



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



4

W. J. Brown

THE MAHARAJA
OF
KASHMEER
AND
HIS CALUMNIATORS

1870

TOURS
IMPRIMERIE DE J. BOUSEREZ

8022 dd

THE MAHARAJA
OF
KASHMEER
AND
HIS CALUMNIATORS

*L
Lalab Singh*

THE MAHARAJA

OF

KASHMEER

AND

HIS CALUMNIATORS

—
1870
—

TOURS

IMPRIMERIE DE J. BOUSEREZ

THE REASON WHY

The recent publication, by Longman, Green & Co^y, of a singularly illogical, ill-written and mendacious Book-let, entitled 'Cashmeer misgovernment,' allegedly written by 'Robert Thorp,' has revived the question how far it might be just, right and proper, to deprive the Sovereign of an independent state of his principality because some men, whose notions of right and wrong are as perverse, as their arguments are weak, conceive he does not govern his subjects by the light they desire. The opportunity is considered suitable to reprint a series of articles that appeared, some two years ago, in the Dehli Gazette, in refutation of a number of accusations of a calumnious character brought, against the Maharajah of Kashmeer, by the Rev. Arthur Brinckman in a pamphlet which it is believed that Gentleman took

pains to circulate largely in England. These articles deal categorically with Mr Brinckman's allegations, and if he be still in England he is hereby challenged to produce satisfactory evidence, other than his own assertions, in support of what he has affirmed.— A sentence has, here and there, been added to present the case more fully to the public, and a few verbal alterations have been made, otherwise the articles remain as they were published.— The notes '1870' are new.

The 1st May, 1870.

THE MAHARAJA OF KASHMEER, AND HIS CALUMNIATORS.

I. — The FRIEND OF INDIA, and the REV. A. BRINCKMAN.
(Reprinted from the Dehli Gazette, April and May, 1868)

« The *Friend of India*, of the 23rd April, [1868] has an article that calls for some remarks at our hands regarding the present government of Kashmir, and although it may appear somewhat late in the day to write on this subject in particular, it is never too late to use our best endeavours to put the *whole* question, as between the Rajah of Kashmir and his calumniators, in the light which a certain portion of the Punjab official world, and of the Press of India, are carefully desirous of excluding from the points at issue. Our cotemporary takes a pamphlet, copy of which has been in our possession for some time, by the « Revd. Arthur Brinckman, late Missionary in Kashmir, » as his text for his comments on the alleged existing state of affairs. Singular to say these comments, though verging on the extreme recommendation of annexation, are, on the whole, not tinged with that bitter spirit of enmity that pervaded the remarks of the *Friend* during the incumbency of the gentleman recently in the editorial chair of Serampore, and it is, probably, owing to his absence that the Maharajah has not been condemned in the wholesale fashion formerly indulged in, and sentenced, out of hand, to deposition from the throne to which he rightfully succeeded, as his father's son, with the entire

concurrence of the British Government, and in virtue of the solemn treaties entered into between that Government and his father the Maharajah Goolab Sing twenty two years ago.

But there is quite enough brought forward to lead to the question, whether all that is alleged in the pamphlet, and in the editorial columns of the Serampore hebdomadal, be as true as those concerned desire the public to believe, and deserving of the very severe sentence called for at the hands of the late missionary and of the editor.

We have, on more than one occasion, expressed our belief that no one would accuse us of partiality for native governments in general, or that of Kashmeer in particular, but we consider it right that those denounced in the wholesale manner adopted by the enemies of the Rajah of Jummo, during the last eighteen months, should have a fair hearing, and not be condemned, without due consideration, by the English public in and out of India; and though *we* shall never stand forth as the advocates of irresponsible power in the hands of a native or any other prince or ruler, nor as the apologists of acts of oppression or tyranny, we deem it our duty to examine, carefully and without favor, how far the allegations of misrule, oppression, tyranny and cruelty, brought against a feudatory of the British empire, are founded on such substantial facts as to warrant the sentence of deposition so loudly called for by the late missionary, though not now fully endorsed by the *Friend*.

We shall, therefore, proceed so to examine the various points made against the Maharajah and his government, premising that, although it *was* a great and unpardonable mistake (Talleyrand declared that political mistakes were worse than crimes) on the part of the British Government to sell Kashmeer and its dependencies to the father of the present ruler, it cannot, under the worst view of the case, be alleged that Goolab Sing was to blame in purchasing an article, whatever might be its nature, that was offered to him for sale by the rightful owner, the more especially as he had assisted in prepa-

ring the title deeds of such property, and knew they were good. The money paid, according to the conditions of the deed of sale, the property became absolutely that of the purchaser, and no sophistry, on the part of the special pleaders who desire to deprive the present owner of his lawful inheritance, can eliminate the faintest of grounds for resuming property that has been so formally, and so completely, alienated in perpetuity.

No one can, honestly and sincerely, profess to believe that this independent principality was sold *de bene esse*, during the good pleasure of the British Government, or conditionally on the good conduct of Raja Goolab Sing. It is true a treaty was made with the purchaser, and certain provisions were made, but that treaty was concluded as between two states negotiating on nearly an equal footing, and, what is most note-worthy, no penal condition, of any kind whatsoever, was attached to the non-observance of any of its provisions, and not one of these bore any reference to the mode, good, bad or indifferent, in which the country was to be governed. Had the contracting parties introduced a clause, to the effect that Maharajah Goolab Sing was bound to good government, in the usual sense of that phrase, as understood by us, and that an infraction of that condition would lead to resumption; or had it been stipulated that the paramount power would have the future option of resuming the land on re-payment of the purchase money, in the event of its being found that the people were not being equitably treated, then indeed, we are prepared to admit, were misgovernment brought home to the purchaser, the seller would have been justified in enforcing the terms of a treaty so framed, and of resuming possession.

But how does the matter really stand? Looking to the treaty itself we find that, so far from there being any penal clause among the articles agreed upon, their tenor is absolutely the other way in this respect, for *Article I* declares, that « the British Government transfers and makes over *for ever, in independent possession*, to Maharajah Goolab Sing, and the heirs male of his body, all the hilly country, etc. »

In *Article XII*, of another treaty, namely that of 11th March, 1846, entered into between the British Government and the Lahore State, on the conclusion of the Sutlej campaign, it is further provided that : — « In consideration of the services rendered by Rajah Goolab Sing of Jummoo to the Lahore State, towards procuring the restoration of the relations of amity between the Lahore and British Governments, the Maharajah [Dhuleep Sing] hereby agrees to recognize the independent sovereignty of Rajah Goolab Sing in such territories and districts in the hills as may be made over to the said Rajah Goolab Sing by separate agreement between himself and the British Government, with the dependencies thereof, which have been in the Raja's possession since the time of the late Maharajah Khuruk Sing, and the British Government, in consideration of the good conduct of Rajah Goolab Sing, also agrees to recognize his independence in such territories, and to admit him to the privileges of a separate treaty with the British Government. »

We may observe, *en passant*, on this significant *fact*, that, while, in the treaty with the Lahore Government, as reconstructed by this treaty, there is a clause (*Art. XVI.*), to the effect that « the subjects of either state, shall, on visiting the territories of the other, be on the footing of the subjects of the most favored nation, » there is no corresponding condition in the treaty with Goolab Sing! This allows a reasonable ground for believing that such clause was purposely omitted at the time of the conclusion of the negotiation, it being borne in mind that the making of this treaty followed the Lahore agreement within five days. The insertion of the clause in one treaty, and its omission in the other, would, therefore, lead to the very reasonable conclusion, not only that the subject had been considered, but that the omission of it from the second document forms the basis of the Maharajah's claim to the option of permitting travellers to visit Kashmeer at all, as well as at such seasons only as he may deem proper, and in such numbers as he may consider fair with reference to the

carrying and other capabilities of his people (4).

Let us now, before proceeding to the more detailed consideration of the allegations of the *Friend* and of the late missionary, turn to a brief review of certain episodes in the not very early history of the British (a professedly Christian) Government in India, with the object of drawing comparisons that may not be altogether pleasant to those who are over loud and persistent in their condemnation of the native (heathen) rule they are so anxious to subvert. It should be borne in mind, at the same time, that there are far more powerful engines at work to carry this, to them most desirable point, than those plied by the *Friend of India*, and the late missionary in Kashmeer. But they are carefully, and wisely, kept out of sight.

