



AS-001018

CSL

FINL DEPT
LIBRARY
CALCUTTA.SUMMARY OF AFFAIRS,
FOREIGN DEPARTMENT,

1818 to 1835. ✓

NIPAL. (38)

Nipal¹ was originally the name applied to the great valley situated in the hills, which form the northern boundary of Tirhoot and Sarun. Prior to the Ghoorkha conquest in 1768, the people were known as Newars. They were a so-called aboriginal race; Mongolian in their physical characteristics; Buddhist or Brahmanical in their religion. They were peaceful, industrious and unwarlike. They cultivated the valley in a very superior style to what was to be seen in the Gangetic provinces. They were traders, workers in gold and silver, and artisans in other ways; equal, if not superior, to the Hindus in everything except weaving. The Newar Rajas were all Hindus, and claimed to be descendants of the Solar race.

Nipal before
the Ghoorkha
conquest.

The early relations of the English with the people of Nipal were merely commercial. British

Early com-
mercial rela-
tions.

¹ Dr. Campbell's Narrative of Political Relations, Proceedings Nos. 49-50 A., 23rd January 1835.



Ghoorkha
conquest.

subjects of Bengal and Behar had transactions with the Newars; and the Company's Agent at Bettia carried on occasional intercourse with the Newar Rajas.

About the middle of the eighteenth century the Ghoorkhas began to invade Nipal under the leadership of Prithi Narain. The Newar Raja of Katmandhu begged for British help. The British government was strongly inclined to aid the Newars. The Ghoorkha invasion had stopped all trade, and all flow of specie from Nipal; and at this very time the trade of the Company was declining in Bengal, and the country was drained of specie.* In 1767 an expedition was sent to Nipal under Captain Kinloch; it reached the hills in the midst of the rainy season, and was compelled to return by the malaria of the Terai and want of provisions.

Stoppage of
trade with
Nipal.

In 1768 the Ghoorkhas completed the conquest of Katmandhu. They massacred every person of distinction connected with the Newar dynasties. They were a fierce and turbulent race, ignorant of arts and trade, and devoted to war and plunder. Prithi Narain was cunning, faithless, inhuman, and sacrilegious. The British commerce with Nipal was brought entirely to a close.

English
missions to
Thibet.

Subsequently the English endeavoured to open up a trade with Thibet. In 1774 Mr. Bogle went on a mission to Thibet. In 1783 Mr. Turner went on

* The drain of specie in Bengal at this period was the result of political revolutions. When the British government obtained the Dewani of Bengal, Behar and Orissa, they employed the surplus revenues in their trading investments in India and China: thus there was no longer an influx of silver from Europe, whilst there was a large outflow of silver to China.



another mission. Neither was attended by any substantial results.

In 1792 the Ghoorkha Raja of Nipal showed an inclination towards an alliance with the English. A treaty was concluded with Mr. Duncan, the British Resident at Benares; it was purely commercial, stipulating for a duty of two and a half per cent. on the imports of both countries.

Treaty of 1792.

The secret object of the Nipalese for concluding this treaty was not discovered until some time afterwards. It then appeared that they were threatened by the Chinese, and were anxious to obtain the support of the British government. They had pushed their armies beyond the Himalayas into the plains of Eastern Thibet, and plundered the temples of Digarchi. The Lama of Digarchi was spiritual father of the Emperor of China; he applied to the Emperor for succour, and the Emperor sent a large army against Nipal.

Nipal threatened by the Chinese.

The Ghoorkha government requested help from the Government of India. Lord Cornwallis was Governor-General. He declined to send an armed force, but offered to mediate between Nipal and China. He sent Major Kirkpatrick on a mission to Katmandhu; and this officer was the first Englishman who is known to have visited the capital of Nipal. Meanwhile the Nipalese had made their submission to the Chinese, and agreed to pay tribute to Peking. Major Kirkpatrick found that the Ghoorkhas rejected all his overtures, and was obliged to leave Katmandhu.

Mission of Kirkpatrick, 1792-3.



Revolutions
at Katman-
dhu.

The state of political affairs at Katmandhu soon became critical. The Raja, Run Bahadur Sah, was a minor; his uncle was Regent. In 1795 the uncle was murdered, and Run Bahadur Sah seized the throne. Run Bahadur Sah reigned with intolerable tyranny for five years. In 1800 he was compelled to abdicate the throne in favour of an illegitimate son, and fly to Benares, leaving the Rani mother as Regent with the aid of a chief Minister.

Ghoorkha
Raja at Bena-
res.

Run Bahadur Sah was well received by the British government, and Captain Knox was appointed to attend him as Political Agent. His residence in British territory worked upon the Ghoorkha authorities at Katmandhu; they showed a readiness to meet the views of the British government. The treaty of 1801 was concluded, under which a permanent Resident was received at Katmandhu. By the twelfth article it was agreed that the representatives of either State should hold no communication whatever with the subjects or inhabitants of the country to which they were accredited without the knowledge and concurrence of the authorities.

British Re-
sident at Kat-
mandhu.

By this time the Ghoorkhas had consolidated their rule over a tract of country extending five or six hundred miles along the frontiers of Oude and British India. Nipal offered a ready asylum to robbers and banditti of every kind. Boundary quarrels were incessant. Captain Knox, the new Resident, was received at Katmandhu merely as a



temporary expedient to ward off any political dangers which might threaten Katmandhu from the exiled Raja at Benares. The Ghoorkha authorities were deaf to all complaints and remonstrances.

In 1802 there was another revolution at Katmandhu. An elder Rani had accompanied Run Bahadur Sah to Benares. She suddenly returned to Katmandhu, overthrew the Rani mother, and assumed the Regency. The Durbar now became rude and insolent to the British Resident. The new Rani Regent stirred up a leader of banditti to cut off the Resident and his followers. Timely warning was given, but Captain Knox saw that his post was untenable, and returned to British territory.

Withdrawal
of the Resi-
dent.

The British alliance with Nipal was formally dissolved. The Ghoorkha Raja was allowed to return from Benares to Katmandhu. He was accompanied by a young and ambitious man, who had shared his exile, and was destined to take an important part in Nipalese affairs. This man was named Bhim Sen Thappa.

Ghoorkha
Raja returns
to Nipal.

On arriving at Katmandhu, Run Bahadur Sah murdered the Minister and reassumed the government of Nipal. Bhim Sen Thappa became Minister. The Raja was killed in some quarrel with his brother. Once again the illegitimate minor was placed on the throne of Katmandhu under the Regency of the elder Rani. But Bhim Sen Thappa was the real and only ruler; he was the favourite of the Rani, and the chief Minister and master spirit, whom all

Bhim Sen
Thappa, Min-
ister and Re-
gent.



were compelled to fear and obey; and for a period of thirty-five years he continued to be the undisputed head of affairs, whilst the reigning Raja was either a minor or only a nominal sovereign.

Nipalese
aggressions
on British
territory.

From 1803 to 1814 the relations of the British government with Nipal were negative and unsatisfactory. They consisted in vain remonstrances against the aggressions of the Ghoorkhas along the whole line of frontier from Rungpore to Rohilkhund; and in fruitless efforts to induce the frontier officers of the Nipalese government to co-operate with British officers in the suppression of robberies and dacoities. Meanwhile the Government of India was most anxious to avoid squabbles with Nipal, and overlooked the aggressions on the plains, until it was forced to conclude that they formed part of a system of determined and stealthy encroachment. In 1804 the Nipalese seized on two large districts which had been ceded to the British government by Oude. Sir George Barlow demanded their surrender, but no redress was obtained. In 1808 the Nipalese seized on another large district. The Government of India was roused into sending a British detachment to recover it at the point of the bayonet; but the Nipalese were not prepared for war, and retired without attempting to resist. A British Commissioner was subsequently appointed in conjunction with a Nipalese Commissioner to investigate frontier disputes. It was found that between 1787 and 1813 more than two hundred villages belonging to the British government had been



seized by the Ghoorkha under a variety of unjustifiable pretexts. It was clearly proved that two British districts had been seized by the Nipalese, to which they had not a shadow of a claim. The Nipalese recalled their Commissioner, and then asserted that the investigation proved the right of Nipal to the districts in question. Lord Hastings, who was then Governor-General, gave the Nipalese government a fixed date for the evacuation of the two districts. At the expiration of that period, the two districts were recovered by a British detachment, without meeting with any resistance.

The government of Nipal, in other words the Minister Bhim Sen Thappa, was resolved on war. A party of Ghoorkha troops attacked a British police post in the recovered territory, and massacred eighteen police officers. The story of the war which followed belongs to general history.

War began
by Nipal.

In 1816¹ the war against Nipal was brought to a close by the treaty of Segowlee. Under this treaty the Nipal government abandoned all claims on the hill Rajas to the west of the river Kalee; they ceded the belt of low lands known as the Terai; they restored the territory of Sikhim to the northward of Bengal to the Sikhim Raja; they agreed to receive a British Resident at Katmandhu; and they engaged never to entertain any European or American in the service of Nipal without the consent of the British government. Mr. Gardner was appointed to be the first British Resident at Katmandhu. Sir David

Treaty
of Segowlee,
1816.

¹ Despatch from the Government of India, 5th November 1816.



Ochterlony, who was in command of the British army in the field, sent on a Native Munshi to ascertain if Mr. Gardner might not advance from Kumaon to Katmandhu by the route of the hills. The Ministers however objected to this route. It was suspected that they were disinclined to allow a British party to explore a new route into Nipal territory. But they said nothing about this. They only urged that the small-pox was raging in that quarter; that the Raja had never had it; and that Mr. Gardner might possibly bring it to Katmandhu.

Reluctance
of Nipal to
cede the Te-
rai.

The Nipal government, as already stated, was bound by the treaty of Segowlee to cede the Terai to the British government. But the Ministers were much averse to the cession. They expressed to Sir David Ochterlony's Munshi a deep anxiety for the restoration of the Terai. They declared that they had only concluded the peace in the expectation of getting back the Terai. They also expressed the hope that the coming Resident would not make a protracted stay at Katmandhu.

Question
about Euro-
pean deserters.

Meantime Lieutenant Boileau went to Katmandhu to take over temporary charge of the Residency until the arrival of Mr. Gardner. He carried a letter and presents for the Raja, and was instructed to execute the terms of the treaty. A question arose about the surrender of two European deserters from the British army, who had been employed in the foundry at Katmandhu. The Nipal Ministers said that the men had been ordered to leave the country. Lieutenant Boileau knew that they had



only been sent a short distance from Katmandhu, and there kept in concealment. The British government decided that the question should be dropped.

The cession of the Terai was a question of greater importance. The Ministers affected to doubt whether the cession comprehended the whole belt of the low country. The term Terai undoubtedly covered all the marshy plain at the foot of the hills. But the northern portion of the belt was forest land; and the Ministers urged that as the term "Babur," or forest, was not used in the treaty, the cession only referred to the Terai up to the edge of the forest, and not to the whole of the Terai up to the foot of the hills.

Objections
to ceding the
Terai.

The dispute about the frontier has long been obsolete. It is only important as showing the extreme tenacity of the Nipal government on all frontier questions from our earliest relations with that State. The concession was made, and even additional territory was granted; but nothing would satisfy the Court of Katmandhu. Commissioners on both sides surveyed the border; but it was some years before a compromise was effected, and the discussion quieted down.

Compro-
mise.

Mr. Gardner arrived at Katmandhu in due course, and was introduced to the Raja in public Durbar. Two high officials, one of whom was the Guru or spiritual adviser of the Raja, were appointed to be the channel of all communications between the Durbar and Mr. Gardner.

Mr. Gard-
ner, the first
Resident un-
der the treaty
of 1816.



Nipalese intrigues with the China authorities against the British government.

Meanwhile Nipal was threatened by China, and the Nipalese government was scheming to embroil the English with the Chinese. It has already been seen that relations¹ between Nipal and China began in 1792, when a war between the two powers was brought to a close. From that time Nipal had been accustomed to send a mission to Peking every three years to carry the tribute agreed upon. But during the war with the British government, Nipal Agents were sent to Lhasa and Peking, and told the Chinese authorities that the Government of India demanded, as the price of peace, the transfer of the tribute heretofore paid to China, together with a free passage through Nipal territory into the Chinese Empire. Accordingly the Court at Peking sent officials to Lhasa to investigate the circumstances.

Action of the British government.

The British government had already sent letters to Lhasa through the Raja of Sikhim, with the view of putting the Chinese officials in possession of the real origin and progress of the war.

Further intrigues.

At this juncture the two Nipalese officials, who carried on all communications between the Resident and the Durbar, informed Mr. Gardner that the Chinese force had advanced to Tonque on the Nipalese frontier, and that the Bhooteas were assembling in force. They professed to impart this intelligence, not as coming from the Durbar, but as a piece of private information given out of their respect for the British government. Mr. Gardner believed that they were acting under the order of the Durbar,

¹ Despatch, 16th November 1815.



and had been sent for the purpose of alarming the British government into granting larger concessions as regards the Terai.

Subsequently the Minister, Bhim Sen Thappa, sought an interview with Mr. Gardner. He was evidently alarmed at the progress of the Chinese army, and sought to avert the danger by engaging the interference of the British government.

British government refuses to interfere between Nipal and China.

Mr. Gardner, under instructions from the Government of India, told the Minister that the British government had no quarrel with China, and would not interfere in any quarrel between Nipal and China. He gave however friendly advice to the effect that Nipal would do well to revert to her previous relations with China, and pay the tribute as before.

About this time the British government was engaged in extending vaccination over India. Some Nipalese officials were vaccinated. The Ghoorkha Raja contemplated doing so, but kept on deferring the operation. At last in 1818 he caught small-pox and died.

Death of the Ghoorkha Raja.

The heir to the throne was an infant. Consequently a Council of Regency was formed at the head of affairs; and for some years nothing disturbed the tranquillity of Nipal; and the relations with the Resident were satisfactory in every way.

Council of Regency.

In 1821 a question arose about the surrender of criminals.¹ The Magistrate of Purneah applied through the Political Agent at Katmandhu for the

Negotiations respecting the surrender of criminals.

¹ General letter, 11th September 1824.



surrender of five Mewatties who were suspected of robbery, and were otherwise notorious bad characters. At first the Durbar was inclined to grant the request. Subsequently it was discovered that the five Mewatties were subjects of Nipal, and had resided twenty years in Nipal territory, and moreover held land in a Nipal village. Accordingly the request was refused unless the British government agreed to a corresponding surrender of criminals. The Resident deemed it inexpedient to entertain the proposition. The Nipal government offered to investigate the charges against the five Mewatties, and on conviction to punish the offenders. Mr. Gardner urged that the Nipal government had not the same means for the investigation of crime in the Terai, as was possessed by the English Courts of Justice; but the Durbar returned no definite reply; and as there existed no treaty obligations for the surrender of offenders who were subjects of Nipal, the demand was pressed no further.

Proposed
overland com-
munication
between Chi-
na and India.

In 1823 the Select Committee¹ of Supra Cargoes at Canton expressed a desire to send urgent letters overland by way of Yunan and Sylhet. They asked the Government of India whether the Raja of Sikkim would send special messengers through his country by way of Lhasa, or any other route. On enquiry through the Political Agent at Katmandhu, it was found that permission must be obtained from the Chinese Umtahs at Lhasa. The Nipal

¹ General letter, 13th June 1823.



Government was opposed to any such communication, and reported that no letters, not even those of the Raja to the Court of Pekin, were allowed to pass Lhassa without being opened and inspected by the local Chinese authorities. The Select Committee was informed accordingly, and the question was dropped.

In April 1829, Mr. Gardner made over charge of the Residency¹ to his Assistant Mr. Hodgson, and subsequently resigned the service. The Government of India expressed their warm approval of his conduct of affairs in Katmandhu.

Mr. Hodgson, Resident.

In October the same year a son and heir was born to the Raja of Nipal. A zeafut and sum of four thousand rupees was presented to the Resident, and shawls were given to the Munshi and Chobdars of the Residency. Mr. Hodgson returned all the money, excepting five hundred rupees; he distributed three hundred rupees amongst the poor people who brought the zeafut, and two hundred rupees amongst the Residency servants. Courtesy prevented his sending back the zeafut to the Maharaja.

Birth of a son to the Ghoorkha Raja.

The Government of India approved of Mr. Hodgson's proceedings, but considered that if a suitable representation were made of the objections entertained by the Government of India, the Durbar would relinquish the practice.

Question of money presents.

Subsequently the Durbar requested a perpetual remission of the duties on goods purchased yearly

Question of remissions of duty.

¹ General letter, 9th October 1830.



at Patna for the Holi festival. The Resident thought that the concession would be objectionable. The Government of India directed that a separate application should be made on each occasion, with an estimate of the probable value of the goods to be purchased.

Native ceremony.

In 1830¹ Mr. Hodgson received an invitation from the Durbar on the occasion of the Khur Kheldee, when the infant son of the Raja would complete his sixth month, and eat boiled rice and milk for the first time.

Mission from Sindia.

The same year Mr. Hodgson reported having given passports to some messengers from Sindia's government who had brought presents from their master some time previously on the occasion of his marriage. The presents had been accepted by the Maharaja of Nipal, and return presents were sent to Sindia. The Resident had also sent letters to the Collectors of Customs at Ghazipore, Benares, Allahabad, and Cawnpore, exempting the presents going to Sindia from the payment of duties.

Mission repudiated at Gwalior.

The Government of India approved of the proceedings of Mr. Hodgson. Subsequently the Resident at Gwalior reported that the Baiza Bai had expressed the utmost surprise at hearing of these messengers; she positively denied that any person had been sent to Nipal, and expressed her belief that the messengers were impostors. Mr. Hodgson afterwards stated his reasons for believing that the messengers and presents were genuine.

¹ General letter, 14th October 1830.



In 1833 it was proposed to establish a sanitarium at Darjeeling in Sikhim territory. The proposition was first discussed in 1830; but Sir Charles Metcalfe and Mr. Bayley opposed it, as likely to excite the jealousy of the Nipal government. Subsequently Lord William Bentinck visited Mussoorie,¹ and was much impressed with the comfort and advantage of a residence in the hills, at an altitude which was dry as well as cold. Cheraponjee was so excessively damp that it could not be converted into a sanitarium. A reference was made to the Nipal government on the subject through the British Resident.

Proposed
sanitarium at
Darjeeling.

The boundary dispute between Nipal and Sikhim was brought to a close. The young Raja of Nipal had obtained his majority.

Relations
between Nipal
and Sikhim.

In April 1834, Mr. Hodgson reported having addressed letters of recommendation² to the different authorities in British India in behalf of a Lieutenant in the Nipalese army, who had been sent on a tour of observation in the plains. Mr. Hodgson had requested that every opportunity might be given to the Nipalese officer to witness parades, inspect forts and arsenals, and observing generally whatever might help to give him an adequate of the military science and resources of the British government.

Proposed
visit of a Ni-
palese officer
to India.

The Government of India considered³ that Mr. Hodgson had exceeded his proper powers, and ought

Remarks
of the British
government.

¹ General letter, 13th November 1834.

² General letter, 6th April 1835.

³ Dr. Campbell's narrative, Proceedings, Nos. 49-50 A., 23rd January 1835.



to have referred the question to them for orders. The Nipalese officer would probably have been allowed to visit the arsenals and other military establishments ; but the British government was not anxious to improve the military resources of Nipal. It was desirable that the servants of the British government should avoid every appearance of jealousy ; but they should abstain from encouraging the military spirit and system of military organization that of late years had made such rapid progress in Nipal.

Dr. Campbell's narrative.

About this time Dr. Campbell submitted a narrative of the political relations between the British government up to date. Part of the information has been embodied in the earlier paragraphs of the present summary. The following facts are, perhaps, worthy of record.

Supreme authority of Bhim Sen Thappa.

Ever since the establishment of a permanent Resident at Katmandhu in 1816, the Minister Bhim Sen Thappa had been the real and sole ruler of Nipal. This man and his family filled all the chief offices of State ; they had kept the young Raja in close bondage until his death in 1818 ; they kept his infant son and successor in the same thralldom ; they excluded the Baradars or Ministers from all real power.

British government declined to interfere.

In the earlier years of the Residency, the Sahs, or royal family of Katmandhu, were anxious to enlist the British government against the Thappa faction ; but Lord Hastings would not listen to these overtures.



Nipal was in all respects independent of the British government. She was bound by the treaty of 1816 not to entertain Europeans or Americans in her service ; but that was all. The British government had never subsidized her army, nor borrowed her money, nor had any claim on her revenue. It was not bound to assist her against any enemy ; nor was it pledged by any guarantee to the reigning dynasty. The Chiefs of Nipal were in no way dependent upon the British government. The Nipal authorities were not bound in any way to listen to the advice of the British Resident on any subject whatever.

Independence of Nipal.

In 1832 the Rani mother died, and Bhima Sen Thappa continued to enjoy undisturbed power. This Minister gave his whole time and energies to the affairs of State. Although Nipal was deprived of a third of her territory in 1816, Bhima Sen Thappa had raised her to as strong a military position as ever on the British frontier.

Military strength.

Between 1816 and 1835 the resources of Nipal had nearly doubled. Before the war the Terai had been nearly depopulated. In 1835 it contributed ten lakhs of rupees a year to the public revenue, and was capable of yielding three times that amount. The Minister had resumed all the rent-free tenures of the Brahmins. The custom duties had been raised from eighty thousand rupees in 1816 to two hundred and fifty thousand in 1834.

Increased revenue.

The constant policy of the Ghoorkha rule had been to perpetuate the warlike habits of the martial tribes, and to maintain a standing army up to the

Warlike policy of the Ghoorkhas.



highest point. In 1818 the regular force of the State was estimated at ten thousand men. In 1831 it was estimated at fifteen thousand. This was the peace establishment in constant pay and under regular discipline, but Nipal was able to bring three times that number of troops into the field. The system of army establishment was one of annual rotation ; the army was changed every year from full pay to no pay. Thus the Nipal government could place treble the number of the peace establishment on a war footing without much loss of efficiency.



HYDERABAD.

There is very little notice of Hyderabad in the General letters during the period which immediately succeeded to the wars of 1817 and 1818. There was a heavy correspondence respecting Palmer's Bank, which created much excitement, but has long been regarded as obsolete.

Palmer's
Bank.

In 1822, serious disturbances broke out in Hyderabad¹ in connection with some religious disputes between a sect called "Ghyr Madhis" and other Muhammadans. Many lives were lost in the affray which was finally suppressed by the Russik battalion under Colonel Doveton on the requisition of the Minister Chandu Lal. The Nizam's government resolved on the expulsion of the "Ghyr Madhis." The Nizam ordered that every man of that sect should be dismissed from his service and banished from his dominions.

Expulsion
of the Ghyr
Madhis.

The administration of the territory of Hyderabad had fallen into the greatest disorder, and the disciplined force under British officers was frequently called upon to repress local rebellions. The country was infested by robbers, and the roads were unsafe for travellers without a large armed escort. In 1820 British officers were appointed in the different districts to settle the revenue administration. The

British in-
terference in
the revenue
administra-
tion.

¹ General letter, 12th September 1823.



results of British interposition¹ for the amelioration of affairs were regarded as very favourable. The Government of India considered that the prospects of future prosperity were highly satisfactory.

Death of
the Nizam,
1829.

In 1829, Sikundar Shah,² Nizam of Hyderabad, died, and was succeeded by his eldest son, Nazir-u-dowla.

European
supervision
withdrawn.

In 1829, in accordance with the urgent request of the new Nizam, the European officers superintending the revenue settlements in Hyderabad territory were withdrawn.³

Unpopular
reforms.

In October 1829, the Resident reported that the Nizam was employed in reforming the establishments of Jaghirdars. Great abuses had crept in. The reforms however were very unpopular. Many of the chief nobles were alienated from the Nizam, and looked to the Minister Chandu Lal as the only person capable of protecting them from spoliation. The reforms were carried out with little regard for the feelings of the Jaghirdars. The Resident regarded them as proofs of the Nizam's energy and activity of mind; he thought that a little more experience would lead the Nizam to direct his attention to higher and nobler objects.

Disturban-
ces at Hyder-
abad.

The same year a bloody fray broke out at Hyderabad between the Sikhs and Arabs in the Nizam's service. Great disturbances also prevailed in consequence of the violent conduct of Mubarik-u-dowla,

¹ General letter, 28th July 1828.

² Separate letter, 12th July 1829.

³ Separate letter, 16th June 1830.



the younger brother of the Nizam. This prince had in former years been imprisoned in the fortress of Golkonda, but had been since released. He now demanded a larger allowance from the Nizam. He was very bitter against the Minister to whom he attributed his imprisonment. He raised a force of three or four thousand Arabs and Rohillas, who were animated with the hope of plunder. The greatest alarm prevailed. Troops were raised by the Nizam and his Minister. The British Resident succeeded in mediating between the two parties. The prince accepted his previous allowance of six thousand rupees per mensem, and promised to abstain from further insurrection.

In 1830 a plot was discovered. Mubarik-u-dowla had been engaged for months in trying to seduce the soldiers in the Nizam's service. He submitted to be arrested, and was again imprisoned in the fortress of Golkonda.

Plot of the younger brother of the Nizam.

Meanwhile the Resident raised a question¹ as regards the employment of His Highness's troops. A new system of non-interference had been adopted as regards the internal affairs of the Nizam's government. The Resident therefore applied for the orders of the Government of India as to whether he should continue to exercise any discretion as to the employment of His Highness's troops, seeing that they were commanded by British officers; whether in fact he should continue to comply with requisitions of this nature in the event of their being called upon by

Question as to the Nizam's army.

¹ General letter, 16th June 1834.



the Nizam to enforce measures which were unjust or unnecessary.

Limits of
its employ-
ment.

The Government of India decided that so long as the Nizam's army was commanded by British officers, the British authorities were bound to exercise their discretion as regards the employment of such officers. The Resident was accordingly directed to satisfy himself as heretofore on these points, previous to complying with His Highness's requisition.

