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GLOSSARY OF INDIAN TERMS

Adawlat - A court of justice.

Ameer - A nobleman.

Bazar - Daily market, or market place.

Bhaindaries - Securities.

Chauth - Blackmail or tribute (usually of $\frac{1}{12}$ of the revenue) levied by the Marathas on countries which they overran but did not administer. The right to levy chauth was acquired from the Mughal Emperor by Peshwa Baji Rao in 1736.

Crore - One hundred lacs or ten millions.

Dacoits - Gang robbers.

Darakhdars - Officials of the Peshwa charged with the audit of the accounts of the saranjams.

Desai - Headman of a district.


Diwan - Native minister of the revenue department, and Chief Justice in civil cases within his jurisdiction. Receiver-General of a province. Finance minister.

Diwani - Right to collect and administer the land revenues of Bengal.

Durbar - The court, hall of audience.

Enam - Present, gift, reward, gratuity, favour. Grant of land held rent-free and in hereditary and perpetual occupation. Assignments of the Government's share of the produce of a
portion of land, for the support of religious establishments.

Fadnavis - A public officer of the Maratha Government through whom all orders and grants were issued and to whom all accounts were sent.

Gadi - Throne.

Hoojrah - Messenger.

Jagir - An assignment of the Government's share of the produce of a portion of land to an individual. The assignment was usually for life, and lapsed on the holder's death to the State, although it was often renewed to his heir on the payment of a fine. A Jagir could also be assigned for the support of any public establishment, particularly of military nature.

Jagirdar - Holder of a Jagir.

Jihad - A holy war by Mohammedans against infidels.

Jizya - Capitation tax or poll-tax imposed on the Hindus of Rajasthan by Emperor Aurangzeb.

Kachhwaha - A native of the state of Jaipur (Amber).

Khalsa - The exchequer; as applied to lands it refers to the property reserved to the State not made over in Jagir or Enam to any other parties.

Khanate - A country or province ruled by a Khan or Prince.

Khillat - A robe of honour with which Princes conferred dignity.

Killadar - Warder of a castle, Commander of a fort.

Maharaja - A sovereign prince; applied in courtesy to all Rajas.
Masnad - The place of sitting, a seat; a throne or chair of State. The large cushion used by Indian Princes in place of a throne.

Nawab - A viceroy or governor of a province under the Mughal Government.

Nazzer - An offering. A present made to a superior.

Nazzeranah - Anything given as a present, particularly as an acknowledgement for grant of lands, public office, etc.

Pant Pritinidhi - Office created by Raja Ram during his exile at Gingi on the Coromandel Coast during the 1680's. Superior in status to the Peshwaship.

Pant Sachev - General Accountant and Auditor of the Maratha State.

Patil - The headman of a village who has general control and management of village affairs.

Pindaris - Organised banditti or marauders whose haunts lay in the valley of the Narbada. First heard of during the war between Aurangzeb and the Marathas.

Raj - A kingdom, a rule, sovereignty.

Raja - A King, Prince.

Rana - A title held by Hindu princes of central and northern India.

Rani - A Hindu queen.

Rathor - A native of the state of Jodhpur (Marwar).

Saddar Diwani Adawlat - High Court of Civil Jurisdiction.

Sanad - A patent, charter or written authority for holding either land or office.
Saranjam - Lands assigned to military chieftains for the maintenance of troops. They were not personal jagirs.

Sardar - Chieftain, Captain, headman.

Sati - Literally, 'good woman'. The rite of widow-burning practised especially among the Rajputs: A Hindu wife who consummated a life of duty by burning herself on the funeral pile of her husband.

Senapati - Commander-in-Chief of the Maratha army.

Shastri - Literally, a 'learned man', 'one versed in knowledge'.

Shia - The most important sect in Islam which began as a legitimist group advocating the claims of Ali (the son-in-law of the Prophet), to the Caliphate. It rapidly developed into a religious movement differing on a number of points from orthodox Islam.

Sibhandis - Irregular native soldiers employed in the service of the revenues and police establishment.

Subadar - Governor of a province, Viceroy.

Sunni - The name of the dominant majority group in Islam, usually regarded as orthodox, who revere equally the four successors of Mohammed.

Talook - Dependency. A division of a province; an estate, a proprietary land usually smaller than a zemindari.

Turrufs - Village units.

Tynaut Zaubtahs - The instrument or deed which fixed the value of saranjams and the conditions of tenure.
Vakil - One deputed to act for another. Ambassador, agent sent on a special commission, or residing at Court.

Vasant Panchami - Spring festival of the Hindus held on 14 February.

Vizier - Chief minister or Prime minister.

Wurshaushans - Annual stipends.

Wuttuns - Hereditary lands.

Zemindari - Propreitary tenure of land. Lands held by a Zemindar or proprietor.

Zillah - District, division.
INTRODUCTION

In their examination of the grand conflict about the motives of British political expansion in Africa under Queen Victoria, Robinson, Gallagher and Denny come to the conclusion that the origin of British political expansion in tropical Africa during the nineteenth century is to be found first in the nationalist crises in Africa itself, ... and only secondarily in the interlocking of these crises in Africa with rivalries in Europe. Together the two drove Britain step by step to regain by territorial claims and occupation that security which could no longer be had by influence alone. The compelling conditions for British advances in tropical Africa [they argue] were first called into being, not by the German victory of 1871, nor by Leopold's interest in the Congo, nor by the petty rivalry of missionaries and merchants, nor by a rising imperialist spirit, nor even by the French occupation of Tunis in 1881 - but by the collapse of the Khedivial regime in Egypt. 1.

My thesis attempts to assess the extent to which comparable situations were responsible for British political expansion in India between 1811 and 1844. Put in another way, my thesis sets out to investigate the extent to which the decay of political systems in the Indian States provided a stimulus for British intervention in their affairs during the period under review. I shall also attempt to estimate

how far local peculiarities in each State influenced the type of political relationship established with it.

The importance of such an investigation is underscored by two considerations: First, although in accounting for British political expansion in India during the first half of the nineteenth century historians have generally acknowledged political unrest in the native States as a factor, they have not examined this factor in sufficient detail to indicate its full impact on British policy. Second, the existing accounts of British political expansion in India during this period do not show in sufficient relief the correlation between the political unrest in, and the political structure of, the native States.

In trying to estimate how far weaknesses in the political structure of the Indian States as well as local peculiarities helped to determine the timing, and the nature, of British political expansion in India between 1811 and 1844, I shall concentrate on three areas - Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Afghanistan.

Until the last two decades of the seventeenth century, the East India Company relied mainly on the Mughal regime for the protection of its trade. For seventy years after the establishment of its factory at Surat (1612), the Company guided its policy by the advice of Thomas Roe, its Ambassador at the Imperial Court from 1615-1619.

It is the beggaring of the Portugal, [Thomas Roe warned] notwithstanding his many rich residencies and territories, that he keeps soldiers that spend it, yet his garrisons are mean. He never profited by the Indies, since he defended them. Observe this well. It hath been also the error of the Dutch, who seek plantation here by the sword. They turn a wonderful stock, they prowl in all places, they possess some of the best; yet their dead payes consume all their gain. Let this be received as a rule that if you will profit, seek it at sea, and in quiet trade; for without controversy, it is an error to affect garrisons and land wars in India.

Nevertheless, as the decay of the Mughal Empire opened the floodgates of disorder, it became impossible for the Company to rely any longer on the Mughal regime for the protection of its widely dispersed factories. The circumstances of the time demanded that the Company should manage its commerce with its sword in its hand. In fact by 1684 it was already clear to the Court of Directors that the time was approaching when they could not venture to 'trade boldly nor leave great stocks ... where we have not the security of a fort.'

4 Ibid., p.43. Gerald Aungier to the Court of Directors.
5 Quoted in Lucy S. Sutherland, The East India Company in Eighteenth-Century Politics, (Oxford, 1952) p.3.
The death of Emperor Aurangzeb in 1707 increased the confusion and insecurity in India. In Bengal the Company took advantage of the event to strengthen Fort William while there was 'an interregnum, and no one likely to take notice of what' it was doing.6

The crisis came in 1756 with the accession of Suraj-ud-Daula to the nawabship of Bengal. His aversion to the growing influence of the Company culminated in the tragedy of the Black Hole of Calcutta. This tragedy gave Robert Clive an opportunity to settle 'the Company's estate in those parts [i.e., in Bengal] in a better and more lasting condition that ever.'7 Robert Clive readily entered into a plot to supplant Suraj-ud-Daula by a ruler who would become a protege of the East India Company. His victory on the plains of Plassey (June 1757) enabled him to elevate Mir Jaffir to the nawabship in place of Suraj-ud-Daula. For a time the Company found it convenient to maintain the fiction of the Nawab's independence. In 1765, however, Robert Clive accepted the Diwani or the fiscal administration of Bengal from the Emperor Shah Alum.

The Directors were still reluctant to mingle politics with trade. Therefore in accepting the Diwani they tried to repudiate the political responsibilities of the office.

---

6 Quoted in P. E. Roberts, History of British India, p.61.
We conceive [they wrote in a despatch] the office of Dewan should be exercised only in superintending the collection and disposal of the revenues. This we conceive to be the whole office of Dewan. The administration of justice, the appointments to offices, Zemindaries, in short, whatever comes under the denomination of civil administration, we understand, is to remain in the hands of the Nawab or his ministers. 8.

Nevertheless, the failure of Clive's reforms and of the Dual Government which resulted from the above policy compelled the Court of Directors in the end to assume full administrative responsibility in Bengal. In 1772 they proclaimed their decision to 'stand forth as Dewan' and appointed Warren Hastings as Governor of Bengal. In 1773 the Regulating Act established a Supreme Council at Calcutta with responsibility for the general administration of the Company's affairs in India. Thus by 1772 the East India Company had been drawn into Indian politics as a result of the decay of the Mughal regime.

The assumption of political power in Bengal assured the security of British commerce there but not on the Coromandel and Malabar coasts. On these coasts, the insecurity caused by the collapse of the Mughal regime became aggravated by European rivalry. British factories and commerce in those areas therefore stood exposed not only to the caprice of native rulers but also to the intrigues of European rivals. The Peace of Paris (February, 1763) established British

---

ascendancy on the Coromandel coast by limiting the number of French troops to be maintained there. But although the Peace ended the direct confrontation between the British and the French in India, it did not guarantee the British security against the covert and subtle form of challenge upon which the French embarked for the rest of the eighteenth century. French military officers entered the service of native States and used their influence to incite the native rulers against the British and to promote the interests of their country. Therefore during the second half of the eighteenth century it became the primary object of the Government of India to substitute British influence for that of the French in the native States and to secure the expulsion of all French nationals from India.

The policy of intervention inspired by the French threat led to serious embroilment with the Nizam of Hyderabad, the Raja of Mysore and the Chiefs of the Maratha Confederacy. The first Maratha war (1775-1782) and the Anglo-Mysorean war (1779-1784) which resulted from British intervention in the affairs of those States evoked the condemnation of Warren Hastings' foreign policy by the Directors of the East India Company. In 1784 an Act of Parliament interdicted the Government of India from declaring war or entering into treaties that might lead to wars without the authority of the Court of Directors or of the Secret Committee. The only exception to this rule was in cases where the wars were absolutely vital to the security of British interests. By and large, this enactment remained a dead letter. Even the pacific Lord Cornwallis, who was sent to India to inaugurate the new era of
non-intervention in the affairs of native States could not help contravening it. The outbreak of the French revolution forced him into war with Tipu Sultan of Mysore, a partisan of the French. For the purpose of this war, Lord Cornwallis negotiated a Triple Alliance with the Nizam and the Peshwa in July 1790.

II.

During Lord Wellesley's Governor-Generalship (1798-1805) the quest for security against the French threat assumed the form of an unabashed quest for expansionism. The policy of non-intervention was completely abandoned. Oudh, the Carnatic and Mysore were firmly brought under the control of the Government of India. After the defeat and death of Tipu Sultan in 1799, Mysore became a diminutive State and was restored to the rule of its former Hindu dynasty. The new State entered into a subsidiary alliance with the Government of India. The Carnatic was annexed on the grounds of alleged treacherous correspondence between Omdut-ul-Omrah and Tipu Sultan during the late war between the British and Tipu. The protests of Ali Hussein, successor of Omdut-ul-Omrah, were silenced. He was set aside in favour of his cousin Azim-ul-Daula who acquiesced and received a pension for himself and his family. Oudh, to all intents and purposes, became a vassal State of the Government of India.

Through his system of Subsidiary Alliances, Lord Wellesley established British dominance over the two most powerful southern
States - Hyderabad and the Maratha Empire. By 1802 these States, which were potential allies of France, had agreed to regard the enemies of the British as their enemies. They had also agreed to submit their differences with other States to the arbitration of the Government of India, and had promised not to employ any European national in their service without the consent of the Government of India. The Nizam and the Peshwa had in addition resigned the conduct of their foreign policy to the control of the Government of India. Above all, they had ceded part of their territory as subsidy for the maintenance of British troops to be stationed in their territories. These troops which were ostensibly meant for the protection of the allied States from foreign aggression were in fact intended to overawe them.

At long last it seemed as though the Government of India had evolved a system for safeguarding its external as well as its internal security without establishing its direct rule over the entire Indian subcontinent. But the British dream of maintaining peace and stability in India through the exercise of indirect influence was doomed to disappointment. Between 1811 and 1844 serious political crises in Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Afghanistan placed the whole question of British security in jeopardy once more. The result was that the Government of India felt itself forced to intervene in these States with a view to establishing tighter political control over them than was originally intended.
I shall now proceed to examine the causes which underlay political instability in the States of Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Afghanistan and attempt to show why the Government of India felt itself compelled to intervene in those States. I shall also examine the consequences of this intervention.
Undoubtedly, imperialism played a major role in British political expansion in India during the first half of the nineteenth century, especially during the Governor-Generalship of Lord Wellesley (1798-1805) and of Lord Dalhousie (1848-1856). In the intervening period, however, British expansion owed a great deal to another equally potent, if not more potent, factor. This factor was the collapse of stable politics in the native States and the resultant political instability. In several cases, it was this instability which provided the initial impetus for British intervention in the native States. Indeed, in Maharashtra, it was the collapse of the authority of the Poona Government, more than any other factor, which provided the main stimulus for British intervention in 1811.

The State of Maharashtra formed the hub of the Maratha Confederacy which was a loosely coordinated system of States. These States accepted the nominal suzerainty of the Peshwas who controlled the territories of Maharashtra from their seat at Poona. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the territories controlled by Peshwa Baji Rao II were bounded on the north by Kandeish, on the south by Mysore, on the west by the Arabian Sea and on the east by Hyderabad. These territories included part of the coastal plain of the Konkan, the mountainous Ghats, the tableland of the Desh and the northern river basins of the Carnatic. To the north and north-east of Maharashtra lay the possessions of the Confederate Chiefs. These territories had been conquered by the captains of Shahu Raja (hereditary ruler of the Maratha State) in the decades which followed the death of the Emperor Aurangzeb (1707), and they formed enclaves in Mughal territory. Of the Confederate Chiefs the Gaikwad ruled over Gujerat, and the Bhonsla over Berar. Sindhia and Holkar controlled principalities in Malwa. Although virtually independent, the Confederate Chiefs regarded themselves as vassals of the Peshwa and looked upon him as the symbol of Maratha unity.

By 1802 this once powerful Confederacy was in the throes of a civil war. The Peshwas who were originally the Prime Ministers of the Rajas of Satara had usurped power and become the dominant authority in the Maratha State since the death of Shahu Raja in 1750. This usurpation of power from the Rajas of Satara weakened the allegiance
of the Confederate Chiefs to the Maratha Government at Poona. The Bhonsla and the Gaikwad, for instance, looked upon the Peshwas as their equals, if not their inferiors; and they were therefore reluctant to acknowledge them as suzerains. The first four Peshwas were powerful enough to impose obedience upon the Confederate Chiefs. But as a result of the prolonged civil wars which convulsed Maharashtra after the death of Peshwa Narrayan Rao in 1773, the Peshwa's Government at Poona found it difficult to assert its authority over Sindhia, Holkar, the Bhonsla or the Gaikwad.

It was not only the Confederate Chiefs who defied the Peshwa's authority. Within Maharashtra itself the feudal chiefs known as the Southern Jagirdars attempted to assert their independence of the Poona Government by carrying defiance of authority to the point of encroaching upon the Peshwa's personal estates. In the six years preceding the signing of the Treaty of Bassein, the Peshwa's authority reached its lowest ebb. Baji Rao was neither able to command the obedience of the Southern Jagirdars nor punish their insubordination. It was this crisis in Maharashtra which compelled Peshwa Baji Rao to accept the subsidiary Treaty of Bassein (December 1802).

---

2 The Southern Jagirdars were so called because their estates were located in southern Maharashtra - between Satara and the river Kistna, and in the Maratha Carnatic (south of the Kistna).
The effect of the treaty was to sunder the tenuous ties which bound the Confederate Chiefs to the Peshwa as subordinates. Henceforth they were recognised as independent in their relations with the Poona Government. The Peshwa agreed to submit his disputes with them to the arbitration of the Government of India. Thus the treaty dissolved the Maratha Confederacy and subjected the Peshwa's foreign policy to the control of the Government of India. As opposed to the Confederate Chiefs, however, the relations between the Peshwa and the feudal chiefs of Maharashtra fell outside the scope of the treaty. From 1804 the Peshwa sought to re-assert his authority over these chiefs with the assistance of the Government of India. He wished to recover the lands which the Southern Jagirdars had usurped and to punish them for their insolence and disobedience. To strengthen his authority, the Peshwa wanted to raise a strong army under his direct authority and correspondingly reduce the military power of the Jagirdars. In fact Baji Rao preferred to dispossess nearly all of the Southern Jagirdars and re-assign their lands to others whom he could control. For this purpose, he invoked Article 9 of the Treaty of Bassein which

---

3 Article 17 of the treaty declared that the Honourable Company 'have no manner of concern with any of His Highness' children, relations, subjects, or servants, with respect to whom His Highness is absolute'. C. U. Aitchison, A Collection of Treaties, Engagements and Sanads relating to India and neighbouring Countries, Third Edition (Calcutta, 1892), Vol. VI, p.58.
obliged the Government of India to defend the integrity of his possessions. 4

The Government of India was at first inclined to regard the Peshwa's disputes with the Southern Jagirdars as a domestic matter which did not concern the British. But it soon realised how intimately connected the disputes were with the security of its possessions in south India. A complete victory for the Peshwa over the Jagirdars would have meant the creation of a powerful State contiguous to the northern frontiers of British possessions, a State, moreover, which in the recent past had looked upon itself as the dominant power in the subcontinent. A victory for the Jagirdars, of course, would have been equally undesirable. It would have meant the dissolution of the political system created through the Treaty of Bassein. It would also have meant the creation of turbulent, and possibly hostile, neighbours for the Government of India as well as for its allies like the Raja of Mysore or the Nizam. The creation of a powerful State under the control of Baji Rao Peshwa, or the emergence of a number of independent chiefs in

---

4 Article 9 of the treaty stated in part: 'The subsidiary force will, at all times, be ready to execute services of importance, such as the protection of the person of His Highness, his heirs, and successors, the overawing and chastisement of rebels, or exciters of disturbance in His Highness' dominions, and the due correction of his subjects or dependants, who may withhold payment of the Sircar's just claims ...'
For the maintenance of the subsidiary force, which was stationed within Maharashtra (at Seroor), the Peshwa ceded territories worth Rs. 26,00,000 per annum. The subsidiary force consisted of 6,000 regular infantry. (See C. U. Aitchison, op. cit., Vol.VI, pp.55,59-60.)
the southern Maratha districts, would have proved equally detrimental
to British interests. The policy of the Government of India therefore
was to intervene in the disputes and attempt to create a condition of
equipoise between the Peshwa and the Southern Jagirdars. This policy
was based on the assumption that such a state of equipoise would enable
the British to exercise overall control over Maharashtra in the interest
of stability in South India.

i. The origin of the Southern Jagirdars, their resources and
relationship to the Peshwa.

Some of the Southern Jagirdars like the Pant Pratididhi and
the Pant Sachev were ancient Jagirdars who owed their jagirs to the
Rajas of Satara. But the majority of the Southern Jagirdars were the
creation of the Peshwas. Shivaji (1627-1680), the founder of the
Maratha State, strongly disapproved of the assignment of lands in
jagir for the support of military or civil officers. This was one
way in which he endeavoured to curb the separatist tendencies which
from the beginning posed obstacles to Maratha unity. None of the men
who distinguished themselves in his service - Moropant Pingle, Abaji
Sondev or Datto Annaji - succeeded in founding baronial families or

5 The only assignments of land which Shivaji permitted were for the
endowment of temples and charities, which being public Trusts
managed by non-military officials, were in no way dangerous to
the State.
bequeathing large landed estates as did Shahu's ministers in the first half of the eighteenth century. All officers of Shivaji, from the Senapati down to the lowest sepoy or servant drew a fixed salary from the public treasury and granaries. Shivaji did not also permit public offices to become hereditary in particular families.

This situation changed within a few decades of Shivaji's death. The execution of Sambhaji by the Emperor Aurangzeb and the subsequent exile of the Maratha durbar threw the Maratha State into confusion. The exigencies of the time and especially the task of re-conquering Maharashtra from the Mughals gave prominence to military prowess. Promises of grants of jagirs were held out to able soldiers as an inducement to expel the Mughals and even to extend Maratha influence further afield. In this way the Gaikwads, the Bhonslas and the Powars set themselves up virtually as sovereigns of Gujerat, Berar and Malwa respectively; and after the rise to power of the Peshwas, they defied or obeyed the Poona Government as suited their purposes. Under these circumstances, it became necessary for the Peshwas to devise means of counterbalancing the power of these Chiefs

---

6 Even before the death of Shahu Raja, the jealousy aroused by the Peshwa's growing ascendancy over the Raja portended the future course of events. For instance, in 1731, this jealousy resulted in a civil war between Peshwa Baji Rao Bullal and Senapati Trimbak Rao Dabhade in which the latter was killed. Again in 1743 a similar civil war nearly broke out between the Peshwa Balaji Baji Rao (Nana Saheb) and Raghují Bhonsla. Soon after Shahu's death in December 1749, the Peshwa again had to face a strong rebellion of Yashvantrao Dabhade and Damaji Gaikwad.
whose turbulence threatened the very existence of the Poona Government. The Peshwas also had to overawe the ancient Jagirdars who resented the authority of the new Government at Poona. The Peshwas found the answer in the creation of a new social group of Brahmin landholders who owed their position entirely to themselves. As such, this group of landholders possessed a vested interest in the Poona regime. Moreover, they were bound to the Peshwas by ties of religion and caste. By the closing years of the eighteenth century, however, the new landholders or Southern Jagirdars had become a source of weakness rather than of strength to the Peshwa's Government.

Prominent among the Southern Jagirdars of the early years of the nineteenth century were the Patwardhans, Rastia, Gokhale, Appa Desai and the Desai of Kittur. Though generally so called, these landholders were strictly speaking not Jagirdars as they did not hold their estates known as saranjams by feudal tenure. On the contrary, they were merely entrusted with the administration of their estates on behalf of the Peshwa; and they were expected to apply the revenues accruing from them to the maintenance of a body of troops of fixed numbers, description and pay. For this service, these Chiefs (or Jagirdars as they were

---

7 See G. S. Sardesai (ed.), Poona Residency Correspondence, (Bombay, 1950) Vol.xii, p.81. All payments were made under the inspection and control of Darakhdars, officers appointed directly by the Peshwa and accountable to him for the annual audit of the accounts of the saranjams. In certain cases, some of the relatives and ministerial officers of the Jagirdars also received fixed allowances.
commonly called) received fixed annual allowances. Their troops could be mustered as often as the Peshwa wished; and the pay of any absentees was to be refunded by them. No men were to be adjudged fit unless they were of a certain description and mounted on horses of certain value. All the expenses of the saranjamy troops were to be defrayed from the assigned revenue. Between them, the Patwardhans, Gokhale, Rastia, Appa Desai and the Desai of Kittur, not to mention the smaller Jagirdars, maintained an army that was about twice as strong as that under the Peshwa's direct control. Put in another way, at the beginning of the nineteenth century these Jagirdars controlled more power in the Maratha State than the Peshwa's Government at Poona.

The Patwardhans were the descendants of Hari Bhat, a Konkan Brahmin priest. His three sons Govind Rao Hari, Ramchander Hari and Trimbak Hari became military officers in the service of the Poona Government. In 1764 Peshwa Madhu Rao I granted a saranjam in the name of Govind Rao, and from it personal allowances were fixed for his nephews Parashuram Bhau and Neelkunt Rao. In return for these allowances, they were required to contribute 2,400 and 1,000 troops respectively out of the total of 8,000 due from Govind Rao. On the death of Govind Rao, a new Tynaut Zaubtah was issued in the name of

---

8 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.87 .
9 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.82 .
Wauman Rao, his son; and after Wauman's death, in the name of Chintaman Rao, grandson of Wauman Rao.

The saranjam of the Patwardhan family which lay north of the Kistna was divided into four distinct, but unequal, parts at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Chintaman Rao, the nominal chief of the Patwardhan family, resided at Sangli near the confluence of the Varna and the Kistna, and to the north-west of Miraj. His estate formed a third of the lands owned by the Patwardhan family. He was 'a capricious and irritable chieftain', 'too haughty and unruly'.^ Trimbak Rao Neelkunt lived at Kurrundwad south of the Kistna and south west of Miraj. Narrayan Rao Gangadhar lived at Miraj. Appa Saheb who was commonly regarded as the head of the Patwardhan family was, like Chintaman Rao, also of a turbulent disposition. Besides his jagir at Tasgaon, he possessed certain districts in Savanur. The value of the saranjam

---


11 In 1782 Miraj passed into the hands of Chintaman Rao, then only a child of six. He was therefore placed under the guardianship of his uncle Gangadhar Rao or Balla Saheb who usurped Miraj and other places during the minority of his ward. These places were confirmed to Narrayan Rao Gangadhar, son of Balla Saheb, in about 1809 by a sanad from the Peshwa. Thus Narrayan Rao did not derive his lands from the original tripartite division of Govind Rao's saranjam. (See Aitchison, *Treaties and Sanads*, Third Edition (Calcutta, 1892), Vol.vii, p.187.

12 Appa Saheb inherited his lands in Savanur from his father, Parashuram Bhau. During the third Mysorean war, Parashuram Bhau received orders from the Peshwa to raise a large body of troops in excess of his saranjamy quota; and on the conclusion of the war, Parashuram Bhau was given the conquered countries including Savanur in payment of the expenses he had incurred in maintaining those troops.
of the Patwardhans was fixed at Rs.25,20,568. But the revenue from the lands assigned to them appeared never to have exceeded Rs.24,00,000. Therefore the number of troops due from them was subsequently reduced from the original number of 8,000 first to 6,597 and again to 5,850, after the occupation of part of their saranjamy lands by Sindhia in 1800.

Madhu Rao Rastia was Jagirdar of Wai. The first grant of saranjamy lands to his family was made in about 1757 when Anand Rao Bheekaji received lands to the value of Rs.10,00,000. Of this amount nine lacs were for the support of 3,000 horse. In 1811 the saranjamy lands of Madhu Rao Rastia were valued at Rs.10,41,008. His quota of troops was 3,302 horsemen. Madhu Rao was a man of insignificant talents.

Bapuji Gokhale inherited part of his saranjam from his uncle, Dhoondoo Pant, who was originally an officer in the service of

---

14 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.84.
15 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.84. The revenues and troops were divided among the four Patwardhan chiefs as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Horse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chintaman Rao</td>
<td>7,13,623</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appa Sahêb</td>
<td>7,54,319</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimbak Rao</td>
<td>2,35,238</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narayan Rao</td>
<td>4,50,762</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.84.
Parashuram Bhau. Dhoondoo Pant later entered the service of the Peshwa and received the districts of Noulgoond and Gudduk as saranjam for the maintenance of half of his troops. The other half was paid from the treasury. These lands lay near the western frontier of Hyderabad south of the Malpurba and north of the Tungabhadra. When Dhoondoo Pant was killed at the beginning of Colonel Wellesley's campaign against the freebooter Dhondiah Waugh (1800), Bapuji Gokhale inherited his uncle's saranjam. This was later increased by the Peshwa on the recommendation of the Government of India. By 1811 Gokhale's saranjam lands were worth only seven lacs of Rupees although he was entitled to lands worth Rs.11,21,500. The troops which he was required to maintain numbered 2,200 cavalry and 2,500 infantry. Gokhale was 'a steady, brave and respectable chief and one of the ablest men in the State of Poona'.

Appa Desai was hereditary Desai of Nipani, and was first employed in the service of the Raja of Kolhapur. Later he entered the service of Sindhia. In 1803 he entered the Peshwa's service and received a saranjam worth Rs.10,00,000. His quota of troops comprised 2,000 horse and 500 foot. His own country was worth about Rs.60,000 a year. Appa Desai was 'violent, oppressive and unruly, but active, energetic and much dreaded by his neighbours'.

18 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.85.
19 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.85.
21 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.86.
The lands of the Desai of Kittur lay south of the Malpurba. His territories were ceded by Tipu Sultan of Mysore to the Marathas to whom he was for a long time tributary. He only became a military chief in the service of the Peshwa in about 1810 when he received a saranjam in the name of his son. His saranjam was worth only Rs.1,49,900 for which he was required to maintain 473 horsemen. The revenue yielded by his own country was about four lacs of Rupees.23

As the Peshwa's authority decayed, their enormous financial and military resources enabled the Southern Jagirdars to defy his Government and to hold his person in contempt. Peshwa Baji Rao was, however, too 'tenacious of authority' to tolerate such insubordination. As a man, he was courteous, dignified in his manners and generally speaking, humane; but he could also be 'vindictive in the extreme.' He never forgot an injury and spared 'no machinations to ruin the object of his resentment'.24 Peshwa Baji Rao was no stranger to adversity. He was born on January 10 1775. His father was Raghunath Rao (brother of Peshwa Balaji Baji Rao) who acted as Regent during the minority of his nephew Madhu Rao, and again during the minority of Peshwa Narrayan Rao, brother of Madhu Rao. Baji Rao spent much of his early life

23 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.86 .
sharing his father's exile at Kopargaon. In October 1792, he was confined at Anandvalli near Nasik with his mother and brothers, Chimnaji Appa and Amrit Rao (the adopted son of his father). After his mother's death in 1794, he and his brothers were transferred to the hill fort of Shivner in Junnar. There Nana Fadnavis kept him under close watch to frustrate his communications with his childless cousin Peshwa Savai Madhu Rao. After several vicissitudes, Baji Rao eventually became Peshwa at the end of 1796. Between 1804 and 1811 he struggled hard to re-assert his authority in Maharashtra.

ii. The crisis in the Maratha State and the policy of Non-intervention, 1804-1811.

By the beginning of 1804, the Peshwa's Government had practically

25 The civil war in the Maratha State was triggered off by the suspicion that Raghunath Rao was responsible for the death of Peshwa Narrayan Rao in 1773. By Article 6 of the Treaty of Salbai (1782) which ended the First Maratha war, Raghunath Rao was permitted to choose a place of residence outside Poona. He chose Kopargaon on the Godavery.

26 Nana Fadnavis was a shrewd statesman and a great Maratha patriot. He played the leading role in the Ministry (Regency Council) set up in 1773 following the death of Peshwa Narrayan Rao. On the accession of Baji Rao to the Peshwaship in 1796, Nana Fadnavis's fortunes declined. He was imprisoned for nearly a year in Ahmednagar fort; but in October 1798, he was released and asked to resume control of Baji Rao's administration. Nana's death on 13 March 1800 marked the 'end of all the wisdom and moderation of the Mahratha government'. See Grant Duff, History of the Mahrathas, Vol.ii, p.350; H.H. Dodwell (ed.), Cambridge History of India, (Cambridge, 1929) Vol.v, p.372.
ceased to exist. In a letter to the Governor-General, General Wellesley observed:

In fact, my Lord, the Peshwah's government is at present only a name. His Highness has not settled even the country along the Beemah, 5 miles from Poonah. It is at this moment a dreary waste, overrun by thieves; and his Highness is incapable of conducting his government himself: he gives no confidence or power to any body, and he has no person about him able to conduct the common business of the country. 27

Four months later, General Wellesley again commented on the state of the Peshwa's Government in a letter to Colonel Close:

It now appears that the Peshwah is not supported by a single Mahratha sirdar or horseman, that he does not enjoy any revenue, and that he has no means whatsoever of supporting his own authority. The records at Poonah will show that he lately applied to me to take measures to catch thieves who had taken refuge in the jungles; and it now appears that, in order to enable the Peshwah to carry on his government at all, the country must be conquered again by the British troops. 28

It was this extreme weakness of the Peshwa's Government that forced him to swallow his pride and accept the subsidiary Treaty of Bassein in December 1802. By the turn of the eighteenth century, he had lost his


28 Ibid., pp.393-94, General Wellesley to Colonel Close, 12 May 1804. (Emphasis mine.)
authority over the Confederate Chiefs as well as the Jagirdars of Maharashtra who were under his immediate authority. The treaty of Bassein placed the Confederate Chiefs beyond the scope of his authority; but it committed the Government of India to assist him to re-establish his authority over Maharashtra. According to the treaty, the Peshwa invoked British aid in subjugating the disobedient Jagirdars.

On 1 March 1804 Peshwa Baji Rao sent his Minister, Sadashiv Mankeshwar, to General Arthur Wellesley to complain about the conduct of the Patwardhans 'who had refused to attend to his requisition and had returned to the south contrary to positive orders'. The Minister stated that it was his Highness' wish to reward Gokhale and Appa Desai who had served in the late war 'with the lands held by the chiefs of the family of Pursheram Bhow, by Prittee Niddee, and by Rastia; and he asked whether the principle of rewarding those who did serve, and of punishing those who did not, was not fair?' The Minister further told General Wellesley that the Peshwa expected to accomplish his object with the assistance of the Government of India. He then gave General Wellesley 'the choice of two plans, either to begin with the family of

---

29 See above p. 14, footnote no. 4.  
Pursheram Bhow, or with Rastia and Prittee Niddee; and to deceive, in the mean time, that party whose destruction might be delayed.\textsuperscript{32}

General Wellesley tried to dissuade the Peshwa from such a course of action. He referred to the weakness of the Peshwa's Government and expressed the fear that the whole of the Southern Jagirdars might unite in common hostility to the Poona Government. The General pointed out that the disorders and confusion which would result from such a civil war might tempt a foreign enemy to interfere in the Maratha State. He advised the Peshwa that it would be better for him to forget the bitterness and humiliations of the last civil war and to 'endeavour, by pardon and conciliation, to settle his government and country, than to enter on any system of revenge so extensive as that proposed, and so dangerous and so imprudent'.\textsuperscript{33} In any case, General Wellesley told the Minister that the Peshwa's request for British assistance could not be granted without orders from the Governor-General.

On 7 March 1804 General Wellesley reported the Peshwa's policy to the Governor-General; and suggested that in its own interest, the Government of India should intervene to settle the disputes between the Peshwa and the Jagirdars.

There is no doubt whatever [General Wellesley observed] that the Peshwa's government cannot exist on its present footing. Unless the British

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., p.380.

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., p.380.
government interfere in some manner respecting the southern jaghireddars, there will be a contest in the southern part of the Empire, which will, in its consequences, affect Mysore and the Company's territories. They will be obliged to interfere in the end, probably with less effect than they can at present, and in the meantime all the benefit of the services of the southern chiefs and their troops is entirely lost. 34.

Arthur Wellesley suggested four alternative lines of action: First, to assist the Peshwa in the destruction of the Southern Jagirdars; second, to observe absolute neutrality in the disputes between the Peshwa and the Jagirdars; third, to interfere to oblige the Jagirdars to perform their customary service under British guarantee of their lands as long as they faithfully served the Peshwa; fourth, to convert the Jagirdars at once into independent States under the protection and guarantee of the Government of India.

General Wellesley then proceeded to examine the merit of each of his propositions. He felt that if the first was adopted and the settlement of the country was subsequently left in the hands of the Peshwa, the new political order which would emerge in the Maratha State would 'not be so advantageous to the British government as that which exists at present'. 35 If the second was adopted, he feared that it would result in a long contest of doubtful result. The

34 Ibid., p.382. (Emphasis mine.) The Company's territories (Kanara) which bordered on Southern Maharashtra were obtained from Mysore as a result of the Anglo-Mysorean wars of 1790 and 1799.
resources of the country would be destroyed; communications between Mysore and Poona would be disrupted; vast bodies of freebooters might gather in the southern provinces of the Maratha State and in close proximity to British territories. These developments would ultimately oblige the Government of India to interfere to safeguard the security and peace of its own territories as well as those of the Raja of Mysore. The fourth might best ensure the security of British territories but it would be tantamount to an unjust expropriation. General Wellesley therefore thought that the third proposition would be the best course of action for the Government of India to take.

The Governor-General approved of General Wellesley's suggestion and empowered him to arbitrate the disputes between the Peshwa and the Southern Jagirdars. On 8 July 1804 Mr. Strachey was appointed arbitrator and instructed to start with Appa Saheb commonly regarded as head of the Patwardhan family. Under the terms proposed by the Government

36

Ibid., pp.403-404. The terms offered were as follows:

i. There was to be mutual forgiveness and pardon of all injuries on both sides. The Government of India was to guarantee the security of the persons of Appa Saheb, his brothers, relations and adherents so long as they served the Peshwa faithfully and refrained from all intrigues with his enemies.

ii. Appa Saheb, his brothers, etc., were to hold the lands mentioned in their Sanads under the guarantee of the Government of India as long as their conduct towards the Peshwa was proper. The lands to be so guaranteed were to be settled by arbitration with due regard to the claims of the Peshwa and the counter claims of Appa Saheb.

iii. In view of the ruin which his lands had suffered from the civil wars, Appa Saheb was not to be required to furnish at any time more than two-thirds of his stipulated saranjamy force. This
of India, Appa Saheb was to restore all the lands he had usurped. In return, his quota of saranjamy troops was to be reduced; and the Government of India was to guarantee the security of his lands, his person and those of his brothers, relations and partisans. Mr. Strachey was instructed to allow the Jagirdars to settle their disputes directly with the Peshwa if they preferred that to his mediation. Rastia and Appa Saheb welcomed British mediation and agreed to go to Poona; Chintaman Rao, however, spurned Mr. Strachey's proposals. During the next few months, the war with Holkar assumed alarming dimensions. As a result the settlement with the Jagirdars was suspended. When the subject was renewed by the Peshwa after the war with Holkar, the Resident at Poona was instructed to refrain from interference in the disputes. This was in line with the policy of non-intervention or 'ring-fence', which was rehabilitated by Lord Cornwallis who succeeded Lord Wellesley as Governor-General in July 1805.

Irrespective of British policy, however, Peshwa Baji Rao was determined to press on with his policy of dispossessing the Southern Jagirdars. His efforts, however, proved indecisive and hampered the reduced quota was, however, to be produced whenever it was demanded. One-third of it was to be permanently stationed at Poona under the command of a member of the Patwardhan family, the security of whose person was to be guaranteed by the Government of India.

iv. Appa Saheb and his relations were to restore to the Peshwa all lands which they held without authority.
restoration of stability in the Maratha State. Between 1806 and 1811 rebellions and disorders prevailed everywhere. At the beginning of 1806 fighting broke out between the troops of the late Killadar of Savanur and troops of the Peshwa's agent. The former were assisted by some of the chiefs south of the Kistna.\textsuperscript{37} In the same year, the Pant Pratinidhi who had escaped from his prison in the fort of Mhasvad declared himself a servant of the Raja of Satara and under no obligation to obey the Peshwa. In the name of the Raja, he embarked upon a career of plunder and devastation. In March 1806 he was defeated by Gokhale who had not yet rebelled against Baji Rao's authority. The Pratinidhi was brought to Poona and imprisoned. A small portion of his extensive jagir was reserved for his maintenance, and the rest sequestrated.

By 1811 the Peshwa's efforts had been partially rewarded. Besides the Pratinidhi's estates, Peshwa Baji Rao had succeeded in seizing several of the estates of the weaker Jagirdars. Encouraged by these successes, his policy towards Rastia and the Patwardhans became more and more vindictive. The prospect of a long civil war in districts which lay in close proximity to British territories began to worry the Government of India. In fact a stage had been reached in the affairs of the Maratha State which the Government of India could not safely ignore, and British intervention in some form or the other in the affairs of Maharashtra seemed inevitable.

\textsuperscript{37} P. C. Gupta, \textit{Baji Rao II and the East India Company}, p. 87.

After the failure of Mr. Strachey's mission in 1804, the problem of the Southern Jagirdars did not engage the serious attention of the Government of India again till 1811 when Mountstuart Elphinstone assumed duty as British Resident at Poona. Born on 6 October 1779 to General Lord Elphinstone, eleventh baron in the peerage of Scotland, Mountstuart Elphinstone arrived in Bengal in 1796 as a writer at the age of sixteen. In 1801 at the age of twenty-two, he was transferred to the Political Department or Diplomatic Service and appointed to Poona as Assistant to the Resident, Colonel Barry Close. He served in this capacity till December 1803 when he was transferred from Poona to Nagpur. He was with General Wellesley at Assaye and earned the following recommendation:

He is well versed in the languages, has experience and a knowledge of the interests of the Mahratta powers, and their relations with each other, and with the British Government and its allies. 38.

Mountstuart Elphinstone was thus suitably qualified for the post of Resident at Poona. He proved to be a shrewd diplomat with a perceptive mind.

During the first three months of Elphinstone's stay at Poona, Baji Rao importuned him with complaints against nearly all of the Southern Jagirdars. He complained about Appa Saheb's retention of the fort of Hoobly contrary to his agreement with Mr. Russell, Mount-stuart Elphinstone's predecessor. The Peshwa considered the conduct of Appa Saheb as proof of his recalcitrance for which the least punishment should be the confiscation of his saranjam.

