CHAPTER IV

FOREIGN RELATIONS

Powers of the East India Company and its Governor-General in regard to foreign relations.

THE East India Company, at a very early period in its career, regarded the approaches to its possessions as a matter for its concern, and as a legitimate charge upon its purse. The Charter of Charles II, in 1661, empowered the Company to make peace or war with any prince not Christian. The Regulating Act of 1773 conferred upon the Governor-General of Bengal exclusive power as against the subordinate Presidencies, save in cases of imminent necessity, to declare war or conclude treaties with Indian princes or powers. It has been shown in the preceding chapter that, in 1793, Commissioner Eyre dismissed the bill in the Chancery proceedings between the Nawāb of Arcot and the Company, because it was 'a case of mutual treaty between persons acting in that instance as States independent of each other, and the circumstance that the East India Company are merely subjects with relation to this country has nothing to do with that.' The Charter Act of 1793 again recognized the Company's position in regard to foreign relations, although it reserved the powers of declaring war, or entering into treaties involving war or guarantee of possessions, for the Court of Directors or the Secret Committee, except in certain specified cases; and the Act of 1813 added the following reservation: 'provided that nothing in this Act contained shall extend, or be construed to extend, to prejudice or affect the undoubted sovereignty of the Crown of Great Britain and Ireland in and over the said territorial acquisitions [of the Company].' The constitutional and legal position of the Company created by these several enactments is described by Wheaton as not equivalent to that of a state, 'even whilst it exercised the sovereign powers of war and peace without the direct control of the Crown, and still less can it be so considered since it has been subjected to that control. Those powers are exercised by the East India Company in subordination to the supreme power of the British Empire, the external sovereignty of which is represented by the Company towards the Native

princes and people, whilst the British Government itself represents the Company towards other foreign sovereigns and states.'

Occasional overlapping of the spheres of Indian and Imperial diplomacy in the days of the Company.

While the means of rapid communication were wanting between Calcutta and Bombay, and between India and London, considerable confusion was apt to arise in fields of diplomacy simultaneously occupied by different authorities distant from each other. The most conspicuous instance of this confusion was afforded by the dispatch to Teherān of Sir Harford Jones as His Majesty's Envoy sent, with the sanction of the Court of Directors, by the Home Government, and the commission entrusted to Sir John Malcolm by the Governor-General, Lord Minto. On the arrival of Sir Harford Jones at Bombay, in 1808, he was ordered by the Governor-General to remain there and await the result of the negotiations entrusted to the agent of the Government of India. Sir John Malcolm's reports soon indicated the failure of his efforts, and Sir Harford Jones was then allowed to proceed to Teherān. He had attained some measure of success when the Governor-General, having meanwhile conferred with Malcolm, decided upon the dispatch of a military expedition. Sir Harford was thereupon ordered to return to India, and his public character was disavowed by the Governor-General. On the other hand, orders sent from London required him to stay; and since he had, in March, 1809, concluded a preliminary treaty with the Shāh, he remained at Teherān awaiting further instructions. The Indian authorities formally protested against the transfer of diplomatic relations with Persia from Calcutta to London and, to support their claim, again dispatched Sir John Malcolm to Teherān; but he was compelled to leave Persia after a few weeks on the arrival of Sir Gore Ouseley, the King's fresh representative, by whom a definitive treaty was concluded in March, 1812. Even at a much later date, during the Crimean War, some confusion was threatened by the communication of orders from England to the Government of Bombay without reference to the Governor-General. On that occasion Colonel Rawlinson, the Political Agent in Turkish Arabia, made proposals for the dispatch of troops, and the supply of funds, from Bombay in a letter addressed to Lord Clarendon; and the Court of Directors, having received suggestions on the same subject from the Government of Bombay, issued direct orders to that Presidency. The Marquis of Dalhousie protested against this procedure, observing that 'operations in the Persian Gulf will affect not Bombay only, but the whole of India.'

Modifications consequent on the direct government of India by the Crown.

The introduction of the telegraph system into India, and the work of territorial consolidation completed by Lord Dalhousie, removed the necessity which had existed under different conditions for giving to the local authorities in Western India powers in the distant field of diplomacy which are no longer exercised by them. Similarly, when the Crown assumed the direct government of India, some of the extensive powers which had devolved upon the Company naturally passed into the hands of the Imperial authorities, and the statute 21 & 22 Vict., cap. 106, sec. 67, declared that all treaties made by the Company should be binding upon Her Majesty. Some portions of the former foreign relations of India have, in consequence, been transferred to the Foreign Office of the Imperial Government, others to the Colonial Office, while in certain fields of activity, as in Persia, officers representing the interests of India still work side by side with the agents of Imperial control. In India itself the Local Governments have practically ceased to be concerned with the external affairs of India; and where, as at Aden, the Government of Bombay still exercises authority beyond the seas, it is under the supervision and control of the Governor-General-in-Council.

Spheres of the Company's authority outside India.

So long as the Company largely managed its own affairs, the sphere of its foreign relations was therefore more extensive than that which now falls to the Government of India. When the Dutch and the British fell out in India, their contests were not confined to the soil of Bengal or Madras. Thus the Madras Government concluded, in 1795, a treaty of alliance with the king of Kandy, and in the following year assumed the government of the Dutch settlements in Ceylon. Kandy was annexed in 1815, and the sovereignty over the whole island was then vested in the Crown. The Company took possession of St. Helena in 1658, but the Dutch recovered it in 1671. Upon the restoration of British authority in 1673, the king regranted the island to the Company as lords proprietors, subject to allegiance to His Majesty, and the Court of Directors appointed the Governor and Council and administered the possession until 1834. Lord Wellesley's projects against Mauritius and Batavia, and his dispatch of an Indian force under General Baird to Cairo in 1800, afford other instances of the wide conception entertained by the Governors-General of Indian responsibilities and foreign interests. The Straits Settlements were under the Company's rule, and were transferred to the Colonial Office as recently as 1867. Penang, afterwards called Prince of Wales Island, in the Straits of Malacca, was acquired