Refractory
Europeans at
Hyderabad.

In 1834, Major Stewart, the Resident at Hyderabad, reported the proceedings¹ of an enquiry which had been held on three Europeans who had engaged in a fray in that city. He requested instructions as regards similar cases, as they were likely, he thought, to be of frequent occurrence under the operations of the new India Bill.

Orders of
the British
government.

The Government of India decided that the way in which Major Stewart had disposed of the case of the three Europeans would form a suitable precedent, namely, to expel such Europeans from the Nizam's dominions. He was accordingly authorised to suggest this mode of treatment to the Minister. As regards general instructions, it was proposed to dispose of each case according to circumstances until some uniform system of procedure should be finally established.

Arabs and
Rohillas.

There had been a fray between the Arabs and Rohillas at Hyderabad. A sanguinary contest was expected. The Minister Raja Chandu Lal

¹ General letter, 7th September 1835.



was sick, and there was great difficulty in raising funds for the payment of the regular troops. The Government of India authorised the Resident to take up funds for such payment as a temporary measure, but to report all he did in this direction without delay.



RAJPOOTANA.

AJMERE.

Introduc-
tion of British
rule

The city and territory of Ajmere was brought under British administration by the treaty of 1818. Under this treaty there were certain exchanges of territory between Sindia and the British government for the adjustment of territory. The city and territory of Ajmere thus came into the possession of the British government.

Wretched
condition.

At this period the city of Ajmere had long been a prey to the rapacity of successive governors. The wealthy had been stripped of their property and driven to emigrate elsewhere. When first occupied by the British it was nearly deserted. The introduction of British authority inspired general confidence; and the prospect of security to person and property induced multitudes to return.

Mr. Wilder,
Superintend-
ent.

Mr. Wilder was the first English Superintendent of Ajmere. His administrative measures received¹ the most favourable notice. From the very first his serious attention had been called to a predatory and uncivilised race known as the Mhairs.

Mhairwar-
ra country.

Mhairwarra, the country of the Mhairs, is a wild and mountainous region of considerable extent,

¹ General letter, 15th January 1820.



intervening between the southern parts of Ajmere and the Rajput States of Jodhpore and Oodeypore. Rights of sovereignty in Mhairwarra were exercised over Mhair villages by Jodhpore and Oodeypore, as well as by the British government.

As early as 1819 Mr. Wilder had been compelled¹ to employ troops against the Mhairs, for the purpose of chastising some of the principal villages of those freebooters. In 1821 a British police officer and establishment was massacred by the Mhairs at Jhak, a village of Mhairwarra belonging to Ajmere. The villagers of Jhak acted in concert with Mhairs from adjoining villages subject to Jodhpore and Oodeypore.

Outrages of
Mhairs.

It was evident such disorders could not be suppressed by mere measures of punishment and other such temporary expedients. They were the natural outcome of an inaccessible country and uncivilised inhabitants. Accordingly it was proposed to raise a local corps, composed of Mhairs, and commanded by a discreet and intelligent European officer residing on the spot, and invested with a certain authority over the Mhair villages. It was hoped that by these means it might be possible both to suppress disorders and to reclaim the Mhairs to peaceful and industrious occupations. It was considered that as these advantages would be shared by Jodhpore and Oodeypore, those States should contribute towards the maintenance of the local corps. Six hundred men were accordingly raised

Formation
of a Mhair
Battalion.

¹ General letter, 13th June 1823.

13982



and placed under the command of Captain Hall of the Quarter Master General's department.

British administration in Mhairwarra.

In 1823 it was determined,¹ with the consent of Jodhpore and Oodeypore, that the British government should take over the entire administration of Mhairwarra, accounting for the collections in their respective villages; and deducting Rs. 15,000 yearly from each State for the maintenance of the Mhair Battalion.

General improvement.

For some years the state of Mhairwarra and the Mhair Battalion were such as to call for little notice, beyond favourable expressions² from time to time on the success of Captain Hall. In 1828 Captain Hall obtained the sanction of the Government of India for an advance of three thousand rupees to the cultivators of Mhairwarra, to enable them to improve their implements of husbandry, and to afford other means for carrying on their labours, so as to restrain them from the commission of crime, whilst tending to increase the revenue.

¹ General letter, 10th September 1824.

² General letter, 10th October 1829.



MEYWAR OR OODEYPORE.

The existing political relations between the British government and the Rajput State of Meywar or Oodeypore began in 1818. At that time Oodeypore had been laid waste by the armies of Sindia, Holkar, and Amir Khan, as well as by many hordes of Pindaree plunderers. The Rana was so reduced that he depended on the bounty of Zalim Singh of Kotah, who made him a monthly allowance of a thousand rupees.

Desolation
of Meywar,
1818.

In 1823 the Meena tribes to the south-west of Oodeypore were troublesome. Their depredations were daily increasing, especially in the neighbourhood of the British cantonment at Neemuch. The Rana was totally unable to suppress these predatory bands. A British force was ordered to quell them. A strong remonstrance was made to the Rana on his permitting such excesses within his territory. As ruler of Meywar he was under an obligation to keep up an effective force for the maintenance of his authority, and the preservation of his country from rapine and devastation.

Depredations
of the
Meenas.

The affairs of Meywar were soon pressed on the attention of the Government of India. Such had been its reduced and disorganised condition that it had almost ceased to exist as a State. The Rana was totally inexperienced in the duties of administration.

Anarchy in
Meywar.



He had not only been guided by the advice of Captain Tod, the former Political Agent, but had invited interference. Since then the state of affairs had been very bad. The Rana was supported by loans from bankers under British guarantee. The Thakoors were turbulent and lawless. A plot was formed for removing the Minister, whom the Resident was bound more or less to support; and the Rana had removed the Minister. The British government had no treaty right to interfere in the domestic concerns of Oodeypore, but policy and justice demanded such interference from the paramount power; and the receipt of a fraction of the revenue by way of tribute, gave the British government an interest in the management of the country.

British interference.

The Resident expostulated with the Rana for the abrupt, unexplained and causeless dismissal of the Minister, when courtesy at least demanded that the consent of the British government should have been obtained. The guarantee was continued to the bankers, as there was no other way of raising funds, excepting at a ruinous loss; but it was limited in amount. Provision was made for the liquidation of the current tribute. Measures were taken for suppressing the predatory habits of the Thakoors; their military services were commuted by contributions of money or lands, and the proceeds were set aside for the maintenance of an effective corps. It was resolved to employ a British force against the rebel Thakoors, who were public robbers and the enemies of mankind.



Amongst these turbulent and rebellious Chiefs, the Rao of Humeerghur had rendered himself notorious by his repeated acts of robbery, outrage, and open defiance to his sovereign's authority.¹ A detachment of British troops advanced against his fort, and captured it at the end of 1823. The Rao fled to the jungles, and his jaghir was sequestered by the government of Oodeypore.

Suppression
of rebellious
Thakoors.

In 1825 the management of Captain Cobbe, who had succeeded Captain Tod as Political Agent at Oodeypore, proved to have been entirely successful.² The interference, however objectionable on general principles, had resulted in much practical benefit to the Rana and people of Meywar, as well as to the interests of the alliance between the two States. The Rana acknowledged the value of Captain Cobbe's services in extricating him from his pecuniary difficulties, and importing vigour and respectability to the administration.

Beneficial
results.

Meanwhile however the question³ of the withdrawal of all interference hitherto exercised by the Political Agent in the internal administration of Oodeypore was pressed upon the Government of India. At the same time it was necessary to take into consideration the unsettled state of the hilly tracts occupied by Bheels, Meenas, and Grassias.

Change of
policy.

In November 1826 Captain Sutherland succeeded Captain Cobbe as Political Agent at Oodeypore.

Withdraw-
al of British
interference.

¹ General letter, 18th September 1825.

² General letter, 27th July 1826.

³ General letter, 28th July 1828.



The Rana and his Ministers were anxious that certain measures should be abolished by the new Agent, which he naturally regarded as grievances. It appeared that from the earliest period of British connection with Oodeypore, the Political Agent had placed his badged servants or peons in the different districts within Oodeypore, in order to report on the acts of local officers and exercise a certain control. He had also placed similar servants on the roads in order to support the opium monopoly of the Company. It further appeared that money had been raised from a Native banker under the British guarantee at the rate of eighteen per cent., in order to pay the Rana from eight hundred to a thousand rupees per day.

Measures
of Sir Charles
Metcalf.

Sir Charles Metcalfe, the Resident at Delhi, authorised Captain Sutherland to withdraw at once all his badged servants from those districts which were not under British management. Also to allow the servants of the Rana to be placed on the roads together with those of the Political Agent. In like manner to withdraw the arrangement with the banker as soon as better measures could be devised. The Rana tendered other requests including one for the remission of arrears of tribute.

Independence of the
Rana.

In reporting these proceedings to the Government of India, Sir Charles Metcalfe expressed his opinion that the supervision which had been exercised by Captains Tod and Cobbe were no longer justified. The necessity, if it ever existed, had altogether ceased. The time had arrived when the Rana might



be allowed to rule as an independent prince without danger to British interests. The Resident did not advise the remission of arrears of tribute.

The Government of India had been but imperfectly acquainted with the details of the supervision exercised in Oodeypore. Generally speaking, however, it was satisfied that such intervention had been necessary at the time and had produced great practical benefit. The proceedings of Sir Charles Metcalfe were fully approved. The management of certain reserved pergunnahs had already been given back to the Rana, together with the revenue arising from custom duties. Under such circumstances there were no grounds for the remission of arrears of tribute, especially as little heed had ever been given to the payment. The tribute was little more than a fourth of the revenue; and as the British government had withdrawn from all control over the revenue, the payment must be left to the good faith of the Rana. The system of raising money under British guarantee at the rate of eighteen per cent. was abandoned, and a loan of a lakh and a half of rupees was authorised at six per cent. interest.

Views of
the Govern-
ment of India.

Meanwhile there was an insurrection in the hilly tracts, instigated or encouraged by Dowlut Singh of Jowas. A force was sent against the insurgents, but was compelled to retreat under circumstances of difficulty and danger. The Rana's troops were altogether inefficient, whilst the British detachment was inadequate. Since then matters had become worse,

Insurrection
in the hill
tracts.



and the country was more disturbed than ever.

British management of disturbed provinces.

The Government of India had now to consider whether to withdraw altogether from this ineffective interference, and leave the Rana to make his own arrangements, or to interpose actively and efficiently. The Rana solicited the aid of British officers, and agreed to pay all the expenses. The Government of India resolved on taking the measure, which indeed was absolutely necessary for the pacification of the country ; and to place the disturbed districts under the exclusive management of British authorities.

Local levy.

Instructions were sent to the Resident at Delhi to the following effect. A local levy was to be raised under a European officer, and paid from the revenue of the hill tracts. This officer was to collect the revenue, communicate with the Chiefs and people, and generally superintend the affairs of that quarter. This system of management was to be extended to the villages of Doongerpore, which were intimately intermixed with those of Oodeypore. A cantonment was to be formed on the Deybur Lake for the location of a British regiment, which could overawe the turbulent and disaffected. Settlements were to be concluded with all the Chiefs of the hill tracts,—Grassias, Bheels and Meenas.

Apparent improvement.

In 1827 Sir Edward Colebrooke, who had succeeded Sir Charles Metcalfe as Resident at Delhi, reported an improved state of things in Oodeypore. A new Minister had been appointed, who gave



decided help to the local British authority. The Government of India ordered its previous instructions to be carried out. A body of regular troops was to be employed to efface the memory of previous disasters.

In 1828 the Maharana died,¹ and his only son succeeded to the vacant throne.* Seven queens and a favourite concubine sacrificed themselves on the funeral pile. The new Maharana was anxious to receive the usual khillut of investiture from the British government, when all the States in alliance with Meywar would present khilluts.

Death of the Maharana.

Major Cobbe, the Political Agent, described Oodeypore territory as being in a wretched state. The habits and character of the new Maharana were very unfavourable to any hopes of improvement in the state of his country.

Unfavourable reports.

Military operations had been carried out in the Hill Tracts under the command of Captain Speirs, the European officer who was appointed to the management of affairs in that quarter. Dowlut Singh of Jowas, the principal rebel, surrendered himself to the mercy of the British government. The pacification of all the Bheel districts soon followed. The villages of Dowlut Singh were made over to the Chief of Jowas, and a small provision was sanctioned for his subsistence. The Grassia Chiefs submitted; they engaged to abstain

Suppression of disturbances.

¹ General letter, 8th May 1829.

* The deceased Maharana was named Bheem Singh. His son and successor was named Koonwar Bheem Singh.



from all disturbances for the future, to protect travellers, and to pay compensation to the merchants that had been plundered. The regular troops were removed to Serohi. A small force was maintained at Khairwareh until the local levy should be fit for service.

Question of
khillut of in-
vestiture.

The Government of India objected¹ to sending a khillut of investiture to the new Maharana of Oodeypore. Presents were to be sent by the British government in the same way that presents were sent by other States, as an acknowledgment of the succession of the new Maharana.

Adminis-
tration of the
Hill Tracts.

In 1828 Major Cobbe retained Political charge of Oodeypore, whilst Major Speirs managed the Grassia, Bheel, or Rajput Chiefs of the Hill Tracts, who were more or less dependent upon the Oodeypore State. The Government of India decided that whenever the Maharana desired the districts in question to be transferred to his administration, they were to be made over. The Maharana would then become responsible for the conduct of the Hill Chiefs towards neighbouring States, and the duties of Major Speirs would be limited to his post as Superintendent of Serohi.

Orders of
the Govern-
ment of India.

The local levy was to continue at the disposal of Major Speirs, the expense to be defrayed by the Maharana. Whenever the Rana could do without the British Superintendent of Hill Tracts, the levy might be withdrawn. The Government of India

¹ General letter, 3rd October 1829.



remarked, in reference to these orders, that it could not be at continual expense for the internal government of territory which did not belong to it.

In furtherance of these instructions Major Speirs was to avoid interference whenever possible; to consider the Hill Chiefs as responsible for the communities under them; to deal separately only with those communities who acknowledged no Chief. Patience and forbearance were strongly inculcated. The Superintendent of Hill Tracts was to employ conciliation as his main instrument, and keep constantly in view the gradual amelioration of the habits of the people. Hitherto the defect in the policy of the British government had been the attempted suppression of disorders by force; and when the force was withdrawn the disorders returned. Meanwhile the Maharana resumed Chappun and all the territory in that quarter, which had previously been under the charge of the Political Agent of Oodeypore.

Non-interference.

The Government of India ordered the Khairwareh levy to be paid up and transferred to Major Speirs. As Joura, Mairpore, Oghna and Pannerwa were no longer considered as feudatory or dependent on the Maharana, His Highness was relieved from the expense of detachments employed in those districts. Major Speirs began to remove the thanahs of the Maharana's troops from those districts. The Grassia Chiefs offered to pay for the continuance of the force; but this was beyond their means.

Internal arrangements.



Minor de-
tails. The Maharana was called upon to make arrangements for the payment of a balance¹ of the tribute due to the British government of more than two lakhs.

In 1833 the disputes between the Oodeypore² State and the States of Sindia, Holkar, and Boondi were negotiated at Ajmere by two of the Rana's Ministers and the Agent to the Governor-General. The same year the Rana prepared to go on a pilgrimage to Gaya, and asked that one of the Assistants of the Agent at Ajmere might be deputed to superintend the affairs of Oodeypore during his absence. The Government of India considered that the deputation of an Assistant was objectionable. The Rana accordingly appointed one of his own officials to conduct the affairs of Oodeypore until his return from pilgrimage.

¹ General letter, 9th October 1830.

² General letter, 13th March 1834.



DUNGERPORE.

In 1824¹ the tranquillity of Dunderpore was disturbed by the turbulent and outrageous proceedings of certain petty Rajput Chiefs. A detachment of the Rampoorra local battalion was called for, but the incipient troubles was quieted by measures of conciliation. The Minister was placed under restraint on account of malversation and embezzlement; on the recommendation of the Resident he was deposed and compelled to refund. In 1825² the ex-Minister and a party of turbulent Thakoors took forcible possession of the palace, and seized the person of the weak and imbecile Raja, in opposition to the new Minister who was supported by the British government. Troops were employed for the restoration of order.

British interference.

¹ General letter, 31st May 1826.

² General letter, 27th July 1826.



JEYPORE.

Anarchy in 1818. Jeypore came under British protection in 1818.

At that time the principality was in a state of anarchy. The Raja was abandoned to the grossest debauchery. The Thakoors had usurped the authority and lands of the State. At last the Raja was induced to resume the State lands. The Thakoors were guaranteed in their legitimate rights and possessions, and executed a paper which defined their future relations with the Raja.

Minority and Regency.

The Raja died in 1818, leaving no sons. For a short time a distant kinsman of the family was placed in power. In 1819 a posthumous son was born; and in accordance with the wishes of the Thakoors, the infant was placed upon the throne under the Regency of his mother.

Internal distractions.

In 1820¹ Sir David Ochterlony, the Resident in Rajpootana, reported on Jeypore affairs. The Durbar was divided and distracted in its counsels; a general mismanagement prevailed throughout the country. Sir David Ochterlony could only recommend the permanent appointment of a European officer to Jeypore. The Government of India saw that the step was becoming a necessity, but objected so strongly to any interference, that it was resolved to defer it as long as possible, in the hope that the Resident might yet be able in

¹ General letter, 2nd May 1823.



concert with the Minister to bring about an improvement.

In 1821 the disorders reached a climax. There was a sanguinary conflict within the palace in which thirty men were killed. Sir David Ochterlony was utterly unable to understand its origin, and could only repeat his recommendation for the deputation of a European officer. Under these circumstances Captain Stewart was sent to Jeypore.

British interference.

The confusion seemed to be hopeless. The Regent mother was completely in the hands of a Mahajun, named Jhota Ram, and two favourite slave girls, one of whom named Roopa Buddarum exercised unbounded influence over her. The revenue had decreased in spite of the general peace, and the expenditure had increased in spite of the reductions consequent on the minority. All that Captain Stewart could do was to induce the Minister to undertake a new settlement of the land revenue in concert with the leading Thakoors.

Character of the Regent Rani.

The Minister, Rawul Beiree Saul, suggested that in former times of emergency, a general assemblage of Thakoors had been called to the capital. The Government of India ordered that unless there was an improvement in the administration, the Thakoors should be again summoned to the city of Jeypore to depose the Rani and form a new Regency.

Proposed assembly of Thakoors.

In 1822 the Minister Rawul Beiree Saul showed signs of weakness.¹ He was afraid to visit Captain Stewart unless accompanied by Jhota Ram. He

Weakness of the Minister.

¹ General letter, 12th September 1823.



was assured by Captain Stewart that the British government would support him, so long as he acted with integrity, and for the benefit of both States. He was reminded of his own suggestion of convoking a council of the Thakoors to remove the infant Raja from the guardianship of the Regent Rani. He replied that the plan was not likely to succeed; that the Thakoors in general were mercenary men, who would support that party which held out the best prospect of advantage to themselves. He considered it would be an advantage to remove the two favourite slave girls already mentioned, and the Rani's Guru, or spiritual guide. The Guru was said to receive large grants for religious purposes, which he appropriated to his own use. No measure, the Minister said, would be successful short of the advance of a British force to the capital; and he was ready to submit to this interference, although it would bring great odium upon him. Captain Stewart represented the inexpediency of the measure, but the Minister asserted that the only alternative was to carry on the affairs of the State in conjunction with Jhota Ram.

Objections
to interfer-
ence.

Captain Stewart could only recommend that matters should run their course. If a British army placed the Minister more decidedly at the head of affairs, it would have to maintain him in that position. Both the Minister and Jhota Ram thought that the new three years' land settlement would prove a success.



In 1823 a military force was sent to Jeypore, with the view of exacting an engagement from the Rani, calculated to exclude her from exercising any baneful influence for the future. No particular results followed. On reference to the Proceedings quoted in the General letter¹, it appears that nothing could be done with the Rani; her conduct was vile and bad in every possible way, whilst no reliance whatever could be placed upon her word.

Evil influence of the Regent Rani.

In 1823 the small chiefship of Poniarra, which was dependent on Jeypore, was in a very unsettled state. Sir David Ochterlony ordered Captain Stewart, the Political Agent, to proceed to the spot. The Jeypore Durbar was resolved to keep the settlement of Poniarra in its own hands, and summoned all the heads of factions at Poniarra to the city of Jeypore. As such interference was not warranted by right or usage, and could only work mischief, Captain Stewart was ordered to proceed to Poniarra.

Affairs of Poniarra.

Meanwhile the abuses of the Jeypore government were increasing. The Regent Rani was excluding the Minister from the efficient exercise of power. The influence of Jhota Ram and the zenana faction was still growing, and the double and divided administration was producing serious evils and disasters in the country at large. Sir David Ochterlony urged the removal of the Regent Rani, and the restoration of the Minister to power.

State of factions.

¹ General letter, 10th September 1824.



British gov-
ernment in-
terference.

The Government of India ordered the Rani to be told that it would support Rawul Beiree Saul as the head of the executive independent of her authority ; and warned her to abstain from all interference, and to confine her duties to the charge of the infant Raja and the internal control of the palace. Jhota Ram was to be removed to a distance from Jeypore. The Minister was to be henceforth responsible to the British government.

Restoration
of the Minis-
ter to power.

The same year Sir David Ochterlony employed a British force for reducing the fort and jaghir of Sambra, and re-annexing it to the khalsa, or State lands of Jeypore. It had been held by the Thakoor Megh Singh by a title which was obviously invalid beyond all dispute. The Thakoor had long been conspicuous in the Durbar in thwarting every measure proposed by the British authorities ; and it was his influence that supported Jhota Ram and his faction. The measure was rightful in itself, and was expected to intimidate the faction that supported the Rani. The demonstration of force, and instructions of the Government of India, produced an immediate effect on the Jeypore Durbar. The Rani, after a short and ineffectual struggle, agreed to accept the Rawul Beiree Saul as Mookhtar, or manager. The Rawul was invested with full powers in a public assembly of Thakoors. The motives of the British government were explained by Captain Stewart to the assembly. He declared that whoever obstructed the Rawul in the exercise of his



lawful authority would be regarded and punished as an enemy by both governments.*

The Rani was to be treated with the same respect as heretofore until the Raja attained his majority. She was to exercise no more power or influence than was consistent with the vigorous and efficient administration of the Mookhtar. This course was deemed preferable to her open and avowed exclusion from all authority.

Restrictions on the Regent Rani.

Jhota Ram retired with a small party of followers to a place of Hindu worship near Gwalior. He was warned that he would be apprehended if he attempted to return to Jeypore.

The Resident Sir David Ochterlony called on Jeypore to pay the expenses of the operations against Sambra. But the Government of India ruled¹ that it was bound by the receipt of tribute to recover without charge any usurped places belonging to Jeypore, unless there was some peculiarity in the case. As regards Sambra the peculiarity worked the other way, as the place had been recovered contrary to the inclination of the Durbar.

Liabilities of the British government.

At the end of 1823 the revenue was improving under the emancipated Minister. The jealousy, ill-will, and opposition of the Rani still continued, but did not paralyse the authority of the Minister as it had done previously. Indeed to some extent it was beneficial, as it stimulated the Minister in the faithful discharge of his duties.

Struggle between the Rani and Minister.

* General letter, 18th September 1825.



Complaints
against the
Minister.

In 1824 the affairs of Jeypore underwent a change. The Resident received a violent letter¹ from the Rani accusing the Mookhtar of mismanagement and defalcation. Sir David Ochterlony dwelt strongly on the defects in the character of the Minister and the faults of his administration. He was accused of indolence, ignorance, prejudice, want of energy, and entire dependence on a favourite.

Disturbances
in Jeypore.

Disturbances began to break out. Four of the battalions of the Jeypore Durbar mutinied for want of pay. They marched against the capital to demand their dues from the Minister. The Minister, acting under the advice of the Political Agent, forwarded the amount to the camp. The mutineers declared that they would march to the palace, and lay their complaints before the Rani, and receive their pay from her alone as their sovereign. The Minister prepared to bring out his own forces to resist the mutineers. The city of Jeypore was excited by the advance of the disorderly soldiery. Colonel Raper, who had succeeded Captain Stewart as Political Agent, ordered the Officer Commanding at Nusseerabad to hold a detachment in readiness to act.

Intrigues
of the Rani.

It now appeared that the Rani was in secret communication with the commanders of the four mutinous battalions. In October the four battalions reached Jeypore, took possession of the city, and were speedily joined by corps from other quarters. The Rani ordered salutes to be fired, and distributed money amongst the soldiery. The Political Agent

¹ General letter, 1st October 1825.



pressed for the departure of the troops. The rumours of the approach of British forces excited alarm. About the end of the month the armed multitude began to break up. The Minister, Rawul Beiree Saul, retired to his jaghir. Sir David Ochterlony paid a visit to Jeypore. A new administration was formed by the Rani, but the return of Jhota Ram to Jeypore was forbidden. Tranquillity was restored, but there was little hope of any improvement, as the Rani continued to be in the hands of the female slave, Roopa Buddarum, and was believed to be in secret intercourse with Jhota Ram. All this while the Rani was carrying on a secret communication with Dhoorjun Saul, the rebel Chief of Bhurtpore, through the medium of a Guru, who was the spiritual guide of both parties.

A fresh crisis seemed to be impending at Jeypore. There was the grossest corruption and speculation. Obnoxious persons were murdered without scruple. The pay of the troops, and the payment of the tribute, were both in arrears. The advice of the Political Agent was disregarded, and he more than once prepared to retire from Jeypore. In 1825¹ the Thakoors of Jeypore had become thoroughly dissatisfied with the existing administration. It was resolved to produce the young Raja in public, and to restore the Rawul Beiree Saul as Mookhtar, or Minister.

