of the latter, have been fearfully misrepresented."

The reason for this was a new plan regarding Afghanistan. As Kaye writes, "Other counsels were prevailing at Simla—that great hot-bed of intrigue on the Himalayan hills—". "They conceived the idea of reinstating the old deposed dynasty of Shah Soojah and they picked him out of the dust

of Ludhiana to make him a fool and a puppet." So Burnes was recalled in 1838 and a Tripartite Treaty concluded between Shah Sooja, the Company and Runjit Singh. In spite of the death of the last, the first Afghan war continued. Troops were moved from Bombay through Sindh up the Indus to Baluchistan. They were also despatched direct to Kabul through the Khyber Pass. The Amirs of Sindh, in accordance with an old treaty refused passage for the troops but were threatened into submission and even forced to pay[227] contributions to support their legitimate sovereign—Shah Shooja. An annual tribute of 300,000 rupees and a ready payment of two million one hundred thousand rupees for the immediate expense of the army was collected.[228] The British officers committed great excesses on the line of march. They reinstated Shah Sooja in Kabul and sent Dost Muhammad as a prisoner to India.

But the British interfered in all transactions "contrary to the terms of our own engagement with the Shah" while outwardly they wore the mask of neutrality.[229] They violated their engagements with the chief of Afghanistan and wanted to rule over the country as Clive did in Bengal during the time of Meer Jaffar. Though Mohan Lal, who had "a genius for traitor-making," the rebel chiefs were either attracted by large bribes or assassinated by the offer of rewards for their heads.[230] The English officers, according to Kaye, did not know how to resist the attractions of the women of Kabul.[231] "The scandal was open, undisguised, notorious." The infuriated Afghans, therefore, revolted against their foreign yoke and killed Shah Shuja and Sir Alexander Burnes, the leader of the old "commercial mission."

Macnaghten, the Resident, desired to retreat and promised in a treaty with Akbar Khan to

restore his father Dost Muhammad to the throne. In a recent book named *Nariangi-Afghanistan* written by Syed Feda Hussain, an authoritative account is given of the death of Macnaghten. It appears that he wrote to certain Sirdars inciting them to rebel against Akbar Khan and wrote to Akbar Khan himself warning him against these very Sirdars. He also arranged for an interview and took with him a portion of his troops to be in ambush and to pounce upon the enemy at a given signal. Akbar Khan discovered his treachery and an altercation ensued during which Macnaghten was killed.[232] Thus the three principal actors in the drama of Afghan politics perished at the hands of the Afghans. They allowed the British to retreat after keeping certain officers with their wives as their hostages. An army of 16,000 men began the disatrous retreat in the depth of winter through the perilous passes. Except Dr. Brydon, the entire army either perished on the road or were made captives by the Afghans. The first Afghan war was not only a blunder but a crime and a sin. Kaye concludes his chapter on the retreat from Kabul thus :—"In the pages of a heathen writer, over such a story as this would be cast the shadow of a tremendous nemesis. The Christian historian used other words but the same prevailing idea runs, like a great river, through his narrative, and the reader recognises one great truth, that the wisdom of our statesmen is but foolishness and the might of an armies is but weakness when the curse of God is sitting heavily upon an unholy cause. "For the Lord God of recompenses shall surely requite."

Lord Ellenborough (1842-1844)

The muddle and confusion in which the Afghan and Indian affairs were thrown required a man at the helm of the supreme local government in India who was well acquainted with Indian politics and not a mere novice in Indian statecraft. Lord Ellenborough had been three times President of the Board of Control and played a prominent part in the debates of 1833. He had denounced the financial embarrassments, brought about by the Afghan war. The two Imperialists, Wellesley brothers, were his friends, guides and philosophers. His ambition, according to Lord Colchester, was to become a "great military statesman."[233] From his public utterances in the House of Lords, people could understand his Indian policy very clearly. He said, "Our very existence in India depended upon the exclusion of the natives from military and political power in that country...We had won the empire by the sword and we must preserve it by the same means, doing at the same time everything that was consistent with our existence there for the good of the people."[234] He consulted the Iron Duke long before his departure from England on the best plan of operations upon which any war should be conducted with the Punjab and Nepal. Yet, in a dinner given by the Court of Directors just before he started, he could coolly say, "Henceforth my first duty is to the people of India", and that, "he wanted to restore peace to Asia," "to emulate the magnificent beneficence of the Muhammadan Emperors in their great works of public utility" etc. etc.

Ellenborough arrived in Calcutta on the 28th February, 1842 and proceeded towards the N. W. Frontier where General Pollock had forced through the Khyber Pass and captured Ali Musjid. The Governor-General declared the Tripartite Treaty to have come to an end since "there was no constituted authority capable of executing the treaty" in Afghanistan. In order to avenge Macnaghten's death, a price was put on Akbar Khan's head and Pollock was instructed "in the event of Mahomed Akbar Khan's coming into his hand without any previous condition for the preservation of his life" to convict him of murder. General Pollock was ordered to withdraw his troops after an exchange of prisoners but he disobeyed and marched on Kabul. He gave an order "for the destruction of the bazaar and two mosques at Kabul" and many excesses were committed by the revengeful British soldiers. After this, prudence was considered the better part of valour and the British withdrew, leaving all prisoners free, including Dost Muhammad.

In order to allay the suspicions of the decline of British military prestige at the courts of Hyderabad, Sindh, Nepal, Bundelkhand &c., Lord Ellenborough made most of the victories in Afghanistan, "issued general orders a little in the French Style," and gave honours and rewards with a lavish hand. He also blustered much about the bringing back from Kabul of what were alleged to be the gates of the Somnath Temple taken by Mahmud of Ghazni 600 years earlier ! The carved gates were carried in regular procession preceded by a bombastic proclamation of the Governor-General in order to conciliate the Hindus. Lord Ellenborough wrote to the Queen, "their restoration to India will endear the Government to the whole people," but this was not true. He himself wrote

to the Duke of Wellington, "The Hindoos, on the other hand, are delighted. It seems to me most unwise, when we are sure of the hostility of one-tenth, not to secure the enthusiastic support of the nine-tenths which are faithful." He considered the Muslim race as "fundamentally hostile to us", probably because his wife had deserted him for an Arab Chief of Damascus. The Christian compatriots of the Governor-General were enraged at all this reverence paid to the gates of a heathen temple as it was "unwise, indecorous and reprehensible." Macaulay condemned him for insulting "the religion of his own country and the religion of millions of the Queen's Asiatic subjects in order to pay honor to an idol." But Ellenborough justified it on the grounds of expediency, adding, "I have only been able to meet those difficulties by acts and language which even in India, I should not myself have adopted under ordinary circumstances."

We shall now consider Ellenborough's relations with the Ameers of Sindh. A Hindu merchant named Derryana pointed out, after the Treaty of 1809 by which "eternal friendship" was concluded between the Company and the Ameers, that "this tribe (the English) never began as friends without ending as enemies." "A shrewd dog"—adds Sir James Mackintosh in his journal where he relates the remark. Later on, when Burnes sailed up the Indus with the coach and horses, a Synd on the water's edge lifted up his hands and exclaimed, "Sind is now gone, since the English have seen the river which is the road to its conquest." The Tripartite Treaty did not mention the Ameers at all and its conclusion was held by the British to suspend necessarily the original treaty with the Chiefs. Kaye writes in the Calcutta Review, Vol. I. "The wolf in the fable did not show greater

cleverness in the discovery of a pretext for devouring the lamb than the British Government has shown in all its dealings with the Ameers."[235]

In January 1839, Captain Eastrick forced upon the Ameers a new treaty for an annual tribute of 300,000 rupees, but for various reasons Sind was coveted by the Christians. First of all, the Ameers were reputed to be very rich, and as Sir Charles Dilke writes, "Our men in India can hardly set eyes on a native prince or a Hindoo palace before they cry 'what a place to break up!' 'what a fellow to loot!'"[236] Again, the English wanted to get command of the Indus for military and commercial purposes. The Governor-General's hatred of Muslims might have also contributed a reason for the war. The Iron Duke also started the bogey of French intrigues (!) with the Sikhs and the tribes of Sind. He also appealed to his friend to restore the reputation of British arms in the East. So, "the real course of this chastisement of the Ameers consisted in the chastisement," says Kaye, "which the British had received from the Afghans. It was deemed expedient at this stage of the great political journey to show that the British could beat someone, and so it was determined to beat the Ameers of Sindh."

Some charges of treasonable correspondence with Persia and violation of treaties were fast trumped up. Ellenborough confesses, "It was really impossible for me to form a decided opinion as to the authenticity of Persian letters," but yet, "I left the matter in Sir Charles Napier's hands"! Sir Charles Napier superseded the sympathetic Major Outram in Sind. Napier succeeded in raising one of the Ameers as a traitor and in the Battle of Meeane, 17th February, 1843, "the Mulatto who had charged of the Amir's guns had been persuaded to

fire high," "the Talpoor Traitor who commanded the cavalry drew off his men and showed the shameless example of flight."[237] So, we can conclude that "the secret service money" was well disbursed.

The excesses committed by the European soldiers after this victory was very disgraceful. J. P. Ferrier,[238] the author of a History of the Afghans, in French, has recorded: "The officers of General Napier invaded even the harems of these unfortunate princesses and carried off the treasures, jewels and even the clothes of their women." Sindh was annexed to the British dominions and Sir Charles Napier was amply rewarded for what he himself described as "a very advantageous, useful, humane piece of rascality," for, as he said, "we have no right to seize Scinde, yet we shall do so." Sir Charles Napier himself has written in the "Lights and Shadows of Military Life" (page 323)—"Our object in conquering India, the object of all our cruelties was money. More than a thousand millions sterling are said to have been squeezed out of India, in the last sixty years. Every shilling of this has been picked out of blood, wiped and put into the murderers' pockets; but wipe and wash the money as you will, the damned spot will not out." But yet, in a proclamation to all the Mahommedan inhabitants of Sind dated 6th August, 1844, Sir Charles Napier found courage to say—"Be it known to all the Mahomedan inhabitants of Scinde, that I am the conqueror of Scinde, but I do not intend to interfere with your religion. I respect your religion, but it is necessary that you should also respect mine. We both worship *one* God," &c., &c.

Now for Ellenborough's treatment of the Sindhia. Sind and Sindhia have no affinity with each other, although the names sound alike, but

Ellenborough tried to treat them both alike. Gwalior, the richest and strongest of all the Maratha States was an independent power, thanks to the exertions of Madhoji Sindhia and Dowlat Rao Sindhia and so the Government of India had no right to interfere in its internal affairs. But Ellenborough wanted to annex it so that, in the event of a war with the Sikhs, the flank of the Company's army might be free from a powerful and independent prince at the head of a well-trained army.

Fortunately for the British, Junkojee Sindhia died on the 7th February, 1843, leaving a widow of eleven and no child. A boy of 8 years was soon adopted and the young Maharanee was appointed Regent, the ministers of the Gwalior Durbar helping her to rule "peaceably and properly." On the 19th., Lord Ellenborough proceeded to Agra in order to be near Gwalior and made some changes in the disposition of the regiments," because "necessity might possibly arise for instant intervention"!! There was a contest in Gwalior for the real control of affairs between Dada Khasjeewalla, an able and popular chief and Mama Sahib, whose repulsive manners and character alienated all sympathy. Just at this critical time, a letter arrived from his Lordship which conveyed these words, "The Governor-General would gladly see the Regency conferred upon the Mama Sahib." Through the intrigues of Colonel Spries, the Resident, Mama Sahib was "elected" Regent and his niece was married to the young Maharaja.