The Peshwa's Minister, Sadashiv Mankeshwar, recounted all the instances of Appa Saheb's disobedience since Baji Rao became Peshwa. These included Appa Saheb's appropriation of certain districts in Savanur which he surrendered only after being threatened with an attack by the subsidiary force. Appa Saheb was also alleged to

39 Appa Saheb had after a long negotiation promised Mr. Russell (then Acting Resident at Poona) to restore fourteen districts which he held without Sanads in Savanur and elsewhere. At the time of Mr. Russell's departure from Poona, he had actually surrendered thirteen. But nearly four months after he made the promise, he still retained possession of the fourteenth district, namely Hoobly, with no intention of giving it up. On the contrary, he moved the Governor's family from Tasgaon to Hoobly to join him. In a defiant letter which he sent in reply to Elphinstone's note calling on him to fulfil his promise, Appa Saheb stated that he would surrender the fort only 'when an order and guns and infantry and other requisites come from the Government'. (G. S. Sardesai, P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.4 .

40 G. S. Sardesai, P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.8 .

41 The Minister alleged that Appa Saheb had begged the Peshwa to entrust him with the settlement of the province of Savanur. He had deliberately protracted the war and occupied part of the conquered province for ten months while his troops lived in free quarters in the Peshwa's country. He had seized the officers of the former Governor and ignored repeated orders to send them to Poona. He
have disobeyed orders to march his troops against the Pindaris when they threatened the Peshwa's territories.

The Peshwa also complained against the insolence of Madhu Rao Rastia. Rastia had promised to surrender certain districts which he held without Sanads on condition of the payment of a certain sum by the Peshwa. Baji Rao alleged that though he had advanced the sum of Rs.2,50,000 and offered to remit his claims to the accumulated revenues of the districts concerned, yet Rastia still refused to surrender the fort of Bedaumy, the most important of the districts in question.

As for Gokhale, he had retained the whole of the extensive jagir of the Pratinidhi (valued at Rs.18,00,000) since he occupied it in 1805. He had neither accounted for the revenues nor obeyed repeated orders to hand over the jagir to another officer. Baji Rao demanded the surrender of the territory and an account of the whole of the revenues collected from it. He indicated that he was ready to deposit at the British Residency the sum of Rs.37,00,000 claimed by Gokhale as had appropriated all the public and private property which fell into his hands; and had retained possession of the districts which he had subdued till threatened with a joint attack by the Peshwa's troops and the subsidiary force. Appa Saheb then promised Mr. Russell that he would surrender the districts and account for the revenues collected in ten days.

The Pindaris were a band of freebooters whose haunts lay in the valley of the Narbada.

G. S. Sardesai, P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.13

P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.8-9, 32-33.
reimbursement for the expenses he incurred in taking possession of the jagir. The Peshwa further complained that Gokhale had refused to permit his agents to enter the Pratinidhi's fort of Purchetgur. Instead, Gokhale had persuaded the garrison to surrender it to himself. 45

After these complaints, Baji Rao outlined his policy to Mountstuart Elphinstone. He regarded the Southern Jagirdars as rebels and traitors and stated his desire to dismiss them all from his service. 46 His Minister told Elphinstone that the enmity between the Patwardhan family and the Peshwa was implacable. He alleged that Appa Saheb had always disobeyed the Peshwa and that the Poona Government derived no benefit from his saranjamy troops. Therefore the Peshwa wished to transfer his lands to other Sardars. Baji Rao was also determined to deprive Gokhale of his entire jagir and to devote its revenues to the maintenance of a body of troops to be paid directly from his treasury and to be commanded by officers chosen by himself. 47 He requested Elphinstone to send at least two battalions of the subsidiary force to assist his troops at Belgaum to recover Hoobly and to intimidate the other Jagirdars into submitting to his demands. 48

45 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.25,31.  
46 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.9. Mountstuart Elphinstone to the Governor-General, 13 April 1811.  
47 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.25. Elphinstone to the Hon. the Vice-President, 16 June 1811.  
The Government of India was not inclined to encourage the Peshwa's policy because it was fraught with danger to the security of British territories in south India. The security of these territories had been a matter of concern to the Government of India ever since 1800, that is, even before the Treaty of Bassein was signed. In that year, General Wellesley drew attention to the political instability in the southern Maratha country and recommended that

in order to insure the tranquillity of our own territories, it will be necessary that we should take some steps to remedy the deficiency in the government of our neighbours, which has endangered it, and has been the cause of the expense which has been incurred in the assembling of the troops under my command. 49.

In General Wellesley's view, the best way of ensuring the tranquillity of British territories in south India was to maintain the integrity of the estates of the Patwardhan family and to use them as a bulwark against inroads from the Maratha State. He regarded the Patwardhan family as the best friends which the Government of India had in the Maratha State. He recalled the services of Parashuram Bhau in the army under his command during the third Mysorean war, as well as those of his sons and relatives during the campaign against Dhoondia Waugh. He did not therefore consider it prudent for the Government of India to connive at their destruction.

The Putwurdhun family, [he pointed out] connected, ... as they are with the British government, are certainly the most respectable of all the Peshwah's subjects properly so called. They are the support of the system of order which exists on the Company's frontier, and on the frontier of Mysore; and they are a check to the nest of freebooters kept by the Rajah of Kolapoor, and to the numerous polygars who inhabit the countries watered by the Kistna, Malpoorba, and Gutpurba. 50.

Thus, even long before the Peshwa unfolded his plans of crushing the Patwardhans to the British Authorities, they had been considering the contrary policy of preserving the Patwardhans as a bulwark for their own territories in southern India as well as those of their allies.

For this reason and in the interest of general tranquillity in India, Elphinstone tried to prevail upon the Peshwa to abandon his policy of destroying the Southern Jagirdars. He did not dispute the Peshwa's right to insist on the recovery of Hoobly and its revenue which Appa Saheb had already promised to refund. But he thought that these objectives could be attained without the use of force. He tried to extenuate Appa Saheb's misconduct and urged the Peshwa to forget the indignities which he had suffered at the hands of the Patwardhan family in the past. Elphinstone pleaded that it would be unwise for the Peshwa to destroy the ancient families in the Maratha State. He was of the opinion that violence towards Appa Saheb would harden resistance by the other Jagirdars. 51 The Resident offered to write to warn Appa Saheb

50 Ibid., p.375. General Wellesley to Lieutenant-Colonel Close, 23 February 1804. (Emphasis mine.)
that unless he evacuated Hoobly before the Peshwa's troops moved from Belgaum, the subsidiary force would be used to assist in expelling him. In that case, the Peshwa's expenses would be charged to him. As for the use of the subsidiary force to intimidate the other Jagirdars, the Resident declined to consider the request until he was satisfied with the justice of His Highness's claims against them. He also wished to convince himself that all peaceful avenues of settlement had been exhausted.

With regard to the Peshwa's decision to dismiss the Jagirdars from his service and create an army under his own direct authority, Elphinstone expressed strong disapproval. Particularly, he did not wish the Peshwa and the allies to lose the services of Gokhale. The increasing raids of the Pindaris into the Deccan necessitated that the allies should maintain their armies in an efficient state for the defence of their territories. It was clear to the Resident that this would be difficult under the Peshwa's proposed scheme. As the proposed army was to be paid directly from the treasury, Elphinstone

52 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.15.
53 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.25. Elphinstone to the Honourable the Vice-President, 16 June 1811. Elphinstone commented: 'The Paishwa's plan of maintaining an army to be paid from his treasury, certainly at first sight presents many advantages, but when they are examined, none will be found to compensate for the loss of such a force as Gokla's. From the careless and indolent character that pervades every department of the Paishwa's Government, it is highly improbable that the proposed branch of the army will ever be diligently attended to.'
concluded that there would be no permanent endowment for its main-
tenance. He feared that the pay of the troops would fall into arrears
and lead to false musters. Besides, the commanders of the proposed
army were likely to be selected from among court favourites and might
prove to be unfit for their duties. In short, Elphinstone feared that
under the proposed scheme, the burden of defending the Peshwa's State
might fall almost entirely on British troops. For these reasons
Elphinstone was opposed to 'the sacrifice of any part of his [i.e., the
Peshwa's] efficient army'.

Elphinstone was left in no doubt that Baji Rao was determined
to assert his sovereignty over the Jagirdars. He became convinced that
the longer the Jagirdars resisted the Peshwa's demands, the more
relentless Baji Rao would become in his decision to seize their entire
saranjams. He was equally convinced that the Peshwa would continue
to press his right to the service of the subsidiary force in carrying
out his policy. Therefore he thought that it would be expedient to
use the subsidiary force to compel Appa Saheb to fulfil his promise
to Mr. Russell, in the hope that this would intimidate the others and
facilitate their quiet submission to the Peshwa. Such a quiet sub-
mission, the Resident thought, would gratify the Peshwa's pride and
incline him to listen to an intercession on behalf of the Southern
Jagirdars. Unfortunately, the orders of the Government of India to

Mr. Russell about the use of the subsidiary force were so explicit that the Resident did not consider himself at liberty to employ it for such a purpose without authority from the Governor-General. Accordingly, he sought permission from the Government of India to employ the force as a last resort to compel Appa Saheb to fulfil an agreement which was concluded through the mediation of the Government of India.  

In July 1811 the Government of India laid down certain principles for the guidance of Mountstuart Elphinstone in handling the disputes between the Peshwa and the Jagirdars. It recognised the predicament of the Peshwa and sympathised with his desire to possess an army under his direct command. It realised that the possession of such an army would reduce his dependence on the service of his feudal chiefs whose individual resources and power often placed them beyond his control. Nevertheless, for the sake of the security of its territories which adjoined those of the Southern Jagirdars, the Government of India was opposed to the Peshwa's policy of raising a new army through the seizure of the estates of the Southern Jagirdars.

55 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.17. Elphinstone to the Vice-President in Council, 9 May 1811. The required permission was given at the end of May. But the Resident decided to postpone action against Appa Saheb till the Government of India decided on a general policy to be pursued towards the entire body of Jagirdars. In this way, the Resident thought that the subsidiary force might be used to subdue the entire body of the Jagirdars in one single operation and thus save effort and expenditure.
To reduce [the Vice-President in Council told Elphinstone] but not to extinguish the power of the Jagheerdars, to recover from them their usurpation and the just demands of the State are wise and legitimate purposes and the aid of the British Government by which alone he can hope to attain them, cannot perhaps in due season be withheld. But the measures to be adopted would require a degree of deliberation, prudence and moderation, with which the violence and precipitation of the proceedings meditated by the Paishwa are entirely inconsistent and from the prosecution of which the British Government has a right to withhold him. 56

Thus by July 1811 the Government of India had come to recognise that its intervention in the political crisis in the Maratha State was inevitable. The intervention was necessitated by the need to strengthen the Poona Government as well as the need to maintain the tranquillity of British territories in south India. Nevertheless, the Government of India wanted to play for more time. It not only wished to bring about a settlement on its own terms, but it also wished to choose a time that suited its own convenience for the intervention. For the moment its attention was engrossed by events outside India.57 It did not therefore wish the Peshwa's disputes with his Jagirdars to be seriously agitated at this period. For this reason it censured

56 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.42-43. N. B. Edmonstone to Mountstuart Elphinstone, 12 July 1811. (Emphasis mine.)
57 Between March and September 1811 Lord Minto, the Governor-General, was away from India on his expedition against Java.
Elphinstone for applying directly to the Poona Durbar for details of the Peshwa's claims on the Southern Jagirdars. 58

This desire to postpone British intervention in the crisis in the Maratha State was reiterated from time to time. Elphinstone was particularly reminded that in advising the Peshwa about his disputes with his Jagirdars, he should take care to

recommend those measures of cautious moderation, equity and justice which may preclude the necessity of having recourse to coercion, and the hazard of committing the British Government to the prosecution of military operations in support of his Highness's rights, and...rather discourage this course and advise (him to desist from) the immediate advancement of claims however just, which [he] may have reason to believe cannot be satisfied without the employment of a military force. 59

58 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.43. Elphinstone was told: 'It was not the wish of Government that for a knowledge of these points, an application should be made to the Durbar. Such an application must naturally be construed to imply that the British Government is prepared to enforce his Highness's claims and must suggest the supposition that a statement of them is demanded with a view to enforce them; and this effect of the application appears to have been present to your mind, as you observe that no application could be more welcome to his Highness's Government. On a reference however to the instructions of the 9th of February you will observe that Government was particularly anxious to avoid the predicament above described and accordingly after an explanation of the mode in which agreeably to the spirit of the alliance any claims on the part of the Paishwa involving the employment of the subsidiary force should be brought forward, it is added that it was not the wish of Government that it should be suggested to the Paishwa to bring forward any demands or propose any arrangements of the nature antecedently described for the reasons thereinafter stated.' (Emphasis mine.)

59 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.46. N. B. Edmonstone to Mountstuart Elphinstone, 19 July 1811. (Emphasis mine. 'he' in the last but one line of quotation reads 'you' in the original.)
In spite, however, of the attempt to postpone British intervention in the crisis in southern Maharashtra, the Government of India was forced to intervene before long.

The threat posed to the security of the territories of the British and their allies by the political crisis in the Maratha State was not only a direct one. There was also an indirect threat. By incapacitating the Peshwa's Government, the crisis made the Maratha State a weak link in the chain of defensive arrangements against the Pindaris. Since 1809 these freebooters had been intensifying their raids into the Deccan. But the Government of India was powerless to take offensive measures against them because the Court of Directors was averse to such a course of action. The Directors were anxious to avoid war with Sindhia and Holkar who were patrons of the Pindaris. The Government of India therefore had to content itself with taking measures to defend its frontiers and encouraging its allies to rely on their own exertions to defend theirs. Accordingly, the Resident urged the Peshwa to send troops to defend the northern frontier of his State. In the middle of August 1811 the Resident informed the Peshwa's Minister that the only part of the common frontier which remained unprotected

---

60 At the beginning of 1809 the Pindaris under Ameer Khan invaded Berar. Because of Berar's contiguity with Bengal, Lord Minto gave the Raja of Berar military aid to expel them though the Raja was not entitled to such aid.
was that of the Peshwa. He then inquired about the Peshwa's plans for the defence of his State.

The Minister stated that His Highness had no other plans than to order the Southern Jagirdars to repair to the frontier with their contingents. But he complained that with the exception of Gokhale and Appa Desai, none of the Jagirdars had shown a willingness to obey the Peshwa's orders. The Minister expressed the hope that this new evidence of insubordination would convince the Resident of the necessity of confiscating their jagirs and devoting their revenues to the maintenance of an obedient army. He told Elphinstone further that the Peshwa expected the subsidiary force to assist his own force on the frontier if the Pindaris proved to be too formidable.

Elphinstone replied that though it was proper for the Peshwa to demand the service of the Jagirdars for the protection of his frontier, he ought not to rely too much on their support. Rather, he should endeavour to raise a force of his own for that purpose. As for the request for the assistance of the subsidiary force, the Resident refused to consider it. He told the Minister that the protection of the Peshwa's frontier was not a service for which the subsidiary force could be properly employed. Besides, infantry was useless against the Pindaris.

61 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.63. Elphinstone told the Minister that the Raja of Berar was employing the whole of his resources against the Pindaris. He stated that the Nizam had 17,000 troops with a proportion of artillery on his frontier.
What was needed, he pointed out, was a body of light cavalry not for the purpose of fighting the Pindaris but for chasing them out of his country. He added that the only regiment of cavalry with the subsidiary force could not cope with the numerous bodies into which the Pindaris would divide. Consequently, he told the Minister that

His Highness must, therefore, of necessity depend entirely on his own resources for protection against the Pindarries; and...to take effectual measures to save his country from the grievous calamities to which it would be exposed, if he neglected to take the necessary precautions in time.

Elphinstone warned that if the Peshwa was reluctant to raise troops from motives of parsimony, he ought to realise that every rupee he saved in this way might in the end cost him a thousand.

At the beginning of October 1811, the Resident revived the discussion about the defence of the Peshwa's frontier. He told the Peshwa that the number of troops which he had sent to the frontier was inadequate. He requested that the strength of the Peshwa's force be increased till it was commensurate with that of the force to which it was to be opposed. The Resident reiterated that the subsidiary force could not be properly employed for the defence of the Peshwa's

62 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.57. Elphinstone to the Vice-President, 9 August 1811.
63 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.64. Elphinstone to the Vice-President, 18 August 1811.
64 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p. 64.
65 The troops consisted of about 2,000 Horse.
frontier against the Pindaris. He denied that the anticipated Pindari inroads were formidable enough to justify their being regarded as an invasion which required the services of the subsidiary force. The Resident regretted that the Peshwa should have abolished the system of Sibhandis throughout his dominions and thereby left his villages undefended. He sympathised with the Peshwa's complaints against the Jagirdars. But he declared that since it was certain that their services could not be secured, the Peshwa had no alternative but to employ some other means for the defence of his State.

Peshwa Baji Rao became irritated. He told the Resident that he had an adequate army for whose maintenance a great portion of his resources was allotted. But its commanders disregarded his orders; and instead of assisting him, they obliged him to employ some of his other troops in watching their movements. He told the Resident that if only the subsidiary force were sent to the frontier and the Jagirdars induced to send their contingents to supplement his levies, there would be nothing to fear from the Pindaris. He regretted that Elphinstone

66 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.73 . Elphinstone to His Excellency the Vice-President, 3 October 1811. The Resident estimated that the Peshwa had not a single soldier beyond his own 2,000 Horse, 500 of the Vinchur Jagirdar's and two battalions of infantry for the defence of his whole frontier. He thought that this made it easy for the Pindaris to plunder his open country and sack his villages up to Poona almost unopposed if they wished. The strength of the Pindaris was estimated at 25,000.

67 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.73 . Elphinstone to the Vice-President, 3 October 1811.
did not appreciate his point of view. He then remarked in exasperation that the Southern Jagirdars could remain idle as Elphinstone seemed to think advisable; and that the subsidiary force could also remain at Seroor. But he warned that he could not be blamed if the small body of troops which he could assemble was overpowered. 68

The irritation felt by the Peshwa was not without justification. He considered it unjust and redundant to be asked to incur the additional expense of raising a new army besides the subsidiary force and his saranjamy troops. He failed to understand why the Government of India should indulge the Jagirdars and allow them to deny him the service of the saranjamy troops under their command. To him, the attitude of the Government of India was tantamount to a condonement of the rebellion of the Jagirdars. This was clearly an infringement of Article 9 of the Treaty of Bassein. 69

It became clear to Elphinstone that British intervention in the disputes between the Peshwa and the Southern Jagirdars could not safely be postponed for too long. The Pindari raids were increasing daily, both in frequency and intensity. But until the Peshwa's disputes with the Jagirdars were settled, Baji Rao could not be relied upon to cooperate with the allies in checking the tide of Pindari

68 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.74. Elphinstone to the Vice-President, 3 October 1811.
69 See above p.14, footnote no.4.
inroads into the Deccan and south India. The distracted state of his country was likely to offer free passage to these freebooters. Nor would he be able to fulfil his military obligations under the Treaty of Bassein in the event of the allies becoming involved in a serious war. Therefore Elphinstone sent a lengthy despatch to the Government of India in which he showed why British intervention could no longer be withheld.

Elphinstone first reviewed the reasons adduced by General Wellesley in favour of British intervention in the disputes between the Peshwa and the Jagirdars. He admitted that the harmful consequences anticipated by General Wellesley from a policy of neutrality had not materialised to any significant degree. But he thought that that happy situation was due to a number of fortuitous circumstances. In the first place, he believed that the Southern Jagirdars were unaware of the policy of non-intervention. He thought it possible that the Peshwa might have restrained the Jagirdars by sedulously insinuating that the Government of India was ready to punish any outrageous conduct on their part.

---

70 By the Fourth Supplementary Article to the Treaty of Bassein, the Peshwa was bound to provide and furnish a body of 5,000 cavalry and 3,000 infantry with due proportion of ordinance and military stores in time of war. (See C. U. Aitchison, op.cit., Vol.vi,p.61.)
Secondly, the Resident pointed out that in spite of the policy of non-intervention, the Resident at Poona found it necessary to interfere in the affairs of the Maratha State from time to time. For instance, General Close on several occasions remonstrated with the Jagirdars whenever their conduct threatened to disturb the public peace. He did so either through their vakils or by letter. Though these remonstrances were couched in the most cautious terms, Elphinstone believed that they must have influenced the conduct of the Jagirdars a great deal.\(^71\) Besides, a British force was kept on the Malpurba during the war with the Confederate Chiefs to deter the Jagirdars from committing any excesses.\(^72\) Finally, Elphinstone attributed the relative tranquillity which prevailed in the southern Maratha country during this period partly to the disunity among the Jagirdars which precluded any concerted action on their part.

In spite of all these favourable circumstances, the Resident pointed out that the southern Maratha country was not entirely free from the threat of serious disturbances. He reminded the Government of India that soon after the Pratinidhi's rebellion, Chintaman Rao threatened to join him if the Peshwa took any violent measures against

\(^{71}\) P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.96 . Elphinstone to Chief Secretary Edmonstone, 26 October 1811.

\(^{72}\) P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.97 . General Close from one of his despatches to the Government of India dated 27 July 1805 seemed to have held the view that but for the presence of British forces on the Malpurba, it would have been impossible to have kept the Jagirdars in order.
him. Chintaman Rao eventually did and compelled the Peshwa to suspend
his attack on the Pratinidhi for some time. Elphinstone believed that
if the British troops were not fully occupied at the time with other
duties, the Government of India would have authorised British inter­
vention to restrain both the Pratinidhi and Chintaman Rao. Since then,
Chintaman Rao had on more than one occasion, attacked the Peshwa's
estates as well as those of the Jagirdars loyal to the Peshwa. He was
induced to stop his depredations partly as a result of strong remon­
strances from the Resident. Chintaman Rao, the Resident disclosed,
had turned his estate into a sanctuary for freebooters pursued by the
troops of the Peshwa. Elphinstone also revealed that not long ago
Chintaman Rao had attacked the Peshwa's district of Belgaum. He had
abandoned the attack only on the approach of a strong detachment of
the Peshwa's army. 73

With regard to the Patwardhans in general, the Resident pointed
out that they maintained a constant correspondence with Sindhia and
Holkar while those Chiefs were at war with the Government of India.
They received an agent of Holkar with great respect and allowed another
to recruit a considerable force which assembled at Meritch (or Miraj).

In short [Elphinstone declared] though the Jagheerdars
never joined in any confederacy against the allies,
their conduct often occasioned much uneasiness and
a considerable British force was always required to
watch them. 74.

73 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.97 .
74 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.98 . (Emphasis mine.)
Elphinstone disclosed that instead of surrendering the lands which they had usurped, the Patwardhans continued to encroach on the territories of the Peshwa. 75

The Resident also informed the Government of India that the Jagirdars were disinclined to perform any service that did not further their own interests. For instance, in the previous year, none answered the Peshwa's summons to march their contingents to protect his frontier against the Pindaris. Even Gokhale and Appa Desai who had served the Peshwa faithfully since 1803 had recently become infected by the rebellious spirit of the other Jagirdars. As a result, they had joined in the civil wars among the Jagirdars and usurped considerable territory at the expense of the Peshwa. His Highness could no longer rely upon them to perform services which were not favourable to their own interests. Finally, the Resident informed the Government of India that the disturbances in the southern Maratha country had spread to the Peshwa's province of Savanur. He also disclosed that the prevailing disorders had resulted in the creation of a considerable body of freebooters in the area. These freebooters had on two occasions at least raided the territories of British allies, namely, the Nizam and the Raja of Mysore. 76

75 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.98 .
76 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.98 .
For all these reasons, Elphinstone recommended British intervention in the Peshwa's disputes with the Jagirdars. If the Government of India did not interfere, he thought that one of three things must happen: either the Peshwa would ultimately succeed in seizing the estates of the Jagirdars; or the Jagirdars might entirely renounce their allegiance to the Peshwa; or the state of instability in the southern Maratha country would remain as it had been in the past nine years. 77

The Resident believed that given a sufficiently powerful army and sufficient time, the Peshwa was capable of crushing the Jagirdars ultimately. Even with his small force he had entirely dispossessed the Pratinidhi, the Jagirdars of Baramutty and Belgaum, as well as Gunpat Rao Paunseh. He had also considerably reduced the jagir of Madhu Rao Rastia.

By continuing his present system [the Resident warned], the Paishwa may possibly reduce all the Jagheerdars without any decided interference on our part, in which case he would deprive them of their lands and all the bad consequences of the first of the plans, contemplated by Lord Wellington, would infallibly ensue. 78

It was also possible, the Resident pointed out, that the Jagirdars might be able to retain their lands till the Peshwa's claims lapsed

77 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.99 .
78 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.99 . (Emphasis mine.)
with the passage of time; or the Jagirdars might win their independence outright after a hard struggle with the Peshwa. The Resident then warned:

Supposing either of these events to take place without the intervention of the British Government in favour of the Jagheerdars, there would be strong reason for apprehending that they would disturb the neighbouring countries or form combinations with the enemies of the allies. There can certainly be no reason for expecting that they would behave better in those respects than they have done hitherto, and the power of the allies to restrain their turbulence would be much less than it ever has been.

The success either of the Paishwa or the Jagheerdars might be expected to be preceded by a struggle in which the neighbouring possessions of the Company, the Nizam, the Raja of Mysore, and the Paishwa would run a great chance of suffering materially. 79

Elphinstone did not wish to forecast the future line of conduct of the Jagirdars if they were allowed to remain in their current situation. But judging by their past conduct, he felt that they would behave with greater or less moderation in proportion to the ability of the Government of India to restrain them. Consequently, the Government of India would have to interfere from time to time to prevent great disorders. This intervention might become most urgent at a time when it was most inconvenient to do so.

From these premises [the Resident concluded] it appears to follow, that it is desirable for the British Government to interfere for the purpose of making such an arrangement as it may approve.

79 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.100.  (Emphasis mine.)
and that it is advisable for the British Government to choose its own time for interfering, and to settle the Jagheerdars on such a footing, as may prevent their distracting its attention at any future period. 80

The Resident did not anticipate serious opposition from the Peshwa. But he expected the Jagirdars to be reluctant to give up the lands they had usurped after having enjoyed undisturbed possession of them for so long. He hoped, however, that they might be intimidated by the prospect of allied action against them to accept a settlement. In any case he felt that the Government of India should not be discouraged from interfering for fear of combined opposition from the Jagirdars. It was an obstacle which would increase by being left alone. If the Peshwa's claims were to be enforced at all, then it would be better to do so before the Jagirdars deemed themselves to have acquired a prescriptive right to refuse to satisfy them. 81

The Resident did not believe that there would be any large-scale combination among the Jagirdars for the purpose of resisting a settlement. 82 In his opinion, the only Jagirdars likely to oppose a

80 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.100. (Emphasis mine.)
81 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.101.
82 Elphinstone pointed out that Gokhale and Appa Desai were in the process of returning to their allegiance and were on bad terms with the other Jagirdars. Gokhale had surrendered the Pratinidhi's forts while Appa Desai was showing an inclination to account for the conquests he had made from Kolhapur. From these two Jagirdars the Peshwa only required the surrender of lands recently usurped. As those lands were insignificant when compared with their lawful saranjamy lands, Gokhale and Appa Desai were not likely to be
settlement were the Patwardhans, especially Appa Saheb. If they resisted, the only Jagirdar likely to join them was Rastia. But the Resident believed that Rastia would not want to risk his lands. In any case Elphinstone observed:

...the difficulty of reducing the Jagheerdars becomes a question of inferior importance, if it appears to the Government that they have always shown a disposition to turbulence when the armies of the allies were engaged in any extensive war. In that case even, supposing that they would all unite to oppose us and that Gokla, Appa Dessaye, and the Dessaye of Kittoor were so much disaffected as to join them against the Paishwa to their own

irritated by the Peshwa's demand. Besides, if Gokhale resisted the Peshwa's demand he would lose the prospect of receiving the additional lands promised by the Peshwa. As for Appa Desai, resistance would isolate him and leave him to fight his wars with the Raja of Kolhapur single handed. The Desai of Kittur was not likely to resist either; for though he would lose an annual revenue of Rs. 45,000 by the settlement, he would recover all that part of his saranjam then held by the Patwardhans. (P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.102.)

P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.103. Elphinstone estimated that Appa Saheb would have to restore lands worth Rs. 3,00,000 per annum; Chintaman Rao Rs. 45,000; Trimbak Rao Rs. 10,000. But in return, the Patwardhans would regain possession of part of their lands lost to the Raja of Kolhapur and the Desai of Kittur. The Peshwa had no claims against Narrayan Rao. Elphinstone recommended that if the Patwardhans resisted a settlement, their strong forts (Meritch and Koosigul) should be captured to smother their rebellion. Meanwhile, the troops of the allies could be used to protect their respective countries against inroads. He estimated the total force of the Patwardhans at about 900 (sic) Horse and 1,700 peons.

Elphinstone pointed out that Rastia had already given up most of his usurped lands and was in personal attendance at Poona. Moreover, a rebellion would cost him his lands in Kandeish which formed one-third of his saranjam.
obvious detriment, and supposing that in consequence their reduction should become a matter of much difficulty, it would still remain to be considered whether this combination is not as likely to take place at some more inconvenient time, and whether it is not expedient to provide against such an event by enforcing the Paishwa's just claims when all advantages happen to be on the side of the allies. 85

The Resident next considered the extent to which British interference should be carried. He advised that the purpose of the intervention should be the preservation rather than the destruction of the Jagirdars. He agreed with General Wellesley that any attempt to destroy the Jagirdars would lead to prolonged disturbances. Besides, the Peshwa's officials had shown that they lacked influence over the people under their authority. They also manifested little interest in the prosperity of the country under their control. Both of these advantages were possessed by the Jagirdars 'and that in a part of the country [i.e., in the districts contiguous to British territories] where they are more required than in any other.' 86 Elphinstone feared that the destruction of so many great Jagirdars would throw the country into great chaos from which he doubted the capability of the Peshwa's own officials to extricate it. Therefore he thought that it must be a necessary pre-condition of British interference that the Peshwa should abandon that policy and allow the Government of India to guarantee the

85 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.104-105. (Emphasis mine)
86 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.105.
saranjams of the Jagirdars on condition that they should serve him faithfully. Also the Peshwa should agree to satisfy such counter claims of the Jagirdars as the Government of India should deem to be equitable. 87

Of the Peshwa's claims 88 the Resident felt that the most important one to enforce was the performance of military service by the Jagirdars. He pointed out that the Peshwa had no disposable regular army, and that in the event of war, the burden of defending his country would fall on British forces. 89 He considered the Government of India to have been fortunate that the subsidiary force had seldom been called upon in the past for any such service. He warned that that state of affairs could not reasonably be expected to continue indefinitely. He hoped that the Peshwa would agree to the terms to be proposed to the

87 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.105.
88 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.105-106. Elphinstone felt that only three of the Peshwa's claims were worth enforcing thoroughly. These were the performance of military service, the restoration of usurped lands and revenues and the proper employment of the Peshwa's officials called Darakhdars.

89 The Resident feared that the Peshwa might even be tempted to discharge the 4,000 Horse that he had raised since the last incursion of the Pindaris if the season passed without another incursion. He disclosed that of the Peshwa's own troops, 2,500 were required to protect his southern possessions while 2,000 remained about his person. With the inability of Appa Desai to serve (owing to his war with Kolhapur), the utmost number of troops that the Peshwa could assemble on his frontier consisted of 3,000 new troops with the Vinchur Jagirdar's troops forming altogether a body of 4,000 Horse, and an additional 1,500 or 2,000 of Gokhale's horse with 2,000 of the Peshwa's infantry. The Resident hoped that a settlement with the Jagirdars would release that part of the Peshwa's army which was employed to watch the Jagirdars and so add a force of nearly 10,000 men to His Highness' army.
Jagirdars and empower the Government of India 'to make such a settlement as may appear advisable' to it.

Thus it had become obvious to Elphinstone by October 1811 that the political situation in southern Maharashtra was too fraught with danger to the security of British territories to permit any rigorous policy of non-interference. British intervention, the Resident in effect argued, had become imperative in order to fulfil Article 9 of the Treaty of Bassein and to ensure the tranquillity of British territories. To ensure its own future security, it was deemed necessary for the Government of India to encroach upon the Peshwa's internal

The terms suggested by Elphinstone were:

i. Mutual oblivion of past injuries.

ii. The remission of pecuniary claims on either side.

iii. The Government of India to guarantee the saranjams of the Jagirdars as long as they served the Peshwa faithfully.

iv. All usurped lands to be restored by the Jagirdars.

v. The Jagirdars to perform service in conformity with the terms of their Tynaut Zaubtahs and with custom. A third of their contingents were to attend the Peshwa at all times under the command of a member of their respective families.

vi. The Government of India to guarantee the personal safety of the Jagirdars and their relations as long as they served the Peshwa faithfully.

vii. All disputes arising in the course of the above arrangements to be referred to British arbitration. (See P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.108.)

P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.108 (Emphasis mine). Elphinstone felt that if the Peshwa obstructed a settlement by his intransigence, the Government of India would have 'strong reasons for declining to assist His Highness against the Jagheerdars, and should be able to put a stop to his complaints of our imputed neglect of his interests in this particular'. (See P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.109.)
autonomy as the price for aiding him to re-assert his lawful authority over his subjects. British intervention could no longer be postponed; for the Peshwa, disappointed in the good faith of the Government of India, 'was now convinced that he must depend on his own exertions, and had therefore been increasing his army...and...deliberating on other more extensive measures for the improvement of his military establishment'.

It was clearly necessary for the Government of India to intervene and impose a settlement favourable to its own interests before the Peshwa became capable of dealing with the Jagirdars himself.

Persuaded by the cogency of Elphinstone's arguments, the Governor-General recorded a minute on 3 April 1812 authorising Elphinstone to arbitrate the disputes between the Peshwa and the Jagirdars. Elphinstone was empowered to enforce the settlement by means of armed force if necessary. Lord Minto had no doubt about the justice of Baji Rao's claim to the obedience of the Jagirdars. 'That the Paishwa is entitled to their obedience and their services [his Lordship declared] and that generally speaking they yield him neither service nor obedience, are facts which admit of no question'. Lord Minto was equally convinced that the obligation of the Government of India to assist the

92 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.141. Elphinstone to the Governor-General, 10 February 1811.
93 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.151. Minute of the Governor-General, 3 April 1812.
Peshwa in asserting his authority was indisputable. He believed it to be wrong to argue that Article 9 of the Treaty of Bassein applied only to prospective acts of rebellion and not to those which existed prior to, and at the time of, the conclusion of the Treaty. His Lordship was of the opinion that to refuse the Peshwa's request for military aid to assert his authority over his subjects would 'amount to a denial of the Paishwa's right to claim the legitimate obedience and service of the Jagheerdars, and consequently to a guarantee of the condition of the latter as it existed at the date of the Treaty, neither of which can reasonably be supposed to have been intended'.

As to the expediency of British intervention, the Governor-General considered it to be self-evident. He agreed with the surmises of Elphinstone regarding the possible consequences of allowing the disputes to continue. Lord Minto recalled that the essential object of the British alliance with the Maratha State was two fold: First, to prevent any of its component parts from becoming a source of danger.

---

94 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.151. The Governor-General was of the opinion that some part of the clause on the employment of the subsidiary force (i.e., Article 9 of the Treaty of Bassein; see p.14 above) was 'obviously descriptive of the actual state of the Jagheerdars.'

95 His Lordship felt that such a limited view of the Treaty would absolve the Government of India from the obligation of interfering beyond the point of dealing with specific acts of disobedience which had occurred since 1803. He disagreed with this view which he believed to have been held by Lord Wellesley's Government. (P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.152.)

96 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.152. Minute of the Governor-General, 3 April 1812.
to the British; second, to secure the benefit of the cooperation of the Maratha State in the maintenance of peace and security in India. The attainment of this dual objective would be difficult if the Peshwa succeeded in crushing the Jagirdars and establishing a strong centralised State; or if the Jagirdars succeeded in dismembering the Maratha State by making themselves independent. The Governor-General was therefore anxious for a settlement in order to anticipate either of these contingencies.

As matters stood, it was obvious to the Governor-General how utterly incapable the Peshwa must be in fulfilling his military commitments to the allies in time of war. It was also obvious to His Lordship that if allowed to remain in their state of insubordination, the Jagirdars would constitute a source of danger instead of strength to the allies in time of war.

...Our interference [the Governor-General concluded] could not be permanently withheld and...under a determination to withhold that interference as long as possible, it must be called for at a time when many disadvantages and possibly considerable dangers would attend it.

But it is not on this ground alone that I found my opinion of the inexpediency of allowing affairs to remain in their present state. The alliance, is in the same condition of inefficiency as it

---

97 By the Treaty of Bassein, the Peshwa was bound to furnish a force of 10,000 Horse and 6,000 infantry in time of war. This was later amended by the 4th Supplementary Article to the Treaty of Bassein which reduced the number to 5,000 cavalry and 3,000 infantry.
practically was at the period of the war with [the] confederate Mahratta Chiefs and from the same cause [i.e., the weakness of the Poona Government caused by the rebellion of the Jagirdars]...

It is on this special ground that I conceive our interference between the Paishwa and his Jagheerdars with a view to place them in a state of due submission to his authority and thereby to give strength and efficiency to his Government to be more than expedient, to be essentially necessary to the preservation of an important branch of our political interests in India,...  

Armed with these sentiments of the Governor-General, the Resident had a meeting with the Peshwa on 3 July 1812. Baji Rao reiterated his policy of dispossessing the Jagirdars and applying the revenues from their jagirs to the maintenance of an army under his direct control. Elphinstone pointed out the futility of this policy. He reminded the Peshwa that ten or twelve years persistence in it had resulted in the crushing of only one great Jagirdar and even that with the help of another. He emphatically told the Peshwa that the Government of India would never give him aid for such a purpose. He also stated that the exigencies of the time called for a speedy solution of the disputes in order to strengthen his Highness' Government.  

Peshwa Baji Rao at last told Elphinstone that his own inclination was to resume the jagirs of the Jagirdars. But in  

---  

99 *P.R.C.*, Vol.xii, p.177. Elphinstone to the Governor-General, 4 July 1812.
deference to the Resident's advice, he was willing to abandon that plan if the Jagirdars would serve him faithfully. He became excited when the Resident told him that the Government of India would assist him 'in any moderate and practicable plan which he might propose for the settlement of his dominions'; and punish the Jagirdars 'if after an arrangement was made, they should attempt to recur to their habits of disobedience'. However, there occurred 'a visible alteration in His Highness' temper and an entire change in his language and sentiments' when Elphinstone asked if he would authorise him 'to pledge the faith of the British Government to their security'. Baji Rao saw in this proposal a veiled attack on his internal autonomy. He therefore told Elphinstone that it was incompatible with the dignity of his Government to negotiate with his own subjects in that manner. He then assumed an angry mood and renewed his complaints against their past misconduct.

In extenuation of their insubordination, Elphinstone urged the assistance which the Jagirdars gave him in ending Holkar's usurpation of his Government. But Baji Rao expressed surprise that the Resident 'should speak in favour of the Jagheerdars or interfere to prevent his punishing them'. Striking his breast, he declared that 'their perfidy was stamped there, and that the impression was indelible'. He became

100 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.178.
101 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.179.
102 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.179.
more and more averse to any settlement in proportion as his resentment against the Jagirdars grew. There was, however, little he could do without the aid of British troops. In the end, he acquiesced in the broad outline of Elphinstone's proposals. On 6 July 1812 Elphinstone discussed the terms of the proposed settlement with the Peshwa's Minister.

Under the terms of what became subsequently known as the 'Agreement of Pandharpur', the Peshwa agreed to overlook the past conduct of the Jagirdars. He agreed to bring forth no pecuniary claims against them without the consent of the Government of India. He also agreed that the Jagirdars should continue to hold their saranjamy lands as long as they served him faithfully. They were, however, to restore all lands and revenues which they had usurped. The Jagirdars were to serve according to the conditions under which their saranjams were granted and to attend with their contingents whenever summoned by the Peshwa. The Peshwa promised to allow them to return to their jagirs when their presence was no longer necessary in Poona, or when the Government of India considered that the state of affairs no longer required their presence. The Peshwa's Government was not to interfere with the Government of India in its negotiation with the Jagirdars. Nor was it to violate any engagement into which the Government of India might enter with them on the basis of the above terms. Finally, the Peshwa was to maintain two battalions of regular infantry 'to be employed
in the settlement and protection of his country'.

On 12 July 1812 the Peshwa left Poona for Pandharpur. The next day Elphinstone followed him. During the journey, the Resident sent letters to the Jagirdars requiring them to be in attendance upon the Peshwa at Pandharpur within a fixed time. He warned them that failure to attend would be regarded as an act of rebellion. In his letters, the Resident expressed his Government's concern about the disturbed state of the southern Maratha country which had long persisted to the mutual injury of the Peshwa and the Jagirdars. He promised that the Government of India would guarantee the fulfilment of the terms of the Agreement of Pandharpur towards all those who submitted. On the other hand, the Resident warned that the Government of India would exert itself to crush anyone who obstructed the execution of the Agreement.

On 22 July Chintaman Rao informed Elphinstone of his 'unqualified acquiescence' in the terms offered to him. His vakil who delivered the message also brought an order of surrender for the district of Seralleh. The vakil announced that his master would be in attendance

103 The Peshwa's Minister in vain opposed this stipulation. (For the terms of the Agreement of Pandharpur, see P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.188-189.)
105 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.201. Elphinstone to the Governor-General, 26 July 1812.
106 Seralleh was the largest of the districts usurped by Chintaman Rao. Its annual revenue was estimated at Rs.60,000.
upon the Peshwa as requested by Elphinstone. Appa Saheb was the only Jagirdar who tried to resist. However, a strong letter from Elphinstone and an order to the subsidiary force to advance, secured his submission. On 31 July Appa Saheb informed the Resident that he would be in attendance at Pandharpur. By 2 August he had crossed the Kistna and was about thirty miles away from Pandharpur. He was accompanied by Narrayan Rao and the son of the Jagirdar of Kurrundwad.

The prospect of having the rebellious Jagirdars under his authority again filled Baji Rao with a sense of triumph. On 1 August 1812 he had a meeting with Elphinstone at which he expressed his gratitude to the Government of India. But his expressions of gratitude were not unqualified, an indication that he was not entirely satisfied with the manner in which the Government of India had dealt with the affairs of his State. Although he promised to treat the incoming Jagirdars with kindness and try to efface all memory of past differences with them from his mind, he candidly told Elphinstone that he could not

107 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.203-204. Elphinstone to the Governor-General, 27 July 1812. Appa Saheb's reply to Elphinstone stated that he was incapacitated by ill-health from proceeding to Pandharpur. He added that 'he had too much to say on the other subjects which [Elphinstone] had mentioned to be included in a letter, but that his vakil would communicate his sentiments regarding them verbally'.