by treaty with the king of Khedah and was taken possession of, in 1786, under the authority of the Bengal Government. There, too, the administration was entrusted to a Governor-in-Council. Lord Hastings sent Sir Stamford Raffles in 1819 to acquire Singapore, and this led to negotiations with the Dutch, which were conducted at home and concluded by a treaty in 1824. Under this treaty the British withdrew from Sumatra, and the Company ceded Bencoolen and its dependencies to the Dutch, who on their part transferred to the British all their possessions in India, including Chinsura and their factories at Balasore and Dacca, and the settlement of Malacca, with undisputed possession of Singapore. In 1825 the Court of Directors united their three settlements at Prince of Wales Island, Singapore, and Malacca under a Governor-in-Council, subject to the Supreme Government at Calcutta. This part of the Company's administration opened the way to several engagements with the neighbouring chiefs. While the field of foreign relations was thus extended in the east, the Company was not less active on the coasts of Arabia and the Persian Gulf. Zanzibar was in direct relations with the Government of Bombay until 1872, when its affairs were transferred to the Government of India, from which they passed, in 1883, into the hands of the Imperial Government. On the east coast of Africa the authorities at Bombay concluded a treaty in 1827, at Berbera, with the Somāli Habar Awal tribe, and with Zeila and Tajūra in 1840. The charge of the Somāli coast was in 1898 transferred to the Foreign Office.

Present responsibilities of the Indian Government outside India.

The settlements of Aden and Pêrim.

At the present time the recognized and direct responsibilities of the Indian Government outside India are limited to Arabia, with the fortress at Aden and the adjoining protectorate; the islands of Perim and Sokotra, and the Kuria Muria islands; the Persian Gulf and parts of Persia; Afghānistān and Tibet; and, to a certain extent, China and Siam. Aden, whose internal affairs are under the administration of the Government of Bombay, is the most important centre of Indian influence on the coast of Southern Arabia. Perim, an island in the narrow strait that connects the Red Sea with the Indian Ocean, was occupied in 1799 by a force sent from Bombay. The entire absence of fresh water had not been anticipated or provided for; and, after much suffering and loss of life, the garrison was withdrawn to Aden as soon as naval operations in the Mediterranean had removed the danger of a French expedition. In 1854 a French engineer visited and surveyed the island, letting it be known that he had recommended his

Government to occupy it. This led to a British officer being dispatched from Aden to resume possession of it (1857), and it has since remained an integral part of the territories of British India. Although unfortified, it is valuable as a coaling station and as a post of observation and report. Aden was secured between the first and final occupations of Perim. The Sultān of Lāhej, in whose territories the fortress was situated, had, as above stated, received the remnant of the detachment sent from Perim, and he then offered to grant the promontory as a permanent station. The offer was declined, but a commercial treaty was concluded with the Sultān. The crews of British vessels wrecked on the coast were at a subsequent date plundered and ill-treated; satisfaction having been refused, coercion was resorted to, and in January, 1839, Aden was taken. The British, once established on the rocky promontory, were of necessity brought into political relations with the chief of Lāhej, whose tribe, the Abdalis, exercised paramount influence over their neighbours. The maintenance of communications with the interior, in order to secure supplies and to promote commerce, led in course of time to direct and more efficacious engagements with the other tribes, who were thus gradually recognized as independent of the Abdalis. The Ottoman Sultān, whose dominion includes Yemen, then asserted his claim to the whole of Arabia. The British Government, on the other hand, held that the chiefs in the vicinity of Aden were independent, and informed the Porte that the relations of these chiefs with the authorities at Aden prevented the Government of India from viewing with indifference any attempt to alter their position. Formal communications were made in 1873, announcing that the British regarded the nine tribes of the Abdali, the Fadhli, the Akrabi, the Haushabi, the Alawi, the Amīrī, the Subaihi, the Yafai, and the Aulaki as included in the former notification. A Turkish force which had been sent to Lāhej was then withdrawn, and the Governor-General of Yemen was directed to abstain from any interference with these tribes. A joint Commission representing the British and Turkish Governments delimitated the frontier of the Aden Protectorate in 1903–4, and various treaties have been made with sub-sections of the nine tribes, which define their obligations to the Government of India and fix the annual stipends due to them. The safety of the trade-routes, the peace of the country, and the maintenance of friendly relations with the Aden authorities are the main object of these engagements.

The tribal territory adjoining Aden.

Sokotra. The island of Sokotra lies about 150 miles off Cape

Guardafui. British relations were entered into with its Māhri chief in 1834, when he agreed to permit a coal depôt to be established there. The subsequent occupation of Aden rendered this concession of no value; but the advantage of the island as a refuge for shipwrecked crews, or as a station for a lighthouse, led to the continuance of close and friendly relations with its rulers. In 1886 a formal protectorate was established over the Sultān, who undertook to enter into no arrangements with any foreign powers except with the sanction of the British Government.

The Arab coast from Bāb el Mandeb to Maskat.

Along the Arab coast, or Hadramaut, extending from Shaik Sayad in the Straits of Bāb el Mandeb to the limits of Maskat at Rās Sair, every maritime tribe has been brought under the protection of the British Government. With some of them relations had been established at an earlier date; but in 1890 the Governor-General ratified a complete set of engagements with the Shaikh of Irka, and with the Atiffi, Barhemi, Akrabi, Fadhli, Lower Aulaki, Duyabi, Kayeti, Wahidi, and Māhri tribes, by which these bound themselves to enter into no correspondence or treaties with any foreign nation or power except with the sanction of the British Government, and to give immediate notice of any attempt to interfere with their country and its dependencies.

