

**THE BRITISH CROWN &
THE INDIAN STATES**

**THE BRITISH CROWN &
THE INDIAN STATES**

**AN OUTLINE SKETCH DRAWN UP ON BEHALF
OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE
CHAMBER OF PRINCES**

By

**THE DIRECTORATE OF THE CHAMBER'S
SPECIAL ORGANISATION**

LONDON

P. S. KING AND SON, LIMITED

ORCHARD HOUSE, WESTMINSTER

1929

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

CONTENTS

GENERAL FOREWORD	PAGE ix
INTRODUCTION	xix

PART I

A CONSIDERATION OF THE EVOLUTION OF POLITICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CROWN AND THE STATES

I. THE FOUNDATIONS OF BRITISH DIPLOMACY	3
II. NON-INTERVENTION	15
III. THE FORWARD POLICY	19
IV. LORD WELLESLEY'S SYSTEM	29
V. LORD HASTINGS' SETTLEMENT	35
VI. HESITATION	40
VII. THE LIMITS OF NON-INTERVENTION	47
VIII. LORD DALHOUSIE AND ANNEXATION	51
IX. AFTER THE MUTINY	55
X. DISQUIETING SYMPTOMS	59
XI. NEW THEORIES	63
XII. DISTRUST	68
XIII. THE SUBJECTION OF THE STATES	73
XIV. THE RENDITION OF MYSORE ,	76
XV. THE STATES AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS	84
XVI. MIGHT AND RIGHT	90

	PAGE
XVII. THE GROWTH OF A WRONG	95
XVIII. THE THEORY OF FEUDALISM AND PARAMOUNTCY	100
XIX. "SUBORDINATE CO-OPERATION"	105
XX. CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE STATES AND THE PARAMOUNT POWER	113
XXI. CERTAIN CONTEMPORANEOUS DOCUMENTS IN THE TIMES OF LORD MORNINGTON AND LORD HASTINGS	122

PART II

AN EXAMINATION OF SOME ASPECTS OF THE FISCAL QUESTIONS
AT ISSUE BETWEEN THE STATES AND
THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

INTRODUCTORY	135
XXII. SOME GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS	137
XXIII. THE LIABILITY OF THE STATES IN REGARD TO DEFENCE	145
XXIV. THE CONTRACTUAL ASPECT	151
XXV. DEFENCE AND ARMED FORCES. I.	157
XXVI. DEFENCE AND ARMED FORCES. II.	165
XXVII. THE QUESTION OF DEBT	170
XXVIII. COMMUNICATIONS	174
XXIX. POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS	177
XXX. PUBLIC WORKS	181
XXXI. CUSTOMS AND TARIFFS	183
XXXII. EXCISE DUTIES	192
XXXIII. THE SALT MONOPOLY	197
XXXIV. RAILWAYS	201
XXXV. CURRENCY AND MINTS	205

Contents

	vii
	PAGE
XXXVI. INCOME TAX	210
XXXVII. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS	212
APPENDIX I. GUARANTEES OF PROTECTION	216
(1) States which have Treaties	
(2) States which have no Treaties, but which have been Guaranteed Pro- tection in some other Express Form	
APPENDIX II. PAYMENTS FOR DEFENCE	225
(1) Territories ceded	
(2) Lump Sum Payments	
(3) Subsidies	
(4) Tributes	
APPENDIX III. SUPPLY OF TROOPS IN TIME OF WAR	237
SUPPLY OF GRAIN AND OTHER MATERIALS	238
INDEX	239
MAP showing Indian States and their positions in relation to British India and Main Lines of Railway Communication	<i>At end</i>

GENERAL FOREWORD

THE GROWTH OF JOINT ACTION AMONG THE INDIAN PRINCES

BY L. F. RUSHBROOK WILLIAMS, C.B.E.
Foreign Minister, Patiala

(With acknowledgments to *The Asiatic Review*, July, 1928)

THAT the Indian Mutiny brought about a revolution in the attitude of the authorities towards the Indian States is, of course, a truism. Up to the time of that outbreak, the Company's officials, remembering the days when the British themselves had been only one among many competitors for the domination of India, were wont to regard the "country powers" with a suspicious eye. The traditional policy of treating each State in isolation, coupled with the increasing material development of British India, had together produced reactions unfavourable to the States, which had tended to decline relatively and absolutely. It was apparently assumed that British India was destined for rapid advance along the lines dictated by early Victorian liberalism; while such of the Indian States as could not be absorbed beneficently under the doctrine of lapse, would inevitably dwindle into mere shadows of their former selves. But the Mutiny, while it gave a severe shock to the easy optimism characterising those who controlled British policy in India, served to demonstrate that the power of the States was still a reality. Lord Canning's famous admission that the patches of native

rule served as breakwaters to the wave which would otherwise have swept us away utterly and completely, may be taken as an index of the changed attitude. Nevertheless, before many decades had elapsed the position showed some signs of approximating to that which had obtained before the Mutiny. As the nineteenth century drew to a close, the growing economic unification of the Indian subcontinent seemed to threaten the very existence of the Indian States. With the development of modern means of communication British India became welded, administratively, into something like a unit; and the disparity in resources and in importance between the territory under British rule and the isolated fragments which remained outside became more than ever accentuated. The solemn pledges given by Queen Victoria were of themselves insufficient to solve the problem presented by the survival of the Indian States. From the States' point of view the danger of the situation lay principally in the fact that the Government of India was responsible for two different sets of duties. In the first place, it governed British India; in the second place, it managed the everyday relations between the Indian States and the Crown. The inevitable tendency of the greater of these two functions to dominate the less was accentuated at the beginning of the present century by an increasing departmentalisation in the Government of India. Policies were laid down for All India by the Technical Departments of the British Indian Government; and the States were expected merely to record their acquiescence. The result, from the Princes' standpoint, was a steady, if unostentatious, encroachment upon the position guaranteed to them by Royal pledge.

They experienced considerable difficulty in devising a remedy. The policy of isolation still persisted; and although it was impossible to prevent a considerable interchange of ideas among the States, the Government of India continued to deprecate any suggestion of joint representation or joint action. But parallel with the

growing realisation by the States themselves of a group of interests separate in degree if not in kind from those of British India, there may be discerned a tendency in higher quarters to look upon the States themselves as constituting jointly a factor in Indian politics. Whether Lord Curzon and Lord Minto were animated by any deliberate desire to associate the Indian Princes with the British authorities in the great task of uplifting all India is uncertain. But it is unquestionable that from the early years of the twentieth century we can trace a growing liberalisation in the policy of the Government of India towards the Indian Princes. Moreover, the new generation of Princes was possessed of ideas which, though possibly inspired by a consciousness of special interests, were quite plainly anything but hostile to the British connection. In the time of Lord Hardinge, the meeting of some of the leading Princes for certain purposes was officially encouraged, although those purposes were to begin with of very minor importance. The habit of joint consultation grew rapidly under official encouragement, with the result that even before 1914 some of the Princes, notably the present Maharajas of Bikaner and Patiala and the late Maharaja of Gwalior, had begun to envisage a scheme for the safeguarding of State interests consistently with the maintenance of the interests of British India and of the Empire.

The outbreak of the war, like the outbreak of the Mutiny, served to exhibit very prominently both the power of the Princes and their abiding loyalty to the Crown. When "boons" to British India were talked of, the Princes somewhat naturally began to consider their own position. Accordingly, when the new policy officially announced in August 1917 became the declared goal of British India, the Princes found little difficulty in securing a hearing, both by Lord Chelmsford and Mr. Montagu, for the representations they desired to put forward. For various reasons the system by which their day-to-day relations with the Crown were conducted was unsatisfactory to them. An analysis of the com-

plaints they put forward in 1918 shows three main directions in which they believed change was necessary. They felt that they had no voice in the determination of All India policy; in other words, decisions were taken by the British Indian authorities alone which, though nominally confined to British India, in reality vitally affected the interests of the States. Secondly, they deplored the lack of any impartial tribunal to decide disputes arising between themselves and the British Indian authorities, for it seemed to them that in a number of cases the Government of India was at once party and judge. Finally, they believed that the Political Department, for all its great work in fighting the battles of the States, occasionally acted in disregard of the treaties, and in general exercised an authority which, if benevolent, was nevertheless in certain respects undeniably arbitrary. In order to remedy these defects, as they appeared to them, the Princes put forward a scheme for a deliberative assembly in which they could meet together and discuss their common interests; which assembly was to form the basis of a system for joint consultation between themselves and the British Indian authorities when matters of concern both to the States and to British India were at issue. They further proposed a system of arbitration, under which any dispute between the British Indian authorities, whether Central or Provincial, and a State, might be submitted to the decision of an impartial tribunal. Finally, they desired to associate with the Political Secretary a committee which would, as they hoped, ensure that the general policy of the Political Department should be more in harmony with the sentiments and desires of the Princes.

The plan put forward by the Princes to Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford afforded a useful basis of discussion. It was not wholly endorsed by the framers of the joint Report, although some very remarkable admissions testified to the general strength of the case it was designed to meet. But the Montagu-Chelmsford Report at least recommended the externals of the machinery

proposed by the Princes, even though these forms did not embody the precise content for which the Princes had hoped. It is, however, to be noticed that when the proposals of the Report came to be translated into action, the modified recommendations were so much weakened, that all that the Princes seemed to have secured as a result of nearly ten years' persistent effort was the institution of the Chamber of Princes under conditions which deprived it of initiative and rendered it merely the shadow of a name. In reality, however, the Princes secured something far more important than was at the time realised—full official recognition of their right to consult with each other; and some opportunity of acquiring that difficult art, the settlement of common interests by amicable discussion.

From that time onwards the progress has been steady, if not always easy. The policy of isolation, so long pursued, has left legacies of separation among the individual Princes which are not to be overcome without much patience and goodwill. But the Chamber of Princes, while somewhat hampered by the Rules of Business over which it had, until well into 1928, no control, has undoubtedly fostered in those who share in its deliberations a habit of co-operation. The formal sessions of the Chamber, for reasons which will be obvious, have from the Princes' point of view been less important than the informal conferences for which the annual gathering at Delhi provides the opportunity. For several years the Standing Committee of the Chamber has possessed its own headquarters in a rented building, where the Chancellor's office is located during the Session. This headquarters is the real centre of action, for it is here that the Princes assemble for the Chamber, hold their most intimate discussions, formulate common policies, and lay the foundations for joint work. Here are discussed those matters which cannot find a place upon the rather stereotyped agenda of the Chamber itself; and here are laid down the lines which will guide the Standing Committee in its discussions with Govern-

ment, now held thrice a year between the sessions of the Chamber. Here also are devised schemes for putting into execution certain Chamber resolutions which would otherwise remain merely the expression of pious hopes.

The existing system of common action among the Princes is in the nature of a makeshift, for the ineffectiveness of the Chamber from the Princes' standpoint has transferred the bulk of the real business to the informal conferences. But since the informal conferences and the Chamber Sessions consist of the same Princes, the Chancellor and the Standing Committee treat mandates from either as possessing the same authority. As a result, real work is done; and several of the greater Princes who at one time stood aloof now regularly send representatives to the informal conferences, where Ministers speak by invitation—always forthcoming—even if they do not vote. The upshot is, that for every one of a long list of grievances the Princes have now a remedy to suggest, even if this remedy has not been accepted by Government. But, naturally enough, the Princes are not satisfied, nor are they content to rest upon their oars.