108 The Jagirdar of Kurrundwad was unable to be present in person as a result of the palsy which afflicted him. Elphinstone was satisfied with the attendance of his son on his behalf.
conceal his dislike for the Jagirdars. 109

In the Agreement of Pandharpur, the Government of India ultimately found a solution to the political crisis which had existed in the Maratha State for nearly two decades. The rebellion of the Southern Jagirdars against Baji Rao's authority underscored the decay of the political system established by Shivaji. The system of assigning hereditary estates for the support of military commanders and their large armies represented a backsliding from Shivaji's system of centralised government. By substituting saranjams for cash payments from the State treasury, the Peshwas placed nearly all of southern Maharashtra under the direct control of powerful military chieftains. Tempted by the prolonged civil wars in the Maratha Confederacy, and with large armies and enormous revenues at their disposal, these military chieftains or Southern Jagirdars attempted to convert their hereditary estates into independent principalities. They denied the Peshwa their customary service, treated his orders and person with contempt and even encroached upon his personal estates. The danger of losing his sovereignty within Maharashtra and the Confederacy left Peshwa Baji Rao with no choice but to solicit British alliance which he had so often spurned in the past.

The price demanded by the Government of India for its aid in restoring the Peshwa to his authority in Maharashtra was the dissolution of the Maratha Confederacy. In return, the Government of India, by the

109 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.212. Elphinstone to the Governor-General, 2 August 1812.
Treaty of Bassein, guaranteed the Peshwa's internal autonomy within Maharashtra and recognised his absolute sovereignty over his subjects in that State. It also bound itself to give him military aid for chastising his rebellious subjects. Apparently, the Government of India did not fully realise the practical difficulties and risks of this commitment till sometime after Baji Rao's return to Poona from Bassein. When it did, it became less enthusiastic about its promise to oblige the Peshwa with the services of British troops for ending the rebellion of the Southern Jagirdars. The Government of India showed a reluctance to risk a rupture with the Jagirdars whose collective power was a force to be reckoned with. Under the convenient cloak of the policy of 'non-intervention', it sought to evade its treaty obligation to the Peshwa. It instructed the British Resident at Poona to treat the Peshwa's disputes with the Southern Jagirdars as a domestic matter for the Poona Government.

By 1811, however, it had become no longer safe for the Government of India to continue to treat the crisis in Maharashtra as an internal matter for the Peshwa's Government. Baji Rao's inflexible resolution to subjugate the Jagirdars at all costs, and the equal determination of the Southern Jagirdars to maintain the status quo precluded hopes of a peaceful settlement. On the contrary, the attitude of the parties to the disputes foreshadowed an interminable contest in southern Maharashtra. Because of the contiguity of Kanara, Mysore and Hyderabad with southern Maharashtra, it was reasonable for the Government of India to feel apprehensive lest parts of these allied territories
which lay in the vicinity of the scene of conflict should suffer injury from the turmoil. To avert this contingency and to make the Peshwa capable of fulfilling his military commitments to the allies in future, the Government of India found it imperative to intervene and resolve the disputes between Baji Rao Peshwa and the Southern Jagirdars.

The Agreement of Pandharpur marked a serious encroachment on the internal autonomy of Baji Rao. Clause six placed almost unlimited power in the hands of the Government of India;\(^{110}\) while clause seven, being irrelevant to the disputes in question, was an unjustified imposition.\(^{111}\) The Agreement not only imposed a barrier between the Peshwa and the Southern Jagirdars, but it also enabled the Government of India to control Baji Rao's relations with his vassals. The Government of India thus took advantage of the weakness of the Poona Government to encroach upon its authority over its subjects. The problem of the

\(^{110}\) P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.189. Clause six of the Agreement of Pandharpur stated: 'The Paishwa's Government will not depart from any of the engagements into which the British Government may enter, in conformity to the preceding articles, nor is any other authority to interfere with the British Government in the present negotiation'.

\(^{111}\) P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.189. Clause seven stated: 'It is part of this arrangement that the Paishwa shall maintain two complete Battalions of regular Infantry to be employed in the settlement and protection of his country.' The Peshwa's Government resisted this clause in vain. Thus the Peshwa became responsible for the maintenance of three separate armies - all ostensibly in his service. These were the saranjamy troops of his Jagirdars, the subsidiary force and the two battalions later known as Major Ford's brigade.
Southern Jagirdars opened Baji Rao's eyes to the fundamental incompatibility between British interests and his; and although he was obliged to acquiesce in the Agreement of Pandharpur, it laid the seeds of a bitter conflict which erupted into the open shortly afterwards and led to the annexation of Maharashtra by the Government of India in 1818.
At the time of the signing of the Treaty of Bassein the authority of the Peshwa within the Maratha Confederacy had been badly undermined by the prolonged civil wars which raged in the Maratha State between 1773 and 1802. By the end of this period, the Peshwa had become a political nonentity defied alike by the Confederate Chiefs and by the Jagirdars within Maharashtra itself. The possibility of Baji Rao regaining control over the Confederate Chiefs after a decade of civil wars seemed remote. He had virtually no army of his own, nor had he the sympathy and loyalty of the majority of his subjects. Without the assistance of a powerful army which only the Government of India could furnish, it was unlikely that Baji Rao could ever regain his authority as head of the Maratha Confederacy.

For reasons which are not difficult to discern, the Government of India was not inclined to assist Baji Rao to recover his authority over the Confederate Chiefs. The armies of Sindhia and Holkar were the best and most efficient possessed by any native State. Commanded by French officers, they were capable of holding their own against the British forces. But this reason apart, the Government of India could hardly be expected to rescue the only power that was capable of challenging it for hegemony in India. Nevertheless, the Government of India could not remain indifferent to the political situation in the
Maratha Confederacy. Baji Rao's impotence stood in marked contrast to the strength of his over mighty vassals. It was therefore obvious that prolonged strife and anarchy must ensue if the Peshwa persisted in his pretensions to sovereignty over numerous territories reluctant to acknowledge his authority. In the interest of peace in India, the Government of India wanted Baji Rao to concede independence to his great vassals as a fait accompli and content himself with sovereignty over Maharashtra. Such was the underlying principle of the Treaty of Bassein.

The Treaty, in effect, sought to dissolve the ties between the Peshwa and the Maratha Chiefs outside Maharashtra. It sought to obliterate all surviving traces of the community of interest which once existed between the Poona Government and the Confederate Chiefs. It was the aim of the Treaty to limit the Peshwa's exercise of sovereign power to Maharashtra and to extinguish or at least to circumscribe his influence elsewhere in the Deccan and in north India. In this way, the Government of India hoped to undermine the Peshwa's position as a rallying point for the Maratha Chiefs and to encourage the latter to look upon themselves as independent sovereigns in their own right. It was also the aim of the Treaty to put an end to the levying of chauth on British allies by ill-disciplined Maratha armies and thus remove the risk of the Government of India going to war with the Marathas in defence of its allies. In due course, the Government of India hoped to be able to end the power of blackmail which the Maratha Chiefs had long exercised over their weaker neighbours in the name of
the Peshwa and of their Confederacy. To promote these objects, the Treaty obliged the Peshwa to subject all correspondence with his former feudal Chiefs outside Maharashtra to the surveillance of the Government of India. The Peshwa was also obliged to seek the enforcement of his recognised rights and claims on the Maratha Chiefs through British arbitration.

The Government of India at first trusted to the Peshwa's good faith for the achievement of the political equilibrium envisaged by the Treaty, but its expectations were soon belied. The Peshwa could not forgive the Government of India for the diminution in his authority caused by the Treaty of Bassein and the Agreement of Pandharapur. Consequently, in proportion as his Government recovered its vigour and authority, he cherished dreams of reviving the Maratha Empire and restoring the Peshwaship to the position of authority and pre-eminence which it once enjoyed. He was encouraged by the attitude of the Confederate Chiefs who, while welcoming de facto independence, nevertheless, were loath to repudiate the nominal suzerainty of the Peshwa who was the embodiment of Maratha nationality and glory. Encouraged by this disposition the Peshwa insisted that the Treaty of Bassein guaranteed all his rights. He maintained the view that the Confederate Chiefs were his vassals and that no treaties could absolve them from allegiance to him. Through a subtle use of his traditional rights of investiture, he tried to assert his sovereignty over the Confederate Chiefs. For the same purpose he tried to re-establish a sphere of influence in Hindustan and the Deccan
through the revival of obsolete territorial claims. The climax finally came with his open assertion of sovereignty over the Gaikwad.

The Government of India could not accept the Peshwa's interpretation of the Treaty of Bassein. It could ill-afford to sacrifice the political advantages gained under the Treaty. Much less could it afford to tolerate the resurgence of the loose Maratha Confederacy with its extravagant claims and concomitant political disorders. Therefore as far as it was concerned, the Peshwa's rights guaranteed by the Treaty were pecuniary rather than political. It regarded the political rights claimed by the Peshwa as subversive of the fundamental purpose of the Treaty. The persistence of the Peshwa in his scheme and the collusion between him and the Confederate Chiefs convinced the Government of India that no treaties, however solemn, could break the attachment of the Maratha Chiefs to the Peshwa. Therefore the Government of India gave up its policy of peaceful co-existence with the Maratha State and resolved upon its annexation to safeguard its security.

i. The Peshwa's claims of sovereign rights in Hindustan and the Deccan.

Before Baji Rao fled to Bassein in December 1802 Colonel Close, Resident at Poona, apparently led him to believe that the Government of India would assist him to recover his authority not only in
Maharashtra but also as head of the Maratha Confederacy. Therefore the terms of the Treaty of Bassein as regards his relations with the Maratha Chiefs outside Maharashtra came as a shock to him. As circumstances at the time made it impossible for him to reject the Treaty, Baji Rao accepted it. But headstrong as he was, he resolved to frustrate the operation of the Treaty as far as the dissolution of the Maratha Confederacy was concerned. For nine years after the signing of the Treaty, however, he bided his time and concentrated on the internal affairs of Maharashtra. He realised that the recovery of his authority within Maharashtra was a necessary step in his ambition to restore the power of the Marathas to its old footing. From 1811, he showed a disposition to thwart the British policy of severing the ties between him and his vassals in Hindustan and elsewhere. He did this through a number of expedients.

One of the ways in which he tried to upset the Treaty of Bassein was to encourage overtures from Holkar's Government for a khillat of investiture. The conferring of a khillat of investiture by the Peshwa

---

1 G. S. Sardesai (ed.), Poona Residency Correspondence, (Bombay, 1953) Vol.xiii, p.196.

Moro Dikshit, the Peshwa's Minister, alleged that the Peshwa had told him that while at Poona, Colonel Close had assured him that the Government of India would compel all the Confederate Chiefs as well as the Peshwa's other dependants to return to their allegiance, after the Treaty was signed. As a result, the Peshwa rejected all overtures from Holkar who, even after he had taken Poona, acknowledged the Peshwa as his master. He alleged that after the Peshwa had rejected Holkar's overtures and alienated all his vassals, Colonel Close went back on his words and offered different terms.
was a significant ceremony. For the Peshwa, it was a symbolic mani­festation of his sovereignty. For the recipient, it not only signified his acknowledgement of the Peshwa's sovereignty, but it also set the seal of legality on his succession to political office. A recognition of his right to invest the Maratha Chiefs with a Khillat of office would therefore have been a great tactical victory for Baji Rao.

A few months after Elphinstone's assumption of duty at Poona, the Peshwa called his attention to several applications which he had received from Holkar's Government for a khillat of investiture. In April 1811, Sakhardam Pandit and Kandu Pandit, the vakils of Holkar, pressed Elphinstone to prevail upon the Peshwa to grant a khillat of investiture to their master. Holkar himself, shortly afterwards, applied to the Peshwa through Elphinstone for a khillat for himself and an honorary dress for his son Malhar Rao. On the instructions of the Government of India Elphinstone informed Holkar that his request was superfluous since he had for many years possessed all the attributes of an independent sovereign and had been always recognised as such by the other powers of India. He therefore required no khillat of investiture

---

2 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.7, 17, 18.
Jaswant Rao's succession to the Holkar estate had not been regularised by investiture from the Peshwa who continued to regard him as his mortal enemy. The Peshwa demanded Rs.80,00,000 as the fee for Holkar's investiture. The grant of an honorary dress to Malhar Rao would signify his recognition as heir-apparent of the Holkar estate.
from any State. Holkar's Government refused to accept this view. Without denying their master's de facto independence, Holkar's vakils argued that their master was as much the servant of the Peshwa as any of His Highness' personal guard. To this view Elphinstone 'found it impossible to prevent their recurring...from time to time'. The vakils of Holkar in the end entered into secret negotiations with the Peshwa to grant a khillat to Holkar. Although the negotiations were terminated when Elphinstone heard about them, Holkar's Government never abandoned its efforts to procure the investiture of Malhar Rao by the Peshwa.

Another way in which the Peshwa sought to undo the effect of the Treaty of Bassein with regard to the Maratha Confederacy, was to advance claims (some of them obsolete) to certain territories and rights outside Maharashtra. These claims were made in Hindustan and the Deccan. One of the territories to be first claimed by the Peshwa was Garha Kota in the central Indian district of Saugor. The Raja who was a tributary of the Poona Government had assisted Ameer Khan, 

---

3 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.35-36. Elphinstone to Chief Secretary Edmonstone, 22 June 1811.
4 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.35 .
5 In 1814 Elphinstone reported to the Government of India that Holkar's Government had become more insistent than ever before on the subject of khillat and that he continued to receive letters from both Malhar Rao and Ameer Khan about it. As late as October 1817 the subject was still being agitated by Holkar's Government. (See P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.318; Vol.xiii, pp.217-218.)
one of the predatory chiefs of central India, during his invasion of Berar in 1809. For his part in the attack on Berar which Baji Rao considered as part of his dominions, the Peshwa's army under Daulat Rao Sindhia seized his country. In August 1811 the Peshwa's Government informed Elphinstone that his Highness intended to accept an offer by Sindhia to hand over Garha Kota to him. The Peshwa claimed sovereignty over it on the basis of chauth which it owed to his Government. By virtue of this, he claimed the right to dispossess the Raja and resume his country. Against the advice of Elphinstone, the Peshwa's Government sent orders to Sindhia asking him to hand over the territory to Baloji Kunjar, the Peshwa's vakil at his Court. After a long and bitter wrangle with Elphinstone, the Peshwa's Minister complied with the British demand for a revocation of the orders sent to Sindhia's Government.

After the Garha Kota episode the Peshwa tried another expedient in his endeavour to re-establish a sphere of influence in central and northern India. He told Elphinstone that he wanted to farm the tribute of Jhansi as well as that of Dhar, Seepree, Kolauras, Dewree, Malharghur and Machalpur to trusted agents of his own. These places were in the hands of rebels or usurpers who either withheld payment of the tribute or paid it irregularly. Although Elphinstone was satisfied that 'the

---

6 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.59-60. Elphinstone to the Vice-President, 18 August 1811.
7 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.60.
8 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.133. Edmonstone to Elphinstone, 3 January 1812; p.460, Elphinstone to Secretary Adam, 24 December 1815.
Paishwa's rights [sic] to several of the places claimed could not be denied, the Government of India, nevertheless, refused to allow these areas to come under the control of the Peshwa's agents for the sake of peace in central and northern India. For a similar reason, the Government of India rejected the Peshwa's claim to sovereignty over Mandvee.

Thwarted in his plans in northern and central India, Baji Rao turned his efforts towards areas nearer home. He tried to claim sovereignty over Kolhapur and Sawantwadi which originally formed part of Shivaji's kingdom. But here as elsewhere his efforts were in vain.

The Kolhapur State came into existence in 1731 as a result of the partition of Shivaji's kingdom between the descendants of his

9 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.461.
10 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.121,122,134. In November 1811 the Peshwa complained against the imprisonment of the Diwan of the Raja of Mandvee and the declared intention of the Bombay Government to occupy the entire territory of the Raja worth Rs.2,50,000 per annum. The Peshwa alleged that by the Treaty of Bassein he had only ceded the tribute of Rs.65,000 due to him from the State of Mandvee without prejudice to his sovereignty. The Government of India replied that from the schedule attached to the Treaty, Mandvee itself and not merely the Peshwa's tribute from that State appeared to have been ceded. But even supposing the cession to have been limited to the tribute, it was obvious that with the tribute, he must be deemed to have relinquished all rights of paramountcy over the Raja who paid it and to have transferred them to the Government of India.
From 1772 the Raja of Kolhapur, Shivaji III, became involved in war with the other Maratha Chiefs notably, the Patwardhans, Appa Desai and the Raja of Sawantwadi. The cause of the war with the Patwardhans was the disputed ownership of two districts, Chikodi and Manowli. In 1803 these districts fell into the hands of the Peshwa who subsequently assigned them as saranjamy lands to Appa Desai. Thus Appa Desai inherited the Patwardhans' war with Kolhapur.
For the next eight years, the struggle for Chikodi and Manowli caused sporadic outbreaks of hostilities between Appa Desai and the Raja of Kolhapur. Towards the end of 1811 a series of victories for Appa Desai endangered the integrity of the Kolhapur State. To avert the incorporation of that State into the Poona State, the Government of India intervened with an offer of its mediation in June 1812. The Peshwa reluctantly agreed. Shortly afterwards, however, he became suspicious when Elphinstone informed him that the Government of India proposed to make its own demands on the Raja simultaneously with the arbitration of His Highness' claims. Elphinstone hinted that the Government of India intended to demand the cession of certain coastal forts in the Raja's country which would protect its trade from future attacks by the pirates of Kolhapur.  

The Peshwa denied the right of the Raja of Kolhapur to make any cessions of territory without his authority. He claimed sovereignty over that State and requested Elphinstone to submit his Government's claims for examination. He even offered to pay the sum of Rs.50,00,000

---

13 Under the administration of Sambhaji's widow, great disorders occurred both on land and on sea. The prevalence of piracy on the coast of Kolhapur led the Government of India to send an expedition against Kolhapur in 1765. The result was a commercial treaty whose terms were never observed. In 1792 the Government of India prepared to mount another expedition against Kolhapur. The young Raja signed another treaty by which he engaged to give compensation for losses suffered by British merchants since 1785 and to permit the establishment of factories at Malwan and Kolhapur. (C. U. Aitchison, op.cit., Vol.vii, p.182.)
claimed from the Raja by the Government of India. He also undertook to indemnify the Government of India for all British ships and cargoes plundered in future by the pirates of Kolhapur. As a result of Elphinstone's rejection of his mediation, the Peshwa tried to obstruct British arbitration of his claims on Kolhapur. He entered into secret negotiations with the Raja and urged him to resist any demands calculated to give the British any special privileges in his country. He sent a vakil to Kolhapur in the name of Gokhale to urge the Raja to break off his negotiations with the Government of India or at least to avoid all written engagements. He even threatened the Raja with his displeasure if he obliged the British.

Despite these obstructions, the Government of India succeeded in arbitrating the Peshwa's claims and concluding a treaty with Kolhapur on 1 October 1812. By the Treaty, the Peshwa was required to restore to the Raja all conquests made within the preceding four years which did not form part of the districts of Chikodi and Manowli. The Raja was also guaranteed against aggression from all powers. The Peshwa determined to frustrate the execution of this treaty. Five months

14 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.167-168. Elphinstone to the Governor-General, 23 June 1812.
15 P.R.C., pp.225-226. Elphinstone to the Governor-General, 13 October 1812.
after the Treaty was signed, he still held on to seventeen turrufs which he ultimately conceded belonged to the Raja of Kolhapur. Before their restoration Appa Desai plundered them of every article of property and carried off cattle from all of them. Meanwhile, the Peshwa's Ministers continued to search their archives for further evidence to support the Peshwa's claims to sovereignty over Kolhapur. The treaty was not finally executed till some fourteen months later.

These reverses did not discourage the Peshwa from persisting in his ambition to defy the Treaty of Bassein and revive the Maratha Confederacy. His next attempt after his defeat over Kolhapur was to claim sovereignty over Sawantwadi. After the negotiation of the Treaty with Kolhapur, the Rani of Sawantwadi attacked the fort of Barratghur held by the Raja of Kolhapur. In fulfilment of its treaty obligation to Kolhapur, the Government of India offered to mediate in the dispute between the two States. The Rani, however, refused to accept British arbitration, and consequently British troops under Lieutenant-Colonel Dowse invaded Sawantwadi. A treaty was subsequently imposed on the Rani's Government. Shortly afterwards the British troops were expelled from Sawantwadi. The Peshwa feared that reprisal action by the Government of India might result in the annexation of Sawantwadi and therefore

17 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.248, 250. Elphinstone to the Governor-General, 10 April 1813.
18 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.256-259. Elphinstone to the Governor-General, 17 May 1813.
claimed sovereignty over that State. As in the case of Kolhapur, he offered to mediate in the dispute between the Rani and the Government of India. Elphinstone rejected the Peshwa's offer on the grounds that His Highness' claim of sovereignty over Sawantwadi made him an interested party and therefore unfit to be a mediator. For a time the Peshwa allowed the matter to rest but he did not abandon his claim.

If the Peshwa was determined to revive the Maratha Empire, the Government of India was equally determined not to permit any changes in the settlement effected by the Treaty of Bassein and the recent Agreement of Pandharapur. By these treaties, the Maratha Confederacy had been replaced by a number of independent and quasi-independent States which lay within the sphere of British influence. It was unthinkable therefore for the Government of India to sacrifice this advantage for the perpetuation of a political system which was organised on the basis of plunder and which had been the cause of dangerous disorders and much anxiety in the past. Nor could the Government of India tolerate Baji Rao's claims to sovereignty over scattered areas as well as to rights which he lacked the necessary power to enforce. Therefore it either denied those claims outright or, where they were too well-founded

19 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.294-295. Elphinstone to the Governor-General, 25 September 1813.

20 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.295. In 1816 the Peshwa's Minister Anand Rao presented a paper to Elphinstone in which the Rani was alleged to have sought the Peshwa's intercession for the recovery of Barratghur, Narsinghur, Vingoora and part of the turruf of Massura of which she alleged she had been wrongfully dispossessed by the British.
to be denied, preferred to have them realised through the agency of the Government of India.

Elphinstone failed to see that the controversy over Holkar's request for a khillat of investiture for himself and an honorary dress for his son, was crucial to the Peshwa's claim of sovereignty over the Confederate Chiefs. He regarded the investiture of Holkar or of his son by the Peshwa as a mere matter of ceremony. As such, he considered Holkar's application as an internal matter for the Peshwa's Government. Moreover, he saw no precedent in the records of the Residency to justify a denial of the Peshwa's nominal sovereignty implied by his performance of investiture. The Resident therefore feared that the Peshwa might 'regard any attempt to alter the language and ceremonies in use between him and his former vassals as a direct attack on his rank and consequence'.

The Government of India, however, took a different view. It considered it imprudent under any circumstances, to allow Baji Rao to exercise even nominal sovereignty over Sindhia, Holkar and the Bhonsla, since those Chiefs evidently shared his ambition to revive the Maratha Confederacy. The Government of India therefore deemed it desirable to make the break of ties between them and Baji Rao complete; and it lost no time in pointing out to Elphinstone that the view taken by him with regard to Holkar's application for investiture by the Peshwa was erroneous.

P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.122-123. Elphinstone to the Vice-President, 24 November 1811. The records showed that only the exercise of actual authority over the Confederate Chiefs by the Peshwa had been disputed and restrained in the past.
It was in fact tantamount to an 'implied recognition of the continued existence of the ancient relations of the Marhattah co-estates.'

The Government of India called the Resident's attention to a letter dated 19 March 1807 which was sent to Colonel Close while he was Resident at Poona. The letter contained the grounds on which the Maratha Confederacy was deemed to have been dissolved by the Treaties of Bassein, Deogaon and Surji-Anjangaon. It pointed out that by his acceptance of those treaties, the Peshwa had implicitly renounced the allegiance of the Maratha Chiefs outside the State of Maharashtra.

On the principle above described it will be obvious to you that the question of conferring a Khilaut of investiture on Holkar (or on his son Mulhar Row as his successor, a point which it seems the Durbar of Holkar has much at heart) cannot properly be classed among those internal concerns of the Peishwa's Government in which you have in your answer to Holkar's letter, disclaimed a right of interference. On the contrary it forms one of those questions of external negotiation which the Peishwa by the 17th article

---

22 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.21. -Chief Secretary Edmonstone to Elphinstone, 31 May 1811.

23 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.21-22. According to Colonel Close's despatch of 24 February 1807 he emphatically maintained at a conference with the Peshwa's Minister that by the arrangements of the Treaty of Bassein Sindhia and Holkar were to be recognised as heads of independent Governments. In his despatch of 26 August 1807 Colonel Close again reported that the Peshwa's Ministers at a meeting with him had agreed that 'no measure should ever be adopted in reference to the former state of things in Hindustan'.

The Treaties of Deogaon and Surji Anjangaon were signed on 15 December 1803 and 30 December 1803 respectively, with the Bhonsla and Sindhia after their defeat in the second Anglo-Maratha war.
of the treaty of Bassein has renounced the right of conducting without the participation and concurrence of the British Government. 24

The Government of India instructed Elphinstone to find a suitable occasion to remind the Peshwa of this principle established by the Treaty of Bassein. It also told the Resident that in his dealings with the Peshwa's Government he should always maintain the position that the Maratha Confederacy had ceased to exist. The Resident was required to remind the Maratha Chiefs also of the implications of the Treaty, since Holkar's solicitude for investiture by the Peshwa and his willingness to pay a nazzeranah for it presupposed that the Maratha Confederacy still existed. The Government of India rejected the plea of Charles Metcalfe and Elphinstone that it should reconsider its decision to avoid offending Holkar and the Peshwa. It stated that it was aware of the designs of the Marathas to maintain their Confederacy which it was the object of the Treaty of Bassein to destroy. Therefore it considered it expedient to oppose Holkar's application for investiture by the Peshwa. The Government of India explained that it was not opposed to Malhar Rao's investiture so far as its significance did not extend beyond his recognition as the legitimate heir and successor of his father. But, it continued:

---

24 P.R.C., Vol. xii, p. 22. N. B. Edmonstone, Chief Secretary to Elphinstone, 31 May 1811. Article 17 of the Treaty of Bassein provided that the Peshwa should not commence or pursue any negotiations with any other State whatever without giving previous notice and entering into mutual consultation with the Government of India.
Considered, however, as a practical recognition of the existence of that form of constitution of which the dissolution was a primary object of our policy both in the formation of the treaty of Bassein and in the arrangements which succeeded the last Marhatta war, our consent to the investiture is opposed by considerations which in the scale of general policy outweigh the partial motives to our acquiescence and the objections to our refusal of it. 25

To remove the impression that the Government of India wished to obstruct the succession of Malhar Rao, the Governor-General suggested a public declaration of his Government's recognition of Malhar Rao as heir and successor of his father Jaswant Rao Holkar.

The Peshwa's acceptance of Garha Kota was seen by the Government of India as another shrewd attempt to maintain his traditional relations with Sindhia and the Bhonsla. As such, the transaction had wide ramifications. It became necessary therefore for the Resident to use all the expedients in his power to frustrate the transaction. He protested against the Peshwa's acceptance of the territory without the prior consent of the Government of India as a breach of Article 17 of the Treaty of Bassein. He admitted that Garha Kota in the past owed chauth to the Peshwa but denied that the territory ipso facto belonged to the Peshwa. He reminded the Peshwa that the Raja of Berar was not his subject but an independent Prince. Therefore the

25 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.51. Edmonstone to C. J. Metcalfe, Resident at Delhi, 2 August 1811. Reply to Metcalfe's letter of 13 July 1811. (Emphasis mine.)
Poona Government could not interest itself in his quarrel with the Raja of Garha Kota and Ameer Khan. For a similar reason, the Peshwa could not share in the conquests of Sindhia since he was an independent ruler whose quarrels, whether just or unjust, did not concern him. But even if his title to Garha Kota was valid, his negotiations with Sindhia for its restoration fell within the scope of Article 17 of the Treaty of Bassein. It was therefore subject to the prior consent of the Government of India.

Elphinstone pleaded with the Peshwa to leave the territory alone. It was too remote from the seat of his Government he argued, and might even be found to be unproductive. He insinuated that Sindhia might after all refuse to surrender it in which case the Peshwa's dignity would be compromised. If he succeeded in getting possession of it from Sindhia, the Raja of Berar might wrest it from him. He implored the Peshwa to refrain from reviving obsolete claims which could only result in the creation of that very state of confusion and instability which it must be the aim of the allies to avert. The Resident finally demanded the revocation of the orders of acceptance sent to Sindhia's Government, and advised the Peshwa to desist from claiming the allegiance

26 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.61-62. Elphinstone to the Vice-President, 18 August 1811.

27 Though Elphinstone did not doubt the authenticity of a letter from the Raja of Berar in which he acknowledged the Peshwa's title to Garha Kota and promised to refrain from attacking it, he nevertheless alleged that the Raja secretly coveted it and was plotting to seize it.
of Sindhia, Holkar and the Bhonsla. He warned the Peshwa that the whole system of Maratta politics was founded on the existing state of affairs and that if His Highness should disturb it, he would not only overturn all his relations to the Maratta chiefs, but materially affect his connection with the British Government. 28

In approving of Elphinstone's handling of the Garha Kota affair, the Government of India remarked that the Peshwa conformed to Article 17 of the Treaty of Bassein by informing the Resident about the offer from Sindhia. He, however, contravened it by pursuing the negotiation against the Resident's advice.

The Peishwah,...[the Government of India pointed out] appears to have lost sight of the true spirit and intent of the treaty in a more general sense, by adopting as the basis of his proceedings the annulled relations of the Marhatta federation which have been distinctly dissolved by the treaty of Bassein, since compatibly with its provisions and obligations they cannot exist. 29

Elphinstone was asked to take every opportunity to remind the Peshwa of the essence of his alliance with the British. He was particularly to remind the Peshwa that the alliance did not oblige the Government of India to guarantee the enforcement of his territorial claims based

28 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.78. Elphinstone to the Vice-President, 13 October 1811. (Emphasis mine.)
29 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.68. N. B. Edmonstone to Elphinstone, 13 September 1811. (Emphasis mine.)
on his old position as the head of the Maratha Confederacy. The Government of India's guarantee of his rights did not include additional territories or rights acquired without its consent. The Peshwa was to be told further that he could not expect British support for the enforcement of claims which he did not mention at the time of the conclusion of the Treaty of Bassein and which he had allowed to remain dormant for a period of nine years. The Government of India warned Elphinstone that in view of the Peshwa's anxiety to exercise privileges not compatible with the principles of the Treaty of Bassein, he should be careful in his communications with the Poona Government to avoid any expressions that tended to countenance the Peshwa's pretensions.

With regard to the Peshwa's proposal about farming his tribute of certain districts held by rebels and usurpers in central India, the Government of India could not dismiss it altogether. Elphinstone admitted that the Peshwa's right to most of the places was well founded.

30 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.69.
31 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.69-70. Elphinstone had told the Peshwa's Minister that the Peshwa would have been justified in declaring war on Ameer Khan for his attempts to disturb the peace of the Deccan. Under those conditions he would have been equally justified in going to war with the Raja of Garha Kota too if the Raja had assisted Ameer Khan. The Government of India pointed out: 'This statement might be construed to imply the Peishwa's right to enter upon a war under his own conception of the urgency of the occasion. It is apparently giving him a voice in the question of peace or war on an occasion on which Government does not admit his right to judge and to determine. It is a point of foreign policy from the cognizance of which except in communication with and under the guidance of his ally he is excluded.'
But even so, the Government of India did not wish any of those areas to come under the orders of agents directly responsible to Baji Rao Peshwa. Therefore it asked the Peshwa to leave the enforcement of his rights in those areas in the hands of the Governor-General. This step was necessary because it was revealed that Wittoba Naik Gaikwad, the prospective farmer of the districts, intended to levy about two thousand men for the purpose of expelling the rebels and usurpers who held those districts. In the execution of this plan, the Peshwa had secured the cooperation of Sindhia. The Government of India could not allow the peace of central India to be disturbed by such elements, and therefore refused the Peshwa permission to farm those districts.

In the case of Jhansi which lay in close proximity to British territories in Bundelkhand, the Government of India asked Elphinstone to adopt a suggestion made to General Close in 1807. This was to the effect that the Peshwa should be discouraged from sending a force for the purpose of collecting the tribute. Elphinstone was rather to encourage the Peshwa to send a collector and assure him that the Government of India would exert its influence to facilitate the payment of the tribute. However, if the Peshwa insisted on farming the tribute of Jhansi which would be tantamount to dispossessing

32 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.460. Elphinstone to Mr. Secretary Adam, 24 December 1815.
the Subadar of Jhansi, the Resident was to restrain him. He was to inform the Peshwa that the Government of India had engagements with the Subadar under which his territories were guaranteed to him personally.\(^{33}\)

The principle of circumscribing the sovereignty of the Peshwa also led to the rejection of his claims of sovereignty over Kolhapur and Sawantwadi. As in the other cases it was necessary to obviate potential disorders which might arise from feeble efforts by the Peshwa's Government to enforce claims several hundred miles away from the seat of his power. Only five months before the Government of India intervened in the dispute between the Peshwa and the Raja of Kolhapur, it had turned down an appeal for help from the Raja. But the prospect of the State of Kolhapur passing under the control of Appa Desai who was the servant of the Peshwa necessitated British intervention. The incorporation of Kolhapur in the Poona State would have encouraged the Peshwa in his ambition. On the other hand, it was probable that Appa Desai would have retained possession of it. This would have emboldened him to defy the Peshwa and led to a rupture which would have affected the tranquillity of British territories nearby. As a result, Elphinstone denied the Peshwa's claims to sovereignty over Kolhapur and restrained Appa Desai. He rejected

\(^{33}\) P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.133. N. B. Edmonstone to Elphinstone, 3 January 1812.
the Peshwa's offer of compensation on behalf of the Raja for losses suffered by the British at the hands of the pirates of Kolhapur in the past. Elphinstone also rejected the Peshwa's offer of security for future losses. He told the Peshwa that he would gain nothing by that undertaking as

the Raja of Kolapore would not in consequence be induced to submit to the Paishwa's authority, nor would the British Government recognize His Highness's sovereignty over Kolapore; so that he would merely pay 50 lakhs of rupees for the Raja without any return whatsoever. 34

In the case of Sawantwadi the same aversion to the extension of the Peshwa's authority outside Maharashtra led to British denial of his sovereignty over that State. This was done despite the fact that Elphinstone's enquiries about the territory's relationship to the Peshwa revealed that

while that Government was settled, it was entirely subordinate to the Paishwa's, but that it had been for a year or two in the hands of usurpers, who paid only a nominal obedience to His Highness's authority. 35

The divergent views held by the Government of India and the Peshwa over the interpretation of the Treaty of Bassein made a rupture

34 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.168. Elphinstone to the Governor-General, 23 June 1812.
35 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.161. Elphinstone to Chief Secretary Edmonstone, 22 May 1812. (Emphasis mine.)
inevitable. Neither side was prepared to give in to the other. Baji Rao's love of power and rank made it hard for him to reconcile himself to diminished authority. He was therefore determined to compensate for the power he had lost in Maharashtra by the renewal of claims which he had allowed to become almost obsolete. The Government of India, on the other hand, was loath to recognise these claims. As the basis of most of the Peshwa's claims was his right to chauth as head of the Maratha Confederacy, their recognition might have established a precedent by which Baji Rao could have laid claim to an endless list of territories and rights acquired by his predecessors and lost subsequently through revolutions.

Moreover, it was evident that Baji Rao would never again be able to control the Maratha Confederacy as effectively as did the first four Peshwas, even if he had the loyal support of the Jagirdars of Maharashtra. The ties between the Peshwa and his non-Maratha subjects had become weak. The Confederate Chiefs had become too powerful for him. The revival of the Maratha Confederacy might give the Confederate Chiefs a chance to interfere again in the affairs of Maharashtra and in the Peshwa's relations with other States. In this way it might lead to a repetition of the dangerous situation created in Maharashtra at the beginning of the nineteenth century by the rivalry between Sindhia and Holkar for the control of the Poona Government, a situation from which Maharashtra was rescued by British intervention. For these reasons the Government of India could not
permit the revival of the Maratha Confederacy with the Peshwa at its head. The irreconcilability of the policies of the Government of India and those of the Peshwa became exemplified in the Peshwa's disputes with the Gaikwad which led to the annexation of Maharashtra.

ii. The Peshwa's disputes with the Gaikwad and the final rupture.

From September 1813 the irritation engendered in the Peshwa's mind by the Agreement of Pandharpur and by the opposition of the Government of India to the exercise of his traditional rights and privileges became increasingly noticeable. This irritation found expression in a series of complaints made by his administration to the Government of India. The Peshwa's Minister urged the settlement of His Highness' disputes with the Nizam in a more 'peremptory and decided manner' than ever before. He complained against the refusal

---

36 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.296. Elphinstone to the Governor-General, 25 September 1813. Elphinstone commented: 'The vehemence with which this point is urged on His Highness's part is the more remarkable, as he has for many months appeared to be entirely satisfied with my assurances, that the requisite enquiry would be undertaken as soon as the pressure of many important affairs would allow the Government time to attend to it.' (Emphasis mine.) The Peshwa's claims against the Nizam were pecuniary. They arose from his right to chauth. By Articles 13 and 14 of the Treaty of Bassein, the Peshwa's claims against the Nizam and the Gaikwad were made the subject of British arbitration. Though proofs of the Peshwa's claims against the Nizam had first been called for during the administration of Sir George Barlow, little had been done towards a settlement. In the middle of 1811 the Peshwa's officials, in exasperation, tried to levy chauth in the Nizam's dominions but they were restrained by the invocation of Article 13 of the Treaty. The Government of India then promised a speedy settlement but the Peshwa waited in vain for two years.
of Madhu Rastia (one of the Southern Jagirdars) to serve against the
Pindaris and declared that the Peshwa would not be satisfied with any
punishment but the confiscation of Rastia's jagir. The Minister also
pressed the Peshwa's right to the service of the subsidiary force
against the rebellious Jagirdar of Sundoor and declared that the Peshwa
would not agree to share the cost of the expedition.\textsuperscript{37} The Peshwa's
Government further renewed its demand for the evacuation of the fort
of Ahmednagar by British troops.\textsuperscript{38}

Symptomatic of the Peshwa's defiant attitude was his announce-
ment of his intention to send an agent to take charge of his territories
in Hindustan and to perform the investiture of Malhar Rao.\textsuperscript{39} He also
announced his intention not to renew the farming of his rent from
Ahmedabad to the Gaikwad's Government on the expiry of the lease,\textsuperscript{40} and
called for a speedy settlement of his claims on the Gaikwad.

\textsuperscript{37} P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.300. Elphinstone to the Earl of Moira,
5 November 1813.

\textsuperscript{38} P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.300. The fort was occupied by British troops during
the war with Sindhia, the Bhonsla and Holkar (1803-1805). It
had, however, been retained since by the British. The Peshwa had
been demanding its restoration since 1811.

\textsuperscript{39} P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.300.

\textsuperscript{40} P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.300. In 1800 the Peshwa farmed his share of the
revenues of Gujerat for five years to the Gaikwad Anand Rao at
the rate of Rs.5,00,000 a year. In 1804 Sir Barry Close succeeded
with great difficulty in obtaining a renewal of the lease for 10
years at Rs.4,50,000 per annum. This lease was due to expire in
June 1814.
The Peshwa's claims on the Gaikwad had a special significance since they involved the vexed question of his claim to sovereignty over the great Maratha Chiefs. The Gaikwads inherited the State of Baroda from the family of Khandi Rao Dabhade, (the senapati of Shahu Raja) whose extensive conquests in Gujerat and Kattiawar were assigned to him as a jagir. Damaji Gaikwad, a sardar in his service who had distinguished himself in the conquest of Gujerat, was appointed as his deputy. In 1721 Khandi Rao and Damaji Gaikwad died within a few months of each other. The former was succeeded in office by his son Trimbak Rao and the latter by his nephew Pilaji Gaikwad. In 1731 Trimbak Rao was killed in a civil war against the Peshwa. His infant son and heir Yeshwant Rao was allowed to succeed to his father's jagir in Gujerat subject to the payment of half of its revenue to the Peshwa. When Yeshwant Rao came of age he proved to be unfit for his position and consequently the Dabhade family gave way to the Gaikwads. 41

Under the regime of the Gaikwads, a series of events enabled the Peshwa to increase his claims against the Government of Baroda and to establish his ascendancy in the Baroda State. 42

41 Aitchison, Treaties and Sanads (Calcutta, 1892), Vol.vi, p.75.

42 i. Damaji Gaikwad (Pilaji's son and successor) supported Tara Bai in her effort to free the Raja of Satara from the thraldom of Peshwa Balaji Baji Rao and came to Poona with an army to assist the conspirators. He was made prisoner and released only after he had agreed to pay Rs.15,00,000 as arrears of tribute from Gujerat. He also agreed to cede half of his possessions and to hold the rest under the Peshwa. In 1755 after the partition of Gujerat, the Peshwa's army in
the time the British signed the Treaty of Baroda with the Gaikwad in 1802 he was more of a vassal than a Confederate Chief.

At the end of March 1811 a vakil from the Gaikwad's Court arrived at Poona to settle the long standing disputes between the Gaikwad and the Peshwa on the subject of arrears of the Gaikwad's tribute and of succession fees. The vakil was also required to

---

conjunction with the Gaikwad's army conquered the town of Ahmedabad and partitioned it. From then on Damaji Gaikwad served the Peshwa faithfully. He served with the Maratha army at Panipat. In the following year he came to Poona to assist Raghunath Rao in a civil war with his nephew Madhu Rao for which he was rewarded with a sanad for his share of Gujerat.

ii. In 1767 Damaji sent his son Govind Rao with an army to assist Raghunath Rao in another rebellion against Madhu Rao. This time Raghunath Rao was defeated and Damaji was punished by the imposition of annual tribute of Rs.5,25,000 and an annual service with 3,000 Horse during peace and 4,000 during war.

iii. The death of Damaji Gaikwad in 1768 precipitated a disputed succession between Syaji (his eldest son but by his second wife) and Govind Rao (his second son but by his eldest wife). Govind Rao who was at Poona when his father died, procured his recognition as successor by binding himself to pay a large nazzer and Rs.2,54,000 per annum. This raised the Gaikwad's tribute to Rs.7,79,000 per annum.

iv. In 1773 Syaji's right was recognised and he supplanted Govind Rao. Fateh Singh who carried on Syaji's administration was permitted to keep his army in Gujerat to overawe Govind Rao. In lieu of the service of his troops, he agreed to pay Rs. 6,75,000 a year. This sum raised the Gaikwad's tribute finally to Rs.14,54,000. [See Aitchison, Treaties and Sanads, Third Edition (Calcutta 1892), Vol.vi, p.76; P.R.C., Vol.xiii, p.30; J. Grant Duff, History of the Mahrattas, Fourth Edition (two volumes, London 1878), Vol.ii, pp.9-12.]