The English had now only to wait until the inevitable breaking out of disturbances to remedy the wrong they had inflicted by a war. Strained relations inevitably broke out between the people and the Maharani on the one hand and Mama Sahib on the other. Ellenborough, sure enough,

began to "deplore" these events. "They may have," he wrote to the Queen of England, "very injurious results upon the tranquillity of the common frontier.....Lord Ellenborough still hopes, however, that no outrage will occur which will render necessary the bringing together of troops for the vindication of the honour of the British Government." Mama Sahib was so weak that he could not put down a small disturbance between a party of villagers and some sepoys and the revolt of a slave girl in the place! At last, he was packed "out of the country with all his baggage without even the common Asiatic ceremony of the best of a tom-tom."[239]

This was a great blunder, for it proved "far more certain to cause the collapse of the independence of this State than the worst acts of a wretched imbecile could possibly bring about." Lord Ellenborough must have rejoiced at the expulsion of his nominee and the installation of Dada Khasjeewalla in his place. He complained from Agra that the needs of a tranquillity on the frontier would not tolerate him to "permit the growing up of a lax system of rule, generating habits of plunder along its frontier," not caring to remember that the British provinces adjoining Gwalior were for two years in a State of open insurrection and that Dada's government was so strong that Sindhia's soldiers were, as the very day of his penning the letter, repelling raiders and rebels from the Company's territories 100 miles away from Gwalior at Khimlassa and Balabehut! Ellenborough also ordered the Resident to withdraw to Dholepure "for a change of air" and before long, Col. Sleeman superseded Col. Spiers. Sleeman was a fit tool for Ellenborough's work, for, has he not written in his "Rambles and Recollections",—"As a citizen of the world, I could not help thinking

that it would have been a great blessing upon a large portion of our species, if an earthquake were to swallow up this court of Gwalior and the army that surrounds it?"

The new minister was an able man, but the Governor-General discovered many faults in him. His payment of all arrears to the troops, of dismissed European and half-blood officers, appointment "of persons notorious for their hostility to British interests and for their connection with plunderers upon our frontier," his "strict control over the conduct and person of the widow of the late Maharajah and of the present sovereign." "It said ... that the minister of the State had intercepted a letter from his lordship to his dear young 'sister' the Maharanee. 'A high crime against the Maharanee,' declared the Governor-General. The letter was written in the Persian language and the Maharanee, a child of fourteen, could neither read nor write any language at all. There was only one man in the capital, who by virtue of his hereditary office of Great Chamberlain and keeper of the crown jewels could enter the most sacred of the female apartments and that man was the Dada Khasjeewalla. Who then except this man," asks Mr. John Hope, "had the privilege to open and read the Governor-General's letter?"[240] Yet, Lord Ellenborough, who had formed an army at Agra of 12,000 men, besides artillery under Sir Hugh Gough, demanded the surrender of Dada. In vain did the Durbar protest against the dishonour. At last, they agreed to place Dada in confinement and appointed Rama Rao Phalkea, who had fought for the English by the side of Lord Lake, in his stead. This did not appease Ellenborough's wrath. He assembled armies on the Northern and Eastern frontiers of the Sindhia's dominions and compelled the Government to

surrender the fallen minister. He died, after ten years of exile, at Benares.

The Governor-General was not yet satisfied, for "there is still no appearance of a settlement without authoritative intervention of the British Government." He wanted "the disbandment and disarming of a disaffected portion of the Gwalior army," for (here the cat is at last let out of the bag) "the existence of an army of such strength in that position must very seriously embarrass the disposition of troops we might be desirous of making to meet a coming danger from the Sutlej." The British troops in Gwalior were to be increased and a further assignment of revenues obtained for their maintenance. In the Treaty concluded with Dowlat Rao Sindhia there was a clause by which "if at any time Scindia should be unable to cope with his enemies, the British Government was obliged to render him military assistance, on the requisition of the Maharajah, but as the Governor-General told Rama Rao Phalkea, "It is impossible, on account of his tender years, for Gyajee Scindea to make the requisition, and, as I am the only judge of his necessities, I shall march my army to Gwalior." All the arguments and protestations of Rama Rao failed, "as would those of a goose who with equal pertinacity declined the proffered aid of a hungry fox"![241]

So Ellenborough invaded the Scindia's dominions, defeated the ill-prepared recruits in two battles on the same day and compelled the Durbar to fall at his feet. The Governor-General was not bold enough to annex the State for fear of "rousing once more the resentment of powerful individuals in Parliament" and of "a general rising of the Native princes." So, a new treaty was concluded by which the Sindhia became a feudatory under the British Government. The Select

Committee of the House of Commons had reported in 1832, "Within the Peninsula, Scindia is the only prince who preserves the semblance of independence." But in 1844 ?

Lord Ellenborough annexed the small Cis-Sutlej State of Kythul which had sought British protection in 1809. Its Chief died without heirs in 1843 and the State was annexed, under the euphemistic phrase of "lapse"—as if the State was originally granted by the British to the Kythul Chief. Of course, the annexation was effected only at the point of the sword. The political agent was repulsed with "some loss" and compelled to retire to Kurnaul, but "the place was soon approached by a preponderating force," and so the affair did not become very serious.

Lord Ellenborough intrigued against the Punjab and succeeded so well that he could write home in 1844 : "Everything is going on there as we could desire, if we looked forward to the ultimate possession of the Punjab." The "British Friend of India," published in London, wrote in December 1843, "we have no proof that the Company instigated all the king-killing which has been perpetrated in the Punjab since Runjeet died... We must say we smell a rat." "A mercenary Company wielding a hireling army cannot live but by plunder." We have, however, evidence of Ellenborough's encouraging the Sikhs to occupy Jellalabad and the Afghan frontier, in order that they might court Afghan hatred. "They will be obliged," wrote the Governor-General, "to keep that principal force in that quarter and Lahore and Umritsir will remain with insufficient garrison within a few marches of the Sutlej." General Ventura of the Sikh army was also induced to become a traitor, for "Ventura anticipates a long anarchy from which the ultimate refuge will be

in our (British) protection"! A division was created between Raja Gholab Singh on the Hills and Raja Heera Singh of the plains. Seventy boats of thirty-five tons each were laid on the Sutlej to serve both as pontoons and for transport purpose. An attack was also organised on Lahore on behalf of Uttur Singh, the surviving brother of the murderer of Runjeet Singh. Therefore, Lord Ellenborough can be charged with creating disorder in the Sikh Raj.[242]

The Governor-General's correspondence also shows his great desire to absorb the State of Hyderabad, in an attempt to relieve the Nizam of his financial difficulties and to drive away the Arabs from his dominion. But as he wrote to the Queen in June 1843, "Lord Ellenborough deems it advisable to do one thing at a time and circumstances do not yet allow of of our devoting our force to the permanent pacification of the Deccan." He did not also get an opportunity to conquer Nepaul, though he was eargerly looking forward for an opportunity to deprive it of its independence. He had to be content with small fry. One such was Jytpore in Bundelkhand, for "evincing hostility to the British Government."

Ellenborough "issued instructions forbidding the presentation in future to the king (Emperor of Delhi) of any offerings by British subjects." Mr. Edwards says,[243] "Up to 1842, the Governors-General who visited Delhi were in the habit of presenting, through their secretaries, a nuzzer of 101 gold Mohurs to the Emperor as a mark of fealty." He had also ambitions to "have in our hands the ancient seat of empire and to administer the government from it." The humiliation of the Emperor would then have been complete.

It was not convenient for Ellenborough to

annex Oude and thus kill the goose that laid the golden eggs. Ellenborough also bled the Nawab Vizier, for he writes to the Duke of Wellington in September, 1842, "I have got the king of Oude to lend 10 lacs more."

Ellenborough's foreign policy was aggressive and ruinous to the country ; he did nothing to restore peace in Asia or "for creating a surplus revenue." He enhanced the salt-tax in order to promote the happiness of the people of India. The Court of Directors had many complaints against him, such as the Somnath gates incident, his separation for long periods from the Council and large expenses incurred without the knowledge and consent of the Court. So, after all, the autocrat was asked to resign his office and hand over the administration to Lord Hardinge in 1844. He was given, according to Sir Robert Peel, a cold welcome, though he was "a great performer on the Indian threatre."

———

Lord Hardinge (1844-1848)

Lord Ellenborough wrote to a friend, "My successor will carry out all my views. He is my most confidential friend, with whom I have communicated upon all public subjects for thirty years." Lord Hardinge was also a kinsman of Ellenborough by marriage. "The selection of a distinguished soldier who also possessed the experience of a cabinet-minister, rather pointed to the anticipation of war." Hardinge's ambition was to "glide into elevation ; he has wound and will wind like a serpent up the pillar of fame."[244]

As soon as he came to India, he amassed about 23,000 additional troops and 28 guns on the Sutlej frontier, preparing for November, 1845 when, Ellenborough had predicted, the "game" of capturing the Punjab would be ready. Raja Dhuleep Singh, about whose parentage there was a good deal of mystery, was reigning in Lahore, with Lal Singh, one of the paramours of the Queen-mother, as Vizier. The British agent at Ludhiana, Major Broadfoot, intrigued with this man as well as the Commander-in-Chief Tej Singh. The Rajput Chiefs of the Hills, especially Gulab Singh of Jammoo, were also induced to act treacherously. Broadfoot was "an Ellenborough man" and "only too prone for war." "Broadfoot is in his element on the frontier," wrote Hardinge. The Major played a very prominent part in exasperating and provoking the Sikhs to war. Captain Cunningham has scathingly exposed some of these in his "History of the Sikhs." For example, he declared the Cis-Sutlej tracts to be liable to escheat on the

death or deposition of Dhuleep Singh. He exercised the crews of the Sutlej boats in the formation of bridges. As Hardinge wrote "Moderation will do us no harm, if in the interval, the hills and plains weaken each other." But "how are we to justify the seizure of our friend's territory, who in our adversity assisted us to retrieve our affairs?"

This was the problem for Major Broadfoot and his assistants to solve. He tried to exaggerate every small act into "a deliberate attempt at a serious violation of the frontier." Mole-hills became mountains. The Lahore Durbar complained of the infliction of indignity, of the seizure of treasure etc., especially since "the Durbar had at great cost twice invaded Afghanistan for the benefit of the British." The English, recognising the worthlessness of Dhuleep Singh and even believing in his illegitimacy, did not want to recognise any other stronger ruler for Lahore.

In October, 1845, Hardinge moved towards the Sikh frontier though no pretext for war had as yet been discovered. Captain Cunningham writes that "the insidious exertions of such mercenary men as Lal Singh and Tej Singh 'coincided with' the beliefs of the impulsive soldiery," and they crossed the frontier to give battle to the "remote strangers of Europe who were disturbing their land. Captain Nicolson from the Ferozpur suspected collusion, though Broadfoot denied the allegation."