Some of our readers are no doubt familiar with, or, if not familiar with, have read, the history or « story » of the early days of the invasion of Bengal by the servants of the Hon'ble the East India Company, military and civil. Some, perhaps many, have not. To refresh the memory of the first, and for the information of the second class of our readers, we take leave to devote a moment or two to certain prominent incidents of those early days which we are occasionally apt to forget or would rather not remember. They relate, more especially, to the banishment of sundry Missionaries, who had come to India to preach the Gospel to the heathen of the land as commanded by their Lord and Master, and to the very stringent rules affecting the residence in the country of what were then, and are even now, by some *good* people, termed « Interlopers. »

With regard to the first of these historical events it is merely necessary to allude to the fact that, so great was

(4) Both these reservations have, recently, been very considerably modified, the restrictions both on the number of visitors, and the period at which, or during which, they may visit Kashmeer being, so far, withdrawn by the present Maharajah, that it is optional with Europeans to remain in Kashmeer all the year round, provided they comply with the existing local regulations on the subject. —
« 4870. »

the dread of the governing body, both at home and in India, of the proselitizing efforts of the great apostles of missions in Bengal, they were (not more than seventy years ago) absolutely prohibited from residing within the limits of the Bengal Presidency. Those who, at the time, had already established themselves there were summarily ordered to quit. Some sought and found refuge in the Danish settlement of Serampore, and there received that hospitality denied them, in the most oppressive manner, by the representatives of a professedly Christian Government and people; and it was only when better counsels began to prevail, several years after, that the rigour of this enforced banishment, which included a prohibition against the landing of all other missionaries on the inhospitable shores of Bengal, was relaxed by degrees, and finally withdrawn in concession to irrepressible public indignation and outcry in England. This occurred in the early years of the eighteenth century of the *Christian* era. We suspect very few people will now be induced to maintain that England, and its government, practised obedience, or even professed to obey, at that time, the dictates of a higher state of progressive civilization than they wish now to accord to the most enlightened native rulers of the present day. Whence then the cry against the benighted Maharaja Runbheer Sing? Clearly he is much more liberal, in regard to missionaries, than were the enlightened English of sixty years since, as will be hereafter proved on the own showing of his present calumniators, or he would not permit them to preach the Gospel in Kashmeer, or even to cross his frontier.

As to interlopers, they were even in a worse condition than missionaries. Their enforced exclusion *from*, or barely tolerated residence *in*, India, continued very much longer. No British subject could venture into the country, unless armed with a formal permission, obtained under stringent penalties from the Court of Directors at home; or if he sometimes did land on Indian shores without such permission, it was at the imminent risk of being summarily expelled at the pleasure

Letter
"Runbheer Sing"

of the local Government, such expulsion involving, in most cases, absolute ruin. No man could proceed into the interior of the country unless protected by a passport from the local Government. And it is only thirty-four years ago that this violent prohibition, enforced by a *British* Government against *British* subjects, was removed by Act of Parliament, and then only as far as Calcutta was concerned, in the teeth of the strenuous opposition of the Court of Directors of the East India Company. Throughout the mofussil, — in Kumaon during Mr. Trail's Commissionership, *and at a much later date*; — in Dehra Dhoon while Mr. Shore reigned there; and even in Huzara, within the last twenty years, during the incumbency of Captain Becher as Deputy Commissioner, British officials, if not the British Government, did all that lay in their power, officially and unofficially, to prevent interlopers from visiting or settling in any but the suddur stations of the province or district. And even there they were frequently exposed to treatment of the most offensive and despotic nature, so bad as to amount to a prohibitive warning to others not to go and put their heads in the lion's mouth.

Be it especially remembered that all these measures were directed against subjects of the Sovereign of Great Britain, by servants, in a secondary degree, of the same Sovereign; and that even travellers, visiting the country out of pure curiosity, were, unless of exalted rank, or protected by special letters, treated with a suspicion that amounted, in many instances, to police surveillance. As to foreigners it was only when armed with the most imperative mandate from authority in England that could not be denied, that they could get a glimpse of the otherwise hermetically sealed British Empire in India. These things are within the memory of many men still living. We know of an instance in which a dweller in the N. W. P., with a « permit » from the Court of Directors, was threatened with deportation « unless he behaved himself. » That meant that he was to conduct himself with due deference to the existing high and mighty local authorities. We go

further, and maintain that there are servants of Government and of the Indian public, especially of the heaven-born or old civilian class, who would, even now, if they could and dared do so, deport every British man, woman and child not belonging to or connected with « the service. »

So much for the conduct of the British Government towards British subjects. We might dwell on the « ancient » practices of certain of the members of the « service, » who, under the sanction of their own individual caprice, violated the rights of any and every native government that strove to resist arbitrary proceedings, who insisted on such native governments levying, from other and less « privileged » traders, such duties as effectually prevented *their* entering on successful competition with the civil-service merchant, who in fact forcibly appropriated the entire monopoly that enabled men to retire, in those days, to their native « bustees » in ten or fifteen years with colossal fortunes.

We might also hint at the perversion of justice, by which, in those same days, Judges and Magistrates, professing the Christian religion, disgracefully resorted to any ends that might afford them profit or advancement at the expense of the heathen subjects of the government they were supposed to represent. What wonder then that really good and zealous Missionaries, when, at last, permitted to preach the Gospel, did so under the greatest difficulties, raised and maintained by many of the so-called Christian governors of the land?

But we think we have adduced quite sufficient to entitle any native chief to ask by what right *we*, the sons and successors of men who did such things, presume to reflect injuriously on a heathen sovereign who, in the exercise of what he deems his « right divine, » and only following, in so doing, the steps of his forefathers, considers *he* has a right to do as he pleases with his own.

Let us view the subject calmly and fairly, apart from all feeling as to what *we* should like, or to what *we now* consider right or consider wrong, and proceed, in that spirit, to examine the accusations so gravely brought

against the Maharajah by men professing the Christian religion, and who, nevertheless, do not hesitate to bear false witness against their neighbour of Kashmir. It is not sufficient that an accuser should *believe* in the truth of the evidence, on which he may speak; he must *know* it to be *true* and reliable, otherwise no one else can or will believe *him*; it is true, a great deal has been written of late, in many instances by persons who evidently had an interest in dwelling on the so-called cruelties and oppressions of the Maharajah, but nothing has, hitherto, been brought forward at all approaching to the crude unsupported allegations of the late missionary to Kashmir, who thinks it no *sin* deliberately to recommend that Maharajah Runbheer Sing should be robbed of his property, and plundered of his estate, because he, a heathen sovereign, without the light of the Gospel to guide him in his onerous task of governing a large independent principality, who is not bound to do right by anything but his interest, who makes no pretence, who has conceded much that he never engaged to concede, is *said* to have followed the example set him, not so very long ago, by British Christian rulers in India in regard to missionaries, Interlopers and visitors, and to have done, because he thought it was for the good of his subjects, supported by *his* religion, what those Christian rulers deliberately did before him in the full knowledge that they acting contrary to the most sacred precepts of *their* Gospel. Is our press, or a portion of it, so utterly lost to all sense of justice, right and honor, as to support suggestions of this kind, and to applaud the outpourings of writers such as the late missionary in Kashmir, who, considering that he has received nothing but civil and courteous treatment at the hands of the Maharajah and his dependants, does not blush to string together no less than fifty-two reasons for robbing him of *his* possessions? And yet it is a fact that of these fifty-two allegations, to be considered by us, fully and carefully in detail, hardly ten have any *show* of truth to support them, while the rest are mere assertions avowedly based on the *hearsay* of men, who

crossing Kashmeer from North to South, or East to West, and taking the replies they get to leading questions for gospel, imagine they *know* the country, its people and its ruler, and have, therefore, a right to brand him as a tyrant, oppressor and worse, on evidence that would not, for an instant, be admitted in a Court of Justice, and be equally rejected by the most latitudinarian court of Equity.

We do not mean to say, for one moment, that there are not irregularities, and probably more than irregularities, in the Jummoo territory, that oppression is not resorted to, here and there, in distant provinces, too far off to be effectually controled in a country consisting of all but inaccessible districts, cut off, for six months at a time, from all communication with higher authority, or that extortion is not practised by officials who imagine they may do so with impunity. But let us remember that these blots, sought to be brought out prominently in a country ruled by a native prince, and on which some of us are casting longing eyes, may, at this day, be traced by careful enquirers to within the very shadow of Vice-regal and other great Christian authorities in British India. Then why not in Kashmeer? And if somewhat worse in Kashmeer than in British India why all this outcry about the alleged mis-government of a country, we deliberately chose to alienate, selling its inhabitants at so much a head? They may reign a trifle more or less triumphantly *there* than *here*, but we maintain that were a careful, impartial enquiry instituted into the vices of the respective governments, the difference, as a recent official publication, noticed by us at the time, and criticised in Parliament, has shown, would not be found so *very* greatly in our favor.