The total sum claimed by the Peshwa on this account and others amounted to about Rs.3,40,76,790. After an examination of the counterclaims of the Gaikwad, Elphinstone estimated the Gaikwad's minimum debt at Rs.1,46,29,789. (See P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.281; Vol.xiii, p.43.)
negotiate for the renewal of the lease of Ahmedabad. The negotiations failed and led the Peshwa to invoke British arbitration at the end of 1813. At the end of February 1814 Gangadhar Shastri, the Minister of the Baroda Government, arrived at Poona to attempt another direct negotiation with the Poona Government.

The part of the negotiations that interested the Gaikwad's Government and the Government of India was the renewal of the lease of Ahmedabad. Under the lease, the Bombay Government under whose supervision the Administration of Baroda was conducted had succeeded in keeping the turbulent tribes of Gujerat in order. It feared that a reversion to the former state of divided authority in Gujerat would disturb the arrangements effected with so much expense and trouble and cause that rich country to relapse into its former condition of anarchy. Moreover, in 1807 the Gaikwad's Government had concluded decennial engagements with the chieftains of Kattiawar for the payment of their tribute. These engagements which overlapped the termination of the lease had been guaranteed by the Government of India and could not be set aside without prejudice to its honour. 44

All attempts to secure the Peshwa's consent to the renewal of the lease, however, proved futile. The systematic efforts of the

44  *P.R.C.*, Vol.xii, p.304. F. Warden, Chief Secretary (Bombay) to Elphinstone, 10 November 1813.
Government of India to whittle down his power had thoroughly shaken his confidence in its good faith and embittered his mind. He therefore harped on 'the loss of credit which he would suffer by allowing another prince to govern his territories and on the chance of its being forgotten that he had any right to govern them himself'. He feared that if he continued to grant long leases to the Gaikwad the renewal might in course of time become automatic, and Ahmedabad might become 'a tributary province instead of one held in absolute sovereignty'. On 25 June 1814 Elphinstone authorised the surrender of the Peshwa's share of Ahmedabad to his agent.

The discussion of the remaining claims of the Peshwa proved to be long and acrimonious because they became entangled in political issues. The 8th Article of the Treaty of Salbai (1782) recognised the Peshwa's sovereignty over the Gaikwad. But during the troubled times that followed the Treaty, the Peshwa was unable to protect the Baroda State. Govind Rao Gaikwad and his Minister were therefore compelled to rely on a body of Arab mercenaries to support their precarious authority. The war of succession which followed Govind Rao's death in September 1800 created an emergency and led his Minister

45 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.309. Elphinstone to Francis Warden, Chief Secretary to Government, 5 January 1814.
46 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.321. Elphinstone to John Adam, 7 May 1814.
47 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.332. Elphinstone to Chief Secretary to the Government (Bombay), 25 June 1814.
to seek military aid from the British factory at Cambay for the
purpose of freeing himself from the thraldom of the Arabs and subduing
the opposition headed by Malhar Rao and Kanhoji Rao. On 16 June 1802
he signed the Convention of Cambay later reduced to the Treaty of
Baroda. The effect of the Convention of Cambay and of the Treaty of
Baroda was to substitute British ascendancy at Baroda for that of the
Peshwa. To soothe the feelings of the Peshwa, however, the 14th
Article of the Treaty of Bassein by which the Peshwa acknowledged
the Treaty of Baroda, guaranteed the just rights or claims of the
Peshwa on the Gaikwad. The Peshwa took the view that this guarantee
extended to his pecuniary as well as his political rights. Elphinstone,
on the other hand, took the view that by the establishment of British
ascendancy at Baroda, the Peshwa had forfeited his political suzerainty

\[\text{48}\]

The Convention of Cambay and the Treaty of Baroda gave the
Government of India wide powers in Baroda, on the basis of which
it deemed itself justified in exercising control over the most
important affairs of the State. By those engagements the Govern-
ment of India became the guarantee of the Gaikwad's debts by
substituting its own Bhaindaries (i.e., securities) for those of
the Arabs. It also became the protector of the Baroda State and
the guarantee of the succession to the masnad. In a letter to
Colonel Walker dated 29 July 1802 Anand Rao Gaikwad stated:
'I call upon all my people to support Major Walker in every
measure that he will take in my administration, as he has helped
me out of the dangerous situation into which the Arabs had plunged
me. No one should oppose Major Walker. If any mischief-makers
act against these wishes of mine, Major Walker is empowered to
punish them. He should not hesitate to enforce his measures even
in opposition to Raoji Appaji, his sons and relatives, or even
against any writing of my own which might hereafter be issued.'
(G. S. Sardesai, New History of the Marathas, (three volumes,
Bombay, 1948) Vol.iii, p.454.)
over the Gaikwad and the right of interference in his internal affairs.

To the Treaty of Baroda was added a private engagement with Raoji Appaji which guaranteed the post of Minister to him. It also guaranteed British protection for the Minister and his kinsmen. Under this guarantee, he was succeeded in July 1803 by his son Sitaram in the office of Diwan to the Gaikwad. Sitaram refused to be subservient to the British as his father had been. With the secret encouragement of the Gaikwad, he persistently opposed the intimate interference of the British in the affairs of Baroda. In 1806 the Government of India ousted the Gaikwad, Anand Rao, and set up a Regency Commission under the superintendence of the British Resident at Baroda. In May 1813 Gangadhar Shastri became a member of the Commission and Diwan in place of Sitaram.

Gangadhar Shastri was a former clerk in the Peshwa's office who accompanied Raoji Appaji to Baroda when he was appointed Diwan to the Gaikwad. He first obtained employment at the British Residency as the Native Assistant. He gradually ingratiated himself with the Resident through his role as an informant and was subsequently transferred to the Court of Baroda and appointed Diwan. His subservience to the British earned him the hatred of the anti-British court faction.

49 The Commission included the Diwan, the Fadnavis, the Resident or his representative and Fateh Singh who was appointed Regent for Anand Rao Gaikwad.
In 1814 this faction sent Govind Rao Bandhuji Gaikwad to Poona to solicit the Peshwa's aid against the Shastri's ascendancy. Bandhuji presented a letter purporting to have been written by Fateh Singh Gaikwad. This letter repudiated the Shastri's mission and regretted his ascendancy over the Baroda Government.

As a result of this letter the Peshwa refused to receive the Shastri's mission when Elphinstone informed him about it. He challenged the legality of the Shastri's appointment as Diwan, a position which he maintained was in his gift and which he had conferred on Raoji Appaji's family. As a result of Elphinstone's protests, the Peshwa reluctantly agreed to receive Gangadhar Shastri. He nevertheless warned that his doing so must not be construed as a recognition of the Shastri's appointment as Diwan.

In June 1814 Elphinstone reported Bandhuji's intrigues to the Bombay Government. Five months later, he informed the Peshwa that Sitaram had been confined because of his attempts to subvert the Baroda Administration. This announcement led to a wrangle between the Peshwa and Elphinstone. His Highness defended the conduct of Sitaram whom he regarded as the legitimate Diwan appointed by himself. He commended Sitaram for bringing the situation of affairs in Baroda to his notice. He claimed the Gaikwad as his vassal and maintained that it was his

50 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.308-309. Elphinstone to Francis Warden, 5 January 1814.
duty to interfere in the affairs of Baroda to save the Gaikwad from oppression. He invited Elphinstone to meet Hoojrahs and other confidential messengers of the Gaikwad whose testimony would convince him that the current Government under Gangadhar Shastri was equally repugnant to Anand Rao Gaikwad and Fateh Singh. The Peshwa told the Resident that it was no breach of treaty for him to interfere to preserve a feudatory State of his. However, 'if the British Government was resolved to deny his rights over all his sirdars in turn, he had nothing left but to submit to their decision'.

Elphinstone admitted that the Gaikwad owed tribute and military service to the Peshwa. But he denied that the Peshwa had the right to appoint the Gaikwad's Diwan. He declared that if the Peshwa had any such right at all, he had not exercised it in the case of Sitaram. Even if he had done so, the Resident declared, it would not excuse Sitaram's attempt to disturb the Government of Baroda. Elphinstone protested against the Peshwa's reception of the messengers from Baroda.

51 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.343-345. Elphinstone to Mr. Secretary Babington, Bombay, 27 October 1814. The Poona Government had received a letter from one of the agents sent to take charge of Ahmedabad which alleged that Anand Rao Gaikwad was under house arrest and that all access to him was denied. Elphinstone denied it. The Minister then proposed that a person should be sent with two Hoojrahs of the Peshwa to ascertain from the mouth of Anand Rao whether he was under restraint or not. Elphinstone refused.

52 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.342. Elphinstone to Chief Secretary Warden, 18 October 1814.

53 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.342. (Emphasis mine.)
He accused the Peshwa of secretly encouraging a plot against a Government with which he was engaged in negotiation under the auspices of the Government of India. He told the Peshwa that the object of the 14th Article of the Treaty of Bassein was to secure his acknowledgement of the Treaty of Baroda. Therefore 'that object was not to be defeated by any phrase incidentally introduced into the preamble'.

The Resident further declared that only such rights of the Peshwa as were consistent with the Treaty of Baroda could be preserved. The Peshwa's claim to sovereignty over the Gaikwad was incompatible with the existence of that Treaty since an admission of his claim would render the Treaty null and void. He made it clear that the Government of India did not claim sovereignty over the Gaikwad. It was true, he admitted, that the Gaikwad was dependent to a certain degree on the Peshwa. Nevertheless, he had no hesitation in saying that the Gaikwad was his own sovereign as far as his internal affairs were concerned. The Peshwa, he pointed out, should have pressed his claims when the 14th Article was discussed and not to have omitted them at the time only to renew them after a lapse of eleven years.

At the beginning 1815 Bhagvantrao Gaikwad, a son of Govind Rao and an illegitimate brother of Anand Rao Gaikwad, arrived at

---

54 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.344. Elphinstone to Mr. Secretary Babington, Bombay, 27 October 1814.
55 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.344.
56 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.345.
Poona to initiate fresh intrigues. The Peshwa received him in full Durbar on the occasion of the festival of the Vasant Panchami (14 February 1815) in the presence of the Shastri and Bapu Mairal, the Gaikwad's vakil at Poona. Elphinstone protested against this insult and demanded that the Shastri's mission be dismissed to enable him to return to Baroda. The Resident announced the suspension of the negotiations between the Shastri and the Poona Government and declared that the Peshwa's hopes of having his claims satisfied must now rest on British arbitration. The Government of India, however, would not undertake the arbitration as long as the Peshwa maintained his right to interfere in the Gaikwad's internal affairs and tried to upset the very treaty under which British arbitration was offered. The Peshwa was therefore to expect no assistance from the Government of India with regard to his pecuniary claims on the Gaikwad till he had renounced his claim to sovereignty over the Baroda State.

In February 1815 the Bombay Government informed Elphinstone that Fateh Singh had disowned responsibility for the activities of Bhagvantrao. It therefore requested the consent of the Peshwa to the arrest and repatriation of Bhagvantrao and Bandhuji. It warned that

57 G.S. Sardesai, *New History of the Marathas*, Vol.iii, p.457. Bhagvantrao delivered to the Peshwa an autograph letter he had brought from Anand Rao. At the same time news reached Poona that Anand Rao and Fateh Singh were virtual prisoners under British guards and were extremely anxious that the Peshwa should intervene to secure their freedom.

58 P.R.C., Vol.xii, pp.351-352. Elphinstone to Chief Secretary Warden, 19 February 1815.
the Peshwa's continued protection of those persons would be regarded as an unfriendly act towards a State over which he had no control. The Bombay Government also stated that the Shastri enjoyed the confidence of Fateh Singh and demanded that he be allowed to return to Baroda. After this the Peshwa's Government adopted a friendly attitude towards the Shastri and the private negotiations were resumed.

In April 1815 an agreement was reached between the Peshwa and the Shastri for the cession of territory worth Rs.7,00,000 in settlement of the Peshwa's claims. Elphinstone considered the arrangement to be advantageous; for though it had the appearance of retaining the Peshwa's connection with the Gaikwad in name, it seemed to him to be the only equitable arrangement for entirely abolishing that relationship in reality.

The Guicawar and the Paishwa [he pointed out] would henceforward be absolutely unconnected states and the British Government would be released from the duty of procuring the annual service of the Guicawar's troops and the payment of his tribute.

The completion of the negotiations was, however, delayed owing to Fateh Singh's aversion to the cession of any part of Baroda territory and the Peshwa's insistence that the Gaikwad's Horse should serve

59 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.354. F. Warden to Elphinstone, 19 February 1815.
60 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.371. Elphinstone to Chief Secretary Warden, 11 May 1815. (Emphasis mine.)
under him whenever he should take the field in person. Gangadhar Shastri declared that the Gaikwad would be willing to acknowledge the Peshwa's sovereignty by receiving investiture from him provided it was always conferred on the nearest heir and without a nazzeranah. But he stated that the expense of the Horse was beyond the means of the Gaikwad.

On 10 May 1815 the Bombay Government passed resolutions censuring Gangadhar Shastri for exceeding his powers and discussing the question of the Peshwa's sovereignty over the Gaikwad. In view of this indiscretion the Bombay Government demanded his return to Baroda. Three days before, the Peshwa accompanied by the Shastri had left for Nasik from where they proceeded to Pandharpur. There on 19 July 1815 the Shastri was murdered. Elphinstone heard the news of

---

61 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.369. Resolutions by the Bombay Government, 10 May 1815. The Resolutions stated that the Shastri was sent to Poona 'to examine into and adjust various demands and papers of accounts' subsisting between the two Governments. But 'it never was in the contemplation either of the Supreme or of this Government and certainly beyond the extent of any powers vested in that native officer by his own Government to bring into discussion any question on the Rights of Sovereignty which may be claimed by the Poona Durbar over that of the Baroda State, much less was he warranted in proceeding the length of stating that the Guiclawar would "acknowledge his sovereignty by receiving investiture from the Paishwa provided it were always conferred on the nearest heir", an admission which affects the basis upon which the treaty of alliance between the Hon'ble Company and the Guiclawar has been concluded and acknowledged by the treaty of Bassein. It embraces a direct acknowledgement of the right of the Paishwa to interfere in the domestic concerns of the Guiclawar, and its effects at this moment from the disposition recently manifested by the Paishwa to encroach upon the rights of the Guiclawar, can hardly be calculated upon.' (Emphasis mine.)
the Shastri's death at Ellora and at once wrote to the Peshwa to demand an investigation and the punishment of the criminals.

Strong circumstantial evidence pointed to Trimbakji Dengle as the person responsible for the Shastri's murder. Trimbakji was a Maratha Patil of Nimbgaon-Jali. He first entered the Peshwa's service during his exile at Bassein. At great personal risk, Trimbakji carried messages to the Peshwa's partisans at Poona. Since then he had steadily risen in the scale of the Peshwa's favour. The Peshwa relied more and more on Trimbakji for the transaction of many important matters of State. By 1815 he had almost superseded Sadashiv Mankeshwar as the Peshwa's Prime Minister. Elphinstone took a strong dislike to him from the beginning and only acquiesced in his appointment to avoid being charged with interference in the internal affairs of the Poona Government. Commenting on Trimbakji's appointment Elphinstone stated:

He certainly is a very unfit person for such a charge. He is absolutely illiterate as not to have learned to read, and his manners and understanding are such as might be expected from the class to which he belongs. He is entirely ignorant of the state of India, of the comparative importance of his master's State, and of its relation to the British Government as fixed by treaty; and to this must be added that he bears a bad character, even among the Mahrattas, for falsehood and want of faith...from the character of Trimbukjee, I am afraid we must meet with more active endeavours to realise the Peshwa's pretensions, and more unreasonable resistance to our advice when at variance with our designs, than we have ever experienced from the present Minister. 62

The Shastri's murder presented the Government of India with a splendid opportunity for removing Trimbakji permanently from the political scene in Poona, and thus ensuring the stability and efficient operation of the alliance with the Peshwa.

The Governor-General assumed that Trimbakji Dengle was guilty. He accordingly instructed Elphinstone to pronounce him so without any further inquiry. The Resident was asked to warn the Peshwa that any attempt to obstruct the cause of justice or connive at the escape of Trimbakji would 'involve him in irretrievable ruin'. The Governor-General, however, agreed with Elphinstone that the Peshwa's honour should be protected by avoiding any investigation into his complicity.

The Peshwa was averse to the arrest of Trimbakji before his guilt had been established. He believed Trimbakji to be innocent and considered it unjust to convict and punish him on the strength of mere rumour. But he promised that if Elphinstone proved his charge he would arrest Trimbakji immediately. Elphinstone, on the other hand, insisted on Trimbakji's arrest as a prerequisite to the establishment of his guilt. Until that was done he feared that no direct evidence

63 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.430. J. Adam, Secretary to Government, to Elphinstone, 10 September 1815.
64 P.R.C., Vol.xii, p.381. J. Adam, Secretary to Government, to Elphinstone, 15 August 1815.
could be procured. He feared that if the identity of the prospective witnesses was disclosed beforehand, they might be liquidated. The Resident urged the Peshwa to expedite the arrest of Trimbakji to prevent him from assembling troops and corresponding with foreign States or becoming a freebooter. He warned the Peshwa that he would be held responsible for either of these acts by Trimbakji. The Peshwa ultimately surrendered Trimbakji. On 26 September 1815 Trimbakji, Bhagvantrao and Bandhuji were handed over to a detachment of Colonel Smith's corps which took them to Panwell and thence to Tannah.

The surrender of Trimbakji was followed by a lull in the acrimonious relations between the Peshwa and the Government of India. During this lull the Governor-General wrote to the Peshwa to impress upon his mind the main principles of his alliance with the British. He told the Peshwa that long before the Treaty of Bassein was signed, the Maratha Confederacy was moribund. His feudal superiority over the Maratha Chiefs had practically lapsed and his legitimate authority had become restricted to Maharashtra. It was not to assist him to recover his authority as head of the Maratha Confederacy which had been 'previously dissolved by the hand of time and the natural course of political events' that the Government of India offered its alliance. Rather, the aim of the alliance was to assist him to recover his lost authority inside Maharashtra. On the basis of the alliance, the Governor-General declared, Sindhia, Holkar, the Bhonsla and the Gaikwad had
in every transaction been regarded as separate and independent States equally removed from that feudal subordinacy which their predecessors once owned to [His] Highness's ancestors and deprived, on the other hand, of every pretension to mix in the affairs of [His] Highness's Government.

The Governor-General then urged the Peshwa to reconcile himself to the new order of things and renounce the vain hope of reviving the ancient Maratha constitution either by overt or covert means.

In the meantime, the Governor-General informed Elphinstone that the murder of the Shastri could not be deemed to have affected the Peshwa's disputes with the Gaikwad since the Government of India had assumed the Peshwa to be innocent of it. Nevertheless, he felt that the Peshwa was morally obliged to offer some atonement to the Gaikwad for the loss sustained by him. He accordingly asked the Resident to persuade the Peshwa to do so.

The Baroda Government demanded that the murder of the Shastri be deemed to have dissolved all links between the Poona and Baroda States. It demanded the following as compensation:

i. The Peshwa's renunciation of all pecuniary claims on the Gaikwad past and future.

ii. The permanent surrender to the Gaikwad of the Talook of Ahmedabad in lieu of the Gaikwad's claim to Baroach; or the farming of the Peshwa's possessions in Gujerat to the Government of India in the interest of political tranquillity in Gujerat.

iii. In the event of the Peshwa agreeing, the Gaikwad was willing to pay the sum of Rs.5,00,000 for a khilat of investiture on the elevation of a legitimate member of the Gaikwad family to the Baroda Gadi and to serve with 1,000 Horse whenever the Maratha Empire was engaged in an important enterprise.

65 P.R.C., Vol.xiii, p.17. Governor-General to His Highness the Peshwa, 20 January 1816. (Emphasis mine. 'His' in lines four and six of quotation reads 'Your' in original.)

66 The Baroda Government demanded that the murder of the Shastri be deemed to have dissolved all links between the Poona and Baroda States. It demanded the following as compensation:

i. The Peshwa's renunciation of all pecuniary claims on the Gaikwad past and future.

ii. The permanent surrender to the Gaikwad of the Talook of Ahmedabad in lieu of the Gaikwad's claim to Baroach; or the farming of the Peshwa's possessions in Gujerat to the Government of India in the interest of political tranquillity in Gujerat.

iii. In the event of the Peshwa agreeing, the Gaikwad was willing to pay the sum of Rs.5,00,000 for a khilat of investiture on the elevation of a legitimate member of the Gaikwad family to the Baroda Gadi and to serve with 1,000 Horse whenever the Maratha Empire was engaged in an important enterprise. (P.R.C.
instructed Elphinstone to procure a resumption of the negotiations on
the basis of the proposition made by the Shastri for a cession of
territory in settlement of the Peshwa's claims. In the event of failure,
however, the Resident was to submit the disputes to British arbitration
as a last resort. Before any steps could be taken by the Resident
the clouds of the approaching storm began to gather fast.

On 14 June 1816 the Peshwa listed a number of grievances
against Elphinstone and declared his suspicion that the Resident was
planning to destroy his State. He complained that though he had
exceeded the sum of the subsidy demanded by the British for the
subsidiary force yet the interests of everyone else, but his, were
upheld; that instead of restoring Kattiawar to him as the Government
of India was bound to do by treaty, it had withheld it from him and
saddled its restoration with unjustified conditions; that the

Vol.xii, pp.442-443.) The Governor-General rejected these
claims as unreasonable. He asked Elphinstone to declare
to the Gaikwad that the Government of India had accepted the
unconditional surrender of Trimbakji, Bhagvantrao and Bandhuji
as constituting an absolution of the Peshwa's Government and
as sufficient proof of the Peshwa's regret for the Shastri's
murder. (P.R.C., Vol.xiii, pp.10-11.)


The Government of India regarded the ratification by the Peshwa of
the decennial arrangements made by the Gaikwad's Government with
the chiefs of Kattiawar to be a point of national honour. The
Peshwa was unwilling to ratify it because he suspected that the
Gaikwad had in some cases allowed the petty chiefs to compound
part of their tribute for a secret payment to himself. Besides,
Elphinstone's proposal that his Highness' Government should be
guided entirely by the advice of the Resident at Baroda, or that it
should commit the whole conduct of its transactions with the petty
Kattiawar States to the control of that officer was unacceptable
to the Peshwa.
Government of India had made the settlement of his claims on the Gaikwad conditional on his making provision for the Shastri's children. Finally he complained that Elphinstone was constantly annoying him about the Southern Jagirdars but would not procure the release of Trimbakji Dengle. 69

Three months after these complaints were made, Trimbakji Dengle escaped from Tannah and began to prepare an insurrection. Until 24 February 1817 Elphinstone did not suspect the Peshwa of complicity in Trimbakji's insurrection. But when the Peshwa denied knowledge of the existence of any insurrection, contrary to popular rumour, the Resident considered the insurrection to have assumed the form of 'an attempt of Trimbuckjee to recover his power by carrying on war against the British Government, under the protection of H.H. the Paishwah'. 70

---

69 P.R.C., Vol.xiii, pp.62-63. Elphinstone to Secretary Adam, 14 June 1816. Elphinstone had been importuning the Peshwa to reconsider his confiscation of the jagir of Madhu Rao Rastia for failure to serve when summoned.

70 P.R.C., Vol.xiii, p.82. Elphinstone to the Governor-General, 11 March 1817. The Peshwa's Ministers sent Elphinstone a letter from the commandant of Gokhale's detachment sent against the insurgents. The letter denied that there was any insurrection. The Peshwa subsequently sent to request Elphinstone to find out the location of the insurgents so that his troops might disperse them.
The coincidence of Trimbakji's insurrection with a projected British campaign against the Pindaris\textsuperscript{71} created a dangerous situation for the British. On the one hand, the Government of India was worried about the uncertainty of the reaction of the Maratha Chiefs of central India to the campaign against the Pindaris who operated under their patronage. On the other hand, it was certain that as soon as British forces began their campaign beyond the Narbada, Baji Rao would throw off all restraints and attempt to free himself from the shackles of the Treaty of Bassein. Elphinstone therefore proposed three alternative plans for rendering him harmless: First, to transfer the powers of State to a Minister as at Hyderabad; second, to regard Baji Rao's conduct as proof of his enmity towards the British and penalise him by the imposition of a new treaty calculated to weaken him through extensive cessions of territory; third, to declare war against him, conquer his country and bestow it on whomsoever the Government of India preferred and on whatever conditions it might wish.\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{71} In September 1816, the Court of Directors at last authorised action against the Pindaris. Early in 1817 the Governor-General, Lord Hastings, began preparations to extirpate the predatory system in India.

\textsuperscript{72} \textit{P.R.C.,} Vol.xiii, pp.97-100. Elphinstone to the Governor-General, 21 March 1817.

Elphinstone preferred the third plan. He felt that under it, the old form of Government would be preserved and the employment of public servants, both civil and military, assured. He believed that the establishment of direct British rule with an English Magistrate and the introduction of the \textit{Adawlat} would not be popular with the generality of the people. Nor would a Raja of Satara who acted on English maxims, rather than in the time-honoured tradition of Shivaji, be acceptable to the Maratha gentry.
On 7 April 1817 the Government of India outlined the conditions on which it would agree to restore the alliance with Baji Rao to its original footing. If the Peshwa should have arrested or expelled Trimbakji by the time of the receipt of the Governor-General's despatch of 7 April 1817, Elphinstone was to consider the alliance restored. Otherwise, Elphinstone was to adopt the following measures:

First, he was to inform the Peshwa that the Governor-General was

The first plan, he thought, would be impracticable with a ruler like Baji Rao whose energy, tenacity of purpose and malignity stood in marked contrast to the indolence of the Nizam which had almost made him 'a page' before British support for his Minister actually made him so. Besides, at Hyderabad, British support was exerted to retain the authority of the State in the hands in which the British found it rather than transfer it to others. Sadashiv Mankeshwar, the only Minister suited at all for the role, lacked sufficient courage or abilities and might probably refuse the office for fear of the Peshwa's vengeance. On the other hand, if he accepted the office, the Government of India would be obliged to enforce all his measures by sheer intimidation which would not deter Baji Rao from intrigue against the Minister as well as the Government of India. It would therefore be impossible to govern in the Peshwa's name without reducing him to the condition of a pensioner like the Raja of Satara.

Under the second plan, Elphinstone felt that the Government of India might increase the subsidiary force and place the Peshwa's entire army under British officers whose pay should be independent of the Peshwa. Alternatively, the Government of India could take the requisite sum for the payment of the army from the Peshwa and maintain the army in the name of the Government of India, with the Peshwa keeping no more than a fixed number of troops (about 2,000 besides garrisons) in his service. The Government of India might also compel Baji Rao to renounce the allegiance of, and all connection with, the Maratha States expressly. He might be asked to engage not to keep vakils or communicate with any foreign State without the consent of Ministers of the Government of India. He might also be asked to subject his internal administration to the advice of the Government of India.
satisfied that he was engaged in a plot against the Government of India and its allies. The Government of India could therefore never again place any confidence in him. Second, Elphinstone was to demand the surrender of Trimbakji within a fixed time as a prerequisite to all further discussions. If the Peshwa failed to comply, Elphinstone was to declare war on him and direct the British troops to attack and conquer his State. Third, the Resident was to warn the Peshwa that if he left Poona while discussions were pending, or permitted Trimbakji to move troops in any part of the Poona State, he would be deemed to have declared war on the Government of India. In such an eventuality, Colonel Smith was to be directed to conquer and occupy the Poona State in the name of the Government of India. 73

After the Peshwa had surrendered Trimbakji, the Governor-General intended to demand certain securities from him as a condition for renewing the British alliance with his State. These securities were to be based on the need to maintain British military preponderance within Maharashtra and to extinguish Baji Rao's means of intriguing with other powers against the Government of India. To attain the former, the Governor-General required the Peshwa to engage to maintain, in conformity to his existing treaty obligation, 74 a body of 5,000 Horse

---

74 By a Supplementary Article to the Treaty of Bassein, the Peshwa was bound to provide 5,000 cavalry and 3,000 infantry in time of war. As the Peshwa could not be relied upon to furnish this army in time of war, the Governor-General considered it just to effect an arrangement under which the services of the stipulated quota of troops would be available to the Government of India at all times.
to be commanded by European officers. The Peshwa was to be required
to provide for their regular payment at the rate of Rs.40 per month
for each horseman exclusive of the pay of the officers. The Peshwa's
establishment of regular infantry (i.e., the battalions under Major
Ford) was to be considered adequate though short of the stipulated
number of 3,000. Their pay was, however, to be independent of the
Peshwa's will.\(^75\) The Governor-General considered an addition to the
subsidiary force unnecessary since by the new engagement, the Government
of India would have a force which, while remaining nominally in the
service of the Peshwa, would in effect be under exclusive British
control.

To render the Peshwa harmless, the Governor-General decided
to deprive him of all ostensible excuses and pretexts for interfering
in the affairs of Hindustan, Bundelkhand and Gujerat. Baji Rao was
to be required to

\begin{quote}
renounce for his heirs and successors, all connections
whatever with the other Mahratta Powers and formally
to recognize the complete dissolution, both in form
and substance of the Mahratta Confederacy, including
of course all the relations still maintained between
him as the executive head of the Marhatta Empire,
and those States. \(^76\)
\end{quote}

Baji Rao was to be further required to promise to communicate with

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{\(^75\) P.R.C., Vol.xiii, pp.133-134. J. Adam to Elphinstone, 7 April 1817.}
\footnote{\(^76\) P.R.C., Vol.iii, p.135. (Emphasis mine.)}
\end{footnotes}
those States only through Ministers of the Government of India. The
Government of India also required the Peshwa to transfer to it
all his rights, claims and pretensions, feudal, territorial and pecuniary in Bundelcund, including
Saugor, Jhansi and the territories of Nauna Govind Row and agree to relinquish all connections with
the Chiefs in that quarter. 77

The Government of India particularly wanted the Peshwa to
renounce all future demands on the Gaikwad. He was also to agree
to renew the lease of Ahmedabad in perpetuity to the Gaikwad on the
same terms as before. He was to consent to the collection of his
share of the Kattiawar tribute by the Gaikwad according to the
arrangement made by Colonel Walker, the former Resident at Baroda.
The cession of the fort of Ahmednagar in perpetual sovereignty to
the Government of India was also to be demanded. 78 The Governor-
General concluded his despatch:

Without these considerations the leaving of Bajy Row in possession of any degree of power would be
hazardous to our interests in a high degree. With them, and the additional security against his
future combinations which the second surrender of Trimbuckjee into our hands under such circumstances
would afford, we might leave to him the internal administration of his Dominions without much
apprehension of danger from his secret intrigues or open enmity. 79

77 P.R.C., Vol.iii, p.135. (Emphasis mine.)
78 P.R.C., Vol.xiii, p.135.
79 P.R.C., Vol.xiii, p.136. (Emphasis mine.)
This despatch is very important. It shows that the policy of the Government of India towards the Poona State was defensive and stemmed from the anxiety of the British to safeguard their internal security. The Government of India was even at this stage, still desirous of following a policy of peaceful co-existence with the Poona State. It had no intention of annexing it yet.

Baji Rao was shocked to learn of the details of the proposed treaty. He took strong exception to the stipulations regarding the

---

80 P.R.C., Vol.xiii, pp.187-193. The 18 Articles of the Treaty included the following:

i. The Peshwa was never to countenance or protect Trimbakji. He was to try to seize and deliver him to the Government of India. Until his surrender, Trimbakji's family were to remain hostages in British hands.

iii. Baji Rao was not to admit into his territories any subjects of any other European or American power without the previous consent of the Government of India.

iv. Baji Rao was neither to maintain vakils at foreign courts nor permit the residence of agents from any power whatever at his court. All communications with any power whatever were to be conducted only through the Resident or other Minister of the Company residing at his court. He was to recognise for himself and for his heirs and successors, the dissolution in form and substance of the Maratha Confederacy and renounce all connection whatever with the Maratha Powers. His rights over all chiefs of the Maratha State between the Narbada and the Tungabhadra and the Nizam's western frontier were to remain unaffected by the treaty.

v. Baji Rao was to renounce all future demands whatever on the Gaikwad. His outstanding demands were, however, to remain the subject of British arbitration. But he was to consent to their being set aside subject to Anand Rao's agreement to the payment of an annual sum of Rs.4,00,000.
Gaikwad and Rastia as well as the demand for the cession of the Konkan.
He also objected to the words 'heirs and successors' throughout the

vi. The Peshwa was to agree to the annulment of the 4th Supplementary Article of the Treaty of Bassein and to place at the disposal of the Government of India sufficient funds for the payment of a force of 5,000 cavalry and 3,000 infantry, and the provision of a due proportion of ordinance and military stores.

vii. Baji Rao was to cede certain specified portions of his territory as well as the tribute of Kattiawar.

xii. Baji Rao was to cede the fort of Ahmednagar in perpetuity to the Company together with the adjoining territory lying within a radius of 2,000 yards from the foot of the glacis. He was also to permit the residence within his dominions (but at no extra cost to his Government) of any number of British troops in addition to the subsidiary force and to allow free passage through all parts of his dominions to all British troops.

xiii. The Peshwa was to cede all his rights, interests, or pretensions feudal, territorial, or pecuniary, in the Province of Bundelkhand, including Saugor, Jhansi and the lands held by Nana Govind Rao and to relinquish all connection with the chiefs in that area.

xiv. The Peshwa was to cede to the Company all his rights and territories in Malwa secured to him by the 11th Article of the treaty of Surji-Anjangaon and all rights and pretensions he might possess in the country to the north of the Narbada with the exception of those he possessed in the province of Gujerat. Baji Rao was not to interfere again in the affairs of Hindustan.

xv. The Peshwa was also to grant his share of Ahmedabad (excluding Kattiawar) in perpetuity to the Gaikwad on the same terms and at the same rent as before.

xvi. His Highness was to consent to recognise the Agreement of Pandharpur as binding on the parties to it and as though it formed part of the new treaty. He was to agree to be guided entirely by the advice of the Government of India with regard to the muster of troops and the duration of service of the Southern Jagirdars, and to issue no orders to them without full consultation with the Government of India. He was to restore to the Southern Jagirdars (especially Madhu Rao Rastia whose lands were resumed in 1814) any portions of their saranjamy lands resumed by him and to permit them to hold them as before under the guarantee of the Government of India.
treaty. He pleaded that his maintenance of vakils at foreign courts as well as the preservation of his nominal sovereignty over the Maratha powers was essential to his honour. The Peshwa's Government objected to the murder of the Shastri being attributed to Trimbakji in the first article of the treaty. Baji Rao declared that he was still not convinced of Trimbakji's guilt and could therefore not assert it in a public document. He requested an alteration in the fourth article which required him to renounce his claims as the head of the Maratha Empire. He pointed out that it was to enable him to reduce the great Maratha Chiefs to obedience that he signed the Treaty of Bassein. Elphinstone, however, refused to review the treaty and on 13 June 1817 the Peshwa reluctantly signed the Treaty of Poona.

The severity of the terms of the Treaty of Poona reflected the determination of Lord Hastings' Government to safeguard the peace and security of India by freeing it forever from the incubus of the Maratha Confederacy. Nevertheless, the harshness of the treaty was beyond doubt and made a rupture inevitable. By the treaty, Baji Rao lost all his ancestral possessions north of the Narbada with the exception of those in Gujerat. But even these passed out of his control forever. The Peshwa lost control over his foreign relations as well as his internal affairs, and the Poona State virtually became a vassal State of the Government of India.

82 P.R.C., Vol.xiii, p.196.
At the beginning of August 1817 Brigadier-General Sir John Malcolm arrived at Poona to discuss with the Peshwa the disposition of his forces in the approaching campaign against the Pindaris. The Peshwa, still smarting from the humiliation of the Treaty of Poona, saw his chance. Under the pretext of cooperating with the Government of India, he began to recruit a formidable army and to incite the Maratha powers to rise against the British. At the same time, he conciliated his brother and his principal chiefs and began to remove his property from Poona. He also began to tamper with the loyalty of the sepoys in the British army and succeeded in procuring the defection of a few.

The rupture between Baji Rao and the Government of India finally occurred on 5 November 1817 when the Peshwa's troops attacked and burned down the Residency at Poona. On 17 November Poona was

83 On 15 October 1817 Elphinstone reported that the Peshwa had employed almost every single horseman in his State irrespective of quality and efficiency. He estimated the strength of the Peshwa's forces at 25,000 cavalry and about the same number of infantry. (P.R.C., Vol.xiii, pp.219-220. Elphinstone to Governor-General, 15 October 1817.)


85 In response to the military preparations of the Peshwa, the Resident sent orders to hasten the march of the European Regiment from Bombay. He also requested General Smith to send back a light Battalion of the subsidiary force from the Narbada (where it had gone to participate in the campaign against the Pindaris) to the cantonment at Seroor. On 30 October 1817 the European Regiment from Bombay arrived at Poona. On 1 November, amid the protests of the Peshwa, Elphinstone moved the Brigade from Poona to Kirkee because of the threatening position assumed by the Peshwa's troops near the British camp and his relentless efforts to seduce the Sepoys from their loyalty. Three days later Elphinstone wrote to order the light battalion and the 1,000 Auxiliary Horse at Seroor
captured by General Smith who had been recalled from the campaign against the Pindaris. The British flag was hoisted on the Peshwa's palace and Elphinstone proclaimed as the Chief British Authority in the Poona State. Lieutenant Robertson was appointed to command the city guard and Police.

In December 1817 the Governor-General took a firm decision to remove Baji Rao from his masnad. Elphinstone was appointed sole Commissioner for the administration of the Poona State. He was instructed to adopt the following measures at the end of the war: First, the whole of the Peshwa's territories (with certain exceptions) were to be occupied and annexed to the Company's dominions. Second, Baji Rao and his family were to be perpetually excluded from the exercise of all sovereign power. Third, Baji Rao was to be banished from the Deccan and kept under surveillance. Fourth, the lands of Jagirdars who did not support the Peshwa's war against the British were to be taken under British protection.

---

to march to Poona. They had marched only fifteen miles when news of their approach reached the Peshwa. Alarmed by the news, he began to put his army on a war footing. He sent a servant, Vithoji Naik Gaikwad, to the Residency to demand the return of the Bombay Regiment, the reduction of the Native Brigade to its original strength and the removal of the British cantonements to a place to be fixed by him. Upon Elphinstone's refusal to comply with these demands, the Peshwa left Poona for Parbutty. Less than an hour after his departure, the Residency was attacked and burned down. This act was followed by the battle of Kirkee which marked the beginning of the final rupture between Baji Rao and the British.

86 P.R.C., Vol.xiii, p.253. Declaration by the Commanding Officer, 18 November 1817.
Such Jagirdars were to continue to hold their lands on the same terms as before subject to any modifications which the Government of India might desire to make in their terms of tenure. Fifth, the lands of Gokhale and other Jagirdars were to be annexed to British dominions. Sixth, the Raja of Satara was to be assigned a jagir or a small compact kingdom. This was deemed necessary to assuage the national feelings of the Marathas and reconcile them to the change. Seventh, Chimnaji Appa (brother of Baji Rao), members of Baji Rao's family who were not seriously implicated in his 'crimes' and such of the principal officers of the old regime as could not be employed under the new were to be pensioned or provided with jagirs. Finally, Elphinstone was to ask Brigadier-General Munro to assume the responsibility of introducing British rule into the southern Maratha districts.87

On 10 February 1818 Satara was captured and a proclamation issued.88 Baji Rao's hopes of success against the British were disappointed by the vigilance of British troops which completely immobilised the armies of Sindhia and the Raja of Berar.89

88 The proclamation promised the establishment of the Raja in an independent sovereignty. It also promised to protect all Wuttuns and enams (hereditary lands), Wurshaushans (annual stipends) and all religious and charitable institutions. All religious sects were promised toleration. (P.R.C., Vol.xiii, pp.301-302.)
89 In a series of skilful manoeuvres, British forces surrounded Sindhia in his capital Gwalior and compelled him to agree to the Treaty of Gwalior, 5 November 1817. By this treaty, Sindhia agreed to assist the Government of India to liquidate the Pindaris. Appa Saheb's
Maharashtra itself most of Baji Rao's sardars slowly left him.

Deserted by his principal chiefs, unable to trust his life to his remaining adherents and without hope of foreign aid, Baji Rao Peshwa surrendered near Asserghur when he discovered that he was surrounded on three sides. On 3 June 1818 he accepted the terms offered by Sir John Malcolm. On 22 August he marched from Mundesoor for attempts to move to the assistance of the Peshwa were frustrated by his arrest and imprisonment on 15 March 1818 at the Residency in Nagpur. Holkar's army was intercepted on its way to assist the Peshwa. On 21 December 1817 his forces were routed in the battle of Mehidpur on the Sipra river. On 6 January 1818 Holkar accepted a subsidiary treaty.

Except on the west which led to the wild inhospitable hills of Northern Kandeish, Baji Rao was surrounded on all sides by British troops - General Doveton at Burhampur, Malcolm at Metowla and Colonel Russell at Burgham.