As soon as news reached Hardinge of the Sikhs crossing the Sutlej, he proclaimed all the possessions of Maharaja Dhuleep Singh on the left or British bank of the Sutlej confiscated and annexed to the British territories. He issued a proclamation "encouraging desertion from the Sikh ranks." The Sikh leaders, instead of marching towards Ferozepur, led the soldiers of the Khalsa

to Moodkee. In the battle that took place there, the Sikhs were defeated. There were traitors in the camp who instead of supplying shot and powder gave them mustard seeds and flour ! The Sikhs retired to Ferozeshah where, in a very severe battle, the English met with disasters unparalleled in the history of their warfare in India.

Even Lord Ellenborough had no confidence in the Commander-in-Chief, Sir Hugh Gough, who "would do admirably at the head of an advanced guard".[245] This was one of the reasons why he was anxious not to be called suddenly into the field. Ellenborough had suggested for the Sikh War, the name of Sir Charles Napier. After Ferozeshah, Sir Henry Hardinge wrote to the Prime Minister, Sir Robert Peel that "he was an excellent leader of a brigade or a division" and nothing more. Moreover, the British cherished supreme contempt for the military capacity of the Sikhs. "The Lahore soldiery was called a 'rabble' in sober official despatches."

The Sikhs did not take advantage of the disaster as the British expected, because their leaders restrained the men on the pretext that the day was inauspicious for a battle. Major Broadfoot died at Ferozeshah—a valiant man who did his duty as he was made to understand it. The news of the British disaster spread rapidly around. The Raja of Patiala was poisoned, probably because of his steady adherence to British interests. Mr. Edwards was sent there to instal the new Raja and to pacify him by the promise of enlarged territory and by the grant of a title to such a number of guns "as would place him at once on a level with the great and ancient Rajas of Hindusthan"![246] Two more battles, Aliwal and Sobraon—the first being "a battle of the official despatch"[247] since the actual one was a very insignificant skirmish, were fought before the British could cross the Sutlej and

proceed to Lahore. Mr. Edwards writes that before the battle of Sobraon "emissaries from Raja Lall Singh arrived and gave us valuable information respecting the enemy's position .....The Sikhs made gallant and desperate resistance, but were driven towards the river and their bridge of boats, which as soon as the action had become general, their leaders Raja Lall Singh and Tej Singh had by previous consent, broken down, taking the precaution first to retire across it themselves."[248] No humanity was shown to the Sikhs who were wantonly and cruelly massacred. Of course, "no Sikh offered to submit and no disciple of Govind asked for quarter." Hardinge's son justifies the carnage by pointing out that "the men vowed vengeance and inflicted it."[249] The English captured 220 pieces of artillery out of which 80 exceeded in calibre, according to the Governor-General, anything known in European warfare. Thus the army raised by the genius of Maharaja Runjeet Singh and for whose efficiency he spared no pains and no expenses if not wholly annihilated, was mostly destroyed.

After Sobraon, Lord Hardinge lost no time in crossing the Sutlej and marched towards Lahore. On account of the adroit management of Raja Gulab Singh, the British marched on unmolested. Hardinge did not consider it advisable to annex the country for "annexation of the country was with the force at our disposal perfectly out of the question" and "the Punjab would never repay the cost of its administration." So a treaty was concluded in March, 1846, by which the Sikh Raj not only lost its independence but was shorn of some of its most valued possessions. But the ink on the treaty was hardly dry when a second treaty was forced at the Lahore Durbar. Raja Lall Singh, probably because he was not rewarded for his

treachery as Gulab Singh had been, intrigued with the Muslim Governor of Kashmir to prevent its transfer to Gulab Singh. "The Kashmir insurrection and the treachery of Lal Singh led to a revision of the treaty." "The Rani was excluded from power, receiving a pension of £15,000 a year. A Council of Regency consisting of eight Sirdars was appointed during the minority of Dhulip Singh, and it was stipulated that they should act under the control and guidance of the British Regiment."

Hardinge's treatment of the Raja of Satara was also very unsympathetic, Major Carpenter, the keeper of the deposed Raja, Pratap Singh, in forwarding a letter of the Raja to Hardinge protesting his innocence, wrote that the Raja was in a position to prove his guiltlessness. "By this letter—for the like of which, in the case of any ordinary felon, any Governor of a gaol in England would be thanked by the Home Secretary, Major carpenter only earned to himself a rebuke from Lord Hardinge." The Raja died in 1847 "protesting to the last that he was innocent, offering to prove his innocence with this evil deed, Lord Hardinge's name is inseparably connected."[250]

Hardinge was raised to the peerage for his services and granted, from the Indian revenues, a pension of £3000 a year. The foreign policy of Hardinge was so aggressive that he had no time, even if he had the desire, to devote to improve the internal affairs of India. He professed to be a very zealous Christian[251] and prohibited Sunday labour. He took great interest in providing for the comforts of the European soldier and office. In January, 1848, he left India after having resigned his office on account of a change of ministry in England.

———

Lord Dalhousie

Lord Dalhousie was the last of the makers of the British Empire. He was an unscrupulous land-grabber, acting on the policy of the ministers in England "That we should avail ourselves of all opportunities for adding to our territories and revenues at the expense of our allies and of stipendiary Princes." Unfortunately for India, the man charged with the portfolios of affairs in India was Sir John Hobhouse, "a man of ability but wanting in discretion who had once been imprisoned for breach of privilege." During the regime of Dalhousie, two provinces, the Punjab and Pegu were brought under the Empire by war and many more by fraud. Although not in chronological order, we shall deal with his wars first.

Under the arrangements inaugurated by Hardinge, Dhuleep Singh was the nominal ruler of the Punjab with Sir Henry Lawrence as the Resident. Sir Henry left India along with Hardinge and his brother Sir John was appointed to officiate for him. Very soon, Sir Frederic Currie than whom no worse candidate could be chosen for the place was nominated Resident. Sir Frederic had written, "It would be madness in us to think of expending blood and treasure to bolster up the puppet Dhuleep Singh or to get up such a government as could be formed out of the elements that now exist at Lahore, which must owe its continuance henceforth to our power alone."[252] His mission was probably to provoke hostilities and thus hasten the annexation of the province. After 1846,

the Punjab had become a feudatory State and the English had taken up the Executive administration. "The occupation of the aristocracy was gone and into every situation of honour and trust an undesirable and unsympathetic alien of the Christian persuasion was thrust." As Colonel Sleeman wrote, "It is Captain This and Mr. That who do or are expected to do everything."

Trouble broke out first in Multan. Runjit Singh farmed out this province after the conquest to Dewan Sawun Mull, for an annual rent of half the revenue, viz. seventeen and a half lakhs of rupees. "He dug canals and induced the people from neighbouring states to settle under his auspices." On his death, Raja Lall Singh demanded an immense nuzerana from his successor Mulraj but he took advantage of the disorders in the Punjab and defeated the troops sent against him. Very soon, however, the district of Junnak, yielding eight lakhs a year, was wrested from him and assigned to Lal Singh's brother. His annual payment was also increased by two lakhs and the Resident had an idea of even increasing it to 30 lakhs. English commissioners, judges and collectors were also to be introduced into Multan. Therefore, Mulraj secretly communicated to Sir John Lawrence, his determination to resign his Government after one year. [253]

Sir Frederick Currie, who came to Lahore soon after this, published the news of Mulraj's resignation and appointed Khan Singh Man as the nominal Governor of Multan to rule under the control of two English officers—Mr. Agnew and Lieutenant Anderson. Mulraj went through the ceremony of handing over the place to them but later in the day, when they were all issuing out of the fort, the two English officers were killed and Khan Singh was bound hand and foot.[254]

Since the English wanted to swallow up the Punjab, and hence they did not try to nip the Multan revolt in the bud. They exasperated the Sikhs by banishing the Queen-mother from Lahore and keeping her a prisoner in Benares on the charge of helping the Multan insurrection. The Resident did not consult the Council of Regency and he admitted that no legal proof of her guilt was obtainable and that a formal trial was undesirable. The Sikh soldiers said that she was the "mother of the Khalsa" and that the English had broken the treaty by "imprisoning and sending away to Hindustan, the Maharanee, the Mother of her people."[255] Even Dost Muhammad wrote to Captain Abbott, "There can be no doubt that the Sikhs are daily becoming more and more discontented. Some have been dismissed from service, while others have been banished to Hindustan, in particular the mother of Maharajah Dulleep Singh who has been imprisoned and ill-treated. Such treatment is considered objectionable by all creeds and both high and low prefer death."

Sirdar Chuttur Singh, the Governor of the Hazara Province was also provoked into rebellion. His daughter was betrothed to the Maharajah Dulleep Singh and when the Resident was asked to fix a day for the marriage he caused so much evasion and delay that Chuttur Singh suspected the evil designs of the Company. This step was taken by the Resident in spite of the warning of Lt. Edwardes: "It would, I think, be a wise and timely measure to give such public assurance of British good faith and intention to adhere to the Treaty as would be involved in authoritative preparations for providing the young Maharajah with a Queen. It would, no doubt, settle men's minds greatly."[256] Again, Captain Abbott, the Resident's Assistant with Chuttur Singh suspected

his fidelity for no reason at all, and, retiring to a distance, persecuted him by raising up the Muslim peasantry through hopes of bribery and opportunities for revenge. The Muslims "assembled in great numbers and surrounded the town of Hurripore." In self-defence, the Sikh Governor ordered the troops, stationed for the protection of the town, to encamp under the fort. But his commandant, an American Christian called Colonel Canora, refused to obey orders and standing between his guns "with a lighted port fire in his hand said, he would fire on the first man who came near." He killed one of the habildars who refused to fire on the soldiers sent by Chuttur Singh to capture the guns and was killed. His conduct was a great military crime ; yet, Captain Abbott was not ashamed to call his death "an atrocious deed" and "a cold-blooded murder" !! The Resident wrote to the Captain that these remarks were unjustifiable and that he had no authority either to raise levies and organise soldiers or to keep the Governor at a distance, but nothing more was done, probably because he was secretly glad at the conduct of the Christian officer. Abbott was determined upon destroyiug Chuttur Singh, despite everything. So, "I assembled the chiefs of Hazara, explained what had happened and called upon them by the memory of their murdered parents, friends and relatives to rise and aid me in destroying the Sikh forces in detail. I issued purwannas to this effect throughout the land and marched to a strong position." Major Evans Bell writes, "when Chuttur Singh found that his appeal to the Resident and the Durbar was fruitless ; that Captain Abbott's proceedings were not disallowed or, to his knowledge, disapproved, and that no terms were offered to him but bare life, what could he think but that he had been marked down

as the first victim in the general ruin of the Punjab State ?" [257]

According to the Treaty of 1846, Dewan Mulraj's revolt ought to have been crushed by the Resident with the help of the contingent maintained from the revenues of the Punjab for the express purpose of preserving "the peace of the country." According to Marshman, Lord Hardinge "organised three moveable Brigades complete in carriage and equipment" "to provide for the prompt suppression of any insurrectionary movements which might arise." [258] But, Currie with an unscrupulous disregard for truth, wrote "The coercion must come from the Sikh Government, unaided by British troops," for "Dewan Moolraj is an officer of the Sikh Government ; he is in rebellion to the Sikh Durbar and the orders of that Government" !! Sir Henry Lawrence wrote in the Calcutta Review for March, 1856, "Had the 10,000 men that had been told off on the N. W. Frontier to meet disturbance, promptly marched on Mooltan in 1848, there would probably have been no siege or at least the affair would have been as insignificant as it proved momentous." The delay in crushing the rebellion sprang, as Captain Trotter suggests,[259] from a secret hope of its spreading far enough to furnish Government with a fair excuse for annexing the dominions of Runjit Singh. So, Currie did not "move a British soldier."