It was the Standing Committee, under the lead of two Princes of great experience, which first put forward a request for an impartial inquiry into the whole relationship between the Princes of India and the Paramount Power. The project was discussed at the Round Table Conference which took place in Simla in the spring of 1927 between Lord Irwin and certain members of his Government on one side and the Standing Committee on the other; and it became generally rumoured in the course of the ensuing summer that an inquiry of some sort would be undertaken. The Standing Committee next took the step of despatching to England two Ministers to obtain an authoritative opinion from eminent counsel upon certain aspects of the legal position of the Princes. This opinion had not yet been considered formally by the Standing Committee when Lord Irwin announced that the Secretary of State had appointed a

Committee of three persons—Sir Harcourt Butler, Professor Holdsworth and Mr. Peel—to inquire into the relationship between the Indian States and the Paramount Power, and to suggest means for the more satisfactory adjustment of the existing economic relations between the Indian States and British India. Once again the Standing Committee lost no time. It proceeded to formulate a plan for a central organisation to prepare a general case on behalf of the States for presentation to Sir Harcourt Butler's Committee; and, further, briefed a well-known English barrister of great experience in public life to advise it throughout on legal questions, and to present the case when ready. These steps were cordially endorsed by the next informal conference of Princes, which authorised the Standing Committee to proceed along the suggested lines, and, further, in its formal rôle as a Session of the Chamber, re-elected the Chancellor and his colleagues for a further year of office. Shortly afterwards it was arranged that as many members of the Standing Committee as could leave India should go to England in the course of the summer of 1928 to assist the Chancellor and counsel in the management of the case, and in putting forward definite suggestions, already tentatively approved, for remedying the Princes' grievances.

It was not to be expected that there would be entire unanimity among the Princes concerning these measures, particularly as certain States had not entirely thrown off their original conviction that the Chamber and all its works were alike useless. But more than three-fourths of the States who are members of the Chamber in their own right, and an equal proportion of those smaller States who are either represented by groups or who stand outside the Chamber altogether, have associated themselves with the Standing Committee. And in the meeting held at Bombay in March, 1928, it was apparent that even those States which preferred to deal directly with Sir Harcourt Butler's Committee were at one with the Standing Committee in their diagnosis of the dis-

ment, now held thrice a year between the sessions of the Chamber. Here also are devised schemes for putting into execution certain Chamber resolutions which would otherwise remain merely the expression of pious hopes.

The existing system of common action among the Princes is in the nature of a makeshift, for the ineffectiveness of the Chamber from the Princes' standpoint has transferred the bulk of the real business to the informal conferences. But since the informal conferences and the Chamber Sessions consist of the same Princes, the Chancellor and the Standing Committee treat mandates from either as possessing the same authority. As a result, real work is done; and several of the greater Princes who at one time stood aloof now regularly send representatives to the informal conferences, where Ministers speak by invitation—always forthcoming—even if they do not vote. The upshot is, that for every one of a long list of grievances the Princes have now a remedy to suggest, even if this remedy has not been accepted by Government. But, naturally enough, the Princes are not satisfied, nor are they content to rest upon their oars.

It was the Standing Committee, under the lead of two Princes of great experience, which first put forward a request for an impartial inquiry into the whole relationship between the Princes of India and the Paramount Power. The project was discussed at the Round Table Conference which took place in Simla in the spring of 1927 between Lord Irwin and certain members of his Government on one side and the Standing Committee on the other; and it became generally rumoured in the course of the ensuing summer that an inquiry of some sort would be undertaken. The Standing Committee next took the step of despatching to England two Ministers to obtain an authoritative opinion from eminent counsel upon certain aspects of the legal position of the Princes. This opinion had not yet been considered formally by the Standing Committee when Lord Irwin announced that the Secretary of State had appointed a

General Foreword

xvii

relations with the Crown are conducted needs radical alteration. They believe they have solid cause for complaint; they also believe that their grievances can be removed consistently with justice to all parties. They realise that they must first prove their case. Afterwards, they must get together and devise a remedy. Finally, they must demonstrate that this remedy is reasonable and just.

INTRODUCTION

THE present generation of Ruling Princes in India differs from the last more than any generation in the past has differed from its immediate predecessors. In particular the attitude of the Princes towards the doctrine of Paramountcy has undergone a radical change.

In certain matters the Princes of the last generation yielded to the demands of the Government of India, partly from a recognition of their common interests with Britain, cemented during the Mutiny of 1857; partly, as is evident from the records of the time, from a sense—peculiarly strong in the East—of the obligations of courtesy; partly because, though tenacious of their rights as they understood them, they had few opportunities of exploring exactly what these rights were. Moreover, at that period—that is for a quarter of a century between 1860 and 1885—the British power in India was neither sufficiently centralised nor sufficiently dominated by the ardour for development, to claim that control over the internal affairs of the States which characterised the interval between the disappearance of the last generation of Princes, and the attainment by the present of the confidence, based upon age and experience, which could encourage them to put their views forward.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century many leading figures had disappeared from the Indian political stage. Jyaji Rao Scindia, Tukoji Rao Holkar, the Nizam Afzal-ud-Daula, with his great Minister Salar Jung, had all passed away, and it happened that a number of the most important States at more or less the same time fell under minority rule.

The young Princes who were to succeed to their great ancestral dominions grew up under the guidance of tutors appointed for them by the Government of India, and were strongly influenced by the example of the British officers who administered their States. Hence they could hardly fail to absorb modern ideas. As a result, when the time came for each to assume his ruling powers, he set about introducing changes into the type of government bequeathed him by his father, and—where such machinery did not already exist—a regular administrative system of modern type was set to work in most of the leading States.

The altered outlook of the Princes was not, however, in one direction only. A new recognition of their duties was accompanied by a fresh consciousness of the rights and privileges of their position; and the fact that their administrations were now provided with Government officials, who were well equipped to investigate their masters' rights, helped to insure a thorough examination of the Princes' position.

Reading the half-forgotten treaties between their States and the British Crown, the Indian Princes were roused to reflection on many questions which had not troubled their fathers. Not only did they find an unmistakable contrast between the relationship in which they themselves stood to the Government of India and the relationship of their predecessors to the Honourable East India Company, but it also grew apparent to them that the clear and definite pronouncements of the treaties on a number of particular questions were ignored in the procedure of the Political Department.

Meanwhile the steady process by which India is becoming fused into economic unity was continuing year by year, and, as the cares of the Government of India increased and the functions of each Department were extended, the tentacles of British Administration began to stretch out towards the States. Reluctant to admit the argument that efficiency and the need for centralised control made it necessary for the Indian Government to take charge of many activities within the States, the

Princes watched uneasily the gradual curtailment, now here, now there, of powers which they had imagined were for ever safeguarded by the Treaties and Engagements. In particular, they observed that during minority administrations, when the British Government virtually controlled the States, irresistible pressure was sometimes applied to achieve ends which, though sometimes but not always benevolently conceived, involved the sacrifice of some cherished privilege, immunity, or liberty on the part of the Prince concerned. They began to appeal, to protest, to memorialise.

It was an age in which India began to be disturbed by new ideas and new ambitions, and, perhaps, the same spirit which was troubling the waters of political consciousness in British India was at work in this awakening of the Princes. But if there was anything in common in the causes of the two movements, there was nothing in common in their effects, and when a wave of sedition swept over India in the time of Lord Minto (1907), the States remained staunchly loyal to the Crown. Their demands were something entirely different from the demands of the malcontents in British India.

At the time of the outbreak of the Great War (1914) the Princes had grown sensible of the dangers arising from the policy pursued by the Government when in temporary charge of States during minority administrations; and many of them had made appeals to the Viceroy in protest against the system which prevailed. As a result of such appeals the Chiefs' Conference was summoned by Lord Hardinge in 1916. The real problem before the Conference was the complaint of the Princes that the British authorities, whenever the reigning Prince was a minor, seized the opportunity to set up institutions in the States, modelled upon the institutions of British India, which were as alien from the sentiments of the people of the States as they were unwelcome to their governments. Closely connected with the problem was the question of the education of young Princes and of the working of the Chiefs' Colleges.

At the first meeting of the Princes with the Viceroy little was done by Government save to ask for the co-operation of the States in the collection of certain statistics and in spreading timely information about epidemics.

Any suspicions which may have associated the discontent of the Princes with imperfect loyalty to the Crown had been already dissipated by the response of the States on the outbreak of war. The States disappointed the expectations of Germany, not only by throwing their entire influence upon the side of the British, but by the emulation of individual rulers who vied in offering their resources to the British Power.

While the war lasted, the catchwords about the liberty of small nations, self-determination and the reward of heroes, which raised many hopes in England and Europe, and in post-war years caused many disappointments, began to have their effect in India also. The Princes in particular were given every assurance of confidence by Government, and the suspicion and mistrust with which they had formerly been regarded were admitted only to be repudiated. Conscious of the efforts which they had made, the Princes could not fail to read in these phrases an earnest of greater trust and a promise of well-deserved emancipation. At the same time it was not hard to see that the expectations aroused in British India by similar promises might easily lead to a situation in which the interests of silent loyalty would be sacrificed to the demands of vociferous politicians.

When the war ended, and the reforms of 1919 were introduced, the Princes found that their hopes had been set too high. While the creation of the Legislative Assembly and the Provincial Legislatures had given overwhelming weight to interests which were often opposed to their own, the Chamber of Princes, set up in response to the demands of the Conferences held in 1916 and after, failed to afford them any real influence in the settlement of matters vitally affecting their States. But if the Chamber has been of little weight in the affairs of India, it has served to accustom the Princes

to meet and to investigate questions of common concern with a view to combined action; and to arouse in them the realisation of how many and how important those questions are.

It was not, however, only political considerations with which they were concerned. The war had left the country in financial difficulties. The Public Debt was large, and the currency system of India, without having fallen into the morasses characterising Central Europe, was sufficiently disorganised to play havoc with the Budget. New forms of taxation were introduced, and their burden fell almost as much upon the peoples of the States as upon the peoples of British India. So to the disappointment of their political hopes was added in the minds of the Princes a feeling of financial injustice and injury. While their subjects unwittingly contributed to balance the budgets of British India, the Darbars had themselves to increase taxation or to reduce productive expenditure in order to balance their own budgets, and while they were willing enough to fall in with the demand that was being made all over India for greater efficiency in administration, they were hampered by want of funds in securing the personnel required to make efficiency possible.

Even before the end of the war these considerations were in the minds of the Princes. In 1917 a scheme had been put forward very much like that which is now advanced on behalf of Their Highnesses. Later, finding the working of the Chamber of Princes little likely to secure for them greater autonomy, with corresponding opportunity to develop the resources of their States, the Princes pressed during the Viceroyalty of Lord Reading for a Round Table Conference. Their request was evaded, but it is probable that if it had been granted they would have demanded some such investigation of their affairs as that undertaken by the Indian States Committee.