The terms included the following:

i. Baji Rao was to resign for himself and his successors all rights, title and claim over the Poona Government or to any sovereign power whatever.

ii. Baji Rao was to proceed immediately with his family and a small number of his adherents and attendants to the camp of Brigadier General Malcolm. From there he was to be escorted to the city of Benares or any other sacred place in Hindustan that the Governor-General might select for his residence.

iii. Subject to his acceptance of the above terms, Malcolm undertook to secure for him and his family a pension of not less than Rs.8,00,000 per annum.

iv. Subject to his fulfilment of the Agreement, his requests in favour of his principal Jagirdars and others ruined by their loyalty to him, as well as of Brahmins of venerable character and religious establishments founded and established by his family, would be given due consideration.

v. Baji Rao was to accept the above terms and to present himself at General Malcolm's camp within twenty-four hours under pain of hostilities and the termination of all further negotiations.
Bithur where he was destined to end his life.92

The annexation of Maharashtra marked the culmination of British involvement in the affairs of the Maratha Empire which began in 1802. This involvement stemmed from the dangerous situation created at the beginning of the nineteenth century by the political crisis which had rocked the Maratha Empire since 1773. If the Government of India had been sure that it could turn Baji Rao into a puppet ruler and control the Maratha Empire through him, it might perhaps have helped Baji Rao to regain his traditional authority over the rebellious Confederate Chiefs. But the character of Baji Rao made it unlikely that he would be inclined to subserve British interests. Therefore the Government of India resorted to its time-honoured maxim of divide et impera to control the Marathas. Taking advantage of the Peshwa's predicament, the Government of India imposed the Treaty of Bassein as the price of restoring him to his authority within Maharashtra.

Through the dissolution of the Maratha Confederacy, the Government of India hoped to stop the interference of the Maratha Chiefs of central India in the affairs of Maharashtra as well as their rivalry for control over the Peshwa's Government. It also hoped to prevent the Maratha Chiefs from interfering in the affairs of other

92 Baji Rao objected to Benares or Allahabad as a place of residence for him.
native States in the name of their Confederacy. On the other hand, the Government of India sought to curb the disorders which might arise from allowing Baji Rao to make ineffectual efforts to command the obedience of his numerous subjects outside Maharashtra. The refusal of Baji Rao to acquiesce in the dissolution of the Maratha Confederacy cost him his sovereignty.

For a time the Government of India relied on threats, remonstrances and harsh treaties to coerce Baji Rao. By the end of 1817, however, it had become apparent that the ties between the Peshwa and the Maratha Chiefs could not be severed by remonstrances or treaties. The continued existence of the office of Peshwa was therefore seen as a threat to the security of the British Empire in India.

The state of our relations to the Peshwa [warned Elphinstone in November 1815] has always been much influenced by his Highness's personal character, and it might be interesting to speculate on the form they might assume if the numerous claims and pretensions of this Government were to fall into

As late as October 1817, Malhar Rao Holkar continued to regard the Peshwa as his sovereign and to importune Elphinstone for permission to receive investiture from him. The Raja of Berar continued to maintain an unofficial vakil at Poona despite the Treaty of Poona. After the burning of the Residency at Poona, the Regent of Holkar's State, Tulsibai, proclaimed her obligation to obey 'the orders of her master' (i.e., the Peshwa) to rise against the British. The Raja of Berar, Appa Saheb pleaded a similar excuse of obedience for his attack on the British Residency at Nagpur. Sindhia was only restrained from moving for fear of risking the immediate annihilation of his army. (P.R.C., Vol.xiii, p.382.)
the hands of an active and warlike Peshwa, who would attend to the improvement of his army, conciliate his Jageerdars, and encourage the former great feudatories to look on him as their chief. It is obvious that in the present state of India there are fine materials for a powerful confederacy under such a leader;...

In justifying the annexation of Maharashtra, Lord Hastings was even more emphatic on the danger to British interests inherent in the office of Peshwa.

The re-establishment of Bajee Rao upon any conditions [His Lordship declared], must appear to every one to have been utterly incompatible with our honour and security...whether we selected Chimnajee Appa,...or brought forward Amrut Rao, the mischief was inevitably the same. We have had full and most serious proof, that no distinction of obligation will prevent a Peishwah from secretly claiming the allegiance of the other Mahratta sovereigns; and irrefragable evidence has shown, that the implicit obedience recognised as due to the mandates of such a head of the Mahratta empire, will operate in violation of every solemnity of pledge to us; nay, in despite of the individual's feelings of attachment to us. There must, then, be no Peishwah.

Thus Maharashtra was annexed in 1818 because its downfall had become essential to the stability of the British Empire in India. This stability was firmly assured by the extension of British suzerainty over Rajasthan which occurred simultaneously with the annexation of Maharashtra.


95 P.R.C., Vol.xiii, p.414. The Marquis of Hastings to the Court of Directors, 20 June 1818. (Emphasis mine.)
Chapter 3
RAJASTHAN AND BRITISH SUZERAINITY

The extension of British political control over the Rajput States in 1818 was, by and large, the by-product of the Pindari war. It was yet another example of how a sense of insecurity engendered by prevailing political instability in neighbouring native States made it impossible for the Government of India to adhere to its avowed policy of non-intervention in the affairs of the Indian States.

Between the second Maratha war (1803-1805) and the Pindari war (1817-1818), the formation of new alliances, especially with the petty States of Hindustan, was regarded as a source of weakness and danger rather than of strength. Opponents of Lord Wellesley's policy maintained that such alliances would involve the Government of India in unnecessary wars and conquests. The aversion to further territorial acquisitions which existed at this time was partly due to the feeling that the Government of India had neither the means nor the men to rule a vast empire. The civil service was inadequate to the complex tasks of administration; and it was feared that while the Government of India might govern a part well and ensure the affection and loyalty of the natives, it could only govern the whole subcontinent badly and incur the hatred of its people. Already there was growing concern about defects in police organisation and about the complexity and inefficiency of the judicial system. These were causing considerable
hardship and resentment among the people of India.\(^1\) It was also argued that besides antagonising the military and ruling classes,\(^2\) the extension of British dominion had a tendency towards lowering the status of the higher classes and levelling Indian society.\(^3\) For

---

\(^{1}\) See the remarks made on the Zillah Courts in the petition written by Meer Ally Gholam Meerlyam dated about 14 March 1807 and addressed to Lord William Bentinck, Governor of Madras, on behalf of 'the ancient Landholders, Puttiels, and Ryots of every description, natives of or resident in the districts of the Bara Mahl, and other dependencies of the Sircar of the Company'. (Parliamentary Debates 1813-1814, Vol.xxvii, Cols.1118-1119.)

See also Lord Minto's Minute of 24 November 1810 and letter of 29 May 1810 on the state of lawlessness created in Bengal by the Dacoits and the inability of the police to protect the people. (R. Dutt, Economic History of India under Early British Rule, Seventh Edition (London, 1950), pp.314-315; Parliamentary Debates 1813-1814, Vol.xxvii, Col.1128.)

Also see Sir Henry Strachey's answers to the Court of Directors' Queries about the judicial system in India, (Dutt, op.cit., p.316); W.K. Firminger (ed.), The Fifth Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Affairs of the East India Company, 28 July 1812 (Calcutta, 1917), Vol.ii, pp.591,592,604,611,636.

\(^{2}\) In his evidence before the House of Commons in 1813, Sir Thomas Munro stated that though the great mass of the Indian population was contented with British rule, there were 'many chiefs and men of rank who held situations under the old Government, who cannot be expected to remain contented under any European Government by which they are themselves excluded from all high situations'. (Oriental Herald (London, 1828), Vol.xviii, pp.39-40 footnotes.)

\(^{3}\) In a letter of protest to Lord Hastings about the policy of intervention and annexation of native States, Sir Thomas Munro argued that even if the extension of British power over the whole of India could be achieved without the risk of internal convulsions, it would still be undesirable as it would result in the debasement of the natives. He observed: 'The effect of this state of things is observable in all the British provinces, whose inhabitants are certainly the most abject race in India. The consequence, therefore, of the conquest of India by the British arms would be, in place of raising, to debase the whole people. There is perhaps no example of any conquest in which the natives have been so completely excluded from all share of the government of their country as in British India.'
this reason and the danger of possible uprising against the British, the policy of interference in the affairs of the native States was condemned.

From about 1810 onwards, however, the policy of 'ring-fence' pursued by the Governors-General, Sir George Barlow and Lord Minto, endangered the security of the Government of India. During the Nepalese war, an increase in the violence and frequency of the predatory attacks on British territories coincided with a steady deterioration in Anglo-Maratha relations and a display of hostile intentions by Sindhia and Ameer Khan. The remarkable coincidence of these events aroused a deep suspicion that the freebooters of India were merely a facade for a carefully organised Maratha conspiracy against the Government of India. To combat this danger, the Court of Directors relaxed its opposition to intervention in the Indian States. To extirpate the freebooter system and to extinguish the smouldering ambition of the restless Marathas, Lord Hastings decided to deprive them of the resources of Rajasthan by establishing the overlordship of the Government of India over the helpless Rajput States.

'Among all the disorders of the native states, the field is open for every man to raise himself; and hence among them there is a spirit of emulation, of restless enterprise and independence, far preferable to the servility of our Indian subjects.' (Quarterly Review, (London, 1858) Vol.104, pp.273-274.
i. Political structure and condition of Rajasthan in the 18th and early 19th century.

The religious bigotry of Aurangzeb alienated the loyalty and support of the Rajput rulers whose valour had helped to stabilise the Mughal power in the past. His death in 1707 became the signal for a renewed effort by the Rajputs to regain their independence. At a meeting held at Udaipur in 1710, the rulers of Udaipur (Mewar), Jodhpur (Marwar) and Jaipur (Amber) concluded a triple alliance 'in which they ratified on oath the renunciation of all connexion, domestic or political, with the empire'. A further step towards independence.

4 In the contest among the sons of Shah Jahan for the throne of their aged father, Jaswant Singh of Jodhpur (Marwar) had espoused the cause of Prince Dara. When Aurangzeb eventually succeeded to the throne, he found it difficult to conciliate the loyalty of the leading Rajput rulers. He ultimately contrived to have Jaswant Singh and Jai Singh murdered and then began a religious persecution of the Hindu race by imposing on them the Jizya. Rana Raj Singh of Udaipur (Mewar), in the name of the whole Hindu race, addressed a letter of Remonstrance to Aurangzeb. Besides, the Rana provided sanctuary for the infant heir of Jaswant Singh (whom the Emperor wished to liquidate). He also thwarted the Emperor's marriage to the Princess of Rupnagar (a junior branch of the house of Udaipur). All these acts provoked the Emperor's wrath against Udaipur and in about 1678, he invaded it with a formidable army. (W. Crooke (ed.), Tod's Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan or the Central and Western Rajput States of India (three volumes, London 1920), Vol.i, pp.439-445; Vol.ii, pp.980-984.)

5 Crooke (ed.), op.cit., Vol.i, p.465. Jaipur and Jodhpur were deemed to have contaminated their blood by their matrimonial connection with the Mughals formed since the days of Akbar. They had therefore forfeited the privilege of marryng princesses of the house of Udaipur which had preserved its racial purity. But to cement the newly formed triple Alliance and emphasise the identity of interest of the Rajput States against their common foe, the ban was lifted on the understanding that the female issues of such marriages should never again be dishonoured by marriage to the Mughals.
was taken when, shortly before his death in 1716, Rana Amra Singh of Udaipur obliged the Mughal Emperor to remit the *jizya* and to allow 'all places of Hindu faith to be rebuilt, with perfect freedom of religious worship'. The Emperor was further obliged to confirm the Rana's control over the ancient feudatories of his dynasty and to restore all districts sequestrated. The repeal of the jizya was confirmed by Emperor Mohammed Shah whose accession marked the beginning of the dismemberment of the Mughal empire. For a time, the steady disintegration of the empire seemed to augur well for the ultimate independence of the Rajput States. However, the northward expansion of the Marathas, and more particularly the conquest of Malwa in 1732, introduced an entirely new feature in the politics of Hindustan.

The conquest of Malwa provided the Marathas with a convenient base for the extension of their influence into Hindustan. In April 1734 they attacked Bundi. The alarm created by this attack caused Sawai Jai Singh of Jaipur to summon a conference of all Rajput rulers in October 1734 to concert measures of common defence. A confederate army was established of which the Rana of Udaipur was appointed commander. Unfortunately, when the crisis arrived with the entry of

---

7 Crooke, *op.cit.*, Vol.1, p.482. This confederacy was formed at Hurra, a town in the State of Udaipur (Mewar) on the Ajmer frontier. Note: The Capitals of the Rajput States are used interchangeably with the name of the States in the text.
Peshwa Baji Rao into Udaipur (Mewar) in 1736, the confederacy quailed and crumbled. There were 'too many discordant particles - too many rivalries and national antipathies' among the Rajputs to permit the successful operation of a Rajput confederacy similar to that of the Marathas. The claim of Jodhpur and Jaipur to equality with Udaipur made them loath to 'submit to the control required to work it out,...'.

When the Peshwa entered Mewar, the terrified Rana welcomed him at Udaipur and agreed to a treaty which stipulated the payment of an annual tribute. The collapse of the all-Rajput confederacy proved to be a tragedy.

Unity of interests [says Tod], was the chief character of the engagement, had they adhered to which, not only the independence, but the aggrandisement, of Rajasthan, was in their power, and they might have alike defied the expiring efforts of Moghul tyranny, and the Parthian-like warfare of the Mahrattas. They were indeed the most formidable power in India at this juncture;...

Throughout the eighteenth century, the Rajputs continued to evince an almost pathological inability to unite to resist the oppression of their common foe. This factor is important in understanding the ease

---

Crooke, op.cit., Vol.i, p.483.

Crooke, op.cit., Vol.i, pp.493-494. The tribute was Rs.1,60,000. To cover it, the Rana mortgaged the Banhada pargana. The treaty remained in force for ten years and was then set aside by the Marathas.

Crooke, op.cit., Vol.i, pp.482-483.
with which the Marathas consolidated their power over Rajasthan in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century. It also helps to explain British policy towards the Rajput States during this period.

The chronic inability of the Rajput States to unite against their common oppressors was the result of a number of inherent factors in the Rajput polity. Among these were weak rulers, endemic clan feuds and inter-state rivalries.

The form of government in the Rajput States was somewhat patriarchal. The dominant political group in each State belonged to one clan, the members of which claimed consanguinity with the ruler. In Udaipur (Mewar), for instance, the chief vassalage of the country comprised two great sub clans and their numerous branches with their own separate titles. These two great sub clans were the Chundawats and the Saktawats, descendants of former Ranas and members of the great Sesodia clan. The Chundawats were the descendants of Chunda, the eldest son of Rana Lakha, who renounced his right to the throne in favour of his younger brother Mokal in the fifteenth century. In renouncing his right, Chunda reserved the privilege to advise the Rana on all important matters of State. He also reserved for himself the principal place in the Council of the Rana. The Saktawats were the descendants of Sakta Singh, brother of Rana Pratap Singh. Both were descendants of Rana Udai Singh founder of the city of Udaipur. 11

Among the chief vassals were nobles of the blood royal - offsets of the younger branches of the reigning Rana's own family within a certain period. These had appanages bestowed upon them. To this class belonged the Rajas of Shahpura and Banera who were 'too powerful for subjects'.

In Jodhpur (Marwar) the relationship between the ruler and his nobles was more complicated. The State grew out of several petty States whose ancient possessions formed a kind of allodial estate system under the dynasty of Jodhpur. As in most Rajput States, the nobles of Jodhpur generally resented the ruler's claim to exercise effective authority over their estates which had been conquered by their ancestors with little or no assistance from the central authority. Thus in several of the Rajput States, there were powerful chiefs who tended to look upon themselves as joint owners of the State with their ruler.

In every State [observes S.C. Dutt], the ruling class belongs to one particular clan... The humblest members of the clan considered themselves along with the ruler as the sons of the same father enjoying their patrimony by the same right as the ruler himself. The latter was thus nothing but a primus inter pares... The State in fact did not belong to the ruler - it belonged to the clan as a whole.

---

12 Crooke, op.cit., Vol.i, p.168.
This idea of joint ownership of the State by the clan was underscored in the complaints made by the chiefs of Marwar against the oppression of Raja Man Singh. In their complaint, the chiefs declared:

Sri Maharaja and ourselves are one stock, all Rathors. He is our head, we his servants: ... When our services are acceptable, then is he our lord; when not, we are again his brothers and kindred, claimants and laying claim to the land. 15

Such a theory of government naturally imposed several disabilities on the power of the Rajput rulers and militated against the emergence of a strong central authority capable of imposing unity and enforcing discipline on all subjects.

An additional restraint on the power of the rulers of Rajasthan was the existence of a hereditary prime minister. 16 In Jodhpur (Marwar), the hereditary prime ministers were always 'mill-stones round the necks of their princes'. 17 In Udaipur (Mewar), during the three decades

15 See Crooke, op.cit., Vol.i, pp.228-229. (Emphasis mine.) A similar idea was forcefully expressed in the remonstrance of the sub-vassals of Deogarh in Udaipur (Mewar) against their chief. They declared: 'When Deogarh was established, at the same time were our allotments: as is his patrimony, so is our patrimony... Our rights and privileges in his family are the same as his in the family of the Presence [i.e., the Rana].' (Crooke, op.cit., Vol.i., pp.231-232.) (Emphasis mine.)

16 According to Barnejee, the office was hereditary in Udaipur but not always so in the other States. (See Barnejee, op.cit., pp.248, 258.)

17 Crooke, op.cit., Vol.i., p.218.
before the alliance with the British, the office was held by the Rawat of Salumbar, leader of the Chundawat clan, who dominated the council of Rana Bhim Singh. As the military minister charged with the political affairs of the fiefs, and backed by a powerful body of retainers always at his command, he possessed unbounded prestige and authority over the military classes. He also had great influence over the inferior officers of the State. The peculiar constitutional position of the Rawat raised serious problems. His powers and privileges were ill-defined and he was irremovable. For generations the Rawats and the Ranas remained on bad terms. To counterbalance the power of the Rawats, the Ranas often supported the Saktawats in their feuds with the Chundawats.

The position of central authority in the Rajput States was further undermined by the custom which denied the ruler the right to command the direct services of sub-vassals. 'The sovereign,...' says Tod 'has nothing to do with those vassals not holding directly from the crown; and those who wish to stand well with their chiefs would be very slow in receiving any honours or favours from the general fountain-head.' The sub-vassal's first loyalty was to his immediate

18 During the negotiation of the Anglo-Udaipur treaty of 1818, the Rana's agent who was a relative of the Rawat of Salumbar tried in vain to introduce a clause confirming the Rawat's position as hereditary prime minister of Udaipur. Charles Metcalfe, aware of its implications, frustrated the request.
19 Crooke, _op.cit._, Vol.i, p.183.
chief; and according to Tod, there were numerous instances of whole clans devoting themselves to their chief against their sovereign.20

Efficiency could only be imparted to a Government so shackled by an unusual display of energy of mind and body on the part of the ruler. 'If he relax,' says Tod, 'each part separates, and moves in a narrow sphere of its own.'21 During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Rajasthan seems to have possessed rulers of considerable ability. Rana Sangram (1508-1527), for instance, appears to have exercised the power of resumption and of transfer of vassals from estate to estate.22 In other words, the fiefs of the great chiefs were at this time not hereditary. During this period, the energetic rulers of Jaipur and Jodhpur succeeded in utilising the power which they derived from their connection with the Mughal court to strengthen their position at the expense of their feudal chiefs.23

This trend towards a strong centralised government, however, proved to be short-lived. Owing to the confusion caused by the long wars waged against Aurangzeb and his successors, the authority of the rulers of Rajasthan fell into decay. In Jodhpur (Marwar), the

20 Crooke, op.cit., Vol.i, p.183.
war with Aurangzeb removed all restrictions on the nobles and the
ruler's power became practically non-existent for a quarter of a
century. In Udaipur (Mewar), the infrequency of attendance at court
by the nobles, together with their privileges, obscured the marks of
their subordination. Their estates became fixed and ultimately hereditary,
and could only be resumed at great peril to the stability of the State.

The Rajput rulers of the eighteenth and early nineteenth
century were not destined to retrieve the authority of the central
government from the decay into which it had fallen. By a remarkable
and an unfortunate series of coincidences, the Governments of the
leading States were, for the greater part of the eighteenth century,
in the hands of minors and imbeciles. Rana Bhim Singh (1778-1828) was
the 'fourth minor in the space of forty years who inherited Mewar'.
He was 'defective in energy and impaired by long misfortune' and
'continued to be swayed by faction and intrigue'. Sawai Pratap
(1778-1803), the contemporary of Bhim Singh, succeeded to the Jaipur
gadi at the age of thirteen. He was an imbecile who 'used to dress
himself like a female, tie bells to his ankles and dance within the
harem. His time was mostly devoted to drinking and attending songs
and dances...'. In Jodhpur (Marwar), the last years of Bijay Singh
(1752-1792) were 'engrossed by sentimental folly with a young beauty

24 Crooke, op.cit., Vol.i, p.511. Bhim Singh was only eight years
of age when he became ruler.
of the Oswal tribe, on whom he lavished all the honours due to his legitimate queens to the disgust of his nobles.26

To counterbalance the power of the indigenous nobles and to prop up their precarious authority, the Rajput rulers of the eighteenth century introduced foreign nobles into their States. Besides, they created standing armies composed of foreign (often Muslim) mercenaries.27 These measures tended to antagonise the indigenous nobility and to widen the gulf between them and their rulers. Feuds and factional strife were the result.28


27 In Jodhpur (Marwar), Raja Man Singh had a corps of 3,500 foot and 1,500 horse with 25 guns. Besides monthly pay, 'lands to a considerable amount' were granted to them. At one time the Raja of Jodhpur is said to have had a mercenary force of 11,000 men in his service. In Jaipur, in 1803, the foreign army numbered 13,000 strong. In Udaipur (Mewar), 'the Rana could command four thousand Rathors holding lands on the tenure of service' from the estate of Ghanerao held by a Rathor noble. (See Crooke, *op.cit.*, Vol.ii, p.1119; Also see Banerjee, *op.cit.*, pp.247, 267.)

28 In Jaipur, a section of the nobles waged a war of succession against Raja Pratap Singh between 1778 and 1803. In Jodhpur the years 1750-73 saw civil war between Raja Ram Singh and the family of his powerful uncle Bakht Singh. The latter's son inherited the conflict after his father's death. From 1790-1793, Bijay Singh's infatuation with his Oswal concubine embroiled him with his nobles and led to a veritable reign of terror, poison and murder. Bhim Singh's entire reign (1793-1803) was engrossed by the seige of Jalor where his cousin and rival Man Singh had taken refuge. In Udaipur, the years 1754-1791 saw the wars of succession between Ari Singh and Ratan Singh as well as the intensification of the Chundawat-Saktawat feud. (Banerjee, *op.cit.*, pp.287-290, 318, 319, 320-22, 352.)
Minority and imbecility of the Rajput rulers and endemic domestic feuds were not the only curse of Rajasthan. Continual interstate wars added to the political and social confusion. The long-standing rivalry between Jodhpur and Jaipur for pre-eminence at the Mughal court, survived the decay of the Mughal empire. The result of this disastrous rivalry and of the disputes which arose from the matrimonial clauses of the triple alliance formed by Rana Amra Singh was that the leading Rajput powers became involved in a state of perpetual warfare. Between 1740 and 1773 Jaipur was continually at war with one or other of her neighbours. Thus Rajasthan was in a state of political decay when the Marathas arrived on her soil. Her

---

29 One of the stipulations of the triple alliance was that the male issues of the marriages between Udaipur (Mewar) princesses and the princes of Jaipur or Jodhpur (Marwar) should enjoy priority of succession by being invested with the rights of primogeniture. In 1743, on the death of Sawai Jai Singh, Madho Singh (his younger son by a princess of Udaipur) with the support of his uncle Rana Jagat Singh of Udaipur, attempted to enforce this stipulation to the prejudice of the claims of Isari Singh, the eldest son of Sawai Jai Singh. This led to war between Udaipur and Jaipur. Between 1743 and 1750 and again between 1761 and 1773, Jaipur was involved in war with Udaipur. On the former occasion the war was caused by the attempt to place Madho Singh on the Jaipur gadi. (See footnote above.) On the latter occasion, the war was caused by the support given by Jaipur to Ratan Singh (the alleged posthumous son of Rana Raj Singh and a pretender to the gadi of Udaipur). In 1741 and again in 1750, Jaipur was at war with Jodhpur - on the former occasion in support of Bikaner (a junior branch of Jodhpur) and on the latter occasion in support of Ram Singh in the civil war between him and his uncle Bakht Singh. On the defeat of Ram Singh, Jaipur offered him sanctuary and often threatened to restore him to the Jodhpur gadi by force. Between 1729 and 1761, Jaipur fought a long drawn out war with the Haras of Bundi and Kota with a view to compelling them to acknowledge her as their overlord.

clans were at war with one another; her leading States were engaged in interminable rivalry; her rulers lacked the ability to give effective leadership to their subjects. In Tod's picturesque language, 'Rajputana was on the verge of collapse from within while the Marathas were knocking at the gates from without'.

The Marathas found the distracted condition of Rajasthan very favourable to the extension of their influence. On several occasions, the Rajput States, either severally or individually, made feeble and ephemeral attempts to expel the Marathas only to recall them on the next occasion to interfere in their domestic quarrels. The impact

---

31 Barnejee, op.cit., p.246.
32 i. In 1744 Isari Singh invoked the aid of the Marathas against Kota which he wished to convert into a vassal State of Jaipur.
ii. In 1747-1748 during the civil war between Isari and Madho Singh Holkar was invited by the Rana of Udaipur to espouse the cause of the latter for the sum of 64 lacs of rupees. In appreciation of Holkar's aid, Madho Singh later ceded to him four districts (Tonk, Rampura, Torah and Pottah), and promised to pay an annual tribute of Rs.350,000.
iii. In 1752 and again in 1754, the Marathas invaded Jodhpur in support of Ram Singh's cause against his cousin Bijay Singh. After defeating a Jodhpur-Jaipur coalition, the Marathas obliged Bijay Singh to promise to cede Ajmer.
iv. In 1769, Sindhia besieged Jaipur with a view to installing Ratan Singh on the gadi. He only raised the siege on the promise of the payment of Rs.63,00,000 for which extensive lands were mortgaged.
v. In 1791, the Rana unable to restrain the Chundawat-Saktawat feud which had been raging since 1784, invited Sindhia to expel the former from Chitor. For the next eight years, Ambaji Inglia took up residence in Udaipur and became the de facto ruler. His authority was maintained by 10,000 Deccani cavalry and four battalions of trained infantry. During his eight years governorship, he accumulated £2,000,000. (See Barnejee, op.cit., pp.290-291; Sir John Malcolm, A Memoir of Central India including Malwa (two volumes, London 1832), Vol.i, p.154; Crooke, op.cit., Vol.i, pp.494-495.)
on Rajput society of local disorders and of Maratha oppression was disastrous. In the forty years between the first Maratha invasion in 1736 and the death of Rana Hamir Singh in 1778, the Marathas extorted a total of Rs.1,81,00,000 (nearly £2,000,000) from the Ranas of Udaipur. This amount did not include individual contributions levied on chiefs, ministers and other persons. The Rana Hamir Singh himself estimated contributions levied up to his time at £5,000,000.33 By the end of the eighteenth century, the Rajput polity was fast approaching dissolution.

The agriculturist, [says Tod] never certain of the fruits of his labour, abandoned his fields, and at length his country; mechanical industry found no recompense, and commerce was at the mercy of unlicensed spoliation. In a very few years Mewar lost half her population, her lands lay waste, the mines were unworked, and her looms, which formerly supplied all around, forsaken. The prince partook of the general penury; instead of protecting, he required protection; the bonds which united him with his subjects were snapped, and each individual or petty community provided for itself that defence which he could not give. Hence arose a train of evils: every cultivator, whether fiscal or feudal, sought out a patron, and entered into engagements as the price of protection. Hence every Rajput who had a horse and a lance, had his clients; and not a camel-load of merchandise could pass the abode of one of these cavaliers without paying fees. 34

At this stage, the Rajput rulers realised that their only hope of

33 Crooke, op.cit., Vol.i, p.510.
34 Crooke, op.cit., Vol.i, p.515. (Emphasis mine.)
relief was an alliance with the Government of India. From the end of the eighteenth century they made repeated overtures to the British for protection.

ii. **First Anglo-Rajput Alliance ends in disillusionment.**

The Maratha dominion of Rajasthan reached its apogee in the last decade of the eighteenth century. Between 1791 and 1799, Ambaji Inglia, the agent of Sindhia, was military dictator of Udaipur. In June 1790, De Boigne (a French military adventurer in Sindhia's service) avenged Sindhia's discomfiture in the battle of Lalsot (1787) by inflicting a crushing defeat on the Jodhpur-Jaipur coalition. After this defeat part of the Jaipur territory was ravaged and brought under Sindhia's control. In September 1790 De Boigne completed the subjugation of the Rajputs when he defeated Bijay Singh at the battle of Merta. Bijay Singh was fined Rs.60,00,000 (c £600,000) and forced to cede Ajmer 'which, lying, as it did, half way between Jaipur and Jodhpur, was the key of the country'. For the next ten years the Marathas experienced no resistance from the Rajputs.

In this prostrate condition, the Rajput rulers appealed to the Government of India for protection. In June 1794 J. Pillet, a

35 Barnejee, _op.cit._, p.353.
36 Barnejee, _op.cit._, p.320.
French military adventurer in the service of Jaipur proposed a protective alliance between Jaipur and the Government of India. In a letter to Colonel John Murray, Military Auditor-General in Bengal, he stated that he saw

nothing except a well formed alliance between the Jaipur Rajah and the Government of His Britannic Majesty and the East India Company - if they see their interest in it - that can avert the deluge ready to descend on the Rajah's head, already preceded by a frightful tempest.

Pillet assured Colonel Murray that if the alliance was formed, the Raja would be able to support the Government of India with 50,000 cavalry besides the resources of his country 'without asking for any return save a firm protection on the part of the Company and full liberty to enjoy his dominions in peace'.

The Maratha victory at Khardla in the following year increased the anxiety of the Rajput rulers for British protection. The Rajas of Jaipur and Kota appealed to Major Palmer for aid and declared their 'readiness to enter into engagements of mutual defence'. But although the Government of India did not wish to see the Rajput States lose their independence, it withheld its protection and recommended self-help. In his reply to Pillet, Colonel Murray stated that 'the

-----------------------------
37 Quoted in Barnejee, op.cit., p.356.
38 Quoted in Barnejee, op.cit., p.357.
Northern Rajahs ought to be held up in their independence of the Marathas as a counterpoise...but this is chiefly to be effected by the Rajahs, through their own wisdom, by uniting to resist encroachments and by resolution to guarantee each other in their respective dominions'.

The indifference of the Government of India to overtures for alliance from the Rajput rulers contrasted sharply with the anxiety with which it sought the alliance of the Marathas about this time. The cornerstone of the Government of India's foreign policy in the eighteenth century was the French threat to British interests in India. The object of the diplomacy of Lord Wellesley, especially of his subsidiary alliance system, was to establish British ascendancy in the major native States which were potential allies of France. The friendship and cooperation of these States were sought by the Government of India to defeat French intrigues and to render the resources of the major native States available to the British in the event of an Anglo-French encounter. Rajasthan in her condition of extreme political weakness and depleted resources posed no threat to the British. It was obvious that an alliance with the Rajput States would be a liability rather than an asset, and therefore did not have a place in the policy of the Government of India.

Furthermore, from 1798 till 1802 Lord Wellesley was engaged in negotiations which aimed at bringing the Marathas into the subsidiary

39 Quoted in Barnejee, op.cit., p.356.
alliance system. From 1800 the minds of officials of the Government of India were haunted by the fear of a possible clash with the Marathas. By the subsidiary treaty of 1800 concluded between the British and the Nizam, the Government of India had engaged to defend him against all enemies, particularly the Marathas. Therefore as long as the Marathas remained outside the subsidiary alliance system and refused British arbitration in settling their claims on the Nizam, the Government of India ran a grave risk of going to war with the Marathas in fulfilment of its treaty obligation to the Nizam. It was important that nothing should be done to jeopardise the negotiations and strain Anglo-Maratha relations. An offer of British protection to the Rajput States would certainly have antagonised Sindhia who then exercised control over the principal States of Rajasthan and the Peshwa's Government. On the other hand, it must have occurred to the British that if an Anglo-Maratha war actually broke out, the Rajputs, in their partially subjugated condition, might furnish an instrument for creating a diversion in favour of the Government of India. By inciting them to rebellion against Sindhia and Holkar, the British might avoid having to face the united strength of the Maratha confederacy. It was in British interests therefore to maintain the status quo in Rajasthan and to impress upon the Marathas, and upon Sindhia in particular, that it was within the power of the British to negotiate an alliance with the Rajput States at any time without actually negotiating such an alliance.
Finally, the Government of India had positive orders to refrain from interference in the affairs of Hindustan. In a despatch to Bengal in 1768, the Court of Directors unequivocally stated that they had no desire to become umpires of Hindustan. They declared:

Much has been wrote from you and our servants in Bengal on the necessity of checking the Marathas, which may in some degree be proper; but it is not for the company to take the part of umpires of Hindustan...we wish to see the present Indian powers remain as a check one upon another without our interfering. 40

This policy was upheld in 1784 when the British Parliament gave statutory approval to the policy of non-intervention in the quarrels of the Indian States. 41 For all these reasons, the Rajputs were left to rely on their own efforts to resist their Maratha oppressors as best as they could.

Nevertheless, events at the turn of the century brought about a change in British policy towards Rajasthan. In 1802, the Government

---

40 Quoted in P.E. Roberts, History of British India, p.169. (Emphasis mine.)

41 Ramsay Muir, The Making of British India 1756-1858, (Manchester, 1923) p.174. Pitt's Act of India 1784, interdicted the Government of India from either declaring war or entering 'into any treaty for making war, against any of the country princes or states in India, or any treaty for guaranteeing the possessions of any country, princes or states' without the specific authority of the Court of Directors or of the Secret Committee. The only exception to the rule was 'where hostilities have actually been commenced, or preparations actually made for the commencement of hostilities against the British nation in India, or against some of the Princes or states whose territories the Company shall be engaged by any subsisting treaty to defend or guarantee'.

of India succeeded in taking advantage of the Peshwa's predicament to impose a subsidiary alliance on his Government. Sindhia, Holkar and the Bhonsla were outraged because they regarded the alliance as an affront to the Maratha nation. When it became apparent that war with these chiefs was inevitable, General Wellesley suggested an alliance with the Rajput States.

In the event of hostilities (with the Marathas), [he wrote to Lord Wellesley] I propose to dispatch proper emissaries to Gohad, and to the Rajput chiefs. You will also employ every endeavour to excite those powers against Sindhia. I propose to guarantee their independence and to secure to them any other reasonable advantages which they may require. The independence of the Rajputs would constitute a power which would form the best security to our north-western frontier in Hindustan...

When war broke out between the British and the Confederate Chiefs, negotiations were opened and treaties subsequently concluded with Jaipur and Jodhpur in December 1803. Udaipur, the weakest of the...

---


43 The terms of both treaties were the same. The Company promised not to interfere in their internal administration nor demand any tribute from them. But if the Marathas 'evinced a disposition to invade' the Company's territories in Hindustan, Jagat Singh and Man Singh were to send the whole of their forces to the aid of the Company's forces and exert themselves to expel the enemy. During the time of war, or prospect of war, the Princes were to act according to the advice and opinion of the commander of the British army. They were to exclude all Europeans from their service and submit all their disputes with other States to British arbitration and award. The treaty with Man Singh was not ratified and was cancelled in May 1804. (See Aitchison, Treaties, Engagements and Sanads, Third Edition (Calcutta, 1892), Vol.iii, pp.94-95, 143-144.)
Rajput States and the farthest from British possessions, was significantly omitted. These treaties complemented the treaty of Surji-Anjangaon, their object being to constitute the Rajput States into 'a barrier against the return of the Marathas to the northern parts of Hindustan'. However, the alliance with the Rajput States proved to be short-lived. It survived the departure of its author by only a few months.

Even before Lord Wellesley left India, some of the Company's servants had expressed doubts about the wisdom of continuing the British connection with the Rajput States. During the war with Holkar, the operation of the alliance with the petty States of Hindustan did not fulfil the expectations of the Government of India. One month after the declaration of war, it cancelled the treaty with Jodhpur because of Man Singh's assistance to the enemy. The Government of India had guaranteed the independence of the Raja of Bharatpur and

---

44 By Clause 2 of the treaty of Surji-Anjangaon, (December 1803) Sindhia ceded all his forts, territories and rights in the Doab, or the country situated between the Jumna and the Ganges, in perpetual sovereignty to the British. He also ceded all his forts territories, rights and interests in the countries to the northward of those of the Rajas of Jaipur and Jodhpur and of the Rana of Gohad. But he was allowed to retain possession of his rights in the area situated between Jaipur and Jodhpur, and to the southward of the former. (Udaipur thus obtained no relief from the treaty.) By Article 9, Sindhia renounced all claims on the Rajas with whom the Government of India had treaties, namely, Jaipur, Jodhpur, Bharatpur and so on. (See C.U. Aitchison, Treaties, Engagements and Sanads, Third Edition (Calcutta, 1893), Vol.iv, p.41.)

45 Quoted in Barnejee, op.cit., p.324.
granted him additional territory in appreciation of his services in the war with Sindhia. Nevertheless, he assisted Holkar on the Jumna and facilitated his invasion of the Doab. After Holkar's defeat in the battle of Dig, the Raja offered him refuge in his fortress and thus prolonged the war. The country of the Raja of Jyenagur was considered by the Government of India as one of the bulwarks of Bengal. But during the war, Holkar's cavalry as well as his infantry moved through it unopposed. The country became a vital link in Holkar's line of communication with Malwa. During the war, Captain Sturrock, Resident at Jaipur, reported his suspicion that the rulers of Rajasthan were willing to form an anti-British coalition.

The depth of the disillusionment of the British with the Anglo-Rajput alliance was reflected in a letter from General Wellesley to Jonathan Duncan, Governor of Bombay.

I have always been of opinion [General Wellesley wrote] that this warfare with Holkar has shown that there is no such thing in India as a frontier, properly so called, particularly against the Mahrattas. In fact, with their horse they can penetrate anywhere, excepting across a navigable river;...but Captain Burr says that the Bheels will defend this frontier, and that by a system of

46 After the battle of Dig, Holkar took refuge in the fort of Bharatpur to which he had been pursued by Lord Lake. Raja Ranjit Singh refused to give him up. The fort was besieged but the Raja repelled four assaults with a loss of 300 men to the besiegers before eventually surrendering the fort. (Aitchison, Treaties and Sanads, Vol.iii, p.233.)

connexion with Oudepoor and different other petty Rajahs, we shall have the service of all these people. This is another error which this warfare with Holkar has exposed. The British Government can form no connexion with petty powers of this description in India, excepting that of subjection on their part and government on ours. Indeed, I doubt whether that connexion can be formed; and if I were to choose whether I would connect the Company with them or leave them with the Mahrattas, I would adopt the latter. Of this I am very sure, that I should be much more certain of their assistance in the day of need by this system than by taking them under the Company. 48

Apart from the disillusionment with the operation of the alliance with the petty Rajas of Hindustan, General Wellesley and Sir John Malcolm felt that it was necessary to strengthen Sindhia's Government as a counterpoise to that of Holkar. General Wellesley was of the opinion that the Government of India had

weakened Scindiah more than is politic; and that [it would] repent having established such a number of these little independent powers in India, every one of whom will require the support of the British government, which will occasion a constant demand of employment of troops, a loss of officers and men, and a claim of money. 49

General Wellesley and Sir John Malcolm therefore favoured the continued


subjugation of the Rajputs to Sindhia's authority as one way of strengthening his Government. 50

Furthermore, General Wellesley believed that the growth of the freebooter system, which he viewed with increasing alarm from 1804 onwards, was partly attributable to the 'extension of our arms, our influence, and our protection: first, by the increase of the number of the people, who must and will subsist by plunder; secondly, by narrowing the scene in which the freebooters may plunder with impunity.' 51 He warned that if this process continued, British territories could not continue to remain immune from the raids of the freebooters. The subsequent abandonment of the Rajput States under Barlow's administration must have been influenced as much by this consideration as by the disillusionment with the Anglo-Rajput alliance and the increase in the Company's debts.

50 Ibid., p.412, General Wellesley to Lieutenant-Colonel Malcolm, 31 July 1806. General Wellesley commented thus on Barlow's policy: 'The arrangement with Scindiah is precisely that which you and I recommended long before, and which I urged, and, I believe, was ordered when I was in Bengal in 1804. I thought also at that time, and so did you, that the Rajpoots ought to have been subjugated to the control of Scindiah's government, as the only mode of re-establishing it; the state in which it must exist, if it is to exist at all. This object might with care and justice have been effected at that time, if the state of Scindiah's government had permitted it; and I am not sufficiently acquainted with all that has passed between the Rajpoots and our government since the period of Monson's defeat, to be able to decide that we ought not to deliver them over to Scindiah, notwithstanding the favourable change which has taken place in the state and dispositions of his councils.'

51 Ibid., p.467. General Wellesley to Major Shawe, 26 February 1804.
Under the strain of Lord Wellesley's wars, the Company's debts mounted steeply. The alarm caused by the increase in debt led to his resignation in July 1805. His successor, Lord Cornwallis, went to India determined to reverse a policy 'which annually calls for reinforcements of men and for remittances of money, and which yields little other profits except brilliant Gazettes'. He was opposed to the extension of the subsidiary alliance system to the petty States of India because it would impose upon the Government of India the burden of propping up and defending impotent rulers. Lord Cornwallis also felt that it would inhibit the emergence of larger and viable States which might exercise a stabilising influence in India. His death, within three months of his arrival in India, left the implementation of this policy to Sir George Barlow, a senior civil servant of the Company.

Sir George Barlow fully shared Lord Cornwallis' convictions; and within a month of his succession to the office of Governor-General, he concluded the treaty of Mustafapur with Sindhia. This was followed

52 The Company's debt rose from £17,000,000 in 1797 to £31,000,000 in 1806. (P.E. Roberts, *History of British India*, p.261.)
54 By the treaty of Mustafapur (November 22 1805), the Government of India engaged 'to enter into no Treaty with the Rajas of Udaipur, Jodhpur, and Kota, or other chiefs, tributaries of Sindhia, situated in Malwa, Meywar, or Marwar', and 'in no shape whatever to interfere with the settlement which Sindhia may make with those Chiefs'.