From Rās Sair onwards the coast line begins to lie within the sphere of influence, or the direct dominion, of the Sultān or Imām of Maskat, between whom and the Indian Government close relations have long existed. In 1798 the Company entered into an agreement with the Sultān to exclude the French and the Dutch from settling either in Maskat or Gombroon (Bandar Abbās). In the next century the British co-operated with the Sultān in the suppression of piracy, secured his assistance for the abolition of slavery, and entered into a commercial treaty. They frequently intervened to protect the ruler, to settle the succession, and even to put down rebellion, and in 1862 they engaged reciprocally with the French Government to respect the independence of the Sultān. When Zanzibar was severed from Maskat in 1861, they used their good offices to fix the annual subsidy to be paid by the former to the latter, and made arrangements to ensure its regular payment. The Sultān on his part has granted consular jurisdiction to the British Agent, and has rendered help in the suppression of the traffic in arms with the Indian and Persian coast. About 75 per cent. of the total value of the foreign trade of Maskat is with India.

The 'Trucial' Chiefs.

From Khor Kalba to Dibba the Batineh coast forms part of the territory of the Shaikh of Shargah. The Shihūh tribe occupy the country from Dibba round the Musandam promontory to Rams, south of Tibba. From Rās-el-Kheima as far as and including Odeid the coast belongs to the 'Trucial' Chiefs[1]. At the beginning of the last century the acts of piracy committed by the Arab chiefs, and especially by those living on this coast, created a reign of terror in the Gulf. The East India Company was forced to take strong measures, and in 1819 it dispatched an expedition to bring these sea-robbers to subjection. A general treaty was then made with them for the suppression of slavery, for the definition of acts of piracy, and for securing to the Company's vessels rights of search and confiscation of slave vessels. Indian and British ships constantly patrolled the Gulf, and the naval and political authorities punished infractions of these engagements, until at last peace and order were established. On the coast the several chiefs were left to settle their own disputes in their own way; but their hostilities at sea were restricted, and finally altogether forbidden by the establishment, in 1853, of a lasting and general peace. The chiefs of Abu Dhābi, Dabai, Shargah, Ajman, Umm-ul-Kawain, and Rās-el-Kheima agreed to refer their quarrels to the arbitration of the British Government, to whom was entrusted the maintenance of the peace of the Gulf and the power of punishing any infraction of it. Measures were also taken for the protection of the British lines of telegraph, one of which has lately been extended to Maskat. Although the chiefs are free to manage their own affairs on land, including the succession to the chiefship, they at times seek the advice of the Resident in respect of such matters, or British confirmation of their title to succeed. In this way their relations with the Indian Government tend constantly to become more intimate.

Odeid and Koweit.

The portion of the Arab coast north of Odeid, on the El Katr promontory opposite Bahrein, is one of special interest to the Indian Government, which protects Bahrein and controls the pirate coast. Odeid itself belongs to the chief of Abu Dhābi, who has already been mentioned as one of those in treaty relations with the Government of India. At the town of El Bidaa a small Turkish garrison has been established since 1872; but this occupation has not been recognized as bringing El Katr within Ottoman jurisdiction, and does not preclude

[1] The name is derived from the truce, now a lasting peace, which prevents hostilities at sea between these chiefs: see below.

such action, whether at El Bidaa or at other places on the El Katr coast, as may be necessary to prevent, or punish, disturbance of the maritime peace. From Katīf town to Koweit Ottoman rule is established and recognized. The Shaikh of Koweit is under treaty obligations with the Government of India in respect of that port (which is visited by a Political Agent) and its neighbourhood. Beyond those limits the sovereignty of the Ottoman Government extends along the coast to Basra.

Turkish Arabia.

The paramount interests of the Indian Government in the peace and commerce of the Persian Gulf, its protectorate over Bahrein, and its relations with the Trucial Chiefs on the pirate coast give rise to intercourse with the Turkish authorities in Arabia. The Government of India is also under special obligation to protect the stream of Muhammadan pilgrims who resort to the sacred places at Mecca and Kerbela, and to administer the fund, created by a treaty of 1825 with the king of Oudh, from which annual payments of Rs. 1,20,000 are made to the high priest and the *mujtahids* residing at the Shiah shrines of Kerbela and Nejef. Indian interests at these places are watched over by a Political Resident in Turkish Arabia, who is also Consul-General at Baghdād; by a vice-consul at Kerbela; and by officers stationed at Jedda, Hodeida, and the island of Kamaran.

Islands in the Persian Gulf.

Various islands in the Persian Gulf have in time past been occupied by the British. Kharak was thus held between 1838 and 1842, and the British Residency was transferred to it from Bushire. In 1856, when Persia captured Herāt, Kharak was again occupied, but was evacuated after the ratification of the Treaty of Paris, in 1857. A British station still remains at Bassidore, on the island of Kishm, although the troops which occupied it have, for the present, been withdrawn. But the most important island in the Gulf is Bahrein, which has passed under several dominions or suzerainties. In 1622 the Portuguese, who had previously acquired possession of it, were expelled by the Persians. The Atabi tribe made themselves masters of the island in 1783, and in 1800 the Sultān of Maskat wrested it from them. On his expulsion a year after, the Wahābis held suzerainty over Bahrein until 1810, when the Atabis again established their authority. In the course of the operations undertaken by the Company against the pirate coast, to which reference has already been made, the British entered (in 1820) into an engagement with the Atabi rulers of Bahrein, with the object of preventing their abetment of piracy and of including them in the general scheme of maritime peace.

Bahrein.