The Committee, which exists "to report upon the relationship between the Paramount Power and the States, with particular reference to the rights and obligations

arising from treaties, engagements and sanads, and from usage, sufferance and other causes; and to inquire into the financial and economic relations between British India and the States," must necessarily deal with the two questions which are uppermost in the minds of the Princes—the disregard of their treaty rights by Government, and the injuries which the existing fiscal system of British India inflicts upon them.

In order to demonstrate the need for a thorough investigation of these matters, it has been necessary to collect evidence from individual States. Reflections on the examination of this evidence are contained in the following pages.

The first part of this volume consists of an historical sketch of the relationship between the States and the Government of India.

Without such historical background the treaties are unintelligible, since to understand them it is necessary to understand the intentions of those who framed them. In this sketch, therefore, the statesmen of the past have been made to speak for themselves, and an examination of their utterances suggests that the views of such authorities as Lee-Warner and Tupper, like the political practices of the last sixty years, have been based upon misconception of the relationship between the States and the Paramount Power; that the construction which has been put upon such phrases as "subordinate co-operation" is unwarranted; and that the fundamental treaty position is very different from what, on the basis of a one-sided practice of recent growth, it is commonly assumed to be.

The second part of this volume deals with the economic and fiscal position of the States in relationship to British India and the central government.

The injuries of which the States are conscious were very much accentuated by war and post-war conditions, and if it were possible to believe that they would automatically disappear in the near future, there would not have been so much need to develop this part of the case.

But that possibility appears remote. It would be idle for the Princes merely to record general protests against the present fiscal policy of Government, and wait for redress; they must substantiate their complaints, secure the acknowledgment of their rights, and insist that the true remedy shall be sought in consultation with them. Thus they hope successfully to get established a system which shall work for the States as well as for British India.

Just as in the political domain a general impression prevails outside the States that the disregard of treaties by the Paramount Power has been in every instance prompted by benevolent considerations, so in the economic domain, while it is admitted that the States have been laid under contribution by the central government, excuse is sought on the ground that the States have corresponding obligations to fulfil. The chief of these obligations is considered to be their share in the defence of India, and the answer—elaborated below—that this obligation was fully discharged by each State on terms prescribed by the East India Company, at the inception of their relations, has never been adequately examined. Moreover, it has never occurred to the outside public that the operation of monopolies controlled by Government might be unfair to the States or that the States could have any rights or even any interest in the matter.

It was apparent, at the Bikaner Conference of Princes and Ministers in 1917, that the same feeling of injustice was shared by a great number of the States. The question was discussed there, and ever since then it has been uppermost in the minds of the Princes. The desire to improve their Governments and to develop their States, combined with the post-war difficulties of the falling value of money and the increased real standard of wages and salaries, only served to give urgency to the demand for restitution which they had already felt it just to make.

The evidence contained in the great collection of State papers presented to the Indian States Committee is intended to show how the treaties of the States have been

disregarded and to exhibit instances of the injustice made possible by certain inherent defects in the existing machinery for conducting the relationship between the Government and the States. The difficulties attendant upon the collection of this evidence have been considerable. Few States maintain well-organised departmental records covering anything but the last few years; and in consequence, some forty-three of the States associated with the Special Organisation of the Chamber of Princes have been obliged to admit that they have no documentary evidence to produce upon several important questions. Even when records exist, they are not always systematically arranged, and in the short time at our disposal it has been impossible for the States to seek out every instance relevant to our case from the total of available documents. Both for this reason, as also because each case has been scrutinised from the standpoint, not merely of importance, but also of demonstrability, the examples contained in the collection are typical rather than exhaustive, and if the records of the States generally had been in better order, much more would have been available. It has been our endeavour to admit no evidence which did not seem to us conclusive, and we have rejected many apparently well-founded complaints for want of formal documentary proof. The cases which we have quoted, whether of political or of economic grievances, must therefore be regarded as illustrative samples of the difficulties which exist and not as a complete account of them.

We desire, however, to emphasise one point. The following pages deal with certain general aspects of the historical and economic relations between the Crown, the States, and the Government of India. Here we desire to utter a note of warning. There is in the case of every State a separate history, a separate set of rights, a separate set of obligations, and a separate economic position. Certain of these particular aspects are brought out in the individual evidence contained in the collected evidence. But everything said in this outline sketch

Introduction

xxvii

must be read as subject to and conditioned by the particular rights and the particular obligations of each State.

It will be clear that the following pages are not the work of a single hand. The work of compiling this historical and economic presentation of the Princes' case has been inspired by the determination to disguise no facts and strain no arguments, and by the resolution to understate rather than overstate the case which is put forward.

APPENDIX I.

GUARANTEES OF PROTECTION.

1. *States which have Treaties.*

ALWAR: Treaty of 1803. Article 2. The friends and enemies of the Honourable Company shall be considered the friends and enemies of Maha Rao Rajah, and the friends and enemies of Maha Rao Rajah shall be the friends and enemies of the Honourable Company.

Article 5. As from the friendship established by the second Article of the present Treaty, the Honourable Company become guarantee to Maha Rao Rajah for the security of his country against external enemies.

BAHAWALPUR: Treaty of 1838. Article 2. The British Government engages to protect the Principality and territory of Bhawalpore.

BANSWARA: Treaty of 1818. Article 2. The British Government engages to protect the principality and territory of Banswarra.

BARODA: Treaty of 1805. Article 2. The friends and enemies of either party shall be the friends and enemies of both, and if any Power shall commit any act of unprovoked hostility or aggression against either of the contracting parties, or against their respective dependents and allies, and after due representations shall refuse to enter into amicable explanations or shall deny the just satisfaction which the contracting parties shall have required, the contracting parties will proceed to prosecute such further measures as the case shall appear to demand. Converted by treaty of 1817 (Article 1) into a definite undertaking to "protect the Gaekwar's Dominions" (which were thereafter considered to include all States paying tribute to Baroda).

Appendix I. Guarantees of Protection .217

BHARATPUR: Treaty of 1805. Article 2. The friends and enemies of one of the parties shall be considered the friends and enemies of both.

Article 7. As by the second Article of the present Treaty the Honourable Company becomes guarantee to Maharajah Runjeet Singh for the security of the country against external enemies . . .

BHOPAL: Treaty of 1818. Article 2. The British Government engages to guarantee and protect the principality and territory of Bhopal against all enemies.

BIKANER: Treaty of 1818. Article 2. The British Government engages to protect the principality and territory of Bikaner.

BUNDI: Treaty of 1818. Article 2. The British Government takes under its protection the dominions of the Rajah of Boondee.

COCHIN: Treaty of 1809. Article 1. The friends and enemies of either of the contracting parties shall be considered as the friends and enemies of both, the Honourable the East India Company Bahador engaging to defend and protect the territories of the Rajah of Cochin against all enemies whomsoever.

CUTCH: Treaty of 1819. Article 5. The Honourable Company engages to guarantee the power of His Highness the Rao Dessul, his heirs and successors, and the integrity of his dominions from foreign or domestic enemies.

DATIA: Treaty of 1818. Article 4. The British Government hereby agrees to protect the original territory of the R^h of Dutteeah, as well as the district now gra^d to the Rajah, from the aggressions of all f^oowers.

DEWAS (Senior, Junior): Treaty of 1818. Article 3. The British Government will protect the Rajahs of Dewas in their present possessions. . . . The British Government will further protect the Rajahs of Dewas against the attacks of enemies, and will aid them in the settlement of any of their rebellious subjects, and will mediate in a just and amicable

APPENDIX I.

GUARANTEES OF PROTECTION.

1. *States which have Treaties.*

ALWAR: Treaty of 1803. Article 2. The friends and enemies of the Honourable Company shall be considered the friends and enemies of Maha Rao Rajah, and the friends and enemies of Maha Rao Rajah shall be the friends and enemies of the Honourable Company.

Article 5. As from the friendship established by the second Article of the present Treaty, the Honourable Company become guarantee to Maha Rao Rajah for the security of his country against external enemies.

BAHAWALPUR: Treaty of 1838. Article 2. The British Government engages to protect the Principality and territory of Bhawalpore.

BANSWARA: Treaty of 1818. Article 2. The British Government engages to protect the principality and territory of Banswarra.

BARODA: Treaty of 1805. Article 2. The friends and enemies of either party shall be the friends and enemies of both, and if any Power shall commit any act of unprovoked hostility or aggression against either of the contracting parties, or against their respective dependents and allies, and after due representations shall refuse to enter into amicable explanations or shall deny the just satisfaction which the contracting parties shall have required, the contracting parties will proceed to prosecute such further measures as the case shall appear to demand. Converted by treaty of 1817 (Article 1) into a definite undertaking to "protect the Gaekwar's Dominions" (which were thereafter considered to include all States paying tribute to Baroda).

Appendix I. Guarantees of Protection .217

BHARATPUR: Treaty of 1805. Article 2. The friends and enemies of one of the parties shall be considered the friends and enemies of both.

Article 7. As by the second Article of the present Treaty the Honourable Company becomes guarantee to Maharajah Runjeet Singh for the security of the country against external enemies . . .

BHOPAL: Treaty of 1818. Article 2. The British Government engages to guarantee and protect the principality and territory of Bhopal against all enemies.

BIKANER: Treaty of 1818. Article 2. The British Government engages to protect the principality and territory of Bikaner.

BUNDI: Treaty of 1818. Article 2. The British Government takes under its protection the dominions of the Rajah of Boondee.

COCHIN: Treaty of 1809. Article 1. The friends and enemies of either of the contracting parties shall be considered as the friends and enemies of both, the Honourable the East India Company Bahador engaging to defend and protect the territories of the Rajah of Cochin against all enemies whomsoever.

CUTCH: Treaty of 1819. Article 5. The Honourable Company engages to guarantee the power of His Highness the Rao Dessul, his heirs and successors, and the integrity of his dominions from foreign or domestic enemies.

DATIA: Treaty of 1818. Article 4. The British Government hereby agrees to protect the original territory of the Rajah of Dutteeah, as well as the district now granted to the Rajah, from the aggressions of all foreign Powers.

DEWAS (Senior, Junior): Treaty of 1818. Article 3. The British Government will protect the Rajahs of Dewas in their present possessions. . . . The British Government will further protect the Rajahs of Dewas against the attacks of enemies, and will aid them in the settlement of any of their rebellious subjects, and will mediate in a just and amicable

218. *The British Crown and the Indian States*

manner any dispute that may arise between them and other States and petty Chiefs.

DHAR: Treaty of 1819. Article 3. The British Government agrees to protect the State of Dhar and its dependencies.

DHOLPUR: Treaty of 1806. As by the third Article of the present treaty the districts of Dholpore, Barea and Rajekeerah have, in conformity to the request of the Maharajah Ranah, been granted to him in sovereignty, and will remain exempt from all orders of the Adawlut or other demands of the Honourable Company, Maharajah Ranah hereby agrees to take upon himself the responsibility for adjusting all disputes which may arise, either external or internal, and no responsibility for assistance or protection remains with the Honourable Company.

GWALIOR: Treaty of 1804. Article 2. The British Government will never permit any Power or State whatever to commit with impunity any act of unprovoked hostility or aggression against the rights and territories of the Maharajah Dowlut Ras Sindia, but will, at all times, in compliance with the requisition of the Maharajah, maintain and defend the same, when such requisition is made, in the like manner as the rights and territories of the Honourable Company are now maintained and defended.