---
by the dissolution of the alliance with Jaipur in July 1806. By these two measures, Barlow renounced all connection with Rajasthan. It was his belief that

with the exception of the defensive alliances subsisting between the British government and the great powers of India, it was for the interest and security of the Company to limit all relations with the surrounding states to those of general amity; and to trust the safety of its territorial possessions to the supremacy of our power, a well-regulated system of defence, and a revival of those contests and commotions which formerly prevailed among the states of Hindustan.

To promote the desired contests and commotions, Barlow tried to persuade Sindhia to accept the district of Tonk-Rampura in lieu of the Rs.400,000 promised him under the treaty of Mustafapur. The

Sindhia on the other hand resigned all claims and pretensions to dominion over the countries of Bundi, Sumedi, Dholpur, Baree and Rajah Kerrah. The river Chambal from the city of Kota in the west to the limits of the territories of Gohad in the east, was to form the boundary between Sindhia and the British. Sindhia was to have no claim on the country northward of the river. (See Aitchison, Treaties and Sanads, Vol.iv, pp.57-58; Sir John Malcolm, The Political History of India 1784-1823 (two volumes, London, 1826), Vol.i, pp.358-359.)

The Jaipur treaty was dissolved on the pretext of breach of treaty. In lieu of any such pretext in the case of Bharatpur and Macherry, Lord Lake was requested to bribe them with lands to agree to release the Government of India from its obligation to protect them. (See Malcolm, The Political History of India, Vol.i, p.373.)

Governor-General hoped that 'as the territory in question was formerly possessed by Holkar,...its cession to Sindhia would tend to confirm and perpetuate an opposition of interests between those chieftains'.

Unfortunately, Sindhia rejected the arrangement because he was shrewd enough to discern the Governor-General's motive. As the district was too inconveniently situated to be retained by the Government of India, Barlow restored it to Holkar.

When Lord Minto assumed office as Governor-General in July 1807, the Government of India had no connection whatsoever with the Rajput States. The Maratha threat seemed to have disappeared with the British victory over the Confederate Chiefs in the second Maratha war. The Peshwa was preoccupied with domestic issues rather than with foreign affairs. Consequently there was no imminent threat to the internal security of the British. Externally, however, the perennial French menace gave cause for anxiety, and for the first two years of his term of office, Lord Minto's attention was diverted from the domestic affairs of India.

In January 1808 rumours reached India that a French army was advancing towards Persia on its way to India. At the same time, it was reported that an advance party of twenty four French military

---

57 Ibid., p.363.
officers had actually arrived in Persia. To provide against any contingency, Lord Minto informed the Home Government in February of his intention of sending missions to the States lying on, and beyond, the Indus for the purpose of negotiating mutual defensive treaties against any invading army. The Governor-General's plan was to meet the enemy 'as far beyond our own frontiers, and as near the countries from which the enemy is to take his departure, as possible'. Accordingly, missions were sent to Persia, Cabul, Sind and Lahore.

Significantly, Lord Minto did not consider enlisting the aid of the Rajputs. Without any provocation from the Marathas, he deemed it unwise in the prevailing state of emergency to offend them. Besides,

59 If a French army had actually entered India at this time, the Rajputs probably would have been brought into an alliance with the Government of India. In the heat of the alarm following the signing of the treaty of Tilsit (7 July 1807), the Court of Directors sent frantic instructions to Minto to foil any French designs by bold diplomacy and a show of force. He was directed 'to win the support of the Indian princes without seeking to interfere in their domestic affairs and to "annihilate" Sindhia and Holkar if they showed fight'. To an inquiry from the Directors at this time concerning the disposition of the native States towards the British, Minto replied on 16 May 1808 that no absolute reliance could be placed on States whose political ambitions had been frustrated by the British ascendancy; but he was sure that 'with states of another description, engagements of co-operation might no doubt be formed, provided these engagements should involve obligations of defensive alliance against all enemies. Of such alliances there is too much reason to doubt the efficiency and policy'. (See V.B. Kulkarni, British Statesmen in India, (Bombay, 1961) p.95; Countess of Minto, Lord Minto in India, p.107.)
recent experience had convinced the Government of India that the Rajput States were a weak and an ineffective barrier against invasion. Therefore, during this time, the Government of India continued to reject overtures made by the Rajput rulers for alliance. In reply to Jagat Singh's appeal in 1808, the Resident at Delhi, Mr. Seton declared that 'the former treaty had been annulled in consequence of its not having been found to produce the expected advantages, and that it was not easy to assign a good reason for renewing an arrangement which upon trial had proved altogether useless'. He repudiated the argument that the Government of India's succession to the supremacy formerly exercised by the Mughals imposed upon it the obligation to protect weaker States. He declared that 'the British Government did not pretend or wish to be considered as the arbiter of the differences between independent States' and that 'even the exercise of mediatorial interference would be a deviation from the system of the British Government'.

Thus Barlow's policy was upheld by Lord Minto's administration.

Between 1807 and 1811 while Lord Minto's attention was fully engrossed in foreign affairs, Ameer Khan and Sindhia steadily

---

60 Quoted in Barnejee, op. cit., p.366.
61 Between 1809 and 1811 Lord Minto devoted his attention to the conquest of Dutch posts in the Far East which had fallen under French control - Amboyna and Java. He also conquered the Isle of Bourbon and Mauritius from the French.
62 Ameer Khan was a Pathan adventurer who entered the service of Jaswant Rao Holkar in 1798, with a body of Pathan troops. Between 1807 and 1810 he gradually made himself the most powerful man in central India. In 1810 Holkar's madness made him de facto ruler of Holkar's country.
consolidated their power in Rajasthan. This period represented the climax of confusion and insecurity in Rajasthan. It saw the revival and intensification of the rivalry between Man Singh of Jodhpur and Jagat Singh of Jaipur for the love of Krishnakumari. It also saw the war of succession between Raja Man Singh and the Pretender Dhonkal Singh. In April 1807 Ameer Khan took up the cause of the Pretender and besieged Jodhpur with the aid of Jagat Singh of Jaipur. A few

63 Krishnakumari, the beautiful daughter of the Rana of Udaipur (Mewar) was first betrothed to Raja Bhim Singh of Jodhpur (Marwar), and after his death in 1803, to his successor Raja Man Singh. Man Singh, however, incurred the displeasure of the Rana by depriving his relative Kishwar Singh of his appanage of Khalirao. As a result, the Rana offered the hand of his daughter to Raja Jagat Singh of Jaipur. The act rekindled the long-standing rivalry between the Kachhwahas and the Rathors. To prevent the celebration of the marriage for which the Diwan of Jaipur had sent an army to Udaipur (July-September 1805), Raja Man Singh invoked the aid of Sindhia who invaded Udaipur in April 1806 and expelled the Jaipur forces. A compromise was reached by which neither ruler was to marry Krishnakumari. The compromise, however, proved to be short-lived.

64 On the accession of Man Singh to the Jodhpur (Marwar) gadi (1803), Sawai Singh of Pokaram, one of the leading chiefs of Marwar, 'put himself in hostility' to the new ruler in an attempt to avenge the murder of his grandfather by a former Raja, Bijay Singh. Sawai Singh set up a Pretender in the person of Dhonkal Singh whom he alleged to be the posthumous son of Bhim Singh. In February 1807 Ameer Khan was induced by a bribe of Rs.100,000 to devastate Jodhpur territory. In furtherance of his plans, Sawai Singh prompted Man Singh and Jagat Singh to violate their compromise of 1806 and to resume their struggle for the hand of Krishnakumari. In April 1807 a formidable coalition of Jaipur, Ameer Khan, Bikaner and a section of the Jodhpur nobility led by Sawai Singh began a siege of Jodhpur. Shortly after, however, Ameer Khan defected to the opposite side and besieged Jaipur. The price paid by Man Singh for Ameer Khan's alliance was the virtual loss of his independence. In July 1810 Krishnakumari under pressure from Ameer Khan, took poison to avoid being married forcibly to Man Singh.
months later, however, he transferred his service to Man Singh and besieged Jaipur. In the following year Holkar and Sindhia ravaged Jaipur territory. In his description of the condition of Jaipur at this time, Broughton speaks of 'crops all laid waste, the beams and thatch of the houses carried away, the doors and door-posts broken down, and of villages smoking in ruins'. In March 1808 Ameer Khan murdered Sawai Singh, patron of Dhonkal Singh, and established his power in Jodhpur (Marwar). He stationed his garrison in her fortresses such as Nagor and Nawa and partitioned the lands of Merta among his followers.

Ameer Khan's depredations were not confined to Rajasthan. In 1809 he subjugated Bhopal which the Government of India regarded as a vital link in the line of communication between Bundelkhand and the Deccan. In the same year Ameer Khan invaded Berar which was contiguous to the Presidencies of Bengal and Madras. It was becoming apparent that sooner or later, the Government of India would have to review its policy towards the patrons of the predatory system who were endangering the peace and security of India. The defeat of Junot at Vimiera by Sir Arthur Wellesley and the subsequent recession of the threat of a French invasion of India paved the way for the necessary review.

---

65 Quoted in Banerjée, *op. cit.*, p.365.
iii. Extension of the 'Pax Britannica' to Rajasthan.

The patrons of the predatory system in India were the Maratha chiefs of central India (Sindhia and Holkar), Ameer Khan and the Pindari chiefs. Sindhia and Holkar were not, strictly speaking, the sovereign rulers of central India. They were rather military commanders in occupation of that country. Nevertheless, since the treaty of Bassein, the Government of India had recognised them as independent rulers. Their dominion was maintained by force, and their principal occupation was to levy contributions from reluctant tributaries at the point of the sword. Their courts were held in their camps which were perpetually on the move.

The Pindaris were originally Hindu outlaws or freebooters mentioned as early as 1689. By the eighteenth century, they were no longer obscure freebooters but powerful and organised banditti. As the mode of Maratha warfare suited their predatory habits, they were induced by occasional grants of land or by the prospect of plunder to attach themselves as irregular cavalry to the armies of Sindhia and Holkar. It was the custom of the Pindaris to assemble every year

66 They were military servants of Peshwa Baji Rao I who deputed them to take charge of his conquests in Malwa. Their main function was to levy the chauth.

67 Their role was to go ahead of the Maratha armies to plunder (not to fight) the enemy. They never enjoyed a reputation for bravery as a body. Lee-Warner comments: 'The Pindaris, unlike the Marathas or the Sikhs, were united by neither social nor religious ties. They were a community of human jackals, who herded together attracted by the love of plunder and murder'. Lee-Warner, The Protected Princes of India (London, 1894), pp.99-100.
about the beginning of November and set out from their haunts in the valley of the Narbada on a campaign of pillage, torture and wanton destruction.

Ameer Khan was the leader of a body of Pathan adventurers. The Pathans were a body of paid troops made up of cavalry as well as native infantry and artillery. Unlike the Pindaris, they were disciplined and regular in their habits. They preyed mainly on the Governments and rulers of Rajasthan. Like the Pindaris, nonetheless, they were a lawless band in that they were not amenable to the authority of any settled Government.

The potential dangers of the predatory system had been foreseen by General Wellesley as early as 1804.

...I think we run a great risk from the freebooter system. [General Wellesley wrote.] It is not known to the Governor-General, and you can have no idea of the extent to which it has gone; and it increases daily... Conceive a country, in every village of which there are 20 to 30 horsemen, who have been dismissed from the service of the state, and who have no means of living excepting by plunder. In this country there is no law, no civil government, and no army to keep these plunderers in order; and no revenue can be collected; indeed no inhabitant can, nor will remain to cultivate, unless he is protected by an armed force stationed in his village. This is the outline of the state of the countries of the Peshwah and the Nizam. 68

General Wellesley warned that unless something was done to strengthen the allied Governments and enable them to maintain law and order in their countries, the security of the Government of India would be seriously jeopardised. In a letter to Colonel Close later in the same year (1804) he observed:

There is no longer any power in any of the governments to restrain the rebellious and discontented spirits, and we must expect that they will fly out whenever they see a weak or undefended point. The only remedy is, to be guarded everywhere, and to force our allies to keep up troops for their own defence. Till that is effected, our system is rotten to the core, and our empire must crumble to atoms by the operations of its size and weakness. 69

Thus by 1804, the weakness of the native States had been recognised as a potential source of danger to the internal security of the British power in India.

In a memorandum which he presented to the Governor-General, on the subject of the freebooter system, General Wellesley urged that the allies must be compelled to maintain adequate troops as a means of providing employment for the military classes in their traditional

69 Ibid., p.472. General Wellesley to Colonel Close, 27 December 1804. (Emphasis mine.)
profession and minimising the danger of the freebooter system. If this advice had been heeded, the Pindari menace might have been nipped in the bud and the Government of India might have been spared the expense and anxieties of the Pindari war. Unfortunately, General Wellesley's advice was not adopted. The Government of India felt then that the maintenance of the forces of the allies in a state of efficiency was inconsistent with the purpose of the subsidiary treaties, namely, to make the allies dependent upon the Government of India for their defence.

A second remedy suggested by General Wellesley, and later adopted by Sir George Barlow, was that there should be no further alliances between the Government of India and the remaining States of India. He pointed out that the extension of British influence tended to aggravate the freebooter system because it increased the number of unemployed persons and narrowed the sphere in which they might plunder with impunity.

...we have [he observed], within the last 5 years, extended ourselves by our policy and our bravery over the whole of India, excepting the territories of Holkar and the Rajah of Berar; supposing that

---

70 Ibid., pp.469-470. Memorandum submitted to the Governor-General by Major-General the Honourable A. Wellesley, relative to the Freebooter system in India, 2 November 1804.
71 Ibid., p.468. General Wellesley to Major Shawe, 26 February 1804.
Scindiah should come into the defensive alliance. In this vast extent of country, in which the numbers of the people, with arms in their hands, who have no means of living excepting by plunder, are so much increased, no man can venture to plunder without incurring the risk, at least, of being destroyed by a British army. Habits of industry are out of the question; they must plunder for subsistence, or be destroyed, or starve, or be taken into the service of some of the allied powers. As we have now narrowed the scene so much, we must not expect that our own territories will be entirely free from their depredations. In fact, if they are to meet the Company's troops in all countries, they have no choice excepting the richest and best cultivated, and those in which they are likely to meet the smallest number of these formidable troops. The Company's territories answer the description in every respect; and there, I think, is the danger of our present exalted situation. 72

By and large, this suggestion was adopted two years later when Sir George Barlow renounced all connection with the Rajput States and virtually designated them and Malwa as areas in which the freebooters might operate with impunity. But this measure proved to be no more than a palliative. Malwa and Rajasthan became nurseries for the freebooters; and from there they began to extend their raids farther afield into British territory from 1809 onwards.

Early in 1809 while Lord Minto was still pre-occupied with foreign affairs, Ameer Khan and his Pathans invaded Berar. The Raja of Berar had no defensive agreement with the Government of India.

Nevertheless, Lord Minto offered him the assistance of British troops to repel the invasion because he appreciated the dangers portended by the invasion.

The question [he stated in defence of his action] was not whether it was just and expedient to aid the Rajah in the defence and recovery of his dominions;... but whether an enterprising and ambitious Mussulman chief, at the head of a numerous army, irresistible by any power except that of the Company, should be permitted to establish his authority on the ruins of the Rajah's dominions, over territories contiguous to those of our ally, the Nizam, with whom community of religion, combined with local power and resources, might lead to the formation of projects for the subversion of the British alliance:... 73

The increasing anxiety about internal security caused by the activities of the freebooters and the possible renewal of the threat of French invasion from the north-west gradually produced a change of policy towards Rajasthan. In July 1809 Seton, the Resident at Delhi, wrote:

I am very sensible of the political advantage of conciliating the Chiefs of the Rajput States to the westward of the British possessions, more especially those situated towards the Indus. If the powerful Rajas of Jaipur, Jodhpur and Udaipur - supposing the government of the latter country to be once more organised - and the petty Chiefs of Bikaner and Jaisalmer and the ruler of Bahawalpur were cordially attached to us, a barrier might be formed against invasion... 74

73 The Countess of Minto, Lord Minto in India, pp.191-192.
74 Quoted in Barnejee, op.cit., p.367. Political Consultations, 5 August 1809, No.1.
In May 1810 during Ameer Khan's invasion of Udaipur (Mewar), the Resident at Delhi warned that if Ameer Khan was allowed to obtain complete control of the country, his power would become very formidable. In 1811 Charles Metcalfe, Resident at Delhi, called the attention of the Government of India to the strategic advantages of an alliance with the Rajput States. But although Lord Minto was not unaware of the strategic importance of an Anglo-Rajput alliance, he was not prepared to inaugurate a new policy on his own initiative and responsibility. He therefore told Metcalfe that although he was 'far from insensible of the actual and prospective evils resulting from...the state of affairs in the north-western quarter of Hindustan',

75 The Resident wrote on 8 July 1810: 'It is greatly to be feared that Amir Khan will at length succeed in getting possession of Udaipur and thereby putting an end to the sovereignty of the most ancient and most venerated of the Rajput Chiefs. The country is so strong and so easily defended that, if once the Pathans were in possession of the strongholds and passes, it would be next to impossible to dislodge them, and in its productiveness they would find immense resources. It would, moreover, insure and facilitate to Amir Khan the conquest of Jaipur where it would appear the greatest alarm prevails.' (See Barnejee, op.cit., p.301. Emphasis mine.)

76 Metcalfe wrote: 'A confederation of the Rajput States under the protection of the Central Government...would deprive the vagabond armies of India of their principal resource for ravage and plunder... The intervention of the Rajputs under our influence would prevent any co-operation between those Northern and Southern powers that we have reason to suppose ill affected towards us.' (Quoted in Barnejee, op.cit., p.368. Secret consultation 12 July 1811, No.1. Emphasis mine.)
he was not prepared to 'enter upon the extensive and complicated field of military and political operations necessarily involved in the adoption' of a policy of intervention.  

Though Lord Minto was unwilling to deviate from the policy of non-intervention pursued by his predecessor, nonetheless, between 1809 and 1813, he frequently called the attention of the Home Government to the growing dangers of the predatory system. In a Minute dated 1 December 1809, he called upon the Directors to decide whether it was expedient to observe a strict neutrality amidst these scenes of disorder and outrage which were passing under our eyes in the north of Hindostan, or whether we should listen to the calls of suffering humanity, and interfere for the protection of those weak and defenceless States who implore our assistance, to deliver them from the violence and oppression of an ambitious and lawless upstart.  

In October 1812 Lord Minto informed the Secret Committee that defensive measures against the freebooters were inadequate and that a complete extirpation of the predatory system was imperative and unavoidable.  

A few months before he left India, Lord Minto urgently called the Directors' attention to the state of insecurity in which the

77 Quoted in Barnejee, op.cit., p.369. Secret Consultations 16 August 1811, No.2.

78 The Countess of Minto, Lord Minto in India, p.194. (Emphasis mine.)

79 Malcolm, Political History of India, Vol.i, p.484 footnote.
British territories had been placed by the activities of the freebooters.

In a secret letter to England he observed:

The situation of these freebooters on the frontier of the dominions of Nagpore, in the vicinity of those of our allies, the Paishwah and the Nizam, and at no very remote distance from our own possessions; their augmented numbers, improved organisation, and increased boldness, arising from the success and impunity with which their depredations have been attended; the powerful instrument of conquest or devastation which they present to the hand of an ambitious or enterprising chief, or a foreign invader; and a variety of other reflections, ... all combined to render the adoption of an extensive and energetic system of measures for their suppression, a matter which presses with increased urgency on our attention, and will become an early object of our concern. 80

Thus by the end of Lord Minto’s term of office, the policy of Sir George Barlow was becoming outmoded. The numbers of the Pindaris had increased; and the commotion he ignored, and even sought to promote in Hindustan, was threatening to overwhelm British territories. 81

Lord Minto was succeeded by Lord Hastings (Earl of Moira) early in October 1813. Born on 9 December 1754, Lord Hastings was the eldest son of Lord John Rawson and his third wife, Lady Elizabeth Hastings. Francis Rawdon-Hastings, the future Governor-General of

---

80 Ibid., Vol. i, p.409. (Emphasis mine.) Secret letter from Lord Minto to Court of Directors 4 February 1813.
81 In 1811, 1812 and 1813, the numbers of the Pindaris greatly increased. In 1813, they passed through Bundelkhand, ravaged the vicinity of Mirzapur and threatened the rich province of Bihar.
India, was educated at Harrow and gazetted Ensign in the 15th Foot in 1771 at the age of seventeen. After matriculating at University College, Oxford, young Francis was promoted lieutenant in the 5th Foot in 1773 and sent to North American to fight in the War of Independence. He returned to England after eight years of active and distinguished service and was appointed aide-de-camp to the King. In 1793, on the death of his father, he succeeded as the second Earl of Moira in the peerage of Ireland. In 1803, he reached the summit of his profession when he was promoted General. 82 Lord Hastings was therefore highly qualified by military ability and experience to grapple with the disturbed situation in India.

When Lord Hastings arrived in India, the French menace which had persistently haunted the imagination of his predecessors had receded. Napoleon's power was on the decline. Mauritius, the base from which French naval operations against India were directed in the past, had been captured. The main task before the Government of India was one of social reform. The British nation was slowly becoming aware of her obligation to the people of India. In the Parliamentary debates of 1813 which preceded the renewal of the Company's charter, several speakers pointed out that India was no exception to the rule which declared the happiness of the subject to be the end of government.

They urged Parliament to make the British dominion in India not only valuable to the British nation but also beneficial to the natives. In response to these appeals, Parliament directed the Governor-General to devote Rs.100,000 (about £10,000) annually out of surplus revenue to the purpose of education. At the same time it was made easier for missionaries to go to India to promote Christianity. These objectives naturally required an era of peace, security and order for their attainment. Lord Hastings fully realised that there could be no personal security, prosperity or social progress as long as the freebooters were allowed to exist and terrorise the population.

It did not take Lord Hastings long to make up his mind about the Pindaris. During the first two years of his term, while his attention was engrossed by the Nepalese war, the predatory powers caused his Government much anxiety. Ameer Khan approached within twelve marches of Delhi with about 30,000 efficient fighting men and about 125 guns. To combat this threatened invasion, Lord Hastings mobilised 4,500 cavalry and infantry. A force of 1,000 irregular horse was held in readiness to oppose the Pindaris. To check Sindhia, who was at Gwalior only three marches from the Doab, five from Delhi and five from Agra, troops were assembled at Cawnpur. In the south,

84 Major Ross-of-Bladensburg, op.cit., p.68.
the subsidiary corps in the Deccan was strengthened and the whole disposable force of the army of fort St. George advanced to the banks of the Tungabhadra. In spite of these defensive measures, the Pindaris succeeded in raiding the Madras Presidency. In February 1816, a party of them, about 23,000 strong, passed near Seroor then south of Hyderabad and fell upon the unprotected province of Guntur. They carried off booty to the value of about £1,000,000 sterling.

Early in 1814 and in 1815, Lord Hastings called the attention of the Home Government to the prevailing state of lawlessness in India. In March 1814 he suggested that 'the British Government should become the acknowledged head of a confederacy, the whole strength of which we should have a right by compact to wield against any invader of the public response.' In a Minute dated 1 December 1815, he declared his suspicion that the Pindari raids were instigated by the Marathas and assured the Directors that if there was no choice left, he should prefer an immediate war with the Mahrattas, for which [the Government of India] should be fully prepared, to an expensive system of defence, against a consuming predatory warfare, carried on clandestinely by the

\[\text{References:}\]

Mahratta powers, wasting our resources, till they might see a practicable opportunity of coming to an open rupture. 88

The Court of Directors, however, continued to regard the Pindari raids as an insignificant distraction and prohibited Lord Hastings 'from making any change in the system of our political relations without special authority from home'. 89 Lord Hastings was asked to desist 'from engaging in any plans of general confederacy, and offensive operations against the Pindaris, either with a view to their utter extirpation, or in anticipation of expected danger'. 90


89 C.H. Phillips, The East India Company 1784-1834, p.214. Buckinghamshire, President of the Board of Control, declared that the Home Government 'saw no reason to alter the existing situation or treaties... We are not willing to incur the risks of a general war for the uncertain prospect of reducing or removing the predatory bands... The confederacy which the Governor-General is desirous to establish would prove a source of weakness;... it might hazard the dissolution of our existing alliances;... it would excite jealousies with respect to our policy;... it might lead to a combination among the native powers by which we might be involved in a contest more extensive than any before... We are much disposed to discourage that system of minute interference in their internal affairs....' (See Ibid., pp.213-214. Emphasis mine.)

90 Major Ross-of-Bladensburg, op.cit., p.90. Commenting on the prohibition, Lord Hastings wrote on 15 April 1816: 'A village was surrounded by the Pindaris. The horrors perpetrated by these demons at other places made the poor villagers, totally unarmed, and incapable of resistance, fly to the desperate resolution of burning themselves with their wives and children. The houses were all of wood and palm leaf mats; so that most of them being set fire to at once, the dreadful sacrifice was immediately fulfilled. Some boys who had not the courage to bear the flames escaped, and explained the circumstances. All the rest of the inhabitants perished; and I am strictly forbidden by the Court of Directors to undertake the suppression of the fiends who occasioned this heart rending scene, lest I should provoke a war with the Mahrattas. (See Ramsay Muir, The Making of British India, p.259. Private journal of the Marquess of Hastings, Vol.ii, p.112. Emphasis mine.)
Before this despatch arrived in India (April 1816), the Pindari raids into the Company's territories had become serious. In February 1816 the Pindaris had made a destructive incursion into Ganjam in the Northern Sircars. During the eleven and half days that they were in the Company's territories, they plundered three hundred and thirty-nine villages and killed one hundred and eighty two people. In addition, they wounded five hundred and five people and tortured three thousand six hundred and three in various ways.  

The effect of these raids on the loyalty and confidence of the people of the Madras Presidency, where violence on such a scale had been unknown for forty years, was alarming.

I speak with full knowledge of the state of opinion [wrote Sir John Malcolm to the Governor-General] when I assert, that in the south of India such has been the consequence of these events, that the best disposed of our subjects have had their minds shaken in the opinion they before entertained of the superiority and permanence of our power, while the disaffected and the turbulent rejoice in this change of sentiment, and look forward with expectation to the further progress of a system which revives their subdued hopes of opposing the British Government, every moment of whose forbearance to avenge the deep insult and injury it has received is naturally construed by this class into inability to meet the danger. At such a period, to talk of defensive measures as in any way calculated to meet this evil, is to betray a

---

total ignorance of the character of our rule,
and the foundation upon which the British
government in India rests. 92

Sir John Malcolm feared that unless the Government of India destroyed
the Pindaris, their example would be emulated in the Deccan; and
every unemployed soldier with a horse and a sword would rise against
the British.

The gravity of the danger from the Pindaris made it no longer
possible for the Directors to persist in their policy of non-intervention.
In a letter authorising the Government of India to take action against
the Pindaris, the Directors stated:

...On former occasions parties of the Pindaris have
extended their incursions with temporary success
into the British territories; but we have not before
had to notice an invasion so systematically directed
against our provinces, so disastrous in its effects,
and perpetrated with such entire impunity...

The Directors told Lord Hastings that their prohibition of an anti-
Pindari confederacy was not intended to restrain him from taking measures
to punish actual outrages on British territory or on British subjects.
The despatch then concluded:

----------------------------------------------------------------------
      Sir John Malcolm to the Marquess of Hastings, 17 July 1817.
The dreadful cruelties which, we are informed, were committed by these freebooters on the inhabitants of the villages have excited our warmest indignation.

To protect these peaceful inhabitants against such outrages, is a duty which no apprehension of inconvenience can justify us in leaving unperformed. 93

The establishment of British suzerainty over Rajasthan was a direct result of the above instruction and formed part of the arrangements made for the suppression of the Pindaris. In other words, the extension of British political control to Rajasthan was not triggered off by an urge for imperial expansion but by the necessity to curb political instability in India.

Before the arrival of the above despatch in India, the Supreme Council had arrived at an unanimous decision 'that the extirpation of the Pindaris must be undertaken, notwithstanding the orders of the Court of Directors against adopting any measures against those predatory associations which might embroil us with Sindhia'. 94 There was increasing suspicion that the Marathas were using the Pindaris as a cover to carry on guerrilla warfare against the British. 95 Their


Malcolm, Political History of India, Vol.ii, Appendix iv, pp.clii, cliii, clvii. Sir John Malcolm to the Marquess of Hastings, 27 July 1817. Sir John commented: 'It has been, since the conclusion of the war in 1805, a favourite opinion with the Mahrattas, that we can yet be opposed by a predatory system of warfare, and that our power may be reduced like that of the successors of Aurung Zebe,
extirpation was therefore considered imperative.

Lord Hastings' plan was to root out the Pindaris from their haunts which lay in Malwa, approximately north of the Narbada, between Ujein in the west and Bhopal in the east. They were to be surrounded on all sides - on the north and east from Bengal, on the south from the Deccan and on the west from Gujerat. As Sindhia, Holkar and Ameer Khan had a stake in the continuance of the predatory system, the Government of India anticipated that they might attempt to resist the destruction of the Pindaris. Therefore it considered the petty independent States of central and northern India which continued to be victims of the predatory system, as its logical allies.

The Government of India saw several advantages in an alliance with the Rajput States for the projected campaign against the Pindaris. First, it would enable the Government of India to command the resources and strategic advantages of Rajasthan. From its situation, Kota was likely to be within the area of the first operations. In that case, by the incessant attacks of plunderers, upon our territories and resources; and the Pindaries have been for some years past considered as one of the great means of accomplishing this object...

...Sindia carries on a harassing war against us, without exposing himself to any of the distresses and dangers of that condition. His troops, most of which are similar in dress, in cast, and in habits to the Pindaries, swell the bands of these freebooters, when they proceed on their plundering excursions; and the latter, when they desire to elude our pursuit take shelter in his country, and melt into his army.' (Emphasis mine.) Sir John Malcolm felt that a suppression of the freebooter system would paralyse the Marathas.
it could not remain neutral in view of its close relationship with the predatory chiefs. The Government of India could not afford to allow Kota's resources to be employed against the British by the enemy. Bundi commanded a very important pass into Hindustan which could be used to intercept the flight of the Pindaris. Second, an alliance with the Rajputs was necessary to ensure that the Pindaris would be deprived of places of refuge or new haunts. Above all, an alliance with the Rajput States was necessary to obviate the ultimate

96 Zalim Singh of Kota farmed extensive districts from Sindhia and Holkar. These districts adjoined his southern frontiers. From the former, he rented the Panj-Mahals; and from the latter, the important districts of Dig, and Pirawa (in the States of Bharatpur and Tonk respectively). Zalim Singh also had Maratha Pandits of great talent in his administration. Through them no political measures of the Marathas escaped his knowledge. As for Ameer Khan, he obtained his military stores and supplies of every kind from Kota whose castle, Shirgarh, afforded a sanctuary for his family. Several Pindari chiefs also held grants of land in Kota. (See Crooke, op. cit., Vol.iii, pp.1573-1574.)

97 Malcolm, Political History of India, Vol.ii, Appendix iv, pp.clix, clxvi. In a letter to Man Singh, Raja of Jodhpur (Marwar), on the eve of the Pindari war, Chitu, one of the Pindari chiefs, wrote: '...without a place of refuge and safety for our families, our minds cannot be at ease. The Maharajah Sindhia cannot give the wished-for place, as his intentions towards us would then be obvious to the English; for this reason, considering our necessity for a place of refuge, I have hopes that from your favour the place you assigned for the residence of Jeswunt Row Holkar's family may now be bestowed for the families of your slaves; then it will reach your ear to what straits and difficulties I have reduced the English, for the whole of their country, even to Calcutta, shall be consigned to devastation and plunder. Let the Huzoor [i.e., the Presence] have reliance on us, and we your slaves shall always be at your command.'
establishment of a Pathan dynasty on the ruins of the Rajput States. Jaipur, from its proximity to British territories, was of great strategic importance to the Government of India. Sir John Malcolm warned that its occupation by Ameer Khan and his Pathans would give them increased means of invading our richest provinces in Hindustan, and of maintaining a direct and constant intercourse with the most turbulent part of the populations of our territories in that quarter, who are of the same tribe, and, indeed, generally speaking, their near kindred.

He reminded the Governor-General that it was to anticipate this contingency that the Home Government had authorised the renewal of the Anglo-Jaipur treaty which was dissolved by Sir George Barlow in 1806. He not only felt that without British aid, Jaipur could not survive as an independent State, but also that

Contemplating the approaching crisis, the necessity of altering our relations to Jypore is too imperative to admit of delay. We must command the territories of this state both for operations and supplies, or they will furnish our enemies with means of attacking us in a very vulnerable quarter.

98 The greatest portion of Ameer Khan's troops were stationed in Jodhpur (Marwar), and he was contriving to make the extensive and valuable tracts of lands usurped from the Raja 'hereditary in his family'. He even thought of supplanting the Raja by his son. (See Malcolm, Political History of India, Vol.ii, Appendix iv, p.cxlviii.)

This opinion was shared by Lord Hastings and Seton, member of the Supreme Council.  

On 20 April 1816 the Governor-General instructed Charles Metcalfe to negotiate a treaty with Jaipur. To enable the Government of India to form alliances with Kota, Bundi, Udaipur (Mewar) and Jodhpur (Marwar), it was necessary to abrogate Article 8 of the treaty of Mustafapur by which Sindhia's power over those States was recognised. In September 1817, the Government of India demanded Sindhia's 'cordial and unqualified support in the Pindari war'. He was warned that failure to comply would be regarded as an act of hostility. In the following October the Governor-General informed Metcalfe of his decision to use the Rajput States as 'a barrier against the revival of the predatory system or the extension of the power of Sindhia and Holkar beyond the limits to be assigned to it by the measures then (October, 1817) in progress'. Without waiting for Sindhia's formal consent, the Governor-General instructed Metcalfe to conclude treaties of alliance with all the Rajput States.

100 Barnejee, _op.cit._, pp.372, 373. Minutes by Lord Hastings and Seton dated 13 April 1816 and 17 April 1816, respectively.
Early in November 1817, while Sindhia still hesitated, British troops secretly advanced towards his territory. Two strong corps were posted on the northern frontier of his territories about sixty miles apart and scarcely two marches from Gwalior. About the same time, troops from the Deccan blocked his line of communication with Maharashtra where the Peshwa was on the brink of a rupture with the British. With barely 8,000 troops at his capital, and almost surrounded, Sindhia reluctantly signed the treaty of Gwalior on 5 November 1817. By this treaty, he agreed to cooperate with the Government of India in extirpating the Pindaris. The two Governments were to 'expel them from their haunts, and to adopt the most effectual measures to disperse and prevent them from re-assembling'. In furtherance of this object, Sindhia agreed to the abrogation of the 8th article of the treaty of Mustafapur and thus left the Government of India 'at full liberty to form engagements with the States of Odeypoor, Joudpoor, and Kotah, and with the State of Boondee, and other substantive states on the left bank of the Chumbul'.

The nature of the connection which the Government of India wished to establish with the Rajput States was one in which their rulers would stand in the position of subordinate allies. It was hoped that such a relationship would secure for the Government of India

103 Malcolm, Central India, Vol.ii, Appendix No.xvi, p.396.
discretionary powers¹⁰⁴ which would enable it to control the foreign
and, where necessary, the domestic policies of the Rajput States.

They will naturally fall into a dependance upon our protection [suggested Malcolm to the Governor-
General], which will put it out of their power, as it ought to be, to reject any engagement that is
formed on liberal and equitable principles. It may be generally observed, that we cannot perhaps
leave such states, too much at liberty in their internal rule, nor limit them too strictly on all
subjects of foreign policy; they must indeed subject their councils on all such points to our
control, or there can be no safety in the connexion.¹⁰⁵

The Government of India did not deem it necessary to annex the Rajput States as it had already decided to do in the case of Maharashtra. Unlike the Peshwa, the Rajput rulers had no pretensions to political supremacy in India and their conduct had never given the Government of India cause for anxiety. Nor were they likely to do so in the foreseeable future either individually or collectively. The Rajputs lacked a national sentiment comparable to that of the Marathas

¹⁰⁴ Commenting on the opposition of the Jaipur Vakils to a clause in the first draft of the Anglo-Jaipur treaty, Metcalfe suggested that the Government of India should not insist upon it since 'the exercise of the power of arbitration in all disputes between Jaipur and other Powers, and on all claims brought forward on that State, was inseparable from the character of protector which the alliance would give us, and did not absolutely require any specific stipulation'. (See Barnejee, op.cit., p.382, footnote. Secret Consultations 2 November 1816, No.1.)

¹⁰⁵ Malcolm, Political History of India, Vol.ii, Appendix iv, pp.cxc-cxci. (Emphasis mine.)
and were unlikely ever to produce a national leader of the disposition
of Baji Rao. Their history showed that there were too many jarring
interests in their parochial, feudal communities to make them capable
of community of interest and unity of action. Headed by imbecile and
dissolute rulers whose authority was held in contempt by their feudal
chiefs, the Governments of Rajasthan lacked the energy and means to
defy the British power even if they had the inclination. Furthermore,
it was unnecessary to annex the Rajput States because it was anticipated
that they would acknowledge British supremacy more readily than the
Peshwa or the Nizam. 'Accustomed to own a superior', the Rajput
rulers had shown themselves to be 'proud of dependence on a great
government'.

106

The Government of India was not keen on extending its terri-
torial sovereignty. It was convinced that the ultimate assumption of
sovereignty over the whole of India was inevitable. But it wished to
postpone this event for as long as practicable. 107 It was aware that
it would take a long time for the people of central India and Rajasthan
to accommodate their habits to the demands and restraints of settled
government. In the meantime, the Government of India favoured an
arrangement which would enable it to exercise general control through

----------------------------------------
106 Ibid., p.cxlix.
107 See Malcolm, Political History of India, Vol.ii, Appendix viii,
pp.cclxxix-cclxxx. Instructions by Major-General Sir John Malcolm
G.C.B., K.L.S., to officers acting under his orders in central
India, in 1821.
its influence rather than the establishment of direct British rule.

In other words, the Government of India wished to retain the Rajput rulers and use them as instruments for maintaining tranquillity in Hindustan.

In his instructions to Charles Metcalfe dated October 1817, the Governor-General asked him to conclude treaties with the Rajputs on conditions which should give to the British Government the entire control over their political relations and proceedings with each other and with foreign States, secure to them the enjoyment of their territorial possessions and the independent exercise of their internal administration under our protection and guarantee, and render their resources available for defraying the charge that will be incurred in the establishment and support of this system.

Between December 1817 and December 1818, Metcalfe concluded treaties with all the Rajput States on the basis of the above instructions. The terms and objects of these treaties were fundamentally the same.

The treaties established 'perpetual friendship, alliance, and unity of interest' between the East India Company and the rulers of Rajasthan, their heirs and successors. The 'friends and enemies


of one party' were to be regarded as the 'friends and enemies of both'. In return for the protection of their States, the Rajput States were required to 'act in subordinate co-operation' with the Government of India. They were to 'acknowledge its supremacy' and to have no 'connexion with other chiefs and states'. The rulers of Rajasthan were further required to renounce their right to 'enter into negotiation with any chief or state without the knowledge and sanction of the British Government'. They and their heirs were to refrain from committing aggression on any one, and were to submit their disputes with any State to the arbitration and award of the Government of India. To defray the cost of their defence, the Rajput rulers were required to pay tribute in perpetuity to the Government of India. Payment of tribute to the Marathas or connection with them on that account was to cease. In addition to tribute, the Rajput rulers agreed to furnish troops according to their means at the request of the Government of

---

110 Udaipur (Mewar) engaged to pay $\frac{1}{6}$ of its actual revenue as annual tribute for five years; and after that period, $\frac{3}{8}$ in perpetuity. The tribute to Jodhpur (Marwar) was to be the same as it had hitherto paid to Sindhia (i.e., Rs.1,08,000). It was to be paid in perpetuity. Kota's tribute, also to be paid in perpetuity, was to be the same as it had previously paid to the Peshwa, Sindhia, Holkar and Puar (i.e., Rs.2,57,600). Jaipur was exempted from the payment of tribute for the first year because of the devastation which its territory had suffered. But from the second year, it was to pay Rs.400,000 (Dihlee rupees) increasing by Rs.100,000 yearly till it reached Rs.800,000 in the sixth year. The tribute was then to remain at Rs.800,000 per annum till the revenues of Jaipur exceeded Rs.40,00,000 when it was to pay $\frac{5}{16}$ of all revenues in excess of Rs.40,00,000 as additional tribute. (See Aitchison, Treaties and Sanads, Vol.iii, pp.9-10, 147, 316.)
India. Finally, the right of the Rajput rulers to exercise absolute authority in their internal affairs was assured. They were also guaranteed against the introduction of British civil and criminal jurisdiction into their States.

Lord Hastings' treaties with the Rajput States present an interesting contrast with Lord Wellesley's subsidiary treaties in certain respects. Lord Wellesley's treaties were signed at the turn of the century when the fear of a French invasion dominated the thinking of British administrators in India. Lord Wellesley's aim was to obtain permanent military occupation of the allied country in order to overawe the allies and frustrate any intrigues on their part against British interests. Accordingly, Lord Wellesley's subsidiary treaties

---

111 Jodhpur (Marwar) was specifically bound to provide a fixed contingent of 1,500 horse. The contingent proved inefficient in the campaign against the freebooters of Nagar Parkar in 1832. As a result the provision was commuted in 1835 for an annual payment of Rs.1,15,000 towards the cost of the Jodhpur legion which was established. (Aitchison, Treaties and Sanads, Vol.iii, p.131.)

112 The subsidiary treaty with the Peshwa certainly had this object. The Peshwa realised this, hence he resisted it for a long time. In 1801 he agreed to accept a subsidiary treaty on condition that 'the troops should be retained within the Company's dominions at all times, except when the Peshwa should formally require their actual services.' (See Choksey, A History of British Diplomacy at the Court of the Peshwas 1786-1818, p.287. Emphasis mine.) Commenting on the Treaty of Bassein, Lord Castlereagh, President of the Board of Control, stated: 'Whatever we may hold out to reconcile the Peshwa to the alliance and however we may profess to respect his independence in the management of his own internal affairs, we cannot deny that in fact as well as in appearance, whilst a British force is at Poona he can be considered in no other light than as politically dependent on us'. (See Choksey, op.cit., p.299.)
stipulated the right of the Government of India to station troops of specified numbers in the territories of the allies. To ensure the availability of funds for the regular payment of the subsidiary force, and to avoid the possibility of constant bickering over the funds, Lord Wellesley preferred a cession of territory by the allies. As the ceded territories were placed under the exclusive management and authority of the Government of India, it had the added advantage of enabling additional British troops to be introduced into the territories of the allies if the need arose. Lord Hastings' treaties with the Rajputs contained no stipulation for the stationing of a subsidiary force in their States, because the recognition by the Rajputs of the supremacy of the Government of India rendered such a stipulation superfluous. Lord Hastings also demanded a cash subsidy instead of a cession of territory.