All this only by way of introduction to remarks we shall have to offer when considering the many and grave accusations brought against the Kashmeer ruler by Mr. Brinckman. The subject is of the deepest interest, and, considering the efforts being made, in certain quarters, to perpetuate the annexation policy, not devoid of painful misgivings.

Mr. Brinckman's accusations against the Rajah of Kashmeer, in the list of crimes imputed to that chief, are indeed very grave, but we do not find that they are supported by anything like the trustworthy evidence that would be required by an impartial mind bent on arriving at something like truth. The Rajah has been dragged to the bar of British public opinion by a self-constituted public prosecutor, who has so far done his duty well, that he has not omitted anything, however weak, that could, by any possibility, be tortured, even by an extraordinary stretch of the most lively imagination, into a crime. We do not consider this fair, just or generous, and hence our interference.

We, therefore, enter seriatim upon the charges deliberately preferred against the Maharajah by the Rev. A. Brinckman, backed to a very material, if not to their full, extent, by the *Friend of India*. He says : —

1. — *First be it remembered that, as far back as 1820, envoys were sent to us from Kashmeer asking for protection.*

Here, at the very outset, is a sample of Mr. Brinckman's most illogical reasoning. *Because*, forty-eight years ago, some Kashmeerees were deputed, or came, to the British Agent Cis-Sutlej States, at the instigation of an unaccredited English traveller (Moorcroft) to seek protection against the tyrannies of an *Afghan Mussulman* governor from Kabul (for Kashmeer wa then a dependency of Kabul), *therefore* we must annex the territory of a *Hindoo* prince who came into possession years after, under the auspices of our Government, and to whom we deliberately sold the territory !

2. — *That it was a cruel injustice (nothing in the annals of slavery was worse) selling Kashmeer to Gholab Singh at all, the injustice being the greater, as an inoffensive people, who, who never harmed us, (who once had asked us to govern them, and who still wished for us to be their masters instead of Gholab Singh, who was hated from Leh to Jummoo), were handed over to*

a tyrant, whose antecedents had caused his name to be hated by the Kashmerees.

In the first place what evidence is there that Goolab Singh *was* hated? There is nothing tangible in support of this allegations though it is very possible that the Mus- sulman Kashmeerees would hate a Hindoo ruler purely on account of his religion. In the next, does it follow that because he may have been hated, his successor is equally detested? Again, who committed this « cruel injustice? » Who *sold* Kashmeer to Goolab Singh? Why, the Christian Governor General of British India, with the consent and by the advice of a great and good man, Colonel Sir Henry Lawrence, whose like for warm- hearted interest in the people of India, and great phi- lanthropy towards the human race in general, we may not see again in haste, and who had plausible if not very philanthropic reasons for doing as he did. But how, by any possible inference, Goolab Singh is to be blamed, and his son to be deposed, because two such men as Lord Hardinge and Sir Henry Lawrence committed a « cruel injustice, » we cannot, for the life of us, under- stand. That these great British Officers made a mistake, and a cruel mistake, is beyond question. Read the tran- saction by the light of the present day, and we see it. But even they had reasons to allege for their action in the sale. Goolab Singh had done good service, and had to be rewarded. The Lahore political horizon was not clear. Many Khalsa troops were hanging about Lahore, and in many parts of the Punjab, especially Mooltan, where a powerful satrap held almost independent sway, threateningly. Lord Gough had only three thousand European soldiers with him on his advance to Lahore. It is no libel *now* to say, what Feroze Shah, or Peeroos- huhur, had lamentably proved, that the native troops were *not* to be depended on, while even British troops, unsup- ported as they unhappily were, wavered before their foe and fell temporarily into confusion « under a misappre- hension of orders. » Goolab Sing probably asked for Kashmeer as the reward of his services, and not to have complied with his request would have made him our ene-

my. Were the British Commanders in a position to refuse, and to meet a combination of the Lahore and Jummoo armies? No. Then they wanted money, certainly the least defensible reason, and by selling Kashmeer they obtained a supply; at the same time they made a firm friend of Goolab Singh, and extricated themselves from the great difficulties otherwise looming ahead. Nevertheless they were wrong in selling Kashmeer and its inhabitants at so much a head. But Goolab Singh cannot, by any possible turn of Mr. Brinckman's logic, be made responsible for this wrong.

Then as to the assertion that the Kashmeerees were anxious for our rule. The bargain, we have simply to observe, was concluded before the Kashmeerees could have known any thing of our army being at Lahore, and therefore had no opportunity afforded them for manifesting a preference one way or the other. We are ready to concede that had there been time for consulting them, and for asking them whether they would prefer British to native rule, they would perhaps have pronounced for the former. Fairly admitting so much, we are still inclined to doubt the existence of any *present* general desire to come under British rule. Does not the « correspondence on the comparative merits of British and native rule » in a great measure justify our assumption? Here and there a man will, as a matter of course, tell the propounder of a leading question that he and his are most anxious to be rid of the Rajah, and that nothing would be more desirable than the resumption of the country by the British Government, but we more than doubt the sincerity of such replies, and must have more reliable evidence than mere assertions before we can fully believe in the existence of any such desire so expressed. The writer of the pamphlet here calls the Kashmeerees an inoffensive people, and elsed where dwells on their good qualities. We on the other hand, declare that a more lying deceitful race of people does not exist on the face of the earth.

3. — *That it is source of serious discontent amongst the Mussulmen in Kashmeer, and not there only, our having sold so many followers of Islam to a Hindoo idolater, to rule over, and terribly oppress as well.*

It possibly is a source of discontent to the Mussulmans of Kashmeer that our Government should have sold their country to the father of the present Hindoo Prince, but surely that is no fault of his. Indeed we do not doubt the circumstance, but can it be intended that it should form the ground, or one of the grounds, for the desired deposition of the present owner of the territory, who acquired his right of possession through purchase by his father from the British Government? Is the writer, may we ask, intending to create the idea that Mahomedans prefer British rule to that of « Hindoo idolaters » because British rulers profess Christianity? Is Mr. Brinckman prepared, on the strength of his own experience, to declare, against the experience and conviction of many men at least quite as well, if not better, qualified to judge, that Mussulmans are contented under British rule in British territory? Let the Wahabec conspiracies answer the question. But even assuming that the wish for British rule may exist, can the surmise be taken to justify wholesale robbery? When Jhansee, to take a recent instance, was handed over to Scindia for his good will during the mutiny, the people in general were reported to have complained of the transfer — but Scindia rules there still.

4. — *That the Mullahs pray daily for us to come and govern Kashmeer, and the whole of that country echoes the prayer.*

If this be really true, that is to say, if the writer makes the remarkable assertion, on the authority of other than his own domestics, or of native visitors too courteous to contradict an expression of their host, it is one of the most striking proofs adducible of the toleration of the Maharaja's government in religious matters, and clearly refutes much of what is advanced on this head in the pamphlet before us. Were a Moolla of the chief mosque,

of Agra, say, to do the like in our hearing, as regards the coming of the Russians, for example, we should consider it our duty, and consider it the duty of all good men, to hand him forthwith over to the police as a preacher or fomentor of sedition. How many men were hanged during the rebellion for only wishing for the expulsion of the British from India? That is a question Mr. Brinckman would not perhaps wish answered. (It is barely possible that we have mistaken Mr. Brinckman's meaning, and that for «priests» we ought to read «boatmen.» But the context forbids this interpretation.)

5. — *That the Government is so bad in Kashmere, that it is a great reproach to us not to do away with it as that country prays.*

It is a much greater reproach to us we think, that we should have sold the country, and the reproach would be infinitely greater still were we to lay violent hands on that which it not ours, as Mr. Brinckman would wish. The Government is not all that it should be, we admit, but for the matter of that, neither is the British Government, notwithstanding every effort of the authorities to secure the happiness and contentment of the people *sua si bona norint*. The painful fact is admitted by the best and most experienced servants of the state. We have frequently shown that the paramount power at one time carries the non-interference policy much too far when it is really and truly in a position to prescribe better systems of Government, while at others it has carried its interference policy much beyond its fair limit.

6. — *That hundreds and hundreds of Kashmeerees die yearly, owing to the avarice and oppression of the rajah.*

This is a very vague and illogical assertion. Avarice and oppression do not usually cause death. All history instructs us that the most avaricious and oppressive of tyrants cannot go beyond a certain point without being

called to account, and we are inclined to give the Kashmeerees more credit for pluck than does their champion. The test would lie in the enumeration of his subjects who now abandon the Rajah's territory to seek protection at the hands of the British Government in British territory where they must know they would be welcomed. We guess the enumerator would have an easy task of it.

