

E. J. May

A FEW WORDS

ANENT

THE 'RED' PAMPHLET.

BY

ONE WHO HAS SERVED UNDER THE
MARQUIS OF DALHOUSIE.

LONDON:
JAMES RIDGWAY, PICCADILLY.

1858.

A FEW WORDS,

ETC.

The 'Red' Pamphlet, entitled 'the Mutiny of the Bengal Army, by One who has served under Sir Charles Napier,' is so full of gross misrepresentations that One who has served under Lord Dalhousie feels constrained to contradict some of them and to ask the Public to distrust more.

It has not been without some misgivings as to the entire propriety of such a step that I assume, on the present occasion, in their absence from this country, an attitude involving the defence of such persons as Lord Dalhousie and the Members of the Indian Government: nor should I, probably, have thought it worth while to notice at all the gross calumnies of an anonymous writer, had these not received apparent countenance from some remarks which lately fell from the Earl of Derby in his place in Parliament.*

Without following him over so extensive a field as the causes of the late Revolt, I will enumerate *seriatim* such of the writer's statements as can be proved to be incorrect:—

Page 9. "The slumbering feeling first shewed itself of late years during the rule of Lord Ellenborough, but the prompt and vigorous measures

* See Times Newspaper of December 4th.

“of that nobleman so completely repressed it, that for six years no similar symptom was any where apparent. A second time it rose in a still more dangerous form, and attempted to coerce the iron will of Sir Charles Napier. That gallant veteran extinguished it ere yet the spark had smouldered into a flame, and was rebuked by Lord Dalhousie for so doing. He retired, to avoid witnessing with his hands tied the catastrophe which he foresaw. A third time, in 1852, the prejudices of the Sepoys were placed in opposition to the will of Government. Lord Dalhousie requested the 38th Regiment to proceed to Burmah. They refused. Lord Dalhousie succumbed. From that moment a revolt became a mere question of time and opportunity.”

Lord Dalhousie did not rebuke Sir Charles Napier for any measure which he took for extinguishing the mutiny in question; nor did Lord Dalhousie at any time express an opinion that Sir Charles Napier had exercised too great severity towards the subordinate troops. The latter's chief act of severity on the occasion referred to was the disbanding of the 66th N. I.—an act which, though beyond the power of a Commander in Chief to originate, was immediately and cordially sanctioned by Lord Dalhousie.

On the other hand, when Sir Charles Napier let off only with imprisonment some mutineers who had attempted to seize the fort of Umritsur, and who had

been condemned to suffer death, Lord Dalhousie, I have been assured, informed him that if he had carried out the original sentence, he should have been cordially supported.

It may be conjectured that the writer refers here to certain remarks made by Lord Dalhousie or rather by the Government of India, on the embodiment by Sir Charles Napier, without previous reference to that Government, of a Ghoorka Regiment in the place of the 66th. But such embodiment was no step in the repression of the mutiny in question. The Ghoorkas had not assisted in pacifying the 66th or any other Regiment; they were at the time many marches off; they had done nothing extraordinary, nothing which called for special—much less instantaneous—reward: and, granting that the measure was in itself a judicious one, there was no reason why the General should not have waited before taking it for the consent of the Supreme Government, distant only some five days post from him. Moreover the whole proceedings took place in February 1850, many months before Sir Charles tendered his resignation.

The real causes of Sir Charles Napier's retirement are exposed in Lord Dalhousie's published Minutes;* and the Duke of Wellington has left upon record a judgment† which has settled the question of who was right and who was wrong in the controversy between them.

* 14th June, 1850 —(Rawul Pindee) 28th July, 1851.

† Memorandum, 30th July, 1850.

With regard to the 38th Regiment, the facts are, that its Commanding Officer, without any order or even hint from Government, took upon himself to ask some of the native officers if they would volunteer for Burmah, and to report to Government afterwards that the men were so inclined. Lord Dalhousie, not suspecting that the Commanding Officer had deceived himself, authorized him to parade the Regiment and to ask it to give formally its collective assent. The men then refused, and as by the terms under which they had enlisted they could not except with their own free will be sent beyond the sea, Lord Dalhousie of course did not force them to go. There having been no mutiny, there could be no *succumbing*.

P. 10. 'The stations of Etawah and Mynpoorie' are 'in the vicinity of Cawnpore and Agra.' The nearer of the above-mentioned stations is more than 100 miles from Cawnpore, and is about 70 miles from Agra, no railway existing to connect the respective points. It is also stated that 'Bolundshur is close to Meerut :— it is above 40 miles off.

Ibid. "Of all the considerable native states with which we had come in contact, the province of Oudh was the only one which had maintained its independence intact." This is most curiously inaccurate. In the first place, how can a State be said to have preserved its independence intact when (as is admitted in the very next page) there was a Resident at its Court, backed by three Native Regiments, who made suggestions which were always attended

to; and when intrigues for the British Resident's favour on the part of the candidates for seats in the King's Council, were openly carried on? Secondly, Holkar, Scindia, the Nizam, the Rajah of Bhurtpoor, and others, particularly the Rajpoot Princes, were equally, if not more independent than Oude.