Raja Shere Singh, the son of Chuttur Singh, marched to Multan at the head of the Durbar troops accompanied by Edwardes at the head of some Muslim recruits. Arriving before Multan, Edwardes made a final appeal for a few heavy guns and an engineering officer with a detachment of sappers. But the Resident could not be influenced. Meanwhile, Shere Singh felt that duty required him to be near his persecuted father and he traced

his steps northward. The Sikhs rallied round those devoted leaders for their Khalsa Raj. The siege of Multan was raised. Confusion prevailed. The British were glad.

During the war, the British turned into very good account the old standing hatred between Sikh and Muslim. The Muslims allied themselves with the English in their design to subvert the Sikh Raj. Ranjit Singh's most powerful minister was a Muslim named Fakir Azizuddin. But his brother Noor-ud-din, a member of the Council of Regency was so loyal to the Company that Sir Lepel Griffin wrote of him, "he at all times was ready to facilitate matters for the British Resident." His second son Fakir Shamsuddin made over the fort of Gobindgarh to the European troops" at a time when any hesitation on his part might have produced serious results."[260] It is not necessary to enter into details regarding the battles of Ramnagar, Chillianwalla and Goojrat here. Lord Gough was outmanoeuvred by Shere Singh and Chillianwalla was "one of the most disastrous engagements" the British have fought in India. Mr. Marshman writes in the Calcutta Review for December 1849 that "the Sikh army waited for, escaped from or moved round the British with the most perfect facility; crossed rivers, which occupied British troops many days; and, in every imaginable mode, demonstrated that the excellence of the British commissariat was no match for the simplicity of the Sikh and that men who can bivouac in the open air and live on parched grain, will march much faster than those who must have double tents and carry their luxuries with them." Multan also fell after a resistance of nine months since Mulraj ran short of provisions and powder and

shot, his magazine having caught fire and being destroyed."

Ever since the beginning of hostilities, Englishmen like Sir George Campbell who wrote under the pseudonym 'Economist' [261] were advising Dalhousie to annex the Punjab since that would finally settle the Frontier Problem and avoid the dangers of a double system of government. "It is easier to hold in check disarmed than an armed people." Again, "If we do not keep the Punjab—what then?" We must abandon the country and retire—our prestige will be ruined and our name will lose its spell." Another argument was that annexation alone would save the Muslims for the revenge of the Sikhs. The old treaty, they said, had died "a natural death." "Duleep Sing was a mere piece of paper money and is now as valueless as a note when the bank has broken." Against the argument of fear at the martial tribes residing in the province, Sir George Campbell asked Dalhousie "But *you* are not afraid!" The strongest reason was, "We having the greatest might have also the best right." So, "the occupation must be complete as a manner—no *concurrent* but an *exclusive* possesion; complete as to place, of no *portion* of the country but *of the whole*; complete as to time, for no *term* of years but for a *permanency*." On the 29th March, 1849, Dalhousie issued a proclamation tolling the death-knell of the Sikh Raj. The annexation cannot be justified on any moral consideration whatsoever. Major Evans Bell observes, "Lord Dalhousie's procedure in settling the future relations of the Punjab with British India after the Company of 1849 just amounts to this:—a guardian, having undertaken for a valuable consideration, a troublesome and dangerous trust, declares, on the first occurrence

of those troubles and dangers, of which he had full knowledge and forewarning, that as a compensation for his exertions and a protection for the future, he shall appropriate his Ward's estate and personal Property to his own purposes. And this, although the guardian holds ample security in his own hands for the repayment of any outlay and the satisfaction of any damages he might have incurred, in executing the conditions of the trust." [262].

We shall now turn to Dalhousie's war with Burma, which were also equally unmoral. In June, 1851, Captain Shepperd, the master and owner of the British ship *Monarch* lying in Rangoon harbour was taken before the police on a charge of having thrown overboard the pilot Esoph, a native of Chittagong and and was fined £101. In August of the same year, a similar charge was directed against Captain Lenis and he was fined £70. "It must be borne in mind that all the parties to these suits were British subjects."[263] The Governor of Rangoon had not been adjudicating in matters where Burmese interests were at stake. But the two gallant captains appealed to the Government of India for redress and compensation amounting to £1920 which was later reduced by the Government to £920. The Indian Government was glad at the pretext of the muddied stream against the Burmese lamb, though according to International Law it could not sit in appeal over the decisions of the court of an independent country. Dalhousie sent two of the Queen's ships that had appropriate names (the *Fox* and the *Serpent*) under the command of Commodore Lambert to Rangoon to demand reparation, though he knew that "these Commodores are too combustible for negotiations."

Lambert was to inquire on the spot whether the compensation claimed was just and "if the Governor refused or evaded compliance" to forward a letter to the king and on no account to commit any act of hostility until definite instructions were given by the Governor-General.

Lambert never obeyed these orders. As soon as he landed, he encouraged the British residents, "Don Pacificos," as Lord Ellenborough named them, to bring to him their complaints and grievances against the Governor of Rangoon and prepared a long list of 38 major heads with no signatures or dates. Of course, any stick is good enough to beat a dog with. He wrote an insulting letter to the Governor and the next day despatched through him the letter to His Majesty adding "I hold you responsible for an answer being delivered in these waters within 5 weeks from this day". The reply came within the stipulated time; the Governor was recalled and dismissed; another nobleman was selected for the place; on the 18th January 1852, Lambert wrote to India, "I am of opinion that the king is sincere and that his Government will fully act up to what he has promised." The new Governor removed the embargo by which the inhabitants of Rangoon had been prevented from holding communication with the boats of the squadron.

But the Commodore was too "combustible"; he wanted to pick a quarrel somehow and so he exaggerated the "disrespect" shown by the Governor to the "deputation" carrying to him his letter by their "having been kept waiting for a full quarter of an hour in the sun" and of receiving it without due ceremonial. Lambert immediately warned the British subjects of the town to take refuge on board the shipping in the river and issued orders to seize "the Yellow Ship" belonging to the King

of Burma. This was the first act of the war. "As if in very derison and mockery" of his superior's orders, he proclaimed the same day "in virtue of authority from the Governor-General of India, I do hereby declare the rivers of Rangoon, the Bassein and the Salwein above Moulmein to be in a state of blockade." It is a most perplexing fact that there does not appear one word or syllable of remonstrance from the Governor-General to vindicate his own authority. [264] Did Lambert possess secret instructions?

In vain did the Burmese officials entreat Lambert to release the king's ship. The Governor of Rangoon sent responsible officers apologising for his fault. But the Commodore was not moved. The Burmese opened a sharp cannonade when the king's ship was taken in tow. This was instantly returned with shot and shell. Lambert chuckled, "Our fire, I have no doubt, must have done great execution, for I have reason to believe that at least 3,000 men were opposed against us."

The Governor of Rangoon wrote a letter to Dalhousie inviting an impartial inquiry into the charge of disrespect to the deputation, and proposing a satisfactory and amicable arrangement of the question of compensation. But the noble Lord was thristing for war and so he ordered an armed expedition to compel the Burmese to accede not only to all previous demands but to pay ten lakhs of rupees "in consideration of the expenses of the expedition and of compensation for property." This was done with such indecent haste that the king of Burma against whose Government, war was declared, had no time to explain matters; for from January 6th, the date of the seizure of the Yellow Ship to February 12th, the date of Delhousie's Minute, is just 36 days, whereas the news had to travel to Ava and the reply from Ava to Calcutta—

a distance that takes up 42 days! As a matter of fact, Dalhousie received the king's reply seven days after the despatch of the armed squadron.

The war was prosecuted with great vigour. "A war it can hardly be called. A rout, a massacre or a visitation would be a more appropriate term. Every thing yielded like toy work to the terrible broadsides of our ships." [265] In the end, Pegu was annexed to the Company's possessions mainly because it was reputed to contain many gold mines and its ancient name was Swarna Bhumi! The English wanted to enrich themselves and cripple Burma's financial resources.

Cobden, the great English patriot, very scathingly exposed the immorality and injustice of the Burmese War in a publication which he very aptly named "How wars are got up in India." It is a pity that none of the Christian writers of Indian history or of the biography of Lord Dalhousie has ever referred to Cobden's pamphlet on the Second Burmese War. No attempt was made by Dalhousie to controvert or deny the serious allegations made against the Indian government by Cobden, though the book was published three years before his departure from India. Mr. Cobden writes: "These wars are carried on at the expense of the people of India ···what exclusive interest had the half-naked peasant of Bengal in the settlement of the claims of Captains Shefferd and Leuis, that he should alone be made to bear the expense of the war which grew out of them?" Mr. Cobden has also given in his book a speech delivered by General Cass in the Senate of the United States in December, 1852, on the Second Burmese War in which he characterisedit as "real rapacity."

Aquisitions by Fraud.

"Ere long," writes Sir J. W. Kaye, "there was a word which came to be more dreaded than that of conquest. The native mind is readily convinced by the inexorable logic of the sword. It is his 'kismut'; his fate; God's will. One stronger than he cometh and taketh all that he hath. There are however manifest compensations. His religion is not invaded; his institutions are not violated. Life is short and the weak man, patient and philosophical, is strong to endure and mighty to wait. But *Lapse* is a dreadful and an appalling word; for it pursues the victim beyond the grave. Its significance in his eyes is nothing short of eternal condemnation."[266] As far back as 1834, the Court of Directors has written, "whenever it is optional with you to give or to withhold your consent to adoptions, the indulgence should be the exception and not the rule and should never be granted but as a special mark of approbation". Dalhousie in a letter to Sir Charles Wood had classified the Native States into three classes, (1) independent sovereignties (2) tributary and subordinate chiefships and (3) chiefships revived or created by the Sanad of the British Government. He also gave it as his opinion that in the case of the first class the Company had no right over adoptions except that of might, that in second class of States though the British had a right to refuse assent, it must usually be conceded as a question of policy." In the principalities of the third class I hold that succession should never be allowed to go by adoption."

The first Indian principality which Dalhousie treated as "lapse" was the State of Satara. Mr. Robert Knight, the author of "The Inam Commission Unmasked" had recognised that the Peshwa was defeated in 1818 mostly by the opportune proclamation issued by the Raja of Satara who 'fell' into British hands. "The assurances of the proclamation and the re-instatement of the Raja of Satara ruined the Peshwa." Raja Pratab Singh proved to be a very intelligent and shrewed man, far above the average of Indian princes. He began to worry the Resident about the fulfilment of assurances and so the Governor of Bombay deposed him and sent him to Benares, placing his brother on the throne. In 1847, Pratab Singh died leaving an adopted son. Sir John Hobhouse now wrote to his nephew: "The reigning Raja is, I hear, in very bad health and it is not at all impossible we may soon have to decide upon the fate of his territory. I have a very strong opinion that on the death of the present prince without a son, and no adoption should be permitted, this petty principality should be merged in the British Empire." [267] In 1848, the brother also died, leaving an adopted son. The sons adopted according to Hindu Law and Religion were set aside, and, though the Satara Raj was paying no tribute to the British, it was annexed under the Doctrine of Lapse. The Story of Satara shows only a "lapse" in public morality among the company's servants.