It is also significant to note that Article 9 of the subsidiary treaty of Bassein committed the Government of India to make the services

113 In the negotiations of 1816 when the attitude of Sindhia, Holkar and Ameer Khan was still uncertain, provision was made in the draft treaty with Jaipur for the stationing of a subsidiary force in its territory. Article 9 of the draft treaty provided that 'the subsidiary force should be stationed at points to be hereafter determined in concert and that a fort should be assigned for the magazines and depots of the force'. Article 11 provided that 'on any invasion of the Jaipur country the British army should have admittance into any fort, the occupation of which might be expedient for the defence of the country'. (See Barnejee, op.cit., p.380, footnote). At the time of the final conclusion of the treaty in April 1818, however, all danger had passed. It is significant that these articles were omitted from the final treaty.
of British troops available to the Peshwa for the purpose of putting
down the rebellion of his subjects. This clause became one of the
main sources of friction between the Peshwa and the British. Lord
Hastings' treaties with the Rajputs avoided any such definite commit­
ment. The right of the Rajput rulers to British military aid against
rebellious subjects was reserved for the option and discretion of the
Government of India.114

The establishment of British suzerainty over Rajasthan in
1818 was clearly a by-product of the Pindari war. The Rajputs were
placed under British protection because it was clear to the Government
of India that, unless it exercised a measure of political control over
the Rajput States, the endemic feuds among their clans and the weak­
ness of their Governments would encourage the revival of the predatory
system and expose nearby British territories to grave danger.

The effect of Lord Hastings' treaties of subordinate alliance
with the Rajput States was to extend British political influence to
the Sutlej without a corresponding increase in their territorial
sovereignty. For all practical purposes, the Rajput States became

114 Under the 3rd Article of the Agreement signed on 1 February
1840 between Sardar Singh, Rana of Udaipur and his chiefs and
witnessed by Major Robinson, officiating Political Agent in
Udaipur, it was stated that: 'The three-eights from the revenue
collections of the Khalsa lands are paid by the Durbar to the
British government for the protection of Meywar from foreign
enemies;... The payment of the tribute as here stated is
exclusively for the protection of the country against foreign
invasion,... (See Aitchison, Treaties and Sanads, Vol.iii, p.42.)
part of the British raj; for though their internal autonomy was
guaranteed,\(^{115}\) their acknowledgement of British supremacy provided
the Government of India with justification for interfering in their
domestic affairs to a greater extent than it had ever ventured to do
elsewhere. From the 1820's, the Government of India interfered
increasingly in the Rajput States to check economic mismanagement
and ensure their ability to pay their tribute.\(^{116}\) It was a measure

\(^{115}\) The only exception was Banswara. Article 5 provided for British
intervention in its internal affairs. (See Barnejee, \textit{op.cit.},
p.406.)

\(^{116}\) In 1819 Tod was directed to assume full control of the affairs
of Udaipur so as to ensure the Rana's ability to discharge his
financial obligation to the Company. This interference was
withdrawn in 1821 but resumed two years later. The Rana was
given a daily allowance of Rs.1,000 and certain districts
reserved for the regular payment of the tribute and the liquida­
tion of the arrears of the tribute. In 1826 Rana Bhim Singh's
authority was re-established.

In Jaipur the story was not much different. During the minority
of Jai Singh III, the Government of India appointed an officer
to reside at Jaipur. He was authorised to interfere in the
internal affairs of the State 'with a view of guarding the
interests of Government and securing the payment of the tribute'.
On the death of Jai Singh in 1835, the Government of India assumed
the guardianship of his infant son, Ram Singh, and set up a
council of Regency comprising five principal nobles and under the
superintendence of the Political Agent for whose decision all
measures of importance were to be submitted.

In Jodhpur, Man Singh's alleged misgovernment led to a military
occupation of his capital for five months. He entered into a
personal engagement to ensure good government. A British garrison
was placed in the fortress of Jodhpur and the controlling voice
in his administration given to the Political Agent.

In Kota, British forces were sent in 1820 against Raja Kishor
Singh when he attempted to assume actual control of his Government.
He was forced to enter into an engagement guaranteeing the
hereditary control of his administration to Zalim Singh and his
heirs. (See Aitchison, \textit{Treaties and Sanads}, Vol.iii, pp.13-14,
85, 154-156, 327.)
of the resignation of the Rajputs to their subordinate status that such minute and vexatious interference did not lead to serious tensions in Anglo-Rajput relations. For the next two decades general tranquillity prevailed in India south of the Sutlej. During this period it was Persia and Afghanistan, particularly the latter, which gave the Government of India cause for alarm.
As in Maharashtra and Rajasthan, the first phase of British involvement in Afghanistan (1838-1842) reflected the sensitivity of the Government of India to political instability in neighbouring native States. During the first decade of the nineteenth century, central authority in Afghanistan was in decay as it was in Maharashtra and Rajasthan. In all these States, the rule of law hardly existed. Feuds and dissensions made them susceptible to foreign intrigue; while the anarchic conditions prevailing in them made British Indian subjects who were under a more rigorous administration, chafe under the restraints of settled government. Such States were therefore a constant source of anxiety to the Government of India and almost invariably became victims of British intervention.

In the opening years of the nineteenth century, Afghanistan was still a unified country. As such it was regarded by the British as a power to be reckoned with. Memories of Zeman Shah's repeated attempts to invade Hindustan still lingered in the minds of Indian rulers; and it was feared that as long as Afghanistan remained a unified State, she might yet vie with the British for the hegemony of northern India. Therefore during this time, the policy of the Government of
India was to checkmate her through Persia. By the second decade of the century, however, the fear of an Afghan invasion had receded; for Afghanistan stood on the threshold of internal convulsions that were destined to culminate in her division into four mutually hostile principalities in 1826, namely, Herat, Kandahar, Kabul and Peshawar.

These developments were at first welcome to the Government of India because they occurred at a time when the British were hard-pressed elsewhere. The decay of Afghanistan therefore assuaged their anxiety about the north-west frontier and induced a sense of security. During this time, 'the strategic connexion of Afghanistan with the security of India had not yet crossed the horizon of their consciousness'. After 1829, however, the Government of India viewed the internal weaknesses and dissensions of Afghanistan not with relief but with

1 The Anglo-Persian treaty concluded in 1801 bound the King of Persia 'to lay waste and desolate the Afghan dominions' and to endeavour 'to ruin and humble the above-mentioned nation' if ever the Durrani monarchs attempted to invade India. (See W.K. Fraser-Tytler, Afghanistan (London, 1950), p.78.)
In another treaty concluded on 25 November 1814 (and based on the extant treaty of 1809), it was agreed in Article 8 that: 'Should the Afghans be at war with the British nation, his Persian Majesty engages to send an army against them in such manner and of such force as may be concerted with the English Government. The expenses of such an army shall be defrayed by the British Government, in such manner as may be agreed upon at the period of its being required.' (See J.W. Kaye: History of the War in Afghanistan (two volumes, London 1851), vol.1, p.645.)

2 This period coincided with the Nepalese war, the Pindari war, and the Burmese war.

3 Fraser-Tytler, op.cit., p.79.
concern. Russia was prowling on the borders of Persia and seeking to extend her influence into central Asia. Persia, Afghanistan's western neighbour, was willing to become a tool in the hands of Russia. Smarting under the loss of a large slice of her territory, and secretly encouraged by Russia, Persia was seeking to recoup her losses at the expense of enfeebled Afghanistan. The proximity of Afghanistan to India made it necessary for the Government of India to take steps to settle her internal squabbles as a preliminary to encouraging her rulers to unite in resisting Persian aggression.

The kind of unity envisaged by the Government of India for Afghanistan was at first social rather than political. The Government of India had not fully recovered from the fright caused by Zeman Shah's projected invasions of India. It was still suspicious of a united Afghanistan. It therefore preferred to maintain her political disunity in order to be able to balance one principality against the other. In fact, all that the Government of India wanted to do was to settle the quarrels between the Barukzai and the Sadozai families as well as the family quarrel among the Barukzai rulers of Eastern Afghanistan. The Government of India hoped that this would suffice to remove the mutual distrust and hatred which were driving the Afghan rulers to seek Persian alliance against one another. This policy did not envisage any political or military commitments on the part of the Government of India.
This policy, however, was not enough to win the friendship of the Barukzai brothers. Dost Mohammed Khan's obsession was with the recovery of the Afghan province of Peshawar from the Sikhs who had been enabled to seize it through the treachery of his brother. For the purpose of recovering Peshawar and gratifying his revenge towards his brother, Dost Mohammed was willing to accept foreign aid from anywhere even at the risk of his independence. The Government of India could not oblige him because it did not want to jeopardise its alliance with the Sikhs; nor did it want to see the rise of a great Mohammedan power beyond the Indus. The result of such conflicting objectives was the breakdown of negotiations between Dost Mohammed Khan and the Government of India. The failure of negotiations was followed by an open avowal on the part of the ruler of Kabul that he would seek foreign aid to renew his war with the Sikh State. By this avowal, he placed the security of British India in danger and so incurred the displeasure of the Government of India. Lord Auckland therefore decided to supplant him by a pliant ruler who would be willing to subserve British interests.

1. Internal political condition of Afghanistan in the 19th century.

The kingdom of Afghanistan was founded in 1747 by Ahmad Shah Durrani following the death of his master Nadir Shah, King of Persia. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the kingdom extended from Herat in the west to Kashmir in the east, and from Balkh in the north to Shikarpur in the south. But in spite of its size, it was a very
weak kingdom. It had known little internal stability since the death of its founder in 1773. Diversity of race, religious animosity and the absence of a settled principle of succession bedevilled the stability of the Afghan kingdom.

The kingdom of Afghanistan lacked a homogeneous population. It consisted of a hotch potch of races - Pathans, Ghilzais, Tajiks, Turks and Persians. The Pathans, the dominant race, lived mainly in the country lying around the Suleiman Range and around Kabul. The leading section among them was the Abdalli tribe of whom the Sadozais and the Barukzais were the most important sections. The monarchs of Afghanistan came from the former, the viziers generally from the latter. Under the Sadozai monarchy, the Abdallis were a privileged class. They held the chief offices of State and their lands were exempted from taxation. The country of the Ghilzais extended from Kandahar to Gundamuck halfway to Peshawar. They were divided into two sections - the Western Ghilzais and the Eastern Ghilzais - which had little intercourse with each other. Once rulers of Kabul before the advent of the Durrani monarchy, the Ghilzais had become a subject race. They naturally resented their supersession by the Durrans. The Persians or Qizilbashas lived mainly in Kabul. They were the descendants of a rearguard of troops left behind in Kabul by Nadir Shah in 1738 during his invasion

4 Fraser-Tytler, op.cit., pp.48-60. The Tajiks were a non-nomadic race of Persian origin. They lived chiefly round Kabul, in Kohistan and the valley of the Panjshir river. The Turks were mainly of Uzbeg extraction and lived north of the Hindu Kush.
of Hindustan. The Sadozai monarchs patronised them and relied on their loyalty. But after the fall of the monarchy, the loyalty of the Qizilbash to Afghanistan became equivocal.

Not only did Afghanistan lack national cohesion but its population was of a turbulent and vindictive disposition. The temper of its people had 'never been attuned to peace'. They were 'impatient of the restraints of a settled government', and were 'continually panting after change'. They knew 'no happiness in anything but strife'. Their delight was to 'live in a state of chronic warfare'. Blood was 'always crying aloud for blood. Revenge was a virtue among them; the heritage of retribution passed from father to son; and murder became a solemn duty'.

Apart from the racial cleavage, and the turbulence of the population, a religious antipathy based on sectarian differences existed between the bulk of the population and the Qizilbash. The former were Sunnis and the latter Shias. This religious disharmony was often exploited for political purposes and was a factor of instability in the politics of Kabul. Aware of the disadvantage of their numerical

5 J.W. Kaye, op.cit. Vol.1, p.34.
6 Ibid., Vol.1, p.11.
7 Mohan Lal: Life of the Amir Dost Mohammed Khan of Kabul, (two volumes, London 1846) Vol.1, pp.36-37, 145. In July 1803 this conflict led to the deposition of Mahmud Shah and the accession of Shah Shuja. In the struggle between Dost Mohammed Khan and his brother Sultan Mohammed Khan for the possession of Kabul, the former courted the support of the Shias, the latter of the Sunnis.
inferiority, the Qizilbashes contrived to add 'to their strength by intrigues around them'. In this they achieved some success; for every man of rank in Kabul had a Persian or Qizilbash as secretary who handled the home and foreign correspondence. The Qizilbashes thereby wielded considerable influence in the politics of Kabul.  

Although Afghanistan was a monarchy, her people exhibited a predilection for republicanism. Ahmad Shah was shrewd enough to see the vulnerability of the monarchy in a country lacking national cohesion or sentiment. He realised that in a country where people's first loyalty was to their local chieftains, the monarchy could only survive by respecting the rights of the diverse races and tribes and granting them a certain measure of autonomy. Instead of ruling as an autocrat, therefore, he ruled through a council of nine principal Sardars representing the different sections of his people. His grandsons, however, lacked his statesmanship, and their attempt to ignore the great chiefs and rule as autocrats weakened the position of the monarchy and undermined political stability in Afghanistan.

---


9 For instance, under Ahmad Shah, a portion of the Qizilbashes became an organised military body under a Khan who was directly responsible to the Shah; but the bulk of the Qizilbashes acknowledged their own chief. (See P.P., 1859, Vol.xxxv, p.50.)
Political stability in Afghanistan was further undermined by the absence of a settled principle of succession. The succession to the throne was not regulated by primogeniture but by intrigue and the sword. In a country where the Kings were polygamous and consequently the number of princes large, the absence of primogeniture was very conducive to succession disputes. Thrice between 1800 and 1818, the sovereignty of Afghanistan changed hands through violent revolutions.

These internal weaknesses inherent in the political structure of Afghanistan led to civil wars and culminated in the overthrow of the Sadozai monarchy in 1818. For eight years after this event, confusion reigned supreme everywhere as the Barukzai brothers quarrelled among themselves for the lion's share of the sovereignty of Afghanistan.

---

10 Ahmad Shah was succeeded by his second son Timur Shah. Timur was succeeded by his fifth son Zeman Shah.

11 Timur Shah, for instance had 23 sons. He failed to nominate an heir.

12 Zeman Shah executed several of the chiefs on a charge of conspiracy for trying to overthrow his unpopular vizier Vafadar Khan. Among the victims was Painda Khan head of the Barukzai clan. His eldest son Fatteh Khan transferred his allegiance to Shah Mahmud whom he assisted to overthrow Zeman Shah. In 1818 Shah Mahmud repeated the folly of Zeman Shah and put Fatteh Khan to death. In the ensuing feud between the Sadozai and Barukzais the monarchy was overthrown and the unity of Afghanistan was destroyed.

13 After the fall of the monarchy, the Government of Afghanistan was divided as follows: Mohammed Azim Khan, the eldest of the brothers took over Kabul as the vizier of his puppet King Shah Ayub; Yar Mohammed Khan was given Peshawar; Purdil Khan had Kandahar and Dost Mohammed Khan took over Ghazni. The death of Mohammed Azim in 1823 led to a struggle among the surviving brothers for Kabul. (See Mohan Lal, *op.cit.* Vol.i, p.117; H.H. Dodwell (ed.), *Cambridge History of India*, Vol.v, p.488.)
It was not until 1826 that Dost Mohammed Khan emerged as successor to the throne of the Sadozais and head of his family.

Dost Mohammed Khan was the twentieth son of Painda Khan, the chief of the Barukzai clan. Unlike the majority of his brothers, Dost Mohammed's mother was not an Afghan but a Qizilbash. At the age of fourteen, he distinguished himself as a brave soldier and a few years later, his bravery earned him the title of Sardar from Mahmud Shah. He was tall and graceful. He possessed a quick understanding and was a great judge of character. His suspicion was 'so easily excited as to amount almost to infirmity'. He was cautious and forbearing and 'called a spade a spade'. He could not 'be long deceived'.

The partition of Afghanistan among the Barukzai and Sadozai clans destroyed its political unity. In Eastern Afghanistan, it failed to extinguish the mutual jealousies and suspicions of the Barukzai brothers. The assumption of the title of Ameer by Dost Mohammed Khan in 1834 and his attempt to enlarge and consolidate his principality of Kabul became a source of alarm to his brothers in Peshawar and Kandahar.

14 P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.79. Burnes to Macnaghten, 3 December 1837; see also Fraser-Tytler, op.cit., p.127.

15 In 1826 when Dost Mohammed Khan succeeded to the chiefship of Kabul, it hardly extended beyond a radius of one hundred miles of the city. He set about suppressing rebellions in Kohistan and elsewhere. In 1832, he added Jalalabad which increased his revenue from Rs.18,00,000 to Rs.24,00,000. He divided his territory into provincial governments and placed his sons in charge. His favourite son, Mohammed Akbar Khan replaced his brother the Nawab Jabbar Khan (whose loyalty he suspected) in the governorship of the eastern Ghilzai country. He transferred the Nawab to a post in Kabul city and kept him under surveillance.
They feared and suspected him and only reluctantly and partially acknowledged the supremacy of one 'born from a mother of a different creed, and not of a high Afghan family'. The continued discord among the brothers not only made their country weak; it also exposed them to the ambition of their immediate neighbours - the Sadozai Prince Kamran to the west and Ranjit Singh to the east.

On the fall of the Sadozai monarchy, Shah Mahmud and his son Prince Kamran had taken refuge in Herat. Prince Kamran regarded Kandahar as a rebel province of the Sadozai monarchy and constantly threatened to recover it by force. By 1837, he had made two unsuccessful attempts and was seeking Persian assistance to achieve his object. On the east, Dost Mohammed Khan was threatened by Ranjit Singh aided and abetted by Sultan Mohammed Khan, brother of Dost Mohammed Khan and former ruler of Peshawar. Sultan Mohammed Khan's enmity towards his brother was implacable. Since his defeat in the contest for the government of Kabul by Dost Mohammed Khan, Sultan Mohammed Khan had been trying to overthrow his brother with the aid of the Sikhs. His

He also forged a marriage alliance with the eastern Ghilzais through his son Akbar Khan. (See P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.76. Burnes to Macnaghten, 26 November 1837.

16 Mohan Lal, op.cit., Vol.i, p.90.

17 Mohammed Azim Khan was succeeded in the viziership of Kabul by his son Habib-ullah Khan in 1823, but he was soon ousted by Sherdil Khan of Kandahar. On the retirement of Sherdil Khan from Kabul, a contest for the governorship of the city ensued between Dost Mohammed Khan and Sultan Mohammed Khan. The latter was favoured by the Kandahar and Peshawar brothers. Ultimately Sultan Mohammed Khan evacuated Kabul and retired to Peshawar. (See Mohan Lal, op.cit., Vol.i, pp.144-146, 165.)
encouragement to Ranjit Singh paved the way for the capture of Peshawar by the Sikhs in 1834 while Dost Mohammed Khan was engaged in repulsing an invasion of Kandahar by Shah Shuja, a former King of Afghanistan (1803-1809) who was in exile in India. In 1835 the Ameer Dost Mohammed Khan made an unsuccessful attempt to recover Peshawar. The loss of the territory rankled deeply in his mind and he resolved to retrieve it at all cost with foreign aid. To this end, he wrote letters in 1836 to Russia, Persia, and Bokhara.

Thus by 1836, the political situation in Afghanistan was becoming a source of anxiety to the Government of India. The small principalities which had replaced the Sadozai monarchy were in disarray. Each was pursuing an independent foreign policy aimed at injuring the other or aggrandising its power and safeguarding its own position. Blinded by the feud between their clans, the Barukzai brothers of Kandahar and the Sadozai Prince of Herat were committed to a policy of mutual destruction. Both looked to Persia for the support of their pretensions. In Eastern Afghanistan, the Barukzai ruler of Kabul, Dost Mohammed Khan, was trying to mount a religious war against the Sikhs in an attempt to retrieve Peshawar and safeguard his position against his treacherous brother Sultan Mohammed Khan. 18 Like the rulers of

18 After the capture of Peshawar, Sultan Mohammed Khan and his brothers accepted the overlordship of Ranjit Singh and were provided with jagirs in Peshawar. They continued to plot the overthrow of their brother in Kabul.
Kandahar and Herat, his main instrument of policy was Persia. In their obsession with their individual security, the Afghan rulers seemed unperturbed by the fact that it was Persia's ambition to gobble up all of them. Their disunity, the oppressiveness of their fiscal policy which was geared to a state of continuous war, and the equivocal loyalty of the Qizilbash to Afghanistan were all favourable to the success of a Persian invasion. The establishment of Persian ascendancy in Afghanistan could only be the forerunner of Russian influence.

Besides, a religious war against the Sikhs might awaken the slumbering fanaticism of Indian Muslims and sow the seeds of sedition among them. It was therefore considered necessary by the Government of India to intervene in Afghanistan not only to prevent the establishment of Persian and Russian influence, but also to curb the frenzy of religious fanaticism that was being fostered along the Indus and so ensure the tranquillity of the north-west frontier.

ii. Burnes' mission to Kabul.

Until 1829, the Government of India was not unduly alarmed at the fratricidal war which rocked the once powerful Durrani kingdom. Its attention was engrossed in events on the Indian mainland and elsewhere. Between 1814 and 1828 the Nepalese war, the Pindari war and the Burmese war followed one another in quick succession. The political decay of Afghanistan was therefore a welcome relief. Moreover, Great Britain was on friendly terms with Russia. Both of them were cooperating on the Eastern Question. Russia could therefore 'hardly be expected to
harbour any inimical designs towards the possessions of a friendly power in the East'. From 1830 onwards, however, the Government of India felt its security jeopardised by the prevailing disunity among the rulers of Afghanistan, which was encouraging Persian and Russian intrusion into the politics of the north-west frontier of India.

Contemporaneously with the civil wars in Afghanistan, Russia had steadily been encroaching upon the possessions of Persia as a step in her attempt to extend her influence into central Asia. In 1801 she appropriated Georgia and a few years later Armenia. From the treaty of Gulistan (1813) which ended the Russo-Persian war of 1811-1813, 'Russia gained very important additions to her territory on the shores of the Caspian on which Persia was to keep no more armed vessels'. Henceforth, for all practical purposes, the Caspian Sea became a Russian lake. After an uneasy peace of thirteen years the war was renewed and Persia once more defeated. By the treaty of Turkomanchai (February 1828) she ceded the khanates of Erivan and Nakhichevan and consented to the recognition of the line of frontier as drawn by Russia. Besides, Persia paid a war indemnity of nearly

£4 million. After the treaty, it became 'the object of Russia to use the resources of the Persian State in furtherance of its own ends, without overtly taking possession of them, and thus bringing itself into collision with other powers'. Persia showed a willingness to become the tool of Russia. She not only resented Britain's breach of her treaty obligations during the Russo-Persian war of 1826-1828, but she also wished to seek compensation for her territorial losses at the expense of Afghanistan. She laid claim to Afghan territory as far as Ghazni. After a successful expedition against Khorassan during 1831-32, the Crown Prince of Persia, Abbas Meerza, projected an invasion of Herat which was only interrupted by his death in the autumn of 1833.

23 Lajpat Rai Nair, op.cit., p.7.
25 By the Definitive Treaty with Persia concluded at Teheran on 25 November 1814, the British Government agreed 'that in case of any European nation invading Persia, should the Persian Government require the assistance of the English, the Governor-General of India, on the part of Great Britain, shall comply with the wish of the Persian Government, by sending from India the force required, with officers, ammunition, and warlike stores; or, in lieu thereof, the English Government shall pay an annual subsidy, the amount of which shall be regulated in a definitive treaty to be concluded between the high contracting parties; it is hereby provided that the amount of the said subsidy shall be two hundred thousand (200,000) tomauns annually' on condition that Persia was not the aggressor. (See Kaye, op.cit., Vol.i, pp.643-46 (Appendix).) On the outbreak of the Russo-Persian war in 1826, the British excused their non-fulfilment of the above terms by alleging that Persia had provoked Russian aggression. (See Kaye, op.cit., Vol.i, p.148.)
26 Ibid., Vol.i, p.155.
Against this background of Russian and Persian designs, the applications of the Afghan rulers for Persian intervention in their domestic quarrels took on an ominous significance. They were a clear indication that the country was without a master and was consequently likely to become subservient to dangerous foreign influences. Therefore instead of neutrality and indifference, 'the Government of India, smitten by the dread of the Russian invasion, showed greater anxiety to learn about the geographical conditions and topography' of the countries beyond the Indus. The Government of India's information was derived mainly from English adventurers whose journeys were in some cases 'undertaken with the knowledge and approval of the Indian Government, if not with its actual support'.

The concern of the Government of India about the internal squabbles in Afghanistan was reflected in the fact that Lord William Bentinck (Governor-General from 1828-1835) condoned the countenance

27 Lajpat Rai Nair, *op.cit.*, p.5.
28 *Ibid.*, p.5. In 1830 Arthur Conolly started from Tabriz for Khiva to get some information about the military strength of the country; but he was captured and escaped to India by way of Kandahar. In the same year, Lt. Alexander Burnes was deputed ostensibly to convey a present of English horses to Maharaja Ranjit Singh, while his real aim was to gather political and geographical information about the territories on the banks of the Indus. In 1832, the same officer was sent by the Government of India to Kabul and Bokhara in order 'to survey the possible route of an advance towards India and to test possible friendships which the British might form in that region'. (See H.H. Dodwell (ed.), *The Cambridge Shorter History of India*, (Cambridge, 1934) p.649.)
given to Shah Shuja's expedition of 1834 by Captain Claude Wade, Political Agent at Ludhiana. That Captain Wade escaped censure was evidence of the Governor-General's secret longing for the restoration of unity and stability in Afghanistan. Before departing from India the Governor-General wrote a minute which reflected his anxiety about the situation in Afghanistan.

The only real danger with which we may be threatened [his Lordship observed], must come from the northwest, and consequently to that important line of operation our main attention should be turned...

The present state of Afghanistan presents no cause for alarm to India. The success that attended the wretched army that Shah Shuja had under his feeble guidance affords the best proof of the weakness of the Afghan power. The assumption of the supremacy by Dost Muhammad Khan may possibly give greater strength and consolation (sic) to the general confederacy. It is much to be desired that this state should acquire sufficient stability to form an intermediate barrier between India and Persia.

Lord William Bentinck also feared that the humiliation felt by the Afghans at the loss of Peshawar might be skilfully exploited by Russia to secure Afghan goodwill and support in the event of a Russian invasion of India. His Lordship thought that if the Russians invaded India, the Afghans 'probably would make a virtue of necessity and join the common cause, receiving in reward for their cooperation

29 Lajpat Rai Nair, op.cit., p.10.
30 Ibid., p.10. Minute by Lord William Bentinck, Governor-General and Commander-in-chief, 13 March 1835. (Emphasis mine.)
the promise of all the possessions that had been wrested from them by Ranjit Singh..." This minute foreshadowed Lord Auckland's Afghan adventure. It became clear to the Government of India that steps must be taken to settle the internal squabbles of the Afghan rulers so as to impart strength to them. It was also necessary to smooth the differences between the Afghans and the Sikhs and promote good relations between them.

Lord Auckland formally assumed office as Governor-General of India on 4 March 1836. His father was a Tory lawyer but he himself was a Whig. An industrious and conscientious public servant, Lord Auckland was essentially a man of peace. He was often given to irresolution and was rather impressionable. Lord Auckland had hardly spent six months in India when occurrences on the north-west frontier led him 'to think that the period of disturbance is nearer than I had either wished or expected'.

A few months after Lord Auckland's departure for India, disquieting letters were received in England by Lord Palmerston from Mr. Ellis, British envoy in Persia. Goaded by a spirit of revenge

31 Ibid., p.11.
33 Lajpat Rai Nair, op.cit., p.12. Lord Auckland to Metcalfe, September 1836.
34 P.P., 1839, Vol.xl, p.328. Letters from Mr. Ellis to Palmerston, dated 25 February 1836 and 1 April 1836.
towards the murderer of their father, the Barukzai rulers of Eastern Afghanistan had made overtures to the Shah of Persia for the conquest and partition of the territory of the Sadozai ruler of Herat. Mr. Ellis was certain that the Shah's own designs on Herat would incline him to countenance any scheme which may facilitate the accomplishment of a favourite object of his ambition, encouraged as he will doubtless be by the Russians to extend his influence, and through him their own, in the countries bordering upon our Indian possessions. 35

The Court of Directors took fright and instructed Lord Auckland to counteract the progress of Russian influence 'in a quarter which, from its proximity to our Indian possessions, could not fail, if it were once established, to act injuriously on the system of our Indian alliance, and possibly to interfere even with the tranquillity of our own territory'. 36 The Governor-General was told that if Mr. Ellis' fears should later be confirmed by his own agents or those of Mr. McNeill on his arrival in Persia, then 'some interference might doubtless be requisite, either to prevent the extension of Persian dominion in that quarter, or to raise a timely barrier against the impending encroachments


36 Fraser-Tytler, op.cit., p.90; W. Habberton, op.cit., p.10. Secret Committee of the Court of Directors to Lord Auckland, 25 June 1836.
of Russian influence'. The best manner of dealing with this problem was, however, left to the discretion of the Governor-General. Lord Auckland's way of dealing with the matter was to send Captain Burnes to Kabul, nominally on a commercial mission.

Captain Alexander Burnes who was an ardent Russophobe like Palmerston was 'a man of endless activity and gallantry...with a Scotchman's ambition to "get on" and a gambler's recklessness in taking chances'. Burnes' mission left India in November 1836 and arrived at Kabul on 20 September 1837. Three months later, Persia began the siege of Herat, a city of great strategic importance in central Asia. The prevailing disunity and mutual distrust of the Barukzai rulers of Eastern Afghanistan caused Burnes to have forebodings of danger.

37 William Habberton, op.cit., p.10.
38 Burnes' instructions required him to furnish information 'upon the present condition, the internal government, the revenue, the military establishment and resources, and the power of the chiefs and the disposition of the people in each country that you may visit, and, as far as may be, in the countries contiguous; and you will particularly learn what has been the degree of recent connexion with Persia, and by what agents it has been conducted, and what would be the probable result of Persian attack upon Herat. You will observe the general feeling towards the British and the Russian Governments, the impression prevailing of the power and resources of either, the degree in which the supposition is entertained of an intimate union between the Persian and Russian Governments, and in which that supposition is likely to have influence; and you will gather all the information in your power on the commerce of Russia, and on the measures adopted by that power with the object of extending her influence in Central Asia.' (P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.24, W.H. Macnaghten to Captain Burnes, 15 May 1837.)
39 Lajpat Rai Nair, op.cit., p.17.
As the country was without one head, it lacked unity of policy. Nor were its rulers capable of acting in concert. The Kandahar Sardars cared more about their own quarrel with Herat than about Dost Mohammed Khan's quarrel with the Sikhs. They regarded Prince Kamran as the enemy of the Barukzai family while Ranjit Singh was 'only the enemy of all the Mussulmans'. The Ameer, on the other hand, was so engrossed in his war with the Sikhs over Peshawar that he could not spare money or men to assist his brothers in the defence of Kandahar. In the absence of aid from Kabul, they came to the conclusion that their safety lay in conciliating Persia. Therefore while Dost Mohammed Khan was eagerly awaiting the arrival of Burnes' mission and hoping to use British mediation to regain Peshawar and secure himself against his brother Sultan Mohammed Khan, the Kandahar Sardars were holding secret consultations with Persia in the hope of securing her aid against their enemy in Herat. On the arrival at Kandahar of Kambar Ali Khan, the envoy of the Shah of Persia, the Kandahar Sardars turned down the Ameer's invitation to send one of their number to Kabul to participate in his negotiations with Burnes. They felt that 'any conference there [ie., Kabul] could only have reference to Peshawur, a restoration of which might not benefit themselves' but aggrandise the power of the Ameer.

41 P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.35. Burnes to Macnaghten, 9 September 1837.
Consequently, they declared their readiness to join Persia against Herat and 'keep aloof from all friendship with the English nation'.

Burnes' task was a difficult one. It was to wean these bickering Afghan rulers from their alliance with Persia without disturbing the political status quo of Afghanistan. The Governor-General thought that an explanation to the Afghan chiefs of the grave risk they ran by their mutual hostility would suffice to detach them from Persia. A settlement of their differences would then follow. It did not, however, take Burnes long to become convinced that nothing could be accomplished without first settling the Ameer's quarrel with the Sikhs over Peshawar.

Since 1834 Dost Mohammed Khan had been trying to dislodge the Sikhs from Peshawar which they had seized in that year as a result of his brother's treachery. The recovery of Peshawar mattered a great deal to him. He wanted to secure possession of it as an insurance against the avowed enmity of his brother who wanted to overthrow him with the support of the Sikhs. It was not so much Ranjit Singh as his brother Sultan Mohammed Khan that the Ameer dreaded. If Peshawar was restored to his brother, the Ameer feared that it would become a rallying point for all those who were disaffected towards him. With a supply of funds from Ranjit Singh to corrupt the Kabulis and the support of malcontents based in Peshawar, Sultan Mohammed Khan would

---

have a good chance of overthrowing him. He was therefore opposed to the restoration of Peshawar to Sultan Mohammed Khan. In fact he would rather let Peshawar remain in the hands of the Sikhs than have it restored to his brother. Besides, the Ameer wanted to possess Peshawar in order to increase his pre-eminence among his co-rulers and enable him ultimately to assert his overlordship. Finally, Ranjit Singh's religious intolerance towards the Ameer's co-religionists on the left bank of the Indus offended the religious prejudices of the Afghans.

Despite the recent victory of the Afghans in the battle of Jamrud, Dost Mohammed Khan had no illusions about the inferiority of his military power to that of Maharaja Ranjit Singh. He therefore wished to rely on the Government of India to prevail upon the Maharaja to surrender Peshawar as it had intervened to prevent him from seizing

43 Dost Mohammed Khan's long-term policy was to resume Kandahar and Herat as successor to the throne of Kabul. For instance, he told Burnes that 'the Afghans had no sympathy with Persia, and if Herat fell into the hands of that kingdom, of which there now appeared a great probability, it was time to unite their strength, or to take measures which would place the resources of Kabul and Qandahar in one hand'. (Fraser-Tytler, op.cit., pp.94-95.)

44 The Maharaja refused the Mohammedans permission to pray aloud and kill cows. (P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.148.)

45 In an attempt to consolidate their position in Peshawar, the Sikhs tried to build a fort called Fattehgur near the Khyber Pass. The Afghans of Khyber under Mohammed Akbar Khan, the Ameer's son, laid siege to the fort and a battle was fought on 1 May 1837 in which the Sikh General Hari Singh was killed. The Sikhs prepared to retaliate with an attack on Jalalabad; but when Burnes arrived at Dera Ismael Khan the opposing armies suspended hostilities.
Dost Mohammed Khan was willing to propitiate Ranjit Singh. He was willing to send his son to Lahore to ask for the Maharaja's forgiveness and to offer to pay him tribute if he restored Peshawar to him. The Ameer was also willing to excuse the past treachery of his brother in Peshawar and to guarantee the jagir which he enjoyed under the Maharaja. In return for the mediation of the Government of India to secure the restoration of Peshawar to him, the Ameer was willing to pledge himself 'to forward its commercial and its political views'. He assured Burnes that the Persian Envoy then at Kandahar would not be allowed to come to Kabul. He wrote letters to his brothers in Kandahar imploring them to break off their relations with Persia. The Ameer was even ready to compel them to comply if necessary.

By the terms of his instructions Burnes had no authority to make any replies that might commit his Government. His duty was merely to transmit any proposals which seemed to him to be reasonable to his Government through Captain Claude Wade, Political Agent at Ludhiana. In making his reports, Burnes emphasised the importance of first settling the dispute over Peshawar. Until that was done, he thought that the

47 P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, pp.43-44, Burnes to Macnaghten, 5 October 1837.
48 P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.41, Burnes to Macnaghten, 5 October 1837.
Ameer would not abjure an alliance with Persia and Russia.

In a settlement of the Peshawar affair [he wrote], we have, as it seems to me, an immediate remedy against further intrigue, and a means of showing to the Afghans that the British Government does sympathise with them, and at one and the same time satisfying the chiefs, and gaining both our political and commercial ends. 51

Burnes pointed out that it was Ranjit Singh's attack on Peshawar which had brought about the dangerous situation on the north-west frontier of India. It would not be out of place therefore for the Government of India to put pressure on the Maharaja to expedite the settlement of the Peshawar dispute. If this was done Burnes hoped that a united Afghanistan under Dost Mohammed Khan could emerge to resist aggression from the west. He pointed out that as Herat was

not likely to strike a decisive blow at any part of the Afghan dominions, but Candahar;... if the ruler of Cabool is freed from his fears of the Sikhs, that chiefship will not only be secure against the inroads of Kamran and his family, but Herat itself, now threatened from the west, may be united to Cabool. 52

In Burnes' opinion the alliance between Kandahar and Persia was the result of the sense of insecurity felt by the Ameer's brothers. Therefore until a settlement of the Peshawar dispute was effected and

52 PP., 1859, Vol. xxv, p.79, Burnes to Macnaghten, 26 November 1837.
the Ameer placed in a position to protect Kandahar, Persian and Russian influence could not be eliminated from Afghanistan.

Burnes did not think that it would be difficult to persuade the Maharaja to restore Peshawar to Afghan rule. He stated that the territory was 'a complete drain on the finances of the Maharaja, from which,...his Highness would now willingly withdraw'.\(^53\) The Envoy endeavoured to disillusion the Governor-General about his belief that Kabul stood in grave danger of conquest by the Sikhs.\(^54\) On the contrary, he thought that the Ameer had nothing to fear from the Sikhs, and warned that 'a trial would,...prove disastrous to the Maharaja, and lead Dost Mahomed Khan into measures which, with all his proffers of assistance, have never yet entered into his contemplation'.\(^55\) Burnes pointed out that the power of the Sikhs west of the Indus was confined to the plains. On the mountains it could only be enforced by the presence of troops. From Attok to Kala Bagh, the Khuttaks and the Sagree Afghans successfully resisted the Maharaja's authority. In view of this, Burnes expected the Maharaja to consent to the restoration of Peshawar to Afghan rule subject to the payment of tribute to Lahore.

\(^53\) _P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.26_. Burnes to Macnaghten, 22 August 1837. See also _p.31_, Burnes to Macnaghten, 8 September 1837.

\(^54\) Lord Auckland wished to foster this impression and suspend it, as it were, like the sword of Damocles over the Ameer's head throughout Burnes' negotiations at Kabul. By convincing the Ameer that he was doomed without British intercession with the Maharaja on his behalf, the Governor-General hoped to frighten the Ameer into acquiescence in the British demands.

Captain Burnes preferred to see Peshawar restored to Sultan Mohammed Khan instead of the Ameer. He shared the common fear that if the Ameer got Peshawar, it might stimulate his appetite for more territory east of the Indus. Nonetheless, he was convinced that the Ameer's dread of his brother's treachery was not groundless. Therefore as a compromise, Burnes recommended a suggestion by the Nawab Jabbar Khan that the treaty which the Maharaja had once entered into with the Ameer and his late brother Yar Mohammed be revived. This treaty envisaged the division of Peshawar and its tribute between the two brothers. The Envoy thought that if Peshawar was jointly held by the Ameer and the Sultan Mohammed Khan it might mollify the fears of the former. Burnes added:

In the event of this arrangement being also rejected, it does certainly appear to me that we are bound, in some way, to protect the Ameer from the cabals of Peshawur and Candahar, without which this country will become a scene of strife, injurious alike to our commerce and our politics.

Like McNeill, Burnes preferred to see Afghanistan united again under a single ruler as the surest way of strengthening her and ensuring

56 Even before he entered Kabul, Burnes writing from Peshawar on 22 August 1837 stated: '...Sultan Mahomed Khan has not concealed from me his differences with his brother of Cabool, and his opinions of being able to injure him by means of Runjeet Sing.' On 9 September Burnes reported that envoys from Lahore in the persons of Sultan Mohammed's son and an agent of the Maharaja had been sent to the Kandahar Sardars to solicit their cooperation in overthrowing the Ameer. On 10 February 1838, Burnes again reported details of a plot by the Maharaja to overthrow the Ameer. (See P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, pp.27, 36, 149.)

her integrity. He did not believe that a unified Afghanistan would be a source of danger to the security of India as it had been in the days of Zeman Shah. He cautioned his Government against relying too much upon the Sikh alliance which might not survive the death of the Maharaja.

As things stand [he wrote], I maintain it is the best of all policy to make Cabool in itself as strong as we can make it, and not weaken it by divided power; it has already been too long divided. Cabool owed its strength in by-gone days to the tribute of Cashmere and Sinde; both are irrecoverably gone, and while we do all we can to keep up the Sikhs as a power east of the Indus, either during the Maharaja's life or afterwards, we should consolidate Afghan power west of the Indus, and have a King, and not a collection of chiefs. Divide et impera is a temporising creed at any time, and if the Afghans are united, we and they bid defiance to Persia,...

Burnes pointed out that it was possible that after the death of the Maharaja the Afghans might inherit a portion of a disintegrated Sikh State. In that case, they might exercise no small influence over the Punjab and probably over British India. Moreover, he felt that important as the Sikh alliance was, it could not hold back the Russian menace. Burnes therefore wished his Government to conciliate the Ameer.

---

58 Even before he entered Afghanistan, Burnes favoured the unification of Afghanistan. Commenting on the negotiations between Persia and Kandahar, he stated in a letter to McNeil: 'If matters go rightly, we shall be able to neutralise the power of the Candahar chiefs, or at all events place them in complete subjection to Dost Mahomed Khan, whose influence increased daily.' (See J.W. Kaye, op.cit., Vol.1, p.182; P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.218, Burnes to Macnaghten, 24 March 1838. For McNeill's view, see Kaye, op.cit., p.293.)