P. 11. "The Kings of Oudh had more than once, "in the season of our distress, accommodated our "Government with loans to a considerable amount, "in re-payment of which we, to our shame be it "said, compelled them to receive accessions of territory alike useless to both parties." Now this is utterly unfounded. The Kings of Oude have ceded lands *to us* in lieu of subsidies which they had bound themselves to pay; but we have never transferred to the Kings of Oude an acre of land. By the first article of the treaty of 1801 the King of Oude ceded to the East India Company in perpetual sovereignty, certain portions of his territorial possessions, in commutation of the subsidy agreed upon in the treaty of 1798. In later years the Kings of Oude have lent us money *at interest*, which interest has been regularly paid to certain persons, pensioners of the King, pointed out by him. This debt has never been repudiated, and the interest has been regularly paid.

Ibid. 'The King of Oudh was the sole remaining independent Mahomedan Sovereign in India.' The Nizam ruling over a larger territory than that of Oude, is a Mahomedan sovereign and is inde-

pendent; and he has remained faithful to us during the mutiny.

Ibid. "It is a remarkable fact, and one that fully refutes Lord Dalhousie's assertions about the misgovernment of Oudh, that not a single instance has been known of a Sepoy settling down after the completion of his service in our provinces; he has invariably proceeded to Oudh, to invest his little fortune in land." This is not a fact. Very many of the Oude men, Sepoys and others, have emigrated into our provinces, particularly into Azimghur, Jounpoor, and Goruckpoor. So remarkable has been the immigration from Oude into those districts, that Mr. Reade, the Senior Member of the Board of Revenue at Agra, who had been many years Commissioner and Collector there, once pathetically lamented to the writer the great injury that would result to those districts from the annexation of Oude. He said:—"Goruckpoor will return to its former waste state, for the Oude population, who have during the last quarter of a century emigrated with their cattle and ploughs in large numbers into it, will, now that Oude has come into our possession, return to their own hereditary lands." It is true that the Oude ryots have not emigrated in the numbers that British cultivators under the same circumstances would have done; but that is on account of the extreme attachment which, as Hindoos, they bear to their ancestral homes. This love is most eloquently and most truly described by Lord Metcalfe

in these words :—“ If a country remain for a series
 “ of years the scene of continued pillage and massa-
 “ cre, so that the villages cannot be inhabited, the
 “ scattered villagers nevertheless return whenever
 “ the power of peaceable possession revives. A
 “ generation may pass away, but the succeeding
 “ generation will return. The sons will take the
 “ places of their fathers; the same site for the same
 “ village, the same positions for the houses, the same
 “ lands will be re-occupied by the descendants of
 “ those who were driven out when the village was
 “ depopulated; and it is not a trifling matter that
 “ will drive them out, for they will often maintain
 “ their post through times of disturbance and con-
 “ vulsion, and acquire strength sufficient to resist
 “ pillage and oppression with success.”

It is also erroneous to say that the Sepoys invested their savings in land; for land had no saleable value in Oude. It is only within our own territories that land is purchased. In Native States, money is given to an influential minister, or as a fine to Government, by government farmers, for the right of buying from the occupiers or the proprietors the land tax over large tracts: but this is not a proprietary right; for the farmer is changed almost annually, and is usually a courtier who has no hereditary connection with the farm.

Ibid. “ Colonel Sleeman, for many years our
 “ Agent at the Court of Lucknow, and one of the
 “ ablest men who ever held that appointment, was

“ so well aware of this fact, that he lost no oppor-
 “ tunity of impressing upon the Government his
 “ conviction that the annexation of Oudh would pro-
 “ duce disaffection in the native army, principally
 “ because it would transfer the family of the Sepoy
 “ from the operation of the Regal Regulations and
 “ justice of the King of Oudh to our own Civil
 “ Courts.” Where has Colonel Sleeman said this?
 and what are the Regal Regulations and justice of
 the King of Oude? Colonel Sleeman, on the con-
 trary, in July, 1851, being then resident at Lucknow,
 made use of these words: “ It will become a subject
 “ of grave consideration for His Lordship, whether
 “ the Government of India can any longer faithfully
 “ discharge towards the people of Oude the duty to
 “ which it is pledged by many solemn treaties; but
 “ His Majesty has utterly disregarded all the advice
 “ then given by the Governor-General; he has done
 “ nothing to improve the administration, abstained
 “ from no personal indulgence, gives no attention
 “ whatever to public affairs.” “ So inveterate is the
 “ system of misgovernment (in Oude), so deeply are
 “ all those now employed in the administration,
 “ interested in maintaining its worst abuses, and so
 “ fruitless is it to expect the King to remove them
 “ and employ better men, or to inspire any man with
 “ a disposition to serve him more honestly, that
 “ I should not do my duty were I not distinctly to
 “ state that the impression is now general in Oude,
 “ and throughout India I believe, that our Govern-

“ment can no longer support the present Govern-
 “ment, without seriously neglecting its duty not only
 “to the people of Oude, but to the Chiefs and people
 “of India generally; and were the Government of
 “India to interfere to relieve the suffering people of
 “Oude from so terrible a yoke, it would, I believe,
 “carry with it their best wishes and sympathies.”*

The manner in which Lord Dalhousie marched troops into Oude, and prevented, by his rapid strategy, any outbreak or useless waste of blood, deserve the highest praise instead of the stupid abuse which it has elicited in the rhapsodical statement to the effect that the ‘hearts’ of the whole Mahomedan population were, by the annexation, ‘filled with rage.’ For a year after the annexation there was, by this writer’s own shewing, no sign of insurrection. How can it be said that the King was “tricked out of his dominions?”—he was forcibly deposed.