Satara served as a precedent for the annexation of Nagpur in 1854. On the 11th December, 1853, Raghojee Bhonsle III died without leaving a son and his grandmother, who had acted as Regent during his minority, adopted the deceased Raja's grandnephew with the consent of his widows. Sir Richard Jenkins in his Nagpore Report of

1827 had pointed out in no uncertain terms the rule regulating succession the Bhonsle's family, viz. "in case he should die without leaving a son, to choose the nearest male descendant of the Rajah who had any" and Yeshwant Rao Aher Rao's adoption was made according to this immemorial custom. Dalhousie himself had written to the Resident in 1844 recognising the rights of an adopted son." In the event of the death of the present Rajah without leaving children or *an adopted son*, you should make arrangements for conducting the Government of Nagpore, pending the orders of the Government of India." But now Dalhousie laid down that "the Ranees" 'natural jealousies,' 'their feelings and interests' *must* make them averse to the continuance of the Raj in the person of an adopted son and it would really be inhuman to encourage them to adopt" !! So, without any inquiry or notice, he proclaimed on the 25th Jan. 1854 that Nagpore had "lapsed into the paramount power, for there was no heir or representative of the Bhonsla family or even a claimant to the throne of Nagpore." In 1826, Nagpore had been officially recognised as "one of the substantive powers of India." In 1854 ?

General Low gallantly opposed this "infringement of treaties" and pleaded that the Company should most carefully avoid unnecessarily accelerating the pace with which India was conquered. He suggested that the annexation of provinces without any ostensible crime might make the natives discontented, but his protests fell on deaf ears in India and England. Sir Charles Wood wrote to Dalhousie: "I have heard of no objection, even from John Mill who is the great supporter of Indian Independence in the East India House." Hogg wrote, "there never was and could not be a clearer case."

The reasons for the annexation of Nagpore did not appear in the records minutes. Nagpore was a great cotton producing province and, "not much inferior to Oude or the Punjab in resources or capacities," "it was superior to them in climate." There are many hill resorts which can equal Simlah, Darjeeling or the Neelgherries. Moreover, the province was very difficult to conquer and very easy to retain. And, according to a writer in the Calcutta Review for 1863, "They (the people of Nagpore) were not easily seduced."

Kaye writes: "The spoliation of the palace followed closely upon the extinction of the Raj. The live stock and dead stock of the Bhonslah were sent to the hammer. It must have been a sad day indeed in the Royal Household when the venerable Bankha Bale, with all the wisdom and moderation of four-score well-spent years upon her, was so stung by a sense of the indignity offered to her that she threatened to fire the palace, if the furniture were removed. But the furniture was removed and the jewels of the Bhonslah family with a few propitiatory exceptions were sent to the Calcutta market."

Jhansi was also annexed on the same plea. The Subedars of Jhansi in Bundlekhand had made their office hereditary but were yet tributary to the Peshwa. The Company negotiated a treaty with the Ruler in 1817 by the second article of which "the British Government consented to acknowledge Row Ram Chand, his heirs and successors as hereditary rulers of the territory enjoyed by the late Row Sheo Bhow at the period of the commencement of the British government." So Jhansi was not a grant; nor was any stipulation made to annex the territory on failure of heirs of the Subedar's body. "No other law was intended or thought of except the Hindoo Law of inheri-

tance, in which adoption is an ordinary and essential incident. No article or stipulation in the treaty gave us the right to interfere with the operation of the Hindoo Law, to mutilate it or to substitute any other law of descent."[268]

"One cannot fail to be struck with the frequency of death without heirs among Indian Sovereigns from the moment when the policy of annexation is proclaimed by a Governor-General," says Ludlow.[269] The last Raja of Jhansi died in Nov. 1853; the kinsman whom he had adopted as his son was not recognised. Dalhousie declared that "the adoption was good for the conveyance of private rights, though not for the transfer of the Principality," and so Jhansi was declared 'annexed.' Dalhousie relied for this decision upon a minute drawn by Sir Charles Metcalfe in 1837, but Major Bell has proved that Metcalfe allowed only a restricted right of resumption. Even in the case of jagheerdars who held grants of land or revenue by gift, he considered that the sovereign has the power of refusing to sanction adoptions only *when the terms of the grant limit succession to heirs male of the body.* But, in the case of Jhansi "there was no gift, because Ram Chand Rao was already in possession; there was no pretensions to the relations of sovereign and subject, for there already existed relations of amity and defensive alliance; there was no grant made, no sunud issued, but a new treaty was concluded between two States. The Raja of Jhansi was no 'jagheerdar' but a 'hereditary ruler', a Hindu Prince." Dalhousie also relied on an alleged precedent of 1835, but in 1835 the adoption or nomination was doubtful; in 1853, the adoption was not doubtful. The only decision at which our government arrived (in 1855) was the decision of not deciding, interposing or even advising in the

dispute." Thus the Company's servants annexed Jhansi with a light heart and the Rani of Jhansi felt so deeply mortified that she took up arms in 1858.

In 1849, Sambalpur in the Central Provinces and Jaitpur in Bundelkhand had already been annexed on the same principle. Tanjore fell in 1855. "The highest legal authority in England, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council emphatically denounced the Tanjore spoliation." Lord Kingsdown said: "The Rajah was an independent sovereign of territories undoubtedly minute and bound by treaties to a powerful neighbour, which left him practically little power of free action; but he did not hold his territory, such as it was, as a fief of the British Crown or of the East India Company; nor does there appear to have been any pretence for claiming it, on the death of the Rajah without a son, by any legal title, either as an escheat or as bona vacantia." [270]

On the death of Mohamed Ghaus, Nawab of the Carnatic in October, 1855, Azim Jah was not granted that title by the Company, though it was itself "technically and formally feudatories of the Nawab and hold all their territory, except the town of Madras, as jaghirs under sunnad from him as sovereign of the country." Lord Harris, Governor of Madras, wrote, "if the semblance of royalty" and "mockery of authority" be allowed to continue, it might "at any time become a nucleus for sedition and agitation." Dalhousie endorsed this view and so one ancient royal house of India was wiped out of existence.

Mr. Robert Knight writes: "About the year 1851, the policy in the ascendant at Calcutta was that of getting rid of 'intervening principalities.' "The two great Mussulman States, Hyderabad and Oude were marked down for annexation and the

process of undermining them, as the Blue Books tell us, was only delayed by the wars in the Punjab and Burmah." [271] Dalhousie wrote a letter to the Nizam in June 1851 by which he advised the Nizam to disband "those turbulent mercenaries, the Arab Soldiery" and also to make an effort for "the early liquidation of the accumulated debt", reminding him at the same time that it was dangerous to "provoke the resentment of the British Government whose power can crush you at its will" and that the independence of sovereignty stood in imminent danger"! The Nizam was asked to employ a British continent to suppress local revolts, a contingent called by Mr. Knight as "the most preposterous example of our national nepotism." Dalhousie also occupied Berar temporarily for the debts of the Nizam and 50 years later, another British Lord, the son of a clergyman, compelled the Nizam to give up Berar in permanent lease to the British Indian Government. Berar was only to be the thin end of the wedge, but thanks to Sir Salar Jung and his statesmanship, Hyderabad escaped the fate of Oude.

The annexation of Oude was Dalhousie's last and most unjustifiable act. Historians have referred to it as the most important contributing cause of the Sepoy Mutiny. It had been condemned on all hands as "Dacoity in Excelsis" &c. The English encouraged the Nawab Viziers to throw off the yoke of the Moghul Emperor only to impose upon them their own heavier one. The Marquess of Hastings styled the ruler of Oude "King" and "His Majesty." Sir Henry Lawrence in the Calcutta Review for January 1845 writes, "Oude affords but a discreditable chapter in our Indian annals and furnishes a fearful warning of the lengths to which a statesman may be carried when

once he substitutes expediency and his own view of public advantage for the simple rule of right and wrong. The facts furnished by every writer on Oude affairs all testify to the same point, that British interference with that province has been as prejudicial to its court and people as it has been disgraceful to the British name."[272] By the Treaty of 1801. the English bound themselves to defend the Vizier's territories against all foreign and domestic enemies and this led the way to a destructive half century of interference. Colonel Sleeman was the Resident at Lucknow during the time of Dalhousie. Oude was coveted by the English for its fine climate and extraordinary fertility and for the opportunities it afforded for the planter and merchant. Without annexation, exploitation was impossible. So, the Europeans began to work up the authorities into rage and abuse the King by such books as "the Private Life of an Eastern King, by a member of the Household of his late Majesty Nussir-uddin, King of Oude"—a book written by an ungrateful British employed as a portrait painter. Dr. Duff, the celebrated Scotch Missionary pointed out [273] that the annexation of Oude was both right and inevitable. "Two lines," said the Reverend Christian, "two lines in the Gazette would banish the whole crew, king, eunuchs, women and chuckladars into their natural insignificance." "Two regiments of Europeans would be sufficient and two regiments of Europeans we can spare." Sir Charles Napier relates an anecdote about Dalhousie's father, who, as the Commander-in-Chief in India, had occasion to visit the Vizier, getting angry at the innocent Nawab's imagining that the commander's wife was being offered for sale when she was only being introduced ! Napier adds "This should certainly have figured among the reasons for annexing

Oude. He would have been stronger than any thing yet adduced for that spoliation.' [274] After the annexation of Oude Dalhousie left India. Sir Edwin Arnold writes: "Beneath his rule the territory of the British merchants trading in the East' received its latest extension, and at his departure, the run of their power verged to a strong setting".

The Indian Mutiny of 1857

It did not require in Lord Canning the vision of a prophet to see the cloud on the political horizon of India, not bigger than a man's hand threatening the fate of that land. He assumed office in March 1856 and not long afterwards, the Indian Mutiny broke out. The Company was riding, in spite of the Mutiny at Vellore, rough-shod over the religous usages and customs of the people. Missionaries were being openly patronised. A good deal of bad feeling was thus created which was quietly but actively diffused.[274] It was in this spirit of neglecting to consult the religious prejudices of Hindu and Muslim sepoys that greased cartridges were served out to them.

Mr. Drummond pointed out in his speeches in Parliament various causes for Munity. "The conduct of many of our young officers towards the Natives is cruel and tyrannical"; Bentinck's observation was that the European generally knew little or nothing of the customs and manners of the people; he said that the root of the whole evil was "the doctrine that India is a country to be *exploited* for the benefit of the Civil Service. If we are going to look upon India, as we have looked upon it hitherto, as a mere place of plunder for English officials, we shall surely lose it and shall surely deserve to lose it". Herbert Spencer, the philosopher, said "The Anglo-Indians of the last century whom Burke described as 'birds of prey and passage in India' showed themselves only a shade less cruel than their prototypes of Peru and Mexico...

Even down to our own day, kindred iniquities are continued. Down to our own day, too, are continued the grievous salt monopoly and the pitiless taxation that wring from the poor ryots nearly half the produce of the soil... And down to our own day, it is common with the people in the interior to run into the woods at the sight of a European."[275]

Again, the Charter Act of 1856 was singularly wanting in any section which may be construed as conferring privileges on the natives of India. The Act of 1833 enacted, at least on paper, that "no native of the said territories... shall by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, colour, or any of them be disabled from holding any place, office or employment under the said Company." The Act of 1813 wanted a sum of not less than a lakh of rupees a year to be set apart for the improvement of literature and encouragement of the natives of India. But the mask of philanthropy was at last thrown away in 1853.