On several occasions after the conclusion of that agreement the chief of Bahrein was protected against claims put forward by Egypt, Persia, and Turkey, who have each asserted sovereignty over the island, the British Government maintaining that the Shaikh was an independent prince in alliance with the Government of India. In pursuance of these relations, the British have interfered to punish breaches of the peace, to settle the succession, and to adjust differences between the chiefs of El Katr and Bahrein. In 1847 Shaikh Muhammad bin Khalīfa entered into a convention with the British Resident for the prevention of the African slave-trade in his ports; and in 1856 his successor further agreed to seize and deliver to British vessels of war slaves imported from any quarter, and to place an embargo upon vessels belonging to himself or his subjects that might have engaged in the trade. In 1861 the chief subscribed to a perpetual treaty of peace and friendship, for the advancement of trade and the security of all persons navigating or residing upon the coasts of the Persian Gulf. In 1880 Shaikh Isā bin Alī signed an agreement binding himself to enter into no negotiations or treaties with any other state, and to refuse permission to any such power to establish diplomatic or consular agencies, or coaling depôts, in his territory, except with the consent of the British Government. More recently the chief has entered into an agreement for the restriction of the trade in arms and ammunition. The Government of India has an Agent stationed on the island, who, in common with the Agent at Maskat and other political officers residing in the Gulf, is subordinate to the Resident in the Persian Gulf, at Bushire.

Relations with Persia.

The conduct of political relations with Persia rests mainly with the Imperial Government. Nevertheless, there are certain matters connected with Persian territory which lie under the special control of the Government of India; and the general interest of India in Persia is evinced by the fact that the Royal Commission on the Administration of the Expenditure of India, in their final report of 1900, recommended that the charges of the legations and consulates in that country should be evenly divided between India and the United Kingdom. At one time (between 1823 and 1834) the Persian mission was wholly supported from Indian revenues, but in 1835 the East India Company fixed its annual contribution towards the cost of it at £12,000. When the Crown took over the government of India, the Imperial Government undertook to contribute a sum of £5,000 a year on account of the Teherān mission,

which was then transferred to the Indian Government. In the following year the mission was restored to the Foreign Office, under an arrangement by which Indian revenues bore $\frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{7}$ths of the cost up to a maximum of £12,000, and this arrangement continued, with successive reductions of the limiting maximum, until action was taken on the report of the Royal Commission referred to above. After 1859 the British Minister at Teherān, and the majority of the consular officers stationed in Persia, were drawn from the Imperial service, and continued until recently to be so recruited; while the Resident at Bushire, the Assistant Resident at Bandar Abbās, and the Director of Telegraphs in charge of the Makrān coast were directly subordinate to the Government of India. Under the latest arrangements the distribution of consular offices in Persia between the Indian and the Imperial (Levant) services assigns to the former two Consuls-General—one for Khorāsān and Seistān, stationed at Meshed, and another at Bushire for Fārs, Khuzistān, and the coasts and islands of the Gulf within the dominions of Persia; consuls in Seistān, and at Kermān and Kermānshāh; and vice-consuls at Bandar Abbās, Ahwāz (for Arabistān), and at Bām. The Imperial (Levant) service supplies the consular posts at Ispahān, Tabrīz, Shīrāz, Resht, Teherān, and Mohammerah. The political interests of the Indian Government in Persian affairs are therefore partly safeguarded by the Imperial Foreign Office, in which case correspondence passes through the Secretary of State for India, and partly by the Governor-General, in which case the Indian authorities keep the Foreign Office informed of their proceedings through the Secretary of State.

Persia, Afghānistān, and India.

Apart from the graver international questions which concern Persia's foreign relations with European powers, there are many others of less importance that directly and particularly affect the Government of India. Throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the rulers of Persia and Afghānistān lost no opportunity for asserting their claims to dominion over each other's territories, and the engagements which now compel them to keep the peace were for the most part concluded with the British Government, which still enforces their execution. In 1722 the Afghān, Mahmūd, occupied Ispahān with a victorious army. Within eight years the Afghāns were expelled by Nādir Shāh, who, in 1736, set aside the old Safavid dynasty of Persia. The tide of conquest now flowed eastward: Kābul and Kandahār were annexed to Persia, and the plains of the Punjab devastated. The assassination of Nādir Shāh in 1747

led to internal disorder, of which Ahmad Shāh Abdāli, founder of the Durrāni family, took advantage by seizing Khorāsān. The establishment of the present ruling dynasty, the Kājārs, under Aghā Muhammad in 1779, once more restored the integrity of the Persian kingdom. Fateh Alī Khān, who succeeded him in 1797, lost no time in entering into engagements with the Indian Government for the promotion of trade and a political alliance. About this period Persia was fully occupied by its differences with Russia, which ended in a long war, while the Afghān ruler, Zamān Shāh, was intent upon intervening in the affairs of Delhi, and taking part in the final struggle with the Marāthās for empire. It was, therefore, to the interest of the East India Company to secure the assistance of Persia in the event of an Afghān invasion of the Punjab. Peace between Russia and Persia was concluded in 1828, and the Kājār Shāh then commenced preparations for an attack upon Herāt. His designs were prosecuted with vigour by his grandson Muhammad Shāh, who commenced the siege of Herāt in November 1837, and was only thwarted by the brilliant defence of Eldred Pottinger and the occupation of the island of Kharak by a force dispatched from Bombay. Meanwhile events were occurring in India which induced the Government to take an active interest in Afghān affairs. The Sadozais and the Bārakzais were the two rival branches of the Durrāni family whom Ahmad Shāh had raised to power. The Sadozai ruler of Kābul, Shāh Shujā, expelled by the Bārakzai, Dost Muhammad, had taken refuge in the Punjab, where Ranjīt Singh had established a strong Sikh State. The British undertook to re-establish Shāh Shujā on the throne, and he was crowned at Kandahār in 1839. It is unnecessary here to review the disasters which followed the execution of this policy. When the British forces were at last withdrawn, Dost Muhammad was left free to pursue his own ambitions, and for a time Kandahār and Herāt continued to be ruled by Afghān governors independent of Kābul. The Sikh Wars seemed to offer to Dost Muhammad an opportunity for regaining the former possessions of Afghānistān in India, but the defeat of his contingent by Lord Gough at Gujrāt, in 1849, compelled him to abandon all hopes of success on that side.