P. 12. “He (Lord Dalhousie) did all this, I may
 “add, in spite of, and in direct contrariety to, the
 “warning voice of the great man whom his paltry
 “littleness and petty jealousy had driven from
 “the country.” Where and when did Sir Charles Napier raise a warning voice? Who ever heard it? There was no mutiny in the 38th Regiment, as has been shewn above, and Lord Dalhousie could not have failed to check what did not exist. The real causes of Sir Charles leaving the country have also been referred to above.†

* Papers relating to Oude, page 28:

† See p. 5.

The asserted dislike of the Sepoys to Lord Dalhousie, is attributed to two measures in these words: —“ Before Lord Dalhousie’s time the roads were “ free to man and beast; that nobleman imposed “ a tax upon all travellers. Previous to his arrival “ in India a Sepoy’s letters were allowed to travel “ free of postage all over India; under Lord Dal- “ housie’s administration he was subjected to the “ same charge as his officer.” Here we have the only two acts, with the exception of the annexation of Oude, which are advanced as having affected the position of the Sepoys injuriously: I will examine them in turn.

First, as to the tolls levied on the roads. Leaving out of sight for the moment the fact that a toll the proceeds of which are expended in the repair of roads is a very legitimate impost, and that men save time and money by paying it, instead of using such as were the old sandy roads of India, I will draw attention to the fact that the toll-gates which have been erected have been placed, and that at long intervals, only on such *new* roads as have been made by Lord Dalhousie and his immediate predecessors, and in almost every case adjoining bridges bestriding streams which could formerly have been crossed only by boats. At the previously existing ferries tolls had always been collected. Has any injury been inflicted by the change? more especially as the bridge tolls are less than were the ferry ones. Again foot passengers (which Sepoys usually are) are not now made to pay tolls on the roads or

bridges, though they were so charged at the old ferries.

The postage question comes next. It is true that Sepoys' letters were formerly sent free of postage to the extent of one per day per company; but they were obliged to pay for all the letters which they *received*. To be quite fair, I allow that the limit of one per company per day was not enforced strictly, and it may have been that practically with lax post-masters all Sepoys' letters *went* free; but they were entitled to receive, and did receive, *none* free of postage. Lord Dalhousie gave India the boon of penny (or rather three-farthing) postage, and with it abolished all franking, thus following the example of the mother country. What was the effect to the Sepoy, of the new postage law? Under the old law he could send a letter from Peshawur to Lucknow for nothing; but an answer would cost a shilling. Under the new law he can for three farthings send the letter, and for another three farthings receive a reply; thus paying for one intercourse by letter with his family $1\frac{1}{2}d$, instead of a shilling. I never before heard that any Sepoy ever complained of either of these measures: most certainly neither of them injured him.

The writer then remarks, finding it probably difficult to account for the delay of a year after the annexation of Oude, before the commencement of the mutiny:—"It might have been supposed that the "feelings of the native Indian community would "have been relieved sensibly by his absence. And

“so, undoubtedly they were for the moment.” But natives have no idea of the persons of Governor-Generals; they cannot discriminate between a Lord Dalhousie and a Lord Canning: they merely look on their individual acts as the acts of the ‘Government,’ and they find fault with or praise the ‘Government’ of the time being, for any order which affects them, without considering who was the particular Governor-General who ordered the measure.

The characters of the several members of the Supreme Government are next given (*pp.* 13, 14, 15); and more calumnious and untrue delineations it would be impossible elsewhere to find.

First is Mr. Dorin. The writer begins by asserting, that a thirty-three years residence in India, and at the capital, must have left a confessedly well educated man as ignorant of the manners and customs of the people of India, as if he had spent those years in England. It surely is not necessary to expose the absurdity of such an assumption as this. At the capital Mr. Dorin must have seen natives from every part of India; must have been in constant communication with officers, civil and military, brim full of information from all parts; and must have acquired much knowledge and experience.

The next words are, “He was verging upon sixty years of age, and in all his habits was a very Sybarite.” Now I have known Mr. Dorin intimately for the last six years, and I emphatically deny that he is given to luxurious living. He is very regular in his habits, is up usually at early dawn, and, after

his morning ride sits down to business, most steadily; regularly, and industriously. I do not deny that he gives good dinners, and the writer of this pamphlet may possibly himself have suffered in his digestion from the champagne, the truffles and *patés de foie gras* pressed upon him by Mr. Dorin; but he did not, I venture to surmise, ever see Mr. Dorin himself indulge in any of these luxuries.

Again, it is an utter absurdity to compare the financial arrangements in India with an English *budget*; they have nothing in common: but, whatever may be the distinction between the respective systems, Mr. Dorin has succeeded well as far as I can recollect in everything that within his own sphere he has undertaken.