Evil complications.

The Rani tried by every means in her power to postpone the arrangement. There were three years

Orders of the Government of India,

¹ General letter, 27th July 1826.



remaining before the Raja could attain his majority, and she was anxious to retain power during the intervening period. An assembly of Thakoors was convened. If they agreed to a new arrangement, the Government of India ordered that there should be no interference. If they could not agree, and asked the British government to name a Regent, Rawul Beiree Saul was to be nominated. Jhota Ram had returned to Jeypore. He was appointed to the command of the palace guards. This post afforded him a pretext for going to the zenana to make reports ; in reality it enabled him to carry on his intrigues with the Rani, personal as well as political, as well as with the ruling favourite, Roopa Buddarum. The Rani actually proposed Jhota Ram as Mookhtar ; but Captain Low, the new Political Agent, gave her a positive refusal.

First Council in favour of the Minister.

The first Council of the Thakoors was held at Jeypore in October 1826.¹ At this Council it was decided that the rule of the Regent Rani had ceased, and the office of Regent was confirmed on Rawul Beiree Saul.

Second Council in favour of the Rani.

A second Council was held at Jeypore the following November, and set aside the decision of the first Council. There was a more formal and careful scrutiny of votes in the presence of Sir Charles Metcalfe and the Political Agent. It was decided by a majority of votes that the Regency of the Rani was the legitimate government of the country. The votes however were nearly balanced.

¹ General letter, 28th July 1828.



A large and exasperated party expressed its dissatisfaction, and was indignant with the Rani's favourites. A petition was presented against the favourites, urging that the Rani was bound to follow the advice of the Thakoors. The petitioners called on the British government either to settle the affairs of Jeypore as the paramount power, or permit them to do it themselves. They said they could do so without bloodshed. Two of the three Jeypore battalions at the capital had declared for their party. Their plan was to imprison Jhota Ram, and the female slave Roopa Buddarum.

Sir Charles Metcalfe considered that as the government of the Regent Rani had been pronounced legitimate, the British government had no further power to interfere. The Government of India decided that it had no alternative but to permit the insurrection, or support the Rani and her favourites; and accordingly declined to interfere.

Government of India declines to interfere.

The disorders and confusion which followed are almost beyond description.¹ The conduct of the Rani soon became more outrageous than ever. She instigated the plunder of villages belonging to Thakoors who had incurred her displeasure, even though their protection had been guaranteed by the British government. There were some threats of advancing a British force against Jeypore, but nothing seems to have been done.

Violence of the Rani.

Meanwhile Captain Low had been ordered² by the Government of India to press the Rani's government

Demands appointment of Jhota Ram as Minister.

¹ General letter, 10th April 1829.

² General letter, 8th May 1829.



for the payment of arrears of tribute ; and if necessary to attach a certain portion of the khalsa lands. Captain Low seems to have remonstrated somewhat strongly with the Regent Rani. The Government of India subsequently observed that the remarks used by him as regards the Rani's favourite and advisers were not justified in diplomatic correspondence between independent States. The Rani urged that there would be no improvement in the administration unless Jhota Ram was appointed Mookhtar, or Prime Minister. She used every effort to induce Captain Low to favour the elevation of Jhota Ram. She declared that if the experiment was only tried for twelve months, or even for six months, the arrears of tribute should be promptly paid. Captain Low replied that the appointment would create general disgust throughout the whole territory of Jeypore.

Views of
the Political
officers.

Captain Low reported all these proceedings to the Resident at Delhi, and referred to the former orders of the Government of India on the subject. He remarked that the toleration of such an appointment would amount to an approval. Sir Edward Colebrooke had by this time succeeded Sir Charles Metcalfe as Resident at Delhi. He could not reconcile the opposition of the Government of India to the appointment of Jhota Ram with its proposed policy of non-interference in the affairs of Jeypore. If the existing administration of Jeypore was to be continued, it should be left entirely unfettered. Private anecdotes of secret scandal were in his opinion



beneath the notice of a great government. The appointment of Jhota Ram was further recommended by the promise of the Rani to pay up the arrears of tribute to the British government.

The Government of India observed that the proposed measure involved some sacrifice of consistency; at first it was even likely to aggravate existing discontents and animosities. But the abilities of Jhota Ram had not been denied, and, under existing circumstances, he already exercised a powerful influence over the mind of the Rani. It was therefore decided to accept the Rani's proposition as an experiment. But no avowed support was to be given to Jhota Ram to induce the Thakoors and people to maintain him in office. Jhota Ram was accordingly appointed Mookhtar; and the tribute for the year ending with April 1827 was duly paid to the British authorities.

Government of India refuses to interfere.

Meanwhile the conduct¹ of the Jeypore government in connection with the Jodhpore rebellion had been most unsatisfactory. There was no objection to the grant of asylum to exiled Thakoors; but the exiles had been allowed to collect forces in Jeypore territory, and to form a junction with Dowkul Singh. The only excuse that was put forward by the Rani's administration was that of being prevented by real inability to check the proceedings of the exiles. Such an excuse could not absolve Jeypore from its responsibility. If the

Encouragement of Jodhpore rebels.

¹ General letter, 3rd October 1829. For an account of the Jodhpore rebellion, see the present summary under the next head of "Jodhpore."



Maharaja of Jodhpore had been independent of British supremacy, he would have had a right to retaliate. It was this consideration that induced the British government to help the Maharaja against his rebellious Thakoors. In thus recording its views the Government of India added, that it had no wish to interfere in the internal affairs of protected States, but it was bound to prevent all hostile acts between them.

Action of
the Govern-
ment of India.

Under these circumstances the Regent Rani was told that the Government of India was displeased at her conduct, and that it was possible she would have to make compensation to Jodhpore for the losses sustained by the Maharaja from the rebel Thakoors.

Jhota Ram
appointed
Minister.

Meanwhile the Rani Regent had appointed Jhota Ram to be Mookhtar or Manager, and took pains to represent the acquiescence of the Government of India as amounting to sanction and approval. The Thakoors in opposition expressed on their part great surprise and bitterness at the change of policy on the part of the British government.

Character
of the new
administra-
tion.

The administration of Jhota Ram began with a show of improvement. Some steps were taken for regulating the police and protecting the highway, by subjecting all Thakoors to the forfeiture of their jaghirs, who failed to pay up compensation for losses on account of plunder committed within the limits of their estates. It was also proposed to reduce the garrisons in all the Raja's forts, and to dispossess several of the Thakoors who held the



lucrative post of Killadar or Commandant. It was believed by Captain Low that these ostensible measures of reform were really planned for the ruin of the Thakoors, whose protection was guaranteed by the British government, in order to involve them in penalties and forfeitures.

The Government of India took the question of these guaranteed Chiefs into consideration. Those who had voted against the Rani Regent in 1826 had been assured of the protection of the British government against oppression on that account. It was decided that this guarantee did not commit the British government to any interference in measures which equally affected the whole body of Thakoors. Local information alone could enable the Government of India to decide on individual cases.

Question of
guaranteed
Chiefs.

All this while Jeypore and Jodhpore were bringing charges against each other, and Ulwar was complaining of the action of Jeypore. A distinction was laid down by the Government of India between premeditated acts directly ordered by one or other of the governments, and outrages perpetrated by subjects without the sanction of their own government. Accordingly each case was ordered to be separately reported.

Responsi-
bilities of
Native States.

In 1830 the Political Agency at Jeypore was withdrawn.¹ At this time there was a serious insurrection in Jeypore. The Rani Regent was urgently

Withdraw-
al of the Poli-
tical Agency.

¹ General letter, 4th March 1831.

imploping the British government for the assistance of a detachment of British troops.

Charges
against the
ex-Minister.

In 1832¹ the Governor-General received letters from the Regent Rani and the Manager Jhota Ram, charging Rawul Beiree Saul and his son with having instigated the murder of the brother of Jhota Ram. One Jeypore force was being sent against the fort of Samode belonging to the Rawul; and another against the fort of Chowmoora belonging to his son. The murder was to have been committed by a Chundamunt Rajput; but the man had made a full confession, which was forwarded to the Governor-General. The confession was accompanied by a declaration, signed by thirty-nine Jeypore Thakoors, expressing their astonishment at such an atrocious attempt.

Orders of
the Govern-
ment of India.

The Governor-General in his replies expressed his surprise at the proposed attack on a chieftain who was avowedly under British protection. The Rani Regent was assured that the charge against the Rawul should be investigated by a British officer. In the event of conviction, the Rawul should forfeit his right to the British guarantee; and the Rani Regent would be left to deal with him and his son as she might deem fit.

Investiga-
tion of the
charges.

Major Speirs, the British Superintendent at Ajmere, was ordered to proceed at once to Jeypore, to recall the forces sent against Samode and Chowmoora, and to begin the investigation of the charge against the Rawul and his son. If the Jeypore government

¹ Separate letter, 30th August 1833.



offered any resistance to his proceedings, he was to assure the authorities that a British army would be sent against the country without loss of time. Major Speirs proceeded to Jeypore. Jhota Ram was very reluctant to recall the Jeypore forces pending the investigation, but at last consented. Both the Rani Regent and Jhota Ram wrote letters to the Governor-General, which were considered to be highly objectionable. Major Speirs concluded his investigation in the force of great obstructions. In forwarding the evidence to the Government of India, he expressed his belief that no proof had been adduced that the Rawul or his son were in any way engaged in intrigues against Jhota Ram or his brother.

The Government of India concurred in this view, and instructed Major Speirs to inform the Jeypore government accordingly. The Government of India was further of opinion that the alleged attempt at assassination was a deeply laid plot devised by the enemies of the Rawul to effect his ruin. Regret was expressed that the Jeypore authorities should have shown so much eagerness in accepting the accusation brought against Rawul Beiree Saul. The alleged assassin was said to have been led by the love of lucre to agree to the commission of the crime ; but the crime itself was alleged to have been committed under circumstances which would have rendered it utterly impossible for the criminal to have reaped the reward of his iniquity. The Jeypore authorities seemed to have been under the

Secret plot
against the
ex-Minister.



impression that the guarantee of the Rawul only lasted during the minority. The Maharaja of Jeypore had attained his majority; and the orders for the advance of the troops against Samode and Chowmoora had been issued in the name of the Maharaja.

Views of
the Govern-
ment of In-
dia.

The views of the Governor-General were explained to the young Maharaja to the following effect. His Lordship could not conjecture the grounds on which it had been supposed that the guarantee ceased with the minority. He desired to see such a reconciliation between the Maharaja and the Rawul as would induce the latter to surrender the guarantee; but the pledge would be maintained until the Rawul resigned it of his own free will, or so long as he abstained from any act which would involve its forfeiture.

Complaints
of Jhota Ram.

The Governor-General Lord William Bentinck was now on tour; and Jhota Ram had the honour of a conference with His Lordship at Agra. The sentiments of the Governor-General as regards the Rawul were fully explained to him. In reply Jhota Ram complained that Lieutenant-Colonel Lockett, the British Resident at Delhi, was unfavourably disposed towards his administration.

Action of
Lord William
Bentinck.

Colonel Lockett was told by the Governor-General that the Jeypore government could not prosper unless he treated it with indulgence; that the tribute imposed on Jeypore was very heavy; that the system of granting guarantees of protection to individuals, however necessary they might have been, had a tendency to embarrass the State. He



was desired to refuse all interviews with the Vakeel of the Rawul excepting in cases of emergency; and to take every opportunity of showing his determination to support the authority of the Jeypore State against Rawul Beiree Saul, or any one else, who might strive to become independent of its control.

Colonel Lockett was also told that there was no portion of the Upper Provinces in which the Governor-General took so warm an interest as the States of Rajpootana. The firmest reliance was placed on his judgment and discretion, but still it was necessary to apprise him that no improvement could be expected for the present; it was enough if the Chiefs abstained from aggressions on their neighbours, and paid their tribute with punctuality. Any interference of British officers in their internal affairs would be in the highest degree pernicious. It therefore behoved the British representative to abstain from concerning himself about the personal character or qualifications of the individuals to whom the administration of affairs might be entrusted. Colonel Lockett replied that Jhota Ram's complaints were utterly groundless, and that the tribute was by no means heavy or unreasonable considering the protection afforded, and the extent of the military expenditure.

Policy to
be pursued
in Rajpoot-
ana.

In 1833 Colonel Lockett reported the death of the Thakoor of Bussoo.¹ This Thakoor exercised

Disturban-
ces in Shekha-
wati.

¹ General letter, 10th July 1834.



absolute powers over the Shekhawati freebooters, and it was hoped that his decease would lead to their suppression. The Government of India had given its attention for some time past to the necessity of adopting measures to curb the lawless propensities of the Shekhawati tribes. In December 1832, a woman and child had been carried off from Rewari. Colonel Lockett recovered the captives, but was reminded of the necessity for punishing the offenders. In March 1833 and the following June, there were more aggressions and outrages. Colonel Lockett was directed to tell the Jeypore Court that it was held responsible for every outrage committed by its subjects or dependents; that unless ample redress was afforded, the British government would right itself either by seizing and retaining the territory of the offending part, or by employing an army to exact satisfaction by force from the Jeypore State.

Birth of a
son and heir.

In October 1833 it was announced that one of the Maharaja's Ranis had given birth to a son and heir to the Raj. Colonel Lockett reported some zenana intrigues impugning the authenticity of the birth. The Government of India told him that unless he could adduce positive evidence, the customary congratulations would not be withheld.

Continued
troubles:
death of the
Rani.

About this time several objectional letters were received from the Maharaja and Rani Regent. Colonel Lockett was instructed to tell the Jeypore Durbar that no notice would be taken of the letters, and no others could be received, until a proper form



of address was adopted. Subsequently some British sepoys and others were murdered in Jeypore territory. Colonel Lockett called on the Jeypore State for the apprehension and punishment of the persons implicated. The Rani Regent of Jeypore¹ died on the 20th of February 1834, after keeping the country in a disorderly and troubled condition for sixteen years. The usual letter of condolence was sent by the Governor-General to the Maharaja. The reported murder of the British sepoys was said to be without foundation.

The death of the Rani Regent in February² 1834, induced Lord William Bentinck's government in the following April to address a letter to Major Speirs, Political Agent at Ajmere, to the following effect: His Lordship observed that the Maharaja being now of full age would naturally assume the government of his country; and that the present moment seemed a suitable opportunity for effecting a reconciliation between the Jeypore authorities and Rawul Beiree Saul. The Agent at Ajmere was accordingly requested to turn his attention to the best means of accomplishing this most desirable object; and, if practicable, of relieving the British government from the embarrassment of future interference with the internal politics of the Jeypore principality. His Lordship added that he was not without strong hopes that Beiree Saul would himself willingly

Views of
Lord William
Bentinck.

¹ General letter, 13th November 1834.

² General letter, 6th April 1835.



accede to any reasonable arrangement with a view to the accommodation of existing differences. In reply it appeared that it had been frequently intimated by the local political officers to a member of the family, that the guarantee given to Beíree Saul extended to his son.

British interference in Shekhawati.

The Government of India was now¹ resolved to take active measures for the suppression of the Shekhawati freebooters; to sequestrate the tract, to assume all the right exercised by Jeypore over Shekhawati, and take over the tribute hitherto paid by the Chiefs to the Jeypore State. This arrangement was to be carried out and continued until the Jeypore government proved that it had the power and inclination to keep the predatory tribes in order.

Opposition to the suppression of Thuggee.

Major Alves, the Agent to the Governor-General for Rajpootana, reported facts which clearly proved that the Jeypore authorities were resolved to resist the efforts of the British government to extirpate the Thug confederacy. Unless this resistance was overcome, the measures taken against the Thugs would prove of no avail. The time had come for the Government of India to interfere with the whole weight of its authority. The opposition of Jodhpore was even greater than that of Jeypore.

Sequestration of Sambhur.

The Government of India resolved to sequestrate the lake and districts of Sambhur until such time as the Jodhpore government had fulfilled all the conditions to which it was bound by its recent

¹ Separate letter, 22nd January 1835.



engagement, and the Jeypore government should have given satisfactory proof of its readiness to co-operate with the British government for the suppression of Thuggee.

Major Alves took possession of Shekhawati with a British force, without encountering the slightest resistance. The Chiefs acceded to every measure he proposed. He met however with much evasion and intrigue from the Jeypore Durbar.

Occupation
of Shekhawa-
ti.

In 1834 the question¹ of the British guarantee to Rawul Beiree Saul was again brought under the consideration of the Government of India, together with that of his son, the young Chief of Chowmoora. Sir Charles Metcalfe, the Vice-President at Calcutta, intimated to the Government of India at Ootacamund, his opinion that the spirit, if not the letter of the engagement of the British government, required that the estate of the son should be equally protected with that of the father. Chowmoora and Samode were in the immediate neighbourhood of each other; it was understood that they originally formed parts of the same estate. The two members of the family were so completely identified by the ties of relationship and interest, that unless the Chief of Chowmoora were also protected, the guarantee of the Rawul would, under existing circumstances, become nugatory. There was little doubt that the desire entertained by Jhota Ram to destroy Rawul Beiree Saul would lead to

Question of
the British
guarantee of
the Ex-Minister
and his
son.

¹ General letter, 6th July 1835.



hostile measures against Chowmoora if the British guarantee were withdrawn.

Views of
the Govern-
ment of In-
dia.

Meanwhile Lord William Bentinck's government at Ootacamund referred to the Vice-President and Council at Calcutta for their sentiments as regards the perplexing question of whether the estate of Chowmoora was included in the guarantee to Rawul Beiree Saul. The President and Council at Calcutta expressed their concurrence with the view already taken by Major Alves, the Agent to the Governor-General for Rajpootana :—

1st.—That the possession of Chowmoora had been recently confirmed on the son of Rawul Beiree Saul by a formal proceeding, in which the British Agent took an active part.

2nd.—That if the Jeypore authorities were allowed to resume the estate by a violent act of spoliation at this juncture, it would throw discredit on the British government.

3rd.—That these conclusions afforded an additional reason for preventing the Jeypore authorities from committing such an unwarrantable injustice.

Lord William Bentinck's government at Ootacamund concurred in these sentiments. Major Alves was informed accordingly, and directed to communicate the decision of the Government of India to the Court of Jeypore.

Suspicious
death of the
Raja.

Subsequent to the above proceeding¹ some extraordinary events took place in Jeypore, which were

¹ Separate letter, 4th May 1835.



communicated to the Court of Directors in special letters. The Raja of Jeypore died suddenly under circumstances which led to a general belief that he had been poisoned by Jhota Ram. The Government of India feared that an investigation of the charge would probably lead to no satisfactory results. Jhota Ram had requested to be relieved of his post as Minister.

Major Alves was ordered to proceed to Jeypore, and inform Jhota Ram that his request was granted; that the British government was glad that he had made it of his own accord; that it had already determined to undertake the guardianship of the infant son of the deceased Raja, and to require the Minister to withdraw from Jeypore. Jhota Ram's retirement from public life was not to preclude further enquiry, or punishment in the case of satisfactory evidence of his guilt. A proclamation was also issued explaining that the British government had no other object in view than the maintenance of one of the ancient States of Rajpootana, and promoting the dignity and interests of its ally, the infant successor to the Raj.

Investigation by Major Alves.

Subsequently Major Alves reported that all classes of natives were impressed with the conviction of Jhota Ram's guilt; that all were anxious that the British government should save them from the deplorable effects of Jhota Ram's administration, by departing from its policy of non-interfer-

General anxiety for British management.



ence, and establishing an efficient government at Jeypore during the minority by the exercise of its authority as a paramount power. Major Alves recommended the appointment of a Political Agent at Jeypore.

Disinclination of the Government of India.

The Government of India was disinclined to take such a strong measure of intervention. It was anxious to do no more than undertake the guardianship of the Raja, leaving the administration to be national and Jeyporean, without any interference of British authority unless it should become unavoidable.

Murder of Mr. Blake.

Major Alves accordingly proceeded to Jeypore, accompanied by Mr. Blake,¹ who was one of the Assistants to the Agent. On the morning of the 4th of June 1835 they had a conference with the Ranis at the palace. On leaving the palace there was a sudden outbreak. Major Alves was attacked and seriously wounded, but managed to escape with his life. Mr. Blake was barbarously murdered.

Arrest of the murderers.

The government demanded the immediate arrest and punishment of the murderers by the Jeypore government. Five had been already executed by the spontaneous action of the Jeypore authorities. Major Alves was gradually recovering from his wounds.

¹ General letter, 6th July 1835.



KISHENGHUR.

In 1827 Sir Charles Metcalfe, the Resident at Delhi, reported to the Government of India¹ that a dispute had arisen between the Raja of Kishenghur and the Thakoor of Futtehghur, one of the members of the Raja's own family. Lord Amherst agreed with Sir Charles Metcalfe that as the Thakoor was a dependent of Kishenghur, the British government would not interfere, except to recommend submission to the Thakoor and forgiveness to the Raja.

Policy of
non-interfer-
ence.

When the Raja of Kishenghur was informed of these orders he began to resume some of the Futtehghur villages; whilst the Thakoor began to retaliate by making depredations on Kishenghur territory. The consequence was that subjects of the British government were said to have been plundered by both parties.

Disturban-
ces in Kishen-
ghur.

Subsequently the Raja of Kishenghur sent a remonstrance to the Government of India against the Maharaja of Jodhpore, alleging that the latter had sheltered and countenanced his refractory subjects. He claimed the help of the British government under the treaty of 1818 to put down the rebellion of Futtehghur and capture the fortress.

Complaints
against Jodh-
pore.

¹ General letter, 8th May 1829.



Views of
Lord William
Bentinck.

By this time Lord William Bentinck had arrived in India as Governor-General. The Government of India was willing to investigate the charge against Jodhpore, and to prevent Jodhpore from interfering in the domestic concerns of his neighbour Kishenghur; but was of opinion that the complaint against Jodhpore was unfounded or exaggerated. No help could be given to the Raja of Kishenghur in the reduction of Futtehghur, as the treaty of 1818 left him free to manage the internal affairs of his estate, and only bound the British government to protect him against external enemies. As regards the losses incurred by British subjects, the Raja of Kishenghur was told that the British government could not permit such depredations. If repeated, the Government of India would interfere and settle the differences between the Raja and his subjects on just principles to prevent the further extension of anarchy.

More dis-
turbances.

The high road soon became dangerous to travellers. Futtehghur was bent on ruining the trade of Kishenghur, and compelling the British government to interfere. It was currently believed that if the Government of India would not interfere to protect the people of Kishenghur, it would certainly interfere to protect its own subjects. Meanwhile the Maharaja was wasting his time at Delhi, vainly calling for the help of British troops, and accusing Jeypore and Jodhpore of assisting his rebel subjects.

Flight of
the Raja.

Kishenghur was thus abandoned to the insurgents. The Raja was ordered to return to his territory at



once, or the British government would consider the propriety of abrogating the treaty, and concluding separate arrangements with the insurgent Thakoors. The Raja was also told that the disorders had arisen from his attempting to resume the villages of his Thakoors contrary to the advice of the British government.

The Raja of Kishenghur left Delhi; he proceeded through his own territory without stopping,¹ and then went on to Ajmere. His imbecility was surprising. At Ajmere his troops were clamouring for arrears of pay, and his life was in danger. The Political Agent gave his word for their payment, and they were immediately satisfied. The Raja then laid siege to Futtehghur. There he was deserted by his Rajputs, and disobeyed by his new levies, and fled disgracefully to Ajmere.

Imbecility
of the Raja.

The Jaghirdars of Kishenghur then rose in a body and captured all the Raja's forts, excepting the one at Kishenghur, which was defended by his mother. The Raja then offered to farm his territories to the British government for twelve years. He was willing to take one-fifth of the net revenues for his personal expenses, and to retire altogether to Delhi. The Government of India raised no objection to the Raja's going to Delhi, but refused to take over the management of Kishenghur.

Insurrec-
tion.

The Raja continued to be as imbecile as ever; but the differences with the Jaghirdars were brought to an amicable conclusion. The Raja left

Retirement
of the Raja.

¹ General letter, 3rd October 1829.



Kishenghur under the management of his mother, and took refuge in a sanctuary near the city of Jodhpore. It was the general opinion that he was insane.



JODHPORE.

Prior to 1818 the territory of Jodhpore was completely exhausted by the inroads of Amir Khan. Man Singh had been Maharaja ever since 1803, but had been terrified by Amir Khan into abdication and pretended insanity, and his only son assumed the Regency. The son died shortly after Jodhpore was brought under British protection; and then Man Singh threw off the mask of insanity, and resumed the administration.

Ravages of
Amir Khan.

In 1820 Man Singh frequently solicited the assistance of British troops to reduce his refractory nobles and settle the administration. The Government of India had repeatedly declared its strong objections to interfere in the internal affairs of any of the Rajpoot States; but still it was disposed to help the Maharaja, provided he would fully and frankly explain his existing embarrassments and future objects. This was all the more necessary in the case of Jodhpore, because the Maharaja had recently treated his Ministers and Thakoors with excessive violence, and put several to death; and it was feared that he only wanted British help in order to continue these revengeful and barbarous proceedings.

Disaffected
Thakoors.

¹ General letter, 2nd May 1823.



Severities
of Raja Man
Singh.

In 1822 some further information was furnished¹ respecting the severities practised by Man Singh. The Thakoors in question had conspired against his life, and he had discovered the plot and driven them into exile. No means were spared to persuade the Maharaja to pursue a milder course. The Maharaja replied that he was most averse to severe measures, and sincerely wished to forgive and forget the past misconduct of his Thakoors; but that the seditious spirit had broken out afresh; fresh conspiracies were formed against his life, and he had no alternative, especially as the Thakoors were under the impression that the British government was favourable to their cause.

Arrest of
Thakoors
under British
protection.