Sir John Kaye in describing the work of Lord Dalhousie in India writes: "But in neither way did Dalhousie even come to understand the genius of the people among whom his lot was cast. He had but one idea of them—an idea of a people habituated to the despotism of a dominant race. He could not understand the tenacity of affection with which they clung to their old traditions. He could not sympathise with the veneration which they felt for their ancient dynasties. He could not appreciate their fidelity to the time-honoured institutions and the immemorial usages of the land." His advisers belonged to the new school of politicians who "insisted upon the duty of universal usurpation." However sympathetic they were to European bondsmen like the Italian, the Switzer or the Pole, Kaye says: "But the sight of the dark-

skin sealed their sympathies. They contended not merely that the love of country, that the spirit of liberty as cherished by European races is in India wholly unknown, but that Asiatic nations and especially the nations of India, have no right to judge what is best for themselves, no right to revolt against the beneficence of a more civilised race of white men who would think and act for them, and deprive them for their own good, of all their most cherished rights and their most valued possessions."

Another English writer says : "For generation after generation, the great aim and object of the servants of the Company from the high civil and military functionaries downwards was to squeeze as large as possible a fortune out of the country as quickly as might be and turn their backs upon it for ever, so soon as that object had been attained and the last golden harvest had been shaken down from the pagoda tree. In perfect truth it has been said that if the native rulers chastised the people with whips, the European master chastised them with scorpions."

According to Ludlow, the Government of the East India Company was "cumbrous, wasteful, inefficient and dishonest as a piece of administrative machinery, as a form of rule peculiarly ill-adapted to fix the affections and loyalty of the native races of India." He says that it failed to give security to person or property, its judicial system was dilatory, costly and inefficient, and its revenue system bred corruption, extortion and immorality ; public works were not used to prevent famines. Drunkenness was introduced and fostered by the exigencies of public revenue. No wonder, Mr. Fraser said : "There is disaffection enough for half a dozen rebellions," for "Vengence sleeps long but never dies."

Who were the mutineers? They were principally (a) the Marathas who had been perhaps the greatest sufferers, for the Peshwa had been deposed and his adopted son treated with scant justice; the Maratha States of Satara, Nagpur and Jhansi were annexed, (b) The Muslims of the North-West Provinces who witnessed the overthrow of the Royal Houses of Delhi and Lucknow, and (c) the Purbias or the Hindus of Oude.

It is not necessary to write in detail about the spread of the revolt and the manner in which it was put down by the English since there are several admirable works on the subject like that of Kaye and Malleson. The Mutiny could not have been suppressed but for the help rendered to the Company by the Sikhs and the Gurkhas. The people of the Punjab were kept loyal by Sir John Lawrence by being plundered of their wealth. The Sikh Chiefs were "stripped of all rank, deprived of all property and reduced each of them to a monthly pittance of 200 rupees." He raised with 'some' difficulty, a forced loan at the rate of 6 per cent. interest. "And it proved a master stroke of policy, for it supplied us with funds when we needed them most sorely and bound the landowners and merchants for the cause of our Government by ties the force of which they could not fail to recognise."[276] He also incited them to take revenge upon the Muslims of Delhi for the murder of their old Gurus. Nepal too had some private scores to pay off—against Oude. Sir Jong Bahadur boasted of having massacred five to six thousand subjects of Oude on his way to Lucknow.

There can be no doubt that there is a great deal of falsehood and exaggeration in British narratives, about Indian atrocities and barbarities during the Mutiny. Mr. Justin McCarthy writes:

"The elementary passions of manhood were inflamed by the stories, *happily not true*, of the wholesale dishonour and barbarous mutilation of women." Granting even that the mutineers were guilty of cruelties, we have to remember that "there is not anything peculiarly Asiatic" in it.[277] We can also note that "it is on the records of our British Parliament in papers sent home by the Governor-General in Council that 'the aged women and children are sacrificed as well as those guilty of rebellion'. They were not deliberately hanged but burnt to death in their villages...Englishmen did not hesitate to boast or to record their boasting writing that they had spared no one and that peppering away at niggers was very pleasant pastime, enjoyed amazingly.....An Englishman is almost suffocated with indignation when he reads that Mr. Chambers or Miss Jennings was hacked to death by a dusty ruffian but in Native histories or, history being wanting, in legends and traditions it may be recorded amongst our people that mothers and wives and children with less familiar names fell miserable victims to the first swoop of English vengeance, and these stories may have as deep a pathos as any that rend our own hearts.[278] Sir Charles Dilke says : "An officer in high command during the march upon Cawnpore reported 'good bag today, polished off rebel's....."It is certain that in the suppression of the Mutiny hundreds of natives were hanged by the Queen's officers who, unable to speak any word of any native language could neither understand evidence nor defence."[279]

Transfer of the Government of India from the Company to the Crown

When the Company's Charter was renewed in 1853, the usual practice of enacting it for twenty years was departed from and thus it was doomed to extinction in the minds of the people. For, "freedom of trade" required fuller development of the resources of India in a more rapid and direct manner. The English also wanted to colonise India. Metcalfe had pointed out that "the Company's hold" was not likely to be so permanent as the King's and that the Europeans settled in India would never be satisfied with Company Government. The days of Company monopoly were temporarily over. This "enlightened selfishness" seized the Sepoy Mutiny as a convenient pretext and agitated for the transfer of the Government of India to the Crown.

The Company presented a petition, drawn up by no less a person than John Stuart Mill, in both Houses of Parliament, through Mr. J. Baring and the Earl of Grey. They said that they had "at their own expense and the agency of their own civil and military servants" acquired the magnificent Empire in the East at a time when "a succession of administrations under the control of Parliament were losing to the Crown of Great Britain another great Empire on the opposite side of the Atlantic"! They pointed out with great emphasis that their government and defence of of India had been done for a century "without the smallest cost to the British Exchequer"—an unique example, they claimed, of that art. They had

tolerated a system of parliamentary control as early as 1783 which had worked with modifications to the advantage of all parties and requested that the Charter Act of 1853 must be given a fair trial. The Company challenged the most searching inquiry into the Mutiny and protested that, even if it were proved that the Mutiny was traceable to the Company's arrangements, that was no reason to divest it of its functions, since their Majesty's Government had the deciding voice in all matters relating to India. They boasted of their Government in India "which has not only been one of the purest in intention but one of the most beneficent in act, ever known among mankind," and they felt it highly ungrateful if Parliament proposed to create the impression in England and India that they have "so abused their trust as to have produced a sanguinary insurrection and nearly lost India to the British Empire; and that having thus crowned a long career of misgovernment they have, in deference to public indignation been deservedly cashiered for their misconduct." They warned the Houses against a general rising in India on the introduction of a new government, especially since "demonstrations of indiscriminate animosity" had grown up in England and India since the Mutiny. Then, they began in a sympathetic strain. "That your petitioners cannot contemplate without dismay the doctrine now widely promulgated that India should be administered with an especial view to the benefit of the English who reside there". (So, the truth is out at last.) They were prepared to accept any correction of defects or even "to relinquish their trust altogether, if a better system for the control of the Government of India can be devised." But since they were not confident in the opportuneness or benefits

of the system proposed, they were constrained to oppose the measure. They suggested a large and independent council of experienced officers to check the Minister of the Crown, but stated that the new council so constituted was exactly the Court of Directors. So, they prayed for a full and free inquiry, pending the proposed transfer.

This petition was of no avail. The Government of India was transferred from the Company to the Crown. A conciliatory proclamation, intended to smooth the ruffled feelings of the people, was prepared. The natives of India look upon the proclamation as the Magna Charta of their liberties. Much nonsense is talked by those who take their stand on this proclamation and demand equal rights and privileges with British citizens. Mr. Freeman writes, "when we come to manifestoes, proclamations, we are on the very chosen regions of his."[280] Sir James Stephen, an eminent lawyer and jurist, said that the proclamation was merely a ceremonial document. It was not a treaty and so it did not impose any responsibility and obligation on the English people.

The fact was, India was not to be governed for the benefit of the natives. A Select Committee of the House of Commons was appointed in 1858 "to inquire into the progress and prospects and the best means to be adopted for the promotion of European colonisation and settlement in India, especially in the Hill districts and healthier climates of that country as well as for the extension of our commerce with Central Asia." The problem of Indian colonisation engaged the attention of Indian rulers of the Company ever since Warren Hastings's regime when Sir Philip Francis and Monson opposed the measure. But, after 1813, an agitation was started for colonisation, ostensibly for philanthropic motives. "A country without capital, knowledge,

morals or enterprise... Our countrymen living amongst them will instruct them in arts, in science and in morals, the wealth and resources of the country will be improved ; the Hindus will rise in the scale of civilisation." Mr. Federick Shore advocated colonisation for a different motive. "The probability is that India will be independent of England long before that event could be produced by colonisation and that, so far from being a means of accelerating that catastrophe, it would rather retard it." B. H. Hodgson of Nepal fame advised the starving peasantry of Ireland and of the Scotch highlands to colonize the Himalayas" as a "durable, safe and cheap barrier against Russian aggression." The Mutiny itself was pointed out as a result of the want of colonisers. So, every encouragement was offered by Government to European settlers, tea-planters, cotton growers, indigo planters, steel manufacturers etc. Hill stations were made accessible by railway from the plains. Changes were made in the law of land tenure. Larger numbers of Englishmen were recruited for offices in India. Still, since the land is already over-populated and since possibilities of industrialisation were not great, India is not very attractive to European gold hungerers. Again, as Meredith Townsend says, "an uncontrollable disgust, an overpowering sense of being aliens, inexorably divided from the people of the land" comes upon them (the Englishman in India) and they glide silently away."[281]

In order to hide selfish desires to exploit India under a pleasant mask, the Proclamation was issued. Even assuming that the Queen, judging from some characteristic modifications made by Her Majesty in order to tone down the arrogance and severity of the original draft,[282] issued the Proclamation on account of her love for the people

of India, we must remember that she was powerless against her ministers and could not set right any wrong done by them. The Proclamation of the Queen was read by Lord Canning on the 18th November, 1858, in Allahabad—memorable as the place where on the 12th August, 1765, Clive obtained from Shah Alam the Diwani of Bengal, Behar and Orissa. Thus ended the rule of the East India Company. The story begins "in feebleness and cowardice, it is pervaded by rapacity, it closes with a course of fraud and falsehood, of forgery and treason, as stupendous as ever lay at the foundation of a great Empire."[283] No one can deny the fact that India has benefited by the abolition of the "Society of Adventurers" called the East India Company.

References

(The volume and page numbers refer to Major B. D. Basu's "Rise of the Christian Power in India," 5 Vols.)