With the Sonthal outbreak Mr. Dorin had nothing to do; the Sonthals having been at the time under the charge of the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, and not under that of the Council of India. The latter part of the paragraph as it goes on, is utterly untrue:—he works hard, is by no means void of energy, and has a highly cultivated mind.

After Mr. Dorin comes Mr. John Peter Grant. The writer says, “Unfortunately, he laboured under
“ a complete ignorance of the habits and customs of
“ the natives of Upper India. Accustomed, during
“ his service, to deal only with Bengalees, he had
“ imbibed the extraordinary notion that they were a
“ type of the Hindostanees generally.” For full three years of his early service Mr. Grant was in Rohilkund in Upper India, and in daily communi-

cation with Hindostanees. It was there he first acquired the character for ability which led to his being called to the capital for service there. Subsequently he was employed for three or four years in important work in the Madras Presidency, and again was called back to Calcutta to fill high office. He has not in his nature one particle of vanity or superciliousness, though he is rather shy and reserved: he listens most attentively to any argument which may be advanced against his own opinions.

The writer goes on to say, "Of military men in general he had a jealous dislike, which prompted him on every occasion to oppose any plans or suggestions offered by a member of that profession." One little fact will shew how groundless is this assertion:—Mr. Grant, when lately appointed a Lieutenant-Governor, contrary to all precedent selected a military man (Major Strachey) for his official secretary.

The next sentence is, "He was an adept at intrigue, and, being possessed of a practical knowledge of revenue matters, a plausible manner, an easy address, and considerable influence at the India House, he had gained a seat in Council at an earlier age than was customary." Mr. Grant was selected for a seat in Council solely on account of his eminent ability; and the news of his appointment was received in India by all classes without a disparaging word.

Again, "It was his advice, given because Mr.

“ Halliday proposed an opposite plan, which de-
 “ layed for seven or eight months the proclamation
 “ of martial law in the Sonthal districts.” Mr.
 Grant proposed no plan; nor did he delay the pro-
 clamation of martial law. The fact is, that when
 Mr. Halliday applied for a law to enable him to
 place the Sonthal districts under martial law, Mr.
 Grant and the Council told him that no law was
 necessary, as he could do what he wished at once of
 his own authority under *Regulation X.* of 1804.

The sentence continues—“ and it will be seen, that
 “ on the occasion of the mutiny at Barrackpore, his
 “ pernicious influence was always opposed to those
 “ prompt and severe measures, on the execution of
 “ which the safety of the Empire depended.” This
 is also untrue. In the *Blue Book** is given Mr.
 Grant’s minute, dated 2nd May, 1857, on the con-
 duct of the 34th N. I., and therein are these words :
 —“ Soldiers who in a large body, whether on or off
 “ duty, armed or unarmed, stand quietly by when
 “ other soldiers are in open mutiny, attempting to
 “ murder their Officers before their eyes, deserve a
 “ very much heavier punishment than the mere loss
 “ of a service which they have disgraced.” These
 words, be it observed, were written before the out-
 breaks, either of Meerut or Lucknow took place, and
 were recorded on a proposition of the Governor-
 General to disband the regiment referred to.

I will not remark on the character given to

* Papers relative to the Mutinies in the East Indies, 1857.

General Low, nor on that to Mr. Peacock, except to say, that Mr. Peacock was not afraid of “re-
 “ sorting to urgent measures. On the occasion just
 “ quoted, Mr. Peacock, on the 3rd May, begins his
 “ minute by saying, I am of opinion that nothing
 “ short of the punishment proposed by the Governor-
 “ General would be sufficient for the late mutinous
 “ proceedings, which have brought dishonour and
 “ disgrace upon all, with only few exceptions, of the
 “ Native Officers and Sepoys of the seven Com-
 “ panies of the 34th Regiment Native Infantry,
 “ who were at Barrackpore on the 29th of March
 “ last; and no less punishment would, in my judg-
 “ ment, operate as a sufficient warning and example
 “ to others.”

The next person mentioned is Colonel Birch, and he is abused in most unmeasured terms. Much of this abuse it is impossible to answer, except by such downright denial as that which I now unhesitatingly give it. Of some of the statements I will try and prove the inaccuracies.

P. 15. “ Sir Charles’s bad opinion was, however,
 “ of this service to Colonel Birch, that it obtained
 “ for him Lord Dalhousie’s patronage. That noble-
 “ man, eager to show his spite towards Sir C.
 “ Napier, took the opportunity of the first vacancy
 “ to appoint Colonel Birch, Secretary to the Govern-
 “ ment of India in the Military Department; thus
 “ placing him, *de facto*, at the head of the army
 “ in India—giving him a position, indeed, exactly

“analogous to that of the Minister of War in France.” It is almost insulting to Lord Dalhousie, to say how utterly incapable he was of such meanness as is here imputed to him. Two facts will shew his feelings towards Sir Charles Napier’s friends, from which may be inferred his feelings for the other’s enemies. Lord Dalhousie made a favourite Aide-de-camp of Sir Charles Napier Commandant of his own body guard,—for a young man a most lucrative and honorary post. Secondly, when Sir Charles retired, Lord Dalhousie appointed Major (now Colonel) Kennedy, the Officer on his Staff, who of all others, Sir Charles highly valued, to a new office, of which the salary was the largest ever held in India by one of Her Majesty’s officers of Colonel Kennedy’s then rank.