In 1823² there was an improvement in the administration of Jodhpore. The Thakoors, however, still held out, whilst the Maharaja protested against the interference of the British government. The Agents of the expatriated Thakoors had been long remaining in the camp of the Resident, Sir David Ochterlony, and were at last dismissed with assurances of safety. On arriving at Jodhpore, they were seized by the Maharaja, and placed in close imprisonment. The fact was reported to the Resident by a newswriter at Jodhpore. Sir David Ochterlony instantly dismissed the Jodhpore Vakeel from his camp. He would have proceeded at once to Jodhpore, but the cattle and carriage of the Residency were at Neemuch.

¹ General letter, 12th September 1823.

² General letter, 10th September 1824.



The Government of India ordered the Maharaja to be told that the Vakeels had proceeded to Jodhpore under a virtual if not actual guarantee for their safety; it was hoped that the affair was a mistake of the newswriter. It was suggested that Mr. Wilder, the Superintendent at Ajmere, should proceed to Jodhpore.

Orders of
the Govern-
of India.

Mr. Wilder's mission proved successful.¹ Man Singh agreed to pardon and reinstate the Thakoors, except the two Chiefs of Boondsoo and Chundawut; and the offences of these men had proved so atrocious that their restoration could not be pressed upon the Maharaja. It was agreed that the Government of India should not interfere if the reinstated Thakoors broke out again.

Settlement
of the diffi-
culty.

Man Singh transferred the Jodhpore villages in Mhairwarra to British management for a period of eight years. He further agreed to pay Rs. 15,000 yearly towards the maintenance of the local corps of Bheels at Beawur. The net revenue of the villages was to be paid to Jodhpore, after the deduction of the yearly contribution.

Affairs of
Mhairwarra.

At this time there were complaints against the Maharaja for alleged oppression towards his consort, who was a princess of Jeypore. A strong feeling on this point existed in the Jeypore Durbar. The Maharaja furnished assurances and explanations on this head, which appeared to be satisfactory.

Domestic
troubles.

Some of the refractory Thakoors² delayed returning to their homes in the hope of getting better con-

Submission
of refractory
Chiefs.

¹ General letter, 31st May 1826.

² General letter, 27th July 1826.



ditions from the Maharaja. At last Mr. Wilder told them that the Maharaja had performed all his engagements to the British government, and that the affair must be considered at an end. The Government of India approved of this withdrawal of the Political authorities from all further pressure on Maharaja Ram Singh. This appears to have brought matters to a crisis ; and the settlement was brought to a close.

Complaints
of Kishen-
ghur.

In 1827 there were complaints¹ against the Maharaja of having given shelter and countenance to certain rebel Thakoors of Kishenghur.

Oppressions
of Man Singh :
rebellion of
the Thakoors.

In 1828 the Maharaja violated the conditions of the settlement which Mr. Wilders had concluded in 1824. He committed such acts of oppression that the Thakoors implored the British government for redress. They were told that the British government had always disclaimed any guarantee of the settlement. It would have amounted to a violation of the Maharaja's rights of sovereignty, which it had always respected excepting in special cases of emergency. Some of the Thakoors rose in arms against the Maharaja and were plundering his country. Ajmere merchants had consequently lost much valuable property in Jodhpore territory. The Thakoors contemplated inviting Dhokul Singh, a former pretender to the Jodhpore throne, to return and revive his claim to the Raj. The Government of India remarked that there were no grounds for interference. The Maharaja had not requested

¹ General letter, 8th May 1829.



assistance. Civil war was raging in Jodhpore; if the Maharaja could not put it down, he would see the necessity of yielding to the reasonable demands of the Thakoors.

The Maharaja soon grew tired of a war which only wasted his money and accomplished nothing. He was ready to come to terms with all of them save one. At this moment Dhokul Singh fled from his retreat on the Delhi frontier into Rajpootana. He was assisted by the Raja of Khetree, a dependent of Jeypore; also by a Jaghirdar of the British government. He joined the insurgent Thakoors who had taken shelter in the Shekawati country.

Pretensions
of Dhokul
Singh.

The Resident at Delhi, Sir E. Colebrooke, authorised the Political Agent at Ajmere to call on the Officer Commanding the Rajpootana Field Force for military help, should it become necessary for the security of Jodhpore city and the safety of the Maharaja.

Action of
the British
Resident.

The Government of India disapproved of this proceeding. The Resident was directed to recall his orders. He was told that the authority of the Government of India was necessary to the issue of such orders, except in very rare occasions of emergency. The Government of India had first to consider whether it was desirable to maintain such a prince as Man Singh on the throne of Jodhpore.

Views of
the Govern-
ment of In-
dia.

Dhokul Singh took¹ the field with a large force and devastated the country far and wide; but want of guns prevented him from capturing any of the

Progress of
the insurrec-
tion: call for
British inter-
ference.

¹ General letter, 3rd October 1829.



Maharaja's fortresses. The Maharaja loudly begged for the interference of the British government. At last the Government of India agreed to help him on the condition that he submitted his disputes with the Thakoors to their arbitration. Assistance, it was said, might be given to princes in cases of usurpation or against wanton and powerful rebellion, but not against universal disaffection caused by their own injustice, incapacity and misrule. The Maharaja of Jodhpore insisted on the other hand that he possessed an unconditional right to the support of the British government against his insurgent Chiefs. This was totally inadmissible, and required to be silenced at once. It was incumbent on princes to have the power of controlling their subjects, and if those subjects were driven into rebellion the rulers must take the consequences. There was no obligation on the part of the British government to support the ruler under such circumstances.

Flight of
Dhokul
Singh.

It was soon known that the Government of India contemplated active interference in the affairs of Oodeypore. Dhokul Singh was told that he could never be a party in any engagements that might be concluded between Maharaja Man Singh under the mediation of the British government. He separated himself from the confederate Thakoors and returned to his old retreat.

Returning
tranquillity.

The Maharaja professed his gratitude to the British government for the promised mediation. The Thakoors complained that it had deprived them



of their leader, and placed them at the mercy of the Maharaja. Both parties however were wearied out and exhausted with the struggle, and prepared to come to an accommodation.

Subsequently the claims of the Jodhpore State against Serohi were taken into consideration. The Maharaja of Jodhpore insisted on his right to levy tribute from Serohi. The Resident at Delhi found great difficulty in disposing of this claim. Jodhpore had frequently invaded Serohi in order to enforce this claim. But such invasions were merely predatory incursions. No regular tribute was ever voluntarily paid by Serohi. The Government of India decided that Jodhpore had no rightful claim to levy tribute on Serohi.

Claims
against
Serohi.

In 1829 it was discovered that Appa Sahib,¹ the ex-Raja of Nagpore, who had been in hiding ever since 1818, had taken up his residence in the city of Jodhpore. One of his servants revealed the fact to the British authorities out of revenge for some alleged ill-treatment that he had received from his master.

Appa Sahib
at Jodhpore.

The Maharaja of Jodhpore was bound by treaty, and by the nature and spirit of the alliance, to deliver up the enemies of the British government. Nevertheless he represented that his honour and reputation would suffer in the eyes of his subjects, and in the estimation of all the Chiefs and people of Rajpootana, if he surrendered a dethroned prince who had sought an asylum within his territories.

Objections
to surrender.

¹ Separate letter, 9th October 1829.



In the end the Government of India resolved not to press the demand. The Maharaja gave a solemn pledge that he would be answerable for Appa Sahib, and undertake that no future attempts would be made by the treacherous Maharatta to attempt further disturbances.

Complaints
against Raja
Man Singh.

In 1833 the Jodhpore Contingent¹ was ordered to Ajmere, but was found to be deficient in numbers and efficiency. Complaints were also brought against Jodhpore of aggressions on the territories of Jessulmere and Oodeypore. The Government of India still maintained a spirit of forbearance towards Man Singh, and was unwilling to pronounce that he had violated the treaty. This was the first occasion that the services of the Jodhpore Contingent were called for. The force was certainly deficient in numbers and efficiency, but it was hoped that a remonstrance would suffice to meet the case. The Contingent was sent back to Jodhpore. Colonel Lockett was told that the British government did not intend calling for the services of the Jodhpore forces in time of peace, but only in time of war.

Aggressions
on Jessulmere
and Oodey-
pore.

As regards the aggressions of Jodhpore on Jessulmere territory, the Maharaja offered such futile excuses by way of palliation, that the Government of India resolved to take serious notice of the outrage. Man Singh was told that he was held responsible for the amount of damage, and that unless

¹ General letter, 13th March 1833.



he satisfied the Rawul of Jessulmere within a reasonable period, the British government would take measures to enforce redress. The amount of compensation was fixed at about eight thousand rupees. As regards the aggressions on Oodeypore territory, the evidence was not sufficient to support the charge ; further information was called for.

In 1834 Major Alves adjusted all questions¹ pending with the Maharaja of Jodhpore, but obtained no security for the payment of the expense of the military operations, and for the due performance of the conditions to which he had agreed. In the letter to the Court of Directors, signed by Lord William Bentinck, the following observations are made: "The entire want of faith, and the habitual disregard of the wishes of the Supreme Government, which has hitherto characterised the proceedings of Maharaja Man Singh, renders it impossible to place any trust on the simple assurances of his intention to fulfil the conditions of his engagement into which his plenipotentiaries have entered on his behalf ; and unless the British government hold a pledge in its hands, it could not be said to have any security that its just claims would be satisfied."

Opinions of
Lord William
Bentinck.

It was under these circumstances that the Government of India resolved² to sequester the lake and district of Sambhur until such time as the Jodhpore government had fulfilled all the conditions to which it was bound.

Sequestration of Sam-
bhur.

¹ Separate letter, 23rd January 1835.

² Separate letter, 22nd January 1835.



JESSULMERE.

British interference.

In 1824, Mr. Wilder, the Political Agent at Ajmere, reported¹ that it had been necessary to interfere in Jessulmere. The Maharawul charged his Minister with having committed an atrocious murder. He summoned the parties accused in order to hold an investigation. The Thakoor of Baroo refused to deliver up the persons charged, although residing in the city, and almost immediately within the precincts of the sovereign's palace. Other Thakoors took the part of the Minister. At last Mr. Wilder sent a native on whom he could rely, to assure the refractory Thakoors that the British government regarded their conduct as highly reprehensible. This proceeding induced the Thakoors to return to their allegiance.

Approval of the Government of India.

The Government of India deprecated all interference as a general rule, but approved the action of Mr. Wilder in the present instance.

¹ General letter, 31st May 1826.



BOONDI.

In Boondi the state of affairs strongly resembled that at Jeypore. The Raja died in July 1821. He was succeeded by a minor aged eleven. A responsible Minister was placed in authority with the countenance¹ of the British government. The Rani, the mother of the young Maharao, strove to usurp the sole authority. She abandoned herself to the counsels of a corrupt and interested faction, of which the chief members were a barber, a eunuch, and a slave girl. She did her best to thwart the Minister. The interests of the minor prince were totally neglected. There was the most wasteful expenditure, general disorder and mismanagement, and all the evils of a double government. In 1823, Captain Caulfield, the Political Agent, proceeded to Boondi. The Rani promised amendment, but soon returned to her old courses. Captain Caulfield was directed by the Government of India to insist upon the removal of the favourites from the counsels of the Rani.

Conflict
between the
Minister and
Rani.

In 1824 the superintendence of the Political Agent proved successful. He recommended² that the title of Raja should be conferred on the Minister. It had been customary for the Rao Rajas of

Grant of a
title to the
Minister.

¹ General letter, 10th September 1824.

² General letter, 31st May 1826.



Boondi to solicit similar titles for their own Ministers from the Moghul Emperors; one Minister in particular received the title from Shah Alam, through the General Nujif Khan. The grant of such a title by the British government as the paramount power would, it was thought, tend to wean the minds of the Rajpoots generally from the ideal dependency on the throne of Delhi. Accordingly the Government of India authorised the Political Agent to confer the title on Kishen Ram in the name of the Hon'ble Company.

In 1825 the reports¹ of the state of affairs in Boondi continued to be highly satisfactory.

Disputes
with Jodh-
pore.

Subsequently² the young Maharao was married to the daughter of the Maharaja of Jodhpore as his chief wife. The Rani mother took improper means to estrange him from his wife in order to maintain her own exclusive ascendancy. The followers of the Jodhpore princess were very indignant, and would have avenged her wrongs but for fear of incurring the displeasure of the British government. Major Caulfield was authorised to tell the Rani mother that the Government of India expected her to retire from all interference in the affairs of the Raj, and her son's zenana, as he was now of a sufficient age for superintending and regulating both. As the young Maharao had fully attained his majority, he was invited to assume the direction of affairs.

¹ General letter, 27th July 1826.

² General letter, 3rd July 1828.



In 1830¹ fresh disturbances were excited in Boondi. The Minister was murdered by a man, who was strongly suspected of being an emissary of Man Singh of Jodhpore, the father of the Jodhpore Rani of Boondi. On hearing of this event at Kotah, Mr. Trevelyan, the Acting Resident at Kotah, hastened to Boondi in order to prevent any collision between the forces of Boondi and a deputation of four hundred armed men, which had recently arrived at Boondi. The collision was fortunately averted, and the murderers of the Minister were punished by the Boondi Raja.

Murder of
the Minister.

The settlement of Boondi affairs was reported home in a special letter.² The Raja of Boondi had placed the eldest son of the murdered Minister in his father's office. The Raja himself manifested much aptitude for public business, and purposed exercising a general control.

Settlement
of affairs.

Mr. Hawkins, the Resident at Delhi, was of opinion that no good would arise from an enquiry as to how far the Maharaja of Jodhpore was concerned in the late murder. The near relationship between the Maharaja of Jodhpore and the Maharao of Boondi rendered it advisable to pacify both parties and bury the matter in oblivion. The Government of India entirely concurred in the views expressed by the Resident at Delhi.

Investiga-
tion deprec-
ated.

Subsequently a warm controversy arose between Mr. Trevelyan, the Acting Resident at Kotah, and

Obsolete
controversy.

¹ General letter, 14th October 1830.

² Separate letter, 24th December 1830.



Mr. Cavendish, the Superintendent at Ajmere. Mr. Trevelyan insisted on the guilt of Man Singh, and urged an investigation. Mr. Cavendish was diametrically opposed to this view. The controversy is obsolete.

Complaints
of Man Singh
of Jodhpore.

Meanwhile Man Singh of Jodhpore represented that the Minister had been slain by a Rajput for using abusive language towards his daughter, the wife of the Maharao of Boondi. He complained that the Maharao of Boondi had unjustly executed three or four confidential servants of the Jodhpore state on the false plea of their being concerned in the murder. The Maharaja appealed to the Governor-General to deliver his daughter from the annoyance and misery to which she was exposed at Boondi.

Views of
Lord William
Bentinck.

In reply Lord William Bentinck expressed his extreme regret at the melancholy occurrence which had taken place at Boondi. He remarked that whoever instigated the assassin was the cause of all that happened in consequence. There appeared however to be no way of remedying the past. The Maharao of Boondi had punished those whom he deemed guilty, in virtue of his undoubted right to exercise sovereign powers within his own dominions. It therefore behoved all parties to forget all that had occurred. As regards the Rani, the Governor-General had great pleasure in complying with the Maharaja's wishes, and was confident that his daughter would be treated with all consideration and respect by the Maharao of Boondi. Subsequently it



was ordered that Jodhpore midwives should be admitted into the zenana of the Boondi Rani at her coming accouchement. Mr. Cavendish, the Superintendent at Ajmere, proposed to refer the quarrel between Jodhpore and Boondi to the arbitration of the Rana of Oodeypore. The Government of India agreed with the Resident of Delhi that such a measure would be inexpedient.



BHURTPORE.

Jât origin. Bhurtpore is a Jât principality; it has been in treaty relations with the British government ever since the year 1803.

Frontier fray. In 1823¹ there was a serious fray on the frontier between Bhurtpore and Ferozepore. A girl was proceeding from her home in a village of Ferozepore to visit some friends in Bhurtpore territory. On the way she was seized and violated by a cowherd of a Bhurtpore village, named Noagaon. She returned to her home and told what had occurred. Her father assembled the inhabitants of his village, laid his turban at their feet, and implored revenge. They all appealed to the Nawab of Ferozepore, who applied to the local officers of the Bhurtpore government to put the offender to death or deliver him up, otherwise the feud would never be extinguished. The Bhurtpore officers confined the offender, but would do nothing more. The people of the Ferozepore village collected all their kinsfolk from neighbouring villages, and attacked Noagaon and set it on fire. They were beaten off, but not until seventy or eighty people were slain. Both the Raja of Bhurtpore and the Nawab of Ferozepore sent troops to the frontier. Villages were burnt

¹ General letter, 15th September 1825.



and lives lost on both sides. The people of Ferozepore were generally worsted, but declared they would not desist from the feud until the original offender was executed. Sir David Ochterlony, the Resident at Malwa and Rajputana, reported the measures taken for repressing these divisions. He laid most blame on the Bhurtpore government, and considered that Bhurtpore ought to have executed the offender without hesitation.

The Government of India ordered the advance of a force to stop further disorders. Strong remonstrances were sent to the Nawab of Ferozepore and the Raja of Bhurtpore on the breach of treaty under which they were bound to refer all disputes to the British authorities. The original offender was condemned to imprisonment for life.

Action of
the Govern-
ment of In-
dia.

The Raja of Bhurtpore died childless in 1823.¹ He was succeeded by his elder brother as his next legal heir. It was rumoured that Doorjan Saul, the son of a younger brother, was preparing to contest the succession on the ground of his having been adopted by the deceased Raja. The Government of India was not satisfied that Doorjan Saul had been adopted. In January 1824 it acknowledged the succession of Buldeo Singh. In 1824,² at the request of Sir David Ochterlony, a khillut of investiture was conferred on the only son and heir of the Raja, named Bulwant Singh, who was only seven years of age. It was hoped

Death of
the Raja:
accession of
Buldeo Singh

¹ General letter, 1st October 1825.

² General letter, 1st October 1825.



that this measure would prevent any commotion as regards the succession; and reasons already existed for anticipating a vacancy.

Rebellion
of Doorjan
Saul: action
of Sir David
Ochterlony.

In March 1825, Buldeo Singh died, and was succeeded by Bulwant Singh. A disturbance broke out which cost several lives. Doorjan Saul had gained over several of the battalions of the State and taken possession of the fort of Bhurtpore. Sir David Ochterlony ordered the assemblage of the largest available force without a moment's delay, with the most formidable battering and bombarding train, in order to support the rightful heir. He also issued several proclamations denouncing Doorjan Saul as a murderer and usurper, and calling upon the Jât population to rise in defence of their lawful sovereign.

Disapproval
of the Gov-
ernment of
India.

The Government of India disapproved of these proceedings, and countermanded the advance of the troops. The hot season, it was urged, had already begun; the war was still going on in Burma, and no decisive advantage had been gained. At the same time no explanation had been received from Doorjan Saul.

Submission
of Doorjan
Saul.

Whilst these instructions were under preparation, Sir David Ochterlony reported that Doorjan Saul disclaimed all intention of usurping the throne. Doorjan Saul declared that he had been driven to opposition by the indignities he had received from the maternal uncle of the minor prince, who had assumed the post of guardian and minister. Doorjan Saul added that a very large party of the Jât tribe



had invited him to form a new administration, because they disapproved of the proceedings of this uncle. Sir David Ochterlony had already countermanded the advance of the British troops, and recalled his proclamations. He promised to investigate the causes of the commotion.

Meanwhile Sir David Ochterlony held a conference with some Bhurtpore Vakeels who had been sent by Doorjan Saul to Muttra. The Vakeels made a show of proposing that the boy Bulwant Singh should be acknowledged Raja, whilst Doorjan Saul exercised the full powers of administration under the designation of Mookhtar or Manager. Sir David Ochterlony did not encourage this suggestion. He observed that the only course likely to mollify the British government was for Doorjan Saul to come into the British camp, with the infant Raja in his hand, and to give assurances of his fidelity and obedience to his lawful prince.

Fresh complications.

In May Sir David Ochterlony returned to his residence near Delhi. On the eve of his departure he was visited by the Guru, or spiritual adviser of Bhurtpore, and other neighbouring localities. The Guru was a priest of the highest rank and influence. He urged the claims of Doorjan Saul, first to the Chiefship, and secondly to the Mookhtaree, or executive authority. Subsequently Sir David Ochterlony forwarded two letters to the Government of India, one from Doorjan Saul, and the other from the Guru. The ostensible object of the letters was to introduce a new Vakeel to the Resident; the

Bhurtpore intrigues.



real object was to assert the claim of Doorjan Saul to the principality. The letter from Doorjan Saul assumed the style and titles of the Maharajas of Bhurtpore and was sealed by him as Maharaja. The letter from the Guru distinctly referred to Doorjan Saul as the Maharaja of Bhurtpore.

Further troubles.

Subsequently there was a serious breach between Doorjan Saul and his brother Mahdoo Singh, which plunged the country in anarchy. Mahdoo Singh attempted to seize the fort of Bhurtpore, but failed; he then retired to the fort at Deeg, and repulsed every force which Doorjan Saul sent against him.

Death of Ochterlony.

The Government of India disapproved of the proceedings of Sir David Ochterlony. Accordingly that officer resigned his post of Resident at Malwa and Rajputana. He died at Meerut on the 15th of July 1825.

Revolt of Doorjan Saul.

The events which followed are matters of general history. Rajputs, Jâts, Mahrattas, Afghans, and not a few British subjects, flocked to the standard of Doorjan Saul. Many of the neighbouring Mahratta and Rajput Chiefs encouraged Doorjan Saul to persist in his resistance to the British government, which was supposed to be fully occupied in the war against Burma.

Action of the Government of India.

Lord Amherst was disinclined to take active measures. His Council however maintained that the British government, as the paramount power, was bound to put an end to the anarchy in Bhurtpore, and support the rightful heir. Sir Charles Metcalfe arrived at Calcutta at this crisis on his way to suc-



ceed Sir David Ochterlony, and he took the same view as the Council. The strong representations of Sir Charles Metcalfe turned the balance. Lord Amherst gave way. The settlement of affairs in Bhurtpore was left to Sir Charles Metcalfe, the new Resident for Malwa and Rajputana, and Lord Combermere, the Commander-in-Chief.

Sir Charles Metcalfe failed to induce Doorjan Saul to submit to the decision of the Government of India. Lord Combermere advanced against Bhurtpore with an army of twenty thousand men and a hundred mortars and heavy ordnance. The walls of Bhurtpore were made of clay, and were of extreme height and thickness. The artillery failed to make any impression. At last the walls were mined. The explosion took place on the 18th January 1826. The breach was made; the British army rushed in; and Bhurtpore was captured. Doorjan Saul was taken prisoner and confined for life, first at Allahabad, and afterwards at Benares.

War against
Bhurtpore.

The course of events may now be resumed from the records. The young Raja was installed on the 5th of February 1826¹. The Government of India resolved to interfere as little as possible in the administration of Bhurtpore, and to regard the Minister as the responsible head of the government of Bhurtpore.

Installation of
Bulwant Singh.

The new administration utterly failed,² owing to the mischievous and infatuated prejudices of the

Conflict
between the
Regent Rani
and the Minister.

¹ General letter, 18th March 1826.

² General letter, 27th July 1826.



Regent Rani. This lady entertained an unreasonable aversion to the Minister. A favourite, named Jancee Bajinaut Rao, exercised an unbounded influence over her mind and counsels. He set aside the legitimate administration, and usurped the entire powers of government in Bhurtpore. He was totally unfitted for such a position by his foreign origin, his low and intriguing character, his inexperience and incapacity, and his unpopularity with the Jât zemindars.

Question of
British management.

Such a state of affairs was intolerable. The British government could not abandon Bhurtpore to its fate, consistent with its duties as the paramount power, and the special claims of the minor Raja; such a course would have filled the whole country with anarchy. Taking the principality under British management promised the greatest hopes of success. The means of setting up a native administration were singularly circumscribed, and no opposition was to be expected from the Jât Chiefs after the blow which the country had lately experienced. The Government of India however was disinclined to take such an extreme measure; it had been decided to try the experiment of a native administration, and there had not been such a failure as to justify such an extent of British interference. Moreover the British management of Nagpore had excited strong objections in England.

Council of
Regency.

Jowahur Saul and Foujdar Choraman, aided by Govind Ram, were accordingly placed at the head



of affairs, independent of the Regent Rani. These three ministers were to form a Council of Regency. Their orders were to be issued in the name of Maharaja Bulwant Singh, and their proceedings controlled and supervised by the Political Agent at Bhurtpore and Resident at Delhi. The duties of the Rani were confined to the custody of the young Raja, and the control of the internal concerns of the palace. Steps were to be taken for the suitable education of the Raja. If the Rani acquiesced in their arrangements, her unworthy favourite Janee Bajinaut Rao might remain at Bhurtpore. The Rani however not only agreed to the management, but ordered her favourite to leave Bhurtpore.

In 1829 the education of the young Maharaja was taken into consideration.¹ The Jâts of Bhurtpore strongly objected to his being instructed in the Muhammadan religion and Persian language. Mr. Trevelyan, Acting Political Agent, urged the propriety of giving the young Maharaja an English education. Accordingly a number of elementary books in English were presented to the young Maharaja.

Education
of the Maha-
raja.

¹ General letter, 10th April 1830.



KOTAH.

Transfer of
sovereignty
from the Ma-
harao to the
Minister.

Kotah was taken under British protection in 1819. For many years there had been a revolution in the government of Kotah, which is common enough in Indian history. For nearly half a century the Maharao had been a mere titular pageant. The Minister was the real sovereign, and managed all affairs as Regent. So completely was this order of things established in Kotah, that the British government had concluded a supplementary treaty with Kotah, under which it had guaranteed the government to Zalim Singh and his heirs for ever.

Struggle
between rival
parties.