The outbreak of the Crimean War introduced a new factor into the political problem. The Marquis of Dalhousie had concluded, in 1855, a treaty with Dost Muhammad which amounted to a restoration of friendly relations. At the same

time the territories known as Baluchistān were brought within the Indian protectorate, and a close contact was thus established between Persia and India, from the coast and the Gulf to the mountain peak of Koh-i-Malik-Siāh. Persia was given to understand that no violation of Afghān territory would be allowed, and that the independence of Herāt must be recognized. The position of affairs was then as follows: the ruler of Herāt professed to hold that fortress as a dependency of Persia; the British Government had warned the Shāh against encroachments upon the independence of that place or of Afghānistān; and Dost Muhammad was known to be resolved upon the annexation of Herāt. The Shāh determined to forestall his rival, and in October, 1856, took the city after a gallant resistance. A fresh agreement was now concluded by the Governor-General with the Afghān Amīr in 1856, and pressure was brought to bear upon Persia by the dispatch of an expeditionary force under Sir James Outram to the Persian Gulf and the occupation of Kharak. In 1857 the Shāh ordered the evacuation of Herāt, having bound himself, by the treaty signed at Paris in that year, to renounce all claims of sovereignty over Herāt and other parts of Afghānistān. In the event of differences arising, the Persian Government undertook to refer them for adjustment to the friendly offices of the British. By the terms of this agreement the British Government has, through the Indian authorities, repeatedly interfered in the interests of peace. Not only has it delimitated the frontiers of Baluchistān and Afghānistān with Persia at various periods, beginning with Sir F. Goldsmid's commission in 1872, and ending with Colonel McMahon's mission in 1903, but it has also composed differences arising out of that delimitation or from other causes. Thus in 1891 General MacLean fixed the boundary on the Kal-i-Kalla and erected pillars on the frontier at Hashtadān, while the troublesome question of canals and cultivation in Seistān has been the subject of arbitration on more than one occasion, the latest occurring in 1903–4. Besides these larger questions, India is concerned in the management and extension by sea and land of the telegraph system, in the protection of trade by the Nushki route, and in the control of the traffic in arms and ammunition. At other times joint operations have been undertaken to suppress brigandage on the borders of Baluchistān, and even to pursue parties that interfered with the construction of telegraphs. In these and other directions the Indian Foreign Department is frequently brought into relation with the Persian authorities.

Relations with Afghānistān.

The conduct of British relations with the Amīr of Afghānistān is an important part of the duties of the Foreign Department of the Indian Government. So far as these dealings arise out of the contact of Afghān and British territories, an account of them will be found in the volumes dealing with the History of India and the State of Afghānistān; and it will suffice here to give a brief sketch of the present situation, with special reference to the reciprocal and external relations of the two countries. On the recognition of Abdur Rahmān as Amīr in 1880, an assurance was given to him as to his position in the following terms: 'Your Highness has requested that the views and intentions of the British Government with regard to the position of the ruler at Kābul in relation to foreign powers should be placed on record for Your Highness's information. The Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council authorizes me to declare to you that, since the British Government admit no right of interference by foreign powers within Afghānistān, and since both Russia and Persia are pledged to abstain from all interference with the affairs of Afghānistān, it is plain that Your Highness can have no political relations with any foreign power except with the British Government. If any foreign power should attempt to interfere in Afghānistān, and if such interference should lead to unprovoked aggression on the dominions of Your Highness, in that event the British Government would be prepared to aid you, to such extent and in such manner as may appear to the British Government necessary, in repelling it; provided that Your Highness follows unreservedly the advice of the British Government in regard to your external relations.' Abdur Rahmān was, in 1883, granted a personal subsidy of twelve lakhs of rupees a year, to which 6 lakhs were added on the conclusion of the Durand Agreement in 1893, with a further addition of half a lakh in 1897 to meet the cost of sending an officer and a small escort to collect the revenue of Eastern Wākhān and attend to the administrative affairs of that tract. Two agreements with the Amīr were signed, on behalf of the Government of India, by Sir Mortimer Durand in November, 1893. The first recited the fact that, by the agreement concluded in 1873 between Russia and Great Britain, the river Oxus was to form the northern boundary of Afghānistān from Lake Victoria, or Sarikol, on the east, to the junction of the Kokcha with the Oxus, and that consequently the Amīr agreed to evacuate districts lying to the north of the Oxus and take possession of others lying to the south of that portion of the river. The second document described the

eastern and southern frontiers of the Amīr's dominions from Wākhān to the Persian border, and provided for a demarcation of the border in detail. It concluded with an expression of the desire of the British Government to see Afghānistān strong and independent, engaging that no objection should be raised to the purchase and importation by Abdur Rahmān of munitions of war, and undertaking, as already stated, 'to increase by the sum of 6 lakhs of rupees a year the sum of 12 lakhs now granted to His Highness.' Abdur Rahmān died in October, 1901, and was succeeded by his son Habībulla, with whom friendly communications were at once exchanged, and a formal treaty was concluded on March 21, 1905, continuing the agreements and arrangements that had existed between the British Government and his father.

Frontier delimitation.