Treaty 1844. Article 6. Whereas the British Government is bound by treaty to protect the person of His Highness the Maharajah, his heirs and successors, and to protect his dominions from foreign invasion, and to quell serious disturbances therein . . .

HYDERABAD: Treaty of 1800. Article 2. The British Government will never permit any Power or State whatever to commit with impunity any act of unprovoked hostility or aggression against the rights and territories of His Highness the Nizam, but will at all times maintain and defend the same, in the same manner as the rights and territories of the Honourable Company are now maintained and defended.

Appendix I. Guarantees of Protection 219

Treaty of 1853. Article 5. It is also hereby agreed that, excepting the said subsidiary and contingent forces, His Highness shall not under any circumstances be called upon to furnish any other troops whatsoever.

INDORE: Treaty of 1818. Article 1. The British Government will at all times extend the same protection to the territories of Maharajah Mulhar Rao Holkar as to its own.

JAIPUR: Treaty of 1818. Article 2. The British Government engages to protect the territory of Jeypore, and to expel the enemies of that principality.

JALSALMER: Treaty of 1818. Article 3. In the event of any serious invasion directed towards the overthrow of the principality of Jessulmere, or other danger of great magnitude occurring in that principality, the British Government will exert its power for the protection of the principality, provided that the cause of the quarrel be not ascribable to the Rajah of Jessulmere.

JAMMU and KASHMIR: Treaty of 1846. Article 9. The British Government will give aid to Maharajah Gulab Sing in protecting his territories from external enemies.

JHALAWAR: Treaty of 1838. Article 5. The British Government engages to take Rajah Rana Mudun Sing's principality under its protection.

JODHPUR: Treaty of 1818. Article 2. The British Government engages to protect the principality and territory of Jodhpore.

KALAT: Treaty of 1876. Article 3. The British Government on its part engages to respect the independence of Khelat and to aid the Khan, in case of need, in the maintenance of a just authority and the protection of his territories from external attack, by such means as the British Government may at the moment deem expedient.

KARALI: Treaty of 1817. The British Government

220 *The British Crown and the Indian States*

takes under its protection the dominions of the Rajah of Kerowlee.

KHAIPUR: Treaty of 1838. Article 2. The British Government engages to protect the principality and territory of Kheirpore.

KISHENGARH: Treaty of 1818. The British Government engages to protect the principality and territory of Kishengarh.

KOLHAPUR: Treaty of 1812. Article 8. In consideration of the cession of the harbour of Malwan, and on condition of the effectual suppression of piracy, the Honourable Company engages to guarantee such territories as shall remain in the Rajah of Kolhapore's possession against the aggression of all foreign Powers and States.

KOTAH: Treaty of 1817. Article 3. The British Government engages to take under its protection the principality and territory of Kotah.

MYSORE: Instrument of Transfer, 1881. Article 5. The British Government having undertaken to defend and protect the said territories against all external enemies. . . .

ORCHHA: Treaty of 1812. Article 2. The territory which from ancient times has descended to Rajah Mahendra Biskermajeet Bahader by inheritance, and is now in his possession, is hereby guaranteed to the said Rajah and to his heirs and successors. . . . The British Government, moreover, engages to protect and defend the dominions at present in Rajah Mahendra Biskermajeet Bahader's possession from the aggression of any foreign Power.

PARTABGARH: Treaty of 1818. Article 1. The Rajah promises to give up all connection with other States, and to the utmost of his power prove his obedience to the British Government, who in return agree to . . . protect him from the claims and trespasses of all other States.

RAMPUR: Engagement of 1794. Article 2. The said Company engage to guarantee the possession of the

Appendix I. Guarantees of Protection 221

said mehals to the said Nabob Ahmed Athy Khan Behander.

REWA: Treaty of 1812. Article 1. The British Government engages to protect the territories at present possessed by the Rajah of Rewah from the aggressions of any foreign Power in the same manner as the dominions of the Honourable Company are protected and defended.

SAMTHAR: Treaty of 1817. Article 2. The British Government, with a view to confirm the attachment and fidelity of the Government of Sumpthur, hereby guarantees to Rajah Runjeet Singh, his heirs and successors, the territory actually possessed by him at the period of the establishment of the British Government in Bundelkhund, and now in his occupation, and the British Government hereby agrees to protect and defend the same from the aggressions of any foreign Power.

SAWANTWARI: Treaty of 1819. Article 2. The British Government engages to protect the principality and territory of Sawant Waree.

SIKKIM: Has no guarantee of protection.

SIROHI: Treaty of 1823. Article 1. The British Government consents to take under its protection, and to receive amongst the number of its dependent and tributary States, the chiefship and territory of Serohi.

TRAVANCORE: Treaty of 1805. Article 1. The friends and enemies of either of the contracting parties shall be considered as the friends and enemies of both; the Honourable Company especially engaging to defend and protect the territories of the Rajah of Travancore against all enemies whatsoever.

TONK: Treaty of 1817. Article 1. The British Government guarantees to Nawab Umurkhan, and his heirs in perpetuity, the possession of the places which he holds in the territories of Maharajah Holkar, under grants from the said Maharajah, and the British Government takes those possessions under its protection.

222 *The British Crown and the Indian States*

UDAUPIR: Treaty of 1818. Article 2. The British Government engages to protect the principality and territory of Oudeypore.

2. *States which have no Treaties but which have been Guaranteed Protection in some other Express Form.*

MANIPUR, Sanad 1891: "Be assured that so long as your house is loyal to the Crown and faithful to the conditions of this Sanad, you and your successors will enjoy the favour and protection of the British Government."

TRIBUTARY STATES OF ORISSA: The relationship of these States with the British Government is laid down in the treaty engagements of 1803. By these engagements the States undertook to pay tribute to that Government, and as its tributaries they must be held entitled to its protection.

STATES WITHOUT FORMAL TREATIES IN BOMBAY AND THE WESTERN INDIAN AGENCY: The tributaries of the Peshwa and Gaekwar were originally guaranteed protection by the terms of the alliances between those rulers and the Company. By Article 2 of the treaty of Bassein it was laid down that if any Power or State whatever shall commit any act of unprovoked hostility or aggression against either of the contracting parties or against their respective dependents or others . . . then the contracting parties will proceed to concert and prosecute such further measures as the case shall appear to demand. . . . The British Government will never permit any Power or States whatever to commit with impunity any act of unprovoked hostility or aggression against the rights and territories of His Highness Rao Pundit Purdham Behander, but will at all times maintain and defend the same in the same manner as the rights and territories of the Honourable Company are now maintained and defended.

Appendix I. Guarantees of Protection 223

A number of States, formerly tributary to the Peshwa, became tributary to the Company, and their tributes, many of which consisted of a share in transit or other duties, since commuted to fixed sums, became payable to the Company. The Company thenceforward became responsible, in place of the Peshwa, for the defence of these territories. The rest of the States who paid tribute to the Peshwa came into direct relationship with the Company upon his resignation in 1818, and the Company assumed his obligations towards them.

The States of Kathiawar and Mahi Kantha as well as Rewa Kantha and Palanpur and Rhadanpur are protected under the Walker Settlement of 1807-8 (Kathiawar), the Mahi Kantha Settlement of 1811-12, the Rewa Kantha Settlement of 1821-14, the Palanpur Agreement of 1813, and the Rhadanpur Agreement of 1820. Only in the case of Bariya in Rewa Kantha was the tribute imposed explicitly in return for protection.

The following States were formerly subject either to Gaekwar or to Peshwa :

Sachin.	Panth Piploda.
Cambay.	States of Kathiawar.
Bansda.	Palanpur.
Dharampur.	Radhanpur.
Jaujar.	Kankrej.
Janjira.	States of Mahi Kantha.
Savanur.	States of Rewa Kantha.
Sandur.	

SANAD STATES IN BUNDELKHAND : These States also were ceded by the Peshwa to the British Government, and though no clause in the Sanads which they received from it guarantees protection to them, it is affirmed in the answers to several of the Papers of Requests submitted by one or other of the chiefs in Bundelkhand.

SOUTHERN MARATHA STATES known as "Jagirdars," Sangli, Miraj Senior, Miraj Junior, Jamphandi, Kurnudwad Senior, Kurnudwad Junior, Ramdurg, Mudhol: Treaty of 1817. Article 13, p. 64. Terms granted by the Honourable East India Company 1819, Article 2: "As long as you shall remain faithful and true to Government, your lands shall be continued to you without interruption."

PUNJAB HILL STATES: These States were conferred by Sanad on their various Chiefs after the Gurkha wars. The Chiefs either pay tribute or were bound to perform feudal services which have since been commuted for money. In answer to a Paper of Requests presented by the Rajah of Bilaspur, he was assured that his territory "shall in every respect be considered to be under the protection of the British Government," and presumably the rest of the Punjab Hill States are to be considered in the same way.

CIS SUTLEJ STATES: Patiala, Jind, Nabha, Kalsia, Maler Kotla, Faridkot, Mandwa, were taken under British protection by a Proclamation in 1809. Patiala received a further guarantee in a Sanad in 1847: "The Rajah of Putteala having requested that he may receive a renewed assurance of protection and guarantee of his rights in his former possessions, the Governor-General is pleased to confer this assurance in the form of a Sanad or Grant."

Jind received a Sanad in the same terms. Nabha was assured of protection in answer to a Paper of Requests and in a Sanad in 1860.

The Chiefs of the so-called "Feudatory" STATES IN THE CENTRAL PROVINCES hold their lands under Sanads containing the following clause: "The British Government will continue, as long as you remain loyal to the Crown and abide by the conditions of the Sanad and of your other engagements with the British Government, to maintain you in the position and privileges which you have hitherto enjoyed or

which are now conferred on you." These States pay tributes.

TEHRI, Sanad of 1820: The British Government will guarantee the Rajah and his posterity in the secure possession of the country now conferred upon him and will defend him against his enemies.

APPENDIX II.

PAYMENTS FOR DEFENCE.

I.—Territories Ceded.

UDAIPUR : Udaipur's share of Mewar Merwara was transferred to British management soon after the subjugation of that part of the country. In 1881, with the view of removing difficulties connected with the adjustments of accounts, the British Government proposed to accept in future the revenue of Mewar Merwara in full discharge of the Udaipur State's contribution towards the cost of the administration of the district, the expenses of the Mewar Bhil Corps (Rs. 50,000) and of the Merwara battalions (Rs. 16,000).

It was further stipulated that should the receipts from the district at any time exceed Rs. 66,000, the surplus money should be paid in full to the Udaipur Treasury.—Treaty of 1818. Aitchison, Vol. III.

GWALIOR: By the treaty of 1803 Scindia made large concessions of territories, yielding a revenue of nearly a crore and a half. Out of the land ceded the East India Company offered to maintain a subsidiary force, consisting of six battalions of infantry with their complement of ordnance and artillery.—Treaty of 1804.

By the treaty of 1817 Scindia was required to provide 5,000 horse (known as the Gwalior Contingent, and afterwards as the Auxiliary Horse) out of his own troops to co-operate with the British troops in suppressing the Pindaris. By Article 5 of this treaty Scindia renounced for a period of three years certain payments amounting to Rs. 7 lakhs annually made to him and his family by the British Government under a previous treaty of 1805, and relinquished for two years to the British Government, the tribute amounting to Rs. 3½ lakhs, which he received from the Rajputana States.