The titular Maharao died at the end of 1819. His eldest son, Rai Kishore Singh, had long been the bitter enemy of Madhoo Rao, the eldest son of Zalim Singh. The death of the titular Maharao made matters worse. Rai Kishore Singh was bent upon obtaining a share of the sovereignty, whilst Zalim Singh was bent upon keeping him as a pageant, as his father had been before him. To make matters worse, Goordhan Doss, the youngest of Zalim Singh, had gone over to Rai Kishore Singh, and thus made common cause with the avowed enemy of his own family.

¹ General letter, 2nd May 1823.



In 1821 Captain Tod was Political Agent in Western Rajputana. He reported that the death of Zalim Singh was expected, and that it would be probably followed by a civil war. The Government of India reviewed the state of affairs. It was bound by treaty to support Zalim Singh and his heirs. Indeed the titular Maharao had no more voice in the administration than the puppet princes of Satara under the sovereignty of the Peishwa. Captain Tod was warned against any attempt at compromise. He might do what he could to promote the comfort and happiness of Rai Kishore Singh, but he was to go no further. He was to see that Goordhan Doss was removed from the service of Rai Kishore Singh, even if it was found necessary to arrest him as a prisoner.

Views of
the Govern-
ment of In-
dia.

Meanwhile Goordhan Doss had taken refuge in the palace of the titular Maharao. He was deaf to all persuasion. Zalim Singh was forced to blockade the palace for several days, before he got possession of his unworthy son. Goordhan Rao was banished from Kotah. The measure proved beneficial. Rai Kishore Singh became formally reconciled to Zalim Singh and Madhoo Rao; and the event was celebrated by all classes in Kotah with rejoicing and festivities.

Forced re-
conciliation.

Subsequently Rai Kishore Singh listened to bad advisers.¹ Goordhan Doss began to intrigue from his retreat in Malwa. Attempts were made to seduce the soldiery of Zalim Singh. At last, in

Fresh out-
break.

¹ General letter, 13th June 1826.



December 1820, the leader of one of the Regent's battalions broke out into revolt. The rising was suppressed, but at that moment Rai Kishore Singh suddenly left his palace in boats in order to rescue the rebel leader. The Rai succeeded in his object after running great personal risks, and then retired from Kotah territory, and took refuge in Boondi. There he sent for Goordhan Doss, and appealed to the Rajputs of Haraotee. Goordhan Doss was prevented from entering Boondi, and after some dangerous adventures managed to escape to Delhi, where he was placed under restraint by the British Resident. Subsequently Rai Kishore Singh proceeded to Delhi, breathing implacable hostility against the eldest son of Zalim Singh, and the state of things guaranteed the treaty.

The Maharao, a public enemy.

Rai Kishore Singh was now regarded as a public enemy. It was no longer possible to arbitrate between two Chiefs, one of whom was guaranteed in the sovereignty of Kotah, and the other in the management of the government. Rai Kishore Singh had broken this arrangement; he had joined the rebel commander of one of Zalim Singh's battalions; and the question was whether he should be restored to his old position at Kotah, and if so, on what terms. A draft of the terms to be exacted from each of the two Chiefs, Rai Kishore Singh and Madhoo Singh, was prepared and sanctioned by the Government of India, and sent to Captain Tod, the Political Agent for Western Rajputana.

Intrigues at Delhi and Calcutta.

Meanwhile Rai Kishore Singh reached the vicinity of Delhi, and engaged deeply in intrigue to



excite the interest of the local authorities in his behalf. He sent an agent, named Mahomed Ali, to Calcutta; and this man specially reported that the Government of India was favourable to the designs of Rai Kishore Singh. He thus deluded both his employers and the public generally. In this proceeding he was aided and abetted by the Head Munshi of the Persian Office at Calcutta, who was subsequently dismissed from his situation.

When Mahomed Ali left Calcutta, Rai Kishore Singh left Delhi and raised a large rabble of armed followers. Offers of help reached him from all directions, and many Thakoors sent their levies to join him. Under such circumstances the terms offered him by Captain Tod were naturally rejected, and at last the titular Maharao entered Kotah territory. Every effort was made to induce him to come to terms; but all persuasion was wasted upon him.

Maharao enters Kotah.

At the end of September 1821, the Officer Commanding the British troops was called upon to advance to the attack. The troops of Zalim Singh and the British artillery were jointly engaged. The Maharao was utterly defeated and fled across the Chumbul river, leaving his camp and baggage in the hands of the victors. From that moment public tranquillity was entirely restored.

Defeat of the Maharao.

At the end of 1821, the Maharao made his submission¹. He agreed to the terms proposed by the Government of India, and was restored to his dignity and throne.

Submission and restoration.

¹ General letter, 12th September 1823.



Views of
the British
government
on Kotah.

The Government of India expressed its satisfaction at this result. At the same time it was stated that the form of government which was originally found established in Kotah, and which the British government was pledged to maintain, was radically vicious. A well-timed proposition for establishing the family of Zalim Singh in a separate and independent principality, on condition of resigning the administration of Kotah, might have proved satisfactory to both parties, whilst it would have been highly convenient to the British government, and conducive to the permanent tranquillity of the country.

Proposed
separate prin-
cipality.

It was urged that the proposed separate principality might be found in the pergunnahs ceded to Kotah by Holkar under the treaty of Mundissore. The cession had been made to reward Zalim Singh, and was annexed to Kotah at his request. The plan was recommended by Sir David Ochterlony, the Resident at Delhi.

Discontent
of the Maha-
rao.

Subsequently it was discovered that the titular Maharao was anything but pleased with the arrangement, and still continued to cherish expectations of recovering the government of Kotah. It was fully believed that on the death of Zalim Singh the old animosity would break out afresh. Zalim Singh would never agree to the proposition made by the Government of India. His son Madhoo Rao would never be able to carry on the executive administration, as he was altogether wanting in ability; and there was an insuperable bar to his ever acting in concert with the titular Maharao.



The only hope of effecting some arrangement lay in the fears of Madhoo Rao; after the death of his father Zalim Singh, he would be forced to come to terms with the titular Maharao.

In 1824 Goordhan Doss began¹ to display a rest-

Intrigues
of Goordhan
Doss.

lessness at Delhi. He and his friends were corresponding with individuals at Kotah, who were hostile to the existing order of things. His father Zalim Singh at Kotah requested that Goordhan Doss might be imprisoned in the British fort of Chunar.

Death of
Zalim Singh.

Zalim Singh died in June 1824, and was succeeded by his son Madhoo Rao. There were symptoms of mutiny amongst the troops, for it was known that Madhoo Rao was wanting in character and capacity. The Political Agent disbanded some of the disaffected soldiery, and tranquillity was restored.

At the end of the year the peace of Haraoti and the adjoining country was much disturbed. The troubles in Jeypore and the war in Burma was creating unrest. Bulwant Singh, a kinsman of the Maharao of Boondi, had taken a leading part in the Kotah disturbances of 1821. He now began to collect troops, and open a correspondence with the titular Maharao; and at last fled from his jaghir. The Political Agent called upon him to disband his troops, and make his submission; but he fired on the party bearing the message. In consequence of this outrage a force was marched against him;

Fresh dis-
turbances.

¹ General letter, 31st May 1826.



and after a protracted resistance, Bulwant Singh was killed with two of his sons and a few followers. The Political Agent had acted in concert with the Kotah and Boondi administrations, and the Government of India considered that he had been fully justified in resorting to active measures.

Quiet res-
tored.

In 1826 there was a better understanding¹ between the Maharao and the Raj Rana, which was ascribed to the judicious policy of Major Caulfield.

Question of
adoption by
the Maharao.

The Maharao had no son. He was anxious to adopt a nephew to the exclusion of his elder brother. A punchayet of Pundits was assembled at Kotah, and came to a unanimous conclusion on the following points:—

1st.—That a person without legitimate issue might adopt a nephew, the son of a deceased brother, to the exclusion of a brother older than the deceased.

2nd.—That the age of the person adopted had no effect upon the adoption.

3rd.—That if a son was born subsequently to the Maharao, that son would succeed to the throne. The adopted son would be excluded, and a suitable provision would be made for him.

Accordingly the nephew was adopted.

Death of
Maharao.

The Maharao died in 1828², and was succeeded by his nephew and adopted son Maharao Ram Singh. Nuzzurs were presented to the Government of India by the new titular prince and the Raj Rana.

¹ General letter, 3rd July 1828.

² General letter, 3rd October 1829.



In 1830 a conspiracy was formed¹ against the life of the Raj Rana of Kotah by certain² persons in the service of the Maharao. Mr. Trevelyan, the Political Agent, reported that a jemadar in the Raj Rana's service had made overtures to the brother-in-law of Maharao to assassinate the Raj Rana when paying his devotions in a temple at Kotah. These overtures were not accepted; they were not even communicated to the Maharao; but they were not made known to the Raj Rana by any of the Maharao's people. Consequently when the plot was at last discovered, there was considerable embarrassment on the part of the Maharao, and suspicion on the part of the Raj Rana.

Conspiracy
against the
Raj Rana.

No positive proof could be obtained as regards the persons concerned in the conspiracy. Mr. Trevelyan considered that it would be inexpedient to continue to agitate the question; it would only keep alive the suspicions and distrust of the Raj Rana. The Government of India entirely approved, and the matter was allowed to drop.

Question
dropped.

In 1833 boundary disputes² were frequently occurring between Kotah and Jeypore, which led to collisions.

Collisions
with Jeypore.

The Raj Rana Madhoo Singh died on the 26th of February 1834³, and was succeeded by his son Muddam Singh. The Governor-General sent a

Death of
Raj Rana.

¹ General letter, 14th October 1830.

² General letter, 13th March 1834.

³ General letters, 13th November 1834, and 6th April 1835.



letter of condolence to the new Raj Rana. A request for a delay of six months in the payment of tribute was refused.



ULWAR.

In 1815 the Raja of Ulwar died¹. There were two infant claimants for the throne—a nephew and an illegitimate son. The Thakoors placed both upon the throne as joint rulers. The Government of India was anxious not to interfere in the affairs of any Rajput State, and consequently accepted the compromise.

Joint rule
of a nephew
and a bas-
tard.

So long as the two princes were minors, public disorders were more or less restrained by the Ministers. But in 1824 the two princes attained their majority, and broke out in open feuds and commotions. An attempt was made to assassinate the Nawab of Ferozpore, who had been a friend of the former Raja, and had espoused the cause of the illegitimate son.

Disturban-
ces.

The Government of India had no means for deciding between the two conflicting princes. There was a stain on the birth of the one; otherwise he seemed the best of the two. At last the illegitimate son was set aside by the Thakoors, and a suitable provision was made for his maintenance.

Bastard set
aside by the
Thakoors.

The new Raja, Benec Singh, was suspected of being concerned in the attempt to murder the Nawab of Ferozpore. The Government of India ordered

Complica-
tions.

¹ General letter, 1st October 1825.



the Resident to investigate the charge in his Court at Delhi.¹ The Raja set the accused men at liberty, and resisted every attempt to bring the men to trial. Levies were being raised, and the people began to fly from Ulwar in considerable numbers. At last in 1825¹ the Raja of Ulwar delivered over the suspected murderers to Sir Charles Metcalfe.

Provision
for the depo-
sed Raja.

Sir David Ochterlony, the previous Resident, had made a yearly provision of one lakh of rupees for the deposed Raja.³ Sir Charles Metcalfe, who succeeded him as Resident, had raised this provision to four lakhs per annum, being one-fourth of the estimated revenue of Ulwar. The Government of India was of opinion that the consent of the deposed Raja to either arrangement ought to have been previously secured. It was explained by Sir Charles Metcalfe that the ex-Raja had concurred in the arrangement only because he was told no better arrangement could be made. Nothing short of the whole principality of Ulwar would have satisfied him.

Dealings
with suspect-
ed conspira-
tors.

The men supposed to be implicated in the attempted assassination were duly brought to trial. The evidence against them was not sufficient for conviction, but their guilt was strongly suspected. The accused were allowed to return to Ulwar. The Raja was told that it was not the custom of the British government to punish persons unless convicted; but as the accused had failed to establish their innocence, it would not be proper for him to employ them.

¹ General letter, 18th March 1826.

² General letter, 27th July 1826.



Difficulties
with the Rao.

The Rao of Ulwar promoted the brother of one of the offenders, and the son of the other.¹ Subsequently in 1826 he wanted to pay a complimentary visit to the Resident, but Sir Charles Metcalfe declined to receive him¹. About the same time the privilege of exchanging letters with the Governor-General was brought to a close². In 1828 the Rao of Ulwar expressed his grief at a measure which led the neighbouring States to conclude that he had incurred the displeasure of the British government. As the stoppage had occurred for a considerable period, it was deemed fitting to allow the correspondence to be resumed.

Non-inter-
ference in in-
surrection.

In 1828³ there was a disturbance at Ulwar. The army, instigated by the Thakoors, broke out into rebellion against the Ministers, and a new administration was formed at Ulwar. The Government of India ordered that there should be no interference whatever. It was considered that an insurrection of the Thakoors and people was a legitimate means for getting rid of a bad Minister. Two of the refugee Ministers were the two men under strong suspicion of being implicated in the attempted assassination of the Nawab of Ferozpoore. One of them fled to Delhi, and began to intrigue for his own return to Ulwar. The Resident placed him under confinement, but the Government of India ordered his immediate release.

¹ General letter, 28th July 1828.

² General letter, 10th April 1829.

³ General letter, 8th May 1829.



Murder.

Subsequently¹ the released man was murdered at Ulwar, with three of his servants, whilst returning from the palace. The Rao felt or feigned the utmost alarm. He offered to cede all his territories to the management of the British government, provided he might retire in safety to Benares or Gaya.

Further difficulties with the Rao.

In 1833 matters² were still unsatisfactory at Ulwar. A son and heir was born to the Rao Raja, and the usual complimentary letters were exchanged. Lord William Bentinck had recently ordered the use of the English language in correspondence with native princes. The Rao Raja objected; he was told that the Government of India had no wish that he should use any medium of communication that was not perfectly agreeable and convenient to himself.

Boundary disputes.

There were boundary disputes between Ulwar and Bhurtpore. An attempt was made by Ulwar to tamper with Mr. Lushington, the Political Agent at Bhurtpore. A bloody fray was committed by Ulwar on the Bhurtpore frontier. Mr. Blake was sent to arbitrate between Ulwar and Bhurtpore. He reported that a redoubt had been built on the disputed spot under the protection of a military force sent by the Ulwar authorities.

Punishment of the Rao.

The Government of India resolved that it would not allow so gross a violation of the international peace of India to be passed over without some decided mark of its displeasure. Accordingly the Rao Raja was fined eight thousand rupees as a

¹ General letter, 3rd October 1829.

² General letter, 13th March 1834.



punishment for the unjustifiable conduct of his people. The fine was not to be given away in charity, lest the Rao Raja should arrogate to himself the merit of the act, and thus weaken the salutary impression which the fine was intended to produce. The money was to be paid over to the Government of India.



SEROHI.

Rise of
British rela-
tions.

The relations between the British government and the Rajput State of Serohi began in 1823. At that time the Rao or Ruler of Serohi was in confinement. In 1818 he had been deposed by the Thakoors for tyranny and oppression, and his younger brother became Regent. Shortly afterwards Serohi was invaded by the Maharaja of Jodhpore, and the Regent begged the protection of the British government. In 1823, the Government of India decided that Serohi was not politically dependent on either Jodhpore or Pahlunpore, both of whom had put forward claims to supremacy. Accordingly the British government concluded a treaty with Serohi, which bore a general resemblance to its treaties with other Rajput rulers; but it provided for the right of the British government to interfere actively and decidedly for the restoration of order and regularity; and it guaranteed the succession to the throne on the death of the Regent, to the heirs of the elder brother, the imprisoned Rao, provided that any such were living at the time.

Condition
of the coun-
try.

The Regent and his Minister expressed themselves highly delighted with having secured the protection of the British government.¹ The coun-

¹ General letter, 10th September 1824.



try was in an extreme state of decay and depopulation, owing to the weakness of the administration, the disobedience of many of the Chiefs, the encroachments of neighbouring States, and the constant ravages and depredations of the Meenas and Bheels. The revenue was trifling. Serohi however was of military importance on account of its central position between Bengal and Bombay, and the great strength of its passes and approaches. In consideration of the impoverished state of the public treasury and country generally, the payment of tribute was excused for three years.

As soon as it was known that Sirohi¹ had been taken under British protection, many of the ryots and merchants, who had fled to the neighbouring countries, returned to their homes. Their lives and property were still threatened by the increasing depredations of the Meenas, and the Regent had neither money nor troops for repressing them. The Government of India guaranteed a loan to be raised by the Serohi State for the maintenance of three hundred Irregulars for police and revenue duties. A detachment of Regular troops was also sent to Serohi to settle the country generally, establish the Rao's authority over his feudatories, and suppress the savage tribe of Meenas.

Military
operations
against wild
tribes.

The military operations were very successful.² Nearly all the rebellious and refractory Thakoors were brought to subjection and obedience; and

Establish-
ment of or-
der.

¹ General letter, 18th September 1825.

² General letter, 31st May 1826.



the Meenas received such severe chastisement that they immediately afterwards began to occupy lands and settle in villages which had been long deserted.

Flight of
the Rao : re-
pentance.

In 1825¹ the Regent Rao collected his family, armed followers, and some of his Thakoors, and suddenly fled from his capital to the hills and jungles. He declared that he would never return unless the article, which guaranteed the succession to the heirs of his elder brother, was expunged from the treaty. He had other complaints, which proved on investigation to be groundless or frivolous. Fortunately for himself, he subsequently repented and returned to his capital, and implored forgiveness. In due course the Government of India pardoned his rash and ungrateful proceedings.

Two ques-
tions at Sero-
hi.

There were two questions at this period which called for an early settlement. In the first place Serohi was still exposed to the raids of the Meenas. Secondly, Jodhpore laid claim to certain collections in Sirohi villages ; and it was on account of these claims that Jodhpore permitted the inroads of the Meenas.

Inroads of
Bheels and
Meenas.

In 1826 and 1827² the continued atrocities committed in Serohi territory by marauders from other States led the people to believe that they were without the pale of British protection. The predatory excursions of Bheels and Meenas from the Jodhpore frontier inflicted the utmost misery.

¹ General letter, 27th July 1826.

² General letter, 3rd July 1829.



Captain Speirs stated that they were driven to this mode of life by the oppressions of their own Chiefs and government. He proposed that the Jodhpore government should put him in direct communication with the Grassia Chiefs, Meenas and Bheels, to the north and westward of the Serohi frontier, to mediate such agreements under British guarantee, as would secure those savage tribes against future ill-treatment by their local officers. He was satisfied that by these means he could establish good order and industry among the wild tribes. All that he wanted was a small body of Irregular troops under the command of a European officer, at the joint expense of Marwar and Serohi.

The Resident at Delhi remarked that the British government, by protecting Serohi against mere banditti, exceeded the spirit of its engagements. Every State was bound to protect itself against robbers. The British government had the right to call on the Maharaja of Jodhpore to restrain his subjects from depredations in other States.

Question
of policy.

The Government of India observed that when existing arrangements were made with Serohi, it was perfectly well known that she could neither defend herself against neighbouring States, nor protect her subjects against marauders, without the help of the British government. Much had been done, but much remained to be done, before Serohi could protect herself out of her own resources. Accordingly the Government of India sanctioned the arrangement proposed by Captain Speirs. The Jodh-

Exception-
al weakness
of Serohi.



pore Contingent, or an equivalent force, was to be employed. Subsequently the Maharaja of Jodhpore adopted measures for establishing a better state of things on the Serohi frontier.

Arrange-
ments with
Grassia Chiefs.

In 1829 it was reported¹ that sufficient funds were not available from the Grassia States and Serohi for the maintenance of a body of troops. Accordingly the Grassia Chiefs were told that they were relieved from certain pecuniary engagements which had been made with them the previous year; and a local force of horse and foot, which had been raised under the name of the Khairwarra Levy, was disbanded. The Grassia Chiefs were further told that they must take their own measures for the preservation of tranquillity in their respective States. The British government could not bear the expense of maintaining troops for their protection against internal disorders.

Bheel out-
rages.

In 1833 eight sepoy soldiers belonging² to the Bombay army were murdered by the Bheels of Serohi on their way down Mount Abo. A demand was made for the apprehension and punishment of the offenders. The Rao of Serohi sent an unsatisfactory reply, and displayed much weakness and imbecility of character. Colonel Lockett, the British Resident, stated his opinion that it might soon be necessary for the British government to assume the direct management of the Serohi State.

¹ General letter, 9th October 1830.

² General letter, 13th March 1834.



The Government of India¹ called for a report from Major Speirs, who had long resided at Serohi. Major Speirs was also directed to explain why the former Rao had been kept so long in confinement. The Government of India also ordered an investigation into the murder case. Major Speirs stated his belief² that if the former Rao was allowed more liberty, there would be more outrages and disturbances than ever. The frontiers were in a disordered state owing to the aggressions of Jodhpore.

Views of
the local au-
thorities.

The murder of the Bombay sepoys by the Bheels of Serohi was again taken into consideration³ by Lord William Bentinck's government at Ootacamund. Colonel Speirs, the Acting Political Agent at Neemuch, was told that His Lordship entirely agreed with the opinion of that officer, that the Serohi government should have the necessity pressed upon it of using increasing exertions for the apprehension of all or any of the accused Bheels; and also that a requisition should be made to that government for the adoption of immediate and decisive steps towards sifting the conduct of an obstructive Thakoor. The subject, it was observed, should never be dropped so long as there was a possibility of bringing to justice any of the parties concerned in this atrocious outrage; and Colonel Speirs was directed to address such representations to the Rao of Serohi as he might deem best calculated to stimulate their efforts for the apprehension of the offenders.

Decisions
of the British
government.

¹ General letter, 10th July 1834.

² General letter, 13th November 1834.

³ General letter, 6th April 1835.



GWALIOR.

Intimate
relations with
the British
government.

The treaties of 1817 and 1818 placed the political relations between the British government and Maharaja Dowlut Rao Sindia on a more intimate footing than had existed under the rule of the Peishwa. The Maharaja frequently requested the aid of British troops to suppress distractions in his dominions.¹ The Government of India considered that extreme cases might arise which would warrant such an interference, but that otherwise it was open to grave objections. In 1821 the Maharaja applied for a detachment of Mahratta Horse belonging to the Subsidiary Force to overawe the mutinous soldiery in his camp; and this application was readily granted, as the employment of a detachment of Mahratta troops was considered to be a very different thing from that of a detachment of a British force.

General
views of
policy.

Major Close, at that time Resident at Gwalior, took a general view of the principles which should guide Political officers in his position; and as the policy he laid down was cordially approved by the Government of India, it may be briefly condensed. The people of Malwa considered that the British government had established its authority through-

¹ General letter, 13th June 1823.



out the country, and that they must look to the British government alone for redress or security against the maladministration of their rulers. On the other hand the texture of Sindia's government was so loose, and so rooted in its propensity to rule by expedients without any reference to remote consequences, that occasions were constantly arising for interference in its internal affairs, and it was not easy to resist the emergency.

Major Close purposed to confine his chief attention to the strict fulfilment of those obligations which had been imposed on the British government; and to secure the protection of the people entitled to it only so far as those obligations were concerned. His chief object therefore would be to secure the rights of the Durbar and its subjects on all matters concerning ourselves, or our allies and dependents; and, when called upon, to secure the reciprocal observance of obligations by Sindia's government. On some rare occasions he might be required to instigate the Gwalior government by moderate expostulations to restrain its officers and servants from the commission of gross acts of outrage and violence; and especially to persuade the Court of Gwalior of the duty of establishing better order, and a new efficient system of government in those parts of its province which adjoined British territories, where a vicious course of management would affect British interests as much as those of the Durbar.

Obligations
and duties.



Friendly understandings.

Subsequently the Government of India considered¹ that His Highness Dowlut Rao Sindia evinced a cordial disposition to cultivate a friendly understanding with the British government; whilst the temper of the Durbar was gradually accommodating itself to the change in its condition, which necessarily resulted from the establishment of the British supremacy in Hindustan. The Maharaja in like manner had reconciled himself to the natural consequences of that event, as affecting his own power and influence in the surrounding States.

Disturbances of a Gwalior Chief in British territory.

In 1823, one of Sindia's chieftains set him at defiance². This man threatened to retire to a village of his own within British territory in the Dekhan. He captured the son-in-law of Sindia, and carried him away as a hostage. Sindia applied for help to the British Resident at Gwalior, who declined to interfere. Subsequently the chieftain entered British territory with two thousand horse and a large rabble following, and threatened mischief. Accordingly the British force at Bhopal was advanced against him and dispersed his forces. At the same time Sindia was informed that the British government would not allow any body of armed men, exceeding three hundred and fifty, to pass from a Foreign State through territory under the protection of the British government, without the sanction of competent British authority.

¹ General letter, 12th September 1823.

² General letter, 10th September 1824.



The same year there was a discussion respecting certain exchanges of territory. The British government was anxious to adjust the frontiers in order to render both territories more compact. It was proposed to assert British sovereignty over all the jaghirs in the Dekhan possessed by Sindia or his subjects; and to withdraw all British protection from its villages within Sindia's dominions.

Proposed
exchanges of
territory.

In 1824¹ there were renewed disturbances amongst Sindia's troops, especially on the Guzerat frontier. The Resident at Gwalior, on the urgent representations of the Baroda authorities, requested Sindia to take some effectual steps for preventing these evils. The Maharaja recalled Man Singh Rao Patunkar, the principal officer of the Gwalior Durbar, in those distant possessions, and appointed another officer to take his place. Man Singh, however, refused to obey orders. The Durbar was in a dilemma. The Maharaja asked for the assistance of the British government. He was told that the British government could not aid him to enforce the obedience of his rebellious subjects, and that he should apply some remedy of his own to these disorders. The Government of India did not consider that the individual case of Man Singh was one which called for British interference. At the same time the Resident at Gwalior was directed to warn Man Singh of the folly of expecting the British government to countenance him in his

Disturbances on the
Guzerat frontier.