The next paragraph is “A worse appointment could not have been made. Colonel Birch was essentially a sycophant, always ready to give up his own opinion, if by so doing he could curry favour with his superior. He had tried this plan with Sir C. Napier, but Sir Charles found him out, and not only felt, but shewed contempt towards him in consequence; he found it an easier task to ingratiate himself with Lord Dalhousie and his successor.” I have often heard, and I believe it is true, that the causes of the quarrel between Sir Charles Napier and Colonel Birch are very different from those stated above. Many years ago Sir C. Napier wrote on Court-Martials, and Military Law,

and he consequently thought himself on those subjects an authority. In an important trial by Court-martial he and Colonel Birch differed on a point of law. Colonel Birch stoutly argued for his own view and asserted it, till he was authoritatively overruled by Sir Charles. The proceedings having been sent home to the Horse-Guards, they were returned with a memorandum pointing out the illegalities which Colonel Birch had previously discovered, but the existence of which Sir Charles had denied. Sir Charles never forgave Colonel Birch for being right when he himself had been wrong.

As the writer gives no instance in support of his own view, I can only put my assertion against his, and say that Colonel Birch is a very clever man and is well acquainted with the Bengal army, and that his orders are never quibbling.

Next in order is Mr. Beadon. The whole of the abuse lavished on this gentleman is so general that it is difficult to meet it. To say that he was against progress is notoriously untrue. To Mr. Beadon is due almost the whole credit of the Penny Postage scheme : he worked at that project indefatigably for more than a year. As for his asserted hatred of the press, it was Mr. Beadon who first gave official countenance to it ; and the telegraphs and railways, particularly the former, owe to him a great deal. He was a most influential and active member of the Council of Education, and on Mr. Bethune's death took almost sole charge of the latter's school for

Hindoo females. It appears (*P.* 15) Mr. Beadon was 'unscrupulous' and 'honest;' I don't understand how he with all his ability can be both *unscrupulous* and *honest*.

Lord Canning's character is too well known for it to need my advocacy; and here there is no attempt at justifying abuse by the narration of facts.

On the remarks in the beginning of the 2nd chapter, I will observe, that on the supposition that they planned the mutiny before they left, the departure of the King and Queen of Oude from Lucknow are inexplicable. They might materially have assisted the plot if they had remained there; but the proceeding of both to Calcutta and of the latter again to England were, under the supposed circumstances, insane proceedings. There is little doubt that, whatever he did afterwards, the King had not conspired at the time he left Lucknow.

Then comes the following passage:—"The new system of administration in Oudh, would, he felt satisfied, cause considerable vexation to the families of the Sepoys; and, consequently, no little discontent amongst the Sepoys themselves. His agents were accordingly directed to lay stress on this new interference of the British with the privileges of the natives. It was pointed out to them, that they were the original owners of the land, the lords of the soil; but that now, gradually and insidiously, the British were depriving them of

“ their rights, and resolved to go on until they had
 “ subverted their religion.” There is some truth
 mixed with much misrepresentation here. The an-
 nexation to our Government of the Crown of Oude
 could have caused no interference with the privileges
 of the *natives* as a body; it did so, no doubt, to a
 certain extent with the privileges of the *Sepoys* and
 their families. With regard to the proprietorship
 of the land, it is well known that it has been only
 since the establishment of British rule and British
 protection that this has been at all recognized.
 Under the previous government the rights of the
 occupiers and real owners of the land had been
 trampled upon by farmers of the revenue, who
 screwed out of the actual cultivators every farthing
 that was attainable. How privileges of the *Sepoys*
 had been interfered with, I will make use of the
 words of a late writer to shew. “ It is not to
 “ be doubted that the conversion of Oude into a pro-
 “ vince of the British empire, deprived the families
 “ of a large portion of the Bengal army of the ex-
 “ clusive privileges which they had long considered
 “ to be their birthright, by placing all the other
 “ inhabitants on a level with themselves. As soon
 “ as the proclamation was issued, which converted
 “ Oude into a British province, they ceased to be an
 “ exceptional class. They had no longer the power-
 “ ful protection and mediation of the British Presi-
 “ dency. Fused into the general mass of the
 “ population, they were left to battle for themselves,

“ and were doubtless losers by what was a gain to
 “ the community at large.”*

P. 18: “ The Enfield rifle required a parti-
 “ cular species of cartridge, and this cartridge in
 “ England was greased with lard made from the fat
 “ either of the hog or the ox. Without reflecting,
 “ or if reflecting, ignoring the consequences of his
 “ act, Colonel Birch ordered that the cartridges for
 “ use in India should be made up similarly to the
 “ cartridges in use in England, and should be used
 “ by the native troops ; that is to say, that Hindoo
 “ Sepoys should handle cartridges besmeared with
 “ the fat of their sacred animal, the cow !” With
 all this Colonel Birch had nothing to do. The En-
 field rifle had been introduced, and cartridges, some
 greased in England, and others prepared with grease
 composed of tallow and bees-wax, and made up
 in the Indian arsenal, had been served out in the
 ordinary course by the Ordnance authorities. Im-
 mediately on its being reported to Government that
 the men objected to them, Colonel Birch, under date
 27 January, 1857, wrote to the Inspector-General
 of Ordnance to allow the Sepoys to apply whatever
 grease was required themselves ; and on the same
 date he sent a telegram to the Adjutant-General
 of the army, directing that all cartridges were to be
 thenceforward issued ungreased. Telegrams to the
 same effect were also sent to the officers commanding

* Edinburgh Review, vol. cvi. page 566.

at Umballa and Sealkote, where there were schools of musketry.*

I would here remark that greased cartridges for the arm known as the Minie rifle have been used for years by native troops without objection.