59 P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.252. Burnes to Macnaghten, 2 June 1838. (Except 'Divide et impera', emphasis mine.)
He believed that if half of what the Government 'must do for others were done for him [i.e., the Ameer], and offers made which he could see conduced to his interests, he would abandon Persia and Russia tomorrow." \(^{60}\)

The Ameer's request and Burnes' views were considered by the Government of India to be incompatible with its line of policy. Lord Auckland's policy was merely to try to settle the differences among the rulers of Afghanistan which were facilitating the establishment of Persian and Russian influence in Afghanistan. He sought to bring about a settlement of these differences through friendly persuasion. His policy was to limit his endeavours 'to gradually influencing the proceedings of the several states by their own sense of their real and mutual interest, and to the tenders of a friendly mediation'. \(^{61}\) It was not part of this policy to upset the balance of power in Afghanistan, or impair the existing British alliance with the Sikhs. Lord Auckland also did not wish to assume any political or military responsibilities for Afghanistan. The Ameer's policy seemed to his Lordship to be inconsistent with all these principles.

The Government of India was opposed to the restoration of Peshawar to the Ameer partly from the fear that it would aggrandise his power to the detriment of the other rulers of Afghanistan. Lord

\(^{60}\) PP, 1859, Vol.xxv, p.252, Burnes to Macnaghten, 2 June 1838.  
Auckland believed that the Ameer's 'scheme of obtaining possession, on any terms, of the Peshawur territory for himself' was proof that he had sinister motives. Burnes was therefore told that the Government of India would not approve of 'an arrangement which should give to any one chief an undue preponderance; which for instance, should enable Dost Mahomed to subdue Candahar, or to aid Persia in the subjugation of Herat'. With regard to Burnes' suggestion that Afghanistan should be united under a single ruler, Lord Auckland was of the opinion that there could be no state of affairs in Central Asia more favourable to the interests of British India than the present division of power among the several rulers of Afghanistan, provided that each state possessed independence within itself, and were willing to maintain social relations with its neighbours.

It was therefore the policy of the Governor-General to uphold the title of the Sadozais to Herat and of the Barukzai Sardars to Kandahar.

Another reason why the Government of India opposed the restoration of Peshawar to the Ameer was its fear that it might redress the balance of power between the Afghans and the Sikhs. If that

---

63 P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.75, Macnaghten to Burnes, 2 December 1837. (Emphasis mine.)
64 P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.284 (footnotes). Lord Auckland to the Secret Committee of the Court of Directors, 8 February 1838.
happened it might enable the Ameer to challenge the power of the Sikhs and probably encourage an Afghan incursion into the countries south of the Indus, especially after the Maharaja's death. The Government of India could not contemplate such an eventuality with equanimity as it would disturb the consolidation of the Sikh alliance which exercised a stabilising influence in India. The Sikh alliance therefore had to be preserved at all costs. It was argued that it would be suicidal for the Government of India with a well-organised Government like that of Runjeet Sing in advance, and our own immense resources in the rear, to labour under such an incubus of alarm from the half-famished multitudes of Persia, and the headlong violence of Russia, as to resign that policy which is demonstrated both by reason and expediency to be the safest, the wisest, and the best suited to our situation, to oblige the Amir. *66*

Burnes was required to tell Dost Mohammed Khan unreservedly that 'under any circumstances', the Government of India's 'first feeling must be that of regard for the honour and just wishes of our old and firm ally Runjeet Singh'. *67* He was to tell the Ameer also that the Governor-General did not think that the Maharaja would be willing to restore

*66* P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.209. C.M. Wade to Macnaghten, 21 March 1838. In a letter to Hobhouse, Lord Auckland stated: 'In his pressing needs, he [i.e., the Ameer] has courted Persia, he has courted Russia and he has courted us. But it would be madness in us, though we may wish to see his independence assured, to quarrel with the Sikhs for him.' (See Lajpat Rai Nair, op.cit., p.17 footnotes.)

Peshawar to him on the terms proposed by him. Further, Dost Mohammed Khan was to be told that the utmost that the Government of India could do for him was 'to endeavour to induce Maha Raja Runjeet Singh to refrain from prosecuting further hostilities against him'. The Governor-General tried to impress upon the Ameer that he had no chance of recovering Peshawar and so he must reconcile himself to its loss and 'thankfully' accept the good offices of the Government of India 'for the peace and security of his remaining territory'.

Lord Auckland strongly censured Burnes for promising pecuniary aid to the Kandahar Sardars. He told Burnes that the Government of India had never contemplated 'positive engagements to assist opposition to actual invasion from the westward, by arms or subsidies'.

---

68 P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.75. Macnaghten to Burnes, 2 December 1837.
71 The Kandahar Sardars had agreed to aid Persia against Herat in the hope of obtaining possession of it on its fall. On the approach of the Persian army, however, they became suspicious of the Shah's ulterior designs on their own chiefship. Accordingly they refused to ratify their treaty with Persia. It was at this juncture, December 1837, that they appealed to Burnes for aid. The Envoy on his own responsibility promised that if on the fall of Herat, Kandahar should be threatened, he and the Ameer would come to its relief. Subject to proof of their attachment to the Government of India, Burnes promised the Kandahar Sardars that the expenses of repulsing the Persians would be defrayed by the Government of India. (P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.97, Burnes to Macnaghten, 23 December 1837.)
Governor-General reminded Burnes that such a promise would be a breach of the treaty of Teheran. Besides, the assumption of obligations at a distance so remote from the seat of its power would be inconvenient to the Government of India. He was therefore inclined to leave that decision to the judgement of the Government in England. Lord Auckland's policy was to confine the British line of defence to the Indus. Even if Herat fell and Persia threatened to invade Eastern Afghanistan, he did not 'contemplate any immediate direct interference by arms or money to arrest the enterprise'. It was his belief that the weakness of Persia itself coupled with the religious antipathy between Shia and Sunni would make Persian rule over Afghanistan 'most precarious and transitory, and in the end attended with serious risk of injury to herself'. Lord Auckland intended to use force against Persia only if she 'should succeed, against all reasonable anticipation, in acquiring a state authority in Afghanistan, and manifest a disposition to interfere with the territories along the course of the Indus'.

Burnes was required to impress upon Dost Mohammed Khan that if he allied himself with Persia or Russia, he would be regarded as an

---

73 By Article 9 of the treaty of Teheran 1814, it was agreed that in the event of war between Persia and Afghanistan, England was not to interfere. She was to use her good offices to effect peace only at the request of both States. (J.W. Kaye, op.cit., Vol.i, p.646.)
74 P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.289, Auckland to Secret Committee, 8 February 1838.
enemy of the Government of India. In that case 'what he might have to dread would not be an invasion only by the Sikhs, but such an invasion undertaken under all the influence of our declared displeasure with an alienation from him'.

Burnes was asked to state these views frankly to the Ameer and to tell him that 'whatever may be his own trust in his independent means of defence, the British Government can deal with him on no other understanding'.

The clash of views between Burnes and Lord Auckland is remarkable. With Russian aggression in mind, Burnes recommended the consolidation of Afghanistan under a single ruler as the best way of warding off danger to the security of India. On the other hand, Lord Auckland was unable to divest his mind of memories of Zeman Shah's attempted invasions of India. He considered the political disunity of Afghanistan as an insurance against Afghan designs on India, and so wished to perpetuate it. Burnes recommended the restoration of Peshawar to Afghan rule as a prerequisite to the detachment of the Barukzai rulers from their friendship with Persia and Russia. Lord Auckland wanted the restoration to be consequent upon the Ameer's renunciation of all dealings with Persia and Russia and of all claims to the territory on his own behalf. Burnes wanted the Ameer to be conciliated; Lord Auckland wanted to

---

intimidate him into compliance with his demands. It was as though the Governor-General was determined to contradict his Envoy at every turn and to reap without sowing.

On 23 February 1838 Burnes went to deliver the Governor-General's message to the Ameer. Dost Mohammed Khan's disappointment was great. Three months after Burnes' arrival in Kabul, a Russian Agent, Captain Vickovich, had also arrived with offers of aid to the Ameer. But confident in his expectation of British mediation in his favour, the Ameer had paid little attention to him. Dost Mohammed Khan was irritated by a hint in the Governor-General's letter that he should

79 In a letter to Burnes stating the essential principles of the Government's policy, Macnaghten wrote: 'Dost Mohomed is now essentially dependent upon our good offices for the removal of his apprehensions from the Sikh power,...his own applications to every quarter open to him for succour against this danger manifest the alarm which he himself entertains; and his Lordship thinks that there is no room for doubt, that although it might be hazardous and unprofitable to the Maha Raja to seek to retain possession of a country so difficult, yet in the immense resources at his command, in his wealthy treasury, and numerous and disciplined army, and with so much of weakness and distraction in the Cabool territory, he has the means of over-running it, when he may determine to make the effort and of consumating at least the ruin of its present ruler. You ought to proceed, in all your intercourse with Dost Mahomed Khan, on this understanding, that the boon which he obtains in consequence of our interest in his favour is no less than safety from the probable destruction of his authority; and representations of the danger which he would incur ought to be made stronger, if dissatisfied with such mediation as we are willing to tender, Dost Mahomed Khan should attempt to form any other political connexions through Persian or Russian agents;...' (P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.122. Macnaghten to Burnes, 20 January 1838.) (Emphasis mine.)

80 Captain Vickovich carried an offer of Russian aid in arms and money for the recovery of Peshawar, Multan, Derajat and Sind. (P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.101. Burnes to Macnaghten, 23 December 1837; p.137, R. Leech to Burnes, 18 January 1838.)
send presents to Ranjit Singh. To the Ameer, it implied subservience to a ruler 'who had never subdued him, which he certainly did not understand'. He resented the low opinion which the Governor-General seemed to have about his power and usefulness. He scorned the offer of the Government of India to prevail upon the Maharaja not to invade Kabul because he believed that it had never been the intention of Ranjit Singh to attack Kabul. Dost Mohammed Khan therefore did not consider the British offer as commensurate with the loss of his external autonomy which the British demands involved.

Nonetheless, the Ameer endeavoured to reach a compromise with the Government of India. After consultation with his brothers, he put forward certain proposals. He agreed to give up his claim to Peshawar on his own behalf. But to obviate possible future collision and to relieve his fears, he asked that all Sikh troops be withdrawn from Peshawar. He wanted Sultan Mohammed Khan or an Afghan to be left free to govern the territory in conformity to the Maharaja's instructions. The Ameer further agreed to write to Ranjit Singh through the Governor-General 'and to do anything short of sending him horses, which he flatly refused to do.' He also arranged for the departure of Captain Vickovich and promised to refrain from further communication with Persia.

---

84 P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.222, Burnes to Macnaghten, 19 April 1838.
The Kandahar Sardars on their part agreed to recall Allahdad their Agent who had accompanied the Persian Envoy. They agreed to join their brother in making friends with the Government of India if it would give a direct pledge to protect Kandahar and Kabul against Persian attack.\(^85\)

As this request was inconsistent with the Government of India's policy, it was rejected by Burnes. At this juncture it was clear that the negotiations had reached a stalemate. Therefore on 22 April 1838 Burnes asked for leave to return to India.

In granting Burnes leave to retire from Afghanistan, the Ameer expressed regret at the failure of their negotiations; and made no secret of his determination to achieve his objectives with aid from some other power.

As my hopes on your Government are gone [he told Burnes], I will be forced to have recourse to other governments. It will be for the protection of Afghanistan to save our honour, and, God forbid, not from any ill design toward the British....In making friendship with any government my object will be to save and **enlarge Afghanistan**... All the Afghans will be grateful to the Government which obliges them....I expected very much from your Government and hoped for the protection and enlargement of Afghanistan. \(^86\)

---

iii. **British military intervention in Afghanistan.**

Burnes left Kabul on 26 April 1838. The failure of his mission placed Lord Auckland in a quandary. Herat was in imminent danger of being conquered by a Persian army aided by Russian engineers. In his note to Burnes the Ameer had not equivocated about his intention to seek foreign aid to renew his war against Ranjit Singh, the 'old and faithful ally' of the Government of India. Captain Vickovich had taken advantage of Burnes' departure to promise everything the Ameer wanted, and had subsequently left for Kandahar on his way to Persia accompanied by a trusted Envoy of the Ameer. In India itself the repercussions were serious. The political atmosphere became charged with anxious expectation as people waited for something to happen on the north-west frontier. Many people began to bury their valuables; while the Muslim newsheets teemed with sedition. Besides sedition at home, war with Ava and Nepal seemed imminent. The latter had sent emissaries all over India presumably to incite a general feeling of hostility against the Government of India. Unrest was also simmering in Baroda, Indore, Jaipur and Kota. 'In short', wrote Lord Auckland, 'in almost every direction we seemed to be surrounded by undisguised foes or doubtful friends'. It was amid these circumstances that the Government of

---

India decided to intervene in the affairs of Afghanistan. In Lord Auckland's view, this was necessary not only to secure tranquillity on the north-west frontier, but also to save the Sikh alliance by anticipat­ing the Ameer's plans of crushing Ranjit Singh with foreign aid.

In May 1838, following the return of Burnes' mission, Lord Auckland saw three alternative courses of action before him. It was open to him to confine his defensive preparations to the Indus and leave Afghanistan at the mercy of Persia. Or, he might attempt to conciliate the Barukzai chiefs by giving them assistance against a Persian attack. Lastly, he might encourage the Maharaja to invade Kabul 'under counsel and restriction, and (as subsidiary to his advance) to organise an expedition headed by Shah Shuja-ul-Mulk'. The Governor-General rejected the first two alternatives. He thought that the first would open the door for the introduction of Russian intrigues to the Indus. As for the second he feared that it would place military power in the hands of the Afghans which might be turned against the Sikhs whom the Afghans hated more than the Persians. He therefore adopted the third

---


91 The Governor-General felt that 'armaments and subsidies to Dost Mahomed Khan and his brothers, would, especially while such pre­tensions were advanced as regards Peshawur, have been attended with the absolute certainty of wholly destroying the cordiality of our alliance with the most powerful and valuable of our friends, Maharajah Runjeet Sing, while they would have involved us in responsibilities that could in no degree be compensated by any aid from chiefs so weak, and divided by so many jealousies and distrac­tions.' (P.P., 1839, Vol.x1, pp.210-211.) The Ameer himself declared that he and his people would rather be conquered by Mohammed Shah of Persia 'who was a kind of a Mahomedan' than by the Sikhs. (P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.217.)
alternative, which he believed would 'conciliate the feelings of the
Sikh ruler and bind the restored monarch [i.e., Shah Shuja] to the
support' of British interests. 92

A few days after taking this decision, Mr. W.H. Macnaghten
was issued with instructions and sent on a mission to Lahore. Mr.
Macnaghten, who was at this time secretary to Government, first entered
the service of the East India Company in 1809 as a cadet of cavalry on
the Madras establishment. He later distinguished himself as a great
Oriental linguist at the College of Fort William. On leaving College
he became an Assistant in the office of the 'Register' of the Saddar
Diwani Adawlat. In 1818 he took up the duties of a Magistrate but was
soon recalled to Calcutta and appointed 'Register' of the Saddar Diwani
Adawlat. In 1833 he was placed in charge of the Secret and Political
Department of the Government Secretariat. He proved himself to be an
expert Secretary possessing 'an extensive acquaintance with all the
practical details of government'. 93 On 31 May 1838, Macnaghten began
a conference with the Maharaja which resulted in the Tripartite Treaty.
This treaty settled the relations that were to exist between the
Government of India, Shah Shuja and the Maharaja after the Shah
became King in Kabul. By this treaty the Government of India sought
not only to establish British influence at Kabul but also, rather

92 Lajpat Rai Nair, op.cit., p.24.
uniquely, a condominium of the British and Sikh Governments over Afghanistan's foreign policy.

The Government of India had no misgivings about the success of its policy to overthrow Dost Mohammed Khan. To replace one ruler by another in a country which had transferred its allegiance eight times within the preceding forty-five years did not seem to be a formidable task. Above all, the internal situation in Afghanistan furnished ample material for the promotion of British objectives. Disaffection towards the Barukzai brothers was rife and only awaited exploitation. It was believed that by aligning himself with Persia, the Ameer had offended the religious susceptibilities of the bulk of his people. It was also believed that burdensome taxation, arrears of salary, unrewarded services and arbitrary confiscations had effaced memories of the oppression of the Sadozai rulers from the minds of the Afghans. Some powerful

94 J.W. Kaye, op.cit., Vol.i, pp.319-322. Among the other terms of the treaty signed by Ranjit Singh on 26 June 1838, Shah Shuja agreed to renounce for himself and his heirs all right to territories lying on either bank of the River Indus and in the possession of Ranjit Singh, namely, Kashmir, Peshawar, Dera Ismael Khan, Multan and their dependencies. On the Shah's establishment on the throne, he was to send certain articles annually to the Maharaja. This arrangement was to be reciprocated by Ranjit Singh. The Maharaja was to furnish the Shah, upon requisition, with an auxiliary force composed of Mohammedans and commanded by one of his principal officers. It was to accompany the Shah as far as Kabul. After becoming King, Shah Shuja was to pay the Maharaja two lacs of rupees annually from the date on which the Sikh troops might be sent to assist in his re-instatement and in consideration of a force of 5,000 men to be stationed by Ranjit Singh in Peshawar ready for the Shah's service.

chiefs like Haji Khan Kaker were alienated from the Ameer. Haji Khan Kaker wished to become a servant of the Government of India and avowed his willingness to avenge himself on the Ameer.  

The Qizilbashes had ceased to look up to the Ameer since 1834 when he assumed the title of Ameer. He had lost their support by his open contempt for their creed and his reduction of the number of Qizilbashes in his service as well as their salaries. Burnes confidently expected the Kohistanis who formed the bulk of the Ameer's infantry to come over to Shah Shuja. Such a defection was expected to weaken and demoralise the Ameer's army which did not exceed 15,000 men. Shah Shuja's forces were therefore not expected to encounter any stiff opposition. Even the Nawab Jabbar Khan, the Ameer's brother who was closely associated with him in the government of Kabul, was willing to betray him. In an interview with Burnes on the morning before he left Kabul, the Nawab asked the Government of India 'to view him as an adherent of it in Cabool, ready to do anything that was asked of him, be it to assist in the removal of the Ameer, or to forward any scheme

96 P.P., 1859, Vol.xxv, p.269. R. Leech to Burnes, 1838. Haji Khan Kaker who was said to be capable of raising a force of 80,000 men was dismissed from the Ameer's service and deprived of his jagir for suspected intrigue with the Sikhs.


which received the approval of the British Government'. No wonder the Government of India felt confident about the success of its Afghan adventure.

During August 1838, the Governor-General's policy underwent some modifications. In May he had decided to use the Sikh army as the main instrument of his Afghan policy. By August, however, he had made up his mind to rely mainly on the Government's own forces to obviate any 'hazard of failure, and of serious detriment to the reputation of the British name among the Afghan people'. The Governor-General also became converted to Burnes' view that a united Afghanistan was to be preferred to a weak and disunited Afghanistan. 'The Barukzie chiefs,' he wrote to the Secret Committee, 'from their disunion, weakness, and unpopularity, were ill fitted, under any circumstance, to be useful allies, or to aid us in our just and necessary views of resisting encroachment from the westward.' In justifying this change of policy Lord Auckland told the Secret Committee that the restored Sadozai monarchy would be placed under immediate British influence in all its important political relations, and that, therefore, the objections which might otherwise have been entertained to supporting a consolidated Mahomedan

power in that quarter, will not be applicable to the state of things which will exist after the successful termination of the present operations. 102

The Secret Committee of the Court of Directors approved this policy but warned that it must not be allowed to result in a permanent occupation of any part of Afghanistan. 103

On 9 September 1838 the siege of Herat was raised. The Russian menace seemed to have receded. Nonetheless, Lord Auckland decided to go ahead with his plan to depose the Barukzai rulers and forestall potential upheavals on the north-west frontier arising from their rivalry and ambition. Mr. Macnaghten was appointed 'Envoy and Minister on the part of the Government of India at the Court of Shah Soojah-ool-Moolk'. Burnes' mission to Kabul was formally terminated on 1 October 1838. From that date he assumed a new role 'under Mr. Macnaghten's directions, as Envoy to the chief of Kelat and other states'. 104

On 1 October the famous Simla Manifesto was issued in vindication of the Governor-General's policy. It declared that the welfare of British possessions in the East required that the Government of India should have on its western frontier 'an ally who is interested in resisting aggression, and establishing tranquillity, in the place of chiefs

---

ranging themselves in subservience to a hostile power, and seeking to promote schemes of conquest and aggrandizement'.

In December 1838 a British Army left Ferozepur for Afghanistan after it had been reviewed by Lord Auckland and Ranjit Singh. In April 1839 it was joined at Quetta by a contingent from Bombay and by Shah Shuja's specially recruited army. The Shah entered Kandahar unopposed at the end of April 1839. The capture of Ghazni unnerved Dost Mohammed Khan and led to his flight from Kabul. On 6 August, Shah Shuja re-entered Kabul after an exile of thirty years. Captain Wade with his motley army of Hindus, Sikhs and Afghans arrived at Kabul from Peshawar on 3 September accompanied by Prince Timur, the Shah's son. A portion of the British force returned to India. The rest, reinforced by a small Sikh force, garrisoned Jalalabad, Ghazni, Kandahar and Kabul. A small contingent was sent to Bamiyan to watch the passes over the main ridge for the movements of the Ameer. 'For the first and last time in history the British were in actual physical occupation of the great north-western frontier of their dominions'.

In the autumn of 1840 the Ameer crossed the Hindu Kush and appeared in Kohistan forty miles north of Kabul. However, he despaired of success and surrendered himself to the British. On 12 November, he

---

105 Fraser-Tytler, *Afghanistan*, p.110. Declaration on the part of the Honourable the Governor-General of India, Simla, 1 October 1838.
began his journey into exile in India. In spite of these early successes, the Afghan campaign was doomed to failure not only because 'there was a canker of injustice at the core', 107 but also because of the anomalies in the British position. The British occupation was planned as a temporary measure but was allowed to develop all the features of a permanent occupation without the relevant precautionary measures being taken. The British defrayed the cost of the Shah's administration but were bound by an agreement not to interfere. They provided the force to back the Shah's measures which often ran counter to their own political predilections. In the exercise of their role as agents and advisers of the Shah the British functionaries could not often help acting as though they were his masters. The Shah resented the restraints placed on his exercise of power; the policy of economic retrenchment inaugurated by the British in 1841 gave offence to the Afghan chiefs; 108 while inflation and the traffic in women between the city and the cantonments outraged the honour of the Afghan men. In 1841 sporadic risings occurred in the districts west and east of Kabul.

On 2 November 1841 disaffection erupted into revolt in Kabul. Alexander Burnes was hacked to pieces at his house in the city.

108 By the spring of 1841 the cost of the occupation of Afghanistan was causing much anxiety in Calcutta and London. It was costing £1½ million a year. Retrenchment became imperative. The victims of this policy were the chiefs in and around Kabul - Kabulis, Ghilzais, Kohistanis and also the Qizilbashes. (See Fraser-Tytler, op.cit., p.115; J.W. Kaye, op.cit., Vol.i, pp.619-620.)
Macnaghten survived him by only seven weeks and then shared his fate. After protracted negotiations the British were allowed to evacuate Kabul in December under the terms of a treaty that guaranteed them safe-conduct. On 6 January 1842 the British army began its retreat to India. A few days later it fell victim to the implacable fury of the eastern Ghilzais. Only one man, Dr. Brydon, reached Jalalabad to report the tragic end of his comrades to Sale's brigade. In the autumn of 1842 a British army re-entered Kabul by way of Kandahar and Peshawar to exact retribution for the massacre of their comrades. The bazar was burned down. After that the British army returned to India and Afghanistan was left alone. On 20 January 1843 Dost Mohammed arrived at Lahore on his way to Kabul to resume his Government.

British intervention in Afghanistan was inspired by the necessity to curb the prevailing political instability in that country. The collapse of the Durrani monarchy in 1818 left Afghanistan without a unity of political control or policy. The four principalities which replaced the Durrani Empire were bedevilled by racial and religious disharmony among their people and by feuds and hostility among their ruling families. While the Sadozai ruler of Herat sought to conquer Kandahar with Persian aid, the Barukzai brothers of Kandahar showed anxiety for a Persian alliance for the purpose of avenging the murder of their father by Prince Kamran of Herat. In eastern Afghanistan, Dost Mohammed Khan was engaged in war with Ranjit Singh and Sultan Mohammed
Khan, former ruler of Peshawar and brother of the Ameer. The Barukzai brothers in Kandahar who dreaded the ambition of Dost Mohammed were inclined to favour Sultan Mohammed Khan in his quarrel with the Ameer.

This unsatisfactory situation in Afghanistan could not be overlooked by the Government of India. The feud between Kandahar and Herat, and the solicitude shown by these rival Afghan principalities for the friendship of Persia exposed Afghanistan to possible Persian conquest. In view of the close understanding between Persia and Russia, a Persian conquest of Afghanistan would have led to the establishment of Russian influence on the north-west frontier of India. The fear of Russian invasion apart, the prevailing instability in Afghanistan could have had a dangerous impact on British interests in India if it had been allowed to continue. Dost Mohammed's war with the Sikhs, apart from hampering the promotion of British commerce in the countries along the Indus, might have proved harmful to the power of the Sikhs whose alliance with the British exercised a stabilising influence on the Indian political scene. Moreover, since that war had a religious bias, it had a tendency to re-kindle the smouldering religious fanaticism of Indian Muslims. In these ways the situation in Afghanistan posed a threat to the security of the British in India.

To safeguard its interests against external or internal enemies, it was essential for the Government of India to intervene in Afghanistan to end the prevailing state of instability. To achieve this objective it was up to the Government of India either to unify
the country under the rule of one man, or to restrain the ambitions of Dost Mohammed and Prince Kamran and reassure the Kandahar Sardars by guaranteeing the independence and integrity of each principality.

Eventually the Government of India decided to unify eastern Afghanistan under a single ruler and forge close links between him and Ranjit Singh. Since it was believed that peaceful co-existence between Dost Mohammed Khan and Ranjit Singh would be impossible as long as the Sikhs kept Peshawar, the Government of India supplanted the Ameer by the exiled Sadozai monarch, Shah Shuja. The Tripartite treaty between the Shah, Ranjit Singh and the British established a Sikh and British condominium over Afghanistan's foreign policy. Apart from this, the role of the Government of India as guarantor of the punctual payment of an annual subsidy of Rs.2,00,000 by the Shah to Ranjit Singh afforded it a pretext for interfering in the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

The failure of Lord Auckland’s Afghan adventure alienated the Afghans and sowed the seeds of bitterness in their minds. Four years later this bitterness was given expression in the assistance which the Afghans gave to the Sikhs in the battle of Gujrat. From then until

109 Lajpat Rai Nair, Sir William Macnaghten's Correspondence relating to the Tripartite Treaty, p.87. Article 18 of the Tripartite Treaty; see also J.W. Kaye, op.cit., Vol.i, pp.322-323.

110 Lajpat Rai Nair, op.cit., p.80. For the article of the Tripartite Treaty relating to the guarantee, see Ibid., pp.86-87 (Article 15); in Kaye’s work (op.cit., Vol.i, p.322) the Article appears as the 16th; P.P., 1839, Vol.xl, p.30 (Article 15).

111 Fraser-Tytler, Afghanistan, p.122.
1854 relations between the Ameer Dost Mohammed Khan and the Government of India were marked by a 'sullen quiescence on either side, without offence but without good will or intercourse'. As for Dost Mohammed he lived to purge himself of the unjust imputations cast on his character and to retrieve his reputation for good faith. On the Indian domestic front the Afghan debacle added fifteen million crores to the Indian debt. Besides, it exploded the myth about the invincibility of the British army. In this way, it is believed to have contributed indirectly to the great crisis of 1857.

112 Ibid., Lord Dalhousie's Minute, 14 March 1854. On the eve of the Crimean war, diplomatic relations were resumed with Afghanistan as a precautionary measure against possible Russian moves in Central Asia.

113 Fraser-Tytler, Afghanistan, pp.124-125.

CONCLUSION

For the most part, the impetus for British intervention in Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Afghanistan between 1811 and 1844 originated in India itself. The intervention was a direct response to the prevailing instability in those States caused by the collapse of their political systems. The impact of European rivalry for empire in the East reinforced the argument for British intervention. But independently of the fear of an invasion of India by an European rival, the manner in which political crises in Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Afghanistan tended to undermine the general stability of the sub-continent and endanger British interests would still in itself have been sufficient reason for British intervention in those States.

Territorial aggrandisement or economic exploitation was not the primary motive for British intervention in those States in the period under review. No pressing economic necessity existed at the time for acquiring additional territory. Free trade and colonisation did not become a significant factor in British expansion in India till after 1833. The Directors of the East India Company did not visualise big European-owned plantations for large scale agricultural production before the 1840's. Till then, export of Indian sugar and cotton into England received little encouragement. During this period, Britain looked to North America and Brazil for her supplies of these agricultural commodities. In fact, between 1805 and 1841 the Government of India disavowed any desire for additional territory.
In the seven years of his administration, Lord Wellesley had brought more territory under direct British rule than the Directors of the Company desired. The Carnatic, the ceded districts of Mysore, Bundelkhand and the frontier province of Oudh swelled British possessions in India. The alarm caused by this rapid political expansion led to the termination of Lord Wellesley's governor-generalship in July 1805 and to the reaffirmation of the policy of non-intervention or 'ring-fence'. It was not till after 1841 that this policy was superseded by one of deliberate annexation aimed at increasing British territorial possessions and revenue.

As political intervention in the native States almost invariably led to wars and often to conquest, the Government of India resisted the temptation to interfere in the internal affairs of the Indian States. Between 1805 and 1811 it tried to overlook the disputes between the Peshwa and his Southern Jagirdars even though it was under an obligation to assist the Peshwa to chastise his rebellious subjects. In 1806 the Government of India dissolved its connection with the last of the Rajput States. During the next decade, it turned down repeated requests from the Rajput States to be taken under British protection. Not even the offer of tribute could influence it. In 1808 Shah Shuja who was reduced to desperate financial straits offered to rent Sind to the Government of India. The offer was rejected. Shortly after, the Shah offered to cede Sind in return for an annual payment. The offer was
denounced and Elphinstone rebuked for recommending it. In January 1812 the Government of India turned down an offer by the Raja of Kolhapur to cede his country to the British in return for a pension.

Why then did the Government of India intervene in Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Afghanistan between 1811 and 1844 with a view to bringing them within the scope of its political control? The answer lies to a great extent in the political crises which beset those States during this period and in the anxiety over their possible repercussions on the general tranquillity of India. After 1809 the external threat posed by the French receded into the background. In its place the Government of India had to contend with a threat to its security which emanated from within India itself. The extent of British concern about the internal security of their rule became manifest in the Parliamentary debates which preceded the renewal of the Company's Charter in 1813. Several of the speakers betrayed an anxiety over the internal security of the Indian empire and advocated caution in the formulation of policies for India. The evidence given before the Committee of the whole House of Commons in 1813 by Sir John Malcolm and Sir Thomas Munro, two of the Company's leading servants, reflected similar concern about the internal security of the British Indian empire.

---

Sir Thomas Munro believed that the Mohammedans were waiting for an opportune moment to rise against the British.\(^3\) This concern persisted till the 1830's.\(^4\) Charles Metcalfe echoed it when he warned that a small crisis was all that was required to trigger off an uprising against British rule in India.\(^5\)

The exclusion of the former ruling classes of India from the higher levels of the Civil Service and the army was a major cause of grievance among the Indians. The exclusion, reinforced by differences in race, religion and culture, created a social and political gulf between rulers and ruled. The rulers had no means of ascertaining the true feelings of their subjects towards them. The uncertainty filled the British with anxiety and forebodings. The fear of an uprising was enhanced by the fact that the Indian army, the main instrument of British power, was overwhelmingly native in composition. Under these circumstances, the Government of India was anxious to guard against the

---


\(^4\) In the 1820's Sir John Malcolm cautioned: 'The only safe view that Great Britain can take of her empire in India is, to consider it (as it really is) always in a state of danger, and to nominate persons to rule it competent from their knowledge of its interests, and from superior energy of character, to meet every emergency that can arise;... The dangers which assail our empire in India from internal weakness are much greater than we can ever apprehend from external power;...' (Sir John Malcolm, *The Political History of India*, Vol.ii, pp.76-78. Emphasis mine.)

remotest contingency which could disturb the internal peace of India. In safeguarding the peace of India several expedients were adopted. The freedom of the Press was curtailed till 1836. Intemperate zeal in proselytising met with official disfavour. The Government of India hesitated about using its agency for the spread of western learning, western culture and Christianity. Sati was tolerated. But above all, the Government of India became sensitive to political unrest in neighbouring native States.

From 1811 onwards, political weaknesses and instability in the native States could no longer be tolerated owing to the fear of a contagion of unrest in adjacent British territories. As early as 1804 General Wellesley forecast that the source of future danger to British rule in India would shift from Europe to India itself. In August 1805 Lord Cornwallis lamented the deplorable condition of the Governments in the native States. They had no funds or troops on which they could depend. Anarchy and disaffection were prevalent. The Government of India was faced with the choice of interfering to exercise an authority that its general policy made it disinclined to exercise or of allowing the integrity of those States to be destroyed. This was the problem which engaged the attention of the Government of India with regard to Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Afghanistan between 1811 and 1844. The interlocking of this dangerous situation in India with rivalries in Europe led to British intervention in the domestic affairs of these States. The purpose of the intervention was to curb disorder, strengthen
the Governments and turn them into reliable allies. In the pursuit of this policy, the Government of India became inextricably involved in the domestic politics of those States.

In Maharashtra the political crisis was a long-term result of the decay of the Mughal regime. The separatist tendencies in the State which Shivaji had suppressed in his time, revived under the stress of war against the Mughal Emperor. Grants of jagirs were offered to military commanders to induce them to sustain the Maratha war of Independence. Gradually the Maratha State grew into an Empire through conquests. The unity of the Empire, however, did not last long. As a result of the Peshwa's usurpation of power from the Raja of Satara in 1750, the military chiefs who ruled territories outside Maharashtra began to defy the Maratha Government based at Poona. By the end of the eighteenth century the Empire had become a loose Confederacy of which the Peshwa was only the titular head. At the turn of the century, the Peshwa's authority reached its very nadir. While Sindhia and Holkar contended for the control of his Government, the feudal chiefs within Maharashtra itself not only tried to throw off their allegiance but also to encroach upon his estates. It was partly to deal with potential disorders from this decay of central authority in the Maratha Confederacy that the Government of India devised the Treaty of Bassein. On the other hand, it was to extricate himself from the crisis in Poona and to recover his authority that the Peshwa accepted British alliance.
The full extent of the impotence of the Peshwa's Government was revealed only after 1803. By the beginning of 1804 his authority hardly extended beyond five miles radius of Poona. His country was overrun by marauding bands. It became imperative for the Government of India to intervene to avert the dissolution of the Maratha State and to preserve the tranquillity of British territories in neighbouring Mysore. For the latter reason, the Government of India could not permit the Peshwa to attempt to dispossess the Jagirdars by force of arms. Therefore it imposed its own settlement - a settlement which seriously encroached on the Peshwa's internal autonomy guaranteed by the Treaty of Bassein.

The encroachment of the Government of India on the Peshwa's internal autonomy produced a reaction on the part of the Peshwa. He regretted his acceptance of the Treaty of Bassein and from then on tried to extricate himself from its shackles by every conceivable artifice. He tried to regenerate the Maratha Empire with the connivance of Sindhia, Holkar and the Bhonsla. He asserted his suzerainty over these Chiefs and his right to invest them with their khillat of office. He tried at the same time to revive his influence outside Maharashtra by claiming sovereignty over certain territories in Hindustan, the Deccan and Gujerat. These pretensions of the Peshwa threatened to disturb the stability of large districts of India since he lacked the power to enforce them. The more he advanced his claims, the more the Government of India interfered with his Government. But the efforts of the Government of India to restrain him by threats, remonstrances
and even harsh treaties were of no avail. The more it tried to restrain Peshwa Baji Rao, the more recalcitrant and vindictive he became. In view of the suspected hostility of several of the native powers, this disposition of Baji Rao jeopardised the security of the Government of India.

Similarly, British intervention in Rajasthan was the result of the deplorable political situation which prevailed in the Rajput States. Endemic disorders arising from inter-clan feuds, from inter-state wars, from the feudal structure of Government and from the imbecility of the Rajput rulers, made Rajasthan very unstable. The climax of the confusion and insecurity was reached between 1807 and 1811. Slowly the Rajput States were approaching disintegration. Their immense resources and strategic advantages were in danger of passing into the control of the predatory bands in India who had a stake in disorder and anarchy. From Rajasthan, the Pathans and the Pindaris gradually extended their raids into British territory. By 1816 the Government of India, and even the Court of Directors, could no longer ignore the disorders in Rajasthan especially in Jaipur which lay in close proximity to British territories in Hindustan.

In Afghanistan the situation was not much different. Though it lay further from British territories than Maharashtra and Rajasthan, events in Afghanistan always came within the ambit of Indian politics because of its strategic position and the religious affinity between its people and the former ruling classes of India. From 1829 onwards
the Government of India became increasingly worried about the political unrest in Afghanistan. The disunity and squabbles among the various Afghan rulers and their appeals for outside intervention portended danger to the security of British India. The concern of the Government of India about the political situation in Afghanistan was borne out by the fact that, although on his assumption of office Lord Auckland rejected overtures from Dost Mohammed for intervention in his disputes with his brother and Ranjit Singh over Peshawar, the Governor-General, nevertheless, offered British mediation a year later for the settlement of the same disputes.

Thus although it cannot be denied that European rivalries and other developments in Europe influenced British political expansion in India during the first half of the nineteenth century, it is clear that the role played in this expansion by weaknesses in the political systems of the native States has not been sufficiently emphasised. The evidence suggests that in Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Afghanistan, political decay had an intrinsic importance as a factor in the British expansion. Put in another way, British political intervention in those States between 1811 and 1844 would have taken place independently of the contemporary rivalries among European powers for empire in the east.

In each of the three areas under discussion no imminent threat of an external invasion existed at the time of actual British intervention. The danger from France had receded by 1811 when the stage
was set for intervention in Maharashtra and Rajasthan. Even in Afghanistan the military occupation of the country occurred, not at the height of the alarm about the Russian-inspired invasion of Afghanistan, but after the danger had passed with the raising of the siege of Herat. The intervention was no doubt undertaken to anticipate a repetition of the Russian threat. But there is equally little doubt that it was undertaken partly to save the Sikh alliance and to curb the spirit of religious fanaticism and jihad which was being fostered in Afghanistan and along the left bank of the Indus. With the geographical advantages of his country backed by Russian arms and money, Dost Mohammed Khan might have been enabled to sustain his war with the Sikhs to the possible detriment of the Anglo-Sikh alliance which the Government of India valued so much. Besides, the prevalence of a spirit of jihad along the Indus gave rise to considerable sedition among Indian Muslims in the months following the failure of Burnes' Mission. This dangerous situation in India had to be ended. British intervention in Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Afghanistan between 1811 and 1844 was therefore largely attributable to the dangers arising from the political situation in those areas themselves.

The extent and nature of the control which resulted from the intervention was also influenced by peculiar local circumstances. These included the calibre and disposition of the native rulers as well as the inherent strength of the political institutions in those States. In Maharashtra a strong sense of kinship and nationality existed. The Marathas had a proud historical past and cherished visions of a Maratha
Empire on the ruins of the Mughal regime. They resented the British intrusion on the Indian political scene which had shattered their dreams of supremacy in India. They looked upon the Peshwa as the symbol of Maratha unity and aspirations. Even in the last days of the Peshwa-ship, the occupant of the office still enjoyed considerable respect and moral influence. In 1817 Baji Rao could still command the obedience of Sindhia, Holkar and the Bhonsla. As long as this embodiment of Maratha nationality existed and the Peshwa enjoyed any measure of political power, the revival of the Maratha Confederacy as a rival of the British for hegemony in India was a possibility. Therefore the abolition of the office of Peshwa and the annexation of Maharashtra became indispensable to the unchallenged supremacy of British power in India.

In Rajasthan, by contrast, no comparable national sentiment existed among the Rajputs. The feudal and clan organisation of their States militated against the emergence of a powerful confederacy in Rajasthan. Disunity had always bedevilled the Rajput States even in the face of a common foe. The Rajput States had at no time in the recent past had pretensions to political supremacy in India, and were not likely to do so in future either individually or severally. The attitude of the Rajputs was still parochial, and they were ruled by dissolute and imbecile rulers who looked to the Government of India for protection against their powerful vassals. Moreover, as a result of their long submission to the Mughal regime, the Rajput rulers had become accustomed to a subservient role in politics. They were therefore
unlikely to consider the British yoke as a humiliation. Hence annexation was unnecessary. Instead, they were required to recognise the supremacy of the Government of India and pay it tribute in return for protection. On the basis of this relationship, the Government of India established a right of interference in the internal affairs of the Rajput States.

In Afghanistan it is hard to say what the nature and extent of British political control would have been in practice if Lord Auckland's adventure had succeeded. The remoteness of Afghanistan from India and the difficulty of communication precluded the extension of the subsidiary alliance system to that country. Nevertheless, the control over Afghanistan's foreign policy secured under the Tripartite treaty, the role of the Government of India as guarantor of the agreements between Shah Shuja and Maharaja Ranjit Singh under the same treaty, and the weakness of the Shah, would have enabled the Government of India to exercise considerable control over Afghanistan's internal affairs.

Just as the collapse of the Khedive's regime in Egypt provoked British occupation in order to safeguard British interests in Egypt and the Middle East, so the collapse of stable politics in Maharashtra, in the Rajput States and in Afghanistan between 1811 and 1844 necessitated the establishment of a measure of British political control over those States to ensure the security of British interests in India. Thus weaknesses in the political structure of the Indian States were a vital factor in British political expansion in India during this period.
The expansion was carried on by successive steps. Every stage was regarded as an end until intervals of anarchy and confusion forced the Government of India to advance a stage further. With the exception of Maharashtra, the Government of India shrank from outright annexation and decided upon a compromise between the reality and the semblance of conquest. In this way it grasped at the advantages, and evaded the responsibility, of conquest. Through measures which left the external paraphernalia of sovereignty intact, the British grasped the substance of power and left its shadow in the hands of native rulers.
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