7. — *That the rajah has several times violated the treaty between our Government and Gholab Singh.*

This is not a bad specimen of the description of vague and therefore apparently malicious accusation in which the late Missionary in Kashmeer indulges. The necessity for adducing even so much as a shadow of proof does not appear to have entered his mind. It surely is no great thing we demand, as a matter of simple justice, that accusations of so grave a character should be supported by incontrovertible proof, and that instances, proving these accusations to be something more than mere shadowy allegations, should be clearly cited. Mr. Brinckman says in one part of his pamphlet, that he can bring forward evidence, but why does he not do so for the satisfaction of his readers instead of himself proceeding, on his bare assertion, to pronounce the Rajah guilty beyond doubt and sentence him out of hand to the extreme punishment of loss of his large, and we must admit beautiful, possessions.

8. — *That the famines in Kashmere are not caused as a general rule by the failure of the crops, but by the locking up of the grain, by the doling it out in handfuls at exorbitant prices, and by sending the grain out of the country to sell in the hills near Ghilghit, the peasants whose labour produced that grain being forced to carry the loads to Ghilghit themselves, where hundreds of them die from cold and starvation yearly, with loads of food on their backs.*

To render this grave charge, a very serious one as the deliberate and premeditated sacrifice of human life

is involved, more complete, and to clearly establish his facts, the writer is bound to show, conclusively, the object the accused chief has in doing that which is imputed to him. Though Political Economy, as we have often found to our cost, is one of the very many sciences of comparatively modern date it is next to impossible to teach the Asiatic, we are inclined to think there must be some misconception or misrepresentation here. The Rajah is, we believe, far too astute to sacrifice his goose for the golden eggs it may contain in the way here represented. The present gain to him cannot be of sufficient magnitude to blunt his subtle intellect so far as to induce him to sacrifice future and permanent wealth and prosperity to temporary profit, however large. This merely as an opinion by the way. We believe, as we have already said, that in some, we will even say in many, instances of ill government, by distant subordinates, and in others of insufficient or ill adapted arrangements, the Rajah may be ill-advised, but we do *not* believe that he is either wilfully cruel or stupidly foolish. He is, we believe, as fully alive to the wisdom of keeping his people as contented, as general circumstances will permit, as most rulers. Allowing, however, that human life is wantonly sacrificed as described, how does it happen that the paramount power which might reasonably tender its recommendation to more merciful consideration, is so remiss as not even to remonstrate? The Nawab of Tonk was deposed for one murder, and that never brought home to himself individually! Is it the sole business of the British representative in Kashmeer to spend his six months in ease and quietness, to look on and leave his Government in ignorance of all the atrocities that are committed, according to the Rajah's enemies, though it is just possible he does not hear of them for the simple reason that they do not occur!

There have been many famines in Kashmere. Famines may originate and be intensified in various ways. They may be caused, as in the British territory of Orissa two years ago, by the gross carelessness of officials heedless of advice and wilfully shutting their

eyes to the signs of the times. They certainly *may* be caused by the storing of grain by greedy and avaricious people, but they have also been *averted* by the self-same course. It is on record that one Joseph distinguished himself, some twenty six centuries ago, by so doing. However that may be we remember hearing, and the fact is beyond dispute, the purchase having been made through Umritser merchants, that, during a famine of recent occurrence in Kashmeer, the Rajah himself purchased large quantities of wheat and rice from the nearest territory (the Punjab) capable of furnishing supplies, the very thing the men responsible for mismanagement in Orissa did not do till it was too late, and distributed the supplies he paid for out of his treasury at a cost of Rs 500,000 for a trifle to the Kashmerees who were starving because their own crops were deficient. We do not think it *likely* he would keep his storehouses closed and open his treasury, to purchase supplies in a distant country, when he had the quantities alleged within his own reach and under his own lock and key! Then, forced labor is not singular in Kashmeer; it is more or less the rule in every town and village in British India outside Calcutta, especially when required by officials, who are never slow to allow labour to be pressed for themselves, though they systematically refuse to allow any pressure of the kind on behalf of outsiders! The statute book will show Mr. Brinckman that the legislature has legalised compulsory labour!

9. — *That the rajah has attacked neighbouring hill tribes sometimes without our permission, violating Article 5 of the treaty.*

We cannot determine whether by « our permission » Mr. Brinckman means his own or that of the British Government, but let him name the particular hill tribe to which he refers, and we will decide upon the weight to be attached to his testimony. We can remember only one tribe upon whom the Rajah has made war, and they may be truly and strictly described as rebels. (We allude to the Trans-Indus tribe of Ghilgit, who are

constantly held up as having been an independent people whom the Rajah was anxious to bring under his subjection.) They have been *acknowledged* to be such by the British Government. Their country was, to all intents and purposes, a dependency of Kashmir, and thus came within the terms of the treaty, which provides that « the limits of the territories of Maharajah Goolab Sing shall not, at any time, be changed without the concurrence of the British Government. »

10. — *That this causes ill feeling among those tribes towards us, they knowing that the rajah is bound by treaty with us not to take up arms against them at all without our special permission and sanction.*

Our remarks to the previous charge apply here. We have simply to observe now that rebellions are, no doubt, caused by ill-feeling, as witness the great rebellion of 1857, against the British Government. To apply Mr. Brinckman's reasoning they ought not to have stirred hand or foot to suppress *it* because it was caused by « ill feeling! »

11. — *That false reports of these affairs are sent to us by the rajah, or published by him, to make us think what an excellent ally we have, keeping these frontier tribes in check at no expense to ourselves.*

Neither the present, nor the late Rajah, has on any occasion attacked any people that can, by any pressure of words, be called « tribes on the frontier of British India. » When Juwahir Sing rebelled against the father of the present Rajah (his cousin) the British Government of the Punjab, then administered by Mr. John Lawrence as Chief Commissioner, actually countenanced the levy of troops in our territory by Juwahir Sing, to aid him in fighting our ally Goolab Sing, and matters might have gone to extremities (for Mr. John Lawrence was, at the time, well known to entertain no particularly friendly feelings for Goolab Sing, and to be indulging in a hankering after his possessions) had

not Lord Dalhousie peremptorily prohibited the further lending of any countenance whatever to Juwahir Sing!

12. — *That the Kashmere government are in the habit of sending false reports of affairs in that country to some of the India newspapers.*

Which of the Indian newspapers? Are those papers so ill managed that they do not possess the means of judging of the veracity of their correspondents? Perhaps it is intended we should accept this and other statements upon the ipse dixit of the writer. Justice forbids it.

13. — *That the head of the Kashmere government sends false official reports to the English Resident at Serinaghur, knowing those reports to be false, and the natives knowing it also.*

There is no English Resident, properly so called, at Sreenuggur. The officer who goes there annually is sent to preside over the visiting British public, and has no right to any official « reports » at the hands of the Maharaja's Government; it is, therefore, improbable that any, much less false, reports are sent to him. The Rajah does, no doubt, acquaint the British Government with any thing in the shape of military movements he deems it necessary to make, and could hardly think it worth while to falsify narratives seeing how easy it would be to get at the truth.

14. — *That the rajah has been for some time levying duties and customs from people who are not his subjects but ours.*

The Rajah *did* at one time, with a singular dis-regard to his true interests, levy very much heavier duties than he should have done; but Mr. Brinckman's idea that British subjects should be allowed to carry goods to and from *any* country, Kashmeer included, because they *are* British subjects, is, to say the least of it, singular. Such things *were* done in the days of Warren Hastings, but the notion is a *leetle* too strong for our times; and

the world in general knows that if merchants choose to carry their goods to or through any country, under whatever rule it may be, they must conform to the customs prevailing there. The Rajah has materially and very readily reduced all his rates of export, import and transit duties at the suggestion of the British Government, and we have sufficient faith, even in him, to believe that he is, at all times, ready to attend to any reasonable suggestions, if not placed before him in too « exacting » a manner.