It is sufficient here to give an outline of the steps taken to complete the delimitation of the frontier of Afghānistān. Negotiations with Russia for the purpose of defining the northern frontier had been commenced in 1869, during the reign of Amīr Sher Alī, and a common understanding was reached in 1873. But it was not until 1884 that General Sir Peter Lumsden, the Commissioner appointed by the British Government, reached Bāla Murghāb in order to commence the actual delimitation. After further delay and difficulty, arising out of the non-arrival of the Russian Commissioner and the collision at Panjdeh, the frontier between Zulfikār, on the Hari Rūd, to the meridian of Dukchi—a group of wells north of Andkhui and within 40 miles of the Oxus—was laid down, and a protocol on the subject was signed by the British and Russian Commissioners in September, 1886. In the course of the next few years, the line between Dukchi and the Oxus, which had meanwhile been settled at St. Petersburg in 1887, was demarcated, and various other details were settled; and finally the Pāmir Joint Commission in 1893–5 carried the boundary from Lake Victoria to Povalo Schveikovski on the Taghdumbāsh Pāmir, a little north of latitude 37° N. The entire length of the Afghān-Indian frontier has not yet been delimitated, but in the few tracts where pillars have not been erected a general understanding has been arrived at pending final settlement. On this and many other matters affecting the administration of the two neighbouring countries frequent correspondence takes place between Afghānistān and India. The Governor-General is represented at Kābul by an Indian Muhammadan agent, and the Amīr maintains an envoy at the head-quarters of the Government of India.

Kashgar.

Pursuing the line of India's frontiers on the north, and bearing in mind that Kashmīr, including Ladākh and its outlying dependencies, is under the direct supervision of the Resident in Jammu and Kashmīr, we find that a corner of the Russian dominions, and parts of the Chinese empire and Tibet, lie beyond the mountain border of India from the Pāmirs eastwards until the boundaries of Burma march with those of Yünnan in China. An assistant to the Resident in Kashmīr is stationed at Kashgar, in Eastern Turkistān, where for a time (1862–78) an independent Muhammadan dynasty established itself, with whose ruler, the Atalik Ghāzī Yakūb Khān, a commercial treaty was made in 1874. Kashgar is situated at the meeting of routes from the valley of the Oxus, from Samarkand, and from China and India; and since Yakūb Khān's death it has been re-conquered by China. Its commerce and trade, of which India formerly monopolized a large part, have lost much of their value owing to the disturbances which ensued during the rule of Yakūb Khān. Such traffic and intercourse with India as still survive fall under the political superintendence of the Indian Government.

Relations with Tibet.

The geographical and historic relations of India with Tibet must always create a community of interests between the two countries. Its capital, Lhāsa, is within 200 miles of the frontiers of Sikkim, and the extension of the Indian railway system to Darjeeling offers some facility for trade and commerce. In times past a close connexion existed between Tibet and the Native States of the Himālayas, and also with Cooch Behār in the plains. The State of Nepāl has, within a comparatively recent period, made wars and concluded treaties direct with the Tibetan Government, while the Government of India has settled the Tibet-Sikkim frontier and secured commercial concessions by agreement with the Chinese Government, under whose suzerainty Tibet is admitted to lie. But although Chinese officials resided at Lhāsa, and the people paid a nominal poll-tax to that empire, the dominant authorities of Tibet long consisted of the chief Buddhist ecclesiastics, at the head of whom was the Dalai Lāma, and local secular chiefs. On one point all these authorities, whether representing the empire of China, the Buddhist church, or the local chiefs, have been agreed, namely in the exclusion of foreign interference and European visitors. The country is known to be rich in gold and other minerals; but the fury of its winds, the height of its numerous passes, and the scantiness and poverty of its population help to maintain this exclusive policy. The

relations of the Indian Government with Tibet consequently involve special difficulties which have rather increased than decreased with time. In 1774 Warren Hastings, on receipt of a letter from the Tāshi Lāma at Shigatse, sent a mission which was well received at that place but was not allowed to visit Lhāsa. In 1783 a second mission was sent which brought back a promise from the Regent, addressed to the Tāshi Lāma, admitting any native traders who might be recommended by the Governor-General to trade at Shigatse, and promising them help in securing transport for their merchandise from the frontiers of Bhutān. In 1792 the Nepālese invaded Tibet, and were only driven out of Shigatse by the aid of the Chinese, who, believing that the Indian authorities had encouraged the Gurkhas, established a post at Phāri and forbade natives of Bengal to enter Tibet. So matters remained until, in 1873, fresh attempts were made to open up trade with the country, and a road was carried from India, through Sikkim, to the frontier at Jelep-La. In a convention concluded at Chefoo with China, in 1876, provision was made for the protection of any mission sent to Tibet. By a convention ratified in 1887 it was agreed that the contemplated mission should be abandoned; but the Chinese Government formally accepted the duty, 'after careful inquiry into the circumstances, to adopt measures to exhort and encourage the people with a view to the promotion and development of trade' with India. In the following year the Tibetans, without provocation, made a hostile advance to Lingtu, a place 12 miles inside the Sikkim frontier, and were expelled with heavy losses. Further negotiations followed, and in 1890 a convention was concluded between Great Britain and China, the latter power acting on behalf of Tibet also. In accordance with its terms regulations for trade were agreed upon by the British and Chinese Governments in 1893, by which a trade mart was to be opened at Yatung, where the right to post a British officer was conceded, and facilities for commerce in all goods, save tea and certain other articles, were to be granted to India. In 1895 delegates from India, China, and Tibet were appointed to demarcate the frontier, but the Tibetans declined to take part in the work and destroyed some of the pillars erected. Remonstrances addressed to the Dalai Lāma against these proceedings were unheeded, and in 1902 an officer was sent to exclude the Tibetans from grounds on the British side of the border which they had occupied. Blockhouses erected by them in violation of the frontier were destroyed, and an arrangement was made with China for