In 1844 a new treaty was signed by Article 2, of which the contingent force was to be considerably increased, and in addition to all the revenues and other receipts, already set apart for the purposes, the revenues of other large districts belonging to the State were assigned to the Government for the maintenance of the force, the total cost of which was now estimated at 18 lakhs annually. The sum appropriated was sufficient to provide 7 battalions of infantry, 2 regiments of cavalry, and four batteries of artillery. (Despatch of the Governor-General to the Secret Committee, dated 21st January, 1844.)

As a reward for his services in the Mutiny, Scindia was given in 1860 territory yielding Rs. 3 lakhs. For convenience the territory was found out of the districts he had assigned in 1844 for the expenses of the contingent.

By the treaty of the same year the Maharajah ceded to the British Government in full sovereignty the remainder of the assigned districts; the Government engaged to maintain a subsidiary force at the reduced minimum cost of Rs. 16 lakhs.—Aitchison, Vol. III.

INDORE: By Article 7 of the treaty of 1818, Holkar was guaranteed protection in return for large cessions of territory.—Aitchison, Vol. IV.

Appendix II. Payments for Defence 227

KOLHAPUR. By Article 8 of the treaty of 1812, Kolhapur ceded certain forts and the harbour of Malwan in return for protection guaranteed.—Aitchison, Vol. VII.

SANGLI: Ceded territories yielding a revenue of Rs. 1,35,000 in lieu of subsidy.—Aitchison, Vol. VII. p. 225.

SAWANTWARI.—Ceded the whole line of east coast from the Karli River to the boundaries of the Portuguese possessions in return for protection (treaty of 1819).—Aitchison, Vol. VII.

BARODA: By the treaty of 1802, Baroda agreed to receive a State subsidiary force from the British Government and to cede the Chauthi and Surat and the Pargana of Chorasi on condition of being supported against his rival, Malhar Rao.

In 1805 the subsidiary force was increased and territories yielding Rs. 11,70,000 were ceded for its support.

In 1808, the Gaekwar ceded additional territories yielding Rs. 1,76,168, as the ceded districts were found not to yield a revenue equal to the amount of the cost of the subsidiary force.

By the treaty of 1817 the subsidiary force was again increased, and the Gaekwar ceded to the British Government all the rights which he had acquired by the farm of the Peshwa's territories in Gujerat yielding Rs. 12,61,969. In 1830 lands yielding 15 lakhs were sequestered from the Gaekwar's territories to provide funds for the additional troops which he had agreed to maintain by the treaty of 1817. In 1832, however, the districts were restored on the Gaekwar agreeing to deposit Rs. 1,00,00,000 with the British Government. In 1839 the District of Petlad yielding a revenue of Rs. 7,32,000 was sequestered, and a part of the revenue of Petlad was appropriated to the maintenance of a body of cavalry organised by the British Government and called the Gujerat Irregular Horse. In 1841, an

agreement made with the Gaekwar revised the treaty of 1817 and provided for a payment of Rs. 3,00,000 for the Gujerat Irregular Horse and for the maintenance of 3,000 horse by the Gaekwar. On the conclusion of this agreement the district of Petlad and the one crore deposited with the British Government in 1832 were returned to the Gaekwar in 1858 as reward for services in the Mutiny. The payment of Rs. 3 lakhs a year for the Gujerat Irregular Horse was remitted.

In 1881 an Agreement was executed by which the British Government allowed the contingent to be disbanded in consideration of an annual payment of Rs. 3,75,000.—Aitchison, Vol. VIII.

NABHA: A portion of the territory of the Nabha State was confiscated owing to its refusal to help the British army during the first Sikh war. This portion was divided between Patiala and Faridkot and the British. The revenue from the British portion was appropriated to the maintenance of 133 infantry and 100 horse, and the Chief was exempted from providing the troops which he had formerly furnished.—Aitchison, Vol. VIII.

HYDERABAD: By the treaty of 1766, in return for the Circars of Ellore, Cricacole, Rajamahendri, Mustfanagar and Murtzanagar or Guntur, the British Government agreed to furnish the Nizam with a subsidiary force when required and to pay 9 lakhs a year when the assistance of the troops was not required. By the treaty of 1800 the subsidiary force was increased, and to secure the regular payment of the troops the Nizam ceded the greater part of the territory which he had acquired under the treaty of Serangapatam (1792) and under the Mysore treaty of 1797, yielding altogether 20,91,428 pagodas, or about 62,74,000 rupees.

By Article 12 of the treaty of 1800 the Nizam was also bound to maintain six thousand infantry and nine thousand horse to co-operate with the sub-

subsidiary force. As the Nizam's troops were inefficient, it became necessary to maintain in their place two battalions, armed, clothed and equipped like the Company's troops.

Later it became necessary to make advances from the British Treasury for the payment of this contingent force, and in 1851 territorial cessions were demanded to liquidate the debt, which then amounted to more than Rs. 78,00,000. A payment of Rs. 40,00,000 was at once made, but the balance remained unpaid, and in 1853 the debt had again risen to Rs. 45,00,000. In 1853 a fresh treaty was concluded and the British Government agreed to maintain in addition to the subsidiary force an auxiliary force, called the Hyderabad Contingent, of not less than 5,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalry and 4 field batteries of artillery, and in order to provide for the payment of this force the Nizam assigned in trust districts in Berar, Dharaseo and Raichur Doab estimated to yield a gross revenue of Rs. 50 lakhs a year. It was also agreed that accounts should be annually rendered to the Nizam, and that any surplus that might accrue should be paid to him. By this treaty the services of the subsidiary force and the contingent were to be at the disposal of the British Government in time of war and the Nizam was released from any further obligation in this respect. The contingent ceased to be a part of the Nizam's army and became an auxiliary force kept by the British Government for the Nizam's use.

In 1860 the debt of Rs. 50 lakhs due by the Nizam was cancelled and the district of Dharaseo and Raichur Doab were restored to him. The Nizam had, however, to cede certain districts on the left bank of the Godavari and to agree to free the traffic on that river from all duties. He further agreed that the remaining assigned districts in Berar should be held in trust by the British Govern-

ment for the purpose specified in the treaty of 1853, and that no demand for accounts of the receipts or expenditure, of the districts should be made. In 1902 Berar was re-leased in perpetuity in consideration of the payment to the Nizam of a fixed and perpetual rental of Rs. 25,00,000 per annum. The British Government were also empowered to redistribute, organise and control the force composing the Hyderabad Contingent. The Hyderabad Contingent has now ceased to exist, the artillery having been disbanded and the cavalry and infantry absorbed in the regular army.

II.—Lump Sum Payments.

INDORE: In lieu of his obligation under Article 11 of the treaty of 1818 by which Holkar agreed to retain a body of not less than 3,000 horse in his service ready to co-operate with the British troops, an annual subvention of Rs. 1,11,214 was paid by him. Besides this, the Maharajah also paid Rs. 7,862 annually towards the Malwa Contingent and Bhil Corps. These payments were capitalised by the State depositing Rs. 23,81,520 with the Government of India, the interest thereon at 5 per cent. being assigned as the payment for the future, "thereby relieving His Highness from all demands on account of the said contingent and Bhil Corps, as well as from all pecuniary demands, present or future, and from service with troops."

DHAR. In 1880 Dhar surrendered to the British Government, Government promissory notes amounting to Rs. 3,00,000, thus capitalising the annual payment of a sum of Rs. 12,000, which was a part of its contribution towards the Malwa Bhil Corps.

III.—Subsidies.

JODHPUR: In accordance with the eighth Article of the treaty of 1818, the State was bound to furnish a contingent of 1,500 horse. This obligation was commuted to an assured payment of Rs. 1,15,000 towards the cost of a contingent called the Erinpura Regiment.

KOTAH: The State pays Rs. 2,00,000 a year towards the cost of the Deoli Irregular Force. This sum was fixed by the treaty of 1838.—Aitchison, Vol. III.

DEWAS: By the treaty of 1818 the two States of Dewas were required to provide a contingent of 50 horse and 50 foot to be at the disposal of the British Government, in return for the guarantee of protection. In 1827 the contingent was raised to 75 horse and 200 foot. This obligation was afterwards commuted to an annual contribution of Rs. 28,474-9-2.

BHOPAL: By the treaty of 1818 Bhopal was guaranteed protection and undertook to provide a contingent of 600 horse and 400 infantry. The contribution paid for its maintenance was raised in 1840. After the Mutiny the contingent was replaced by the Bhopal Battalion. Since 1849 the State has paid an annual contribution of Rs. 1,61,290.

JAORA: Pays Rs. 1,59,027-4-4 in place of the quota of troops formerly maintained as part of the Malwa Contingent.

DHAR: Pays an annual contribution of Rs. 7,656 towards the maintenance of the Malwa Bhil Corps.

JHABUA: Pays Rs. 1,271 towards the cost of the Malwa Bhil Corps.

ALIRAJPUR: Pays Rs. 1,271 towards the cost of the Malwa Bhil Corps.

BARWANI: Pays Rs. 3,389 towards the cost of the Malwa Bhil Corps.

232 *The British Crown and the Indian States*

CUTCH: By the treaty of 1819, the Maharaja of Cutch agreed to provide a contingent force in return for the guarantee of protection. The State at present pays a contribution of Rs. 1,86,949, which is liable to be reduced to a minimum of Rs. 88,000 if the contingent is reduced.

AKALKOT: Pays Rs. 14,592 in lieu of the service of horsemen.

JATH: Pays Rs. 6,400 in lieu of the service of horsemen.

PHALTAN: Pays Rs. 9,600 in lieu of the service of horsemen.

MIRAJ (Senior): Pays Rs. 12,557 in lieu of the service of horsemen.

MIRAJ (Junior): Pays Rs. 6,412-8 in lieu of the service of horsemen.

JAMKHANDI: Pays Rs. 20,840-10 in lieu of the service of horsemen.

MUDHOL: Pays Rs. 2,671-14 in lieu of the service of horsemen.

KURUNDWAD: Pays Rs. 1,696-8 in lieu of the service of horsemen.

BARODA: In 1881 an agreement was executed by which the British Government agreed to allow the contingent of 3,000 horse maintained by the Gaekwar to be disbanded in consideration of an annual money payment of Rs. 3,75,000.

MYSORE: Used to pay Peshkash and subsidy of Rs. 35,00,000, which has since 1926 been reduced to Rs. 25,00,000.

TRAVANCORE: By the treaty of 1795 the Rajah engaged to pay an annual subsidy adequate to maintain 3 battalions of sepoy. In 1805 one more Regiment was added; eventually the subsidy payable by the Travancore State was fixed definitely at Rs. 80,00,000.

COCHIN: Pays Rs. 2,00,000.

Appendix II. Payments for Defence 233

IV.—Tributes.