15. — *That he has been in the habit of preventing commerce flowing into our dominions by force.*

Here again we admit that the Rajah has not always seen his true interest, and we believe that some articles of commerce have been at times diverted to Kashmeer for which *perhaps* a better market and better prices might have been obtained in the Punjab. But this chief is not singular in his prohibitive duties and « protection. » Like others in a more civilized atmosphere he has not yet been converted to free trade principles. Not to wander far, however, suppose we turn the tables a trifle, and enquire, *1st.* — What were the means adopted to induce wool and other traders to come to Palumpoor last year? *2ndly.* — Whether the sales of wool and pushm effected at Palumpoor were encouraging? And *3rdly.* — If not encouraging, what became of these articles? *Were they carried back to Kooloo? (1)?*

(4) A great deal has been said and written about this fair in the Kangra valley, its aid in developing the trade of Central Asia, with its advantages to the merchants of the plains, and a great deal more will be said, written and done in the same direction. Much as the writer of this note differs from Sir John Lawrence on many points, he is entirely at one with him in considering the whole so-called Central Asian trade movement as next to unmitigated humbug, got up to serve private ends of aggrandizement, and fostered by the credulous bonhomie of a Governor General too new in office to have got behind the scenes and see all the wires at work to make this molehill into a mountain. It has been broadly asserted that this movement received peculiar development last year (1869) as shewn by the number of merchants who came from Yarkund « to attend the fair! » The fact is that these « mer-

16. — *That he has compelled traders by force to come through his territory, who were coming to us, in order to levy money from them.*

17. — *That he has annexed territory to his own without asking our permission. See Article 4 of the treaty.*

18. — *That the trade ready to flow to Hindustan from Yarkund, Khotan, Tartary, and other places, is stopped by the rajah's officials, which fact damages our prestige and popularity in those parts of Central Asia.*

We club these three charges together for the sake of convenience. We dismiss the second which is in fact a repetition of a former quære, by merely asking what territory the Rajah has annexed? Surely a vague assertion of this description cannot be of any weight. Until we obtain the information we seek, we cannot judge of the correctness of the accusation.

As to the other two we have to observe that the officials of the Rajah have, we believe, injured the interests of both commerce and of their master, by exactions and monopolies of an unauthorized character, relying on distance for impunity. But a mild and proper representation from the Government of India put matters straight, and we repeat that we do not entertain a doubt that wherever *just* causes of complaint may arise, similar representations will be followed by results of an equally satisfactory character. The Rajah is *now* quite

chants » were pilgrims to Mekka, who were induced to undertake the pilgrimago, in a peculiarly holy year, by promises on the part of the Khoosh Begee or Atalik Ghazee, to remit a considerable amount of their land rent to all who performed the pilgrimage successfully, while the « merchandize » they brought down consisted merely of goods which, sold by the way, would afford them means to defray their long journey to Arabia and back. Some of these, who took the Kooloo route (many others came down through Kashmeer) were caught by the way, and induced to visit Palumpoor!!! And the drama has culminated in the prospective deputation of Mr. T. D. Forsyth, to Yarkund, at a probable expense of some 5,000 pounds sterling, at a time when India is ringing with a just outcry against the imposition of new taxes! — « 1870. »

aware, though he has not always been so, and was not singular in holding the opinions that prevailed before the days of Cobden, that low duties, whether transport, import, or export, tend invariably to an increase of trade. We have been told that the present comparatively low duties yield the Rajah quite as much as the previous high rates did, and with half the trouble, as smuggling carried on largely and in some instances by individuals of high degree, has been materially reduced.

19. — *That the inhabitants of Cashmere are not allowed to come into our territory, no one being allowed to come without a pass, which is seldom obtained without having interest or giving a bribe.*

A pure fiction. We are sorry to be obliged to use such a strong word to describe the assertions of a gentleman of Mr. Brinckman's present position, but there are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of Kashmeerees who leave their homes to pass the cold weather in various towns in the Punjab, and who return to the valley in the spring, without let or hindrance.

20. — *That hundreds of Kashmeerees escape over the hills to our territory yearly, leaving their country, their homes, their families, solely on account of the oppression and misrule rampant in their own land.*

If it were true that «hundreds of Kashmeerees» escape on account of the oppression and misrule rampant in their country, how comes it that so many return in the ensuing spring? We repeat that, of our own knowledge, very many go to and fro (*).

(*) A friend of ours once upon a time told us a good anecdote *apropos* to this subject. He was going to the meeting at Wuzerabad between Lord Dalhousie and Goolab Singh in 1854, with Sir Henry Lawrence. The weather was cold (décember) and the two walked on while the carriage was getting ready. They overtook a Post office runner, returning from his daily stage, and our friend, finding he was a Kashmeeree, asked him what brought him to the Punjab? « Oh the oppression in my country. » A sly look at Sir Henry, who was rather sensitive on this subject, elicited a question from *him*. — " When did you leave Kashmeer? » « Oh I never lived there myself. My grandfather emigrated. » The laugh was now Sir Henry's. — Ed. D. G.

21. — *That that country, said by all to be so fruitful and so fair, is comparatively going to waste, and becoming depopulated year by year.*

That Kashmeer is not so populous as it was, is, we believe, true, and it follows, as a matter of course, that cultivation is not so extensive as it used to be when the inhabitants were more numerous. But are Gholab Singh and, Rajah Rumber Singh to blame for this? Let us search the chronicles of a few years back, and we shall find that in thirty years the population had been reduced from 800,000 to 200,000! In 1828 a dreadful earthquake destroyed 1,200 persons and was in two months followed by the cholera, by which 100,000 perished in the course of forty days. In 1833 an unseasonable fall of snow caused the failure of four-fifths of the rice crops. The roads were covered with the corpses of those who attempted to emigrate. Parents frequently sold a child for a rupee to prolong existence for two or three days; mothers killed and devoured their own offspring. Pestilence followed, and from these successive calamities resulted an almost unexampled depopulation. Surely these visitations and their lamentable consequences, still markedly felt in Kashmeer, are not to be laid at the door of the Jummoo Rajah, who only acquired the valley in 1846?

22. — *That «slavery,» in every sense of the term, exists in Cashmere, no man having anything of his own, not even his soul and the care of it, — everything, the land, the water, the food, and the refuse, the weeds, being the rajah's.*

Slavery does exist, but it also exists in all other native states and even in British territory notwithstanding our laws against it. The institution is so ancient that it is difficult to eradicate it effectually, and of course more so in a hill country like the Rajah's, where the police must be lax on account of the distance between towns and villages, but we trust the reproach will soon be wiped out. That the Rajah lays claim to much that, in other countries, is personal, individual, property, is also

true to a certain extent. But it must be remembered that this tenure has prevailed from time immemorial, and that the present Rajah is only following in the steps of his predecessors, Mahomedan and Hindoo, in keeping it up. His sound common sense will, in good time, show him the disadvantages of such a system of interference with what should be strictly considered as private property, but it does not follow because he is doing as others did before him that his face is to be blackened before all the world and his territory to be "resumed" or confiscated by a stroke of Mr. Brinckman's pen.

23. — *That everything is in the hands of the rajah, so that there is no chance for private enterprise — no encouragement to genius; in fact, to be in appearance in possession of money is a crime, unless much of it goes to the rajah.*

Here again there are some grains of truth mixed with a large amount of exaggeration. But the case is no worse than in many of our provinces. How many men in the Punjab, for example, can be pointed at as having become rich by trade or enterprise since the acquisition of the province by the British? A railway contractor or two, not over-scrupulous as to the means of acquiring money, and the tale is told in full. While hundreds of families, who were rich and of great consideration, are now reduced to comparative pauperism, by the action of the new rule.