P. 19. "The Government were confident and calm. Although, about this time (Jan. and Feb.), the excited state of the minds of the Sepoys, consequent upon the discovery of the nature of the grease, was reported to them, not a single explanation was offered, not an attempt made to soothe them. It is true that an order was issued, after the interval of almost a month, to serve out no more greased cartridges; but, in the absence of any accompanying explanation, the Sepoys viewed that merely as an evidence that the Government was baffled for the time, and waited only for a more convenient season for the renewal of their insidious attacks on their caste." The first letter which was sent to Government on the subject of the objection of the Sepoys to the greased cartridges, was dated 26th of January; the order to serve out no more was issued the next day, the 27th: this interval of one day, the writer of the pamphlet calls 'almost a month.' Moreover, General Hearsey paraded all the troops at Barrackpore on the 9th of February, and fully explained the matter to them: but the writer of the pamphlet says there was no explanation.

* Papers, &c. App. p. 5.

P. 20. "To give one instance of the apathy of the Government at this momentous period, it will suffice to state that, although disaffection had been manifested in the most marked manner by the Sepoys at Barrackpore and Dumdum, on account of the greased cartridges, towards the end of January, it was not before the middle of the following month that Colonel Birch telegraphed to the schools of musketry at Sealkote and Umballa to prohibit the use by the Sepoys at these stations of the greased cartridge." The telegram, as we have just seen, was sent on the 27th of January, *not* the middle of February.

I pass on to page 25, where it is stated that General Hearsey had a severe *wigging* administered to him by the Secretary to Government, Colonel Birch, for promoting Sheikh Phultoo to be a havildar. This misrepresentation has already been exposed by Lord Granville in the House of Lords. The promotion was confirmed; but Government, to prevent its becoming a precedent, noticed that it had been made without authority.

At the beginning of the 3rd chapter are these words:—"The 19th were disbanded, and in the opinion of the Government a lesson had been therefore read to the Sepoys, which they would not easily forget. They argued that Lord Ellenborough, by the disbandment of a regiment in 1844 (the 34th Native Infantry), had repressed a mutiny, and that Sir Charles Napier, by a similar

“ measure, in 1849, had effected the same end ;
 “ quite oblivious of the fact, that the entire circum-
 “ stances were dissimilar, and that both those states-
 “ men had followed up their disbanding orders by
 “ others.”

It is one of the most remarkable features of the Indian army, that simple dismissal from it is a grave, nay severe military punishment. This is true in the case of a Sepoy newly enlisted, but applies with tenfold force to the native officers, and those men who are entitled to pensions. We have it confessed (*p.* 8) that a “ nobler or more liberal institution than the pension establishment for native soldiers does not exist, and it was thought by those competent to judge, that the estimation of the benefits accruing from it was fixed so firmly in the minds of the Sepoys, that that single consideration would weigh against all temptations to mutiny or revolt.” The mere disbanding of a regiment had answered its purpose respectively in 1844 and 1849 (it should I think be 1850), why should it not answer in 1857? It is said that the circumstances were dissimilar, and that the disbanding orders were on the previous occasions followed up by others. How were the circumstances dissimilar? Mutiny in 1844 is similar I should say to mutiny in 1857; and what were the other orders alluded to? They are not mentioned, and I, for one, know nothing of them.

P. 27. “The Indian statesmen chuckled at the

“ease with which they had (to their own satisfaction) disproved the vaticinations of Lord Dalhousie’s rival.” Sir Charles Napier is here meant. I did fancy that no one but a Napier would ever have called Sir Charles Napier a rival of Lord Dalhousie ! But what are the vaticinations here referred to. The *Edinburgh Review** thus eloquently disposes of this insinuation. “Indeed a prevailing faith in the native troops is conspicuous in Sir Charles Napier’s writings, as it has ever been in the minds of a vast majority of the ablest and most experienced officers. In his well-known report on the military occupation of India, Napier emphatically spoke of the native army of India as one ‘in a good state of discipline, complete in its equipments, full of high courage,’ and with ‘a high military spirit reigning through its ranks.’ ‘This force,’ he added, ‘could be *doubled* without any injurious pressure on the population, and every part of India can furnish recruits in abundance. Our service is extremely popular, and the troops faithful to a proverb.’ We look in vain in his official writings for any thing to bear out the assertion now so frequently made to the disparagement of the Indian Government, that if they had attended to Sir Charles Napier they would not have been taken by surprise.” That the Indian Government was not at the beginning of the year satisfied with the general conduct of the

* Vol. cvi. page 557.

Sepoys may be concluded from the tenor of many documents that have been laid on the tables of the Houses of Parliament; but it abstained from increasing the danger by revealing the concern they may have felt.