1. Letters from a Competition Wallah, Vol. I. XXVI
2. Lord Wellesley Vol. I. XXX.
3. Kaye, Afghanistan II, 13., quoted in. Vol. I XIVI.
4. Bruce's Annals of the East India Company, I, 128. Vol. I. 17,
5. Mill—History of India, IV. ch. i. Vol. I. 23.
6. Bishop Heber's Journal. Vol. I 34.
7. Political History of India—Introduction p. 2. Vol. I 37.
8. Colonel Malleson—Decisive Battles in India. Vol. I 41.
9. The English in India—System of Territorial Acquisition. William Howit. Vol. I 43
10. The Calcutta Review, vol. VII 1847, p. 226. Vol. II 44.
11. Grant Duff—History of the Mahrattas 1873, p. 340. Vol. I 47.
12. The English in Western India, Rev. Philip Anderson, p. 22. Vol. I 54.
13. S. C. Hill—Bengal in 1756-7, vol. III. 161-162. Vol. I 66.
14. Ibid. II, p. 16. Vol. I 64.
15. Ibid. III, p. 162, Vol. I 67.
16. S. C. Hill, vol. III, p. 384, Vol. I 69
17. Thornton—History of the British Empire in India, vol. I, p. 190, Vol. I 89.
18. S. C. Hill, vol. III, p. 296. Vol. I 91.
19. Holwell's Letter to the Court of Directors 30-11-1756, Vol, I 93.
20. Talboys Wheeler—Early Records of British India, p. 162. Vol. I 95.
21. Appendix IX. First Report, 1772. Vol. I 102.
22. Calcutta University Magazine, 1895. Vol. I 98.
23. Old Fort William in Bengal—C. R. Wilson, vol. II, p. 59, Vol. I 98.
24. Bengal in 1756-1757, Vol. I, p. XCIV, Vol, I 106.
25. Major Kirkatrick to the Court of Directors, 25th Jan. 1757, Vol. I 109,

26. S. C. Hill, vol. I, p. CXV, Vol. I 111.
27. S. C. Hill. Vol. ii, pp. 74-76. Vol. I 116.
28. Ive's Voyages, p. 109, Vol. I 127.
29. Scrafton—Reflections, p. 66. Vol. I, 133.
30. Ive's voyages, p. 119-120. Vol. I, 144-45.
31. Ive's Voyages, p. 145. Vol. I, 185.
32. Decisive Battles, p. 73, Vol. I, 189.
33. Orme—History of Industan, vol. II, p. 82. Vol. I, 195.
34. Decisive Battles—p. 71 Vol, I 206
35. Mill—vol. III, p. 135 Vol. I 220
36. Mill—vol. III, p. 203, Vol. I, 228.
37. Orme—vol. II, p. 195, Vol. I, 224.
38. Ibid. „ „ p. 196, Vol. I, 223.
39. Malcolm, Life of Clive, vol. II, pp. 70-72. Vol. I, 230.
40. Ibid. Vol. II, pp. 119, et seq. Vol. I, 235.
41. First Report, 1772, pp. 158-159, Vol. I, 242.
42. First Report, 1772, p. 160, Vol. I, 248.
43. Mill—vol. III, pp. 213-214, Vol. I, 255.
44. Maulvi Badruddin Ahmed—Calendar o Persian Correspondence, Calcutta, 1919. Vol. III, p. viii. Vol. I, 259.
45. First Report, 1772, pp. 230-1. Vol. I, 259.
46. Maulvi Badruddin Ahmed—Ibid. Vol. I, 261.
47. First Report, 1772, p. 232 Vol. I, 270.
48. Ibid. Vol. I, 270.
49. Ibid Vol. I 271
50. Torrens—Empire in Asia pp, 45-46 (Panini Office Reprint) Vol. I, 274
51. Professor Sydney Owen—India on the Eve of the British Conquest. Vol. I, 297
52. Wheeler—Early Records. pp 275-276 Vol. I 299
53. Mill—vol III p. 224. Vol. I 304
54. Mill III pp 229-230 Vol. I 308
55. Verelst—Views of Bengal. pp. 8 and 46 Vol. I, 309
56. Letter to the President and Council of Bengal, 8-2-1764. Vol. I, 309.
57. Malcolm, Life of Clive, vol. II, p. 283. Vol. I, 323.
58. Calendar of Persian Correspondence, p. X. Vol. I, 337.
59. Ibid. P. 206 Vol, I, 343.
60. Ibid. P. 207 No. 1730, Vol. I, 344.
61. Elphinstone's Rise of British Power in India, pp. 390-1. Vol. I, 331.
62. Long's Selections for the Unpublished Records of Government for the years 1748-1767, pp. 325-326. Vol. I, 336.

63. Seir-ul—Mutaquerin. Trans. Col. Briggs. Panini Office Reprint, 1924, vol. II, pp. 478-479. Vol. I, 351.
64. Broome, History of the Rise and Progress of the Bengal Army, p. 351. Vol. I, 351.
65. Vansittart, Narrative of the Transactions in Bengal, vol. III, p. 368-369. Vol. I, 362.
66. Rise of British Power, p. 397. Vol. I, 374.
67. Long's Selections, pp. 356-358. Vol. I, 376-78,
68. Seir. II, p. 536. Vol. I, 392.
69. Long. pp. 553-554. Vol. I, 396.
70. Statistical Account of Bengal, vol. IX, p. 191. Vol. I, 410.
71. Wheeler—Early Records. Vol. I, 414.
72. Seir. III, p. 9 Vol. I, 426.
73. Third Report, 1773, p. 394. Vol. I, 427.
74. Seir, vol. III, p. 13, Vol. I, 432.
75. Third Report, p. 325, Vol. I, 432.
76. Caraccioli—Life of Clive, vol I, p. 447. Vol. I, 435.
77. Mill, vol. III, p. 305. Vol. I, 443.
78. Early Records, p. 375. Vol. I, 451.
79. Seir, vol. III, p. 32, Vol. I, 451,
80. Burke's Speeches, vol. I, p. 131, Vol. II, 2.
81. Seir, vol. III, p. 65. Vol. II, 5.
82. Mill III, 397. Vol. II, 6.
83. J. Clarke—"British India and England's Responsibilities." p. 25. Vol. II, 7.
84. Grant Duff, p. 32. Vol. II, 39.
85. Mill III, p. 432. Vol. II, 47.
86. Grant Duff, p. 340. Vol. II, 40.
87. Keene, Madhav Rao Sindhia, Rulers of India Series. Vol. II, 86.
88. Seir, p. 205. Vol. II, 144.
89. Ibid. P. 206. Vol. II, 146.
90. Seir, Briggs' Translation, p. 354. Vol. II, 151.
91. Calcutta Review, Jan. 1845. Vol. II, 99,
92. Ibid Vol. II, 100.
93. Memoirs of Madras. Sir Charles Lawson, p. 68. Vol. II, 160.
94. Charles Macfarlane. Our Indian Empire, London, 1844. p. 227. Vol. II, 162.
95. Cornwallis Correspondence. Vol. I p. 415.Vol.II 164.
96. Ibid. P. 365, Vol. II, 165.
97. Lecky. History of England. Vol. III, P. 197. Vol. II. 170.
98. Mill. V. 225. Vol. II, 175.

99. Revd. W. H. Hutton. Marquess Wellesley. R. of I' Series. P. 32. Vol. II, 99.
100. Wilks. Historical sketch of the South of India. Vol. III, p. 38. Vol. II, 100.
101. Mill. Vol. V, Vol. II, 189.
102. Mill. Vol. V, p. 278. Vol. II, 190.
103. Thornton. History of British India. Vol. II, 163.
104. Mill. V. 327f.n. Vol. II, 196.
105. Kaye. Administration of the East India Company, pp. 419-421. Vol. II, 198.
106. Mill V. p. 355. Vol. II, 201.
107. Fifth Report, 1812, Mr. Dowdeswell's Evidence, Vol. II, 206.
108. Kaye. Ibid. P. 200. Vol. II, 207.
109. Mill V. 332. Vol. II, 208.
110. Mac Neile. Memorandum on the Revenue Administration of the Lower Province of Bengal. p. 9. Vol. II. 209.
111. Life of Lord Teignmonth Vol. I pp. 226-230. Vol, II 217.
112. Pater Auber. Rise and Progress of the British Power in India, London, 1837. Vol. II p. 140. Vol. II, 218.
113. Grant Duff. p. 521. Vol. II, 237.
114. MacFarlane. Vol. II, p. 27. Vol. II, 246.
115. Major Bird, Asst. Resident for Oude. "Dacoity in Excelsis", pp. 32-34. Vol. II, 254.
116. Sir Henry Lawrence, Calcutta Review, Jan. 1845. Vol. II, 257.
117. MacFarlane. Vol II. p, 31. Vol. II, 255.
118. R. R. Pearce. Life and Correspondence of the Marquess of Wellesley. Vol. II, p. 289, Vol. II, 276.
119. Asiatic Quarterly Review Jan. 1887 Vol. II 293.
120. Maria Graham. Journal of a Residence in India, 1813. Pp. 84-85. Vol. II, 307.
121. Wellesley Despatches. Vol. I. Appendix, pp. 668-669. Vol. II, 315.
122. Ibid. Vol. II, 315.
123. Ibid. I, 382. Vol. II, 330.
124. Ibid. I. 400. Vol. II, 332.
125. Mill. VI, p. 109. Vol, II, 342.
126. Bird. Dacoity in Excelsis. Vol. II, 348.
127. Mill VI, p. 191, Vol. II, 350.
128. Bird, Ibid. Vol, II, 359.
129. Major Evans Bell. The Empire of India, pp. 107-108. Vol. II, 388.

130. Ranade. Rise of the Maratha Power, p. 246, Vol. II, 398.
131. Torrens Empire in Asia, pp. 20-21. Vol II, 399.
132. Ranade. Pp. 250-1. Vol. II, 400.
133. Mill vi, p. 216, Vol. II, 401.
134. Life of General the Rt. Hon'ble Sir David Baird Bart. London, 1832, vol. I, pp. 160-162. Vol. II, 412.
135. Surat Volume of Bombay Gazetteer, p. 127n. Vol. II, 415.
136. Ibid. P. 129n. Vol. II, 416.
137. Mill vi, 207-208. Vol. II, 417.
138. Wellesley Despatches. II, p. 222-223 Vol. II, 419.
139. Mill vi. p. 208-211. Vol. II, 422.
140. Grant Duff, p. 540, Vol. II, 440.
141. Mill vi, p. 130. Vol. II. 445.
142. Mill vi, p. 271 Vol. III, 2.
143. Ibid. p. 281 Vol. III. 20.
144. Review of Reviews July 1898, Vol. III, 11.
145. Wellesley Despatches. vol, IV. pp. 28-29. Vol. III, 13.
146. Pearce's Wellesley, vol II, p. 343 et seq. Vol. III, 82.
147. Wellesley Despatches, vol III, p. 185 et seq. Vol. III, 97.
148. Asiatic Journal, Jan. 1845, pp. 305-310. Vol. III,145.
149. Asiatic Quarterly Review. Apr. 1889. Vol. III, 150.
150. European Military Adventures in Hindustan. Compton, pp. 173-174, Vol. III. 160.
151. Ahmednagar Gazetteer, p. 695 Vol. III, 169.
152. Mill vi, 358. Vol. III 195.
153. J. Beames. Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1883. Vol. III. 229.
154. Wellesley Despatches, vol. IV. p. 64, Vol. III, 264.
155. Mill vi, p. 400, Vol. III, 299.
156. Grant Duff, p. 590, vol. III, 330.
157. Mill vi. Vol. III, 401.
158. Notes on Indian Affairs—F. J. Shore Vol. III, 360.
159. Memoirs of Ameer Khan trans. by Prinsep, p 215 Vol. III, 365.
160. Ameer Khan, p. 286, Vol. III, 476.
161. Political History of India Vol, III 479
162. Kaye's Selections from the Papers of Lord Metcalfe, p. 7. Vol. III, 480.
163. Edinburgh Review, 1807 Vol. III 484
164. Mill V 587 Vol. IV 9
165. "Lord Minto in India" by Lady Minto, p. 185. Vol. IV. 11.