Name of State.	Tribute (Government Ra.).		Remarks.
	Ra.	s. p.	
Udaipur . . .	2,00,000	0 0	The tribute under Article 6 of the treaty, dated the 13th January, 1918, was fixed for the first five years at one-fourth of the revenues of Udaipur, and thereafter at three-eighths in perpetuity. In 1826 it was fixed at 3 lakhs, Udaipur rupees. In consequence of financial embarrassments of the State, the tribute was reduced in June 1846 to Government Ra. 2 lakhs.
Dungarpur . . .	17,500	0 0	Tribute payable under Article 9 of treaty, dated 11th December, 1818, Salim Shahi Ra. 35,000.
Banswara . . .	17,500	0 0	The tribute payable under Article 9 of the treaty, dated the 25th December, 1818, was Salim Shahi Ra. 35,000 = Government Ra. 17,500-0-0.
Jaipur	4,00,000	0 0	Tribute payable under Article 2 of Agreement, dated 4th September, 1871, taken as part of, and supplementary to, the treaty, dated 2nd April, 1818. The payment of a like amount to the Darbar, under the Salt Treaty, is set off against this tribute.
Lawa (Thakurate)	225	0 0	The tribute has been paid since the 1st April, 1883. Reduced by Government from Ra. 3,000.
Jhalawar . . .	30,000	0 0	The tribute payable under Article 11 of the treaty, dated the 8th April, 1838, was Ra. 80,000-0-0. A part of the territories which were made over by Kotah in 1838, for the formation of the Jhalawar States, was restored to Kotah in 1899, and the tribute was reduced to Ra. 30,000 by a Sanad dated the 30th January, 1899.
Kotah	2,34,720	0 0	The tribute payable under Article 7 of the treaty, dated 25th December, 1817, was Ra. 2,89,720. A remission of Ra. 25,000 was sanctioned by Sanad, dated 25th September, 1819; and on the formation of the State of Jhalawar, a further reduction of Ra. 80,000 was granted under Article 4 of the treaty, dated 10th April, 1838. The tribute was enhanced in 1898 by Ra. 50,000 when certain territories were restored to Kotah from Jhalawar.
Bundi	40,000	0 0	Tribute payable under Article 5 of the treaty dated 10th February, 1818, as <i>chauth</i> of Bundi and other places.
Shahpura (Chietship)	10,000	0 0	The tribute is paid on account of Fargana of Phulia under the Sanad dated 27th June, 1848.

234 *The British Crown and the Indian States*

TRIBUTES—continued.

Name of State.	Tribute (Government Rs.).		Remarks.
	Rs.	a. p.	
Sirohi	6,881	4 0	The tribute originally payable under Article 8 of the treaty, dated 11th September, 1823, was Bhilari Rs. 15,000 or Government Rs. 13,762-8-0. The Chief, having rendered meritorious service during the mutinies, a remission of half his tribute was sanctioned by the Government of India on the 18th December, 1857.—Aitchison, Vol. III.
Bundhelkhand . .	27,194	5 6	The following five States in the Bundhelkhand Agency pay tribute for certain villages or districts in their territories, namely, Charkhari, Panna, Ajaigarh, Bihat, and Paldeo.—Aitchison, Vol. V.
Junagarh	28,394	0 0	—
Nawanagar	50,312	0 0	—
Bhavnagar	1,28,060	0 0	—
Porbandar	21,202	0 0	—
Dhrangadhara	40,671	0 0	—
Rajkot	18,991	0 0	—
Wadhwan	26,009	8 0	—
States of Mahi Kantha Agency.	921	11 2	—
States of Rewa Kantha Agency.	24,382	0 0	—
Cambay	—	—	Tribute remitted in return for admission of salt excise.—Aitchison, Vol. VI.
Bansda	7,351	8 0	In 1858 the Rajah of Bansda agreed to pay Rs. 1,500, in addition to this tribute, in consideration of the British Government foregoing its share in transit duties. In 1873 the Rajah was granted Rs. 8,698 per annum as compensation for abolishing transit duties. The net payment made by the State to the British Government is, therefore, now Rs. 153-8-0.
Dharampur	9,000	0 0	By an agreement signed in 1870, this sum was made payable in place of the British share in transit duties which were then abolished.
Bhor	4,684	0 0	—
Jath	4,847	0 0	—
Hindur (Nalagarh)	5,000	0 0	Sanad 1860.
Bashahr	3,945	0 0	Sanad of 1816 required a tribute of Rs. 15,000 which was reduced in 1847 in compensation for the abolition of transit duties.
Baghat	2,000	0 0	Sanad of 1862 required a tribute of this amount, but the actual payment is now Rs. 132-6-0, as part was remitted on account of lands ceded at Solon and Kasauli.
Jubbal	2,520	0 0	—
Kapurthala	1,31,000	0 0	In commutation of military service.
Mandi	1,00,000	0 0	—

Appendix II. Payments for Defence 235

TRIBUTES—continued.

Name of State.	Tribute (Government Rs.).		Remarks.
	Rs.	a. p.	
Chamba . . .	10,000	0 0	Part of the tribute was remitted on account of lands made over to Government. The actual payment is now Rs. 3,800.
Suket . . .	11,000	0 0	Sanad 1846.—Aitchison, Vol. VIII.
Travancore . . .	13,319	8 0	Paid as equivalent of the Peashah and Nazrana formerly due to the Nawab of the Carnatic.—Aitchison, Vol. X.
Benares . . .	2,19,000	0 0	—
Manipur . . .	15,000	0 0	Sanad 1891.—Aitchison, Vol. XI.
Cooch-Bihar . . .	67,700	15 0	Sum fixed in 1780.

The following 17 States in Orissa received Sanads in 1894, redefining their status and mentioning the tribute which they are liable to pay :

	Rs.	a. p.	
Athgarh . . .	2,800	0 0	—
Athmallik . . .	480	0 0	—
Baramba . . .	1,397	15 5	—
Bod . . .	800	0 0	—
Daspalla . . .	661	7 11	—
Dhenkanal . . .	5,099	0 9	—
Hindol . . .	551	3 11	—
Keunjhar . . .	1,701	1 3	—
Khandpara . . .	4,211	8 8	—
Morbhanj . . .	1,067	11 9	—
Narsinghpur . . .	1,455	8 3	—
Nayagarh . . .	5,525	4 1	—
Nilgiri . . .	3,900	7 8	—
Pal Lahara . . .	266	10 8	—
Ranpur . . .	1,400	13 2	—
Talcher . . .	1,039	10 5	—
Tigaria . . .	9,158	0 0	—
Bonai and Gangapur.	1,750	0 0	Sanad of 1899.
Bamsa . . .	1,500	0 0	Sanad 1905.
Kalahandi or Karound.	12,000	0 0	Sanad 1905.
Patna . . .	8,500	0 0	Sanad 1905.
Rairakhol . . .	800	0 0	Sanad 1905.
Soapur . . .	9,000	0 0	Sanad 1905.—Aitchison, Vol. I.

Feudatory States in the Central Provinces.

	Rs.	a. p.	
Bastar . . .	17,200	0 0	—
Chang Bhakar . . .	387	0 0	—
Jashpur . . .	1,250	0 0	—
Kanker . . .	—	—	Tribute remitted in consequence of resumption by Government of sugar duties.
Kawardha . . .	32,000	0 0	—
Khairagarh . . .	70,000	0 0	—
Kondka . . .	15,000	0 0	—

236 *The British Crown and the Indian States*

TRIBUTES—continued.

Name of State.	Tribute (Government Rs.).	Remarks.
	Ra. a. p.	
Korea	500 0 0	—
Nandgaon . . .	70,000 0 0	—
Raigarh	4,000 0 0	—
Sakti	1,300 0 0	—
Sarangarh . . .	1,350 0 0	—
Sarguja	2,500 0 0	—
Udaipur	800 0 0	—
Baghat	2,000 0 0	Sanad of 1862 required a tribute of this amount, but the actual payment is now Rs. 132-6-0, as part was remitted on account of lands ceded at Solon and Kasuli.

The following States were granted Sanads which required the provision of forced labour. This was afterwards commuted for money payments.

	Ra. a. p.	
Bhaji	1,440 0 0	—
Kothar	1,000 0 0	—
Kumharain . . .	2,000 0 0	—
Dhami	360 0 0	—
Balsar	1,080 0 0	—
Mailog	1,440 0 0	—
Beja	180 0 0	—
Taroch	280 0 0	—
Kunhiar	180 0 0	—
Mangal	72 0 0	—

The following States paid tribute to Scindia which were assigned to the British Government as part of the payment for the Gwalior Contingent under the treaties of 1844 and 1860.

	Ra. a. p.	
Khilchipur . . .	11,134 3 6	—
Ratlam	65,520 0 0	—
Sailana	32,760 0 0	—
Jodhpur	1,08,000 0 0	Reduced by Rs. 10,000 on account of cession of land at Amarkot.—Aitchison, Vol. IV.

APPENDIX III.

SUPPLY OF TROOPS IN TIME OF WAR.

- UDAIPUR:** By Article 8 of the treaty of 1818 the troops of the States shall be furnished according to its means at the requisition of the British Government.
- DUNGARPUR:** By Article 10 of the treaty of 1818 the Maharawal, his heirs and successors engaged to afford what military force they might possess to the British Government upon their requisition.
- BANSWARA:** Engaged to furnish troops according to its means to the British Government on requisition.
- JAIPUR:** The Maharajah agreed to furnish troops on the requisition of the British Government. (Treaty of 1818.)
- KISHENGARH:** Engaged to furnish troops on the requisition of the British Government, according to its means.
- KARAULI:** Engaged to furnish troops on the requisition of the British Government, according to its means. (Treaty of 1817.)
- ALWAR:** Alwar troops to co-operate with those of the British Government. (Treaty of 1803.)
- BIKANER:** The Maharajah of Bikaner will furnish troops on the requisition of the British Government, according to his means. (Article 8 of the treaty of 1818.)
- KOTAH:** "Furnish troops according to his means when required." (Treaty of 1817.)
- JHALAWAR:** The Maharajah Rana agreed to supply troops according to his means.
- BHOPAL:** Article 6, treaty of 1818. "The State of Bhopal shall furnish a contingent of six hundred (600) horse and four hundred (400) infantry for the service of the British Government. Whenever required and when necessary, the whole of the Bhopal forces shall join the British army excepting such a portion as may be requisite for the internal administration of the country."

238 *The British Crown and the Indian States*

DATIA: By the treaty of 1818, Article 6, "the Rajah hereby binds himself to employ his troops at his own expenses whenever required to do so in co-operation with those of the British Government on all occasions in which the interest of the two States may be mutually concerned."

SAMTHAR: Provision similar to that of Datia.

CUTCH: By Article 14 of the treaty of 1819 the Rao, his heirs and successors, engaged to afford what military force they might possess to the aid of the Honourable Company's Government upon requisition.

PATIALA: By the Sanad granted in 1847, the Maharajah, among other things, engaged himself to attend in person with his forces should the Cis Sutlej territories be invaded by the enemies, while the British Government gave up all claims to tribute or revenue or commutation in lieu of troops or otherwise.

JIND and NABHA: Same as above.

The following States are bound to render service, presumably when called upon in time of war :

Sirmur.	Kothar.
Kahlur.	Taroch.
Jubbal.	Kunhiar.

JAMMU and KASHMIR: By the treaty of 1846 the Maharajah engaged for himself and heirs to join the whole of his military forces with the British troops when employed within the hills or in territories adjoining his possessions.

SUPPLY OF GRAIN AND OTHER MATERIAL.