¹ General letter, 18th September 1824.



opposition to the orders of his sovereign. Man Singh was also told that the British government might soon find itself unable to remain an unconcerned spectator of commotions and hostilities on the common frontier of Malwa and Guzerat, excited by the rebellion of one of the Maharaja's own officers.

Reluctance
of the Maha-
raja to terri-
torial exchan-
ges.

Meanwhile the Maharaja showed such reluctance¹ to exchanges of territory that the Government of India ordered him to be informed that there was no intention of requiring His Highness to make any sacrifice of territory, or to extort compliance with the demands of the British government. All that was wanted was such exchanges as would rectify the frontier and prove mutually beneficial to both States. Subsequently His Highness agreed to certain concessions as regards Nimar.

Question
of the succes-
sion.

In 1825 the Maharaja was seriously ill,² and the Government of India was anxious that he should either adopt an heir, or name his successor. Sindia would do neither the one or the other. The British government disclaimed all pretensions of regulating or controlling the succession. Meanwhile his wife, Baiza Bai, exercised the power of Regent. The Government of India decided that if military aid should be required under the emergency, it should be furnished; but the Gwalior Durbar would be expected to pay the expenses of the force, and to arrive at a favourable adjustment of all depend-

¹ General letter, 31st May 1826.

² General letter, 18th March 1826.



ing questions as regards Sindia's possessions in the Dekhan, and to co-operate heartily in certain arrangements which were being proposed at that time as regards Malwa opium.

In May 1825 Sindia recovered his health and performed the customary ceremony of bathing.¹ He showed his good-will to the British government by ordering a salute to be fired in honour of the peace with Burma. He tried to come to an amicable arrangement with Man Singh Rao Patunkar, by sending him two lakhs and a half of rupees. Man Singh rejected the offer, and the Maharaja resolved on coercive measures. For a long time the Resident at Gwalior withdrew from all concern in the dispute, but allowed Sindia to employ a detachment of the contingent. Man Singh however was emboldened to commit more acts of violence and outrage. He opened a fire on the detachment in which eighty of Sindia's men were killed or wounded. At last he was reduced by a force² from the Bombay side, but the matter is not very clearly stated in the records. There were many lengthy negotiations with Sindia at this period respecting disturbances within his territories, the propriety of maintaining a police force, and other matters of a personal character, which are now obsolete.

Dowlut Rao Sindia died without³ male issue in March 1827. Before his death the propriety of

Friendly relations: interference forced on the British government.

Death of Dowlut Rao Sindia: adoption of Jan-koji Rao.

¹ General letter, 27th July 1825.

² General letters, 3rd October 1829, and 9th October 1830.

³ Proceedings 26th June 1834, Nos. 2 and 3.



adopting a successor had been represented to him by the British Resident; and five boys of his own family had been sent up from the Dekhan to Gwalior to enable His Highness to make the selection. The Maharaja died without making any selection. After the event, the widow, Baiza Bai, wished to adopt a member of her own family to the exclusion of Sindia's family, but no one could countenance her in an adoption which was universally odious to the Court and camp of Gwalior. Under these circumstances she adopted one of the five boys belonging to the family of Dowlut Rao Sindia. She then married the boy, who was eleven years of age, to her youngest grand-daughter. The new Maharaja was installed on the throne of Gwalior by the British Resident under the name of Jankoji Rao Sindia, being the name of the chief of the family who was slain at the battle of Paniput in 1761.

Question of international law between Gwalior and Kotah.

A curious question of international¹ law arose about this period. A rich banker named Salaja Belal, who had long been in the service of Sindia, died without heirs at Kotah. The Gwalior Durbar laid claim to the inheritance. The Government of India declined to press this claim on the Kotah government. The Gwalior Durbar urged that the British government was bound to interfere under the treaty; especially as the terms of the treaty precluded the Gwalior State from entering into discussions with other princes without the consent of the British government. In reply the

¹ General letter, 8th May 1829.



Durbar was told that they might submit a statement of their claim through the Political Agent. The claim as regards the deceased¹ banker was repeatedly pressed by the Gwalior Durbar with the utmost pertinacity. It was said that certain records belonging to the Gwalior State were amongst the banker's effects. Accordingly the Political Agent at Kotah was called upon to use his good offices with the Kotah government as regards the papers. Meanwhile the Raj Rana of Kotah was appointing a manager to take charge of the banker's property. The Gwalior Durbar protested against the measure. They urged the claim of Sheo Lal, an illegitimate son of the banker who had been expelled from Kotah territory.

The Government of India decided that the Gwalior Durbar might appoint a proper manager to the districts within Gwalior territory, which had been previously rented by the banker; and that the Kotah government should be prevented from all interference. It was explained to the Durbar that the family of the banker were not subjects of Sindia. They were natural born subjects of Kotah, and had been settled and domiciled in Kotah during three generations, or the greater part of a century. They had served Kotah and received jaghirs from Kotah. The banker had been only appointed a vakeel to Sindia; and though the office was hereditary, it was merely nominal, and gave no claim to Sindia to confiscate the property.

Orders of
the Govern-
ment of In-
dia.

¹ General letter, 3rd October 1829.



Question as to the employment of the Gwalior Contingent.

The question of the employment of the Gwalior Contingent¹ at the call of Sindia's government was again brought under the consideration of the Government of India. The Gwalior Durbar had requested the services of the Contingent to reduce some refractory Thakoors. The Resident, Lieutenant-Colonel Fielding, reported that these Thakoors had been unjustly deprived of their possessions by the Gwalior Durbar. Consequently the employment of a force against them commanded by British officers would render the British government an aider and supporter of Sindia's oppression. The Government of India refused to allow the force to be employed against the Thakoors in question.

Intrigues of the Baiza Bai.

At this time the Baiza Bai was intriguing to secure the Regency for life to the exclusion of the young Maharaja who had been adopted after the death of Dowlut Rao Sindia. She kept the prince under restraint; excluded his name from the State seal, and requested the British government to recognise her as Regent for life.

Views of the Government of India.

The Government of India observed that the Baiza Bai had herself adopted the young Maharaja; that the validity of the adoption had been acknowledged by the voice of all parties at Gwalior; that the prince was entitled to assume the government on the termination of his minority. Under these circumstances the British government could not sanction a different arrangement, involving the maintenance of the Baiza Bai, or any other person, in the exercise of

¹ General letter, 14th October, 1830.



sovereign power for life without a manifest violation of the proper and recognised usage of Hindu States. The Government of India was actuated by no other motive than the one prescribed by law and justice. The character and conduct of the Baiza Bai during her Regency had not been such as to render it desirable that she should exercise authority for life. The concession would possibly induce Her Highness to treat the young Maharaja with more kindness ; but the Government of India was not prepared to make such a sacrifice of principle.

The Resident was authorised to tell the Baiza Bai that the Government of India would not recognise as valid any public instrument of the Gwalior State that was not authenticated by the Maharaja's seal ; and that a free and unreserved intercourse must be established between the Resident and the young Maharaja as a check on any ill-usage. The education of the Maharaja was an important question, but the British government could only interfere in the way of advice. The prejudices and ignorance of the Mahrattas, and their attachment to their ancient usages, were such as to preclude any considerable innovations ; and the British government was obliged to rest content with a very moderate improvement in the system of instruction adopted for His Highness. Should the Baiza Bai threaten to retire altogether from the Regency, the Resident was not to attempt to dissuade her from her purpose ; he was merely to observe and report all that passed, accompanied with an expression of his own views as to the administration of the country.

Claims of
the young
Maharaja.



Lord William Bentinck's visit to Gwalior.

In December 1832,¹ the Governor-General Lord William Bentinck being on a tour in the Upper Provinces, paid a visit to the Court of Gwalior. For a long time he had expected to be finally called upon to decide between the claims of Maharaja Jankoji Rao Sindia and those of the Baiza Bai. Meanwhile the Gwalior Durbar was agitated by doubts and conjectures; the Baiza Bai was afraid of being deprived of her authority; the young Maharaja was in dread of being excluded from all power.

Complaints of the Maharaja.

During the conferences the Maharaja gave vent to vehement complaints against the Baiza Bai. She not only ill-treated him, but he suspected her of designing to adopt a kinsman of her own as successor to the throne of Sindia. He urged that his age and capacity fitted him for assuming the reins of government, and begged the Governor-General to instal him on the throne.

Views of Lord William Bentinck: obligations of the British government.

As far as the rights of the Maharaja were concerned, Lord William Bentinck was of opinion that Jankoji Rao Sindia possessed the same right to the throne as if he had been the lawfully begotten son of Dowlut Rao Sindia. As regards the obligations of the British government, the succession of Baiza Bai had been equally in accordance with the will of Dowlut Rao Sindia, and had followed his death without any interference on the part of the British government. As regards the subsequent adoption, the British government had so far interfered as to urge the propriety of the measure; to approve and sanction it when made by the Baiza Bai; and to

¹ Separate letter, 23th June 1833.



require the use of the seal of the adopted Maharaja in all public transactions. This interference had been exercised exclusively for the good of the country, and according to the supposed wishes of the people, in order to prevent the evils of a disputed succession. Lastly, the Government of India had expressly declined to guarantee the claims of the Baiza Bai to be formally acknowledged as Regent for life, which determination had since been approved by the Court of Directors.

These circumstances seemed to His Lordship to point to the propriety of abstaining from all interference in the present question. It was not clear whether such interposition was in unison with the wishes of the people, or in furtherance of their benefit; and the British government was not bound to exercise judicial cognisance in the case. This was not modified by personal experiences. The country seemed to be prosperous and flourishing. The rule of the Baiza Bai appeared to be firm and able, and as just as could be expected from a native administration. As far as could be ascertained, there was no party opposed to her interests. There was thus no motive for interference, and nothing to justify it. Jankoji Rao Sindia was intelligent, but very young, and was said to have an ungovernable temper. Lord William Bentinck was therefore of opinion that justice and policy alike forbade any interposition. But there was nothing to debar the British government from interfering as the paramount power, should such interference become necessary to secure tranquillity and promote the public welfare.

Non-interference in behalf of the Maharaja.



No one else
to be adopted.

His Lordship accordingly informed the Maharaja that the Government of India would not interfere to place him in full power; it would, however, prevent the Baiza Bai from adopting any one else, so long as he conducted himself obediently to her wishes, and abstained from all attempts to shake her authority, before the time arrived for his own elevation to the government. The Baiza Bai was recommended by His Lordship to treat the Maharaja with kindness, and not to regard him with harsh and resentful feelings.

Disinter-
estedness of
the British
government.

These assurances allayed all apprehensions, and appeared to satisfy, not only the parties concerned, but the whole court. All were alike assured that the Government of India was entirely disinterested, and had been actuated by no other motive than to secure the welfare and prosperity of Sindia's dominions. Sir Charles Metcalfe and Mr. Ross concurred in these views, that it was not incumbent on the British government to interfere in the affairs of Gwalior for the purpose of establishing or excluding the authority of the Maharaja, if interference could be avoided.

Views of
Sir Charles
Metcalfe.

Sir Charles Metcalfe however was of opinion that it would be extremely difficult for the British government, as the paramount power, to avoid interference. He considered that the appearance of support which had been given to the Baiza Bai was a virtual interference in her favour, not to be avoided without a declaration in favour of the Maharaja. The right lay with the Maharaja as the



heir and successor of Dowlut Rao Sindja. The Bai was only entitled to rule during¹ his minority, after which she must be considered as a usurper. She was however in possession, and as long as she was supported by the public opinion of the State, that is of all the military chiefs of power and influence, it did not behove the British government to enforce the rights of the Maharaja. Should however a division be found to exist, and a civil war broke out affecting British interests, or the general tranquillity of India, interference would certainly be in favour of the Maharaja. Under such circumstances it would be best for the Government of India to avow, whenever occasion might arise, that it was convinced of the right of the Maharaja; but that so long as the Thakoors remained satisfied with the rule of the Regent Baiza Bai, it would abstain from all interference.

In the following July 1833¹, a revolution broke out in Gwalior, in which all the troops and Thakoors, except the Baiza Bai's own kinsmen, declared for the Maharaja. The result was that Jankoji Rao Sindia assumed the administration of affairs, and the Baiza Bai, having taken refuge in the British Residency, finally retired from Gwalior. In August 1833² a royal salute was fired from the ramparts of Fort William in recognition of the accession of Jankoji Rao Sindia.

Revolution
in favour of
the Maharaja.

¹ Separate letter, 31st August 1833.

² Separate letter, 19th December 1833.



Nature and
duties of the
Gwalior Con-
tingent.

The same year the question¹ was revived as to the nature and duties of the Gwalior Contingent. Lord William Bentinck observed that Sindia's government seemed perfectly willing to continue the maintenance of the force on the existing footing, because it gave them strength and importance in the eyes of their neighbours and subjects. Moreover such a force was of use to the British government in preventing the turbulent and disaffected tribes of Central India from availing themselves of the separate and independent jurisdictions to re-establish the Pindari system. At the same time the services of the Contingent were to be strictly confined to its legitimate objects. If employed in matters of internal administration, the residue of British officers should be withdrawn. Otherwise those officers might be employed in ousting or putting down jaghirdars or native Rajas, of whom the British government knew nothing, and who were likely to be injured people; or they might be taking part in disputes for political power at the capital.

Dacoities
and boundary
disputes.

The prevalence of dacoities in the neighbourhood of Gwalior, and the defective state of the police, were brought by the British Resident to the notice of the Government of India. Complaints were also received respecting the movements of Sindia's troops on the frontier during the adjustment of boundary disputes between the authorities of Sindia and those of Ameer Khan. The Government of India ruled that there were no objections

¹ General letter, 13th March 1834.



to independent States coming to an amicable settlement amongst themselves as regards such disputes, but a military demonstration on the frontier was a very different affair.

The same year¹ there had been a collision between Sindia's officials and some dāk-runners in the service of the British government respecting the payment of duties. The Government of India referred the matter to the Resident at Gwalior, expressing the hope that the Durbar would perceive the impropriety of detaining dāk-runners. In case of misbehaviour it would be better for the Aumil to represent the matter to the nearest British functionary, which would ensure immediate redress.

Collision
between Gwa-
lior officials
and British
dāk-runners.

In 1834, Mr. Cavendish, the Resident at Gwalior, raised a question² as regards the Grassia Chiefs who received tunkahs. Lord William Bentinck observed that the conditions under which the Grassias received their tunkahs were generally specified at the time the settlements were made; but His Lordship was not aware that dependence, real or nominal, upon the authority who paid the tunkah, formed any parts of those conditions. With all the Grassias it was probably a condition, expressed or implied, that they should keep the peace within their limits, as well as refrain from committing depredations. Their neglect to fulfil such conditions formed a fit subject for sub-

Question as
regards the
Grassia
Chiefs.

¹ General letter, 10th July 1834.

² General letter, 6th April 1835.



sequent investigation ; but the bare charge of their having so misbehaved could not justify the suspension of their stipends. To withhold payment would be the most likely means of instigating the Grassias to return to the irregular course of life, from which it was the object of the guarantee to reclaim them. The Resident was accordingly instructed to secure the punctual discharge of the Grassias claims by Sindia's government. Any misconduct could be investigated by the officers within whose jurisdiction they might be located.



INDORE.

Nothing of importance respecting Indore or Holkar is entered in the General letters to Europe between 1818 and 1825. In 1826 the Government of India reported¹ that there was continued and unbroken tranquillity throughout Malwa. No occurrences had happened of any importance. Mulhar Rao Holkar dismissed his Minister for undue familiarity with his mother, and a new Minister was appointed. The British government was adverse to this arrangement, but refrained from all interference. Non-interference of the British government.

In 1828 Mr. Wellesley, the Resident in Malwa, was ordered² to withdraw the police posts from the high road from Malwa to Guzerat. He objected that the cost was only nine hundred rupees per mensem, and that the petty States traversed by the road refused to pay the money. The Government of India refused to maintain police posts in countries not under its jurisdiction, and ordered the charge of the roads to be made over to the native governments. Removal of British police posts.

In 1829, under the head of Indore, there are lengthy reports of the proceedings³ of Captain Operations against Thuggee.

¹ General letter, 28th July 1828.

² General letter, 3rd October 1829.

³ General letter, 14th October 1830.



Borthwick against the Thugs. Forty prisoners were condemned and executed as leaders of gangs of stranglers; twenty-one were transported and kept to hard labour for life; twelve were condemned to labour for shorter periods; and one, a boy of eight or nine years of age, was sent to his native country, and set at liberty.

Question of
a refractory
Bheel.

The case of Jugga Rawul, a Bheel Chief, who had been imprisoned at Asirghur, was taken into consideration under instructions from the Court of Directors. Conciliatory measures had been tried with this man, but proved a failure. He broke the engagements he had made, and was the terror of the neighbourhood, until military operations compelled him to surrender. The Rawul of Banswarra recently applied for his release, and promised to be security for his good conduct; he had even urged that the release of Jugga Rawul would help him in the management of the Bheels. The Raja of Pertabghur, who had equally suffered from the man's depredations, strongly objected to his release. Major Stewart, the Resident at Indore, believed that the Rawul of Banswarra had been influenced by mercenary motives in requesting the release of this Bheel.

Disturbances
amongst
the Bheels.

In 1833 there were disturbances amongst the Bheel tribes¹ in the Vindhya mountains on the north of the Nerbudda river. Mr. Martin, the Resident at Indore, submitted a letter from Captain Outram, who was employed against the Bheels in

¹ General letter, 13th March 1834.



the Satpura range to the south of the river. Captain Outram drew attention to the system instituted by Sir John Malcolm for conciliating the Bheel tribes. He noticed the bad effects arising from the abolition of the Bhopawar Agency, and proposed the appointment of Captain Pettingall to carry on the political duties of that station. The Government of India appointed Captain Pettingall as a local Agent at Bhopawur, to bring about a pacification of the Bheels in that quarter.

Maharaja Mulhar Rao Holkar died on the 15th October 1833¹. The son of Bapoo Holkar was adopted as successor to the throne of Indore. The Government of India saw no objection to the adoption. The usual letter of condolence was sent to the widowed Rani. Lord William Bentinck observed that the Government of India was not bound to support this arrangement if it should be found to be illegal, or subversive of the rights of any other party, or contrary to the wishes of the majority of the Chiefs and followers of the Holkar State.

Death of
Mulhar Rao
Holkar: ques-
tion of adop-
tion.

Mr. Martin, the Resident at Indore, had strongly urged the necessity for the active interference of the British government, through its representative, in the future administration of Holkar's government. Lord William Bentinck saw nothing in his arguments that would not equally apply to the administration of any other State during a minority. If the apprehension of mismanagement justified the assump-

Policy of
non-interfer-
ence laid down
by Lord Wil-
liam Ben-
tineck.

¹ Separate letter, 31st July 1834.



tion of the internal administration of Indore, other States in India would view the proceedings of the British government with jealousy and distrust ; they would regard their own independence as resting on a very insecure basis. As regards the interests of the British government, it would incur all the odium attaching to measures of necessary economy, without deriving any benefit from assuming the government of the country. The Government of India accordingly determined to abide by the salutary system of non-interference. This resolution was not to prevent the Resident from offering his advice whenever it might be sought, or from making such suggestions as were calculated to promote the prosperity of the State.

Rival claimants to the succession.

Meanwhile the existence of two other claimants was noticed :—

1st.—Huri Holkar, the son of the eldest illegitimate brother of the late Jaswant Rao Holkar. This man had been in prison for rebellion ever since 1819. Mr. Martin observed that Huri Holkar could have no legitimate claim to the inheritance of his late cousin, which according to Hindu law belonged of right to the adopted son. If no adoption had been made, and expediency had been the only guide, the mature age of Huri Holkar would have justified the propriety of recognising him as the successor to the Raj.

2nd.—An infant son, recently born of a woman of the late Maharaja Mulhar Rao Holkar, of whom His Highness was the acknowledged father.



The Government of India informed the Resident at Indore that it had no intention of departing from its policy of non-interference. British influence however would not be exerted to maintain the present order of things, if opposed to the general wish of the country. The Government of India would not pronounce upon the relative superiority of the three claimants to the throne of Indore, namely, the adopted son, the collateral relative, and the posthumous son. The decision must be left to the general voice of the country. The duty of the British government was to maintain whatever arrangement might appear to be unequivocally consonant with the general will. On one point the British government would not remain passive. If Huri Holkar obtained the throne, British influence would be used to prevent vindictive measures towards his old opponents.

British government refuses to interfere.

Reports were subsequently received from the Resident of the unsettled state of affairs at Indore. Efforts were being made for the release of Huri Holkar, whose claim to the throne was acknowledged by the general voice.

Agitation in behalf of Huri Holkar.

Replies to the Governor-General's letters of condolence were received from the widowed Rani and others. A day was fixed for the investiture of the adopted son. The ceremony was carried out on the 17th January 1834. The new Maharaja ascended the throne under the name of Martand Rao Holkar.

Investiture of Martand Rao Holkar.

In the following April Huri Rao Holkar was released from confinement by a body of armed men and proclaimed as the head of the Indore State. The

Revolution in favour of Huri Rao Holkar.



Durbar importuned for the interference of the British government. The Resident was told to continue his intercourse with the existing authorities, so long as they maintained their present position. If Huri Rao Holkar subverted their authority and established his own, the Resident was to regard him as the sovereign of the State.

Protracted
struggle.

The protracted struggle led to a deplorable state of affairs. Lord William Bentinck trusted that it would not be of long continuance. The commotions were very serious at Indore, because Huri Rao Holkar refused to receive a deputation from the Durbar. The Rani mother appealed to the Resident for advice; he persuaded her to relinquish the struggle and permit Huri Rao Holkar to assume the sovereignty. The authority of Huri Rao Holkar was universally acknowledged throughout the country. Nothing was wanting to stem the tide of anarchy but the presence of Huri Rao Holkar at Indore.

Huri Rao
Holkar escorted
to Indore
by British
troops.

At last Lord William Bentinck complied with a request of Huri Rao Holkar for a party of British troops to escort him to the capital. This measure, His Lordship remarked, was consonant alike to policy and humanity, while it involved no departure from the policy of non-interference.

Invested by
the British
government.

Huri Rao Holkar arrived at Indore, and assumed the sovereignty amidst the acclamations of all classes. The Government of India conferred on him a khillut of investiture.

Growing
anarchy.

In May every hope that Huri Rao Holkar would



rule with a firm and energetic hand was utterly disappointed. The affairs of Indore fell into a melancholy state. Lord William Bentinck saw that some steps must be taken to prevent the spread of desolation and misery. His Lordship sent an impressive admonition to Huri Rao Holkar.

In 1834 there were fresh complaints against the oppressions of Huri Rao Holkar towards the son of the former Minister. As Lord William Bentinck had already addressed serious remonstrances to Huri Rao Holkar, he did not deem it necessary to make a separate communication to him on this individual complaint. But the Resident was authorised to tell Huri Rao that His Lordship had heard with deep concern the apparent want of consideration shown to the just claims of one, from whose family the Holkar State had received such able and faithful service.

Fresh complaints against
Huri Rao
Holkar.

¹ General letter, 6th July 1835.



BHOPAL.

Regency of
the Kudsia
Begum.

Shortly after the conclusion of the treaty of 1818, the Nawab of Bhopal was killed by the accidental discharge of a pistol in the hands of a child. He had no son, but he left one daughter, known as the Secunder Begum. He was succeeded by a nephew, a mere child, who was ultimately to marry the Secunder Begum. Meanwhile the Regency was entrusted to the mother of the Secunder Begum, who was known as the Kudsia Begum.

Conspiracy
against the
Begum.

In 1821 Major Henley, the Political Agent at Bhopal, had been obliged more than once to interfere in the administration.¹ The Nawab was still young; the Dewan, or chief Minister, was devoid of energy; and some of the principal Chiefs were usurping his authority. There was a failure of credit and resources. A plot was formed for the destruction of the Regent Begum. Major Henley called on the Officer Commanding at Hoshungabad to hold the troops in readiness to advance. The measure proved successful. The plot was suppressed, and the leaders were banished or deprived of their posts. A native official of character and capacity was associated with the Dewan as Joint Minister.

¹ General letter, 13th June 1823.



In 1824 several members of the Patan aristocracy of Bhopal were dissatisfied¹ with the Begum and Ministers; they fancied they had been treated with neglect. A compromise was effected by admitting two of the party into the administration. Compromise.

In 1828 serious disputes broke out between the Regent Begum and the young Nawab². The Begum utterly refused to give her daughter in marriage to the young Nawab. It is needless to enter into details of this quarrel³. The Government of India had acknowledged the young Nawab as the lawful successor to the throne of Bhopal. Subsequently the young Nawab disclaimed all intention of assuming the administration unless it was conferred on him by the Regent Begum. It was alleged that he was physically disqualified for marriage. In the end the Nawab withdrew his claim to be married to the Secunder Begum, and with it abandoned all pretensions to the throne. It was agreed that his younger brother should become Nawab, and be married in due course to the Secunder Begum. Disputes between the Kudsia Begum and the young Nawab.

In 1833 the Minister died,⁴ and the Begum Regent appointed her own brother to the office of Minister. Appointment of Minister. The Government of India informed the Resident at Indore, that so long as the Begum continued to be Regent of the State, she must be unfettered in the choice of a Minister; and that there was no ground

¹ General letter, 31st May 1826.

² Separate letter, 10th April 1829.

³ Separate letter, 8th May 1829.

⁴ General letter, 10th July 1834.



for the interference of the British government in such a question.

Action of
the Kudsia
Begum.

The Resident also reported that the Begum was trying to extort the consent of the Nawab to the maintenance of her own plans of administration beyond the time when the Regency should cease. The Government of India observed that no promise of a prejudicial nature obtained from the Nawab during his minority would be deemed binding upon him after he had attained to years of discretion. This view was to be distinctly explained to the Begum Regent.