24. — *That the rajah will not allow a British gentleman to remain in his dominions during six months of the year. Persians and others with whom we may happen to be at war being allowed to remain. Affghans, Ghilghitees, Yarkundees, Tartars, Bengallees, Punjabees, strangers of all kinds remaining while the countrymen of the sovereign to whom the rajah is tributary, whose supremacy he acknowledges by treaty, are turned out of the country in November.*

We are not of those who go the length of considering the Rajah quite right in preventing Europeans from

remaining in his country all the year round should any of them desire it. Few care to do so, but it would be a boon to some to be able to remain. But let us take the Rajah's probable view of the case. *He* knows full well that the servants of the East India Company fought hard and long for the exclusion from India of their own countrymen not in the service, and *we* know full well that natives have attributed their action in that direction to any but the motives proclaimed. His father assisted at the making of the treaty with Lahore on the 11th March 1846. In that treaty there was a clause expressly providing for the admission of travellers into the Punjab on conditions to which we have already alluded. On the 16th of March following; or only five days after, the Rajah himself concluded a treaty with the Governor General, in which no clause of the kind was introduced. He therefore very reasonably considered himself master of the situation, and, what is still more to the purpose, the British Government have uniformly supported the views of the Chief of Kashmeer, in this particular respect, a fact that indicates unmistakably the existence of some tacit or express understanding on the subject. That it would be a graceful and judicious act on the part of the Rajah to forego what he considers his right of exclusion, and what the British Government also clearly consider his right, we do not mean to deny, but we should remember at the same time that the conduct of some of the visitors who have, to a certain extent, enjoyed the hospitality of the Rajah, and have been his guests, has not always exactly been such as to induce His Highness to « enlarge his borders (4). »

(4) Since the above was written, and, there is some reason to believe, in consequence of what was above written, the Rajah has, as already stated, relaxed this regulation and travellers are free to go to and stay in Kashmeer, if they will abide by the rules of the country. — « 4870. »

25. — *That the conduct of the rajah and his officials, towards us brings great discredit upon us, we only being allowed up as visitors as a treat for a time, — the rajah fixing the date of our coming and going, sending spies to watch and report upon many of the visitors, rendering things unpleasant in numerous ways, so as to make the country unpopular with us.*

If there is *any* discredit cast upon us we must look to the British Government for redress. If there has been and still is an understanding anent the treaty of 1846 between the high contracting powers on the subject of visitors, it should be generally made known so as to remove all erroneous impressions. If there really is no such understanding, then the British Government are to blame for allowing the Rajah to act as if it existed, and should take steps to put matters straight. So long as this is not done, the Rajah is not to blame for doing what the English authorities now openly admit to be his right.

Mr. Brinckman knows, as well as we do, why some visitors are subjected to what he calls espionage. He knows well that most of the goods, shawls especially, sent to the Punjab are subject to an export duty. He knows as well as we do, that some visitors connive at their servants bringing down goods for parties who thus evade the payment of duty, that other parties themselves bring away dutiable goods, and that in so doing they are either parties to a fraud or commit a fraud on the Rajah's exchequer. It is quite beside the question to allege that these duties are too high. Visitors to Kashmeer may not constitute themselves judges in the matter, and should not smuggle, or wink in any way at the smuggling of goods by their servants.

26. — *That the rajah increases the price of supplies to visitors year by year with a twofold object, — to make gain of us in particular, and to make us think that Cashmere after all is not such a fruitful country.*

Is Kashmeer to be an exception, for the benefit of English visitors, to the admitted fact that prices have

risen fifty per cent throughout India within the past ten years? Surely if free trade is to become a recognized principle with us, we may not justly deny its advantages to others.

27. — *That the rajah makes us buy our provisions from himself, at a fixed rate, which is most exorbitant, getting the English Resident yearly to sign the tariff paper. People wishing to supply Europeans at their own prices, being forbidden so to do and punished if detected so doing.*

We have reason to believe that the tariff arrangements here complained of, are carried out as much for the benefit of visitors as of the dealers, who are apt, whether acting as the Rajah's agents or on their own account, to ask more of temporary residents than is fairly their due, and Mr. Brinckman should be thankful for this consideration shown him. The Rajah is not bound to submit any tariff to the official Mr. Brinckman will persist in styling the « English Resident. » And the British representative need not sign any paper of which he does not approve.

28. — *That contrary to the spirit of this extract from the Queen's proclamation, 1858, religious toleration does not exist in Cashmere, it being a crime in Cashmere for any one to become a member of the same religion of the Queen who issued that proclamation, and of whom the rajah is a subject, and whose supremacy he acknowledges. « We desire no extension of our present territorial possessions : and while we will permit no aggression upon our dominions, or our rights to be attempted with impunity, we shall sanction no encroachment on those of others. We shall respect the rights, dignity, and honour of native princes as our own, and we desire that they, as well as our own subjects, should enjoy that prosperity and that social advancement which can only be secured by internal peace and good government. We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to*

all our other subjects; and those obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil. Firmly relying ourselves on the truth of Christianity, and acknowledging with gratitude the solace of religion, we disclaim alike the right and the desire to impose our convictions on any of our subjects.

We declare it to be our Royal will and pleasure that none be in anywise favoured, none molested or disquieted, by reason of their religious faith or observances, but that all shall alike enjoy the equal and impartial protection of the law; and we do strictly charge and enjoin all those who may be in authority under us that they abstain from all interference with the religious belief or worship of any of our subjects, on pain of our highest displeasure.»

We should like much to have Mr. Brinckman's facts in support of his sweeping assertion that it is a crime to become a Christian in Kashmeer. When these facts, properly authenticated, are before us, then we shall be prepared to deal with them. In the mean time we may remark that we do not find the Rajah is bound to tolerate Christianity in his dominions. It is not so long ago, as we have already shown, since the British Government deported Christian Missionaries and decried their missions. It took us a long time to arrive at our present mind on this all important subject (3).

29. — *That men have actually been persecuted and imprisoned for inquiring after or professing Christianity in Cashmere.*

We take leave to doubt this assertion. There are grounds for believing that some men of bad character and known to be so, not known perhaps by the really good Christian Missionary to whom they professed

(4) The Editor appears to have singularly overlooked the strong fact against Mr. Brinckman that the proclamation he wishes to twist in his own favor bids him and others remember that the sovereign disdains all right and desire to impose her (religious) convictions on any of our subjects. — « 1870. »

themselves ready to embrace Christianity, but to many others, made their alleged conversion a stalking horse to get out of the country, and so evade their just punishment, besides ridding themselves of the importunity of creditors. But this point requires more careful elucidation than we can give it at this time, and shall have our best attention on a future occasion.

30. — *That not only is religious toleration not shewn to the people, but that hindrances are put in the way of our having divine services. The English visitors having to worship in the upper room of the residency, sometimes in a building most unsuitable for a place of assembly for worship.*

A most childish accusation against the Rajah's government! Does Mr. Brinckman not know that there is still no church, that we can call such, in the civil station of Lahore! and that half the Christian population of that place have really no house of prayer to which to resort for religious worship? — Does the gentleman mean that the Rajah is bound to build churches for his visitors? If they really desire to have a house of prayer let them build one, and we will be bound to say the Rajah will see that it is taken care of. What would Mr. Brinckman say to the Mahomedan Kashmeerees who have come to Loodhecana if they should maintain that the British Government must build them a Mosque because they have come to a country where every one is free to follow his own religion?

31. — *That the rajah has distinctly refused permission for the English to build for themselves a suitable place for the performance of divine worship.*

When the Rajah's letter of refusal is produced, then, but not till then, shall we place any reliance on this assertion as it is evidently intended to be taken. It is quite possible the Rajah may have refused the *terms* on which suitable land was demanded. He is doubtless averse to admitting his visitors to a footing from which

he might find it difficult to remove them hereafter, and our whole career in India fully justifies his caution.

32. — *That the object in making us worship in the residency is not seeking our benefit, but an interested plan of the rajah's.*

Nothing easier than to attribute vague and interested motives. If the Rajah were the intolerant prince he is represented to be, he would forbid the preaching of the gospel in every possible shape. Has he ever done this or evinced a desire to do it?

33. — *That we have not a foot of land wherein to bury our dead; that the Rajah will not even allow us to keep and consecrate an acre of ground wherein to bury officers who die. Bishop Cotton was allowed to read the consecration service over that spot where the graves are, but with the condition that the land, the tombs, everything there, were to be fully understood to be still the sole property of the Rajah, he in return engaging to keep the graveyard and the tombs in repair, which he does not do. This year (in the early part of it) until a complaint was made, the place was in a disgraceful state.*

Can any thing be more ridiculous than this accusation? Let us read it over carefully, and we find that it absolutely contradicts itself in the most palpable manner, for it appears, on his own showing, that there is a burial ground, that is *has* been consecrated, and that, no sooner was the Rajah's attention drawn to the unsatisfactory state it had fallen into, than he ordered it to be remedied. We remember the days, when the graveyard, south-east of the Anarkullee bazaar in Lahore, was not only shamefully neglected, but pigs actually found disturbing the bodies of the dead interred there! Complaints are frequently rife throughout India that burial grounds are neglected. We have more than once called attention to the neglected state of the graves near our fort. And is it to be made a subject of accusation against a Hindoo Prince, that he forgets to look after the graves

of men of another creed when their own brethren in the faith, and their rulers, are shown to be equally or rather more guilty?

The Rajah's « condition that the land, the tombs, everything there, were to be fully understood to be the sole property of the Rajah, » confirms our view, that the only objection he has to churches is founded on the terms on which land has been demanded.

34. — *That a proof of the country being comparatively depopulated owing to oppression, is the fact that no woman under any pretext whatever is allowed to pass out of the country.*

The *sequitur* is the other way, with all due deference to Mr. Brinckman's reasoning powers, which do not appear, if his pamphlet is to be taken as a sample, of a very high order.