PATIALA: By the Sanad of 1860 the Maharajah is bound to co-operate with British forces on an enemy appearing and to provide carriage and supplies of grains, etc. free to the British troops.

JIND and NABHA; Same as above.

INDEX

- ADAM, JOHN, 51
 Afghanistan, Russian Influence, 1876, 72
 Aitchison, Sir Charles, 62, 64, 81, 100, 155 *note*, 156 *note*, 225, 226, 227, 228, 234, 235, 236
 Akalkot, Defence Subsidies, 232
 Alam, Shah, 6
 Alivajpur, Defence Subsidies, 231
 Alwar :
 Installation of Maharajah, Lord Curzon's Speech, 91
 Protection Treaty 1803, 216
 Troops, Supply in time of War, 237
 Amherst, Lord, 40, 41, 42
 Annexations under Lord Dalhousie, 51
 Arcot, Nawab of, Treaty with, 33
 Army :
 Costs of Maintenance, 157 *et seq.*
 Imperial Services Troops instituted, 85, 87
 Indian States' Defence Liabilities, 68, 69, 145 *et seq.*
 Subsidiary Forces, 32, 33, 46, 47, 127
 Auckland, Lord, 47, 49, 51
 Baghat, Tribute payable by, 234
 Bahawalpur Treaty 1838, 216
 Balsar, Tribute in lieu of Forced Labour, 236
 Banda, Tribute payable by, 234
 Banswara Defence Liabilities and Tributes, 216, 233, 237
 Barlow, Sir George, 27, 28
 Baroda :
 Ceded Territories in return for Protection, 227
 Defence Subsidy, 232
 Gaekwar, Deposition 1875, 71, 77
 Protection, Treaty 1805, 216
 Barwani, Defence Subsidies, 231
 Basmahr, Tribute payable by, 234
 Beja, Tribute in lieu of Forced Labour, 236
 Bell, Major Evans, 150 *note*
 Benares :
 Re-establishment of State, 94
 Tribute payable by, 235
 Bengal, Warren Hastings' Administration, 5
 Bengal Political Letter 1822, 130
 Bentinck, Lord William, 42, 44, 45, 46
 Bhaggi, Tribute in lieu of Forced Labour, 236
 Bharatpur :
 Plunder of, 41
 Protection, Treaty 1805, 217
 Salt Manufacture, 200, 201
 Bhavnagar, Tribute payable by, 234
 Bhawalpur, Installation of Nawab, Lord Curzon's Speech, 91
 Bhopal :
 Defence Liabilities and Tributes, 217, 231, 237
 Subordinate Co-operation, Bhopal Case 1863, 108
 Bhor, Tributes payable by, 234
 Bikaner :
 Protection, Treaty 1818, 217
 Troops, Supply in time of War, 237
 Brockman, Colonel, 201
 Bundelkhand, Defence Liabilities, 233, 234
 Bundi, Defence Liabilities, 217, 233
 Bussy, 4, 13
 Calliaud, John, 4
 Cambay, Tribute payable by, 234
 Campion, Colonel, 9
 Canning, Lord, 55, 58, 70, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 150 *note*
 Carnatic :
 East India Company's Treaties, 4
 Wellesley's Annexation, 23
 Cavendish, Hon. Mr., 45
 Central Provinces "Feudatory" States :
 Guarantee of Protection, 224
 Tribute payable by, 235
 Chamba, Tribute payable by, 235
 Chamber of Princes, Inauguration, 95 *et seq.*
 Charas Duty, 195
 Chelmsford, Lord, 95
 Chivalry, Orders of, 101
 Cis-Sutlej States, Guarantees of Protection, 224
 Clive, Lord, 6, 8, 10

- Close, Major, 44
- Cochin :
 Alliance, Treaty 1791, 18
 Defence Subsidy, 232
 Protection, Treaty 1809, 217
 Coinage, *see* Currency.
- Combermere, Lord, 42
- Communications Services, 174
- Cooch Behar :
 Treaty 1773, 8
 Tribute payable by, 235
- Co-ordination of Powers, 99
- Coorg :
 Intervention, and War with, 46
 Treaty of Alliance 1790, 18
- Cornwallis, Lord, 16, 17, 18, 21, 27, 39, 47
- Cowen, Robert, 3
- Crown, Assumption of Government, 55, 56 *et seq.*
- Currency :
 Coinage Revenue 1924-29, 209
 Coinage Rights of Indian Princes, 205
 Exchange Fluctuations, 73, 83, 207
 Gold Standard Reserve, 206
 Government Currency, and Mint Services, 205 *et seq.*
 Paper Currency Revenue 1924-29, 208, 209
 Rupee, Sterling Value fixed, 88
 Silver Depreciation, 83, 88, 206
- Curzon, Lord, 90, 91, 95, 97
- Sovereignty of Crown, Insistence upon, 91
- Customs :
 Revenue, 183 *et seq.*
 Sea Customs, 213, 214
 States Contribution to, Tables, 191
 Yield of, 1926-27, Table, 190
- Cutch :
 Defence Liabilities, 232, 238
 Protection, Treaty 1819, 220
- Dalhousie, Lord, 31, 35, 46, 51, 58, 102, 103, 114
- Non-intervention and Annexation Policy, 52 *et seq.*, 56
- Daly, Sir H., 77
- Datia, Defence Liabilities, 217, 238
- Debt, Interest on Government Debts, 170 *et seq.*
- Defence and Armed Forces, Cost of, 157
- Defence Liabilities of Indian States, 145 *et seq.*
- Dewas :
 Defence Subsidies, 231
 Protection Treaties 1818 and 1888, 155, 217
- Dhami, Tribute in lieu of Forced Labour, 236
- Dhar, Defence Liabilities, 217, 230, 231
- Dharampur, Tribute payable by, 234
- Dholpur :
 Alliance, Treaty 1779, 11
 Protection, Treaty 1806, 218
- Dhrangadhara, Tribute payable by, 234
- Dickinson, John, 150 *note*
- Dinkar Rao, 49
- Disraeli, 73
- Diwani, grant of, 5
- Dufferin, Lord, 84, 85, 86
- Dungarpur, Defence Liabilities, 233, 237
- Dupleix, 13
- Durand, Sir Henry, 58
- East India Company :
 Alliances with Native States 1805, 29
 Committee, Report 1812, 34
 Diwani, Grant of, 5
 Government, Transfer to Crown, 55
 Trading Monopoly Removal, 40
 Treaties, 3 *et seq.*
- Economic Relationships, 135 *et seq.*
- Edward VII :
 Proclamation by, 100
 Visit to India as Prince of Wales, 71
- Elgin, Lord, 58, 90
- Ellenborough, Lord, 19, 49, 51, 114
- Elliot, Alexander, 10
- "Empress of India," Assumption of Title, 73, 102, 105
- Exchange, *see* Currency.
- Excise Revenue, 192 *et seq.*
- "Feudatory" Relationship, 72, 73, 100 *et seq.*, 113 *et seq.*
- Fiscal Relationships, 135 *et seq.*
- France, Operations in India, 1793-98, 19, 20
- Fraser, General, 52
- Gaekwar, Guarantee of Protection, 222, 227
See Baroda.
- Gladstone, 84
- Governor-General of India, 43
- Great Mughal, British Crown's Assumption of Powers of, 73, 82, 102, 120, 121
- Gwalior :
 Alliance, Treaty 1781, 11

- Gwalior (*cont.*):
 Ceded Territories, Defence Payments, 225
 East India Co.'s Relations with, 1833-34, 44, 45, 48, 49
 Protection, Treaty 1804, 218
 Tribute payable by assigned States, 236
- Halifax, Lord, 56, 68, 84
 Hamilton, Sir Robert, 53
 Hardings, Lord, 50, 95
 Hartington, Lord, 73, 76
 Hastings, Marquess of, 33, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 102, 105, 106, 107, 114
 Non-intervention Policy, 38
 Hastings, Warren:
 Allahabad and Kora, Cession of, 8 *et seq.*
 Departure from India, 15, 16
 Dholpur and Gwalior Treaties, 1779-81, 11
 Early Administration, 3
 Maratha War, 1776-82, 11
 Nawab of Oudh, Hastings' Treatment of, 14
 Hindus, Tribute payable by, 234
 Holland, Sir Robert, 96
 Hyder Ali, 7, 11, 18
 Hyderabad:
 Alliance, Treaty 1798, 21
 Ceded Territory in return for Protection, 228 *et seq.*
 East India Co.'s Relations with, 4, 21, 218, 228
 Mornington, Lord, Letter to Resident, 1799, 122
 Protection, Treaty 1800, 218
 See Nizam.
- Imperial Service Troops, instituted, 85, 87
 Income Tax, Revenue from, 210 *et seq.*
 India Act, 1773, 15
 India Bills, 1783, 1784, 15
 Indian Princes:
 Chamber of, Inauguration, 93 *et seq.*
 Education Policy of Lord Mayo, 66
 Permission to leave India, 92
 Rights under Proclamation 1858, 56, 57
 Royal Titles Bill, Effect of, 73
 Viceregal Visits to, 85, 88, 93
 See Native States.
 Indian States Committee, 98
 Indore:
 Defence Payments, 230
 Neutrality 1815, 45
 British Crown and Indian States
- Indore (*cont.*):
 Protection, Treaty 1818, 149 *note*, 219, 226
 Industrial Reorganisation, 137 *et seq.*
 Infanticide, Abolition, 117
 Irrigation Schemes, 181
- Jaipur:
 Defence Liabilities and Tributes, 219, 233, 237
 Metcalfe, Sir C., Document 1835, 128, 129
 Subordinate Co-operation, 106
 Jaisalmer, Treaty 1818, 219
 Jamkhandi, Defence Subsidies, 232
 Jammu and Kashmir, Defence Liabilities, 219, 238
 Jangira, East India Co.'s Treaty with 1733, 9
 Jaora, Defence Subsidies, 231
 Jath, Defence Liabilities, 232, 234
 Jevons, Stanley, 183 *note*
 Jhabua, Defence Liabilities, 231
 Jhalawar, Defence Liabilities and Tributes, 219, 233, 237
 Jind, Grant of New Territory 1847, 51
 Jind and Nabha, Troops and Grain Supply, 238
 Jodhpur, Defence Liabilities, 219, 231
 Joshi, Wadia, 139 *note*
 Jubbal:
 Defence Liabilities, 234
 War Service, 238
 Junagarrh, Tribute payable by, 234
- Kahlia, War Service, 238
 Kalat, Treaty 1876, 219
 Kaputhala, Tribute payable by, 234
 Karauli, Defence Liabilities, 219, 237
 Kashmir:
 British Resident appointed 1885, 85
 Customs Treaty, 185, 186
 Defence Liabilities, 219, 238
 Excise Duties, Exemption, 192
 Russian Intrigues, Maharaja accused 1888, 85
 Trade Route, Treaty 1870, 85
 Kathaiwar, Walker Settlement, 1807-8, 223
 Khaipur, Treaty 1838, 219
 Kinnaird, Douglas, 40
 Kirkpatrick, Major, 19
 Kishengarrh, Defence Liabilities, 220, 237
 Kolhapur, Defence Liabilities, 220, 227
 Kotah:
 Defence Subsidies, 231