a settlement on the spot of the difficulties which had arisen. Colonel Younghusband, who had been appointed British Commissioner, proceeded, in July, 1903, to Khamba Jong, which had been arranged with the Chinese Government, with the consent of the Dalai Lāma, as the place for negotiations. The Tibetans, however, resisted the approach of this peaceful mission and prevented the Chinese delegate from joining Colonel Younghusband's camp. As their attitude became more hostile, and as it was undesirable to retain the mission in so exposed a point as Khamba Jong, it was withdrawn, but entered the Chumbi valley in December, 1903, when a further attempt was made to get into touch with the new Ambān (Chinese Resident) at Lhāsa, who was specially empowered to effect a settlement. This failed owing to the obstructive tactics of the Tibetans, and the mission advanced to Gyāntse in April, 1904, encountering some slight opposition *en route*. At Gyāntse the attitude of the Tibetans was at first friendly, but subsequently the mission was attacked. Reinforcements were sent up, and on their arrival Tibetan delegates put in an appearance. The Ambān was, however, still prevented by the Tibetans from joining the mission, and the delegates had no real power or intention to negotiate, while a large armed force of Tibetans held the *jong*, or fort, dominating Gyāntse and would not withdraw. The fort was therefore captured, and in July the mission advanced towards Lhāsa, as it was clear that only there would it be possible to get into direct touch with the Ambān and the Tibetan Government. It reached Lhāsa, after trifling opposition, in August, 1904, and in the following month a treaty was signed which settled the frontier and other questions. To this settlement China signified her adhesion on April 27, 1906.

With China.

With the Chinese authorities in Yünnan many questions of internal order, commercial intercourse, and mutual assistance must constantly arise, requiring a prompt settlement with the British officials in Burma. Conventions with China in 1894 and 1897, the latter being rendered necessary owing to the violation of the former by the Chinese cession to France of part of the State of Kiang-hung, have enabled the frontier to be traced with more or less detail from a point fixed in latitude 25° 35′ N. and longitude 98° 14′ E. The main result of the surveys undertaken between 1897 and 1900 was to demarcate the boundary as far as 21° 46′ N., with the exception of the part bordering on the Wa States from 23° 28′ to 22° 9′ N., where the hostility of the tribes and differences between the

Commissioners interposed for the time insuperable difficulties. As regards the border north of 25° 35′ N., the information available in 1894 was insufficient to enable a line to be traced on the map appended to the convention, and a settlement was therefore reserved. In 1898, a Chinese official having entered the territory in dispute with an armed force, intimation was made to the Tsungli Yamen that the exercise of Chinese authority on the west of the range of mountains forming the watershed between the N'maikha and the Salween rivers could not be tolerated. In 1904, after examination of the country, a formal communication was made to the Chinese Government to the effect that the watershed of all streams draining into the N'maikha from the east, and to the north of 25° 35′ N., was the natural boundary, and would be treated as the actual political boundary until a joint settlement was reached. In former days the East India Company bore the whole expense of diplomatic intercourse with China, but when its monopoly of trade with that country ceased in 1834, the Imperial Government paid two-thirds of the cost until 1875. Subsequently a fixed sum was paid by India, varying from £15,000 to £12,500 a year. The interests of India in China are not confined to the opium trade. Border questions are frequent, and the extension of the railway system in Burma lends importance to the state of communications and the facilities offered in Yünnan. A British Consul-General is stationed at Yünnan-fu, under the authority of the Imperial Government, and a consul resides at Tengyueh.

With Siam.

Although the French Protectorate over Tongking, established in 1883 and confirmed by the Chinese Government in 1885, has brought French influence to bear on Yünnan, and British engagements have recognized the position of France on the Mekong, the nature of the country on the eastern border of this part of Burma has not yet required the establishment of any special agency for the conduct of relations with the French possessions across the river. With Siam, on the other hand, the British have had long-continued relations. The acquisition of Prince of Wales Island in 1786 brought the Company into close connexion with Khedah and thus with Siam. The Siamese proved bad neighbours, gave no effect to commercial engagements made in 1826, and even occupied Khedah. After the first Burmese War Arakan and Tenasserim were added to the British dominion, and when Lord Dalhousie annexed Pegu it became necessary to settle the frontier and to enter into closer relations with the kingdom of Siam. In

1874, after prolonged discussion, a treaty was concluded for the prevention of heinous crime on the border and the development of peaceful commerce. It was also agreed that judges should be established in the Chiengmai Province for the peaceful adjustment of civil disputes between British and Siamese subjects. This arrangement did not work well, and in lieu of it provision was made, in 1884, for the establishment of a British consular officer at Chiengmai with adequate jurisdiction. By treaties concluded in 1883 and 1885 arrangements were made for granting passports to British subjects and for the extradition of criminals. In 1887 an Order in Council prescribed the registration of British subjects resident in Siam, and this was modified by a further Order, issued in 1889, which regulates the exercise of civil and criminal jurisdiction by consular courts. After the annexation of Upper Burma the Siamese claimed trans-Salween Karenni, and some other States to the east of the Salween, as part of the Province of Chiengmai. Finally a joint Commission, in 1892–3, settled the line of frontier, which is now clearly demarcated along the whole length from the Mekong down to Victoria Point. Great Britain and France have mutually determined to respect the integrity of the central districts of Siam in the Menam valley; and by a declaration signed in London in April, 1904, it was agreed that the influence of Great Britain should be recognized by France in the territory west of the basin of the Menam, including the Malay Peninsula and the adjacent islands. The maintenance of the influence thus recognized in the country that borders upon Burma is necessarily a concern of the Indian Foreign Department.

Pecuniary liabilities of the Indian Government outside India as determined in 1900.