35. — *That instances have occurred when the authorities have stopped English travellers who had Cashmere servants, and locked those servants up. In one case, a gentleman and his wife had to witness their Cashmere servant, who was carrying their baby in his arms, turned back through a large village, baby and all!*

The grounds for doing what is here stated to have been done, may be found in our remarks on Mr. Brinckman's twenty-fifth allegation, to which our readers are referred. We think the less said on this phase of the Rajah's misdeeds the better. It would not be pleasant to find the Rajah publishing a list of all those who, either themselves or by their servants, positively defrauded the Kashmeer Government by assisting parties to evade export duties.

It should be borne in mind, moreover, that there is a great out-cry against our own emigration laws in India. Perhaps the Rajah objects to his subjects being enticed away, and why not? He has not the slightest objection to their leaving Kashmeer on their own legitimate affairs.

36. — *That it is very seldom, if an English visitor is annoyed or insulted in Cashmere, that he can obtain any redress or satisfaction whatever, except promises which are not fulfilled.*

Why? Perhaps because it is often the case that the insult and « annoyance » are the result of the English visitor's over-bearing and tyrannical conduct. Once a traveller had the hardihood to claim redress against a Kashmere official whom he had bound hand and foot and brought a prisoner into Sreenuggur ! This is a fact that came out on a trial for libel in Lahore, the party confessing to the truth of the affair in the witness box.

There is a tradition in our own provinces that a European thinks he can never obtain justice from a native judicial officer. It is not impossible that in Kashmere also the European and the native ideas of what is just may differ.

37. — *That every possible difficulty is thrown in the way of procuring supplies, except at certain places, for certain reasons.*

We don't doubt this at all, but we think it possible that if reasonable, unprejudiced, people, knew the « certain reasons, » they would pronounce them valid.

There are some parts of the hill country, as there are some parts in British India, where it is difficult to obtain any supplies, the people being naturally unwilling to part with the food stored up for subsistence during winter; but we venture to assert that no difficulty is found by those who give notice of the line of their journey, and *who pay* regularly for all that is supplied to them.

38. — *That while the poor peasants are forbidden to bring their supplies to the English visitors for sale, that women of improper character are allowed to come freely, because they are all taxpayers to the rajah. I mention this simply to shew the avarice of the Rajah's government, and its oppression of the labouring classes.*

The writer, let us hope, blushed while penning these lines. We could write a history of English immorality in Kashmere, which of itself would prove the moderation of the Rajah. Who sends for women of improper character?

The prostitutes *were* tax-payers, but they are not so now, for at the very time that the Revenue Board of Calcutta were directing the imposition of a licence tax on that class, and the *Friend's* friend was arranging for a similar measure in Lahore, the Rajah directed the total relinquishment of this obnoxious impost, which yielded him about Rs. 40,000 per annum.

39. — *That if a moonshee comes to the bungalows to teach Cashmeree to a European, he is threatened and punished, if his visits are repeated, by the rajah.*

We will undertake to assert that there is something behind this allegation which, if brought forward, would give a different complexion to the affair. We could a tale unfold anent this charge also. It may be imagined.

40. — *That the Rajah only allows us fifteen annas for our rupee in Cashmere, his annas being far inferior to ours, while his own wretched Chilkee rupee is valued at ten annas.*

We assert, on the other hand, that Indian currency is at a premium in Cashmere, and that the Chilkee rupee is *worth* ten annas as containing that amount of silver. If the Rajah chooses to debase his currency it is to be regretted as bad policy, but it is no business of ours. The British Lion is not justified in tearing his weaker neighbour because he is so foolish as not to take things at an arbitrary valuation!

41. — *That, according to the Rajah's own reports, the cholera was far worse in Cashmere this year than in any other part of India. By his own account it is a hotbed of cholera, and as he refuses to do anything to try and stay its progress in his dominions, it would be as well if we took Cashmere, if only for the reason*

of making it healthier, and stopping the spread of that pestilence.

Another bright specimen of Mr. Brinckman's logic ! It is no fault of the Rajah that cholera prevails in Kashmere ; and it is the fault of the religion in which he has been brought up, that he does not do all that might be done to mitigate its horrors. But to say that *therefore* it would be « as well if we took Kashmere, » is as simply ridiculous as for us to assert that the Russians ought to come and take India because cholera prevails here, in some shape or other, all and every year of our lives. Will Mr. Brinckman, « or any other man » read what recent sanitary reports have divulged as to our management in this respect, till lately ; and how much remains to be done by us yet (6).

42. — That owing to the indifference and cruelty of the Rajah's government, hundreds of lives were needlessly lost by his inhuman behaviour, while cholera was raging this year in Serinaghur.

It would perhaps be no palliation of the indifference and cruelty of the Rajah's government to say that hundreds and hundreds of thousands) of were ives sacrificed in Orissa by the « humane » conduct of the Bengal Board of Revenue ! but then it is no coor the Rajah that he really does not know how and where to stop, and has as yet not the art of mitigating, (stopping is impossible,) the ravages of cholera. He is not singular in this !

(6) Let Mr B. read the accounts of the pestilence that carried off from 90 to 100 and occasionnally as many as 120 victims in one day, during the prevalence of cholera in the one unfortunate town of Umritsur, in 1869, and say whether the Bridish government ought to be deprived of the Punjab because a pig-headed official, whom the government should have removed at once, was praised for doing all he could to intensify the mischief, and allowed to ride rough-shod over common sense, propriety and every consideration of what should be done in opposition to what *he* would have done. Were the acts of Government and of its executive officers in this one place to be thoroughly sifted, in this one instance of cholera outbreak alone, the English public would stand aghast. — « 1870 ».

43. — *That intolerance as regards Christianity is carried to such a pitch, that men coming to the medical missionary to have an operation performed, have been prevented so doing, and have died in consequence.*

We have the greatest respect for the medical missionary deputed to Kashmere for the last three years, and we believe all that he advances of his own knowledge. But hearsay evidence, and the representations of any one member of a lying, deceitful and cunning race, must be and should always be received with caution and distrust. The relatives of the sick and dying, even in our own provinces, cannot be persuaded to seek relief and aid from European physicians. How easy for the Kashmeerees to say the Rajah will not permit it!

44. — *That sentries are regularly posted to prevent people coming to the medical missionary.*

Something of the kind *was* at one time done, and we are quite sure it would have been sufficient to make it the subject of a temperate representation to the Rajah himself, to ensure a discontinuance of the practise adopted, be it remembered, with the sanction of the British officer representing the Punjab Government at Sreenuggur, who himself removed to Goolmurg when he should have remained at his post!

45. — *That not only are the Cashmerees persecuted for coming to the medical missionary, but that Pathans have also been thus dealt with.*

That people *do* visit the medical missionary in large numbers, in spite of what is here written, is proved beyond a doubt by a published return of Dr. Elmslie, in which he enumerates some thousands of persons as having been under medical treatment, by him, during the six months devoted in Sreenuggur to the alleviation of the miseries of those of the inhabitants who sought his valuable aid, and it is therefore simply a misstatement to assert that people were prevented from consulting him.

What difference is there between Kashmeerees, (almost

all Mahomedans) and Pathans? Is this introduced to mislead the British public, and to show how violent is the persecuting spirit of the Rajah's rule?

46. — *That the Rajah takes bad characters from our army into his, and that his Sepoys cannot return to Hindostan without bribing, or escaping back over the hills.*

Here again is a singular confusion of ideas. The British Government should rather be thankful that the Rajah relieves them of their bad characters, but then why the complaint that *his* sepoy cannot return to Hindostan? If their time is expired, the Raja would not think of keeping them. If not they are simply deserters.

47. — *That not only are Cashmerees forbidden to quit the country, but our subjects also, unless in the service of European visitors.*

We maintain that Kashmeerees are not forbidden to leave the country, and it is therefore unlikely that our subjects would be prevented from doing so. We suspect that, in most cases, the Rajah would be too happy to be rid of them.

48. — *That although the resident has no authority to punish a Cashmeree, yet the Rajah has in one or two instances seized and put in chains our subjects who have been accused of crimes in Cashmere, and has also imprisoned our subjects who were blameless.*

Why should criminals not be punished, wherever they may be found? Have British subjects a special license to go into Kashmeer, commit excesses, do violence to the people, and even resort to crime, and pass scatheless out of the land they have outraged? We invade Kashmere annually on the understanding that we, and our followers, will respect the Laws, but we regret to say the infraction of those Laws is as much the rule as their observance is the exception. It is *just as possible* that innocent people may occasionally have fallen into

the meshes of the police in Kashmere, as that such is the case very often in British India. Is Mr. Brinckman so ignorant of the leading traits of the British Government in India, and especially of its police, as not to know that the imprisonment of innocent parties is a lucrative traffic carried on by the police throughout the length and breadth of British India?