- Kotah (*cont.*):
 Protection, Treaty 1817, 220
 Tribute payable by, 233
 Troops, Supply in time of War, 237
 War Services, 238
 Kothar, Tribute in lieu of Forced Labour, 236
 Kumharsain, Tribute in lieu of Forced Labour, 236
 Kunhiar, Defence Liabilities, 236, 238
 Kurundwad, Defence Subsidy, 232
- Laing, Samuel, 59
 Lake, Lord, 27, 47
 Lansdowne, Lord, 86, 87, 88, 90
 Lawa, Tribute payable by, 233
 Lawrence, Lord, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 67, 101
 Lee-Warner, W., 90, 113, 116 *note*, 121, 153, 156
 Liquor, Sale at Railway Stations, 196
 Lyall, Sir A., 11, 13
 Lytton, Lord, 72, 73, 74
 Indian Princes, Recognition of Nobility by, 74, 75, 101
- Macpherson, Sir John, 15
 Madhava Rao, Sir T., 49, 65
 Mahi Kantha States, Defence Liabilities, 223, 234
 Mailog, Tribute in lieu of Forced Labour, 236
 Malcolm, Sir John, 29, 37, 100
 Malhar Rao, Deposition of, 71
 Mandi, Tribute payable by, 234
 Mangal, Tribute in lieu of Forced Labour, 236
- Manipur:
 Defence Liabilities, 222, 235
 Rebellion, 89
- Maratha Confederation:
 Disappearance of, 36
 French Alliance 1798, 20
 Raids, 3 *et seq.*
 Travancore Attack, 18
 Wellesley's Operations 1799, 25 *et seq.*
- Maratha War 1776-82, 11
 Mayo, Lord, 65, 66, 102, 104, 197
 Paramountcy Policy, 63 *et seq.*
- Menon of Travancore, 49
 Metcalfe, Sir Charles, 28, 29, 33 *note*, 38, 41, 43, 47, 106, 128
 Minto, Lord, 28, 29, 35, 92, 93
 Co-operative Policy, 93
 Mints, *see* Currency.
 Miraj, Defence Subsidies, 232
- Moira, Lord, *see* Hastings, Marquess of.
 Montagu-Chelmsford Report, 95
 Morley, Lord, 93
 Mornington, Lord, *see* Wellesley.
 Motor Spirit, Revenue from, 193
 Mudhol, Defence Subsidy, 232
 Muir, Ramsay, 51
 Munro, Sir Thomas, 125
 Mutiny, 54, 55
- Mysore:
 Annexation of Territory 1792, 18
 British Administration 1833, 43, 81
 Defence Liabilities, 78, 81, 220, 232
 Instrument of Transfer 1881, 220
 Payments under Treaty 1799, 81
 Regency 1868, 60, 80
 Restoration to Independence 1881, 76 *et seq.*
 Wellesley's Operations 1799, 22 *et seq.*
- Nabha Confiscated Territory, Subsidy, 228
 Napier of Magdala, Lord, 68
 Nasir ud den Shah, 48
 Nationalist Movement, 94
- Native States:
 Annexations, 51
 Currency Questions, *see* Currency.
 Customs Revenue Contributions, 143, 183 *et seq.*, 191
 Defence Liabilities, 145 *et seq.*, 165 *et seq.*
 Distrust of, under Lord Mayo, 68, 69
 Economic and Fiscal Relationships, 135 *et seq.*
 Excise Revenue, 192, 193
 "Feudatory" Relationship, 72, 73, 100 *et seq.*, 113 *et seq.*
 Government Services to, 145 *et seq.*
 Income Tax Contributions, 210 *et seq.*
 Indian States Committee, 98
 Non-intervention Policy, 28, 35, 38, 39, 43, 52, 115, 128 *et seq.*
 Payments, Total, by, 213
 Political Relations with East India Co., 115
 Post Office Services, 177 *et seq.*
 Pre-Mutiny Period Policy, 114
 "Prescriptive Rights" Claim, 117
 Public Works Services, 181 *et seq.*
 Railways, Provision and Upkeep, 174 *et seq.*

- Native States (*cont.*):
 Railways, Share in Profits, 201
at seq.
 Rights, Adjustment, 98
 Roads, Provision and Upkeep,
 176, 177
 Social Reforms by "consent,"
 117
 "Subordinate Co-operation"
 Conditions, 105 *at seq.*
 Subsidiary Alliances 1806-13, 34
 Subsidiary Forces, Document
 1817, 32, 125
 Tributes payable, List of, 233
at seq.
 Troops, Supply in time of War,
 237 *at seq.*
 "Usage" Principles—the Post-
 Mutiny conception, 117
See also names of States.
 Nawannagar, Tribute payable by, 234
 Nepal, War with, 1814-16, 36
 Nizam Afzal-ud-Daula, 5, 7, 17, 18,
 19, 21, 22, 25, 26, 30, 32, 155,
 228
 Mornington, Lord, Letter to Suc-
 cessor 1799, 122
See Hyderabad.
 Non-intervention Policy, 28, 35, 38,
 39, 43, 52, 115, 128 *at seq.*
 Norman, Sir Henry, 90
 Northbrook, Lord, 68, 70, 71, 72
 Northcote, Sir Stafford, 76
 Ochterlony, Sir David, 41
 O'Dwyer, Sir Michael, 200
 Opium Revenue, 193
 Orcha, Protection, Treaty 1812,
 220
 Orissa States, Defence Liabilities,
 222, 235
 Oudh:
 Allahabad and Kora, Cession to,
 8, 9
 Buffer State under Ring-fence
 System, 9, 10
 East India Co.'s Treaties with, 4,
 5, 48
 Subsidiary Forces, Expenses of, 32
 Wellesley's Operations 1799, 23
at seq.
 Palanpur Agreement 1813, 223
 Palmer & Co., Hyderabad, 40, 43
 Paramountcy:
 Defence in the Paramountcy
 Agreement, 147
 Drawbacks of Protection by Para-
 mount Power, 119
 East India Company's Claim, 120
 Paramountcy (*cont.*):
 Financial Obligations under
 Agreement, 137 *at seq.*, 151
at seq.
 Theory of, 63, 82, 100 *at seq.*, 102
 Partabgarh, Protection, Treaty
 1818, 220
 Patiala:
 Railway Extension, Refusal, 97,
 108
 Troops and Grain Supply in time
 of War, 238
 Peahwa, Protection Guarantee, 222,
 Phaltan, Defence Subsidy, 232
 Pindari War 1814-17, 36
 Police Forces, 172
 Political Department, Cost and
 Contributions to, 172
 Political Officers, Status and Duties,
 110 *at seq.*
 Porbandar, Tributes payable by, 234
 Post Office Services, 177 *at seq.*
 Proclamation of Queen Victoria
 1858, 55, 56
 Protection Guarantee, List of
 States possessing, 216 *at seq.*
 Public Debt, Increase under Lord
 Amherst, 42
 Public Works Services, 181 *at seq.*
 Punjab Hill States, Protection
 Guarantee, 224
 Railways:
 Construction, Economic Effect
 of, 65 *at seq.*
 Contribution to Revenue, 201
at seq.
 Financial Results 1925-27,
 Table, 203
 Liquor, Sale at Stations, 196
 Patiala Incident, 97, 108
 Provision and Upkeep, Finances
 for, 174 *at seq.*
 Rajkot, Tributes payable by, 234
 Rajputana States:
 Maladministration 1834, 48
 Paramountcy Policy, 64
 Treaties 1817-22, 36, 37
 Rampur Engagement 1794, 220
 Ranjit Singh, 29, 35
 Reading, Lord, 97, 98
 Regulating Act 1773, 5
 Residencies, "Easements," Abol-
 ition, 92, 109
 Rewa Kantha States, Defence
 Liabilities, 221, 223, 234
 Rhadampur Agreement 1820, 223
 Ripon, Marquis of, 76, 83
 Roads and Bridges, Provision and
 Upkeep, 176, 177

- Royal Titles Bill 1876, 73
 Rupee, Sterling Value fixed, 88
 Russia :
 Afghanistan, Russia's Policy
 1876, 72, 83
 Kashmir Intrigues 1888, 85
- Salar Jung, 49, 55, 65
 Salisbury, Lord, 74
 Salt :
 Bharatpur Manufacture, 200, 201
 Brine Wells, 200
 Monopoly Agreements, 75, 197
 Taxation and Revenue, 197 *et seq.*
 Samthar Defence Liabilities, 221, 238
 Sanad Guarantees of Protection, 222
 Sanads, Issue of, 1861, 56
 Sangli, Ceded Territories in lieu of
 Subsidy, 227
 Satara State, Creation of, 37
Sati, Prohibition of, 117
 Sawantwari :
 Defence Liabilities, 227
 East India Co.'s Treaty 1730, 3
 Treaty 1819, 221
 Scindia Daulat Rao, 13, 18, 21, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 36, 225, 226
 Sea Customs, 213, 214
 Secretary of State, Appointment of, 1858, 15
 Secundur Jah, Succession Document 1799, 122 *et seq.*
 Shahpura :
 British Protection in, 51
 Tribute payable by, 233
 Shore, Sir John, *see* Teignmouth, Lord.
 Sikh States :
 Treaty 1846, 51
 Wellesley's Policy, 17
 Silkim, no Guarantee of Protection, 221
 Silver, Depreciation, 83, 88, 206
 Sindh, Annexation, 1842, 49
 Sirnim, War Service, 238
 Sirohi, Defence Liabilities, 221, 234
 Southern Maratha States, Protection, Treaty 1817, 224
 Sovereign Independence, Recognition, 1805, 30
 Stewart, Col. Josiah, 44
 Stewart, General, 69
 Strachey, Sir John, 200
 Subordinate Co-operation, Meaning and Conditions of, 105 *et seq.*, 108
- Subsidiary Forces in Indian States, Document, 1817, 125
 Suket, Tribute payable by, 235
- Taroch :
 Tribute in lieu of Forced Labour, 236
 War Service, 238
 Tehri, Guarantee of Protection, 1820, 225
 Teignmouth, Lord, 18, 19, 21, 39
 Tipu, Operations against, 1790, 17
 Tonk :
 Defence Liabilities, 221
 Deposition of Nawab, 60, 101, 104
 Travancore :
 Alliance, Treaty 1795, 3, 18
 Defence Liabilities, 221, 232
 Inter-postal Convention, 110
 Tipu, Operations against, 17
 Tribute payable by, 235
- Treaties :
 East India Co.'s Settlements, 3 *et seq.*, 30
 Irrigation Schemes, 182
 Paramourncy as Violation of Treaty Rights, 105
 Personal Nature of Early Treaties, 118
 Protection, Guarantees, 216 *et seq.*
 Salt, 75, 197
 Subordinate Co-operation, Conditions in, 105, 106
 Tupper, Sir Charles, 71, 113
- Udaipur :
 Ceded Territories, Defence Payments, 223
 Treaty 1818, 105, 155, 222
 Tribute payable by, 233
 Troops, Supply in time of War, 237
- Vernacular Publications Act, 76
 Victoria :
 "Empress of India," 73, 102, 105
 Proclamation 1858, 55, 56
 See Great Mughal.
- Wellesley, Lord, 12, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 31, 50
 Recall of, 27
 Resident in Hyderabad, Letter to, 1799, 122
 Wood, Sir Charles, *see* Halifax, Lord.