A brief reference may here be made to the Report of the Royal Commission on the Administration of the Expenditure of India presented in 1900 to both Houses of Parliament, since it throws a side-light upon the special interests of India in the field of Imperial diplomacy. It was held that the United Kingdom should bear one-half of the military charges at Aden, and half the cost of the mission and consulates in Persia. It was eventually decided, as regards Persia, that India should contribute a sum of £6,000 per annum towards the cost of the establishments maintained there under the immediate orders of His Majesty's Government, and that all future charges incurred by common consent should be equally divisible between the two exchequers. Towards the expenditure on Aden a lump contribution of £100,000 a year is now made by the

Imperial Government, which also contributes towards the cost of special armaments. The contribution of India towards the China establishments mentioned above (£12,500) was to be open to revision after a term of years. While India pays half the subsidy for telegraphic communication with the Mauritius, and maintains the Basra-Baghdād mail service, Great Britain subsidizes the mail steamers on the Karūn river. In consideration of the stream of Indian pilgrims passing through Jedda to Mecca, a moiety of the cost of the Jedda consulate is borne by India, and small contributions are also made, in the interests of Indian emigrants, to the consular expenses in Réunion and Surinam. The maintenance by India of the consulate at Chiengmai is held to be justified by her direct and substantial interest in questions affecting Siam.

Foreign possessions in India.

Within India itself little difficulty arises in connexion with the possessions of France and Portugal. The former power engaged, by the Treaty of Paris in May, 1814, not to erect any fortifications in the establishments to be restored to her, and to maintain no greater number of troops than might be necessary for the purposes of police. By a second treaty, concluded in March, 1815, and a subsequent convention arrived at between the Governments of Madras and Pondicherry in May, 1818, the supply of salt, opium, and saltpetre to the French establishments in India was regulated. Under present arrangements the British authorities supply the salt required at Pondicherry for consumption at prime cost, the French giving up the right of local manufacture, while at Chandernagore an annual payment is made to the French authorities in lieu of a salt supply. A somewhat similar arrangement was made, in 1884, in regard to opium at the latter place. The limits of French jurisdiction in the neighbourhood of Chandernagore gave rise to some discussion, which was terminated by a convention in March, 1853. There are certain small plots scattered about India—as for instance at Jugdea in Tippera; at Cossimbazar and Berhampore, in Murshidābād District; at Patna and Dacca; at Masulipatam and Calicut; and at Surat—where the French formerly occupied factories or *loges*. While these factories lasted the French had jurisdiction over persons resident within them in respect of transactions originating therein. With the abandonment of the factories the jurisdictionary rights lapsed, and French jurisdiction is now confined within the limits of Chandernagore, Pondicherry, Kārikāl, Mahé, and Yaṅam. Between these establishments and British India extradition is arranged under the terms of Article IX of the Treaty of March,

1815, whereby a fugitive criminal is at once handed over on the demand of the proper authority.

The Indian possessions of Portugal are now limited to the territories of Goa, the small settlement of Diu off the coast of Junāgarh in Kāthiāwār, and Damān, which lies about 100 miles north of Bombay. The only questions to which these foreign possessions have given rise are of a fiscal character, concerning the administration of the salt and opium revenue, and in regard to extradition. By the Lisbon Treaty of December, 1878, a customs union was established between the Indian possessions of the two Crowns, and a tariff of duties was agreed upon; the exclusive privilege of manufacturing and selling salt was granted, under certain conditions, to the Government of British India; and arrangements were made with regard to opium. At the same time provision was made for extradition. This agreement was terminable after twelve years. On the expiration of that period it lapsed, and since then each country has maintained its fiscal independence, while a new extradition treaty has been discussed but has not yet been concluded. The port of Marmagao, opposite the town of Goa, is connected by rail with the system of railways in the Southern Marāthā country; and as at Pondicherry so also at Goa, a British consular officer is established for the purpose of ready communication and the safeguarding of British interests.

Foreign consular agents in India.

Independently of those political affairs with foreign powers which are dealt with at first hand by the Government of India, there are others in which the Foreign Office in London acts in concert with the Governor-General through the medium of the Secretary of State for India. Various European nations, the United States and some other American Republics, Liberia, Japan, Persia, and Siam are represented in India by consular officers whose head-quarters are established on the coast and whose functions are mainly commercial. Under the rule of the Company such officials were recognized by the Court of Directors according to the phrases and forms used in the following dispatch addressed to the Government of Bombay on August 2, 1843: 'At the request of His Majesty the King of the French, which has been communicated to us through the Queen's Government, we have consented to the recognition of M. —— as Vice-Consul for France at Bombay.' But the transfer of India to the Crown has led to a change of procedure. Only the Imperial Government is now addressed on such matters, and the Government of India can recognize no consular appointment requiring His Majesty's *exequatur* until

an intimation of the appointment is received from the Imperial Government. Where His Majesty's *exequatur* is not needed to an appointment made in India by consular officers of foreign powers under the standing regulations of their service, the Government of India can recognize the person so appointed. It is only necessary to add that Native States cannot receive foreign consular agents, and that the Government does not recognize consuls for places in the interior of British India or in the Native States.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sir Charles Aitchison.—*Treaties, Engagements, and Sanads relating to India and Neighbouring Countries* (Calcutta, 1893). Vols. x and xi. Published by authority of the Foreign Department of the Government of India.

Lord Curzon.—*Persia and the Persian Gulf Question* (1892).

Lord Curzon.—*The Pamirs and the Source of the Oxus* (1896).

V. Chirol.—*The Middle Eastern Question* (1903).

E. F. Knight.—*Where Three Empires Meet* (1893).

W. W. Rockhill.—*The Land of the Lamas* (1891).

J. G. D. Campbell.—*Siam in the Twentieth Century* (1902).

G. P. Badger.—*History of the Imams of Oman* (Hakluyt Society, 1870).

Sir T. D. Forsyth.—*Report of a Mission to Yarkand in* 1873 (Calcutta, 1875).

Colonel Biddulph.—*Tribes of the Hindu Kush* (Calcutta, 1880).