49. — *That the Rajah will not improve his roads, thereby hindering traffic and inconveniencing us.*

If the Rajah is satisfied with the condition of his roads it is surely no business of ours, though we consider he would consult his own interests materially if he did improve them for the use of traders. If visitors choose to go to Kashmere they must take things as they find them, and be thankful when they remember how free those roads are from robbers and murderers, how perfectly secure is their property after entering the Rajah's territory; and that if they do lose any thing, now and then, the value is *at once* made good to them by the Rajah's government, — more than is done in any part of British India. (7) What is the chief fault found with *us* by the good folk at home? That we don't give good roads. Did Mr. Brinckman never read, or has he forgotten, the outcry of the Manchester people because their cotton could not find its way to the sea-board?

50. — *That if it is true that Russians are advancing, as said, they can have a fair pretext for quarrelling with us and attacking Cashmere at any moment, owing to the manner the Rajah oppresses the traders coming from those lands which will soon be Russia's, according to all accounts.*

A culminating piece of logic too abstruse by far to be dissected or commented upon!

(7) It is a fact that a traveller, who was in 1866 robbed, on the right bank of the Jhelum at the ferry of Kohala on the road from Murree to Sreenuggur, was told by the British officer representing the government in Kashmeer « just » to write « left » for « right » and he would get him compensation, *and compensation was paid accordingly* on the faith of a British officer!!! — « 1870 ».

51. — *That the Rajah's government have been in the habit of opening, reading and destroying letters sent to Europeans in Kashmeer.*

This is probably the only really tangible case against the Rajah's government. It has been frequently asserted that letters have been opened, and as a matter of course destroyed, but in order to make the Rajah responsible, the fact must be brought home to him, or to his immediate ministers, and until this is done we shall be loath to believe that *he* would himself descend to a practice as low as it is despicable. Indian and other Postmasters, and even Governments are not immaculate on this point, and we know that hundreds of letters were opened at a time when there was no special necessity for its being done, and the sanctity of the post thus violated.

52. — *Article 9 of the treaty: « The British government will give its aid to Maharajah Gholab Singh, in protecting his territories from external enemies. »*

Introduced by way of a climax, and supported by such ridiculous arguments that we do not consider it necessary to reproduce them here.

That the Rajah's government of Kashmere and its dependencies, is no more perfect than ours, in proportion to the slow advance it is making, is beyond a doubt; but that because a Reverend gentleman has not had it all his own way in Kashmere; because he has chosen to listen to gross exaggerations of the evils that do exist, and thought it right to string those exaggerations into a series of criminatory questions and print them, is a little too much of a thing which is good for nothing. Mr. Brinckman thinks he has done well in coveting his neighbour's goods, because that neighbour will not do all Mr. Brinckman wished him to do, or thought he ought to do, and we tell him that in so writing he is breaking « the Law and the commandments » of which, as a member of his sacred order he should be a strict observer as well as a teacher.

Let us put a case. Mr. Brinckman's father had money and estates; a neighbour of his is also holder of

an estate, but wants, for special reasons of his own, to sell it. He offers it to Mr. Brinckman's father who agrees to buy, and pays for it. The father dies, M. Brinckman succeeds, when all at once a stranger trespasses on his lands, calls him all sorts of names, tells him he must not do this, must not do that, but do the other, and threatens him with summary resumption by the old proprietor because he chooses to do what he pleases with his own. We apprehend Mr. Brinckman would be very apt to kick him off his property and bid him mind his own affairs. We trust the application of this parable may not be thrown away on the Rev. Gentleman of whom we now take leave, bidding him beware of again throwing stones lest he break his own glasshouse !



II. — Mr. ROBERT THORP'S KASHMERE MISGOVERNMENT.
London, Longman, Green and Co. 1870. Price Eighteen pence.

Under what special circumstances this something more than a Pamphlet, something less than a Book, came to see the light, it is difficult to say. Mr. Robert Thorp had been an officer in H. M. Service. It is needless to dwell on his antecedents. He was in Kashmeer two or three seasons, and there conducted himself so as to incur the just displeasure of the local Government. In the autumn of 1868 he is reported to have expressed his determination to remain in Sreenugger (the capital of Kashmeer), during the winter against the rules in force, but was finally induced, by the British officer in charge of English visitors in Kashmeer during the season, to give up the idea. He remained however, later than the date of departure prescribed by the British government for all visitors, was taken suddenly ill, and died at the capital some time in November.

No sooner was his death heard of in the Punjab than the most sinister reports of his having been poisoned, on account of his known enmity to the Maharajah, were circulated by the press and in that portion of society which may be styled of the gobe mouche order.

Fortunately for the reputation of the Maharaja and his officials Dr Caley had just passed through Sreenuggur, on his way from Leh to Lahore, and had only proceeded a couple or three stages towards the plains when a messenger bearing an urgent request from the local authorities to him to return and enquire into the matter, overtook him. He did return and not only found, on a post-mortem examination, that Mr Thorp's death was caused by disease of the heart of long standing, but that the house

he had occupied, his papers (amongst which it is believed were all the notes on which the publication recently issued is founded) and other property, had been formally taken charge of within the briefest possible time after his death by the chief officers of the Maharaja on the spot, sentries placed to prevent all interference with the several effects and every thing, even to the body, left in exactly the condition in which it was at the time of his sudden decease. The papers were, it is presumed, brought away, but of the how or the wherefore or by whom the Book came to be published, some fourteen months after M^r Thorp's death, there is no sign on the face of it. He is not even styled the late M^r Thorp.

How any one, with a grain of common sense, could think of placing the notes, on which the publication is founded, into — shape it cannot be called, — something of a condition for submission to the public of England, it is most difficult to understand. The material is crude, ill-digested, and ill-conceived; the arrangement it is made to assume by the Editor, whoever he may be, is most clumsy, while the arguments are wholly untenable and the conclusions illogical to a degree.

The only question in which M^r Thorp, or the person who has published his notes, does not fully coincide with the Rev. A. Brinckman, is the individual guilt of the Maharajah as regards the atrocities alleged to have been perpetrated in his dominions. The accusations are now shifted from the Maharajah, who is no longer personally vilified, at least to the extent indulged in by the late Missionary, to his Ministers, and the responsibility of the misgovernment is now placed on their shoulders.

The line of argument, if argument it can be called, generally followed, is, however so closely allied to that adopted by the Rev. A. Brinckman that it is altogether unnecessary to refute it in detail, and the answers given, in the first part of this Pamphlet, may be fairly considered replies to all the general accusations of misgovernment, cruelty and oppression alleged by M^r Thorp.

It is a singular comment on M^r Brinckman's allega-

tion, as to letters addressed to or from English Gentlemen in Kashmeer being opened and destroyed, that the papers of M^r Thorp, a known enemy of the Maharaja and his ministers, and therefore reasonably to be suspected of having taken notes with the view of printing them, were most carefully preserved, and made over, untouched, to D^r Cayly after his death.

There is no wish to present the Government of the Maharaja in a better light than it will fairly bear. It, no doubt has its faults ; some of them are in the course of being redressed, while others are only faults in the eyes of writers who profess to think British Government in India an institution so perfect as to be a model for all others. The people of India, though thankful for much, have reason to doubt the correctness of this opinion in its entirety and so have many writers of note and ability.

A breach of treaties, on grounds of its own showing, is *the* crime in British Indian History. Let British Indian statesmen beware of adding to the long list by listening to the puerile ravings of men who advise the annexation of Kashmeer on grounds they would be ashamed to advance in matters of every day private life. Let them remember that they may not bear false witness against their neighbour, nor covet his house, or *any thing* that is his (8).

(8) The *Friend of India* has the following audacious and mendacious paragraph in a late issue : — « Mess^{rs} Longman and Co announce *** a new Edition « of Kashmeer misgovernment by the late M^r Thorpe, the memory of whose *murder* at Srinuggur must still be fresh in the memory of Kashmeer visitors » ! Is it possible to conceive any thing more atrocious than this deliberate repetition of an unfounded accusation most satisfactorily met, at the time, by the incontrovertible testimony of D^r Cayley published by the Punjab Government ? — « 4870 »

1111