Conditions
signed by the
young Nawab.

Subsequently the Resident reported that the young Nawab had been induced to sign a paper giving his consent to the following conditions proposed by the Begum :—

1st.—That he would never marry any other wife than the Secunder Begum.

2nd.—That he would be obedient in all things to the Secunder Begum.

3rd.—That he would never call his parents to him except in cases of emergency.

The Nawab, however, had refused to recognise the Begum Regent's brother in the capacity of Minister.

Conspiracy
at Bhopal.

In 1834 an alleged conspiracy was reported by the sons of the Minister who died in 1833 in concert with the parents of the Nawab. The object was to subvert the existing state of affairs in Bhopal; in other words to overthrow the authority of the Begum Regent and her brother the Minister.

¹ General letter, 7th September 1835.



The Political Agent, Mr. Wilkinson, reported the measures he had taken to frustrate the designs of the conspirators. The Government of India approved of his proceedings, but demurred at one of his expressions of opinion. Mr. Wilkinson seemed to think that the British government was bound to interfere in the internal affairs of Bhopal for the purpose of maintaining the existing order of things against the designs of the conspirators.

Question of interference.

The Government of India observed that the British government was certainly bound to protect Bhopal against foreign aggression. But an attempt to effect a change in the administration could not be considered as an act of foreign aggression, which required the British government to step in for the protection of the Bhopal State. Mr. Wilkinson however had acted rightly and properly in cautioning the neighbouring Chiefs against affording any countenance or encouragement to the conspirators.

Views of the Government of India.

Mr. Wilkinson was told to take every favourable opportunity afforded by these occurrences of impressing on the Begum Regent the necessity for a strict performance of the engagements into which she had entered with regard to the British alliance and the future prospects of the young Nawab.

Remonstrances with the Kudsia Begum.



NURSINGPORE.

Murder of
the Minister
by the Re-
gent.

The Raja of Nursinghur, a person of mean intellect and imbecile character, had abdicated the throne.¹ His son Cheyn Singh became Regent. About the end of 1823 the Minister of Nursinghur was murdered under circumstances of great atrocity. At the first the ex-Raja was suspected of being implicated in the murder. Ultimately it was proved that his son, the Regent, was the murderer. Cheyn Singh then openly avowed the crime, and pleaded that the Minister had been justly put to death for his haughty and overbearing conduct.

British in-
terference.

The Government of India felt that in its capacity as the paramount power it was bound to punish the crime. Cheyn Singh was told to retire into Hindustan with a small body of followers; and informed that a suitable provision would be made for him until his contrition should induce the British government to restore him.

Punish-
ment of the
Regent.

Cheyn Singh promised compliance, but evidently prepared for resistance. Persuasion was wasted on him. A detachment of British troops was ordered up, but still he did not move, and his armed followers began hostile operations. At last his position was attacked, and after a desperate resistance,

¹ General letter, 31st May 1826.



he was defeated and slain with forty-five of his followers.

The Government of India lamented the loss of life, but considered that Cheyn Singh deserved his fate. Had he escaped to the jungles at the head of his desperate band of outlaws, he might have become the terror and scourge of the whole country.

Danger
averted.



DHAR.

Adoption
by the widow.

The Raja of Dhar died in 1834. The Resident at Gwalior reported¹ that Jaswant Rao Powar had been adopted by the widow of the deceased Raja, and placed upon the throne with the acquiescence of all the parties concerned.

Necessity
for the sanc-
tion of the
British gov-
ernment.

The Government of India would not refuse its consent to a measure which had been ratified by the Dhar authorities; but remarked that the arrangement ought to have been first submitted for the sanction of the British government. The despatch of a khillut of investiture was delayed so long as there was any prospect of a competition for the throne of Dhar.

Unsettled
prospects.

Mr. Bax, the Resident at Indore, subsequently reported² the removal of the Dhar Minister, Bappoo Rughonath, by the young Rani; he feared that the step taken would prove very injurious to the Dhar State. The Government of India remarked that if these anticipations were realised, it was much to be deplored, but there seemed to be no legitimate means by which the injurious effect could be averted.

¹ General letter, 6th April 1835.

² General letter, 7th September 1835.



JABOOAH.

In 1833, the Raja of Jabooah died¹, and was succeeded by an adopted son. A younger son, named Moti Singh, was anxious to assume the administration during the minority. The elder Rani and the principal Thakoors were opposed to this arrangement.

Disputes
regarding the
Regency.

The Resident thought that the British government should interfere. The Government of India however ruled that there was no ground for departing from its policy of non-interference. Any attempt at coercing the younger son would be attended with odium. The Jabooah State was in a position to arrange the difficulty without British aid.

Non-inter-
ference.

There was an objection to confer the khillut of investiture, as Holkar's government had a probable claim to exercise the privilege.² The Government of India, however, had invested a former Raja of Jabooah, and no objection had been raised by the Indore Durbar. Moreover no claim had been put forward by the Holkar State in the present instance. Accordingly the khillut of investiture was conferred according to the established precedent.

Khillut of
investiture.

¹ General letter, 13th March 1834.

² General letter, 10th July 1834.



Continued
dissensions.

In 1834¹ there were long pending dissensions in Jabooah, originating in a struggle for the supremacy between the guardian of the minor Raja and Moti Singh, the brother of the deceased Raja. The Resident at Indore reported² a renewal of aggressions in Jabooah by Moti Singh. He was directed to refrain from all intervention, beyond making it known that the British government would not interfere with the people of Jabooah in their election of a ruler.

¹ General letter, 6th April 1835.

² General letter, 7th September 1835.



BUNDELKUND.

In 1821, Mr. Maddock, the Acting Agent to the Governor-General, reported¹ the generally peaceable state of Bundelkund. Hostilities between the Chiefs and their Jaghirdars had been comparatively unfrequent during the previous year, but some disputes still remained to be settled in order to ensure tranquillity.

General
condition of
Bundelkund.

The highway between Saugor and Bundelkund was exposed to constant robberies and murders. The road traversed the territories of Punnah, Bijawar and Churkaree; and reparation and punishment were impossible, owing to the defective condition of the police in those States and the neighbouring jaghirs. It was recommended that these States should be required to clear the jungle on either side of the road for the space of a hundred yards; and that each should maintain guards at intervals within his territory for the protection of travellers. If a robbery or murder was committed, and the offenders were not apprehended, the village in which the crime had been perpetrated was to be liable to forfeiture with sufficient lands in the vicinity to maintain a police establishment.

State of the
highways.

Subsequently it appeared "that cases of murder by a certain class called Thugs" were very

Discovery
of Thuggee.

¹ General letter, 13th June 1823.



frequent in the Bundelkund States. Accordingly a further report was called for.¹

Obligations
of the British
government
to interfere.

In 1822 the question² was raised of whether the British government had renounced the right acquired by the treaty of Poona to protect jaghirdars from the usurpations of the local Bundelkund rulers. The Government of India decided that it had never relinquished the right of interference for the correction of acts of gross and flagrant violence or oppression, committed by any of the dependent Bundelkund chieftains, even against their own subjects. Such a right naturally and necessarily flowed from the actual relations subsisting between the parties. It could not be relinquished without depriving the British government of one of its most powerful means of rendering its paramount authority conducive to the welfare and tranquillity of the country. This interference however was to be limited to cases clearly demanding it. There was no necessity for the British government going out of its way to interfere in jaghirs granted by the independent chieftains or their ancestors. But when the good faith of the British government was involved in the maintenance of such grants, or when a general and indiscriminate resumption of jaghirs was carried out by a ruling chieftain, as might lead to disorder, the Government of India was bound to interfere. The holders of grants from the Peishwa stood on a different footing.

¹ General letter, 12th September 1823.

² General letter, 10th September 1824.



In their case the Government of India might be bound to interfere. But the Peishwa seemed to have limited his interference to Mahratta Brahmans, a class which was the least likely to suffer positive injustice from their Hindu Chiefs, and were the best able to defend themselves. It was not therefore likely that any cause of this kind could arise, which would call for British interference.

In 1825, a serious disturbance¹ was created by a petty jaghirdar, known as Nunnee Pundit. He raised a force to resist some order of his local superior, the Chief of Jaloun. Mr. Ainslie, the Agent to the Governor-General, ordered him to disband his force. The Nunnee Pundit then attacked the fortress of Culpee, but was repulsed by a detachment of Native Infantry, and his force was dispersed. He fled into Sindia's territory, but was given up by the Maharaja. He was henceforth imprisoned in the Fort of Chunar. The Chief of Jaloun confiscated his jaghir.

Insurrection
of the Nunnee
Pundit.

During the first Burmese war the Chiefs of Bundelkund offered sums of money towards the expenditure. The amounts were accepted as subscriptions to the public loan; and the Chiefs were encouraged to vest a portion of their hoarded wealth in these securities.

Contributions
towards
the Burmese
war.

In 1834 the Agent of the Governor-General for Bundelkund reported² the death of the Raja of Oorcha, and the succession of a younger brother.

Massacre
at Oorcha.

¹ General letter, 27th July 1826.

² General letter, 7th September 1835.



He added that the demise of the Raja had been followed by a massacre, but that the cause and particulars were unknown; and that he did not consider himself authorised to institute any minute enquiry into the matter without previous sanction.

Duty of the
British gov-
ernment to
interfere.

The Government of India replied that on the occurrence of such an extraordinary atrocity as that to which the Agent alluded, it was both the right and the duty of the paramount power to learn all the circumstances connected with the catastrophe, in order to punish the actors, or at any rate save itself from the indignity of countenancing its perpetrators. A full report was called for, both as regards the massacre, and the extent to which the right of the younger brother had been recognized by the people of Oorcha.

Complaints
of the Raja
of Jhansi
against his
own subjects.

In 1834 the Governor-General received letters from the Raja of Jhansi complaining of the devastation of his country by his rebellious subjects, and of the assistance awarded them by neighbouring States.

The Agent for Bundelkund was told that the Raja's allegations were of a serious nature, and this was not the first time they had been advanced. The Agent was further told to state how far they were well founded; also to report upon the present condition of Jhansi territory.



SUMPTHUR.

Sumpthur is one of the three States in Bundelkund that have concluded formal treaties with the British government. In 1827 the Raja of Sumpthur died.¹ The elder Rani had no children. The younger Rani had an infant son who succeeded to the throne. The first question to be decided was the appointment of a Manager to conduct the affairs of Sumpthur under the control of the Rani mother, and to act as guardian to the infant Raja.

Death of
the Raja.

At this period there were two parties in Sumpthur. One was headed by Bahadur Singh, the uncle of the infant Raja, and was more or less supported by the elder Rani who was childless. The other party was headed by Omrut Singh, the chief Minister who had long enjoyed the confidence of the deceased Raja. It was also supposed that Omrut Singh was supported by the Rani mother.

Two parties
at Sumpthur,
the uncle and
the Minister.

Mr. Ainslie, the Agent of the Governor-General for the States of Bundelkund, was opposed to the appointment of Bahadur Singh as Manager. Bahadur Singh was an ambitious man, and his nearness of kin rendered it dangerous to entrust him with the guardianship of the minor Raja. Accordingly Mr. Ainslie reported to the Government of India

Objections
to the uncle:
appointment
of Minister as
Manager.

¹ Special letter, 10th April 1829.



that he had requested Omrut Singh to continue to conduct the affairs of Sumpthur as Manager; and that he expected shortly to be informed of the views of the Rani mother as regards the future administration of Sumpthur.

Dissensions. Dissensions had broken out between the two parties in Sumpthur, very shortly after the death of the Raja in 1827. The Killadar or Commander of the fort of Sumpthur was murdered. Omrut Singh suppressed the disorders and placed some restraint upon Bahadur Singh; but was induced shortly afterwards to remove the sentries.

**Arrest of
the Minister.**

Subsequently Omrut Singh was one day about to leave the fort, when he found himself a prisoner. Bahadur Singh had closed the gates, and assumed the chief authority. Mr. Ainslie sent an order to the usurper to restore Omrut Singh to his authority as Manager. Bahadur Singh was also called upon to attend the Agent's camp. Mr. Ainslie assured Bahadur Singh of personal security, and promised to enquire into his alleged grievances. Bahadur Singh agreed to come, but afterwards excused himself on the score of rheumatism.

**Opposition
of the Rani
mother to the
Minister.**

Mr. Ainslie deputed a native official to learn the wishes of the Rani mother. At the interview which followed, the Rani mother distinctly stated that she was averse to Omrut Singh retaining his power. Mr. Ainslie proposed an interview with the Rani mother at a place about twenty miles from Sumpthur. Meanwhile he applied to the Government of India for orders as to the protection



of the young Raja, and the interests of the State ; he remarked that both objects would be promoted by a display of military force.

The Government of India issued orders to the following effect. Military preparations were premature. It was not to be assumed that the usurping party in the Raj would resist the final decision of the British government. Before that decision could be arrived at, the real merits must be fully investigated and reported. The season allowed ample time for enquiry, explanation, remonstrance, and negotiation, whilst maintaining a tone and attitude becoming the dignity of the British government in a matter in which its authority had been somewhat set at defiance.

Orders of
the Govern-
ment of In-
dia.

The Government of India observed that there was a doubt as to who was to be considered the legitimate head of the State of Sumpthur during the minority ; and consequently as to who possessed the right of appointing a Manager. It was a question whether the elder Rani or the Rani mother possessed that authority. It was however abundantly manifest that Omrut Singh, whatever might be his abilities and fitness for the trust, was extremely unpopular with all parties at Sumpthur. It was even doubtful whether he possessed the good-will of the Rani mother, who had been supposed to favour him.

Question as
to right of
appointing a
Manager.

Mr. Ainslie was ordered to proceed at once to Sumpthur ; to order the release of Omrut Singh ; to ascertain who was the legitimate Regent of Sumpthur ; to enquire what were the established usages

Investiga-
tion ordered.



of the Raj as regards the government of the country during minorities ; to find out the general feeling of the chiefs and people as regards the appointment of a Manager. The Government of India was prepared to recognise any man as Manager—Bahadur Singh, Omrut Singh, or any other official—provided only that the appointment was in accordance with the popular voice, and approved by the legitimate Regent.

Dhuleep
Singh appointed
Manager
by the Rani
Regent.

Mr. Ainslie went to Sumpthur. He restored confidence by placing the minor Raja on the throne. He reported that the Rani mother was Regent ; that she desired the appointment of Dhuleep Singh as Manager. This man was the eldest son of the Killadar of Sumpthur fort, who had been murdered. Next to Omrut Singh he was considered by all parties to be fitted for the post.

Acquies-
cence of the
British gov-
ernment.

The Government of India ordered Mr. Ainslie to inform the Rani Regent and Dhuleep Singh that it concurred in the nomination of a Manager selected by the Rani Regent and the assembled Chiefs.

Satisfac-
tory settle-
ment.

In May following it was reported¹ that the settlement of Sumpthur was satisfactory. The new Manager Dhuleep Singh was approved by the Rani Regent and all the ladies of the zenana. The whole Goorgur tribe, who constituted the ruling and predominant class in Sumpthur, were equally well disposed towards him. Bahadur Singh had disappeared from Sumpthur.

¹ General letter, 8th May 1829.



In 1829 fresh disturbances broke out in Sumpthur and sanguinary outrages were committed.¹ The Rani Regent, however, vindicated the authority which her party seemed to possess. Mr. Ainslie reported that the Rani Regent was completely under the control of an officer named Khas Qualum; that Khas Qualum had become the virtual Manager of the Raj; that unless he was deprived of power there was no hope of any improvement in the affairs of Sumpthur. The Agent further reported that the country was torn by faction and drifting into anarchy; and he feared that Sumpthur would be utterly ruined before the Raja attained his majority. He recommended that a native agent should be deputed to Sumpthur to act as a check upon Khas Qualum, and upon the party opposed to his elevation.

Disturb-
ances and
anarchy.

The Government of India regretted the state of affairs at Sumpthur, but did not consider that it was bound to interfere for the purpose of setting up a new ministry, and regulating the internal affairs. The British government was not responsible for the anarchy in Sumpthur, and could not apply a remedy without revolutionising the institutions of the country. The very existence of such a state of things presented in itself a strong additional motive for sedulously avoiding authoritative interference, of which the success was very doubtful.

British gov-
ernment re-
fuses to inter-
fere.

¹ General letter, 9th October 1829.



Rani Regent the legitimate head of the State.

Mr. Ainslie was directed to abstain from manifesting any extraordinary interest in behalf of the ex-Manager Omrut Singh, or any other minister who was out of power. Any leaning on his part would only encourage intrigues against the Rani Regent, or an open opposition to her authority. She was the legitimate head of the government during the minority of the Raja. No sanction could be given to the proposal to depute a native agent to act as a check upon Khas Qualum and her party.

Destruction of the ex-Minister.

In January 1830 there were fresh scenes of bloodshed and outrage.¹ The Rani Regent sent a large force against the fort of Bassoobee, where Omrut Singh had taken up his residence. Before the fort was stormed, Omrut Singh built up a large funeral pile, and placed his family and property upon it. A quantity of gunpowder was placed underneath the pile. The powder was fired and the whole was blown into the air. The fort was immediately attacked, and Omrut Singh, and all who adhered to his fortunes, perished in the storming of the place.

Regrets and disapproval of the British government.

The Government of India expressed its extreme regret and disapprobation. Omrut Singh had courted his fate; the tragic circumstances were his own act. The Rani Regent might have good reasons for wishing to dispossess him from the fort, although those she assigned had little validity. Omrut Singh had opposed her orders, and so far had

¹ General letter, 14th October 1830.



placed himself in opposition to her government. Nevertheless it was too probable that the Rani and her party had deliberately resolved on his destruction, in order to gratify their revenge, and effect the removal of a hated political opponent. The discredit of the sanguinary and deplorable catastrophe, which followed their unjust attack upon Omrut Singh, as well as the responsibility of it, must necessarily fall upon the administration of the Rani Regent.

Mr. Ainslie was directed to communicate to the Rani Regent the strong feelings of concern and dissatisfaction excited in the mind of the Government of India; to express in unreserved language its disapprobation of outrages and oppression in protected States. The moral influence of the British government would thus be directed to restrain mismanagement and violence; although it might not be consistent with its policy, nor indeed always at the option of the British government, to prevent such occurrences by decided and authoritative interference.

Remon-
strances.

The Agent was directed to transmit copies of his correspondence with the Rani Regent to enable the Government of India to judge how far so positive and unreserved a declaration of the policy of non-interference was called for from the British government. Its immediate effect had been to let loose every bad and revengeful passion upon the head of the unfortunate victim. It would be satisfactory to find that if the declaration could be avoided, it

Question of
a declared po-
licy of non-
interference.



was at least accompanied by the strongest remonstrance against violence and cruelty.

Necessity
for British in-
terference.

Mr. Ainslie forwarded the correspondence called for, and stated his opinion that unless a system of interference was introduced into the independent States of Sumpthur, Duttiah, Jhansi and Orcha, beyond what was authorised by the treaties, it would be impossible to prevent similar occurrences, as mere expressions of disapprobation appeared to be wholly ineffectual.



PUNNAH.

In 1829 a Brahmin returned to Punnah after performing a pilgrimage to Brindabun. The Raja of Punnah was attacked with leprosy about the same time. Accordingly he suspected the Brahmin of having bewitched him, and put the man to death on the ground that his leprosy was the consequence.

Execution
of a Brahmin
for witchcraft.

Mr. Ainslie, the Agent of the Governor-General for Bundelkund, remonstrated with the Raja. He proposed to the Government of India that the Raja should be removed from the head of affairs at Punnah, and be required to reside at Benares or Jagannath Puri. Meantime the widow of the Brahmin had heard of the murder of her husband and performed a Suttee.

Deposition
of the Raja
recommended

The government of Lord William Bentinck decided¹ that the Raja of Punnah was no longer fitted to govern his country. The management was to be committed to the same servants who had carried on the administration during the Raja's absence on a previous occasion. The eldest son of the Raja was in his seventeenth year, but his character was so bad that it was thought best to carry on the gov-

Deposition
ordered.

¹ General letter, 14th October 1831.



ernment in the name of the Raja, so as to exclude all claim on the part of the son.

Suttees at
Punnah.

In 1834 the Raja died ;¹ five human beings perished in the Suttee at Punnah. The Agent of the Governor-General was directed to communicate to the ruling authorities at Punnah a sense of the deep abhorrence with which the shocking practice was regarded by the British government. He was not to use terms which would inspire a dread of authoritative interference, but only such as would impress upon all parties the detestation in which the practice was held by the Government of India.

¹ General letter, 6th July 1835.



SOHAWUL.

Sohawul is one of the protected States of Bhagelkund. It is not held under a treaty, but under a sunnud.

Status of
Sohawul.

In 1826,¹ Lal Amin Singh was Jaghirdar of Sohawul. His son Lal Rughonath Singh was Manager. Lal Rughonath applied to Mr. Maddock, the Agent to the Governor-General for Malwa, for assistance in recovering four villages which had been mortgaged to a mahajun, or merchant. The Manager stated that the mahajun had already received seven thousand rupees in excess of the sum due. Mr. Maddock called on the mahajun for the accounts. The mahajun represented that the terms of the mortgage exempted him from producing any accounts as regards three of the villages; but he was ready to present the accounts of the fourth village.

Dispute
between the
Manager and
a merchant.

About the end of 1827, Mr. Maddock heard from several quarters that the Manager of Sohawul, and the mahajun in question, were each raising troops and preparing for open hostilities. Both, however, were willing to submit their claim to the arbitration of Mr. Maddock. Accordingly Mr. Maddock agreed to mediate, and appointed eight arbiters selected by either party.

Threatened
hostilities.



Settled by
arbitration.

In March 1828 the award was given ; five of the arbiters were in favour of the mahajun, and the remaining three for the Manager of Sohawul. Mr. Maddock accepted the decision of the majority. In July 1828, the Manager was called upon to pay up the claim due to the mahajun on the three villages, and was authorized to demand the account of collections in the fourth village.

Bad faith
of the Mana-
ger.

In December 1828, the Manager signed a bond agreeing to abide by Mr. Maddock's decree, and promised to find security for the payment of the instalments. In February 1829 he seized one of the villages, and plundered the mahajun of all his property. The Manager was summoned to Jubbulpore to answer for the faithless violation of a solemn engagement made in the presence of a British officer. The charge was investigated by Mr. Maddock, and reported to the supreme authority.

Orders of
the Govern-
ment of India
as regards in-
terference.

The Government of India offered some remarks on the propriety of interference in this particular case. The action of the Manager of Sohawul was pronounced to be most unlawful and contumacious ; it constituted a contempt of authority and violation of the public peace. As Lal Rughonath Singh was only Manager of Sohawul, and the Jaghirdar Lal Amin Singh was still living, the propriety of declaring Sohawul a forfeiture would have to be taken into consideration. Meanwhile Lal Rughonath Singh was to make full compensation to the mahajun to the amount of seventeen thousand rupees, which was the estimated value of the plundered property ;



and he was to be kept at Jubbulpore until the amount was paid. In case of difficulty, a portion of the Sohawul Jaghir was to be attached, as the Jaghirdar was to some extent responsible for the acts of the Manager.

Further enquiries showed¹ that the Jaghirdar had retired from the management in 1825 and become a religious recluse. The Agent reported that he was almost an idiot and incapable of managing his estate. The eldest son had already shown by his crimes that he was unfit for the duty; and the father admitted that his other son was equally criminal. The Agent recommended that the estate should be placed under British management, as the only way of obtaining compensation for the wrongs of the suffering villagers inflicted by the late Manager. The Government of India ordered that Sohawul should be placed under the management of an Ameen, subject to the control of the Agent, until the compensation should have been paid. The case was then to be again taken into consideration.

Sohawul
placed under
British super-
vision.

¹ General letter, 14th October 1830.



REWAH.

Aggres-
sions of the
Raja towards
his Chiefs.

In 1829 Mr. Maddock, the Agent of the Governor-General for the States of Bundelkund, commented¹ on the systematic aggressions and resumptions practised by the Raja of Rewah towards his feudatories and jaghirdars. Under the treaty of 1814 the Raja was pledged not to molest the Jaghirdar of Simeriah. In 1823 the Jaghirdar appealed to the British government for protection, and an adjustment was effected. In 1828 he requested that the article introduced in the treaty in his favour might be withdrawn. The Government accordingly cancelled the article. Immediately afterwards he was deprived of his estate by the Raja.

¹ General letter, 3rd October 1829.



COOCH BEHAR.

The affairs of Cooch Behar¹ are very little noticed in the General letters. The Raja was supposed to pay yearly tribute, and occasionally some arrears were paid up. At intervals a British Commissioner was appointed to manage the State.

Obscure
condition of
Cooch Behar.

In 1834, the Raja of Cooch Behar announced his intention of going on a pilgrimage to Benares, accompanied by his eldest son. He left his second son in charge of the government of the State during his absence. The Government of India informed the Agent of the Governor-General on the North-East Frontier, that whilst it would have been desirable for the Raja to have made a different arrangement, yet so long as he lived there was to be no interference in his management of affairs.

Non-inter-
vention of
the British
government.

¹ General letter, 6th April 1835.



SIKHIM.

Beginning
of political
relations.

The political relations of the British government with the little State of Sikhim began at the outbreak of the Nipal war of 1814 and 1815, and are generally noticed under the head of Nipal. At the conclusion of the war, the tract of country between the Mechi and the Testa rivers, which the British had wrested from Nipal, was made over to the Raja of Sikhim by treaty.

Status of
Sikhim.

The territory of Sikhim formed a political block between Nipal on the west and Bhootan to the eastward. The object of the treaty with Sikhim had been to prevent the extension of Nipal conquest to the eastward. But two other advantages might have been expected from the geographical position of Sikhim. It lay between the British dominion on the south, and Thibet territory on the north. It might thus be proved a means for opening up a communication with Thibet and the Chinese authorities at Lhassa. It might also exercise some observation over the neighbouring State of Bhootan.