Ibid. "The jemadar who commanded the guard of the 34th on the 29th of March, and who had prevented that guard from assisting Lieutenant Baugh, had also been tried and condemned to death. The sentence, however, owing to some red-tape informalities, originating with Colonel Birch, was deferred, most prejudicially to the public interests, to the 21st of April." Considering that this man had been tried for his life, a delay of three weeks between the commission of the crime and the carrying out the sentence of the law was not very long. But long or not, the execution of the jemadar was not deferred through any *red-tapeism* of Colonel Birch, but by the desire of General Anson, who was at a distance in the Hills, and who fancied that it would be illegal to depute to General Hearsey the confirmation of a capital sentence on a native commissioned officer (which a jemadar is).

P. 28. "Hence the wretchedly weak measure of sparing the guard of the 34th, who had beaten their officers; they actually feared to incense them, and believed they were acting the part of statesmen by saving them from condign punishment." The Governor-General in Council in his general

order of the 4th of May, disbanding the 34th Regiment, expresses his deep regret that, of the ruffians “ who perpetrated this cowardly act, the only one “ who was identified has escaped his punishment, “ by desertion.”*

Ibid. “ It has since transpired, that soon after the “ attack upon Lieut. Baugh had been reported to the “ Government, it had been determined to disband “ the 34th, and that an order was at the time drafted “ in which this resolution was announced. For up- “ wards of three weeks that order was kept back.” There was no keeping back of the order. At first courts of inquiry were held, in order if possible to separate the guilty from the innocent ; but eventually on the 30th of April the Governor-General drew up his minute for disbanding the regiment. This minute was concurred in by the members of Government on the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th of May respectively, and the order was carried out on the morning of the 6th of May.

P. 29. “ And it is certainly true that they had “ little other surety for the tranquillity of the country “ than the fidelity of the Sepoy.” Events have, however, proved that the population is with us, though the Sepoy has failed us.

With regard to the suggested future encouragement of the settlement of independent Europeans, it may be asked, when has the Saxon in India wanted or required Government patronage? All he requires

* Papers, &c. App. pp. 157-8.

there as elsewhere, is a clear field and no favour ;— and that he has had. When, and how, and where have members of the Civil Service encouraged the cultivation of opium ; and when, and how, and where have they neglected the cultivation of cotton ? And if they have, why and how do those acts tend to shut out independent Europeans from India ?

In the account of Sir Henry Lawrence's proceedings at Lucknow, the writer attempts to shew that it was Sir Henry's conduct which spurred on Lord Canning to disband the 34th regiment. To this I answer, in conclusion, that Lord Canning's minute was written on the 30th of April, and that Sir Henry Lawrence's spirited proceedings began on the evening of the 3rd of May.

Oriental Club,

15th December, 1857.

IMPORTANT PAMPHLETS

RECENTLY PUBLISHED BY

JAMES RIDGWAY, PICCADILLY.

1. DESCRIPTION OF THE SEAT OF WAR IN EUROPEAN TURKEY. Translated from the Treatise of Baron de Valentini. Third Edition, with Additions. By MONTAGUE GORE, Esq. Price 1s.
2. MR. MONTAGUE GORE'S LECTURE on the ORGANIZATION of the FRENCH ARMY. Delivered at the United Service Institution. With an Appendix—Notes on the Caissons d'Ambulance of the French Army and the Military Schools. Second Edition. Price 1s.
3. LECTURE on the PRODUCTS and RESOURCES of BRITISH INDIA. By MONTAGUE GORE, Esq. Delivered before the St. James's Literary and Philosophical Society. Second Edition. Price 1s.
4. THE GOVERNMENT OF THE EAST INDIA COMPANY and its MONOPOLIES; or, The Young India Party and Free Trade. By MALCOLM LEWIN, Esq., late Second Judge of the Sudor Court of Madras.
Also, by the same Author,
5. HAS OUDE BEEN WORSE GOVERNED BY ITS NATIVE PRINCES THAN OUR INDIAN TERRITORIES BY LEADENHALL-STREET? Price 1s.
6. PUBLIC OFFICES AND METROPOLITAN IMPROVEMENTS. By ALEX. J. BERESFORD HOPE, Esq., M.P. Second edition. Price 6d.
7. THE FORMATION of a NATIONAL PARTY in GERMANY. A Necessity of the Present Crisis. Translated from the German of GUSTAV DIEZEL, by FREDERICA ROWAN. Price 1s.
8. RUSSIA, GERMANY, AND THE EASTERN QUESTION. By GUSTAV DIEZEL. Translated from the German by FREDERICA ROWAN. Price 1s.
10. ON THE MILITIA FORCE AND ITS RIGHT APPLICATION TO THE PRESENT CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE COUNTRY AND THE REGULAR ARMY. A Letter to the Right Hon. Sidney Herbert, Secretary-at-War. From COLONEL MANSFIELD, 53rd Regiment. Second Edition. Price 1s.
11. SPEECH OF THE RIGHT HON. EARL GREY, in the House of Lords, on the 14th February, 1854. Price 6d.
12. EARL GREY'S SPEECH on the WAR Price 1s.
13. LORD BROUGHAM'S SPEECH ON LIFE PEERAGES, February 22, 1856. Price 1s.
14. LORD BROUGHAM'S SPEECH on CRIMINAL LAW PROCEDURE, March 23, 1855. With the Resolutions of the House of Lords. Price 1s.
15. LORD BROUGHAM'S SPEECH on the SLAVE TRADE. House of Lords, June 26, 1855. Price 1s.
16. LORD BROUGHAM'S SPEECH, July 27th, in the House of Lords, on the RELIGIOUS LIBERTIES BILL. With the Bill, Schedules, and Notes. Price 1s.
17. LORD BROUGHAM'S SPEECHES on NATIONAL EDUCATION. House of Lords, 24th July and 4th of Aug. 1854. Price 1s.
18. THE HON. J. HOWE'S SPEECH on the UNION of the NORTH AMERICAN PROVINCES, and on the Right of British Colonists to Representation in the Imperial Parliament, and to Participations in the Public Employments and Distinctions of the Empire. Price 1s.
19. THE HON. J. HOWE'S LETTER to the HON. FRANCIS HINCKS; being a Review of his Reply to Mr. HOWE'S SPEECH on the Organisation of the Empire. Price 1s.