166. Wellington Despatches I. p. 120-121. Vol. IV,23,
167. Kaye Lives of Indian Officers. Vol. I, p. 169. Vol. IV. 41.
168. Minto in India. pp. 98-101. Vol. IV, 42.
169. Ibid. P. 154 Vol. IV, 66.
170. MacFarlane. Vol. II. p. 181, Vol. IV, 90.
171. M. Victor Jacquemont—Letters from India, Vol. I. pp. 323-324. Vol. IV, 92.
172. Wilson's Note, Mill VII, p. 385. Vol. IV, 98.
173. Prinsep, History of the Political and Military Transactions in India during the administration of the Marquess of Hastings, p. 63. Vol, IV, 116.
174. Dacoity, Chapter IV. Vol. IV, 123.
175. R. C. William's, History of Dehra Dun. Motilal Ghose, A. B. Patrika, 16th Feb. 1900. Vol. IV, 134-35.
176. Wilson on Mill. Vol. VIII. Vol. IV, 134.
177. Prinsep I. Vol. IV, 137.
178. Ibid. P. 192 Vol. IV, 154.
179. Wilson-Mill, VIII p. 316 Vol. IV, 156.
180. Malcolm's Report on Central India, Vol I. p. 436. (2nd Edition). Vol. IV, 163.
181. Ibid. P. 433n. Vol. IV, 165.
182. Annual Biography and Obituary for 1835. Vol. IV, 178.
183. Journal of the Poona Sarvajanik Sava Vol. IV, 181.
184. Kaye's Life and Correspondence of Malcolm. Vol. II, p. 193n. Vol. IV, 188.
185. Private Journal of the Marquess of Hastings. Panini Office Reprint p. 273 Vol. IV, 196.
186. Colebrooke's Elphinstone I. 276. Vol. IV, 209.
187. History of the Rise and Decline of the present State of the Shastree Family, 1868. Bombay pp, 6-8. Vol. IV, 224.
188. Baroda Gazetteer p. 219. Vol. IV, 227.
189. Baroda Gazetteer. p. 222. Vol. IV, 240.
190. Fifteen Years in India, London, 1823, p. 492. Vol. IV, 267.
191. Kaye's Life of Malcolm, II, 257. Vol. IV, 270.
192. Digby. Prosperous India. p. 450. Vol. IV. 272.
193. Prinsep—Vol. I, pp. 427-430 Vol. IV, 290.
194. Papers relating to the war in India presented to Parliament by command of the Prince Regent, p. 70. Vol. IV, 299.
195. Nolan's History of the British Empire. Vol. II, pp. 510-11. Vol. IV, 337.

196. Autobiography of Lutfullah Trasn. by Captain Eastwick. pp. 103-104 Vol. IV, 337.
197. Lt. Lake, Journal of the Seiges of the Madras Army, p. 107. Vol. IV, 341.
198. Major Archer. Tours in Upper India I, p, 2. Vol. IV, 345.
199. Private Journal. p. 97. Vol. IV, 344.
200. Ibid. Pp. 24 et seq. Vol. IV, 352.
201. Ludlow. British India. Vol. II, pp. 37-38. Vol. IV, 356.
202. Torren , pp. 290-1. Vol. IV, 362.
203. Thornton V 105. Vol. IV, 417.
204. Kaye. History of the Sepoy War. pp. 270-271. Vol. IV, 423.
205. Military Reminiscences. Welsh. Vol.II, pp. 240-41. Vol. IV, 439.
206. Ludlow II, p. 265. Vol. IV, 440.
207. Auber. Vol. II, p. 606. Nol. IV, 444.
208. Sir W. Kaye. Calcutta Review. Vol. I, p, 341. Vol. IV, 448.
209. Rev. Dr. Moeglin. History of Coorg. Vol. IV, 455.
210. Major Evans Bell—The Mysore Reversion, pp. 21-24. Vol. IV, 460.
211. Indian Examiner and Universal Review, 1844, April "Varitas." Vol. IV, 463.
212. John Hope—"The House of Sindhia"—a Sketch, 1863. Longmans. Vol. IV, 468.
213. Captain Cunningham. History of the Sikhs, p. 205. Vol. IV, 472.
214. Kaye's Selections, pp. 211-217. Vol. IV, 474.
215. Ludlow. Vol. II, p. 97. Vol. IV, 481.
216. Meerut Universal Magazine. 1835. Vol. IV, 486.
217. Ibid. Vol. I, p. 12. Vol. IV, 488.
218. Political or Foreign Minutes of Evidence before the Parliamentary Committee of 1832 Vol. VI. Vol. IV, 490.
219. Indian Daily News. March 30. 1909. Vol. IV, 491
220. Lieutenant White, "Considerations on the State of Br. India," pp. 60-61. Vol. IV, 492.
221. Meerut Universal Magazine. Vol. I, p. 112.Vol. IV, 494.
222. Political History of India, pp. 21-22. Vol. V, 3
223. Memoir of General John Briggs by Major Evans Bell, p. 277.
224. Mill and Wilson. ix, p. 394. Vol. V, 22.
225. Dr. Garnett—"A forgotten Episode of Indian History," 225. Vol. V, 38.

226. Kaye's Lives of Indian Officers. Vol. II, p. 26. Vol. V, 41.
227. Kaye's History of the War in Afghanistan. Vol. I, p. 298. Vol. V, 55.
228. Lutufullah, pp. 294-296. Vol. V, 56.
229. Mohan Lal. Life of Dost Muhammad Khan, pp. 206-209. Vol. V, 59.
230. Kaye, Ibid, p. 202. Vol. V, 61.
231. Ibid, pp. 143-144. Vol. V, 62.
232. Modern Review, Feb, 1907. Vol. V, 66.
233. Nineteenth Century for August, 1899, p. 238. Vol. V, 72.
234. Hansard, vol xix, Third series, p. 191. Vol. V, 71.
235. The Calcutta Review. Vol. I, pp. 220-225. Vol. V, 92.
236. Greater Britain. Vol. V, 94.
237. Life of Sir Richard Burton by Lady Burton, London, 1893, p. 141. Vol. V, 105
238. History of the Afghans by J. P. Ferrier—Translated by Cap. Jesse. Murray—London, 1858. p. 297, Vol. V, 287.
239. John Hope pp. 46-49. Vol. V, 118.
240. Ibid. Pp. 53-59. Vol. V, 125.
241. Ibid. Pp. 66-67. Vol. V. 128.
242. Mir Shahmut Ali—Sikhs and Afghans. Murray. 1847. Vol. V, 148.
243. Ed ards. Reminiscences of a Bengal Civilian, p. 57. Vol. V, 155.
244. Life of Sir Charles Napier. Vol. IV, p. 205. Vol. V, 165.
245. Colchester's Ellenborough, p. 435. Vol. V, 188.
246. Reminiscences, p. 92-93. Vol. V. 200.
247. Wanderings of a Naturalist in India. Dr. Adams, 1867. Vol. V, 201.
248. Reminiscences. pp. 99-100. Vol. V. 202.
249. Rulers of India Series, Monograph on Hardinge p. 119. Vol. 204.
250. Ludlow. II, 154. Vol. V, 213.
251. Calcutta Review. Vol. VIII, p. 529. Vol. V, 215.
252. Career of Major Broadfoot, p. 268. Vol. V, 179.
253. Sir George Lawrence—forty three years in India, p. 241. Vol. V, 231.
254. Dr. Buist Narrative—p. 6. Vol. V, 235.
255. Punjab Papers, p. 362. Vol. V, 241
256. Punjab Papers, p. 271. Vol. V, 243.
257. Retrospects and Prospects of Indian Policy, pp. 126-27. Vol. V, 251
258. History of India, Vol. III, p. 305. Vol. V, 252.

259. History of the British Empire in India. Vol. I, p. 134. Vol. V, 254.
260. The Punjab Chiefs, 1890, Vol. I, p. 1109. Vol. V. 262,
261. Letters of Economist. Reprinted by the 'Sun' Printing Press, Lahore, 1897. Vol. V, 267.
262. Retrospects and Prospects, p. 142. Vol. V, 265.
263. Cobden. "How wars are got up in India, 1867." p. 30. Vol. V, 283.
264. Cobden, pp. 55-60. Vol. V, 296.
265. Ibid. P. 98. Vol. V, 305.
266. Kaye's Sepoy War, 1869. Vol. I, p. 69. Vol. V, 311.
267. Leewarner's Life of Lord Dalhousie. Vol. II, p. 158. Vol. V, 321.
268. Major Evans Bell, Empire in India, pp. 202-03. Vol. V. 337.
269. British India. Vol. II, p. 190. Vol. V, 343.
270. Empire in India, p. 97. Vol. V. 342.
271. The Statesman, July 1, 1880. Vol. V, 346.
272. Calcutta Review, January, 1845. Vol. V, 356.
273. Ibid. July, 1855. Vol. V, 358.
274. Life of Sir Charles Napier, 1857. Vol. IV, p. 296. Vol. V, 351.
275. Social Statistics. Vol. V, 372.
276. Bosworth Smith. Life of Lord Lawrence II, p. 308. Vol. V, 379.
277. Torrens. Empire in India, p. 5. Vol. V, 383.
278. Kaye, Sepoy War. Vol. II, Vol. V, 385.
279. Greater Britain. Vol. V, 386.
280. Methods of Historical Study, London, 1886. pp. 258-259. Vol. V, 414.
281. Asia and Europe, p. 87. Vol. V, 461.
282. Review of Reviews, Ap. 1897. Vol. V, 416.
283. Ludlow. Vol. I, pp. 198-99. Vol. V. 414.

INDEX

ERRATA

Page	line	error	correction
28	last line ...	amrched	marched
40	4 lines from bottom	serveral	several
80	19 lines „ „	Nizan	Nizam
„	4 „ „ „	french	French
92	13 „ „ „	desparate	desperate
153	1st para last three lines	omit	
169	4th line from bottom	Benke's	Burke's
171	last line	future	fortune
”	2nd line from bottom	from	form
178	6th „ „ „	Thone	Throne
178	20th line from top	after 'people' reference No. 205.	
179	1st. line of page	Bentink	Bentinck
181	2nd line from bottom	after 'management' reference No. 210.	
182	2nd line of page	Joypore	Jeypore
184	13th line of page	ply	play
187	15th line from bottom	222	223
188	7th line from bottom	Englishman	Englishmen
192	9th „ „ „	Burus	Burnes
193	14th „ „ „	Though	Through
194	4th „ „ „	an	our
197	9th „ „ „	Synd	Sind
198	last line	charged	charge
201	10th line from bottom	as	on
206	last line	threatre	theatre
211	14th line from bottom	with	With
”	4th line „ „	office	officer
217	page title	Dachansie	Dalhousie
223	Title	Aquisitions	Acquisitions
231	line 4	Arnod	Arnold