Atrocities
in Sikhim.

After the peace with Nipal, the affairs of Sikhim excited but little attention or interest. About 1825¹ the Raja committed some frightful atrocities in the family of an uncle, who was one of the Karjees or Chiefs of Sikhim. Several persons were mur-

¹General letter, 8th May 1829.



dered, and a large number fled into Nipal territory. A letter was sent to the Raja of Sikhim, expressing very strongly the feelings of the British government as regards these barbarities. But the Government of India was not in a position to take any action in the internal affairs of Sikhim, or to exercise any interference between the Raja and his Chiefs.

In 1829, the Raja of Sikhim¹ complained that certain of his ryots had taken refuge in Nipalese, and called on the British government to interfere for their surrender. These were the men who had fled from the scene of murder. The Raja threatened to recover the refugees by force at the risk of an open rupture with the Nipalese government. Mr. Scott, the Agent to the Governor-General on the North-East Frontier, attempted to explain to him that British interference was out of the question. He proposed to withdraw a small detachment of British troops that were posted at the fortress of Nagree in Sikhim territory, in order to convince the Raja of his folly. The Government of India approved the action of Mr. Scott, and sent a letter of remonstrance to the Raja.

Demands
of the Raja
against Nipal.

Subsequently disputes arose respecting the boundaries between Sikhim and Nipal. British officers were deputed to investigate the cause of quarrel and to settle the frontier. This led to the discovery of Darjeeling in Sikhim territory, and its favourable position as a sanatorium. The proposal to establish

Discovery
of Darjeeling
as a sanatorium.

¹ General letter, 9th October 1830.



a sanatorium at Darjeeling had been first discussed in 1830. It was opposed by Sir Charles Metcalfe and Mr. Bayley on the ground that it would excite the jealousy of the Nipalese authorities. Subsequently Lord William Bentinck visited Mussoori, and was much impressed with the comfort and advantage of a residence in the hills, at an altitude where it was dry as well as cold. Cherapoonjee had been originally suggested as a sanatorium, but was so excessively damp from the heavy rainfall as to be unfit for the purpose.

¹ General letter, 10th July 1834.



ASSAM.

In 1818¹ there were no treaty relations between the British government and Assam. In 1819 there was a revolution in the affairs of Assam. Poorunder Singh was nominally Raja of Assam. His principal minister was known as the Booda or Bura Gohayn. Both were driven from Gowhatti by a disaffected party headed by Chunder Kaunt. This last man was a competitor to the Raj. He was supported by the Burmese; and also by an army composed of the subjects of the Man Raja, with other rude tribes bordering on Assam.

Revolution
in Assam.

The exiles, Poorunder Singh and the Gohayn, applied to the British government for help. They were told that the British government did not interfere in disputes within Foreign States; but that the exiles would find an asylum within British territory so long as they conducted themselves peacefully.

Exiles in
British terri-
tories.

Chunder Kaunt in his turn applied for the surrender of the refugees, but was told that the British government never refused an asylum to political exiles. The Government of India however was willing to live on terms of friendship with the existing ruler of Assam, and to comply with his wishes when-

Surrender
of the refu-
gees refused.

¹ General letter, 12th September 1873.



ever they were not at variance with established usage. The Burmese government also called upon the Government of India for the surrender of the refugees, and was answered in the same terms.

Burmese
occupation of
Assam.

Meanwhile Chunder Kaunt had come into conflict with the Burmese. He connived at the murder of the Assamese Minister, who was in the interest of the Burmese. Subsequently Chunder Kaunt was expelled by the Burmese, and a Burmese Raja set up in his room.

General
alarm.

The Burmese in Assam were strongly reinforced from Ava. Alarm was felt in British India at the appearance of a formidable power on the frontier in the place of a weak government like that of Assam. The Burmese threatened that unless the Assamese refugees were delivered up, they would follow them into British territory and carry them off as prisoners.

Dispute
about a sand
bank.

Subsequently the dispute arose between the Burmese and the British authorities about a sand island near Goalparah, on which a flag had been erected to distinguish it from the Assam dominion. The Burmese threatened to take forcible possession of the island. The Burmese forces in Assam were greatly reduced¹ in numbers, but, still much inconvenience was felt from their proximity to the British frontier. These soldiers carried nothing but their arms; subsisted upon what they found in the countries they invaded; and might easily have floated down the Brahmaputra river into British territory on boats or rafts.

¹ General letter, 10th September 1824.



The Burmese Governor of Assam requested permission to pass through British territory at Chittagong, on his way to Arakan, with three hundred armed followers, and a number of Assamese slaves. Permission was granted for the Governor to travel through British territory; but he was told that he could not bring more than thirty armed followers with him. He was also told that he could not bring any of the Assamese captives who had become slaves, as it was contrary to the laws and usages of the British nation to allow the passage of slaves through any of its territories.

Passage of Assamese slaves refused by the British government.

In 1823 the British government was compelled by the exigencies of the coming war with Burmah to send a military force into Assam for the protection of its own frontier. When the war was over, the Agent of the Governor-General on the North-East Frontier began to make arrangements for the settlement of Assam.

British occupation of Assam.

The country was in a wretched state. In 1825 there was a famine. It was an ancient custom in time of famine for all persons who owed service to the State to sell themselves as slaves to the government. In Assam the whole male population owed service to the State.

Wretched state of the country.

In 1828 the Agent of the Governor-General had issued a proclamation permitting the people to sell themselves as slaves.¹ The Government of India however had already abolished slavery in their terri-

Assam slavery abolished.

¹ General letter, 8th May 1829.



tories, and consequently relinquished all claims upon the people of Assam.

Singphoo
invasion.

In 1830 Assam was invaded by the Singphoos, a wild hill tribe, of whom nothing appears to have been known.

Division of
Assam be-
tween Poorun-
der Singh and
the British.

In 1833 the Government of India made over Upper Assam to Raja Poorunder Singh, the man who had been expelled by Chunder Kaunt and the Burmese. Lower Assam was brought under the management of the Agent to the Governor-General.

Claims of
Chunder
Kaunt reject-
ed by the Bri-
tish govern-
ment.

Chunder Kaunt protested against the accession of Poorunder Singh to the throne of Upper Assam, and urged his own claim to that dignity. The Government of India ordered that an answer should be given to Chunder Kaunt to the following effect. When the British government sent a force into Assam they found the country occupied by the Burmese foreigners. The rule of the native princes was altogether subverted; the whole province was in acknowledged subjection to the Ava government with whom the British government was at war. The British army carried on a series of successful operations against Ava; the former princes of Assam rendered no assistance; on the contrary, they appeared to be in communication with the enemy. At last the British government drove the Burmese out of Assam. The inhabitants of Assam tendered their allegiance to the power which rescued them from a state of hopeless suffering. Assam

² General letter, 16th January 1834.



passed under the sway of the British government. Since then Chunder Kaunt had been living on a pension under British protection. In assigning a certain tract of country to Raja Poorunder Singh, the Government of India had exercised its right as the paramount authority in Assam.

The village settlement was introduced into the new province of Lower Assam; but native collectors were appointed to the district, under a native system which was utterly corrupt. Before they could obtain charge of a district, they had been compelled to fee the native officials at Gowhati. Every collector furnished security on which he paid a commission of ten per cent., a sum equal to the whole of his legitimate salary. He was required to pay half a year's revenue into the treasury before he had realised any of the collections of his district; and on this advance he had to pay interest from fifty to a hundred and twenty per cent. Further it appeared that in some instances, whatever land remained unassessed from being unoccupied was thrown on the hands of the collector at an arbitrary valuation, and he was expected to make good the revenue, though the necessity for such an arrangement originated in the want of ryots.

Corrupt
native admin-
istration.

Under such circumstances there had been complaints of undue exactions on the ryots. The Government of India remarked that "it was quite evident from these facts that the revenue system was erroneous, and that its tendency must have been to convert even a well-disposed native office into an extortioner."

Orders of
the Govern-
ment of In-
dia.



CACHAR.

Distracted
state of Ca-
char.

The tract known as Cachar lies on the north-east frontier to the south of Assam. It used to be bounded by Bengal on the west and Munipore on the east. Little is known of the country before the first Burmese war. It was distracted by internal struggles for the ascendancy, and exposed to constant aggressions from the side of Munipore. Ultimately the hill tract was seized by a rebel Chief; the Raja failed to expel him, and this division was finally recognised.

British an-
nexation of
the plains.

In 1830 the Raja was assassinated, leaving no descendant real or adopted. The sovereignty of the whole had thus lapsed to the British government; but the hill tract was left in the hands of the rebel Chief, and the remaining country annexed to the British dominion.

Satisfaction
of the inhabi-
tants.

This arrangement¹ was in accordance with the wishes of the inhabitants. The heads of villages and districts, and the people at large, were evidently anxious that the British government should assume the administration. In 1833 Cachar was thought to be of no value, excepting that it interposed between Sylhet on the south and Assam on the north, and

¹ General letter, 16th January 1834.



between the Cossiah hills on the west and Manipore on the east.

Lord William Bentinck was anxious for the introduction of European skill and capital into Cachar. For this purpose he desired the removal of existing restrictions from Cachar, as regards the possession of land. In those parts of India which were fully populated, there were objections to the settlement of Europeans; chiefly on account of the character of those among whom they must settle, and the probable collisions which would take place between the European proprietors and the inhabitants. But in Cachar all these conditions were different.

Proposed
introduction
of European
skill and ca-
pital.

Accordingly application was made to the Court of Directors that Europeans might be allowed to occupy waste lands in Cachar on the same terms that they were permitted to obtain grants in the Sunderbunds. Lord William Bentinck's government observed that a road through Cachar into Manipore was of the first importance. It was necessary to render Manipore accessible to British troops. It was essential for the improvement of the resources of Cachar, as well as for the efficiency of the police required for the protection of travellers. The construction was further recommended by the consideration that the road might be easily kept in order by the Raja of Manipore through the instrumentality of the Naga tribes.

Application
for grants of
waste lands.

The Government of India also considered a proposal to grant lands in Cachar to veteran sepoys in lieu of pensions. Cachar afforded abundance of fer-

Proposed
grant of lands
to retired se-
poys.



tile soil on easy terms. Retired sepoy could invite their friends or kinsmen to join them as colonists; whereas, in other parts of British India, where waste lands had been given in lieu of pensions, there was no inducement of the kind.



JYNTEAH.

In 1824 the State of Jynteah was taken under British protection in consequence of the outbreak of war with Burma. The Raja of Jynteah furnished no assistance during the war, but acknowledged his allegiance to the British government.

British protection during Burmese war.

The affairs of Jynteah attracted but little attention until the year 1833,¹ when Lord William Bentinck was Governor-General. A new Raja had succeeded to the throne, and hesitated to enter into any engagement for the payment of tribute to the British government. He was told by the Agent of the Governor-General on the North-East Frontier that he would not be recognised by the British government as Raja of Jynteah, until he bound himself to contribute something towards the general defence of the frontier. The Government of India approved the action of the Agent.

Question of tribute.

The same year it was reported² that the Jynteah authorities had kidnapped four British subjects for sacrifice. The Raja was supposed to be implicated, and was told that unless he helped to bring the perpetrators to justice, he would incur the serious displeasure of the British government.

British subjects kidnapped for sacrifice.

¹ General letter, 31st March 1834.

² General letter, 10th July 1834.



British interference.

In 1834 the Agent on the North-East Frontier sent a British officer to Jynteah to effect a reconciliation between the Raja and his disaffected Chiefs. The Government of India approved¹ of the measure on the supposition that the continuance of disturbances in Jynteah would affect the tranquillity of the Cossiah districts in British territory; otherwise it would have been considered inconvenient for the British government to have interfered between a sovereign prince and his subjects in a quarrel in which it had no concern.

Jynteah Raja implicated.

All this while constant demands were made on the Jynteah Raja to punish the perpetrators of the human sacrifice, which it was discovered had taken place at Gobah. The chieftain of Gobah was also concerned in the atrocity; but as the Jynteah Raja pretended to be sovereign of Gobah, he was held responsible. Accordingly the Raja was told that if he could not apprehend and punish the offenders within two months, the British government would take the matter in hand; and that if Gobah was to blame, the district would be subdued and annexed to British territory. Subsequently it was proved², that the Jynteah Raja had not only failed to comply with the demand of the Government of India, but had participated in the offence.

¹ General letter, 6th April 1835.

² Separate letter, 27th April 1835.



COSSIAH HILLS.

In 1834 the Government of India reported¹ that an agreement had been concluded with the Chiefs of Ramrye, binding them to pay a tax of one rupee for each house. Lieutenant Inglis was appointed to conduct the assessment. The Government of India, under Lord William Bentinck, decided against levying a money tax from the hill tribes. They were poor and entirely dependent upon the produce of their hills, which they bartered in the plains. Fairs had for some time been established along the Cossiah and Garao hills, but as yet none on the Cachar borders. If tribute was required, it was deemed best to exact personal service in opening some essential line of communication.

Poor state
of the coun-
try.

¹ General letter, 16th January 1834.



MUNIPORE.

Beginning
of political
relations.

Munipore was first brought into political relations¹ with the British government by the first Burmese war. Under the treaty of 1826, concluded with Ava, Gumbheer Singh was recognised as Raja of Munipore.

Designs of
the Raja.

Soon after the Singhphoo invasion of Assam in 1830, Gumbheer Singh proposed to subjugate the hill tribes between Munipore and the Singhphoo tribes. To satisfy the anxiety of Poorunder Singh, Raja of Assam, peremptory orders were sent to Gumbheer Singh not to permit his troops to pass the water line without the permission of the British government. Subsequently it was deemed sufficient to prohibit Munipore from entering the plains of Assam.

Status of
Munipore be-
tween British
and Burmese
territory.

Prior to the Burma war, the British government had no knowledge either of the passes connecting its territory with that of Munipore, or of the resources of Munipore. The panic occasioned by the simultaneous appearance of two divisions of the Burma army, one from Munipore, and the other from Assam, led to a very general flight of the inhabitants of Cachar into Sylhet. Under these circumstances the establishment of the Munipore dynasty was regarded as a means of defence on the

¹ General letter, 16th January 1834.



frontier, especially as the Maniporees were known to be deadly enemies of the Burmese. But notwithstanding the uninterrupted tranquillity which followed the war, it was found that Manipore was totally incompetent to defend itself against a Burmese invasion. Its entire population was estimated at between thirty and forty thousand. Its available revenues were not more than four or five thousand rupees a year. It was so surrounded that it was excluded from any great participation in the advantages of traffic; and it was evident from the several reports that had reached the Government of India, that Manipore had no means for extending its agriculture.

Gumbheer Singh died in January 1834.¹ His infant son was recognised as Raja of Manipore. A Regency was established with the Rani at the head to govern the country during the minority. The Government of India sanctioned² the arrangement, and ordered that a suitable education should be imparted to the young Raja.

Regency on
the death of
the Raja.

The Government of India reported³ to the Court of Directors that the Kubboo valley had been made over to the Burmese government at Ava; and that Raja Gumbheer Singh had agreed to receive an allowance of five hundred rupees a month by way of compensation.

Frontier
arrange-
ments.

¹ General letter, 13th November 1834.

² General letter, 6th April 1835.

³ Separate letter, 15th June 1835.



SUMBULPORE.

Beginning
of political
relations.

In 1818 the sovereignty of the little State of Sumbulpore was transferred from the Rajas of Nagpore to the British government.

Diamond
mines.

In 1824, Major Gilbert, the Agent on the South-West Frontier, furnished¹ some curious information respecting the diamonds of Sumbulpore. They were not found in mines, but in the mud and sand of the Mahanudi river, by a class of people called Jharas. In return for this service of searching after diamonds, the Jharas enjoyed sixteen villages rent-free. When a diamond was discovered the finder received a reward proportionate to its value. When Sumbulpore was possessed by the Mahrattas of Nagpore, all diamonds found in the neighbourhood were appropriated by the Mahratta commander. The Government of India had long ordered that the produce of the so-called diamond mines should be left open to future consideration. In 1830, the Agent, Major Mackenzie, forwarded² a diamond to the Government of India which had been presented by the Rani. The right of searching for diamonds was farmed to the Rani of Sumbulpore for the yearly sum of three thousand rupees. At

¹ General letter, 18th September 1825.

² General letter, 9th October 1830.



this period the country of Sumbulpore was ³torn by internal dissensions.

In 1827 the Raja of Sumbulpore had been greatly addicted to opium. In 1829 he visited the Agent's camp, and showed himself to be utterly unfitted for the management of the country. He proposed that the conduct of affairs should be entrusted to his half-brother, and this arrangement was carried out. Major Mackenzie took steps to tranquillize the district, which was occupied by a savage and turbulent race known as the Khonds. For some time a system of warfare and plunder had been carried on between these Khonds and the Zemindars of Bustar and Goad.

Settlement
of Sumbul-
pore.

The police system in force in Sumbulpore was taken into the consideration of the Government of India. It would have been more in accordance with the new policy of non-intervention to have withdrawn the police force altogether, and left the native chiefs to form and pay their own police establishments; but the existing system had worked well for years, and was therefore allowed to continue. The Agent was ordered to prevent all undue interference on the part of the local officers.

Police sys-
tem.

In 1830 Captain Wilkinson succeeded to the post of Political Agent on the South-West Frontier. He reported¹ the rebellious and refractory conduct of the Kols; he believed that they had been driven into insurrection by the oppression of the Raja of Singhboom or his Minister.

Kols.

¹ General letter, 14th October 1830.



Rebellion
by Sumbul-
pore.

In 1833 there was an insurrection¹ in Sumbulpore accompanied with much bloodshed and many atrocities. It was suppressed by a British force, and the ringleaders were tried and executed. This state of affairs was brought about by the incapacity of the Rani who had been made Regent.

Rival claims
to Sumbul-
pore settled
by the British
government.

There were many chiefs who urged claims to the Raj. Narain Singh was supposed to be the most popular. Accordingly he was placed upon the throne on the three following conditions:—

1st.—He was to maintain the tranquillity of the country to the utmost of his power, and administer affairs with equity and justice.

2nd.—He was to secure the safe conduct of the dāk through his country.

3rd.—He was to pay annually a yearly sum of eight thousand rupees for the support of the Rani.

¹ General letter, 10th July 1834.



SINGHBOOM.

In 1821 the Raja of Singhboom acknowledged¹ his submission to the British government, but solicited aid against the Lurka Kols. This savage race had become very formidable. They were distinct from Hindus in manners, language, religion, and appearance; inferior in civilisation to other hill people; but superior in courage and industry, inasmuch as they possessed large and flourishing villages, with extensive tracts of well cultivated land. But for years their depredations had rendered them the terror of the surrounding country.

Depredations of the Kols.

Major Roughsedge, Agent for the South-Western Frontier, promised to aid the Raja, but hoped to reclaim the Kols by conciliatory measures rather than by force of arms. Some steps were necessary, not only for the protection of the neighbouring inhabitants, but for the safety of the new road to Nagpore which lay through the Kol territories.

Proposed conciliatory measures.

In a subsequent journey to Sumbulpore, Major Roughsedge marched through those divisions of Singhboom which were inhabited by Kols. On the first day's march the Kols came out and readily acknowledged the Raja's authority. The second day the Kols exhibited a determined hostility. They murdered one of the camp followers in sight

Hostilities.

¹ General letter, 13th November 1834.



of Major Roughsedge's encampment. Another body of Kols surrounded a dāk despatch and grain escort, with the evident intention of slaughtering the bearers. Major Roughsedge was forced to attack them; but they showed a most resolute opposition. One village was destroyed and many Kols were slain, but their spirit was by no means broken.

Reduction
of the Kols
by a British
force.

Subsequently¹ the Kols attacked and defeated a party of native police in the service of the Raja; they slaughtered the commander of the force and fourteen of his men. The Raja fled to the north-west quarter of Singhboom. The matter was referred to the Military Department. A force was sent against the Kols and soon reduced them to submission. Their future relations with the British government and the Singhboom Raja were then settled by Major Roughsedge.

Restoration
of an idol to
the Raja.

During 1823 and 1824 the Kols were generally² tranquil. At this period they were jealous of the growing power of their own chief. They attributed it to his possessing the Poora Dabee, a tutelary deity belonging to the Raja of Singhboom, which had been stolen from the Raja's grandfather. The dignity of the Singhboom Raja had been so much lowered by the loss of this favourite idol, that he was in a state of abject despair. Major Gilbert, the new Agent, reported that the recovery of the idol by the Raja would have a good effect on his wild and superstitious subjects. The Gov-

¹ General letter, 13th June 1823.

² General letter, 18th September 1825.



ernment of India remarked on the melancholy superstition, but considered that the restoration of the stolen idol might be demanded in order to remove the despondency of the Raja. The idol was subsequently restored¹ to the Singhboom Raja. Later reports² refer to the apparent improvement of the Kols, their internal tranquillity, and increased confidence in the British government.

¹ General letter, 31st May 1825.

² General letter, 10th April 1829.



CIS-SUTLEJ STATES.

General
question of
succession.

In 1820 a question arose about the succession to Sikh chiefships in cases where there was no heir to the husband, male or female. It was stated that under Sikh and Hindu law, no widow could adopt a successor without the written authority of her deceased husband, and no relatives on the widow's side were acknowledged to be lawful heirs. The Government of India formally declared its right to all Sirdarees in the territory of the protected Sikh States, as might escheat from the want of legal heirs; and it was more disposed to exercise such right, as it received no compensation in the way of tribute for the protection afforded and its attendant expenses. Accordingly the Resident was directed to attach all domains so circumstanced on the decease of the present occupant. The mode of disposing of such estates to be considered hereafter as occasions arose.

Belaspore
affairs.

Belaspore was brought under the consideration of the British government in consequence of the death of the Chief without heirs. It was not considered desirable to take possession of so detached a spot. Accordingly the chiefship was offered to the Sirdar of Kulsia on condition of paying tribute.

¹ General letter, 2nd May 1823.



In 1821 the Sirdar of Kulsia refused¹ to accept Belaspore on the terms proposed; and it was resolved to retain it with the view of giving it in exchange for some debatable territory in the Bhuttee country.

In 1823 it was² found necessary to issue proclamations strictly forbidding all Sikh chiefs from interfering in the affairs of their neighbours. Such interference had often led to frays attended by great loss of life. At the same time the principle was reiterated on which the British government with few exceptions had always acted; namely, to avoid minute interference in family disputes, or breaches between lord and vassal, chief and subject, excepting when there was flagrant injustice, or serious interruption to the general peace; at the same time to investigate and adjust all important causes of difference, and repress all attempts on the part of the chiefs to obtain redress by force of arms.

Maintenance of the place by the British government without internal interference.

In 1823 there was an enquiry into the right of succession to the Sikh chiefship of Thaneswar, which was disputed between the full brother and the elder widow of the deceased chief. The Government of India was satisfied that widows frequently succeeded to Sikh estates on the death of the husband without issue. But the law of the Shastra, which regulated inheritance to real property, had no application to the case of a raj or chiefship in any part of India. It was therefore decided that the full brother must succeed.

Disputed succession in Thaneswar.

¹ General letter, 28th September 1823.

² General letter, 10th September 1824.



PUTIALA.

Disputes
between the
Raja and his
mother.

In 1819 Raja Kurrum Singh was permitted¹ to assume the administration of the affairs of Putiala. In 1823 the Raja confidentially communicated² to the Deputy Superintendent of Sikh Affairs certain complaints against his mother. This lady had conducted the government of Putiala during the minority in association with the Minister. Being endowed with a bold and masculine spirit, she had been unwilling to relinquish her authority as Regent. She claimed a right to interfere, which obstructed the Raja's administration.

Complaints
against the
Rani.

The specific complaints against the Rani were that she injured the honor of the family, by not observing the customary seclusion; usurped jaghirs by means of fabricated sunnuds; detained the State treasure and wardrobe; allowed her officers to appropriate the Raja's valuable effects; held a separate court by distinct expenditure; and issued orders counteracting the Raja's measures.

British in-
terference.

These charges were supported by the local authorities, and the interference of the British government was deemed necessary. The Government of India agreed that the Raja must be assisted in the assertion of his just rights. After some show of opposition, the Rani submitted, and the dispute was satisfactorily settled.

¹ General letter, 15th January 1820.

² General letter, 18th September 1825.



DELHI.

About 1818 Mr. Charles Metcalfe, Resident at Delhi, carried out¹ an extensive investigation of rent-free Jaghirs. During the half century of anarchy which preceded the introduction of British authority, these lands had been alienated in the most irregular fashion. Royal firmans had been procured for a small douceur at a time when the so-called Emperor of the Moghuls was languishing in extreme poverty and wretchedness, and had no territory to bestow. In like manner grants were procured under the Vizier's seal, long after the Vizier had ceased to officiate, and his seal had been discontinued. Forgeries were innumerable, and all sorts of grants had been sold in the streets of Delhi; so that little faith could be placed on documents, and long possession in general constituted the only trustworthy evidence of a title.

Investigation of rent-free Jaghirs.

It was stated that from the beginning of Baber's reign in 1526 to the end of that of Alamghir the Second in 1759,—a space of two hundred and seventy-three years,—only sixty-six villages had been granted away in perpetuity. In the lifetime of Shah Alam, a period of only forty-eight years, no less than one hundred and twenty-two villages were alienated for ever. Of these eighty-eight were assigned in

Irregular nature of the grants.

¹ General letter, 2nd May 1823.



perpetuity without any reference to the so-called Emperor, by the Viziers, Peishwas, Sindias, and other Sirdars; and all exercised the privilege of alienating the royal revenues simultaneously and co-existently. The Emperor moreover converted forty-one villages into permanent grants, which had been previously given in Jaghir by the above-mentioned chieftains.

J. TALBOYS WHEELER.