Important Pamphlets published by Ridgway, Piccadilly.

20. **THE FARM SCHOOL SYSTEM** of the CONTINENT, and its Applicability to the Preventive and Reformatory Education of the Pauper and Criminal Children in England and Wales, By JOSEPH FLETCHER, Esq. H.M.'s Inspector of Schools, &c. &c. Price 1s.
21. **LOIS WEEDON HUSBANDRY.** By the Author of "A Word in Season to the Farmer." Bound in cloth. Price 3s 6d. Second edition.
22. **A WORD in SEASON; or, HOW TO GROW WHEAT with PROFIT.** 15th Edition, corrected, with a Word or Two More to those who have Tried. Price 1s.
23. **INSTRUCTIONS for GROWING ITALIAN RYE GRASS.** By WILLIAM DICKINSON. Price 1s. Second edition.
24. **THE FINANCIAL POLICY of WAR. TWO LECTURES** on the FUNDING SYSTEM, and on the Different Modes of Raising Supplies in Time of War, delivered before the University of Oxford, in Trinity Term, 1855. By GEORGE K. RICKARDS, M.A., Professor of Political Economy. To which are added some Remarks on Mr. Newmarch's Recent Publication, "On the Loans raised by Mr. Pitt during the first French War." Price 1s.
25. **MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE. REMARKS** upon the LAW of MARRIAGE and DIVORCE. Suggested by the Hon. Mrs. Norton's Letter to the Queen. Price 1s. Second edition, with Appendix.
26. **THE NEW METHOD OF PLANTING, SETTING, or DIBBLING GRAIN, PULSE, MANGOLD, &c. &c.** By SIGMA. Price 1s. Third Edition.
27. **THE SPEECHES of the HON. THOMAS ERSKINE** (afterwards LORD ERSKINE), when at the Bar, on Subjects connected with the Liberty of the Press, and against Constructive Treason. With Preface by the Rt. Hon. Lord Brougham. New Edit. 4 vols. 8vo. Portrait. Price £2. 2s.
28. **JOHNSON and SHAW'S FARMER'S ALMANAC for 1857.** Containing Lists of Fairs—Farmers' Clubs—Agricultural Societies—and all Agricultural Improvements to the Present Time—With Lists and Prices of the best Implements and their Makers, &c. &c. &c.—the whole having been re-written for this year. Price 1s sewed, and 2s bound and interleaved.
29. **MANNING the NAVY. VICE-ADMIRAL BOWLES'S PAMPHLETS** on NAVAL AFFAIRS, from 1815 to 1853, now first collected. With a Preface on the best Means of Manning the Navy. Price 6s bound in cloth.
30. **LORD COLLINGWOOD'S MEMOIRS and CORRESPONDENCE, PUBLIC and PRIVATE.** By G. L. NEWNHAM COLLINGWOOD, Esq. F.R.S. Fifth Edition. 2 vols. 12mo. 12s.
The portrait of one English worthy more is now secured to posterity."

Quarterly Review.

"We do not know when we have met with so delightful a book as this, or one with which we are so well pleased with ourselves for being delighted. Its attraction consists almost entirely in its moral beauty."—*Edinburgh Review.*

"Having thus referred to Lord Collingwood's Life, I may be allowed to say, that the publication of that volume is indeed a national good; it ought to be in every officer's cabin, and in every statesman's cabinet."—*Southey's Life of Lord Nelson*, New Edition, p. 348.
31. **WHAT NEXT—AND NEXT?** By RICHARD COBDEN, Esq. M.P. Price 1s.
32. **1793 AND 1853. In Three Letters.** By RICHARD COBDEN, Esq. M.P. Fifth Edition. Price 2s.
33. **SPEECH OF LORD JOHN RUSSELL** on NATIONAL EDUCATION, 1s.
34. **SPEECH OF THE RIGHT HON. ROBERT LOWE**, on THE LAW OF PARTNERSHIP and JOINT STOCK COMPANIES, 1s.
35. **SPEECH OF THE RIGHT HON. ROBERT LOWE**, on THE ABOLITION OF LOCAL DUES UPON SHIPPING, 1s